

(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. <i>2886.</i>	Press ~~Mis.~~
<i>23-25.</i>	
Dated <i>2-9-</i>	<i>18 67.</i>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department.
2nd September 1867.*

Read the following papers :—

No. 23. Endorsement of the Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 12th August 1867, No. 228.

From the Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, to the Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 10th August 1867, No. 276.

1. When I granted the Chief Engineer special leave to England on urgent private affairs, of which I had the honor to advise you in letter No. 176, dated the 13th May, three months' cumulative privilege leave was due to him, as during a service of four and a half years he had only been absent about three weeks.

2. Under these circumstances, I have the honor to request that you will be good enough to convey the sanction of Government to the leave granted to Mr. Smart being considered "privilege leave" with special permission to proceed to England on urgent private affairs.

3. Mr. Smart went home under the full conviction that he was doing so on privilege leave, which would carry with it pay and allowances; but owing to the manner in which I described the leave, the Auditors object without special authority to pass full salary, &c., &c.

Recommended for the sanction of Government.

(Signed) J. C. ANDERSON, Lieut.-Colonel, R. E.,
Consulting Engineer for Railways.

The Consulting Engineer is requested to report on what date Mr. Smart availed himself of the three weeks' leave referred to in paragraph 1 of Mr. Elwin's letter, and whether, in the event of Mr. Smart's last leave being regarded as *privilege* leave, the grant of a portion of his salary to the officers who acted for him during his absence would be in accordance with existing practice on the Madras Railway.

(Signed) J. H. M. SHAW STEWART, Major, R. E.,
Under Secretary to Government.
13th August 1867.

No. 24. Endorsement of the Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 20th August 1867, No. 231.

From the Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway, to the Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 15th August 1867, No. 281.

1. Adverting to the observations of the Under Secretary to Government, in the Department of Public Works, communicated with your Docket No. 183, dated yesterday, I have the honor to state, that Mr. Smart availed himself of privilege leave from the 13th to the 24th December 1865, in all twelve days, not three weeks, as stated in my letter of the 10th instant, No. 276, wherein the Christmas holidays were reckoned as a part of the leave.

2. Privilege leave is granted to Heads of Departments and Subordinate Officers of the Railway, as the exigencies of the service admit, and it has long been an understood rule that when an officer is unable, without detriment to the interests of the Company, to avail himself of his annual month's leave, such leave is carried to his credit, and taken when convenient. This was precisely Mr. Smart's case.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
2nd September 1867.*

3. Under the revised Furlough Regulations applicable to this Company, paragraph 3, I am authorized to grant officers one month's privilege leave in each year on full pay, such leave being allowed to accumulate, and be taken to the extent of three months together.

4. With regard to Major Shaw Stewart's inquiry, "whether in the event of Mr. Smart's last leave being regarded as privilege leave, the grant of a portion of his salary to the officers who acted for him during his absence, would be in accordance with existing practice on the Madras Railway," I beg to state that it would be so, and also in conformity with Circular No. XXXV, dated the 2nd April 1862, from the Government of India, as to the grant of acting allowances.

1. I am of opinion that the Agent and Manager was empowered to grant three months' cumulative privilege leave to the Chief Engineer, but that he is mistaken in supposing that the grant of a portion of his salary to the officers who acted for him during his absence is at the same time in conformity with Circular No. 35, dated 2nd April 1862, (G. O. No. 282, dated 27th May 1862). Paragraph 3 of this Circular rules that under no circumstances shall a Company pay more in the aggregate than the amount of the full salaries of the sanctioned appointments, and the Circular appears to refer more to Officers acting for others on Furlough and in receipt of reduced allowances, than for those on privilege leave in receipt of full allowances.

2. I look upon the case now referred as one requiring the special sanction of the Government and of the Board of Directors. It appears that Mr. Smart was strictly entitled to three months' privilege leave on full salary, but that the officers who officiated for him during his absence were not, under existing rules, entitled to any extra salary. Owing, however, to application for special leave having been made on behalf of Mr. Smart, the officers who were appointed to officiate for him were allowed an additional salary (G. O. No. 1,689, dated 28th May 1866). They cannot now be retrenched, nor would it seem just that they should be called upon to undertake additional duties and responsibilities without extra remuneration.

3. I am of opinion that the leave rules for Officers of the Railway should be revised, and that as regards privilege leave, they should be assimilated to those in force for officers in Civil employment under Government.

4. Had these rules been applicable in Mr. Smart's case, the officer or officers who acted for him would have drawn 20 per cent. of his salary, or Rupees 363-10-2 per mensem. The actual additional salary drawn by the Deputy Chief Engineers who officiated conjointly for him was Rupees 431-13-0; and Mr. Going who was appointed to officiate as Deputy Chief Engineer drew Rupees 90-14-6 in excess of his normal salary. The total additional expenditure was thus Rupees 522-11-6 per mensem, but if, as the Agent and Manager proposes in his last report to the Board of Directors, Mr. Smart forfeits when absent his tentage allowance of Rupees 105 per mensem, the extra expenditure is reduced to Rupees 417-11-6, or only about Rupees 54 in excess of the deputation allowance which would have been drawn under the Government Rules.

(Signed) J. C. ANDERSON, Lieut.-Colonel, R. E.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
2nd September 1867.*

No. 25. ORDER THEREON, 2nd September 1867, No. 2,686.

RAILWAY, No. 2.

1. As a special case, and on the condition that, during his absence, Mr. Smart forfeits his tentage allowance of Rupees 105 per mensem, the Government authorize the leave for three months which was recently granted to that gentleman being regarded as "privilege leave," subject to the approval of the Board of Directors.

2. The Governor in Council quite concurs in the opinion expressed in paragraph 3 of the Consulting Engineer's observations of the 20th instant, and requests that the Agent and Manager may be called upon to address the Board upon the subject of assimilating the rules which regulate the grant of leave to the Officers of the Company to those in force for officers in Civil employment under Government.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) CHARLES A. ORF, Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government.

Madras, August 15th 1867.

From

R. B. Allen Esq.,
Agent and Manager. *of the M.R.*

To

Lieutenant Colonel J. C. Audetson, M.C.
Consulting Engineer for Railways.

SIR,

Adverting to the observations of the Under Secretary to Government in the Department of Public Works, communicated with your Docket No 183, dated yesterday, I have the honor to state, that Mr. Stuart availed himself of Privilege Leave from the 15th to the 27th December 1865, in all twelve days not three weeks, as stated in my letter of the 10th instant, No 276, wherein the Christmas Holidays were reckoned as a part of the leave.

Privilege Leave is granted to Heads of Departments and Subordinate Officers of the Railway, as the exigencies of the service admit, and it has long been an understood rule that when an officer is unable, without detriment to the interests of the Company, to avail himself of his annual months leave, such leave is carried to his credit, and taken when convenient - This was precisely Mr. Stuart's case.

Under

3. Under the revised Regulations applicable to this Company, Paragraph III, I am authorized to grant Officers one month's privilege leave in each year on full pay, such leave being allowed to accumulate, and be taken to the extent of three months together.

4. With regard to Major Stewart's inquiry, "whether in the case of 'Mr. Stewart's' leave being regarded as 'privilege' leave, the grant of a portion of his salary to the Officers who acted for him during his absence, should be in accordance with existing practice 'on the Madras Establishment', I beg to state, that it would be so, and also in conformity with Circular No. XXXV dated the 2nd April 1861 from the Government of India, as to the grant of Acting Allowances.

I have the honor to be,

Yours most respectfully,
Wm. J. Lister
Agent and Manager.

No. 231.

9

MADRAS RAILWAY
Orders Part II
Page 49.

I am of opinion that the Agent and Manager was empowered to grant three months cumulative privilege leave to the Chief Engineer, but that he is mistaken in supposing that the grant of a portion of his salary to the officers who acted for him during his absence is at the same time in conformity with Circular No. 25 dated 2^d April 1862 (C. O. No. 282 dated 27th May 1862). Para III of this Circular rules that, under no circumstances shall a company pay more in the aggregate than the amount of the full salaries of the sanctioned appointments, and the Circular appears to refer more to officers acting for others on furlough and in receipt of reduced allowances, than for those on Privilege leave in receipt of full allowances.

2

I look upon the case now referred

as

MADRAS RAILWAY.

From

The Agent and Manager.

To

The Consulting Engineer
for Railways

Dated August 18th 1862
Recd.

No. 231.

Applying to the Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway to pay to the Chief Engineer, during his absence, the amount of his salary, in accordance with the provisions of the Privilege leave.

as one requiring the special sanction of the Government and of the Board of Directors. It appears that Mr Smart was strictly entitled to three months privilege leave on full salary, but that the officers who officiated for him during his absence, were not under existing rules entitled to any extra salary. Owing however to application for special leave having been made on behalf of Mr Smart, the officers who were appointed to officiate for him, were allowed an additional salary (G. O. No 1689 dated 28th May 1866). They cannot now be rebuked, nor would it seem just that they should be called upon to undertake additional duties and responsibilities without extra remuneration.

3. I am of opinion that the leave rules for Officers of the Railway should be revised, and that as regards Privilege leave, they should be assimilated to those in force for officers in Civil employment under Government.

4. Had these Rules been applicable in Mr Smart's case, the officer or officers who acted for him would have drawn 20 per cent of his salary or Rupees 363-10-2 per mensem. The actual additional salary drawn by the Deputy Chief Engineers who officiated conjointly for him was Rupees 431-13-0; and Mr Going who was appointed to officiate as Deputy Chief Engineer drew Rupees 90-14-6 in excess of his normal salary. The total additional expenditure was thus Rupees 522-11-6 per mensem, but if, as the Agent and Manager proposes in his last report to the Board of Directors, Mr Smart forfeits when absent his tentage allowance of Rupees 105 per mensem, the extra expenditure is reduced to Rupees 417-11-6; or only about Rupees 54 in excess of the deputation allowance which would have been drawn under the Government Rules.

Madras -
20th August
1867

J. Anderson. Lieut. Colonel R. E.
Consulting Eng^r for Railway

To the Secretary to Government
P. W. (Department of Public Works)
Fort St. George.

No. 2. 76.

MADRAS RAILWAY.

AGENT AND MANAGER'S OFFICE.

Madras, August 10th 1867.

From

A. B. Ewin Esq.
Agent and Manager of the M.R.

To

Lieutenant Colonel J. C. Anderson, R.E.
Consulting Engineer for Railways.

Sir,

When I granted the Chief Engineer
special leave to England, on urgent private affairs,
of which I had the honor to advise you in
letter of 17th, dated the 13th May, three months
elapsed previous leave was due to him, as during
a period of four and a half years, he had only
been absent about three weeks.

Under these circumstances, I
have the honor to request that you will be good
enough to convey the sanction of Government to the
leave granted to Mr. Stewart being considered
"private leave" with special permission to proceed
to England on urgent private affairs.

Mr. Stewart is not home under
the full sanction, that he was doing so on
"private leave", which would carry with it, pay
and allowances, but owing to the manner in which
I described the leave, the Auditors object without
special

Pro: 2nd Sept 1867
1867.

RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

From *No 3043*
The Consgr. Engineer for Railways,

To
The Secretary to Government,
P. W. Dept.

Dated *12th* } *August 1867.*
Received *13* }

No. 228.

Enclosures, No. /

W 3/25/67
Recommending
for the sanction of Govt,
a letter from the Agent
& Manager, applying to
the 3 months leave
granted to Mr. Smart
being considered as
"Privilege leave."
ex 2686 - 2nd Sept 1867
W. H. W.

No 23

c. 23rd Sept 1867 Or 28th

Pro. of Govt. for Sept 1867. 23/35
 RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

From
 The Consgr. Engineer for Railways,
 To
 The Secretary to Government,
 P. W. Dept.

Dated 20th August 1867.
 Received 24th

No. 23/.

Enclosures, No. 3 ✓

Submitting with re-
 marks a letter from the Agent
 and Manager in reply to the
 under Secretary's Observations
 on Consulting Enggr's Report
 to Government No 228 of 12th
 August, on the subject of
 leave to Mr Smart Chief
 Enggr.
212.2686-22nd Sept 1867

No. 24

C. 23rd Aug 767 C. 28th

Public Works Department.

C. 2686

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 2nd Sept^r/67

Read the following

From The Consulting Enggr. for Railways. H. E. C. 228 dated 12th Aug^r/67/
 From ———— (Here enter No. 23/ dated 20th August/67/)

As a special case,
 and on the condition
 that, during his ab-
 sence, Mr Smart for-
 feits his tentage allow-
 ance of Rs. 105 per
 mensem, the Govt au-
 thorizing the leave for
 three months which was
 recently granted to that
 gentleman being re-
 garded as "privilege
 leave," subject to the
 approval of the Board
 of Directors -

The

2 The Governor
in Council quite
concur in the opinion
expressed in para 3
of the Consulting Eng^r's
observations of the 20th
Inst^d, and requests
that the Agent and
Manager may be called
upon to address the
Board upon the sub-
ject of assimilating
the rules which regulate
the grant of leave to the
Officers of the Company
to those in force for
Officers in Civil employ-
ment under Government.

M.

20
2

To
The Com^r Gen^l
for Railways.

Dec^r 2/9/67

PC

83025-
P. W. 1867. Department.

Proc. of Govt. for September
No. 2686

PROCEEDINGS OF GOVERNMENT.

Dated 2^d September 1867

Granting authority
conditionally for the three
months leave lately granted
to Mr. Smart Chief Engineer
Madras Railway, being
regarded as privilege leave.

Issuing instructions
for the assimilation of Railway
Leave Rules to those in force
for Officers in Civil employ-
ment under Government.

No. 23 @ 25