

(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.	1936	Press
B.P. No.		Mis. _____
Dated	14-7-	4875-195

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
14th July 1875.*

No. 373. Read the following letter from Captain L. CONWAY-GORDON, R.E., Controller of Public Works Accounts, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. MULLINS, R.E., Officiating Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Fort St. George, 3rd July 1875, No. 36 W :—

I HAVE the honor to forward you, for the orders of Government, a copy of a letter No. 27, dated 11th June 1875, received from the District Engineer, Tinnevely, on the subject of the horse allowance to be granted to Overseers in the Public Works Department.

2. With reference thereto, I have remarked that, under the Travelling Allowance Rules, any subordinate officer is entitled to horse allowance who is required to move daily or frequently to a greater distance than he can easily travel on foot, irrespective of the means of conveyance employed.

3. On the other hand, G. O., No. 1,698 distinctly excludes all other means of conveyance except the horse, and further lays down that the horse must be the Overseer's own property. Under this Government Order, therefore, an Overseer who possessed or hired a camel, or a bullock-bandy, or a mule, or indeed any other means of conveyance, except a horse of his own, is not entitled to an allowance.

4. In the present instance, the District Engineer, Tinnevely, reports that the Overseer does not possess a horse, but that he keeps a bandy, drawn, I conclude, by oxen. The Overseer consequently does not appear to me entitled to horse allowance under the rules. At the same time, I feel some difficulty in auditing such charges, as I am not aware of the precise object which Government had in view when making the distinction between the different means of conveyance.

From J. D. GRANT, Esq., Assistant Engineer in charge of District Engineer's Office, Tinnevely, to Captain L. CONWAY-GORDON, R.E., Controller of Public Works Accounts, dated Palamcottah, 11th June 1875.

In forwarding to you the travelling allowance bill of the Tinnevely Range for the past month, I beg to inform you that Overseer Kuppusawmy Iyengar has no horse and does not require one, being engaged on survey work, and this being the case he is not, under G. O., No. 1,698 of the 24th June 1874, entitled to any allowance whatever.

2. As however he keeps a bandy and requires it, he is fairly entitled to draw some allowance, but of what nature I cannot find.

3. If therefore you feel precluded by the Government Order above quoted from passing single horse allowance to this man, I have the honor to request that you will refer the matter to Government, and obtain for him some relaxation of the rule.

No. 374. ORDER THEREON, 14th July 1875, No. 1,996.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 36.

It was ruled in G. O., No. 1,698, dated 24th June 1874, that no travelling allowance whatever should be passed to an Overseer not possessing and in the habit of using a horse. This order will be modified by the addition of the words, or suitable means of conveyance; but District

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
14th July 1875.

Engineers will observe that it is considered advisable Overseers should generally travel on horseback, and it is only under special circumstances that the possession and use of other means of conveyance should be held to entitle a subordinate to horse allowance.

(True Extract.)

Major, R.E.,

Offg. Joint Secretary to Government.

To all Superintending and District Engineers.
To the Executive Engineer, Wynaad.
" Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. S. T. Austin.

Spare Copies

Timewelly Dist Engrs Off
Palani collah 11 June 1875

From The Assistant Engineer in ch. of
District Engineers Office Timewelly

To The Controller of P. W. Accts.
Madras.

Sir. In forwarding to you the Travelling Allowance Bill of the Timewelly Range for the past month I beg to inform you that Overseer Lappasawmy Iyengar has no horse and does not require one, being engaged on Survey work, and this being the case he is not under G. O. No. 1698 of the 24th June 1874 entitled to any allowance whatever.

As however he keeps a Bandy and requires it, he is fairly entitled to draw some allowance, but of what nature I cannot find.

If therefore you feel precluded by the G. O. above quoted, from passing single horse allowance to this man I have the honor to request that you will refer the matter to

to Government and obtain for him
some relaxation of the rule.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your devoted servant
Signed, J. H. Grant
Asst Engineer

In ch. of Dist. Engrs office
Sincerely

(True Copy)

A. H. Hall
Chief Asst to the
Controller of P. & M. S.

GP

GP

No. 36 W

FROM

THE CONTROLLER,
PUBLIC WORKS ACCOUNTS,

TO

The Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department,FORT SAINT GEORGE, 3^d July 1875.

Sir

I have the honor to forward you for the orders of Government a copy of a letter No. 27, dated June 11 1875, received from the District Engineer, Trincomelley, on the subject of the Horse allowance to be granted to Overseers in the Public Works Department.

2. With reference thereto, I have remarked that under the Travelling Allowance rules, any subordinate officer is entitled to Horse Allowance who is required to move daily or frequently to a greater distance than he can easily travel on foot; irrespective of the means of conveyance — employed

Pr. 4390/75.

96-11th July/75

m B M 375

employed.

2. On the other hand G. O. No. 1690 distinctly excludes all other means of conveyance except the horse, and further lays down that the horse must be the Overseer's own property. Under this G. O. therefore, an Overseer who possessed or hired a camel, or a bullock-bandy, or a mule or indeed any other means of conveyance, except a horse of his own is not entitled to an allowance.

3. In the present instance, the District Engineer Innerelly reports that the Overseer does not possess a horse, but that he keeps a bandy, drawn & conclude by oxen. The Overseer consequently does not appear to me entitled to horse allowance under the rules. At the same time, I feel some difficulty in auditing such charges, as I am not aware of the precise object

object which Government had in view when making the distinction between the different means of conveyance.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Yours most Obedt Servt.
Lowrey Gordon
Controller of P. & M. Works

1828-29. 1/2-1/2 491-492
21 June 74. 514-517-416
orig. cl. 2761 & 2048 of 1874.

P.W. Dept.
From No: 4390
The Controller of
P.W. Accounts
To
The Secy to Government
P.W. Department.

N^o 36 W.
Dated 3^d
Recd 5 } July 1875
E.I.

Forwarding, for the
orders of Government
copy of a letter from
the Dist. Engineer
Tinnevely, on the
subject of Horse
Allowance to be
granted to Overseers
in the P.W. Dept.

N^o 273

1875-76. 8-7-75

Public Works Dept.

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 18th 1875

Read the following

From
The Contr. of P.W. Accts (H.C. N^o 36 W. 27th July 1875)

of B. No. 1974 of 14th July 1875

It was ruled in
G.O. N^o 1698, dated 24th
June 1874, that no travelling
allowance whatever should
be paid to an Overseer
not professing and in
the habit of using a horse.
This order will be modi-
fied by the addition of
the words, or other suit-
able means of conveyance,
but District Engineers
will observe that it
is considered advisable

2. *Attenuatus* N 373/4.