

M.R.O. 1-77,000-8-4-51
(1) Number of pages 8
(2) Date of repair _____
(3) Initials of the Referee _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	2621	Press
		Not
37-32		
Dated	3 11.	1862

Not to be folded or roughly handled

17

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
3rd November 1862.*

No. 31. Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel R. STRACHEY, R. E., Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, to the Secretary to the Government of Fort Saint George, in the Public Works Department, dated the 30th September 1862, No. 3,835:—

SIR,

In reply to your letter No. 1,673, dated 14th July 1862, requesting information which may serve as a guide for distinguishing between establishment and work-people, I am directed to forward copies of a Circular* recently issued from the Office of the Inspector General of Public Works Accounts for the guidance of Account Offices under the Government of India, hoping that it may supply the information desired as to the difference between the two classes.

Circular from Major G. CHESNEY, Inspector General of Public Works Accounts, on tour, Nynce Tal, to — dated Inspector General's Office, 11th August 1862, No. 26.

SIR,

1. A recent inspection of the Establishment bills submitted by several Executive Engineers for audit shows that the instructions conveyed in Circular No. 6 of 1862 of the Government of India, regarding the pre-audit of Establishment charges, have in many cases been construed to mean that the wages of all persons who are paid by the month should be charged for in the Establishment bill. With the sanction of the Government of India—the following explanations on this point are circulated for general information.

2. Heretofore it has been customary to entertain considerable temporary Establishments in addition to the regular sanctioned ones of each division, consisting of clerks, mohurrirs, mechanics, &c., and sometimes even of persons superintending works, whose rank and pay corresponded with those of the regular Upper Subordinates. The pay of these temporary Establishments was charged to the works, either in the Day-books of works, or in a monthly list of 'Work Establishment,' the total cost of which was distributed over the works by the Office of Account.

3. The new rules of Circular No. 6 affect the old system—

1st. By abolition of informal nomenclature:—whence persons getting the pay of Overseers, Sub-Overseers, &c., are now to be called Overseers, Sub-Overseers, &c.

2nd. By requiring charges for temporary Establishments to be shown under their proper heads:—thus a temporary clerk, employed in the Executive Engineer's Office, is no longer to be charged as 'Work Establishment,' with which he had no more connection than the permanent clerks, but as 'temporary Office Establishment.' On the other hand some permanent charges which were formerly entered under the head 'Office' have now been transferred to 'Work.'

3rd. By bringing all Establishment charges together in one account, and making all subject to pre-audit.

4. But it was never intended that charges which were not for Establishment in the proper sense of the term should now be included in the Establishment bills, and in auditing the bills all such charges should be disallowed, as tending to enhance unduly the charges on this head of service.

5. Thus in many divisions a large number of mistrees, mohurrirs, chaprassees, and chokeedars, are now charged for as Establishment. Now in every division one or two mistrees can be usefully employed on miscellaneous duties connected with the service of the Department which cannot be adequately represented by any particular estimate, and such a person may be appropriately considered as a member of the Establishment; indeed in many divisions one or two mistrees have for a long time been borne on the permanent roll. But the number who can be profitably employed in this way must be very small, certainly not more than one or two at each principal station; all other mistrees can only be required for employment on some specific works, and should be charged in the Day-books accordingly; and if no works are going on

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
3rd November 1862.*

they should not be kept up. The pay of such men, though calculated by the month, should be dealt with as daily pay just as much as that of other workmen, and they would usually only be paid for the days on which they are employed.

6. It is to be hoped that under this view of the case a much closer check will be kept on this class of charges than was practicable when they were exhibited in the old vague 'Work Establishment lists,' to be distributed generally over all the works in progress. They must now appear either as regular 'Work Establishments,' or be charged in specific Day-books. The staff of mistrees proper to be charged in the first way can be regulated with reference to the known wants of a division, while charges in Day-books can be tested by the amount of work done.

7. Similar remarks apply to charges for mohurrirs. In many divisions a small staff of these is necessary to aid the assistants and principal subordinates in their vernacular accounts, although it is thought that the use of these might to a great extent be obviated by the employment of the regular Sub-Overseers of the Department. But the number required for this purpose, who may be fairly considered as Establishment, should be definitely fixed upon a review of the actual requirements of each division, and all others required for specific works should be charged in the Day-books of those works as explained in the last paragraph.

8. So also with regard to chaprassees. It is believed that the number of these has been lately fixed for each division by the different Local Governments, but the returns show numbers largely in excess of those scales in almost every division of which the bills have been inspected. Here also the same principle should be maintained in discriminating between what is Establishment and what is not. If the existing scale allowed is insufficient for the business of the division, that may be a reason for submitting a revised scale for sanction, but no chaprassees should be kept up beyond the authorized scales, except for employment on definite works, and the Superintending Officers may usually satisfy themselves whether the works properly admit of the charges by inspection of the Day-books.

9. In short in determining what is Establishment and what is not, it should be considered whether the charge is incurred for duties connected with the miscellaneous service of the division, or for employment on specific works, which employment would cease if the work were stopped. In the former case the charge is properly referred to the head Establishment, whether it be for a chaprassee or an Executive Engineer; in the latter the charge should be exhibited in the account of the work concerned.

10. Chokeedars are in a different category, since they must often be kept up for duties which are not represented by any expenditure, as for guarding vacant buildings; clearly, therefore, in such cases they come under the head of Establishment, as defined in Circular No. 6. But it is hoped that the present method of exhibiting charges for chokeedars will enable them to be properly scrutinized; the necessity for all such should be clearly ascertained, and whenever there appears to be room for reduction, a proposal to that effect should be submitted to the Local Government.

No. 32. ORDER THEREON, 3rd November 1862, No. 2,621.

Communicated to the Chief Engineer, with reference to his letter No. 1,818, dated 2nd July 1862.

(Signed) W. I. BIRDWOOD, Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government.

Circular No. 26 of 1862.

FROM

MAJOR G. CHESNEY,

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF P. W. ACCOUNTS.

(On tour, Nynce Tal.)

TO

INSPECTOR GENERAL'S OFFICE, 11th August 1862.

General
Accounts.

SIR,

A recent inspection of the Establishment bills submitted by several executive engineers for audit shows that the instructions conveyed in Circular No. 6 of 1862 of the Government of India, regarding the pre-audit of Establishment charges, have in many cases been construed to mean that the wages of all persons who are paid by the month should be charged for in the Establishment bill. With the sanction of the Government of India—the following explanations on this point are circulated for general information.

2. Heretofore it has been customary to entertain considerable temporary Establishments in addition to the regular sanctioned ones of each division, consisting of clerks, mohurrirs, mechanics, &c., and sometimes even of persons superintending works, whose rank and pay corresponded with those of the regular Upper Subordinates. The pay of these temporary Establishments was charged to the works, either in the Day-books of works, or in a monthly list of 'Work Establishment,' the total cost of which was distributed over the works by the Office of Account.

3. The new rules of Circular No. 6 affect the old system—

1st, By abolition of informal nomenclature:—whence persons getting the pay of overseers, sub-overseers, &c., are now to be called overseers, sub-overseers, &c.

2nd, By requiring charges for temporary Establishments to be shown under their proper heads:—thus a temporary clerk, employed in the executive engineer's office, is no longer to be charged as 'Work Establishment,' with which he had no more connection than the perma-

ment clerks, but as 'temporary office Establishment.' On the other hand some permanent charges which were formerly entered under the head 'office' have now been transferred to 'work.'

3rd, By bringing all Establishment charges together in one account, and making all subject to pre-audit.

4. But it was never intended that charges which were not for Establishment in the proper sense of the term should now be included in the Establishment bills, and in auditing the bills all such charges should be disallowed, as tending to enhance unduly the charges on this head of service.

5. Thus in many divisions a large number of mistrees, mohurrirs, chaprassees, and chokeedars, are now charged for as Establishment. Now in every division one or two mistrees can be usefully employed on miscellaneous duties connected with the service of the department which cannot be adequately represented by any particular estimate, and such a person may be appropriately considered as a member of the Establishment; indeed in many divisions one or two mistrees have for a long time been borne on the permanent roll. But the number who can be profitably employed in this way must be very small, certainly not more than one or two at each principal station; all other mistrees can only be required for employment on some specific works, and should be charged in the Day books accordingly; and if no works are going on they should not be kept up. The pay of such men, though calculated by the month, should be dealt with as daily pay just as much as that of other workmen, and they would usually only be paid for the days on which they are employed.

6. It is to be hoped that under this view of the case a much closer check will be kept on this class of charges than was practicable when they were exhibited in the old vague 'work establishment lists,' to be distributed generally over all the works in progress. They must now appear either as regular 'work establishments,' or be charged in specific Day-books. The staff of mistrees proper to be charged in the first way can be regulated with reference to the known wants of a division, while charges in Day-books can be tested by the amount of work done.

7. Similar remarks apply to charges for mohurrirs. In many divisions a small staff of these is necessary to aid the assistants and principal subordinates in their vernacular accounts, although it is thought that the use of these might to a great extent be obviated by the

employment of the regular sub-overseers of the department. But the number required for this purpose, who may be fairly considered as Establishment, should be definitely fixed upon a review of the actual requirements of each division, and all others required for specific works should be charged in the Day-books of those works as explained in the last paragraph.

8. So also with regard to chaprassees. It is believed that the number of these has been lately fixed for each division by the different Local Governments, but the returns show numbers largely in excess of those scales in almost every division of which the bills have been inspected. Here also the same principle should be maintained in discriminating between what is Establishment and what is not. If the existing scale allowed is insufficient for the business of the division, that may be a reason for submitting a revised scale for sanction, but no chaprassees should be kept up beyond the authorised scales, except for employment on definite works, and the Superintending Officers may usually satisfy themselves whether the works properly admit of the charges by inspection of the Day-books.

9. In short in determining what is Establishment and what is not, it should be considered whether the charge is incurred for duties connected with the miscellaneous service of the division, or for employment on specific works, which employment would cease if the work were stopped. In the former case the charge is properly referred to the head Establishment, whether it be for a chaprassee or an executive engineer; in the latter the charge should be exhibited in the account of the Work concerned.

10. Chokeedars are in a different category, since they must often be kept up for duties which are not represented by any expenditure, as for guarding vacant buildings; clearly, therefore, in such cases they come under the head of Establishment, as defined in Circular No. 6. But it is hoped that the present method of exhibiting charges for Chokeedars will enable them to be properly scrutinised; the necessity for all such should be clearly ascertained, and whenever there appears to be room for reduction, a proposal to that effect should be submitted to the Local Government.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient Servant,

J. G. MEDLEY, Major,

Offg. Under Secy. to the Govt. of India, P. W. D.,

for G. CHESNEY, Major,

Inspector General of P. W. Accounts.

2631
21 Nov 1862
27 Nov 1862

N. 3835.

From
The Secretary to the Govt of India
To The Secretary to the Govt of Port St. George
in the Public Works Dept.
Dated the 30th September 1862.

Pub. Works Dept.
General
Establishments

Sir, In reply to your letter N. 1673 dated 14th July 1862, requesting information which may serve as a guide for distinguishing between Establishment and workpeople, I am directed to forward copies of a Circular recently issued from the Office of the Inspector General of P. W. accounts for the guidance of Account Officers under the Govt of India, hoping that it may supply the information desired as to the difference between the two classes.

N. 25 30 Aug 1862

Wm

5/11

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
W. Manning L.A.C. &c.
Secretary to the Govt of India

Public Works Dept.
Pro. of Govt for No. 1

Oct 31/22

(21)
From the Secretary to
the Govt of India.

Dated 30. Sept.
Received 17. Oct. 1862

Enc. 1 with 2. 1862.

From Chief Secy of the Govt.
From 1036 in Pro.
From 1103 in Pro.

Forwarding Copies of a circular
for the Inspector General
of P. & W. Accounts during
the absence of the different
officers in Establishments and
work people.

With a view
No 2621-3. November.

No 2621.

Communicated to the Chief Engineer

with reference to his letter of 19. 10. 1862 p. 2. July 12.

Cheltenham
30 November 1862

13/11/62

St. John's Bay, England, 1862

No 2621-32.
Oct 22. 1862