

(1) Number of pages 20
(2) Date of repair 1/87
(3) Initials of the Referencer lunn

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P.W.D DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	2887-w	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	14-12-1880	197.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

A. Muni

285
1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

14th December 1880, No. 2,837 W.

General.
Establishment.

Read the following paper:—

No. 65. Endorsement of the Chief Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated Fort St. George, 3rd December 1880, No. 2,302.

From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieutenant, R.N.R., Master Attendant, Administrative Department, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, dated Madras, 29th November 1880, No. 10,546.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of G.O., Public Works Department, No. 2,563 W., dated 8th instant, communicated to me with G.O., Marine No. 581, dated 24th idem, and to express my regret that my letter, dated August 7th last, No. 6,862, should have led Government to suppose that a serious malversation of funds had taken place on the part of the Public Works Department. I beg respectfully to submit that nothing was more foreign to my mind than such a reflection.

2. As already explained in my letter No. 8,997, dated October 12th last, I simply stated the facts as they occurred, viz., that in September 1878 I received the revised estimate of Rs. (1,310) eleven thousand three hundred and ten for the Masulipatam quay, which I did not feel justified to recommend while no trace was reported of the earlier sanctioned work, on which a sum of Rs. (3,861) three thousand eight hundred and sixty-one had, according to the accounts received from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, been expended.

3. The Collector of Kistna, in paragraph 6 of his letter recorded in the above Government Order, refers to the subject as follows:—"Captain Taylor says that Rs. (3,861) three thousand eight hundred and sixty-one have already been spent on the abandoned wooden jetty. I do not know where this information comes from, but I think there must be some mistake. There is not at this moment a trace of anything having been spent, and Rs. (3,800) three thousand and eight hundred can hardly have gone this way. The boatmen and Sea Customs Superintendent tell me nothing was done; that the site was only marked out with stakes when Captain Richardson interfered." Such was the statement made by the highest official on the spot in June 1880 after so short a period as "over two years" since the work had been put in hand, viz., October 1877, and I stated the case much the same way that there was no trace of the earlier sanctioned work over two years in hand. Then I was naturally anxious to know the nature of the work executed when nearly half the amount of the estimate had been expended, and therefore suggested, in my report on the above letter, that, before any more expense was incurred, an explanation of the expenditure should be afforded. I did not then possess the information now furnished in the Government Order, "that the work was stopped almost immediately after its commencement, and the total loss would be little over Rs. (400) four hundred."

4. As mentioned in my letter No. 9,249, dated October 19th last, the credits were duly received, but they certainly threw no light on the above point, viz., the nature of the work executed for the expenditure incurred, amounting to Rs. (3,861) three thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and it is to be noted that both as regards receipts and expenditure, no details are afforded in the accounts of the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, rendered to this Office, beyond the name of the work and the amount. That the credits were the sale proceeds of timber bought I learn for the first time from the Government Order under acknowledgment, and while I am glad to find from it that satisfactory explanations have been rendered to Government, I am

still left ignorant of the nature of the outlay originally incurred. It is also to be remarked that it is admitted in the same Government Order that, taking into account the credits, there was still a debit of Rs. (1,303-10-0) one thousand three hundred and three and annas ten, on account of the work in question, at the time of my writing in August last.

5. In conclusion, I beg leave to observe that I voluntarily preferred no complaint on the matter, but merely reported on a reference forwarded to me by Government, and my remarks were made purely from a spirit of inquiry, so as to arrive at the real facts connected with the expenditure of funds, the administration of which is entrusted to me, before further expense was incurred, and which I believe the Government expect every public officer thus situated to exercise. If such inquiry is to be repressed for fear that it is likely to be misunderstood as imputing malversation of funds and followed by censure, then I respectfully submit the interests of the public service must necessarily suffer.

6. I therefore solicit that the Government will, on reconsideration of the whole of the circumstances of the case, be pleased to remove the censure recorded in the Government Order under acknowledgment.

TRANSFERRED to the Public Works Department for disposal.

(Signed) R. DAVIDSON,
Chief Secretary.

No. 66.

ORDER THEREON, 14th December 1880, No. 2,887 W.

IN this letter the Master Attendant requests to be relieved of the censure contained in the Proceedings of Government of the 8th November 1880, No. 2,563 W.

2. Captain Taylor disclaims any intention of imputing malversation of funds on the part of the Public Works Department in connection with the work done to the quay at Masulipatam, and this explanation is accepted by Government, but it is

* (Including Rs. 772 percentage for establishment and Tools and Plant.)

remarked, that while the Government were certainly led to believe that Rs. 3,800,*

"nearly half the estimate for the whole work," had been expended, although no

trace of result could be found, there was no mention made of the fact that the Port Fund had been recredited with Rs. 1,735-10-3 between April 1878 and July 1880, of which the Examiner states that the Master Attendant's Office was duly advised.

3. From the letter of the Superintendent of Works, Kistna, dated 28th August 1880, it appears that further recoveries have been or will be made, (the whole being from resale of timber purchased for the wooden jetty of which the construction had been stopped,) and that the ultimate loss on the original expenditure is estimated at Rs. 408 against the provision of Rs. 470 to cover this item in the revised estimate of Rs. 11,350 for a stone quay.

4. When addressing Government on the subject, the Master Attendant should have put before them all the facts of the case as known in his own office, ascertaining them by reference to local officers if he was imperfectly informed.

(True Extract.)

To the Marine Department.
" Superintendent of Works, Kistna.

Colonel, R.E.,
Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

GENERAL
ESTABLISHMENT.

Subt. of 1880 Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

THE MARINE DEPARTMENT,
&c. &c. &c.

Dated December 14th.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 14th December 1880, No. 2,887 W.

DECEMBER
Nos. 65-66

Administrative Department

No. 10546

Madras.

Main Office,

29th November 1880.

From

J. H. Taylor, Esq., Lieut., R. N. R.,
Master Attendant,
Administrative Department,
Madras.

To

The Hon. Mr. Davidson, C. S. I.,
Chief Secretary to Government
Marine Department
Fort Saint George.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge
the receipt of G. O. Public Works Department,
No. 2663, dated 8th inst., communicated to me
with G. O. Marine No. 581, dated 24th inst., and
to express my regret that my letter dated 1st
August 7th inst., No. 6362, should have led to any
misunderstanding. That in various communications
of yours had taken place on the part of the
Public Works Department. I beg respectfully
to submit that nothing was more foreign to
my mind than such a reflection.

2. As already explained in my letter
No. 8997, dated October 13th last, I simply stated
the facts as they occurred, viz., that in September
1878 I received the revised estimate of repairs
(11310) eleven thousand three hundred and ten
for

for the Maculipatnam group, which I did not
feel justified to recommend, while no trace
was reported of the entire sanctioned work,
in which a sum of Rs 3861, three thousand
eight hundred and sixty one had, according
to the accounts received from the Examiner of
Public Works Accounts, been expended.

3 The Collector of Krishna, in para
6 of his letter, recorded in the above G.O., refers
to the subject as follows:— "Captain Taylor says
that Rs 3861, three thousand eight hundred
and sixty one have already been spent on the
abandoned wooden jetty. I do not know where this
information comes from, but I think there must
be some mistake. There is not at this moment
a trace of anything having been spent, and
Rs 3861, three thousand eight hundred
and sixty one have gone missing. The Collector and
the District Superintendent tell me nothing and
say that the site was only marked out with
stakes when Captain Richardson interpreted the
order. The statement made by the highest
official on the spot in June 1880, after he had
been for over two years since the work had
been commenced, viz. October 1877, and I stated
the same in the same way that there was no
work of the kind sanctioned work over the years
in hand. I have been naturally anxious to know
that

the nature of the work executed was nearly
half the amount of the estimate had been expended,
and therefore suggested in my report on the
above letter that, before any more expense was
incurred, an explanation of the expenditure should
be afforded. I did not then possess the information
now furnished in the G.O. that the work was
"stopped almost immediately after its commence-
ment, and the total loss would be little over
"Rs 4000 four hundred."

4 As mentioned in my letter No 9249, dated
October 19th last, the credits were duly re-
ceived, but they certainly throw light on
the above point, viz, the nature of the work
executed for the expenditure incurred, amounting
to Rs 3861, three thousand eight hundred
and sixty one, and it is to be noted that both
as regards receipts and expenditure, no details
are afforded in the accounts of the Examiner of
Public Works Accounts, rendered to this office,
beyond the name of the work and the amount.
That the credits were the sale proceeds of
timber bought I learn for the first time from
the G.O. under acknowledgments, and while I am
glad to find from it that satisfactory explana-
tions have been rendered to Government, I am
still left ignorant of the nature of the outlay
originally

originally incurred. It is also to be remarked
that it is admitted in the G. O. that, in
taking into account the credits, there was still
a debit of Papers (1303-1000) and thousand
three hundred and three and some two, an
account of the work in question, at the time of
my writing in August last.

5 In conclusion, I beg leave to observe
that I voluntarily prepared no complaint on
the matter, but merely reported on a reference
forwarded to me by Government, and my remarks
were made purely from a spirit of inquiry so
as to arrive at the real facts connected with
the expenditure of funds, the administration
of which is entrusted to me, before further
expense was incurred, and which I believe the
Government expect every Public Officer thus
situated to exercise. If such inquiry is to
be repressed for fear that it is likely to be
misunderstood as imputing misadministration of
funds and followed by censure, then I can
respectfully submit the interests of the
Public Service must necessarily suffer.

6 I therefore submit that the
Government will, on reconsideration of the
whole

13
whole of the circumstances of the case, be
pleased to remove the censure recorded in
the G. O. under acknowledgment.

I have the honor to be
Sir,

your most Obedt Servant

J. W. Taylor

Master Attendant

Administration Department

the quay at Masulipatam
and this explanation
is accepted by Govt.
but it is remarked
that while the Govt.
were certainly led to
believe that Rs 3,800,
"nearly half the estimate
for the whole work," had
been expended, although
no trace of result could
be found, there was
no mention made of
the fact that the Port
fund had been recredited
with Rs 1785-10-3 between
April 1878 and July 1880,
of which the Examiner
states that the Master
Attendants office was
duly advised.

+ (including Rs 442
percentage for Establish-
ment and Tools and Plant)

From the letter of
the Supt. of Works, Madras,
dated 28th August 1880
it appears that further
recoveries have been
or will be made (the
whole being from
resale of timber pur-
chased for the wooden
jetty of which the con-
struction had been
stopped) and that
the ultimate loss on
the original expendi-
ture is estimated
at Rs 408 against the
provision of Rs 470
to cover this item in
the revised estimate
of Rs 11,350 for a stone quay.

4. When addressing
Government on
subject, the Mass.
attendant should
have put before
all the facts of the
case as known in his
own office, ascertaining
them by reference to
local officers if he
was imperfectly informed.

S
10/12

Marine Department 7 ✓
Supt. of Works Division
Dated 7 ✓
321-81 21

grad.

7689
1881
Govt. of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. No. 114 Decr 1880, No. 2887 W

Nos. 65 046

Copy of Despatch from
Order as letter from the
Master Attendant Madras
requesting to be adhered
to the census contained
in O.S. of the 8. Nov
in connection with the
work done to the

35
/ 11