

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	2263	Press
	450.451	Mis.
Dated	27—5—	1867.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th September 1867.*

No. 450. Read the following letter from the Controller of Public Works Accounts, to the Secretary to Government, Department Public Works, dated Madras, 17th September 1867, No. 2,364 :—

1. I have the honor to lay the following particulars before Government, and to solicit orders thereon.

2. The conservancy of Salt works having been transferred* from the Public Works to the Revenue Department, a provision of Rupees 2,00,000 was made in the Civil Budget for 1867-68 for that purpose, under the head of "Petty Construction and Repairs." This transfer was made as a measure of administrative convenience, with a view to relieve the Public Works Department of much unnecessary work in supervising and accounting for

expenditure on petty works and repairs requiring no engineering knowledge to supervise, and to allow that department more leisure to attend to works requiring professional skill and talent.

3. From the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 15th July 1867, it will be seen that it is under a misapprehension regarding the authority which should pass expenditure on Salt works, for it directs the accounts to be submitted to this Office by officers who are authorized to draw funds direct from the Civil Treasuries.

4. On the receipt of the above, I addressed the Accountant General, and that Officer's letter to the Board of Revenue is attached. From this I am led to infer that the amount set apart for "Petty Construction and Repairs," on account of Salt works, has not been transferred to the Public Works Department, though the amount allotted to irrigation works in the Civil Budget has been so transferred.

5. I addressed the Board on the 26th July 1867, and, in their reply, they stated that they have apportioned the 2,00,000 Rupees for Salt works, as well as 3,75,000 for Irrigation works to the various divisions of the Presidency.

6. The question now arises, am I to consider the whole of the amounts referred to in the Board's Proceedings, No. 5,763, as transferred to the Public Works Department, both for Salt works and Irrigation, as the Board, from their Proceedings dated 15th July, seem to think I should, or am I to consider that the amount sanctioned for Salt works is to be dealt with entirely by the Collectors and the Accountant General. If the former, I shall have to issue instructions to Superintending Engineers accordingly; if the latter, the Public Works Department has no concern whatever with the disposal of the grant for Petty Construction and repair for Salt works, neither in granting funds, which should be drawn by Civil Officers, from Civil Treasuries direct, under rules framed by the Board of Revenue;

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th September 1867.*

nor in supervision of works by Executive Officers of the Public Works Department; nor in accounting for expenditure.

7. I have thus entered fully into the question, because, from the correspondence laid before Government, the procedure to be adopted is not understood, apparently, by the Board of Revenue.

8. And now in connection with this case I have to request the orders of Government as regards the expenditure incurred by Mr. Fraser on Salt works.

This Office No. 1,102, dated 19th July 1867, to the Superintending Engineer, 4th Division. That Officer's reply, No. 2,032, dated 22nd July 1867. Statement of Objectionable Items for June 1867. This Office No. 1,153, dated 24th July 1867, to the Board of Revenue, and Proceedings thereon.

From the correspondence noted in the margin, it will be observed that objection has been taken by this Office to the large expenditure on Salt works without a transfer of funds duly authorized, and that Mr. Fraser furnishes an explanation on the subject. The Board was addressed by me, and a promise of a provision for the expenditure by Mr. Fraser made.

9. In the Superintending Engineer's letter to the Board of Revenue, No. 1,638, dated 2nd July 1867, sanction is requested to estimates, aggregating to Rs. 12,395, and accorded in G. O. No. 1,738, dated 20th July 1867; but from the accounts of the East Coast Canal Range under Mr. Fraser, the expenditure to the end of July has amounted to Rupees 23,654 already. Whatever may be the whole amount authorized to be expended by Mr. Fraser, or any other Public Works Officer, I would request that a regular sum be made over to the Public Works Department, or that the expenditure on Salt works be treated as a charge against the Civil Department at the close of the year.

Referred to the Revenue Department. As the sum provided in the Civil Budget Estimates of the current year for Salt works has not been transferred to the credit of the Public Works Department, no portion of the expenditure incurred from that source should appear in the accounts of that department.

(Signed) J. H. M. SHAW STEWART, Major, R. E.,
Under Secretary to Government.

No. 451. ORDER THEREON, 26th September 1867, No. 2,263.

Separate Revenue, No. 51.
Salt.

1. The Controller has rightly assumed that the provision of two lacs of Rupees in the Revenue Budget for Salt works has not been transferred to the Public Works Department.

2. The Board have rightly stated in their Proceedings, No. 4,435, dated 15th July 1867 (forming an enclosure to the Controller's letter), that the works to be "provided for from this grant will be executed by the Revenue Department, but they seem in error in instructing the Collector to render his accounts for this expenditure " to the Controller of Public Works Accounts, just as he now does for Local Fund Works."

3. The Local Fund Rules provide that the accounts for works executed by the Revenue Department shall be transmitted to the Board of Revenue after exami-

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th September 1867.*

nation by the District Superintending Engineer, and the same rule should be maintained as regards the Salt works similarly executed.

4. As regards paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Controller's letter, the Government observe that in the Board's revised Budget of the Salt works for the current year, Rupees 75,438 are provided for the Madras District, and provision is included for the sets of works referred to in the Board's Proceedings, Nos. 4,074 and 4,571, dated 1st and 19th July 1867, the estimates for which aggregate Rupees 11,800 and Rupees 12,395 respectively.

5. It appears that Mr. Fraser is supervising the execution of these works for the Revenue Department.

6. The Government observe that the Accountant General's letter, No. 2,189, dated 23rd July 1867, to the Revenue Board, on the subject of their Proceedings of 15th idem, No. 4,435, above quoted, is evidently based on a misapprehension, the Board's Proceedings having reference to the Revenue Budget grant for Salt works, and the Accountant General's objections being based on the transfer of the provision in the Revenue Budget for Irrigation works and repairs, which has been made to the Public Works Department.

7. The Board have probably already pointed out this mistake.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Controller of Public Works Accounts.
.. the Department Public Works.
.. the Revenue Board.
.. the Accountant General.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

N. 2263.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 27 September 1867.

Read the following
letter from the Controller
of Public Works accounts.

Enquiring how the expense
on Salt and Irrigation
is to be dealt with in ac-
count, and suggesting that in-
creased be debited to Civil
Department or an allotment
the same transferred to
the Public Works Department.

(Here enter 17th Sept. / 67)
N. 2364

W.D.

The Controller has
rightly assumed that the
provision of two lacs of
Rupees in the Revenue
Budget for Salt Works
has not been transferred
to the Public Works Department.

The Board have
rightly

rightly stated in their
Proceedings No 4435, dated
15th July 1867 (forming an
enclosure to the Controller's
letter) that the works to
be provided for from this
grant will be executed by
the Revenue Department,
but they seem in error in
instructing the Collector to
render his accounts for
his expenditure to the Con-
troller of Public Works
accounts just as he now
does for Local Fund Works.

The Local Fund rules
provide that the accounts
for works executed by the
Revenue Department shall
be transmitted to the Board
of Revenue after examina-
tion by the District Super-
intending Engineer, and the

same rule should be main-
tained as regards the Salt
Works similarly executed.

As regards paras 8 and
9 of the Controller's letter, the
Government observe that
in the Board's revised
Budget of Salt Works for
the current year, Rs 75,438-
are provided for the Chandra-
district and provision is in-
cluded for the sets of works
referred to in the Board's
Proceedings Nos 4074- & 4571-
dated 1st and 19th July 1867-
the estimates for which ag-
gregate Rs 11,800- & Rs 12,395-
respectively.

It appears that
Mr. Fraser is supervising
the execution of these works
for the Revenue Department.

~~In conclusion~~ The Go.
-ernment observe that the
Accountant General's letter
No. 2189, dated 23rd July 1867 to
the Revenue Board, on the sub-
-ject of their Proceedings of
15th Idem, No. 4435 above quoted,
is evidently based on a mis-
-apprehension; the Board's
Proceedings having reference
to the Revenue Budget
grant for Salt works and
the Accountant General's
objections being based on
the transfer of the provision
in the Revenue Budget
for Irrigation works and re-
-pairs which has been made
to the Public Works De-
-partment.

The Board have
probably already pointed
out

W. H. Hall

In conclusion, The Go.
vernment observe that the
Accountant General's letter
No. 2189, dated 23rd July 1867 to
the Revenue Board, on the sub-
ject of their Proceedings of
15th Idem, No. 4435 above quoted,
is evidently based on a mis-
apprehension; the Board's
Proceedings having reference
to the Revenue Budget
grant for Salt works and
the Accountant General's
objections being based on
the transfer of the provision
in the Revenue Budget
for Irrigation works and re-
pairs which has been made
to the Public Works De-
partment.

The Board have
probably already pointed
out

out this mistake.

LB

4 Cope to the Controller of Accounts Dept 30
21 Copies to Dep't Public Works ✓
14 — Revenue Board ✓
6 — Accountant General. ✓

Oct 11

Revenue 1867 Dep't
Bo of Cont'gen & Fin

No 2263.

Bo of the Ordnance Cont
of 27th Septemb 67

Under Secy 11th Novemb 67
12th 1868-69.

Bo Board of Revenue
of 15 Novemb 67 C No 3154.
20th 4 Dec 68—28/12

No 450-451

MANDAL DECODED OFFICE

25/6/24

QUR. V. 40 sur. 24

কাজে

உத்தரவிடப்பட்டு பொதுமக்களுக்கு உதவுக என்று அரசாங்கம் எதிர்பார்த்துள்ளது.

200
1000000
1000000

~~452-455, 22.9.1867~~

867-

[illegible]

