No 4432 D. dy 20.7.88
" 2546C. " 5.7.88
B. No 2963W " 7.11.87
G.O. 1809W. 29.7.80
" 1915W. 7.8.84

No 2464 W d/13 August 1888

Communicated to the Depty Engr IV Circle with reference to his letter No 262EW of 28th June 1888.

8/8/88

S.E. IV Circle
Ex. Engr

D 14/8

O.S. 46/8/88 M. 9.8.88

S 18/8.

[6]

Govt. of (188) Madras.

P.W.C. No 7743

To

The P.W.D.

Read 6-8-88.

Proceedings, dated 31 July 1888.
No. 449

Subject.

No 2464 W d/13 August 1888

Sanctioning the temporary exemption of Coopoo Rao for the period during which he acted as clerk IV 3d Grade.

Proceedings of the Madras
Read the follow

20th July 1888, No. 429, Educational.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—again the following papers:—

G.O., dated 16th November 1887, Mis. No. 627, Educational.

Read—the following letter from H. B. GRIGG, Esq., M.A., Director of Public Instruction, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 31st October 1887, No. 7671:—

I have the honor, with reference to the enclosed correspondence, to request the sanction of Government for the employment of Mr. G. H. Stuart as an Assistant Examiner to the Board of Examiners for the College of Engineering, under Article II of the Rules, and for paying to him from the balance of fees collected for the Surveying and Draughtsmen's examination in May last, and now with the Principal, the sum of Rs. 500 for the work, which comprises, I understand, all the higher mathematical work.

2. A meeting of the Board, at which the Principal was present, was held at my office to consider how the work allotted to the Board could be reduced to reasonable limits, and I decided to relieve the examiners of all work not of a final character. But even with this relief the amount of examining to be done, to which has been added the additional work consequent on the permission accorded by Government to failed candidates to appear again under the old rules, was, in my opinion, quite beyond what could fairly be demanded of the Board; and I therefore decided to allow, subject to the approval of Government, the employment of Mr. Stuart as proposed by the Board.

3. When the approaching examinations have been completed, I will ask the Board to again consider the details of the present system in view of limiting the examinations to reasonable dimensions. The examination is now unquestionably too detailed in each subject. The qualifications of the students can be sufficiently well ascertained without putting them questions in so many portions of the subjects studied.

Order—dated 16th November 1887, Mis. No. 627, Educational.

The employment of Mr. G. H. Stuart as an Assistant Examiner to the Board of Examiners for the College of Engineering at the next ensuing examinations, and the payment to him of Rs. 500 from the source indicated, is sanctioned.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Chief Secretary.

To the Director of Public Instruction.
" Accountant-General.

Order

No 2432 D. d/20. 7. 88.
" 2546 C. " 5. 7. 88
B. No 2963 W " 7. 11. 87
G. O. 1809 W - 29. 7. 80
" 1915 W. 7. 8. 84

No 2464 W d/13 August 1888
D

Communicated to the Supdg Engr IV Circle with reference to his letter No 262 EW of 28th June 1888.

8/8/88

S E IV Circle
Exe Engr

D 14/8

O.S. 446 8/88 M. 9.8.88

D 18/8.

R. 11. 8. 88

P.W.C. No 7743

[6]

Govt. of (188) Madras.

(4)

To

The P.W.D

Recd 6-8-88

Proceedings, dated 31 July 1888.
No. 449

Subject.

Sanctioning the temporary exemption of Coopoo Rao for the period during which he acted as clerk IV 3rd Grade.

Proceedings of the Madras G
Read the following

20TH JULY 1888, No. 429, EDUCATIONAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following papers:—

G.O., dated 16th November 1887, Mis. No. 627, Educational.

Read—the following letter from H. B. GRIGG, Esq., M.A., Director of Public Instruction, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 31st October 1887, No. 7671:—

I have the honor, with reference to the enclosed correspondence, to request the sanction of Government for the employment of Mr. G. H. Stuart as an Assistant Examiner to the Board of Examiners for the College of Engineering, under Article II of the Rules, and for paying to him from the balance of fees collected for the Surveying and Draughtsmen's examination in May last, and now with the Principal, the sum of Rs. 500 for the work, which comprises, I understand, all the higher mathematical work.

2. A meeting of the Board, at which the Principal was present, was held at my office to consider how the work allotted to the Board could be reduced to reasonable limits, and I decided to relieve the examiners of all work not of a final character. But even with this relief the amount of examining to be done, to which has been added the additional work consequent on the permission accorded by Government to failed candidates to appear again under the old rules, was, in my opinion, quite beyond what could fairly be demanded of the Board; and I therefore decided to allow, subject to the approval of Government, the employment of Mr. Stuart as proposed by the Board.

3. When the approaching examinations have been completed, I will ask the Board to again consider the details of the present system in view of limiting the examinations to reasonable dimensions. The examination is now unquestionably too detailed in each subject. The qualifications of the students can be sufficiently well ascertained without putting them questions in so many portions of the subjects studied.

Order—dated 16th November 1887, Mis. No. 627, Educational.

The employment of Mr. G. H. Stuart as an Assistant Examiner to the Board of Examiners for the College of Engineering at the next ensuing examinations, and the payment to him of Rs. 500 from the source indicated, is sanctioned.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Chief Secretary.

To the Director of Public Instruction.
" Accountant-General.

order

G.O., dated 24th November 1887, Mis. No. 639, Educational.

Read—the following letter from H. B. GRIGG, Esq., M.A., Director of Public Instruction, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Ootacamund, 13th September 1887, No. O-239 :—

In article II of the new rules of the College of Engineering it is provided that "the admission and all final examinations" are to be conducted by an independent Board of Examiners, whose remuneration is to be fixed from time to time by Government. The Board may employ assistant examiners with the sanction of Government. The decision of the Board in regard to the qualifications of candidates to be final. These rules came into force from the 1st January 1886.

2. The work of the Board in 1886, however, did not include the examination for draughtsmen and surveyors, whose examinations were still conducted by the College staff.* Towards the end of April last Captain Henderson brought the matter to my notice simply with the view of employing external examiners. and as the fees had been paid, and as the urgency of the arrangement did not admit of laying the case before Government, I approved his proposals.

* Letter from the Acting Principal, College of Engineering, dated 25th April 1887 (requested to be returned).

3. The new rules provide [Article IV (6) and (8)] for the demand of fees for *admission* examinations only in the case of civil and mechanical engineers and of engineer subordinates. The fees for the final examination of draughtsmen and surveyors appear to have been levied irregularly under G.O., No. 95, dated 6th April 1866. I say irregularly, because that order contemplates the levy of a fee of Rs. 15 from candidates for certificates in surveying and not for a fee of half this amount from candidates in this subject and for fees of a similar amount from candidates for certificates as draughtsmen, and because that order must be held to have been superseded by the new rules.

4. As I thought the whole question regarding the examinations at the college needed revision in view of the above facts, of the fact that the examinations are not self-supporting, and of the fact that remuneration fixed for the Board in G.O., dated 2nd November 1885, Mis. No. 677, will not be adequate for the work which must finally devolve on the Board, I called on Captain Henderson to submit proposals for making the entire work falling on the Board under the rules self-supporting. His proposals are embodied in his letter (requested to be returned), No. 231-C., dated 19th August 1887.

5. The remuneration of the present Board was fixed by Government at the present figures on my recommendation (letter No. 6139, dated 15th September 1885, recorded in G.O., dated 12th October 1885, Mis. No. 632). I considered it undesirable to remunerate the members of the Board on the university system. Dr. Duncan, however, held a different view, I presume, because the remuneration did not vary with the amount of work, and recommended a fixed scale of remuneration in his letter No. 8080, dated 4th December 1886. The Government, in G.O., dated 8th January 1887, Mis. No. 21, declined to sanction the increase suggested. The total present remuneration is Rs. 1,800. At the rates proposed by Dr. Duncan, the aggregate remuneration would have been about 25 — 30 per cent. higher, whilst he apparently contemplated confining the work of the Board to the examinations relating to civil engineers, mechanical engineers and engineer subordinates.

6. I think the scale of remuneration originally proposed by me will be too low, as observed by Major Henderson, when the new scheme is in full working. Major Henderson, however, includes *term* examinations in the Board work, whilst the intention of the rules is simply to dispose of certain subjects in the courses for engineers and engineer subordinates at *term examinations* [Article V 1 (*a*) and 2 (*a*)]. But I consider that the candidates concerned should bear the full cost of maintaining the Board.

7. I propose therefore to raise the remuneration from the 1st November next, when the second year of the Board's life expires, to the following amount :—

	RS.
President	900
Two members at Rs. 700 each	1,400
Assistants	250
Total ..	2,550

This sum, I would observe, is but little above that suggested by Dr. Duncan for work which does not represent more, I should say, than two-thirds of the work which will devolve on the Board by requiring them to conduct the examinations for surveyors and draughtsmen. An additional sum of about Rs. 250 must be provided for assistant examiners for the vernacular and field test work.

8. To meet this outlay I propose to fix the fees for admission and final examination as follows :—

	RS.
Admission, Engineer class	20
Do. do. Subordinate class	15
Final, Engineer class	20
Do. Subordinate class	15
Do. Draughtsmen	10
Do. Surveyors	15
Intermediate, Engineer class	10
Do. Subordinate class	6

9. At these rates the several examinations should produce an income of not less than Rs. 2,550 annually. This estimate is based on the following figures :—

	No. of candidates.	Fee.	Total.
		RS.	RS.
Admission Examination, Engineer class	15	20	300
Do. do. Subordinates ..	35	15	525
Final Examination, Engineer class	10	20	200
Do. Subordinate class	25	15	375
Do. Draugtsmen	35	10	350
Do. Surveyors	20	15	300
2 Intermediate Final Examination, Engineer class, 10 candidates in each year	20	10	200
2 Intermediate Final Examination, Subordinate class, 25 candidates in each examination	50	6	300
		Total ..	2,550

10. I propose that, as regards the Engineer and Subordinate Engineer classes, these new rates should not affect students already in the college, but should apply to surveyors and draughtsmen from the end of the current year.

11. As regards the constitution of the Board I would recommend, on the expiry of the three years for which the present Board has been appointed, that the Board be constituted as follows:—One Royal Engineer or Civil Engineer officer of the Public Works Department, one Civil Engineer not in Government employ and a Mathematician when practicable, one officer of the Educational Department. My object in making this recommendation is to secure the representative character of the Board, and also the presence on the Board of an officer who has kept up his knowledge of the higher mathematics. This is not to be expected of officers whose work has been for years of a practical and executive character.

12. Should these suggestions be approved by Government, I will submit a draft notification for their approval, embodying them in the College Code of Rules.

13. Should, however, the Government not be prepared to raise the fees in the way proposed, I would suggest, as an economical alternative arrangement, that the conduct of the examinations concerned be transferred from 1st January 1888 to the

Commissioner for the Uncovenanted Civil Service Examinations to be included among the examinations held under notification, dated 31st March 1886, through the agency of a "Board of Professional Examiners," as provided in article 4 of that notification.

Order—dated 24th November 1887, Mis. No. 639, Educational.

Pending further experience of the working of present arrangements, the Government are not prepared to alter the decision recorded in G.O., dated 8th January 1887, No. 21, Educational, and from the correspondence recorded in G.O., dated 16th November 1887, No. 627, it would appear that, if further expenditure is proved to be necessary, it should be spent on strengthening the Board and not on increasing the stipends of members.

2. The Government approve of the principle that the examiners of the college should, as far as possible, be conducted by examiners unconnected with the staff, but they are not disposed to sanction the proposal to charge fees for the intermediate examinations, which form a part of the college discipline. The fees specified in paragraph 8 of the foregoing letter are accordingly approved, with the exception of those for the intermediate classes, and subject to the limitation proposed in paragraph 10.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Chief Secretary.

To the Director of Public Instruction, with two enclosures.

READ—also the following paper :—

From H. B. GRIGG, Esq., M.A., Director of Public Instruction, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Ootacamund, 27th June 1888, No. O-300.

With reference to G.O., dated 24th November 1887, No. 639 (Educational), I have the honor to submit, for the consideration of Government, a report (requested to be returned) from the President of the Board of Examiners, College of Engineering.

2. In the first place I would draw the attention of Government to the fact that the intermediate examinations to be held by the Board under Article 5 (*a*) of the College Rules are really the final examinations in the subjects or branches of the subjects concerned. The Board strongly advocate the retention of the system of examining finally in certain subjects at the close of the first or second year of the course, and their reasons may, I think, be accepted, although, to my thinking, the system is too schoolish and cumbersome, and makes public examination rather an accessory of education than its final test.

3. In view of the above recommendation I hope the Government will sanction the levy of fees at final examinations held during the course at the rates mentioned in paragraph 9 of my letter recorded in the Government order above read, substituting for "subordinate class" the words "other classes," as I observe that the Board propose to examine draughtsmen and survey students at the end of the first year finally in certain subjects. I submit a draft notification for the approval of Government.

4. The next point raised is the constitution of the Board and its remuneration. It will be observed that the Board recommend a board of three members with three assistant examiners, one for mathematics, one for science, one for Tamil and Telugu. I entirely object to the transfer of the mathematical work to an assistant examiner. The standard of study in mathematics is very high, and, as proposed in my letter, should devolve on a member of the Board. I therefore do not support their proposal. If the work is too heavy for one examiner, it can in the less advanced subjects be well shared by the engineering examiners, who have until this year done the work unaided. The other two assistant examiners are necessary.

5. As regards the salaries of the staff the Board propose to give the President and the members the salaries recommended in pargraph 7 of my letter, and in addition Rs. 500 to the mathematical assistant examiner, Rs. 200 to the science assistant examiner, and Rs. 150 to the assistant examiner for vernaculars. There is no sufficient reason, I think, for varying my former recommendation beyond raising the provision for assistant examiners from Rs. 250 to Rs. 350. I certainly do not see my way, in view of the fact that the classes are at present very weak (they averaging less than half the strength on which my calculation was based), to proposing a material increase in the cost of the Board, whilst on the other hand I believe it would not be practicable to secure good men to sit on the Board if the additional sum required for assistant examiners, Rs. 500, is to be taken out of the Rs. 2,300 to be allotted to the Board of three members, for I fancy few specialists will undertake the work of the Board if the present rates are not raised. The fees for this year will probably not much exceed Rs. 1,000, thus leaving a net charge on provincial for the Board of Rs. 1,500 approximately.

11 - 11. 8. 87

6. The Board will complete their three years' term as a board next month, and I take this opportunity of proposing the constitution of a fresh board, under article II of the notification, as follows :—

President.

Major Coaker, R.E., Public Works Department.

Members.

Mr. G. H. Stuart, Educational Department.
" J. A. Jones, M.I.C.E., Vice-President, Madras Municipality.

The assistant examiners will be selected later.

ORDER—dated 20th July 1888, No. 429, Educational.

The permanent addition to the Board of Examiners for the College of Engineering of an assistant examiner for science on a yearly remuneration of Rs. 250 is approved, but, in view of the small proportion borne by fees to the total cost, the Government cannot sanction the proposed enhancement of the remuneration paid to the President and members. With the addition of the assistant now sanctioned, the Board will cost Rs. 2,125 a year.

2. The Director's remarks in paragraph 4 of the foregoing letter on the objections to the delegation of the mathematical work to an assistant examiner are concurred in by the Government, and the constitution of the Board recommended in paragraph 6 is approved.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Ag. Chief Secretary.

To the Director of Public Instruction, with enclosure returned.
" Public Works Department.
" Accountant-General.

Exd, J. Moses.

Order thereon 14th August/88
no: 2470 W.

Recorded

Captain RE
under Secy to G

Govt. of {1888} Madras.

EDUCATIONAL.

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 20th July 1888, No. 429.

JULY.

College of Engineering.

Approving of the permanent addition to the Board of Examiners for the — of an Assistant Examiner for Science and the constitution of the Board recommended by the Director of Public Instruction, but declining to sanction the proposed enhancement of the remuneration paid to the President and members of the Board.

R- 11- 8- 88

Replies to the points noted in the Summary of Inspection notes dated 18th April 1888.

(Item No) 4. A register of all documents received in, or issued from, the office is duly kept up. The memo returning the voucher referred to was given to one of the Inspecting Accountants to be shown to the Examiner. Apparently it was not so shown. A copy is herewith enclosed.

5. The Imprest has been reduced to Rs 50—

6. On receipt of G. O. No. 2355 W dated

Order nd September 1887, I sked the Superintending Engineer to make an exception in this district to the rules therein laid down, as they would answer no useful purpose whatever. The Superintending Engineer, while agreeing with my views, Considered it useless to reopen a matter recently decided by Government. I thereupon ordered that the practice of Sub division Officers' Calling for and opening tenders — a practice which had existed in this district for many years with the

the Superintending Engin Sanction — should be discontinued. The upshot of the Change in procedure was that no tenders whatever were received for Several illiterate mistries, who cannot works — a result which I had pointed out was inevitable — and after a delay of two months I authorised the Sub division officer to make the best arrangements he Could for Starting the works, reporting the matter to the Superintending Engineer. With these exceptions works have Since the date above mentioned only been

Order nd September 1887, I sked the Superintending Engineer to make an exception in this district to the rules therein laid down, as they would answer no useful pur-pose whatever. The Superintending Engineer, while agreeing with my views, considered it useless to reopen a matter recently decided by Government. I there-upon ordered that the practice of Sub division Officers' Calling for and Opening tenders — a practice which had existed in this district for many years with the

the Superintending Eng

Sanction — should be discontinued - The upshot of the Change in procedure was that no tenders whatever were received for Several [illegible] are illiterate Mistries, who cannot read [illegible] — a [illegible] sult which I had pointed out was inevi-table — and after a delay of two months I authorised the Sub di-vision officer to make the best arrangements he could for Starting the works, reporting the matter to the Superintending Engineer. With these exceptions works have since the date above mentioned only been or given out on tenders called for and opened by the Executive Engineer.

Similarly when the Contracts for works to be executed during 1888-89 were given out by the Executive Engineer in February last, no tenders whatever were received by the Executive Engineer for at least one half of the works. This is not due to any defect in the notices calling for tenders, such notices being printed in the District Gazette, and being posted all over the District for one month before the date fixed for opening tenders, but is solely due, as has already been

been frequently pointed out by the present and former Executive Engineers, to the fact.

(1) That the majority of the Contractors of this district are illiterate maistries, who cannot read or write, and who will not take up works except in the vicinity of their villages. In addition to this it must be borne in mind

(2) That a large number of the persons who tender for Contracts are pure adventurers, who possess no Capital and who borrow money at 5 per cent per mensem, and break at once if they cannot reap an immediate profit out of the work; and

(3) That the number of competent Contractors is very small in proportion to the large numbers of works

Given out on tenders called for and opened by the Executive Engineer.

Similarly when the Contracts for works to be executed during 1888-89 were given out by the E[illegible] in

pursued until, with the sanction of various Superintending Engineers, viz for the Sub division officers to assemble the Contractors, to show them the estimates, to instruct them to send in tenders forthwith, and, for the reason given in (2), to forward the tenders when received to the Executive Engineer with the Sub division officer's recommendation.

[illegible]

18 | 11-11-8-88

been frequently pointe out by the present and former Executive Engine to the fact:

(1) That the majority of the Contractors of this district are illiterate maistries, who [illegible] on the mischief that would be caused were the Superintending Engineer to select Contracto without prior reference to the Executive Engineer, or the latter (in many Cases) in his turn without reference to the Sub division Officer.

For the reason given in (3) it is quite idle to expect that there will be much Competition in this district. Probably at least three fourths of the people who tender for works belong ~~belong~~ to the Class of "adventurers" and Cannot be trusted

(4)

(5)

been frequently pointed out by the present and former Executive Engineers, to the fact.

(1) That the majority of the Contractors of this district are illiterate maistries, who cannot re

buildings in the neighbourhood of a big town, while for irrigation works, such as the Upper Odai Dam, Vizianarayanum Tank &c situated in remote localities, the Executive Engineer may consider himself very fortunate if he can induce a good Contractor to send in a tender.

(8) 11. 11. 8. 8

(7)

For the reason given in (2,) accurate knowledge of the private means and circumstances of all tenderers is indispensable, and can of course only be obtained by enquiries in the locality where the tenderers reside. It is impossible [illegible] to tenderers, Stre. and in other work in connection with giving out Contracts.

It would take time to point out other objections to the Code rules in reference to works in this district. This has already been done both by me* and by former Executive Engineers, and as a matter of fact the Code rules have never been followed until quite recently, simply because

---

* Vide my letter to the S.E.
No 2026, dated 5 Oct. /87
No 3198, dated 21 Jan. /88
No 3455, dated 22 Feb. /88

-carry out works of the simplest character. The only works for which there is any thing like competition between trustworthy contractors are for buildings in the neighbourhood of a big town, while for irrigation works, such as the Upper Odai Dam, Vizianarayanum Tank &c situated in remote localities, the Executive Engineer may consider himself very fortunate if he can induce a good contractor to send in a tender.

~~undertaking an useless duty~~). Half my time during the last six months has been taken up in running after contractors, in correspondence with the sub division officers with regard to tenders, and in other work in connection with giving out contracts.

It would take time to point out other objections to the Code rules in reference to works in this district. This has already been done both by me* and by former Executive Engineers, and as a matter of fact the Code rules have never been followed until quite recently, simply because

* Vide my letters to the S.E.
No 2026, dated 5 Oct. /87
No 3198, dated 21 Jan. /88
No 3455, dated 22 Feb. /88

ey will not work, and it has probably seemed more important to Superintending Engineers that works shall be properly carried out rather than that red-tape rules shall not be infringed.

I consider that the following relaxation of the rules is indispensable.

(a) For works below Rs 1000 tenders to be called for, and opened by Sub division officers, the tenders received being then sent on to the Executive Engineer with the Sub division officers' recommendation. This will obviate the useless formality, (which

in a tender.

I agree in the Supg Engrs arguments & endorse his recommendations, except as regards emergent works.

which now occurs) by which tenders for a large number of petty works are called for by the Executive Engineer with the result that

(1) either no replies are received, or

(2) if replies are received all the tenders sent in have to be forwarded to the Sub division officer with a request that he will enquire into the circumstances of each ~~tender~~ tenderer and report to this office.

(b) For all other works, irrespective of amount, tenders to be called for by the

Executive Engineer, a Contractor Selected and the tender, Bonds &c sent to the Superintending Engineer for approval. I can see no useful object whatever in requiring the Superintending Engineer to do more than this, and it seems to me that all he can possibly do in the matter is to see that the Bond &c is drawn up properly.

(C) As far as I am aware the Code rules do not even provide that emergent works, such as breaches &c can, failing the possibility of the work being done departmentally

departmentally, be at once put in hand by a Selected Contractor without tenders being Called for. Departmental work on an extensive scale is an impossibility in this district, where labourers will not work without advance and good maistries are most difficult to procure. A relaxation of the Code rules is therefore necessary empowering the Executive Engineer

or a

I am decidedly of opinion, that emergent work, where as a rule neither an Estt nor a specification can be drawn out prior to the work being started, should not be given on Contract —

J.W.B

to start all emergent works by Contract without Calling for tenders.

(d) Finally, when after a months notice by the Executive Engineer or Sub division Officer, no tenders have been received, the Executive Engineer be empowered to make the best arrangements he can for carrying out works.

7.

~~for approval.~~

7. The Course followed ~~on~~ in all these 9 cases has been the same as that pursued for many years past without any objection being made. I must here again bring prominently to notice that the only alteration made in the manner of giving out Contracts since I have been in the Division is to do so in stricter accordance with the rules on the subject, viz to take away the power from Sub division officers of Calling for d acce new, ting, t ten

the Executive Engineer's approval, tenders. What is now objected to by the Examiner has been done for years without any objection being made. The fact that I brought the whole question of the difficulties experienced in regard to Contracts to the inspecting Examiner's notice, and requested him to look thoroughly into the matter, as also that his Accountants were occupied for a fortnight in over-~~packing~~ hauling the Office, may account for this.

8. In the case of the Upper Odai Dam the Special [illegible] of the

the Superintending Engineer was obtained (Vide Superintending Engineer's Endorsement No 3701 A dated 9th September 1887) to Continue the work under the only Contractor in the whole district Competent to execute it. The trouble met with in the progress of this work, involving in two cases legal proceedings against Government (which were subsequently Compromised) has been reported in full, and is largely traceable to Contracts having been given, under the open tender system, men without Capital who should never have been employed.

In one other case mentioned tenders were called for, but no replies were received; while in the two remaining cases tenders were not called for as it was known to be perfectly useless to do so, the Contractors selected only taking up the works as a favour. In none of the three cases did the Superintending Engineer make any objection to the course followed, having before him, in special reports, the great difficulties experienced in

in this district in placing Contracts.

9. As bonds were executed in Piece Workers agreement their transactions were accounted for in the Piece Workers Accounts Form No. 16. G. O. No. 94 W dated 11th January 1888, defining the terms "Contract" and "Piece Work," was only received in this Office on the 12th February 1888.

10. The works noticed here being of an emergent nature were started in anticipation of sanction to the estimates.

11. As the works

para 936 of the P.

were given on Contract on the Piece Workers agreement, the bills relating to such works were prepared in the Piece workers bill (Form No 14 A) vide also reply to item No 9.

13. The necessary sanction has been obtained vide G. O. No 2011 dated 21st March 1888.

14. The Executive Engineer reported the State of Confusion in which the records were in on his first arrival in the district, and long ago obtained temporary establishment to arrange them properly. The work will take

a

a long time.

15. Part III was not filled in as there were no arrears due to the parties though payments were made during the month.

16. Will be attended to in future.

17. The Shed was not newly built but was reconstructed with the old materials available from the old sluice dismantled. As there was a large saving under Contingencies, and as the Cost of the reconstruction of the Shed was only Rs 130, it was rebuilt.

para 936 of the P. Revision

ib

in Co

20. No penalty was inforced, as it is not understood that the Code rule referred to implies that an Executive Engineer is not to use his discretion in such a matter. It is the rule and not the exception in some parts of the district for Contractors to fail in point of time, and if penalties were invariably inforced, without regard to the Circumstances of each Case, the State of things would speedily become worse than they are at present. Where I have reason to believe that Contractors fail from ~~to arr.~~ b of Knowledge of The wor. their

I quite agree with the Exec. Engr. Wherever we have got difficulty in getting Contracts taken up at all, any harsh infliction of penalties would only add to our difficulties.

A very sufficient reason for our [illegible] getting into arrears.

and not from Carelessness their business, I am Certainly not disposed to inflict fines.

21. The Contract Certificates received from the Sub divisions with Cash extracts for the last period of December 1887, viz 20th to 31st were not posted into the Ledger as the Accountant and his assistant had been engaged for a fortnight in furnishing information to the Inspecting Accountants and the Examiner on their inspection.

24. The Accountant States that as soon as the bills are received from the Sub division with their C ~~to the Sub~~ ed

Cash book, they are Checked either by the Accountant or by his Assistant, but the Measurement Sheets are not Checked in the Divisional Office, as they are Checked by the Sub divisional Clerk as soon as received from the Overseers before payments are made. He adds that if the Measurement Sheets are to be Checked a third time in the Division Office, it will be a difficult task for him and his assistant to keep up with their other work, as 65 bills are received on an average in each month. The Office Establishment is at

present

present insufficient to Cope properly with the work it has to do, and at times work falls very much into arrears, though I am satisfied that every member of the Office establishment does his best to keep up with work. I cannot afford, from my present establishment, to give another Clerk solely for accounts duty, and if it is Considered that the responsibility for final Checking of the Measurement Sheets of works in the Sub division is to be done in the Executive Engineer's Office and not to be left to the Sub

Division Clerk, and the Accountant is held to be right in his Contention that neither he nor his Assistant has time for the duty, an additional clerk to my Office will be necessary.

27. The excesses were not noticed in previous years and the source of them is not now traceable. These excesses have been brought into the Return for the half year ending 31st March 1888.

30. The books are Complete in all respects.

32. The entries noticed have been signed and the Service books are Complete pr

All I should consider necessary is careful inspection of all documents & that he completely checks a good percentage of the measurement Sheets

I do not see how the Exec Eng is to keep the service books of men not employed under his immediate orders. If they get leave from the Tahsildar or other Rev officer, how can the Exec Eng book it?

J.W. Rundall
Supg Eng

31 May 1888

33. Attended to

34. As these lascars are still under the orders of the Revenue Department, Service Books were not opened for them along with other Conservancy establishments. This will now be done on receipt of information as to the Service &c from the Revenue Department.

A.S. Russell
Executive Engineer
Tinnevelly Division

Palamcottah
22nd May 1888

ENCLOSURE 195
12 JUN 88
EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS

T.N.
2/333/88

E.3
P.W. 5199/88
10628

SUPDG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
4/953/TN
15 OCT. 88
P.W.D.
SIXTH CIRCLE

Tinnevelly Division

Replies to the points noted in the Summary of Inspection Notes of the Deputy Examiner of P.W.A.

Notes of inspection by H. G. ... is ...
Esquire, of the office o
Division, on 16 to

ENCLOSURE
12 JUN 88
EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS

A. S. Russell, E
charge of the D
Executive Engine
The present Ac
vadivelu Mood
charge of the ac
2
above office by
in November
G. O. 3087 W of 2
3
number
(1) The Venka
W. V. Bak
neer.
(2) The Sheri
M. R. R.
Sub Engine
have dra
contractors
of materials.
4. There are only two imprest holders, both recouped by the Executive Engineer namely
Supervisors

T.N.
1/333/88 **D. P. W.**

From

A. S. Russell Esqre
Executive Engineer
Tinnevelly Division.

To

The Detached Officer
Srivilliputur

Station Palamcottah

E.2
P.W. 519
733
10633

No. 2709

Dated 2 December 1887
Despatched
Received

ENCLOSURES.

Reference

SUPDG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
3/953/TN
15 OCT. 88
P.W.D.
SIXTH CIRCLE

The Detached Officer is requested to enter the parti-culars of work done a the measurements thereo in part III of the enclose Nominal Muster Roll (Voucher No. 2 of his Imprest account date 28th Ultimo) and to return the voucher without delay.

(Signed) A. S. Russell
Exe: Engineer

(True Copy)

A. S. Russell
Executive Engineer

ENCLOSURE 1195 12 JUN 88 EXAMINER, P.W. ACCOUNTS

ENCLOSURE 1195 12 JUN 88 EXAMINER, P.W. ACCOUNTS

F.N. 2/333/88

E.3

P.W. ~~5799~~/88
16638

SUPDG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE 9/1953/N 13 OCT. 88 P.W.D. SIXTH CIRCLE

Tinnevelly Division

Replies to the points noted in the Summary of Inspection Notes of the Deputy Examiner of P.W.A.

ENCLOSURE 12 JUN 88 EXAMINER, P.W. ACCOUNTS

Notes of inspection by H. Raines Esquire, of the office of the Executive Engineer Tinnevelly Division, on 16th to 19th January 1888.

The present Executive Engineer Mr A. S. Russell, Executive Engineer 3rd Grade, took charge of the Division from Mr A. M. Hayes, Executive Engineer 4th Grade, on the 28th February 1887. The present Accountant M. R. R. V. A. Sundaravadivelu Moodelliar, Accountant 5th Grade, took charge of the accounts on 23rd April 1887.

2. The last examination of the above office by an Accounts Officer was in November 1886, Vide papers printed with G. O. 3087 W of 22nd November 1886.

3. The Sub-Divisions are 2 in number

(1) The Tenkarai Sub-Division under Mr W. V. Baker, Honorary Assistant Engineer.

(2) The Shermadavi Sub-Division under M. R. R. S. S. Raghavachariar Avergal, Sub Engineer 3rd Grade, both these officers have drawing accounts and pay contractors, piece-workers and suppliers of materials.

4. There are only two imprest holders, both recouped by the Executive Engineer namely

Supervisors

Supervisors Messrs G. C. Fitzgerald and M. R. R. Arumanayagam, each with an imprest of Rs 100/-

5. The balance of the Executive Engineer's drawing account at the close of 1887 was proved correct. The cash book was compared with the pass book and checked for two months, as were also Sub-Divisional cash extracts and imprest accounts.

6. The cash book is kept by the accountant, while the more important duty of auditing Sub-Divisional cash accounts, imprest cash accounts, contractors' bills and work abstracts is left to a Clerk and neglected by the accountant, who says he has no time to attend to it. The accountant himself prepares salary, and travelling allowance and contingent bills too, and does other mere ink-work, all quite voluntarily and under no compulsion, while the more important work of accounting is left very much to the Clerks. Now that the matter is for the first time brought to his notice, the Executive Engineer agrees to at once set the accountant free for his legitimate work.

7. The Sub-Divisional Officers' cash extracts reach the Executive Engineer three times a month, and are generally supported by vouchers complete.

8. The Divisional cash book is not certified at the close of the month by the accountant, as having posted the cash abstract book.

9. Imprest Voucher No $\frac{2}{28}$ of 6th November 1887 (a Nominal Muster roll) for Rs 6-12-0 was not available for audit. It was said to have been sent to the imprest holder, but no record of the despatch of it exists in the Office.

10. The imprest accounts are generally recouped with sufficient frequency, and promptitude, but M. R. R. Supervisor Arumanayagam's expenditure being rather under Rs 50/- per month, his imprest might perhaps be reduced.

11. The accounts of works for three months were thoroughly audited through work abstracts into initial accounts, measurements being checked, and materials at site accounts being thoroughly analysed. The agreements and accounts of contractors and piece-workers were also thoroughly checked.

12. There being but little petty supervision and a great scarcity of labor, no works in this Division are executed departmentally. The bulk of the work is done

by

Sup

by contract, but there has been much
difficulty in placing large contracts
requiring skilled labor. In this and other
engineer-
divisions the Local Fund Board's Engineer-
operations
ing Operations are at such rates and of such
department
magnitude as to quite outbid this Department
for labor as well as for contractors. The work
offered by the Local Fund Engineer is not
only more simple, road making or mending
for instance, but more continuous than
department
the jobs offered by this Department.

13. Such men as seriously
division
contract for work in this Division are not
district
only scattered in the District far beyond
reach of any publication, but are unable to
read any language. Advertising for tenders therefore
has been found only a great waste of time, response,
if any, coming from men of no experience or
capital, or serious intention of fulfilling their
contracts unless it should prove very remunerative.
There are a few skilled masons and men of
the maistrie class who tender for works when
invited, but as the choice of, and arrangement
with, any of these men must ultimately be left
sub-divisional officers
to the Sub-Divisional Officers, (the Executive
Engineer knowing nothing of them) the Executive
Engineer considers it a saving of time to allow
sub-divisional officers
Sub-Divisional Officers to open tenders, and has

so

so ordered, and that when opened all the tenders
sub-division
are to be forwarded to him with the Sub-Division
al officer's
al Officer's recommendation and report regarding
each. This is not in accordance with G.O. 2355 W
of 2d September 1887, and under ordinary
circumstances (though doubtless all tenders would
be sent forward as received and with the most
scrupulous bonâfide report) it might be
sub-divisional officers
inexpedient to give Sub-Divisional Officers
other than Gazetted Officers such complete
control over the contractors as the opening and
selection of tenders would generally involve.

14. Remarks regarding the following works are particularised in the headings of columns 4 to 8. A cross opposite a work in either column shows that the remark in the heading applies to that work

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Name of work	Amount of Estimate	Name of contractor or piece-worker	Contract made by Executive Engineer in anticipation of superior authority	Contract made without inviting tenders	Contract agreement exists, but no ledger account with contractor	Piece worker engaged without written agreement	Bills in wrong form (14 A instead of 14)
Providing with falling shutters &c	Rs 28,740	Pommai Sawier Coomo		×			
Upper Odai Dam Repairs to the bund Korkai Tank	1,070	Pakianatha Nadar	×	×			
Demarcating the bed of Korampallam tank	830	Subramania Pillay		×			
Raising the left bank of Thambraparni River above Strivaikuntham Anicut	6,654	Do		×			
Repairs to bund of Periakolum Tank	230	Nallaperumal Pillay		×	×		×
Repairing the bank of Ammanpuram tank	210.	Esuvadian Nadar				×	
Do. Do. Seemmavadi tank	310	Do				×	
Repairing Manur anicut head sluice	140	Parama Nadar				×	
Raising lower portion of Ramadeen channel and the tank dependent on it	113.	Chinnakannoo Pillay				×	
Drainage of Sathur River	197	Pakianatha Pillay				×	
Clearing silt in North main Channel	1,650	Pakianatha Nadar				×	
Raising the left bank of Tambraparni River below Strivaikuntham Anicut	7,600	Visvanatha Pillay, Krishna Iyer, Kupposwami Naidoo, Pakianath Nadar, Esuvadian Nadar and Sivagnana Pillay			×		×
Reconstructing a sluice in Shadayaneri tank	1650	Muthukottan			×		×
Improving the Submagistrate's cutcherry at Tuticorin	1580	Appavoo Pillay			×		×
Renewing revetment of Srivikuntam Periakolum Tank	9620	Subramania Pillay			× ×		× ×

Name of work	Amount of Estimate	Name of contractor or piece worker Piece worker	Contract made by Executive Engineer in anticipation of superior authority	Contract made without inviting tenders	Contract agreement exists, but no ledger account with contractor	Piece worker engaged without written agreement	Bills in wrong form (14 A instead of 14).
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Clearing silt in Kodagam channel	2,250	Ninar Pillay			×		×
Clearing silt in Poleam channel	3,120	Ootheravachagam Pillay			×		×
Do in Tinnevelly channel	1,550	Perianayagam Pillay			×		×
Improving the Nattur Melakolum tank	.	Muthukathan	×				
Improvements to Vizianarayanam tank and channel	.	S Ninar Pillay	×				
Anicut across Kakanada River	.	S Venkatarama Iyer	×				
Improving the Kakanallur channel	.	Sudalaimuthu Pillay	×				
Raising revetment Veerasigamani Periakolum	.	S Venkatarama Iyer	×				
Improving the Pavur Channel and tank	.	R. Veerasamy Naidu V. Kuppier and Arasappah Pillay	×				
Sub Registrar's office at Radhapuram	.	Veerapillay	×				
Pachanallur surplus weir	.	Perianayagam Pillay	×				

Name of work	Amount of Estimate	Name of contractor or piece-worker Piece worker	Contract made by Executive Engineer in anticipation of superior authority	Contract made without inviting tenders	Contract agreement exists, but no ledger account with contractor	Piece worker engaged without written agreement	Bills in wrong form (14 A instead of 14).
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8.
Clearing silt in Kodagam channel	2,250	Nirrar Pillay			x		x
Clearing silt in Poleaw channel	3,120	Ootheravachagam Pillay			x		x
Do in Tinnevelly channel	1,550	Parimanayagam Pillay			x		x
Improving the Nattur Melakolum tank	..	Muthukothan	x				
Improvements to Vizianarayanam tank and channel	..	S. Nirrar Pillay	x				
Anicut across Kakanada River	.	S Venkatarama Iyer	x				
Improving the Kakanallur channel	..	Sudalaimuthu Pillay	x				
Raising revetment Veerasigamani Periakolum	..	S. Venkatarama Iyer	x				
Improving the Pavur Channel and tank	.	R. Veerasamy Naidu V. Kuppier and Arasappah Pillay	x				
Sub Registrar's office at Radhapuram	.	Veerapillay	x				
Pachanallur surplus weir	.	Perianayagam Pillay	x				

15 All contract Bonds bonds are executed on paper with adhesive labels and not on paper with impressed stamps as required by chapter III, Section 9 (b) of the Stamp act.

16. Papankal channel - Constructing a sluice in lieu of Kulianeri Supply Sluice Estimate Rs 200/-

This contribution work was commenced without the sanction of Government ~~para 1339.~~ in continuation contravention of Code para 1339.

17. It took a long time to produce papers relating to any account matter, shewing that the records are not in first rate order. This was borne out by enquiries on the subject, but the Executive Engineer is taking this up thoroughly.

18. Reconstructing surplus weir at Pachanallur, Rs 600/-

Part III of work abstract is not filled in, although departmental payments were made in that month.

19. In part I of work abstract when there is more than one contract certificate, the different items in the bill appertaining to each sub-head should be distinctly noted, and a total struck in the last column instead of adding the different items on a bit of paper, and then entering the total only in the work abstract.

20. Expenditure on the construction

of

of a lascar's shed is debited to "contingencies" of the above Estimate estimate. It is desirable that the item should be shown as a distinct sub-head.

21. Improving Vizianarayanam tank and channel, Rs 23,850.

The work abstract for October 1887 is not signed by the accountant but is signed by the Executive Engineer.

22. Here again two different items in a contract certificate appertaining to one sub-head of estimate have been entered as one item in work abstract, the totals being made on a bit of paper.

23. Part III of work abstract is not filled in although there are payments to maistries &c during the month.

24. Improving Kakanallur channel, Rs 17,205.

When a work abstract is prepared for a work which is done by contract, simply with the object of bringing in, the petty supervision charges, and when the items in the Certificate are such as to admit of direct posting into the register of works, the total value of work done as per contract certificate may be entered in a lump sum in the work abstract, instead of unnecessarily copying the charges on each sub-head in detail in the work abstract.

checked

25. Korkai Tank – Repairs to bund of – Estimate Rs 1,070

According to his agreement, the contractor Sakianatha Nadar should have completed his work by the 15th July 1886, instead of which the work was completed in December 1887. The work was first measured on 31st October 1887. A reference regarding the above was made to the Tenkari Sub-Division in November 1887, his reply is still awaited.

26. It may be said that as a rule measurements of work are frequent and payments promptly made.

27. The contractors' ledger is not written up as work is measured, or as payments are made. Payments made in January 1888 by the divisional office Divisional Office to contractors are not yet entered in the Ledger, nor are all those made in December 1887.

28. Measurement books are never compared with measurement lists after the arrival of the former in the office, and measurement lists are cancelled only after the accounts to which they relate are submitted to the Examiner. It must be added that certain measurement books compared with lists were found to agree in the detail.

29. The instructions contained in Code para 1367 are not observed. Bills paid in Sub-Divisional Offices are not on arrival in the Executive Engineer's office checked with measurement lists, except as regards total quantity of work done, the accountant's idea being that as the checking of details has been done already in the sub-divisional office Sub-Divisional Office, it need not be done again.

30. Work abstracts come up from the sub-divisional offices Sub-Divisional Offices ready made – there is no date stamped upon them on arrival, and except a sort of audit by a clerk, there is no checking of these important documents in the Executive Engineer's Office, which however bear signs of occasional examination by the Executive Engineer himself.

31. The Budget registers are in order.

32. Screw gearing shutters indented for in June 1887 from the P. W. D. Workshops whence they were received, in December 1887, as well as other similar items should have found place in the register of liabilities.

33. The consolidated return of Tools and Plant for 30th September 1887 was

checked

checked with Sub-divisional returns.

34 In the following items the consolidated return differs from the Sub-Divisional returns.

Name of article	As per consolidated return Balance on 31 March 1887	 Balance on 30 Septr/87	As per Sub-Divisional Return Balance on 31 March 1887	 Balance on 30 Septr/87
Staves Levelling Tellescopic	37	37	38	41
Crowbars	88	48	89	64
Hammers Sledge	68	66	73	71

35 The articles in charge of Sub-Division al Officers are certified to have been counted by the Sub-Divisional Officers during the half year.

36. The consolidated return of Tools and Plant for the half year ending 31st March 1888 has been opened out, and is posted up to the end of December 1887.

37 Famine tools are mixed up with general tools both in the Store rooms and in the Divisional Return of Tools and Plant, it is thought desirable that the famine tools should be separately stocked and accounted for, as they have to be separately reported upon half yearly by the Executive Engineer.

38. The Service Postage Label

account

account was checked for two months (December 1887 and January 1888), and found in order.

39. The Register of buildings is apparently in order.

40. Claims for Travelling allowance of Lower Subordinates, Office and Petty Establishment from March to November 1887 inclusive, were checked and found to be correct. Claims of lascars attached to the Division Office are noted in pencil on odd bits of paper, and lack the Executive Engineers initials as having passed them. The above slips are in tamil: it is desirable that an English version should be always on hand. In cases where daily allowance is claimed, the hour of departure and the places visited should be noted.

The journals of the Lower Subordinates are sent on to the Superintending Engineer. Under Code para 531 they should be filed in the Division Office.

41. The service books of the following individuals having been sent out for reattestation by subordinates

were

were not available in Office

(1) M. R. R. G. N. Subroyalu Naidu, Overseer 2^d Grade
(2) Thanuvan, Lascar
Madakone
(3) Sudal mada kone, Lascar
(4) Moothia Pillay, Do
(5) Sudalaimoothu Pillay, Do
(6) Veeravagu Pillay, Do
(7) Subboo Pillai, Do
(8) Subramania Pillay, Do
(9) Sivan Pillay, Do
(10) Ramakone, Do
(11) Permanayagam, Do
(12) Pakiamthevan, Do
(13) Hussain Sahib, Do
(14) Vallia thevan, Do
(15) Abraham, Do
(16) Sudalaimoothu Pillay, Do
(17) Moothoosami Pillay, Do

42. It is doubted whether a Supervisor who is not a sub-divisional officer, would be "the head of the office" of a lascar working under such Supervisor according to the intention of the heading of the last column of page 5 of the Service book. in which column many service books in this Division bear only the signature of a
sub-divisional officer
subordinate not nor a Sub-Divisional Office.

43. In the service book of lascar Syed Ahmed the entries in the first page opened on 7^th July 1884 have not been signed by any officer

44. In the service book of Shaik Moideen Sahib, head lascar Lascar, Hamadien Channel, the appointment and promotions &c have not been signed by any Officer

45. The service books of the following employees require reattestation.

Name and rank	Date of last attestation
A. Theruvetty, Lascar	6^th December 1881.
Nataraja Iyer, Draftsman	15^th June 1882

46. The service books for the
lascars
following Lascars have not been, but should be opened out.

Sudalai Eswarapillai
Viraragoo Pillay
Devanayagam Pillay

At Madura
23rd January 1888

(Signed) H. Rainier
Inspecting Officer

O.N. 1362 d/ 18th April 1888.

Forwarded, with the accompanying summary and remarks, for the information and orders of Government.

4/333/88

(C No. 93.)

Division Tinnevelly Summary of Inspection Notes dated 18th April /88

Item No.	Para. of Inspection Notes.	Irregularity noticed.	Code or other order bearing on the subject.	Examiner's Remarks.
1	3.	Irregular payment of contractors, piece-workers and suppliers by Sub-Divisional Officers.	1371.	1. The question of who is to be authorized to make these payments has been taken up separately, see G. O. No. 3207 W. dated 24th November 1887.
2	6.	Neglect of accountant in regard to audit of Sub-Divisional accounts &c, owing to his being engaged on other work that might well be done by the office.	374	2. The Executive Engineer has promised to alter the arrangement.
3.	8	Non-entry of certificate at foot of cash book in regard to posting of cash abstract book, by accountant.	Entry at foot of Cash Book Form 143.	3. The Accountant will be directed to attend to this.
4	9.	Want of a record in regard to return of certain vouchers to Sub-Divisional officers		4. There should be a register of all documents received into, or issued from the office.
5	10.	Imprest of M.R.R. G. Arumanayagam Supervisor, susceptible of reduction	1575	5. The Executive Engineer might consider whether the imprest can be reduced. The amount is very small

Item No.	Para. of Inspection Notes.	Irregularity noticed.	Code or other order bearing on the subject.	Examiner's Remarks.
6	13	Tenders for contracts opened by Sub Divisional Officers and sent on to Executive Engineer with recommendation	1350	6. If the Executive Engineer finds a difficulty in carrying out the Code rules, it is thought that he should apply through the Superintending Engineer for sanction of Government for such relascation of the rules as may be considered necessary and suitable.
7	14	Irregularities in regard to Contracts (1) Contracts made by the Executive Engineer in anticipation of Superior authority in 9 cases.	1350 1354	7. Apparently requires the Superintending Engineer's attention.
8	„	(2) Failure to call for tenders in 4 cases	1355	8. See remarks against item 6.
9.	„	(3) Failure to enter transactions with contractors in contractors' Ledger in 9 cases	1868	9. Requires the attention of the accountant.
10	„	(4) Failure to execute agreements with piece-workers in 6 cases		10. It seems a question whether, in the case of piece-work properly so called, any written agreement is necessary. The question will be taken up in connection with the subject of contract forms now under consideration in communication

Item No.	Para. of Inspection Notes.	Irregularity noticed.	Code or other order bearing on the subject.	Examiner's Remarks.
				10. (Contd). communication with the Government Solicitor.
11	14	(5) Transactions with contractors entered in the bill for Piece-workers', Form 14 A, instead of contract certificate form 14 in 9 cases.	1370	11. Accountant should bring such cases to the Executive Engineer's notice and have proper forms used.
12	15	(6) Irregular stamping of contract bonds	Stamp Act, Chapter III, Sections 8 and 9th	12. The opinion of the Government Solicitor has been requested as to the description of stamp required. On receipt of his reply the matter will be submitted for orders.
13	16.	Want of Government sanction to putting a contribution work on hand	1339	13. The necessary sanction should now be obtained.
14	17.	Unsatisfactory condition of records		14. The Executive Engineer has taken this matter up.
15	18 23	Incomplete state of work abstracts	1758 III	15. Part III of the work abstract should be completed when there are any arrears to be recorded.
16	19 22	Details of charges to the same sub head for work done by more than		16. Accountant should see that the

Item No.	Para. of Inspection Notes.	Irregularity noticed.	Code or other order bearing on the subject.	Examiner's Remarks.
16 (Contd).	19 22	than one contractor not entered in work abstract &ca		16 (Contd). the work abstract is posted in proper detail
17	20	Irregular debit to contingencies of a work	936.	17. The circumstances under which the construction of the shed was permitted under case of a repair estimate, seem to require explanation. The cost of the shed is not stated.
18	21	Failure of accountant to sign a work abstract		18. Accountant should attend to this.
19	24	Unnecessary copying of a contract certificate in the work abstract of a certain work	1760	19. Do
20	25	Failure of a contractor to complete a work within the stipulated time	1368.	20. Code para 1368 requires officers to strictly enforce the terms of contracts. It is not stated whether any penalty was enforced.
21.	27	Delay in posting the contractors' Ledger	1868	21. Should be attended to by the accountant.
22	28	Failure to compare measurement lists with measurement books when opportunity offers		22. There is no rule requiring comparison of measurement sheets, and measurement books. It is for Government to say whether such

Item No.	Para. of Inspection Notes.	Irregularity noticed.	Code or other order bearing on the subject.	Examiner's Remarks.
22 (Contd)	28	offers, and delay in cancelling measurements for which bills have been prepared.		22 (Contd). a check should be excercised. I am inclined to think that occasional inspection of measurement books with a view to seeing whether they give indications of recording bonâfide measurements as taken on the spot, is all that is required.
23	29.	Want of attention to the rules in Code para 1367 regarding monthly measurements.	1367.	23. This subject is being separately considered, see G. O. No. 3130 W. dated 19' November 1887.
24	29.	Insufficient check of bills paid by Sub-Divisional Officers in the Executive Engineer's Office	374	24. Should be attended to by the accountant.
25.	30	Insufficient audit in the Executive Engineer's office of work abstracts prepared by Sub-Divisional Officers, and date of receipt not entered on them.	374 1759	25. Do
26	32	Failure to enter certain known liabilities		

Item No.	Para. of Inspection Notes.	Irregularity noticed.	Code or other order bearing on the subject.	Examiner's Remarks.
26 (Contd)	32.	liabilities in the Register of liabilities	1595	26. Should be attended to by the accountant.
27	34	Differences between the consolidated return of Tools and Plant and the sub-divisional returns.		27. The discrepancies should be enquired into. They seem to require explanation.
28	37.	Want of separation of Famine Tools on general list		28. The orders referred to by the Inspecting Officer are contained in G. O. No. 940 W dated 28th March 1883. This order has ~~now~~ never been codified, and therefore under Code para 5 it is not now binding. It is for Government to say whether they wish the order to be revived.
29	40	Claims of travelling allowances of office lascars drawn up in Tamil on odd bits of paper		29. Forms for use in connection with these claims, will, it is hoped, be submitted for approval in a few days.
30	41	Service books (17) not available at inspection, having been sent out for re-attestation by subordinates	864 I	30. The Executive Engineer should report after personal inspection, whether the books which were not produced at inspection, are now complete in all respects.
31	42	Service books of lascars in many cases only signed		

Item No.	Para. of Inspection Notes.	Irregularity noticed.	Code or other order bearing on the subject.	Examiner's Remarks.
31 (Contd)	42	signed by subordinates under whom they are working, and not by Sub-Divisional Officer or Executive Engineer. (doubtful whether such subordinate can be considered the head of the office.)		31. This question will be separately submitted for orders.
32	43. 44	Entries in first page of a lascar's service book, and in another case the appointment, promotion &c not signed by any officer	864	32. These omissions should now be remedied; and the fact reported.
33	45	Want of re-attestation of service books in 2 cases	864 Note 1.	33. Should be attended to by the Executive Engineer and a report made when this has been done.
34	46.	Service books not opened out in 3 cases	864	34 ——— Do ———

Major R.E.
Examiner P. W. Accounts
Madras.
29.
1/4.

ENCLOSURE
1195
12 JUN 88
EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS

Item No.	Para. of Inspection Notes.	Irregularity noticed.	Code or other order bearing on the subject.	Examiner's Remarks.

ENCLOSURE
12 JUN 88
EXAMINER, P.W. ACCOUNTS

E.7

PWC No. ~~3640~~

From. I.N 5/333/86 I.N 1/155/88 ~~5109~~ 10633

Major. C.H.P. Christie. R.E.

Examiner. P.W. Accounts

Madras.

no 3207 w a/ 24-11-87
" 3130 w a/ 19-11-87
" 2355 w a/ 2-9-87
" 3087 w a/ 22-11-86
" 940 w a/ 28-3-83

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
No. 1/480
8/5/88
P.W.D.
TINNEVELLY

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
7/953/IN
15 OCT. 88
P.W.D.
SIXTH CIRCLE.

To.

The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department.

Rq 19.4.88

B. No. 1250 W d/ 27-4-88

O.R. 1362 of 18.4.88

Tinnevelly Division

Note of inspection by H. Rainer, Esquire, of the office of the Executive Engineer — Forwards with the accompanying summary and remarks for the information and orders of Government.

5109/16 - 23/4 w 24/4

No 822

Tinnevelly Division Office
Palamcottah 23rd May 1888
Despd 28th

From

A.S. Russell Esqre
Executive Engineer
Tinnevelly Division

To

The Superintending Engineer
6th Circle.

Sir

Enclosures 5

× herewith returned.

With reference to your Endorsement No. 112 I.N dated 30th ultimo, on G.O. No. 1250 W× dated 27th ultimo, I have the honor to submit herewith replies to all points requiring explanation.

7

2. I beg particularly to draw your attention to my remarks regarding Contracts. In my letters noted in the margin I have already explained the difficulties met with in this district in placing Contracts and the tendency of certain of the Code rules to answer no purpose except to hamper work. Briefly these difficulties may be sum

No. 2026 dated 5th October/87.
No. 3455 dated 22nd February/88
No 3198 dated 31 Jan/88.

but see that the Contract is properly drawn up, and can have no knowledge of what is indispensable in choosing a Contractor in this district, viz: accurate information regarding his private means and circumstances.

4. Unless the proposals I have made, with regard to the modifications necessary in Code rules, are made, works cannot be carried out except after much trouble and delay have been experienced, for which the Code rules and not the Executive Engineer must in future be blamed.

5. I beg you will clearly explain to the Chief Engineer, either by sending on this letter or otherwise that, as far as possible, I have complied with Code rules; that in no case have I made the smallest deviation, [illegible]m the methods allowed for years in [illegible] district, by various Superintending Engineers, in regard to the giving out of Contracts, except by withdrawing the Concession formerly permitted to sub division officers of calling for and giving out Contracts subject to the Executive Engineer's approval. Any one reading the Report of the inspecting Examiner would hardly be aware of the fact that the practices now stated to be objectionable have existed for years without objection being made.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obdt Servt

A. Russell.
Executive Engineer

RE
26/5

do not

No 253 T.N. Enclo: 6

Submitted with its accompaniments to the Chi Engr for the favor of orders.

2 The orders in the Code regarding Contracts are not suitable to the conditions under which work has to be executed in outstations, though there is no difficulty in carrying them out in large towns, as regards works at or near those towns.

3 There is the same trouble more or less in all Districts in this Circle, tho' most trouble is experienced in Tinnevelly.

4. I consider the rules require to be made more elastic & workable.

31 May

J. W. Rundall
Supg Engr
VI Circle

Trichy
1888.

12 JUN 1888
ENCLOSURES
P. W. ACCOUNTS

Ref: sent No 112 T.N. of 30-4-88

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OF
No. 333 T.N
30 MAY. 88
P.W.D.
SIXTH CIRCLE.

From
The Executive Engineer
Tinnevelly Dn

To
The Supg Engineer
VI Circle

No ~~822~~

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OF
1/953/T.N
15 OCT. 88
P.W.D.
SIXTH CIRCLE.

Dated 23rd }
Despd 28th } May 1888
Recd }

No. 2466 W. d/ 13th August 1888

Enclo: 5

Notes of Inspection by the Dy Examiner of the Office of the Executive Engineer Tinnevelly Dn

Submits replies to points requiring explanation in the as required in G.O. No 1250 W. of 27. 4. 88.

W d/ 27.4.88.
No 87 W d/ 24-11.87
" 3130 W d/ 19.11.87
" 2355 W d/ 2-9.87
" 3087 W d/ 22.11.86.
" 2161 W. d/ 16-7-88
" 2196 C – 11-6-88
No. 2196 C d/ 11th June 1888

To

C

For favour of remarks.

6.6.88

D. W.

7/6/88.

P. W. D. 6TH CIRCLE.

EXAMINED
No. 1195
12 JU[illegible] 1888
ENCLOSURES

From

The Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No. 253 T.N.

Dated 31/ May
Received 4/6/88 1888.

Enclosure. 4-3

Notes of Inspection by the Dy Examiner of the Office of the Exec: Engr Trichinopoly Dn

Submits for orders replies of the Exec: Engr to points requiring explanation in the — as required in G.O. No. 1250 W. of 27' April/88 —

To

No. 1965 d/ 25.7.88
Enc. 3

To W.

Returned with the following remarks:-

2. Item 17 of summary. Code para 936 lays down that "sheds for workmen" is an item to be foreseen and separately provided for in the estimate. Since it was overlooked, the cost should not have been mixed up with "contingencies", but charged as a distinct sub-head. Apart from this, all unforeseen charges that can be separately detailed should be so detailed, the cost being met from the provision for contingencies, but such charges are not intended to be treated as "contingencies".

3. Item 22. Please obtain orders of Government whether any, and if so what check is required.

4. Item 34. The Executive Engineer might be asked to explain the circumstances under which the lascars are employed under the Tahsildar. They are P. W. D. lascars and as such, service books should be kept up for them by the Executive Engineer. He has promised to do so.

5. Item 24. The question of the accountant's responsibility for the check of measurement books (in this Presidency measurement sheets) appears to be settled by the Government of India Resolution No. 225 A. G. dated 21st. Ju[illegible] communicated with G. O. No. 2161 W. [illegible] July 1888. It seems a question ho[illegible] whether it is practically poss[illegible] for the accountant and his ass[illegible]ants to check every measuremen[illegible] calculation; and it might be well to obtain the opinions of Supg. Engineers before attempting to enforce the ruling.

Tr 4/8 6/8 R. 11. 6. 88

A distinction might, I think, be made between measurements of bona fide piece-works and measurements of contract works.

6. Items 6,7,8 and 20. Items 6,7 and 8 relate to procedure in calling for and dealing with tenders, and item 20 to the question of enforcing the terms of contracts. I take them together because they are, I think, intimately connected. As regards the first point, the Executive Engineer alleges that the procedure prescribed in the Code is impracticable, for the reason that to put it shortly, three-fourths of the men who tender are impecunious adventurers without any of the necessary qualifications of a contractor, that really competent contractors can hardly be got to tender, and that the sub-divisional officer is alone able to distinguish the good from the bad.

7. Now, in the first place, it seems to me that if anything is certain to encourage and foster the adventurer class of contractors, it is laxity in enforcing the terms of contracts and a justifiable expectation, that once a contract has been secured, the rates will be raised, or the terms somehow altered, if the contractor can make out any plausible case; and that steady insistance or substantial security in a shape immediately available, and firm, but not necessarily harsh, enforcement of the terms of contracts, would very soon eliminate this class much more effectually than any process of discretionary selection by subordinates, a process which it can hardly be desirable to encourage.

8. In the second place I would submit that, if the difficulty in securing competent contractors is really as great as it is represented to be, the fact seems to point to the expediency of dropping the contract system altogether. The contract system can hardly be an economical one when there is no genuine competition.

9. In the third place, it seems to me, that if the Supg. Engineer is right, as I venture to think he is, in his opinion (see his marginal remark on page 13) as to the inexpediency of giving out emergent

work on contract at all, then the Executive Engineer's case almost falls to the ground, because the essence of his complaint seems to be that the procedure causes a little delay, which cannot be a very serious matter as regards works not emergent.

10. Lastly I should think that if competent and suitable contractors are so few, it should not be difficult for the Executive Engineer to have the necessary information as to their capabilities and qualifications recorded in his office; the list of such men being added to when necessary, after due inquiry as to any new tenderers.

25/7

C.

25/7

P.W.C. No 7358

Nr. 4

Recd 26.7.88

No. 2465 W d/ 13th August 1888

No. 2465 W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 13th August 1888

READ the following

From Supdg. Engr. VI Circle. H.E. No. 253 T. N. d/ 31st May 1888.

Office Note from the Engr. P.W.d. " No. 1965 d/ 25th July 1888.

The Engineer's Office Note will be communicated to the Supdg. Engineer VI Circle.

2. The Govt. agree with the remarks in paras 6 to 10.

3. The Engineer will submit separately his views on the subject of paras 3 and 5 of his note, when the opinion of Supdg: Engineers will be called for.

3/8/88

Despd 14/8

To The Supdg. Engr. VI Circle

" Engr. P.W.d.