

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 18
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 10/89
 (3) ஆதாரக்குறிப்பவர் கருக்கொப்பம் 12/8

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

(77)

P W D துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	1355	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	20 5.12.89	1989

109

மடிக்கலோ கண்டயடி கையாளலோ கூடாது

9 Sheets

Copy of letter no. 11,711 d/28th November/
1888. from J. L. Johnston Esq. to the Superintendent Engineer
Louisiana Dⁿ to the Superintendent Engineer
3^d Circle

B.55

35

With reference to your endorsement
no. 1755 d/10th November 1888, on L.O. no. 3552 d/
of 7th November 1888, I have the honor to make
the following suggestions, with a view to
relieving the account work in these Engineers'
Offices: —

(a) Travelling allowance rules should
be simplified. They are too complex and
require an establishment for purposes
of checking. It is a question whether the
cost of this establishment covers the
amount retrenched. It is however the
compilation which affects this Office.
The change should be towards fixed
allowances under a few restrictions
such as maintenance of a certain
number of tents and carriage for
tents and the necessity for being out

of Head Quarters at least 20 days a month.

(b) At present vouchers have to be taken for every payment. For each horse, travelling by rail, for each Huddal Cooly, for the maintenance of the Office cat, for the purchase of a broom and a box of matches, a voucher is necessary. Theoretically this necessity for vouchers for every sum paid out is quite correct, but theory can be often carried too far.

(c) Work vouchers have to be submitted to the Examiner when the expenditure on any one sub head reaches Rs. 2500. This limit may be safely raised to Rs 5000.

(d) For works costing more than Rs. 500, Completion Reports are now prepared giving the sub heads of sanctioned estimates and expenditure under each sub head.

This entails much labor:—for as the work register exhibits sub heads and

expenditure under each, for all works from Rs 2500 only and upwards, it follows that this detailed information for works less than Rs 2500 and up to Rs 500 has to be picked out from the vouchers for the compilation of the Completion Report. The limits should be raised to Rs 5000 also—the same as for work vouchers. 1355

1355 (e) Deviation statements seem unnecessary when excess over estimate falls within 5% of the sanctioned amount. The Executive Engineer should have more latitude in making small deviations, as for instance in ordering a little less cement there, and a little more earth work here, without being liable to be called upon for explanation for every trifling deviation.

(f) The sub divisional accounts are simple, but it is the calling for explanation for each trifling deviation. The necessity for obtaining the initials of Assistant even, to every correction in

2 2

3 3

vouchers which worry Sub Divisional Officers, the provision of one little requirement entails the return of the voucher to the Sub Divisional Officer with a covering docket and as it often happens that the Sub Divisional Officer is unable to fulfil the requirement at once, but has to await the arrival of the Asskman or to travel towards him, there is delay and consequent reminders from the Examiner's Office to that of the Executive Engineer and from that of the Executive Engineer to the Office of the Sub Divisional Officer. I would therefore not insist on the task of obtaining the initials of piece workers to every correction but would be satisfied with those of the Executive Engineer and Sub Divisional Officer. In the case of Contractors the present exactness may be insisted on.

What I wish to convey is that under the present system, there is a too great desire

desire for absolute - mathematical correctness in all details

135
A Sub Divisional Officer who fails in this absolute correctness, as a rule fails altogether, for he has so many explanations to make and so much extra Office work, that he has but little time for inspection & for estimating. The preparation of bills becomes irksome for he knows a large crop of dockets calling for explanations - initials &c are to follow. The remedy for this is, as I recommended before, the appointments of good Deputy Accountants to the Offices of Sub Divisional Offices instead of 'writers'. A Sub Divisional Officer may be a good man as far as 'worth' is concerned. He may have a good knowledge of masonry, mechanics, and of the character of native labor. but he is very much handicapped by his Office work. What relieves the Sub Divisional Officer,

3 3

relieves the Executive Engineer's Office in the same proportion

3. At present the 'Office' is more important than that of 'works'.

Copy of letter no. 465 d/24 December 1888, from
J. P. Barlow Esq. Executive Engineer
Mumool Division to the Superintending
Engineer & General

With reference to your reminder no. 2128 d/20th December 1888, on the subject of reduction of Account work in the Executive Engineer's Office, I have the honor to submit the following remarks.

1. The Sub-Divisional Officers must be treated as Imprest holders allowing them small advances to meet unforeseen charges only, all the bills being indiscriminately sent to the Divisional Office where they will undergo complete check before.

payment. By this arrangement there will be only one Cash book for the whole Division, and the Sub-Divisional Officers will be relieved of the burden of sending Cash Account three times a month. 1355

2. The Sub-Divisional Officers will still more be relieved when the Contractors or piece workers are required to prepare the bills themselves without any Departmental assistance.

3. A simpler form of work abstract than form No. 6 must be introduced.

4. The practice of sending Work vouchers to the Examiner should be discontinued unless they are specially required by him in the case of large works.

5. The duties and responsibilities of Accountants should be more clearly defined.

No 2341, d/18 January 1889. 14

Copies of letters received from the
Executive Engineer laid down and
14

Sumoal Divisions are forwarded to
the Chief Engineer P.W. Department as directed
in H.O. 3552 of 7th November 1888. The
recommendation of the former Officer to
give the Sub-Divisional Officers Accounts
does not commend itself to the Superintend-
ing Engineer. The recommendation of
the latter Officer to make Sub-Divisional
Officers Imprest holders can be carried
out at once without reference to higher
authority and orders will be issued accord-
ingly.

W. H. Smalley C.E. R.E.
Superintending Engineer 3^d Grade
Camp Sumoal
18 January 1889

Copy of letter No 2102 of 21st January
1888 from Col. W. Smalley R.E. Superintend-
ing Engineer 3^d Grade to the Chief Engineer
P.W. D. in ad as

Reference H.O. No 3207 of 21st November/87

I have the honor to report that

135
I am of opinion that all payments by cheque
to Contractors might and should be made by
the Executive Engineers themselves, and that
only petty cash payments should, as a rule,
be made by Sub-Divisional Officers and
Quereurs. The only exception would be in the
case of Departmental work at other than Head
Quarters and here the only way I see would
be to give the Officer in charge a sufficient
Imprest and recoup it often or better to
institute (as suggested by the Examiner)
a system of Imprest drawing account with
Sub-Divisional Officers varying in amount
with the requirements from time to time
to be settled by the Superintending Engineer.
If however it is considered that Officers
other than Executive Engineers may make
payments on their own responsibility, it
is the Sub-Divisional Officer as a matter
of course, to whom only this concession

would be made. Attached Officers and Quereers should not have Imprest of more than Rs 100 and Rs 50 respectively and their authority should be limited to petty cash payments. Sub Divisional Officers Drawing account should in this case be limited generally to Rs 2500 a month and the maximum of their cheques to Rs 200 but this would be subject to modifications.

The Exec. Engineer Jund & apah suggests that they should make all payments for works under Rs 500 and the Executive Engineer all payments for works above Rs 500 and this suggestion may be thought worthy of consideration.

As regards Sub Divisional Establishment if Sub Divisional Officers are entrusted with payments on their own responsibility. The

Executive Engineer generally thinks that one clerk is sufficient but that he should have had some training previously in the Examiners Office and hence it is presumed should be a higher paid clerk than at present.

(Copies)

H. M. J. J. J.

Superintending Engineer & Council

11 May 1889

From
The Superintendent Engineer
3^d Corps

To the Chief Engineer
P.W. Department
Madras

Accompaniments to No 330
-58,
from the Superintendent Engineer
3^d Corps

Copies of Correspondence
on the question of drawing
accounts being in the
Genl Officers' hands.

1355 ✓
1353
to copy
with C. 3560
4347 only.

15.5.89 1353

7

4347.

D.W.

135

Copies of the papers
now submitted were
received before and
are in the linked
"Pie over" file. The
S. E. misquoted the
number of one and
the date of the other
so they could not
be traced. If the
subject is not to
be dealt with yet
the S. E.'s letters may
be recorded?

J.B.

Q

14/1/9

The subject must lie over
until the report of the
Accounts Committee
has been received. If
the letters may be recorded

D.W.

Draft order Sub. 2 (MOR)
There is nothing 4.5.09.
to show that the papers were
placed before the Comtee. vide
para 7 of India's Resoln. in
3552. W. 27th Nov. 1889.
J. B. 14/5

4347

RH

Please say what
became of papers
recd. in reply to
G.O. No. 3552. W
87. Nov. 1888.
Were they handed
to the Comtee?

JB.

S. A. W. 13/5/9
L.O. book now
linked. D.P.
13-5-89

RH.

Copies of the papers now
submitted by S.E.M.C.
in reply to 2114. C. & I.V.G.
are in the linked file
and there was no reason
to ask S.E. for further
copies. It is a pity the L.O.
files were not looked
into before it was stated
that the papers could be
retraced. Both the letters
however were in the
G.O. No. 1558 & 1574
+ this was the JB.
misleading point 14/5
16-5-89

No. 330

Superintending Engineer's Office,
3RD CIRCLE,

Bellary 11. May 1889.

From, Col. W. Smalley R.E.
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
3RD CIRCLE.

To,

THE Chief Engineer
P.W. Department
Maddur

Sir,

Enclosures.

Referring to your memorandum
copies of correspondence No. 2114 C dated 1st July 1889, I have
the honor to forward copies of the
undermentioned correspondence.

- (1) Copy of letter No. 1674 d/28th November
1888 from the Executive Engineer
Bangalore Division and copy of
letter No. 1665 d/26th December 1888
from the Executive Engineer Bangalore
Division with Superintending Engineer's
foot note bearing No. 2344 d/18th
January 1889.
- (2) Copy of letter No. 2102 d/21st January
1889.

I have the honor to be

Your most obedient servant

W. Smalley R.E.

Superintending Engineer Bangalore

Memo No. 2114 C. 434
 1079 C. 434-3-89
 479 W. 434-2-89
 235 W. 434-1-89
 3001 W. 434-11-89
 1079 C. 434-3-89
 479 W. 434-2-89
 235 W. 434-1-89
 3001 W. 434-11-89
 1079 C. 434-3-89
 479 W. 434-2-89
 235 W. 434-1-89
 3001 W. 434-11-89

From,
 The Superintending Engineer,
 IIIrd Circle,
 Bellary.

To,
 The Chief Engineer
 P. W. Deptt
 Madras

Received pending
 the receipt of
 the report of the
 accounts committee
 submitted.

Dated 11 May 1889
 Received

Enclosures 1
 No. 330

Subject.

Drawing Accounts being
 in Sub-Divisional Officers
 hands

Forwarding copies of
 correspondence on the
 question of —

(9)

20.7.11

15.5.89
 16.5.89

24.7.15