Marine
~~blic Works~~ (1899) Department.

G.O., No. 866 Marine

DATED 15-9-99

16/9/99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Fees for the audit of the Harbour Trust Account~~ant~~

Fixing the fee for the audit of the Harbour Trust ~~Board's~~ Accounts by the Acct Genl, Madras at the sum of Rs 2500 per annum, and regretting that the Govt is unable to entertain the proposal of the ~~Harbour Trust Board~~ Board ~~for~~ to the employment of private auditors for the purpose.

10/14

P. W. 26.
00—19-7-99.

INDEXED.

19/9/99

PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	1013	Ma.	14-11-99				

Government (1899) of Madras.

MARINE.

Recd. } 1899. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 866, 15th September 1899.

SEPTEMBER.

Fees for the Audit of the Harbour Trust Accounts

Fixing the fee for the audit of the Harbour Trust Accounts by the Accountant-General, Madras, at the sum of Rs. 2,500 per annum, and regretting that the Government is unable to entertain the proposal of the Board to the employment of private auditors for the purpose.

1,000—2-3-99.

P. W. Department

now devolves on the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

2. The Examiner has no objection to relinquishing his audit and the Accountant General is prepared to take it up, provided his fee is fixed at Rs 2500 for the audit of both accounts. The Harbour Trust Board thinks this fee to be excessive and proposes the appointment of a private firm of Accountants on a smaller fee.

3. His Excellency the Governor in Council observes that the question of employing private auditors has been considered× before and negatived, and that the present practice is in conformity with that at other places where there are Port Trusts. His Excellency the Governor in Council regrets therefore that he is unable to entertain this proposal of the Harbour Trust Board.

× G.O. 330 Mar dd 25th July 1887
" 402 Mar dd 9th Septr 1887
" 62 Mar dd 22nd Febry 1888.

4. Following the practice in Bengal and Bombay, the Accountant General, Madras, will

will undertake the audit of both the Revenue and petty maintenance accounts of works, the audit being a monthly concurrent one. When construction is resumed, the question of retransferring the audit of petty works to the Examiner, P.W. Accounts, who will then have the audit of major works, will be revived.

5. The fee for the Accountant General's audit as defined above will be Rs 2500 per annum, and this amount is sanctioned under Section 44 of the Harbour Trust Act. It would appear that this is the amount paid by the Bombay Port Trust for the audit of its accounts. It is Rs 900 less than the sum now paid by the Madras Harbour Trust Board.

2P

To
The Chairman, H.T. Bd
" Acctt General
" P.W. Department.

R.S.
27/4/97

14.5.97

866 m 866

Marine DEPARTMENT.

READ the following :—

Letter from the Accountant General, Madras, No. 1065, dated 18th March 1899.
Letter from the Chairman, Harbour Trust Board, Madras, No. 34, d/11th April 1899.
Office note from the Examiner, P.W. Accounts, No. 653 A/A, dated 20th May 1899.
Letter from the Accountant General, Madras, No. QA/4024, dated 14th July 1899.
Letter from the Chairman, Harbour Trust Board, Madras, No. 34/1, d/10th August 1899.

Fees for the audit of Harbour Trust Accounts

Circulated to

~~H.E. the Governor.~~

~~The Hon. Mr. A. T. Arundel C.S.I.~~

The ~~Hon. Mr. H. M. Winterbotham~~

FOR ORDERS

The Harbour Trust Board now pays for the audit of its accounts.

Flag T. — (1) The Examiner, P.W. Accounts Rs. 2,400 per annum

Flag U. and (2) The Accountant General — " 1,000 — "

Total " 3,400

The Examiner's audit is a Concurrent one and deals with Construction. The latter is an annual one and deals with Revenue expenditure.

2. The Accountant General considers that his fee is inadequate for the work done, and proposes that it should be raised, on the ground that the Revenue transactions of the Board have almost doubled since the rate of fee was fixed. He states that a sum of Rs. 2,000 approximately represents the cost of the present audits.

3. The Chairman, Harbour Trust Board

suggests
Board contends that if the fee is raised, the Accountant General should undertake a Concurrent audit of both Revenue and petty maintenance accounts of works, the latter of which devolves on the Examiner. The Chairman remarks that it seems superfluous to have two auditors under present circumstances, when no Construction work is going on.

4. The Accountant General has no objection to change his yearly audit into a Concurrent one, as regards Revenue Expenditure, but adheres to the proposed fee of Rs 2000 for this work. He also agrees to undertake the audit of the petty maintenance accounts of works, but requires for this work an additional fee of Rs 500. The Examiner, P.W. Accounts has no objection to relinquishing this audit.

5. The rates proposed by the Accountant General are considered by the Harbour Trust Board to be excessive. It suggests that a private firm of Accountants be permitted to undertake the work of Concurrent audit, leaving the Annual audit, the only one obligatory under the Act, to the Accountant General. By this arrangement, the Cost of audit would be

	Rs
(1) for private auditors (Concurrent audit)	1200 p.a
(2) for the Accountant General (yearly audit)	500 *
Total Rs	1,700

as now proposed by the Trust. The Acctt. General now gets Rs 1000. & complains that this is insufficient!

It will be seen that this amount is less by Rs 800 than that demanded by the Accountant General.

6. The question of employing private auditors has been considered before, and negatived. The present practice conforms with that at other places where there are Port Trusts; the Government of India ⊕ desiring such uniformity.

Vide G.O. 330 Mar d/25. 7. 87. Flag III.
" 402 " d/ 9- 9-87 Flag IV
" 62 " d/ 22. 2-88. Flag II

⊕ ide Govt. of India letter printed in G.O. 330 Mar, d/25th July 1887. Flag III.

7. Under Sections 43 and 44 of the Harbour Trust Act, the appointment and remuneration of auditors rest with Government. It is thus for Government to decide

whether

4

whether the Accountant General's proposals should be accepted.

8. When Construction recommences, it will probably be found convenient to retransfer to the Examiner the audit of maintenance of works, as he will then audit all other "works" expenditure.

R.S. 9. I recommend that we follow the practice in Bengal & Bombay, & make the Acct General auditor with an annual fee of Rs 2500, which is the amount of the Bombay fee, & is Rs 900 less than the Board has hitherto paid - the audit to be of both Revenue Expenditure & petty maintenance accts, & to be held monthly, the Examiner's audit to cease.

21. 8. 99

7

I think this recommendation should be adopted. But, let the file be circulated to Hon. Members.

A.E.H
12.9.99

I agree.
A.H. 13-9-99.

H.W.
13-9-99

8

Marine (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 1105

Order

From
The Chairman,
Harbour Trust Board,
Madras.

No. 34/1

Dated 10-8-99
Despatched 12-8-99
Received 14-8-99.
Enclosures 11 { Plans [illegible] / others 11 }
Spare copies –

SUBJECT.

Audit fee for auditing Harbour Trust Accounts.

Replying to endorsement No.369 E dated 18th July 1899 re-

BACK PAPERS.

G. O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	3692	& papers	18-7-99
	Copy of Act II of 1886		
	164 E of 25-3-99		

FURTHER PAPERS.

G. O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Marine (1899) Department.

E.S.

CURRENT No. ~~409~~ 673/99

P. W. ACCOUNTS
12 MAY. 1899

E

No. 164 E. of 25-3-99

~~Order~~

Referred to the Chairman Harbour Trust Board for remarks.

R.D.

A.K.
24.3.99.

D.W.

D 25/3/99

From

The Accountant-General
Madras.

No. 1065

Dated 18th March 1899

Received 20-3-99

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Suggesting that, while the fee for the audit of the construction accounts is fixed at Rs. 2400/ per annum, the fee for the audit of both the Revenue & the Construction accounts of the Harbour Trust Board may be fixed at Rs. 2000/ instead of Rs 1000/ which is inadequate for the work done.

11

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
Madras Act II of 1886	
678 Mar	2-10-96 (SC)
589 "	2-9-96 (SC)
448 "	19-6-96 (SC)
447 "	19-6-96 (SC)
144 "	6-3-96 (SC)
143 "	6-3-96 (SC)
2770 W	2-11-95 (SC)
2029 W	15-8-95 (SC)
153 Mar	31-5-95 (SC)
1109 W	9-5-95 (SC)
+ papers	

E.J. 3
Mar 9 [illegible]
1105

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

9/12 14

Outside Audit Department.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
Accountant-General's Office,
18th March 1899.

No. 1065

EX
P. W. ACCOUNTS
12 MAY 1899
No.

From

T. HESKETH BIGGS ESQ.,
ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

The Secretary to Government,
Public Works, Marine.

SIR,

With reference to paragraph 40 of the report on the audit of the Revenue and allied accounts of the Madras Harbour Trust Board forwarded under this Office No. 1058 dated 17th March 1899, I have the honour to bring to the notice of Government that the present fee of Rs.1,000 fixed in G.O. No.153, dated 31st May 1895, Marine for the audit of the above accounts is inadequate for the work done. In G.O. No.434, Marine, dated 12th October 1889, the fee for the audit of both the Revenue and construction accounts of the Harbour Trust Board was fixed at Rs.1500/ with the remark that this sum is under the actual cost. It was explained in this Office letter No.305, dated 9th February 1895 that the proportion of the above audit fee for the two accounts was two thirds and one third, or Rs.1,000/- for the Revenue and Rs.500/- for the Capital accounts and the fee for the audit of the former accounts alone was, therefore, fixed in 1895 at Rs.1000/-

13

2. Since 1889, however, the Revenue transactions of the Board have almost doubled, and the time given by my outside audit establishment for the examination of these, the heaviest of accounts audited by my Office, has increased proportionately but the amount of the fee has remained the same.

3. A sum of Rs.2,000/ approximately represents the cost of the present audits. I have the honour, therefore, to suggest that fee for the audit of these accounts may be fixed at that amount. I may point out that the fee for the construction accounts, the audit of which is now much less than that of the Revenue, is fixed at Rs.2400 per annum.

G.O. 628 Marine / 2-10-98

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Accountant-General.

9/14

Marine (1898) Department.

a/3 **CURRENT No.** ~~502~~ Mar 673/99 E6

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS.
12 MAY. 1899
No.....

No. 223 Ed. Office Note 9th May 99
~~Order~~

To C

Please say whether you have any objection to raise to the transfer of the maintenance accounts audit to the Accountant General now that the Construction accounts is closed. It would entail of course the abolition of the fee now paid to the P.W. Dept.

A.R.
6-5-99.

D.W.

From
The Chairman,
Harbour Trust Board,
Madras.

No. 34

Dated 11th April } 1899
Despatched — " — }
Received Registered } 19-4-99
Enclosures (two)
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Audit fee.

Remarking on the Accountant General's letter No.1085 dated 18th March suggesting that the fee for audit of Harbour Board's Revenue and allied Accounts should be raised.

BACK PAPERS.

G. O.	No.	Department.	Date.

G.O. 5

Mar 9/10/99
1105

FURTHER PAPERS

G. O.	No.	Department.	Date.

15

Marine (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. ~~550~~ 677

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS.
12 MAY. 1899
No.

Order

From
The Chairman,
Harbour Trust Board,
Madras.

No. 34

Dated 11. 4. 99

Despatched

Received 27-4-99

Enclosures to letter No 34

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Audit fee of the Accountant-General for auditing Harbour Trust Revenue accounts.

BACK PAPERS.

G. O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS

G. O.	No.	Department.	Date.

16

Harbour Trust Office,

MADRAS, 20th October 1899.

No. 3151(A)

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS
12 MAY 1899
No.........

FROM

Ware Austin Esq I.C.S.,

CHAIRMAN, HARBOUR TRUST BOARD,
MADRAS.

To

The Honble Col. D. McNeil Campbell R.E.,

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
Marine Department.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of G.O. Marine dated 2nd October No.678 and to inform you that the sum of Rs 5,000 has been paid into the Treasury as directed to the credit of the Public Works Department being audit fee of the Madras Harbour Works Accounts for 1893/94, 1894/95 & 1895/96.

2. I submit that this amount should be charged to construction and not to Revenue Account as has always hitherto been the custom, being part of the expenses incurred in connection with construction.

3. The annual charge for the audit of the Engineers Accounts subsequent to the date of the completion of the Harbour on the sanctioned design, fixed at Rs 200 per mensem, will it is presumed apply only when Harbour improvements are in active progress, and there are accounts to be audited, and not to the period which has elapsed since the date the Harbour was reported as completed 9th May. Up to the present time, when no work has been going on, and accounts are non existent, except for a small monthly cash statement of expenditure on minor heads, which are incorporated in the general accounts of the Trust and require no special separate audit.

I have &c,
Signed W. Austin,
Chairman,
Harbour Trust Board.

HARBOUR TRUST
MADRAS 11 APR. 9
SECRETARY'S OFFICE

(True Copy)

Secretary, Harbour Trust Board.

~~6~~7

Enclo + ~~2~~

Mar cho ~~802~~/99
673

~~978~~
1105

17

Harbour Trust Office.

MADRAS, 30th October 1896.

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS
12 MAY 1899
No. ....

No. 3352 (A)

FROM

Ware Austin Esq I.C.S.,

CHAIRMAN, HARBOUR TRUST BOARD,

MADRAS.

To

The Honble Col. D. McNeil Cambell R.E.

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

Marine Department.

Sir,

In continuation of para 3 of my letter No. 3153 A dated 20th October, I am requested by the Trustees to again address you regarding the audit fee for the Engineer's Accounts, which under G.O. No. 678 Marine, dated 2nd idem has been fixed at Rs 200 per mensem.

2. The Board is of opinion that this amount is excessive, and not justified by the nature and extent of the audit, even when Harbour improvements are in active progress, and the audit concurrent.

3. As pointed out in my letter No. 5087 (A) dated 21st February 1896, the audit fee paid by the Bank of Madras for the audit of the whole of the accounts of the Presidency Bank is only Rs 1800 per annum to two qualified Public Accountants, and there can be no comparison between the audit of such a set of accounts and of the simple statements to be maintained in the Engineer's Office hereafter, relating to Harbour Improvements, kept by one single native Accountant; and yet the Board has been directed to pay for such an audit more than the Madras Bank pays for accounts kept by numerous large Departments, and dealing with crores of Rupees monthly.

4. The Board would submit that Rs 600 per annum or Rs 50 monthly is ample remuneration to cover the expenses to the

Public

16

blic works Examiner of such an audit as is in future re
or the accounts of the Board's Engineer.

I have &c,
Signed W.Austin,
Chairman,
Harbour Trust Board.

HARBOUR TRUST
MADRAS 11 APR.99
SECRETARY'S OFFICE

(True Copy)

C. Pinteret

Secretary,
Harbour Trust Board.

Encls & E/X
Mar C No. ~~580~~/99
678
978
1105

F.S.

19

Harbour Trust Office,
MADRAS, IIth April 1899.

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS
12 MAY 1899

No. 34

From

Herbert Bradley Esq I.C.S.,
Chairman, Harbour Trust Board,
MADRAS.

To

Colonel A.W.Smart R.E.,
Ag. Secretary to Government,
Marine Department.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of memo dated 25th March No.I64 E Marine forwarding to me for remarks letter from the Accountant General No.I065 dated I8th idem—herewith returned—suggesting that the fee for the audit of the Harbour Board's Revenue and allied accounts should be raised, and bringing to notice that while the fee was fixed in G.O.No.434 Marine dated I2th October I889 at Rs I000 per annum for the audit of Revenue and Rs 500 for the Construction Accounts, the fee for the audit of the latter by the Examiner of Public Works Accounts when transferred to him was fixed at Rs 2400—G.O.Marine No.678 dated 2nd October I896.

not returned

Flag E

Flag T.

2. The Trustees objected at the time to pay Rs 200 per mensem to the Examiner as they considered it "excessive and "not justified by the nature or extent of the audit even when "Harbour Improvements are in active progress and the audit "concurrent" (vide Mr Austin's letters Nos.3I5I A dated 20th October I896 and 3352 A dated 30th idem—copies of which are enclosed for ready reference) but Government over-ruled their representation (G.O.No.I4 Marine dated 5th January I897.)

Flag D.

3. Under section 44 Act II of I886 the remuneration of the auditors of the Harbour Trust Accounts must be paid

"such

"such remuneration as the Governor in Council may determine" and—although the fee now payable to the Accountant General is small as compared to that received by the Examiner when the respective work involved is taken into account—I would again respectfully invite the attention of Government to the fees paid for audit by the Bombay and Calcutta Port Trusts. The former is fixed at Rs 2500 per annum and the latter at Rs 5000 (vide para 3 of Mr Austin's letter No.5087 A dated 21st February 1896 printed with G.O.No.143 Marine dated 6th March 1896) and these amounts have not been increased according to the latest Administration reports to hand from those Ports.

Flag E

4. Should Government consider that the Accountant General's audit fee should be increased, I would request that the audit should be conducted concurrently month by month as the accounts are closed, when any little discrepancy or irregularity discovered could at once be set right, as is done in Bombay and Calcutta. To bring such to notice long after they have occurred is of little practical use.

5. I would also request that should Government decide to increase the Accountant General's fee the question may be again considered as to whether he should not conduct the audit of the petty maintenance accounts now audited by the Examiner, for it seems superfluous to have two auditors under present circumstances when no construction work is going on.

6. The present is by no means a time at which any one connected with the Harbour Trust can view with equanimity any proposal to increase the expenses of the Trust. The coal traffic on which the finances of the Board have long depended is rapidly leaving us and the Trust cannot afford to increase expenditure any where.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your Obedient Servant,

Herbert Bradley

Secy.

Chairman,
Harbour Trust Board.

Enclos 4
[illegible]
1105

Marine DEPARTMENT. 12

21

Marine

~~Public Works~~ (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 673

G. Mis-270

Accts Genl's Office
9 JUN 1899

No. 277E d/ 7 June 99

Encl.

Referred to the Accountant General for ~~Order~~ remarks on the alternative proposals of the Chairman Harbour Trust Board.

C. S.

7.6.99

To
The Acct. Genl with Chos. 409 - 504 - 550 and 673 to be returned -

From

The Examiner P. W. Accounts Madras & Coorg

No. 653 A/4

Dated 20 May 99
Received 25
Registered 25
Enclosures 76.
Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Audit of Harbour Works' accounts — States that the Examiner ~~should not~~ may be relieved of the responsibility of

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPE

No.	Date.

Ext
2
Mar 778/9
1105/9

---

93 Marine DEPARTMENT. 12

22

E- No. 27.
1,000—16-5-98

KEEP-WITH CURRENT No.

dated 189 .

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1898. { P. W. DEPT.
(9)

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 20 May 1898.
(9)

OFFICE NOTE No.

To 653 A/A

W.

No objection whatever. I entirely concur with the Board's Chairman that one auditor should now be sufficient and beg to join him in the opinion that the entire audit should be a monthly one. If you will kindly let me know from what month my audit may cease I will arrange accordingly.

N. R.

Offg: C.

20.5.99.

E.P. 9
Mar 27/99
1105

23 Marine DEPARTMENT. 13

READ the following :—

Letter from the Accountant General, Madras, No. 1065 dated 15th March 1899.

Letter from the Chairman, Harbour Trust Board, Madras, No. 34 dated 11th April 1899.

Office note from the Examiner, P.W. accounts, Madras, No. 653A/A., d/ 20th May 1899.

Fees for the audit of Harbour Trust Accounts

Circulated to

His Excellency the Governor

FOR ORDERS

The Acct. Genl. should be asked his opinion on the alternative proposal of the Chairman H.T.

A.E.H.
5.6.99

In his letter read above, the Accountant General asks that the fee paid for the audit of the Revenue and allied accounts of the Harbour Trust Board may be raised from Rs 1,000 to Rs 2,000 per annum. He represents that work in connection with the audit of these accounts has nearly doubled since 1889 when the fee of Rs 1,000 was fixed. He also points out that the fee of Rs 500 which was being paid for the audit of the Harbour Construction Accounts has now been raised to Rs 2,400 per annum.

2. The Chairman, Harbour Trust Board, to whom the matter was referred, represents that the Harbour Trust Board cannot, in its present financial condition, afford

[P. W. 43.
1,000—28 2-99.]

HE 29.5.99 R 6/6

afford to increase expenditure anywhere, and enquires whether the Accountant General should not, if the fee is to be raised, conduct the audit of the petty maintenance accounts now audited by the Examiner, as it is superfluous to have two auditors when no construction work is going on. The Chairman also institutes a comparison between the charges for the audit of the Madras Harbour Trust accounts and those of the Trusts at Calcutta and Bombay, and the accounts of the Bank of Madras, and urges that the former, judged by these standards, are excessive. The amounts compare as follows:—

Madras Harbour Trust	Rs 3,400
Bombay Port Trust	" 2,500
Calcutta Port Trust	" 5,000
Bank of Madras	" 1,800

3. The Chairman also proposes that the Accountant General should be asked to conduct his audit concurrently, month by month, when any little discrepancy or irregularity discovered could at once be set right. To bring these to notice long after they have occurred is, he states, of little practical use.

The Examiner, P.W. accounts also concurs with the Chairman H. T. Bd. that one auditor should now be sufficient & that the entire audit should be a monthly one. He is prepared to hand over his audit to the Accountant General.

The audit fee might then be raised to Rs 2000 as reported by the Acct Genl. a still a saving of Rs 1400 on current annual cost of audit will be effected J Bell 16.8.99

Marine (189) Department.

CURRENT No. 978

369 E 18 July 99

~~Order~~ Endorsement

To

The Chairman, Harbour Trust Board,

(unofficially)

Please say whether the H. T. Board accepts the terms offered by the Accountant General in his present letter.

Secretary to Government.

CHAIRMAN
MADRAS HARBOUR TRUST

From The Acct. Genl. Madras

No. Oct / 4024

Dated 14-7-99

Received 17-7-99

Enclosures Plans nil } total 8
others 8 }

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Stating that if the Harbour Trust Board agrees to pay Rs 2500/ for the combined audit of the Revenue accounts of the Harbour Trust Board and of the petty maintenance accounts, Govt. of India will be applied to for sanction for the necessary additional establishment.

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
~~14 mar~~	~~5-1-97~~

Entered on back of docket by Clk 1/05.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

E/
9 mar/1/05-/9

Outside Audit Department.

Fort St. George,
Accountant-General's Office,
14 July 1899.

No. O.A./4024

From

T. HESKETH BIGGS ESQ.,
ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL to the
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Marine Department.

Sir,

In returning the papers received with your endorsement No.277 E., dated 7th June 1899, I have the honour to state that I have no objection to the audit of the Revenue Accounts of the Harbour Trust Board being conducted concurrently month by month as proposed by the Chairman in return for the increased fee of Rs.2000/- although the change will impose extra work on my Office.

2. I also agree to the transfer of the audit of the petty maintenance accounts to my Office from that of the Examiner Public Works Accounts provided that the Board will pay an additional audit fee on that account of Rs.500/ or Rs.100/- less than the sum which the Chairman proposed in his letter No.3352 A., dated 30th October 1896 to pay to the Examiner Public Works Accounts for the audit.

6

x Flag D.

If the Harbour Trust Board agrees to pay Rs.2500/-for the combined audit I will apply to the Government of India for sanction for the necessary additional establishment and on receipt thereof the changes proposed in the correspondence may be brought into effect.

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
~~14 mar~~	~~5-1-97~~

Entered into back of docket by 9 mch/1/05.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

E/ 9 mar/1/05-9

Outside Audit DEPARTMENT.

FORT ST, GEORGE,
Accountant-General's Offic
14 July 189

No. O.A / 4024

From

T. HESKETH BIGGS ESQ.,
ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

THE Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Marine Department.

SIR,

In returning the papers received with your endorsement No.277 E., dated 7th June 1899, I have the honour to state that I have no objection to the audit of the Revenue Accounts of the Harbour Trust Board being conducted concurrently month by month as proposed by the Chairman in return for the increased fee of Rs.2000/- although the change will impose extra work on my Office.

2. I also agree to the transfer of the audit of the petty maintenance accounts to my Office from that of the Examiner Public Works Accounts provided that the Board will pay an additional audit fee on that account of Rs.500/ or Rs.100/- less than the sum which the Chairman proposed in his letter

× Flag D. No.3352 A., dated 30th October 1896 to pay to the Examiner Public Works Accounts for the audit.

If the Harbour Trust Board agrees to pay Rs.2500/-for the combined audit I will apply to the Government of India for sanction for the necessary additional establishment and on receipt thereof the changes proposed in the correspondence may be brought into effect.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Accountant-General.

E.10
Mar 1105/99

EXTRACT of Proceedings of the TRUSTEES OF THE HARBOUR OF MADRAS, at a Meeting held at the Offices of the Board on Friday the 4th day of August 1899.

. . .

4. Read endorsement No.369 E, dated 18th July 1899, from the Secretary to Government, Marine Department, enquiring whether the Harbour Trust Board accepts the terms offered by the Accountant General to pay Rs 2,500 per annum, for the combined audit of the Revenue and of the Petty maintenance accounts.

Read also letter dated 25th July 1899, from Messrs Ronaldson and Ronaldson, Public Accountants, Madras, replying to a reference that they would undertake a concurrent audit of the Harbour Trust accounts for a fee of Rs 1,200 per annum.

Resolved that the Chairman address Government.

. . .

(True Extract)

C Vincent

Secretary & Traffic Manager,
Harbour Trust Board.

E; 11
mar 1105/98

Harbour Trust Office.
MADRAS, 10th August 1899.

No. 34/1

FROM

Herbert Bradley Esq I.C.S.,

CHAIRMAN, HARBOUR TRUST BOARD,
MADRAS.

To

W.B.deWinton Esq,

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
Marine Department.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your endorsement dated 18th July No.369 E forwarding current number 978 Marine (herwith returned together with its enclosures) which was considered by the Trustees of the Harbour at their last meeting,and I submit a copy of the resolution then passed with reference to the concurrent monthly audit of the whole of the Board's accounts, for which the Accountant-General suggests that a fee of Rs 2500 per annum should be paid if conducted month by month by his Outside Audit Department,the audit of petty maintenance,and petty construction accounts by the Examiner to cease.

2. The Trustees are of opinion that the sum suggested is excessive.Enquiries were made from Messrs Ronaldson and Ronaldson, Public Accountants of this City, as to the fee for which they would undertake a concurrent monthly audit.After looking into the accounts they have offered to undertake the work for a fee of Rs 1200/- per annum.

3. One of the members of this firm is,as Government may be aware,a joint auditor with another gentleman of the accounts of the Bank of Madras,and the Trustees of the

Harbour

Harbour are of opinion that the audit of their accounts could be carried out to the satisfaction of Government and of the Board by this firm, and would invite special attention to the difference in the remuneration asked. The Accountant-General suggests Rs 2500/-per annum while Messrs Ronaldson and Ronaldson are willing to carry out a monthly concurrent audit for less than half that amount viz Rs I200

4. Referring to the letter on this subject from Sir James Westland dated Simla 30th April I887 No.2279, vide G.O Marine Nos.330,33I, dated July 25th I887, I would observe that Messrs Ronaldson and Ronaldson would be none the less independent of the Harbour Trust Board as auditors because the Trustees indicate their preference for the audit being conducted by them, the appointment resting entirely with Government.

5. Should Government decide that the Accountant-General's audit must continue I would invite your attention to the proposal made by Sir Richard Barlow in his letter dated I0th October I887, vide G.O. Marine No.62 dated February 22nd I888 and would suggest that Messrs Ronaldson and Ronaldson be appointed to conduct the monthly concurrent audit desired by the Board for a fee of Rs I200/-per annum; and that the Accountant General should also be directed to examine and report upon the accounts which have annually to be laid before H.E. the Governor in Council under section 43 Act II of I886. The Government would probably consider Rs 500 sufficient for the Accountant-General's audit once a year, this having been the fee originally fixed for his monthly audit, vide G.O.Marine No.3I5 dated 9th July I888.

It will be observed from G.O.No.402 Marine dated 9th September I887 that Government has already ruled that the only obligatory audit is an annual one.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your Obedient Servant,

Herbert Bradley
Chairman,
Harbour Trust Board.

Secy & T.M.