

(1) Number of pages_____

(2) Date of repair_____

(3) Initials of the Referencer_____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

Government of Madras

Public works DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1882	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
244-245		
Dated	13. 7. 1874	195.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
13th July 1874.*

No. 244. Read the following letter from T. MOSS, Esq., Officiating Controller of Public Works Accounts, to Colonel G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 11th June 1874, No. 2,141 :—

WITH reference to G. O., No. 1,484 of the 5th instant, relative to funds required to be placed at the disposal of Civil Officers, I have the honor to state that the instance referred to by the District Engineer, Chingleput, is the only one in which any difference of opinion has arisen, and that in all other districts and ranges no doubt exists as to the course to be followed in supplying funds to Civil Officers who carry out public works.

2. In his letter to Government the District Engineer states (paragraph 4) that I sent a "*direct*" order to the Range Officer to pay Rupees 10,000 to the Civil Officer, and this is described as a "*novel*" proceeding. The facts however are different : I did not address the Range Officer *direct*, but sent to him a copy of

* No. 312 of 27th January 1874.

the letter* I addressed to the District Engineer. I beg attention to this letter

(copy annexed), because it will show that I took some pains to explain to the District Engineer that there was no irregularity, and that there was proper sanction and allotment for the work for which the Civil Officer required funds.

3. The District Engineer in his 1st paragraph states that my proceeding in this instance was opposed to all rule and precedent, but in reality there was no departure from rule on my part. Not satisfied with the explanation contained in the letter above referred to (and annexed), the District Engineer again addressed me* on the subject, and maintained that

* No. 2,921 of 30th January 1874.

I should supply the Civil Officer with funds direct and not through the Range Officer. I then explained† further on the

† No. 18 of 3rd February 1874.

subject, and I added that "in no case has the Controller of Public Works Accounts, Madras, placed funds at the disposal of Civil Officers in the direct manner which you consider necessary."

I cannot therefore understand how the District Engineer continues to regard my proceeding as opposed to all rule and precedent.

4. When the Civil Officer applied to me for funds on the 14th January last,

* No. 153 of 16th January 1874.

I simply wrote* in reply that "an application should be made to the Public

Works Officer in charge of the Chingleput Range for the funds required, under the rules for advances to Civil Officers;" and I submit that there was nothing irregular in this, seeing that, as stated in the 1st paragraph of the annexed letter, funds for the work had been allotted, and there was no reason to suppose that the Range Officer was not prepared to make the advance required.

From T. MOSS, Esq., Officiating Controller of Public Works Accounts, to Colonel F. J. MOBERLY, R.E., District Engineer, Chingleput, dated Madras, 27th January 1874, No. 312.

WITH reference to your letter, No. 2,857, of the 22nd instant, regarding the road from Chingleput to Soorappeas' Choultry and funds for the same, I have the honor to refer you to

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
13th July 1874.

Item 8, Part I., of the current year's Budget, a copy of which was forwarded to you with the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 1,245, of the 10th July last. I beg also to refer you to my No. 299, of the 16th August last, intimating that funds had been placed at your disposal for the above and other works.

2. The intention of Local Fund Rule XLI., to which you refer in respect to funds, is simply that the Controller shall arrange to supply Civil Officers with funds for Public Works, and does not require that this should be done without the intervention of Executive Engineers or Range Officers, as supposed by Mr. Executive Engineer Lowry, who has also addressed me on the subject. It is a standing rule of the department that funds to Civil Officers entrusted with the execution of public works should be supplied by the nearest Executive Engineer, and it is to be regretted that Mr. Lowry did not comply with the request of the President of the Local Fund Board, supported as that request was by a copy of my letter, No. 153 of the 16th instant. Allowing even that I had not followed the correct course, the responsibility would not have been Mr. Lowry's but mine, and it would have been for me to correct the mistake and adjust the outlay. A copy of this letter will be forwarded to Mr. Lowry.

No. 245. ORDER THEREON, 13th July 1874, No. 1,882.

ACCOUNT, No. 10.

ORDERED to be recorded.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Officiating Controller of Public Works Accounts.
District Engineer, Chingleput.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

Public Works Department

Proceedings of the Madras Govt.

Read the following:

From
The Offg. Controller of
Public Accounts (H. E. Esq. 2141 of 11th
June 1874.)

The explanation
submitted by the
officiating Controller
of Public Works Ac-
counts in reference
to his correspondence

submitted by the
Controller's explanation
is satisfactory and
the D. & R. 22nd
Spec. 10th in future con-
form to the instructions
from - 20/6 1874

I think that the Controller
of the D. & R. Officers has been negligent
in his actions - As I gather the
Controller has previously
referred to the Civ. Eng. & the Range
Officers under the rules & provisions
did his duty properly
If I am wrong the Civ. Eng.
will kindly not follow the instructions
the fact is not

I think this might be suitably "recorded" as per
Sd/- Mr. [Signature]

any modification
of that order.

It is understood
that the Controller is
right so far as re-
-gards the channel
through which the
Civil Officer is to be
supplied with funds
but he must carry
out the transactions
with due regard
to the financial
requirements of the
Range Officer in
respect of his own
works.

It may be that
the compliance of
the

With reference to
the Hon. Mr. Ro-
-binson's note,
the Secretary is
satisfied that the
retention of the
1000 Rs. only
will suffice. The
order referred to
set matters to
rights; and the
Controller may be
satisfied with
having the last
word —

GM
22.6.74

the Range Officer with
the requisition will
have to be postponed
till his receipt of
funds on a sup-
-plementary demand
made by him spe-
-cially to meet the
Civil Officer's requisition.

GM

350

Private

Madras
H. S. S.

W. S.

022.772

1/21/74

Office of the Controller of
Accounts
Madras 27th January 1874
No. 312

From
The Officiating Controller of
Accounts
The District Engineer
Chingleput

Sir
With reference to your letter
No. 2807 of the 22nd instant regarding
the road from Chingleput toloor
appears Choultry and funds for
the same I have the honor to refer
you to item 3 part I of the Current
year's Budget a copy of which was
forwarded to you with the Proceeds
of the Board of Revenue No.
1245 of the 10th July last. I beg also
to refer you to my No. 299 of the
10th August last intimating that
funds had been placed at your
disposal for the above and other
works.

2. The intention of Local Fund
Rule XII to which you refer in
respect to funds is simply that
the Controller shall arrange to
supply Civil Officers with funds
for Public Works, and does not.

R. S. S. 1/74
C in 19/6/74 R. S. S. 1/74

request that this should be done with-
out the intervention of Executive
Engineers or Range Officers
as approved by Mr Executive
Engineer Lowry who has also
addressed me on the subject. It
is a standing rule of the Depart-
ment that funds to Civil Officers
entrusted with the execution of
Public Works should be supplied
by the nearest Executive Engineer
and it is to be regretted that Mr
Lowry did not comply with the
request of the President of the
Local Fund Board supported as
that request was by a copy of my
letter No 153 of the 10 District. Al-
lowing even that I had not followed
the correct course, the responsibility
would not have been Mr Lowry's
but mine, and it would have
been for me to correct the mis-
take and adjust the outlay.
A copy of this letter will be for-
warded to Mr Lowry.

P.W. 350

Ph. 7/13/9

L.S.N. 2

I have &c

Sgd/ J. Moss

Offg Controller of P. Accounts

(true copy)

[Signature]

Offg Controller of P. Accounts

Office of the Controller of
P. & H. Accounts
Madras 11 June 1894
No 2161
From
The Officiating Controller of
P. & H. Accounts
The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Fort St George

Sir,
With reference to G.O No 1484 of
the 5th instant relative to funds
required to be placed at the dis-
posal of Civil Officers, I have the
honour to state that the instance
referred to by the District Engineer
Chingleput is the only one in
which any difference of opinion
has arisen and that in all
other Districts and Ranges no
doubt exists as to the course to
be followed in supplying funds
to Civil Officers who carry out
Public Works.
In his letter to Government
the District Engineer states (para
4) that I sent a direct order
to the Range Officer to pay
Rs 1000 to the Civil Officer
and this is described as a

request that this should be done with-
out the intervention of Executive
Engineers or Range Officers
as approved by Mr Executive
Engineer Lowry who has also
addressed me on the subject. It
is a standing rule of the Depart-
ment that funds to Civil Officers
entrusted with the execution of
Public Works should be supplied
by the nearest Executive Engineer
and it is to be regretted that Mr
Lowry did not comply with the
request of the President of the
Local Fund Board supported as
that request was by a copy of my
letter No 153 of the 10 District. Al-
lowing even that I had not followed
the correct course, the responsibility
would not have been Mr Lowry's
but mine, and it would have
been for me to correct the mis-
take and adjust the outlay.
A copy of this letter will be for-
warded to Mr Lowry.

P.W. 350

Ph. 7/13/9

L.S.N. 2

I have &c

Sgd/ J. Moss

Offg Controller of P. Accounts

(true copy)

[Signature]

Offg Controller of P. Accounts

Office of the Controller of
P. & H. Accounts
Madras 11 June 1894
No 2161
From
The Officiating Controller of
P. & H. Accounts
The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Fort St George

Sir,
With reference to G.O No 1484 of
the 5th instant relative to funds
required to be placed at the dis-
posal of Civil Officers, I have the
honour to state that the instance
referred to by the District Engineer
Chingleput is the only one in
which any difference of opinion
has arisen and that in all
other Districts and Ranges no
doubt exists as to the course to
be followed in supplying funds
to Civil Officers who carry out
Public Works.
In his letter to Government
the District Engineer states (para
4) that I sent a direct order
to the Range Officer to pay
Rs 1000 to the Civil Officer
and this is described as a

request that this should be done with-
out the intervention of Executive
Engineers or Range Officers
as approved by Mr Executive
Engineer Lowry who has also
addressed me on the subject. It
is a standing rule of the Depart-
ment that funds to Civil Officers
entrusted with the execution of
Public Works should be supplied
by the nearest Executive Engineer
and it is to be regretted that Mr
Lowry did not comply with the
request of the President of the
Local Fund Board supported as
that request was by a copy of my
letter No 153 of the 10 District. Al-
lowing even that I had not followed
the correct course, the responsibility
would not have been Mr Lowry's
but mine, and it would have
been for me to correct the mis-
take and adjust the outlay.
A copy of this letter will be for-
warded to Mr Lowry.

P.W. 350

Ph. 7/13/92

L.S.N. 2

I have &c

Sgd/ J. Moss

Offg Controller of P. Accounts

(true copy)

[Signature]

Offg Controller of P. Accounts

Office of the Controller of
P. & H. Accounts
Madras 11 June 1894
No 2161
From
The Officiating Controller of
P. & H. Accounts
The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Fort St George

Sir,
With reference to G.O No 1484 of
the 5th instant relative to funds
required to be placed at the dis-
posal of Civil Officers, I have the
honour to state that the instance
referred to by the District Engineer
Chingleput is the only one in
which any difference of opinion
has arisen and that in all
other Districts and Ranges no
doubt exists as to the course to
be followed in supplying funds
to Civil Officers who carry out
Public Works.
In his letter to Government
the District Engineer states (para
4) that I sent a direct order
to the Range Officer to pay
Rs 1000 to the Civil Officer
and this is described as a

"novel" proceeding. The facts however
are different, I did not address
the Range Officer direct but
sent to him a copy of the letter * 10312 of 27th
I addressed to the District Engineer January 1874
I beg attention to this letter
(copy annexed) because it will
show that I took some pains to
explain to the District Engineer
that there was no irregularity
and that there was proper sanction
and allotment for the work
for which the Civil Officer required
funds.

3. The District Engineer in his
1st para states that my proceeding
in this instance was approved to
all rule and precedent, but in
reality there was no departure
from rule on any point, it is
satisfied with the explanation
contained in the letter above re-
ferred to (and annexed) the
District Engineer again ad-
dressed me on the subject and
maintained that I should supply
the Civil Officer with funds direct
and not through the Range Officer.
I then explained further on the
subject and I added that
in no case has the Controller
of P & Accounts maintained

* 102921 of 30th
January 1874

* 1018 of 30th
January 1874

placed funds at the disposal of
Civil Officers in the direct manner
which you consider necessary.

I cannot therefore understand how
the District Engineer continued
to regard my proceeding as
opposed to all rule and precedent.

4. Then the Civil Officer applied
to me for funds on the 14th of January
last I simply wrote in reply that

"an application should be made
to the Public Works Officer in
charge of the Chingleput Range
for the funds required under the
rules for advances to Civil Officers"

and I submit that there was nothing
irregular in this; seeing that, as
stated in the 1st para of the annexed
letter, funds for the work had been
allotted and there was no reason
to suppose that the Range Officer
was not prepared to make the
advance required.

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Yours most obedient servant

[Signature]
Off Controller of P & Accounts.

[Signature]

10/1/74

W. 1874 Department
No. 3581

The Offg Controller of
Public Works Department
Fort St George

The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Fort St George

Dated 11 June 1874.
Recd 12 June 1874.

No 2141

En: 1

Gl. No: 1882. 13-7-74.

Submits explanation
on the letter from the
District Engineer
Chingleput relative
to the supplying
of funds to civil
officers.

With order.

Control of P.W. D.
D. 2. 1874
D. 2. 1874

Entered to be recorded.

1882

244-245

3rd July 1874
Recd to Secy 13 June 1874

3561

Govt. of 1874 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.



The Engineer.

Dated

Recd.

Encl. /

G. O., 13 July 1874, No. 1882

Nos. 244-245.

Funds Letter from
the Controller of P.W. Accts
submitting explanation
ⁱⁿ reference to his cor-
respondence with the S^r
Mr. Chingleput relative
to Civil Officers being
supplied with funds,
Records of -