

of travelling allowance
can be drawn, there
could therefore be no
objection to sign it
on the part of the Officer
making or supporting
claims to horse allowance.

In the other journals
submitted with the
Engr note, the certificate
was requisite. The

~~Certificate~~ ~~was~~ ~~seen~~ and being

part of a form
prescribed by the
Govt. of India, and

should not have
been erased in

Dec 20/7/87

Dec 10/7/87

Oct 30. VII
H. M. 15.7.87
16.7.87

Q. 18.7.87

21/7/87

Mr. H. P. H. H. H.

2300 W

No 1937 W of 19th July/87

See for issue

To the Secy to the Govt
with 16 enclos

S. S. VI circle.

13.7.87. 18.7.87.

GOVT.
OF MADRAS. }

1887.

{ P. W.
DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras,

6th

July.

1887.

OFFICE NOTE No.

297.

Enclo. 15-

To

E. W.

Kindly see the enclosed correspondence (original) with the Supg. Engineer 6th Circle, and say whether you endorse the view taken by the Supg. Engineer.

2. The certificate attached to the Journal is part of a form prescribed by Govt., and must be taken to have the approval of, and to be considered necessary by Govt. If Officer, thinks the certificate superfluous or objectionable, his proper course, in my opinion, is to represent the matter to you, with a view to such modifications as, on consideration, may seem desirable.

3. The body of the Journal does not show the distance from head-

KEEP-WITH

Genl. No.

dated

188 .

Examiner's letter No. 59 S. E. 6th.
of 31st. May 1887.

Supg. Engineer's letter No. 248 M. D. the Supg. Engineer or any other
of 9th. June 1887.

Examiner's letter No. 83 S. E.
6th. dated 13th. June 1887.

Supg. Engineer's docket No.
292 M. D. dated 21st. June 1887.

1000-12-5-87.

x to be returned

13-7-87. 18-7-87.

10-19-7-87.


quarters. It shows the distance travelled; but a man may travel thirty miles without going beyond a radius of five miles from his head-quarters, and some years ago there was a case of an Officer who habitually drew travelling allowance, contrary to rules, for journeys "not taking him to a point more than five miles from his head-quarters," see this office No. 217 W. dated 2nd. March 1878. It is quite possible — though it seems to me immaterial — that, in the first lot of Journals sent to the Supg. Engineer, there may have been no cases to which this particular remark in the certificate could apply; but in the Journal for April 1887, of Mr. S. Gopaulkistnier — one of the second lot — there is a claim for daily allowance on the 9th. and 10th. which is certainly not complete without the certificate.

4. As to para 3 of the Supg. Engineer's letter, the fact that a certificate does not happen to have any application in a particular


case

case, or in a particular locality, is not necessarily a reason for scoring it out. That which is notorious to a resident in the District may be quite unknown to a Central Office. The argument, if admitted, leads logically to the conclusion, that no certificate can ever be necessary unless it is false; for if it is true there is no case to which it applies.

5. The Supg. Engineer is the Controlling Officer, and charged as such with the duty of scrutinizing the details of journeys etc., and it seems to me that if it is not primarily his duty to enforce the observance of all forms prescribed by Govt. in connection therewith, at any rate I ought to be able to count on his assistance in such matters.



C.



L. G. no 912 W. of 25. 3. 87.
 B. no 215 W. of 22. 1. 87
 no 113 C. " 13. 1. 87
 B. no 264 W. of 11. 10. 82
 L. G. 3015 W. of 27. 7. 78
 " 1914 W. of 20. 4. 78.

P.W.C. No 5149

(4)

R. G. 7. 87

No: 16

2000
 20000

0. 8. 7. 87 R. 18. 7. 87

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the

Read the following

From the Engineer P.W. Dept. No. 297 of 6 July 1887.

The Supg. Engineer
 To Circle will be requested
 to explain the view taken
 by him in his letter no.
 248 M.D. of 9 June 1887
 to the Engineer P.W. Dept.

Let us understand this.
 The certificate is altogether
 applicable in the case of a
 claim for double house allowance.
 The P.E. has stated his views
 clearly, why should he propose.
 I believe that all that is
 necessary is to let the
 certificate be altered in applicable
 cases house allowance is concerned
 but in all other cases is required
 and should be passed in whole or in
 part.

Don

11/7/87

It is clear that the
 Certificate at the foot
 of the journals is not
 applicable to an officer
 drawing house allowance,
 but at the same time
 there is nothing repugnant
 in the certificate. If,
 however, it is considered
 advisable to alter the
 form, the Supg. Engineer
 should submit his pro-
 posals for the change.

In view

of

0. 19. 7. 87.

In the case of officers
who draw travelling al-
lowance ~~see~~ it is neces-
sary that some certificate
should be signed by the
controlling officer viz: the
Supt. Engineer, and if
he does not approve
of the form, he should
represent the case for the
orders of Government.

MCR
8.7.87

To

S. E. T. C.

Exr. P. W. D.

W

Q. 8.7.87. Q. 18.7.87

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

no 1937W

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the *19th July 1907*

Read the following

From the Exr. P. W. Dept no 297 & 6. 7. 87 -

MCR
16th

The certificate
attached to Journals
of occupation ~~is~~
obviously inapplicable
in cases in which home
allowance is claimed
under Sec. 29, Rule
6 of the Civil Tr. Act
Code, but there is
in it nothing con-
trary to the terms
under which any
authorised description

J