(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 28

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 10/81

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

PWD துறை

(23)

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	2157	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	3-8-1852	~~198~~.

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

14 Sheets

25th July 1892, No. $\frac{10}{2065}$ W., Public Works.

2157/1

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Letter—to

The Right Honorable the SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA.

My Lord,

We have the honour to forward herewith five copies of each of the following budget estimates of the Public Works Department for the year 1892–93 :—

Final Issue.

(1) Imperial Military works.
(2) „ Civil „
(3) Provincial „ „
(4) Incorporated Local Funds.
(5) Excluded Local Funds.
(6) Irrigation Major works.
(7) „ Minor Works and Navigation.

2. With reference to your Lordship's despatch, No. 7, Public Works, dated 18th August 1887, we attach a statement showing the approximate amount of establishment charges applicable to the construction of the Rushikulya and the Periyár projects, the only works in progress in this Presidency on which special establishments are exclusively employed. It will be observed that the cost of the establishment chargeable to the Rushikulya project is 3·5 per cent. less than that estimated for the previous year and 2·6 below the 23 per cent. usually allowed in this Presidency. In the case of the Periyár project, the percentage for the current official year is 29·6 or ·2 per cent. less than that of 1891–92. Should, however, the grant for *works* be increased during the year, as seems probable, this percentage will be correspondingly reduced.

We have the honour to be,
My Lord,
Your Lordship's most obedient, humble servants,

(Signed) WENLOCK.
(„) J. C. DORMER, Lieut.-Genl.
(„) H. E. STOKES.
(„) J. H. GARSTIN.

Fort St. George,
25th July 1892.

Exd. S. J. Pereira.

ENCLOSURE.

STATEMENT showing the approximate estimated amount of establishment charges applicable to works under construction in 1892–93.

System of works for which Capital and Revenue accounts are kept.	Capital expenditure on works.	Establishment.											Grand Total.	Percentage of establishment on Capital expenditure on works.
		Direction and accounts.			Construction.									
		Chief Engineer for Irrigation and Superintending Engineer.	Accounts, Central office	Total.	Engineer.	Upper subordinate.	Lower subordinate.	Petty.	Accounts.	Office.	Travelling allowance.	Contingencies.	Total.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	
Periyár project	(a) 6,44,300	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Rateable share of General Provincial establishment ..	..	(b) 15,775	11,156	26,931	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	26,931	..
Charge for establishment to be actually employed on the work	..	(c) 1,200	..	1,200	57,156	45,396	6,132	11,328	5,760	19,908	14,136	2,760	1,62,576	1,63,776	..
Total ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1,90,707	29·6
Rushikulya project	(d) 3,57,724	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Rateable share of General Provincial establishment ..	..	(e) 14,913	6,194	21,107	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	21,107	..
Charge for establishment to be actually employed on the work	..	..	..	..	21,288	9,180	600	2,364	960	6,468	9,672	1,500	52,032	52,032	..
Total ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	73,139	20·4

(a) Excludes Rs. 12,690 on account of land.
(b) Share of Superintending Engineer's establishment on account of No. 2 Periyár division.
(c) Extra allowance at Rs. 100 a month to Superintendent of Works, No. 1 Periyár division.
(d) Excludes Rs. 6,000 on account of land.

(e)		RS.
Share of establishment of Chief Engineer for Irrigation	.. ..	4,643
Do. do. of Superintending Engineer	.. ..	10,270
	Total ..	14,913

2157/2

GOVT. OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

(Copy.)

LETTER to the Right Honorable
the Secretary of State for
India.

No $\frac{10}{2065\ W.}$, dated 25th July 1892.

Forwarding, with remarks, the final issues of the budget estimates of the Public Works Department for 1892-93.

Statement shewing the approximate estimated amount of [illegible] to works under construction in 1892-93.

System of works for which Capital and Revenue Accounts are kept	Capital Expenditure on works	Establishment													Grand Total	Percentage of Establishment on Capital Expenditure on Works	Remarks
		Direction and Accounts			Construction												
		Chief Engineer for Irrigation and Superintending Engineer	Accounts Central Office	Total	Engineer	Upper Subordinate	Lower Subordinate	Petty	Accounts	Office	Travelling Allowances	Contingencies	Total				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Periyar Project																	
Rateable share of General Provincial Establishment	(a) 6,36,000	(b) 23,491	11,050	34,541	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34,541		(a) Excludes Rs 22,000 on account of Land. (b) Share of the Establishment of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation Rs 8268 Do of Superintending Engineers Do on account of Periyar No 2 Division - 15,223 Total Rs 23,491
Chargeable for Establishment to be actually employed on the work		(c) 1,11,240	-	1,11,240	4,580	21,456	2,400	1992	1800	7068	8,268	376	54,960	1,66,200		(c) Cost of Establishment of Superintendent of Works No 1 Periyar Division
														2,00,741	31·5	
Rushikulya Project																	
Rateable share of General Provincial Establishment	3,62,602	(d) 15,041	6,300	21,341	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21,341		(d) Share of the establishment of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation Rs 4,714 Do of Superintending Engineers Do 10,327 Total Rs 15,041
Charge for Establishment to be actually employed on the work		-	-	-	21,288	9,180	600	2,364	960	6,468	10,140	1,272	52,272	52,272		
														73,613	20·3	

Madras
April 1872

J. S. Sherlock-Hubbard
Examiner of P.W. Accounts
Madras.

CB 19/4

(C. No. 1201/8.)

KEEP-WITH

CURRENT No.

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1892. { P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

dated 189 .

Madras, 14th. April 1892.

OFFICE NOTE No. 5655A

To

W.

2157/6

With reference to Code para I472A, I beg to submit herewith the statement ~~statement~~ showing the approximate estimated amount of establishment charges applicable to Periyar and Rushikulya Projects for I892-93.

2. I would invite attention to the fact that the whole cost of the establishment of No.I Periyar Division has heretofore been entered under "Direction" but it seems to me that this is not quite correct, since some portion of that establishment is no doubt employed on "Construction". I am not however in a position to say in what proportion the cost of that establishment should be distributed between Direction and Construction.

14/4

C.

14/4

(Greene)

per month which he gets as Superintendent of Works.

2(15)/6

3. It is not clear to me why the Periyar should be debited with any charge on account of the Establishment of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, as all matters connected with the project are dealt with by me and not by S.I.

4. It seems to me also that the debit of Rs 15,223 on account of the Supdg Engineer's office is unduly high.

5. The total annual cost of the Supdg Engineer and his office is apparently about Rs 30000.

Surely the Periyar No II is not accountable for half the total expenditure in the VI circle

257

(Sd) J.
W

No 2348 C

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Madras, 4 May 1892

OFFICE NOTE.

From W

To C

Your office note No 5655 A d/ 14 4. 92

So far from the whole Establishment of No I Division being chargeable to "direction", it should be precisely the other way and the whole of it should be charged to "Construction"

2. The Supdt of Works is merely an Executive Engineer with powers of a Supdg Engineer and his work is essentially "Construction" - If any part of his pay should be charged to "direction" it is at most the allowance of Rs 100 per

---

EXAMINER
No 1518 A
MAY
P. W. ACCOUNTS

No 2348 C

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Madras, 4 May 1892

OFFICE NOTE.

From W

Paper 16

215/7

To C

Your office note No 5655 A d/ 14. IV. 92

So far from the whole Establishment of No I Division being chargeable to 'direction', it should be precisely the other way and the whole of it should be charged to 'construction.'

2. The Supdt of Works is merely an Executive Engineer with powers of a Supdg Engineer and his work is essentially 'construction'. If any part of his pay should

be charged to 'direction' it is at most the allowance of Rs 100 per month which he gets as Superintendent of Works.

3. It is not clear to me why the Periyar should be debited with any charges on account of the Establishment of the Chief Engr for Irrigation, as all matters connected with the project are dealt with by me and not by E.I.

4. It seems to me also that the debit of Rs 15,223 on account of the Supdg Engineer's office is unduly high.

5. The total annual cost of the Supdg Engineer and his office is apparently about Rs 30,000.

Surely the Periyar No. II is not accountable for half the total expenditure in the VI Circle

4.5

W

E.I.
Pw 5229/92

No. 682 d/A d/16.5.92

To W.

Please see accompanying revised statement prepared on the lines of your paras I,2 and 3, and modified in accordance with the figures of the final issues of the budget, and with the latest establishment bills received.

2. The figures in column 2 of the statement are taken from the final issue of the Irrigation Budget for I892-93.

3. As regards the Superintending Engineer's share of establishment debitable to the No.II Periyar Division being excessive, I do not see my way to avoid the excess; as from the marginally noted memo it will be seen, that this share bears the same ratio to the total cost of Supg.Engineer's establishment, as the grant for works and repairs in the No.II Periyar Division bears to the total grant for works and repairs in the 6th.Circle.

19/5
C.

16/5
([illegible])

Memo.

	Rs.
I.Grant for works &repairs under all funds(Buildings and Roads and Irrigation) in the 6th.Circle......	6,32,765
2.Approximate establishment charges for I892-93 on account of Supg.Engineer 6th.Circle and his Establishment..................	35,868
3.Grant for Works and Repairs in the No.II Periyar Division.....................	2,78,300
4.Share of Supg.Engineer's establishment chargeable to No.II Periyar..........	I5,775

25/6

5229

Mams No. 2348 C d/ 4-5-92
Despatch No. 10/2065-W d/ 25-7-92

Encls 2
Recd: 18-5-92

No. 520 I d/ 8-6-92
3347 C d/ 2-7-92
2348 C d/ 4-5-92
4263 I d/ 11-8-90.
4839 I d/ 4-9-90
3279 I d/ 11-4-91.
1393 W d/ 4-5-92.

0/25/7

23.8.92

Urgent

No. 3347 C

EXAMINER
No. 20 C
4 JUL 1892
Enclosures
P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Madras, 2 July 1892

C.

Immediate 2/7

OFFICE NOTE.

From W

25/9

To C

Can you let me have the actual total charges on account of establishment for No. I & II Periyar Divisions

(a) for the year 1891-92

(b) for the months of April & May 1892 including travelling allowances and contingencies.

2. Minute accuracy is not wanted; only actual direct charges debitable to the two divisions are required, not imaginary debits such as rateable

shares of Supdg Engineers' and E.E's offices

L W

PW E.I 7680/92

Note.—

Office note from the Examiner P.W. Accounts
No. 5655 A d/ 14.4.92
Do —— do —— No. 682 S.A. d/ 16.5.92

—

These papers have been delayed for some time as I wished to analyse the figures, which id not seem to me altogether trustworthy. As regards the Periyar, Rs 26,000 of the amount debited to it is merely a paper debit being a rateable share of the cost of the Chief and Supdg Engineer's offices in which not a

single extra man
is employed on
account of the work,
and of the central
accounts office, in
which the actual
charge is at most
the pay of a single
accountant, say
Rs 960 a year.

2. Omitting this sum
the real charge, i.e.
the expenditure w[illegible]
Provincial funds
have to meet in
return for the 23 per
cent on works, according
to the Examiner's
statement, is Rs 164,736
or 25.6 per cent on
the grant.

3. Even this however
does not represent the

is taken from that
printed with the budget
(Appendix C) and
apparently represents
the estimated cost
of sanctioned establish-
ment, which in the
case of the Periyar
is nearly the scale
entered in my original
report; thus for No. II
Division the figures
entered are:—

1 Executive Engineer
3 Assistant Engineers
5 Upper Subordinates

the actual staff employed
being one Executive
Engineer and eight
upper subordinates,
whose salaries amount
to Rs 2,590 per mensem

the statements. [illegible] llowances will be educed in something ike the same proportion. n the other hand o entry is made for ffice establishments or this Division, temporary stablishment being eparately entered s a lump sum

4. The total charges ntered in Appendix C. are

No I Division .. Rs 43,940
" II " 75,330
119,270

exclusive of lower subordinate, office, nd petty establish ments which according to the Examiner's statement amount to Rs 37,368

5. The total according to the latter statement (omitting the rateable charges) is Rs 164,736. The salaries of engineer and upper subordinate establishment according to this statement amount to Rs 103,7$\overset{5}{\cancel{6}}$2, but according to the Appendix to Rs 92,724, the difference being probably due to the omission of t[illegible]ary establishment [illegible] the Appendix.

6. The actual direct cost of establishment, including all charges, in 1891-92 was

No I Division Rs 99,082
" II " " 52,128

or 18.9 per cent on the actual expenditure Rs 7,98,323 ind. there is no reason to suppose that this will be appreciably deviated from during 1892-93, the staff employed being practically the same.

7. This amounts to ~~Rs~~ 23.4 per cent on the budget grant× for 1892-93, but it is ce in that the la ill have to be in d during the nd the ultimate cost to Provincial funds will probably be not more than about ~~Rs~~ 20 per cent.

8. It must be borne in mind that all

8

× Rs 644,300

215/13

establishment charges are unusually high this year owing to the smallness of the grants for works. Taking the figures in Appendix C the following are the percentages of divisional establishments to expenditure on works: 215/13

Cons: Architect	10.03
Rushikulya ...	12.23
Periyar No II	15.00
West Coast	17.19
Buckingham Canal	18.77
Kistna Western	18.78
Periyar No I ...	20.58

all others are higher, but for the reasons stated above the ultimate percentages for both Periyar Divisions will probably be below these figures

9. The above remarks have reference to the

Hon: Member's note on G.O. No 1393W of 4th May 1892, but for the purposes of para 1472 A of the Code the Examiner's statement must it is presumed be accepted.

Rel 8 July

67

Amb-7. R 9/7

No 2157 W d/ 3rd August 1892

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

B

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Office Note from the Exar. P.W. Accts. No: 565SA d/ 14.4.92
— do — do — No: 682SA d/ 16.5.92
— do — do — No: 53C d/ 5.7.92

Recorded with reference to the despatch to the Secretary of State No: 10/2065 W d/ 25th July 1892.

18

Cr

No. 2157. W. S 3 August 92