

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

REGISTRATION DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 177	Press Mis.
Dated 17	18

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
19th June 1869.*

No. 421. Read the following letter from the Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 21st May 1869, No. 24:—

I HAVE the honour to submit, for the consideration of Government, the correspondence as per margin, which has taken place between the Agent and my-self.

From Agent, No. 460, 12th March 1869.

To	"	"	312, 17th "	"
From	"	"	1, 1st April "	"
To	"	"	8, 3rd "	"
From	"	"	62, 26th "	"
To	"	"	40, 29th "	"
From	"	"	88, 13th May "	"

* Mr. Stoney.

† Mr. Cox.

2. Last January and February the Assistant* to the Chief Engineer was sick, and an officer† was sent from the Main Canal to perform his duties.

Under the Rules, Mr. Stoney was entitled to full pay for the first month of his illness, and afterwards to half pay, and the Chief Engineer proposed to give Mr. Cox some additional salary. In support of this arrangement there is no existing Rule, and, on the other hand, there is a Rule, No. 56, page 12, of a Manual‡ of Rules approved by the Board, which appeared

‡ Enclosed.

to me, though the Agent thinks differently, to bar any claim on the part of Mr. Cox.

3. Under the circumstances, therefore, I suggested that if Mr. Henslowe considered it advisable that provision should be made for such acting appointments as circumstances might necessitate, it would be better to obtain the approval of Government and of the Board to a Rule which might fairly meet the claims of officers so employed, and to his letter No. 62, of the 26th April, the Agent appended a draft Rule on this subject.

4. As the Rule proposed by the Agent did not appear to me quite suitable, I drafted the following Rules, the one

No. 40, 29th April.

ing in higher appointments, and the other for those who might perform the duties of a higher appointment in addition to those of their substantive appointments, and to these the Agent has agreed; but he wishes the Rules to be considered applicable to all the officers of the Company, and not only to Executive and Assistant Engineers.

No. 88, 13th instant.

I.—Every Officer appointed to act in a higher appointment than that which he holds substantively will be allowed one-third of the difference between the salaries of the two appointments for the first month, and one-half such difference for any further period, in addition to the salary of his substantive appointment.

II.—An Officer appointed to act for another Officer holding a higher appointment, and required to perform at the same time the duties of his own appointment, will be allowed the salary of the higher appointment for the whole time.

Under Rule I. the Acting Officer will draw the allowances of the higher appointment, and under Rule II. the allowances of the higher or of the lower, whichever may be the greater.

5. I think the Board of Directors should be left to make such proposals as they may deem fit, with regard to the deputation allowances of those of their

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
19th June 1869.*

officers who may be required to perform, for a time, the duties of the principal appointments, such as those of Agent and Manager, Chief, and Deputy Chief, Engineer. The nomination will usually rest with the Board, and the scale of remuneration should also be fixed by them, subject to the approval of Government. Under these circumstances I beg to recommend that the rules for deputation allowance be, as was intended when they were drafted, considered applicable only to Executive and Assistant Engineers, and that they be sanctioned for adoption subject to the approval of the Board.

From the Agent and Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Madras, 12th March 1869, No. 460.

I HAVE the honour to request that you will be good enough to say if there is any objection to the arrangement proposed in the annexed letter* from the Chief Engineer being carried into effect.

* No 1,143.

2. I ask the question because it is not altogether in conformity with the Rules.

From the Chief Engineer, to the Agent and Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Kurnool, 5th March 1869, No. 1,143.

In forwarding you a copy of Mr. Stoney's letter of 2nd instant, with the Doctor's Certificates, I have the honour to inform you that Mr. Stoney was obliged to be absent from office and to give up all work, except a little drawing, on the 10th January. He was relieved by Mr. Cox on the 16th. I am anxious to give him every indulgence the Rules allow, and therefore recommend that of the Rupees 1,100, forming the salary of the Assistant Engineer for January and February, Mr. Stoney draw full pay and allowances for January 1st to 16th, full pay only from 17th to 16th February, and half pay only 17th to end of February, total Rupees 918-7-4, and that the balance of Rupees 181-8-8 be paid to Mr. Cox (who discharged Mr. Stoney's duties from 17th January to end of February) in addition to his regular pay of Rupees 420, including allowances.

From F. G. STONEY, Esq., Assistant to the Chief Engineer, to the Chief Engineer of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Kurnool, 2nd March 1869.

With reference to your No. 229, of the 2nd instant, I have the honour to submit for your approval my claim, that under Agent's Rules Nos. 10 and 11 (leave of absence on sick certificate) I am entitled to my salary, according to said Rules, in support of which I beg to enclose Doctor's Certificates.

2. I would also bring to your notice, that though I was obliged to discontinue attending the office after the 10th January, yet I continued to act for the Company at my own house, and was engaged up to Monday the 18th January in making the revised drawing of rolling shutters, &c.

3. I would therefore ask that my absence from office should count from, say, Saturday the 16th January, and not from the 10th, i.e., from 17th January to 28th February inclusive.

My account would, in this case, stand thus:—

January at full pay...	500	0	0	
Do. allowance 1st to 16th inclusive...	25	13	4	
February 1st to 16th inclusive, full pay ..	285	8	0	525 13 4
Do. 17th to 28th do. half pay ...	107	2	0	
				392 10 0
Total ..				918 7 4

May I request that you will forward this to the Agent and Manager with your approval.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
19th June 1869.*

Madras Irrigation and Canal Company.

THIS is to certify that F. G. Stoney, Esq., Assistant to Chief Engineer, of Central Division, is fit for duty. He was under medical treatment from 1st to 28th February 1869.

KURNOOL,
1st March 1869.

(Signed) C. A. ANDREWS,
Consulting Surgeon.

Madras Irrigation and Canal Company.

THIS is to certify that F. G. Stoney, Esq., Assistant to Chief Engineer, of the Central Division, was incapacitated by ulcers from the performance of his duty from the 10th to the 31st January 1869.

(Signed) C. A. ANDREWS,
Consulting Surgeon.

From the Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Agent and Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Madras, 17th March 1869, No. 312.

In reply to your letter No. 460, of the 12th instant, with its accompaniments, I have the honour to inform you that, under the Rules, Mr. Stoney having, according to the Medical Certificates furnished, been incapacitated by sickness for the performance of his duties from the 10th January to the 28th February inclusive, is entitled to full pay from the 10th January to the 9th February, and to half pay from the 10th to the 28th February, with allowances from the 1st to the 9th January.

2. Rule 56, page 12, of the rules approved by the Board on the 26th June 1867, appears to bar Mr. Cox's claim to any increase of salary while acting for Mr. Stoney. I do not offer any opinion as to whether this rule is an advantageous one, but so long as it remains in force it must, I consider, be acted upon.

From the Agent and Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Madras, 1st April 1869, No. 1.

REFERRING to your letter No. 312 of 17th ultimo, I have the honour to point out that the rule to which you allude does not preclude such any arrangement as that recommended by Mr.

56, page 12.

Latham, and which I should have had no hesitation in carrying out, but for the possibility of your eventually raising an objection.

2. The Rule was drawn up in London to meet a special case, and so it came to be incorporated in the general body of Rules.

3. It simply provides that an Engineer, under certain circumstances, shall be ENTITLED to receive certain allowances. Then follows the rider which excludes salary from the application of the Rule; that is to say, it bars the Engineer's claim of RIGHT; but it by no means forbids the Company's administrative Officers from granting remuneration under such special circumstances as have arisen in this case, I therefore support Mr. Latham's recommendation.

From the Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Agent and Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Madras, 3rd April 1869, No. 8.

In reply to your letter No. 1 of the 1st instant, I have the honour to inform you that I think that officers who are required to perform the duties of a higher appointment than that which they hold substantively should receive some additional remuneration. I am of opinion, nevertheless, that at present there is no Rule sanctioning such an arrangement, and that the only Rule on the subject shows that the Board of Directors, at least so far as the question in the special case to which you refer, and, with which I am not acquainted, was brought before them, were disinclined to admit a

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
19th June 1869.*

claim to increase of salary. Under these circumstances it appears to me that the proper course is to draft a Rule, and to ask the Board to adopt it. I would suggest that the Rule be, in the first instance, submitted for the provisional approval of the Madras Government.

2. Until a Rule shall have been duly made and approved, I shall not be able to admit a charge of this kind but if you think it advisable to do so, I shall be ready to recommend the Government to allow of the Rule being acted on, subject to the Board's approval.

3. As regards the terms of the Rule there will, I think, be no objection to the grant of a deputation allowance of such an amount as, when added to the salary of the lower appointment, will not make that in excess of the salary of the higher appointment, with the proviso, however, that in no case should the arrangements made cause an increase in the cost of the appointments affected.

From the Agent and Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Madras, 26th April 1869, No. 62.

Upon the suggestion contained in your letter, No. 8, of the 3rd instant, I have framed a Rule which I hope the Government will act upon, as I feel assured the Board will never object to my paying an employé money honestly earned.

2. You are mistaken in assuming that the rule to which you refer had any reference whatever to a *claim to increase of salary*.

The case was simply this:—Mr. Lowe on succeeding Mr. Brunton as "Officer in charge" drew the same *allowances* that Mr. Burton had drawn.

3. You objected to this in your memorandum of audit, No. 384, 1st March 1866, and in your No. 34, of 30th May 1866, you said that "no increase of allowance could be passed *without the previous sanction of the Board*."

Thereupon Mr. Latham made the following observations:—"It is a good illustration of the complication of the system of sanction that, *A*. being an Engineer drawing Rupees 150 allowances, as necessary for his duties (clause 6 of any Agreement,) if he be removed, and *B*. being the most deserving and active junior, and drawing Rupees 120, be put in *A*'s place, *B*. shirks none of the work, but is only paid Rupees 120 allowance until the *previous sanction* of the Board (paragraph 1 of Captain Mullins' letter) shall have been obtained." Mr. Latham, therefore, asked me to apply to the Board to pass the rule to which you refer.

4. This is an instance, I think, of the inexpediency of framing a general Rule upon each special occasion to meet an individual case. The rule proposed by Mr. Latham referred *only* to allowances. The Board added as a rider the few words referring to salaries, which you take as a "Rule," and give to it an application never intended.

5. I am very averse to passing Rules to meet particular cases, but I still hold that there is nothing in this particular Rule forbidding me to pay Mr. Cox a fair remuneration for the arduous and difficult duties he has been called upon to perform on account of the illness of the regular incumbent.

6. I append a Rule for your approval, but I must point out that your proposed proviso would make it of none effect. It would be impossible to expect a man to undertake higher duties and heavier responsibilities without any remuneration.

RULE.

Any officer undertaking in lieu of his own duties the duties of a more highly paid post, shall be entitled to receive 25 per cent. of the higher salary (or such smaller proportion as shall not increase the lower salary to a greater amount than the higher salary) in addition to his own proper salary, and any officer undertaking the duties of another post in addition to his own proper duties shall be entitled to receive 50 per cent. of the salary attached to the duties thus imposed upon him in addition to his own salary.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
19th June 1869.*

From the Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Agent and Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Madras, 26th April 1869, No. 40.

In reply to your letter No. 62, of the 26th instant, and with reference to the Rule thereto appended, I have the honour, before submitting the correspondence to Government, to request your consideration of the subjoined remarks.

2. The first part of the Rule provides that an officer acting in a higher appointment shall receive a deputation allowance of twenty-five per cent. of the salary of that appointment, or such smaller sum as may, added to the salary of the substantive appointment, not exceed the full salary of the higher post. The latter part of the Rule is intended to govern the salary of an officer performing the duties of two appointments. Its effect would be that an officer temporarily holding two appointments might draw considerably more pay than an officer of superior rank, as for instance an Executive Engineer might be entitled to claim more than the salary of the Deputy Chief Engineer; and again that, as drafted, an Executive Engineer left without his proper complement of Assistants might be considered capable of receiving half the Assistant's pay.

3. It appears to me that Rules governing acting allowances should be taken in connection with those which prescribe the salaries of officers on leave. Now the Rules in force for the officers of the Company, as given in Appendix D., pages 26 to 29 of the Manual, show that officers on sick leave, and it is these cases which will occasion the necessity of acting appointments and pluralities are allowed full salary for one month; half salary for five months afterwards; one-third salary for six months afterwards; twelve months being the longest leave that can be taken.

Taking this Rule into consideration then I would suggest the following rules for deputation allowances to Assistant and Executive Engineers:—

I.—Every Officer appointed to act in a higher appointment than that which he holds substantively, will be allowed one-third of the difference between the salaries of the two appointments for the first month, and one-half such difference for any further period, in addition to the salary of his substantive appointment.

II.—An Officer appointed to act for another Officer holding a higher appointment, and required to perform at the same time the duties of his own appointment, will be allowed the salary of the higher appointment for the whole time.

Under Rule I. the Acting Officer will draw the allowances of the higher appointment, and under Rule II. the allowances of the higher or of the lower, whichever may be the greater.

4. My idea is that allowances to acting officers should not be allowed to add in any considerable degree to the cost of the establishments, and also that it is not necessary generally that, while acting and performing the duties of an appointment, such officers should draw quite as much salary as they would be entitled to, if confirmed in the higher appointment.

From the Agent and Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Madras, 13th May 1869, No. 83.

In reply to your letter No. 40, of the 29th ultimo, I have the honour to state that after due consideration of the question, I am prepared to accept your Rules for Deputation Allowance, but I am not prepared to accede to your proposed limitation of the operation of the rules to "Assistant and Executive Engineers."

2. If an arrangement for giving increased remuneration for the discharge of the duties of a higher post, or for undertaking at the same time the duties of two distinct appointments, be a fair and proper one in the case of Engineers, it must be equally so in regard to other branches of the service, and I do not see any valid reason why a distinction should be made.

3. With the proviso that the arrangement is to be of general application I accede to your proposed rules, and will forward them by an early mail to the Board for their approval.

4. If I understand you rightly, in all cases where an officer undertakes the duties of a more highly paid post, or the duties of two distinct posts, these Rules come into operation.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th June 1869.

No. 422.

ORDER THEREON, 19th June 1869, No. 1,997.

IRRIGATION, No. 16.

STENCH to the approval of the Board of Directors, the Government sanction the introduction of the Rules for the regulation of deputation allowance to the Executive and Assistant Engineers in the service of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company.

2. For the reasons given by the Consulting Engineer the Government consider it advisable that the Agent should ascertain the views and wishes of the Board before any rule for the grant of deputation allowances to the superior Officers of the Company is introduced.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R. E.,

Secretary to Government.

To the Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company.
" Agent and Manager for do. do.

Ed. S. T. Augustin.

Consulting Engineer's Office
Irrigation Canal Company
Madras, 21st May 1869.

No. 24.

Mrs. Major L. Mulliver, R.E.
Civil Engineer for the Co.
Secretary to Government
Department of Pub. Works.

I have the honor to submit for the consideration of Government the correspondence, in relation to the margin, which has taken place between the Agent and myself. -
I am sorry to say that the Chief Engineer was sick and an officer was sent from the Main Canal to perform his duties. Under the Rules Mr. Stacey was entitled to full pay for the first month of his illness, and afterwards to half pay, and the Chief Engineer proposed to give Mr. Stacey some additional salary. In support of this arrangement there is no existing rule and on the other hand there is a rule, No. 56 page 12, of a Manual of Rules approved by the Board, which appears to me, though the Agent thinks differently, to bar any claim on

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
19th June 1869.

No. 422.

ORDER THEREON, 19th June 1869, No. 1,997.

IRRIGATION, No. 16.

SUBJECT to the approval of the Board
of Directors, the Government sanction
the introduction of the Rules for the
regulation of deputation allowance to the Executive and Assistant Engineers in the
service of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company.

2. For the reasons given by the Consulting Engineer the Government consider it advisable that the Agent should ascertain the views and wishes of the Board before any rule for the grant of deputation allowances to the superior Officers of the Company is introduced.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R. E.,

Secretary to Government.

To the Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company.
.. Agent and Manager for do. do

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Consulting Engineer's Office
Irrigation Canal Company
Madras, 21st May 1869.

No. 24.
Major L. Mulliken R.E.
Consulting Engineer for I.C. Co.
Secretary to Government
Department of Pub. Works.

Have the honor to submit for the consideration of Government the correspondence, which has taken place between the Agent and myself. -
11th 460-12th March 69.
" 312-17th do do
" 1st 17th April
" 8-3rd do do
" 62-26th do do
" 40-29th do do
" 33-15 May 69.
Mr Stoney.
Mr Coy.
Last January and February the Assistant Chief Engineer was sick and an officer was sent from the Main Canal to perform his duties. Under the Rules Mr Stoney was entitled to full pay for the first month of his illness, and afterwards to half pay, and the Chief Engineer proposed to give Mr Coy some additional salary. In support of this arrangement there is no existing rule and on the other hand there is a rule, No. 56 page 12, of a Manual of Rules approved by the Board, which appeared to me, though the Agent thinks differently, to bar any claim on

on the part of Mr. Cox.

3. Under the circumstances therefore I suggest that, if Mr. Winland considered it advisable that provision should be made for such acting appointments as circumstances might necessitate, it would be better to obtain the approval of Government and of the Board to a rule which might fairly meet the claims of officers so employed, and to his letter No 62 of the 26th April the Agent appended a draft rule on this subject.

4. As the rule proposed by the Agent No 40-29 April not appear to me quite suitable, I drafted the following rules, the one providing for allowances of officers acting in higher appointments, and the other for those who might perform the duties of a higher appointment in addition to those of their substantive appointments, and to these the Agent has agreed, but he wishes the rules to be considered applicable No 88-13 instant to all the officers of the Company, and not only to Executive and Assistant Engineers.

1. Every officer appointed to act in a higher appointment than that which he holds substantively, will be allowed one third of the difference between the salaries of the two appointments for the first month, and one half such difference for any further period, in addition to the salary of his substantive

substantive appointment.

2. An officer appointed to act for another officer holding a higher appointment, and required to perform at the same time the duties of his own appointment, will be allowed the salary of the higher appointment for the whole time.

Under Rule I the acting officer will draw the allowances of the higher appointment, and under Rule II the allowances of the higher or of the lower, whichever may be the case.

3. I think the Board of Directors should be left to make such proposals as they may deem fit, with regard to the reputation allowances of those of their officers who may be required to perform, for a time, the duties of the principal appointments, such as those of Agent and Manager, Chief, and Deputy Chief, Engineer. The nomination will usually rest with the Board, and the scale of remuneration should also be fixed by them, subject to the approval of Government. Under these circumstances I have recommended that the rule for reputation allowance be, as was intended when they were drafted,

Rich.

2. For the reasons given
by the Consulting Engineer,
the Jock. consider it advisa-
ble that the Agent should
as-

2

To Mr. J. L. Co. -
Agent & Manager - D.C.
Sept 11/69

Copy in a letter to England
of 10th August 1869

Luc 2264

Court of 1869, Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

The Consulting Engr.
for Irrigation and
Civil Company

Dated

Re: 1

10/12/69 - June 1869

Nos. 421-422

Reputation allowances (H. H. H. H.)

Order on the title from
the Congress relative to the in-
-troductory of certain Rules
for the reputation of reputation
allowances to the effect of the Co.