3374/97

Archives I–10,006—16-8-77.

(1) Number of pages 46

(2) Date of repair 9. 1. 87

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Public Works DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. B.P. No.	131 W	Press. Mis.
Dated	18. 1. 1881 ~~197~~.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

18th January 1881, No. 131 W.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

Read the following paper :—

No. 107. Despatch from the Most Honorable the Secretary of State for India.

Public Works.
No. 6.

INDIA OFFICE, LONDON,
8th April 1880.

MY LORD DUKE,—Your Grace's letters, No. 72 of 19th December and No. 1 of 8th January last, on the subject of the provision of funds for the prosecution of the Madras Harbour Works duly reached me, and in reply I telegraphed to you on 2nd February that "you must refer question by telegram to Viceroy."

2. Desirable as it is for the reasons urged in your Grace's letters, that the Harbour Works should proceed as rapidly as possible, and that their progress should not be delayed by insufficiency of the annual grants for their prosecution, it nevertheless belongs to the Government of India to determine how much can, in each successive year, be spared for the purpose out of the aggregate amount at their disposal. In case their decision on the point be unsatisfactory to your Government, it is to them that appeal should in the first instance be made.

3. This long established rule has not in this instance been observed. Eleven lakhs having been estimated by your Government as the amount required for the operations of 1880-81, and seven lakhs having been stated by the Government of India to be the largest grant of which circumstances would admit, your Grace's letter of 19th December inviting the interposition of the Secretary of State was addressed to me, without reference to the Government of India, further than was involved in the transmission of a copy of the letter to that authority.

4. There is a still wider deviation from the regular course in your Grace's subsequent letter of 8th January, which asks for confirmation of your having, without reference to the Government of India, authorised an expenditure for January, of Rs. 29,000, in excess of the total provision for the current year, and further asks for my authority to expend during the two remaining months of February and March an amount similarly in excess of Rs. 1,60,000.

5. Both these proceedings seem to me to show an imperfect appreciation of the proper relations between the supreme and subordinate Governments in India.

6. I am glad to find by a telegram received from the Government of India that they have been able to make arrangements for the provision of sufficient funds for the unchecked prosecution of the work.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) CRANBROOK.

His Excellency the Most Noble
The Governor in Council, Fort St. George.

No. 108. ORDER THEREON, 18th January 1881, No. 131 W.

THE Government regret that the foregoing despatch from the Secretary of State for India imputes a motive to their despatches No. 72, dated 19th December 1879, and No. 1 of 8th January 1880, which they feel called on to disavow.

2. The Government did not at all appeal to the Secretary of State to interpose between them and the Government of India, but sought to induce His Lordship to relax restrictions which he had imposed on that Government, and to which they ascribed their inability to satisfy the needs of the Madras Harbour Works for the current year.

3. The Government see no breach of rule in this procedure.

4. Ordered that copy of these Proceedings be forwarded to the Secretary of State for India.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. H. SANKEY, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of (1881) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated January, 188

Issued

Recd. Filed

G. O., 18th January 1881, No. 131 W.

JANUARY.
Nos. 107-108.

Provision of funds for the Madras Harbour Works in excess of the allotment sanctioned by the Government of India for 1879-80.—Disavowing the motive imputed to this Government by the Secretary of State in addressing him direct on the subject of the—

131/3

India Office,
London, 8th April 1880.

Public Works,
No. 6

To His Excellency The Most Noble The Governor in Council, Fort St. George.

My Lord Duke,

Para. 1. Your Grace's Letters, No. 72, of 19th December, and No. 1, of 8th January last, on the subject of the provision of funds for the prosecution of the Madras Harbour works, duly reached me, and, in reply, I telegraphed to you on 2nd February that "you must refer question by "telegram to Viceroy."

2. Desirable as it is, for the reasons urged in your Grace's letters, that the Harbour works should proceed as rapidly as possible, and that their progress should not be delayed by insufficiency of the annual grants for their prosecution, it nevertheless belongs to the Government of India to determine how much can, in each successive year, be spared for the purpose out of the aggregate amount at their disposal. In case their decision on the point be unsatisfactory to your Government, it is to them that appeal should in the first instance be made.

3. This long established rule has not in this instance been observed. Eleven lacs having been estimated by your Government as the amount required for the operations of 1880-81, and seven lacs having been stated by the Government of India to be the largest grant of which circumstances would admit, your Grace's letter of 19th December, inviting the interposition of the Secretary of State, was addressed to me without reference to the Government of India, further than was involved in the transmission of a copy of the letter to that authority.

4. There is a still wider deviation from the regular course in your Grace's subsequent letter, of 8th January, which asks for confirmation of your having, without reference to the Government of India, authorized an expenditure, for January, of Rs. 29,000 in excess of the total provision for the current year, and further asks for my authority to

expend, during the two remaining months of February and March, an amount similarly in excess of Rs. 1,60,000.

5. Both these proceedings seem to me to show an imperfect appreciation of the proper relations between the Supreme and Subordinate Governments in India.

6. I am glad to find, by a telegram received from the Government of India, that they have been able to make arrangements for the provision of sufficient funds for the unchecked prosecution of the work.

I have the honour to be,
My Lord Duke,
Your Grace's most obedient humble Servant,
(Signed) CRANBROOK.

No 1

Public Works

8th April 1880

Copy

Letter to Fort St George

No 6

[illegible] 7 May 80

131/5

India Office, London
8th April 1880

Public Works

No 6.

My Lord Duke,

Your Grace's letters No 72 of 19th December, and No 1 of 8th January last, on the subject of the provision of funds for the prosecution of the Madras Harbour Works duly reached me and in reply I telegraphed to you on 2nd February that you need refer question by telegram to Viceroy.

2. Desirable as it is for the reasons urged in Your Grace's letter that the Harbour Works should proceed

His Excellency
The Most Noble
The Governor in Council
Fort St George

proceed as rapidly as possible and that their progress should not be delayed by insufficiency of the annual grants for their prosecution, it nevertheless belongs to the Government of India to determine how much can, in each successive year, be spent for the purpose out of the aggregate amount at their disposal. In case their decision on the point be unsatisfactory to your Government, it is to them that appeal should in the first instance be made.

3. This long established rule has not in this instance been observed. Eleven lakhs having been

estimated

estimated by your Government as the amount required for the operations of 1880-81, and seven lakhs having been stated by the Government of India to be the largest grant of which circumstances would admit, your Grace's letter of 17th December inviting the interposition of the Secretary of State was addressed to me, without reference to the Government of India, further than was involved in the transmission of a copy of the letter to that authority.

4. There is a still wider deviation from the regular course in your Grace's subsequent letter of 8th January, which

asks

asks for confirmation of your having, without reference to the Government of India, authorised an expenditure for January of Rs 29,000, in excess of the total provision for the current year, and further asks for my authority to expend during the two remaining months of February and March an amount similarly in excess of Rs 160,000.

5. Both these proceedings seem to me to shew an imperfect appreciation of the proper relations between the Supreme and Subordinate Governments in India.

6. I am glad to find

by

by a telegram received from the Government of India that they have been able to make arrangements for the provision of sufficient funds for the unchecked prosecution of the work.

I have the honor to be,
My Lord Duke,
Your Graces most
obedient humble Servant,

P.W.C. No. 224

No. 5

Public Works
8th April 1880

The
~~Letter~~ to Fort St. George
No. 6

Recd. 7/5/80

Regd. [illegible]

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

LIST of PAPERS sent in *Circulation on the* 18th May 1880.
and not yet returned. 13/5/80

Department.	No.	Date.	Subject.	When sent out.
P.W. Dept.			× Despatch from the Secy of State No. 5 of 8th April /80 Pointing out the irregularity in addressing the Home Govt. direct in place of the Govt of India, in regard to the provision for the uninterrupted progress with the Harbour Works	18 May 1880
× Spare Copy attached.				

The undersigned has the honor to request that early orders may be passed on the above mentioned paper.

C. H. Sankey Col. R.E.
Secy to Govt. P.W.D.

To
Hon. W. Hudleston
His Grace the Governor

Department.	No.	Date.	Subject.	When sent out.

Ser 11.6.80 -

Despatch from the Secretary of State for India, No. 6, dated 8th April /80.

FOR ORDERS.

As many of the original papers as the Record Department have been able to trace are put up.

2. The Office Note marked A relates to the attempt made by the Hon. Mr Huddleston to stop the second of the "Despatches.

3. In the absence of the undersigned on tour, Major Pennycuick

circulated a Note, which cannot be found at Chepauk, explaining the case to the Hon. Member, who thereon remarked that he thought the direct address to the Secretary of State could be justified on the ground of the previous direct address (Despatch No 72 of the 19th Dec/79)

4 It is thought that this latter – that is to say the earlier Despatch – can be justified on the ground of the terms employed in Major Filgate's letter recorded with Proceedings of the 16th Dec/79, No. 3236 W., and by the urgency of the matter.

5. It will be observed that in General Fraser's letter of the 8th January, No. 11 A.G., no exception was taken to the course adopted by the Madras Government in addressing the Secretary of State. It may also be inferred from the same letter that had the reference been made to the Govt of India "in the first instance", it would have proved unsuccessful.

6. It may be noticed that the Govt of India

have themselves encouraged a direct address to the Secretary of State in connection with the Harbour where time can be saved – see para 11 of Govt of India Despatch No 118 of the 17th Augt/74 printed with G Mo 2758 of the 30th Septr/74, and the consequent Despatch to the Secretary of State, No. 32 of 1874.

7. The exceptional character of the Harbour Works has resulted, it is thought, in exceptional procedure more than once & this Govt. having been in direct communication

with the Home Govt on questions relating to the estimates which would in ordinary course have been discussed with the Govt of India – see for instance Despatch No. 6 of 1876, and No. 8 of 1879.

8. Attention is invited to the terms of the second paragraph of Lord Cranbrook's Despatch in which it is said that it "belongs to the Govt of India to determine how much can in each successive year be spared for "the works" out of the aggregate amount at their disposal."

9 And in para. 3 "the long established rule" of addressing the Govt of India in the first instance is spoken of.

10 This appears inconsistent with the 9th paragraph of Lord Salisbury's Despatch No. 20 P.W. of the 11th March 1875, printed with G.O. No 2060 of the 20 July 1875, in which the Govt of India were desired "to advance the sum of £628,000 out of extraordinary funds for the construction of a Harbour in accordance with the plan of Mr Parkes".

11 It was originally hoped that the Harbour would have been completed in five years, and the estimates were prepared on that assumption. It seems plain that it was Lord Salisbury's intention that the above mentioned sum should be advanced *within the time named* — *not* that it should be left to the Govt of India to distribute the amount over as many years as they might think fit; the inevitable result of which would have been to vitiate the estimate for Establishment and ultimately to burden Madras

trade with increased dues rendered necessary by excess on the sanctioned estimate.

12. So far from it having been "a long established rule" for the Govt of India to fix the amount of the yearly grants, it will be seen from the marginal order (marked passage) that up to the last 18 months the expenditure on the works proceeded under the orders and on the responsibility of the Govt. of Madras, the Govt of India indirectly authorising

No 4258 W of the 6th Nov/78 (Finl Pro No 1835 of 14th Oct/78).

their financial irregularity.

13. That thorough financial control over the Harbour Works, as in the case of any other Productive Public Work, should be exercised by the Govt of India is doubtless most desirable, but it should be subject to the general lines of Lord Salisbury's Despatch of 1875, which virtually sanctioned a definite expenditure within a fixed time.

14. It will be recollected by the Members of Govt. that the Harbour Budget Estimate of last Official Year was considerably

of the balance of the estimate within this and the next official year.

16. In the present state of the finances, the Harbour Works are indeed a heavy charge, but it is obvious that in the interests of economy, as on every other ground, they ~~must~~ should be finished at the very earliest possible date.

R. H. Sankey
Col. R.E.
Secy. to Govt. Oct 18

5/5

[illegible]

Sec. of St. Despatch

8 Apr. 75.

In turning again [illegible]

[illegible] Despatches

of 19 Dec. 74 &

5 Jan. 75. I think

[illegible] Sec. of St. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] quite

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] appeal [illegible]

[illegible]

us & the G. of I.

We ought to indicate lines to telegr instructions sh. be best impressed on the G. of I. & the S. of S. by ascribing their inability to satisfy our needs for the N.W.F. in the current year. There is no breach of rule in this. I [illegible]

---

telegr. a/c S. of S.
Apr. 20 [illegible]
The S. of S. [illegible]
& Amir: his understanding
to appeal agst.
G.I. We ask you
to tel. your instructions
on G.I. despatch
of Jan.

[illegible] by despatch

"We regret the fact ~~that~~ that
yr. Lop's despatch
of 8 Apr. No 20 S.S.
imputes a motive to
our despatches of

19 Decr. 79. Had Divn.
by ~~a motion~~ &c. we
feel called on to
disavow.

We did not appeal
to yr. Lordship to interfere
between us & ~~the~~ Govt.
of Ind. We sought to induce
yr. Lordship to relax the restrictions
imposed by you on the
Govt. of I. to which they ascribed
their inability to satisfy
our needs for the M. H. W.
in the current year

We trust yr. L.ship will
consideration [illegible] [illegible]
acquitting [illegible] of any intended [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible]
to the S. of S. for this year — [illegible]

For orders 13/18

Despatch from the
Secy. of State for India
No. 6 of 22 April 1880 —
objecting to the action
of this Govt. in addressing
the Home Govt. direct
on the subject of the
provision of funds for
the Madras Harbour Works
in excess of the allotment
sanctioned by the Govt.
of India for 1879-80.

No action has yet
been taken on the Hon.
Mr. Anderson's note of
23rd May last, suggesting
a justification of the
procedure followed
by the Govt., the file
having apparently been
mislaid at Govt. House
& returned to the
Secretariat

Secretariat after the Xmas Holidays.

The Govt. of India have, ~~to~~ as will be seen from the papers put up,+ long since accorded sanction to excess expenditure during 1879-80, and it may perhaps be considered ~~that the~~ question of procedure may be allowed to drop, as it is now a year old.

+ G.O. 1704 W d/17th July 1880 –
" 2008 W d/25 Augt 1880

~~AHH~~

13/1/81

I suppose that
Wait the delay
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
the G.S.
Wa

No 131 W

P.W. Works

Public Works Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 18th Jany /81

Read the following :—

13/28

Despatch from the Secy: of State } (P.W. No. 6 d/ 8th April /80)

The Government regret that the foregoing despatch from the Secy: of State for India imputes a motive to their despatches No. 72 dated 19th December 1879 and No. 1 of 8th Jany 1880, which they feel called on to disavow.

2. The Government did not at all appeal to the Secy: of State to interpose between

them

Cm

them and the Government of India, that sought to induce his Lordship to relax restrictions which he had imposed on that Government, and to which they ascribed their inability to satisfy the needs of the Madras Harbour Works for the current year.

3. The Government see no breach of rules in this procedure.

4. Ordered that copy of these Proceedings be

be forwarded to the Secretary of State for India.

13/21

17.1.87

P. & D.

No 3 d/ 27th January 1881

13)/22

To

The Right Honorable
the Secy. of State
for India

My Lord Marquis.

We beg to forward copy of our Proceedings on your Lordship's despatch No. 6, dated 8th April 1880, which we regret was mislaid up to the present time.

despd 27/1/81
with 1 Encl

Cy

[illegible]

224

Govt. of [1879] Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

20/11/8

Dated

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. 18th May 81 No. 1316
with Schedules

Nos. 1096 to 1097

Forwg. Copy of Desp. disavowing the motive imputed to this Govt. in addressing the ~~[illegible]~~ direct on the subject of the provision of funds for the M. W. works in excess of the allotment sanctioned by the Govt. of India for 1879/80

Provision of funds for the M. W. works in excess of the allotment sanctioned by the Govt. for 1879/80.

Disavowing the motive imputed to this Govt. by the S. of S. in addressing him direct ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ on the subject of the