14-9-86

No. 6038 C. d/ 18th Septr 1886.

To C.

For remarks.

A.D.W.

No 426
16-9-86

To W.

Your O. N. No. 3090 C. dated 13th. September 1886.

Will be admitted, if sanctioned by Government, vide also G. O. No. 2269 W. dated 9th. September 1886.

C.

23.9

16/9

B. No. 2401 W d/ 21/9 Septr/86.

B The Examiner is authorised to admit the claims

The Examiner is authorised to admit the claims.

17/9/86

S E V C ✓ 16/9/86.

Exr. 23/9

Desptd 22/9/86 29/9

From

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
5TH CIRCLE,

To

THE Chief Engineer
P.W. Deptt.

Dated 8
Recd. 9/10 } September 1886.

ENCLOSURES.

B. No. 2401 W d/ 21-9-86

No. 2739.

Lt West's Claims
for actual Expenses

~~Recommends that~~
~~the Examiner be author-~~
~~-ized to pass the~~
now ~~in~~ arrears.

Enclos NR

No. 1648 C.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

Chepâk, 30th April 1886.

OFFICE NOTE.

From D.W.

To C.

Your 18 W d/ 21.4.86.

Please let me have your Dis:: List No. 335 and Mr. Davidson's and Lieut West's diaries for Novr. & Decr. 1885.

(Sd) D. McC.

30.4.86

D.W.

Despd

30/4/86

W. 4/5.

Entered in Receipt Regist

No. 271

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,

V CIRCLE, MADRAS,

Chepâk, 17th April 1886.

From

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

V CIRCLE,

To

THE Chief Engineer

P.W. Department

Enclosures.

SIR,

I have the honor to submit for orders, some questions of items of travelling allowance that are not admitted by the Examiner of P.W. Accounts.

Mr. Davidson the Executive Engineer in North Arcot, claimed actual expenses for an aggregate of 15 days halt at Head Quarters, between 25th November and 13th December, Rupees 22½, at 1½ Rupee daily.

Audit was deferred pending information, whether there were charges for up-keep of private property, or equipage hired by the month - the necessity the rules will be evaded, as they can be, with the greatest ease.

How is the Examiner to say where one occasion comes to an end, and another occasion comes on? If an Executive Engineer is crippled in his marching arrangements, because he has dismissed his carts; and if in a heavy burst of monsoon, he cannot get others at a moments notice to take out his camp - he will fail to be present where he should be - breaches may occur or be aggravated in his absence, entailing expenditure and loss of revenue - he will be reprimanded by the Superintending Engineer, and by the Government; but on the other hand, he will have acted in accordance with the Examiner's ruling, that at a critical period, he must not put the Government to the expense of two or three day's cart hire to enable him to start off, when his presence is urgently required at a distance.

4. In consequence of my having explained that actual expenses were claimed for 7 days on which the camp was actually on the march: the Examiner says the Sanction of Government is required under Section 27 rules 3 & 4 of the Travelling Allowance Codes I request that the Sanction of Government may be accorded for these 7 days - as well as for the 8 days, regarding which I feel sure there was no need of my troubling the Government.

I request also that 17 Rupees deducted from Assistant Engineer Lieutenant Hest's travelling allowance Bill may on the same grounds be passed.

5. Mr Davidson went

to Madras to receive instructions from yourself about the house to be prepared for the Ex King of Burmah - and Asst. Engr. Lieutenant West was directed by the Acting Superintending Engineer, in December, to meet him at Bangalore. I have maintained that under the amended Code Rule para 470 Standing order No. 247 of 1884, the authority of the Superintending Engineer alone is needed for an Officer's journey on duty within the limits of the Circle. I read the rule that a Subordinate Officer is every Officer subordinate to the Superintending Engineer: and I shall be glad to learn if any other construction should be put on the expression - at any rate I request that the charges may be admitted.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt. Servt.
H N D Prendergast Col R.E.
Superintg. Engr. 5 Circle

Rgh 417
26-4-86

No. 1579 c d/ 21st April/86.

To S. E. V C.

Please submit for information Mr. Davidson's diary & bill and Lieut West's bill with ~~the~~ Examiner's disallowance lists &ca. thereon.

18/4/86
D. W.

No. 388

The Diaries of Mr. Davidson and Lieut. West for the months of November and December 1885, and the Bills for November and December, with the Examiner's disallowance lists No. 335 and 396 of 1885/86 are all with the Examiner.

Van Wendeyart Col. R.E.
Superintending Engineer 5th Circle

Pub Wo ~~3023~~ 3251

(7)

From
The Supdtg: Engineer
5th Circle

To
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

Dated 17th
Recd. 19/30
April 1886

No. 271

Travelling allowance — Submits for orders some questions of items of — that are not admitted by the Examiner of P. W. Accounts

70

[Form No. I.]

N.B.—In any future communication on this subject, the number and date of this letter should be quoted.

No. 18 W

From
The EXAMINER,
PUBLIC WORKS ACCOUNTS,
Madras.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department.

Madras, 21st April 1886.

Sir,

In forwarding, for such action as Government may deem requisite, the accompanying original Disallowance Lists for travelling allowance claims from the North Arcot Division, I have the honor to make the following remarks.

2. Item (a) - The replies given refer entirely to Mr. Davidson's claim, but apparently are intended to cover Lieutt. West's claim as well. My remarks however concern the former. The claims have been made inaccurately, and are not, as they stand, admissible either under the rules of the Civil Travelling Allowance Code or under the spirit of the orders of Government. From the 1st. October to the 30th. December 1885 (the day previous to the Xmas vacation) Mr. Davidson has claimed actual expenses for every halt made at Head Quarters. Camp equipage has therefore been kept up continuously, not for employment upon any immediately projected journeys, and actual expenses are inadmissible under the spirit of G.O. No. 2519 W. dated 24th. October 1885. Apart from this the claims have been inaccurately preferred under Civil Travelling Allowance Code Section 27 rule I, since from the Superintending Engineer's remarks, borne out by the Executive

Engineer, a portion should have been made under Section 27 rules 3 and 4, requiring the sanction of Government. The Superintending Engineer's authority has thus been set aside only in favor of the authority of the Civil Travelling Allowance Code and the orders of Government.

3. Item (b) - The authority of Government is necessary when an Officer travels beyond the limits of his jurisdiction. The authority of the immediate Superior can be given only when a Subordinate travels beyond the limits of that Subordinate's jurisdiction. If it were otherwise, the authority of Government, would be necessary only when Chief Engineers travelled beyond the limits of the Presidency.

4. Attention is specially necessary to the remarks which have called for the strongly expressed disapproval of the Superintending Engineer.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servant.

J. C. Cardew

Examiner P. W. Accounts.

Encs: One

E.P. 21/4

21/4.

Puch. 3368

(7)

Rcd 5/5/86

No. 1648 C.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

Chepâk, 30th April 1886.

OFFICE NOTE.

From Div. Rd. 70 / 1. 5. 86

To C.

Your 18. W. 8 21. 4. 86.

Please let me have your Dis: List no: 335 and Mr Davidson's & Lieut West's diaries for Novr & Dec/85.

30/4/86

Div.

Encls: 5.

To W

I. O. N. No. 97 of 4/5/86

Herewith, which please return when done with.

DCE

5R 1.5

C. 18/5/86

G.O. No 1749 W. 22.6.83
" " 2104 W 1.8.83
" " 2478 W 4.9.83
B. No 112 W 14.1.84
G.O. No 98 W 14.1.84
" " 857 W 28.3.84
B. No 2327 W. 22.9.84
G.O. 2980 W 4.12.84
B. No 2270 W 30.9.85
G.O. 2492 W 22.9.85
B. No 2579 W 24.10.85
No 1579 C. 21.4.86
No 1648 C. 30.4.86
" 1630 C. 29.4.86

6. 7.5.86 A. 25.5.86

Mch 3372

(1)

Recd 5/5/86
En 5.

Note.

The attached papers relate to a disallowance made by the Examiner P.W. Accounts to a claim made by Mr. Davidson, Ex. Engineer, North Arcot Division for actual expenses for halts at Head Quarters from 25th and 27th November to 6th December and 9th, 10th, 12th, 13 December, 15 days at Rs. 1½ = Rs. 22-8-, and also to a disallowance made to a similar claim by Lieutt. West. Mr. Davidson said claims as stated above and the Examiner in the disallowance list asked for information if charges for the upkeep of equipage hired by the month had been included and requested that the necessity for the maintenance of the equipage if hired should be explained for the Superintending Engineer's orders.

To this Mr. Davidson replied that he did not keep up bandies by the month and he explained the difficulties and obstructions to work that would arise by constantly dismissing and re-engaging bandies. The Superintending Engineer supports the Executive Engineer's claim stating that the equipage was not hired by the month and that though the halt of 15 days appears long that in 7 days out of that time the equipage was on the move.

The Examiner in his rejoinder still disallows the claim stating that the equipage is evidently maintained continuously and not employed for the occasion, and that the special sanction of Government is necessary for the days on which the equipage was on the move as mentioned by the Superintending Engineer.

The Ex: Engineer (Mr. Davidson) in reply stated that he had already certified that he did not keep bandies by the month nor were they kept up continuously and he uses some very strong language in conclusion.

The Superintending Engineer supports the Executive Engineer and considers that the Examiner has set aside his ruling. On this the Examiner hands the matter up to Government in his No. 18 W of 21st. April 1886. The Sup. Engineer also refers the matter to the Chief Engineer in his No. 271 d/ 17th April 1886. The order stating that actual expenses are not to be claimed for equipage hired by the month has been communicated to all Officers in the Department and it is doubtful if the Examiner is not exceeding his province in consequently disallowing claims till an Officer has certified that the equipage is not hired by the month - it seems to be the duty of the Superintending Engineer to see that cost of such equipage is not claimed and that when passed by the Supg. Engineer, the Examiner should accept it: It seems as if the Examiner were not acting in accordance with the Spirit of G. O. No. 2476 W of 4th September 1883. However, as that may be, the Examiner now goes further and disallows claims for expense of equipage which he considers is kept continuously. Though Mr. Davidson explained that he did not keep equipage continuously, the Examiner still adheres to the opinion that he did, and grounds this opinion apparently on the fact that Mr. Davidson claims actual expenses for every halt made at Head Quarters from 1st October to 20th December, but it must be remembered that Mr. Davidson was travelling off and on during that time and whether it was necessary for him to maintain his bandies in the intervals while he was at Head Quarters cannot possibly be known by the Examiner and is certainly a matter to be left to the discretion of the Superintending Engineer, and as that Officer passed the claims, the Examiner should have said nothing further. The same remarks apply to Lieutt: West's claims.

The Examiner seems to be wrong in stating that the claims have been inaccurately preferred under Civil Travelling Allowance Code Section 27 Rule 1 and that a portion (he refers to the days when equipage was moving while Executive Engineer was at Head Quarters) should have been made under Section 27 Rules 3 and 4 requiring the sanction of Government as Mr Davidson did not claim full allowances for those days but only actual expenses and whether the equipage

equipage was on the road or halted seems immaterial. If the Executive Engineer had charged anything over what he claims for expenses at Head Quarters, then the sanction of Government would have been necessary. As stated in para 3 of Exrs letter the sanction of Government is necessary for the journeys of Mr Davidson and Lieutt West beyond the limits of their jurisdiction. With reference to para 6 of the Examiner's letter, the language used by Mr Davidson is most reprehensible and it is a matter of surprise that an Officer in his position should have so far forgot himself. The Superintending Engineer has expressed his disapproval of the words used by the Executive Engineer, but it is considered that he should have made him withdraw them.

Yes.

It is considered that, as the Executive Engineer has certified that the equipage was not hired by the month, and as the Supg. Engineer is evidently satisfied that it was necessary for the Executive Engineer to maintain equipage during the halt he made, that the Examiner should be directed to pay the amounts due to both Mr. Davidson and Lieutt. West, and that his attention should be drawn to G.O. No. 2476W of 4th September 1883, and that the Supg. Engineers should in future be left to decide whether it is necessary for an officer to maintain his equipage during a halt or not.

7/5/86

12.5.86

---

(7)

Note by Dw.

For his orders.
The recent reference to Financial Dept. relative to definition of actual expenses has not been [illegible].

10.5.86

W

No. 1314W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

B/cm

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 26th May 1886

READ the following

Letter from the S. E. V Circle (A.E. No. 271 d/ April 17. 1886)
" " " Ex. P.W. Accts (" " 18W d/ " 21. ")
Office note from the S. E. V Circle (" " 388 d/ " 29 ")
" " " " ——do—— (" " 468 d/ May 4 ")
" " from the Ex. P.W. Accts (" 97 d/ " 5. ")

These papers relate to disallowances made by the Examiner P.W. Accounts with respect to claims on account of actual expenses for upkeep of camp equipage during halts at head quarters, preferred by Mr. Davidson, Executive Engineer North Arcot Division, for 15 days in November and December 1885, and by Lieutenant West, Assistant Engineer, for 17 days in December 1885.

2. The Examiner bases his disallowance on the ground that the camp equipage was kept up continuously, & that the claims are therefore inadmissible under the spirit of G.O. No. 2519 W dated 24th October 1885.

3. Mr. Davidson has however distinctly certified that, both in his own case and that of Lieut: West, the equipage was not hired by the month, and the Supdg Engineer has satisfied himself as to the necessity for the frequency and duration of the halts, and passed the claims.

4. Such being the case, the Government consider that the Examiner

exceeded his province in disallowing the claims. In G.O. No. 2476 W dated 4th September 1883, it was clearly laid down that the duty of checking and scrutinising the travelling allowance bills of officers under their control is vested in Superintending Engineers, who are expected to check any tendency to unnecessary expenditure, the check being specially neceſsary in cases where "actual expenses" are claimed; and that the Supdg Engineer's counter-signature to such charges is sufficient authority for the Examiner to admit the claims. The Examiner is required to bring to notice only cases of "flagrant and systematic abuse of the rules." G.O. No. 2519 W d/24th October 1885, moreover, was communicated to all Supdg Engineers, whose duty it is to see that claims are made in accordance therewith, and when such claims are passed by Supdg Engineers, the Examiner should admit them, except when flagrantly in contravention of rules.

5. For the seven days during which Mr. Davidson's camp was on the march, it is clear that the sanction of Govt. was required, under section 27 rules 3 & 4 of the Civil Travelling Allowance Code; the period of absence from head quarters being distinctly defined in rule 3; but the Examiner could ~~easily~~ have pointed this out, instead of disallowing the claims altogether.

6. The Government consider that the language used by Mr. Davidson, in his reply to the Examiner's rejoinder of 29th March 1886, is most reprehensible, and they are surprised that an officer in his position should have so far forgotten himself.

The Supdg Engineer has expressed his disapproval of the expressions used, but ~~it is considered~~ ~~that~~ he should have directed Mr. Davidson to withdraw them before submitting the case to Government. Mr. Davidson should now be ordered to do this.

7. With these remarks, the Examiner P.W. Accounts is authorised to admit the claims of Mr. Davidson and Lieut: West to actual expenses for the periods in question.

8. The journeys made by those officers beyond the limits of their jurisdiction are sanctioned, under para 470 of the P.W. Code.

WS
14.5.86

25/5/86

To, The S.E. V Circle }
" E. P.W. Accts }
(with 6 enclosures).

Issued
27/5/86
Cu

~~The Hon. H. S. Sullivan~~
~~C. S. I.~~

GOVERNMENT
20 MAY
DEPARTMENT

B. No. 1314 Wd/ 26 May 188

B. M/26/5

E M/27.5

3023 ✓
3116 ✓
3336 ✓
3351 ✓
3371 ✓

Ele 25/5 - Sd 28/5

Ay. 35/5 - Cir 14/5 - W. 4/6

Returned from [illegible] 25 5 86

No. 178/S.E.

D. P. W. North Arcot Division Office
1st July 1886.

From

The Executive Engineer
North Arcot Dn.

To

The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle

Sir

I have the honor to return G. O. No. 1314 Wd dated 26th May 1886, together with your Endorsement No. 1386 dated 25 June 1886 and the Disallowance list which accompanied it.

I have scored through the expressions objected and as ordered beg to withdraw these expressions, and further to express my regret at having used them.

I have &c

(Sd) J. P. Davidson
Executive Engr.

(True Copy)
W. H. Newton
C.W.E.
8 July/86

No 163 of 1886/87

No 1619

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer P. W. Department with reference to para 6 of G. O. No 1314 W dated 26 May 1886.

W Hinton
Col R.E.
Superintg Engr 5 Circle
8th July 1886.

B. No 1314 W. 26.5.86
No 1648 C. 30.4.86
" 1630 C. 29.4.86
" 1579 C. 2.4.86,

No. 1780 W d/14th July 1886

Recorded, with reference to para 6 of G.O. No. 1314 W. dated 26th May 1886

10.7.86

12.7.86

14.7

19/7

15/7

20/7

O.C. 10/7.
C. 10.7.86 C.R. 14.7.86

P.W.C.No. 5358

No. 1619. (4)

From
The Supdg. Engr.
5 Circle

To
The Chief Engineer
P.W. Dept.

Dated 8th July 1886
Recd. 10 "

B. No. 1780 W d/14th July 1886

Disallow. List
No. 396 of 1885–86.

Forwards copy of letter from Executive Engineer North Arcot Dn. stating that the expressions objected to in the — have been withdrawn

Entd. in R.R. 20/7

No. 163 of 1886/87

Ex. North Arcot Division Tr. allowance Bill for June

Name & Rank	Amount disallowed			Reason of D
(a) J. P. Davidson Esqr. Executive Engineer Actual expense for 2d to 4th and 23d to 26th June 1886 = 7 days at Rs. 1.				(a) Admitte only pending certificate of the clai to Section 2 civil Trav code.
(b) Do. — Do. Actual expenses for the 5th and 6th December 1885 at Rs. 1–8–0. per diem	3	"	"	(b) Disall actual e halts at subsequ 10 days is vide Sec of the civ allowan
× × ×				
(c) J. P. Davidson Esqr. Exe. Engineer Actual expenses Arrears 1st to 4th, 7th to 12th, 23d to 25th, and 28th February 1886 = 14 days at Rs 1 per diem.	14	"	"	(c) Disa claims expens not ha preferr of the to whi
For March 1886, 2d, 3d, 7th to 10th, 23d to 25th, 28th to 31st = 13 days at Rs 1 per diem	13	"	"	No. Tra inf
For April 1886, 1st to 6th, 11th to 13th, 23d to 27th = 14 days at Rs 1 per diem	14	"	"	
For May 1886. 1st, 2d, 16th to 18th, & 26th = 6 days at Rs 1 per diem	6	"	"	I.

Copd. A.L.

1886.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Current No. 6700

From The Supdg. Engr. V Circle

Enclos.—

No. 2500
Dated 27th August/86
Received 30 "

SUBJECT.

Recomds. that the Exr. P.W. A. be authorised to pass the Claims preferred by J. P. Davidson Esqr. Ex. Engr. N.A. for actual expenses in arrears for the four months Feby to May 1886.

DISPOSAL.

No. 2971 C Dated 31st August 1

To C

For favor of remarks.
(Initd.) Arnold
D.W.
Recd
1/9/86

No. X.

ENCLOSURE
1 SEP 86
EXAMINER, P.W. ACCOUNTS

Chepauk
18th August/86

From

J. P. Davidson Esqr
Under Secretary to Government
Irrigation Branch

To,

The Superintending Engineer
5th Circle

Sir

Enclos
1 List.

In forwarding the accompanying Extract from Disallowance list of the North Arcot Division for June's Travelling Allowance I have the honor to ask your attention to the Disallowance item (C) and the reasons given by the Examiner for this disallowance.

2. My reasons for not preferring the actual expenses claims, in the bills of the respective months to which they relate, were explained in North Arcot Division Office letter No. 194 of 3 July/86, which accompanied the Division Travelling Allowance Bill for July; the reasons given would appear to have been

accepted by you, as the claims were passed.

3 The facts are briefly these; in the Travelling Allowance Bills for December 1885 and January 1886, I preferred certain claims for actual expenses, which, though supported by the requisite certificates, and passed by the Superintending Engineer were disallowed by the Examiner of P. W. Accounts; against this Disallowance I appealed to the Superintending Engineer, who, referred the matter to Government.

4. I was of opinion that, while the question was under the consideration of Government, and pending their orders, it was only proper for me to postpone preferring claims, of a nature similar to those objected to, and disallowed by the Examiner, I therefore, made no claims for actual expenses during the months of February to May, both months inclusive.

5. The order of Government No 1314 W of 26 May/86 was communicated to me with Your office No 1386 of 26th June 1886. In this order Government decided in my favor, and authorized the Examiner P. W. Accounts to admit my claims for December 1885, and January 1886.

6. G. O. No 1314 of 26 May having only reached me ~~only~~ towards the end of June 1886, the Travelling Allowance Bill for June was the first, in which I considered it respectful to prefer actual expenses claims, and I accordingly claimed all actual expenses from February to June both months inclusive.

7. The Examiner has admitted my claims for June, but disallows the arrears claims on the grounds that, they should have been claimed in the Bills of the months to which they relate.

8 The claims of Lieut. W. C. S West for February, March and April have been disallowed on the same grounds. Lieut. W. C. S West, I may mention, postponed preferring his claims on

my advice.

9 I request that you will refer the matter to Government & obtain orders authorizing the Examiner to admit the claims disallowed.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

R Davidson
Under Secy. to Govt.
Irrigation Branch

Forwarded
H. E. Clerk
Executive Engineer Na. Ln.
9-8-86

No. 2500.

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer P.W. Deptt. and recommended that the Examiner P.W. Accounts be authorized to pass the claims for actual expenses in arrears for the four months February to May 1886.

Enclos 1
P.W. ~~6700~~ 6836/

9/2958
24-8-86

ENCLOSURE
1 SEP 86
EXAMINER P.W. ACCOUNTS

2. As explained by Mr. Davidson the claims were not made in the Bills for the months to which they relate pending decision of Government on a reference made by the Superintending Engineer upon the Examiner's disallowance of similar claims of Mr. Davidsons for previous months.

W H Burton Colly R.E.
Superintg Engr
5 Circle

27th August 1886.

9

No. 2971 C d/ 31st August 1886
B. M. 1780 W. 14-7-86
G. O. 1428 ?.4.6.86
B. M. 1314 W 26.5.86
G. No 1648 C. 30.4.86
" 1630 C. 29.4.86
" 1579 C. 21.4.86

For favor of remarks

Dir. C
31/8/86
DW

To
No. 388
2-9-86
Dr.

Enclosure

Your O. R. No. 2971 C
d/ 31st August 1886.

Will be passed, if Government considers them admissible

C

ackd 1/9/86

No. 2269 W d/ 9th Septr/86
Dei

The Exr is author-ised to admit the claims for "actual expenses".

The Exr is auth-ised to admit the claims for "actual

SET
Exgs
G. O. 2079 4/9/86
9/9/86
C. M. 9.86
R. 9.9.86
6.9.86

P. W. C. No. ~~67~~ 886

(6)

Recd ~~30.8.86~~
3.9.86

Enclos: 2

No. 2269 W d/ 9th Septr 1886

DW

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
5TH CIRCLE, MADRAS,
Chepauk, 8th September 1886.

No. 2739.

From
THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
5TH CIRCLE,

To
THE Chief Engineer
P.W. Department.

Enclosures.

SIR,

In continuation of my endorsement No. 2500 dated 27th August 1886, I have the honor to state that for the same reason as explained therein Lieutt. West's claims for actual expenses from January to April 1886 were not made in the Bills of those respective months, and I would therefore recommend that the Examiner of P.W. Accounts be authorized to pass the claims now in arrears.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt Servant
W H Hinton
Col. R.E.
Superintg Engineer
5th Circle