M.R.O. 1—39,000—16-10-23.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Judicial **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No.	1836	Press ~~Mis.~~
230-231A. Dated	20-12-~~19~~ 1864	

4/4

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following papers :—

No. 230. From C. COLLETT, Esq., Civil and Session Judge of Vizagapatam, to the Honorable A. J. ARBUTHNOT, Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George; dated Vizagapatam, 21st November 1864, No. 392.

I have the honor respectfully to submit for the consideration of Government the conduct of the Civil Pay Office.

2. On the 3rd instant, the Pay bill of the Judicial establishments in this Zillah was forwarded. On the 4th, a form of leave of absence granted was sent under another cover. On the 5th July last, the Civil Paymaster put a notice into the Gazette that these forms should be attached or stitched to the bill. It was therein pointed out that bills are "*detained*" waiting audit pending receipt of such forms.

3. The form in question related to a single individual; it is not a voucher, does not affect an Anna in the bill, and indeed serves no apparent purpose whatever, as its contents are noted in the bill. On the 10th instant, the Pay office not content with merely detaining the bill, and without caring in the least whether my office was situated only 50 yards off in the Fort, or was 500 miles away up-country returned the bill to me unaudited* simply because this form was not stitched to the bill as the Civil Paymaster pleases to have it. If the Pay office would have waited 24 hours they would have got the form, or at any rate they might have telegraphed for it.

* Copy of Memorandum sent is enclosed.

4. Already what with the course of the post and the delays in the Pay office, our pay is not usually drawn here till three weeks after it is due. This delay we know is unavoidable, but the Pay office does not seem to think it worth any consideration. No doubt the Pay office has not, from experience, ever learnt to appreciate the inconvenience caused by any such delay, though perhaps if the office ran the risk of having to pay interest during the delay needlessly caused in the issue of pay to others, a more cautious and considerate spirit would prevail.

5. I take the liberty therefore to submit to the notice of Government this instance of what, in my humble opinion, is a wanton and arbitrary abuse of official forms, causing loss to public servants without any pretence for saying that it is necessary to protect the interests of the State.

No. 93.

MEMORANDUM.

Returned unaudited.

2. The bill should be submitted with the usual monthly leave Statement stitched to the bill as required in this Office Notification, No. 63, dated 5th July 1864, published in the *Gazette*, page 27 of Vol. II.

FORT SAINT GEORGE,
10*th November* 1864.

(Signed) W. DONALD,
Chief Assistant Civil Paymaster.

To the Civil and Session Judge of Vizagapatam.

(True Copy).

(Signed) C. COLLETT,
Civil and Session Judge.

Referred to the Civil Paymaster for explanation.

FORT SAINT GEORGE, (Signed) A. J. ARBUTHNOT,
6th December 1864. *Chief Secretary.*

To the Civil Paymaster.

No. 231. From R. W. LODWICK, Esq., Civil Paymaster, Fort Saint George, to the Secretary to the Government of Fort Saint George, Judicial Department; dated 8th December 1864, No. 202.

I have the honor with reference to the accompanying documents, to state that the abstract was returned in accordance with the usual practice; because nothing in the way of audit can be effected when a leave Statement is not received.

2. I am at a loss to understand what Mr. Collett can mean by saying that the leave Statement "does not affect one Anna of the bill", the fact being that on this important document altogether depends the audit of the bill, which cannot be looked at till the leave Statement is to hand, and it is therefore a standing rule all over India, and has been for many years, that the bill and the leave Statement should come in together.

3. It is also not understood how the leave Statement can have been posted the day after the bill, for it was not received into this office till four days after the latter.

4. When a leave Statement is not in the packet with a bill, this Department cannot but suppose that the officer has forgotten it altogether, and will not send it till it is called for; and as a written call for the statement takes quite as much time to reach the officer as the bill does itself if returned, and there is more certainty of the Statement and bill agreeing if the latter is returned than if it be kept here, while the chance of the bill being mislaid in this office is avoided by its return, immediately it is found that a leave Statement is not forthcoming, the bill is sent back with a call for the document wanted.

5. A case of this sort is not considered to be one in which the telegraph can be rightly employed, as the neglect of a standing rule has led to the call being made, and Government cannot therefore be properly put to the expense of the telegram.

6. Mr. Collett is wrong in saying that the return of the bill had anything to do with the leave Statement not having been stitched to it. This Department having found that sometimes leave Statements got mislaid when loose, to prevent such occurrences desired that they might be affixed to bills, but no abstract is returned because a leave Statement is sent in loosely; and the reference to the stitching of the leave Statement made in the Memorandum from my Assistant cannot bear the construction put upon it by Mr. Collett.

7. I can with the greatest confidence assert that when audit is in any way possible, a bill is never returned from this office. Whenever clerical, or other mistakes are committed, the objectionable items are invariably deducted and the remainder of the bill is passed at once, but in the event of there being an unauthenticated erasure in the total, no leave Register, or an illegible signature, bills are altogether inadmissible, and are therefore returned at once as their audit is impracticable.

A. ORDER THEREON, 20th December 1864, No. 1836.

he Governor in Council is of opinion that the practice observed by the Civil ster, of returning salary bills when unaccompanied by a leave Statement, is onable. Much of the delay complained of in the case under notice was caused observance of this practice. In such cases, the salary bills should be retained immediate requisition made for any statements or vouchers that may be d.

(True Extract).

Chief Secretary.

Civil Paymaster.
Civil and Session Judge of Vizagapatam.

R. H. Lee.

Order 20th December 1864. No. 1836.

The Governor in Council is of opinion that the practice observed by the Civil Paymaster, of returning salary bills when incomplete by a brief statement, is objectionable. Much of the delay complained of in the case under notice was caused by the observance of this practice. In such cases the salary bills should be returned and an intimation of the objections made for any statements or vouchers that may be required.

To The Civil Paymaster
The Civil & Sessions Judge of Vizagapatam } dated 29th Dec 1864
10

Ltr. 26 Dec 64