~~and his inefficiency in English should have been considered when he was recommended by the Supdg: Engineer for the exemptions already as granted him.~~

CG.
10.8.85

W.
24.8

There are no necessary qualifying examinations for Sub-Overseers that I am aware of. I have accordingly struck out proposed para 2. Code para 520 rules that certain deductions are to be made when the Sub-Overseers are not proficient in English so far as to keep accounts in that language, & so far as I can see admits of no exceptions, so para 1 is correct. A man is made a Sub-Overseer 1st grade because he possesses the requisite practical qualifications — but that is no argument against the deduction. It is the condition necessary for the appointment [illegible] a condition for the full salary of the grad[illegible] that he should be proficient in English.

CG.
10.8.85

24/9

AY 24/8

R. 20.8.85

Recd 21.8.85

26/8

FB.

R. 26.8.85

10.8.85

R. 19.8.85

R. 8.8.85

Co. 20.8.85

(10)

No. 1961 Wly. 24th Augt 1885

S. E. IV Circle

Exr. P.W. Accts.

Desp. 24/8

No. 1186 Nilgiri Division Office
Ootacamund 27th July 1885.

From
The Executive Engineer
Nilgiri Division;

To
The Superintending Engineer
4th Circle

Sir,

With reference to G.O. No. 1094 W of 9th May 1885, in which Maistry Maduranayagam Pillay was appointed a Sub Overseer in this Division, I have the honor to report that the man is not so far proficient in English as to be able to keep accounts in that language. It will be necessary therefore under Code para 520 to make a deduction of Rs 5 from his salary until he does qualify. Considering however his age, and that he possesses the requisite practical qualifications, I do not think that in his case a

knowledge

knowledge of English would necessarily tend to make him more useful than what he now is, and I would therefore, suggest that the Chief Engineer's sanction be obtained to his being specially exempted from the operation of Code para 520.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obed^t. Servant

A. D. Smith Major R.E.

Executive Engineer

No. 318/E.W.

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer with a request that he will be good enough to obtain the necessary sanction for Maduranayagam's exemption from the operation of Code para 520.

F. Beatty Colonel R.E.
Supg. Engineer IV Circle

H.D.E. 25/7 29th July /85.

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 617 N.D.
28 JUL. 85
FOURTH CIRCLE

~~From~~

The Executive Engineer
Nilgiri Division

Ow Encl
6935/85

No 1186
Dated 27.7.85
Received
Enclosures. 0

Maduranayagam Pillay Sub Overseer. Deficient in English language — Requests to obtain the Chief Engr's sanction for Exempting — from.

317 W

R. No. 335.
4. 8. 85.

Enc: 1.

No. 1801.D 4th August 1885.
~~G. O. No 1094 W. 9. 5. 83.~~

To C

For remarks

Cd

DW
3.8.85

No. 356 of 5th Augt/85.

To W.

Encs: 1.

As his efficiency in this particular point is below the standard in, and is especially provided for by, the Code, his salary must be regulated accordingly.

DC

C
aoa
5/8

E.P.
5/8.

No. 1094 W d/ 9-5-83
" 1801 D d/ 4-8-85

B. 20-8-85 Rto 21-8-85 R. 24-8-85
avg. 10 8 85
B. 8-8-83 R. 19-8-85

P. W. C. No. 6771
6933

(10)

From

The Supg. Engineer
Fourth Circle

Dated 29th } July 1885.
Despd. 30th }
Recd. 1st Aug. 85.

Enc. 1

No. 318
E. W.

No. 1961 W d/ 24. 8. 85

Maduranayagam Pillay,
Sub Overseer.

Forwards Executive Engineer's letter No. 1186 of 27th July/85 reporting upon the qualification of — and requests to obtain sanction for exempting — from the operation of Code para 520.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No. 1961 W

B

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 24th August 1885

READ the following

From the Suptg: Engr: IV Circle A.E. No. 318 E.W. d/ 29th July/85

Office Note from the Examiner P. W. Accounts } " No. 356 dated 5th August/85.

The Govt. are unable to sanction the exemption of Maduranayagam Pillay from the operation of para 520 of the P. W. Code.

W
17.8.85

~~His promotion from maistry to Sub Overseer involved his exemption from the necessary qualifying Examinations-~~

and

~~and his inefficiency in English should have been considered when he was recommended by the Supdg. Engineer for the exemptions already granted him.~~

CS
10. 8. 85

There are no necessary qualifying examinations for Sub-Overseers that I am aware of. I have accordingly struck out proposed para 2. Code para 520 rules that certain deductions are to be made when the Sub-Overseers are not proficient in English so far as to keep accounts in that language, & so far as I can see admits of no exceptions, so para 1 is correct. A man is made a Sub-Overseer 1st grade because he possesses the requisite practical qualifications — but that is no argument against the deduction. It is the condition necessary for the appointment, & a condition for the full salary of the grade is that he should be proficient in English.

CS
10. 8. 85

Ap. 20-8-85 Ord. 21-8-85
Obj. 10-8-85
R. 8-8-85 R. 19-8-85 R. 26-8-85

(10)

No. 1961 Wdf. 24th Augt 1885

S.E. IV Circle

Ex. P.W. Accts.

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of {1885} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated May, 9th.

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 9th May 1885, No. 1094 W.

MAY.

Mettupalaiyam-Gudalur Main Road

Deciding that no increase to the upper subordinate establishment is needed for the supervision of the —, and appointing a sub-overseer, first grade, instead.

~~and his inefficiency in English should have been considered when he was recommended by the Supdg: Engineer for the exemptions already &c granted him.~~

CS
10. 4. 85

(10)

No. 1961 W. 24th Augt 1885

There are no necessary qualifying examinations for Sub-Overseers that I am aware of. I have accordingly struck out proposed para 2. Code para 520 rules that certain deductions are to be made when the Sub-Overseers are not proficient in English so far as to keep accounts in that language, & so far as I can see admits of no exceptions, so para 1 is correct. A man is made a Sub-Overseer 1st grade because he possesses the requisite practical qualifications — but that is no argument against the deduction. It is the condition necessary for the appointment, & a condition for the full salary of the grade is that he should be proficient in English.

CS
10. 4. 85

S. E. IV Circle

Exr P. W. Accts.

R. 20. 8. 85
Ord. 21. 8. 85
R. 19. 8. 85
R. 8. 8. 85
R. 26. 8. 85
Desp 24/8

9th May 1885, No. 1094 W., Public Works.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

Read—the following papers :—

From A. B. SAMPSON, Esq., Under Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department (General), to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Simla, 23rd April 1885, No. 590 G.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 673 W., dated 18th March 1885, and, in reply, to convey the sanction of the Government of India to the entertainment of an additional second-grade overseer for employment on the through line of communication from Mettupálaiyam in the Coimbatore district to Gúdalúr in the Wynaad, with effect from 1st April 1885.

2. I am to add that the sanction is given in the form asked for, but I am to point out that the effect of adding one upper subordinate to the Madras establishment would apparently be to increase the number from 185 to 186, and this increase would ordinarily give an addition in the rank of supervisor. I am to inquire if the Madras Government desires the addition to the scale to be in the overseer grade.

From Colonel J. BEATTY, R.E., Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Coonoor, 29th April 1885, No. 167 E.W.

With reference to paragraph 3 of G.O., No. 672, of 18th ultimo, I have the honor to report that the Executive Engineer, Nílgiri division, having now completed his arrangements for carrying on the new work and repairs on the road from Kullar to Gúdalúr, finds he can manage without the additional overseer; but states that a sub-overseer on Rs. 50, to assist Mr. Bragg, Sub-Engineer, with the numerous works within the station of Ootacamund, would be very acceptable.

2. If this additional first-grade sub-overseer can be allowed, Major Smith has suggested the appointment to the post of a person named Maduranayagam Pillay, a very efficient maistry now employed in the sub-division on a pay of about * Rs. 30 and charged to estimates. But as Maduranayagam has not passed any examinations, special sanction would be needed † to enable the Examiner to pass his pay.

* Actual rate Rs. 1-12-0 for the number of days employed.

† *Vide* paragraphs 163 and 520 of the Public Works Code.

Order—dated 9th May 1885, No. 1094 W., Public Works.

In the circumstances represented by the Superintending Engineer, the sanction accorded by the Government of India to the increase of the upper subordinate establishment will not be availed of.

2. An additional sub-overseer, first grade, is sanctioned for duty in the Nílgiri division. The Superintending Engineer is at liberty to nominate to the post the man recommended by the Executive Engineer, who seems to possess the requisite practical qualifications.

3. The sanction accorded in paragraph 2 of these proceedings has been registered as Provincial No. 11 W. of 1885-86, and classified as Establishment, Lower Subordinate, Permanent.

(Here enter No. 1095 W., dated 9th May 1885.)

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. SHAW-STEWART, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

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

Exd. A. Grubert.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of {1885} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated May, 9th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 9th May 1885, No. 1094 W.

MAY.

Mettupalaiyam-Gudalur Main Road

Deciding that no increase to the upper subordinate establishment is needed for the supervision of the —, and appointing a sub-overseer, first grade, instead.

REFERENCE TO MADRAS P. W. D. CODE.

PARAS. 2362 TO 2365.

G. O. No 3127 W. 19. 12. 84
" " 66 W. 9. 1. 85
" " 776 W. 30. 3. 85
" " 1076 W. 8. 5. 85
B. No 880 W. 10. 4. 83
" 629 W. 7. 3. 84
" 941 W. 5. 4. [illegible]
" 1173 W. 9. 5. 84
" 1510 W. 18. 6. 84
" 1723 W. 12. 7. 84
" 1969 W. 12. 8. 84
" 2265 W. 13. 9. 84
" 2547 W. 16. 10. 84
" 2732 W. 4. 11. 84
" 3012 W. 8. 12. 84
" 111 W. 13. 1. 85
" 370 W. 14. 2. 85
" 873 W. 10. 4. 85
" 1073 W. 7. 5. 85
" 1215 W. 22. 5. 85
" 1501 W. 26. 6. 85
" 1639 W. 14. 7. 85

R 27/8

26/8

Ack. LLR. ~~Recd. 26/8/85~~

Original

[illegible] 46825

(6)

P. W. D. FORM.
No. M 112.

CENTRAL OFFICE OF ACCOUNTS.

CIRCLE Madras Harbor Works.

FUND Civil Department Transfer

Recd 3/8/85 In Duplicate

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of May **1885.**

No. ——

MADRAS,

Dated 1st August 1885.

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

No. 1962 Wdd. 24th Augt 1885

D. C. Gordon

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

With order

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of requiring the orders of Government.

Item No.	Particulars of each Item.	Month in the Accounts of which Objectionable Expenditure first appeared.	Comparison with Estimate.			Comparison with Appropriation of the Year.			Expenditure during the Month.	Opinion of the Superintending Engineer, with final Remarks by Examiner.	Orders by Government.
			Amount of Estimate.	Expenditure up to Date.	Excess over Estimate.	Amount of Appropriation.	Expenditure of the Year.	Excess over Appropriation.			
	Civil Department. Transfers. Excess over Estimate										
1	Madras Harbor Works.	Octr 1884.	57,45,765	69,37,944	11,92,779	"	"	"	26,975	Sanction of the Secretary of State to Revised Estimate awaited.	No. 1962 W., 24th Augt 1885
	Want of Appropriation										
2.	Madras Harbor Works	April 1885	"	"	"	"	48,997	48,997	26,975	Appropriation of Funds awaited.	Still awaiting the sanction of the Secretary of State. Still awaiting the sanction of the Secretary of State.
	Miscellaneous Irregularities Works for which Revised Estimates are promised										
3	Madras Harbor Works	Octr 84.	57,45,765	69,37,944	11,92,779	"	"	"	26,975	Sanction of the Secretary of State to Revised Estimate awaited.	

CU.
13.8.85

US.
16.8.85

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

To The Supdt. Madras Harbour Works thro' the Examiner P.W. Accts.

To The Supdt. Madras Harbour Works thro' the Examiner P.W. Accts.

Desp. 24/8/85

Reference to Madras P. W. D. Code.

Paras. 2362 to 2365.

B. No 1717 W. 11. 7. 84
" 1968 W. 12. 8. 84
" 2177 W. 3. 9. 84
" 2462 W. 6. 10. 84
" 2783 W. 7. 11. 84
" 2995 W. 5. 12. 84
" 110 W. 13. 1. 85
G. O. No 246 W. 2. 2. 85
B. No 368 W. 14. 2. 85
" 1174 W. 19. 5. 85
" 1570 W. 26. 6. 85
" 1758 W. 29. 7. 85

orginal

Arch 682

(5)

P. W. D. Form.
No. M 112.

CENTRAL OFFICE OF ACCOUNTS.

Circle Archaeological

Fund Provincial

Recd 3/8/85 [illegible]

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of May 1885.

No. ____

Madras,
Dated 1st August 1885.

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

D. C. Gordon

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

No. 1964 W. 24/8/85

P 27/8

Agl. 66/8.

Aug 14. 8. 85

B. 12. 8. 85.

Co. 19/8/85

26/8

With order

With order

Co. 20. 6. 85

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of May 1885 requiring the orders of Government.

Item No.	Particulars of each Item.	Month in the Accounts of which Objectionable Expenditure first appeared.	Comparison, with Estimate.			Comparison with Appropriation of the Year.			Expenditure during the Month.	Opinion of the Superintending Engineer, with final Remarks by Examiner.	Orders by Government.
			Amount of Estimate.	Expenditure up to Date.	Excess over Estimate.	Amount of Appropriation.	Expenditure of the Year.	Excess over Appropriation.			
	Archaeological Division. Want of Appropriation.										No. 1964 Wdf. 24th August 1885
1	Restoration works at Humpi Ruins	May/85	"	"	"	"	3653	3653	3653	Early provision of funds is awaited.	The question of the provision of funds under consideration in the Financial Department. The question of providing funds is under consideration in the Financial Department
	Miscellaneous Irregularity.										
2	Non submission of Audit Notes &c.	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	Again brought to the notice of Government with the remark that the Audit Notes &c. have not been received up to date.	This matter will now be attended to by the Supdg. Engr. III Circle. This matter will now be attended to by the Supdg. Engr. III Circle.

Cs.
17.8.85

16.8.85

D. C. Gordon

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

1/8.

31/7.

To
The Supdg. Engr. III Circle
thro' the Examiner P.W. Accts
The Supdg. Engr. III Circle
thro' the Examiner P.W. Accts

24/8/85

14/6.

20.6.85

26/6

REFERENCE TO MADRAS P. W. D. CODE.

PARAS. 2362 TO 2365.

B. No 1717 W. 11-7-84
" 1968 W. 12. 8. 84
" 2177 W. 3. 9. 84
" 2462 W. 6. 10. 84
" 2783 W. 7. 11. 84
B. " 2995 W. 5-12. 84
" 110 W. 13—1—85
G. O. No 246 W. 2. 2. 85
B. No 368 W. 14. 2. 85
" 1174 W. 19. 5. 85
" 1500 W. 26. 6. 85

Ld 3/8

Ack. 67/7.
A. 18.7.85 R. 23.7.85 -

---

original -

Arch 5794

P. W. D. FORM.
No. M 112.

CENTRAL OFFICE OF ACCOUNTS.

CIRCLE Archaeological

FUND Provincial

Recd 2/7/85 In duplicate

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of April **188**5.

No.

MADRAS,
Dated 1st July 1885.

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

No 1758 W of 29th July/85

D. C. Gurdon
Examiner of P. W. Accounts, Madras.

With orders
With orders

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of April 1885 requiring the orders of Government.

Item No.	Particulars of each Item.	Month in the Accounts of which Objectionable Expenditure first appeared.	Comparison with Estimate.			Comparison with Appropriation of the Year.			Expenditure during the Month.	Opinion of the Superintending Engineer, with final Remarks by Examiner.	Orders by Government.
			Amount of Estimate.	Expenditure up to Date.	Excess over Estimate.	Amount of Appropriation.	Expenditure of the Year.	Excess over Appropriation.			
	Miscellaneous Irregularities										No 1758 W. d/ 29th July 1885
	Archæological Division										
	Failure to return to this Office, the accounts and Audit Notes forwarded to Mr. Black for verification and resubmission									With reference to G.O. No. 1174 W dated 19th May 1885 brings to notice again that the Archæological Engineer has not up to date returned to this Office, many of the accounts with Audit Notes thereon forwarded to him for verification and return. D. C. Cunnon	~~The report of the S.E. IIId Circle as to how Mr Black's [illegible] stands is still awaited.~~ This matter will now be attended to by the S.E. III Circle, who has taken charge of Mr. Blacks Accounts & books. Ch 26.7.85

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

Abd 1.7 EB 1/7

CW 23.7

To
The S.E. III Circle
and the Examiner of P. W. Accounts

Co. 20.6.85

original

Rec'd. 4982

(6)

P. W. D. Form.
No. M 112.

REFERENCE TO MADRAS P. W. D. CODE.

PARAS. 2362 TO 2365.

B. No 1717 W. 11. 7. 84
" 1968 W. 12. 8. 84
" 2177 W. 3. 9. 84
" 2462 W. 6. 10. 84
" 2783 W. 7. 11. 84
" 2995 W. 5. 12. 84
" 110 W. 13. 1. 83
G. O. No 246 W. 2. 2. 83
B. No 368 W. 14. 2. 83
B No 1174 W. 19. 5. 83

CENTRAL OFFICE OF ACCOUNTS.

Circle Archaeological

Fund Provincial

Rec'd 5/6/85 In Duplicate

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of March **1885.**

No. ______

Madras,
Dated 4th June 1885.

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

No. 1500 W of 26th June 1885

D. C. Gordon

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

Ass. 94/6.

G. 20. 6. 85

Ed
29/6

Ed 26/6

With disposal

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of March 1885 requiring the orders of Government.

Item No.	Particulars of each Item.	Month in the Accounts of which Objectionable Expenditure first appeared.	Comparison with Estimate.			Comparison with Appropriation of the Year.			Expenditure during the Month.	Opinion of the Superintending Engineer, with final Remarks by Examiner.	Orders by Government.
			Amount of Estimate.	Expenditure up to Date.	Excess over Estimate.	Amount of Appropriation.	Expenditure of the Year.	Excess over Appropriation.			
	Miscellaneous Irregularities										No 1500 W d/ 26th June 1885
	Archaeological Division										
1	Failure of return to this office the accounts and Audit Notes forwarded to Mr. Black for verification and resubmission.									With reference to G.O. No. 1174 W. dated 19th May 1885, brings forward that the Archaeological Engineer has not up to date resubmitted to this office, many of the accounts with Audit Notes thereon, forwarded to him for verification and return. This officer's habitual disregard of all calls from this office on the subject makes it a matter for the notice of Government, as accounts are meanwhile retarded. D. C. Corsaux	The S.E. III Circle has been directed to relieve Mr Black of his duties, & to submit a full report as to how his work stands. That report must now be awaited. ~~Mr Black's attention is drawn to the orders of Govt. passed on this item in G.O. No 1174 W D/19th May/85 with a view to the explanation called for therein being furnished immediately~~ 22-6-85 ~~Mr Black will acknowledge by return of post the receipt of this order, and will submit at same time full explanation of his failure to comply with the orders of Govt, No 1174 W of 19 May '85, in the Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items for February. Should Govt not receive that explanation within 10 days from this date Mr Black will be formally suspended.~~

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

19.6

2d

~~H~~ S.E. ~~III~~ Circle
through the Examiner
of P. W. Accts

4/6

Urgent

Dak 3792

(2)

P. W. D. Form.
No. M 112.

Reference to Madras P. W. D. Code.

Paras. 2362 to 2365.

B. No 1717 W. of 11-7-84
" 1968 W. " 12-8-84
" 2177 W. " 3-9-84
" 2462 W. " 6-10-84
" 2783 W. " 7-11-84
" 2995 W. " 5-12-84
" 110 W. " 13-1-85
G. O. No 246 W. " 2-2-85
" " 368 W. " 14-2-85

CENTRAL OFFICE OF ACCOUNTS.

Circle Archæological Division

Fund Provincial

Recd 29/4/85 In duplicate

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of ~~January~~ February 1885.

No.

Madras,
Dated 28th April 1885.

B. No. 1174 W. of 19th May /85

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

D. C. Gordon

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

To Archæological Surveyor [illegible]
designation of the [illegible]

Dir 18 [illegible]

The [illegible] of the [illegible] in [illegible] of the Circle [illegible] Archæological Division [illegible] for special employment in the [illegible] Presidency. The draft order [illegible] has been made [illegible] & resubmitted for approval.

13/5

23/5

21/5

20/5

Appd. 8/5/5

A. 13.5.85. R. 13.5.85

With order

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of ~~March~~ February 1885 requiring the orders of Government.

Item No.	Particulars of each Item.	Month in the Accounts of which Objectionable Expenditure first appeared.	Comparison with Estimate.			Comparison with Appropriation of the Year.			Expenditure during the Month.	Opinion of the Superintending Engineer, with final Remarks by Examiner.	Orders by Government.
			Amount of Estimate.	Expenditure up to Date.	Excess over Estimate.	Amount of Appropriation.	Expenditure of the Year.	Excess over Appropriation.			
	Miscellaneous Irregularities Archaeological Division Failure of return to this Office, the accounts and audit notes forwarded to Mr. Black for verification and re-submission.									Brings to notice that the Archaeological Engineer although repeatedly written to, has not resubmitted to this Office, many of the accounts with audit notes thereon forwarded to him for verification and return.	No. 1174 W. of 19th May/85 The immediate attention of Mr. Black is drawn to the remarks of the Examiner P.W. accounts. The audit notes and other accounts should be returned to the Examiner at once and the delay which has already taken place should be fully explained. 13.5.85 15.5.85

O. C. Gordon

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

28/4

28/4

19/5

To
H. C. Black Esqr.
through the Examiner
P.W. accts.

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.

110 W of 13/1/85
246 W of 2/2/85
2995 W of 5/12/84
2753 W of 7/11/84
2462 W of 6/10/84

Idn 19/2 Feb 16

Original – Dile 670

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

CENTRAL OFFICE OF ACCOUNTS.

CIRCLE Archaeological

FUND –

Rec 26/1/85 In Duplicate

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of November 1884.

No. ______

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
26 JAN 85
P.W. DEPARTMENT MADRAS

MADRAS,
Dated 24th Jany 1885.

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

B. No 368 W of 14th Feby 85
Despd 14/2

D. C. [illegible]

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

With order

GENERAL.
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of {1885} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated February, 2nd.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 2nd Feb. 1885, No. 246 W.

FEBRUARY.

Work at Humpi

Instructions for submission of revised estimates for — and Rs. 15,000 allotted for expenditure in the current official year.

2ND FEBRUARY 1885, No. 246 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Account.

READ—the following paper :—

G.O., dated 28th January 1885, Mis. No. 177, Financial.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Department, dated 17th January 1885, No. 129 :—

ABSTRACT.—Requesting the Accountant-General to transfer to the Public Works Department the grant of Rs. 5,000 already made, and applying to the Government of India for a further allotment of Rs. 10,000.

Order—dated 28th January 1885, Mis. No. 177, Financial.

The Financial Department cannot make any further grants this year. The necessary funds must be provided from savings in the Public Works Department.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. S. BENSON,
for Chief Secretary.

ORDER—dated 2nd February 1885, No. 246 W., Public Works.

From paragraph 5 of the note by the Chief Engineer, recorded with G.O., No. 2516 A, dated 22nd November 1884, it is observed that to pay for work at Humpi already executed as well as for new work proposed, a sum of Rs. 15,772 would be necessary during the current official year. The proposals sent up have, however, been somewhat modified by the orders of Government quoted above. The estimates should be revised accordingly, and submitted for sanction, prepared in the prescribed form. Meanwhile, the appropriation of funds, amounting to Rs. 5,000, sanctioned in G.O., No. 129, dated 17th January 1885 (Public Department), is supplemented, from the Provincial Reserve, to the extent of Rs. 10,000. The allotment for the work during the current official year is thus Rs. 15,000.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. SHAW-STEWART, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, III Circle.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" Financial Department.
" Public "

Exd. A. Grubert.
Spare Copies

2945 W D 5/12/84
2783 W D 7/11/84
2462 W D 6/10/84

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.

D 15/12

Original
Table 10

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

CENTRAL OFFICE OF ACCOUNTS.

CIRCLE Archaeological

FUND

G.O. 20/12/84 [illegible]

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of October **1884.**

No.

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
20 DEC 84
P. W. DEPARTMENT MADRAS

MADRAS,
Dated 19th December 1884.

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

G.O. No. 110 W d/13 January

D. C. Carmony

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

With order

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of October 1884 requiring the orders of Government.

Item No.	Particulars of each Item.	Month in the Accounts of which Objectionable Expenditure first appeared.	Comparison with Estimate.			Comparison with Appropriation of the Year.			Expenditure during the Month.	Opinion of the Superintending Engineer, with final Remarks by Examiner.	Orders by Government.
			Amount of Estimate.	Expenditure up to Date.	Excess over Estimate.	Amount of Appropriation.	Expenditure of the Year.	Excess over Appropriation.			
	Want of Appropriation										No. 110.W d/13 January/85
1.	Outlay on Archaeological Works	April/84	.	.	.	.	4,309	4,309	1307	Brought to the notice of Government with reference to G. O. No. 2995 W dated 5th December 1884.	Orders in the Public Dept as to a grant for the work are still awaited.

D. C. Carmany

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

C.S.
10.1.85

W.S.
10.1.85

13/1/85

To H. C. Black Esqre
thro' the Examiner P. W. Acct.

24brw 6/10/84

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.

Id 11/11

28/10

10/11

PWC No 9028

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

CENTRAL OFFICE OF ACCOUNTS.

(2nd duplicate)

Recd 29.10.84

CIRCLE Archaeological

FUND Provincial

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of August 1884.

No. ——

MADRAS,
Dated 28 October 188

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

B No. 2783 W 2/7 November/84

O. C. Gordon

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

With orders

With order

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of August 1884 requiring the orders of Government.

Item No.	Particulars of each Item.	Month in the Accounts of which Objectionable Expenditure first appeared.	Comparison with Estimate.			Comparison with Appropriation of the Year.			Expenditure during the Month.	Opinion of the Superintending Engineer, with final Remarks by Examiner.	Orders by Government.
			Amount of Estimate.	Expenditure up to Date.	Excess over Estimate.	Amount of Appropriation.	Expenditure of the Year.	Excess over Appropriation.			
	Want of Appropriation					Archaeological				Brought to the notice of Government with reference to G.O. No. 2462 W. dated 6th October 1884 on the Provincial Objectionable Items Statement for July 1884.	B. No. 2783 W d/ 7 November/84 The question of funds is still under consideration in the Financial dept
1.	Outlay on Archaeological Works	April/84	.	.	.	.	1943	1943	876		

CY
5.11.84

WS
5.11.84

J. C. Gordon

To
J. C. Black Esqre
Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras. Thro' The Exr P.W. Accts Dept
7-11-84

E.P. 28/10. CH 28/10.

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.

fd 8/10

10/10

D.26.8.84.

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

August 4

CENTRAL OFFICE OF ACCOUNTS.

Circle Archæological

Fund Provincial

Recd 26/9/84 \ In Duplicate

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of July **1884.**

No. ——

Madras,
Dated 25th September 1884.

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

No. 2462 W of 6th October/84

D. C. Gordon

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

26/9

With order

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.

Id 8/10 Fd 10/10

O. 26.8.84.

Arch 8063

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

August 4

CENTRAL OFFICE OF ACCOUNTS.

Circle Archaeological

Fund Provincial

Recd 26/9/84 In duplicate

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of July 1884.

No. ———

Madras,
Dated 25th September 1884.

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

No. 2462 W d/ 6th October/84

D. C. [illegible]

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

25/9

With orders

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of July 1884 requiring the orders of Government.

Item No.	Particulars of each Item.	Month in the Accounts of which Objectionable Expenditure first appeared.	Comparison with Estimate.			Comparison with Appropriation of the Year.			Expenditure during the Month.	Opinion of the Superintending Engineer, with final Remarks by Examiner.	Orders by Government.
			Amount of Estimate.	Expenditure up to Date.	Excess over Estimate.	Amount of Appropriation.	Expenditure of the Year.	Excess over Appropriation.			
		Archæological									No. 2462 W of 6th Oct/84.
	Want of appropriation										
1	Outlay on Archæological works.	April 1884					1064	1064		Brought to the notice of Government with reference to G. O. No. 2177 W dated 5th September 1884.	The question of funds is still under consideration in the Financial Department

D. C. Gordon

CG
CG 3.10.84

6/10/84

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

To F. C. Black Esqr
~~thro the Exr PWD~~

23/9. 25/9 3.10

O. 26.8.84.

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.

G. O. No 2393 W. 27. 8. 83
B. No 1717 W 11. 7. 84
" 1968 W. 12. 8. 84.

O. G. S. 15/8.
O. 26. 8. 84.

Original

7101

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

CENTRAL OFFICE OF ACCOUNTS.

(17)

CIRCLE Archaeological

FUND Provincial

Recd 25/8/84 [illegible]

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of June **1884**

No. No. 2177 W dated 3-9-84

MADRAS,
Dated 23d August 1884

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

D. C. Gordon
Examiner of P. W. Accounts, Madras.

28/8

With Orders

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of June 1884 requiring the orders of Government.

Item No.	Particulars of each Item.	Month in the Accounts of which Objectionable Expenditure first appeared.	Comparison with Estimate.			Comparison with Appropriation of the Year.			Expenditure during the Month.	Opinion of the Superintending Engineer, with final Remarks by Examiner.	Orders by Government.
			Amount of Estimate.	Expenditure up to Date.	Excess over Estimate.	Amount of Appropriation.	Expenditure of the Year.	Excess over Appropriation.			
	Archæological Division										No 2177 W a/3rd September /8
	Want of Appropriation										
1	Outlay on Archæological works	April 1884	.	.	.	.	1069	1069	.	Brought to the notice of Government with reference to G.O. No 1968 W dated 12th August 1884	The question as to an allotment of funds is under consideration in the Finl Depts in the Finl Dept
											26.8.84
											27.8.84

J. C. Curzon

…r of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

O.G.S. 15/8.
O. 26.8.84.

28/8

To J C Black
thro C

4/9

1717 W 11.7.84
2393 W 27.8.83

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 those 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.

G.O. No 2393 W. 27.8.83
B. No 1717 W 11-7.84

O.H. 33/8. Rec 13/8 Ag. 14/8 Jo 14/8

---

original

D.C. No 6332

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

(16)

CENTRAL OFFICE OF ACCOUNTS.

CIRCLE Archaeological

FUND Provincial

[illegible] 30/7/84 [illegible] Duplicate

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of May **1884.**

No. ——

MADRAS,
Dated 29th July 1884.

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

No. 1968 W of 12th August/84

D. C. [illegible]

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

With Order

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts Executive Engineers for the Month of May 1884
requiring the ers of Government.

Item No.	Particulars of each Item.	Month in the Accounts of which Objectionable Expenditure first appeared.	Comparison with Estimate. Amount of Estimate.	Comparison with Estimate. Expenditure up to Date.	Comparison with Estimate. Excess over Estimate.	Comparison with Appropriation of the Year. Amount of Appropriation.	Comparison with Appropriation of the Year. Expenditure of the Year.	Comparison with Appropriation of the Year. Excess over Appropriation.	Expenditure during the Month.	Opinion of the Superintending Engineer, with final Remarks by Examiner.	Orders by Government.
	Want of Appropriation		Archaeological Division								No. 1968 W. of 12th August/8
1.	Outlay on Archaeological Works	April 1884	"	"	"	"	1067	1067	39	Brought to the notice of Government with reference to G.O. No. 1717 W dated 11 July 1884.	The question of funds is still under consideration in the Financial Dept The question of funds is still und Consideration in the Financial Dept

D. C. Cardew
Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

Cd.
5.8.84

W.S.
7.8.8

To H.C. Black Esq.
Through the Examr. P. W. A

To H.C. Black Esq

1/8

2893 of 27.8.83

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.

---

original

JD No 539

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

CENTRAL OFFICE OF ACCOUNTS.

CIRCLE Archeological Division

FUND Provincial

Recd 26/6/84 In Duplicate

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items
in the Accounts of Executive Engineers
for the Month of April 1884.

No. ———

MADRAS,

Dated 25th June 1884.

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

No. 1717 W of 11th July 1884

J. P. Conway

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

With Orders

4293 of 27.8.83

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.

11/7

15/7

---

original

Index No. 539

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

CENTRAL OFFICE OF ACCOUNTS.

Circle Archiological Division

Fund Provincial

Recd 26/6/84 In Duplicate

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of April **1884.**

No. ______

Madras,
Dated 25th June 1884.

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

No. 1717 W of 11th July 1884

J. P. Conway

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

With Orders

Provincial Statement of Objectionable Items in the Accounts of Executive Engineers for the Month of April 1884 requiring the orders of Government.

Item No.	Particulars of each Item.	Month in the Accounts of which Objectionable Expenditure first appeared.	Comparison with Estimate.			Comparison with Appropriation of the Year.			Expenditure during the Month.	Opinion of the Superintending Engineer, with final Remarks by Examiner.	Orders by Government.
			Amount of Estimate.	Expenditure up to Date.	Excess over Estimate.	Amount of Appropriation.	Expenditure of the Year.	Excess over Appropriation.			
			Archeological Division								No. 1717 W. dated 11th July 1884
	Want of Appropriation										
1	Outlay on Archeological works - - - - - - - -	1884 April	..	..	..	..	1.028	1.028	1.028	Brought to the notice of Government. Early provision of funds awaited.	The question as to provision of funds is under consideration in the Financial Dept.

9.7.84

11/7

Examiner of P. W. Accounts,
Madras.

To A. C. Black Esqre.
through the Examr of P. W. Accts.

(N) Arch 7194

No. 1966 Wd/25th August 1885

O.H. 67/8.

Arch. 7105

Nº 1966 W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 25th August 1885

READ the following

Pros. Public departt No 1806 of 31st July 1885

Communicated, with a copy of G.O. No 478 of 4th April 1881, Public, to the Secy. Code Committee, who will submit a standing order making the necessary additions to Rule IV para 987 of the P. W. Code.

18.8.85

Code Comttee despd 25/8/85

---

(12) Arch 7194

B. No 1005 W of 13.4.81

B

Recorded with reference to G.O. No 1005 W of 13th April 81.

14.8.85

Please let me see the Rules as they now stand.

16.8.85

O.H. 8/7/8.

---

(4) Arch 7105 ✓

Govt. of {1885} Madras.

PUBLIC.

20 S.C

Issued

Recd. 12/8/85 Encl.

G.O., 31st July 1885, No. 1806.

No 1966 W of 25th August 1885

JULY.

Memorial Rules.

Communicating to all heads of departments a notification of the Government of India, regarding an addendum to rule 4 of the rules for the transmission of memorials to Her Majesty's Government.

31st July 1885, No. 1806, Public.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following paper :—

Notification of the Government of India, Home department (Public), dated Simla, 17th July 1885, No. 1273.

Addendum.—In rule IV of the rules for the transmission of memorials to Her Majesty's Government, published with Home department notification, No. 707, dated the 29th March 1878, as amended by notification, No. 445, dated 18th March 1881, at the end of the first sentence, after the words "or to an Act to which the Governor-General has assented," add the words "or which relate to a case which has been previously under the consideration of the Government of India, whether on appeal or otherwise."

A. MACKENZIE,
Secy. to the Govt. of India.

No. 1281.

Copy forwarded to the Government of Madras for information, in continuation of endorsement, No. 14-446, dated 18th March 1881.

(By order.)

(Signed) F. C. DAUKES,
Under Secy. to the Govt. of India.

To the Government of Madras.

Vide P. W. Code
para: 987 &c
D. P.
12-8-85.

Order—dated 31st July 1885, No. 1806, Public.

Communicated in continuation of G.O., 4th April 1881, No. 478, to the departments of the Secretariat, the Honorable the Judges of the High Court, and to heads of departments.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Revenue department.
" the Military do.
" the Public Works department.
" the Honorable the Judges of the High Court, with C.L.
" all heads of departments under the Chief Secretary.

Exd. J. Wright.

No. 1966 Wdy. 25th August 1885

Communicated with a copy of G.O. No 478 dy. 4th April 1881 Public, to the Secy Code Committee, who will submit a Standing Order making the necessary additions to Rule IV para 987 of the P. W. Code.

(True Extract)

Sd/

To
The Secy Code Committee

With G.O. 478 Public

Govt. of (1885) Madras.

PUBLIC.

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 31st July 1885, No. 1806.

No. 1966 Wdy. 25th August 1885

JULY.

Memorial Rules.

Communicating to all heads of departments a notification of the Government of India, regarding an addendum to rule 4 of the rules for the transmission of memorials to Her Majesty's Government.

31st July 1885, No. 1806, Public.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following paper :—

Notification of the Government of India, Home department (Public), dated Simla, 17th July 1885, No. 1273.

Addendum.—In rule IV of the rules for the transmission of memorials to Her Majesty's Government, published with Home department notification, No. 707, dated the 29th March 1878, as amended by notification, No. 445, dated 18th March 1881, at the end of the first sentence, after the words "or to an Act to which the Governor-General has assented," add the words "or which relate to a case which has been previously under the consideration of the Government of India, whether on appeal or otherwise."

A. MACKENZIE,
Secy. to the Govt. of India.

No. 1281.

Copy forwarded to the Government of Madras for information, in continuation of endorsement, No. 14-446, dated 18th March 1881.

(By order.)

(Signed) F. C. DAUKES,
Under Secy. to the Govt. of India.

To the Government of Madras.

Order—dated 31st July 1885, No. 1806, Public.

Communicated in continuation of G.O., 4th April 1881, No. 478, to the departments of the Secretariat, the Honorable the Judges of the High Court, and to heads of departments.

(True Extract.)

E. F. WEBSTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Revenue department.
„ the Military do.
„ the Public Works department.
„ the Honorable the Judges of the High Court, with C.L.
„ all heads of departments under the Chief Secretary.

Exd. J. Wright.

No. 1966 Wd/ 25th August 1885

Communicated with a copy of G.O. No 478 dd. 4th April 1881. Public, to the Secy Code Committee, who will submit a standing order making the necessary additions to Rule IV para 957 of the P. W. Code.

(True Extract)

(Sd) J.S.S.

W

To The Secy Code Committee

with G.O. 478 Public

Govt. of {1885} Madras.

PUBLIC.

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 31st July 1885, No. 1806.

No. 1966 Wd/ 25th August 1885

JULY.

Memorial Rules.

Communicating to all heads of departments a notification of the Government of India, regarding an addendum to rule 4 of the rules for the transmission of memorials to Her Majesty's Government.

31st July 1885, No. 1806, Public.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following paper :—

Notification of the Government of India, Home department (Public), dated Simla, 17th July 1885, No. 1273.

Addendum.—In rule IV of the rules for the transmission of memorials to Her Majesty's Government, published with Home department notification, No. 707, dated the 29th March 1878, as amended by notification, No. 445, dated 18th March 1881, at the end of the first sentence, after the words "or to an Act to which the Governor-General has assented," add the words "or which relate to a case which has been previously under the consideration of the Government of India, whether on appeal or otherwise."

A. MACKENZIE,
Secy. to the Govt. of India.

No. 1281.

Copy forwarded to the Government of Madras for information, in continuation of endorsement, No. 14-446, dated 18th March 1881.

(By order.)

(Signed) F. C. DAUKES,
Under Secy. to the Govt. of India.

To the Government of Madras.

Order—dated 31st July 1885, No. 1806, Public.

Communicated in continuation of G.O., 4th April 1881, No. 478, to the departments of the Secretariat, the Honorable the Judges of the High Court, and to heads of departments.

(True Extract.)

E. F. WEBSTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Revenue department.
,, the Military do.
,, the Public Works department.
,, the Honorable the Judges of the High Court, with C.L.
,, all heads of departments under the Chief Secretary.

Exd. J. Wright.

No. 1966 dd/ 25th August 1885

Communicated with a copy of G.O. No 478 dd/. 4th April 1881. Public, to the Secy Code Committee, who will submit a standing order making the necessary additions to Rule IV para 957 of the P. W. Code.

(True Extract)

(Sd) J.S.S.

W

To The Secy Code Committee
With G.O. 478 Public

Govt. of {1885} Madras.

PUBLIC.

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 31st July 1885, No. 1806.

No. 1966 dd/ 25th August 1885

JULY.

Memorial Rules.

Communicating to all heads of departments a notification of the Government of India, regarding an addendum to rule 4 of the rules for the transmission of memorials to Her Majesty's Government.

31st July 1885, No. 1806, Public.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following paper :—

Notification of the Government of India, Home department (Public), dated Simla, 17th July 1885, No. 1273.

Addendum.—In rule IV of the rules for the transmission of memorials to Her Majesty's Government, published with Home department notification, No. 707, dated the 29th March 1878, as amended by notification, No. 445, dated 18th March 1881, at the end of the first sentence, after the words "or to an Act to which the Governor-General has assented," add the words "or which relate to a case which has been previously under the consideration of the Government of India, whether on appeal or otherwise."

A. MACKENZIE,
Secy. to the Govt. of India.

No. 1281.

Copy forwarded to the Government of Madras for information, in continuation of endorsement, No. 14-446, dated 18th March 1881.

(By order.)

(Signed) F. C. DAUKES,
Under Secy. to the Govt. of India.

To the Government of Madras.

Order—dated 31st July 1885, No. 1806, Public.

Communicated in continuation of G.O., 4th April 1881, No. 478, to the departments of the Secretariat, the Honorable the Judges of the High Court, and to heads of departments.

(True Extract.)

E. F. WEBSTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Revenue department.
,, the Military do.
,, the Public Works department.
,, the Honorable the Judges of the High Court, with C.L.
,, all heads of departments under the Chief Secretary.

Exd. J. Wright.

Govt. of {1881} Madras.

PUBLIC.

To
The REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated April, 4th.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 4th April 1881, *No.* 478.

B No. 1005 W a/ 13" April 1881

Recorded

APRIL kd/ C.C.R

D.W.

Memorial Rules.—Communicating Notification of Government of India making an addition to Rule IV of the Rules for the transmission of memorials to Her Majesty's Government.

No 1298 of 29.7.85

31st July 1885, No. 1806, Public.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following paper :—

Notification of the Government of India, Home department (Public), dated Simla, 17th July 1885, No. 1273.

Addendum.—In rule IV of the rules for the transmission of memorials to Her Majesty's Government, published with Home department notification, No. 707, dated the 29th March 1878, as amended by notification, No. 445, dated 18th March 1881, at the end of the first sentence, after the words "or to an Act to which the Governor-General has assented," add the words "or which relate to a case which has been previously under the consideration of the Government of India, whether on appeal or otherwise."

A. MACKENZIE,
Secy. to the Govt. of India.

No. 1281.

Copy forwarded to the Government of Madras for information, in continuation of endorsement, No. 14-446, dated 18th March 1881.

(By order.)

(Signed) F. C. DAUKES,
Under Secy. to the Govt. of India.

To the Government of Madras.

Order—dated 31st July 1885, No. 1806, Public.

Communicated in continuation of G.O., 4th April 1881, No. 478, to the departments of the Secretariat, the Honorable the Judges of the High Court, and to heads of departments.

(True Extract.)

E. F. WEBSTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Revenue department.
,, the Military do.
,, the Public Works department.
,, the Honorable the Judges of the High Court, with C.L.
,, all heads of departments under the Chief Secretary.

Exd. J. Wright.

---

[6]

(13)

Arch 7/94

Govt. of (1881) Madras.

PUBLIC.

To
The Revenue Department,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated April, 4th.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 4th April 1881, No. 478.

B No. 1005 W a/ 13th April 1881

Recorded

APRIL

Kd/ C.C.R.

D.W.

Memorial Rules.—Communicating Notification of Government of India making an addition to Rule IV of the Rules for the transmission of memorials to Her Majesty's Government.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

4th April 1881, No. 478.

Memorial Rules.

Read the following paper :—

Notification of the Government of India in the Home, Revenue, and Agricultural Department (Public), dated Fort William, 18th March 1881, *No.* 445 [*Current No.* 657].

Addendum.—In Rule IV of the Rules for the transmission of memorials to Her Majesty's Government, published in Home Department Notification, No. 707, dated the 29th March 1878, after the words "legislative proceeding of the Governor-General in Council" add the words "or to an Act to which the Governor-General has assented."

(Signed) C. GRANT,
Offg. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

No. 14-446.

Copy forwarded to Local Governments and Administrations for information in continuation of endorsements Nos. 2113 and 54-2114—2122, dated 7th November 1879.

(Signed) F. C. DAUKES,
Under Secy. to the Govt. of India.

ORDER THEREON, 4th April 1881, No. 478.

Communicated to the Departments of the Secretariat, the Honorable the Judges of the High Court, and to Heads of Departments.

(True Extract.)

R. DAVIDSON,
Chief Secretary.

To the Revenue Department.
„ the Military Department.
„ the Public Works Department.
„ the Honorable the Judges of the High Court.
„ all Heads of Departments under the Chief Secretary.

Exd. J. W. Fischer.

No 1298 of 29.7.85

No 1967 Wdf. 25th August 1885

Comd to the
C. E. for Rys and
the Exr P. W. A.

Cd
17.8.85

16.8.85

C. E. for Rys:
Exr P. W. A.

Des/ed 25/8/85

1841/9

Oyl. 77/8.

22/8

15.8.85 22.8.85

---

[6]

(13) Arch 7194

Govt. of 1885 Madras.

To

The Public Works Dep

No 1967 Wdf. 25th Augt 1885

Ex'd 15/8/85.

Proceedings, dated 6th August 1885
No. 1162 Mis: Financial

Subject.

Sanctioned the entertain
as a Clerk on the permanen
establishment of the Cons
Engr for Railways of V. Co
-vale Mudali; who is ove
25 yrs.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

4th April 1881, No. 478.

Memorial Rules.

Read the following paper :—

Notification of the Government of India in the Home, Revenue, and Agricultural Department (Public), dated Fort William, 18th March 1881, No. 445 [Current No. 657].

Addendum.—In Rule IV of the Rules for the transmission of memorials to Her Majesty's Government, published in Home Department Notification, No. 707, dated the 29th March 1878, after the words "legislative proceeding of the Governor-General in Council" add the words "or to an Act to which the Governor-General has assented."

(Signed) C. GRANT,
Offg. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

No. 14-446.

Copy forwarded to Local Governments and Administrations for information in continuation of endorsements Nos. 2113 and 54-2114—2122, dated 7th November 1879.

(Signed) F. C. DAUKES,
Under Secy. to the Govt. of India.

ORDER THEREON, 4th April 1881, No. 478.

Communicated to the Departments of the Secretariat, the Honorable the Judges of the High Court, and to Heads of Departments.

(True Extract.)

R. DAVIDSON,
Chief Secretary.

To the Revenue Department.
„ the Military Department.
„ the Public Works Department.
„ the Honorable the Judges of the High Court.
„ all Heads of Departments under the Chief Secretary.

Exd. J. W. Fischer.

Financial *Department.*

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

From the P.W. Dept. No. 1298C, d/ 29th July 1885, requesting sanction for entertainment as a clerk on the permanent establishment of the Consulting Engineer for Railways of V. Casavulu Mudali, who has passed his 25th year.

Order, 6th August 1885, No. 1163 (Mis)

Sanctioned.

(True Extract)

Chief Secretary

To

The P.W. Dept.

No 1298 of 29.7.85

No. 1967 Wdf. 25th August 1885

Comd. to the C. E. for Rys and the Exr. P. W. A.

CS
17.8.85

W
18.8.85

C. E. for Rys:

Exr. P. W. A.

Despd. 25/8/85

D 4/9

O.G.S. 77/8.

D. 15-8-85 ... 22-8-85

---

[6] (13) Arch 7194

Govt. of {1885} Madras.

To

The Public Works Deptt

No. 1967 Wdf. 25th Augt 1885

Recd 15/8/85.

Proceedings, dated 6th August 1885
No. 1162 Mis: Financial

Subject.

Sanctioned the entertain as a Clerk on the permanent establishment of the Consul Engr for Railways of V. Cas-vala Mudali; who is over 25 yrs.

No. 1968 Wdf. 25 Augt 1885

D 4/9

B/

No. 1968W

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of India
P.W. Department

Ootacamund, 25th August 1885.

Sir,

With advertence to my letter No. 2607.W d/ 24th October 1884, I am directed to forward copies of the correspondence* marginally noted, and to request that, in the circumstances set forth, the Government of India may be moved

*Endorsement ~~Letter~~ from the Collector of Salem
No. ~~306~~ 1742 Eng. d/ ~~30th June~~ 4th July/85.
Pros: of the Board of Revenue
No. 6414 mis: d/ 14th July/85
Memo: by the P.W. Department
No. 1292. C d/ 28th July/85.
Pros: in the Finl: Dept:
No. 1181 (mis:) d/ 10th Augt./85.

R. 15.8.85

Government in
...ancial Depart.
...ment.

CO.
...8.85

To W

Revised draft submitted for approval.

C.
20/8/85

Obd 18.8.85 } R. 22.8.85
R. 17.8.85
B. 17.8.85 A. 22.8.85

FB/

~~D10~~
W

B

Superseded

Public Works Department.

To

The Secy to the Govt of India
P. W. Dept.

Sir,

In forwarding copies of the correspondence* marginally noted, I am directed to request that the Government of India may be moved to accord sanction to the reduction of houserent payable by the Dy. Tahsildar, Shevaroy Hills, accepted by

* Letter from the Collector of Salem No. 392 d/ 30th June/85
Pros of the Board of Revenue No. 6414 Mis d/ 14th July/85
Memo by the P. W. D No. 1292 C d/ 28th July 1885.
Pros of the Fin. Dept. No. 1181 (Mis) d/ 10. 8. 85.

R. 15.8.85

~~Inch 7238~~

[6]

Dept 781. 21. 4. 84
1330. 18. 6. 84
P. W. No 1958 W. 11-8-84
" " 2012 W. 15-8-84
" " 2137 W. 29. 8. 84
" " 2606/2607 W. 24. 10. 84
Do 2944 W. 28. 11. 82
Do 1292 C. 28 7. 83

Govt. of 188 Madras.

To

The P W Dept

Rev 17/8/85 Ex 3

Proceedings, dated 10/8/ 1885
No. 1181 Mis

Subject.

No. 1968 W d/ 25th August 1885

Reducing House rent payable by the Dy Tahsildar Shevaroy Hills ~~to~~ to Rs 10 per mensem

Aug 5. 87/8.

R. 17. 8. 85 R. 22. 8. 85

Financial
~~Public~~ Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Procs of the Board of Revenue, No. 6414 (mis) of 14th July 1885, regarding the house rent to be paid by the Dy Tahsildar of Shevaroy Hills.

Memo: from the P.W. Dept: d/25th July 1885, No. 1292 C.

Order, 10th August 1885, No. 1181 (mis)

The Government accept the recommendation made by the Board of Revenue to reduce the amount of house rent payable by the Deputy Tahsildar, Shevaroy Hills to Rupees (10) ten per mensem. The papers will be transferred to the Public Works Department in view to the necessary sanction of the Government of India being obtained.

(True Extract)

Chief Secretary.

To
The Board of Revenue
" P.W. Dept, with papers.

No. 392

Deputy Tahsildar's Office
Shevaroy Hills 30th June 1885

BOARD'S GEN. REG. No 3924 OF 1885

To
The Collector and
District Magistrate
Salem

Report of C. H. McBride
Deputy Tahsildar and
2nd Class Magistrate
Shevaroy Hills.

Respected Sir,

In original with enclosure

With reference to the enclosed correspondence received from the Executive Engineer Coimbatore Division Docket No. 485 of 23rd instant, I beg to state that since December 1884 I have been paying Rs 15 House rent as ordered in your Endorsement

No. $\frac{2410}{Eng}$ dated 23rd October 1884 on letter from Executive Engineer Coimbatore dated 15th idem No. 1640, but am now told that, as I ought to have paid at the rate of 7½ percent on the value of the House Rs 3000 which makes it Rs 18-12-" a month, I must pay up the arrears due and from the date the new Room was completed, its value is to be added to the Rs 3000 and rent paid at 7½ percent which would bring it up to Rupees 22/ a month. Government in G. O. dated 15th August 1884 No. 2011. W. Public Works, state that Officers should not be ordinarily called upon to pay, as rent for buildings, a sum exceeding ten percent of their salary which in my case would be Rs 15. I beg that you will kindly interfere in this matter as Rupees 22 out of my small pay is a large sum to give away a month.

I beg &c. &c.

(Signed) C. H. McBride
Deputy Tahsildar
and 2nd Class Magistrate

The Board of Revenue

Ref. on $\frac{1742}{Eng}$. **Endorsement** d/ 4th July 1885

Submitted for the favourable

OW Inz 3
2536/85
7238

Pub 3054/1/85

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

Dated 14th July 1885.
No. 6414 Mis

READ Endorsement of the Collector of Salem No 1742/Eng dated 4th July 1885 on report from Mr C H. Mc Bride Deputy Tasildar and 2nd Class Magistrate Shevar Hills, dated 30th June 1885 No 392.

Resolution

Submitted for the orders of Government

(2) The Charge for rent made in this case is apparently Calculated with reference to the letter from the Government of India printed with G.O. 20th Nov. 1884 No 2501. But para 3 of that letter seems to contemplate the exemption from the General rule of Officers in the position of Mr Mc Bri – whose case is said to be met by the provisi of the P.W. Code.

(3) Under Sec 1230 of the Madras Code the Charge for rent to a Supervisor 2nd grade a rank corresponding as regards Salary with that of Mr Mc Bride – is fixed at Rs 10 a month and irrespective of the

Ind

of any subordinates other than those of the Public Works Department.

(By order)

C. Unwin. Major R.E.

Under Secy to Govt P.W.D.

to Pub/7238/5

To

The Public Department

with papers returned

Pub C

Exd Iw

Fr S.D.

To Board of Revenue
" P.W. Dept, with papers.

Chief Secretary.