Archives I—10,006—16-8 77.

(1) Number of pages 18

(2) Date of repair 17·11·86

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Public works. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. B.P. No.	437 (W)	Press. Mis.
Dated	26. 2. 1880	197

Not to be folded or roughly handled

437

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

26th February 1880, No. 437 W.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

Read the following papers :—

No. 64. From J. W. RUNDALL, Esq., Acting Superintending Engineer, Fifth Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Trichinopoly, 26th December 1879, No. 2,277 T.J.

WITH reference to G.O., No. 3,326 W., of the 23rd December 1879, I have the honor to state Mr. Hannan is the officer responsible for having spent Rs. 560 on protecting sand spit and repairs to sand fences at Negapatam without any estimate for the work having been sanctioned.

2. No report was made to me on the subject.

3. There is a grant of Rs. 540 provided in the Special Fund Budget for the current year.

4 I have called on Mr. Hannan, through the Superintending Engineer, Fourth Circle, for his explanation, which I will forward when received.

No. 64-A. From the same Officer, dated Trichinopoly, 20th January 1880, No. 2,407 T.J.

IN continuation of my No. 2,277 T.J., of the 26th ultimo, I have the honor to report that in a letter, dated the 10th instant, Mr. Hannan states that as a yearly grant for maintaining the sand spit at Negapatam no estimate was necessary. According to paragraph 24 of Chapter XIII of the Government of India Code, Mr. Hannan is wrong in supposing that no estimate was required.

2. Mr. Hannan also states that he never authorised an expenditure in excess of the grant for this work. Rs. 20 has however been spent. I will inquire who is responsible for this extra expenditure.

No. 65. ORDER THEREON, 26th February 1880, No. 437 W.

THE further report alluded to in the last paragraph of the second of the foregoing letters will be awaited.

2. It is observed that the procedure was not at variance with that generally adopted hitherto in this Presidency for works of the description, so long as the expenditure did not exceed the budget allotment, but that the excess outlay of Rs. 20 was irregular.

3. It is not anticipated that, in the altered circumstances of the Department, such cases are likely to recur.

4. The Examiner will therefore be authorised to pass the expenditure without estimate.

(True Extract.)

Major, R.E.,
Ag. Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, Fifth Circle.
" Examiner of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt: of |1880| Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

The SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
FIFTH CIRCLE,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated February, 26th.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G. O., 26th February 1880, No. 437 W.

FEBRUARY.
Nos 64-65.

Sand spit at Negapatam.—Authorises with remark the passing of the expenditure incurred by Mr. Hannan for protecting without estimate.

C. 19.2.80.

No. 69 of 30/1/80 –

R No. 877 8/11/80

C.

2/437

437 W

Please look at these papers

I understand in this and other somewhat similar cases that the rule followed at least in this Presidency has been not to submit maintenance Estimates but simply to accept and work up to Budget Sanctions for such

The necessity for detailed Estimates in all cases is laid down in § of I Code (new Edition) Chap VII 4 and the para 59 annexed but there is still room for doubt as to the precise character of the Estimates, dates for submission &c regarding all of which I should wish you to ~~state~~ state what has been the practice generally in the Provinces

[illegible] of [illegible] usage [illegible]

17.2.80 [illegible]

with which you are acquainted

As to the validity of the excuse offered here by Mr Hamish that will of course depend on what has actually been the practice in Madras regarding which I will make further enquiries

28/1/80

No. 107 of 16.2.80

TO W.

THE RULES FOR THE PREPARATION OF ESTIMATES FOR REPAIRS TO ROADS ARE CONTAINED IN GOVERNMENT OF INDIA P.W. CIRCULAR NO.76 OF 1876 PAGE 18, AND THESE RULES HAVE FORMED THE GUIDE IN THE PUNJAB AS FAR AS POSSIBLE. THERE HAS ALWAYS BEEN A TENDENCY TO LUMP THESE OPERATIONS UNDER 'CONSOLIDATION' AND 'COLLECTION'. ESTIMATES SHOULD I THINK BE FRAMED TO ENSURE THE BEST APPLICATION OF THE FUNDS AVAILABLE. THE ESTIMATES FOR COLLECTION SHOULD BE FRAMED BEFORE THE BEGINNING OF THE WORKING SEASON SO AS TO ALLOW OF OPERATIONS BEING CARRIED ON DURING DRY WEATHER, THOSE FOR CONSOLIDATION SHOULD BE READY AND SANCTIONED BEFORE THE MONSOONS BEGIN.

16/2

OFFG.C.

3/437

14/2
16.2

SB
16/2

D.W.

This question as far as roads are concerned has now lost almost all interest for us but please ask what has been the practice in Madras. I have been myself accustomed to (1) a specific sanction for all repairs outlay (2) a subdivision of the Repairs Estimate as given in the Madras into 3 heads:

(a) Collection breaking & stacking metal

(b) Spreading & consolidating

(c) Petty repairs to surface clearing drains &c in the form of a mileage allce.

17.2.80

IV.

For buildings no work has been done except on special estimates — "General repair estimates" have never been adopted to my knowledge —

For road maintenance the practice has been to go to the other extreme, and to have no estimates at all, the budget grant being the estimate —

My own practice as an Executive Officer, and that which I ordered as a District Engineer, was to expend the maintenance grant (or so much of it as was wanted) to the best possible advantage —

Some Officers did prepare what were called "working estimates" but they were of an informal character, were never attended to, and their preparation was rather a farce —

It must however be understood that this refers only to works for which a specific budget grant was made, and ~~the only~~ expenditure was as strictly limited by the budget grant as by the estimate in ordinary cases —

Where a lump sum was provided for works under a particular budget subhead special estimates are always required —

I consider that Mr Hannan's excuse is sound as regards the Rs 540, but not as regards the extra Rs 20 —

AW

S

System above 17^{2} would probably answer with good officers all round — not otherwise

Mr. Hannan's case may only be separately dealt with as above — otherwise record

17/2/80

11

No. 2277 T.J.

Supg Engrs Office 5th Circle
Trichinopoly 26th Decr /79
28th

Buildings & Roads.

From,
J. W. Rundall Esquire
Ag Supg Engineer 5th Circle

4/457

To,
Colonel R. H. Sankey R.E.
Chief Engineer P.W.D.
Madras —

Objectionable Statement

Sir,

With reference to G. O No. 3326 of the 23rd December 1879, I have the honor to state Mr. Hannan is the Officer responsible for having spent Rs 560 on protecting Sand Spit and repairs to Sand fences at Negapatam without any Estimate for the work having been sanctioned —

2. No report was made to me on the subject —

3. There is a grant of Rs 540 provided in the Special Fund Budget for the current year.

4. I have called on Mr. Hannan through the Superintending Engineer 4th Circle for his expla-

4

uation which I will forward when
eceived -

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obdt. Servt.
J. W. Rundall
Ag Supg Engineer
5th Circle

5/437

P.W. No. 913W. 26.2.79.

From,
The Supdt. Engineer
5th C.
To,
The Chief Engr.
P.W.D.

No. 2277 T.J
Dated 27th Dec. /79.

Pros. of Govt. 26th Feb/80 No. 437

Sand spit and repairs to sand fences at Negapatam —

States that Mr. Hannan is responsible for having spent Rs. 560 on protecting — without Estimate —

Back No. 64

30/12

P.2

No. 2407 T.J.
Supdg. Engrs' Office 5th Circle
Trichinopoly 20th January/80

6/437

Buildings & Roads.

From,
J. W. Rundall Esquire
Ag. Supdg. Engineer 5th Circle
To,
Colonel R. A. Sankey C.B. R.E.
Chief Engineer P.W.D.
Madras.

Sir,

In continuation of my No. 2277 T.J. of the 26th Ultimo, I have the honor to report that in a letter dated the 10th Instant, Mr. Hannan states that as a yearly grant for maintaining the Sand Spit at Negapatam no Estimate was necessary. According to para 24 of Chapter XIII of the Government of India Code, Mr. Hannan is wrong in supposing that no Estimate was required.

2. Mr. Hannan also states that he never authorised an Expenditure

6

in excess of the grant for this work. Rs 20 has however been spent. I will enquire who is responsible for this extra expenditure.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obdt. Servt.

J. W. Rundall
Ag. Supg. Engineer
5th Circle

1/437

P.C. No. 912 W. 26.3.79.

Buildings & Roads
P.W.D.
22 JAN 80

From,

The Supdt. Engineer
5th Circle

To,

The Chief Engr.
P. W. D.

No. 2407 T.J.

Dated 20th January /80.

Pros. of Govt. D/26th Feb/80
No. 437. W

Sand spit at
Negapatam.

Reports further
on the Expenditure
incurred by Mr. Hanman
for protecting — without
Estimate —

Back No. 64. A.

No 437 W.

Genl. P. W. D.
Sect. 8
437

Pro: of the Madras Government
Under date the 26th Feby/80

Read the following:—

From
The Supg. Engr. Fifth Circle (H.C. No. 2277 T.J. d/27th Decr./79
— do — do (" " 2407 — " — 20th Jany/80)

The further report alluded to in the ~~fourth~~ last paragraph of the second of the foregoing letters will be awaited.

2. It is observed that the procedure was not at variance with that generally adopted hitherto in this Presidency for works of the description, so long as the expenditure did not exceed the budget allotment,

but that the excess outlay of Rs 20 was irregular.

3. It is not anticipated that, in the altered circumstances of the Dept., such cases are likely to recur.

4. The Examiner will therefore be authorised to pass the expenditure without estimate.

18/2/80

18/2

S.E. Fifth Circle ✓
Exr. P.W. Accts. ✓
Despd
6-3-80

Nos 80 & 513

Govt. of (1880) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

⑨

To

Dated [illegible]

Issued

Recd. Rec 27-2-80

Encl.

G. O. 26 Feby 1880, No. 437W

Nos. 64 65

Sand Spit at Negapatam

Authorises with remark the passing of the Expenditure incurred by Mr Hannan for protecting — without estimate -