M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-31.

(1) Number of pages

(2) Date of repair

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 136 Press —Mis.—

280-81

Dated 17-1 1871.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 280. Read the following letter from the Acting Superintending Engineer, 5th Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Bangalore, 19th December 1870, No 199-A.:—

In reference to Proceedings of Government and G. O. dated 19th November 1870, No. 2,788, I have the honour to make the following statement in regard to paragraph 3 of the letter of the Controller of Public Works Accounts, dated 25th October 1870, No. 1,542, to the address of the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department.

2. Mr. Brock observes, "I cannot conceive any more lax system of audit than "that which permits of large items of expenditure on Public Works being passed "on vouchers such as that submitted by Captain Wood. Had that officer recorded "his check measurements in the Contract Certificate, as well as his opinion, in "general terms, on the work performed, this office would have a guarantee that the "disbursements recorded in the voucher represented the value of the work actually "performed and passed by the Executive Engineer."

3. It will be seen from the accompanying letter (copy), No. 814, dated 29th November 1870, from the Executive Engineer, that these conditions, which Mr. Brock considers as essential, had in fact been complied with by the Executive Engineer, and that that officer made a special report to me on the subject previous to receiving my sanction for paying for the work performed by the contractor, whose bill forms the subject of the Controller's remarks.

4. The work in question, as the Controller is well aware, was a special one, undertaken under peculiar circumstances by a contractor for a lump sum, and it formed the subject of the several orders of Government quoted in Captain Wood's letter enclosed.

5. When, therefore, the Controller found from the monthly statement forwarded to him from my office that the disbursement in question had been formally sanctioned by me, it must have been evident that I had accepted the report of the Executive Engineer, in reference to this work, as satisfactory.

6. The whole discussion turned, as it appeared to me, on the point whether the Controller or the Superintending Engineer of a Division is responsible to Government that a Range Officer performs satisfactorily, as regards quantity and quality, a work which he reports to be completed,

7. What I stated in my previous letter on the subject, and what Mr. Brock is "at a loss to understand," was, that so long as the Controller was a professional officer of experience it was undoubtedly a matter of importance that these details should be put before him. But that it appeared to me scarcely necessary, if not an inconsistency, to submit such information to a mere Office of Account.

8. As a matter of fact, quantities of work perfomed are invariably entered in the bills submitted from the Bangalore Range, and I believe that the bill under reference is the sole one not showing such quantities; and I feel satisfied, therefore, that, under these circumstances, Mr. Brock must regret the imputation conveyed, however unintentionally by his words, namely, that vouchers are habitually submitted by Captain Wood in a loose and unsatisfactory manner.

9. I have only to add in conclusion that, in deference to the expressed wishes of Government, I have now requested the Executive Engineer, Bangalore Range, to be so good as to enter on all Contract Certificates submitted by him, in future, to the Controller, the nature of the check measurements taken, or other examination of the work made by him.

No. 281. ORDER THEREON, 17th January 1871, No. 136.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 31.

THE Government do not consider it necessary to make any comment on this letter beyond observing that, after a careful perusal of the Controller's letter of the 25th October 1870, No. 1,542, they are unable to see that it bears the interpretation, placed upon it by Captain Roberts, that the Executive Engineer at Bangalore is charged with "habitually" submitting vouchers in a "loose and unsatisfactory manner." Mr. Brock's remarks refer specifically to the Contract Certificate for the Ulsoor Water Supply Project, and those remarks abundantly show that the rules prescribed in the Manual in regard to Contract Certificates had not been adhered to.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,
Secretdry to Government.

To the Acting Superintending Engineer, 5th Division.
" Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Executive Engr's Office
Bangalore 29th Nov. 1870

No. 814

From
The Executive Engineer
Bangalore

To The Superintending Engineer
5th Division

Sir

In reference to G.O. dated 19th November 1870, No. 2788, I have the honor to submit the following remarks in case you consider the letter of the Controller D. P. W. Accounts, dated 25th October 1870 No. 1542, should have conveyed an erroneous impression to the Government of the circumstances of the matter under reference.

The Controller specifies in the particular case leading to the reference, that of a payment of Rupees 15,000 to a contractor

on account of work done to the cisterns of the Ulsoor Water Works which failed.

With my No. 188, dated 10th May 1869, I submitted a proposal for repairing these cisterns, and forwarded a tender and specifications from a Contractor for carrying out these repairs.

The Government, in their order dated 1st July 1869, No. 2132, approved of the proposal, and authorized the acceptance of this tender.

The work was executed by the Contractor, and the result of the repairs was reported by me in my No. 12, dated 5th April 1870, to the address of the Superintending Engineer 5th Division.

Authority for disbursing Rupees 17,000 to the Contractor on account of these repairs was then granted by the Superintending Engineer 5th Division in his No. 17 dated 2nd May 1870 to the address of the Executive Engineer, Bangalore.

So far then from its being the case, as the Controller implies, that this payment was made by me on an unsatisfactory and loose examination of the work, you will observe that the payment was not made before I had forwarded a special and detailed report of the work for your information, and received your special sanction for the disbursement.

From the way the Controller mentions the circumstance, the very opposite of such a course must have been the one which the Government probably understood as having been actually pursued.

I therefore do myself the honor of submitting the above explanation and beg leave again to express my doubts regarding the propriety of submitting the remarks which the Controller and Government think necessary.

3

For the proper execution of the work the Executive Engineer is responsible to the Superintending Engineer, and if, either from ignorance or wilful breach of trust a Contractor is permitted to scamp his work, either in quantity or in quality it is not very likely that the Executive Engineer will record this under the head "Remarks by Range Officer" on the Contract Certificate for the information of the Controller.

The safeguard against the ignorance, or connivance, of the Range Officer is to be found in the Superintendence of the Superintending Engineer and not, I beg leave to submit, in the submission to the Controller of Department Public Works Accounts of any remarks which will certainly not be favorable on the nature of the work done by the Range Officer

Why?

signing the Remarks.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt Servt
(Signed) H. W. Wood Captain R.E.
Executive Engr Bangalore

True Copy

Richd J. Roberts Lieut Col R.E.
Actg Superintg Engr 5th Division

P.W.D. 515 15.

No 197

Supg: Engrs Office 5th Division
Bangalore 19th December 1870.

From

The Dy Supg: Engineer
5th Division

To

The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Madras.

Sir, In preference to Proceedings of Govt
and G.O dated 19th November 1870 No 2788.
I have the honor to make the following
statement in regard to para 3 of the letter
of the Controller of Public Works Acct:
dated 25th October 1870, No 1542, to the address
of the Secretary to Government P.W. Dept.

2. Mr Brock observes "I cannot con-
"ceive any more lax system of audit
"than that which permits of large items
"of expenditure on Public Works being
"passed on vouchers such as that submitted

"by Captain Wood. Had that Officer record-
"ed his check measurements in the Contract-
"Certificate, as well as his opinion, in ge-
"general terms, on the work performed,
"this Office would have a guarantee that
"the disbursements recorded in the voucher
"represented the value of the work actu-
"ally performed and passed by the Ex:
"Engineer."

3. It will be seen from the accom-
-panying letter, (Copy) No. 814 of 29th Nov. 1870,
from the Executive Engineer, that these
conditions, which Mr. Brock considers
as essential, had in fact been complied
with by the Executive Engineer, and
that that Officer made a special report
to me on the subject, previous to receiving
my sanction for paying for the work
performed by the Contractor whose
bill forms the subject of the Controller's
remarks.

4. The work in question, as the Controller

is well aware, was a special one, undertaken
under peculiar circumstances, by a Contract-
-or for a lumpsum, and it formed the
subject of the several orders of Government
quoted in Captain Wood's letter enclosed.

5. When therefore the Controller
found from the monthly Statement
forwarded to him from my office that
the disbursement in question had been
formally sanctioned by me, it must
have been evident that I had accept-
-ed the report of the Executive Engineer,
in preference to this work, as satisfactory.

6. The whole discussion turned, as
it appeared to me, on the point whether
the Controller or the Superintending
Engineer of a Division is responsible
to Government that a Range Officer per-
-forms satisfactorily, as regards quantity
and quality, a work which he reports
to be completed.

7. What I stated in my previous letter on the subject, and what Mr. Brock is "at a loss to understand" was, that so long as the Controller was a Professional Officer of experience, it was undoubtedly a matter of importance that these details should be put before him. But that it appeared to me scarcely necessary, if not an inconsistency, to submit such information to a mere Office of Account.

8. As a matter of fact, quantities of work performed are invariably entered in the bills submitted from the Bangalore Range, and I believe that the bill under reference is the sole one not showing such quantities; and I feel satisfied, therefore, that under these circumstances, Mr. Brock must regret the imputation conveyed, however unintentionally by his words, viz. that Vouchers are habitually submitted by Captain Wood in a loose and unsatisfactory manner.

9. I have only to add in conclusion that in deference to the expressed wishes of Government, I have now requested the Executive Engineer Bangalore Range to be so good as to enter on all Contract Certificates submitted by him, in future, to the Controller, the nature of the check measurements taken, or other examination of the work made by him.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obt. Servant
Rich.d Roberts Lieut.t Colonel
A.g Insp.r Engr.s 5th Division

No 3565 P.R.O.

Proceedings of the Straits Settlements

Royal Engineers

From.

The Asst. Colonial Engineer

Dated 5th Dec. 1870

Rec'd 19th Dec. 1870

Ans. 1st

Submitting remarks on G.O. No 2788 of the 19th November 1870 requiring adherence to the rules requiring certain entries to be made in Contract Ledger

No 280

Encl. 22nd Dec 1870 CR 31st

No 5156.

From.

The Asst. Surg. Engrs

5th Division

Dated

Rec'd 19th Dec 1870

Ans. 1st

Submitting remarks on G.O. No 2788 of the 19th November 1870 requiring adherence to the rules requiring certain entries to be made in Contract Ledger

No Frigate Dated 17th

No 1136 of the 25th October 1870 No 1542, they are unable to see that it is necessary the interpretation placed upon it by Captain Robertson that

(4)

the Executive Engineer
at Bangalore is
charged with "habitually"
submitting vouchers in
a loose and unsatisfactory
manner" - Mr. Brooks'
remarks refer specifically
to the Contract Certificate
for the Ulsoor Water Supply
Project, and those remarks
abundantly show that
the rules prescribed in
the Manual in regard
to Contract Certificates
had not been adhered to -

25
3

L. Cooper 5th
Controller
Dept. 19/1/71

12 Jan 1870 Dist

Cpc 5756

t of 1871 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To the Superintending Engr
5th Division

Dated

Read. 23rd

G. O. 17 Jany. No. 136.

Nos. 2801281

Contract Certificates Papers

ers in the letter from the
Engr 5th Dn submitting
marks in G. O. No. 2788 of
directing adherence to
regarding rules regarding certain
ries to be made in Con-
ct Certificates.