

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை - 16 -
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 25.10.90
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 607

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

PWD துறை

62

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	3002	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	11-11-1891	198

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

7 Shells

7

11TH NOVEMBER 1891, No. 3002 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, 3rd November 1891, No. 6717.

Acting under the authority conveyed in para. 2, G.O., No. 2984 W., Public Works, dated 8th November 1887, this office has from time to time brought to notice of the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, cases in which Executive Engineers have failed to inspect sub-divisional offices once in six months. That order was passed on the recommendation in para. 4 of Examiner's office-note No. 608, dated 4th October 1887, in reference to the Nellore division, but I would earnestly request a reconsideration of the matter.

2. By the very character of his position as financial officer, an Examiner is often unavoidably brought into conflict with Executive officers. I am quite prepared to accept this position in the legitimate discharge of my duties, but I respectfully submit that it is no portion of an Examiner's duties to interfere with administrative functions, and that anything of the kind is decidedly calculated to increase friction between the Accounts and Executive branches.

3. The inspection or non-inspection of sub-divisional offices is distinctly an administrative duty, and I think it should be left entirely to Superintending Engineers to deal with. I would therefore recommend that the order in question be cancelled, and that Superintending Engineers be charged with the responsibility of seeing that such inspections are made with sufficient frequency. Perhaps the best way of securing this would be by means of a simple abstract, to be submitted half-yearly to Superintending Engineers, showing the inspections made during the half-year, in precisely the same way that the Examiner keeps the Accountant-General, Public Works Department, informed of his inspections of divisional offices.

Note by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

I entirely concur in the above remarks. I do not know why the duty of reporting on the examination of sub-divisional offices was even imposed on the Examiner.

6th November 1891.

(Signed) J. PENNYCUICK, Colonel, R.E.,
Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

ORDER—dated 11th November 1891, No. 3002 W., Public Works.

His Excellency the Governor in Council agrees with the remarks of the Chief Engineer and Examiner. The instructions issued on para. 4 of the Examiner's letter

recorded with G.O., No. 2984 W., dated 8th November 1887, are accordingly cancelled, and the duty of inspecting sub-divisional offices will be dealt with entirely by Superintending Engineers, who will be expected to see that it is performed with sufficient frequency.

(True Extract).

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

To Superintending Engineers.
„ the Consulting Architect to Government.
„ the Superintendent of Works, Periyár Project.
„ the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. C. M. Brisson.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of {1891} Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated November, 11th.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 11th Nov. 1891, No. 3002 W.

NOVEMBER.

Inspecting Sub-divisional
offices

~~Orders delegating to Superintending
Engineers the duty of —.~~

Orders laying down that
S. Es are responsible that the
duty of — is regularly
performed.

KEEP-WITH

CURRENT No.

GOVT. }
OF MADRAS. }

189/.

{ P. W.
{ DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

dated

189 .

Madras, 3rd *November* 1891.

OFFICE NOTE No. 6717.

To

W.

Acting under the authority
conveyed in para 2 of O.P. 2924 W.
O.W. dated 8th November 1887, this
office has from time to time
brought to notice of the Secretary
to Government P.W. Department
cases in which Executive Engi-
neers have failed to inspect
sub divisional offices once
in six months. That order
was passed on the recommend-
ation in para 4 of Examiner's
Office Note No. 608 dated 4th
October 1887 in reference to
the Kottur division, but I
would earnestly request a
reconsideration of the matter.

2. By the very character of
his position as financial
officer, an Examiner is often

unavoidably brought into conflict with Executive officers. I am quite prepared to accept this position in the legitimate discharge of my duties, but I respectfully submit that it is no portion of an Examiner's duties to interfere with administrative functions, and that anything of the kind is decidedly calculated to increase friction between the Accounts and Executive Branches.

3. The inspection or now inspection of sub-divisional offices is distinctly an administrative duty, and I think it should be left entirely to Superintending Engineers to deal with. I would therefore recommend that the order in question be cancelled, and that Superintending Engineers be charged with the responsibility of seeing that such

inspections are made with sufficient frequency. Perhaps the ^{best} ~~simplest~~ way of securing this would be by means of a simple abstract, to be submitted half-yearly to Superintending Engineers, showing the inspections made during the half-year, in precisely the same way that the Examiner keeps the Accountant General & W. Department informed of his inspections of divisional offices.

18/11 3 P
Note by the Chief Engineer
Section's concern in
the above remarks - I
do not know why the
duty of reporting on the
administration of sub-divisional
offices was ever imposed
on the Examiner -

S
E. W.
6.11.91

No. 2984 W of 8-11-87
" 2495C " 5-6-90

HM

For orders.

I agree with W
W
9 Nov

D

W
6.11

From orders

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

3002/5

Read the following

office note from the Secy. P.W. Dept. N.E. No. 6717
of 3rd Nov. 91
note by the Chief Engineer, P.W. Dept. N.E. No. — of 6 Nov. 1891.

His Excellency the
Governor - in Council
agrees with the remarks
of the Examiner and
Chief Engineer. The
instructions issued
on para 4 of the Examiner's
letter recorded with G.O.
2984 W dated 8th Nov.
1887 are accordingly
cancelled, and the
duty of inspecting sub-
divisional offices will
be dealt with entirely
by Suptg. Engineers,
who will be expected
to see that it is performed
with sufficient frequency.

To
The Suptg. Engineer
C. A. to Govt.
Supts. of works P. Project
Secy. P.W. Dept. RA

W 11-91 S 10.11

11624

30026

It seems that the

suggestion might
be acted on - ³⁰⁰²⁶

It has happened
one or twice lately
that letters deposited
that Sub. P^m have
not been inspected
for 6 months, where
as a matter of
fact they have been
so inspected - This
arises from the
information being
obtained from the
accounts which
represent what has
happened up to the
end of a month,
not what has
happened between
end of month &
date of submission
of accounts -

W. B.
5.11.91

CN^o 11024

Cont. of 1891 Studies.

PUBLIC WORKS

18/11/91

C.O. 11. XI 1911 30026

Inspecting in Sub-
divisional Offices.

Instructions issued
in part 4 of the Engineer's
letter headed with C
2684 W of 8. XI. 87 regarding
— by the Engineer
P.W.C. cancelled, and
this duty left entirely to
Supt. Engineer, ordered.

~~Under delegating to
S.E. the duty of~~

Orders laying down that
S.E.s are responsible that the
duty of — is regularly per-
formed.

C 11/11/11
1911

CN^o 11024

Col. of 1891 31nd 35.

PUBLIC WORKS

11/11/91

C.O. 11.81 191 30026

Inspecting in Sub-
division of Office.

Instructions issued
on part 4 of the Engineer's
letter issued with C.O.
2684 W of 8.11.87 regarding
— by the Engineer
P.W.C. cancelled, and
this duty left entirely to
Supt. Engineer, ordered.

Since delegating to
S.E. the duty of

Orders laying down that
S.E. are responsible that the
duty of — is regularly per-
formed.

11/11/91
1911