

(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 12

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 1982

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

PWD துறை

144

அரசாணை எண்.
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.

208

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் : 21-1-1882

198

மடிக்கலோ கண்டபடி கையாளலோ கூடாது

6 Shats

ஆவண, கா-1-18,006-15-6-87.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General
Account.

READ—the following papers:—

Office-note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated 15th January 1892, No. 63 S.A.

In G.O., No. 3053 W., of 14th November 1891, a procedure was authorized which will afford considerable relief to divisional offices in connection with the submission of completion reports, and it is considered that the detail in which registers of works need be kept is also susceptible of appreciable curtailment.

2. The orders of the Government of India on the subject, as contained in volume II of its code, are as follows:—

“(a) For works costing under Rs. 2,500, the accounts need not be kept by sub-heads; the registers of works will show merely the total charges against the work in cases where the Superintending Engineer and the Examiner approve.

“(b) For works costing from Rs. 2,500 to Rs. 10,000 each, in cases where the Superintending Engineer and the Examiner approve, the accounts of sub-heads need not be kept according to actual cost, but according to the normal cost arrangement.

“(c) For works costing over Rs. 10,000 each, the accounts of sub-heads will be kept according to actual cost (*chapter XIII, para 60*).”

3. The Public Works Accounts committee of 1889 went considerably further in their recommendations for curtailment of this record of outlay by sub-heads, to wit—

“Several officers of high standing and experience laid great stress on the desirability of limiting the detail of outlay in the works accounts. It is alleged that the distribution of charges between sub-heads is frequently arbitrary. The committee thinks that the record of outlay on all works costing Rs. 5,000 and under may, unless specially otherwise ordered by the sanctioning or controlling officer, be limited to totals under cash and stock (*para. 238 of the committee's report*).”

4. These recommendations were accepted by the Government of India in the following terms:—

“The Government of India is pleased to give local Governments and Administrations power to raise, at their option, the limit of cost of works, below which outlay need not be recorded by sub-heads from Rs. 2,500 to Rs. 5,000.

“In the case of the Irrigation branch of the department, however, it appears to the Government of India that it will be advisable that outlay on special works which require exceptional care, such as aqueducts and syphons on distributaries should be recorded by sub-heads even if they are estimated to cost less than the above limit provided the estimated cost is not under Rs. 2,500. Local Governments and Administrations may also empower Superintending Engineers to extend this principle to any other works estimated to cost between Rs. 2,500 and Rs. 5,000 (*Government of India Circular No. 10 P.W., dated 10th October 1889*).”

5. It would therefore be in strict accordance with the orders of the Government of India to discontinue the record in registers of works of outlay by sub-heads under—

(i) all original works, *excepting* special irrigation works which require exceptional care, such as aqueducts and syphons on distributaries, costing Rs. 5,000 and under;

(ii) all exceptional original irrigation works costing Rs. 2,500 and under; and even this will be an appreciable relief to divisional offices.

6. In reference to *repairs*, I think the record of outlay by sub-heads may be dispensed with without any sacrifice of control over expenditure in *all* cases of (a) ordinary and (b) annual repairs, *irrespective of amount*, and that, in cases of *special* repairs, costing above Rs. 5,000, the sanctioning authority might declare, at time of sanction, whether the registers of works should be posted according to sub-heads or not.

7. If these proposals, which I have discussed with the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, meet with the approval of Government, I would ask the favour of early orders on them in order that they may be brought into force with effect from the accounts of the current month.

Note by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

I concur in the above proposals.

16th January 1892.

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

ORDER—dated 21st January 1892, No. 208 W., Public Works.

The proposals of the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, which are concurred in by the Chief Engineer, are approved and sanctioned.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" Superintending Engineers.
" the Consulting Architect to Government.
" the Superintendent of Works, Periyár Project.
" the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Exd. A. D. Xavier.
Spare Copies

2
208

GENERAL
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of {1892} Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated January, 21st.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 21st Jan. 1892, No. 208 W.

JANUARY.

Register of Works

Certain modifications proposed by the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, in the detail in which to keep —, approved and sanctioned.

KEEP-WITH

CURRENT No.

GOVT.
OF MADRAS.

1892.

P. W.
DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

dated

189

Madras, 15 January 1892.

OFFICE NOTE No. 63 Lit

To

W.

In G.O.No.3053 W.of 14th.November 1891 a procedure was authorized which will afford considerable relief to divisional offices in connection with the submission of Completion Reports;and it is considered that the detail in which Registers of Works need be kept is also susceptible of appreciable curtailment

2. The orders of the Government of India on the subject,as contained in volume II of its Code,are as follows:-

(a) For works costing under Rs.2,500, the accounts need not be kept by sub heads;the registers of works will show merely the total charges against the work,in cases where the Superintending Engineer & the Examiner approve.

(b) For works costing from Rs.2,500 to Rs.10,000 each,in cases where the Superintending Engineer & the Examiner approve,the accounts of sub heads need not be kept according to actual cost,but according to the normal cost arrangement".

(c) For works costing over Rs.10,000 each, the accounts of sub-heads will be kept according to actual cost" (Chapter XIII, para 80).

3. The P.W. Accounts Committee of 1889 went considerably further in their recommendations for curtailment of this record of outlay by sub-heads; to wit:

"Several officers of high standing & experience laid great stress on the desirability of limiting the detail of outlay in the works accounts. It is alleged that the distribution of charges between sub-heads is frequently arbitrary. The Committee thinks that the record of outlay on all works costing Rs.5,000 and under may, unless specially otherwise ordered by the sanctioning or controlling officer, be limited to totals under cash and stock" (para 238 of the Committee's Report).

4. These recommendations were accepted by the Government of India in the following terms:-

"The Government of India is pleased to give Local Governments and Administrations power to raise at their option, the limit of cost of works, below which outlay need not be recorded by sub-heads, from Rs. 2,500 to Rs.5,000.

"In the case of the Irrigation Branch of the department, however, it

appears to the Government of India that it will be advisable that outlay on special works which require exceptional care, such as aqueducts and syphons on distributaries should be recorded by sub-heads even if they are estimated to cost less than the above limit, provided the estimated cost is not under Rs. 2,500. Local Governments and Administrations may also empower Superintending Engineers to extend this principle to any other works estimated to cost between Rs.2,500 and Rs. 5,000". (Government of India Circular No.10 P.W. dated 10th. October 1889).

5. It would therefore be in strict accordance with the orders of the Government of India to discontinue the record, in Registers of works, of outlay by sub-heads under-

- (i) all original works, excepting special irrigation works which require exceptional care, such as aqueducts & syphons on distributaries, costing Rs.5,000 and under;
- (ii) all exceptional original irrigation works costing Rs.2,500 & under;

and even this will be an appreciable relief to divisional offices.

6. In reference to Repairs, I think the record of outlay by sub-heads may be dispensed with, without any sacrifice

4873 CD 31.10.89
in the C.A. 5399/90
in his table with
his P.W. Accounts
Committee
Span copy is
kept.

of control over expenditure, in all cases of (a) Ordinary and (b) Annual repairs, irrespective of amount, and that in cases of special repairs costing above Rs. 5,000 the sanctioning authority might declare, at time of sanction, whether the registers of works should be posted according to sub-heads or not.

7. If these proposals, which I have discussed with the Chief Engineer P.W.D., meet with the approval of Government, I would ask the favour of early orders on them in order that they may be brought into force with effect from the accounts of the current month.

H/15/1

C.

H/15/1

I concur in the

above proposals -

S. E. W.

For order

I have no objection

S.

18.1.1

Recd: 15.1.92

No. 916-744/20-3-88
- 2871 W - 14-9-88
" 470-1 W - 16-1-89
" 4873 W - 25-10-89
" 882 W - 24-3-91
" 1747 W - 29-6-91
" 2590 W - 28-9-91
" 3053 W - 14-11-91
" 6 W - 4-1-92

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following

Office note from the Secy. P.W. Dept. No. 635A dated 15 January 1892.
Note by the Chief Engineer P.W.D. dated 16 Jan'y '92

S/144

The proposals of the Examiners P.W. Accounts which are concurred in by the Chief Engineer are approved and sanctioned.

19.1.92

S. 19.1

To the Secy. P.W. Dept. 22/5/91
Supty. Engineers
C.A. to Govt.
Supt. of Works P. Projct
Chief Eng. for Engrs

No 432

Govt. of (1892) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated

Recd.

Encl.

G.O. 21st January 1892 No. 208-M

Register of Works

Certain Modifications
proposed by the Examiners
P.W. accounts in the
detail in which to keep
—, approved and
sanctioned

(6)

LC. 20/11