

Government {1899} of Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Spare copies

NOVEMBER.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

READ—the following papers:—

From J. M. LACEY, Esq., Executive Engineer, Ganjám Division, to the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, dated 10th August 1899, No. 3088.

It was decided in G.O., No. 2589 W., dated 8th October 1898, that a quarterly progress report of works in estates entrusted to the Public Works Department for execution should be submitted by the Superintending Engineer concerned to the Chief Engineer, through the Collector, for transmission to the Court of Wards.

2. Prior to receipt of the Examiner's Circular letter, No. 600 A./B., dated 9th April 1898, the outlay on estate works was being accounted for under "IV. Items adjustable by Civil Department". Under the instructions contained in the above Circular all estate works are being treated as "contribution works" and the procedure laid down for accounting for the expenditure on such works is being closely followed.

3. Paragraph 82, clause VI, Chapter IX, Volume I of the Public Works Code delegates to the Examiner the duty of reporting monthly to the administrators of the "contribution funds" the outlay to date upon each work against the amount of estimate and deposits.

4. Under the altered conditions, I think it unnecessary to submit the quarterly report called for in G.O., No. 2589 W., dated 8th October 1898. Please obtain definite orders of Government on the subject.

No. 765 G.N.

Copy communicated to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, for favour of orders.

11th August 1899.

(Signed) W. C. DeMORGAN,
Superintending Engineer, I Circle.

Office-note from the Examiner, P.W. Accounts, dated 19th Sept. 1899, No. 1127 A./B.
" " " " 25th Oct. " " 1224 A./A.

ORDER—No. 3099 W., dated 27th November 1899.

With his endorsement read above, the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, submits, for the orders of Government, copy of a letter from the Executive Engineer, Ganjám division, in which that officer states that, as works in the estates under the Court of Wards are now treated as "contribution works," the duty of reporting monthly to the administrators of the funds the outlay to date upon each work against the amount of the estimate and deposit, devolves upon the Examiner of Public Works Accounts under clause VI, paragraph 82, Chapter IX, Volume I of the Public Works Code, and that the quarterly progress reports hitherto submitted by Superintending Engineers under G.O., No. 2589 W., dated 8th October 1898, are no longer necessary.

2. It will be seen from clause V, paragraph 82, Chapter IX, Volume I of the Public Works Code that it is incumbent on Executive Engineers to furnish the local body or individuals with the fullest information about the progress of expenditure on each work and the anticipated excesses over estimates. Executive Engineers are in a position to furnish this information immediately after the close of the month, while the Examiner can convey information only as regards booked expenditure, after the accounts for each month are audited, i.e., two months after the outlay has been incurred. In these circumstances, His Excellency the Governor in Council considers that the quarterly progress reports prescribed in G.O., No. 2589 W., dated 8th October 1898, should continue to be submitted by Superintending Engineers.

3. Quarterly progress reports should be similarly submitted to the Registrar of the University of Madras in the case of works carried out from University Fee Funds.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government.

To Superintending Engineers.

" the Consulting Architect to Government.
" the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" the Revenue Department.
" the Educational Department, with copies of G.O., Nos. 2589 W.,
dated 8th October 1898, and 3052 W., dated 22nd November 1899.

Ed T K. Narayana Aiyangar.

Read the following:—

Letter from the Executive Engineer, Raichur Div., No. 3088, dated 10 Aug 1899
 do Endorsement thereon by the Suptg. Engineer, No. 765 P.W., dated 11 Aug 1899
 do Office Note from the Examiner, P.W. Accounts, No. 1127 A/13, dated 19 September 1899
 do — Do — do — do — do, No. 1224 A/4, dated 25 Oct 1899

Circulated to X not in the file

2 Encls

ORDER.

No. 3088 11/9

With his endorsement read above, the Suptg. Engineer, Ivide, submits, for the order of Govt., copy of a letter from the Executive Engineer, Raichur Division, in which that officer states that, as works in the estates under the Court of Wards are now treated as "Contribution Works", the duty of monthly reporting to the administrators of the funds, the outlay to date upon each work against the amount of the estimate and deposit, devolves upon the Examiner of P.W. Accounts under Clause VI, para 82, Chapter IX, Vol. I of the P.W. Code, and that the quarterly progress reports

hitherto submitted by Suptg. Engineers under G.O. No. 2589W, dated 8 October 1898 are no longer necessary.

2. It will be seen from Clause D, para 82, Chapter IX, Vol. I of the P.W. Code, that it is incumbent on Executive Engineers to furnish the local bodies or individuals with the fullest information about the progress of expenditure on each work and the anticipated excesses over estimates. Executive Engineers are in a position to furnish ^{this} information immediately after the close of the month, while the Examiners can convey information only as regards booked expenditure, after the accounts for each month are audited i.e. two months after the outlay has been incurred. In these circumstances, His Excellency the Governor-in-Council considers that the quarterly progress reports prescribed in G.O. No. 2589W, dated 8 October 1898, should continue to be submitted by Suptg. Engineers.

3. Quarterly progress reports should

be similarly submitted to the Registrar of the University of Madras in the case of works carried out from University fee funds.

H/ 22/11/99
D. W.

To
Suptg. Engineers ✓
The C.A. to Govt. ✓
" Exr., P.W. Accounts ✓
" Revenue Department ✓
" Educational Department,
with copies of G.O. No. 2589W ✓
8.10.98.

& 3052 W of 21-99.

Special order

At disposal on C.No 7247

X-60/2-11-99

Sent
9/12/99.

Letter no. 3088 dated 10th August 1899
from J. M. Lacey Esqr., Executive
Engineer, Ganjam Division, to the
Superintending Engineer, First Circle.

It was decided in G.O. no. 2589 W
dated 8th October 1898, that a quarterly
progress report of works in Estates entrusted
-ed to the P. W. D. for execution should
be submitted by the Suptg. Engineer
concerned, to the Chief Engineer through
the collector, for transmission to the Court
of Wards.

2

Prior to receipt of the Examin-
-er's circular letter no. 600 ^A dated
9.4.99, the outlay on Estate Works
was being accounted for under
iv. items adjustable by Civil Dept.
Under the instructions contained in the
above circular all Estate works are
being treated as "Contribution Works"
and the procedure laid down for
accounting for the expenditure on
such works is being closely followed.

3. Para 82 clause VI chapter IX, vol. 1
of the P. W. Code delegates to the Examiner
the duty of reporting monthly to the
administrators of the "Contribution funds"
the outlay to date upon each work against
the amount of estimate and deposits.

4. Under the altered conditions, I
think it unnecessary to submit the
quarterly report called for in G.O.
2589 W. dated 8.10.1899. Please obtain
definite orders of Government on the
subject.

Not traceable
in the registers

5/8/99

No. 765 G.O. dt 11.8.99

Copy communicated to the Chief
Engineer, Public Works Department
for favour of orders

M. D. Morgan
P. E.

Superintending Engineer
1st Circle

12/5

Public Works (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 8805

724

From

The Examiner P.W. Accounts,
Maddur Corro

No. 1224 A

Dated 25th October 1899.

Received 26-10-99

Registered 27-10-99

Enclosures

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

India Code Volume I Chapter
IX-82 Rule VI — Explaining
with remarks the nonobservance
of —

3099 W
G.O. for issue below.

H. P. V.
12/5

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
File connected with G.O. 3099 W dated 8.9.99. put up ending into 4109 C of 13/10/99 put up with C.O. 9744 to send H.C. 4.12.99 b/H 4/12/99 note Examiner's office note no. 1127 A-B-28.9.99. quites in this G.O. has not been read from the Dept. when this is read in the records b/H 15.2.00.	

FURTHER PAPER

No.	Date.

KEEP-WITH

CURRENT No.

GOVT.
OF MADRAS.

1896/9

E. No. 27.
1,000-9-12-95.

P. W.
DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS,

dated

189 .

Madras, 25th: October 1896/9

OFFICE NOTE No. 1224 A/A

To
W.

Your O.N.No. 4109 C dated the 13th:
October 1899.

The rule in para 1342 VI of the late Madras Code prior to its modification by Standing Order No. 1047, and the rule in India Code Volume I. IX. 82 VI were identical, both providing for a copy of the work voucher being furnished by the Examiner to the Administrators of funds.

2. But, on the abolition of Audit by sub heads, (G.O.No. 3009 W dated - 24th: October 1889) and the consequent nonsubmission of work vouchers to C's office, the rule in the Madras Code relating to the submission of work vouchers to the administrators was expunged with the approval of the Code Committee as signified in W's O.N No. 34 C dated the 6th: January 1890, while the India Code was left unaltered up to the time of its adoption by the Madras Presidency in 1892.

3. In June 1893, the 1892 Edition of the India Code rule referred to was amended by Standing Order No. 149 of 2nd June 1893 in the terms now existing in the -- edition of 1894, but no action appears to have been taken on the modification introduced by that Standing Order, apparently for the reason that the rule was not applicable at the time, as depositors consisted, chiefly or entirely, of Mirasdars Shrotriendars and other land holders and ryots who contributed their own money in aid of -- public works, and were not administrators of funds in the sense prescribed by the Code rule.

4. The only question that now arises is whether the Code rule should be made -- applicable to Court of Wards Estate Works and works carried out from University Fee Funds which have now to be treated as contribution works.

5. My own opinion is that it need not be; for, under India Code Volume I. IX-82 Rule V it is incumbent on the Executive Engineer to furnish the local body or individuals -- with fullest information about the progress of expenditure on each work, as also the -- anticipated excesses over estimates, and the Executive Engineer is in a position to furnish this information to administrators immediately after the close of the month, while I can only convey information as regards booked expenditure (a great deal -- less than the above information) after the accounts for each month are audited, i.e. two months after the outlay has been

incurred.

6. Besides this, there are -- other means devised in this Presidency for keeping administrators of funds -- aware of the progress of works carried out on their behalf by the Department (for instance please see G.O. No. 2589 dated 8th October 1898), and I do not consider that, for a mere change -- in procedure in accounting for outlay, any practical advantage will result -- by the observance of the Code rule in question.

The question is whether the Code rule should be followed. It is no answer to say that there are other means by which the object of the Code rule is attained.
Ally
22/4/00

X The Ex. Engr. raised the question whether the Examiner's monthly reports should not be substituted for the Quarterly returns now rendered. The Examiner's reply is that they need not be, because Quarterly returns are now being submitted!

Ally
22/4/00

New Rule VI of the Code was unnecessary! The fact that the Ex. Engineer can better furnish information of a certain kind does not absolve the Ex. from furnishing what the Code apparently contemplates as information of a different kind.

Ally
22/4/00

H.R.

OFFG: C.

22/10/99