Copy of letter from the Escaminer S. W. Accounts Madras, to the Accountant General S. W. Department, № 68 A. dated 12th July 1887.

I have the honor to request that you will favor me with an expression of your opinion, as to whether Section 71 Rule 4 of the Civil Travelling Allowance Code, debars a Deputy Chief Engineer from signing, "for Chief Engineer" or "by order", a sanction required to be given by the Chief Engineer under authority delegated to him by the Local Government, in accordance with Section 14 Rule 1 of the Civil Travelling Allowance Code, and whether the practice should be questioned by this Office.

2. It seems to me that in both cases, i.e, whether giving sanctions or countersigning bills, the exercise of the functions of a controlling office is concerned, and that if the delegation is inadmissible in one

case, it is equally inadmissible in the other.

/ True Copy /

G E Patton
Supt. Correspondence Branch.

CH 23/8.
EP. 23/8.

E.2

Copy of letter from the Accountant General P.W. Department, to the Examiner P.W. Accounts Madras, No. 722 E. dated 1st August 1887.

In reply to your letter No 68 A dated 12th Ultimo, I have the honor to state that, in my opinion, a special sanction given under the provisions of Travelling Allowance Code, Section 14, rule 1, should be signed by the Chief Engineer to whom the power of according such sanction is delegated, and that the signature of the Deputy Chief Engineer "for" or "by order" of the Chief Engineer is inadmissible and should not be accepted.

/ True Copy /

G E Patton
Supt. Correspondence Branch

CH 23/8.
EP. 23/8

E.1
P46622/87

KEEP-WITH Genl. No.

dated 188 .

1000—12-5-87.

[C. No. 8.]

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 188 . { P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 23rd August 188 .

OFFICE NOTE No. 474.

To Encl-2

W.

With reference to E. W's. memos Nos. 2020 C. and 2201 C. dated 16th. June and 4th. July 1887 respectively, sanctioning the conveyance of horses and tents as required by Section 14 Rule I of the Civil Travelling Allowance Code, signed by "Dy. Chief Engineer" for Chief Engineer or "by order", please see my letter to the Accountant General P. W. D. No. 68 A. dated 12th. July 1887, and his reply No. 722 E. dated 1st. August 1887 intimating that, in his opinion, the signature of the Dy. Chief Engineer "for" or "by order" of the Chief Engineer is inadmissible, and should not be accepted by me as authority.

2. If you think it necessary to continue the present practice,

please obtain the approval of the
Government of India thereto.

22/8 C.

Ab 23.

29.
22/8.

PWC 6622

(2)

R 24.8.87

E 2

No 2902 C of 29-8-87

No 2705 C. 13. 8. 87.
" 2020 C. 16. 6. 87
" 1884 C. 16. 11. 83
B. No 1873 W. 13. 8. 83
Q. 6. 1597 W. 6. 6. 83
B. No 3267 W. 11. 12. 82
Q. 6. 2984 W. 13. 11. 82.
B. No 2966 W. 9. 11. 82
Q. 6. 2471 W. 23. 9. 82
No 2201 C. 1. 7. 87
" 1927 C. 8. 6. 87
B. No 1446 W. 26. 5. 87
" 1280 W. 11. 5. 87
" 2663 W. 12. 10. 86
No 2038 D. 15. 11. 84
B. No 395 W. 14. 2. 84
No 2000 D. 10. 11. 84
" 1706 C. 20. 10. 86

Ab 1149. VIII
26-8-87

10. 24. 8. 87. R 29 - 8 - 87

C. No. 6622

To

D.C.

(2)

For Orders.

The original draft orders of both No 2020 C of 16/6/87 and No 2201 C of 1/7/87 (com-mon) were approved by C. to the ter-mination when signed by you. Shall I now prepare fresh copies of the 2 items for C's signature, and ask C to substitute these for those signed by you?

BP
24/8/87

If W has no objection, it only seems necessary to inform C that in future, in similar cases, the memo will be signed by the Chief Engineer -

W
26.8.87

JoW

I can easily be arranged that such orders shall be signed by S.W. in future,

but

No. 2902 C.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

Chepâk, 29th August 1887.

OFFICE NOTE.

From W

To C

Your office note No. 474 dated 23rd August 1887.

In future, all special sanctions given by S.W. under the rules in the Civil Fr: Allow leave, will be signed by S.W.

(Sd) JoW
26.8.87 W.

Desp. 30.8.87.

6

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Account.

Read—the following paper :—

Office note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 30th September 1887, No. 590.

Please favor me with your opinion with reference to endorsement, No. 257, dated 7th September 1887, from the Executive Engineer, Dowlaishweram Workshops division (copy herewith), whether it would not be better that in all cases of sanctions the responsible officer should sign himself. The principle is the same as is involved in Civil Travelling Allowance Code 71 (4).

Enclosure.

From the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, to the Executive Engineer, Government Workshops, dated Dowlaishweram, 23rd August 1887, No. 1383 G.D.

Reference.—His letter No. 185, dated 2nd August 1887.

Has the honor to approve of the rate of rent (at Rs. 15 per month) paid by Mr. Jopp for the bungalow referred to in the Workshops officer's letter No. 429, dated 30th March 1887.

No. 257.

Copy forwarded to the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, with reference to paragraph 10 of his audit note on the accounts for November 1886.

2nd September 1887.

(Signed) J. E. PAUL,
Executive Engineer.

Order—dated 13th October 1887, No. 2710 W., Public Works.

The Government agree with the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, whose note will be communicated to Superintending Engineers for information and guidance.

(True Extract.)

Captain, R.E.,
Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To Superintending Engineers.
To the Consulting Architect to Government.
„ Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
„ Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. J. Moses.
Spare Copies

7691

To Dw

Endorsement
The principle is apparently the same as that admitted in W. 2902 C 8, 29.8.87, but delay in communicating questions with accounts when Subsidy occurs in Cuddapah.

Cuddapah
5/10

I am not sure that the question of delay is a serious one — In my opinion the responsible officer should sign in all cases of Sanctions.

Chief
5.10.87

27/10

GENERAL.
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of {1887} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated October, 13th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 13th Oct. 1887, No. 2710 W.

OCTOBER.

Sanctions

Concurring with the suggestion of the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, that in all cases of — the responsible officer should sign himself.

KEEP-WITH Genl. No.

dated 188 .

1000—12-5-87.

[C. No. 8.]

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 188 . { P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 30th September 188 .

OFFICE NOTE No. 590

Encls-one

To W.

Please favor me with your opinion with reference to endorsement No. 257 dated 7th. September 1887, from the Executive Engineer Dowlaishwaram Workshops Division (copy herewith), whether it would not be better that in all cases of sanctions the responsible officer should sign himself. The principle is the same as is involved in Civil Travelling Allowance Code 71(4).

30/9

C.

30/9

30/9.

No. 2902 C1 29.8.87. Genl Sect

No. 2710 W a/13th October/87

JP3

The Government agree with the Examiner P.W. Accts, whose note will be communicated to Supdg. Engineers for information and guidance.

Work
6.10.87

Sec
8/10/87

PWC No. 769

R 9.10.87

E.1

Supdg. Engrs
C.A. to Govt
Ch. Engr for Irrign
Excr. P.W. Accts.

With order

Circ 11-10-87 R 13-10-87
10.10.87 R 10/10/87
10.24

No. 1383 G.D. Enclosure 8 pcs

Superintending Engineer's Office 1st Circle
Station. Dowlaishweram.

Dated 23rd } August 1887.
Despatched 27th }

To.

The Executive Engineer
Government Workshops.

Reference:- His letter No. 185 dated 2nd August 1887.

Has the honor to approve of the rate of rent* paid by Mr. Jopp for the bungalow referred to in the Workshops officer's letter No. 429 dated 30th March 1887.

* at Rs 15 per month.

(Signed). T. B. Murray
Assistant Engineer
for Superintending Engineer 1st Circle

(True Copy)

No. 257.

Copy forwarded to the Examiner P. W. Accounts with reference to Para 10 of his Audit note on the Accounts for November 1886.

Dated 2nd Sept 87
Despd 7th

(Signed) J. E. Paul.
Executive Engineer

(True Copy)

W Murray
Supdt Correspce Branch.
2/9. 30/9
2/9. 30/9.

E.1
PW7691/87

769

Govt. of {1887} Madras

PUBLIC WORKS.

14/10

Dated

Read. Encl.

G.O., 13 Oct. 1887, No. 2710 W

Sanctions

Concurring with the suggestion of the Exr: P.W. Accounts that in all cases of — the responsible Officer signed sign himself

160/10

P.W.O. No. 1287

KEEP-WITH Genl. No.

dated 188 .

1,000—7-2-88.

[C. No. 8.]

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1888. { P.W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 28 March 1888.

OFFICE NOTE No. 1287

To

W.

In G.O. No. 2710 W. dated 13th. October 1887 Government ruled that in all cases of sanctions the responsible officer should sign himself. I now solicit orders of Government as to whether a similar rule should not hold good in the case of Superintending Engineers remarking on the divisional objectionable items statements, as in many cases it may happen that his orders on excesses over estimates on sub-heads are applied for, and in all cases it appears advisable that he should be personally cognisant of the irregularities brought to notice in the objectionable items statements.

2. The reference is made in connection with an objectionable itemsstatement relating to the

Mcc 3055

Dowlaishwaram Workshops, the disposal on which by the Supg. Engineer is signed by Mr. Murray, Asstt. Engineer "for Supg. Engineer"; but the case is not an isolated one. Moreover I recently noticed a case in which Mr. Murray countersigned "for Executive Engineer" a completion report previously signed by himself as sub-divisional officer; from which it would seem to be quite possible for Mr. Murray to virtually review his own proceedings from the beginning to end. It is impossible to tell in such cases whether the original documents (office copies) have been dealt with by the officer really responsible, or whether the whole matter has been left, as one of mere routine, to the officer who actually signs. This seems undesirable.

Rey 29.3.88

No. 1122 W. dy 14-4-88

No. Ms. 2710 W dy 13.10.87
W. 2902 C dy 29.8.87

C.

28/3.

G.L.S. 30/IV. Hem 7.4.88 M: 10.4.88

6/4/88

No. 1122 W.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 14th April 88

READ the following

Office Note from the Examiner P.W. accounts, dy No. 1287 dy 28th March 1888.

It is not desirable to extend the ruling in G.O. No. 2710 W of 13th October 1887 to cases not involving definite sanctions.

Mcm
5.4.88

Lou
6/4/88.

To The Exr. Offr.

D 14/4

3055

To Dr.

For orders.

It may not always be convenient for Engrs to sign remarks on divisional O.S. statements - e.g. when they are on tour.

It ought to be assumed apparently that the S.S. in all cases approves the Engr remarks, & that when one Engr signs "for" another, he does not do so on his own responsibility.

The C might write and request that the Ch. Engr would himself sign every S.W. memo.

It is not desirable to extend the ruling of G.O. Nos 2710 & 2713 Oct 1887 to cases in which missing definite sanctions were

No 1122 W. of 14th April 188

O.S. 30/iv: Hon. 7.4.88 - Rec: 10.4.88.

C 5/4/88

4/88