M.R.O. 1—82 400—23-11-30

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Financial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 240 Press ~~Mis.~~

Dated 26. 4. 18 59

B. No. 11-12 S/L

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 11. Extract from the Minutes of Consultation in the Revenue Department, dated 8th April 1859, No. 484.

(*Vide* Diary to Consultation, 12th April 1859, Nos. 17 and 18.)

(*Communicating copy of a letter from the Acting Civil Auditor, in view to its being considered whether the practice referred to, viz., appending a note or Memo: at the foot of a Bill, to obtain explanation, when it is returned, is a right and proper one in an Audit Office.*)

No. 12. ORDER THEREON, No. 240; dated 26th April 1859.

There does not appear to be any objection to explanation in respect to a doubtful item in a Bill being called for by a note or Memorandum appended to the foot of the Bill, in minor matters, in place of being applied for by regular letter.

2. In the present case however it seems from Mr. J. L. Lushington's letter of the 8th Ultimo, para. 2 that the Assistant in charge of the Audit of the Revenue Survey and Settlement Bills passed an increased charge for which there appeared no authority, and contented himself with making a note at the foot of the Bill calling for explanation.

3. This was clearly wrong, and such a practice should at once be stopped. No charge should be admitted without due authority, on the expectation of its being subsequently supplied.

4. It does not appear to Government how the practice adverted to could, as represented by the Acting Civil Auditor in his second letter para. 2, be required to obviate delay and inconvenience to entire Establishments, inasmuch as all the items in the Bill might be passed as to which there existed no doubt, and those only be refused where sufficient authority was wanting.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. A. P. W. Begbie.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 484.

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation under date the 8th April 1859.

Read the following letter from J. L. LUSHINGTON, Esq., Acting Civil Auditor; to J. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Secretary to Government; dated Fort Saint George 23d March 1859, No. 240.

SIR,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Extract Minutes Consultation No. 370 dated 21st March 1859, and with reference to para. 2 I beg to state that there is no distinct rule in this office, for appending a note or memo., at the foot of a Bill, to obtain explanation, when it is returned.

2. The practice was adopted by this office, on the introduction of the pre-audit system in this Presidency, in accordance with that obtaining at Agra, in view to save correspondence and to obviate delay and inconvenience to entire establishments, by the detention of a bill until the necessary explanation was received; as frequently the information sought, is a matter of form or authority inadvertently omitted.

3. In graver matters, letters are sent requesting explanation.

Referred to the Financial Department where it will be considered whether the practice referred is a right and proper one in an Audit office.

(A true Extract.)

J. D. Bourdillon

Secretary to Government.

To the Financial Department.

Exd. H. M. Elliot.

Financial Deptt.

No. 2440

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation
Under date 26th April 1859

Read the following
Extract from the Minutes
of Consultation in the
Revenue Department.

(Dated 8th April 1859 No. 484)

There does not appear
to be any objection to explana-
tion in respect to a doubtful
item in a Bill being
called for by a Note or
Memorandum appended to
the foot of the Bill, in
minor matters, in place
of being applied for by
regular letter.

2 In the present case
however it seems from
Mr. J.L. Washington's letter

of the 8th Ultimo para 2 that the Assistant in charge of the audit of the Revenue Survey and Settlement Bills passed an increased charge for which there appeared no authority, and contented himself with making a note at the foot of the Bill calling for explanation.

3 This was clearly wrong and such a practice should at once be stopped - No charge should be admitted without due authority on the expectation of its being subsequently supplied.

4 It does not appear to Government how the practice adverted to could, as represented by the Acting Civil Auditor in his second letter para 2, be required to obviate delay and inconvenience to entire Establishments, in as much as all the items in the Bill might be passed as to which there existed no doubt, and those only be refused where sufficient authority was wanting.

JP

To the Acting Civil Auditor.
Revenue Dept } Dispd 29th

Dft Cons 29 April 1859.
Fmk 1859 Depatch
No 240

Extract Mins Cons.

Dated 26 April 1859.

11 & 12

C 15 Afghanistan
12 21