

P. H. D.

No. 78 of 15-9-76

No. 2094 of 8-Sept/85

These Proceedings will be communicated to the Director General of Railways, with request that the value of the missing rail may be written off against the Bellary District Railway.

2. The Supt. Engrs & Civil will draw the attention of the General Supt. Public Works Stores & Port & Harbour to the rules communicated with G.O. No. 78 dated 15th April 1876.

3. 9. 5
1. 9. 85

7. R. (for perusal of counter initials)

5. 9. 85

To the Dir. of Ry.
" Ch. of Ry.
" S. E. & Civil
" Dy. State Ry. Secy.

137/8. P. 2379 8. 9. 85
109-29-8-85 P. 5. 9. 85

Dec 7335

Govt. of (1885) Madras.

MARINE.

10 S.C.

Issued

Recd. 21/8/85

Encl.

G.O., 7th August 1885, No. 328.

No. 2094 of 8-9-85

AUGUST.

Good Records for file.
F.C. 24/8/85
C. 8256-23-9-85
24/8/85

Stores.

Ordering that the value of a rail missing from a consignment brought out by the S.S. *Hawraen* be adjusted under orders in the Public Works department, and drawing the attention of all departments, to the rules for shipping and landing Government —, issued with G.O., No. 297 of 1876, Marine.

with order

7TH AUGUST 1885, No. 328, MARINE.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieut., R.N.R., Master Attendant, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 23rd July 1885, No. 6054.

Administrative department.

I have the honor to state that the steamer *Hawarden* brought out a consignment of steel rails for the Bellary-Kistna Railway in January last, and that, according to the accounts kept on board by the Government tally-clerk, seven rails were missing, the value of which was duly deducted from the vessel's remaining freight; but the Port Storekeeper, State Railway Stores, gave a receipt for the consignment showing eight rails as short-landed, and held this department responsible for the extra one deficient according to his account, as this office did not consider the vessel liable for the same.

2. In the discussion which followed on the matter, the Port Storekeeper first maintained that the account kept by his subordinates on shore must be taken as correct, and not that kept by the tally-clerk on board. He next declared that, admitting the vessel was not liable, it only shifted the responsibility to the Marine department and its boatmen, the boats sent off being hired boats. Finally, he wrote that the rail was lost by being buried in the sand owing to the fact that the boatmen of this department unloaded and left the rail so close to the water's edge that they were repeatedly covered by the surf before they could be removed.

3. It cannot fail to strike any one that the last theory was an after-thought; because, if such was actually the case, it was the most natural thing to say so at once when the dispute first arose, and not after other grounds had failed. The consignment consisted of 11,075 rails, and if they were discharged by the boatmen in the careless manner it is attempted to be made out, the loss should have certainly been much greater, and not limited to one single rail. The fact was that the boatmen as usual put down the rails beyond the reach of the surf at the time of landing, but a sufficient number of coolies were not employed by the Port Storekeeper's people to remove them at once. The rails were therefore allowed to accumulate as boat-load after boat-load was discharged, and, before the whole could be removed, a spring-tide setting in, the water washed over a portion of the rails. However, there is nothing to show that the missing rail was actually lost by being buried in the sand.

4. The Port Storekeeper further endeavoured to make out that the rails were not taken charge of till they were stacked and counted. Such a course would have been contrary to the rules; but what actually took place was that the rails, as they were put out of the boats, were removed, under the superintendence of his own subordinates and by coolies employed by them, to a convenient spot on the beach, where they were stacked and kept in charge of his people till they were carted away, which occupied some days. They were never at any time in the custody of the Second Assistant Master Attendant.

5. The rules * sanctioned by Government for observance in discharging Government consignments (paragraph 2) provide that the Second Assistant Master Attendant will arrange for the discharge of Government cargo, being careful to

* Vide G.O., No. 297, dated 7th August 1876.

intimate previously to the departments concerned when any of their stores are likely to reach the pier or shore, in order that a trusty subordinate may be sent to take charge of them. This system was decided upon, after careful consideration and from past experience, as the most economical and efficient arrangement that could be adopted; for if the Second Assistant Master Attendant was to take charge of all Government cargo discharged from boats on the beach and the pier, a large and costly establishment of writers, conicopolies, and peons would be required to watch the landings, to keep accounts of receipts and deliveries, and conduct correspondence with departments. The enormous cooly-labor necessary would require to be supplied by the Marine department, and subordinates employed to superintend the coolies. To crown all, endless disputes would arise with departments regarding damage and short-delivery of stores pending delivery. To avoid all this the above rule was framed, and it has worked most satisfactorily.

6. The present controversy with the Port Storekeeper suggests the advisability of Government confirming the rule and impressing on departments the duty imposed on them by the same, viz., that they are required to receive delivery of stores as they are discharged from the boats or as they reach the inner end of the pier.

7. With regard to the missing rail, it appears the consignment was stacked and kept on the beach for some days and were carted to the railway for despatch, during which time the loss might have occurred. Considering all the circumstances of the case, I beg respectfully to suggest that it be ordered to be written off. The value of the rail is Rs. 7-8-0.

ORDER—dated 7th August 1885, No. 328, Marine.

The value of the missing rail will be adjusted under orders in the Public Works department.

2. The attention of all departments will be called to the rules for shipping and landing Government stores, issued with G.O., No. 297 (Marine), dated 7th August 1876, a strict observance of which is enjoined.

(True Extract.)

E. F. WEBSTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Master Attendant, Madras.

„ Revenue department.

„ Public Works „

„ Military „

„ Heads of departments at Madras under the Chief Secretary.

Exd. E. Fernandez.

N^o 2094 Madras 8th Sept 1885.

These Proceedings will be communicated to the Director General of Railways, with request that the value of the missing rail may be written off against the Bellary Kistna Railway.

2. The Suptg. Engineer V Circle will draw the attention of the General Supt. Public Works Stores and Port Storekeeper to the rules communicated with G.O. N^o 78 dated 15th April 1896.

(Signed) J.H.

To
The D. Genl. of Rys:
- C. L. for Rys.
- S. E. V Circle
- Secy to State Ry. Accts.

P.W.D.

Govt. of (1885) Madras
MARINE.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 7th August 1885, No. 328.

N^o 2094 Madras 8th Sept 1885.

AUGUST.

Stores.

Ordering that the value of a rail missing from a consignment brought out by the S.S. *Hawarden* be adjusted under orders in the Public Works department, and drawing the attention of all departments, to the rules for shipping and landing Government —, issued with G.O., No. 297 of 1876, Marine.

With order

7TH AUGUST 1885, No. 328, MARINE.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieut., R.N.R., Master Attendant, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 23rd July 1885, No. 6054.

Administrative department.

I have the honor to state that the steamer *Hawarden* brought out a consignment of steel rails for the Bellary-Kistna Railway in January last, and that, according to the accounts kept on board by the Government tally-clerk, seven rails were missing, the value of which was duly deducted from the vessel's remaining freight; but the Port Storekeeper, State Railway Stores, gave a receipt for the consignment showing eight rails as short-landed, and held this department responsible for the extra one deficient according to his account, as this office did not consider the vessel liable for the same.

2. In the discussion which followed on the matter, the Port Storekeeper first maintained that the account kept by his subordinates on shore must be taken as correct, and not that kept by the tally-clerk on board. He next declared that, admitting the vessel was not liable, it only shifted the responsibility to the Marine department and its boatmen, the boats sent off being hired boats. Finally, he wrote that the rail was lost by being buried in the sand owing to the fact that the boatmen of this department unloaded and left the rail so close to the water's edge that they were repeatedly covered by the surf before they could be removed.

3. It cannot fail to strike any one that the last theory was an after-thought; because, if such was actually the case, it was the most natural thing to say so at once when the dispute first arose, and not after other grounds had failed. The consignment consisted of 11,075 rails, and if they were discharged by the boatmen in the careless manner it is attempted to be made out, the loss should have certainly been much greater, and not limited to one single rail. The fact was that the boatmen as usual put down the rails beyond the reach of the surf at the time of landing, but a sufficient number of coolies were not employed by the Port Storekeeper's people to remove them at once. The rails were therefore allowed to accumulate as boat-load after boat-load was discharged, and, before the whole could be removed, a spring-tide setting in, the water washed over a portion of the rails. However, there is nothing to show that the missing rail was actually lost by being buried in the sand.

4. The Port Storekeeper further endeavoured to make out that the rails were not taken charge of till they were stacked and counted. Such a course would have been contrary to the rules; but what actually took place was that the rails, as they were put out of the boats, were removed, under the superintendence of his own subordinates and by coolies employed by them, to a convenient spot on the beach, where they were stacked and kept in charge of his people till they were carted away, which occupied some days. They were never at any time in the custody of the Second Assistant Master Attendant.

5. The rules * sanctioned by Government for observance in discharging Government consignments (paragraph 2) provide that the Second Assistant Master Attendant will arrange for the discharge of Government cargo, being careful to

* Vide G.O., No. 297, dated 7th August 1876.

intimate previously to the departments concerned when any of their stores are likely to reach the pier or shore, in order that a trusty subordinate may be sent to take charge of them. This system was decided upon, after careful consideration and from past experience, as the most economical and efficient arrangement that could be adopted; for if the Second Assistant Master Attendant was to take charge of all Government cargo discharged from boats on the beach and the pier, a large and costly establishment of writers, conicopolies, and peons would be required to watch the landings, to keep accounts of receipts and deliveries, and conduct correspondence with departments. The enormous cooly-labor necessary would require to be supplied by the Marine department, and subordinates employed to superintend the coolies. To crown all, endless disputes would arise with departments regarding damage and short-delivery of stores pending delivery. To avoid all this the above rule was framed, and it has worked most satisfactorily.

6. The present controversy with the Port Storekeeper suggests the advisability of Government confirming the rule and impressing on departments the duty imposed on them by the same, viz., that they are required to receive delivery of stores as they are discharged from the boats or as they reach the inner end of the pier.

7. With regard to the missing rail, it appears the consignment was stacked and kept on the beach for some days and were carted to the railway for despatch, during which time the loss might have occurred. Considering all the circumstances of the case, I beg respectfully to suggest that it be ordered to be written off. The value of the rail is Rs. 7-8-0.

ORDER—dated 7th August 1885, No. 328, Marine.

The value of the missing rail will be adjusted under orders in the Public Works department.

2. The attention of all departments will be called to the rules for shipping and landing Government stores, issued with G.O., No. 297 (Marine), dated 7th August 1876, a strict observance of which is enjoined.

(True Extract.)

E. F. WEBSTER,
Chief Secretary.

To the Master Attendant, Madras.

„ Revenue department.

„ Public Works „

„ Military „

„ Heads of departments at Madras under the Chief Secretary.

Exd. E. Fernandez.

Govt. of (1885) Madras.
MARINE.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 7th August 1885, No. 328.

AUGUST.

Stores.

Ordering that the value of a rail missing from a consignment brought out by the S.S. *Hawaraen* be adjusted under orders in the Public Works department, and drawing the attention of all departments, to the rules for shipping and landing Government —, issued with G.O., No. 297 of 1876, Marine.

7TH AUGUST 1885, No. 328, MARINE.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieut., R.N.B., Master Attendant, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 23rd July 1885, No. 6054.

Administrative department.

I have the honor to state that the steamer *Hawarden* brought out a consignment of steel rails for the Bellary-Kistna Railway in January last, and that, according to the accounts kept on board by the Government tally-clerk, seven rails were missing, the value of which was duly deducted from the vessel's remaining freight; but the Port Storekeeper, State Railway Stores, gave a receipt for the consignment showing eight rails as short-landed, and held this department responsible for the extra one deficient according to his account, as this office did not consider the vessel liable for the same.

2. In the discussion which followed on the matter, the Port Storekeeper first maintained that the account kept by his subordinates on shore must be taken as correct, and not that kept by the tally-clerk on board. He next declared that, admitting the vessel was not liable, it only shifted the responsibility to the Marine department and its boatmen, the boats sent off being hired boats. Finally, he wrote that the rail was lost by being buried in the sand owing to the fact that the boatmen of this department unloaded and left the rail so close to the water's edge that they were repeatedly covered by the surf before they could be removed.

3. It cannot fail to strike any one that the last theory was an after-thought; because, if such was actually the case, it was the most natural thing to say so at once when the dispute first arose, and not after other grounds had failed. The consignment consisted of 11,075 rails, and if they were discharged by the boatmen in the careless manner it is attempted to be made out, the loss should have certainly been much greater, and not limited to one single rail. The fact was that the boatmen as usual put down the rails beyond the reach of the surf at the time of landing, but a sufficient number of coolies were not employed by the Port Storekeeper's people to remove them at once. The rails were therefore allowed to accumulate as boat-load after boat-load was discharged, and, before the whole could be removed, a spring-tide setting in, the water washed over a portion of the rails. However, there is nothing to show that the missing rail was actually lost by being buried in the sand.

4. The Port Storekeeper further endeavoured to make out that the rails were not taken charge of till they were stacked and counted. Such a course would have been contrary to the rules; but what actually took place was that the rails, as they were put out of the boats, were removed, under the superintendence of his own subordinates and by coolies employed by them, to a convenient spot on the beach, where they were stacked and kept in charge of his people till they were carted away, which occupied some days. They were never at any time in the custody of the Second Assistant Master Attendant.

5. The rules * sanctioned by Government for observance in discharging Government consignments (paragraph 2) provide that the Second Assistant Master Attendant will arrange for the discharge of Government cargo, being careful to

* Vide G.O., No. 297, dated 7th August 1876.

intimate previously to the departments concerned when any of their stores are likely to reach the pier or shore, in order that a trusty subordinate may be sent to take charge of them. This system was decided upon, after careful consideration and from past experience, as the most economical and efficient arrangement that could be adopted; for if the Second Assistant Master Attendant was to take charge of all Government cargo discharged from boats on the beach and the pier, a large and costly establishment of writers, conicopolies, and peons would be required to watch the landings, to keep accounts of receipts and deliveries, and conduct correspondence with departments. The enormous cooly-labor necessary would require to be supplied by the Marine department, and subordinates employed to superintend the coolies. To crown all, endless disputes would arise with departments regarding damage and short-delivery of stores pending delivery. To avoid all this the above rule was framed, and it has worked most satisfactorily.

6. The present controversy with the Port Storekeeper suggests the advisability of Government confirming the rule and impressing on departments the duty imposed on them by the same, viz., that they are required to receive delivery of stores as they are discharged from the boats or as they reach the inner end of the pier.

7. With regard to the missing rail, it appears the consignment was stacked and kept on the beach for some days and were carted to the railway for despatch, during which time the loss might have occurred. Considering all the circumstances of the case, I beg respectfully to suggest that it be ordered to be written off. The value of the rail is Rs. 7-8-0.

ORDER—dated 7th August 1885, No. 328, Marine.

The value of the missing rail will be adjusted under orders in the Public Works department.

2. The attention of all departments will be called to the rules for shipping and landing Government stores, issued with G.O., No. 297 (Marine), dated 7th August 1876, a strict observance of which is enjoined.

(True Extract.)

Justus

Chief Secretary.

To the Master Attendant, Madras.

" Revenue department.

" Public Works „

" Military „

" Heads of departments at Madras under the Chief Secretary.

Exd. E. Fernandez.