

(1) Number of pages _____
 (2) Date of repair _____
 (3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	770	Press
370-372		Mis.
Dated	15. 3	18 71.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th March 1871.*

No. 370. Read the following letter from the Superintending Engineer, 4th Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Camp at Palmanair, 13th February 1871, No. 4,559 :—

WITH reference to Government Order, No. 280, dated 30th January 1871, I have the honour to report that I gave Mr. Hayes the substance of the charges preferred against him in my letter, No. 4,282, dated 23rd idem, for such explanation as he may have to give. He has now submitted his defence, and

I beg to forward it to Government, together with my reply thereto entered in a third column, introduced in the paper for the purpose.

2. The first and main charge against Mr. Hayes is that he did not, as he professes to have done, actually lay out the 1,300 Rupees sanctioned for the repairs of the Singara Calvay spring channel. The other charges merely support this one, which by itself, and without such corroboration, would scarcely allow of even a departmental case being made out against the Supervisor.

3. As I anticipated, Mr. Hayes questions the accuracy of my measurements. All that I can say is that I endeavoured to be as liberal as possible in my measurements, and rejected only such as clearly appeared to me ought not to be taken into account.

4. As I have already said, the discrepancy by itself would only have aroused my suspicion; and, had there not been other circumstances tending to strengthen the suspicion until it amounted to a conviction in my mind that Government have been actually defrauded in the case of the work in question, I would not have troubled Government in the matter.

5. The Acting Collector, Mr. Whiteside, informed me that the Talook Sheristadar, who under orders carefully estimated the work done, reports that the cost of what has been done is only Rupees 120, and that the present appearance of the channel shows that no expenditure of Rupees 1,000 could have been made on it so recently as alleged by Mr. Hayes.

6. I proceeded to the place, and my examination of the channel, and the replies my inquiries elicited, and the unsatisfactory state of the accounts, showed, as I consider very conclusively, that fraud had been perpetrated.

7. I take leave to doubt the inference, which Mr. Hayes obviously intended his remarks to lead to, that Lieutenant-Colonel Bean approved of an expenditure of Rupees 1,300 on the channel in question after an examination of the same. I think it highly improbable that Colonel Bean would have done anything of the sort had he known the circumstances of the case, which, on examination, could not fail to bring before him.

8. I do not see that Mr. Hayes' explanations, with reference to any one of the charges, exculpate him, and, under all the circumstances of the case, I consider it very desirable that he should be removed from the department. I would specially invite attention to present measurements of channel and the original estimate showing there was fraud intended, even if the present work was carried out as a new work, which I am quite certain from inspection is not the case.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th March 1871.*

9. I take this opportunity of subjoining extracts from Mr. Robinson's letters showing the opinion entertained by that gentleman of Mr. Hayes—

"I receive very unfavourable reports of the results of expenditure in the Calastri Zemindari, and I beg to request that you will intimate to Mr. Hayes that I shall be obliged as guar-

dian of the public interests to report direct to Government that he has not my confidence nor the good opinion of the people within his range, with a request that his services may be transferred elsewhere. I regret to have to write in this strain, but, with the difficulties of an unfavourable season to face, I must have officers in the range in whose industry and disinterested co-operation and advice I can implicitly rely.

"With reference to my remarks respecting the unfavourable reports which have reached my ears, I may state that this is the universal sentiment in the talook, and that I have good reason to believe that it is not undeserved.

"This is not the first occasion by many on which Mr. Hayes' management of the range has come under well-deserved reprobation. If you will be pleased to refer to the correspondence noted in the margin, (and there has been much demi-official correspondence to the same effect,) you will find that I have been denouncing for years past Mr. Hayes' hopeless apathy and general unfitness for the post he now holds.

"Mr. Hayes has neither my confidence nor the good will of the people I consider, and cite the case of the Chendragherry Range as a pregnant example of the worse defects in the present organization of the department. In my evidence before the Commissioners now sitting in the Board's Office, I illustrated my unfavourable opinion of the present organization of the department very principally from the results as shown in this range.

"I thought well of Mr. Hayes when he first joined the range, but it is long since I found reason to change my opinion. I now consider that, in the interests of that part of the district, Mr. Hayes' transfer elsewhere is most desirable and should not be delayed."

No. 371. From the Controller of Public Works Accounts, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Chempauk, 1st February 1871, No. 2,361.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the Proceedings of Government of the 30th January 1871, No. 280, and, in reply, to offer the following observations.

2. The work (clearing the Singara Calvay spring channel) referred to by the Superintending Engineer of the 4th Division was commenced in August 1869,

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th March 1871.*

on an estimate of Rupees 1,300. The original grant was Rupees 1,000, which was worked out as follows:—

August 1869	...	...	...	Rs. 300
September "	...	...	...	" 200
October "	...	...	...	" 200
November "	...	...	...	" 300

3. In January 1870 a further grant of Rupees 300 was made, and this amount was shown to have been expended in March following.

4. Paragraph 52 of Section II. of the Manual prescribes that, in the case of works executed on contract, the monthly accounts of Range Officers shall be accompanied by Contract Certificates (Form H.), with the receipts of the contractors for all payments, recorded either on the Contract Certificates themselves, or separately, as the case may be.

5. The work under notice was carried out on contract by Comarasawmy Moodelly and Rungiah Moodelly, and the payments* made to each of them are supported by all the vouchers required by the rules, namely, Contract Certificates, and the receipts of the contractors or their Agents.

6. The payments in August and September 1869, amounting together to Rupees 500, were made by the Range Officer on the reports of the Maistry in executive charge, and this fact is distinctly recorded on the reverse of the vouchers for those months. In October and November 1869, and March 1870, four payments, aggregating Rupees 800, were made. In each of these cases, the measurements recorded in the Contract Certificates are signed by the Range Officer himself, who, on the reverse of the vouchers, records the following remarks:—

October 1869	...	"Work in good progress."
November "	...	"In good progress." "Work done up to allotment satisfactorily."
March 1870	...	"Satisfactorily completed."

7. In addition to these vouchers the Range Officer's "Completion Certificate" was submitted with his Progress Report for March 1870. This shows not only that the work as per estimate had been executed in a substantial manner, but that 52 cubic yards of additional earthwork had been performed.

8. I am thus quite at a loss to understand what Colonel Wilkieson means by "want of check in the Controller's Office." If that Officer, by this expression, implies that this office should, in the case of each payment, have insisted upon the production of the Range Officer's own measurements, I would respectfully invite the attention of Government to paragraph 8 of their orders of the 19th August 1865, No 2,413, which, for ready reference, is quoted below:—

"The Government consider it inexpedient to issue any orders which will render the grant of a monthly clearance to Range Officers contingent on their

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th March 1871.*

inspecting every work entered in their Progress Reports (Form C.) once every quarter. It is the business of a Range Officer to inspect the works within his charge as often as it may be possible to do so, and the Government will rely upon the Superintending Engineers exercising such control over their Subordinate Officers as will ensure the duties of inspection being efficiently performed."

9. It will thus be observed that Government, in the clearest possible terms, declined to permit this office to withhold the confirmation of clearances for expenditure incurred on works, even although those works may not have been personally inspected by Range Officers *once in three months*, and further held *Superintending Engineers* responsible that the duties of inspection were efficiently performed by their executive officers.

10. Not having the Superintending Engineer's letter in *extenso* before me, I am unable to say whether it contains a full history of the circumstances of the case, so far as this office is concerned. In the absence of the *whole* of the Contract Certificates, and of the final Completion Certificate, it is absolutely impossible to arrive at a proper conclusion as to whether the check exercised by this office was effective or otherwise. With these documents now before them, in a complete form, the Government will, I trust, be satisfied that everything has been done by the Audit Department to ensure a strict adherence to the rules. Mr. Hayes having, on the reverse of the two first certificates, stated that the measurements had been passed upon the reports of the Maistry, and promised that the work would subsequently be inspected and the measurements checked by himself, this office, in the absence of the signature of any other subordinate of the range to the certificates which followed for the months of October and November 1869 and March 1870, and with the Range Officer's remarks in those certificates, quoted at the foot of paragraph 6 above, could not but have arrived at the conclusion that the promised inspections had been made, and the measurements duly checked and found to be correct.

11. From the papers recorded in G. O., No. 2,788, dated 19th November 1870, the Government will see that I am doing all that is possible to ensure a complete and thorough audit of expenditure incurred on contract, and it is worthy of note that while one Superintending Engineer considers that this office is bound, before passing expenditure, to have placed before it the detailed measurements of Range Officers, another entertains the opinion that its interference, so far even as requiring the entry, on the reverse of Contract Certificates, of check measurements whenever taken, and of general remarks as to the quality of the materials supplied and work performed, is altogether unnecessary.

12. It is much to be regretted that, before proffering a charge of neglect against another and distinct branch of the department, the Superintending Engineer did not remit the case for such explanations as this office was able to afford. Had this been done, the Superintending Engineer would at once have been in a position to have placed the subject before Government in a thoroughly complete form, and not only would time have been saved, and needless correspondence, avoided but the Superintending Engineer would probably have seen that the imputation of neglect was unsustainable.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th March 1871.*

No. 372. ORDER THEREON, 15th March 1871, No. 770.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 30.

In his letter of the 23rd January 1871, No. 4,282, the Acting Superintending Engineer of the 4th Division

brought to the notice of Government that, owing to certain representations by the Revenue authorities of the North Arcot District in connection with the Singara Calvoy spring channel in the Chendragherry Range, he had personally inspected the work executed on a repair estimate of Rupees 1,300, which had been sanctioned in 1869-70.

2. That inspection, and the measurements taken by the Superintending Engineer went to show that against 15,440 cubic yards of work, valued at Rupees 1,300, said by the Range Officer to have been performed, no more than 10,575 cubic yards, valued at Rupees 920, could be traced, making it thus to appear that an over charge of Rupees 380 had taken place and a misappropriation of money to that extent made.

3. Colonel Wilkieson likewise brought to notice that, in November 1870, certain work to the same spring channel was commenced by Mr. Hayes on emergency, but that, as the whole of the work provided for in the estimate of Rupees 350 was not of an urgent character, a portion, which ought to have been treated as a new work, being for deepening the channel, operations were put a stop to on the 21st November, but not till an expenditure of Rupees 211 had been incurred. On examining this work Colonel Wilkieson is satisfied that there is a deficiency of 16 yards in the stone work as compared with Mr. Hayes' accounts, and that the earthwork for which an additional charge of Rupees 167-7-0 was made ought to have been done within the original estimate of Rupees 1,300.

4. As respects the measurements entered in the bill, Colonel Wilkieson states that they were taken by the Maistry, and that the Range Officer, ignoring the rule which requires every member of the department to keep a "Note Book" of all measurements taken by him, neglected this plain duty, and accepted the Maistry's figures without taking the trouble of verifying them by personal examination. Further, the Acting Superintending Engineer makes some remarks on the manner in which the vouchers furnished by Mr. Hayes were prepared, and on the system under which they were passed in the Controller's Office.

5. As a "*prima facie*" case would thus appear to have been made out against the Supervisor, the Government considered it necessary to have before them Mr. Hayes' explanations and such additional vouchers as seemed to be wanting to show how far he had conformed, or not, to the rules under which all expenditure on works is accounted for and which guide the Controller in adjusting departmental outlay. Mr. Hayes was accordingly called upon for such explanations as he might have to offer, and the Controller was requested to furnish the documents referred to.

6. These are now before the Government, and His Excellency the Governor in Council, after giving his most careful attention to all that has been adduced by the Acting Superintending Engineer in support of his charges, as well as what the Supervisor has urged in his defence, is unable to come to any other conclusion than that, suspicious as the circumstance is of the Supervisor having advocated,

and induced the Superintending Engineer to authorize, the expenditure of a sum of money on the repair of the Singara Calvay spring channel so greatly in excess of the maximum amount which under the rules it was admissible to spend on the work, it is not possible to place such reliance on measurements of earthworks taken many months after their completion as would justify the Government in dealing with Mr. Hayes in the manner suggested by Colonel Wilkieson. His Excellency the Governor in Council has reason to believe that in work of the nature of clearances of spring channels, and especially when these clearances are in loose soil or partly or wholly in the beds of rivers, there are many influences always in operation to obliterate the marks by which correct or trustworthy measurements can be obtained. Taking this into consideration, and seeing that Mr. Hayes could have had no personal interest in clearing the channel to the extra depth to which Colonel Wilkieson found it had been excavated, the Government hesitate to form any definite opinion on the evidence before them; but, as it has come to their knowledge that, in the month of March 1868, Mr. Hayes purchased a bungalow situated on the Pantheon road for Rupees 6,000, and that no longer ago than last December he bought another house on the Poonamallee road for Rupees 7,500, His Excellency the Governor in Council, before passing final orders, thinks it necessary to call upon Mr. Hayes to explain in what manner he came into possession of these large sums.

7. As regards the vouchers furnished by the Supervisor it appears from the documents obtained from the Controller's Office, that Mr. Hayes has strictly conformed to all the rules prescribed by the Manual for the preparation of Range Accounts, and that, as respects the personal check required to be exercised by him on contract work, there would seem to be nothing to show that, with the exception of certain portions for which two part payments were made, the work for which certificates were given was not examined and so far measured by him as to satisfy him of its correctness, although in the absence of a "Measurement Book" this cannot be absolutely affirmed.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,

Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 4th Division, with twelve Enclosures.
" Controller of Public Works Accounts, with seven Enclosures.

Ed E. C. Shonker.

No 4559. Superintending Engineer's Office
4th Division
Camp Pannamallee
13th February 1871.

Mr.

Colonel C. V. Wilkieson R.E.
Superintending Engineer
4th Division

Mr.

Colonel C. A. Orr R.E.
Secretary to Government R.E.

Sir

With reference to Government

Order No. 280 dated 30th January 1871

Enclosures 12

1 Charge sheet with Mr.
Hayes' explanation and
Sub Engineer's rejoinder together with

9 Enclosures

1 Original estimate marked II
amounting to Rupees 1300

Vouchers under one wrapper
marked I.

I have the honor to report
that I gave Mr. Hayes
the substance of the
charges preferred against
him in my letter No. 4282
dated 23rd Idem, for such
explanation as he may
have to give. He has
now submitted his
defence and I beg to
forward

forward it to Government together
with my reply thereto inserted
in a third column introduced
in the paper for the purposes.

2. The first and main charge
against Mr. Hayer, is, that he
did not, as he professes to have
done, actually lay out the 1300
Rupees sanctioned for the repairs
of the Singara balwa Spring
channel. The other charges merely
support this one which by itself
and without such corroboration
would scarcely allow of such
a departmental case being made
out against the Supervisor.

3. As I anticipated Mr. Hayer
questions the accuracy of my
measurements. All that I can
say is that I endeavoured
to be as liberal as possible in
my measurements and reported
only such as clearly appeared

2
to me ought not to be taken
into account.

4. As I have already said
the discrepancy by itself would
only have aroused my suspicion,
and had there not been other
circumstances tending to strengthen
the suspicion until it amounted
to a conviction in my mind
that Government have been
actually defrauded in the case
of the work in question, I would
not have troubled Government
in the matter.

5. The Acting Collector Mr. Whithead
informed me that the Sadook
Sheristadar who under orders
carefully estimated the work
done, reports that the cost of
what has been done, is only
Rupees 120 and that the present
appearance of the Channel shows
that

that no expenditure of Rs 1000
could have been made in it
so recently as alleged by Mr. Hayes.

6. It proceeded to the place
and my examination of the
channel, and the replies my
inquiries elicited, and the
unsatisfactory state of the accounts
showed as I consider very con-
clusively that fraud had been
perpetrated.

7. I take leave to doubt the
inference which Mr. Hayes ob-
viously intended his remarks
to lead to, that Lieut Colonel
Beane approved of an expenditure
of Rupees 1300 on the channel
in question, after an examination
of the same. I think it highly
improbable that Colonel Beane
would have done any thing
of the sort had he known the
circumstances of the case which
an examination could not
fail

fail to bring before him.

8. I do not see that Mr. Hayes
explanations with reference to any
one of the charges soculpate him
and under all the circumstances
of the case I consider it very
desirable that he should be
removed from the Department.
I would specially invite attention
to present measurements of
channel and the ^{original} estimate showing
there was fraud intended, even
if the present work was carried
out as a new work, which I am
quite certain from inspection is
not the case.

9. I take this opportunity of
subjoining extracts from
Mr. Williams's letters showing the
opinion entertained by that
gentleman of Mr. Hayes.

"I receive very unfavorable" *Mr. Robinson's*
reports of the results of expenditure" *Letter No. 12733*
in the *Calatrás Remindari* " *2/19th Dec/87*
and I beg to request that you
will intimate to Mr. Hayes
that I shall be obliged as
guardian of the public interests
to report direct to Government
that he has not my confidence
nor the good opinion of the
people within his Range,
with a request that his
services may be transferred
elsewhere. I regret to have to
write in this strain but with
the difficulties of an unfavorable
season to face I must have
Officers in the Range in whose
industry and disinterested co-
operation and advice I can
implicitly rely."

"With reference to my remarks *Mr. Robinson's*
respecting the unfavorable reports *Letter No. 12733*
2/30th Aug/88
which

134
"which have reached my ears,
"I may state that this is the
"universal sentiment on the subject
"and that I have good reason
"to believe that it is not un-
"deserved."

Mr. Robinson's "This is not the first occasion
Letter No. 127 "by many on which Mr. Hayes'
2/5th April/89 "management of the Range has
"come under well deserved re-
"probation. If you will be
"pleased to refer to the correspondence
"noted in the margin (and
"there has been much deni-
"official correspondence to the
"same effect) you will find
"that I have been denouncing for
"years past Mr. Hayes' hope-
"less apathy and general ineptitude
"for the post he now holds."

"Mr. Hayes has neither my
"confidence nor the good will
"of

of the people, I consider and
cite the case of the "Spendragbury"
Range as a pregnant example
of the worst defects in the
present organization of the
Department. In my evidence
before the Commissioners now
sitting in the Board's Office,
I illustrate my unfavorable
opinion of the present organization
of the Department, very principally
from the results as shown in this
Range."

"I thought well of Mr. Hayes
when he first joined the Range,
but is long since I found reason
to change my opinion I now
consider that in the interests
of that part of the District,
Mr. Hayes' transfer elsewhere is
much desirable and should
not be delayed."

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servant

William Cobble,
Superintendent

No 2361 Office of the Controller of
Public Works Accounts.
Chepoort, 1st February 1871.

From the Controller of Public Works Accts.
Madras.

To the Secretary to Government.
Public Works Department.
Fort St George.

Sir,

1. Have the honor to
acknowledge the receipt of the Proceed-
ings of Government of the 30th January
1871, No 280, and, in reply, to offer
the following observations.

2. The work clearing the
Srinivasa Cothach spring channel/
reported to by the Superintending
Engineer of the 7th Division was
commenced in August 1869 on
an Estimate of Rs. 1,500. The original
grant was Rs. 1,000, which was
worked out as follows:-

August 1869.	Rs. 300
September "	200
October "	200
November "	300

1871 1st Feb
1000 of 1000 on 1000

From
No 686

the
Superintending
Engineer
of the 7th Division

2nd of the
Superintending
Engineer
of the 7th Division

Date 13th Feb 1871
Recd 15th Feb 1871

Enc. 1st 213453

Submitted to Mr. Major

Explanation in the charge
of the 7th Division

with regard to certain
expenditure committed

in the clearing of the
Srinivasa Cothach spring

in the 7th Division
No 70-15 received by

Ch 2361

1000 of 1000 on 1000

3. In January 1870, a further grant of Rs. 300 was made, and this amount was shown to have been expended in March following.

4. Para 52 of Section II of the Manual prescribes that, in the case of works executed on "Contract", the monthly Accounts of Range Officers shall be accompanied by Contract Certificates / Form H / with the receipts of the Contractors for all payments, recorded either on the Contract Certificates themselves, or separately, as the case may be.

5. The work under notice was carried out on Contract by Comarasingh Moodelly and Kunjah Moodelly, and the payments made to each of them are supported by all the vouchers required by the rules, viz., Contract Certificates, and the receipts

Comarasingh Moodelly
for work done from August 1869 to March 1870.
Rs. 1000
Kunjah Moodelly
for work done in March 1870.
" 300

of the Contractors or their Agents.
6. The payments in August and September 1869, amounting together to Rs. 500, were made by the Range Officer on the reports of the Motistry in executive charge, and this fact is distinctly recorded on the reverse of the vouchers for those months. In October and November 1869, and March 1870, four payments, aggregating Rs. 800, were made. In each of these cases, the measurements recorded in the Contract Certificates are signed by the Range Officer himself, who, on the reverse of the vouchers, records the following remarks:-
October 1869. - "All in good progress."
November 1869. - "In good progress."
"All work up to allotment satisfactorily."
March 1870. - "Satisfactorily completed."

7. In addition to these vouchers

The Range Officer's "Completion Certificate" was submitted with his Progress Report for March 1870. This shows, not only that the work as per Estimate had been executed in a substantial manner, but that 52 cubic yards of additional earthwork had been performed.

8. I am thus quite at a loss to understand which Colonel Wilkison means by "want of check in the Controller's Office." If that Officer, by this expression, implies that this Office should, in the case of each payment, have resorted upon the production of the Range Officer's own measurements, I would respectfully invite the attention of Government to para 8 of their Orders of the 19th August 1865, No 2413, which, for ready reference, is quoted below:-

"The Government consider it

unwise to issue any orders which will render the grant of a monthly clearance to Range Officers contingent on their inspection of work entered in their Progress Reports / Form C / and every order. It is the business of a Range Officer to inspect the works within his charge as often as it may be possible to do so, and the Government will rely upon the Superintending Engineers exercising such control over their subordinate Officers as will ensure the duties of inspection being efficiently performed."

9. Shall thus be observed that Government, in the clearest possible terms, declined to permit this Office to withhold the confirmation of clearances the expenditure incurred on works, even although those works may not have been personally inspected by Range Officers more than three months, and further held Superintending Engineers responsible therefor.

The duties of inspection were efficiently performed by their executive Officers.

10. Not having the Superintendent Engineer's letter in extenso before me, I am unable to say whether it contains a full history of the circumstances of the case, so far as this Office is concerned. In the absence of the whole of the Contract Certificates, and of the final Completion Certificate, it is absolutely impossible to arrive at a proper conclusion as to whether the check exercised by this Office was effective or otherwise. With these documents now before them, in a complete form, the Government will, I trust, be satisfied that every thing has been done by the said Department to insure

or strict adherence to the rules. Mr. Hoyle having, on the reverse of the two first Certificates, stated that the measurements had been passed upon the reports of the Ministry, and promised that the work would subsequently be inspected and the measurements checked by himself, this Office, in the absence of the signature of any other subordinate of the Range to the Certificates which followed for the months of October and November 1869 and March 1870, and with the Range Officer's remarks in those Certificates, quoted at the foot of paragraph above, could not but have arrived at the conclusion that the promised inspections had been made, and the measurements duly checked and found to be correct.

11. From the papers recorded
in G.O. No 2788, dated 19th
November 1870, the Government
will see that I am doing all
that is possible to insure a
complete and thorough audit
of expenditure incurred on
Contract, and it is worthy of
note that while one Superin-
tending Engineer considers
that this Office is bound, before
passing expenditure, to have
placed before it the detailed
measurements of Range
Officers, another interposes
the opinion that its inter-
ference, so far as requiring
the entry, on the reverse of
Contract Certificates, of check
measurements is unnecessary
taken, and of general remarks
as to the quality of the
materials supplied and

work performed, is altogether
unnecessary.

12. It is much to be
regretted that, before preferring
a charge of neglect against
another and distinct branch
of the Department, the
Superintending Engineer did
not permit the case for such
explanations as this Office
was able to afford. Had this
been done, the Superintend-
ing Engineer would at once
have been in a position to
have placed the subject
before Government in a
thoroughly complete form,
and not only would time
have been saved, and
needless correspondence
avoided, but the Superin-
tending Engineer would

probably have seen that the
reputation of neglect was
unsustainable.

Have the honor to be
Your most ^{obedient} servant.

S. Hoof

Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Robert L.

11 29 29
29

29

July 1871

29

the

282,

never

ought

that,

even-

me

the

cow-

Singara

mel

ry Range,

in-

execu-

timate

of

1871 / Kept
P. of Govt for March

From No. 481.

The Controller of Public Works
Accounts.
Madras.

To
The Secretary to Government.
Public Works Department.
Fort St. George.

Sorted 1st
Recd 2nd February 1871.

No. 2361

Submitting Certificate
and Completion Certificate for
clearing the Singara Calway
spring Channel, Chendraghery,
executed by Mr. J. J. J.
Superintendent, and
offering certificate of completion
thereon.

No. 770-15 March 1871

No 371

No. 770 P. M. D. 29
Proceedings of the Madras Government

Read the following

From

The Super Engineer
H. E. No. 4559 of 13th July 1870

" Controller of Mr. Accts. No. 2361 of 1st Dec 7

In his letter of the
23rd January 1871 No. 4282,
the Acting Super Engineer
of the 1st Division brought
to the notice of Govt. that,
owing to certain represen-
tations by the Revenue
authorities of the North
Arcot District in con-
nection with the Singara
Calway spring Channel
in the Chendraghery Range,
he had personally in-
spected the work execu-
ted on a repair estimate
of

of Rs 1300, which had been sanctioned in 1869/70.

That inspection, and the measurements taken by the Super Engineer went to show that against 15,440 cubic yards of work valued at Rs 1300, said by the Range Officer to have been performed, no more than 10,575 cubic yards, valued at Rs 920, could be traced, making it thus to appear that an over charge of Rs 380 had taken place and a misappropriation of money to that extent made.

Colonel Wilkieson likewise brought to notice that in November 1870, certain work to the same spring

31
spring channel was commenced by Mr. Hayes on emergency, but that, as the whole of the work provided for in the estimate of Rs 350 was not of an urgent character, a portion, which ought to have been treated as a new work, being for deepening the channel, operations were put a stop to on the 21st November, but not till an expenditure of Rs 211 had been incurred. On examining this work Col. Wilkieson is satisfied that there is a deficiency of 16 yards in the stone work as compared with Mr. Hayes' accounts, and that the earthwork

earthworks for which Rs 167-7
were charged/ought to have
been done on the original
estimate of Rs 1300.

As respects the mea-
- surements entered in the
bill, Col. Wilkison
states that they were taken
by the Maistry, and that
the Range Officer, ignoring
the rule which requires
every member of the De-
- partment to keep a
"note Book" of all mea-
- surements taken by him,
neglected this plain duty,
and accepted the Maistry's
figures without taking
the trouble of verifying
them by personal exa-
- mination. Further the
Acting Super Engineer matters
come

an additional charge of
Rs 167-7 was made
within N

some remarks on the
manner in which the
vouchers furnished by
Mr. Hayes were prepared
and on the system under
which they were passed
in the Controller's office.
As a "prima facie"
case would thus appear
to have been made out
against the Supervisor,
the Govt. considered it
necessary to have before
them Mr. Hayes' expli-
- cations and such ad-
- ditional vouchers as
seemed to be wanting
to show how far he had
conformed, or not, to the
rules under which all
expenditure on works is
accounted for and which
guide

guide the Controller in
adjusting departmental
outlay. Mr. Hayes was
accordingly called upon
for such explanations
as he might have to offer
and the Controller was
requested to furnish the
documents referred to.

These are now before
the Govt. and His Ex-
cellency the Governor
in Council, after giving
his most careful attention
to all that has been
adduced by the acting
Supt Engineer in support
of his charges, as well as
what the Supervisor has
urged in his defence, is
unable to come to any
other conclusion than that,
suspicious

suspicious as the circum-
-stance is of the Superi-
-or having advocated,
and induced the Su-
perintending Engineer
to authorize the expendi-
-ture of a sum of money
on the repair of the Singara
Calvary Spring Channel
so greatly in excess of the
maximum amount
which under the rules
it was admissible to
spend on the work, it is
not possible to place
such reliance on mea-
-surements of earthworks
taken many months
after their completion
as would justify the
Govt. in dealing with
Mr. Hayes in the manner
suggested

suggested by Col. Wilkison.
His Excellency the Governor
in Council has reason
to believe that in works
of the nature of clearances
of Spring Channels, and
especially when these
clearances are in loose
soil or partly or wholly
in the beds of rivers, there
are many influences
always in operation
to obliterate the marks
by which correct or
trustworthy measure-

-ments can be obtained.

Taking this into consi-
-deration, and seeing
that Mr. Hayes could
have had no personal
interest in clearing the
channel to the extra
depth

depth to which Colonel
Wilkison found it
had been excavated,
the Govt. hesitate to
form any definite opinion
in the evidence before
them, but, as it has
come to their knowledge
that, in the month of
March 1868, Mr. Hayes
purchased a Bungalow
situated on the Pantheon
Road for Rs 6000 and
that no longer ago than
last December he bought
another house on the
Jannamallee Road
for Rs 7500, His Ex-
cellency the Governor
in Council, before
passing final orders,
thought it necessary to
call

call upon Mr. Hayes to explain in what manner he came into possession of these large sums.

As regards the vouchers furnished by the Supervisors it appears from the documents obtained from the Controller's office, that Mr. Hayes has strictly conformed to all the rules prescribed by the Manual for the preparation of Range accounts, and that as respects the personal check required to be exercised by him on contract work, there would seem to be nothing to show that, with the exception of certain portions for

which two part payments were made, the work for which certificates were given was not examined and so far measured by him as to satisfy him of its correctness, although in the absence of a "Measurement Book" this cannot be absolutely affirmed.

W. H.

Lo.
The Sup. Engrs. & Co. Dr. with 12 incl. ✓
Controller of P. & R. Acc. with 7 incl. ✓

Recd. 17/3/71.

Dec 19 Angust 1852 266-380
" 19 Nov 1852 366-380
" 30 Jan 1853 558-559

26-3-08

Further into Power 62 2/14 34
Dec 12 1539 11-6-51

Govt. of 1871

PUBLIC WORKS.

To The Superintendent
of the Office

Date

Recd.

Recd.

G. O. 15 March 1870

No. 370 & 372

and being being removed
and removed to the
by the and submitting
remarks. Mr. Supervisor
of the relations of the in
relation with the charges, ex-
posed against him for in-
fidelity at the Brigada
of the Army of the United States.

to 25 Feb 1870 and March