(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 20
(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 16/9/88.
(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P.W துறை

அரசாணை எண்.
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 1291W

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் : 2.5.1888 ~~198~~ .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

ஆவண. கா-1—18,006—15-6-87.

B. S.

1291

2ND MAY 1888, No. 1291 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Account.

READ—the following papers :—

From G. T. WALCH, Esq., Superintending Engineer, I Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Dowlaishweram, 22nd March 1888, No. 2854 G.D.

I have the honor to enclose letter No. 514, * dated 21st instant, from the Executive Engineer, Western Division, and to request that, if possible, the signature of one competent witness besides that of the person who makes the payment may be considered enough for each petty cash-payment.

* To be returned when done with.

ENCLOSURE.

From W. C. DEMORGAN, Esq., Executive Engineer, Godávari Western Division, to the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, dated Godávari, 21st March 1888, No. 514.

The difficulty in procuring two witnesses to each petty cash-payment was brought to the notice of the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, Madras, in replying to para. 6 of the audit note on accounts for November 1887.

2. The Examiner, in his letter No. 509 S.E. 1, of 7th March 1888, has suggested that the question may be referred for the orders of Government through your office.

3. Petty cash-payments are generally made by the Subdivision officers and imprest-holders while on circuit, as piece-workers naturally object to travel to the head-quarters of the division or subdivision to receive a trifling payment.

4. The prompt submission of vouchers is frequently delayed for want of a witness who is able to sign his name to the name.

5. In para. 2 of his letter under reference, the Examiner states that *any* member of the Establishment, *other* than the person responsible for the payment, is a competent witness.

6. I have therefore the honor to suggest that one witness may be considered sufficient to cash-payments. As a clerk is generally present when payments are made, he could witness marks, &c., and the delay would be avoided.

7. I have the honor to request that, if you agree with me, the orders of Government may be obtained on the subject.

From the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated 23rd April 1888, No. 1391.

In my opinion, no relaxation of the rule should be allowed (unless better cause can be shown) in the case of payments to "contractors," as, in such cases, there should seldom, if ever, be any difficulty in getting two witnesses, of whom one at least, and both when convenient, should, it is thought, always be some member of the divisional establishment; a contractor generally has a following of some sort, a gumastah and a friend or two, one of whom could witness when two members of the establishment are not available.

2. As regards piece-workers, a distinction might, I think, be drawn between individual piece-workers and gangers or headmen of piece-workers, and in the case of payments to the latter, attestation of some sort seems desirable, but it does seem probable that there may frequently be difficulty in getting two witnesses, because the simple sort of work on which they would be engaged would seldom require a work

gumastah of the divisional staff, and they have not the sort of following that a contractor generally has, and I think one witness might be considered sufficient, he being a Government servant. In the interests of the men who constitute the gang, it is desirable that there should be some guarantee that the amount was actually paid to the headman.

3. With regard to a payment made to an individual piece-worker, it seems to me that there is no real difference between his case and that of a laborer for daily wages, and, as far as I can see, there is no reason why a witness should be required for a payment to one and not for a payment to the other.

4. I therefore suggest for—

(a) payments to "contractors" two witnesses, one at least, and if possible both, a Government servant;

(b) payments to headmen of "piece-workers," one witness, a Government servant;

(c) payments to individual piece-workers no witness necessary. Using the term contractor and/piece-worker in the sense implied in G.O. No. 94 W., dated 11th January 1888, according to which a man who undertakes to do a definite quantity of work of any kind is a contractor, whilst a piece-worker is merely a laborer paid by results.

5. I think this opportunity might be taken of ruling that the witness should always be described, by entry of his occupation, &c., so as to admit of his being found when wanted. If this is not done, attestation by any number of witnesses can be of little value.

6. It would perhaps be better not to dispose of the matter on the representations of a single Executive Engineer, but to refer it to Superintending Engineers generally for opinion. Other Executive Engineers may possibly suggest cases not considered above as to which some ruling may be desirable.

7. Para. 4 of the Executive Engineer's letter is not understood. I can understand that a payment might be delayed for want of the required witnesses; but I cannot understand the voucher being delayed, for, if the payment is not made, there can be no question of voucher, and if the payment is made (without witnesses) the defect can never be remedied. As I understand the rules, what is wanted is witnesses of the payments, and not merely witnesses of the payee's signature.

ORDER—dated 2nd May 1888, No. 1291 W., Public Works.

Communicated to Superintending Engineers of other Circles for an expression of their views.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Superintending Engineers, II to VI Circle.
" Consulting Architect to Government.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts
" Superintending Engineer, I Circle, for information.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.
Spare Copies

1291/2

GENERAL.
ACCOUNT.

Gobt. of {1888} Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated May, 2nd.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 2nd May 1888, No. 1291 W.

MAY.

Petty Cash-payments

Requesting the views of Superintending Engineers as regards the number of witnesses considered necessary in attesting—.

1888.

1291/3

P. W. DEPARTMENT

Current No. 3087/

1291/W

From

The Suptg. Engineer
I circle

ENCLOS.—

No. 2854 G. D.
Dated 22d March 1888
Received 3rd April 1888

SUBJECT.

Suggesting that petty Cash payments may be attested by one witness only owing to the difficulty of obtaining 2 competent witnesses always to attest such payments.

DISPOSAL.

No. 1475 C Dated 6th April 188

To.

C

For favour of remarks.

(Sd) W. L. C. B
4-4-88
D.W.

Despd 6/4

D 11/4

110

No. 514

D. P. W.

Executive Engineer's Office Godavari Western Division.
Dated 21 March 1888.

From

The Executive Engineer
Godavari Western Division.

To

The Superintending Engineer
First Circle

Encl:

Sir,

The difficulty in procuring two witnesses to each petty cash payment was brought to the notice of the Examiner P. W. Accounts Madras, in replying to para 6 of the audit note on accounts for November /87.

2. The Examiner in his letter No. 509 SEI of 7-3-88 has suggested that the question may be referred for the orders of Government, through your office

3. Petty cash payments are generally made by

opinion

the SubDivision officers and Imprest holders while on Circuit, as Piece-workers naturally object to travel to the headquarters of the Division or Sub-Division to receive a trifling payment.

4. The prompt submission of Vouchers is frequently delayed for want of a witness who is able to sign his name to the name.

5. In para 2 of his letter under reference the Examiner states that any member of the Establishment other than the person responsible for the payment is a competent witness.

6. I have therefore the honor to suggest that

one witness may be considered sufficient to cash payments. As a clerk is generally present when payments are made he could witness marks &c and the delay would be avoided.

7. I have the honor to request that, if you agree with me the orders of Government may be obtained on the Subject.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obdt Servt
W de Morgan
21/3/88 Executive Engineer

Ent 21/3

Sd 21/3

opinion

ENCLOSURE
9/18
1 APR 88
EXAMINER, P.W. O.

No. 514 2327 G.D / 22-3-88

D. P. W.

Ch. Eng. 3087/88

From

The Executive Engineer
Godavari Western Division.

To

The Supdg: Engineer
First Circle

Dated
Despatched 21 / 22 } March 1888
Received

Ser dept
20/3/88

E.1 / P.W. 3791/88

Enclo:

Subject.

Petty cash payments – Difficulty in procuring 2 witnesses to each of –

Requesting to obtain Govt: orders, ~~[illegible]~~ ~~the clerk, present~~ (regarding ~~the~~ certain suggestions mad.

No. 2854 G.D. 3P

1291/6

FROM,

G. T. Walch Esqre
~~THE~~ SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
FIRST CIRCLE.

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DOWLAISHWARAM, 22d March 1888
Despd 27/3/

SIR,

I have the honor to enclose letter* 514 – 21st Instant from the Executive Engr: Western Division and to request that if possible the signature of one competent witness besides that of the person who makes the payment may be considered enough for each petty Cash payment.

*To be returned when done with –

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

Walch
Supdt: Engr: 1st Circle.

opinion

No. 1475 C of 6.4.88
" 94 W of 11-1-88

EXAMINER
No. 968
7 APR 1888
ENCLOSURES 1
P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Pl. C. No. 305[illegible]

FROM,

G. J. Walch Esqr

~~THE~~ SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

129/2

FIRST CIRCLE.

No. 1475 C d/6th April 1888

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

To C

In favour of remarks.

WW
4.4.88

Out

DATED 22
DESPTCHED 27 } March 1888
RECEIVED

NO. 2854 G.D.

41P

ENCLOSURES. 1

Recd 3 [illegible]

Encl 1

SUBJECT.

Petty Cash Payments.

Difficulty in procuring 2 witnesses for to each of

Request to obtain the sanction of Government for the signature of one Competent Witness to.

To W.

No. 1391 Encl 1
23.4.8

In my opinion,no relaxation of the rule should be allowed (unless better cause can be shown) in the case of payments to "contractors",as in such cases, there should seldom,if ever,be any difficulty in getting two witnesses,of whom one at least,and both when convenient,should it is thought always be some member of the divisional establishment — a contractor generally has a following of some sort,a goomastah and a friend or two,one of whom could witness when two members of the establishment are

0
26/4 - OSS 134/1V

70

opinion

are not available.

2. As regards piece-workers a distinction might I think be drawn between individual piece-workers and gangers or headmen of piece-workers, and in the case of payments to the latter, attestation of some sort seems desirable, but it does seem probable that there may frequently be difficulty in getting two witnesses, because the simple sort of work on which they would be engaged would seldom require a work gumastah of the divisional staff, and they have n the sort of following that a cont or generally has, and I think one witness might be considered sufficient, he being a government servant. In the interests of the men who constitute the gang it is desirable that there should be some guarantee that the amount was actually paid to the headman.

3. With regard to a payment made to an individual piece-worker, it seems to me that there is no real difference between his case and that of a laborer for daily wages, and as far as I can see, there is no reason why a witness should be required for a payment to one and not for a payment to the other.

4. I therefore suggest for

(a) payments to "contractors" two witnesses, one at least, and if possible both a government servant,

(b) for payments to headmen of "piece-workers", one witness, a government servant,

(c) for payments to individual piece-workers no witness necessary.

Using the term contractor and piece-worker in the sense implied in G.O. No. 94 W. dated 11th. January 1888, according to which a man who undertakes to do a definite quantity of work of any kind is a contractor, whilst a piece-worker is merely a laborer paid by results.

5. I think this opportunity might be taken of ruling that the witness should always be described, by entry of his occupation, etc., so as to admit of his being found when wanted. If this is not done, attestation by any number of witnesses can be of little value.

6. It would perhaps be better not to dispose of the matter on the representations of a single Executive Engineer, but to refer it to Supg. Engineers generally for

opinion

7P

opinion. Other Executive Engineers may possibly suggest cases not considered above as to which some ruling may be desirable.

7. Para 4 of the Executive Engineer's letter is not understoo I can understand that a payment might be delayed for want of the required witnesses : but I cannot understand the voucher being delaye for if the payment is not made ther can be no question of voucher and if the payment is made (without witnesses) the defect can never be remedied. As I understand the rule what is wanted is witnesses of the payments, and not merely witnesses of the payee's signature.

Genl Acct

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

129/9

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the

READ the following

8P

From the Ex. Engr Godavari W. Divn No 514 d/ 21.3.88
" " S. E. I Circle No 2854 G.D. d/ 22.3.88
" " Exr P.W. Accts - 1391 d/ 23.4.88.

Communicated to Supdg Engrs of other circles for an expression of their views.

26.4.88

x 15/5

27/4/88

Supdg Engrs II. to VI Circles
C.A. & Govt.
Exr P.W.A.
S.E. I Circle for information.

Govt. of {1888} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

5/5

Dated

Recd.

Encl.

G.O. 2nd May 1888 No. 1291 W.

Petty Cash Payments

Requesting the views of Superintending Engineers ~~with~~ as regards the number of witnesses considered necessary in attesting —.

190/14

9