M.R.O. 1—77,000—8-6-31.

(1) Number of pages 1/2

(2) Date of repair

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1827 Press Mis.

1882-83

Dated 1-7- 1882.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 182. Read the following letter from the Controller of Public Works Accounts, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 27th June 1871, No. 836 :—

Original letter from the Deputy Accountant-General, No. 1,971, dated 22nd June 1871, with a bill.
From Accountant-General, No. 1,692, dated 9th June 1871.
To do., No. 308, dated 12th June 1871.
From do., ,, 1,823, ,, 14th ,, ,,
To do., ,, 466, ,, 17th ,, ,,

5 Channel Monigars at Rs. 7 per mensem.
2 Do. do. at ,, 5 do.
26 Channel Distributors at ,, 2 do.
Total cost ... ... Rs. 97
Annually ... ... ,, 1,164
Vide page 44 of the current year's Budget and G. O., No. 17, dated 3rd September 1870.

In their Proceedings of the 9th December 1870, No. 1,990, the Government directed that their orders of the 23rd August 1870, No. 1,311, should be held in abeyance, and that the Neranikum establishment as per margin, in the Tinnevelly District, should continue to be paid by the Civil Department till March 1871, all charges for 1871-72 and subsequent years being defrayed from the Public Works Budget.

2. The pay of one of the Monigars on this establishment for January last, amounting to Rupees 4-4-8 as per enclosed bill, not having been disbursed from the treasury of the Tinnevelly District before the 31st March 1871, the admission of the item, as a charge against the Civil Department, is refused by the Accountant-General, who, in his letter No. 1,692, dated 9th instant, applied to me for information as to whether the Monigar's salary would be accepted by this office as a debit to Public Works. In reply I informed the Accountant-General that, in the absence of specific Budget provision for a charge appertaining to the *past* official year, I could not pass the bill without special sanction, whereupon the Accountant-General observed that there would probably be sufficient savings from the Public Works Budget of 1871-72 to meet the salary of the Monigar in question, and that, if no such savings were expected, this office should take steps to obtain a supplemental grant for the purpose.

3. The two points upon which the orders of Government are now respectfully requested are—

1*st*.—Whether the pay of the Monigar for January last should now be passed by this office as a charge against the Public Works Department.

2*nd*.—Whether in cases in which charges properly debitable to the Civil Department are not adjusted in time by that department, and require adjustment under circumstances like the present, in the Public Works Accounts, this office or the officer who incurred the charge, should take measures for obtaining the sanction of Government.

4. On the first of these points I need only observe that no difficulty is anticipated in meeting the small charge of Rupees 4-4-8 from savings on the Public Works Budget for establishments. With regard to the second question, so far as it bears on the case under consideration, I beg leave to remark that this office is unable to explain how it happened that salary due for January 1871 was not disbursed till *April* following, a point upon which it appears to me that the Government would expect to be furnished with explanation. Moreover, this office, being one of audit, has simply to refuse the admission of a charge for which no specific Budget

provision exists, leaving it to the officer concerned to place the matter before Government with his explanations, and obtain special sanction. This course is ordinarily adopted by officers of the Department Public Works, and it appears to me that, if a different procedure is to be followed in the case of officers of other departments, and this office be required to take the initiative in obtaining authority for the admission of charges to which it has objected, it would be assuming duties and responsibilities which are not understood to devolve upon it, and for the fulfilment of which, in a manner satisfactory to itself and to Government, it would be necessary frequently to enter upon a protracted correspondence, with a view of obtaining explanations which might be furnished at once directly by the officers concerned.

No. 183. ORDER THEREON, 12th July 1871, No. 1,832.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 23.

UNDER the circumstances brought to notice the Government authorize the Controller of Public Works Accounts to pass against the savings on the Public Works allotment for establishments, for the current official year, the salary of the Monegar referred to for the month of January last amounting to Rupees 4-4-8.

2. The view taken by the Controller (paragraph 4) in regard to the limit of the duties and responsibilities devolving upon him is correct, and His Excellency the Governor in Council is of opinion that, on a charge being disallowed by the Audit Office, it is for the officer who incurs it to lay before Government a full explanation of the circumstances of the case with a view to sanction being obtained.

3. Explanation should be afforded by the Collector of Tinnevelly why the Monegar's salary for January 1871 was not drawn and paid at the proper time.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. CARPENDALE, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Controller of Public Works Accounts, with six enclosures.
" Collector of Tinnevelly.
" Acting Superintending Engineer, 8th Division.
" Revenue Department.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Office of the Controller of Public Works Accounts
Madras 27 June 1871.

No 836

From The Controller of Public Works Accounts

To The Secretary to Government Public Works Department Fort St George.

Enclosure 6.

Original letter from the Superintending Engineer 8th Division dated 22nd June 1871 with a like Form Recommending Rs 192 of June 1871.

Sir,

In Abstract Proceedings of the 13th December 1870 No 1990 the Government directed that Rs 1311 should be held in abeyance, and that the Establishment as per margin, in the Tinnevelly District, should continue to be paid by the Civil Department till March 1871, all Charges for 1871-72 and subsequent years being defrayed from the Public Works Budgets

5 Channel Monegars @ Rs 7 per mensem.
2 Do Do @ Rs 5 Do
26 Channel Distributors @ 2 Do
Total Cost per Mensem Rs 97
Annually Rs 1164.
Vide Page 44 of the Current years Budget and G.O. No 17, dated 30th September 1870.

The

2. The pay of one of the Moregars on this Establishment for January last, amounting to Rupees 4-4-8 as per enclosed bill, not having been disbursed from the Treasury of the Tinnevelly District before the 31st March 1871, the admission of the item, as a charge against the Civil Department, is refused by the Accountant General, who, in his letter No. 692 dated 9th instant, applied to me for information as to whether the Moregar's salary would be accepted by this Office as a debit to Public Works. In reply I informed the Accountant General that, in the absence of specific budget provision for a charge appertaining to the past Official year, I could not pass the bill without special sanction, whereupon the Accountant General observed that there would probably be sufficient savings from the Public Works Budget of 1871-72 to meet the salary of the Moregar in question, and that if no such savings were expected, this Office should take steps to obtain a supplemental Grant for the purpose.

3. The two points upon which the orders of Government are now respectfully requested are.

1st Whether the pay of the Moregar for January last should now be passed by this Office as a charge against the Public Works Department

2. Whether, in cases in which charges properly debitable to the Civil Department are not adjusted in time by that Department, and require adjustment under circumstances like the present, in the Public Works Accounts, this Office or the Officer who incurred the charge should take measures

for

for obtaining the sanction of Government.

4. On the 1st of these points, I need only observe that no difficulty is anticipated in meeting the small Charge of Rupees 4-4-8 from savings on the Public Works Budget for Establishments.

With regard to the second question, so far as it bears on the case under consideration, I beg leave to remark that this Office is unable to explain how it happened that salary due for January 1871 was not disbursed till April following, a point upon which it appears to me that the Government would be expected to be furnished with explanation. Moreover this Office, being one of audit, has simply to refuse the admission of a charge for which no specific budget provision

provision exists, leaving it to the Officer concerned to place the matter before Government with his explanations and obtain special sanction. This course is ordinarily adopted by Officers of the Department Public Works, and it appears to me that if a different procedure is to be followed in the case of Officers of other Departments, and this Office be required to take the initiative in obtaining authority for the admission of Charges to which it has objected, it would be assuming duties and responsibilities which are not understood to devolve upon it, and for the fulfilment of which, in a manner satisfactory to itself and to Government, it would be necessary frequently to enter upon a protracted correspondence, with a view of obtaining explanations which might be

furnished

furnished at once directly by
the Officers Concerned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

S. Woodf

Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Edward

Rec'd 8th September 1870 30 17 Lbs
15 Ldrs — 82 Mds

P.W. Dr. 1871 Dept
Mad. Govt Judl
No. 2997.

From
The Controller of
P.W. Accounts
Madras

To
The Secretary to
Government
P.W.D
Fort St. George

Dated 27th June 1871
Rec'd 27th June 1871

No 836

Ref. Corrs. of
No 1832 - 12 July 71

Soliciting the orders of Government to pass the Salary of Rs. 4-4-8 of a Moneyar employed in the Veeravanallum Establishment in the Tinnevelly District as a charge against the P.W. D. and affording explanation & information connected therewith -

No 182
65 July 71 R-7th

P.W. Department.

No. 1832.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
dated the 12 July 1871.

Read the following

From
The Controller of P.W. Accounts. No. 836 dated 27th June 1871

Under the circumstances brought to notice the Govt. authorize the Controller of Public Works Accounts to pass the charge against the savings on the Public Works allotment for the current official year for establishments, the salary of the Moneyar referred to for the months of January last amounting to Rs. 4-4-8.

The view taken by the Controller (para 4) in regard to the limit of the duties

and responsibilities de-
-volving upon him is
correct, and His Excellency
the Govr in Council is of
opinion that, on a charge
being disallowed by the
Audit office, it is for
the Officer who incurs it
to lay before Govt
a full explanation
of the circumstances of
the case with a view
to sanction being ob-
-tained

Explanation should
be afforded by the
Collector of Limerick why
the Manager's salary for

13 3

January 1871 was not
drawn and paid at the
proper time.

To
The Govt of P. W. Accounts with his Lres
" Coll of Limerick
" Supty Engr 8th Dn
" Revd Dept
" Financial Dept

Desp 13/7/71

Govt of 1871 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To the Controller of Public Works Accounts

12th July 1832.

Nos. 182 & 183

65 July 1871 R-7