

[illegible]

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
107	197						
372	197						

*Co. 295 Mar 7 16. August
1872.

period in question

R.B.

4/1/97

Marine (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 1391

Order

From The Revenue Dept

No. 5056 his

Dated 10th Decr 1896

Received 17. 12. 96

Enclosures 8 Marine orig 400

Spare copies returned.

SUBJECT.

Ordering the grant of certain allowances to Mr Swaine for the period during which he was in command of the "harporita" in her trip to the Laccadives

4/1/97
To The Presy: Port Officer.
" Accountant General.

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

Revenue Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ again G.O. No. 328 Marine, d/ 13th May 1896, considering that the case of Mr. Swann is similar to that of Mr. Carlyon and that allowances on the same scale may be passed.

Read again the following G.O. No. 2953 Vis. Rev., d/ 24th July 1896, on Endorsement of the Marine Dept., No. 357 E., c/ 9th July 1896, transferring to the Revenue Dept. letter from the Presidency Port Officer, recommending allowance to Mr R.L. Swann for the period he was in charge of steamer "Margarita" for the trip to the Laccadives:---

Referred to the Board of Revenue for remarks which should be submitted through the Accountant General.

READ also the following Endorsement of the Accountant General, No. 2888, dated 15th Sept. 1896, on Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue, No. 2976 Mis., d/ 29th Aug. 1896, recommending payment of deputation allowance to Mr. Swann for the period during which he was in charge of the steamer "Margarita":---

Forwarded to Government.

Mr. R.L. Swann was in command of the L.G.S. "Margarita" during his trip to Laccadives from 21st Decr. 1895 to 11th Febr. 1896. In their order No. 328 Marine dated 13th May 1896, Government considered that his case was similar to that of ~~Swann~~ Mr. Carlyon referred to in the Government of India letter No. 1975 Finl. dated 19th April 1894, recorded in Madras Government Order, No. 160 Marine dated 1st May 1894 and that allowances on the same scale might be passed. Mr. Carlyon was originally allowed table money at Rs. 3 per diem while on board and no allowance while on shore. On the representation of the Madras Government, the Government of India sanctioned an allowance of Rs. 4/ a day for the period of his deputation. I think the Government of India intended to avoid all technicalities by giving him in all a lump

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
581 E.	man.		20-11-96
533 E.	man.		2-11-96
521 E.	- do -		23-10-96
511 E.	- do -		5-10-96
357 E.	- do -		9-7-96
374 man	- do -		27-6-96
351 do	- do -		16-6-96
328 do	- do -		13-6-96
257 E	- do -		8-6-96
252 do	- do -		16-4-96
178 E	- do -		27-3-96
159 E	- do -		17-3-96
155 man	- do -		11-3-96
110 E.	- do -		2-3-96
96 E.	- do -		26-2-96
388 man	- do -		19-12-95
Extract Gazette 1343. to 46			
Part I 26.11.95			
346 man			21-11-95
328 do	man		8-11-95
426 do	do.		13-12-94
160 G/L	- do -		1-12-94
112-13 man	- do -		3-6-94
295 G/L	- do -		16-5-92
164. man	- do -		17-6-92
117. man	- do -		16-5-92
552 do	- do -		21-12-91
556 do	- do -		31-12-91
423 G/L	- do -		31-8-88

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	117 E	man.	19-2-97

Rs. 3/ per diem.

sum of Rs. 4/ a day. But Government restricted him to Rs. 3/ afloat and Rs. 4/ ashore.

As Mr. Swann was never ashore, he, according to the view taken by Madras Government in the case of Mr. Carlyon, will only get Rs. 3/ a day. If Government accept my view of the Government of India Order, he can be given Rs. 4/ a day for the whole period. As the Rs. 4/ includes both table money and deputation allowance, no further allowance can be given.

ORDER thereon, No. 5056 Mis., d/ 10th Decr. 1896.

It is observed that Mr. Swann's case differs from that of Mr. Carlyon in the following important respects:--

(a) Mr. Swann was on board the "Margarita" throughout the whole period of his deputation whereas Mr. Carlyon was for a time ashore in Bombay. There is thus no necessity to consider the question of granting a "shore allowance" to Mr. Swann.

(b) In Mr. Swann's case, the question arises whether he should receive pay at the rate of Rs. 200/ or Rs. 300/ per mensem during the deputation, whereas there was no question as to the rate of pay to which Mr. Carlyon was entitled.

(c) Mr. Swann's case is fully covered by the Civil Service Regulations; Mr. Carlyon's was not. Under Art. 98 of the Civil Service Regulations, the former officer is eligible to draw the pay or salary which, but for his deputation he would have continued to draw either as substantive or officiating. It has been ascertained from the Marine Dept. that, but for his deputation to the Laccadives, Mr. Swann would have been posted to act as Agent for Govt. consignments and Personal Assistant to the Presidency Port Officer in which case he would have drawn Rs. 300 per mensem. He should thus receive pay at the rate of Rs. 300 per mensem throughout the whole period of his deputation. Under the same Art. he is eligible to receive a deputation allowance of Rs. 60 per mensem the grant of which the Government is pleased to direct. Under Art. 1117 and appendix 25, he is

entitled to table money at the rate of Rs. 3/ per diem. Para 3/. The consideration of this case has disclosed the fact that the orders issued in G.O. No. 117 Marine, d/ 16th April 1892, para 2, did not represent the intention of Government which was to sanction the grant to Mr. Carlyon of the deputation allowance of Rs. 60 per mensem for which he had been declared eligible by the Accountant General. The subsequent papers show that, when it was directed that the Government of India should be requested to sanction the grant of a shore allowance of Rs. 4 per diem to Mr. Carlyon, this Government was under the impression that Mr. Carlyon had actually been granted the deputation allowance of Rs. 60/ per mensem. The Marine Dept. will be requested to issue the necessary orders for the purpose of giving effect to what was the actual intention of Government in Mr. Carlyon's case and if necessary to address the Government of India with a view to ascertaining whether the grant of the shore allowance to Mr. Carlyon would have been refused, if it had been stated that it was intended to give him a deputation allowance as well. It is observed that a deputation allowance is granted in consequence of a "decided increase of work or responsibility" or a "change of station", whereas the grant of a shore allowance was in Mr. Carlyon's case recommended on the ground of extra ~~work~~ expense to which he had been put. It would therefore seem that the question of giving or withholding a shore allowance should be considered as distinct from that of granting a deputation allowance.

(True Extract)

Ag. Secretary to Govt.

To the Marine Dept.

- Accountant General-
- Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).

Revenue Department
 As Mr. Swann was never ashore, he, according to the view taken by the Government in the case of Mr. Carlyon, will only get Rs. 24 a day. A Government receipt in view of the Government of India Order, he can be given Rs. 24 a day for the whole period. As the Rs. 24 includes both table money and deputation allowance, no further allowance can be given.
 ORDER THEREON, No. 5058 M.S., d/ 10th Decr. 1892.
 It is observed that Mr. Swann's case differs from that of Mr. Carlyon in the following important respects:--
 (a) Mr. Swann was on board the "Havanna" throughout the whole period of his deputation whereas Mr. Carlyon was for a time ashore in Bombay. There is thus no necessity to consider the question of granting a shore allowance to Mr. Swann.
 (b) In Mr. Swann's case, the question arises whether he should receive pay at the rate of Rs. 2000 or Rs. 2500 per mensem during the deputation, whereas there was no question as to the rate of pay to which Mr. Carlyon was entitled.
 (c) Mr. Swann's case is fully covered by the Civil Service Regulations; Mr. Carlyon's was not. Under Art. 98 of the Civil Service Regulations, the former officer is eligible to draw the pay or salary which, but for his deputation he would have continued to draw either as substantive or officiating. It has been ascertained from the Marine Dept. that, but for his deputation to the Pacific, Mr. Swann would have been posted to act as Agent for Govt. consignments and Personal Assistant to the Presidency Port Officer in which case he would have drawn Rs. 2500 per mensem. He should thus receive pay at the rate of Rs. 2500 per mensem throughout the whole period of his deputation. Under the same Art. he is eligible to receive a deputation allowance of Rs. 60 per mensem the grant of which the Government is pleased to direct. Under Art. 117 and Appendix A, he is