(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 46

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் June 89

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

(59)

P. W. D. துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	1523	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	8-6-1889	~~19~~ .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

British Sheets 5, 11, 12, 21, 23
(18 + 5)

23 Sheets

ஆவண. கா-1—18,000—15-6-87.

20th August 1888, No. 2566 W., Public Works.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Account.

Read—the following paper :—

Office Note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 7th August 1888, No. 2023.

In paras. 19 to 24 of his notes of inspection of the office of the Executive Engineer, Trichinopoly Division, in January last, the Deputy Examiner brought to notice certain irregularities connected with the receipt and accounting for security deposits and earnest money of contractors, and against item 9 of the summary of the report I remarked that the matter would be taken up separately. The report and summary were forwarded to you under my endorsement No. 1337, dated 13th April 1888.

2. In my No. 389 S. E., 16, dated 1st May 1888, I drew the Executive Engineer's attention to the Deputy Examiner's remarks and requested him to report fully as to the practice in connection with such transactions, and I now submit a copy of that officer's reply, No. 10 Exr., dated 8th June 1888.

3. The Executive Engineer's letter deals with several distinct subjects, namely—

(*a*) the time of taking security from contractors;
(*b*) the system of accounting for earnest money received;
(*c*) the failure of the head clerk to bring promptly to account certain specific items received as security of contractors.

The first of these subjects will be dealt with, if necessary, in connection with the general question of contracts. Regarding the second I shall shortly address you separately, but in the meanwhile I have drawn the Executive Engineer's attention to Code para. 1897 and have requested him to conform to the Code rules pending further orders of Government.

4. As regards the third point, with reference to the Executive Engineer's remark that he does not see "that any fault can be found with the action of either the Executive Engineer or the head clerk," I have informed the Executive Engineer that in my opinion the failure of the head clerk to enter in the cash book until the 11th January, if not later, sums admittedly received on the 20th and 21st December, if not earlier, was a grave irregularity. With regard to these specific items it does not seem necessary to say any more; but the inquiries which I have thus been led to make into the system in force in divisions generally has strongly impressed me with the necessity of more clearly defining the duties and responsibilities of head clerks in connection with the receipt and disbursement of cash, and of providing some means—however imperfect—of ensuring that all sums received shall be brought to account, and that promptly.

5. Taking the rules and practices as they now are, it seems to me—

(*a*) that there is no sufficient recognition of the necessity for the continuous presence in every divisional office of some responsible individual to receive and make payments;
(*b*) that when such an individual is provided there is no provision for the proper enforcement of his responsibility by a separate account of his dealings; and
(*c*) that, as regards such account as is required to be kept, there is no provision whatever for securing the completeness of the account in respect of sums received.

6. With regard to the first point, Code para. 1638 says: "Cashiers may be appointed under the orders of Government whenever the cash transactions of a division are considered sufficiently extensive to require it;" and then continues: "*if the Executive Engineer desires it*, the head clerk of the office *may* carry on the duties of cashier and have charge of the cash chest." Also Code para. 1628 says: "in the absence of any precise orders of Government, the Executive Engineer will make such arrangements for the custody of the keys and the proper disbursement of all moneys as he considers requisite." If the Executive Engineer's absence from head-quarters were a rare event, the provisions might be quite sufficient; but seeing that in almost every division the Executive Engineer is absent from head-quarters the greater part of the month, and is continually coming and going; seeing that even if disbursements, other than very petty ones, can be suspended during the Executive Engineer's absence, the receipt of sums tendered cannot well be so suspended; and having regard to the trouble involved in a transfer of responsibility on every occasion of the Executive Engineer's departure and return, it seems to me that it would be much better to rule that in all divisions to which no cashier is appointed, the head clerk *shall* perform the duties of cashier, unless, for some special approved reason, the Executive Engineer considers it unnecessary or undesirable to allow any receipt or disbursement of money during his absence.

7. With regard to the second point, whether the duties of cashier are performed by a cashier specially appointed as such, or by the head clerk under orders of the Executive Engineer, or by no one in particular, only one account is kept of receipts and disbursements of the divisional office—at least only one account is recognized, and I understand from Mr. Rainier that, as far as his observations go, only one account is kept—and this account is the Executive Engineer's cash book. I question very much whether this is a desirable arrangement for the enforcement of responsibility for the dealings of the cashier, or of the individual carrying on the duties of cashier. I think that every individual separately entrusted with the receipt, custody, or disbursement of cash should be required to keep a separate account of his own dealings. In circular memorandum from the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, No. 1670, dated 16th July 1881, as originally issued, this was provided for in the case of a head clerk carrying on the duties of a cashier during the Executive Engineer's absence, and perhaps it was supposed (though it is not the case) that a cashier appointed as such does keep his separate account. The proposal was that the head clerk should keep his own cash book and that the accountant should post the Executive Engineer's cash book therefrom.

8. Exception was taken to this proposal by my predecessor on what seems to me very mistaken grounds; and the circular was modified to read that "when the appointment of a special cashier has not been sanctioned, the head clerk may be entrusted with the duties of cashier;" and this is the basis of the present Code rule quoted above.

9. My predecessor apparently argued—

(*a*) that cheques drawn for cash would be dealt with by the accountant as cheques and by the head clerk as cash, and that receipts in cash (coin?) would be under the head clerk's responsibility and receipts by cheque under that of the accountant, and that, consequently, there would be a division of the duties and responsibilities of the cashier; and

(*b*) that as the accountant would have to repost the whole of the cashier's transactions in the Executive Engineer's cash book, the relief to the accountant would be very slight.

I am quite unable to follow the first of these arguments, and there seems to me to be very little force indeed in the second. Receipts realized *must* be technically *cash*, whether received in coin or by cheque; the accountant could have nothing whatever to do with these *qua* cashier, nor could he have anything to do, as cashier, with cheques drawn for cash; he need not even see them or handle them, his duty being confined to bringing their issue to account from the counterfoils, or from information furnished by the Executive Engineer.

10. With regard to the second argument, it is not at all necessary that the accountant should repost all the cashier's transactions *in the Executive Engineer's cash book*; the cashier (or head clerk) can be treated like any other subordinate disburser, and his transaction posted directly *into the cash abstract book* as provided in Code para. 1841 for sub-divisional cash transactions, the only difference being that the posting would be from the original instead of from a copy or extract.

11. Subject to the slight modification indicated in the last paragraph, the course prescribed in original memorandum from the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, No. 1670 of 1881, is, I think, unquestionably the proper one as far as the circular went, but the circular should, I think, have gone a little further and laid down that this course should invariably be followed by the cashier or his substitute, and that where no cashier is appointed the head clerk must always perform the duties of cashier. I would suggest that this procedure should now be prescribed.

12. With regard to the third point (*c*) of para. 5, there is only one way of providing a check over the accounting for receipts, that is by insisting on receipts being invariably given in a suitable printed form, supplied to the cashier in press-numbered books like cheque books, and notifying that no receipt will be recognized unless given in that form; a duplicate should be recorded at the time on a counterfoil, or, still better, produced simultaneously by means of carbonized paper. An additional security can, if desired, be obtained by providing for endorsement of cash receipt by the Executive Engineer before the book is made over to the cashier, the form making it clear (by the position of the signature) that the Executive Engineer is not signing the receipt in blank but simply completing it to make it a valid receipt form. Absolute control over the accounting for receipts is of course impossible, but that is no reason why the best means of control that can be devised should not be provided. In reply to my inquiries, Mr. Rainier, giving the result of his observations during inspections, describes the present system or want of system as follows: "Sometimes a receipt is given; sometimes not: when a receipt is given it is sometimes initialled on the counterfoil by the Executive Engineer, sometimes by the accountant only. Sometimes Form No. 217 (Miscellaneous Receipt) is used when giving such receipts, but not always; this is the only book form, it is never press numbered." I do not think such absence of system should be tolerated.

13. Closely connected with the question of the conduct of the duties of cashier when no cashier is appointed is the question of whether there are any cases in which it is necessary to appoint a cashier as such. This is a question that can hardly be usefully considered without a clear understanding of what is meant by a cashier, and what the duties of a cashier are. The term cashier seems to me to be applied to two totally different classes of servants, whose duties can seldom, if ever, be properly discharged by one and the same individual, and I am disposed to attribute to this confusion much of the failure to derive proper advantage from the services of the individuals who have been appointed in several divisions under the designation of cashiers.

14. Code para. 790 mentions three classes of servants, namely cashiers, pay clerks and paymasters; but in all paragraphs (1639 and 1770—75) dealing with the duties of such servants the single term "cashier" is used. This is to be regretted because the duties of a cashier and of a pay clerk are in one most important respect essentially different, and, ordinarily speaking, cannot practically be discharged by one individual. At any rate there are two distinct kinds of duties to be considered; and the servant who discharges one set of duties is usually called a cashier, whilst he who discharges the other set is usually called a pay clerk.

15. A cashier, in ordinary parlance, is one who remains at a fixed place to receive sums tendered at that place, and to make payments to creditors coming to that place for payment. A pay clerk, on the other hand, is one who goes about from place to place for the purpose of paying creditors at the places where they are. A paymaster is the supervising head of an establishment of cashiers or of pay clerks or of both combined, and probably all mention of him might be omitted from the Code, there is no apparent likelihood of such a functionary being required except on a

railway staff. We have to deal only with cashiers, whose duties are essentially stationary, and with pay clerks whose duties are essentially peripatetic.

16. Using the terms "cashier" and "pay clerk" in the senses defined above, there is nothing to prevent the cashiers from keeping the Executive Engineer's cash book, if, which however I question, it is desirable that he should do so, instead of keeping his own cash book; but it is, I think, impossible for a single individual to perform satisfactorily the combined duties of pay clerk and cashier, unless his duties as cashier are to be entirely suspended during his absences, which can seldom be otherwise than highly inconvenient, and even if this is admissible, it can hardly be possible for a pay clerk to perform satisfactorily the further duty of keeping the Executive Engineer's cash book. A cashier might perhaps act also as pay clerk within the station at which his cash chest is located, but that is probably the limit of the satisfactory combination of the two functions.

17. There are at present six sanctioned cashiers, one in each of the following divisions, sanctioned in the Government Order quoted against each, namely:—

Godávari Central ...	... G.O., No.	186 W.,	dated	23rd Jan. 1885.
Godávari Eastern	... „ „	2816 W.,	„	8th Oct. 1883.
Kistna Eastern ...	... „ „	1165 W.,	„	10th Sept. 1881.
Presidency ...	... „ „	2048 W.,	„	19th Aug. „
Nellore (Sangam)	... „ „	185 W.,	„	2 th „ 1884.
Ganjam	... „ „	1489 W.,	„	3rd June 1887.

There was also for some time a cashier in the Nílgiri Division, sanctioned in G.O., No. 2430 W., dated 2nd October 1884. The Nellore Division cashier was sanctioned for the Sangam Project and transferred to the Nellore Division on the amalgamation of the two divisions.

18. In the Godávari Central Division the cashier's appointment was expressly asked for in order that he might *make payments throughout the division* and so relieve executive officers; in the Godávari Eastern Division the cashier was asked for in order that he might make payments in the head works sub-division and the divisional office and keep the Executive Engineer's cash book; the Sangam (now Nellore) cashier was asked for for the purpose of relieving executive officers of payments in the Kanigiri Sub-division; in the other cases I can find no mention of the duties the cashier was intended to perform, but it may, I think, be presumed that the cashier was in every case appointed for the purpose of relieving executive officers of the duty of making payments. As far as I can discover, however, it does not seem that cashiers generally perform the duties for which they were presumably appointed. It appears from the vouchers received with accounts that in the Godávari Central Division the cashier makes payments only in the divisional office and in the head-quarters sub-division, not throughout the division as intended; in the Godávari Eastern Division it seems that he pays in the head works sub-division as intended; in the Kistna Eastern Division it seems that he makes only petty payments in the divisional office and workshop payments (Bezváda Workshops), but this is quite a recent development, and correspondence with the Executive Engineer shows that until quite recently he was regarded as a sort of special assistant to the accountant; in the other divisions as far as can be gathered from the vouchers, and in the case of the Presidency Division from personal inquiry, he only makes petty payments in the divisional office. Also with regard to the Nílgiri cashier (now abolished) it appears from the correspondence recorded in the marginally-noted Government Orders that it was a very long time before the cashier began to perform his proper duties, if indeed he ever did do so.

No. 2430 W., dated 2nd Oct. 1884.
„ 1043 W., „ 4th May 1885.
„ 1340 W., „ 29th „ 1886.

19. I am disposed to think that the failure to utilize the service of the cashier for the purpose for which they were presumably appointed is entirely due to the incompatibility of the several functions which the Code ascribes to a cashier, the one duty most distinctly laid down, that of keeping the Executive Engineer's cash book, being almost of necessity incompatible with the duty of making payments throughout a division or even a sub-division, and I think it might be worthwhile to ask Superintending Engineers to consider the necessity of continuing the appointments of cashiers and the expediency of substituting in certain cases pay clerks.

20. My own opinion is that there is probably not a single division in which, under present condition, there is the slightest necessity for the appointment of a cashier, in the sense in which I use the term; that is to say remembering that it is number rather than amount of payments that should be considered, I think there is probably no division in which the transactions, whether receipts or disbursements, of the divisional cash chest are so frequent and numerous that the duties of cashier cannot be very well performed by the head clerk.

21. I will not venture any opinion as to the scope for the employment of pay clerks; personal knowledge of the condition of each division can alone enable any one to form a useful opinion on that point; but I may point out that, since officers of experience and judgment have on several occasions endeavoured to introduce the system of payment by a separate staff, there is at least *primâ facie* ground for thinking that the system might with advantage be introduced in a good many divisions, to the great relief of the executive staff, and though there might not be at first any obvious economy in such a system, it is probable that the saving in travelling allowance of officers, by obviating journeys useless except for payments, would go a long way to meet the cost of the pay clerks, whilst the balance would be more than met by the increased efficiency of the executive staff for their proper work of professional supervision. I put it in this way because too often it is only the obvious money cost and the obvious money saving that are considered, but the saving of the time of executive officers would really be a much more important consideration than the saving of their travelling allowances.

22. I am also inclined to think that, under altered conditions, there might be plenty of room for the continued employment of a cashier in the Presidency Division. There are at present eight offices located in the Chepák buildings each with a separate cash chest. This seems a wasteful system. With a little arrangement it would be easy for the cashier of the Presidency Division to make all the petty payments of the eight offices, on pay orders signed by the responsible officers, as would be done at the head-quarters' offices of any railway.

23. This is not the place to go into the question of the security to be required from cashiers, or from clerks discharging the duties of cashiers, but it may be well to mention that, in connection with the preparation of forms of agreement of deposit, one of the points on which stress is laid by the Government Solicitor is the necessity of correctly describing the duties of the servants concerned, and this is an additional reason for clearly recognizing the distinction here pointed out between cashiers and pay clerks.

Enclosure.

From Captain L. LANGLEY, R.E., Executive Engineer, Trichinopoly Division, to the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, Madras, dated 8th June 1888, No. 10 Exr.

In reply to your No. 389 S.E/6, dated 1st ultimo, I have the honor to state as follows: In the first place, referring to the extract from Mr. Rainier's inspection notes forwarded with your letter under reply, I have to inform you that the agreement with the contractor alluded to says nothing whatever about the *immediate* deposit of Rs. 100. The works are "Rs. 100 to be deposited as security." The amount was deposited on 21st December last. The contractor (Kuppuswami Naidu) states, that at the time he executed the agreement abovementioned, a much larger sum than Rs. 100 was due to him for certain work, so he did not think it necessary to pay the deposit before.

It is supposed that the Executive Engineer did not think it necessary to call upon him for the deposit before, for the same reason. In the early part of December last, the contractor's claims were adjusted, and the doors and windows made by the contractor under the abovementioned agreement, which had been previously in the charge of the Executive Engineer, were handed over to the contractors for delivery at Ammayanáyakanúr. It was then necessary to take the security, and this was done on 21st December. On the 22nd, the office was closed for the Christmas holidays. During the holidays, the contractor petitioned the Executive Engineer for the return of the deposit on the ground that the work was finished. The latter replied that the deposit must be retained till the Executive Engineer, Periyár Division, for whom the work was done, acknowledged its receipt. The deposit should of course have been taken when the agreement was signed, and the delay in not paying the deposit into the treasury on 5th January, was also irregular. Otherwise, I do not see that any fault can be found with the action of either the Executive Engineer or the head clerk. I have thought it necessary to go into this matter because Mr. Rainier's account of the transactions is both inaccurate and misleading, and because this appears to have been an exceptional case.

The practice obtaining in this office regarding the depositing of securities up to January last was as follows :—

Cash securities were duly entered in the cash book as they were received, except in cases in which the amounts had to be refunded within a very short time; in such cases the amounts were kept in the cash chest and returned to the depositors. Earnest moneys received with tenders were returned to the contractors. Although securities were entered in agreements, they were not taken in some cases where contractors had large balances due to them on other works.

Since January last, all securities deposited by contractors have been paid into the treasury at once, after record in the cash book. Earnest moneys are received and returned then and there, so that there is no necessity for mentioning them in the cash book. In future, all securities mentioned in agreements will be taken at the time that the agreements are signed.

ORDER—dated 20th August 1888, No. 2566 W., Public Works.

Communicated to Superintending Engineers for an expression of their views.

(True Extract.)

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

To Superintending Engineers.
To the Consulting Architect to Government.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. E. A. Hankins.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of {1888} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated August, 20th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 20th Aug. 1888, No. 2566 W.

AUGUST.

Security from Contractors

Office Note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, remarking on the failure of the Head Clerk, Trichinopoly Division, to bring promptly to account certain specific items recovered as —, as shown in a letter from the Executive Engineer reporting on certain irregularities noticed in the procedure in connection with the receipt and accounting for security deposits and earnest money of contractors, communicated to Superintending Engineers for an expression of their views.

1523/5

1523

d/ 5 March/89

Cound: ~~to the S.E.~~ to the S.E.
P. Works for the information & guidance of the Ex. Engr. No. 2 Periyar Division.

2:- The Ex. Engr. should report on the several points brought to notice by the Exr. P.W.A.

27.2.89

27/2/89

To the S.E. P.W. Works with the papers in original - returned

Exr. P.W.A.

D 5/3

5

11/3

8/3

rklu 1891

From
Major C. H. S. Christie R.E.
Examiner of P. W. Accounts
Madras.

1523

To
The Secretary to Government
P. W. Department

Dated 25th February 1889
Received 27

No. 256 d. 25th February 1889.

B. No. 650 W d/ 5-3-89

Inspection Note of No. II Periyar Division —
Forwards with summary and remarks —

5

35

S P.W.
W

No. 650Wd/5-3-89

1889.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

1523

Current No. 2939

From The Supdg. Engineer
Periyar Project Works

Enclos.—

No. 519 P.R.
Dated 22nd March 1889
Received 27 — do —

Subject.

Submitting letter from the Exec. Engr. No II Periyar Divn reporting on the several points brought to notice by the Exr P.W. Accts in the Inspection Notes of No. II Periyar Dn.

Disposal.

No. 1636C Dated 28th March 1889

To
C

For any further remarks you may have to offer none especially with reference to No 4.

(Sd) W. L. C. B.
27-3-89

6

28/3

DW.

D
29/3

No. 1636cd/28-3-89.
" 650W " 5-3-89

1889.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Current Nos 2939 & 3983

From The Examiner
P. W. Accts.

1523

Enclos.— 2

No. 563
Dated 1st May 1889
Received 2 — do —

Subject.

Noting & returning with remarks letter from the Exec. Engr. No II Periyar Divn reporting on the several points brought to notice by the Exr. P.W Accts in the Inspection Notes of No II Periyar Dn.

Disposal.

No. 2262C Dated 9th May 1889

Forwarded in original (return requested) to the Supdg. Engineer Periyar Project for the information and guidance of the Exec. Engr. No II Division and for further

7

7

9/5 '95

D 9/5

report.

(By order)

(Sd) W. L. C. Baddeley
Capt. R. E.
Dy: Chief Engineer P. W. D.

(Sd) R. R. E. D. B.
6-5-89.

No II Periar Division

Reply to the Examiner's Remarks on the Summary of Inspection Notes dated 2nd February/89

1523

(1) - Noted

(2). The cheque was drawn on the 11th and the Accountant should have entered it when the Cheque Book was given him on the 16th to Compare and see whether he has received all the information. If the Deputy Examiner had drawn my attention to no notice being sent of Cheques drawn I could have found the delinquent. — I will here mention that I reported the accountant for Carelessness and trying to make errors which he ~~should~~ would have the Credit of finding out.

(3) - Owing to Carelessness in not keeping a Supply of receipt Stamps - These are not procurable in Camp.; the Camp Clerk has since been ordered to.

(4) - Noted. I have followed an old Custom as when these Small imprests are made, the Executive Engineer is personally responsible and it used to be Considered a needless entry in the Cash Book.

8

(5) I regret the Deputy Examiner did not bring this to my notice personally - I am not aware of it and believe the Accountant to blame. The bills are signed and given for despatch before salaries are drawn and I have reprimanded the Accountant for bringing me a list of Cheques to be drawn before the despatch - In the Case of holidays occuring a cheque for cash is sometimes drawn to be ready to disburse when the Salary Bill is signed -

(6) This was not failure but refusal, because the Accountant would not keep the Register in the detail I required -

(7). Noted - This is clearly the Accountant's duty -

(8-) This is Contract Work and the material at site is measured monthly when the bill is prepared and where there is one Contractor who supplies material as well it does not appear of any use but will be done if ordered - No ten day Reports are kept up on any Contract work In this Case it is presumed the Accountant posted the Work Voucher from the bill - He might have gone through the formality of making a ten day report

(9) Accountant Kodanda Rama Iyer should have drawn my attention to this.

(10) This was the Accountant's fault and the omission took place before I had an opportunity of checking, it was current work in arrears by the Accountant.

(11) Noted - Probably as there were no tools and plant to issue, the [illegible] returns were not entered -

(12) Noted - I never sign the agreements till the deposits are complete in this Case one pass book had not yet been given back by the Contractor and the other only a few days before examination of Office - The agreements were on the ordinary Departmental forms.

(13) This has been attended to since receipt of the Circular - These two works being for small amounts, it was not thought worth while to take fresh bonds -

(14.) This for the Accountant.

9 (15) The Service Book was received after the man went on furlough and was being verified in previous Division

9

(16.) This is attended to - Orders were issued before the examination of Accounts.

1/582 P.R./89

ENCLOSURE
20 MAR 89

(17). Since received (See 12.)

(18) The schedule of rates was with the Head Draughtsman. Accountant Kothanda Rama Iyer asked him for it on being told it was in the Camp box (which he should have brought in) – The Accountant said it did not matter, else it would have been produced in time – I regret the Deputy Examiner did not mention this to me. and if none of these irregularities are mentioned personally, it does not seem worth while for the Executive Engineer to neglect other work to be present at the Examination of Accounts.

C. A. Target

Camp. Peranai
18th March 1889
D/20

Executive Engineer
N.th Arcot Division

1523

ENCLOSURE
253
29 MAR 89
EXAMINER'S

SF No. 22

8 582 PR / 22-3-89

No. 1053

From,

C B Target Esqr

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,

No. II. PERIAR DIVISION.

To,

Superintending Engineer
Periar Project Works

STATION [illegible]

Dated 18
Despatched 20 } March 1889
Enclosures 3

4 / 2939/89 / 3983 / 3381

2 - S. E.'s No. 415 P.R. / 11-3-89 with 2 Encs.
1 - E. E.'s Reply to the several points referred.
3

Sir,

I have the honor to return your Endorsement No 415-P.R / 11-3-89 on the Examiner's inspection notes, with its enclosures and reply to the several points therein referred to

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt Servt
C B Target
Ex. Engineer
No II Periar Divn

Notes of inspection by H. Rainier Esquire Inspecting Officer of the office of the Executive Engineer No. 2 Periar Division at Madura on the 17th to 21st January 1889 1523

Mr. C. B. Target Executive Engineer 1st Grade assumed charge of this Division on the 25th July 1888. The Accountant M. R. Ry. K. S. Kodandarama Ayyer, B. A. joined the office on the 30th idem. This is the first examination of the office by an accounts officer.

2. There are two Sub Divisional Officers

(1) Mr. J. F. Somers Esq

Assistant Engineer 1st Grade

(2) Abdul Latif Sahib OK

Supervisor 2nd Grade

who have imprests of Rs 75 and Rs 100 respectively.

3. The Executive Engineer is the only drawing officer - he banks with the Madura and Trichinopoly treasuries, the latter because of its convenience for payments to the South Indian Railway of freight charges.

4. In addition to the imprests mentioned in para 2, one of Rs 100/- is held by temporary Overseer A. Narayanasamy Naidu, and one of Rs 20 by M. Balasundrum Pillay the 2nd Clerk of the Executive Engineer's Office. The latter being for the advance of train fares to lascars, is recouped whenever lascars travelling charges are audited

5. Mr Somers Eve has from his imprest given sub imprests of Rs 10 and 5 respectively to Mr King (Overseer) and Mr Warner.

6. The balance of the Executive Engineer's drawing account on the 1st January 1889 was analysed and proved correct. There was a difference of Rs 10,965-14-3 between the present balance of the cash book under "Bank or Treasury" and the balance at the Treasury as per counterfoils of cheque Books which is accounted for thus –

Letter of credit for January 1889 omitted from cheque book calculation	Rs 10,000
Error in bringing forward balances in counterfoils of cheque Books	1000
	Rs 11,000
Deduct	
Amount of a cheque (et 35 of 11th Jan [illegible] not entered in the Cash Book	34-1-9
	Rs 10965-14-3

There was no voucher for the Rs 34-1-9 (above cheque) the payment had been made by the Executive Engineer in camp and was not advised to the Executive Engineer's Office hence its omission from the divisional Cash Book. 1523

7. The cash balance was found to be Rs 5/- less than the book balance that amount having been advanced by the Executive Engineer to the Camp Clerk without any entry in the Cash Book. This will now be rectified the Executive Engineer said.

8. Salaries of September and October 1888 were disbursed prior to the despatch of the Salary Bill, which is contrary to Code 473(3).

9. The Register of works does not, except in the case of form four works in November 1888, bear the Executive Engineer's initial as having examined and passed each account (Code 311 III)

10. Excavation from the Head sluice to Fall in the 3rd mile

12

A contract bill for Rs 1175-2-7 in favor of M Venkataswamy Naidu for work done in December 1888 but paid for on the 1st January 1889 has been duly shewn in the work accounts for December 1888 as a liability but has not been credited to the Contractor in the Contractor's Ledger for that month

29 MAR 89

11. The same remark applies to another bill for Rs 3271-15-3 in favor of the same contractor for earthwork from Ramarajapuram tank to Natchikulum tank.

12. Head sluice to Paranai Anicut. Constructing a sluice to Vilargulem channel

Stone to the value of Rs 114/- paid for in Form No M 17 (Bill for materials) on the 31st December 1888 has been shewn in the work abstracts as materials at site but the receipt has not been entered in any tenday report.

13. Constructing a fall and bridge combined in the 5th mile Estimate Rs 6200/

For the period 8th to 20th December 1888 the tenday reports are for periods 8th to 10th December Rs 3-9-0 and 11th to 20th December Rs 46-0-9 while the Nominal Muster Rolls are for periods 8th to 13th December Rs 9-3-0 and 14th to 20th December Rs 40-6-6 the totals in the aggregate agree but it would be better to make tenday reports and Nominal Muster Rolls for corresponding periods and so avoid confusion.

15 23

14. A Register of liabilities is maintained but the supplies of instruments &c from P. W. Stores received in December 1888 which were not paid for in that month has not been entered as a liability in the Register

15 × × × ×

15 A The return (M 13) for the current half year has been opened but the monthly receipts and issues have not been posted up.

13

16. There are four agreements entered into with contractors since the formation of this Division. Two of them viz with M Venkatasawmy Naidu for earth work 1st reach and S. Shunmuga Moodeliar for masonry

1st reach are not signed by the Executive Engineer or any one on behalf of Government the other two with P Subba Naidu for store shed at Peranai and Syed Khader Batcha Saib for the pest house at Natchikulam are improperly stamped with Court fee stamps.

17. In the contractors Ledger bills paid in January 1889 are not yet entered to debit of Contractors

18. Only one service book was produced viz that of Supervisor S. Vythialingam Pillay - those of other permanent members viz

(1) Corporal R. King Overseer
(2) Abdul Latif Saib Supervisor

have been returned to the Divisions concerned for the verification of their services there.

19 The entries in the first page of service book of Vythialingam Pillay requires a reattestation the date of the last attestation being 31st May 1876.

20. The claims to Travelling allowance of petty and office establishments from July to October 1888 inclusive were audited and found correct but the memos of lascars claims in a few cases do not shew their movements.

21. There are two deposits now in the Sav
banks. The pass book for one of them
produced but that for the other (Rs 260
the security of M. Venkatasamy Na
Contractor) has not yet been obtaine
handed over to the Executive Engineer
Contractor. 15/23

22. The Schedule of rates was not p
it having been left, it was stated,
Executive Engineer's camp office

23. × × × /14

Madras
2d February 1889

(Signed) H. Rain
Inspecting O

Forwarded

253
20 MAR 89

No. 256 dated 25th Feby 1889

1175
15

Forwarded to the Secretary to Govern-
t P. W. Department for information and
ers of Government with the accompany-
summary and remarks.

M43
27/3/89
5087

(C. No. 93.)

Division. No. II Periyar Summary of Inspection Notes dated 2nd February 1889.

Item No.	Para. of Inspection Notes.	Irregularity noticed.	Code or other order bearing on the subject.	Examiner's Remarks. 153
1	6	Errors in balance in Treasury, as shown in counterfoil of the Executive Engineer's Cheque book	1620	1 The Executive Engineer should be more careful in noting his treasury balances in counterfoils of cheques. ✓
2	6	Non entry of a cheque, paid by the Executive Engineer in camp, in cash book, owing to failure in advising the payment to the Executive Engineer's office.		2. The Executive Engineer should promptly intimate all payments made by him in camp
3	6	Failure to obtain a voucher for a payment made by the Executive Engineer in camp	1642	3 The Executive Engineer should explain why no voucher was taken 15
4	7	Failure to record in the cash book an advance made by the Executive Engineer in camp to a clerk		4. The Executive Engineer should explain. I think that in such cases sums taken by the Executive Engineer into camp should be noted in in the cash book as temporary imprests either with the Executive Engineer or with his camp clerk, or whoever has actual charge of the cash. A similar procedure is prescribed in Code 1773 to be observed when Cashiers (pay clerks) take out

Item No.	Para. of Inspection Notes.	Irregularity noticed.	Code or other order bearing on the subject.	Examiner's Remarks.
				similar sums, and it might be well to lay it down also as regards the Executive Engineers.
5	8	Irregular payment of salaries before despatch of salary bill to the Examiner P. W. Accounts Madras for audit	473 (2)	5 The Executive Engineer should explain the disregard of the code rule, and should state whether it is now being observed.
6.	9	Failure of the Executive Engineer to initial accounts of work in the Register of works	311 III	6. The Executive Engineer should state whether the rule is now being observed.
7	10 11	Failure to credit contractors with the value of work done by them in the Contractors Ledger in two cases	1868	7. If the bills were passed by the Executive Engineer the amounts should have been credited to the contractor concerned in the Contractors Ledger. The Accountants attention should be drawn to this
8	12.	Failure to record receipt of materials in a ten day report.	1752	8. If the bills were passed by the Executive Engineer the amounts should have been credited to the contractor concerned in the Contractors ledger The Accountants attention should be drawn to this.

Item No.	Para. of Inspection Notes.	Irregularity noticed.	Code or other order bearing on the subject.	Examiner's Remarks.
8	12	Failure to record receipt of materials in a ten day report.	1752	8. All materials received and issued should be recorded in the ten day report. It is not clear how the work abstract was posted without this having been done The Executive Engineer should insist on the correct posting of ten day reports by Sub Divisional Officers.
9	13.	Daily reports drawn up for periods not corresponding with the Nominal Muster Rolls in two cases.	Form M 5 Note 4	9. The daily report should be drawn up for the same periods as the Nominal Muster Roll and it should be checked with it to see that the total number and cost of labour of each class, and on the whole work shown in the two documents agree. The Executive Engineer should see that this is attended to.
10	14	Failure to record a certain liability in the Register of liabilities	1595	10. All liabilities adjustable by transfer should be carefully entered in the Register
11	15A.	Failure to post form M 13 half yearly return of tools and plant.	Form M 13 Note 4	11. The returns should be kept posted up to date

Item No.	Para. of Inspection Notes.	Irregularity noticed.	Code or other order bearing on the subject.	Examiner's Remarks.
12	16	Agreements with contractors in two cases not signed by the Executive Engineer on behalf of Government.		12. If the agreement is in one of the ordinary departmental forms signature by the Executive Engineer is not necessary
13	16	Agreements with contractors improperly stamped with Court fee stamps in two cases.	Stamp Act Chapter III Section 9(b)	13. Instructions as to the kind of stamps required have been given to the Executive Engineers by circular. The Executive Engineer should explain why proper stamps are not used.
14	17	Failure to debit a contractor with payments made to him in the contractors ledger.	1860	14. The contractors should have been debited in the ledger with the amounts paid as soon as the payments were made. The Accountant should be directed to attend to this.
15	19	Want of re-attestation to a service book	864.	15. The service book should be re-attested and the Executive Engineer should report when this has been done
16	20	Failure to show movements of lascars in these memos for claims to travelling allowance in a few cases	Civil Travelling Allowance Code Section 18 Note I	16. The Executive Engineer should report whether this is now being attended to
17	21	Non receipt by the Executive Engineer of a Post office Saving Bank pass book on account of security deposited by a Contractor.		17. The Executive Engineer should report whether the Savings Bank Pass books have since been received by him and lodged in chest
18	22	Schedule of rates not forthcoming at inspection having been left in the Executive Engineer's camp.	920	The Schedule of rates should have been kept ready for the inspection as it is the duty of the inspecting accounts officer to look into it when inspecting Divisional offices

Madras }
February 1889 }

Major R.E.
Examiner of P. W. Accounts
Madras

A
23/2
JP 25/2

17

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

Item No.	Para. of Inspection Notes.	Irregularity noticed.	Code or other order bearing on the subject.	Examiner's Remarks.
				1523
				78

[illegible] W Department S.D

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

Brur 2/7 2939/89
3983
5281

1523 No 519. P.R

Enclo: 3.

? 650 W.Y 5/3/89.

Submitted to Government with reference to G. O. No 680 W. of 6th Feby

2. Almost all the points noted are trifling irregularities for which the accountant rather than the Executive Engineer is responsible. The latter has complained of the carelessness and disobedience of the accountant Kothandarama Iyer who has since lately been transferred to another Division.

3. The only point requiring special notice is No 4. It would seem to be more convenient to continue the former custom of considering the sums in question as cash in the personal custody of the Executive Engineer and forming part of his cash balance. The unnecessary multiplication of imprest accounts is to be avoided.

19

Periyar }
2 March 89 }
23

J. Penny Col R.E.
Supg Engr Periyar Project.

To The Chief Engineer
P. W. Department Pd

No. 1636 C d/ 28th March 1889

To
C

For any further remarks you may have to offer more especially with reference to No. 4.

27.3.89
D.W.

No 563 d/ 1st May 1889

To W.

Enc 3.

Noted and returned with the following remarks:-

2. Item 2 of the summary. It was not the accountant's duty to keep the cash book.

3. Item 4. Sums taken out by the Executive Engineer into camp and expended must be accounted for and recorded in some document and the imprest account would appear to be the most suitable. The treatment of these sums as temporary imprests would prevent items being lost sight of and would get over the seeming irregularity of payments made by the Executive Engineer in camp not being recorded in the cash book on date of

---

P.W. ACCOUNTS
253
29 MAR 1889
3

P.W. Cns: ~~2930~~

1 Ex

3[illegible]/89

No 519. P.R.

From,

The Superintending Engr
Periyar Project works.

To,

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

Dated 22nd } March/89.
Recd 27 }

Enc- 3.

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
27 MAR. 89
P.W. DEPARTMENT, MADRAS

Examiner's Report in Notes— Submits No IV. Dd Executive Engineer's letter regarding the points on the —

To

1523/20 C

payments. There can be no more trouble in accounting for these amounts regularly, as temporary imprests, than in accounting for them in memos in a note book or on scraps of paper.

4. Item 5. The responsibility for the disregard of rule appear to lie with the Executive Engineer, who should satisfy himself that payments may be made and not sign any cheque that is put before him by the accountant. Cheques should not be drawn before the proper time. Executive Engineer does not say whether the rule is now attended to.

5. Item 8. If the accountant did not keep the register of works properly, the Executive Engineer should have reported the fact, otherwise he makes himself responsible. He did bring to notice as regards one work that the accountant had not kept the register in some peculiar manner that he desired, but as far as I could make out from his letter, the accountant was in no way to blame, the fault being in the Executive Engineers' instructions. The matter is still under correspondence. In any case this would not excuse the Executive Engineer for general failure to initial the register. The Executive Engineer should say whether the rule is now being observed.

Item 8. The materials were

Memo No 1636C d/ 20. 8. 89
Do. No 350 d/ 5-3. 89

paid for on a separate bill for materials and were not apparently supplied in execution of a contract for work. When paid for, they were the property of Government and not property of the contractor, and should have been brought into a ten-day report for posting into the work abstract. It is not the duty of the accountant to prepare ten day reports in any case and in most cases it would be impossible and in any case most irregular for him to do so.

7. Item 9. The Executive Engineer does not state whether he has done anything to prevent the continuance of the irregularity.

8. Item II. The Executive Engineer's reply is not understood. The accounts show that there were receipts of tools and plant during October, November and January and these should have been entered in half yearly returns.

9. The final remarks of the Executive Engineer regarding irregularities not being mentioned to him personally, will be replied to after reference to Mr. Rainier who is absent on tour.

C.

1/5

1/5

O. Em 6/5

PWC No 3983

5387/89

1523

1523

21

G.L. No. 970. P.R.
13-5-89

Ry 2-5-89

E.2

No. 2262 C.d/ 9th May 1889

Forwarded in original (return requested) to the Supdg: Engineer, Periyar Project for the information and guidance of the Exe. Engineer of No. II Division and for further report.

(By order)

W. C. Baddeley Capt. R.E.
Dy: Chief Engineer P.W.D.

No 803, P.R.

Communicated to the Executive Engineer No II Periyar Division for attention.

J. Pennycuick
Colonel R.E.
Supg Engr Periyar Project

15/23

Kodaikanal
13-5-89
Dy 15

No 363.

Noted & returned.
With regard to Para 5th the examiner up to date has given no reply –
I never initial a page of the register of Works as long as I suspect inaccuracies.

22

Exe: Engr
No II. P. Dn
25-5-89

27/5
Dy 28-5-89.

1002 P.R.
28.5.89

No. 915 P.P. Encls 2

Submitted to the Chief Engineer P.W.D. with reference to his No 2262 C of 9 May/89

J. Pennycuick
Col R.E.
Supg Engr
Periyar Project

Kodaikanal
21 May/89

Despd 28 June/89.

To
the Chief Engineer
P.W. Department

No 803, P.R.
13.5.89

1523/23

[illegible] 58

No 915 C.R.

From,

The Superintending Engineer
Periyar Project

To,

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

Dated 31st May
Reg'd 2nd June } 1889.
Received 5 "

4
An — 2

[illegible]

Examiner's Inspection
note — Submits Executive
Engineer's remarks on the —

23

With order

7262 C / 7/5/89
1636 C / 28/3/89

B

Recorded
Recorded

mcr
6.6.89

or shall

be directed to re
on the points in Ex
363 - 8.1.8.89 as ur
-gently he ou
done? vide
8 June 89 -

1523
23

Exe Pro. A.
Exe P.W.A. — Posted 8/6/89

Cy

P 17/6.