

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 14
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 1/9/
 (3) ஆதரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 602

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

PWD துறை

(63)

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	1173	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் : 8-4-1892		198 .

மடிக்கலோ கண்டபடி கையாளலோ கூடாது

2 shab

DV

ஆவண, கா-1-12,006-15-5-57.

(2)

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

READ—the following papers:—

Office-note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 6th February 1892, No. 203 S.A.

The Executive Engineer, West Coast division, has asked me to state whether, in my opinion, sub-overseers may be allowed to draw anything in the shape of actual expenses beyond the conveyance allowance admissible under Civil Service Regulations, article 1183, should they travel on duty beyond 20 miles either by carts or boats.

2. Under appendix No. 22 referred to in Civil Service Regulations, article 1133, as modified by Standing Order No. 47, items 31 and 32, it is possible that mileage is admissible to sub-overseers under the special order of the Executive Engineer or Assistant Engineer; but the wording of the standing order seems ambiguous.

3. The question is what allowances should sub-overseers (entry No. 31 in appendix 22) and surveyors (entry No. 32 in the same appendix) respectively draw? The remark that originally stood against entry No. 32 was—

May be allowed mileage under the special order of the Executive or Assistant Engineer and if that remark "be struck out" and "bracketed with that already appearing against entry No. 31," it would mean—

(i) That No. 31, sub-overseers, would be entitled to—

- (a) Conveyance allowance, and
- (b) Mileage.

(ii) That No. 32, surveyors, would be entitled to nothing.

Is *that* the meaning? If so, the standing order would probably have been worded somewhat in this way: "Strike out entry No. 32, surveyors, and bracket the remark now appearing against it with that appearing against entry No. 31."

4. Or is it the intention that both (a) and (b) are applicable to both Nos. 31 and 32? I cannot think that this was intended, for the simpler wording of the standing order would have been: "Bracket entries Nos. 31 and 32 together."

5. Or was it intended that neither No. 31 and 32 should draw mileage? If so, the words "and the same" (which obviously refers to the "remark" and *not* to "entry No. 32") in the third line of the standing order is misleading.

6. The point involved is an important one and I would therefore request that it may be referred to the Government of India in the Financial Department for decision.

No. 649 C.

Referred to the Financial Department.

(Signed) J. PENNYQUICK, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

9th February 1892.

G.O., dated 5th April 1892, No. 416, Financial.

Read—again the following paper :—

G.O., dated 4th March 1892, No. 269, Financial.

Read—also the following paper :—

From the Government of India, Finance and Commerce Department, dated 23rd March 1892, No. 1240.

In reply to your letter No. 270 (Financial), dated the 4th March 1892, I am directed to say that sub-overseers should be regarded as entitled to conveyance allowance and to mileage under the conditions specified in the entry 31, appendix No. 22, and in clause (b) of article 1183, Civil Service Regulations, and surveyors to neither.

Order—dated 5th April 1892, No. 416, Financial.

Communicated to the Public Works Department.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) N. S. BRODIE,
Acting Under-Secretary.

ORDER—dated 8th April 1892, No. 1173 W., Public Works.

Communicated to the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, with reference to his office-note No. 203 S.A., dated 6th February 1892, also to Superintending Engineers for information and guidance.

(True Extract.)

Major, R.E.,
Under-Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
„ Superintending Engineers.
„ the Consulting Architect to Government.
„ the Superintendent of Works, Periyár Project.
„ the Chief Engineer for Irrigation (T.R.S.).

Exd. A. D. Xavier.
Spare Copies

1173/2

GENERAL
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of {1892} Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated April, 8th.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 8th April 1892, No. 1173 W.

APRIL.

Conveyance Allowance

Proceedings, Financial Department, communicating letter from the Government of India stating that sub-overseers are entitled to — and to mileage under certain conditions and that surveyors are entitled to neither, communicated to the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

(C. No. 1201.)
8

KEEP-WITH

CURRENT No.

GOVT.
OF MADRAS.

1892.

{ P. W.
DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

dated

189

Madras, 6 February 1892.

OFFICE NOTE No. 203 SA

To W.

The Executive Engineer,

West Coast Division, has asked me to state whether in my opinion, sub-overseers may be allowed to draw anything in the shape of actual expenses beyond the conveyance allowance admissible under Civil Service Regulations article 1183, should they travel on duty beyond 20 miles either by carts or boats.

2. Under appendix N^o 22 referred to in Civil Service Regulations article 1183 as modified by Standing Order N^o 47, items 31 and 32, it is possible that mileage is admissible to sub-overseers under the special order of the Executive Engineer or Assistant Engineer; but the wording of the Standing Order seems ambiguous.

3. The question is, what allowances should sub-overseers (entry N^o 31 in appendix

Appendix 22) and Surveyors (entry No. 32 in the same appendix), respectively, draw ?

The remark that originally stood against entry No. 32 was —

"May be allowed mileage under the special order of the Executive or Assistant Engineer" and if that remark "be struck out" and bracketed with that already appearing against entry No. 31, it would mean —

- (i) that No. 31, Sub-Oversers, would be entitled to
 - (a) conveyance allowance, and
 - (b) mileage
- (ii) that No. 32, Surveyors, would be entitled to nothing.

Is that the meaning? If so, the Standing Order would probably have been worded somewhat in this way, "strike out entry No. 32, Surveyors, and bracket the remark now appearing against it with that appearing against entry No. 31."

4. Or is it the intention that both (a) and (b) are applicable to both No. 31 and 32? I cannot think that this was intended, for the simpler wording of the Standing Order would have been — "Bracket entries No. 31 and 32 together";

2 Pm

5. Or was it intended that neither No. 31 and 32 should draw mileage? If so, the words, "and the same" (which obviously refers to the remark and not to "entry No. 32"), in the third line of the Standing Order is misleading.

6. The point involved is an important one, and I would therefore request that it may be referred to the Government of India in the Financial Department for decision.

1177/4
H/4

b. P/5/2
D/6/2

3720/92

Recd. 8-2-92

330

N^o 649 C of 9th February 1892

Referred to the
Financial Department.

Indians →
Col. R.E.
Secty to Govt
P.W.D.

Int. 684/92



G.O. dated 5 April 1892, No 4163 Finance.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

1173/4

Read again G.O. 8/4th March 1892 No 269 -
Read the following paper:—

From the Government of India, Finance and Commerce Department, dated 23rd March 1892 N^o 1240.

In reply to your letter N^o 270 (Finance) dated the 4th March 1892, I am directed to say that subordinates should be regarded as entitled to conveyance allowance, and to mileage under the conditions specified in the entry 31, Appendix, N^o 22, and in Clause (a) of Article 1183, Civil Service Regulations, and surveyors to neither.

Order 5th April 1892 N^o 416.
Communicated to the Public

Works Department.

(True Extract)

W. Brodie
Asst. Under Secretary

To
The Public Works Department, with C.No 230
Accountant General

300

Govt. of 18 | Madras.

To

The P.W. Depto

11

Encls 1

Recd: 7-4-92

Proceedings, dated 5 April 1892
No. 416

Subject.

Communicating to the P.W. Depto letter from the Govt of India stating that sub overseers should be regarded as entitled to conveyance allowance and to mileage under the conditions specified in the entry 31, Appendix A 22 and in Clause (b) of Article 1183 Civil Service Regulations and Surveys to neither.

No. 669.C of 9.2.92
No. 1260.C of 10.3.92

Recd aming
1294 3/4
1770 3/4

No. 1173 May 8 April 92

4 Pm Communicated to the Govt P.W. Acct. with reference to his office note No. 203 S.A. dated 6 Feb 1892; also to Super. Sur. for information & guidance.

S 7.4 0013
7.4.92

To the Govt
- Super. Sur.
- C.A. to Govt.
- Super. P. Project.
- Ch. S. for J.R.S.)

1173
78

Che 3770

Govt of Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

9/4/92

8 April 1892 1173. 4

Conveyance Allowances

Progs Financial Dept.
Comg letter from the Govt.
of India stating that
Sub Overseers are entitled
to —, and to mileage,
under certain conditions,
and that Surveyors are
entitled to neither, Comd.
to the Examiner P.W. Account.

(7)

200
12

J.C. 8/4

5/8/92