

NOTES.

REFERENCE TO MADRAS P. W. D. CODE.

CHAPTER XIV.—PARAS. 1829 TO 1832.

1. The object of this Return is to place before Government an analysis of all shortcomings in matters of financial regularity in the operations of each month with a view to their being remedied. It should be submitted to Government on the first day of the third month succeeding that to which the accounts relate.

2. There should be a separate statement for each separate Fund—Imperial, Provincial, Local, and Irrigation.

3. The Provincial statement will be posted from the Divisional Statements of Objectionable Expenditure. The statement need not be delayed in order to embody the remarks of the Superintending Engineers if these do not reach the Examiner's Office in time. It is desirable, however, that the Superintending Engineer's opinion should be recorded as far as may be practicable, and, in order to ensure this being done, the Divisional Statement of Objectionable Items should be checked immediately on receipt and sent to the Superintending Engineer for his remarks before the audit of the other accounts is proceeded with.

4. All Executive Officers who have failed to submit their Divisional Statements of Objectionable Items with their Monthly Accounts, as well as those whose statements are generally incomplete, should be specially brought to the notice of Government under "General Remarks" at the end of the statement.

5. Items of irregular expenditure which are left uninclosed by Executive Engineers in their Divisional Statements of Objectionable Items should be distinctly noted as such either in a separate supplementary statement or in the original statement in red ink.

6. Columns under all the heads should be filled up in each case so as to bring out clearly where estimate or appropriation exists and where it does not.

7. In the case of large projects such important features as the following should be stated with precision:

- | | |
|--|--|
| A. Lump sum estimate. | 1. Submitted to Chief Engineer. |
| B. Abstract detail estimate by sub-heads, and so on. | 2. Submitted to Superintending Engineer. |
| | 3. Not yet submitted. |

8. A large work which is proceeded with on merely a lump sum sanction is still objectionable till an abstract and detail estimate by sub-heads is submitted and sanctioned for it by competent authority.

9. Special mention should be made of works being carried out in portions by authorities, beyond whose powers of sanction it would be to sanction the expenditure as a whole.

10. An important point to notice is the duration of a serious irregularity.

11. Voluminous masses of detail, when their practical significance could be given in a few lines, should always be avoided as a rule. If, for instance, the state of matters as to sanction in one month does not materially differ from that of a preceding month, it will answer all practical purposes to say so, instead of sending another full report.

12. Too much stress can never be laid on the fact that this statement is not to take place of special reports, then and there, of works on which serious irregular expenditure is being largely incurred, either without estimate or appropriation.

Co. 3236. H. 7.12.82

Duplicate
P. W. D. Madras.
Form No. M 64 a.

CENTRAL OFFICE OF ACCOUNTS.

CIRCLE 4th

FUND Excluded Local

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items
in the Accounts of Executive Engineers
for the Month of October 1882.

No. _____

MADRAS,
Dated 16 December 1882.

FORWARDED for orders to the Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department, Madras.

Bho 3409w. 22.12.82.

D. C. Edwards

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

with order
Receipt H. Ray.

All communications
should be addressed
to the Secretary.

No. 784 R. E.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Railway Establishment

To

The Secretary to the Govt of Madras,
Public Works Department.

Fort William, 14th December 1882.

Sir,

In acknowledging the receipt of your letter No. 2989 of the 13th November 1882, on the subject of the use of the Form E "on duty" certificate to be used by all Military Officers travelling on duty by rail without a Government passage warrant, I am directed to intimate that as the later ruling of the Department of Finance and Commerce referred to, viz. Resolution No. 3505 of the 1st September 1882, is only applicable to Officers who draw fixed monthly travelling allowances, and as there are no such Officers in the

the Public Works Department it is
consequently unnecessary to circulate
the ruling in question among the
Officers attached to this Depart-
ment. —

Rev. 19/12/82

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant

J. A. Subram

Major A.E.

Under Secretary

Document Accomps. *Nil*

— Nil —

B No 3408 of 22. 12. 82.

Recorded.

Cu

20. 12. 82

Co. 1369 h. 2. 6. 82
" 2989- h. 13. 11. 82

Log 11

by Mr. A. with copy of
go to h. 12/11/82
Ear. P. W. A. with copy of
if 80. 7. 11. 82
desp. 22-12-82
Entd. in Receipt Regs

BOARD OF REVENUE, 28TH NOVEMBER 1882, No. 2921.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

READ—the following letter from H. G. TURNER, Esq., President, Local Fund Board, Vizagapatam, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 5th May 1882, No. 319; and endorsement by Lieutenant Colonel ROSS THOMPSON, R.E., Acting Deputy Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated 16th May 1882, No. 1061-C.

I have the honor to submit plans and estimates as per margin, for constructing a hospital, cook-room and latrine for the use of the Local Fund dispensary at Sálúr. At present, the institution is held in a thatched building constructed as a temporary measure at the cost of Local Funds. The Circle Board wanted to raise a pukka building there; and as Sálúr is gaining importance as the Pottangi Ghât Road is completed, it is considered necessary to provide accommodation for in-patients in the new building. The proposed buildings are estimated to cost Rs. 5,610.

2. The Circle Board's Resolution* approving of the plans and estimate is enclosed. I request that you will be so good as to obtain sanction of Government

* No. 1, dated 28th April 1882. for the plans and estimate. It is also requested that a sum of Rs. 2,000 be allotted from the General Fund reserve for the current year for this work.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 and 2.—Plan.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Estimate.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Specification.

ENCLOSURE No. 5.—Extract from Proceedings of the Local Fund Board.

Endorsement, No. 1061-C.

Forwarded to the Board of Revenue with the following remarks.

2. The plan is not in accordance with the standard design sanctioned in G.O., No. 194, dated 28th August 1876.

3. The plans and estimates do not bear the countersignature of the President, Local Fund Board.

Reference on the above, dated 31st May 1882.

Communicated to the President, Local Fund Board, Vizagapatam Circle, who is requested to state whether there is any reason for departing from the standard plan in this instance. He will also countersign the plan and estimate, as required by Local Fund Rule, No. 23, Clause 10.

(Signed) R. SEWELL,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the President, Local Fund Board, Vizagapatam,
with four enclosures.