P 3698 W - 22-12-83.
3945 - 11. 1. 84.

## 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 unincluded 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.
B. Abstract detail estimate by sub-heads, and so on.
{ 1. Submitted to Chief Engineer.
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.

F.C.
B-ks. 569 W. 1-2-84.

original

No. W. 836

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

## CENTRAL OFFICE OF ACCOUNTS.

Circle 3rd

Fund Imperial and Provincial

Rec'd 30/1/84 & Duplicate

**Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of** November **1883.**

*No.* ———

Madras,
*Dated* 29th January 1884.

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

No. 29/5 dated 4th Feby/84

D. V. Gundappa

*Examiner of P. W. Accounts,*
*Madras.*

With Orders

## Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts requiring the orders of Government.

of Executive Engineers for the Month of November 1883

| Item No. | Particulars of each Item. | Month in the Accounts of which Objectionable Expenditure first appeared. | Comparison with Estimate. Amount of Estimate. | Expenditure up to Date. | Excess over Estimate. | Comparison with Appropriation of the Year. Amount of Appropriation. | Expenditure of the Year. | Excess over Appropriation. | Expenditure during the Month. | Opinion of the Superintending Engineer, with final Remarks by Examiner. | Orders by Government. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | Kurnool. Nil. Bellary. | | No. 291 Rd/4th Feby/84 |
| | Excess over Appropriation Imperial Military Original Works. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Government Bakery at Bellary | October 1883 | - | - | - | 3,000 | 4224 | 1224 | 104 | Sanction of the Government of India to the additional allotment of Rs 600 recommended in G.O. No 79 W dated 11th January 1884 is awaited Further appropriation will however be necessary. | Item No 1- Result of application submitted to the Govt of India will be communicated when received — Suptg: Engr will take the requisite action |
| | Cuddapah. Kurnool Canal. Nil | | | | | | | | | | |

D.C. Gordon

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

The S. E. III Circle thro' the Examiner R. W. Acres