(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 18

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் -6-88

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

பொதுப்பணித் துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	1456 W	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	17. 3. 1888	~~198~~ .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

ஆவண. கா-1—18,006—15-6-87.

17TH MAY 1888, No. 1456 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

1456/1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Account.

READ—the following paper:—

Office Note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 4th May 1888, No. 1439.

I beg to forward herewith, for information and orders of Government, the correspondence noted in the margin, regarding the forms for the progress reports (forms Nos. M 90 and 91) submitted by Executive Engineers to Superintending Engineers.

Letter No. 1836 G.D., dated 28th October 1887, from the Superintending Engineer, I Circle.
Examiner's letter No. 357 S.E.I., dated 28th November 1887, to the Superintending Engineer, I Circle.
Supg. Engineer's reply, No. 2711 G.D., dated 5th March 1888, with two enclosures in original, to be returned.

2. As regards form No. M 90, the provision therein made for the distinct record of (1) approximate valuation of work done, and (2) booked outlay, and the explanatory note (2) on the form, are so explicit in themselves that it is difficult to understand how any Executive Engineer could, as stated by the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, have come to the conclusion that the figures entered are in all cases to be actuals.

3. In the case of No. M 91, the form provides for the expenditure to end of each month being shown, and note 1 on the form lays down that the expenditure noted against each work will be approximate only as far as concerns the last month entered, thereby apparently implying that for previous months the approximate expenditure (as originally entered) should be corrected to actuals.

4. I cannot see that, as far as form No. M 90 is concerned, there is any necessity for modifying in any way either the form, or the notes thereon, or the Code paragraphs relating thereto.

5. As regards form No. M 91, it seems to me that if the inference mentioned in para. 2 is correct, provision should be made for showing against each work approximate and actual outlay on two separate lines, as suggested in my letter to the Superintending Engineer, this plan being very much neater and a little less troublesome than the alternative plan of correcting each month's entry in the following month.

6. It may, however, be a question whether it is really necessary even to show anything more than approximate outlay. If Government consider that this is not necessary, that is to say, that the approximate outlay to end of the latest month as it appears in the return for one month need not be corrected to actual outlay in the return for the following month then, of course, two lines will be unnecessary. It will be seen that in the sample returns, forwarded by the Superintending Engineer for inspection, there are no corrections, but then it is understood that the figures are in all cases actuals.

7. I submit the case for the orders of Government as to whether any change, and if so what change, is to be made in either or both of the forms, or in the notes thereon, or in the Code paragraphs relating thereto.

8. In regard to para. 2 of the Superintending Engineer's letter, No. 1836 G.D., dated 28th October 1887, it appears that there is no such omission as the Superintending Engineer refers to in the present edition of the Code, the rules in which correspond with paras. 313 and 317 of the edition of 1882.

ORDER—dated 17th May 1888, No. 1456 W., Public Works.

The Government consider that in form No. M 91 approximate outlay is all that is necessary. The figures need not, therefore, be corrected to actual outlay. The "notes" on the form should be corrected accordingly.

2. Form No. M 90 needs no alteration.

(True Extract.)

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

To Superintending Engineers.
To the Consulting Architect to Government.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts, with two enclosures.
" Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.
Spare Copies

1456/2

GENERAL.
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of {1888} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated May, 17th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 17th May 1888, No. 1456 W.

MAY.

Progress report forms

Orders on office note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, forwarding correspondence regarding — Nos. M 90 and 91, with remarks.

COPY OF LETTER FROM THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER 1ST. CIRCLE, TO THE EXAMINER OF P.W.ACCOUNTS MADRAS, NO.1836 G.D. DATED 28TH. OCTOBER 1887.

1456/3

AT THE END OF NO.1 OF THE "NOTES" PRINTED ON P.W.D. FORMS NOS.90 AND 91 IT IS SAID THE EXPENDITURE NOTED AGAINST EACH WORK IN THE FORM WILL "OF COURSE BE APPROXIMATE ONLY SO FAR AS CONCERNS THE LAST MONTH ENTERED."

2. THESE ~~WORKS~~ words HAVE BEEN OMITTED FROM PARAS 298 AND 302 OF THE NEW EDITION OF THE CODE, AND CONSEQUENTLY THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEERS SUPPOSE THAT THE EXPENDITURE OF EACH MONTH TO BE ENTERED IS THE ACTUAL, AND THEREFORE STATE THAT THE FORMS CAN NO LONGER BE SENT IN TO REACH ME BY THE 15TH. OF EACH MONTH.

3. I TRUST THEREFORE THAT A STANDING ORDER MAY BE ISSUED, ADDING TO CODE PARAS 298 AND 302 THE OMITTED WORDS.

(TRUE COPY).

G. E. Statter

SUPDT. CORRESPONDENCE BRANCH.

29
4/5

COPY OF LETTER FROM THE EXAMINER P.W. ACCOUNTS MADRAS, TO THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER IST. CIRCLE, NO.357 S.E.I.
DATED 28TH. NOVEMBER 1887.

1456
4

WITH REFERENCE TO YOUR LETTER NO.1886 G.D. DATED 28TH. OCTOBER 1887, I HAVE THE HONOR TO REQUEST THAT YOU WILL SEND ME SOME SAMPLES OF PROGRESS REPORTS IN FORMS NOS.90 AND 91 AS ACTUALLY SUBMITTED TO YOU BY EXECUTIVE ENGINEERS.

2. AT THE SAME TIME I BEG TO INQUIRE WHETHER, IN FORM NO. M. 91, THERE SHOULD NOT BE TWO LINES FOR EACH WORK, ONE FOR BOOKED OUTLAY AND THE OTHER FOR APPROXIMATE OUTLAY TO A MONTH LATER.

(TRUE COPY).

G.E.Ratton.

SUPTT. CORRESPONDENCE BRANCH.

29.
4/5.

COPY OF LETTER FROM THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER 1ST. CIRCLE, TO THE EXAMINER OF P.W. ACCOUNTS, MADRAS, NO. 2711 G.D. DATED 5TH. MARCH 1888.

1456
3/5

WITH REFERENCE TO YOUR LETTER NO. 357 S.E.I. DATED 28TH. NOVEMBER 1887, I HAVE THE HONOR TO FORWARD HEREWITH PROGRESS REPORTS, FORMS NOS. 90 AND 91, AS ACTUALLY SUBMITTED BY THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, GODAVERI EASTERN DIVISION, FOR YOUR PERUSAL AND RETURN.

2. IN REPLY TO PARA 2 OF THE ABOVE LETTER, I HAVE THE HONOR TO SAY THAT IN FORM 91 THERE ARE NOT TWO LINES FOR EACH WORK, ONE FOR BOOKED OUTLAY AND THE OTHER FOR APPROXIMATE OUTLAY, NOR DO I SEE THE NECESSITY FOR SUCH AN ARRANGEMENT.

(TRUE COPY).

G. E. Patten

SUPTT. CORRESPONDENCE BRANCH.

R.R. 4/5.

E.1
P.W. 4190/8

[C. No. 8.]

110

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1888. { P.W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

1456/6

Madras, 4th. May 1888.

Office Note No. 1439

Encl: 5

To

W.

KEEP-WITH Genl. No.

dated 188 .

* Letter No. 1836 G.D. dated 28th. October 1887 from the Supg. Engineer 1st. Circle.

Examiner's letter No. 357 S.E.1, dated 28th. November 1887 to the Supg. Engineer 1st. Circle.

Supg. Engineer's reply No. 2711 G.D. dated 5th. March 1888 with 2 enclosures in original, to be returned.

I beg to forward herewith for information and orders of Govt., the correspondence* noted in the margin, regarding the forms for the progress reports (Forms Nos. M 90 and 91) submitted by Executive Engineers to Supg. Engineers.

2. As regards form No. M 90, the provision therein made for the distinct record of (1) approximate valuation of work done and (2) booked outlay, and the explanatory note (2) on the form, are so explicit in themselves that it is difficult to understand how any Executive Engineer could, as stated by the Supg. Engineer 1st. Circle, have come to the conclusion that the figures entered are in all cases to be actuals.

2. In the case of No. M 91 the

1,000—7-2-88.

form provides for the expenditure to end of each month being shown, and note one on the form lays down that the expenditure noted against each work will be approximate, only as far as concerns the last month entered, thereby apparently implying that for previous months the approximate expenditure (as originally entered) should be corrected to actuals.

3. I cannot see that, as far as form No. M 90 is concerned there is any necessity for modifying in any way either the form, or the notes thereon, or the Code paras relating thereto.

4. As regards form No. M 91, it seems to me that, if the inference mentioned in para 2 is correct, provision should be made for showing against each work approximate and actual outlay on two separate lines, as suggested in my letter to the Supg. Engineer, this plan being very much neater, and a little less troublesome, than the alternative plan of correcting each months entry in the following month.

5. It may however be a question whether it is really necessary even to show anything more than approximate outlay. If Government consider that this is not necessary; that is to say that the approximate outlay to end of the latest month as it appears in the return for one month, need not be corrected to actual outlay in the return for the following month, then of course two lines will be unnecessary. It will be seen that in the sample returns, forwarded by the Supg. Engineer for inspection, there are no corrections, but then it is understood that the figures are in all cases actuals.

1456/7

6. I submit the case for the orders of Government as to whether any change, and if so what change, is to be made in either or both of the forms, or in the notes thereon; or in the Code paras relating thereto.

7. In regard to para 2 of the Supg. Engineer's letter No. 1836 C.D. dated 28th. October 1887 it appears that there is no such omission as the Supg. Engineer refers to in the present edition of the Code, the rules in which correspond with paras 313 and 317 of the edition of 1882.

C.

28.4/5.

P.W.C. No. 4190

P. W. Department
Ootacamund 11 May 1888.

No. 146. D.

To

E. I.

For favor of remarks.

It appears to this office that the approximate outlay for the latest month need not be corrected to actual outlay in the return for the following month.

7.5.88

R 5.5.88

E. 5

Fol
8/5/88

W

Certainly in Form M 91 approximate outlay is all that is necessary and there can be no necessity or advantage in afterwards entering actual outlay, it would add greatly to the work

12/5/88

0
7/5

R. 17.5.88

No. 1456 W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

1456
8

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 17th May 1888

READ the following

Office Note from the Exr P.W. Accts (A.C. No. 1439 d/ May 4, 1888)
~~do from the C.E. for Irrign (d/ " 12, ")~~

310

The Government consider that in Form No. M 91 approximate outlay is all that is necessary. The figures need not therefore be corrected to actual outlay. The "notes" on the form should be corrected accordingly.

2. Form No. M 90 needs no alterations.

D. 29/5

Supdg Engineers.
Consg Architect.
Exr P.W. Accts write 2 copies.
C.E. for Irrign

Fol
16/5/88

14656/9

[illegible]

Govt. of {1888} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated

Recd. Encl.

G.O. 17 May 1888, No. 1456 W.

Progress report forms

Orders on office note from the Examiner P.W. Accounts forwarding correspondence regarding — No. 4071 with [illegible]

J.A. 19/5 808 [illegible]

9