

(1) Number of pages \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Date of repair \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Initials of the Referencer \_\_\_\_\_

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

## Government of Madras.

### Public Works DEPARTMENT.

|               |                        |
|---------------|------------------------|
| G.O. No. 1823 | Press<br>Mis. <i>U</i> |
| 711-712       |                        |
| Dated 30-6-   | 1865.                  |

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*62/*

Office of the Controller of P.W.  
Accounts  
Madras 15 May 1865

N<sup>o</sup> 144

From  
Captain J. F. Fischer R.E.  
Controller of P.W. Accounts

To  
Major G. Chesney R.E.  
Assistant General M.D.  
Simla

Sir,

9 May 1865  
N<sup>o</sup> 1265

With reference to the orders of the  
Madras Government as per margin I  
have the honor to forward a printed copy  
of the correspondence to be returned on the  
subject of the claim made by Lieut.  
enant Smalley R.E. for deputation al-  
in the absence whilst in charge of a range of the Godavery Dist.  
in the absence of Captain McNeill in addition  
to his own range.

2. Clause III of para 7 of the Resolu-  
tion of the Government of India N<sup>o</sup> 3365  
dated the 28 November 1864 declares the  
following is computed as regards ap-  
pointments which are in classes and  
grades on the average undated pay  
of the grades in the class in which  
the

the Officer acts but no provision has been made to remunerate an officer for discharging the duties of an absentee of his own Class or for an Officer of a Senior Class officiating one of a Senior in addition to discharging the duties of his <sup>own</sup> substantive appointment and as there are cases of frequent occurrence in this Presidency. My instructions regarding the disposal of them may be furnished for the guidance of this Office.

3. In submitting my own opinion on this case for the consideration of the Madras Government. I stated the spirit of the Resolution above referred to appeared to be that an Officer discharging the duties of an absentee in addition to those of his own substantive appointment was entitled to remuneration and I came to this conclusion from the fact that in paragraph of the same Resolution the Government of India undertook to bear the expenses in

in such cases for Officers absent on Privilege leave without any reference to Class or grade. Cases frequently occur also of an upper subordinate who is already in charge of one Extenture Range being placed in charge of another in addition to his own. I request you will be good enough to inform me if any and what remuneration is to be granted to him.

I have the honor to be,  
Yr. Obedt. Servant,  
J. J. Fischer, Captain R.E.  
Controller of M. Accounts

(True Copies)

Captain R.E.

Controller of M. Accounts

No 613

From The Accountant General  
Public Works Department

To The Controller of Public Works Accounts  
Madras

Sunday 7<sup>th</sup> June 1865.

Sir

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No 144 dated 15<sup>th</sup> May last, forwarding for opinion correspondence on the subject of a claim made by Sreentenant Smalley R.E. for deputation allowance whilst in charge of a range of the Godavery District in addition to his own range, and to reply as follows:-

It appears from these papers that, prior to taking charge of a second range, Sreentenant Smalley was drawing acting allowances as Officiating 1<sup>st</sup> Assistant Engineer. I believe that under the old rules which obtained formerly in Madras an Officer was entitled to acting allowance when officiating in a higher grade, and while those rules held, Sreentenant Smalley was entitled to the half pay of a 1<sup>st</sup> class in addition to half that of a 2<sup>nd</sup> class Assistant. But under the new rules (Standing Order No 11 of 1865) an officer is not entitled to any extra allowance for acting promotion within his own class. In fact, acting promotions from

With some view to the  
the fact that the  
to the day of the  
dated 21 June 1865 No 144

100/400/1865

Official and  
Sunday

from grade to grade within a class cease to have any meaning or force.

3 It would appear from entries N:201 and 203 A in the Proceedings of the Madras Government for 9<sup>th</sup> May 1865, enclosed in your letter, that Lieutenant Smalley has drawn more travelling allowance than he is entitled to. An assistant officiating for an executive Engineer would be entitled to the rate of allowance prescribed for the latter, but not to additional allowance when in charge of two divisions, because travelling allowance is computed by the mile or the day and not at so much per division. Moreover in this case, as Lieutenant Smalley held charge of the range belonging to another Officer of his own class, there could apparently be no difference in the rate of travelling allowance.

4 As regards remuneration for holding double charge, such is not allowed under the new rules. This is a condition of the Civil rules under which the Officers of the Public Works Department have been placed

placed. These rules are generally more favorable than those formerly in force, although in this respect they are less so, and the Department generally has benefitted by the change. The only exception allowed is in the case of an executive Engineer holding charge of a second division in addition to his own. In such a case he is allowed Rupees 100 a month additional under the last clause of the rules, but I am of opinion that this rule would require the sanction of the Government of India to be made applicable to a Madras range even for an executive engineer. I would suggest that this point be referred to the Government of India through the Government of Madras.

5 I may observe that the authority quoted in your letter under reply (Government of India Financial Department N:3365 of 28<sup>th</sup> November 1864) is not the latest on this subject. The last published rules regarding officiating appointments

appointments are contained in this  
department's Standing Order No. 11 of  
1865.

6 The extract from the Madras  
Government's Proceedings received with your  
letter, is herewith returned, as requested.

I have the honor to be dear  
Signed J. Chesney  
Accountant General

From

Office of the Controller of  
Public Works Accounts.  
Madras 21<sup>st</sup> June 1865.

No. 484.

From  
Captain J. F. Fischer. P.E.  
Controller of Public Works Accounts.  
To  
Colonel C. A. Orr. P.E.  
Secretary to Government. D.P.W.

Sir,

With reference to L.O. of the 9<sup>th</sup> May  
last No. 1265, I have the honor to forward for  
the information of Government copy of a letter  
to my address from the Accountant General  
P.W.D. No. 613 dated 7<sup>th</sup> instant together  
with copy of a letter I addressed to that Officer  
in obedience to the orders of the Madras Govern-  
ment.

2. It appears from para. 5 of Major Ches-  
ney's letter that the orders of the Government  
of India Financial Department No. 3365 of  
the 28<sup>th</sup> November 1864 are not considered by  
him as the latest authority on this subject.  
viz. deputation allowance to Officers acting  
for absentees &c. but he refers to standing  
order No. 11 of 1865 in this Department as  
containing the rules governing allowances to  
Officers on such occasions. This standing order  
has

has never been communicated to this Office or made applicable to this Presidency, I regret. therefore I am unable to give a more decided opinion in this matter than I did in my letter to your address printed with L. O. under reply.

3. I would further point out Major Lherney from para: 3 of his letter appears to have forgotten that Travelling Allowance in this Presidency is granted by the Madras Government at a fixed rate to the Officers of the Department and in this matter they are not guided by the rules prevailing in the Provinces under the Supreme Government. Sir: Smallly is therefore fully entitled to those allowances passed to him by this Office under the orders of the Madras Government.

I have the honor to be  
Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

Captain P. E.

Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. J. M. C.

Proceedings of the <sup>ev. 1823</sup> Madras Government.  
Under date the 30<sup>th</sup> June/65

Recd the following

From the Controller of  
P.W. Accts

Forwards for the infor-  
mation of Govt Copy of a  
letter from the Acct Genl P.W.D.  
Bengal regarding Deputation  
allowances

H. 21<sup>st</sup> June/65. h. 484

It is clear from  
para 3 of Major Ches-  
ney's letter above recorded  
that Lieutenant Smalley  
is not entitled to depu-  
tation allowance for the  
period during which he  
held charge of Captain  
Mackgill's range in the  
Isodewy Dist, in ad-  
dition to his own.

JP  
WJ

21<sup>st</sup> June 1865  
Pro. of Govt Copy 22/65

to the Controller of P.W.  
Accounts  
to the Secy. to Government  
P.W.D.  
Fort St. George

Recd 21<sup>st</sup> June 1865  
No. 484.

Forwards for the  
information of Govt Copy  
of a letter from the Acct Genl  
P.W.D. Bengal re-  
garding Deputation al-  
lowances.

ev. 1823 - 30<sup>th</sup> June 1865

22/7/11

Deputation or additional travelling allowance will not, in future, be passed to Officers holding temporary charge of more than one Range.

Similarly no additional travelling allowance will be granted to Subordinates when in charge of two Ranges.

Such portions of Standing Order No. 11 of the Government of India as apply to the Public Works Department of the Presidency will be circulated to all Officers for information and

guidance - 8

*Libra*

of 1865

To: The Controller  
5 Rgs 1st Div  
all other Sup. Rgs } With Standing Order No. 11 of 1865.

Recd 1st July 1865

Revised Copies of Standing Order No. 11 of 1865  
- Recd 1st July -

(10)  
P. W. 1865 Deputee  
Pro: of Gov. for June

No. 182  
Pro: of the M. Gov.  
of 31 June/65

Letter from the  
Controller P. W. Accounts  
regarding Scott Smallley's  
claim to deputation allow-  
ance for the period during  
which he held charge of  
Captain Magill's Range  
in the Colony District  
in addition to his own  
allowance thereon.

