M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(1) No. of pages 40

(2) Date of repair 15-6-1966

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1055
55-56

Press
~~Mis.~~

Dated 6-4- 1866.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 55. Read the following letter from the Superintending Engineer, 1st Division, to the Secretary to Government, Department Public Works, dated Waltair, 9th March 1866, No. 2,772:—

Enclosure 1.

1. I have the honor to submit the accompanying original letter from the Controller, refusing audit to certain Travelling Allowance Bills, for the consideration of Government.

2. The Controller stops the travelling allowances in this case not because the charges are not in accordance with the Regulations, but because he differs with me as to the necessity of the Range Officer maintaining a set of bearers and a boat's crew.

3. Captain Fischer quotes paragraph 10 of G. O. No. 2,860, dated 27th September 1865, as empowering him to disallow travelling allowances on these grounds; that is, he claims to be authorized by Government to decide whether a Range Officer should have marched on a certain day or to a certain place, and whether he should have maintained a set of bearers or not; in short, as it is expressed in his own letter, the Controller claims to allow only what he considers the Range Officer entitled to, without reference to the Superintending Engineer's opinion, or to the Regulations.

4. The Sub-Engineer in this case maintained, during the two months for which travelling allowance is disallowed by the Controller, a full set of bearers *and* a boat's crew for each of the days for which travelling allowance is claimed, and is therefore entitled, by the Regulations, to the allowance under Rule VI, paragraph 2.

From the Controller of Public Works Accounts, to the Superintending Engineer, 1st Division, dated Madras, 20th February 1866, No. 3,227.

2 Inspection Reports.

1. In reply to your letter, No. 2,550 of the 10th instant, I have the honor to observe, that I do not think Sub-Engineer Veeranah performed any duty in the month of December which would entitle him to receive higher remuneration than double horse allowance, and, consequently, I have passed his travelling allowance bill for that allowance; you will observe that the abovementioned Sub-Engineer did not actually travel during the entire month, as a journey of five or six miles out, shown on each day, cannot be deemed "travelling," as the term is accepted in connection with the duties of the Department. He may have kept up a tonjon and bearers, but his duties do not appear to have been such that he was actually and necessarily obliged to keep up a full set of bearers *continuously* on the public service only. And being empowered by the concluding portion of paragraph 10 of G. O. No. 2,860, dated 27th September 1865, to disallow all claims not entitled by the entries in the Inspection Reports, I have disallowed the travelling allowance forwardde with your letter, and have passed what I consider the subordinate is entitled to.

2. The same remarks apply to Sub-Engineer Veeranah's travelling allowance bill for January.

No. 56. ORDER THEREON, 6th April 1866, No. 1,055.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 7.

1. In this letter Captain Ryves appeals against the decision of the Controller of Public Works Accounts, who has disallowed the travelling allowances passed by the Superintending Engineer to Sub-Engineer Veranah for the months of January and February, and contends

that the Sub-Engineer, having maintained a full set of bearers and kept up a boat's crew during the time for which travelling allowance is claimed, is entitled to full allowances under Section 2, paragraph VI. of the Rules.

2. It appears from the correspondence that during the whole of the two months the Sub-Engineer never proceeded to a greater distance than six miles from his head quarters, and that he always returned there on the same day. As he, therefore, never passed a night away from his own house, the Government do not consider that journeys of the above nature constitute such travelling as is intended by the Rules, and they think that, under the spirit of those Rules, the Sub-Engineer is not entitled to the allowances claimed.

(True Extract.)
(Signed) CHARLES A. ORR, Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 1st Division, with Enclosure.
" Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. S. T Augustin.

3

Supte Engineer's Office 1st Div.
Waltair, 9th March 1866.
Despd 11th do.

No. 272

From Captain J. G. Pyres R.E.
Superintending Engineer 1st Div.

To, Colonel C. A. Orr, R.E.
Secretary to Government P.W.

Sir,

Encl 1

I have the honor to submit, the accompanying original letter, from the Controller refusing audit to certain Travelling Allowance bills, for the consideration of Government.

2. The Controller stops the Travelling Allowances in this case not because the charges are not in accordance with the Regulations, but because he differs with me as to the necessity of the Range Officer maintaining a set of bearers and a boats' crew.

3. Captain Fischer quotes para 10 of G.O. No. 2860. dated 27th September 1865 as empowering him to disallow Travelling Allowances on these grounds - that is he claims to be authorized by Government to decide whether a Range Officer should have marched on a certain day or to a

a certain place, whether he should have maintained a set of bearers or not: in short, as it is expressed in his own letter the Controller claims to allow only what he considers the Range Officer entitled to, without reference to the Superintending Engineer's opinion or to the Regulations.

4. The Sub Engineer in this case maintained during the two months for which Travelling Allowance is disallowed by the Controller a full set of bearers and a boat's crew for each of the days for which Travelling Allowance is claimed and is therefore entitled by the Regulations to the Allowance under Rule VI para 2.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Most obedient Servt

H. R. [illegible] Capt. R.E.
Superintending Engineer 1st Div.

Public Works Department.

No. 1055

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT

Under date the 6th April 1866.

Read the following

From the Superintending Engineer
of the 1st Dn &c

(Here enter No. 2772 dated 9th March 1866)

Sir Alexander Keller Clerk
to Civil Engineers appeals
against the decision of
the Controller of Public
Works Accounts, who
has disallowed the Tra
velling Allowances pass
ed to the Superintending
Engineer to Sub Engineer
Personally for the months
of January and February
and Controller thereof the Sub
~~Superintending~~ Engineer,
having maintained a
full set of bearers and
kept up a boat's crew
during the time for
which Travelling Allow

To
The Superintending Engr
1st Division

To
The Secretary to Govt
P. Works
Madras

Dated 9th March
Desp 11th do — 1866
Received 22nd

No. 2772

Enclosure two

Submits, for the Considera-
tion of Govt, the Controller's
No. 3227 dated 20th February
refusing audit to certain
Travelling allowance bills
for Sub Engineer, Mr. S
Range, Godavery

A. 55

No. 265 March 1866 P. 45 Office

No. 1055 - 6th April 1866

is claimed, is entitled to full allowances under section 2 Para VI of the Rules.

2 It appears from the correspondence that during the whole of the 2 months the Sub Engineer never proceeded to a greater distance than 6 miles from his Head Quarters, and that he always returned there on the same day. As he therefore never passed a night away from his own house, the Government do not consider that journeys of the above nature

constitute such travelling as is intended by the Rules, and they think that, under the spirit of those rules, the Sub Engineer is not entitled to the allowances claimed.

To Supdg Engr 1st Circle

The Controller of P.W. Accts

Secy to Govt

(71)

P. W. 186 6. Department.

Proc: of Govt for April

No. 1055

PROCEEDINGS OF GOVERNMENT. of Madras

Dated 6th April 1866