Public Works (1899) Department.

20

G.O., No. 2283. W
2284

DATED 31 August 1899.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Telegram - Ordered that the Br Resident of Telegraphs be requested to withdraw his objection to the admission, as a charge to the State, of the sum of 9 Rs incurred on a telegram sent from Krishnagiri to Nandyal on the occasion of His Excellency's tour.

Br Resident of Telegraphs addressed

Indexed.

[P. W. 2 2,000—29-3-99.]

[P. W. 45. 1,000—28-2-19.]

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

READ the following:—

Letter from the Director General of Telegraphs, No 8224 T, dated 22nd March 1899 (Telegram

Circulated to His Excellency the Governor

Objection to a Telegraph

ORDER.

No: 2283 W 31-8-99

A.E.H. 24.8.99

Ordered that the Director General of Telegraphs be addressed H. E. No 2281/W dated 31st Aug.

To

The Director General of Telegraphs, Calcutta.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your letter No 8224 T, dated 22 March 1899, in which exception is taken to a charge of 9 annas on account of a telegram sent by the Public Works Department Divisional Officer, Trichinopoly to an Engineer at Nandyal. The telegram in question worded as follows:—

"Boat wanted for Governor's use. Send that immediately Kurnool".

2. The charge is objected to on the gro

Please instruct as to action required. H.E.H.

Time with a deletion

25.8.99

(1) Files
(2) Landmark & Entitlement Draw

Ref

[P. W. 42-A. 1,000—2-3-99.]

G.O.

...und that as "travelling allowance" is ...wn, the cost of the message should be ...id for from the private funds of the person ...erned and not charged to the State". The ...ge in this case would fall on His Excellency ... Governor of Madras, if your view of the ...atter is upheld.

The objection taken by you seems ...be sustainable only if the "tour allowance" ... His Excellency the Governor is a "travelling ...llowance" as contemplated by the rules. His ...cellency the Governor has, however, been ex...essly placed outside the Travelling Allowance ...les. There would thus seem to be an essential ...fference between the "tour allowance" drawn ... His Excellency and a fixed "travelling ...wance". It is in this difference that the rule ... the Telegraph Department under which the ...sent demand is made has its origin. ... difference consists in the fact that a fixed ...velling allowance" is appropriated and absorbed ...to his private funds by the officer to whom ...is granted. But it is a fundamental ...dition of the grant of "travelling allowance" ...t it should not be a source of profit to the ...ividual. Hence the rule under which the ...graph Department acts, as tending to prevent ...licit profit, is justifiable.

(The "tour allowance" of His Excellency the Governor is not, and cannot be, a source of profit to the individual, and to apply the ordinary rule of the Telegraph Department to the latter allowance would only be to transfer the charge from one head of account to another — a proceeding which seems to be unnecessary and useless.

+5. I am to request, therefore, that you will be so good, on consideration of this view of the matter, as to withdraw the objection raised to the admission as a charge to the State, of this ~~recoverable~~ sum of 9 annas.

I have &c &c

R.S.

H.F.-11

(Turned ~~with~~ the following leave)

+4. Cases of similar telegrams must have arisen before, but I am not aware that objection has ever been taken to any of them. Moreover, it is difficult to say where the line is to be drawn: for, in arranging for a Commissioner's tour, the various District officers must often have telegrams to send dealing with the subjects which range from his carriages and camel boats to trades and official interviews. If one allowance is to be

G.O.

be made to distinguish between 'private' persons and 'officials' in such matters, it will be a question of great difficulty sometimes to discriminate between the two.

A.S.H.

Public Works D.

Read the following :—

Letter fr the Director General of Telegraphs, No. 8224 T., dated 22nd March 1899. (Flag A)

Objection to a telegraph charge

Circulated to

H. E. the Governor

FOR ORDERS

Flag C.

Submitted for orders whether

(1) An order be drafted in the sense of the Chief Secretary's Note dated 9th August 1899 and communicated to the Director General of Telegraphs in reply to his objection statement.

or

(2) the matter be at once laid before the Government of India for settlement.

2. It is quite possible that the Director General of Telegraphs may, in reply to the proposed G.O., say that he is not cognizant of the terms of His Excellency the Governor's Contract allowance, and the question would then have to go up to the Government of India ultimately

[P. W. 43.
1,000—28-2-19.]

H. E. 145

ultimately noted of in the
first instance, as suggested
in (2) above.

C.S.

12. 8.11

Financial Dept

For the C.S.

This correspondence relates to the charge for a Scotch telegram sent by one subordinate of the P. W.D. to another in Sept. 08 in connection with boat arrangements for H.E. the Governor when on tour. The Director General of Telegraphs considers that, in accordance with the ruling of the F.B.I. in regard to telegrams relating to arrangements for journeys when T.A. is drawn, this charge is not properly debitable to the State.

Page 1 of Current

Page 5 of Current

The Punati Secy. considers that the ruling quoted by the D. T. G. cannot be held to "apply to the Governor who does not draw "Travelling Allowance", and who, consequently cannot be called upon to pay from his private purse for telegrams that may be sent in connection with his tours"

P. W.D refers the matter to Financial for opinion as to whether the cost of this telegram is debitable to H.E. the Governor's Contract Allowance or not

Attention is solicited to letter No. 22 Fin. dy. 1. 96 printed on pages 1-3 of P.O. No. 175 Fin. of the 17th March 1896 which gives a history of the Contract Allowance. It will be seen (from para 7) that the present allotment of Rs 90,000 includes Rs 35,000 for Tour charges, & a reference to paras 4-6 of letter No. 304 Financial of the 18th Feby 1878 & para 6 of India's letter No. 2312 of 26. April 1878 on page 1 of P.O. No. 875 Fin. of 17th May 1878, shows that this sum of Rs 35,000 was fixed as a limit by the Govt of India in face of the opinion that of this Govt that the Tour charges should depend on the Tours undertaken, as it is not desirable that a Governor should be fettered by an arbitrary fixed limit of expenditure for this purpose"

Thus Rs 35,000 would, therefore, appear to represent a maximum consolidated T.A., & in this view the refund of the charge for the telegram from the Contract Allowance appears to be in order.

9.8.97

I do not concur with the view taken in the above note. The correspondence quoted only shows that a limit has been placed on the Budget allotment for the Governor's contract allowance.

The question of the Telegraph Dept. being from contingencies only of the tour allowance is a travelling allowance as custom stated by the

[G / 24]
1,000—25-3-99

DEPARTMENT.

C. No. From the , No. , dated 189 .
" " , " , " 189 .
" " , " , " 189 .
" " , " , " 189 .

---

les but the Govt has been
properly placed out side
the travelling allowance rules
and it seems to me that
there is an essential difference
between the two allowances
and a fixed travelling allowance
and it is in that way
difficulty that the rule
of the Telegraph Dept under
which this demand is made
has its origin. The difference
is that a fixed travelling
allowance goes into the
private pocket of the officer
to whom it is granted. He
he can save it he can apply
it as example to the education
of his children. But it is
a fundamental condition
of the grant of travelling allowance
that it shall not be a source
of profit to the individual
and hence the telegraph
Dept rule as tending to
prevent this is justifiable.
But the tour allowance is
not & can not be a source

of profit to the individual
who may be Governor. Hence
the Telegraph Dept rule will
only take money out of
one pocket of Govt &
put it into another
which seems to me a
useless proceeding.

I am therefore of
opinion that the Govt of the
Telegraph is not
debitable to the Governor
Contract allowance

G.I.
9/8/99

Dr. W. n.o. 11/9/99

P.T.O.

x With printed file to be handed out

Note

I. No. 864 D of 11 August 1899.

The Chief Secretary.

As a general question in connection with the H. C.'s Contract allowance is involved, the proper Dept. to deal with the matter seems to me to be the Financial. If, however, you think otherwise, I shall be quite prepared to take it up in the P. W. D.

10.8.99

I think the D.P.W. is the proper Dept. to deal with this matter

P.W.D.

4

Public Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 3260

1957 c-97

D

From The Superintg. Engineer
3rd Circle
Bezwada

No 518 dated 25th April 1899

~~Order~~

No. 1547 W

To

The Private Secy.
to His. the Governor. M.O.

Dated 19 4 99

Received
Registered } 21.4.99
Enclosures 1 2
Spare copies

For favour of remarks.

ACK
24.4.99.

Ans 1/4/99
to.

P.W.

SUBJECT.

Telegram sent by the Lower Dule Divl Offr Krishna — puram to the Overseer in charge 4 & 5 sections Revenue Canal, regarding boat required for His Excellency the Governor in Sept. last. — States that the — could not be considered as private —

O.L.S. 39

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
19510	6-4-99

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

5

RECEIVED 26 DEC 1899 GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

with financial please decide
whether this
telegram debitable to
Also contract allowance
or not -

26 12 99

Fwd Secy
4.0

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS



Public Works

(189 7.) Department.

CURRENT No. 2766. 3260/98

SUPERINTENDENT Regr. 3554 8 APR. 9 4TH CIRCLE

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER 14 APR. 99 151

From The Director General of Telegraphs.

No: 1951 C. 26 apl 99

No. 8224 T.

Referred to the Suptg. Engr., III circle, for report as to the circumstances under which the telegram referred to was sent as "state."

Dated 22nd March 99.
Received } 29. 3. 99.
Registered
Enclosures
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Col. R.E. Requesting that the Amot of a telegram classed "State" by mistake, be caused to be paid in to the Treasury.

Ag. Secretary to Govt. P.W.D. R. — 9 — 99

Pur

[P. W. 29. 2,000—18-99-0.]

FURTHER PAPERS.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

2

No. 8224 T.

FROM

THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF TELEGRAPHS,

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras
Public Works Department
Madras

Dated The 22nd of March 1899.

SIR,

THE Government of India having ruled that telegrams regarding leave, arrangements for journeys when travelling allowance is drawn, or on other private business, should be paid for from the private funds of the person concerned, and not charged to the State, I am directed to request the favour of your causing to be paid into the Treasury the sum of Rs. 1-9-4, being the cost of the telegram, copied in the margin, which, though classed "State" by the sender, does not appear to have been properly chargeable to Government. If however the telegram was classed "State" by mistake, and the amount paid for it has not been charged to Government, an intimation to this effect from the sender will be accepted and the claim withdrawn.

State - Deferred.

From Lower Sub Divisional Krishnapuram.

To S. Nalena. Iyer Overseer Canal 4 & 5 Sections Kandrjal S.M. Railway

Words 9 dated 27. 9. 98

Boat wanted for Governer's use Send Rat immediately Kurnool.

The name and disignation of the sender as written at the foot of the telegram are (name illegible) Lower Sub Divisional officer.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient Servant,

Chief Superintendent,

attached to the office of Director General,

Traffic Branch.

C G P—No. 434 T (s)—11 3 99—1,000.

3.

Superintending Engineer's Office,
3RD CIRCLE,
Bellary 19th April 1899.

No. 1547/W.

FROM Lieut. Col. W. L. Co. Baddeley R.E.
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
3RD CIRCLE,

To THE Chief Engineer,
P.W. Department,
Ootacamund.

Sir,

1 Enclosures. In reference to your No. 1961 C of 6th April 1899, I have the honour to return the letter from the Director General of Telegraphs, and to state that the message was sent in connection with the last tour of His Excellency the Governor in Kurnool.

2. The wording of the telegram should in my opinion have prevented this reference, it being clear that the boat was required for the use of His Excellency the Governor, and that the instructions sent by wire by the Lower Subordinate Divisional Officer to the Overseer could not possibly be considered as relating to any private business of the sender.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
W. Baddeley Lieut. Col. R.E.
Superintending Engineer, III Circle.

18/4/99.

From

The Superintending Engineer,
3rd Circle,

To

The _____

_____

_____

Dated } _____ 189 .
Received }

Enclosures.

No.

Subject.