

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 4
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 12-89
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் [Signature]

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P.W.D துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	1849-W	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	5-7-1890	198 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

3273
28 MAY 1890

No. 2354 D. 1899

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Ootacamund, 21st May 1890.

OFFICE NOTE.

From W.

To

C.

Your office note No. 2553, dated 3rd May 1890.

The statement in question was not sent to you for verification as it was checked by this office.

2. The establishment allowed for the late Presidency ^{D^o} was considerably larger than that of a 1st class or special division, and as the work which devolved on each of the Sub divisional offices of that division was always greatly in excess of

02552-V
2nd 19-V

of that of an ordinary sub-division, a portion of the division establishment was always drafted to the sub-divisions to enable them to cope with their work.

Consequently each sub-division of the late Presidency division always had more establishment than that sanctioned for it. When the Civil Works of the late Presidency division were transferred to the Presidency Architect, the two sub-divisions with the establishments actually attached to them were made over to that officer. This being the case the Presidency Architect in his proposition statement showed as the "present scale" the establishment of each sub-division actually made over to him, and this he explained in the foot-note at the end of the statement.

3. With reference to para 2
of

of your note it is observed that para 25 of the Code treats of changes in the establishment requiring the sanction of the Govt. of India and does not require statements of establishments sanctioned by this Govt. to be verified by you before sanction.

4. As however it is desirable that statements of propositions for revision of establishment requiring the sanction of the Local Govt. should be checked in your office, this procedure will be adopted as a rule.

Approved
19.5.80
W

Cri

To W.

No. 3092 d/19-6-90
14-10-0-90
The letter of the Code rule (para 26) apparently does not require that the proposal statements for establishment should be sent to my office for check, but, as it has always been the practice to send such statements to my office, it was thought that the intention of code para 26 was that proposals requiring sanction of Government should be treated in all respects similarly to those requiring sanction of the Government of India, and the omission was pointed out so as to clear my office of any responsibility.

2. Of course, Government can sanction any proposal within their power without regard to previous sanction and therefore without regard to the accuracy or inaccuracy of the statement of previous sanctions, but if they require the statement to be given -- as they do --, they would presumably desire it to be checked by the audit office and as it is now proposed "as a rule" to adopt the procedure, it would perhaps be well to modify the code accordingly. It is desirable that the extent of responsibility of the audit office should be made clear.

PW C.A. 58025

Rd 70-6-90

No 2354 C d/ 21-5-90

777 W d/ 28-3-90

1195 C d/ 5-3-90

1196 W d/ 23-4-88

350 W d/ 9-2-80

No. 1849 W d/ 5 July 1890

PO
J. S. 30/6/90

The Examiner's view
in para 1 of this note is
accepted - Para 26 P.W.
Code will be modified
accordingly.

Thurs
25-6-90

May
Earl
P. 17

Check VI
Hunt 127 VI
VII

20/6 20/6 20/6 20/6