

Engineer's, Fifth Circle, letter, he considers that these should not entail a charge upon Government in the way of Travelling Allowance claims, because they come within his definition of what is private property and personal Establishment. Now there are only two ways by which Camp equipage can be obtained at all, that is, excluding Servants, it must be bought and maintained, or it may be hired; and as to Servants there is only one way by which they can be obtained, namely, by hiring. But according to the Engineer's views camp equipage whether hired or purchased and maintained is part of an Officer's private property, and personal Establishment, and, therefore, it should not entail a charge upon Government. Looking at the question in this way I cannot conceive any circumstances under which an officer would be entitled to any travelling Allowance at all for halt at Head Quarters, and yet there

No. 221

TINNEVELLY DIVISION OFFICE

Cuttalam 23rd August 1883
D.P. 25th

From

The

Executive Engineer

To

Tinnevely Division.

The

Superintending Engineer

6th Circle.

SIR,

In acknowledgement of the receipt of G. O. No 2104 W, dated 1st first of August, and your Memorandum No 961 T dated 13th instant, regarding the New Travelling Allowance rules, I have the honor to inform you that I am still in doubt as to what charges may be considered "actual expenses," for the Examiner has not stated in any of his letters what expenses may be considered actual expenses.

2 Camp & equipage consists of horses, bandies, tents, and camp servants, but so far as I can make out from the Examiner's replies to para 6 of the Superintending

must be in circumstances under which, in the opinion of the Government of India, an Officer is entitled to Travelling Allowance, for if he is not why was section 26, Rule I, inserted in the Code? Now the fact that this rule is in the Code, I think, it is evident the Government of India admit that Officers ought to be reimbursed the actual expenses incurred by them for maintaining camp & equipage during halts at Head Quarters.

3 In para 3 of his letter dated 15th May 1883 No 69 S.E. the Examiner says "if Officers understand that such actual expenses must include only items disbursed outside of their ordinary every day expenses for the upkeep of private means of locomotion and private servants, there cannot be any possible difficulty in their arriving at a legitimate amount." This view of the question seems reasonable

and fair, for it implies that "actual
expense" should be considered to include
only the expenses incurred on the Estab-
lishment beyond what a man would
keep if he were not obliged to go into
camp, and, therefore, if the Examiner had
kept to this opinion there would be
no serious ground for complaint. He
has not however done this for from
his replies above referred to, it seems
that the expenses of maintaining any
camp equipage that falls within his
definition of what is practically private
property, and personal establishment
should not be included by Officers in
their bills for actual expenses, notwith-
standing that the expense so incurred
is "outside of their ordinary every day
expenses, for the upkeep of private
means of locomotion and private servants."
I think this a very unfair way of

dealing with the question because so
long as Government profess, and I
understand that they do profess, to re-
-imburse Officers all reasonable expenses
incurred on the maintenance of camp
equipage, the question whether the
camp equipage is private property or
not can make no difference whatever
to the State, unless it can be shown
that by adopting some other means
for obtaining camp equipage Officers
could get it cheaper. It is however
not possible to do this, and, therefore,
I submit that the Examiner's way of
treating the subject is very unfair.
It is useless to argue that when an
Officer returns to Head Quarters he
can discharge the whole of his camp
equipage, for as regards Horses and Tent
this is simply impossible, and as to Servants

^{and handbills}
It is also practically impossible. This
being so it is only fair and reasonable
for Government to pay for the maintenance
of camp equipage which is kept
and used solely for Government service. Section 28 seems
I cannot help thinking that this is the ^{time to confirm}
^{this view, and as}
view the Government of India hold, ^{there is no reference}
^{in it to private}
for there is nothing in the Code to in- ^{the Examiner's}
-dicate that they desire any distinction ^{view must be}
to be made about private property, ^{wrong - I do}
while at the same time, they must be
well aware that, practically, all officers
to whom travelling allowance is given
use for camp equipage their private
property, that is, property that the
Examiner would consider private property.

4 The Government order under re-
-ference in short amounts to this, that
in future Officers will not get any trav-
-elling allowance at all for halts at

Head Quarters. As this order does not
seem to coincide with the opinion of
the Government of India, and as at least
two Superintending Engineers evidently
agree that the Examiner's interpretation
of Section 26 Rule I is open to argument,
I respectfully request with reference
to para 5 of the Code, that you will
be good enough to advise Government
to refer the whole question to the Go-
-vernment of India for an authori-
-tative ruling, and I trust you will
not refuse to do this, for it will be sa-
-tisfactory to know what is the opinion
of that Government, as those Public
works Officers serving in this Presidency
will know that as regards travelling
allowance they were not being treated

Code I further respectfully beg you
will be good enough to move Government
to ask the Government of India to intro-
duce paragraph 615 of the P.W. Code, or
at least, the spirit of it, into the Travelling Allowance Code. The latter
seems to have been issued in order
to bring together into a convenient form
all the rules affecting travelling allowances;
and in doing this it appears that it
was not intended that any material
alteration should be made in the
old rules; as regards the spirit of those
rules so as to deprive Officers of any
travelling allowance they were per-
mitted to draw under the old rules.
In these circumstances there appears
no reason for refusing to permit
travelling allowance.

seems

is

will

be

it

is

as direct travelling allowance is given to
the Officers mentioned in Schedule D some
of whom get tentage in addition under
Schedule C. Public works Officers are
obliged to travel as much as any, and
more than many of the Officers referred
to — in either of these schedules, and,
therefore, there seems to be no cogent
reason for excluding them; not only
from these schedules, but for declining
to give them any travelling allowance
at all for halt at head quarters.

With regard to Schedule F the
one in which Public works Officers are
included, I think it was very unfair
to put them in this Schedule for by
so doing they are in the same position
as regards travelling allowance as Officers

It is also practically impossible. This

Departments very rarely go into camp,
and, consequently, their expenses in the
way of keeping up camp equipage
are very little, but it is quite the
reverse with Public Works Officers
as they are obliged to be in camp
during every month in the year,
and to spend about two thirds
of each month in camp. The camp
to a life Public Works Officers are obliged
use to lead is extremely unpleasant
and often unhealthy, and, therefore,
any action on the part of Govern-
ment tending to make camp life
still more uncomfortable must
result in inspection work being im-
properly performed. The Govern-

I think

it is sufficient to allow Officers to pro-
vide themselves with suitable and
adequate camp equipage, they will go
into camp as little as possible and
even then many, and particularly su-
-ordinates, will travel in such an
uncomfortable way that they will be
unfit for work.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Yours Most Obedt^{ly} Servant

J. W. Martin.

Recruitment Engineer

Leut Col R.E.
Superior Circle.

And handles

Al N: 77174
27-8-83

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

From

The Executive Engineer

Tinnevely Division.

To

The Superintending Engineer

6th Circle.

No. 221

Dated

23rd

Despd.

25th

Recd.

August 1883

ENCLOSURES.

SUBJECT.

Requests to move
Government as to
what charges may be
considered "actual expenses"

I think

No 414 T.N.

En: 1.

Forwarded in original as requested
by the Executive Engineer Tinnevely.

The Superintending Engineer cannot
but consider that the question of actual
expenses requires consideration and
that the Examiner's ruling (that only the
cost of hired carriage is actual expense)
which has been accepted by the Madras
Government, is one that entails an
officers and Subordinates who maintain
proper camp Equirage considerable
hardship.

2 It has always been considered
in the department (and there is nothing
in the spirit of the new rules to the
contrary) that travelling allowance
was supposed to cover not only the actual
cost of Carriage &c, but also to contribute
towards the cost of the maintenance of
Teaks and other Equirage and for it
to do this more than the actual cost
of the hired carriage should be allowed

actual expenses w

at Head Quarters.

3. To Officers and Subordinates who maintain proper Camp Equipage the fact of halting at Head Quarters for a few days, saves little or nothing and therefore this ruling of the Examiners which it is believed is harsh and not borne out by the New Code will entail on these Officers and Subordinates considerable loss and will tend to make them maintain insufficient Camp Equipage and also avoid head quarters as much as possible and this of course to the detriment of the service, under the present rules the Controlling Officers can have no power to check abuses of this sort.

4. The Superintending Engineer considers that a scale of Camp Equipage (as is done in the Revenue Department), should be laid down for all P. & S. Officers and Subordinates, this Camp Equipage should include tents and horses; that on Certificates (and occasional

inspections by Superior Officers, that it
is maintained $\frac{1}{2}$ daily allowances
should be accepted as actual expenses.

Rodairkanal. 3
5^e September 1883 3

M. Munn - Lieut Col R.E.
Superintending Engineer W. Va.

No 1749 W 20-6-83
No 2104 W 1-8-83
No 2476 W 4-9-83
26-11-07

No 2633 W 18 Sept 83

Recorded

with reference to
G.O. No 2476 W
of 4th Sept 1883, under
which the duty of
checking "Actual
expenses" is vested
in Supt Engineer.

W
13.9.83
CJ
11/9

From.

The Supt Engineer
6 circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No 414 T.N.

Dated 5th 3
Revd. 10 } September/83.

En 1

No 2633 W 18-9-83

Point out certain differences
in the Rules in regard to actual
expenses & Camp equipment & reports
that a scale for camp equipment
as is done in the Revd Dept. may
be laid down.

Lt Supt Circle
S. S. S. S. S.