

Revenue (1899) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 900

DATED 3rd March 99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Communicating ^{to the Board of Rev} A-G's Order on B.F.

No 555 of 7.2.99 to the Bd. of Rev. and stating
that the A-G ^{he} does not treat the allowance
drawn by Sub. Inspectors in charge of circles
as acting allowance.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
G.O. C.A.O.							
S.O. No 270	279	292 19-4-99					

Government {1899} of Madras. REVENUE.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1899.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899:—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a *charge allowance* coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (i.e., a charge allowance under article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Exd. P. Seetharam.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

[SUBJECT.—*Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.*]

*Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and
Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.*

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Please see draft below.

V.K.R.
1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.
3-3-99.

[*Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.*]

*Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES
dated 12th December 1899.*

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in whatever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 *per mensem*. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Correspondence ensued with the object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—
(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and
(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an *acting* instead of a *charge* allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.
15-12-99.

To the Honourable Member.

G. S. FORBES.
15-12-99.

I don't understand why article 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under article 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Assistant Inspectors draw the charge allowance for the first thirty days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

A. T. A[RUNDEL.]
18-12-99.

To Secretary—

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the Honourable Member's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

T.P.K.
20-12-99.
V.K.R.
20-12-99.

To the Accountant-General u.o.

G.S.F.
21-12-99.

No. 133.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Charge allowance under article 115 is not allowed for the first thirty days in privilege leave arrangements as it does not come under the exceptions mentioned in article 123, Civil Service Regulations.

If there is a transfer of station, the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

T. HESKETH BIGGS.
23-12-99.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Secretary—

V.K.R.
8-1-00.

To the Honourable Member—

G.S.F.
9-1-00.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the Accountant-General says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

A.T.A.
10-1-00.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

T.P.K.
12-1-00.
V.K.R.
15-1-00.

Issue.

G.S.F.
16-1-00.

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, to the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, dated 16th January 1900.

"In reply to your Demi-official dated 12th December last, regarding charge allowance of Assistant Inspectors, I am to enclose a copy of the Accountant-General's un-official note No. 138, dated 23rd December 1899 and to state that the Government does not consider it advisable to reopen the question."

[Issued as Demi-Official No. 11, Revenue, dated 16th January 1900.]

Through the Accountant-General Madras.

Revenue (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 1299

Recd. B. P. (S.D.) No. 555 of 7.2.99.
A.G.'s Eudt. No. 670 of 20.2.99.

G.O. mis No. 900 of 3rd March '99

The A.G.'s Eudt. will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

The A.G. does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

From The Secretary to the Commissioner of Salt, Abkari and Separate Revenue, Madras.

Order

Mis. No. 555

To

The Board of Revenue (S.D.)

Des. 6-3-99
Notes enclosed with G.O. 400 of 3.3.99
Subject: Charge allowance (G.O. 143 of 10.1.99)

Dated 7th February 1899.

Received } 21

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

Note. To Secy

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O. No. 143 of 10.1.99. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the 'charge allowance' is treated as 'acting allowance'. The A.G. previously replied that it was not (vide page 2 of the notes). It is being treated as 'charge allowance' and is liable, under Art. 120 of the C.S.D., to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy. Please see draft thereof.

Requesting Government, with remarks, to instruct the Accountant-General not to disallow the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of Circles during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements.

SUBJECT.

Purs
Sent the D.O. of 14/2/99
under a letter of 14/2/99

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
mis	143	Rev	10.1.99
4 papers put up with it			

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O. C.No.	No.	Department.	Date.
D.O. No. 270999			

PRICE 1 pie. $\frac{2,000}{1-0-08}$



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Separate Revenue).

Dated 7th February

189 9.

Mis. No. 555.

Read Government Order, No.143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution:-

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of Circles. The Accountant-General having held that Exchange Compensation Allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs.25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of Circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in Article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the

2
definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was ~~due~~ to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that ~~retrospective~~ effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of Circles was a charge allowance coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in Article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that ~~retrospective~~ effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it was an acting allowance, but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of Circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in para 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states, that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system". The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance but, ^{would} very respectfully ask

No. He treats it
as charge allowance
(vide A-4's
remarks on page 29
of the notes under G.O.
143
10-1-99

G.O. 143
10.1.99

whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege ^{leave} arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898 it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "Charge allowance coming under the definition of Salary" (i.e. a Charge allowance under Article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of Article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that Article 120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under Article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under Article 115 (vide Article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True extract.)

G. S. S. S.
Acting Secretary.
10.2.99

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

Revenue (1899) Department.

D. O. CURRENT No. 270.

For St. George
Accountant General's Office
20th February 1899.

No 670

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply.

to the unofficial reference from Government C no 8103,
it was reported that article 120 Civil Service Regulations
is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

W. H. T. L.
Accountant General.

Order

From The Hon. Mr. J. Thomson,
Revenue Board Officer.
(Sep. Revenue).

No.

Dated 12th December 1899

Received 13/12

Registered 13/12

Enclosures

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Re: the grant of Charge
allowance to Asst. In-
spectors in charge of
circles.

The Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Mis	900	Rev	3.3.99
Mis	143	Rev	10.1.99
Procus	4544	Rev	17.8.98 (0)
Procus	491	Mis	24.6.94
"	563	Rev	11.8.88 (0)
"	443-6	Rev	21.6.88 (0)
"	1006	Rev	25.10.87 (0)

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

900.
5-5-99

D.O. from the Hon. Mr. Thomson to the
Hon. Mr. Forbes, 27.12.99



pp
Jute
13/2/99

My dear Forbes,

May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with Government Order Mis.No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a Circle, in whatever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of Circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw Exchange Compensation Allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was Government Order No. 4544, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw on the Charge Exchange Compensation Allowance; but the Accountant General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

[To be printed in United Commas]

3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are ^{four} Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of Circles who are entitled to Exchange Compensation Allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors lose between them Rs.100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors who are entitled to Exchange Compensation Allowance gain Rs.1-9-0 a month each for three months or Rs.14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings Mis.No.4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of Circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a Charge Allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings Mis.No.555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this, Government Order Mis.No.900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that Article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to Charge Allowances under Article 115.

6. Whether that ruling is correct or not, the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of Circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of Exchange Compensation Allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began.

Yours sincerely,

Board of Revenue
Separate Revenue
Dated 12th December
1899.

Thomson

[To be printed in United Commas]

Rev. Dept.

D.O. 80.11 d/16.1.00

202 from the Hon. Mr. Borkes
to the Hon. Mr. Thomson
16/11/00

My dear Thomson,

In reply to your D.O.
dated 12th December last regarding
charge allowance of Assistant
Inspectors, I am to enclose a
copy of ^{the} Accountant General's
unofficial note and to state
that the Govt. does not consider
it advisable to reopen the
question.

(I now order)

Yours sincerely,

W. B. Borkes

15-1-00

* No. 138 d/23.12.99.

D.O.C. No. 270.

From the Hon. Mr. J. Munson, I.C.S.

Dated 12th December 1899.

FOR ORDERS.

To Secy.

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs 25 per mensem. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in Art. 47(c) of the C.S.D. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Inspectors to draw Exchange Compensation ^{allowance on this} Allowance; but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Correspondence ensued with the object of getting over the

G.O. 454
17.8.98

second ^{effect of the} ruling; but the Govt declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the A-G
(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that Art 120 of the C.S.D. applies to charge allowance under Art. 115; and

(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Asst. Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a p.l. vacancy" and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O. No. 454 d/17.8.98. Much good will not come of paying an acting instead of a charge

FOR ORDERS.
G.O. 143 7 200
10.1.99 3.3.99

page 4 of the notes under
G.O. 143
10.1.99

8/2

allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

KD
15-12-99

Hru.
8/25/99

I don't understand why Art 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under Art. 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Asst. Insp. drew the charge allowance for the first 30 days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

At 18.12.99.



At 22/12

To Secy.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the A.G. says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

At 10.1.00

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the H. M's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

PKS.
20.12.99
KD
20-12-99

To the Asst. Gen. Secy.
8/25/99

u.o. No 829
21-12-99

Take to next page

138

If there is a transfer of station the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

A. G.

The Secretary to Government.

Revenue Department. N. O.

81-1-00

To Secy

Please see draft below.

Emph.

PK
12.1.00.

Here enter H. L. L. records
overleaf of 10.1.00

189

, DATE:

RENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.

Government (1899) of Madras.
REVENUE.

Recd.

Regd.

} 1899.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

. Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899:—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(e) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a *charge allowance* coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (e) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (i.e., a charge allowance under article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

Government {1899} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd.

Enclosures

1899.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —,

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899:—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a *charge allowance* coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (*i.e.*, a charge allowance under article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

Government {1899} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd.

Enclosures

1899.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899:—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a *charge allowance* coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (i.e., a charge allowance under article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

Government {1899} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd.

Enclosures

1899.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899 :—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a charge allowance coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (i.e., a charge allowance under article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

Government {1899} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd.

Enclosures

1899.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899 :—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a *charge allowance* coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (i.e., a charge allowance under article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

Government {1899} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd.

Enclosures

1899.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —

Government {1899} of Madras. REVENUE.

2

No. 900, REVENUE, 3RD MARCH 1899.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899 :—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a *charge allowance* coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (i.e., a charge allowance under article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

Recd.

Enclosures

1899.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899 :—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a *charge allowance* coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (i.e., a charge allowance under article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

Government {1899} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd.

Enclosures

1899.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899 :—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a *charge allowance* coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (*i.e.*, a charge allowance under article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

Government {1899} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd.

Enclosures

1899.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899 :—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a *charge allowance* coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (*i.e.*, a charge allowance under article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of article 120. of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

Government {1899} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd.

Enclosures

1899.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899 :—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a *charge allowance* coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (i.e., a charge allowance under article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

Government {1899} of Madras.

REVENUE.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Recd.

Enclosures

1899.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899 :—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a *charge allowance* coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (*i.e.*, a charge allowance under article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

Government {1899} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd.

Enclosures

1899.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899 :—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a *charge allowance* coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (i.e., a charge allowance under article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

Government {1899} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd.

Enclosures

1899.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899:—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a *charge allowance* coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (i.e., a charge allowance under article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

Government {1899} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd.

Enclosures

1899.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899 :—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a *charge allowance* coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (i.e., a charge allowance from the operation of article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

Government {1899} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd.

Enclosures

1899.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899:—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a *charge allowance* coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (i.e., a charge allowance under article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

Government {1899} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd.

Enclosures

1899.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 900, 3rd March 1899.

MARCH.

Acting Allowance

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Accountant-General's endorsement stating that he does not treat the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles as —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899:—

Read—G.O., No. 143, Revenue, dated 10th January 1899.

Resolution—Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899.

The Board regrets it has again to ask the orders of Government on the matter of the allowance drawn by the Assistant Inspectors of the Salt, Abkari and Customs Department when placed in charge of circles. The Accountant-General having held that exchange compensation allowance should not be claimed in respect of the charge allowance of Rs. 25 drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, on the ground that the charge allowance was not covered by the definition of "Salary" as given in article 47(c) of the Civil Service Regulations, the Board requested Government to move the Government of India to amend the definition of "Salary" and to permit the officers to draw the allowance with retrospective effect. The Accountant-General, through whom the Proceedings were submitted, was of opinion that no amendment of the definition was necessary but that, if the Government of Madras held that the grant of the charge allowance was to be taken as increasing the salary of the Assistant Inspectors, he was prepared to accept the ruling. He also stated that retrospective effect should not be given to the order, as it would necessitate the recovery of the acting allowance drawn by substitutes in privilege leave arrangements. Government decided that the allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles was a *charge allowance* coming within the definition of "Salary" contained in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations, but agreed with the Accountant-General in considering that retrospective effect should not be given to its order. Since the receipt of this Government Order (No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898), the Accountant-General has been disallowing the charge allowance drawn by Assistant Inspectors during the first thirty days of privilege leave arrangements, apparently on the presumption that it is an acting allowance but, as this places Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles in a much worse position than prior to the date of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, the Board made the recommendation contained in paragraph 3 of its Proceedings disposed of in the Government Order now under reply. Government now states that it "does not see any good ground for changing the present system." The Board does not venture, in the face of the Government Order, to repeat its request for the grant of the regular acting allowance, but would very respectfully ask whether, in ordering the present system to remain unchanged, it was also the intention of Government that the charge allowance should be treated as an acting allowance and should not be given for the first thirty days in a privilege leave arrangement. From the terms of the Government Order of 17th August 1898, it would appear that it was not intended to treat it as an acting allowance but as a "charge allowance coming under the definition of salary" (*i.e.*, a charge allowance under article 115 of the Civil Service Regulations), and as such it should be exempted from the operation of article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, seeing that article

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Exd. P. Sestharam.

20 Copies.

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Exd. P. Seetharam.

20 Copies.

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Exd. P. Seetharam.

20 Copies.

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Exd. P. Seetharam.

20 Copies.

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Exd. P. Seetharam.

20 Copies.

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Exd. P. Sestharam.

20 Copies.

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Exd, P. Seetharam.

20 Copies.

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Exd. P. Seetharam.

20 Copies.

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Exd. P. Seetharam.

20 Copies.

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Erd. P. Sestharam.

20 Copies.

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Exd. P. Seetharam.

20 Copies.

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General:

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Ed. P. Seetharam.

20 Copies.

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Exd. P. Seetharam.

20 Copies.

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Exd. P. Seetharam.

20 Copies.

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Exd. P. Seetharam.

20 Copies.

120 applies only to the charge allowance granted under article 176 and not to the charge allowance granted under article 115 (*vide* article 123 A). If Government agrees with the Board it requests that the Accountant-General may be instructed to permit the allowance being drawn as before for the first thirty days of a privilege leave arrangement also.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. TODHUNTER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General.

No. 670.

Forwarded to Government. In this office reply to the un-official reference from Government C. No. 8103, it was reported that article 120, Civil Service Regulations, is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
20th February 1899.

(Signed) HESKETH BIGGS,
Accountant-General.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

ORDER—No. 900, Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The Accountant-General's Endorsement will be communicated to the Board of Revenue.

2. The Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Exd. P. Seetharam.

20 Copies.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

[SUBJECT.—*Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.*]

*Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and
Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.*

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Please see draft below.

V.K.R.
1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.
3-3-99.

[*Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.*]

*Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES
dated 12th December 1899.*

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in whatever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 *per mensem*. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Correspondence ensued with the object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—

(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and

(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

G.S.F.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an *acting* instead of a *charge* allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.

15-12-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

[SUBJECT.—Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.]

Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and
Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Please see draft below.

V.K.R.

1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.

3-3-99.

[Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.]

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES
dated 12th December 1899.

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in what-ever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was "G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 per mensem. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

G.Os., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899, and No. 900, dated 3rd March 1899.

2. Correspondence ensued with the object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—

(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and

(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant

Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

G.S.F.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an acting instead of a charge allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.

15-12-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

[SUBJECT.—Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.]

Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2.* Please see draft below.

V.K.R.

1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.

3-3-99.

[Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.]

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES dated 12th December 1899.

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in what ever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was "G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the cession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 *per mensem*. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Correspondence ensued with the G.Os., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899, and object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—

(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and

(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

G.S.F.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an *acting* instead of a *charge* allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.
15-12-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

[SUBJECT.—Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.]

Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and
Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Please see draft below.

V.K.R.
1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.
3-3-99.

[Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.]

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES
dated 12th December 1899.

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in whatever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 *per mensem*. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Correspondence ensued with the object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—

(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and

(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

G.S.F.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an *acting* instead of a *charge* allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.
15-12-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

[SUBJECT.—*Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.*]

Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Please see draft below.

V.K.R.
1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.
3-3-99.

[*Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.*]

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES dated 12th December 1899.

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in whatever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 *per mensem*. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Correspondence ensued with the object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—

(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and

(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

G.S.F.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an *acting* instead of a *charge* allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.

15-12-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

[SUBJECT.—Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.]

Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and
Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Please see draft below.

V.K.R.

1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.

3-3-99.

[Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.]

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES
dated 12th December 1899.

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in whatever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 *per mensem*. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Correspondence ensued with the object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—

(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and

(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

G.S.F.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an *acting* instead of a *charge* allowance; as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.
15-12-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

[SUBJECT.—Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.]

Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and
Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Please see draft below.

V.K.R.
1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.
3-3-99.

[Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.]

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES
dated 12th December 1899.

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in whatever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 per mensem. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Correspondence ensued with the object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—

(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and

(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant

Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

G.S.F.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an acting instead of a charge allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.
15-12-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

[SUBJECT.—Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.]

Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Please see draft below.

V.K.R.
1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.
3-3-99.

[Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.]

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES dated 12th December 1899.

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in whatever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as "acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 *per mensem*. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Correspondence ensued with the object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—
(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and
(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an *acting* instead of a *charge* allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.
15-12-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

[SUBJECT.—Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.]

Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Please see draft below.

V.K.R.
1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.
3-3-99.

[Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.]

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES dated 12th December 1899.

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in whatever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was "G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 *per mensem*. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

G.Os., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899, and No. 900, dated 3rd March 1899.

2. Correspondence ensued with the object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—

(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and

(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

G.S.F.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an *acting* instead of a *charge* allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.
15-12-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

[SUBJECT.—Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.]

Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Please see draft below.

V.K.R.
1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.
3-3-99.

[Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.]

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES dated 12th December 1899.

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in whatever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 *per mensem*. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Correspondence ensued with the G.Os., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899, and No. 900, dated 3rd March 1899, object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—

(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and

(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an *acting* instead of a *charge* allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.
15-12-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

[SUBJECT.—*Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.*]

Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Please see draft below.

V.K.R.
1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.
3-3-99.

[*Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.*]

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES dated 12th December 1899.

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in whatever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 *per mensem*. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Correspondence ensued with the object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—

(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and

(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

G.S.F.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an *acting* instead of a *charge* allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.
15-12-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

[SUBJECT.—Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.]

Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Please see draft below.

V.K.R.
1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.
3-3-99.

[Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.]

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES dated 12th December 1899.

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in whatever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was "G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 *per mensem*. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Correspondence ensued with the G.Os., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899, and No. 900, dated 3rd March 1899, object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—

(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and

(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

G.S.F.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an *acting* instead of a *charge* allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.
15-12-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

[SUBJECT.—Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.]

Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Please see draft below.

V.K.R.
1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.
3-3-99.

[Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.]

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES dated 12th December 1899.

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in whatever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which¹ no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing² to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 *per mensem*. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Correspondence ensued with the G.Os., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899, and No. 900, dated 3rd March 1899. object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—

(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and

(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

G.S.F.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an *acting* instead of a *charge* allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.
15-12-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

SUBJECT.—Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.]

Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Please see draft below.

V.K.R.
1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.
3-3-99.

[Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.]

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES dated 12th December 1899.

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in whatever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was "G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 *per mensem*. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Correspondence ensued with the object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—

(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and

(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

G.S.F.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an *acting* instead of a *charge* allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.

15-12-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

[SUBJECT.—Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.]

Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and
Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Please see draft below.

V.K.R.

1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.

3-3-99.

[Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.]

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES
dated 12th December 1899.

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in what-ever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was "G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 *per mensem*. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Correspondence ensued with the object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—

(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and

(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

G.S.F.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an *acting* instead of a *charge* allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.
15-12-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 900, MIS., REVENUE, DATED
3RD MARCH 1899.

[SUBJECT.—Charge allowance granted to Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles.]

Board's Proceedings (Separate Revenue), No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and
Accountant-General's Endorsement thereon No. 670, dated 20th February 1899.

To Secretary—

The question was fully discussed in the notes under G.O., No. 143, dated 10th January 1899. The only point now raised by the Board is whether the "charge allowance" is treated as "acting allowance." The Accountant-General previously replied that it was not. It is being treated as "charge allowance" and is liable, under article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations, to be withheld for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Please see draft below.

V.K.R.
1-3-99.

Issue.

G. S. FORBES.
3-3-99.

[Issued as G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899.]

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, to the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES
dated 12th December 1899.

"May I ask you to look into the file of papers ending with G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899, as I do not think the effect of the orders passed has been fully understood.

"2. Prior to May 1898, every Assistant Inspector in charge of a circle, in whatever arrangement he was acting, drew Rs. 25 a month charge allowance instead of an acting allowance of Rs. 65 to which, under the Civil Service Regulations, he would be entitled. In the case of a few of these Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles, I raised the question in May 1898 whether they were not entitled to draw exchange compensation allowance on the charge allowance of Rs. 25. The answer to that was "G.O., No. 454, Revenue, dated 17th August 1898. This allows my request that the officers should be entitled to draw exchange compensation on the charge allowance; but the Accountant-General has used the occasion in such a way as to make the concession a loss and not gain to the whole body of officers concerned by disallowing the charge allowance for the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

"3. The net effect of the order and his interpretation of it may be illustrated from the list as it stands at present. There are four Inspectors on privilege leave. There are three Assistant Inspectors in charge of circles who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance. The four men acting for the Inspectors, lose between them Rs. 100 under the Accountant-General's ruling. The Assistant Inspectors, who are entitled to exchange compensation allowance, gain Rs. 1-9-0 a month each for three months, or Rs. 14-1-0 in all between them under the order itself.

"4. In asking for a reconsideration of the matter (Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 4415, dated 7th November 1898), I did not go fully into the technical part of the question, because I was proposing to clear the whole difficulty by giving the Assistant Inspectors appointed to charge of circles an acting allowance, to which I still believe they are fully entitled, instead of a charge allowance. Government was unable to accept this and matters were left where they stood.

"5. I raised the technical question, therefore, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 555, dated 7th February 1899, and the order on this—G.O., No. 900, Mis., Revenue, dated 3rd March 1899—is that the Accountant-General does not treat the allowance as acting allowance. This is based on a ruling of the Accountant-General's, for which no grounds are given, but which I should like to have an opportunity of discussing, to the effect that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations is applicable to charge allowances under article 115.

"6. Whether that ruling is correct or not the net effect of the orders is, as I have pointed out above, that the whole body of Assistant Inspectors, when in charge of circles under privilege leave arrangements, now suffers, as the result of securing some small amounts of exchange compensation allowance to the very few entitled to that perquisite. What I would ask you, therefore, is to send this demi-official to the Accountant-General with a request that he will advise in what manner the Assistant Inspectors may best be put back into at least as good a position as they were in before the discussion began."

To Secretary—

Assistant Inspectors placed in charge of circles draw an allowance of Rs. 25 *per mensem*. This allowance was treated by the Accountant-General as local allowance; but on the representation of the Board of Revenue, it was decided that it was a "charge allowance" coming within the definition of salary in article 47 (c) of the Civil Service Regulations. The effect of this decision was (i) to enable Assistant Inspectors to draw exchange compensation allowance on this, but (ii) to deprive them of the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

2. Correspondence ensued with the object of getting over the second effect of the ruling, but the Government declined to make any change.

3. Mr. Thomson suggests a reference to the Accountant-General—

(i) as to the correctness of the ruling that article 120 of the Civil Service Regulations applies to charge allowance under article 115; and

(ii) for advice as to how the difficulty may be got over in drawing the charge allowance during the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy.

4. In the course of the previous discussions, the Secretary observed that Assistant Inspectors were "no worse off than other officers in a privilege leave vacancy," and this remark still holds good. There is therefore no ground for pursuing the subject further.

G.S.F.

5. If a change should be made, the question for consideration will be whether the allowance may be treated as a local allowance as before the issue of G.O., No. 454, dated 17th August 1898. Much good will not come of paying an *acting* instead of a *charge* allowance, as far as the first thirty days of a privilege leave vacancy are concerned. On the other hand, it would sensibly increase the number of minutes requiring His Excellency's sanction.

V.K.R.
15-12-99.

To the Honourable Member.

G. S. FORBES.
15-12-99.

I don't understand why article 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under article 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Assistant Inspectors draw the charge allowance for the first thirty days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

A. T. A[RUNDEL.]
18-12-99.

To Secretary—

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the Honourable Member's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

T.P.K.
20-12-99.
V.K.R.
20-12-99.

To the Accountant-General u.o.

G.S.F.
21-12-99.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

No. 133.

Charge allowance under article 115 is not allowed for the first thirty days in privilege leave arrangements as it does not come under the exceptions mentioned in article 123, Civil Service Regulations.

If there is a transfer of station, the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

T. HESKETH BIGGS.
23-12-99.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Secretary—

V.K.R.
8-1-00.

To the Honourable Member—

G.S.F.
9-1-00.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the Accountant-General says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

A.T.A.
10-1-00.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

T.P.K.
12-1-00.
V.K.R.
15-1-00.

Issue.

G.S.F.
16-1-00.

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, to the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, dated 16th January 1900.

"In reply to your Demi-official dated 12th December last, regarding charge allowance of Assistant Inspectors, I am to enclose a copy of the Accountant-General's un-official note No. 133, dated 23rd December 1899 and to state that the Government does not consider it advisable to reopen the question."

[Issued as Demi-Official No. 11, Revenue, dated 16th January 1900.]

To the Honourable Member.

G. S. FORBES.
15-12-99.

I don't understand why article 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under article 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Assistant Inspectors draw the charge allowance for the first thirty days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

A. T. A[RUNDEL.]
18-12-99.

To Secretary—

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the Honourable Member's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

T.P.K.
20-12-99.

V.K.R.
20-12-99.

To the Accountant-General u.o.

G.S.F.
21-12-99.

No. 133.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Charge allowance under article 115 is not allowed for the first thirty days in privilege leave arrangements as it does not come under the exceptions mentioned in article 123, Civil Service Regulations.

If there is a transfer of station, the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

T. HESKETH BIGGS.
23-12-99.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Secretary—

V.K.R.
8-1-00.

To the Honourable Member—

G.S.F.
9-1-00.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the Accountant-General says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

A.T.A.
10-1-00.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

T.P.K.
12-1-00.
V.K.R.
15-1-00.

Issue.

G.S.F.
16-1-00.

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, to the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, dated 16th January 1900.

"In reply to your Demi-official dated 12th December last, regarding charge allowance of Assistant Inspectors, I am to enclose a copy of the Accountant-General's un-official note No. 138, dated 23rd December 1899 and to state that the Government does not consider it advisable to reopen the question."

[Issued as Demi-Official No. 11, Revenue, dated 16th January 1900.]

To the Honourable Member.

G. S. FORBES.
15-12-99.

I don't understand why article 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under article 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Assistant Inspectors draw the charge allowance for the first thirty days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

A. T. A[RUNDEL.]
18-12-99.

To Secretary—

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the Honourable Member's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

T.P.K.
20-12-99.
V.K.R.
20-12-99.

To the Accountant-General u.o.

G.S.F.
21-12-99.

No. 138.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Charge allowance under article 115 is not allowed for the first thirty days in privilege leave arrangements as it does not come under the exceptions mentioned in article 123, Civil Service Regulations.

If there is a transfer of station, the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

T. HESKETH BIGGS.
23-12-99.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Secretary—

V.K.R.
8-1-00.

To the Honourable Member—

G.S.F.
9-1-00.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the Accountant-General says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

A.T.A.
10-1-00.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

T.P.K.
12-1-00.
V.K.R.
15-1-00.

Issue.

G.S.F.
16-1-00.

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, to the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, dated 16th January 1900.

"In reply to your Demi-official dated 12th December last, regarding charge allowance of Assistant Inspectors, I am to enclose a copy of the Accountant-General's un-official note No. 138, dated 23rd December 1899 and to state that the Government does not consider it advisable to reopen the question."

[Issued as Demi-Official No. 11, Revenue, dated 16th January 1900.]

To the Honourable Member.

G. S. FORBES.
15-12-99.

I don't understand why article 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under article 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Assistant Inspectors draw the charge allowance for the first thirty days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

A. T. A[RUNDEL.]
18-12-99.

To Secretary—

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the Honourable Member's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

T.P.K.
20-12-99.
V.K.R.
20-12-99.

To the Accountant-General u.o.

G.S.F.
21-12-99.

No. 133.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Charge allowance under article 115 is not allowed for the first thirty days in privilege leave arrangements as it does not come under the exceptions mentioned in article 123, Civil Service Regulations.

If there is a transfer of station, the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

T. HESKETH BIGGS.
23-12-99.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Secretary—

V.K.R.
8-1-00.

To the Honourable Member—

G.S.F.
9-1-00.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the Accountant-General says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

A.T.A.
10-1-00.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

T.P.K.
12-1-00.
V.K.R.
15-1-00.

Issue.

G.S.F.
16-1-00.

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, to the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, dated 16th January 1900.

"In reply to your Demi-official dated 12th December last, regarding charge allowance of Assistant Inspectors, I am to enclose a copy of the Accountant-General's un-official note No. 138, dated 23rd December 1899 and to state that the Government does not consider it advisable to reopen the question."

[Issued as Demi-Official No. 11, Revenue, dated 16th January 1900.]

To the Honourable Member.

G. S. FORBES.
15-12-99.

I don't understand why article 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under article 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Assistant Inspectors draw the charge allowance for the first thirty days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

A. T. A[RUNDEL].
18-12-99.

To Secretary—

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the Honourable Member's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

T.P.K.
20-12-99.
V.K.R.
20-12-99.

To the Accountant-General u.o.

G.S.F.
21-12-99.

No. 133.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Charge allowance under article 115 is not allowed for the first thirty days in privilege leave arrangements as it does not come under the exceptions mentioned in article 123, Civil Service Regulations.

If there is a transfer of station, the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

T. HESKETH BIGGS.
23-12-99.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Secretary—

V.K.R.
8-1-00.

To the Honourable Member—

G.S.F.
9-1-00.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the Accountant-General says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

A.T.A.
10-1-00.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

T.P.K.
12-1-00.
V.K.R.
15-1-00.

Issue.

G.S.F.
16-1-00.

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, to the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, dated 16th January 1900.

"In reply to your Demi-official dated 12th December last, regarding charge allowance of Assistant Inspectors, I am to enclose a copy of the Accountant-General's un-official note No. 138, dated 23rd December 1899 and to state that the Government does not consider it advisable to reopen the question."

[Issued as Demi-Official No. 11, Revenue, dated 16th January 1900.]

To the Honourable Member.

G. S. FORBES.
15-12-99.

I don't understand why article 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under article 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Assistant Inspectors draw the charge allowance for the first thirty days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

A. T. A^[RUNDEL.]
18-12-99.

To Secretary—

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the Honourable Member's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

T.P.K.
20-12-99.
V.K.R.
20-12-99.

To the Accountant-General u.o.

G.S.F.
21-12-99.

No. 133.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Charge allowance under article 115 is not allowed for the first thirty days in privilege leave arrangements as it does not come under the exceptions mentioned in article 123, Civil Service Regulations.

If there is a transfer of station, the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

T. HESKETH BIGGS.
23-12-99.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Secretary—

V.K.R.
8-1-00.

To the Honourable Member—

G.S.F.
9-1-00.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the Accountant-General says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

A.T.A.
10-1-00.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

T.P.K.
12-1-00.
V.K.R.
15-1-00.

Issue.

G.S.F.
16-1-00.

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, to the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, dated 16th January 1900.

"In reply to your Demi-official dated 12th December last, regarding charge allowance of Assistant Inspectors, I am to enclose a copy of the Accountant-General's un-official note No. 138, dated 23rd December 1899 and to state that the Government does not consider it advisable to reopen the question."

[*Issued as Demi-Official No. 11, Revenue, dated 16th January 1900.*]

To the Honourable Member.

G. S. FORBES.
15-12-99.

I don't understand why article 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under article 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Assistant Inspectors draw the charge allowance for the first thirty days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

A. T. A[RUNDEL]
18-12-99.

To Secretary—

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the Honourable Member's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

T.P.K.
20-12-99.
V.K.R.
20-12-99.

To the Accountant-General u.o.

G.S.F.
21-12-99.

No. 133.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Charge allowance under article 115 is not allowed for the first thirty days in privilege leave arrangements as it does not come under the exceptions mentioned in article 123, Civil Service Regulations.

If there is a transfer of station, the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

T. HESKETH BIGGS.
23-12-99.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Secretary—

V.K.R.
8-1-00.

To the Honourable Member—

G.S.F.
9-1-00.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the Accountant-General says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

A.T.A.
10-1-00.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

T.P.K.
12-1-00.
V.K.R.
15-1-00.

Issue.

G.S.F.
16-1-00.

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, to the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, dated 16th January 1900.

"In reply to your Demi-official dated 12th December last, regarding charge allowance of Assistant Inspectors, I am to enclose a copy of the Accountant-General's un-official note No. 138, dated 23rd December 1899 and to state that the Government does not consider it advisable to reopen the question."

[Issued as Demi-Official No. 11, Revenue, dated 16th January 1900.]

To the Honourable Member.

G. S. FORBES.
15-12-99.

I don't understand why article 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under article 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Assistant Inspectors draw the charge allowance for the first thirty days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

A. T. A[RUNDEL.]
18-12-99.

To Secretary—

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the Honourable Member's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

T.P.K.
20-12-99.

V.K.R.
20-12-99.

To the Accountant-General u.o.

G.S.F.
21-12-99.

No. 133.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Charge allowance under article 115 is not allowed for the first thirty days in privilege leave arrangements as it does not come under the exceptions mentioned in article 123, Civil Service Regulations.

If there is a transfer of station, the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

T. HESKETH BIGGS.
23-12-99.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Secretary—

V.K.R.
8-1-00.

To the Honourable Member—

G.S.F.
9-1-00.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the Accountant-General says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

A.T.A.
10-1-00.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

T.P.K.
12-1-00.

V.K.R.
15-1-00.

Issue.

G.S.F.
16-1-00.

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, to the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, dated 16th January 1900.

"In reply to your Demi-official dated 12th December last, regarding charge allowance of Assistant Inspectors, I am to enclose a copy of the Accountant-General's un-official note No. 138, dated 23rd December 1899 and to state that the Government does not consider it advisable to reopen the question."

[Issued as Demi-Official No. 11, Revenue, dated 16th January 1900.]

To the Honourable Member.

G. S. FORBES.
15-12-99.

I don't understand why article 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under article 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Assistant Inspectors draw the charge allowance for the first thirty days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

A. T. A[RUNDEL.]
18-12-99.

To Secretary—

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the Honourable Member's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

T.P.K.
20-12-99.

V.K.R.
20-12-99.

To the Accountant-General u.o.

G.S.F.
21-12-99.

No. 133.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Charge allowance under article 115 is not allowed for the first thirty days in privilege leave arrangements as it does not come under the exceptions mentioned in article 123, Civil Service Regulations.

If there is a transfer of station, the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

T. HESKETH BIGGS.
23-12-99.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Secretary—

V.K.R.
8-1-00.

To the Honourable Member—

G.S.F.
9-1-00.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the Accountant-General says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

A.T.A.
10-1-00.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

T.P.K.
12-1-00.

V.K.R.
15-1-00.

Issue.

G.S.F.
16-1-00.

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, to the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, dated 16th January 1900.

"In reply to your Demi-official dated 12th December last, regarding charge allowance of Assistant Inspectors, I am to enclose a copy of the Accountant-General's un-official note No. 138, dated 23rd December 1899 and to state that the Government does not consider it advisable to reopen the question."

[Issued as Demi-Official No. 11, Revenue, dated 16th January 1900.]

To the Honourable Member.

G. S. FORBES.
15-12-99.

I don't understand why article 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under article 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Assistant Inspectors draw the charge allowance for the first thirty days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

A. T. A^[RUNDEL.]
18-12-99.

To Secretary—

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the Honourable Member's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

T.P.K.
20-12-99.

V.K.R.
20-12-99.

To the Accountant-General u.o.

G.S.F.
21-12-99.

No. 138.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Charge allowance under article 115 is not allowed for the first thirty days in privilege leave arrangements as it does not come under the exceptions mentioned in article 123, Civil Service Regulations.

If there is a transfer of station, the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

T. HESKETH BIGGS.
23-12-99.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Secretary—

V.K.R.
8-1-00.

To the Honourable Member—

G.S.F.
9-1-00.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the Accountant-General says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

A.T.A.
10-1-00.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

T.P.K.
12-1-00.

V.K.R.
15-1-00.

Issue.

G.S.F.
16-1-00.

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, to the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, dated 16th January 1900.

"In reply to your Demi-official dated 12th December last, regarding charge allowance of Assistant Inspectors, I am to enclose a copy of the Accountant-General's un-official note No. 138, dated 23rd December 1899 and to state that the Government does not consider it advisable to reopen the question."

[Issued as Demi-Official No. 11, Revenue, dated 16th January 1900.]

To the Honourable Member.

G. S. FORBES.
15-12-99.

I don't understand why article 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under article 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Assistant Inspectors draw the charge allowance for the first thirty days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

A. T. A[RUNDEL.]
18-12-99.

To Secretary—

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the Honourable Member's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

T.P.K.
20-12-99.

V.K.R.
20-12-99.

To the Accountant-General u.o.

G.S.F.
21-12-99.

No. 133.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Charge allowance under article 115 is not allowed for the first thirty days in privilege leave arrangements as it does not come under the exceptions mentioned in article 123, Civil Service Regulations.

If there is a transfer of station, the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

T. HESKETH BIGGS.
23-12-99.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Secretary—

V.K.R.
8-1-00.

To the Honourable Member—

G.S.F.
9-1-00.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the Accountant-General says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

A.T.A.
10-1-00.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

T.P.K.
12-1-00.
V.K.R.
15-1-00.

Issue.

G.S.F.
16-1-00.

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, to the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, dated 16th January 1900.

"In reply to your Demi-official dated 12th December last, regarding charge allowance of Assistant Inspectors, I am to enclose a copy of the Accountant-General's un-official note No. 138, dated 23rd December 1899 and to state that the Government does not consider it advisable to reopen the question."

[Issued as Demi-Official No. 11, Revenue, dated 16th January 1900.]

To the Honourable Member.

G. S. FORBES.
15-12-99.

I don't understand why article 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under article 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Assistant Inspectors draw the charge allowance for the first thirty days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

A. T. A. [RUNDEL.]
18-12-99.

To Secretary—

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the Honourable Member's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

T.P.K.
20-12-99.
V.K.R.
20-12-99.

To the Accountant-General u.o.

G.S.F.
21-12-99.

No. 133.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Charge allowance under article 115 is not allowed for the first thirty days in privilege leave arrangements as it does not come under the exceptions mentioned in article 123, Civil Service Regulations.

If there is a transfer of station, the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

T. HESKETH BIGGS.
23-12-99.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Secretary—

V.K.R.
8-1-00.

To the Honourable Member—

G.S.F.
9-1-00.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the Accountant-General says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

A.T.A.
10-1-00.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

T.P.K.
12-1-00.
V.K.R.
15-1-00.

Issue.

G.S.F.
16-1-00.

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, to the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, dated 16th January 1900.

"In reply to your Demi-official dated 12th December last, regarding charge allowance of Assistant Inspectors, I am to enclose a copy of the Accountant-General's un-official note No. 138, dated 23rd December 1899 and to state that the Government does not consider it advisable to reopen the question."

[Issued as Demi-Official No. 11, Revenue, dated 16th January 1900.]

To the Honourable Member.

G. S. FORBES.
15-12-99.

I don't understand why article 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under article 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Assistant Inspectors draw the charge allowance for the first thirty days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

A. T. A[RUNDEL].
18-12-99.

To Secretary—

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the Honourable Member's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

T.P.K.
20-12-99.

V.K.R.
20-12-99.

To the Accountant-General u.o.

G.S.F.
21-12-99.

No. 133.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Charge allowance under article 115 is not allowed for the first thirty days in privilege leave arrangements as it does not come under the exceptions mentioned in article 123, Civil Service Regulations.

If there is a transfer of station, the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

T. HESKETH BIGGS.
23-12-99.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Secretary—

V.K.R.
8-1-00.

To the Honourable Member—

G.S.F.
9-1-00.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the Accountant-General says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

A.T.A.
10-1-00.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

T.P.K.
12-1-00.

V.K.R.
15-1-00.

Issue.

G.S.F.
16-1-00.

*Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, to the Hon'ble
Mr. J. THOMSON, dated 16th January 1900.*

"In reply to your Demi-official dated 12th December last, regarding charge allowance of Assistant Inspectors, I am to enclose a copy of the Accountant-General's un-official note No. 138, dated 23rd December 1899 and to state that the Government does not consider it advisable to reopen the question."

[Issued as Demi-Official No. 11, Revenue, dated 16th January 1900.]

To the Honourable Member.

G. S. FORBES.
15-12-99.

I don't understand why article 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under article 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Assistant Inspectors draw the charge allowance for the first thirty days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

A. T. A. [RUNDEL.]
18-12-99.

To Secretary—

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the Honourable Member's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

T.P.K.
20-12-99.

V.K.R.
20-12-99.

To the Accountant-General u.o.

G.S.F.
21-12-99.

No. 133.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Charge allowance under article 115 is not allowed for the first thirty days in privilege leave arrangements as it does not come under the exceptions mentioned in article 123, Civil Service Regulations.

If there is a transfer of station, the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

T. HESKETH BIGGS.
23-12-99.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Secretary—

V.K.R.
8-1-00.

To the Honourable Member—

G.S.F.
9-1-00.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the Accountant-General says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

A.T.A.
10-1-00.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

T.P.K.
12-1-00.

V.K.R.
15-1-00.

Issue.

G.S.F.
16-1-00.

Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, to the Hon'ble Mr. J. THOMSON, dated 16th January 1900.

"In reply to your Demi-official dated 12th December last, regarding charge allowance of Assistant Inspectors, I am to enclose a copy of the Accountant-General's un-official note No. 138, dated 23rd December 1899 and to state that the Government does not consider it advisable to reopen the question."

[Issued as Demi-Official No. 11, Revenue, dated 16th January 1900.]

To the Honourable Member.

G. S. FORBES.
15-12-99.

I don't understand why article 120 is held to apply to charge allowance under article 115. Is there any ruling of India to that effect?

I suppose the Assistant Inspectors draw the charge allowance for the first thirty days if there is a transfer of station. Is this so?

A. T. A[RUNDEL.]
18-12-99.

To Secretary—

May the Accountant-General be asked (u.o.) to answer the Honourable Member's queries? No information on the points is traceable in the office.

T.P.K.
20-12-99.
V.K.R.
20-12-99.

To the Accountant-General u.o.

G.S.F.
21-12-99.

No. 133.

ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Charge allowance under article 115 is not allowed for the first thirty days in privilege leave arrangements as it does not come under the exceptions mentioned in article 123, Civil Service Regulations.

If there is a transfer of station, the Assistant Inspector draws three-fourths of the charge allowance.

T. HESKETH BIGGS.
23-12-99.

To the Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Secretary—

V.K.R.
8-1-00.

To the Honourable Member—

G.S.F.
9-1-00.

Mr. Thomson may be told what the Accountant-General says. It does not seem advisable to reopen the question.

A.T.A.
10-1-00.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

T.P.K.
12-1-00.
V.K.R.
15-1-00.

Issue.

G.S.F.
16-1-00.

*Demi-official from the Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, to the Hon'ble
Mr. J. THOMSON, dated 16th January 1900.*

"In reply to your Demi-official dated 12th December last, regarding charge
"allowance of Assistant Inspectors, I am to enclose a copy of the Accountant-
"General's un-official note No. 138, dated 23rd December 1899 and to state that the
"Government does not consider it advisable to reopen the question."

[Issued as Demi-Official No. 11, Revenue, dated 16th January 1900.]

Q
fa
to
9