

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 4
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 4 ஜூன் 1893
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 82

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

சென்னை

அரசாணை எண்.	2566 W.	அச்சகம்
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.		பலவகை
நாள் :	10.10.1893	498

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—again the following papers:—

G.O., dated 20th June 1881, No. 1148, Financial.

Read—Proceedings of Government in the Military Department, dated 10th June 1881, No. 3142 (Current No. 1387).

Order—dated 20th June 1881, No. 1148, Financial.

The Honorable the Governor in Council resolves to direct that in future cheques for amounts due by Government shall be drawn only in the name of the individual creditor or of a known Bank or Agency Firm named by him. This rule will not interfere with the present practice of granting separate cheques to Government servants whose names are included in the general bills of the office establishment concerned, or to any known Bank or Agency Firm on their account. In the event of contractors in the Public Works or other Department desiring their representatives to receive payments to them from Government, such representatives must hold a Power of Attorney from the contractor.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Offg. Chief Secretary.

To the Departments of the Secretariat.
„ all Heads of Departments.
„ the Accountant-General.

G.O., dated 25th February 1892, No. 245, Financial.

Read—the following letter from T. W. RAWLINS, Esq., Accountant-General, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 17th February 1892, No. 494:—

In G.O., dated 20th June 1881, No. 1148, Financial, Government directed that “in future cheques for amounts due by Government should be drawn only in the name of the individual creditor or of a known Bank or Agency Firm named by him.” This rule was strictly enforced for some time, but gradually ~~and~~ ^{and} cheques came to be issued in favour of the clerks and peons who presented the bills when the latter were endorsed in their favour. On a recent change of personnel in this office, the course prescribed in the Government Order was reverted to, but, objections being raised by officers concerned, the existing practice was allowed to continue. In face of the Government Order existing this was of course irregular, and I now have the honour to enquire whether it is the desire of Government that it should still be strictly enforced. I may point out that the order does not lessen the risk of fraud except in so far as it stimulates the watchfulness of the heads of offices by emphasizing their responsibility.

Order—dated 25th February 1892, No. 245, Financial.

The Government formally withdraws G.O., dated 20th June 1881, No. 1148, so far as clauses 1 and 2 are concerned.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Accountant-General.

From T. W. RAWLINS, Esq., Accountant-General, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 26th June 1893, No. 1755.

In consequence of a case of forgery which had recently occurred in the Presidency Paymaster's office, a Government Order was passed, No. 1148, dated 20th June 1881, directing that in future cheques should be drawn for sums due by Government "only in the name of the individual creditor or a known Bank or Agency Firm named by him." This rule was, I understand, strictly carried out in this office at first, but after some time fell into abeyance, and when I took charge at the end of 1888 it had become a dead letter and cheques were invariably drawn in the name of the clerk or peon in whose favour they were endorsed. In 1891 an attempt was made to revert to the prescribed rule, but on protests being made by officers on the score of waste of time I referred the matter to Government in my No. 494, dated 17th February 1892, in the last clause of which I remarked that the order did not lessen the risk of fraud except in so far as it stimulated the watchfulness of the heads of offices by emphasizing their responsibility, and in G.O., No. 245, dated 25th February 1892, the prohibitions embodied in G.O., No. 1148, dated 20th June 1881, were cancelled.

2. A case of forgery has now occurred which makes it necessary to modify the remarks made at the close of my No. 494, dated 17th February 1892, and to bring the matter to the notice of Government once more. A contingent bill for Rs. 226-10-11 was endorsed by the Secretary to the Board in favour of his cashkeeper, who, by a clever alteration of 2 into 4 in both words and figures, changed the amount to 426-10-11 and obtained and cashed a cheque for that amount, of which he, of course, retained Rs. 200 and brought only Rs. 226-10-11 to account. Without in the least conceding that the Bank officials are more careful than the Presidency audit branch of my office, I venture to submit that it would have been much more difficult to carry out this fraud had the cheque been made payable to the Secretary, for the latter would presumably have noticed the difference between the amount of the cheque and that of the bill which he had passed, especially if, as in the case of cheques that I endorse, the cheque had to be verified by a responsible officer before endorsement. If, in order to escape this danger, the cashkeeper had presented the bill intact and had attempted to alter the cheque after endorsement, he must infallibly have left marks of erasure which would be infinitely more apparent on the thin panel of green over white paper than the amount of a cheque has to be written than on the white paper of a bill and must have ensured detection at the Bank.

3. The necessity for submitting a cheque for the endorsement of the officer who signs the bill would entail some slight additional delay in payment and some very slight additional trouble to the officer, but I trust the above remarks will show that besides emphasizing the responsibility of the officer concerned it would, to a considerable extent, diminish the possibility of such a fraud as that which I have now brought to your notice, and I venture to trust that Government will be pleased to reconsider their order.

Telegram from the Accountant-General Fort St. George, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Ootacamund, dated 28th August 1893.

I solicit answer by wire to 1755, dated 26th June, recommending reconsideration of order relating to cheques being drawn in favour of others than individual creditors or known Bank or Agency. I strongly support proposition and consider present practice dangerous.

From J. E. COOKE, Esq., Officiating Accountant-General, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 28th August 1893, No. 2432.

I have the honour to state that, in the course of my personal investigation into the practice of the various departments of this office, I have found an arrangement in force in the Presidency Audit department by which cheques in payment of official bills are sometimes drawn out in the name of the peons of an office to meet the convenience of the drawing officer.

2. I have been referred on this point to Mr. Rawlins' letter, No. 1755, dated 26th June in which he recommends that this arrangement should be disallowed. One case of a fraudulent alteration of a figure clearly proved how unsafe the arrangement is and how it adds to the difficulties of the officer in charge of this department of work in maintaining a proper check.

3. I beg respectfully to be allowed to support Mr. Rawlins' recommendation. The practice seems to me to be distinctly dangerous as well as unnecessary and there is a very real risk of irregularities passing unnoticed until it is too late to prevent fraud. I have ventured to ask for orders by telegram, in order, if possible, to correct the practice in time to meet the heavy pressure of responsibility in the first week of September.

ORDER—dated 7th September 1893, No. 869, Financial.

The Accountant-General has been informed by telegram that the Government agrees to his proposal that the provisions of G.O., dated 20th June 1881, No. 1148, should be strictly enforced in future. The attention of Heads of Departments will be drawn to the matter and they will be required to verify each cheque before endorsement.

(True Extract.)

J. W. P. P. P.
J. W. P. P. P.
for Chief Secretary.

To the Accountant-General.
" the Departments of the Secretariat.
" all Heads of Departments.

Gobt. of {1893} Madras.
FINANCIAL.

No 2566 W of 10 October
1893.

Communicated
to officers of the P.W.
Dept with reference
to G.O. no 1702 w of 9th
July 1891.

Issued 205.c

Recd. 25.9.93

Encl.

G.O., 7th September 1893, No. 869.

DUIS
2-10-93

11/10

SEPTEMBER.

DESPATCHED

11 OCT. 93

Cheques.

Directing the attention of Heads of Departments to the rule that — for amounts due by Government shall be drawn only in the name of the individual creditor or of a known Bank or Agency Firm named by him, and requiring them to verify each cheque before endorsement.

Ch E for Govt
Ch E for Sup
Supts Supers
CP to Govt
S of a P. P. 1
Encl. P.W. a
Encl. P.W. a
2/10/93
32/10