

769.
Govt. of Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Marine

Dated

Recd.

Encl.

G.O. 5/8/1896 No. 538 Mar.

Audit of the Harbour Works
Construction accounts.

Considering that the delay
in the part of the Examiners of
P. W. accounts in introducing
the system of monthly—
has not been satisfactorily
explained.

P. W. 19.
1895-1896.

5/8 Wdf

40
2

Mem: 488: 7.7-96
589: 2.9-96

Gobt. of {1896} Madras.
MARINE.

Dated August, 5th.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O. No. 538, 5th August 1896.

AUGUST.

**Audit of the Harbour Works
Construction Accounts**

Considering that the delay on the part of the Examiner of Public Works Accounts in introducing the system of monthly — has not been satisfactorily explained.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper :—

From D. C. GORDON, Esq., Examiner of Public Works Accounts, Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 10th July 1896, No. 505 A.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt (yesterday) of G.O. No. 447, Marine, dated 19th June 1896, on the subject of the audit of the Harbour Works accounts, in which explanation is required why the monthly audit of the accounts was not brought in operation from October 1895.

2. Until I had opportunity of knowing something of the accounts kept for the Harbour Works, and the procedure in force, it was impossible to determine what modifications might be required, or what accounts could be prepared for submission, or how far audit, as laid down by Public Works Department rules and procedure, could be applied.

3. At the end of November 1895 I audited the accounts for 1893-94, my report was forwarded to Government under my No. 27 A. of 11th January 1896. In that report I showed that the procedure was very much at variance with departmental procedure, the report dealing with the more important matters, and the accompanying memorandum with minor matters chiefly affecting the preparation of the initial accounts and the compilation of the general accounts. I considered it was impossible to have previous procedure altered and a new and not-understood procedure introduced at a time when the works were very near completion, and that it could be of no advantage to adopt a new course for six months' accounts of the closing of the works. In paragraph 15 of my report I stated that the audit for 1895-96 could not be taken up till the accounts for that year were completed, and that it would be convenient that monthly accounts should commence from 1st April 1896.

4. In G.O., No. 259 W. of 22nd January 1896, Government recommended my remarks and suggestions to the attention of the Chairman of the Harbour Trust Board. In my next report on the accounts for 1894-95, forwarded to Government with my No. 65 B. of 23rd January 1896, I stated in paragraph 8 that the accounts for 1895-96 would be audited when completed, and that monthly accounts should be sent from 1st April 1896. No orders have been issued on this report. The Chairman of the Board replied to both my reports in his No. 4705 of 6th March 1896 (see my No. 231 B. of 26th March 1896 to Government) and took no exception to the proposal for the introduction of the monthly accounts from 1st April 1896. There has, therefore, been no intention to introduce the monthly audit previous to that date.

5. Government now desire that all expenditure under Capital should be audited under the Public Works Department procedure, and I shall arrange with the Chairman of the Board for the submission of monthly accounts from 1st April 1896 of the current miscellaneous expenditure connected with the construction accounts, referred to in paragraph 11 of my report on the accounts for 1895-96 (see my No. 437 A. of 17th June 1896 to Government) and for all other expenditure chargeable to Capital.

ORDER—No. 538, Marine, dated 5th August 1896.

The delay on the part of the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, referred to in G.O. No. 447, Marine, dated 19th June 1896, in introducing the system of monthly audit of the Harbour Works Construction accounts has not, in the opinion of His Excellency the Governor in Council, been satisfactorily explained.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government.

To the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.
Spare Copies

From

The Examiner, P.W. Accounts,
Madras.

To

The Secretary to Government,
P.W. Department.

No.

505-A

Dated 10 July 1896.

Recd.

Audit of the accounts of the Madras
Harbour Works. Offering explanation why
monthly-----was not brought in operation
from October 1895.

7.7.96. 485 Mar.
7.7.96. 484 Mar
19.1.96. 447-48 Mar
10.4.96. 1260 W
2.4.96. 228.9 Mar
26.3.96. 210 Mar
17.3.96. 1491 C.
6.3.96. 143.4 Mar
22.1.96. 259 W
6.11.95. 2817 W
2.11.95. 2770 W
15.8.95. 2029 W
15.8.95. 2024 W
11.7.95. 1710 W
27.6.95. 1573 W
18.6.95. 1481 W
9.5.95. $\frac{3}{1108W}$
9.5.95. 1109 W
9.5.95. 1108 W
19.4.95. 138.
16.11.94. 2945 W
4.9.94. 2194 W
16.6.94. 227 Mar
aa 21 485

N.B.—In any future communication on this subject, the number and date of this letter should be quoted, and the communication should be addressed to the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, Madras, and not to any officer by name.

[E. No. 93].
500—21-5-96.

FROM D. C. GORDON, Esq.,

EXAMINER OF P. W. ACCOUNTS, MADRAS,

To

The Secretary to Government,

Public Works Department.

No. 505 A.

Madras, 10th July

1896.

SIR,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt (yesterday) of G.O. No. 447, Marine, dated 19th. June 1896, on the subject of the audit of the Harbour Works accounts, in which explanation is required why the monthly audit of the accounts was not brought in operation from October 1895.

2. Until I had opportunity of knowing something of the accounts kept for the Harbour Works, and the procedure in force, it was impossible to determine what modifications might be required, or what accounts could be prepared for submission, or how far audit as laid down by P.W.D. rules and procedure could be applied.

3. At the end of November 1895 I audited the accounts for 1893-94, my report was forwarded to Government under my No. 27-A. of 11th. January 1896. In that report I showed that the procedure was very much at variance with departmental procedure, the report dealing with the more important matters and the accompanying memorandum with minor matters chiefly affecting the preparation of the initial accounts and the compilation of the general accounts. I considered it was impossible to have previous procedure altered and a new and not-understood procedure introduced at a time when the works were very near completion, and that it could be of no advantage to adopt a new course for six months' accounts of the closing of the works. In para 15 of my report I stated that the audit for 1895-96 could not be

taken up till the accounts for that year were completed, and that it would be convenient that monthly accounts should commence from 1st. April 1896.

4. In G.O. No. 259 W. of 22nd. January 1896 Government recommended my remarks and suggestions to the attention of the Chairman of the Harbour Trust Board. In my next report, on the accounts for 1894-95, forwarded to Government with my No. 65 B of 23rd. January 1896, I stated in para 8, that the accounts for 1895-96 would be audited when completed, and that monthly accounts should be sent from 1st. April 1896. No orders have been issued on this report. The Chairman of the Board replied to both my reports in his No. 4705 of 6th. March 1896 (see my No. 231 B. of 26th. March 1896 to Government) and took no exception to the proposal for the introduction of the monthly accounts from 1st. April 1896. There has therefore been no intention to introduce the monthly audit previous to that date.

5. Government now desire that all expenditure under Capital should be audited under the P.W.D. procedure, and I shall arrange with the Chairman of the Board for the submission of monthly accounts from 1st. April 1896 of the current miscellaneous expenditure connected with the construction accounts, referred to in para 11 of my report on the accounts for 1895-96 (see my No. 437-A of 17th. June 1896 to Government) and for all other expenditure chargeable to Capital.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servant.

D. P. Carson

Examiner, P.W. Accounts, Madras.

*Recd
11/7*

[R.O.]

Marine P.W. DEPARTMENT.

*538/101
6-8/96*

READ the following:—

From the Examiner, P.W. Accounts, Madras, No. 505 A dated 10th July 1896.

FOR ORDERS.

The Examiner submits the explanation called for in G.O. 447 Marine dated 19th June 1896 in regard to the delay, which he has allowed to occur, in the introduction of the system of concurrent audit of the Harbour works construction accounts. It will be seen from the order -- quoted that in May 1895 the Government approved of the system. The order on the subject, G.O. 1108 W d/ 9th May 1895, was duly communicated to the Examiner. The "intention" of the Government may be said to date from this time. Notwithstanding -- which the Examiner says, at the end of para 4 of his present letter, -- that there was no "intention" to -- introduce the monthly audit previous to the 1st April 1896. Whose "intention" he now speaks of is not quite clear. The intention of Govt having

X Flagged A.

I intend to use the view of Hon.

Minister on the question raised.

Plum circulation.

#98 27.7.96

X Flagged B

that it
st

having been declared in May 1895, as stated above, the Examiner might, if such action had been necessary, set about finding out "what modifications might be required" &c. (Vide para 2 of his present letter). But it is extremely doubtful whether any lengthened inquiry was necessary. A week or two spent by a P.W. accountant in the Harbour works -- office would, it is thought, have -- sufficed to throw light on the -- requirements of the case. In this connection it may be remarked that prior to the transfer of the Harbour works to the charge of the Harbour Trust Board ^{in 1886} all the accounts of the works were audited in the Examiner's office, a Public Works accountant -- being specially attached to the -- works to keep and render the accounts. There was thus no novelty in the situation. Certainly none -- that should have taken over a year to master.

2. The Examiner endeavours to make a point of the fact that the Govt. has not repeated its orders on certain special occasions when, in his opinion, they ought to have been -- repeated. This was wholly unnecessary.

In

G.O. 1108 W d/9 May 1895. Flagged B

x
G.O. 2029 W d/15th August '95.
Flagged C

x. Flagged D.

In May 1895 the Government approved the introduction of the system. On the 15th August 1895, the formal -- sanction of the Government of India to it was communicated to ^x ~~the~~ ^{Examiner} ~~him~~. No action was taken ^{even then}, or in October 1895, when, as would appear from para 2 of his Office Note No. 221 A dated 21st May 1896, printed with G.O. 228 Marine dated 2nd April 1896, the harbour works accounts had been made over to him.

3. The ~~Examiner's~~ audit reports on his ^{post} ~~post~~ audit were addressed to the Chairman Harbour Trust Board direct by the Examiner, copies ^{only} being forwarded for the information of Government. It was not essential that Government should pass any -- particular orders on these reports, the requirements of the law having ^{made to the Board and} been met when the reports were published ~~in the Gazette~~ in accordance with Section 44 of Act II of 1886, but the Govt. notwithstanding, recommended the remarks and suggestions contained in the first report to the attention of the Chairman, and in G.O. 484 Marine dated 7th July 1896 the Government inquired how far these and other suggestions had been complied with by the Board.

4. But all this matter introduced into

x G.O. 259 W d/22 January 1896 Flagged E

a Flagged F

into his explanation by the Examiner does not seem quite relevant.

The question is whether the Examiner had sufficient excuse for non-compliance with distinct orders of

Government, and this question is, in the light of the above remarks, submitted for His Excellency's consideration.

My answer will be "no"
MS
30/7/96

23/7/96

I do not think the excuse is sufficient.

JS
30/7/96

2.84
2.896

HS
that it
n st
Audit of the Harbour Works
Construction Accounts.

The Hon. Mr. Blair C.E.

The Hon. Mr. Gurn C.E.

H.E. the Governor 31/7

538 Marine

23/7/96 (8)

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

28
Read the following

From the Examiner, P.W. Accounts, Madras, No. 505 A, dated 10th July 1896.

No. 538 Marine 25 August 1896

The delay on the part of the Examiner, P.W. Accounts, referred to in G.O. 447 Marine dated 19th June 1896, in introducing the system of monthly audit of the Harbour Works Construction Accounts has not, in the opinion of His Excellency the Governor in Council, been satisfactorily explained.

JS
5/8/96

DECEASED
10 AUG 13

The Examiner, P.W. Accounts.

W

(a) The position taken in the draft is that Govt. had issued distinct orders in the early part of 1895 for a certain system of audit to be carried out, and that the Examiner has unduly delayed giving effect to those orders - has in fact ignored them altogether. In his office note p. 10 he says "the matter was made over to me so late as October 1895" but he omits to say what steps he took to have the matter made over to him earlier, and he does not explain why, having had the matter made over to him in Oct 95, he did not immediately proceed with the work. Had he done so, the accounts from Oct. 95 to May 96 would have come under concurrent audit.

The fact that he incidentally mentions the delay in office notes and reports dealing with other subjects cannot, and usually does not, exonerate from blame for failure to carry out a positive order. If he wished to hold this order in

abeyance. He should have come up specially and asked that it be suspended. In none of the incidental references which he quotes did he ask for specific orders on this point, and no orders were, therefore, given. In the absence of such orders the Ex. does not seem justified in assuming that the intentions of Govt. were otherwise than which they had stated in their Proceedings.

The fact is, the reference to the matter was so casual that it escaped notice, as might have been expected.

It is always assumed that an order issued by Govt. holds good until it is obeyed or cancelled. It would be impossible to work a Secretariat office on any other principle.

R.S.

22 July 96.

- (b) In this case the accounts for 1893-94 were being dealt with. There was no question of a concurrent audit for that period.
- (c) The same remark applies partly to this period. I did not apply for specific orders on this

If question of convenience had
 audit. Had he done so,
 attention would have been
 drawn to the matter &
 the orders of govt. could
 have been obtained -
 (d) This note of Lt was
 addressed to the Board. &
 no orders of govt. were passed
 on it, as explained in
 para 3 of the "note for orders"
 L.P.

In his office note (place D)

the Bar means that the
unfulfilled
complex ^{process} is in the

please begin with the accounts
(a)
for 1856 - 58 with the L.O

Thereon which the objection
there & it seems to me
that C has ^{proved} nothing.

thinking that I will be
^{leave} down the system in the future

then then I thought he
should not take any steps in
Oct/25 when the accounts were

near as to him
(6)
L L V flasse E Lux
screen the jeans and
lux said with, and a
concern and

The same amount (c) applied to

(4) L. O. Glass F

(2) I have 8 of his No 65B 123rd Reg 86
I state that monthly accounts were for
the year 1896 and the new year
before on this.

22/7/86