(1) Number of pages 26

(2) Date of repair 2.7.87

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P.W.D DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. **B.P. No.**	1749 W	**Press.** **Mis.**
Dated	22-6-1883	

Not to be folded or roughly handled.

Archives —I 10,006-9 80

No. 636 G.Q. 1744

FROM THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
FIRST CIRCLE.

TO, THE CHIEF ENGINEER
~~FOR IRRIGATION.~~ P.W. Department

DOWLAISHWERAM, 29th May 1883

SIR,

1 Copy of Letter No 262 G.Q. dated 2[illegible] to the Examiner.
1 Do Do No 47 S.E. 1st dated 30th April 1883 to the Supdg. Engineer
1 Do Do No 403 G.Q. dated 5th M[illegible] to the Examiner.
1 Do. Do No 69 S.E. 1st dated 18th May /83 to the Supdg. Engineer

I have the honor to forward herewith for your Consideration Copies of Correspondence as per margi that has passed between myself and the Examine of P.W. Accounts about the new Travelling allowance Rules.

(2) I Cannot understand how the Examiner Can suppose it to be equitable that an Officer who instead of hiring a Government boat provides himself with one (the Cost of which generally is between Rs 1000 and Rs 2000) and wh has to keep it in repair at a Consi

be allowed to charge anything as part of his actual expenses to cover interest on the Capital expended, depriciation, and cost of repairs, and undoubtedly the result of the Examiners interpretation of the rules can only be that no Officer will keep a private boat – a most undesirable result.

At the same time there can be no doubt that the introduction of claims varying with the value of private property will cause not only much trouble but be perfectly impossible to check.

Even as it is I do not see how a Superintending Engineer is to check in any way the "actual expense" charges, and I would respectfully state my opinion that their introduction into the travelling allowance rules is most unwise.

I sh[illegible] be [illegible] an authori

ruling as to whether the upkeep of of a horse or horses used for work and the pay of extra servants kept because of the necessity of moving about, camp are to be considered "actual expenses of keeping up camp equipage.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obdt. Servt.
J. Tewald
Offg. Supdg. Engineer

the way of travelling allowance claims. To do so, would in fact be equivalent to renting out such property to Govt.

3. I base my opinion upon the wording of the certificates prescribed in para 626 of the Code which to my mind indicates that the cost of maintaining private conveyance of any sort should not be included in the computation of actual expenses. Further under para 615 halting allowance was admitted to meet hire and not ordinary or normal outlay on private prop

2 No. 250 of 9.6.83.
Enc: 4.

Madras,
No. 1305 D. 7th June/83

To C.

For any further remarks he may desire to offer.

Cd

Dy. W
6/6

No. 272 of 9th June/83.
Enc: 4

To W.

Your O.N. No. 1305 D. dated 7th. June 1883.

I understand the Superintending Engineer's argument to be that the maintenance or up-keep of private property (e.g. boats, horses, conveyances, appointments, and servants) used by Govt. Officers in performance of their tours of inspection in the interests of public service should be defrayed by Government for the periods during which they are so used.

2. In my letter No. 60 of 15th. May 1883 to the Superintending Engineer, I have given my opinion that such private property should not be considered as entailing ge upon Government in

---

PWCR ~~4701~~
4880

From

The Supdt. Engineer
1st Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. Department

Dated 29th }
Despd 30th } May/83
Recd 5/6/83 }

No. 636 G.D.

Enclosures. 4

New Travelling allowance Rules - Correspondence about the - Copies of - Submits - for Consideration.

To

NO. 262 G.D.

FROM, THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
FIRST CIRCLE.

TO, THE EXAMINER OF
PUBLIC WORKS ACCOUNTS,
MADRAS.

DOWLAISHWERAM, 23rd April 1883

SIR,

(1) To avoid, if possible, trouble with the Travelling allowance bills for April I shall feel obliged for information on the following points.

(2) Has rule 1 Section 26 - been made applicable by Government order to this Department.

3. This District is different from most where bandies have to be "engaged", or kept for "moving Camp" many of the officers have to do all their "moving Camp" in boats, hiring in most cases from Government but in some cases keeping their own private boats. In the cases of hiring is the halting

is to be simply the hire of the Boat, plus the hire of lascars & lascars kept for working her - or can anything extra - and if so how much, be drawn for the horse or horses which all Officers have to keep continuously for travelling purposes -

P.W. No 4
6701/83
4880

4. In the case of Officers owning private boats - the acquisition of which should be encouraged - how is the halting allowance for them to be calculated. It would be obviously unfair and impolitic to put such officers at a disadvantage as compared with those that hire Government boats - whilst to introduce an "ad valorem" allowance would be to add greatly to the trouble & friction of working the rules.

I have &c &c
Sd/ G. S. Walch
Offg. Supdg Engr. 1st Circle

(True Copy)

No 4

~~From~~

The Examiner, P.W. Accts
Madras

To

The Superintending Engineer
1st Circle

No. 47 S.E. 1st. Madras 30th April 1883.

Sir,

In reply to your No. 262 G.R. of 23rd April/83, I have the honor to offer the following remarks.

2. As regards matters on which the Government has already issued orders which are not opposed to the spirit of the new Travelling allowance Code, I see no necessity for the reissue of such orders with direct reference to certain sections of the new rules. For instance, under section 67, rule 1, Government ~~d~~ to declare who sha

159. 5th dy

be the Controlling Officer. In as much as it has already declared that Superintending Engineers are such, I see no object in reissuing that order, but take it for granted that, there being nothing in it opposed to the spirit or letter of the new rules, it remains in force. So also in regard to your query, para 2, I see no reason to except any special order of Government on the subject of section 26 rule 1 which in spirit agrees with Code para 613.

3. Your para 3. whatever be the number, quantity, or kind of Conveyance or "Camp" kept up, the halting allowance admissible is subject to the maximum of the daily allowance. If the Officer computes his penses to have been less than the daily allowance, he but if more, he still can draw only the full daily allowance. As to the manner in which he arrives at his calculation, I should consider that the Cost of upkeep of only such Conveyance or "Camp" as was absolutely in use for the period in question should be taken account of, and that if an Officer were doing a boat journey, he should not take into his account the Cost of a horse or horses which he has not been using for the journey and during the period in question.

4. Your para 4. I would draw your attention to section 11 & section 61 rule 1. Officers using Government boats, without paying rent for them, would draw only half allowances even if the crews were paid by the Officers. It is however the rule in this Presidency that rent is to

× Art. 999, 5th Edn. C.S.R.

be paid for Government boats, so that as a matter of fact all boats so hired become for the time private boats. The Officers who have their own private boats would have an advantage over those who had hired boats because even if the expenses of the former proved less than the maximum daily allowance they have no rent to pay, while the latter would draw probably the maximum while the expense (Rent plus wages of Crew) might be greater.

I have &c. &c.
Sd/ D. C. Gardon
Examiner P. W. Accts.

(True Copy)

Offg Supdg Engr 1st Circle

P.W. Ex 3
4701/83
4880

No. 403 G.D.

FROM, THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
FIRST CIRCLE.

TO, THE EXAMINER OF
PUBLIC WORKS ACCOUNTS,
MADRAS.

DOWLAISHWERAM, 5th May 1883

SIR,

With reference to your No. 47 - 30-4-83 -

Last para of your para. 2 -

The new Travelling allowance rule which provides that in future officers may draw during a halt of 10 days the "actual expenses of Keeping up Camp equipage" seems to me very different from the old rule (see para 615 of the Code) under which officers halting not more than 3 days (exclusive of any "dies non") at Head Quarters drew full Travelling allowances if they maintained Carriage for the tents - quite irrespective of the a your Para 4 does not seem to me to deal with the Case put in my Para 4 as if that had been understood – It may be plainer put thus –

A hires a boat^x from Government for Rs 1 a day – and keeps boat Lascars which Cost him 8 Ans a day during his 10 days halt he Claims 1-8-0 a day and gets it.

^x Kept in repair by Government

B has his own boat for which he paid^x Rs 1000 and he keeps Boat Lascars which Cost him 8 As a day; is he t recover only 8 As? that would be nanifestly unfair and would soon top the acquisition of private boats – the very thing we wish to encourage, hilst to introduce Claims varying ith the value of private property will ause endless trouble –

^x and he has to keep it in repair.

do not see how a Supdg. Engineer in any way to Check the accu ey of these "Actual expenses" [illegible]

1749/7

introduction as one of the most unwise steps I have known taken in departmental management –

1749/2

I have &c &c

Sd/ G. T. Walch
Offg. Supdg. Engr. 1st Circle

(True Copy)

Offg. Supdg. Engr. 1st Circle

P.W.a.c.
6701/83
6880

No. 69 S.E. 1st

1749/8

From

The Examiner
Public Works Accounts
Madras.

To

The Superintending Engineer
1st Circle

Madras, 15th May/83.

Sir,

Your No. 403 G.Q. of 5th Instant.

In the Case you put, A would be reimbursed the actual expense he had been put to for the maintenance of a boat and crew during his halt at Head Quarters, subject to the maximum of the daily allowance of his rank. B would be reimbursed the Cost of maintaining the crew for his private boat, if that crew were hired only for the

Occa

occasion, and were not his private servants, part of his personal establishment.

2. I do not consider that Government should be expected to pay as actual expenses an estimated amount for maintenance (repairs, wear & tear &c) of private boats, any more than for maintenance of private horses, conveyances and their appointments used for tours for Government service.

3. A Superintending Engineer must of course rely much on the certificate of an Officer for the correct statement of his claim for actual expenses, and if officers understand that such actual expenses must include only items disbursed outside of their ordinary every-day expenses for the [illegible] of private means of locomotion, and private servants, there cannot be any possible difficulty in their arriving at a legitimate amount.

I have &c &c

(Sd) D. C. Gordon
Examiner P.W. accts

(True Copy)

Offg. Supdg. Engr. 1st Circle

No. 108 G.L. P. 152

FROM, THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
FIRST CIRCLE. 1749/10

TO, THE CHIEF ENGINEER P. W. Department
~~FOR IRRIGATION.~~

DOWLAISHWERAM, 6th June 1883
Despd. 8th

SIR,

In continuation of my No. 636-29/5
I have the honor to request to be informed
whether the upkeep of a palki & bearers
to be considered as ("actual expenses
keeping up camp equipage)" it used un
the former Travelling Allowance Rules
to be considered as one of the things whic
warranted the passing of halting allow-
-ances - but if the cost of up-keep of
horses is not to be taken into consideratio
in claiming "expenses" under the New
rules, I do not see how that for "bearers"
can be - for horses & palki bearers are
used for precisely the same object.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient Servt

Offg. Supt. Engr. 1st Circl

P.W.C.N. 5000

From

The Supg. Engine

1st Circle

To

The Chief Engine

P.W.D.

Madras

Dated 6th }
Despd. 8th } June 1883
Received 14 }

P. 130[illegible] 4/6/83

No. 108 G.L.

Enclosure Nil

New Travelling

Allowance Rules —

Making certain

references on the —

Extracts

No. 1749 W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

1749/12

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 22d June /83.

READ the following

From the Supdg. Engineer First Circle —	H.E. No. 636 G.L. d/29th May /83
Office Note, from the Examiner P.W. Accts	" No. 272 d/9th June 1883.
From the S.E. First Circle	" " 108 G.L. d/ 6th " "

13

The Government concur in the views expressed by the Examiner P.W. Accounts in the foregoing note which will be communicated to the Supdg. Engr. First Circle for information and guidance.

To

The Supdg. Engr. First Circle ✓
other Supdg. Engrs ✓
Chief Engr. for Irrigation ✓
Examr. P.W. Accts

Despd 18/6

17/6

14/6

3.

3. al.

20-11-07

14-5-10

17-9-10

Govt. of (1883) Madras

PUBLIC WORKS

Date

Recd.

G. O. 22nd June 188[illegible] No. 1714 G[illegible]

Nos.

Upkeep of palki bearers

Passing orders on question whether the —— used by Govt officers when on tours of inspection should be defrayed by Govt.

135/12

Entered in Receipt Register