

(1) Number of pages 22
 (2) Date of repair 12-2-87
 (3) Initials of the Referencer lewo ✓

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P.W.D DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1526-W	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	18-6-1881	197

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1526
T

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

18th June 1881, No. 1,526 W.

General.
Account.

Read the following papers:—

No. 69. G.O., No. 1,966 W., dated 17th August 1880.

No. 69-A. Office Note from the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 29th April 1881, No. 452 N.

No. 69-B. Office Notes from the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, dated 11th and 17th May 1881, Nos. 149 and 172.

No. 69-C. Office Note from the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 20th May 1881, No. 525 N.

No. 69-D. Office Note from the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, dated 27th May 1881, No. 210.

No. 69-E. Office Note from the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 3rd June 1881, No. 133 N.

No. 69-F. Office Note from the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, dated 9th June 1881, No. 257.

No. 70. ORDER THEREON, 18th June 1881, No. 1,526 W.

It having been represented that considerable labor is involved in the preparation of the Statements of Objectionable Items in triplicate, it is now directed, in supersession of paragraph 2 of the orders quoted above, that the statements shall in future be rendered in duplicate by the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, one part being recorded in the Government Office, and the other issued with the orders of Government to the officers concerned through the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, who will note the orders in his own office before transmission of the statement.

2. Separate statements should be prepared for each Circle or Superintendship of Works under—

- (a) Irrigation.
 - (b) Local Funds.
 - (c) Imperial and Provincial.
- (True Extract.)

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

To Superintending Engineers.
" Superintendents of Works.
To the Consulting Architect to Government.
" General Superintendent, Public Works Stores and Workshops.
" Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Examiner of Public Works Accounts.
Exd. E. C. Shunker.
Spare Copies

GENERAL
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of 1881 Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEERS,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated June, 18th.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 18th June 1881, No. 1,526 W.

JUNE.

Nos. 69-70.

Statements of Objectionable Items to be
rendered in future in duplicate by the
Examiner, Public Works Accounts.



No.

GOVT.
OF MADRAS.

188

P. W.
DEPT.

SECRETARY.

Chopank, 29 April

1881

OFFICE NOTE.

To

C

The accompanying
Statements of Objectionable
Items for the month of
January, 1881, are returned
for the purpose of being
prepared in triplicate for
each Circle as directed
in para 2 of L.O. No. 1966 W
of 17 August 1880.

CC12

By: Dy W

CC1

TO Y.
 HERewith THE OBJECTIONABLE
 ITEM STATEMENT FOR JANUARY 1881.
 PREPARED IN TRIPPLICATE FOR EACH
 CIRCLE AND SUPERINTENDENT OF WORKS
 AS REQUESTED.

20/2
5/5/81

1526/3

[Exr. Wks. Form No. 111.]



GOVT. OF MADRAS.

1881.82

[P. W. DEPT.]

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 17th May 1881.

Office Note No. 172.

To *A.*

With reference to your
 Office Note 152 of 29th April 1881
 and para 2 of G.O. No. 466 of
 14th August 1880. I find that
 through some omission on the part
 of my Office, the triplicate copies
 have never been sent till now when
 your Office Note drew attention to the
 omission.

KEEP WITH Genl. No.

dated 18

* y Charge (Barlow Park & Buckingham
 Canal exchng) - four forms and
 a triplicate in each case.
 $4 \times 4 \times 3 = 12$

I would now ask if it is
 really necessary that this extra
 copying should be done, for the
 effect is that 24 separate statements
 have to be prepared to meet the
 requirements of the G.O. and this
 represents a good deal of labor and
 time. I do not know with what object
 the order was issued, but probably
 the intention was to cause some
 communicating to Officers concerned
 the action of Government in
 the objections brought forward.
 Whilst this action has been
 communicated in periodical
 G.O's

G.O., and it is likely that previous to the receipt by the Office of information of the action taken a statement for a subsequent month has issued repeating previous inaccuracies which may have been corrected but not communicated early enough to prevent the repetition.

I would suggest that the order be modified, and propose for your consideration the following procedure. Only one statement for each circle and Superintendent ship of works embodying Imperial, Provincial, and Local funds is necessary for submission to Government. A separate statement would be necessary for Irrigation.

The order of Government recorded on these several statements should be communicated in manuscript on the originals to the Examiner who will transcribe them, on his Office Copies, and so obtain the earliest notice of the action of Government. After transcription the Examiner will return them to it for transmission, again in original, to the Offices of the several circles or changes concerned. These Offices should take Copies, or deal with them as they consider necessary, and retransmit them to it where the documents might be recorded, for they would have



1326
11

	Imperial Provincial Local funds	Irrigation
1. Civil -	1	1
2. -	1	1
3. -	1	1
Godavari -	1	1
Krishna -	1	1
Architect. -	1	-
Quarrying -	1	1
	7	6

Hastor, Works
Machinist's Canal } none.

have one been done, and no printed G.O. would then be necessary. The result would be that my Office would make 13 returns instead of 24, and your Office would give orders on 13 instead of 24 returns, and the several Officers would perhaps copy ^{two} one returns each instead of the whole thing being thrown on my Office and on yours in different degrees.

Oct

C. ^{ad 17/10}
16/5/81

1526/1

h. 525. k. 20-5-81
~~h. 525. k.~~ To C. R. 14/6/81

C. office note h. 172.8
17-5-81.

The present form of
objectionable item statement
was drawn up by W. in
communication with Major
Traill - The proposal to
submit it to this office
in triplicate was seen by
the latter officer & apparently
approved by him - The
assertion in the present office
note "I do not know with
what object the order was
issued" appears to have
been made without reference
to previous papers.

2. The adoption of the suggestion
now made by the C. does
not seem to be feasible -
If a single copy for each
circle be sent in, & circu-
lated as suggested by C.
it would probably often

6-30-5-81

2. All past experience goes to

be a month or more
before the statement finally
comes back to this office
from the S.E. In the
meanwhile we shall have
no record here of the
Orders passed, although
they are constantly required
for reference. A statement
for one month could not
be disposed of until the
previous month's statement,
with the orders of Govt. thereon,
is returned by
the S.E., for the previous orders
would be required for reference
or comparison.

To save a portion of
the copying work com-
plained of, the statements
might perhaps be
submitted to this office
in duplicate. After
Orders have been passed,
one copy might be

1526
6
sent to the S.E. or S. of W.
as at present. The other
might be sent to C. in
view to the orders of Govt.
being transcribed on his
office copy, & our copy
returned to us with
the least possible delay.

Cy
19/5

Please see the above,
and let me know your
views. More especially
on the points raised
in para. 2 -

Cen
JW
N. 210/27.58

to W.

I HAD NOT SEEN THE PREVIOUS
PAPERS, BUT THERE IS NOTHING IN THEM
TO PROVE THAT THE SUBMISSION OF THE
EXTRA COPIES WAS NOT TO BE OVERCOME,
NOR IS THERE MUCH IN THE MEMO SUBMIT-
TED TO OVERTHROW MY PROPOSAL.

2. MAJOR TRAIL APPROVED APPARENTLY

2. All past experience goes to



THE PROPOSAL FOR TRIPPLICATES, BUT AS HE NEVER CARRIED THE PROPOSAL INTO PRACTICE, HE COULD NOT HAVE REALIZED THAT THE THEORY AND PRACTICE WERE VERY DIFFERENT.

3. THE ARGUMENT THAT IT WOULD BE A MONTH OR MORE BEFORE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEERS ETC. RETURNED THE DOCUMENT, IS HAZARDED WITHOUT APPARENTLY CONSIDERING THAT THERE WOULD NOT BE THE LEAST NECESSITY FOR SUCH DELAY. IF THE STATEMENTS ARE PROMPTLY DEALT WITH AFTER SUBMISSION BY MY OFFICE, THE ORDERS WOULD BE ISSUED TO ME FOR TRANSCRIPT AND RETURN TO YOU IN (TAKING AN EXTREME TIME) 10 DAYS FROM DATE OF FIRST SUBMISSION. GIVING A WEEK FOR TRANSIT TO SUPERINTENDING ENGINEERS ETC, THREE DAYS FOR DETENTION BY THEM, AND A WEEK FOR TRANSIT ON RETURN, WE HAVE A MAXIMUM OF 27 DAYS FOR FINAL DISPOSAL AFTER FIRST SUBMISSION. THIS WOULD ALLOW OF THE STATEMENTS BEING RETURNED IN

15/6/7

AMPLE TIME BEFORE THE NEXT ONES

WERE DUE.

4. AS TO REFERENCES TO THEM BEING NECESSARY, THERE WILL BE THE TRANSCRIPTS IN MY OFFICE ALWAYS AVAILABLE, SO THAT THIS DIFFICULTY FALLS TO THE GROUND.

5. YOU HAVE NOT MADE ANY REMARK ON MY SUGGESTION TO EMBODY IMPERIAL, PROVINCIAL, AND LOCAL FUNDS IN ONE STATEMENT, INSTEAD OF HAVING SEPARATE ONES FOR EACH FUND. I PRESUME YOU SEE NO OBJECTION TO THIS. IT SEEMS TO ME A WASTE OF LABOR TO SUBMIT EVEN 20 STATEMENTS IF IT CAN BE MADE TO ANSWER IF A LITTLE PROMPT DISPATCH WERE USED IN THE OFFICES CONCERNED.

Handwritten signature

Handwritten initials

N^o 133 A. R N^o 219 of 1882

6.

Your Office Note N^o 210 of 27th May 1881.
2. All past experience goes to

prove that the delay incidental to the passage of documents through office outside the Secretariat is considerable, and this alone would be a strong objection to your proposal. But there is another which quite precludes your recommendation being entertained. It is contrary to Secretariat rules that any documents on which Members of Govt may have voted should be circulated beyond the Secretariat.

3. Although, therefore, I cannot consent to the change proposed by you I shall be glad to find some feasible method by which the amount of copying may be minimized eg. only such fresh objectionable items as arise within the month might be brought forward with all the columns filled in while those for previous months upon which no fresh expenditure has been incurred might be referred to by Number only and the month in which last brought forward.

4. Though filled in in manuscript, the form itself will, it is presumed, be printed on



153/8

5. I am further prepared to receive the statements in duplicate, instead of triplicate - the duplicate copy containing the orders of Government being transmitted to Supg. Engineers through your Office when you can transcribe the order before passing them on. The return of the duplicates by you to the Secretariat for transmission to Supg. Engineers would only cause delay without any corresponding advantage.

6. There is no objection to including Provincial and Imperial Works in one statement - but Local Fund Works must be separately brought forward, as these frequently require reference to the Provincial or other Dept. which administer the Funds.

7. I shall be glad to learn the extent to which you are prepared to adopt my suggestions. I shall then move the Govt to modify their proceedings of the 17th August 1880 accordingly. *W. H. P.*

AE for consideration
RS

Oct 3rd 1881 } 3/6/81 W.



YOUR OFFICE NOTE NO. 123 N.

OF 3RD INSTANT.

PARA 3 - THIS WILL SAVE BUT LITTLE TROUBLE, AND NO CHANGE THEREFORE NEED BE MADE IN PRESENT PROCEDURE.

PARA 5 - THIS WILL SAVE TROUBLE AND SOME DELAYS. I WOULD REQUEST THEREFORE THAT THE ORDERS BE MODIFIED ACCORDINGLY, THAT IS, THE STATEMENTS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED IN DUPLICATE -

ONE COPY BEING FOR RECORD IN YOUR OFFICE, THE SECOND FOR TRANSMISSION TO THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER IN ORIGINAL THRO' MY OFFICE, AFTER TRANSMITTAL OF THE ORDERS OF GOVERNMENT.

PARA 6 - THREE SETS OF STATEMENTS WILL BE PREPARED IN FUTURE

- I. FOR IRRIGATION.
- II. LOCAL FUNDS.
- III. IMPERIAL AND PROVINCIAL.

EVEN THIS ARRANGEMENT WILL REQUIRE

22 STATEMENTS IN ALL.

PARA 7 - AS STATED ABOVE, THE MODIFICATIONS PROPOSED ARE -

- I. SUBMISSION OF THE STATEMENTS IN DUPLICATE.
- II. SEPARATE STATEMENTS FOR

- (A) IRRIGATION.
- (B) LOCAL FUNDS.
- (C) IMPERIAL & PROVINCIAL.

Handwritten initials

9/6

Handwritten: 1521/3

Handwritten: 1521/3

No. 1526 W.

Handwritten: Gent. Sec.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 18th June 1881

Read the following:—

G.O. No. 19668, dated 17th August 1880
Office note from the Secy: to Govt. P.W. D.

No. 1521, dated 27th April 1881

Office note from the Examiner, P.W. Accounts
Nos. 149, and 172, dated 11th & 14th May 1881

Office note from the Secy: to Govt. P.W. D.
No. 525, dated 20th May 1881

Office note from the Examiner, P.W. Accounts
No. 210, dated 24th May 1881

Office note from the Secy: to Govt. P.W. D.
No. 123, dated 3rd June 1881.

Office note from the Examiner, P.W. Accounts
No. 257, dated 9th June 1881.

Handwritten signature

It having been represented that considerable labor is involved in the preparation of the

Handwritten initials

statements of objectionable items in triplicate, it is now directed, in pursuance of para 2 of the orders quoted above, that the statements shall in future be rendered in duplicate by the Examiner, P. & Accounts, one part being recorded in the Govt. Office, and the other issued with the orders of Govt. to the officers concerned through the Examiner, P. & Accounts, who will note the orders in his own office before transmission of the statement.

Separate

1526
10

2. Separate statements should be prepared for each Circle or Superintendence of Works under

- (a) Irrigation
- (b) Local Funds
- (c) Imperial and Provincial

Att

13.6.81

Supr. Engrs ✓
Supt. of Works ✓
Comm. Architect Govt. ✓
Supt. P. & Accounts ✓
Workshops ✓
Chief Eng. for Irrigation ✓
Exr. P. & Accounts ✓

Desd
20-6-81

Govt. of Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 18 June 1881, No. 1526 W

Nos. 69-70

Statements of Obj. Items
to be rendered in future in
duplicate by the Engineer
of Works.

136/12