

Estt (1946) Department.

16 SERIES.

G.O. No.

1261

Ed

Dated

26.6.1946

[Despatch Abstract.]

Stationery and Printing Department - ~~Amalgamation - Proposals called for from the Superintendent, Government Press.~~

Back Papers.

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

Further Papers.

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

CONFIDENTIAL.

D.O. No.84/S/42.

29 MAY 1946

Government Press,
Mint Buildings,
Madras.

Dated 24th May 1946.

28625

Dear Mr. Viswanatha Ayyar,

When Mr.F.W.A. Morris, I.C.S., was Collector of Madras in November 1942 he approached me regarding the question of amalgamation of the Government Press and the Stationery Office as he stated that he found it difficult to give any time to supervision of the work of the Stationery Office and as he had no technical knowledge he had to accept without query whatever proposal the Assistant Superintendent of Stationery might put up.

2. At Mr. Morris's suggestions he and I had a long conference with Sir Thomas Austin the Adviser to His Excellency the Governor on the subject and he was convinced by us that the proposition was sound and agreed that the question might be taken up and examined.

3. After protracted correspondence it was decided by Government that the time was not appropriate and that the question should be dropped for the present vide G.O. No.574 Edn., dated 15th April 1944.

4. I do however feel that the present time is most appropriate for the question to be raised again in view of the likelihood of Mr. Duncan's availing himself of leave preparatory to retirement shortly and I enclose herewith for your perusal copies of my D.Os No.84/S/42 dated 24-12-42 to Mr. Masterman (Mr. Morris's successor) No.8/S/43 dated 20-1-1943 and No.103/S/43 dated 4th December 1943 to Mr. Bhaskara Rao (Mr. Masterman's successor).

5. Many efforts have been made by the Public Service Commission, Madras without success to find a suitable and qualified person to Mr. Duncan and Government have proposed that the post should be reserved for an officer with war service when such an officer can be found but this need not delay the issue for until a suitable officer is found one of the officers of the Government Press, trained in Paper Technology can take over from Mr. Duncan and work in the Stationery Office under my control.

6. I shall be grateful if after perusal of the correspondence you would let me know your views on the subject and whether I may put up proposals to Government officially.

7. I am firmly convinced that I shall be able to show very considerable savings in a short time and I hope you will give me your support.

Yours sincerely,

alby

P.S. Viswanatha Ayyar Esq., I.C.S.,
Deputy Secretary to Government,
Education and Public Health Department,
Fort St. George, Madras.

Enclosure.

Copy of D.O. No.84/S/42 dated 24-12-42 from Mr.A. Lepper,
at Press Madras, to Mr. Masterman.

I and your predecessor Mr. Morris had an interview with Mr. Austin on November 3rd, 1942, and Mr. Morris expressed the difficulty he found in giving time for proper supervision of the work of the Stationery Office under his control, and suggested that the question of amalgamation of the Government Press and the Stationery Office might be taken up again. I pointed out that the amalgamation was desirable and that there was a clear case for it and Mr. Austin agreed that the question should be raised again and as I had at no time been given an opportunity of knowing the objections raised by the previous Superintendents of Stationery, that I should be permitted to see your office files on the subject. These have been of immense help to me and I have been able to see the difficulties which the Stationery Office felt existed in the amalgamation of the two offices. There has been a tendency in the past to adduce arguments in favour of amalgamation claiming that it will result in more efficient and economical despatch of work. While doing so there has, I admit, been a certain amount of recrimination and fault finding in the letters that have issued from my office. This has naturally caused resentment in your office. Whatever may have been the motives in this, I would like to express my regret that any suggestions should have been made which implied that the Stationery Office was not working efficiently. In taking up this question again it is not with the desire to improve the efficiency of the Stationery Office, nor even with the hope that any immediate economy can be demonstrably proved to be possible. I do not wish that the pay and conditions of service and prospects of advancement of anyone now working in the Stationery Office should be adversely affected if the amalgamation is sanctioned by Government, and I would also like to see that the Government are not put to any appreciable additional expenditure thereby. I would much appreciate your help in devising a scheme whereby all these can be ensured.

It has been questioned more than once in your office file why the Superintendent, Government Press is repeatedly putting up this proposal for amalgamation. I would like to say here most emphatically that this has not been done with any desire for self-advancement on the part of the Superintendent, Government Press, nor of any officers in the Press. The Superintendent, Government Press has not always been able to prove to the satisfaction of the Superintendent of Stationery, the Board of Revenue and the Government what the advantages are in such an amalgamation. But I would like to say that every time it has been put up the Superintendent, Government Press had only one object in view viz. to overcome those difficulties which he felt to exist in the two offices being separate and which he sincerely felt could be overcome ~~those difficulties~~ if the two offices were amalgamated and he felt convinced that this would eventually contribute to a better working of both the departments. If I am asked to give concrete instances I shall not find it easy, but successive Superintendents of the Press have felt this difficulty, but unfortunately they have not so far been able to make the Superintendent of Stationery realize the nature and extent of these difficulties. I am not hopeful of being much more successful than they have been for the reason that these difficulties, when expressed to those not fully acquainted with the problems of a complicated process such as Printing, may appear to be of no consequence.

But these difficulties are largely connected with the consuming and purchasing departments being under separate management. It has been urged by one of the Superintendents of Stationery that this separation is an excellent thing, but his successor has refuted this (Please see Mr. Cox's marginal remarks on page 80 of the 1930 file of your office). My intention in pointing this out is not to infer that this is an erroneous assumption because two Collectors have held contradictory views on this matter, but only to show that it is not such an undisputed principle as it is claimed to be that the purchasing and consuming departments should be separate. My chief difficulty arises from the fact that these are kept separate instead of being under one charge. If this is such an established principle

one would expect to see it more generally adopted. But does some other department buy the stores required by the Public Works Department? Does one find business houses having separate purchasing departments? Why is it that other Provincial Governments in India have not adopted this principle? In every other Province and in the Government of India, the Stationery and Printing are under the control of one officer.

that he takes only about 60% of the Stationery Stores,

I find it mentioned in your office file that uniformity with other Provinces is not necessary, nor by itself an argument for its adoption. I agree with this; the need for uniformity is not by itself an argument for its adoption, but it cannot be denied that this principle that the purchasing and consuming departments should be kept separate has not found wide acceptance; in fact it does not appear to have been adopted anywhere except in this Province, and even in this Province in any department except in the Stationery and Printing departments. It makes one doubt the validity of the principle just enunciated; on the contrary, the general almost unanimous adoption of the principle that the purchasing and consuming departments should be under the charge of the same officer leads one to observe that this latter principle may be more correct. It will be urged against this that even if it were so, the Superintendent, Government Press is not the sole consumer of the Stationery Stores, and what about the other 40%? When one considers that this 40% is divided among a large number of offices and therefore, each one consumes only a very tiny part of the Stationery Stores, it may be realized that by far the largest consumer is the Government Press.

I have written at some length already on this question of whether it is desirable to have the purchasing and consuming departments under one control because your office file shows that the opinions of several previous Superintendents of Stationery have been against this combining of the purchasing and consuming departments. The opinion of Mr. Tottenham and Mr. Kershaw have been brought up by your office to show that such a combination is unwise. This has been supported by Mr. Henderson and recently by Mr. Viswanatha Rao. I have already referred to Mr. Cox's remarks on this; his objections were based on other reasons.

Therefore, it is very necessary to clear up beforehand this question of whether it is really a sound principle that the purchasing and consuming departments should be under separate control. I have already pointed out that my chief difficulties are on account of this separation of the two departments. Though much can be done to ensure the proper supply of the articles I require by careful preparation of the annual indents and submitting these to the Stationery Office as I do at present, many difficulties arise in the course of the year on account of the supply of articles in insufficient quantities, not quite correct specifications such as size, weight, quantity, etc. It is not easy to give concrete instances, nor is it of much use, but I would request you to take my word for it that such difficulties do occur frequently. I am not going to suggest that in such cases the Stationery Office is to blame, and it is not my intention to suggest that the Stationery Office has not always tried to comply with all my requirements. They certainly have, but in spite of that dislocation and difficulties and expensive substitutions of materials have arisen from time to time. Only the person on the spot realizes fully his difficulties, and telephonic messages and even personal talks will not bring to the purchasing department the proper sense or urgency which the consuming department feels. I have several times felt this sense of impotency and so have my predecessors. It is this, more than anything else, that has induced them and is inducing me now, to urge that the consumer knows best what he requires and he is the proper agency to make the purchases for his use.

What objections are there to combining the purchasing and consuming agency under one control? It was urged by your office that "the line between the two is likely to get blurred if the Press, the main spending department, purchases stationery and also spends it on itself and all other indenting departments. The checks possible in the present system will tend to disappear". The Superintendent of Stationery does not exercise any appreciable check over my requirements unlike in the case of other offices in which the requirements are very small, and in which the necessity to keep to the average of three years is usually insisted upon by you. In the case of a Press, it is a service department and it does only the work sent to it for printing by other departments and if more work is sent, then more stationery is consumed. If the average requirements of the past three years of a particular quality of paper are 10,000 reams and, if the demands made on me for printing work by the Government departments exceed this quantity, then I shall require more, and you have to supply this quantity. If I require less, then my periodical requisitions are accordingly less. In this respect, being a service department whose output is directly proportional to the demands made on it by the administration of the Province, the Press is different from other offices whose indents are received in the Stationery Office.

My accounts are audited by the Accountant General, and even after amalgamation, the accounts of both the Stationery section and the Press section will be audited. In fact, if amalgamation is sanctioned, it is my intention to keep all accounting separate as it is now. All the checks that the Stationery office now exercises I shall desire to continue. Even in the Press there are consuming and Store sections and the accounting system is such that there is a close check between one department and another. This is not blurred nor done away with because both sections are under my charge. I am most anxious that all checks that are exercised now shall continue. If I fail in this, the annual audit will bring mistakes, if any, to the notice of Government. There is no justification to think that I alone should not be entrusted with the responsibility of being both a purchaser and a consumer while there are several other departments under the Government in this Province and the same two departments in every other Province in India in which the same officer is both the purchaser and the consumer. Is it possible that the likelihood of the line between purchasing and consuming getting blurred has not been noticed by all these Governments and in the case of other departments under this Government? Why are there no business concerns which follow this principle of separation?

It will help in clearing misapprehension on this point if I mention briefly what I propose to do if the two departments are amalgamated. I should not make any changes in the procedure now obtaining. The Press section will continue to submit its annual indent as it is doing now. Requisitions will be sent periodically as now. Supplemental claims will not be complied with by the Stationery section until the Store section of the Press has explained to my satisfaction the necessity for it. There is no reason to suppose that I shall be prepared to gloss over mistakes. Mistakes like these are open to audit objections and it is not to be supposed that even if it were not so a conscientious officer may be willing to overlook them. I can state most emphatically that I will not allow the line between purchasing and consuming to get blurred or the checks now exercised to be relaxed to the slightest extent if the two departments are amalgamated. Besides, the rules laid down in the Stationery Manual, the Printing Manual, the Government Press Office Manual and the systems of accounting and auditing prescribed by the Government preclude any such possibility.

I quite realize the sincerity of the fear of the Stationery Office, the Board of Revenue and the Government in making a departure for the first time from what has been the practice for many years. But I would ask them to take what might appear a bold step, and I can assure them that nothing but good will result therefrom. The example of other Provinces and even other departments under the Madras Government would appear to show that there is no risk whatever.

It has been urged that a technical expert such as the Superintendent, Government Press is not necessarily the best person to be in charge of an administrative department such as the Stationery Office. This is based on an incorrect appreciation of my duties in the Press. There is considerable administrative work in the Press, and the time of the Superintendent, Government Press is mostly spent on this. The complications and difficulties of administration of a large Press have to be known from personal experience to be correctly appreciated. No two works are alike; the demands made on it are great; the problem of administering a large concern employing over 2,000 hands and spending several lakhs of rupees a year does not call for merely technical knowledge; very considerable administrative ability is required and I hope it will not be seriously urged that I have not the requisite ability to manage the Stationery Office.

Another difficulty which existed till now with regard to amalgamation of the two offices was the question of personnel. As Mr. Cox has rightly pointed out, Mr. Duncan, the present Assistant Superintendent of Stationery who was drawing in 1931 about the same pay as Mr. Green, my predecessor and not far junior to him, could not have been expected to serve under the latter. It was even more difficult to expect him to serve under me when I succeeded Mr. Green, as I am many years junior to Mr. Duncan in service. As long as Mr. Duncan continued as Assistant Superintendent of Stationery amalgamation was not possible, and I do not wish to proceed with it until after Mr. Duncan has retired from service. When he retires this difficulty will no longer exist. Even the subordinate staff in the Stationery Office may feel that their prospects of advancement are less in an amalgamated office than directly under the Collector of Madras - they may have prospects of going out as Revenue Inspectors for instance - and these chances should in my opinion continue, new entrants only coming under revised rules.

The next objection has been on account of the fact that all the previous proposals put up by the Superintendents of the Government Press involved considerable additional expenditure on the Superior Establishment if compared with working ~~as~~ the two departments separately. I agree that this has been so. They have been in the past based on the assumption that the Superintendent of Stationery received Rs 200/- for his duties in connection with the Stationery Office. We had not taken into account that 1/5 of the pay of the Assistant Superintendent of Stationery was debited to Central Revenues for work done by him as Assistant Pay Master of Carnatic stipends and 1/4 of the pay for work done in the Stamps Section. There have also been other inaccuracies. It is my intention now to try to reduce this additional expenditure to a minimum. I am not going to suggest that any reductions in establishment will be possible, and my intention is, as I have already said, to work the two departments exactly as they are now, the only difference being in the management.

These I think have all along been the main objections and I have dealt with them in detail. If you are of the opinion that these objections still exist in spite of my observations, or you require further information on any point I shall be only too pleased to try my best to clear them up, probably the best way would be by personal discussion. Before the scheme goes to Government I think there should be a certain measure of agreement between yourself, the Board of Revenue and myself that the proposal is sound and will rule out many difficulties which at present exist. I am enclosing an Annexure which supplements this letter and is a full statement giving my remarks against all the objections raised in the past and those put up by Mr. Viswanatha Rao and the Board of Revenue last year. Your office files are returned herewith with many thanks.

II.

Copy of D.O. No.8/S/43 dated 20-1-43 from Mr. A. Lepper, Superintendent, Government Press, to Mr. C.H. Masterman,

With reference to our conversation on 18-1-43 you have asked me to specify the advantages that are likely to accrue in the event of amalgamation of the Government Stationery and Printing Departments taking place. In para 2 of my letter No. 84/S/42 dated 24th December 1942 I have pointed out that there are difficulties which exist in the two offices being separate and which I feel convinced could be overcome if they were amalgamated and that this would eventually contribute to a better working of both the departments. I have also pointed out that it is extremely difficult to give concrete instances of these difficulties which are real but when expressed to those not fully acquainted with the problems which arise in a printing office may appear of little consequence and they are largely due to the purchasing and consuming departments being under separate management.

2. As in the case of all other offices I have to prepare my annual indents for printing paper and stationery and submit them to the Stationery Office and though this is done as accurately as possible it is extremely difficult for me to keep within the bounds of those indents on which the Stationery Office usually insists. The Press is a service department and does only the work sent to it for printing by other departments and it is impossible to forecast the demands likely to be made on it during the year and there are fairly frequent instances of the supplies of paper or other materials being insufficient and running out of stock leading to lengthy correspondence in endeavouring to convince the Stationery Office that my demands for additional quantities are justified. In the cases of urgent work this leads to much further correspondence with other offices explaining the delay in the supply of books or forms and considerable dislocation and delay in other cases due to technical difficulties with which I do not propose to burden you. Surely the consumer knows best what his requirements are and surely he is the proper agency to make his own purchases rather than having to apply to another completely separate department to meet the printing demands made directly on him.

3. I am afraid I must say that the Stationery Office is not always very helpful when it runs out of stock of any particular kind or weight of paper. My indents are usually returned with an endorsement on it "No stock" without any covering letter or intimation as to when or how it will be replenished and it is left to me to make my own arrangements to get over the difficulty and I have to decide whether to take the job off the machine and wait or, on account of the urgency, substitute another paper which may be slightly heavier in weight and possibly more expensive. These difficulties have to be represented to the Stationery Office in writing before I can get any information regarding fresh supplies. This correspondence could be avoided if the two offices were under the same management.

4. The Stationery Office has also to purchase for me printing ink, book-binder's requisites including cloth, thread, glue, etc. and there have been numerous cases of purchases of materials required by the Press which have been found quite unsuitable for the purpose for which they are required and because the two offices are separated long correspondence has to be carried on about these supplies also. The result has been that the Assistant Superintendent of Stationery now has to send materials to me for testing before purchase which also leads to delay in final supply.

5. I could point out innumerable instances where materials supplied are not at all according to the specifications and I as

the

the one who has to use them am put to considerable difficulties in doing so which also leads me to believe that supplies are not being inspected as they are received for defects which cause hardship to the consuming departments.

6. I have been very reluctant to point out these lapses on the part of the Stationery Office and I have done so now only in an attempt to point out some of the disadvantages and difficulties which amalgamation would eliminate. Your office will take it as an accusation and an imputation of neglect of their duties, but believe me I have no such intention as I have not the necessary evidence to come to such conclusions which if known by your office will only cause an embitterment of relations between the two offices which I am anxious to avoid.

7. Printing and Stationery are so closely allied that it seems to me impracticable to have the two branches under entirely separate control leading to endless correspondence and in some cases unavoidable delays (for instance the hours of work and holidays of the Stationery Office, except the stores, differ from those of the Press and if fresh urgent supplies outside the stores are required on a Government holiday which does not apply to the Press, the Stationery Office is found to be closed and delay is inevitable). When Mr. Duncan retires a paper expert with his experience will not be found to take his place and therefore it seems preferable to have an officer trained in paper technology and a qualified printer to supervise the work of both the Stationery Office and the Press who can probably give more time to it than the Collector with his multitudinous kinds of work in other directions. (Please don't take this in the light that I am casting aspersions on the Collector's effective control of the Stationery Office). But I do feel that it would tend to the smoother working of both departments if they were under one management and I am convinced that in the long run a considerable amount of saving will be effected by amalgamation.

Staff

8. The Stationery Office would no doubt resent my remarks which I think are not unjust. Please keep the contents of this letter to yourself and ask your successor to do so also when you go to the Board of Revenue.

III.

dated 4-12-43

Copy of D.O. No.103/S/43 from Mr. A. Lepper, Superintendent, Government Press, Madras to Mr. Bhaskara Rao.

--

About a year ago I wrote a long D.O. No.84/S/42 dated 24th December 1942 to Mr. Masterman on the question of amalgamation of the Stationery & Printing Departments after his predecessor Mr. Morris and I had interviewed Mr. Austin who is strongly in favour of it. I saw Mr. Masterman on this question early in January this year but since then I have heard nothing further of it probably as he was transferred to the Board of Revenue. As the Assistant Superintendent of Stationery Mr. Duncan had been given a year's extension of service the matter was not then urgent and I did not want to worry you about it knowing how busy you were in connection with the distribution of rice and other civil supplies but as the question of Mr. Duncan's retirement must again be engaging the attention of Government I should like to re-open the matter with you.

2. The work of these two departments are so closely allied that it seems to be highly desirable and practicable that they should be under one control, a fact which has been realized in every other province in India except Madras. I have given in my letter No.8/S/43 dated 20th January 1943 to Mr. Masterman some of the difficulties with which I am faced and which are very

largely

largely connected with the purchasing and consuming departments being under entirely separate control and I have already pointed out and it seems correct that these difficulties when expressed to those not fully acquainted with the technical processes of printing may appear to be of no consequence. Difficulties do exist and as it is not easy to give concrete instances successive Superintendents of Stationery have not been convinced of them. I have written at considerable length in my D.O. No. 84/S/43 on this question of whether it is desirable to have the purchasing and consuming departments under one control (vide paras 3 to 7). The opinion of Mr. Tottenham and Mr. Kershaw have been brought up to show that such a combination is unwise but conditions have changed very much since their time.

3. Successive Superintendents of Stationery seem to fear that there will be no proper checks if the departments are amalgamated but if it comes about I do not propose to make any changes in the existing procedure, the Press section will continue to submit its annual indent as it does now, requisitions will be sent periodically as now, supplemental claims will not be complied with until the Store section of the Press has explained to my satisfaction the imperative necessity for it. The accounts of both the Stationery section and the Press section will be audited separately every year by the Accountant General which should surely be sufficient check for any mistake which might be brought to light and can I not be trusted to see that the so called line does not get blurred if the Stationery section purchases stationery and issues it to the Press section with all existing checks (vide page 8 of the Annexure).

4. As I do not intend to proceed with amalgamation until Mr. Duncan retires and intend to put up proposals to Government to appoint an officer of the Press who has been trained in England in Paper Technology and the Paper Trade there will be no difficulty as regards personnel and finding a suitable incumbent for the post when Mr. Duncan goes. I shall be in charge of the two departments and there will be no question of securing an expert stationer cum printer as a study of stationery, paper technology and paper trade customs form part of a practical printer's training for in all printing businesses in England and America the printer is always his own stationer.

5. There will be an officer in charge of the Stationery section as at present with the necessary staff, I have no intention to change the site of the stores. There will be no difficulty in running the Stationery Stores in the same way in which I am now supervising the work of the Branches of the Press at Mount Road, the Penitentiary and the High Court by calling there periodically for inspection, if I find it necessary I can call daily at the Stationery Section on my way to Mint Buildings and occasionally spend as much as half a day there.

6. Until I have had experience of the interior working of the Stationery Office I cannot possibly say if any savings can be effected but I am convinced that amalgamation will lead to a better working and understanding between both departments and that considerable savings will eventually accrue though it is impossible to give any estimate as to the extent. Anyhow the officer to be put in charge of the Stationery section will draw a considerably lower scale than Mr. Duncan.

(True copies)

Superintendent.

Conf

Do
[My dear Sir]

Amalgamation of
Stationery & Printing depts.

I am desirous to invite
a reference to your Compt. Do. no
84/S/42 & 24/5/46 to Mr
Viswanath Ayyar. I am
and to ask you to put up details
of proposals specifically on the
above subject, at an early date

sepol.
25/6/46

A. Letter Esq
Supr. Govt.
Press

JP
25/6/46

[Yours sincerely]

Srk
25/6/46

28625 F1 - 1/46 Edn. dv. 25/6/46. Sdu
71

223
4

My dear mother
I am writing you
to tell you that I
am well and hope
you are the same.

I am writing you
to tell you that I
am well and hope
you are the same.
I am writing you
to tell you that I
am well and hope
you are the same.

Yours truly
A. J. J.

A. J. J.

Yours truly
A. J. J.

Amalgamation of Printing
& Shaking Depths

8
E & P. H. Dept. (F. 1)
PROPOSAL - AMALGAMATION OF PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.
G.No. 28625, from the S.G.P., No. 84 S/42 d/ 24-5-46.

pick
The S.G.P. has addressed Government demi-offi-
cially requesting for a reconsideration of the orders
negating the proposal for the amalgamation of Stationery
and Printing Departments. He states that until a suitable
war.candidate for filling the post of Assistant Supdt. of
Stationery becomes available one of the officers of the
Govt. Press trained in paper technology can take over from
Mr. Duncan and work in the Stationery office under his
control. He states in this connection, that he is firmly
convinced that he shall be able to show very considerable
savings in a short time in case the proposals for amalga-
mation is given effect to. He also states that if Govt.
let him know their views on the subject he would put up
proposals to Govt. officially.

pick
Cio 514 20 (V)
15444
The question of the amalgamation of the Stationery
and Printing Departments was considered by the Govt. more
than once in the past. It was last considered during
1943-44 and the Government/^{have}decided that the proposal of the
amalgamation of the Stationery and Printing departments
be dropped for the present.

M-1-3 v
L-662 7 (I)
10818
In 1918 the Government appointed a Committee
with a former Superintendent of Stationery (Sir Charles
Todhunter) as President to consider the question of control
of the Stationery. This committee recommended the
transfer of the work relating to Stationery and Stamps to
Superintendent, Govt. Press. The Govt. accepted the
recommendation and ~~petitioned~~ obtained the sanction of the
Secretary of State for the amalgamation of the two departments.
The reasons for the proposed amalgamation were briefly as
follows :-

(1) The operations of the Stationery
department involve heavy expenditure of several lakhs per

annum and there is no whole time officer in charge of them. The Collector of Madras and his Assistant (from the Deputy Collectors' cadre) who ^{was} are in charge of the department have other and more important duties to do and could not devote that time and attention to details which the administration of the Stationery Department called for.

(2) Neither the Collector ^{cum} Superintendent of Stationery nor his assistant (both liable to constant change of personnel) possessed the technical knowledge required for the control and purchase of stationery articles and the qualifications ~~necessary~~ necessary for the economical management of the department.

(3) The dual control and division of ~~the~~ responsibility due to entrusting the technical work of the Stationery office namely, the check and tabulation of indents of printed forms, to the Superintendent, Government Press, ^{was} ~~is~~ undesirable.

(4) The fact that the Superintendent, Government ~~Press~~ Press, ^{had} ~~has~~ to get his supply of paper from the Stationery office tends to duplication of work.

The Secretary of State's sanction for amalgamation was received in April 1919 and in June the Government decided to give effect to it on the return of Mr. Fisher, Superintendent, Government Press in October of that year. But the amalgamation of Printing and Stationery Departments was not effected in October 1919 as Mr. Fisher extended his leave and retired from 6-4-1920. The question of a, suitable successor to Mr. Fisher was meanwhile taken up with Mr. Cogwell, the Controller of Printing and Stationery, India, who hinted that as a result of the report of the Stores Committee the scheme of amalgamation would probably have to be altered. The question of amalgamation was accordingly held over.

In 1931 the question of amalgamation of Printing and Stationery Department was again taken up and it was held in abeyance on the following grounds that:

It may be noted that the Stores Purchase Committee's report did not in any way affect the Stationery & Printing Dept. as they stand when the amalgamation was decided in 1919.

Pen 4 in 1932, this work was solely entrusted to the S.G.P. - 40 7R (B) 91-32

p 13 7 40 933-34 (Y) 3-11-20

p 24 - (Y)

11-66-67 (Y) 11-33-34 (Y) 3-11-20

(1) ^{that} in existing conditions in Madras it was not certain whether economy would result from the amalgamation;

(2) ^{that} there would be difficulties in combining the personnel;

and (3) that it was not certain whether duplication of work ~~might~~ delays occurred then would be obviated by the change and whether any increased efficiency would result.

In 1932, the Madras Retrenchment Committee recommended that the question of amalgamation of the Stationery office and the Government Press should be re-examined in view of the fact that the post of the Collector of Madras who ^{was} ~~is~~ also the Superintendent of Stationery and Stamps was to be merged in that of the Collector of Chingleput and in the light of the information given to them that a large proportion of the paper in the Stationery were being utilised by the Press. The Government carefully considered the question ~~and~~ and came to the conclusion that under the then existing conditions ^{+ building} and personnel ~~should~~ the proposed amalgamation would not effect any economy and that it was not possible to foresee what would happen to the temporary combination of the Collector of Madras and Chingleput.

At the instance of the present Superintendent, Government Press, the proposal was examined in 1941-42, the reasons urged by him for the proposed amalgamation were as follows :-

(1) ^{that} The Stationery and Printing Departments ^{are} ~~was~~ under one control in the Governments of most countries ~~as~~ as well as the Government of India and important Indian Provincial Governments except Madras;

(2) that the Government Press was the largest consumer of Stationery supply and the recommendation of the S.G.P. was always accepted before the annual tender for the

1-34 2 (J) 210 18 R 27233

11-3 2 40 185-2 (e) 3-2-42

11-33-34 (Y)

several kinds of ^{standard} stationery paper was placed;

(3) that the Asst. Superintendent of Stationery was not a printer and had no experience of printing.

(4) that in the past there were numerous cases of purchases by Stationery Office of materials ~~which were~~ required by the Press which were found unsuitable. (5) that an Assistant with a technical knowledge of printing and book binding was essential rather than paper expert.

(6) that the old warehouse opposite to the Press under the control of the Commissioner of Excise could be reconstructed for the storage of paper saving a good deal of cartage and transport;

(7) that a reduction ~~of~~ of the menial and clerical establishment of the Stationery Office was anticipated;

The Superintendent of Stationery and the Board of Revenue submitted a report on the points urged by the S.G.P., in addition to the arguments advanced against the proposal in 1931-33. It was held that the following additional grounds existed.

(1) It was necessary that a large consuming unit like the Press should be distinct from the main purchasing department like the Stationery and Stores Department.

(2) A Technical Expert may not be a good administrator and administrative ability and experience are qualifications which the head of a Stationery Department should have.

(3) The Superintendent, Government Press had a full time job in the Press and he would not be able to control both the departments satisfactorily.

It was again decided that the S.G.P.'s proposal for amalgamation should be rejected.

In 1943 the question of amalgamation of printing and stationery departments was again raised by the S.G.P. The then Superintendent of Stationery (Mr. Bhaskara Rao) agreed with the S.G.P. that the time was ripe for amalgamating the two departments under one direction. The Board of Revenue was

however against the proposal. The reasons urged by the S.G.P. in support of the proposal which answer the arguments levelled against the proposal are as follows:-

(1) The present S.G.P. was competent to handle both departments and the problem of finding an expert in both Printing and Stationery did not present much difficulty, as they were allied subjects and a printer of his standing would also be a stationer.

(2) As regards subordinate establishment, the S.G.P. intended to work the two departments distinct from each other as they were then. Hence there would be no difficulty as regards the personnel of the Subordinate establishment. As regards Mr. Duncan, who could not work under the present S.G.P., it was the intention that this proposal should come into effect after Mr. Duncan retired.

(3) The present S.G.P. would not find any difficulty in supervising and controlling the work done in the Government Press housed in different places at considerable distances apart and in the stationery office situated at considerable distance to the office from any of them.

(4) The S.G.P. admitted that there ~~will~~ be no saving in expenditure as regards establishment, but he was confident that there would be a saving under 'purchases' and 'consumption' when the departments were amalgamated.

(5) The Superintendent, Govt. Press would not make any change in the existing procedure of accounting and auditing and that the necessary checks would be enforced.

The then Adviser to H.E. (Sir Thomas Austin) in charge of the Press minuted on the proposal as follows:-

"I feel that a case has been made out for general approval of this proposal. There is much to be said on both sides. The two determining factors that have led me to bring this matter up again are (1) the impossibility of finding a successor to Mr. Duncan and (2) the increase in efficiency and in savings under 'purchase'."

"and consumption which amalgamation should ensure. I consider that Mr. Lepper is capable of running the amalgamated Department and there is plenty of time to train successors to him".

Sir Hugh Hood, the then Adviser in charge of Finance expressed himself against amalgamation of the Stationery and Printing Departments and the proposal was thereupon dropped for the present.

Mr. Duncan, the present Superintendent of Stationery has been granted leave preparatory to retirement from October of this year and it is for consideration whether the proposal for amalgamation of Printing and Stationery Departments may be reconsidered in the light of the points mentioned in Mr. Lepper's D.O. on page 1 c.f. and arguments advanced by him in 1943. The Revenue Department already suggested in 1944 that if the Printing and Stationery Departments were to be amalgamated, the work relating to stamps and Carnatic Stipends, which is now being done by the Assistant Superintendent of Stationery might remain with the Collector of Madras who might be able to give such assistance as might be necessary for the discharge of this work. The Superintendent, Govt. Press did not indicate even on the last occasion the exact financial implication of the scheme and this was pointed out by the Finance Department and they desired to formulate detailed proposals for examination in that department if the scheme were to be proceeded with.

For orders whether before proceeding further the proposal of the S.G.P., for the amalgamation of Printing and Stationery departments will be accepted. The file may be circulated to H.M. (Ed).

Fin. should see first for acceptance of the proposal in view of the effect of the proposal is that the S.G.P. will become "Suptdt of Printing & Stationery". He will have in Mr. Duncan's place an "Asst Suptdt of Stationery", drawing considerably less pay than

129 nf
(V)

15
NF (V)

12 nf
(V)

DS
S

Mr. Duncan (probably the same as the A. SGP in the Press) to look after Stationery part of his job.

I think we should ask SGP to submit proposals through the Bd of Rev.

SRK
24.6.46
S.

He is S.P. to put up details proposals. We can consult the Board of Revenue while the matter is being examined simultaneously in the Secretariat. I think the time has come for the amalgamation to give effect to, and the financial and other implications have to be examined. We can circulate it later.

A draft Do is submitted.

Home & record this. Make a Rr Diary entry for 1.10.46.

SRK

1261200 [26.6.45] Issues D.O. no. 28625 F-1
Mis Recorded. Enq 25.6.45

