1) Number of Pages :- 38
2) Date of repair :- 4-88
3) Initial of restorer lom

P. W. Department

Go.No. 3040 W
Dated :- 11. 11. 1887

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

Read—the following papers :—

Office note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 3rd May 1887, No. 77.

Financial Department G.O., No. 1263 L.F., of 5th October 1886, communicated with Public Works Department G.O., No. 2818 W., of 25th October 1886, ruled that a charge of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on amount of estimates scrutinized should be made to Local Funds for such scrutiny. No orders have been issued as to the charge to be made for scrutiny of a *revised estimate*, and in the absence of such orders it seems to have been held in this office that a second charge at the same rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. should be made on the full amount of the revised estimate.

2. There is no instance in which two distinct sums have in this way been charged for one work, because, prior to 1886-87, under Financial Department Order No. 609 of 22nd March 1880 (quoted in G.O., No. 3211 W., of 6th December 1882), the charge for scrutiny was a lump sum of Rs. 21,250. But in the year 1885-86 an original estimate of Rs. 93,000 for a bridge over the Srívaikuntham anicut, Tinnevelly district, was scrutinized and the lump sum (Rs. 21,250) charged in that year must be held to include a charge for that estimate; and in 1886-87 a revised estimate of Rs. 1,10,000 for the same work was scrutinized, and a distinct charge of Rs. 2,750, being $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the full amount of the revised estimate, was made for the scrutiny. Practically, therefore, the scrutiny of the estimate of this work has been charged for as for the scrutiny of an estimate of Rs. 2,03,000.

3. If the total charge were limited to the percentage on the amount of the larger of the two estimates, original or revised, the Public Works Department would no doubt be scrutinizing the smaller estimate without any charge, which perhaps would not be quite fair; but on the other hand it cannot, I think, be intended that the charge should be practically doubled on account of some trifling alteration in the details of an estimate. I therefore solicit orders of Government on the point.

Office note to the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 21st May 1887, No. 1734 C.

[Your office note, No. 77, dated 3rd May 1887.]

G.O., 1263 L.F., Financial, dated 5th October 1886, orders that the contribution should be fixed at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the value of the estimates scrutinized. In the case you refer to, of the Srívaikuntham anicut bridge, the revised estimate provided for a new design which required scrutiny quite as much as the original design; percentage was therefore rightly charged on both the original and revised estimates; but in the case of a revised estimate which provides only for increases in quantities or rates and does not require fresh scrutiny of the original plans and estimates, the percentage should only be charged on the larger estimate.

Order—dated 11th November 1887, No. 3040 W., Public Works.

Communicated to Superintending Engineers, with reference to G.O., No. 2818 W., dated 25th October 1886.

2. In the statements prescribed in G.O., No. 2866 W., dated 2nd November 1886, of Local Fund estimates scrutinized by the Public Works Department, a note for the guidance of the Examiner should be entered against each revised estimate showing whether the revision was rendered necessary by material changes of design, or only by alterations in quantities or rates.

(True Extract.)

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

To Superintending Engineers.
To the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" Local and Muncipal Department.

Exd. A. Aubert
Spare Copies

3040/2

14

BUILDINGS AND ROADS,
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of (1887) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated November, 11th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 11th Nov. 1887, No. 3040 W.

NOVEMBER.

Local Fund Works

Communicating to Superintending Engineers the instructions issued regarding the mode of calculating the percentage charged for the scrutiny of revised estimates for —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

3040/3

16th October 1880, No. 2,387 W.

General.
Establishment.

Read the following paper :—

No. 77-A. From Major-General A. FRASER, R.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, (General,) to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Simla, 17th September 1880, No. 1,639 G.

I AM directed to acknowledge your letter without number, dated 6th August, asking the Government of India to reconsider the refusal to sanction the increase of the salary of the Deputy Chief Engineer, to that of a Superintending Engineer.

2. I am directed to state that the Government of India has no wish to interfere with the Madras Government in its management of its Local Funds, but the Governor-General in Council is at present in entire ignorance of the *permanent* arrangements proposed for the management of Imperial and Provincial Public Works Expenditure. So far as the Government of India is informed, one of two things must happen under present arrangements, either (1) the proportional cost of Establishment for Imperial and Provincial Works must be inordinately high; or (2) the Local Funds Officers must carry out a considerable portion of the Imperial and Provincial outlay, those funds receiving the usual per centage.

3. Until the Government of India is informed—

(1) of the total amount of money to be expended on works of all kinds,
(2) of the distribution of this among Imperial, Provincial and Local Works,
(3) of the permanent organization of the Establishment, including the Chief Engineer and Accounts Establishment, by which these several Funds are respectively to be expended,

the Governor-General in Council must decline to sanction any isolated item of expenditure increasing the salary of any officer on the Imperial List.

4. The Governor-General in Council considers that the charge for Public Works Establishment should not be increased by personal allowances, while it is at the same time desirable that the professional talent of the Public Works Department should be utilised for the benefit of Local Funds.

5. It therefore appears to the Government of India that the Madras Provincial Establishment should be so organized as to permit the Chief Engineer's Office, or the offices of Superintending Engineers of Circles, to examine all important Local Fund projects, and that for conducting these duties no special allowances should be made to any officer, but a fixed contribution, sufficient to cover the services performed, should be credited to the source from which such establishment is paid. It would appear proper that the full contribution proposed to be assigned by the Local Funds, viz., Rs. 21,250, should be accepted, and the duties distributed as the Madras Government may consider desirable.

No. 77-B. ORDER THEREON, 16th October 1880, No. 2,387 W.

ORDERED that the following letter be addressed to the Government of India :—

(Here enter No. 2,388 W., dated 16th October 1880.)

(True Extract.)

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

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

GENERAL
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of (1880) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated October, 16th.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G. O., 16th October 1880, No. 2,387 W.

OCTOBER.

Nos. 77-A-77-B.

Deputy Chief Engineer.—Passing orders on letter from the Government of India declining, with remarks, to sanction the proposal to increase the salary of the — to that of a Superintending Engineer.

3040/4

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

No. 2,388 W.

No. 77C.

FROM

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,
Public Works Department,

TO

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
Public Works Department.

SIR,—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th September 1880, No. 1,639 G., and in reply to invite attention to my letter of the 1st October 1880, No. 2,277 W., in which the general questions to which your communication relates ~~has~~ have been fully discussed, and I am to express a hope that, until a decision has been arrived at in regard to the future normal scale of the Madras Public Works Department, the present arrangements may be allowed to hold good.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

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

FORT ST. GEORGE,
16th October 1880.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

3040/5

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of (1880) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

Dated October, 16th.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G. O., 18th October 1880, *No.* 2,888 W.

OCTOBER.
No. 77C.

ADDRESSING on the subject of the proposal to increase the salary of the Deputy Chief Engineer to that of a Superintending Engineer.

3640/6

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers :—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 31st March 1885, No. 1124.

Read—again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 29th April 1884, No. 1442.

Read—also the following papers :—

From the	President,	Local Fund Board,	Anantapur,	dated	6th June	1884,	No.	14.
„	„	„	„	„	23rd „	„	„	17.
„	„	„	Arcot, North,	„	14th Aug.	„	„	326.
„	„	„	Arcot, South,	„	29th May	„	„	38.
„	„	„	Bellary,	„	25th Sept.	„	„	—
„	„	„	Canara, South,	„	6th „	„	„	1254.
„	„	„	Chingleput,	„	27th May	„	„	31.
„	„	„	Cuddapah,	„	1st June	„	„	45.
„	„	„	Coimbatore,	„	10th May	„	„	317 L.F.
„	„	„	Ganjam,	„	16th Aug.	„	„	980.
„	„	„	Godávari,	„	23rd Sept.	„	„	86.
„	„	„	Kistna	„	23rd „	„	„	968.
„	„	„	Kurnool	„	16th May	„	„	19.
„	„	„	Madura,	„	23rd June	„	„	61.
„	„	„	Malabar,	„	1st Sept.	„	„	1045.
„	„	„	Nellore,	„	11th July	„	„	29.
„	„	„	Nilgiris,	„	28th May	„	„	34.
„	„	„	Salem,	„	21st „	„	„	1225.
„	„	„	Tanjore,	„	16th Aug.	„	„	1291.
„	„	„	Tinnevelly,	„	13th Dec.	„	„	145.
„	„	„	Trichinopoly,	„	2nd June	„	„	542.
„	„	„	Vizagapatam,	„	29th July	„	„	470.
„	Accountant-General,			„	21st June	„	„	62-L.F.D.
„	„			„	21st Feb.	1885,	„	186-L.F.D.

Resolution—dated 31st March 1885, No. 1124.

In G.O., dated 6th December 1882, No. 3211 W., Public Works Department, the contribution to be paid from Local Funds for the scrutiny of plans and estimates for Local Fund works by the Public Works Department was fixed at Rs. 21,250 per annum. The Board, however, observed in their Proceedings, dated 12th January 1883, No. 88, that as the number of estimates examined by the Chief Engineer in each year since the issue of G.O., dated 22nd March 1880, No. 609, was very small, the cost of the scrutiny for each estimate was proportionately heavy, and requested the Presidents of Local Fund

1880-81	35
1881-82	85
1882-83 (nine months)	51
Total ..	171

Boards to report, at the end of 1883, the number of cases in which it was found expedient to consult the Public Works Department, as it was thought that, as time went on, Presidents would avail themselves more freely of the services of Superintending Engineers. Again, in their Proceedings, dated 5th March 1884, No. 743, reviewing the operations of Local Funds for the year 1882-83, the Board remarked that the amount of contribution paid to the Public Works Department for the scrutiny of the estimates and plans for Local Fund works was excessive, being 23 per cent. of the outlay on works, the estimates for which were scrutinized by the Public Works Department, and promised to submit the matter for the orders of Government on receipt of the information called for from the Presidents in paragraph 3 of Board's Proceedings, dated 12th January 1883, No. 88, above referred to. The Government, in paragraph 11 of their order thereon, dated 10th July 1884, No. 1533, agreed with the Board in their opinion, and awaited the further communication promised on the subject.

2. As the district reports failed to supply adequate information on which to base an opinion in regard to the question whether Local Funds obtained a fair return for the contribution paid by them, the Presidents were requested, in Board's Proceedings, dated 29th April 1884, No. 1442, to furnish a statement in the form therein prescribed, and to this reference the above read letters are submitted in reply. Owing, however, to the numerous inaccuracies detected in these statements, the Board found it necessary to call upon the Accountant-General to furnish them with a statement of the expenditure incurred in 1883-84 on works whose estimates and plans were scrutinized by the Public Works Department, and from the figures given by him, the following statement has been compiled :—

Circles.	1882-83.						1883-84.		
	Number of estimates scrutinized and approved by Public Works Department.	Total value of the estimates.	Expenditure incurred on such estimates.	Amount contributed from Local Funds.	Percentage of column 5 to 3.	Percentage of column 5 to 4.	Number of estimates scrutinized and approved by Public Works Department.	Total value of the estimates.	Expenditure incurred on estimates approved in 1883-84.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		RS.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.				RS.	RS. A. P.
1. Anantapur	1	4,650	2,544 0 0	607 3 4	12·8	23·5	..	..	..
2. Arcot, North	1	14,768	800 0 0	187 14 0	1·3	23·5	3	21,938	11,732 2 0
3. Arcot, South	4	42,268	1,741 5 3	408 13 11	1·0	23·5	3	30,550	8,404 6 1
4. Bellary	2	11,992	3,806 4 1	893 13 3	7·5	23·5	..	..	..
5. Canara, South	3	47,507	14,384 14 5	3,378 4 1	7·1	23·5	3	50,500	13,593 9 0
6. Chingleput	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
7. Coimbatore	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	8,030	1,396 5 6
8. Cuddapah	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	6,400	..
9. Ganjam	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	20,560	10,763 4 4
10. Godávari	8	64,575	13,986 15 2	3,284 12 8	5·1	23·5	1	2,700	712 3 6
11. Kistna	2	1,85,208	23,935 1 10	5,621 0 8	3·0	23·5	4	89,303	24,106 0 0
12. Kurnool	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
13. Madura	1	22,260	..	..	..	..	1	11,800	3,400 0 0
14. Malabar	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	5,035	4,503 10 10
15. Nellore	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	1,58,215	26,063 11 4
16. Nílgiris	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
17. Salem	1	18,000	8,200 13 10	1,925 15 7	10·7	23·5	..	4,126	4,723 7 9
18. Tanjore	1	7,400	225 0 0	[illegible] 13 5	0·7	23·5	27	1,01,170	20,438 0 0
19. Tinnevelly	2	9,730	8,551 14 3	2,008 6 6	20·6	23·5	3	23,320	6,874 13 3
20. Trichinopoly	1	4,500	2,243 0 0	526 12 3	11·7	23·5	3	47,575	2,651 7 5
21. Vizagapatam	3	22,436	10,066 3 10	2,363 15 4	10·5	23·5	3	14,940	10,235 2 1
Total ..	30	4,55,234	90,485 10 8	21,250 0 0	4·7	23·5	61	5,96,162	1,49,596 12 1

2040/7

Circles.	1883-84—*contd.*			Percentage of column 13 to 9.	Percentage of column 13 to 12.	Total.				Percentage of column 19 to 17.	Percentage of column 19 to 18.
	Expenditure incurred on estimates approved in 1882-83.	Total of columns 10 and 11.	Amount contributed from Local Funds.			Number of estimates.	Value of estimates.	Expenditure.	Amount contributed.		
	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.				RS.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.		
1. Anantapur	2,309 8 5	2,309 8 5	233 8 2	..	10·1	1	4,650	4,853 8 5	830 14 6	17·9	17·1
2. Arcot, North	2,434 4 2	14,166 6 2	1,432 0 0	6·5	10·1	4	36,646	14,966 6 2	1,619 14 0	4·4	10·8
3. Arcot, South	16,572 3 2	24,976 9 3	2,624 13 10	8·3	10·1	7	72,818	26,717 14 6	2,933 11 9	4·0	11·0
4. Bellary	7,971 14 2	7,971 14 2	805 13 11	..	10·1	2	11,992	11,778 2 3	1,699 11 2	14·2	14·4
5. Canara, South	12,220 12 1	25,813 14 1	2,609 7 8	5·2	10·1	6	98,007	40,198 12 6	5,987 11 9	6·1	14·9
6. Chingleput	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
7. Coimbatore	..	1,396 5 6	141 1 11	1·8	10·1	2	8,030	1,396 5 6	141 1 11	1·8	10·1
8. Cuddapah	1,991 12 4	1,991 12 4	201 5 11	3·1	10·1	1	6,400	1,991 12 4	201 5 11	3·1	10·1
9. Ganjam	..	10,763 4 4	1,088 0 1	5·3	10·1	2	20,560	10,763 4 4	1,088 0 1	5·3	10·1
10. Godávari	..	712 3 6	71 15 7	2·7	10·1	9	67,275	14,699 2 8	3,356 12 3	5·0	22·9
11. Kistna	863 0 0	24,969 0 0	2,524 0 10	2·8	10·1	6	2,74,611	48,904 1 10	8,145 1 6	3·0	16·7
12. Kurnool	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
13. Madura	7,414 0 0	10,814 0 0	1,093 2 6	9·3	10·1	2	34,060	10,814 0 0	1,093 2 6	3·2	10·1
14. Malabar		4,503 10 10	455 4 10	9·0	10·1	1	5,035	4,503 10 10	455 4 10	9·0	10·1
15. Nellore	..	26,062 11 4	2,634 10 2	1·7	10·1	4	1,58,215	26,062 11 4	2,634 10 2	1·7	10·1
16. Nilgiris	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
17. Salem	..	4,723 7 9	477 7 0	11·	10·1	1	22,196	12,924 7 7	2,403 6 7	10·9	18·6
18. Tanjore	1,079 0 0	21,517 0 0	2,175 1 5	2·1	10·1	28	1,08,570	21,742 0 0	2,227 14 10	2·0	10·2
19. Tinnevelly	..	6,874 13 3	694 15 7	3·0	10·1	5	33,050	15,426 11 6	2,703 6 1	8·2	17·5
20. Trichinopoly	..	2,651 7 5	267 15 9	0·6	10·1	4	52,075	4,894 7 5	794 12 0	1·5	16·2
21. Vizagapatam	7,760 8 0	17,995 10 1	1,819 2 10	12·2	10·1	6	37,376	28,061 13 11	4,183 2 2	11·2	14·9
Total ..	60,616 14 4	2,10,213 10 5	21,250 0 0	3·6	10·1	91	10,51,396	3,00,699 5 1	42,500 0 0	4·0	14·1

7040/8

3. It will be observed from the above statement that the percentage of the contribution paid from Local Funds has fallen from 23 in 1882-83 to 10 in 1883-84, the large decrease being due to the fact that the expenditure incurred on such works in 1883-84 was more than double that incurred in the preceding year. The foregoing remarks contrast the contribution with expenditure, but a fairer method is to compare the contribution with the value of the estimates; the substitution of this process gives 4·7 and 3·6 as the percentages of 1882-83 and 1883-84, respectively. Even this rate is high when compared with that fixed in G.O., dated 28th April 1880, No. 871, for the preparation of designs and estimates for Government works by the Local Fund Engineering Establishment, viz., 5 per cent. on the amount of the estimate. From another point of view, it will be seen that in 1882-83 and 1883-84, Rs. 21,250 were each year contributed for the scrutiny of thirty and sixty-one estimates, which was at the rate of Rs. 708 in the former, and Rs. 348 in the latter, year, for the scrutiny of each estimate, which seems an unnecessarily high contribution, because the labor of preparation very much exceeds that of simple scrutiny. Under these circumstances, as materials for the formation of a definite opinion are at length before them, the Board resolve to recommend to Government that the contribution payable by Local Fund Boards to the Public Works Department for scrutiny of estimates shall be fixed at the uniform rate of 2½ per cent. of the value thereof.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) C. F. MacCARTIE,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Chief Secretary to Government, Financial Department,
with twenty-four papers, in original, to be returned.
" all Presidents of Local Fund Boards.
" the Accountant-General.

No. 32.

Referred to the Public Works Department for remarks.

(By Order.)

Madras,
2nd May 1885.

(Signed) M. HAMMICK,
Acting Under Secretary.

No. 155-E.

Memorandum.

Adverting to endorsement from the Financial Department, No. 32, dated 2nd May 1885, referring to the Public Works Department, for remarks, Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 1124, dated 31st March 1885, embodying a suggestion that the contribution payable by Local Fund Boards to the Public Works Department for scrutiny of estimates should be fixed at the uniform rate of 2½ per cent. of the value thereof, the undersigned has the honor to observe that the charge of Rs. 21,250 per annum now made to Local Funds, when distributed among the various circles, appears to be by no means excessive. There are twenty-one Local Fund circles, and the average annual contribution from each circle is Rs. 1,000, or about Rs. 84 monthly. The average monthly charge to each Local Fund circle is thus little more than the pay of a second-grade overseer, and for this amount the Local Fund Boards obtain the professional advice of officers of long and varied experience.

2. It is greatly to the advantage of public interests that Local Fund Boards should be encouraged to avail themselves to the utmost of the professional experience which is placed at their disposal, and in this aspect it appears better that the contribution should be in the shape of a fixed annual sum, than in that of a percentage charge on the amount of the estimates forwarded for departmental scrutiny.

3. If the Financial Department considers the contribution now made by the Local Fund Boards to be excessive, this department is of opinion that the proper course is to reduce its amount, but not to substitute for it a percentage charge.

Ootacamund,
28th May 1885.

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

To the Financial Department, with its C. No. 103 L.F., returned.

From the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 28th January 1886, No. 369-C.

Abstract.—*Forwarding statements showing the number and value of estimates for Local Fund works finally approved by Superintending Engineers during 1882-83, 1883-84, and 1884-85.*

Order—dated 5th October 1886, No. 1263 L.F., Financial.

On a careful consideration of the foregoing papers, the Government are of opinion that the present arrangement should be discontinued. The sum of Rs. 21,250 now paid to the Public Works Department for the scrutiny of plans and estimates for Local Fund works covers the whole cost of an establishment engaged not only on local work but also on that of the Public Works Department, which is clearly unfair to the local boards. The Government accordingly accept the recommendation of the Board of Revenue that the contribution should in future be fixed at the rate of 2½ per cent. on the value of the estimates scrutinized by the Public Works Department. This arrangement will accordingly come into force from 1st April 1886.

2. The attention of all Presidents of District Boards will be called to No. 36 of the new Local Fund rules sanctioned in G.O., dated 26th June 1886, No. 721 L.F., under which only estimates for new works connected with buildings, drainage and masonry, and generally all works of a special or unusual character, amounting to upwards of Rs. 2,500, and for all other new works amounting to upwards of Rs. 5,000, need be sent to the Public Works Department for scrutiny.

(True Extract.)

for *Chief Secretary.*

To the Public Works Department.
" the Accountant-General.
" all Presidents of District Boards.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

[illegible]

5 E. 28.5.85
604 W 5.10.86.
995 W 10.8.86.
464 C. 10.4.86 3080/9
369 C 28.1.86.
1037 C. 11.6.85.
265 E. 23.6.85.
669 E. 29.9.85.
310 E. 4.7.85
794 W. 31.3.85
1902 W 5.8.84
3533 W 8.12.83
2454 W 1.9.83
1483 W 23.5.83.
420 W 8.2.83.
3211 W 6.12.82
1134 W 12.5.80
918 W 10.4.80.

For back correspondence see the [illegible]

19/9/03

No. 2818 W a/ 25th Octr./86

Communicated with advertence to G.O. No. 3211 W. dated 6th Decr. 1883, to the Examiner P.W. Accts in view to the necessary adjustments being effected; also to Supdg. Engrs for information.

22/10/86

CHIEF SECRETARY
4 MAR 1907
GOVT. OF MADRAS

22/10/86

22/10/86

25/10

Exr. P.W. Accts ✓
Supdg. Engrs ✓

Cat. 119

PWC No. 8218

Govt. of {1886} Madras.

FINANCIAL.

29/4/07 R.S.C.

Write for 20 copies
23/10/86

Issued

Recd. 21.10.86 Encl.

G.O., 5th Oct. 1886, No. 1263 L.F.

No. 2818 W a/ 25th October/86

OCTOBER.

Scrutiny of Plans and Estimates.

Accepting the recommendation of the Board of Revenue that the contribution for the — for Local Fund works should, in future, be fixed at the rate of 2½ per cent. on the value of the estimates scrutinized by the Public Works Department; ordering that this arrangement be brought into force from 1st April 1886, and stating what estimates should be so scrutinized.

~~With~~ With order

3040/10

CAW

No need to circulate ~~this~~ [illegible]

14/10/20

For further correspondence see the [illegible]

P.W. 8218

C A W

Draft as noted in portion marked with red pencil quoting No & date of letter sending up the normal scale

RH

10/10/80

Draft is submitted

Hon W Hughes

His Grace the Governor

7040/11

For orders 2387/11

The letter now with sent up from the S of I No 1639 G of 17th Septr. so practically it seems to me raises the whole question as to whether the old system of executing all Imperial Provincial & Local Fund works solely through the Agency of the P.W. Estabt should not be reverted to, but as the Govmt have already decided to separate the two former from the latter, and have sent up a scheme for new normal Estab. embodying this principle it might be sufficient to ~~intimate~~ this in so many words to the S of I asking that the existing arrangement

[illegible] in fact not [illegible]

Cer 4.10.80 – Rtd 11.10.80 –

27.9.80

Should be allowed to hold good till a decision has been arrived at in connection with our normal scale

I should in the mean-while endeavour to ascertain how much the combined Imperial Pro-vincial & Local Fund Estabts are costing so as to compare with the former [illegible] but ~~as~~ it would be better I venture to think not to wait for a return of this kind which will take some time to compile before replying

As in another Office note of this date I have dealt with another portion of the general question it would apparently also be better to send an answer on this subject at the same time 4/10/80

All communications should be addressed to the Secretary.

No. 1639 G.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

GENERAL.

3040/12

To,

The Secretary to the Govt of Madras
Public Works Departt

Simla 17th September 1880.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge your letter without number, dated 6th August, asking the Government of India to reconsider the refusal to sanction the increase of the salary of the Deputy Chief Engineer to that of a Superintending Engineer.

L 1879 B. W.

2 I am directed to state that the Government of India has no wish to interfere with the Madras Government in its management of its

Local

Local Funds, but the Governor General in Council is at present in entire ignorance of the permanent arrangements proposed for the management of Imperial and Provincial Public Works Expenditure.

So far as the Government of India is informed, one of two things must happen under present arrangements, & either (1) the proportional cost of Establishment for Imperial and Provincial Works, must be inordinately high, or (2) the Local Funds Officers must carry out a considerable portion of the Imperial and Provincial outlay, those funds receiving the usual per centage.

3/ Until the Government of India is informed

(1) of the total amount of money to be expended on works of all kinds,

(2) Of the distribution of this among Imperial, Provincial and & Local works.

(3) of the permanent organization of the Establishment, including the Chief & Engineer and Accounts Establishment, by which these several funds are respectively to be expended,

the Governor General in Council must decline to sanction any isolated item of expenditure increasing the salary of any Officer on the Imperial List.—

4/ The Governor General in Council considers that the charge for Public & Works Establishment should not be increased by personal allowances, while it is at the same time desirable that the professional talent of the P. W. Department should be utilized for the benefit of Local Funds.—

5/. It therefore, appears to the Govt of India that the Madras Provincial Establishment should be so organized as to permit the Chief Engineer's

office

Office, or the Offices of Superintending Engineers of Circles, to examine all important Local Fund projects, and that for conducting these duties no special allowances should be made to any officer, but a fixed contribution, sufficient to cover the services performed, should be credited to the source from which such Establishment is paid. It would appear proper that the full contribution proposed to be assigned by the Local Funds, viz. Rs. 21,250, should be accepted, and the duties distributed as the Madras Govt. may consider desirable.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedt. servant,

Alex. Fraser Major Genl., R.E.,
Secretary to the Govt. of India

G.O. 28-11-78 No. 4498 W
" 10-4-80 No. 918 W
Min 1287 W of 31-5-80
" 1579 [illegible] 6-8-80
List of [illegible] allowances for [illegible]/80

[illegible] 4-10-80 [illegible] 11-10-80
O 27-9-80 [illegible] 15-10-80

P.W.D.
27 SEP 80
No. 66

(3)

Genl
Estabt

No. 2387 W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 16th Octr./80

Read the following:—

3040
14

From
The Govt. of India. (P.E. No. 1639 G. d/ 17th Septr./80).

Ordered that the following letter be addressed to the Govt. of India.

(No. 2388 W d/ 16th Octr./80)

To
The Secretary
to the Govt. of India
P.W. Dept.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th September, 1880, No. 1639 G, and in reply to invite attention to my letter of the 1st October 1880 No 2277 W. in which the general questions to which your Communication relates has been fully discussed, and I am to express a hope that, until a decision has been arrived at in regard to the future Normal Scale of the Madras P.W. Dept; the present arrangements may be allowed to hold good.

2277 W.

copied 12/10/80

2387 W.

11/10/80

Drafts to Simla 18/10/80

P.C. Despd 29-10-80

11/10

For perusal

22/10

3040/15

10-7-72

19/4

Addressing on the subject of the proposal to increase the salary of the Dy Chief Engineer to that of a Supt Engr.

6075.

Govt. of {1880} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated 23/11

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G. O., 16th Oct. 1880 No. 2387 W.
2388 W.

Nos. 77 A - 77 B
77 C

Dy Chief Engineer

Passing orders on letter from the Govt of I declining, with remarks, to sanction the proposed to increase of the salary of the ___ to that of a Supt Engineer.

2/2

2/2

Keep-with Genl. No.

dated 188

+ G. No. 918 W. 3/4/80

[C. No. 8.]

GOVT. OF MADRAS. 1887. P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

3040/16

Madras, 3 May 1887.

Office Note No. 77

To W.

Financial Dept G.O. No 1263 L.F. of 5 Octr 86, communicated with P.W.D. G.O. 2818 W. of 25 Oct 86 ruled that a charge of 2½ per cent on amount of estimates scrutinized should be made to Local Funds for such scrutiny. No orders have been issued as to the charge to be made for scrutiny of a revised estimate, and in the absence of such orders it seems to have been held in this office that a second charge at the same rate of 2½ per cent should be made on the full amount of the revised estimate.

2. There is no instance in which two distinct sums have in this been charged for one work, because prior to 1886-87, under Finance Dept. orders No 609 of 22 March 1880 (quoted in G.O. 3211 W of 6.12.82) the charge for scrutiny was a lump sum of Rs 21250. But in the year 1886

n original estimate of Rs 93,000 for a bridge over the Srivaikuntham anicut, Tinnevelly District, was scrutinized and the lump sum (Rs 21,250) charged in that year must be held to include a charge for that estimate; and in 1886-87 a revised estimate of Rs 1,10,000 for the same work was scrutinized, and a distinct charge of Rs 2750 being 2½ per cent on the full amount of the revised estimate was made for the scrutiny. Practically therefore the scrutiny of the estimate of this work has been charged for as for the scrutiny of an estimate of Rs 2,03,000.

2. If the total charge were limited to the percentage on the amount of the [illegible] of the two estimates — original or revised — the P.W.D. would no doubt be scrutinizing the smaller stimate without any charge, which haps would not be quite fair; t on the other hand it ~~can~~ cannot I think intended that the charge should be tically doubled on account some trifling alteration in the tails of an estimate. I therefore licit orders of Govt. on the point

C

P.W.C. No 3366

R 4-5-87

No 1581 C of 7-5-87

No 1704 C of 21-5-87

To C. 2080/17

Your office note No. 77. 3rd May /87.

G.O. 1263 L.F. [illegible] dated 5th October /86. orders that the Contributions should be fixed at the rate of 2½ per cent on the value of the Estimates scrutinized.

In the case you refer to, of the Srivaikuntam anicut bridge the revised Estimate provided for a new design which required scrutiny quite as much as the original design, percentage was therefore rightly charged on both original & revised Estimates; but in the case of a revised Estimate which provides only for increases in quantities or rates, and does not require fresh scrutiny of the original plans & Estimates, the percentage should only be charged on the larger Estimate.

18/5/87.

Dy
21/5/87

B & R
cl work,

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No. 3040 W

3040
18

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 11th Aug/87

READ the following

Office note from the Examiner P. W. Accts. H.S. No. 77 dated 3rd May 1887

Office note to the Examiner P. W. Accts. H.S. No. 1734 C a/21st May 1887.

3

Communicated to Superintending Engineers, with reference to G. O. No. 2818 W dated 25th October 1886.

2. In the statements prescribed in G. O. No. 2866 W dated 2nd November 1886, of Local Fund estimates scrutinised by the Public Works Department, a note for the guidance of the Examiner should be entered against each revised estimate, showing whether the revision was rendered necessary

by

by material changes
of design, or only by ~~increased~~ alterations in
of quantities or rates

MCR
11.11.87

JW
11/11/87

No. 1734 C of 20-5-87 }
" 1581 C of 7-5-87 } & files

To Supdg Engr
Exr PWD
Local & Mutual pay
24/1

Cn

3080
19

3366

Govt. of (1887) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS

12/11/87

Dated

Recd. Endd.

G.O., 11th Nov 1887, No. 3040 W

Local fund works

=

Communicating to Supdg Engineers the instructions issued reg: the mode of calculating the percentage charge for the scrutiny of revised Estimates for ——

29/4/27

[illegible] 10-11-87

~~[illegible]~~

Sent [illegible] 11-11-87

12/11

Cw: 11/11