

21st April 1875.

Read the following letters :—

No. 564. From Colonel C. H. DICKENS, R.A., Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, (Establishment—Account,) to Colonel G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Fort William, 22nd March 1875, No. 116 E. A.

With reference to Notification, No. 121, dated the 15th instant, appointing Captain Conway-Gordon, R.E., to be Controller of Public Works Accounts in Madras, I am directed to request that you will convey to the Government of Madras the following remarks explanatory of the circumstances of the appointment.

2. In the Resolution noted in the margin, the Government of Madras decided on adopting for the Public Works Department in Madras the system in force in the Provinces more directly under the Government of India. The difficulties attendant on the supervision of the introduction of this change, added to those connected with the Capital and Revenue Accounts of Irrigation, led the Government of India to form the conclusion that it was necessary to select a specially qualified officer for the charge of the accounts in Madras. Captain Conway-Gordon is the officer who was selected, but before appointing him, the Accountant-General of this department was desired to discuss the subject with the Secretary in Madras. This was done, and the Government of India understands that, excepting Mr. Brock being held to have claims to the post, no objection is felt to Captain Conway-Gordon's appointment.

3. More lately the letter of the Government of Madras supporting the petition of Mr. Brock for restoration to Madras has been received. On this subject a separate reply will be sent, but meanwhile I am directed to say that, putting aside all other reasons, the avowedly bad state of Mr. Brock's health and his desire to retire from the service on the earliest date on which he becomes entitled to pension are held by the Government of India to preclude his employment for the exceptionally difficult and severe duties now devolving on the Controller of Accounts in Madras which will probably continue for some time.

4. In selecting Captain Conway-Gordon for the post, the Governor-General in Council considers that he is nominating an exceptionally able and competent officer, and trusts that the Government of Madras will be satisfied with the selection made.

No. 565. From the same Officer, dated Fort William, 25th March 1875, No. 128 E. A.

I AM directed to acknowledge receipt of your letter, No. 108, dated the 14th January last, forwarding, for the consideration of the Government of India, copy of a letter from Mr. S. Brock claiming to be reinstated in his former post of Controller of Accounts, Madras, and in his former grade of Controller, 1st class, 2nd grade.

2. In reply, I am to state that Mr. Brock's letter was in the first instance referred to the Accountant-General, Public Works Department. A copy of that officer's report is herewith forwarded for the information of the Government of Madras, and the Governor-General in Council trusts that Colonel Innes' explanations will make

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
21st April 1875.*

clear to the Madras Government the circumstances under which it is not considered desirable that Mr. Brock should retain the post of Controller at Madras.

3. A separate communication will be made as to Mr. Brock's destination on his return from furlough.

No. 566.

ORDER THEREON, 21st April 1875, No. 1,130.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 46.

ORDERED to be recorded.

(True Extract.)

G. W. WALKER, Colonel,

FROM
THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL, P. W. D.

No. 630 E. } Fort William, 15th March, 1875.
Received 15th "

*Petition from Mr. Brock, Controller,
P. W. Accounts, for restoration to
his former post and grade in Madras.*

As directed in Government letter No. 68 E—A, dated 5th March 1875, I have the honor to report on the petition for restoration to his former post and grade, submitted through the Government of Madras, to the Government of India, by Mr. Brock, formerly Controller of Public Works Accounts in Madras, but at present absent on furlough.

The facts of the case may be thus briefly stated—He was appointed Controller of Public Works Accounts in Madras in 1869. Towards the close of 1871 I inspected his Office and work, and reported most unfavorably of the results of that inspection. On this, Government desired that his attention should be drawn to certain defects which they mentioned in their letter to Madras, and to the various points which I had noticed orally in the course of my inspection, and said that my report showed that he had failed in, and not realized his duties, but that it was hoped matters would be found to have improved on the occasion of the next inspection. But six months after receiving these orders, Mr. Brock took furlough, and has not yet re-joined from it. In the interim it has been decided to introduce the Indian system of accounts into Madras, and to proceed vigorously with the adjustment of the Capital and Revenue Accounts of the Irrigation Works there. And hence, on my motion, the Government of India ruled that Mr. Brock could not, under such circumstances, be entrusted with the Madras Controllership, and that, if the Madras Government could not otherwise provide for him, he should be posted as Controller on a reduced grade to some minor charge, and be required to work for a time in some well-trained Office, where he might learn the duties of his post as there carried out.

It is against this decision that Mr. Brock submits his petition, in which he is supported by the Madras Government. The grounds of his petition are—1st, that the circumstances of his appointment

make it unjust that he should be transferred from Madras elsewhere, as at the time he accepted it, it was a local, and not a general, appointment; 2nd, that he does not know what fault is found with him, or why he is considered to deserve punishment; 3rd, that any unfavorable report on him by me is at variance with all other opinions respecting him, including those of Colonel Chesney, Captain Filgate, the Madras Government, and all Madras Officers of standing and eminence with whom he has been brought in official contact.

In presence of a plea of this nature, I am anxious that my judgment or opinion may be set aside, and that the decision of Government may be based on the actual merits of the case, i. e., the facts as admitted or proved, and the fair inferences from them.

I may parenthetically remark that I have no sort of prejudice against Mr. Brock. My relations with other Madras Officers, and with the other Officers of the Uncovenanted Service in the Department, militate against any idea of prejudice towards those bodies of Officers, and, as to Mr. Brock personally, I believe him to be a meritorious, hard working, and painstaking Officer, and one who acts fully up to his lights. My sole objection to him is that he is unfit for the Madras Controllorship for the special reasons given, and that he has heretofore failed as a Controller from entire absence of training and of knowledge of the work and responsibilities which really appertain to his post.

He carried out properly, with some ordinary shortcomings, the superficial and Accountant's work of his Office, such as the arithmetical check of the accounts he received, their comparison with vouchers, the compilation of returns from them, and the audit of personal bills. But the points in his work to which I objected were these—

(1). He failed to exercise, in fact he admitted that he did not attempt to exercise, any watch or control over the progressive adherence to estimates on the part of Executive Officers, i. e., a guard against any such excessive cost during the progress of works as would tend to lead to eventual excess over their estimates. With us, this watch is arranged for mechanically. Under the Madras system, the mechanical control was dispensed with, but this in no way diminished the necessity for vigilant control in the matter, or the responsibility for it as part

of the functions of the Controller. But he had not realized this, and had never attempted any watch in the matter.

(2). He entirely omitted to check the stock accounts. This was admitted, and the plea was adduced that there was hardly any stock to account for, but, on enquiry, it was found that there was quite enough stock, and there was quite enough confusion about stock, to invalidate any such plea. Subsequent inspections of Range Offices have fully corroborated this point.

(3). Instead of knowing intimately the working of Executive Offices, and guiding the Officers in matters of account, he was virtually in the dark respecting them. The one office I went to, which was an important one, close to Madras, was not at all in the state he had reported it to be. And the Inspection Reports sent in by Mr. Moss, after Mr. Brock's departure, show the Range Offices to be, as a rule, in a sad state, with no real general system or method, each person managing things in his own fashion, and serious irregularities chronic in all of them.

(4). When he received statements or returns from other Departments affecting the accounts or finances of the Public Works Department, he did not check or scrutinize them, and even when they were clearly incorrect, he raised no objection, but accepted and endorsed them. This was especially the case with respect to the returns of Irrigation Revenue, and it is only the persistent action that has been adopted since Mr. Brock left that has led to these returns being now drawn up with due care and attention.

(5). He failed to prepare and keep up any returns by which to watch properly such matters as the progress of the outlay on works compared with the Budget, the proportion of cost of establishment to other outlay, and the like. He gave some fair excuses for this omission, but they were analyzed in my report, and, I think, indicated at the best too great a readiness to accept trifling difficulties as good grounds for dispensing with useful measures of control.

These were the descriptions of shortcomings which I reported and found fault with. That they actually existed cannot well be disputed, nor do I see how it can be disputed that they were omissions of the most serious and important functions of the Controller.

In point of fact, they form, in my opinion, the real and distinctive functions of

a Controller as contrasted with those of an Accountant.

A close grasp and control of the expenditure of executives, watch over the financial regularity of the operations of the Department, and scrutiny of all accounts affecting the Department before accepting and adopting them—these are the functions which Mr. Brock failed to carry out, and if these functions are to be dispensed with, then the duties of a Controller degenerate into those of a mere Accountant.

These then were the points on which Mr. Brock's original condemnation was pronounced, and, as above observed, the Inspection Report that have since reached the Government, and other matters that have transpired, have, it appears to me, incontestibly corroborated all that I reported in 1871.

The decision of Government was, as already described, that Mr. Brock should not be removed, but that he should be given the chance, till the next occasion of inspection, of remedying the defects pointed out by me orally, and by the Government of India in their letter.

But he remained at his post only six months, and then took leave, and everything that subsequently transpired only tended to show that, so far as Mr. Brock was concerned, he had not made, nor realized that he had to make, any change in his conduct of his office. Then came the decision that the India system was to be introduced into Madras, while it had already been ordered that arrangements for the new Capital and Revenue Accounts should be adopted for the Irrigation works, and be carried out vigorously, and, under these circumstances, the Government of India decided that Mr. Brock must go elsewhere, and that a specially selected officer should be posted to Madras. This removal from Madras is the first point against which Mr. Brock petitions, and I believe I have said all I need say to show that the step is quite necessary and unavoidable.

But I may be excused for adding the following remarks.

The retention of Mr. Brock at Madras was originally allowed in the hope, and, I may say, expectation that, with the intelligence he seemed to possess, he would realize his shortcomings and respond to the call of Government to amend his practice. But this expectation is greatly weakened now by the tone which he adopts of ignoring that he had failed.

Another point I would beg to bring to notice is this, that from the support given to this petition by the Madras Government, it may be inferred that that Government does not appreciate the extent of his shortcomings, and I may add, in a broad way, that it would appear that the gravity and speciality of the responsibilities and functions of a Controller are not fully understood by the Madras Government. And I would urge that some steps should be taken, both in writing to the Madras Government, and by the issue of a Standing Order to correct their impressions.

It is most desirable, in fact quite necessary, for the financial interests of the Department, that the impression should be removed that a Controller is merely a Head Accountant or Compiler of Accounts, and that his post is one of which the duties can be perfectly well performed by any tolerably respectable and intelligent Clerk or Accountant. Ordinarily, a Head Clerk in the Secretariat is, in truth, likely to be almost the least suitable official to select for such a post. His past position and relations to the Local Government are almost certain to militate against his assuming a proper independence and tone in the conduct of the high responsibility with which the Controllorship invests him, and when, as in the present case, he is found to fail, it seems essential that there should be no hesitation in taking decisive action, especially when the failure lies in those parts of his work on which the value of the whole depends, and in respect of which the greatest trust is reposed.

The next point which Government decided recently about Mr. Brock, and against which he appeals is his reduction in pay and grade. The reason for this is clear. The grade and pay were assigned to the Madras Controllorship for the assumed performance of certain highly responsible functions. Whoever is posted there to perform these functions should get that grade and pay, and not Mr. Brock, who should instead receive the grade and pay of such other post to which he may be nominated. Every possible consideration has been shown to Mr. Brock in this matter, for the permanent place in the grade is kept vacant, and there has been only a temporary promotion made, so that, as soon as he could show himself fit for it, he might be

re-appointed to his old grade and post. But it was quite out of the question—an absolute wrong to the public purse—to give first class pay to an Officer who did such work as Mr. Brock's has been above described to have been, or to give Mr. Brock first class pay in those minor charges with which he may presently be entrusted.

I now turn to the pleas Mr. Brock has brought forward in his petition:—

1st.—As to his claim to be considered a local Officer; his removal from the post is not based on the ground of his being no longer local, but of his being unfit for that post, and consequently liable to removal from it without any alternative at all.

2nd.—As to his not knowing in what way he has given dissatisfaction; I need hardly add to the remarks I have already made, and especially to those to the effect that this plea seems to me to be the worst feature in the case. In the course of the inspection of 1871, I could not have expressed more clearly than I did the shortcomings which showed themselves, and in my interview with Mr. Brock in October last, I was equally explicit.

3rd.—As to the satisfaction he has invariably given on all other occasions; with reference to the Madras Government and Madras Officers, I have already shown why they might possibly be satisfied with him, while he was wholly failing in most important duties required by the Government of India. As to Captain Filgate, he never made any inspection of Mr. Brock's work. He was his junior officer, and he only visited him in Office to make certain enquiries, the result of which, as can be seen from his brief report, had no connection with Mr. Brock's conduct of his work; and Colonel Chesney never inspected or even saw his Office. His valedictory eulogy was based, and necessarily based, solely on the promptitude and intelligence with which he rendered accounts and furnished information. My inspection in 1871 was the first and only inspection that was ever made of his work, and nothing that Mr. Brock adduces of the satisfaction he gave to others really conflicts with my conclusions. Throughout Mr. Brock refers to the satisfaction he gave to the Government of Madras. He fails to see that the Gov-

ernment of India is at least equally interested in his performance of his duties, and equally requires to be satisfied regarding it.

Before concluding, I must allude to some further steps that have occurred in Mr. Brock's case, and, as bearing on them, I put up a demi-official note which I recently received from him in Madras. There are two points that are now involved, first, a consideration of his general claims for meritorious service ending in ill-health, second, his employment on return from furlough next month. On the first point, what has been Mr. Brock's service, and what special claim has he to consideration.

As to the severity of the work he had to perform on which he appears inclined to lay great stress he seems to have been a hard worker according to his lights, but considering the far greater and more responsible range of the functions of Controllers in the other equally large Offices, it cannot be admitted that any exceptional work, likely to cause unusual ill-health or to demand more than ordinary intervals of rest, was imposed upon him.

Next what has been this long and meritorious service, and what is the degree of ill-fortune to which he affects to be a victim.—

(1).—In August 1855, he became a Government servant, an Accountant, he says, in the Public Works Department.

(2).—In May, 1863, he became Chief Assistant (which is understood to mean Head Clerk) in the Public Works Secretariat.

(3).—In June 1868, he was translated from that post, where he drew Rs. 600 per month, to the Controllorship on Rs. 1,200, rising by annual increments of Rs. 75 to 1,600.

(4).—In April 1873, he proceeded on furlough.

(5).—In April 1875, the order of Government reduces him to Rs. 1,100.

Hence, though there is nothing on record to show that he had enjoyed any unusual education or possessed exceptional ability, he was, after about 13 years' service in subordinate* situations, raised from a mere clerkship to an appointment where he drew the pay of old and experienced

* i. e., Situations as of Clerk, Accountant, and the like.

officers, where in fact, his position was as high as, with a very few exceptions, any Public Works officer holds in Madras. Then after being there about three years, his work was examined by his departmental superior, and he was found to have failed most seriously.

After this failure, after only 18 years of work, of which not four have been in positions of responsibility, he considers himself hardly dealt with (1), having a salary of Rs. 1,100; (2), having rank higher than that of many Public Works Officers of mark and of greater age and standing than himself; and (3), having the pick as will be seen further on of all available posts except Madras itself!

On the second point, i.e., his employment, it has first to be decided whether, on consideration of the above remarks, the Government of India will continue to employ him. They can re-place his services at the disposal of the Madras Government, as he demurs to being an officer of the Government of India. But if the Government of India decide to employ him, the nature and location of his post must depend in a great measure on the length of the remainder of his service. If he has only three or four months to serve, and means to retire at the end of that time, then it is of comparatively trifling importance where he is posted; exactly as Deputies and Assistants are occasionally placed in large charges for a short time, merely to carry on work on a basis already fixed; and, in this event, he might go to Mysore, an opening in which has been purposely made in view of this contingency. But if he is to be longer than 3 or 4 months in the Department, then I consider it absolutely essential, both to his own future satisfaction and to the demands of the interests of the Department, that he should work for a time in some such office as Mr. Marten's, so as to get an insight into the work as there done, and the functions there accepted as devolving on the Controller. Let me again explain this, even at the risk of being thought too prolix. In our Offices, one of the first essentials is that the Controller should know intimately, and watch and control thoroughly, everything that goes on affecting accounts and economy, in every division in his controllership; know, for instance, how all the initial and executive work is done, how the expenditure is managed and supervised, and how it progresses.

Any of our really effective Controllers could give immediate information on all such points, could name the works in which there is any tendency to exceed estimates, say how the stock stands, and how, in fact, all points are situated that affect the financial work of any Division. Further he watches the progress of every sort of expenditure and compares and analyzes them from sundry different points of view—the progressive agreement of actuals with estimates and with budgets, the proportion of establishment to works, and the like; and he takes potential action where he sees any tendency to extravagance or irregularity. He also assists and guides the administrative officers in all matters of financial rules, and brings to their notice all cases in which they themselves as well as subordinate officers appear to tend to violate them, and he takes an authoritative part in all matters of accounts with other Departments, and would, as a rule, laugh at the notion of accepting or utilizing a document from another Department which he had not scrutinized, or of whose accuracy he was not fairly satisfied. All such work as this, Mr. Brock has yet to learn, and, having learnt it, he must first try his hand in a charge where there are only a few Divisions; for this work, even for only a few divisions, will be a material addition to the functions which he has heretofore carried out. To do all this, in a heavy charge, such as Madras, requires very great powers of administration, and thorough knowledge and experience of details, and he simply did not attempt it at all, and has, in fact, to realize what it means, and how it should be done. As yet he has done only the superficial work already described. Finally, Mr. Brock may object to working any where except in Madras or Mysore, but in that case and if Government do not care to employ him in Mysore, his services should not, in my opinion, be retained at all. He has no such overwhelming claim on the Government of India as that he should choose his post however unfit he may be for it.

Edw. J. McLeod Jones
Accountant General

15th March, 1875.

All communications
should be addressed to
the Secretary.

No. 116 E.A.
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

ESTABLISHMENT.

Account.

To
The Secretary to the Govt of Madras,
Public Works Department.

Fort William 22nd March 1875.

Sir,

With reference to Notification No. 121 dated
the 13th Instant, appointing Captain Conway
Esq. R.E., to be Controller of Public Works
Accounts in Madras, I am directed to request
that you will convey to the Government of
Madras the following remarks, explanatory
of the circumstances of the appointment.
2. In the Resolution noted in the margin
the Government of Madras decided on
adopting for the Public Works Department
in Madras the system in force in the
Provinces more directly under the Government
of India. The difficulties attendant on the
change in the system of this character

M 3103 C dated 31st }
October 1874.

added to those connected with the Capital and Revenue accounts, of Irrigation led the Government of India to form the conclusion that it was necessary to select a specially qualified officer for the charge of the accounts in Madras. Captain Conway Gordon is the officer who was elected, but before appointing him, the Accountant General of this Department was desired to discuss the subject with the Secretary in Madras. This was done and the Government of India understands that, excepting Mr. Brock being held to have claims to the post, no objection is felt to Captain Conway Gordon's appointment.

3. More lately the letter of the Government of Madras, supporting the petition of Mr. Brock; for restoration to Madras has been received. On this subject a separate reply will be sent, but meanwhile I am directed to say that, putting aside all other reasons, the avowedly bad state of Mr. Brock's health, and his desire to retire from the service on the earliest date on which he becomes

157
entitled to pension, are held by the Government of India to preclude his employment for the exceptionally difficult, and severe duties now devolving on the Controller of Accounts in Madras which will probably continue for some time. In selecting Captain Conway Gordon for the post the Governor General in Council, considers that he is nominating an exceptionally able and competent officer, and trusts that the Government of Madras will be satisfied with the selection made.

I have the honor to be
Yours most ^{truly} obedt. servt.
W. Dickins Col. R. S.
Secretary to the Govt. of India

g.B.

h.w.

No. 128 E.A.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

ESTABLISHMENT.

Account.

All communications
should be addressed to
the Secretary.

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Public Works Department.

Fort William, 25th March 1875.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your
letter No. 108 dated the 14th January, last, forward-
ing for the consideration of the Government of
India, copy of a letter from Mr. S. Brock,
claiming to be reinstated in his former post
of Controller of Accounts, Madras, and in his
former grade of Controller 1st class, 2^d grade.
2. In reply I am to state that Mr. Brock's
letter was in the first instance referred to the
Accountant General, Public Works Department.

O.P. 1875 del.

No 2034.

Mr. S. Brock

File 22 March 1875

Dec. 29th —

No. 116 E.A.

O.P. No. 113A. 21-4-75

Offering remarks
explanatory of the cir-
cumstances of the ap-
pointment of Captain
Conway Gordon R.S.
as Controller of P.W. Works,
Madras and intimating
that a separate reply
will be made to Mr. Brock's
petition on the subject of his
reinstatement.

No. 564

1-1-75-11-
3-25-11-6-4-75

^{a copy}
~~Under receipt~~ of that Officer's report, ~~a copy~~
~~which~~ is herewith forwarded for the informa-
tion of the Government of Madras, and the
Governor General in Council trusts, that Colonel
Innes's explanations ^{will} make clear to the Madras
Government, the circumstances under which it
is not considered desirable that Mr Brock should
retain the post of Controller at Madras.

3. A separate communication will be made as
to Mr Brock's destination on his return from
furlough.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient servant,

W. Dickson Col. R. A.
Secretary to the Govt. of India.

quoted in the margin,
the first explaining the
circumstances under which
it has been considered
necessary to appoint
Captain Conway Gordon
R.E. to be Controller of
Public Works Accounts,
Madras, and the second
communicating copy of
Colonel Innes' report
on Mr. Brock's petition
for reinstatement in
his former post and
grade at Madras.

I am to state, in
reply, that His Excellency
the Governor in Council
is unable to agree in
the estimate formed by
Colonel Innes of Mr.
Brock's qualifications,
but that as the Governor
General

N^o 115 C.A. of 22nd March 1875
" 128 — — — 25th — — —

General in Council is ^{23rd} satisfied
that he has been removed
on good grounds, His
Excellency in Council
does not wish to press
for a reconsideration of
the case.

His Excellency the
Governor in Council
however feels it to be
his duty to call attention
to the passage at page
5 of Colonel Innes'
letter, in which that
Officer thinks fit to
pass something like a
censure upon the Madras
Gov^t. His Excellency
in Council cannot
but suppose that this
portion of the letter
was inadvertently

Communicated

communicated to the
Govt. with the rest of
Colonel Innes' report
for their consideration,
by the Govt. of India.
As however it has been
so communicated, His
Excellency in Council
thinks it right to notice
the passage. Colonel
Innes states that from
"the support given to this
"Petition by the Madras
"Govt. it would appear
"that the gravity and
"speciality of the respon-
"sibilities and functions
"of a Controller are not
"fully understood by the
"Madras Government."
Upon this His Excellency
in Council observes that
the

258
the support given to the
petition by this Government
consisted of a statement
that the grounds on
which the petition is
based "Commend them-
"selves to His Excellency
"the Governor in Council
"as just in themselves, and
"as well deserving of con-
"sideration". The grounds
thus referred to are
various, but among
them is the fact that
the manner in which
Mr Brock had con-
ducted his duties had
been commended by
this Govt., and it is
from this, it is presumed,
that Colonel Innes
has

has drawn the inference
that the functions and
responsibilities of a
Controller are not
understood by the
Madras Govt. By
parity of reasoning
Colonel James would
have been justified in
concluding that in the
year 1870 the functions
of a Controller were
not understood by the
Accountant General in
the Public Works Dept.
of the Govt of India,
who on the 23^d of April
that year expressed
his views in the following
terms as regards Mr.
Brook's qualifications
in a demi official
letter which is mentioned
prominently

279
prominently in Mr Brook's
Memorial, and which
was confirmed by the
Official Correspondence
also mentioned by Mr.
Brook.

"I am satisfied from
the way in which you
have conducted your
duties as Controller,
and the prompt way
in which the Madras
Accounts are rendered,
that the Madras
Govt. have made a very
good selection in your
appointment." It thus
appears that the
opinion expressed re-
specting Mr. Brook
by the Madras Govt.,
and which Colonel James
considers to be evidence
that

Madras Cantonment

[illegible]

1541

I think you record
it may be better
simply to record
the letter of the S. I

12/6/94

Arthur J. Allen

X

Rattob

Public Works Department.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the

READ the following:—

From
The Government of Louisiana N. E. No. 115. L. A. dated
22nd March 1875.

His Excellency the Governor in Council, fully concurs with the opinion arrived at by the Government of India, as to the necessity for selecting an exceptionally able and competent officer to take charge of the Accounts in Madras; and he trusts that

There is a mistatement
regarding Mr. Brock's
desire to retire -
Col Innes' violence &
positive persecution of
Mr. Brock made him

31
A true Account of
Irrigation is one that dread moving away
requires an accurate from the protection
Knowledge of the real End of the Madras Govt
in View; and ability and H. Munro was not
tact in carrying out the at all desirous of
measures for their attain- whoring
ment; with due respect
to local peculiarities, and
to the wishes of the Madras
Government.

2. The Govt. promised
a Communication respecting
Mr. Brock will be awaited.

G. M. W.

Lapur - R. L. P. 5

W. L. P. 5

2/4

W. L. P. 5

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT

Under date the

Read the following:—

From the Secretary to the Govt. of India } (M.L. No 128. A dt 25 Mar 1875)
 and which was confirmed by the official correspondence also (understood)

On reconsideration - resolution arrived at by the Madras Government, and with reference to the at the end of the last meeting - recorded in para 3 of their I think it will perhaps be better simply to record. // 16/6

Mr. Campbell went with the action of the Govt. of India in suddenly ordering the removal of Mr. Brock without more notice or explanation than that afforded in their letter No 377 of 28 September

Ides like a hot (just this) at the argument when it can be of no use Brock was not expected to work. He only says I saw his office work

Recorded

Recirculate this with the Secretary to the Govt. of India

6.11.75

I think this had better be kept for present

PM

recorded into these Pro-
ceedings. It is not un-
derstood therefore how
the action of the Govt of
India is now justified by
the Accountant General
H. H. Dept on the score of
the resolution of this
Government to assimilate
the local systems of H. H.
Accounts to that in use
under the Govt of India.

His Excellency the
Governor in Council is
however satisfied of the
expediency of a change,
and considers that Mr.
Brock will have no
further cause of complaint
if

Mr. Brock was a more im-
satisfactory paper
J. H. W.

I am, however, satisfied
that I am concerned that
great importance has been
done to an excellent
servant. I am satisfied

if permitted to be
continued in his service in his present
position. I am, however, satisfied
that I am concerned that
great importance has been
done to an excellent
servant. I am satisfied

if permitted to be
continued in his service in his present
position. I am, however, satisfied
that I am concerned that
great importance has been
done to an excellent
servant. I am satisfied

We have, I think, two
alternatives before us, viz.
1. to record
2. to require acknowledgment
of a signature - but to note Mr. Brock's
remarks upon the Madras Govt
(at head of page 5) in Colonel
James' Report. I confess I am
rather in doubt as to
this alternative - but it is
more to be avoided than inter-
official recognition, but
entire violence in submitting
matter to their own or to
other Govt. effect not in the
interests of the public service to
be passed over.

But that we feel it our
duty to acknowledge the
paper of 5 in which
Mr. Brock's remarks are
contained, and which we must
communicate to the Govt of India.
The rest of his Report, I
think, for their consideration.
The Govt of India, however, has
been so communicated to us, we

think it
 right to note the paper.
 Col. James says that "from
 the support given to this petition
 by the Members for it appears
 that the functions and especially
 of the Controller are not fully understood
 by the Members for it." Upon this we
 have to observe that the support
 given to the petition by the for
 consisted of a statement that the
 grounds on which the petition
 is based "cannot be made out
 at all in C. as just in themselves, and
 as well deserving of consideration."
 The grounds then referred to
 are various: - but among them is
 the fact that the manner in which
 Mr. Brock had conducted his duties
 had been commended by the for.
 and from this it is presumed that
 the functions of a Controller are not understood
 by the for. He would have been
 greatly surprised by parity of
 reasoning, Col. James would
 have been justified in concluding

that in the year 1870 the
 functions of a Controller
 were not understood by
 the Accountant Genl. in the
 P. W. Dept. of the Govt. of India
 who on the 25th April that
 year enclosed in a draft
 D.O. letter (which is
 mentioned prominently in Mr.
 Brock's memorial and was
 therefore before Col. James) his
 views in regard to the for
 as follows: -
 "I am satisfied that the
 paper of the for is not
 It thus appears that the opinion
 expressed respecting Mr. Brock
 by the Members for it, and which Mr.
 James considers to be evidence to
 the Members for it, does not indicate
 the functions of a Controller, is the
 opinion of a late Act. Genl. in the
 D. of the Govt. of India. In short
 words, the opinion of the
 paper by Mr. Brock of the
 Members for it is equivalent to
 an assertion that his predecessor
 (Col. Chesney) did not
 understand the functions of
 a Controller, whereas by Col. James
 is fully cognizant of the
 an assertion which is not likely
 to command any
 general assent.

378
 Memo
 When applying (in 1873)
 for 2 years leave of absence, I
 asked that such leave might
 be granted to me under the
 new Leave Rules, as, under
 them, I would be entitled to
 800 £ pr annum for the
 whole period, against
 600 under the old rules
 and 600 under the new
 600 for the 1st fifteen months under
 375 for the last nine months
 The Govt. of India gave the

leave under Suppl. F, but
added that my name
would be submitted to the
Secretary of State, in order
to the benefits of the New
Leave rules, being extended
to me, in anticipation of
the introduction of a general
law for all India.

Up to date, I have
not enjoyed any of the
advantages of the new
rules, and I accordingly
wrote (3 Dec last) to the
P. W. Accountant General,

394
pointing out the fact, and
requesting that my leave may
be regarded as taken under
the old rules - which would
enable me.

1st To draw higher allowances
than Suppl. F provided for,
and

2nd To count the ~~former~~ ^{present}
on leave as reckoning
towards pension.

If my case be considered
with reference to the old
rules, a service of 20 years
will render me eligible to
a pension of £ 300 p annum,
and that service will be

completed in August next -
or within 5 months of the
present date -

On the occasion of my
visit to Palenka in October
last, I represented to the Acct^y
General the hardship involved
in my transfer to Palenka Ben-
gal, and he then was good
enough to say that he freely
admitted that ^{the} circumstances
of my case were of an excep-
tional character, and that
in fairness, I should be allowed
to select another station, such
station not being made as

418
in Bombay. Having been
allowed the choice, I unhesi-
tantly selected Mysore, and
offered to prefer my request
by letter. This, however, the
Accountant General said
was unnecessary, as he
would take a note of
my wish, and arrange
accordingly. Shortly after-
wards, I was posted to
Indore, and on my way
visiting the several persons

Smith (in January) to Col
 James at Madrid, he
 desired me to write to
 him upon the subject. This
 I did at once and at the
 same time I informed the
 Accountant General that
 looking to the state of my
 health, it was not my
 intention to continue in
 the service for a longer pe-
 riod than was necessary
 to render me eligible to
 be re-appointed. Therefore, if it
 were decided that I
 should be re-appointed, I
 would, in the mean time,
 be far from being
 to myself, and in the
 fail in furthering the
 public interests. Looking
 to these circumstances, I
 again requested that, if it
 were decided that I

should not have made
I must be posted to
Mysore - Subsequently
(about 3 weeks ago) the As-
sistant General tele-
graphed to me to know
when I purposed returning
in person - My reply was to
the effect that if my leave
were allowed to be taken
under the old rules I should
return within a year;
otherwise I must serve
till October next year.

I have heard nothing fur-
ther upon the subject, but
as my leave will termi-
nate on the 14th proximo,
I am most anxious to know
my future destination -
i.e. whether I may join
the Eugene Courtall's office
if the Madras appoint-
ment is decided to me

15 March / 75

J. Thosell

Public Works Dept.

49A



Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the

1875

Read the following

From the Govt. of India (H.E. No: 116 P. & A of 22nd March)

do

do

(H.E. No: 120 P. & A of 25th do-)

G.O. No. 1130 of 21st April 1875

Ordered to be

recorded.

225 J
Gobi. of 1875 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated

Recd.

And

G. O. 21 April 1875 No. 1130

No. 564 - 565

W. Brock

The letter of the Government of India
replying to the petition of ~~Mr. Brock~~
and explaining the circumstances
of the appointment of Capt. Conway-
Gordon as Controller of P. W. Accounts,
Madras, ordered to be recorded.