

Public Works (1898) Department.

G.O., No. 2792 *W*

DATED *1st Nov 98*

3/11/98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Repair Schedules

Accepting the recommendation
of the Chief Engineer in regard to the proper
preparation of ———, Calling on the Engineer
to report on the results of the order, after a trial
of six months, and directing Supt. Engineer
to give full information to the Board about Sub Division
requiring an additional clerk.

320/15

Indexed. *2/11*

J. H. B.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Accepting the recommendations of the Chief Engineer in regard to the proper preparation of —, calling on the Examiner to report on the results of the order after a trial of six months, and directing Superintending Engineers, with remark, to give full information about sub-divisions requiring an additional clerk.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

READ—the following papers:—

From the Superintending Engineer,	I Circle, dated 16th June 1898, No. 242 G.L.
" " " "	II " " 31st May " " 317 G.L.
" " " "	III " " 9th July " " 1212 W.
" " " "	IV " " 27th " " " 394 W.
" " " "	V " " 15th " " " 467 W.
" " " "	VI " " 12th " " " 1126 T.C.
Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated 10th September 1898, No. 1064 A./A.	

Note by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

In G.O., No. 1199 W., dated 12th May 1898, the opinions of Superintending Engineers were invited on a proposal of the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, that all outlay on repairs costing over Rs. 5,000 should be shown by sub-heads. The present practice under which the outlay on all repair works is shown in the accounts in a lump sum only was introduced by G.O., No. 208 W., dated 21st January 1892, and the Examiner recommended that this order should be reconsidered in favour of his proposal. The reason for his recommendation was that, under the existing system, an Executive Engineer is rarely likely to discover an excess over estimate until *after it has actually occurred* while it was very necessary that he should have ready means of knowing it in proper time.

2. The opinions of Superintending Engineers on the point have been received and considered. The Superintending Engineers of I, II, III and VI Circles support the Examiner, but give little or no reasons for doing so. The Superintending Engineers of the IV and V Circles go much more fully into the matter, and recommend that the existing practice be continued. The Chief Engineer agrees with the Superintending Engineers, IV and V Circles, that it is not advisable to alter the existing rule for the reasons—

- (1) that the work register is posted too late to be of any practical use in checking expenditure quickly; and
- (2) that the clerical staff is already overworked, especially in sub-divisions.

3. It is, however, necessary that something should be done to stop the enormous number of revised estimates now sent in, and to ensure that repair estimates are properly prepared in the first instance. The undersigned believes that a large amount of money is wasted annually in doing unnecessary repairs; and recommends that orders be issued to the following effect:—

(a) In the monthly B form of progress report, Sub-divisional officers should invariably report the probability of excess over any estimate and the cause thereof. If they fail to do so, they will be liable to be held personally responsible if excess does occur.

(b) Divisional officers should personally scrutinize, on the spot, all repair estimates, amounting to Rs. 2,500 and over, before submitting them for sanction, and certify—

- (1) that they provide for all requirements, and are adequate as to rates; and
- (2) that they provide for no unnecessary work.

4. The Examiner reports that he has not the smallest doubt that an additional clerk for sub-divisions is a real and an urgent necessity. He states that quite three-fifths of the points taken up in his audit of divisional accounts is ascribed to inattention or delay on the part of sub-divisional officers. The question of strengthening the clerical establishments of sub-divisions came before Government in 1893, and it was decided in G.O., No. 2439 W., dated 22nd September 1893, that in view of the growing tendency of divisional offices to pass on to sub-division officers work which they ought to do themselves, proposals for increasing the sub-divisional staff could not be entertained unless an equivalent reduction was made in divisional offices. The undersigned is, however, of opinion that, quite independent of work which ought to be done in divisional offices, sub-divisional clerks have in many instances considerably more work than one man can with efficiency accomplish, and agrees with the Examiner that an additional clerk in most sub-divisions is a necessity. The Chief Engineer therefore recommends that Superintending Engineers be called on to submit lists of sub-divisions, to which, in their opinion, an additional clerk should be appointed giving full reasons for the necessity in each case. It is not proposed to take action in this matter until the financial horizon is brighter.

17th October 1898.

(Signed) W. B. DEWINTON,
Chief Engineer.

ORDER—No. 2792 W., dated 1st November 1898.

His Excellency the Governor in Council accepts the Chief Engineer's recommendations embodied in paragraphs 3 and 4 of his note above recorded, and directs that immediate effect be given thereto.

2. Sub-divisional and divisional officers will be instructed to carefully carry out the proposals in paragraph 3 of the note. The Examiner, Public Works Accounts, will, after consultation with Superintending Engineers, report on the results of this order after a trial of six months.

3. In submitting lists of sub-divisions in which an additional clerk is considered necessary, Superintending Engineers will supply full information as to the amount of correspondence and expenditure in the sub-division during the preceding five years, and as to whether work that should be done in the divisional office is being thrown on the sub-divisional staff. It should also be stated whether any reduction can be made in the divisional office establishment.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

" Tank Restoration Scheme.
" Superintending Engineers.
" the Consulting Architect.
" the Superintendent of Works, Lighthouse division.
" the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

Current No. 5272 of 1898 of 16 June 28 from S.E. T. C. 2424
Again G.O., dated 4724 of 1898 of 31 May 28 from S.E. T. C. 3174
Again G.O., dated 5786 of 1898 of 9 July 28 from S.E. T. C. 12124
Current No. 6334 of 1898, dated 27 July 28, from S.E. T. C. 3944
" " 5966 " 1898, " 15 July 28, " S.E. T. C. 4674
" " 5933 " 1898, " 12 July 28, " S.E. T. C. 11264
" " 7594 " 1898 " 10 Sept 28 " Ex. P. W. Acct. 1064
Print of Oct 28, Note by the Chief Engineer P.W.

ORDER. No. 2792 W of 1.11.98

His Excellency the Governor
in Council accepts the Chief
Engineer's recommendation
embodied in paragraphs 3 and
of his note above recorded
and directs that immediate
effect be given thereto.
2. Subdivisional and Division
Officers will be instructed
to carefully carry out the
proposals in para 3 of the
note. The Examiner P.W. Ac
Counts will, after consultation
with Suptg. Engineer, report
on the results of his order
after a trial of six months
3. In submitting lists
of subdivisions, in which
an additional clerk is con
sidered necessary, Suptg. Engineer

A. 4H
29.10.98

will supply full information as to the amount of correspondence and expenditure in the Sub-division during the preceding 5 years, and as to whether work that should be done in the Divisional Office is being thrown on the Sub-divisional staff. It should also be stated whether any reduction can be made in the Divisional Office establishment.

APK

16.10.26.

17.10.26

Note. Please see note by the Chief Engineer accompanying.

To the Chief Engineer for Draft
 " Do " T.R.S.
 " Suptg. Engineer
 " Consr. Architect
 " Supt. of Works, Light House
 " Examiner P.D. Accounts

Over

Note by the Chief Engineer P.W.D. 3 Oct 1926

X Slipped B

In G.O. No. 1199 W.D. 12.12.1925

The opinions of Suptg. Engineers were invited on a proposal of the Examiner P.D. accounts, that all outlay on repairs costing over Rs. 5,000 ^{should} must be shown by subheads. The present practice under which the outlay on all repair works is shown in the accounts in a lump sum only was introduced by G.O. No. 205 W.D. 1.1.92, and the Examiner recommended that this order should be reconsidered in favour of his proposal. The reason for his recommendation was that under the existing system, an Executive Engineer is rarely likely to discover an excess over estimate until after it has actually occurred while it was very necessary that he should have ready means of knowing it in proper time.

2 Slipped R

2 The opinions of Suptg. Engineers ^{on the same} have been received

themselves,
~~at divisional offices, pro-~~
posals for increasing the sub-
divisional staff could not
be entertained unless an equi-
valent reduction was made
in divisional offices. The under-
signed is, however, of opinion
that quite independent of
work which ought to be done
in divisional offices sub-
divisional clerks have con-
siderably more work than
one man can with efficiency
accomplish, and agrees with
the Examiner that an additional
clerk in most subdivisions
is a necessity. The Chief
Engineer recommends that
Capt. Engineers be called on
to submit lists of subdivisions,
to which in their opinion an
additional clerk should be ap-
pointed, giving full reasons
for the necessity in each case.

It is not proposed to take action
on this matter until

14.10.28. The financial
horizon is lighter when

On
17.10.28

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 7594

17924

From The Examiner, Mr. Reed
Madras

Order

No. 1064 $\frac{A}{A}$

Dated 10th September 1898.

Received
Registered } 12-9-98

Enclosures 8

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Outlay on Repair Works

Costing over Rs 5000 —

Furnishes E's remarks in
connection with the question
of accounting for — by
Sub heads.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.
3790C	30.8.98
1199W	12.5.98
2969C	24.6.98
2439W	22.9.93
208W	21.1.92

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 5272

From W. De Morgan Esquire
Executive Engineer in charge
Z Circle

Order

No. 242 GL

Dated 16 th/₄ June 1898

Received }
Registered } 23. 6. 98

Enclosures nil

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Outlay on repairs costing over
Rs 5000, - Reporting that in his
opinion the — should be kept
by sub heads -

compute by sub
in sub

o A.S 300

12/29/88

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

S. E. L. 1000—15.1.98.

No.	Date.	No.	Date.
2969C	21-6-98		
1199W	12-5-98		
208W	21-1-92		

NO. 242 GL

From

Enclosures. *nil* To

The

W.C. DeMorgan Esq. M.I.C.E.
 Superintending Engineer, in Charge
 Executive First Circle.
 Chief Engineer
W.C.

Waltair,

Camp

16.6.1898.

Despd 19-6-1898

Sir,

With reference to *your* NO: 1199W dated 12.5.98, I have the honour to inform you that in my opinion the outlay on repairs costing over Rs 5000, should be kept by sub heads, and that G.O. no: 208W dated 21.1.92 should be modified so as to bring it into keeping with Code II-II-153.

I have the honour to be,
 Sir
 Yours most obedt^t & T

W.C. DeMorgan
 19.6.98
 Exec Engineer in Charge

W.C.
 18/6

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 4724

From The Superintending Engineer
H. A. ...

Order

No. 3178

Dated 31-5-98

Received } 3-6-1898
Registered }

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Classification of
Cutley by subhead.
uniforms that he agrees
with the Examiner in
his opinion regarding
the —

Confidential
11/10/98

1229/8

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

bo 317 gl

Superintending Engineer
2^d Circle dated 31.5.98

From

J. H. Annan Esquire,

Superintending Engineer
The Corle

The Chief Engineer.

Public Works Department

Sir,

With reference to letter N^o.
514 $\frac{A}{A}$, dated 23rd April '98, from
the Examiner, P. W. Accounts, printed
with G. O. N^o. 1199 W, dated 12th May '98
regarding the classification of outlay
by subheads, I have the honor to
state that I quite agree with the
Examiner.

I have the honor to be
 Sir,
 Your most obed^t Serv^t
 Wm. W. Murray
 Superintending Engineer

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 5786

Order

From the Superintending Engineer
General
Bengal

No. 1212 u

Dated 9 — 7 — 98.

Received }
Registered } 11. 7. 98

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Accounts of repair works
costing over Rs 5000 each

States that the —
should be kept by sub heads

Compile
On 11.7.98

o L S 300
12/9/98

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No. Date.

No.

Date.

No. 1212W.

Superintending Engineer's Office,

3RD CIRCLE.

Bellary 9th July 1898.

FROM

Lieut Col W. L. C. Biddlesey R.E.,

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

IIIRD CIRCLE,

BELLARY.

To

THE Chief Engineer

P.W.D.,

Madras.

Sir,

Enclosures.

With reference to G.O. No. 1199W dated 12.5.98, I have the honor to state that I consider that expenditure on repair works costing Rs 5000 and above, should be kept by Sub heads. Most of the part payments are made by the Sub Divl Officers on hand receipt form No 16 and as there is no provision in the form for entries under sub heads, excess payments are not easily detected by the Divisional Office.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Yours most obedt Servt

Wm Boddley
Lieut Col R.E.,
Superintending Engineer,
III Circle

From

The Superintending Engineer,
IIIrd Circle,
Bellary,

To

The _____

Dated

Received

189 .

Enclosures.

No.

Subject.

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 6334

Order

From

The Supg. Engineer,
4th Circle

No. 394

Dated 27th July 1898.

Received

Registered

Enclosures ✓

Spare copies ✓

SUBJECT.

Classification of outlay
on all repair works by
sub heads.

Submits his opinion regarding
the _____

045300

12/9/8

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.
-----	-------

No.	Date.
-----	-------

No 394
W

Supg Engineer's office 4th Circle
Coimbatore 27th July 1898

From

A. H. Garrett Esq.
Supg Engineer, 4th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer,
P. W. Department.

Sir,

In reply to G O No 1199 W dated
12th May 1898, I have the honor to record
my opinion in favour of the existing
practice of showing the outlay on repair
works in a lump sum and not by
sub. heads.

2 In the case of estimates for
ordinary and annual repairs great
accuracy is from the nature of the case
absolutely impossible. When large
repair estimates are put in hand it
is almost invariably the case that a
good deal of work is found to be neces-
sary which could not have been foreseen
when the estimate was being made.

3 If the outlay on such estimates had to be shown by sub-heads, the amount of correspondence regarding deviation statements and revised estimates would be far greater than in the case of original works.

4 The Examiner apparently only objects to the present system on the ground that Executive Engineers are not able to discover an excess over an estimate till it has actually occurred, but this objection would disappear if Sub-Division officers were made to submit every month a statement giving the names of works on which there was likely to be an excess with full explanation on which the Executive Engineer could pass orders.

5 There is no doubt that under the present system Sub-Division officers may sometimes be given by Executive Engineers too large a discretionary power, but this appears to me to be the only danger and as it would not always be present it would, I think, be a mistake

mistake to legislate for its removal by a measure which would greatly increase work in all Divisional and Sub-Divisional offices.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most obed^t. servant

Ans. M. M.

Supg Engineer & Linc

AP
25/7/0

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 5966

Order

From *The Supy Engineer*
5th mile

No. 467th.

Dated 16th July 1898.

Received 16.7.98

Enclosures 2

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Accounts.

Gives his opinion on
G. A. N. 1199th dated
12th May 1898 regard-
-ing -

Complete
on
19.7.98

025300

229/4

25/3/98
25/3/98

With reference to your endorsement No: 215 B of 3-6-98, on G. O. No: 1199 W of 12-5-98, I have the honour to inform you that the main object with which the record of outlay by sub-heads has been ordered to be kept is to keep a watch over the actual quantity and rate of work as compared with the sanctioned estimate, with a view to the submission of revised estimates, if necessary, for sanction. But this information can at first hand be had from the sub-D. of works who supervise the works and from inspectors of those works, instead of waiting till the payments made are recorded in registers which must necessarily be sometime after the outlay has been incurred (i.e.) after the excess, if any, has actually occurred. I am of opinion that no additional advantage will be gained by reverting to

to the procedure now recommended. It
will only throw additional work on the
already overworked establishment, without
any advantage accruing therefrom. By
continuing the procedure authorized
in G. O. No: 208 W of 21-1-92, no sacrifice
of control over expenditure will ever
be made.

(True Copy)

Amherst
Colonel R.E.
Offs. Supt. Engineer.
V Circle.

From. C. A. Smith Esquire, Executive Engineer
South Arcat Division, to the Supt.
Engineer, V Circle, Madras, dated
Maddalore, 14 June 1898, No: 428 S.E.

With reference to your No: 215 G
of the 3rd instant, I have the honour to state as
follows:—

2. Originally the Examiner had
the duty of watching expenses over sub-heads of
estimate for works costing Rs 2000 and upwards.

3. This system was subsequently
modified on the Committee's report (vide G. O.
No: 3009 of 24-10-89) and the duty devolved on
the Superintending Engineer.

4. It was subsequently found that
divisional Offices being hard-pressed for
want of time, Registers of Works were not
posted until after the submission of accounts.
Some temporary expedients were resorted to
for preparing the schedule of expenditure—
defeating the object of the Register of Works.

5. To remedy these irregularities
the limit of works to be accounted for by
details of sub-heads was raised to Rs 500
and repair works of whatever amount
excluded from this category.

5/1/93
255/255
255/255

6. The responsibility of the Supty. Engineer in regard to excesses over sub-heads remaining unaltered as also his power to sanction repair estimates irrespective of amount, the accounting of repair estimates of over \$5000 by sub-heads is not likely to be attended with any advantageous results.

7. From the B- progress reports submitted to the Supty. Engineer in the case of each work or repair estimated to cost over \$2500 the Executive and Supty. Engineers get a general idea of the progress made as compared with expenditure incurred and the probable cost of the remainder of the work and the remarks on these reports, if carefully entered by sub-divisional officers ought generally to be sufficient to indicate the necessity for a revision of the estimate to provide for any anticipated excess.

It wither the distribution of expenditure by sub-heads in many cases arbitrary and the quantities recorded in the Registers are unreal and the rates struck are therefore far from being actuals. This state of things is the natural result of the

piece-work system where the material and labour are supplied by different individuals and purchases made by sub-divisional officers are charged off to sub-heads under P.W.D. Code Vol. II, Chapter I, para 103. Thus the accounting by details of sub-heads is not a sure means of indicating the possibility of an estimate being exceeded.

9. For these reasons it is preferable not to impose more work without any compensating advantage on the Divisional Office which has necessarily to get through a larger amount of work within a short space of time available for the compilation of the monthly accounts.

10. With regard to para 3 of the Examiner's Office note, works costing over \$5000 are generally small in number and the large number of items of excesses over estimates is generally in the case of works below that limit. The best way to reduce the number of excesses over estimates would be to provide some stringent measures for sub-divisional officers taking immediate steps to legalize them. As it is this

is very much neglected and revised estimates are not submitted until excesses have occurred.

11. This is in my opinion due very largely, if not entirely, to the insufficient clerical establishments provided for subdivisions. I consider that with few exceptions all sub-divisions should have two clerks as it is impossible for one clerk without assistance to do what he is now expected to do.

(True Copy)

Colonel R.E.
Offs: Supty: Engineer,
V Circle.

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,

V CIRCLE, MADRAS,

Chepak, 15th July 1898.

No. 467

From

Colonel. A. W. Smart R.E.

Offs: SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

V CIRCLE,

To

THE Chief Engineer,

P. W. D.

Madras.

SIR,

Enclosures 2.

With reference to G. O. No. 1199 W of 12-5-98, I have the honour to state that of the 5 Divisional Officers in this circle who were called upon to express their views, 3 have merely stated that it would be advisable to keep the outlay on repair works costing over Rs 5000 by sub-heads of work and the remaining two, the Executive Engineer of South Arcot and Behinglepud do not recommend any change in the existing practice of not shewing the outlay on all repair works by sub-heads of estimate, even if cost Rs 5000 or more.

I entirely concur with the Executive Engineers Behinglepud & South Arcot.

in their opinion that the accounting of
outlay on repairs by sub-heads of work does
not give any additional advantage but
throws extra work on the already overworked
sub-divisional and divisional Office esta-
-blishments, and that it would serve little
or no useful purpose. The only possible case
in which this method of accounting might
be useful would be when there is more than
one contractor on a work, but even in this
case the bills would give all necessary
information. It must also be noted that
the registers must necessarily be in arrears
two months at least and the information
they might afford should be before that
time be already in the possession of the
Sub-Divisional Officer or Executive Engineer.

The monthly B. Form
progress reports which are now submitted for
all original and repair works costing
Rs 2500 and upwards afford sufficient
information to show whether an estimate
is or is not likely to be exceeded.

I forward herewith
copies of the letters from the Executive
Engineers

Engineers Chingleput and South Arcot
for information.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your Most Obedt. Servant

Ankur Colonel R.

Offs: Supts: Engineer,
V. V. V.

Public Works (1891) Department.

CURRENT No. 5933

der

From

The Bridge Engineer
W. C. C. C.

No. 1126 TC

Dated 12th July 1895.

Received 15. 7. 95

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Reporting that onlay^{repair}
on all special works
Costing over \$5000 must
be kept by Sub. heads &
the record of onlay by
subheads in the case of
ordinary repairs may be
disposed with.

Complete
16/7/95

597
594/95

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

Superintending Engineers Office
Camp Pili-patti
Dated 12th July 1898.
D/14

N. 1126 T.C.

From

The Superintending Engineer
Ft. Circle

Trichinopoly

To

The Chief Engineer
Public Works Department.

Sp.

With reference to G. O. No 1199 W
dated 12th May 1898, I have the honour
to inform you that I am of opinion that the
outlay on all special repair works costing
over Rs 5,000 must be kept by sub-heads. The
record of outlay by sub-heads in the case of
ordinary annual repairs, irrespective of
amount may be dispensed with.

I have the honor to be

Car.

Your Most Obedient Servant

O. F. Boddy Ltd. Chas.
Superintending Engineer & Civil

KEEP WITH

CURRENT No.

GOVT.
OF MADRAS. }

1897.

{ P. W.
DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

dated

189 .

Madras, 10 September 1897.

OFFICE NOTE No. 1064 ^A/_A

To
W.

Your Office Note No. 3790 C dated
30th. August 1898.

I think that, if orders are now issued in accordance with clauses (c) and (d) para 2 of your Office Note under reference, and strictly enforced, they must go a great way towards remedying the evil complained of; and in that case I do not consider that the existing orders which have formed the subject of this correspondence need undergo any modification. A trial of six months or so under the orders you now propose to issue will shew the extent of the improvement obtained, and it might at the end of that time be advantageous to institute a comparison between the existing and the new order of things.

2. As regards the question raised in your para 3, I have not the smallest doubt that an additional clerk for Sub Divisions is a real, - and, I may add, an urgent necessity. At a rough guess

guess

0258
7594/88

guess, I should say that quite three-fifths of the points taken up in my audit of Divisional Accounts are ascribed to inattention or delay on the part of Sub Divisional Officers.

3. A perusal of G.O.No.2439 W dated 22nd. September 1893 will shew that Mr. Sherlock Hubbard, the then Examiner, recommended that there should be two clerks attached to each Sub Division - one on 30 and one on 25 instead of one clerk only on 20/ to 30/. The proposal, however, involved an increase in cost, and appears to have been negatived because it could not be met from a corresponding saving through reduction in Divisional Offices. In the present instance it seems a question whether the extra expense involved in your proposal could not be provided for by the transfer to Sub Divisional Offices of the "Overseers' clerks" and "clerks of detached officers above the rank of Overseer." In this connexion please see references that passed between us ending with your Office Note No. 513 D dated 22nd. June 1898 - In any case, this is not a point on which I am in any position to form an accurate judgment. It is a question that would rest with you to initiate and recommend; and all I need say further is that the proposed increase will be within the powers of the Local Government to sanction if the total

cost

cost does not exceed Rs.25,000 per annum, and that, therefore, there would be no objection to it from an audit point of view provided the necessary money is found in the Budget.

*This is quite inborn the
Overseers' clerks have
very heavy work in their
own sphere. H. H. H.*

17.10.98

*10/10.9.98
c.
21/9/98*