

(1) Number of pages 24
(2) Date of repair 11-11-86
(3) Initials of the Referencer long

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P.W.

DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1395 W	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	16-5-1879	~~10~~ :

AK
Not to be folded or roughly handled

1395

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

16th May 1879, No. 1,395 W.

General.
Account.

Read the following paper:—

No. 113. Endorsement from the Superintending Engineer, Third Circle, dated 17th April 1879, No. 2,154, on letter from Mr. J. O'Shaughnessy, dated 9th April 1879, No. 56.

No. 114. ORDER THEREON, 16th May 1879, No. 1,395 W.

THE Government sanction a refund to Mr. O'Shaughnessy of Rupees 55-8-0, being the amount actually paid by him for office accommodation in the Victoria Hotel from the 25th November to the 31st December 1878, and an office allowance from the 1st January to the 13th April 1879, of Rupees 45 per mensem, as an acquittance in part of the rent paid by him for Pugh's Gardens.

2. Mr. O'Shaughnessy's action in moving into Pugh's Gardens in anticipation of the sanction of Government was unauthorized, and the tone of his present letter is very reprehensible and cannot any longer be permitted.

(True Extract.)

Major, R.E.,
Ag. Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, Third Circle.
Examiner of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spec. Copies

Chayes
9th April 1879

From

T

Circle

11

ENCLOSURE

In reference to G.O. dated the 31st
 March 1879. to 969w which sanctions
 an allowance of Rs 30 per mensem to be
 paid to me for providing accommodation
 for my office in my own residence, I have
 the honor to observe that the circumstances
 of the case do not appear to have been
 sufficiently or correctly reported and I request
 you will do me the favor to submit this
 letter to Government with a view to His
 Grace the Governor in Council being
 pleased to reconsider the subject.

2. I informed the Superintendent Engineer on the 29th October 1878, that in accordance with the orders of Government dated the 18th September 1878 No. 3675 W, my office would probably arrive in Madras about the 20th November and Inquired if

Cont. of (1879) *Indian*
PUBLIC WORKS.

1994

1000

Admission into the Intelligence Service Office. Searching for answers required by the Intelligence on a regular basis and searching on the line of the

arrangements had been made for its accommodation.

3. The Superintending Engineer reported in his No. 3989 dated the 22 November 178, that my office could occupy a building at Guindy which he believed required some slight repairs and whitewashing.

4. I arrived in Madras on the 20th November and ascertained that the building at Guindy had not been repaired and that owing to its having been recently used as a Native school house it was unsuited for occupation. I therefore hired for the time being part of a detached building belonging to the Hotel in which he was staying at Rs 1 1/2 per day for the accommodation of my office.

5. I reported on the 14th December 178 that the building at Guindy was in several respects unsuitable for the Canal Office, and it had as it was required by the Executive Engineer as well as by the Collector of Chengalpet for other Government purposes there would

1395
be no advantage in putting the Canal Office in it. I mentioned also in the same report that as there was no accommodation for the Canal Office in any of the Government Buildings in the Presidency, it would be necessary if the proposal to locate it at Guindy was not insisted upon, to rent a house or to give the Canal Officer an allowance for the purpose which was the course adopted when the Canal was previously a separate charge.

6. I was informed on the 20th December in Superintendent Engineer's No. 4918 of the 18th idem that the Chief Engineer insisted on the Canal Office occupying the building at Guindy, and that in regard to the inconvenience of distance from my residence I could get to it by rail from Madras. I then asked the Executive Engineer (Chengalpet) whose division the building is situated to kindly have an estimate prepared for the necessary repairs, the estimate

arranging the room was submitted
on the 26 February 1879 and as far as I
know it has not been sanctioned and
the building is therefore unfit for
occupation at this day.

Meanwhile the General the Governor
disapproved of the proposal to locate
the Canal Office at Genoa and in deference
to the General's suggestion the Chief Engineer
submitted on the 6th January for information
regarding the accommodation and
rent of the premises called Pugh's
Garden previously occupied by the
Canal Office.

8. This information was furnished
on the 6th January and the Chief Engineer
Bryson was at the same time informed
that as the accommodation available
for my office at the Victoria Hotel was
inconvenient and insufficient and
until the building at Genoa was
ready for occupation or until further
orders were received on the subject I
had rented Pugh's garden in anticipation

1395
of the sanction of Government to similar
arrangements in regard to the rent as
were sanctioned for the Executive Engineer
of the Presidency Division.

9. I heard nothing further on the
subject until the 26 March 1879 when
I was informed that accommodation
would be provided for my office in the
P. W. Office at Chapank from the 1st
May 1879 and I have received information
today that the Stores and tools
belonging to my Division can be
accommodated in ~~the~~ Fort St. George.

10. I admit that in Pugh's garden
I have had the advantage of dwelling
in a part of a better building than I
could afford to rent on my own account
and it is also convenient to my work.
In other respects residence at the Adyar
is, considering my income, inconvenient
and expensive, and I could not think
of looking in my personal interests an
expensive residence in that locality.

11. I occupied the building in the

bona fide interests of Government alone
and I have continued to do so on the
supposition (as I heard nothing to the
contrary) that my arrangements were
approved and that the conditions
stated in my letter No 258 dated 13th
January 1879 were accepted.

12. The terms of the Chapter and section
of the Government of India Code quoted
in the order of Government under reference,
are no doubt conditional on the
willingness of the Officer concerned to
provide accommodation for his office
for a sum of Rs 30 a month, there is
nothing in the rules to compel any
Officer to provide accommodation
for his office on these or any other
terms, and I am sure His Grace the
Governor in Council, would not if
the circumstances were fully explained
sanction proceedings upon which any
such construction could be placed.

13. This particular expounding of the
Government of India Code quoted is

Impetuous of
Presidency
House and
Belvedere 9/5

1295
further inapplicable to the case in question,
because it cannot be said that the
separate building occupied by my office
from the 25th November to the 31st December 78th
was part of my residence and I am
sure the Government will not refuse
to sanction the amount which in good
faith I paid for that building on
their account. As regards the
proportion of the rent of my present
office which I should pay for dwelling
in it. If the Government decide
that the conditions upon which
the Executive Engineer Presidency Division
was permitted to dwell in his office
are not to be applied in my case, it
would rest with myself under the
provision of Chapter II, III 5th
to decide how much should be fairly
charged, and in the case of any
other occupant I should not hesitate
to say half the rent and no more.

I have the honor to be
Your most obedient servant
W. H. H. H. H.
Buckingham Palace

Shagreened

The claims now made by Mr. Thompson are not very clearly stated, but they appear to be:—

- (1) a refund of the sum actually paid by him for office accommodation

Cir. 8.5.79. Ptd. 14.5.79
 L. R. 12-4

provided at the Victoria
Hotel, from the 25th November
to the 31st December, at
£1 1/2 per diem, amounting
to £55-8-0.

(2) An Office allowance
of £10 from 1st January to
30th April, at the rate of
£75 per annum, being
half of the rent paid by
him for Ragh's Gardens.

As regards the first
claim, the undersigned
is of opinion that it may
be conceded, as no
accommodation had apparently
been provided for Mr.
O'Shaughnessy's office
when it arrived in
Madras.

W. O'Shaughnessy's
claims under the second
head are, in the opinion
of the undersigned, fairly
& fully met by the allowance
of £30 per annum,
sanctioned by Govt. in their
order W. 969 W. of 31st March.

W. O'Shaughnessy states that he
moved into Ragh's Gardens
of his own accord, without
authority, "in anticipation
of the sanction of Govt. to similar
arrangements in regard to
the rent as were sanctioned
for the Secy. Engineer of the
Presidency Division." W. O'Shaughnessy
had no reason to
anticipate such sanction,
as the cases were entirely
dissimilar. In the
case of the Presidency Secy.
Engineer, the amount of
house rent forfeited was
£100 per annum, while
in W. O'Shaughnessy's case, it
would be only £45 per
annum. In the
case of the Presidency Secy.
Engineer, the lower story
of the house taken by Govt.
was intended to provide
accommodation (1) for
the Supy. Engineer's office,
(2) for the Secy. Engineer's
office, with a very large
amount of records, and
(3) for two sub-divisional

137
Offices. In Mr. Oth's
case, the accommodation
to be provided was for a
small office, with no
records whatever. In
the first instance, the Govt.
were prepared to pay
\$100 monthly for the
necessary accommodation;
and in the second instance
the undersigned is of
opinion that the allowance
of \$30 per mensem, sanctioned
in G.O. N. 969 W dated
31st March, is ample.

The tone of Mr. Oth's
letter now before Govt.
requires no comment.

1/5/79. J. M. M. M. M.

I think that Mr. Oth is
drawing upon little
credit for his official
work. But I would like
the N. 55. 8. & N. 45
for office but on acct.
of his father -
I think Mr. Oth's
style of addressing his
superiors is the only
sharply reprehensible.

Cir. P. 6. 79. Det. 14. 5. 79.
22. 4. 79

For Order

Approved by the 22nd of the
Buckingham Ct. Dr. regarding
the decision arrived in
regard to the rent for the
Office - G.O. of 31st March 1879
No 969 W

Colonel W. L. Shaw. I think
being appointed under the
circumstances of the case
has at any request drawn
up the accompanying note
showing that while Mr.
O. Shampson may be
eventually entitled to
a refund of Rs 55-0-0
on account of the Office was
provided at the Victoria
Hotel from 25th Nov. to
31st December, he is not
entitled to more than
Rs 30 per mensem for
the remainder of the
time as ruled by the
G.O. in question.
This appears to me to
be in accordance with the

Code rules

These it is true under
any special circumstances
admit of a maximum
rent being paid of Rs 45
but maximum provided there
does not exceed half the
rent of the house

I am not myself aware
of the existence of such
special circumstances in
this case, though Rs 45
could be less than half
the rent -

Mr. O'Shaughnessy's
style of writing is not
~~but~~ ordinarily admirable
in official correspondence
and perhaps should be
disfavored in the case of
the same notice

8.5.79

[Signature]

3166 1395
Public Works Department
N^o 1395 W
PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the

16th May 1899

Read the following:-

Endorsement from the Supg Engr
3 Circle on letter from Mr J O'Shaughnessy
No 56 dated 9th April 1899
(H E No 2154 of 14th April 1899)

The Government
sanction a refund to
Mr O'Shaughnessy of
Rs. 55-8-0; being the
amount actually paid
by him for Office ac-
commodation in the
Victoria Hotel, from the
25th November to the
31st December 1898, and
an Office allowance
from the 7th January to
the 13th April 1899, of
Rs. 45 per mensem, as
an acquittance in part
of the rent paid by
him for Pugh's Gardens.

Mr O'Shaughnessy

1875

action in moving into
Pay's gardens in ante-
cipation of the sanction
of Government was
unauthorized, and the
tone of his present
letter is ~~very~~ repre-
hensible. ~~It is assumed~~
~~to adopt a non-hostile~~
~~style when addressing~~
~~his superior.~~

12/5 and cannot
any longer be per-
mitted

Att

14-5-77

Refugee Hunt file ✓
up main ✓
Desp 23-5-77

3166



Genl. of 118791 31/3/35.

PUBLIC WORKS.

19/5

8/1/35

16 May 1395

Not 113-114-

Recommendation for the
Buckingham Canal
to Office - Sanction
ing the charges in-
curred by Mr
Orkney, in re-
sponse of — and
remarking on the tone
of his letter —