

(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.	3532	Press
~~B.P.~~ No.		Mis.
Dated	26-12-	195
		1876

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
26th December 1876. No. 3,532.*

No. 561. Read the following letter from Captain L. CONWAY-GORDON, R.E., Examiner of Public Works Accounts, to Major-General G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Fort St. George, 9th December 1876, No. 326 W:—

IN my letter No. 176 W, dated 18th August 1876, I had the honor to submit to Government a copy completed of Appendix A of the Budget for 1876-77.

2. The figures entered in this Appendix have to be based on the information furnished in the Budgets themselves, and it was, in fact, from the information given in the Budgets that this statement in the present case was prepared.

3. Sometime after the Appendix had been completed, certain entries in the divisional accounts raised some suspicion as to the correctness of the entries in the Budgets, and more especially in the Local Fund Budget, as regards the locality of the works therein entered, and as these suspicions have been since confirmed I have the honor to address Government on the subject.

4. From G.O., No. 1,570, dated 23rd June 1876, it would appear that the Local Fund Public Works Budget was completed in the Public Works Department from the Circle Budgets furnished by the Financial Department, which Circle Budgets do not show the Public Works Divisions concerned, and it is possible that the Public Works Department was not in a position immediately to supply the further information required as to the situation in the several Public Works Divisions of the various public works, the execution of which was approved. But be this as it may, since the preparation of Appendix A, I have already discovered no less than one hundred and ninety-nine instances in which a work stated in the Local Fund Budget to be situated in one Public Works Division has actually been carried out and accounted for in another.

5. I enclose for reference a copy of a Local Fund Budget showing the particular errors I now refer to, and should the divisional accounts furnish the means of discovering others, I will point them out to Government in subsequent communications. The Provincial Budget also contains a few errors of the same kind.

6. These errors obviously affect the correctness of the figures entered in the statement forwarded to Government in my letter of the 18th August; but as more than half the official year has been elapsed and this statement has probably long since been forwarded to the Government of India, it may not be perhaps worthwhile to disturb it. I have brought the matter to notice solely with the object of securing more accuracy in the Local Fund Budget in future.

No. 562. ORDER THEREON, 26th December 1876, No. 3,532.

ACCOUNT, No. 30.

* e.g., Nos. 75 to 91, 94, 95, 97 to 99, 101 to 104, 106 to 108, 128, 133, 138, 140.
† e.g., Nos. 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 27.

Of the one hundred and ninety-nine mistakes enumerated by the Examiner—of which only seven occur under Original Works—it is observed that not a few* have erroneously been so called; that others† consist in the omission to enter in the column of locality the name of the Range in addition to the name of the Circle;

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
26th December 1876. No. 3,532.

and that of the remainder the larger proportion are due to insufficient knowledge as to how much of a road lay in one, how much in another Range.

Nevertheless it is obvious that a repetition of such inaccuracies as do exist should be guarded against.

2. His Excellency in Council conceives that it should not be difficult for Local Fund Presidents to get the works properly entered according to the Public Works Ranges. A little care and inquiry would no doubt secure this. The Examiner's letter will therefore be referred, through the Financial Department, to the Board of Revenue, with a view to their impressing upon the Presidents the necessity for seeing that the Circle Budgets are submitted in the form prescribed by the Government of India.

(True Extract.)

Major-General, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To District Engineers.
To the Financial Department, with Budget.
Examiner of Public Works Accounts

From the Examiner, Public Works
Accounts No. 326 Wd of 9th Decr 1876.

FOR ORDERS.

It was stated in
G.O. No. 1570, d/23rd June
1876, that the Financial
Department having taken
no action to obtain sub-
mission of the Local Fund
Budget Estimates in the
prescribed form, an attempt
was made in the Public
Works Secretariat to ar-
range the details so as to
present a compiled Budget
in the form required by the
Government of India. The
immediate result of this
was that instead of the
budget reaching the Govt
of India by the 15th February

It surely should
not be difficult for
Local Fund Presidents
to get the works properly
entered according to
P.W. divisions - a
little care & enquiry
will secure that fact
upon the Examiner's letter
to the Board & will

it did not leave Madras
till the 23rd June. And
numerous mistakes as
regards the locality of works
are now pointed out by the
Examiners. So much a correct
compilation of the Local
Fund Budgets it is abso-
lutely necessary that the
Circle budgets should be
rendered in all respects
in the desired form.
Even the Board of Revenue
with their special appliances
for supervising Local Fund
Budgets profess themselves
unable to throw the Circle
Budgets into the prescribed
form as ordered by the
Financial Department
in their Proceedings No. 1637
dated 7th September 1896.
They say that if the present
orders are persisted in the
budgets will have to be

Wm. H. ...
Mr. ...
...
...

SP
returned to the districts

The inexpediency therefore
of the Public Works Secretariat
(who have no special appli-
ances) making another at-
tempt at re-arranging details
seems established. It is
accordingly suggested that
next years budget be for-
warded to the Government
of India in the form in
which it is rendered to the
Local Government.

...
Secretary to Government. M.B.

...

FROM L. CONWAY-SCLESON,

EXAMINER, P. T. ACCOUNTS,

TO THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

NO. 226.7.

PORT ST. GEORGE, 9TH DEC. 1976.

SIR,

IN MY LETTER NO. 176.7. DATED AUGUST 19TH 1976, I DID THE HONOR TO SUBMIT TO GOVERNMENT A COPY COMPILED OF APPENDIX A. OF THE BUDGET FOR 1976-77.

2. THE FIGURES ENTERED IN THIS APPENDIX HAVE TO BE BASED ON THE INFORMATION FURNISHED IN THE BUDGETS THEMSELVES, AND IT WAS, IN FACT, FROM THE INFORMATION IN THE BUDGETS THAT THIS STATEMENT IN THE PRESENT LETTER WAS PREPARED.

3. SOMETIME AFTER THE APPENDIX HAD BEEN COMPILED, CERTAIN ENTRIES IN THE DIVISIONAL ACCOUNTS RAISED SUSPICION AS TO THE CORRECTNESS OF THE ENTRIES IN THE BUDGETS, AND MORE ESPECIALLY IN THE LOCAL BUDGET, AS REGARDS THE LOCALITY OF THE WORK THEREIN. SINCE, I HAVE THE HONOR TO ADDRESS GOVERNMENT ON THE 10 JAN.,

4. FROM GOVERNMENT I HAVE BEEN ADVISED THAT...

IT WOULD APPEAR THAT THE LOCAL FUND PUBLIC WORKS BUDGET WAS COMPILED IN THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FROM THE CIRCLE BUDGETS FURNISHED BY THE FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT, WHICH CIRCLE BUDGETS DO NOT SHOW THE PUBLIC WORKS DIVISIONS CONCERNED, AND IT IS POSSIBLE THAT THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT WAS NOT IN A POSITION IMMEDIATELY TO SUPPLY THE FURTHER INFORMATION REQUIRED AS TO THE SITUATION IN ^{THE} SEVERAL PUBLIC WORKS DIVISIONS OF THE VARIOUS PUBLIC WORKS, THE EXECUTION OF WHICH WAS APPROVED. BUT BE THIS AS IT MAY, SINCE THE PREPARATION OF APPENDIX A., I HAVE ALREADY DISCOVERED NO LESS THAN ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-NINE INSTANCES IN WHICH A WORK STATED IN THE LOCAL FUND BUDGET TO BE SITUATED IN ONE PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION HAS ACTUALLY BEEN CARRIED OUT AND ACCOUNTED FOR IN ANOTHER.

5. I ENCLOSE FOR REFERENCE A COPY OF A LOCAL FUND BUDGET SHOWING THE PARTICULAR ERRORS I NOW REFER TO, AND SHOULD THE DIVISIONAL ACCOUNTS FURNISH THE MEANS OF DISCOVERING OTHERS, I WILL POINT THEM OUT TO GOVERNMENT IN SUBSEQUENT COMMUNICATIONS. THE PROVINCIAL BUDGET ALSO CONTAINS A FEW ERRORS OF THE SAME KIND.

6. THESE ERRORS OBVIOUSLY AFFECT THE CORRECTNESS OF THE FIGURES ENTERED IN THE STATEMENT FORWARDED TO GOVERNMENT IN MY LETTER OF THE 18TH. AUGUST; BUT AS MORE THAN HALF THE OFFICIAL YEAR HAS BEEN ELAPSED AND THIS STATEMENT HAS PROBABLY LONG SINCE BEEN FORWARDED TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, IT MAY NOT BE PERHAPS WORTHWHILE TO DISTURB IT. I

HAVE

HAVE BROUGHT THE MATTER TO NOTICE SOONLY WITH THE OBJECT OF SECURING MORE ACCURACY IN THE LOCAL FUND BUDGET IN FUTURE.

I HAVE THE HONOUR TO BE

SIR,

YOUR MOST OBEYIENT SERVANT.

Edmund Gordon

EXAMINER, P. & A. ACCOUNTS.

9823-6-76 No 1571
" 11-11-76 - 41
" 27-9-76 - 146.

P.W.D.
11 DEC 76
No 326 W.

FROM THE EXAMINER,
P.W. ACCOUNTS,
TO THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
P.W. DEPARTMENT.

NO. 326.W.

DATED 9TH. DEC. 1876.

RECD.

ENCLOSURE-ONE.

REMARKING ON THE LOCAL
FUND BUDGET FOR 1876-77.

No 561

9823-6-76
Cir 15-12-76

air

No 3532 Public Works Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 26 Dec 78/6
Read the following

From the Examiner of P.W. Accounts No 326 W 79 Dec 76

+ e.g. Nos (75 to 91) (94) (95) (97 to 99) (101 to 103)
(106 to 108) (120) (123) (128) (140).

+ e.g. Nos (8) (9) (10) (11) (17) (27)

Of the 199 mistakes
enumerated by the
Examiner - of which only
7 occur under original
works - it is observed that
not a few have erroneous
ly been so called. That
the omission to enter in
the description in the column
of locality the name of
the Range in addition to
the name of the Circle;
and that of the remainder
the larger proportion are
due to insufficient know-
ledge as to how much
of a road lay in one
Range or how much in another
Range.

2. Nevertheless, it is obvious that a repetition of such inaccuracies as do exist should be guarded against. And so long as the Budget is prepared in the Public Works Secretariat from ^{there is} insufficient data, no safeguard against their re-occurrence exists.

3. His Excellency in Council conceives that it should not be difficult for Local Fund Presidents to get the work properly entered according to the Public Works Range. A little care and enquiry would no doubt secure this. The Examiner's letter will therefore be referred

at the end of the Budget
10-10-1907

through the Financial Department, to the Board of Revenue with a view to their impressing upon the Presidents the necessity for seeing that the Circle Budgets are submitted in the form prescribed by the Government of India.

G.M.W.

At Engrs. 132
Encl. kept with Budget: 7
Exp. P.M. Ault 5
Sd/- 10-1-1777

8492



85

Govt. of Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

N. B. J. J. J.

Dated

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. 26th Dec 1876, No. 3532

Nos. 561/62

Local Fund Audits.

Passing orders on a
letter from the Ex.
P. W. H. pointing out
mistakes in the com-
-pilation of, for 1876-77.

Sub. to P. W. H.

N^o 561/62