

it was considered
taken one horse with which
he was equipped for duty.

WCS
7.3.51
ML
8/3/00

Account reply
to reference made
to Mr. Taylor
9.11.00

To

The Examiner P. W. Accounts.



No. 1039C of 10th June 1888. J. W. D.
1888

Office note from the Examiner P. W. Accounts No. 1159
dated March 5, 1888.

Copy of the above
~~forwarded to Mr. Taylor~~
~~who~~ is requested to explain
whether he charged for the
conveyance by rail of any
other horse besides the
one for which special
permission was requested in
his letter No. 936 P. P. dated
3rd February 1888, and to
give the dates on which
(1) he reached Munnayanikann
himself and
(2) his horse or horses

26 Mar

There

WCS 8.11.88

ta
he

reached that station.

Wm

9.3.88

Wm

9/3/88



- No. 553 Wd/16-2-88
- " 2540 W - 24-9-87
- " 37 C - 6-1-88
- " 2705 C - 13-8-87
- " 1881 W - 13-7-87
- " 2201 C - 1-7-87
- " 1446 W - 26-5-87
- " 1280 W - 11-5-87
- " 2663 W - 12-10-86
- " 395 W - 14-2-84
- " 2984 W - 13-11-82
- " 2471 W - 23-9-82

No. 1039 C of 10th March
1888

To,
The Suptt of Works
Perris.
10.3.88

at

No. 713.P.R. Office of the Suptt of works.
Perris Project

Kumbhi Madras District

13th March 1888.

Of 13th

From,

H. S. Taylor require
Suptt of works.

To, The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

Sir,

As requested in No. 1039 C
of 10th Instant, I have the honor
to explain that the conveyance
by rail of one horse only has been
charged for, for which sanction
was asked in my No. 936.P.P of
3rd February 1888.

2. I arrived at Annamalai from
Madras on the 8th September
1887, and the horse having started
from Madras the day after, arrived
on or about the 10th Idem.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedt servt

H. S. Taylor
Suptt of works.

FOR ORDERS.

There seems nothing in Mr. Taylor's case which places it beyond the provisions of this rule, and it is submitted that if the sanction of the Government of India has to be requested to the admission of the charge, the Examiner should be called on to state more fully the grounds on which he considers the application necessary.

Should it be decided to refuse the sanction as suggested by the Honorable Member, and to admit the cost of conveyance for a portion of the journey only, - viz: Trichinopoly to Ammayanahamur - the sanction of the Government of India would still, in the Examiner's opinion, be necessary, on the ground that "a ruling to this effect would be an interpretation of the rule as to the point on which the letter of the rule is not clear."

It thus appears that while section 12 of the Code covers, as far as can be seen, the sanction as already given, any attempt to limit the sanction to

It is perfectly clear that we can pay a charge for a horse carried with him. Mr. Prant did not know the dates. All we care for is that the horse was necessary & carried with the Officer.

Does not seem to apply

to a portion of the journey - would involve an interpretation of rule requiring special reference to the Government of India.

In this connection reference is invited to section 7, rule 2, which reads as follows: "The local Government, for special recorded reasons, may permit travelling allowance to be calculated by a route other than the shortest or cheapest, provided that the journey is actually performed by such route."

Mr. Taylor has reported in reply to the reference made to him that he only claims - conveyance by rail for ^{the} one horse, - the subject of the present reference.

MCR
19.3.05
MCR
19/3/05

R.S.