

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 10
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் செப்டம்பர் 1991
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் for

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

PWD துறை

(17)

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	<u>2151</u>	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் : <u>3-8-1852</u>		<u>198</u>

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

5 Shakti

2151
W.
1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Account.

READ—the following papers:—

Office-note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 25th July 1892, No. 60 A.

With reference to para. 1 of G.O., No. 1112 W., dated 5th April 1892, I beg a reconsideration of the order that unsettled claims of piece-workers should be dealt with in precisely the same manner as dues to contractors.

2. It has recently been brought to my notice that this very question was submitted by my predecessor for the opinion of the Accountant-General, Public Works Department, who in his letter No. 1129 G., dated 15th October 1888, replied as follows:—

“In reply to your letter, No. 300 A., dated 17th ultimo, requesting instructions as to the treatment in accounts of unpaid wages, I have the honour to inform you that . . . the amounts should not be credited to deposits, but the liabilities recorded in the day-book, register of works and completion report. If ever any such item be paid in after years, the payment when made must be charged to the work, even though the completion report may have been previously passed.”

This opinion was received in this office before the present para. 1750 in the Madras Code was issued to the department under Standing Order No. 430, dated 25th July 1888, which, however, had previously been approved by Government.

3. At the time of writing my office-note No. 395 S.A., dated 16th March 1892, I was not aware that the question had ever been raised by this office, but it will be noticed that, in para. 4 thereof, I submitted, for the approval of Government, a procedure based on the orders of the Accountant-General to me while in another province and which is in complete accordance with his instructions quoted in para. 2 of this note.

4. The objection to the procedure authorized in para. 1 of G.O., No. 1112 W., dated 5th April 1892, is that the charge against grant will be raised before the payment is made, and I may add that, in connection with my proposal to allow the estimated amount of compensation for land to be debited to a work in cases in which, at the time of preparing the completion report, the amount actually paid was not known, the Accountant-General recently wrote to me as follows:—

“3. The only case in which such a procedure is permitted in the Public Works accounts is when it is considered expedient to close the accounts of a work and of a contractor—*vide* Public Works Department Code, volume II, chapter XIII, para. 67—but even here the procedure is admittedly wrong in principle and it is not probable that Government will approve of any extension of the incorrect practice.”

5. Now that the Government of India Code will come into force from 1st August 1892 it appears most desirable that the practice in this Presidency should be in accord with that followed in other provinces and I, therefore, request that the following

procedure may be substituted for that authorized in para. 1 of G.O., No. 1112 W., dated 5th April 1892:—

(1) If, at the time of preparing a completion report or completion certificate for a work, any wages to piece-workers are still unpaid, the amount of such arrears of wages shall be distinctly recorded in the completion report or completion certificate.

(2) If the payment be made subsequently, the charge to the work should be made at the time the liability is discharged, even though the completion report or completion certificate may have been previously passed.

(3) The sums unpaid must *not* be charged to the grant until they are actually disbursed.

(4) If such sums are not claimed within six clear months, excluding the month in which the wages were earned, they will be considered as forfeited under schedule II of the Indian Limitation Act of 1877 and they will remain as short charges to the works concerned.

6. Every completion report and completion certificate will thus show the total cost of a work including liabilities, which will be recorded as a separate item, and there will consequently be no sacrifice of administrative check over outlay as compared with sanctioned estimate.

Note by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

I think the principle is wrong, but the matter is not one of much importance, as the cases in which dues unpaid at the time of preparing the completion report are paid later will be very rare indeed, and it will be as well to use the same procedure as in other provinces. I, therefore, support the Examiner's proposal.

28th July 1892.

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

ORDER—dated 3rd August 1892, No. 2151 W., Public Works.

On reconsideration, the Government directs that the procedure indicated in para. 5 of the Examiner's note be adopted in supersession of that ordered in para. 1 of G.O., No. 1112 W., dated 5th April 1892.

(True Extract.)

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

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

Exd. A. D. Xavier.
Spare Copies

2151
2

GENERAL.
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of {1892} Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated August, 3rd.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 3rd Aug. 1892, No. 2151 W.

AUGUST.

Wages to Piece-workers

Certain procedure proposed by the Examiner of Public Works Accounts regarding the treatment of — remaining unpaid at the time of preparing a completion report or completion certificate for a work, approved for adoption with remarks.

KEEP WITH

CURRENT No.

dated

189 .

GOVT. OF MADRAS.

1892.

(C. No. 1201.)

P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 25 July 1892.

OFFICE NOTE No. 1014

To

W.

With reference to para I of G.O.

No. IIII2 W. dated 5th. April 1892, I beg a reconsideration of the order that unsettled claims of piece-workers should be dealt with in precisely the same manner as dues to contractors.

2. It has recently been brought to my notice that this very question was submitted by my predecessor for the opinion of the Accountant General P.W. D. who in his letter, No. II29 G. dated 15th. October 1888 replied as follows:-

" In reply to your letter, No. 300 A dated 17th. ultimo, requesting instructions as to the treatment in accounts of unpaid wages, I have the honour to inform you that the amounts should not be credited to Deposits, but the liabilities recorded in the day-book, register of works, & completion report. If ever any such item be paid in after years, the payment when made must be charged to the work, even though the completion report may have

been previously passed".

This opinion was received in this office before the present para I750 in the Madras Code was issued to the Department under standing order No. 430, dated 25th. July 1888, which however had previously been approved by Government.

3. At the time of writing my office note No. 395 S.A. dated 16th. March 1892, I was not aware that the question had ever been raised by this office; but it will be noticed that in para 4 thereof I submitted for the approval of Government a procedure based on the orders of the Accountant General to me while in another Province, and which is in complete accordance with his instructions quoted in para 2 of this letter.

4. The objection to the procedure authorized in para I of G.O. No. III2 W. dated 5th. April 1892 is that the charge against grant will be raised before the payment is made; and I may add that, in connection with my proposal to allow the estimated amount of compensation for land to be debited to a work in cases in which, at the time of preparing the completion report, the amount actually paid was not known, the Accountant General recently wrote to me as follows:-

"3. The only case in which such a procedure is permitted in the P.W.

accounts is when it is considered expedient to close the accounts of a work and of a contractor, vide Public Works Department Code, volume II, chapter XIII, para 67, but even here the procedure is admittedly wrong in principle, and it is not probable that Government will approve of any extension of the incorrect practice."

5. Now that the Government of India Code will come into force from 1st. August 1892 it appears most desirable that the practice in this Presidency should be in accord with that followed in other Provinces, and I therefore request that the following procedure may be substituted for that authorized in para I of G.O. No. III2 W. dated 5th. April 1892.

- i. if at the time of preparing a completion report or completion certificate for a work, any wages to piece-workers are still unpaid, the amount of such arrears of wages shall be distinctly recorded in the completion report or completion certificate.
- ii. if the payment be made subsequently, the charge to the work should be made at the time the liability is discharged, even though the completion report or completion certificate may have been previously passed.
- iii. the sums unpaid must not be charged to the grant until they are actually disbursed.

iv. if such sums are not claimed within six clear months, excluding the month in which the wages were earned, they will be considered as forfeited under Schedule II of the Indian Limitation Act of 1877, and they will remain as short charges to the works concerned.

6. Every completion report and completion certificate will thus show the total cost of a work, including liabilities, which will be recorded as a separate item, and there will consequently be no sacrifice of administrative check over outlay as compared with sanctioned estimate.

Dec. 25. VII. 92

Note 3 E. W. Mearns

I think the principle is wrong, but the matter is not one of much importance as the sums in which they are unpaid at the time of preparing the completion report will be paid later with the very same interest, and it will be as well to use the same procedure as in other Provinces - I therefore support the Revenue proposal -

Ex. No. 1112-2 W 8.4.92

CN-7590

No. 2151 W 13 August 92

4 Hel 30 July

On reconsideration the Govt. directs that the procedure indicated in para 5 of the Examiner's note be adopted in supersession of that ordered in para 1 of G.O. No. 1112 W of 5 April 1892

207

over 28.7.92

To The Secy. P. W. Dept.
Suptg. Engrs.
Comm. Dist.
Supt. of Works, Project
Chief Engrs. for Divs.

26/7

68-7
11-8

23.8.92

2151/5

C No 7590

Govt. of Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

29-5-15
20-7-15

3rd August 1892 No. 2151/H

Wages to piece-workers

Certain procedure proposed
by the Examiner of P.W. works
regarding the treatment
of ——— remaining unpaid
at the time of preparing
a completion report or
Completion Certificate
for a work, approved
for adoption with remarks.

(5)

2/10

2/10

14

1-3
2
53/8

20-3/8