

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 12
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 27.7.88
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 10m

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P.W. குறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	<u>2870</u>	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	<u>14. 9 - 1888</u>	<u>198</u>

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

A.14

14TH SEPTEMBER 1888, No. 2870 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

2870
1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Account.

READ—the following paper :—

From R. G. MACDONALD, Esq., Officiating Deputy Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department (Account—General), to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Simla, the 31st August 1888, No. 313 A.G.

In reply to your letter No. 1685 of the 7th June last, I am directed to state that for the reasons given in Public Works Department letter No. 312 A.G., dated 31st August 1888, the Government of India regrets it is unable to approve of the proposal made by the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, that work vouchers should be submitted quarterly.

2. I may add that the term "sub-head" was used in Public Works Department letter No. 80 A.G. of the 6th April 1887, in the sense in which it is defined in Public Works Department Code, Vol. I, Chap. XII., para. 15.

ORDER—dated 14th September 1888, No. 2870 W., Public Works.

Communicated to the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, with reference to G.O. No. 1684 W., dated 7th June 1888.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. S. J. Pereira.
Spare Copies

GENERAL
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of (1888) Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated September, 14th.

Read.

Encl.

G.O., 14th Sept. 1888, No. 2870 W.

SEPTEMBER.

Work Vouchers

Letter from the Government of India declining to approve of the proposal for the submission of — quarterly, communicated to the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

4TH NOVEMBER 1887, No. 2930 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General
Account.

READ—the following paper:—

Office note from the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 28th October 1887, No. 706.

With reference to paragraph 3 of my office note, No. 617, dated 5th October 1887, submitting notes of inspection of the Kurnool division, I beg to suggest that Superintending Engineers be asked to report, after communication with Executive Engineers, and, through them, with sub-divisional officers, as to the various circumstances which prevent the submission of vouchers at the proper time, *i.e.*, with the account to which they relate.

2. The failure of sub-divisional officers to submit vouchers with their accounts has been frequently noticed in inspection reports, but these reports do not give any information as to the number of cases in which vouchers are wanting. I find, however, from an examination of the audit notes for twelve months past that, on an average, there have been in each month about 400 cases of vouchers not received in the Central office at the time of completing the audit of the divisional accounts, that is to say, generally about six weeks after the close of the month to which the accounts relate; and when I point out that a large number of vouchers are invariably received in the interval between the receipt of the accounts and the completion of the audit, and that a very large number of those received by me with the accounts are probably, in the same way, received in the divisional office in the interval between receipt of the sub-divisional accounts and the completion of the divisional accounts, it will be seen that the number of cases in which sub-divisional officers fail to submit vouchers with the accounts to which they relate must be very large indeed.

3. The code (paragraph 1642) lays down that no disbursement shall be made without a receipt being taken, and though it is probable that there may, now and then, be cases in which the failure to obtain a receipt at the time of payment may be unavoidable, I cannot believe that, with due attention to the rule quoted above, the number of cases could be anything like what it is.

4. Should Government approve of the suggestion made in the first paragraph, I would further suggest that Executive Engineers should be reminded that what is wanted is a real and intelligible reason or reasons. I say this because I find that in very many cases the replies made to this office, when similar explanations are asked for in individual cases, are no explanations at all; as, for instance, "non-receipt from the sub-divisional office," without any explanation of why the sub-divisional officer did not submit the voucher, or "returned to sub-divisional officer for revision," without any intimation of the grounds on which it was so returned, and so on.

ORDER—dated 4th November 1887, No. 2930 W., Public Works.

Communicated to Superintending Engineers for report, as suggested by the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. O. HASTED, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

To Superintending Engineers,
" the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. E. Hernandez.

Spare Copies

GENERAL
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of 1887 Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated November, 4th.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 4th Nov. 1887, No. 2930 W.

NOVEMBER.

Accounts

Vouchers.—Superintending Engineers directed to report as to the circumstances which prevent the submission of — with the accounts to which they relate.

[For General Distribution.]

Circular No. 9 Public Works.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

ACCOUNT.

General.

To

THE GOVERNMENTS OF MADRAS, BOMBAY, BENGAL, THE NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES AND
ODISH, AND THE PUNJAB, IN THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.
THE CHIEF COMMISSIONERS, CENTRAL PROVINCES, BRITISH BURMA, AND ASSAM.
THE RESIDENT AT HYDERABAD.
THE RESIDENT AT MYSORE (THROUGH FOREIGN DEPARTMENT).
THE AGENTS TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL FOR CENTRAL INDIA, RAJPUTANA, AND
BLUCHISTAN.
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PORT BLAIRE AND CHIEF COMMISSIONER, ANDAMAN AND NICOBAR
ISLANDS.
THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF TELEGRAPHS.
THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF MILITARY WORKS.
THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.
THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF RAILWAYS.
THE DIRECTOR-IN-CHIEF, INDO-EUROPEAN TELEGRAPH.
THE DIRECTOR, PERSIAN TELEGRAPH.
THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR, PERSIAN GULF TELEGRAPH.
THE CONSULTING ENGINEERS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA FOR GUARANTEED RAILWAYS,
CALCUTTA, LAHORE, AND LUCKNOW.
THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL.
THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL, BENGAL.

Simla, June 16, 1882.

SIR,

It has been brought to notice that even in cases in which a receipt has been taken from the contractor as a final payment in settlement of all demands, disputes frequently arise on the plea, either that the contractor did not understand English, or was unable to read, or that the words relating to the final payment had been added to the document after the signature of the payee had been obtained to the receipt.

2. The Government of India has therefore been pleased to rule that the words "*as a final payment in settlement of all demands*," which are, under existing orders, to be added in manuscript on Public Works Forms Nos. 14, 15, and 18 when these forms are used as final receipts, shall in future be printed on a certain proportion of the forms as an integral portion of the form itself, and that these special forms so printed shall alone be used when taking final receipts from contractors. As a further precaution, these special forms should be printed bi-lingually, *i. e.*, in English and in the vernacular of the District; and in every case where the contractor can write, he should be required to add in his own handwriting words to the effect that the payment is in full settlement of all demands.

3. In the case of payees who can neither read nor write, their mark or seal should be attested by two competent witnesses, in whose presence the nature of the payment should be fully explained.

4. Local Governments and Administrations will make their own arrangements to supply Executive Engineers with the forms necessary for carrying out these instructions, the forms being printed in such languages as may be considered necessary.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient Servant,

L. CONWAY-GORDON,

Offg. Dy. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

2870
5/4

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

ACCOUNT
General.

To

Circular No. 9 Public Works.

Dated Simla, June 16, 1882.

Received

Order No 1702 Wd 6th July 82

Communicated
to officers of the P.W.
Dept for information
and guidance

2 The Secy to the
Code Committee will
take the necessary action
with respect to para 4

(true copy)
1st/ A. S. Russell
Under Secy to Govt
D.W.D.

B. No 1702 Wd
6th July 1882

Modifications in Public Works Code Forms Nos.
14, 15 and 18.

Govt. Central Branch Press, Simla.—No. 74 P. W. D. A. D.—15-6-82.—1,400.

Suptg Engr's
Consy Archt. to Govt.
Supt Engr P.W. D. to
Supt Engr P.W. D.
Examiner P.W. D.

(1)

No. 313 Ag.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

ACCOUNT.
General.

To The Secretary to the
Government of Madras,
Public Works Department

Simla the 31st August, 1882.

Sir,

I reply to your letter No. 1685 of the
7th June last. I am directed to state, that
for the reasons given in Public Works Depart-
ment letter No. 312 A dated 31st August/88 the
Government of India regrets it is unable to
approve of the proposal made by the Examiner
Public Works Accounts, that work vouchers
should be submitted quarterly—

2. I may add, that the term—
"sub head" was used in Public Works Depart-
ment letter No. 30 A of the 6th April
1887 in the sense in which it is defined

in Public Works Department Code Volume

I Chapter XII para 15 -

Maquette honoree,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant

R. G. Manton

Offg Secy to Govt of India

10
545

4. 16. 84 W. 7. 6. 88
16. 85 W. 20. 3. 88
10. 52 W. 15. 4. 87.

(Communicated to
the Examiner P. W. Aceto.
with reference to G.O.
No. 1687 W dated 7th
June 1888.

W. G. M.
6. 9. 88

Ex. P. W. Aceto. 10/26/89

2870
6

Est. of 1883

PUBLIC WORKS.

1879
Dated
10. 14. Sep 1888 No. 20704

Work Vouchers

to be given to the party who
declines to approve of the
proposal to ~~submit~~ for
the submission of —
quarterly, and to the
Ex-aminers.

40
✓

10/19 1879