(9)

Archives I-10,006—16-8 77.

(1) Number of pages 18

(2) Date of repair 31/3/87

(3) Initials of the Referencer [illegible]

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

PW DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. B.P. No.	1944 (W)	Press. Mis.
Dated	2-8-1882 ~~197~~.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

2nd August 1882, No. 1944 W., Public Works.

1949
1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General
Establishment.

No. 15.

Read—the following papers :—

From Lieutenant-Colonel H. R. MEAD, R.E., Superintending Engineer, Fourth Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Coimbatore, 4th July 1882, No. 255 :—

I have the honor to state that paragraph 621-iv of the Public Works Code being inconsistent with the provision of paragraph 622, I consider that the former necessarily requires correction.

2. Paragraph 622 provides that if a member of the office establishment travels by any other conveyance than railway, and if the allowance mentioned in paragraph 616 (*i.e.*, three-tenths of his salary) is insufficient, he can recover the actual expenses, whereas paragraph 621, clause iv, restricts this claim to the three-tenths of the individual's salary in addition to railway fare, if he makes also journey on the same day by railway.

3. As clerks often have to make a railway journey in the course of another journey at the discretion of the officer under whom they serve, it will be hard upon them if the allowances are regulated in accordance with paragraph 621-iv of the Code. I have therefore the honor to request that the rule may be modified to the effect that in allowing the actual expenses the restriction of three-tenths of their salary may be removed.

4. I enclose a copy of Lieutenant Romilly's letter, which causes this reference, also the Examiner's reply.

No. 15-A.

Office Note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated 20th July 1882, No. 321.

The ruling contained in paragraph 621-iv does not appear to me to be inconsistent with that contained in paragraph 622 of the Public Works Department Code. One applies to *combined* railway and road journeys, and the other solely to road journeys. Under the former nothing in excess of double or single railway, *plus* three-tenths of pay for the number of days absent from head-quarters, is admissible, and under the latter only three tenths of pay for the number of days absent from head-quarters, and under special sanction *when ordered* to travel by special or particular conveyance other than railway, actual expenses.

2. If any modifications of existing rules are considered necessary by Government, the previous sanction of Government of India should be obtained [illegible]th r[illegible]e to paragraph 652 of the Public Works Department Code.

No. 16.

ORDER—dated 2nd August 1882, No. 1944 W., Public Works.

The rules referred to by the Superintending Engineer were framed by the Government of India and are applicable to the three Presidencies, and this Government do not consider that there is sufficient ground to recommend a modification of them.

(True Extract.)

Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.,
Irrigation Branch.

To the Superintending Engineer, Fourth Circle.
Examiner of Public Works Accounts.

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of {1882} Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated August, 2nd.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 2nd Aug. 1882, No. 1944 W.

AUGUST.
Nos. 15-16.

Public Works Code.

Declining to recommend a modification of paragraphs 621 and 622 of the —.

B. Project Division Office
Camp Venkatasamoodrum 31st May/82

No. 53/S

1944/3

From, The Executive Engineer
B. Project Division

To, The Superintending Engineer
4th Circle

Sir,

I have the honor to enclose a Disallowance list with "final" remarks from the Examiner and one to which in all probability similar final remarks will be attached and to ask that the matter may be referred to Government.

The whole question turns on the manner in which paras 616, 621 & 622 of the Code are to be interpreted and I must confess I am now much puzzled on this point. According to para 616 any of my clerks or Draftsmen when travelling with me are entitled to 3/10 salary as batta. By para 621 I. II if they travel by rail they are entitled to rail fare for any day on which their journey is made by rail. By para 621 IV if they travel by train and otherwise (a very comprehensive term) they are entitled to railway fare plus actual expenses not exceeding 3/10 salary. By Para 622 if ordered to travel by conveyance other than railway & 3/10 of

salary

salary as batta is insufficient to cover his expenses. I am authorized to pass his actual travelling expenses. I have acted to the best of my intelligence by these rules and the Examiner now finally disallows my action on the grounds that Para 622 only applies to journeys other than by rail when a clerk is ordered to travel by a particular conveyance say dâk". This distinction between paras 621 & 622 as drawn by the Examiner is so very delicate, that I fail to detect the difference. Say one of my clerks has to travel with me from Tripatore to Venkatasamudram on 1st June the journey has to be made by train to Mullapuram 49 miles and thence by road to Venkatasamudram 8 miles. I do not know if the journey from Mullapuram to Venkatasamudram would be looked on by the Examiner as by dâk, but I most distinctly assert that it is a "journey other than by rail". As regards special Conveyance I only know of three in this Country viz: boat, bullock cart & palankein. The second may perhaps be subdivided into single bullock and double bullock cart & one of these two latter modes of special conveyance

the

the clerk must most certainly employ. Now will not the clerk have been ordered on the 1st to travel "by a particular conveyance other than by rail" and so become entitled to the allowances admissable by para 622, or to render him eligible for this must he have a memo handed him on his arrival at Mullapuram directing him to proceed by special conveyance" to Venkatasamudram?. I really cannot see how the fact of a man having already travelled 50 or 60 miles by train with a view to complete a journey by road to a camp distant from the line of rail on the same day furnishes an argument for his not having been ordered to travel by conveyance other than by rail on that day.

One of my clerks draws Rs 16 a month the other Rs 30, and 3/10th salary is Rs 4-8- and Rs 9 a month or not quite 3as and 5as a day in their respective cases. In the event of a journey from Mullapuram to Venkatasamudram by bandy 10as is the least for which a cart can be hired and as there is no village at Mullapuram and bandies have to be *sent*

for

for from Venkatasamoodram the cartmen demand rather more, thence if the Examiner's interpretation of the paras is correct the ordinary performances of their duties must be an expensive matter for the clerks and attached as they are to a special office like this where travelling means waste of time and distances have to be covered as quickly as possible they must be out of pocket every month.

13 JUL 82

17 JUL 82

I have &c.

(Signed) J. F. Romilly Lt: RE
Executive Engineer

(True Copy)

Lt: Colonel RE
Supt: Engineer IV Circle

No. 144 S: E 4th

1229/5

From, The Examiner
Public Works account
Madras

To,
The Superintending Engineer
4th Circle

Madras 26th June 1882.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 122 dated 5th Instant, I have the honor to state that the particular item adverted to by you has been correctly disposed of by this office as under existing rules (P. W. Department Code para 621-IV) nothing in excess of double or single railway fare plus $\frac{3}{10}$ ths of pay for the number of days absent from head quarters is admissible to a member of office Establishment for a combined railway and road journey.

2. The provisions of para 622 are applicable to solely road journeys performed by special or particular conveyance

conveyance other than railway, and do not affect the cases of combined journeys in which the option of allowing actual expenses can be exercised up to a certain limit only i.e up to a maximum as given in para 1.

3. Original Papers returned.

I have &ca

(Signed) D. C. Gordon
Examiner P. W. Accts.

(True Copy)

Lt. Col. R.E.
Supdg. Engineer IV Circle

ENCLOSU
13 JUL

JUL 82

Enclosure 2

No. 255

Supdg. Engr's Office 4th Circle
Coimbatore, 4th July /82.

From,

The Supdg. Engineer
4th Circle

1449
6

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. Departt.
Madras

Sir,

I have the honor to state that para 621-II of the P. W. Code being inconsistent with the provisions of para 622, I consider that the former necessarily requires correction.

2. Para 622 provides that if a member of the Office Establishment travels by any other conveyance than Railway and if the allowance mentioned in para 616 or

(i.e. 3/10 of his salary) is insufficient, he can recover the actual expenses, whereas para 621 clause IV restricts this claim to the 3/10 of the individual's salary in addition to Railway fare, if he makes also journey on the same day by railway -

3- As clerks often have to make a Railway journey in the course of another journey at the discretion of the officer under whom they serve, it will be hard upon them if the allowances are regulated in accordance with para 621- IV of the Code, I have therefore the honor to request that the rule may be modified to the effect that in allowing

1944/7

the actual expenses the restriction of 3/10 of their salary may be removed

4- I enclose a copy of Lieut. Romilly's letter, which causes this reference also the Examiner's reply.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedt Servt

Lt Col. R.E.
Supg Engineer, 4 Circle -

ordered to travel by special or particular conveyance other than railway, actual expenses.

3. If any modifications of existing rules are considered necessary [illegible] Government, the previous sanction of Govt. of India should be obtained with reference to para 652 of the P.W.D. Code.

20.7.82

R. No. 275. 13th July 1882
Enc 2
No. 585 E d/ 11th July 1882

15 JUL 82
ACCOUNTS

To

C.

For any further remarks he may have to offer with respect to the proposed modification of Code rules.

10.7.82

For W.

No. 321 20th July 1882
Enc 2.

Recd 22/7

To W.

The ruling contained in para 621-IV does not appear to me to be inconsistent with that contained in para 622 of the P.W.D. Code- One applies to combined railway and road journeys, and the other solely to road journeys. Under the former nothing in excess of double or single railway, plus 3/10th of pay for the number of days absent from head quarters is admissible, and under the latter only 3/10th of pay for the number of days absent from head quarters, and under special sanction when

Recd to only 26/7

only 6/7

From

The Supg Engineer,
Fourth Circle.

Dated 4th
Despd Do } July 1882.

No. 255.

Enc: 2

P.W. Code:—

Pointing out the inconsistency between paras 621 and 622 of the —; and considering that the former requires modification—

To

A/

1944/8

No. 1944 W

general
Estabt

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 2nd August 82

Read the following:—

From the Supdg Engineer Fourth Circle } A & E No. 255 d/ 4th July 1882

Office note from the Examiner P.W. accounts } " " 321 d/ 20th July 1882.

The rules referred to by the Superintending Engineer were framed by the Government of India and are applicable to the three Presidencies, and the Government do not consider that there is sufficient ground to recommend a modification of them.

28.7.82

To

Supdg Engineer Fourth Circle

Examiner P. W. accounts

2/7/82

4423.

Govt. of (1882) Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated 4/8

Recd.　　Encl.

G. O. 2nd Augt 1882, No. 1944.

Nos. 15–16

Br Code.

Declining to recommend a modification of paras 621 and 622 of the ——.

503/8

[illegible] in Receipt Room