(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 34

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 8/88

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

பொதுப் பணி துறை

அரசாணை எண். 3030W
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் : 26-9-1888 ~~198~~ .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

ஆவண. கா-1—18,000—15-6-87.

26th September 1888, No. 3030 W., Public Works.

3030/1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Account.

Read—the following papers:—

Office note from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Madras, 28th June 1888, No. 147.

In his letter No. 778 K.S., dated 16th instant, the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, suggests the advisability of delegating to him the power of sanctioning estimates for component works of the Kistna delta up to a limit of Rs. 2,500, with the view of avoiding the necessity now experienced under the existing rules of his having to apply to Government for sanction to small estimates. This suggestion would necessitate a portion of the provision for unforeseen works being placed at the Superintending Engineer's disposal to meet the estimates sanctioned by him. The Government of India in their letter, printed with G.O., No. 179 I., dated 9th March 1888, state that a register should be kept by Superintending Engineers whenever they are empowered to sanction estimates up to Rs. 10,000 or any lower limit, and in their endorsement No. 92 B., dated 22nd February 1888, that Local Government can confer on Superintending Engineers powers to sanction estimates for individual works or parts of irrigation projects to a maximum limit of Rs. 10,000. Please let me know (1) whether the above remarks of the Government of India are intended to apply only to projects under 43. Minor Works and Navigation, or also to those under 49. Irrigation; (2) whether there are any rules or orders of the Government of India laying down that Superintending Engineers should not be entrusted with the power of sanctioning estimates for component works of the projects ordered to be carried out from Loan funds; and (3) whether you see any objection to Superintending Engineers in this Presidency being entrusted with the power. It seems to me that should it be unobjectionable to grant the power applied for in the case of the Kistna delta, the privilege should also be extended to other projects under 49. Irrigation.

Office note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated 23rd August 1888, No. 2132.

From the Government of India letter printed with G.O., No. 179 I., dated 9th March 1888, and from para. 7 (*c*) of G.O., No. 916 W., dated 23rd March 1888, it appears to me that there is nothing to prevent the Local Government giving Superintending Engineers power to sanction estimates for individual works up to Rs. 10,000 each or any lower limit within the limits of the sums placed at their disposal for the purpose from the general estimates for projects classed under 49. Irrigation.

2. But with reference to the register required by the former G.O., I think it will be inconvenient to split up the estimate amounts placed at the disposal of the Superintending Engineer among the several sub-heads to be extended across the head of the register. It would, therefore, be necessary to treat the total amount placed at the disposal of each Superintending Engineer as available for sanction under all the sub-heads; but the amounts actually sanctioned should be detailed under the prescribed sub-heads (extended across the register) and a periodical (say quarterly) return sent in to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation (through the Examiner for check) of total estimates sanctioned by them.

3. The Chief Engineer would then enter the totals as additional sanctions (reducing the balance) under each estimated sub-head, at the same time increasing the balance under unforeseen requirements at his own disposal by the total of all sub-heads, and deducting the same total from the balance of Superintending Engineer's reserve.

4. In the case of projects where there is no provision under "Unforeseen works," it would first have to be provided in the Chief Engineer's register, by reduction of other sub-heads, and the Superintending Engineers would (from the sum thus provided) be given their several allotments.

5. Transfer from "Unforeseen requirements" to other heads would be made from time to time according to necessity.

6. It is a little difficult to make my meaning intelligible in writing; but I can easily explain it personally; and, as far as I can see, the procedure intended to be described above is the only way of avoiding either keeping in the Chief Engineer's office two registers (one for the Chief Engineer and one for the Superintending Engineer) or else dividing every single column of the register into two columns, one for the Chief Engineer and one for the Superintending Engineer.

Order—dated 26th September 1888, No. 3030 W., Public Works.

In the case of irrigation projects sanctioned under 35. Protective Works, or 49. Capital Expenditure on Public Works (not charged against Revenue), the Governor in Council will be prepared to authorise a Superintending Engineer to sanction original or revised estimates for individual works of any project in his circle to such an amount as he may from time to time deem right within the limits of Rs. 10,000 laid down by the Government of India—see endorsement No. 92 B., dated 22nd February 1888.

2. There is no necessity for any portion of the amounts provided under *sub-heads* being specifically placed at the Superintending Engineer's disposal. The Superintending Engineer who may thus be empowered to sanction estimates for individual works of an irrigation project will see that a register showing the estimates sanctioned and the balances still available under each sub-head is maintained in his office in the form prescribed in G.O., No. 179 I., dated 9th March 1888. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation will, on receipt of applications from the Superintending Engineers concerned, arrange to have placed at their disposal from the amounts now available for unforeseen works of each project the sums required to cover the outlay on new works not originally contemplated and the excess expenditure involved by the sanctions accorded by the Superintending Engineers.

3. Superintending Engineers will, from 1st October next, furnish the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, through the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, with quarterly returns of sanctions accorded by them in the annexed form, so as to reach the former officer within one month after the close of the quarter to which they refer.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
To Superintending Engineers.
To the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" Revenue Department.

Exd. J. Henricus.
Spare Copies

3030/2.

GENERAL.
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of {1888} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated September, 26th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 26th Sept. 1888, No. 3030 W.

SEPTEMBER

Estimates for Individual Works of an Irrigation Project

Powers of a Superintending Engineer to sanction original or revised — in his circle as he may deem necessary from time to time within a limit of Rs. 10,000.

STATEMENT showing the modifications made in the estimates for the Project and the estimates for individual works sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer, Circle, during the quarter ended with 18

Name of canal or drain.	Classification.		Mileage.	Name of channel or affluent.	Name of work.	Works completed.				Estimates sanctioned for individual works.	Revised Estimates.				Remarks.
	Main head.	Sub-head.				Estimate.	Outlay.	Excess.	Saving.		Original estimate.	Revised estimate.	Increase.	Decrease.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
			MILES. FT.			RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	

N.B.—The items under each sub-head should be totalled.

	Amount.
	RS.
Footnote.—Balance available brought forward from the last return	
Amount placed at the Superintending Engineer's disposal by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation in his memo. No. , dated	
Savings effected on completed works, column 10	
Do. anticipated on revision of estimates, column 15	
Total ..	
Deduct—	
Excess on completed works, column 9	
Estimates sanctioned for individual works, column 11	
Increase of revised estimates sanctioned over the original estimates, column 14 ..	
Balance available to be carried over to the next return	

3030/3

3030/1

ANNEXURE.

Office note by the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, dated 18th October 1887, No. 662.

Referring to what I wrote about the routine character of the disposals on objectionable items statements, I may begin by saying that my remarks apply quite as much to my own action as to that of any other officer. I have to deal every month with some fifty or sixty of these statements; they are due on a certain date, and there is a certain limited time for preparing them; and the result is that it is impossible for me to give to them anything approaching to the personal attention which, in my opinion, I should give to any matter reported to Government. Practically I seldom attempt more than to see that there are no unnecessarily irritating remarks in them. If I attempted to do more I should probably delay the submission of the statements indefinitely.

2. It is an established principle of official correspondence that two or more subjects should not be mixed up in one letter (see Code paragraphs 878 and 887), but an objectionable items statement entirely ignores this principle. If each item is thoroughly gone into, they do not all, so to say, *mature* at the same date, and an item which could be disposed of at once may be delayed for weeks or months on account of some other item having no real connection with it. And if they are all gone into at once, their disposal requires, probably, a review of an utterly bewildering amount of matter. The result is that nowhere—neither in the Executive Engineer's office, nor in the Superintending Engineer's, nor in the Examiner's—is any individual item taken up at all thoroughly; at every stage the disposal has to be hurried through in a limited time; many, if not most, of the remarks are of the most futile character, and, when the statements reach Government, they seldom contain any adequate materials for the proper disposal of individual items.

3. In my opinion, therefore, the first step towards making the objectionable items statements more practically effective should be, in a large measure, to do away with them, that is to say, to abandon to a great extent the collective treatment and to deal with the items individually.

4. A collective objectionable items statement is intended, I presume, to serve two distinct purposes. It is intended—

(i) as a means for regularising, remedying, removing, and checking irregularities, and

(ii) as a means of exhibiting statistically in a more or less general view the general mass of irregularity, and showing its increase or decrease.

The first purpose, for reason stated above, is secured very badly, and the second can be much better secured by a condensed and classified abstract.

5. The irregularities at present included in the monthly objectionable items statements are:—

(i) Irregularities in respect of estimates.
(ii) Irregularities in respect of appropriations.
(iii) Non-submission of completion reports.
(iv) Miscellaneous irregularities.

If the statement, in its present form, is retained at all, I would confine its use entirely to the first two classes, for which it was originally designed, and for which—it may perhaps be capable of improvement—it is suited; but I think it would be very much better to deal with the two classes in separate statements, and to have for each a specially adapted form. I would provide for a separate periodical statement of overdue completion reports in a suitable form designed *ad hoc*, so as to show clearly all material facts, such as known dates of completion, when and by whom last inspected, whose inspection awaited, reason for non-submission, &c., with any further remarks of officers concerned. And I would exclude all miscellaneous irregularities, and arrange that they should be separately and individually reported after due inquiry when necessary. Register of these items could be kept by me in any form and in any detail considered desirable, and periodical statements submitted showing, under any desired classification, their numbers and increase or decrease, and these abstracts would include, according to the wishes of Government, either all items whatsoever, or all outstanding more than a certain time, or only those actually reported to Government. As regards some classes of these miscellaneous irregularities, it might very possibly hereafter be found convenient to submit separate periodical statements in suitable forms as proposed in the case of completion reports, but I will not attempt to go into that matter now.

6. I have said above (in the last paragraph) that I would report all miscellaneous irregularities separately *after due inquiry when necessary*, and with regard to this last clause I may say that, in most cases of a plain breach of some distinct rule, whether by way of commission or of omission, I would propose to report the matter at once. "Inquiry," in far too many cases, simply means inordinate delay, months spent in sending reminder after reminder, eliciting eventually a bare statement to the effect that the matter is under correspondence with the Superintending Engineer, or that the irregularity was unavoidable, or that the matter will be disposed of shortly—which may mean anything from one month to eighteen—or some information equally useless, whereas the essential thing, in nearly all these cases, is that they should be dealt with and disposed of promptly. Therefore I would, as a rule, report the irregularity at once, but with a view to saving time and trouble it might be arranged that, in all such cases, I should send a copy of the report to the Executive Engineer concerned, with an intimation that, under such and such a paragraph of the Code (to be introduced for the purpose with the approval of Government), the officer's explanation (meaning of course a real and full explanation) should be furnished at once *to Government* through the Examiner, and, if necessary, through the Superintending Engineer, such explanation being due (again according to Code) within a specified time. Failing arrival of the explanation within the prescribed time, I should at once report the non-receipt to Government, and leave the further disposal of the matter entirely to Government. I do not for a moment wish to suggest that there is anything specially heinous about these miscellaneous irregularities, or that their number is very abnormal in Madras, but I think that the one great irregularity—a consequence I think of the system—is the way in which, in far too many cases, they are allowed to linger on unremedied, and, except as a matter of routine, almost unnoticed. I am convinced that, with a little promptness and determination, such of these irregularities as are not really unavoidable would soon be stopped under a system of individual treatment, whilst, as regards many of the remainder, the result of the more thorough consideration given to the matter would be to remove the occasion for technical irregularities by suitable modifications of the Code when shown to be desirable.

7. I am myself very dubious as to the advantage of the collective treatment as regards any of the different classes of irregularities, so far as concerns the first of the purposes referred to in paragraph 4, but that treatment is not so obviously unsuitable for the first three classes of irregularities as it is for miscellaneous irregularities. It is, however, very desirable, I think, that the different *classes* should be separately dealt with, because it is only on this condition that the forms adopted can, from time to time, be suitably modified, and more perfectly adapted to the several purposes. It would be impossible for me to go fully into the matter here, but I have no doubt that the collective treatment of these irregularities, *class by class*, can be materially facilitated by taking note of necessary incidents and of points of similarity between individual cases of the same class and gradually adapting the form used to the circumstances and requirements of the class concerned, so as to ensure all essential facts being clearly exhibited, and if Government should approve of the suggested change, I would at once take into consideration the question of alterations immediately desirable in the present form to meet more completely the requirements of the classes of cases referred to.

8. I would therefore deal with (1) irregularities as to estimate, (2) irregularities as to appropriation, and (3) non-submission of completion reports, in three separate

statements, and, as already suggested, I would make these statements quarterly instead of monthly as at present; but with regard to appropriations somewhat closer attention may be necessary towards the close of the financial year, and therefore during the last quarter of the year this one statement might be more frequent. As regards the statistical report or abstract relating to miscellaneous irregularities, I think that a half-yearly statement would be quite sufficient.

9. With a view to distributing the work in connection with these statements I would fix the due dates of the three quarterly statements, so that the statement for some one class should be due every month.

10. With a view to reducing the *number* of statements I would prepare them by circles instead of, as now, by divisions, and as regards separation by funds I see no reason why one statement (for each circle) should not be submitted for all funds dealt with in the General Branch and one for all dealt with in Irrigation Branch of the Secretariat.

11. With regard to specific measures for reducing irregularities of any kind with the more careful attention to individual cases which the proposed changes will, in my opinion, secure, experience will, I have no doubt, soon indicate both the measures to be taken in order to put a stop to real irregularities, and the modifications required in the rules in order to remove from the category of objectionable items many transactions and proceedings which are really unobjectionable, and possibly unavoidable, and I may point out that the adoption of any part of the suggestions made by the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, in his letter, No. 771 T.J., dated 18th July 1887 (see also my office note No. 489 of 26th August 1887) for increasing the powers of Superintending Engineers will at once tend to reduce irregularities in respect of estimate. As regards this class, however, something more might, I think, be done. It seems to me that when a work is begun without estimate, or is continued after the estimate is exceeded, either (1) the work must go on, and ought to go on, regardless of estimate, or (2) it ought to be stopped; and I am quite prepared to admit that in the majority of cases the work probably ought to go on, and that the technical irregularity, under present rules, is unavoidable; but in such cases I think the Superintending Engineer might be empowered, if he is satisfied that the work ought to go on, to grant a provisional sanction, within his powers of course, and for a limited time, on a rough estimate of the expenditure, pending submission of detailed plans and estimates; and that when the expenditure is likely to exceed his own powers, he should report the circumstances and obtain a similar provisional sanction from Government; but if the objectionable items statement to Government is a quarterly return, such provisional sanction by Government should hardly ever be necessary. Precautions against above would not, I think, be difficult.

12. The only other suggestion that I can make "with a view to making the statements more practically effective" is that Government should insist on having real explanations, and real reasons, instead of the futile routine remarks which are now so frequent, and which, as I have already pointed out, are in a great measure—indeed I hope almost entirely—the result of the system, which makes any other than a routine disposal a matter of considerable difficulty.

13. The adoption of the proposals now made would no doubt necessitate some modification of the present system of dealing with objectionable items as between the Examiner and the Executive Engineer, but it is not now necessary to consider this matter at length.

14. I wish to repeat that nothing that I have said is meant to imply that there is any abnormal amount of irregularity in the Madras Presidency. I do not think there is; but I think there is more than there should be, or need be; and I think that the labor involved in, and the irritation caused by, the system at present adopted for remedying irregularities is out of all proportion to the results, and that better results might be secured with, in the end, much less trouble; and, in case I have not already made my meaning sufficiently clear, I will also repeat that, in my opinion, the fault lies almost entirely with *the system* (which compels a routine, and therefore ineffectual, treatment of the matter), and not with those who work with, or work under, the system.

15. It may be said that detailed inquiry into individual items might proceed concurrently with the collective treatment under the objectionable items statement system, and no doubt it *might;* but there is an obvious waste of time in doing the same thing twice over, and I do not think that the staff generally has any time to spare.

16. With regard to the question as to what other statements could be similarly dealt with, *i.e.*, submitted less frequently than at present, I think that, if I have to single out individual statements, I can only specify the monthly divisional return of grants, expenditure and balances, in so far as it extends beyond a bare application for credit. The monthly application for credit would of course remain, but would be a very simple matter. The rest might, in my opinion, be made a quarterly statement if not done away with altogether, together with the budget register and connected procedure (see Code paragraph 1588 *et seq.*) in divisional offices, leaving to the Examiner the responsibility for taking the check which the present procedure is intended to secure; but this return is so intimately connected with returns required by the Accountant-General, Public Works Department, that it might be difficult to obtain the sanction of the Government of India to any change.

17. I am also seriously of opinion that all practical purposes would be perfectly well secured, and the audit in some respects considerably facilitated, if detailed accounts—*i.e.*, accounts supported by schedules in full detail—were submitted bi-monthly instead of monthly. I think the difficulties both in divisional offices and in the central office are considerably enhanced by the impossibility of disposing of one set of accounts before the next is submitted. The Financial Department would probably require some monthly accounts, but there need not, I think, be any difficulty in providing for monthly abstract statements in sufficient detail and sufficiently accurate, without insisting on the monthly submission of the mass of detail now required.

18. In conclusion, I may mention that there seems to be no reason why Government—if so disposed—should not at once sanction the procedure suggested above in connection with miscellaneous irregularities. Sanction of the Government of India seems unnecessary.

3030/6

20TH MARCH 1888, No. 917 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Account.

LETTER—from
COLONEL H. R. MEAD, R.E.,
Joint Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Public Works Department,

To
THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

With reference to the latter part of paragraph 7 of my letter, No. 2611 W., dated 4th October 1887, in which it was stated that certain points in connection with the question of reducing clerical work in divisional offices would probably before long form the subject of correspondence with the Government of India, I am directed to forward a copy of the Proceedings of this Government, No. 916 W., dated 20th March 1888, and to request the sanction of the Government of India to the modification of paragraph 352 of the Madras Public Works Code in the manner suggested in paragraph 8 of the Government order. The Code paragraph in question is based on paragraph 124, chapter III, volume I, of the Government of India Code.

2. I am also to recommend strongly, for the sanction of the Government of India, the proposal under head VI of the proceedings that the objectionable item statement be made a quarterly instead of a monthly return. Under the present procedure the orders of Government on the statement for one month rarely reach the officers concerned before the submission of the return for the succeeding month, and many items which have been finally disposed of by the orders on one statement are thus unnecessarily repeated in the next. It is also argued that, if the return be submitted quarterly, numerous petty irregularities, which are now reported to Government, would find no place in the statement, inasmuch as they would be remedied before the expiration of the quarter. I am at the same time to invite attention to paragraphs 12 *et seq.* of the Government order, and to the accompanying copy of a note by the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, No. 662, dated 18th October 1887, which show the measures proposed to render the objectionable item statement less of a routine matter than it now is and more effective in the prevention and removal of irregularities.

3. I am also directed to inquire whether the Government of India would be inclined to view favorably the proposals in paragraphs 16 and 17 of the order, that the monthly return of grants, expenditure and balances be converted into a quarterly

return, and that the divisional accounts in full detail be submitted bi-monthly instead of monthly as at present. If so, I am to say that the measures necessary to carry out the changes will at once be taken into consideration and the result reported to the Government of India in due course.

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

(Signed) H. R. MEAD, Colonel, R.E.,
Joint Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

Fort St. George,
20th March 1888.

Exd. J. Moses.
Spare Copies

3030/1

GENERAL.
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of {1888} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated March, 20th.

Encl.

Recd.

20th March 1888, No. 917 W.

MARCH.

Monthly Divisional Accounts

The Government of India addressed with regard to certain suggestions for the simplification of the — and the reduction of clerical work in divisional offices.

3030/6

No. 92B.

Government of India
Public Works Department
Civil Works
Buildings
Calcutta, the 22nd February 1888.

The Governments of Madras, Bombay, Bengal, the North-Western Provinces and Oudh, and the Punjab.
The Chief Commissioners of the Central Provinces, Burma Upper/Lower, Assam and Coorg.
The Resident at Hyderabad
The Agents to the Governor-General for Central India, Rajputana and Baluchistan.
The Accountant-General P. W. D.

The following is forwarded to the Local Governments, Administrations and Officers marginally noted, for information and guidance

(By order)
(Signed) R. B. Buckley
Under Secy. to the Govt. of India

Extract, paras. 3 and 4 of letter from Government of India, Public Works Department, No. 91B., dated 22nd February 1888, to Government of Bengal, Public Works Department.

3. The sanction given in Public Works Department No. 1479G., dated 3rd November 1882, remained in force till the issue of the fifth edition of the first volume of the

Code

Code, when it was abrogated by the ruling in Chapter I, para 3. This alteration does not appear to have been specially brought to the notice of the Government of Bengal, but nevertheless the powers of Superintending Engineers in Bengal are now those defined by the Code in Chapter III, paras 57 and 67, which limit their powers of sanction to new works or additions to Rs 2,500

4. The Government of India, however, having taken the matter again into consideration, is of opinion that the powers at present possessed by Superintending Engineers may, in the case of selected officers, be advantageously expanded, so as to enable them to sanction estimates to the extent to which they may now finally approve designs and details. I am accordingly directed to state that when, in the opinion of a Local Government, any Superintending Engineer can, with due regard to his qualifications and business habits, be entrusted with the power, the Local Government may, in supersession of existing rules, confer upon him authority to sanction estimates for individual Civil Works or parts of Irrigation projects, upto a maximum of Rs 10,000. It must, however, be distinctly understood that no work thus sanctioned can be commenced without a specific appropriation of funds sanctioned by the Local Government, or such other authority as may be necessary in each case.

305/41

EXAMINER
No. 11
6 JUL 1888.
ENCLOSURES
P. W. ACCOUNTS

3030/10

Letter from the Supdg: Engr: II Circle No. 778 KS
dy 16th June 1888

—

I have the honor to forward herewith for your approval and sanction of Government an estimate amounting to Rs: 465 for excavating a branch channel from Mattur channel, 13 miles 23 chains on the Commanur canal.

2. The necessity for the work is explained in the Executive Engineer's report accompanying the Estimate.

3. I request that the Estimate may be sanctioned from the balance available for unforeseen works.

4. It would facilitate work much if the necessity for going up to Government for sanction of small estimates like this were obviated by granting me power to

sanction

107

sanction up to a certain limit, say Rs. 2500. For instance, if I had such power, this work could be carried out now. As it is, it will have to be postponed until next working season.

E. I.
PW 5493

O.S. 155/VI/88 } m 29/6/88

E. I. Form No. 34-F.

KEEP-WITH

No. dated 188

No. [illegible]
6 JUL 1888
ENCLOSURES
P. W. ACCOUNTS

3030/11

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

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION

Madras, 28th June 1888. / P

OFFICE NOTE. No 147

Circulation Register.

To	From	Despatch Date.	Receipt Date.
W	E. I.		

4

In his letter No 778 K. S. dated 16 Instant the Superintending Engineer Second Circle, suggests the advisability of delegating to him the power of sanctioning estimates for component works of the Kistna delta up to a limit of Rs 2500 with the view of avoiding the necessity now experienced under the existing rules of his having to apply to Govt for sanction to small estimates. This suggestion would necessitate a portion of the provision for unforeseen works being placed at the Superintending Engineer's disposal to meet the Estimates sanctioned by him. The Govt

10/

of India in their letter printed with G. O. No 179 I, dated 9 March 1888 state that a register should be kept by Supg. Engrs whenever they are empowered to sanction estimates up to Rs 10000 or any lower limit and in their endorsement No 921B dated 22d February 1888 that Local Govt can confer on Supg. Engrs powers to sanction estimates for individual works or parts of Irrigation projects to a maximum limit of Rs 10000. Please let me know (1) whether the above remarks of the Govt of India are intended to apply only to projects under 43. Minor Works and Navigation or also to those under 49 Irrigation; (2) whether there are any rules or orders of the Govt of India laying down that Supg. Engrs should not be entrusted with the power of sanctioning estimates for component works of the projects ordered to be carried out from Loan funds and (3) whether you see any objection to Supg. Engrs in this Presidency being entrusted with the power. It seems to me that should it be unobjectionable to grant the power applied for in the case of the Kistna delta the privilege should also be extended to other projects under 49 Irrigation

CAS

No. 2533 C d/4th July 1888

To C

For favour of remarks.

26.6.88

14.6.88

2.7.88

P. W. Recd. 840

847

Recd. 2. 7. 88

Statement showing the modifications made in the Estimates for the —— project and the Estimates for individual works sanctioned by the Supg. Engr —— circle during the quarter ended with 18

Name of Canal or drain	Classification		Mileage		Name of channel or affluents	Name of work	Works completed				Estimates sanctioned for individual works	Revised Estimates				Remarks
	Main head	Sub head					Estimate	Outlay	Excess	Saving		original Estimate	Revised Estimate	Increase	Decrease	
1	2	3	4		5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
			miles	ft.			Rs	Rs	Rs	Rs	Rs	Rs	Rs	Rs	Rs	

N. B. The items under each sub head should be totalled.

Foot note

	Amount Rs.
Balance available brought forward from the last return	
Amount placed at the S. E's disposal by the Chief Engineer Irr. in his memo No —— dated ——	
Savings effected on completed works, Column 10	
Savings anticipated on revision of Estimates Column 15	
Total	
Deduct	
Excess on completed works Column 9	
Estimates sanctioned for individual works, Col 11	
Increase of revised Estimates sanctioned over the original Estimates Column 14	
Balance available to be carried over to the next return	

3030/12

P. 21327 ~~24~~ 23 8-8

Enc. 1

To W. ~~33~~ 30/17. 31

From the Government of India letter printed with G.O. No. 179 I. dated 6th. March 1888 and from para 7(c) of G.O. No. 916 W. dated 23rd. March 1888, it appears to me that there is nothing to prevent the Local Government giving Supg. Engineers power to sanction estimates for individual works up to Rs. 10,000 each or any lower limit, within the limits of the sums placed at their disposal for the purpose from the general estimates for projects classed under 48 Irrigation.

2. But with reference to the register required by the former G.O., I think it will be inconvenient to split up the estimate amounts placed at the disposal of the Supg. Engineer among the several sub heads to be extended across the head of the register. It would therefore be necessary to treat the total amount placed at the disposal of each Supg. Engineer as available for sanction under all the sub heads; but the amounts actually sanctioned should be detailed under the prescribed sub heads (extended across the

register) and a periodical (say quarterly) return sent in to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation (through the Examiner for check) of total estimates sanctioned by them.

3. The Chief Engineer would then enter the totals as additional sanctions (reducing the balance) under each estimated sub head, at the same time increasing the balance under unforeseen requirements at his own disposal by the total of all sub heads, and deducting the same total from the balance of Supg. Engineers reserve.

4. In the case of projects where there is no provision under "unforeseen works", it would first have to be provided in the Chief Engineer's register by reduction of other sub heads, and the Supg. Engineers would (from the sum thus provided) be given their several allotments.

5. Transfer from "unforeseen requirements" to other heads would be made from time to time according to necessity.

6. It is a little difficult

3030/14

410

to make my meaning intelligible in writing, but I can easily explain it personally, and as far as I can see, the procedure intended to be described above is the only way of avoiding either keeping in the Chief Engineer's office, two registers (one for the Chief Engineer and one for the Supg. Engineer) or else dividing every single column of the register into two columns, one for the Chief Engineer and one for the Supg. Engineer.

C.

23/8

No. 3342 C.d. 4th September 1888

R/39

To
E. I.

Please frame an order accordingly, which can issue in the General Branch, if approved by Govt.

6/9/88

1.9.88

1/9/88

W

P.W.C. No. 8493

Sub y I. no 92 B. 22.2.88
916 W 20.3.88.
179 I 9.3.88
917 W. 20.3.88
No. 11 778 K.S. 16.6.88
391 I 14.7.88

R/ 27-8-88
Enclo. 2

Genl
Acd

No. 30.30 W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

510 380/15

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 21st September 1888

READ the following

Office Note to the Examiner of P.W. Accts. } (No. 1417 d/ 28th June 88)

— Do — from — Do — } (No. 2132 d/ 23 Augt 88)

In the case of irrigation projects sanctioned under 35. Protective works ~~43. Minor works and Navigation~~ or 49. ~~Capital~~ Capital Expenditure on Public Works (not charged against Revenue) the Chief Engineer for Irrigation may, in exercise of the powers delegated to him in para 7 (c) of G.O. No 916 W. dated 20th March 1888, authorize a Supg. Engineer to sanction original or revised estimates for

The Govt. in Council will be pleased to authorize a Sub. Dl. O. to sanction original or revised estimates for individual works of any Project in his charge [illegible] [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] within the [illegible]

For individual works of any such Projects in his Circle not Exceeding Rs 10000 each against the provisions made for them in the sanctioned estimates for the Project. There is no necessity for any portion of the amounts provided under Sub-heads being specifically placed at the Supg. Engineer's disposal. The Supg Engineer who may thus be empowered to sanction estimates for individual works of an Irrigation Project will see that a register showing the estimates so sanctioned and the balances still available under each Sub-head is maintained in his office in the form prescribed

by the Govt of India in endorsement No 92 B dated 22nd Feb

in G.O. No 179. I. dated 9th March 1888. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation will on receipt of applications from the Supg Engineers Concerned place at their disposal from the amounts now available for unforeseen works of each Project the sums required to Cover the outlay on new works not originally Contemplated and the excess expenditure involved by the sanctions accorded by the Supg. Engineers.

2. Supg. Engineers will, from 1st October next, furnish the Chief Engineer for Irrigation through the Examiner of Public Works Accts with quarterly returns of sanctions accorded by them in

in the annexed form, so as to reach the former office within one month after the close of the quarter to which they Refer.

19/9/88

To W for approval

21/9/88

D/C

To

The Chief Engineer for Irrign:

Superintending Engineers

The Examiner P. W. Accts:

" Revenue Dept

3080/17

Govt. of (1888) Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 26th Sept 1888, No. 3030 W.

Estimates for individual works of an Irrigation Project

~~[illegible]~~

Powers of a Supg Engr to sanction original or revised — in his Circle ~~with~~ as he may deem necessary from time to time within a limit of Rs 10,000.

190/17

27/9 27/9