No 2897 Wds/Decr 4. 1885

B

Recorded.-

2. On Mr Bird's return from furlough, the necessity for passing the Examination prescribed in para 97 of the P.W. Code will be pointed out to him.

W.D.
4.12.85

Rec 2/12/85.

No 2897 Wds/Decr 4. 1885

N.B.

As W. Bird is not eligible (under para 97 of P.W. Code) for promotion to rank of E.E. 4th grade, he must be temporarily superseded.

But should he pass the necessary test within a reasonable time after his return from furlough, he should in my opinion be permitted to resume his place in the list according to his College position.

W.D.
4.12.85.

With order

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

6TH CIRCLE.

Trichinopoly, 29th November 1883.

No. 1731 T.J

From

The Superintending Engineer,

6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer

P. W. D.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No 1296 T.J dated 28th September/83, and with reference to G.O. No 2910 W dated 15th October/83 I have the honor to forward the Executive Engineer Mr. Hughes further report with enclosures (which I request may be returned).

The facts of the case may be briefly stated as follows:-

2. In March Mr. Brilliard entered into a Contract to supply 3000 C. feet of timber according to scantlings at Rs 3 3/4 a cubic foot the whole of the wood was to be supplied by the 15th of July/83, Mr. Hughes the Executive Engineer appears to have sent the Contract to the Assistant Engineer Mr. Bird the sub-officer and that this officer paid all the bills, and as vouchers

approved of by you in memo No 955/C dated 14th May/83.

ENCLOSURE. 14.

1. Mr Hughes's letter No 3312/10-11-83 with a statement B, 10 Bills + Mr Bird's letter No 965/3-10-83.
1. Statement A.

for his expenditure sent only the signed bills receipted to the Division office, all measurements &c remained in his office and as far as I can see the Executive Engineer did not in any way see that the accounts, measurements &c were properly kept by the sub-officer.

3. Mr Bulliard the contractor established a workshop just outside the Jail works and as he received wood in log, Mr Bird made payments on it and as scantlings were cut further payments were made.

Wood was also required for the Palace works and although not included in the Contract, wood was received from Mr Bulliard (as also for 3 other small works) in the same way and similar payments made.

4. The payments were made on ordinary bills prepared in Mr Bird's office signed by Mr Bulliard and supported by measurements; with regard to these measurements, statement marked A shows the voucher in Mr Bird's office for each payment.

It will be noticed that bills Nos 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 10, have written on them by Mr Bird "not inspected" and I do not understand why the Examiner did not on the receipt of these bills in his office call attention to the irregularity.

5. A sum of Rs 662-12-- was deducted as security from bills Nos 3, 4, 6, 7, & 8, but Mr Bird on the 9th July in bills Nos 9 & 10 paid this amount without any reason or authority to Mr Bulliard.

6. In July Mr Bird was transferred to Sinnenelly Division being relieved by Mr Manson, on receipt of the transfer papers I found that the Jail accounts the most important work in the Division had not been gone into, I at once directed that Mr Manson should take stock and the result was a large deficiency of wood and the overpayment to Mr Bulliard was discovered.

At the end of July the Executive Engineer found that the Security money had been repaid to Mr Bulliard by Mr Bird, but instead of reporting the matter he only

addressed Mr. Bird on the subject.

7. on the bills being examined further overpayments were found — Rs 150 & 135 a Ton or Rs 3 & Rs 2.7 a c ft were paid for Logs, these rates when the rate for wrought wood was Rs 3.12. were more than ¼ should be and no deduction as usual on incomplete work was made.

Again in bill No 6 paid on the 25th May, 758 c ft of wrought scantlings were paid for in full but the value of only the same quantity of rough wood in log was deducted, no allowance being made for wastage.

8. The above shows that the accounts, measurements &c were most carelessly kept so much so that no information as regards receipts &c of the wood can be traced, the Executive Engineer Mr. Hughes has therefore taken stock of all the wood at the Palace & Jail and valued it the result is shown in statement B and is that Rs 1566-7-4. is due from Mr. Bulliard to Government.

9. With regard to this account Mr. Bulliard although not acknowledging its correctness is unable to dispute it, he allows that he has been cheated by his Agents and that he has been overpaid. He says he is willing to sign his accounts and acknowledge their correctness provided he is given contracts to enable him to work them off.

I have informed him that unless he signs his accounts I must decline to allow him to take up Govt. contracts but that if he does this and deposits Rs 1000 in Cash or Govt. paper I am willing to allow him to take up certain work on condition that 20 per cent of all payments shall go towards paying off his debt.

The Executive Engineer considers that there is no hope of recovering any of the overpayment and I must say I think it is not likely that Mr. Bulliard will be able to do so as however this Department is so much to blame for the way in which the accounts have been kept and the overpayment made

I

I think it right to make the offer I have to Mr. Bulliard.

10. In conclusion I can only remark that in my opinion Mr. Bird is directly responsible for the manner in which the accounts have been kept and the overpayments made but that the Executive Engineer Mr. Hughes ought to have seen that the accounts were properly maintained, the practice of allowing the measurements sheets on which the bills were paid to be kept in the sub-Division office was most irregular, had they as they ought to have been sent to the Division office the irregularity would have been checked in April or May.

Again the fact of the materials in Bills Nos 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, & 10, for large amns not having been inspected by the sub-officer, ought to have been brought to the notice of the Executive Engineer by his Accountant, if not directly seen by him, and most certainly the Examiner's office ought to have detected it and reported the irregularity.

Again

Again in June it ought to have struck the Executive Engineer that Mr. Bulliard would fail in completing satisfactorily in proper time this large contract — Clause 14 of the Bond ought to have been enforced and arrangements made to make him get on with work faster or to cancel his contract. At the end of July the Executive Engineer knew that he had no money on deposit as security from Mr. Bulliard and should have known of the overpayment this ought to have been reported at once.

I have the honor to be

Sir

your most obedient servant.

Asst. Engineer, Sinde.

P. W. D. 6TH CIRCLE.

From

The Superintending Engineer,

6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No. 1731 T.J

Dated 29th November 1883
Received 1/12/83

24
Enclosure. Nil.

No. 3684 Wdy Dec. 22nd 1883

Over-payment to contractor Mr. Bullian for supplying timber

Reports further on the —

DW
Do orders
Cer
5.12.83

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 188 . { P. W. DEPT.

SECRETARY.

Chepauk, 11th December 1883.

OFFICE NOTE.

To W

Overpayment of Rs. 1566 to a Contractor.

S.E. VI. reports an overpayment of Rs. 1566-7-4 to Contractor Mr. Bullivant for timber supplied to the Tanjore Jail.

This excess payment Ex. Engr. attributes to carelessness & irregularity on the part of the Sub-Division officer, Mr. Third, of the Ex. Engineer, Mr. Hughes, and of Examiner's office.

The loss is evidently due to the acceptance of a number of bills by Mr. Third without proper check.

I do not quite follow S.E. when he ascribes irregularity to Ex. Engr. & to Examiner. The bills would necessarily be passed by these officers on the certificates at first signed by Mr. Third to the effect that the claim was correct & that the materials had been received.

The words "not inspected" on back belong to the Remarks by Executive Engineer & would be entered by Mr. Hughes if he had not examined the work. That would have been no reason for Examiner rejecting

the Voucher, he then says
copies it is true this part of
bill is initialled by Mr Third
& it is therefore not clear what
the Work of it should be.

I would recommend the file being
sent to C for any remarks on the
case he would wish to offer.

Throughout this business to I
can trace the visit and expenses
attendant on the passing for
materials before they are delivered
on the works for which they are
intended.

In my opinion the Asst Engineer
was mainly to blame – next Exr:
Engineer & the Accountant, but in a
lesser degree, for not calling for the
detailed measurements, &c.

In para 9 Cl: head proposes a
way out of the difficulty, but does
not say whether Mr Chilliard has
accepted or is likely to accept the
offer made to him. Indeed if he
likes Mr Chilliard may decline any
proposal & the Dept cannot touch
him as far as I can see.

CS.

Ors.

C remarks received
& submitted.

Cr
17.12.83

this may be done.
US.
11.12.83.

Yes.

Yes.

No 2657 Dy

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 188 . { P. W. DEPT.

SECRETARY.

Chepauk, 13th December 1883.

OFFICE NOTE. R. No 929
14.12.83.
Enc: 28

To

C.

Letter from S.S. VI Ex
1296 T.J. dy 28th Sept 1883
Ditto Ex 1731 T.J. dy 29th
November 1883, with enclosures.

For any remarks on
the case you may
wish to offer.

CS
Ors
12/12

Fr. No. 11242

[Exr. Wks. Form No. 111.]

W No 29100 - 15-10-83.
955-C - 14-5-4
831 C - 20-4-4

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1883. { P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 16th December 1883.
Rec'd 17

OFFICE NOTE No. 996.

To
W.

26
Encs. 28

Your Office Note No. 3657 D.
dated 13th. December 1883.

My remarks are I presume necessary only in regard to the assertion made by the Superintending Engineer that "most certainly the Examiner's Office ought to have detected" the fact that the Materials in Bills for large sums had not been inspected by the Sub Divisional Officer.

2. The Bills in question were not submitted to the Examiner's Office, and the payments referred to have evidently been treated as for work done by Departmental Agency.

3. The only one of the amounts which is clearly traceable, Rs. 1,464, has been so treated, and the others probably followed the same course.

KEEP WITH Genl. No.

dated 18

4. Had the transactions been shewn as Contract Work there could have been no mistake such as has occurred in paying up the amount withheld as deposit from previous bills.

C.

99.
15/12

To W.

C. now explains that his office is in no way responsible for the overpayment for materials, &c.

Perhaps an order might now be drafted censuring the officers concerned for carelessness & lapsity. &c.

As regards the proposal to give further work to Mr Bulliard under certain conditions, the arrangement might be left to S.E. If Mr Bulliard declines to accept the terms offered the less will probably have to be written off to the work, but that may be settled hereafter in case the contractor refuses.

C.S.
18/12

Yes. above suggestion may be followed.

18-12-83.

Unquestionably W. Bird is the person most in fault, but the Exec: Engineer must share in the censure

18-12-83.

No 3684W.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the Decr 22nd 1883

READ the following

Letter from the Supdg: Engr.
Sixth Circle A.C. No 1731 T.J. d/ 29th Novr/83.
Office Note from the Examiner
P.W. Accounts — 996 d/ 17th December/83

In his letter above recorded, the Superintending Engineer, Sixth Circle, reports a serious overpayment, amounting to Rs 566-7-4, to a Contractor Mr Bulliard, for timber supplied on account of the Tanjore Jail works.

2. This excess payment Colonel Mead attributes to carelessness and irregularity on the part of the Sub-Division officer, Mr Bird, of the Executive Engineer,

Mr. Hughes, and of the
Examiner's office.

3. The loss is evidently
due to the acceptance of
a number of bills by
Mr. Bird without proper
check, and to the failure
of the Executive Engineer
to detect the irregular
manner in which the ac=
=counts were kept. The
risk and confusion at=
=tendant on payment
for materials, before they
have been delivered on the
works for which they are
intended, can be traced
throughout the report.

4. In the opinion of
Government, Mr. Bird, the
Assistant Engineer, was
mainly to blame; next, but in a lesser degree,
the Executive Engineer, and
the Accountant, for not
calling for detailed mea=
=surements. The Examiner
P.W. Accounts explains that

his office is in no way
responsible for the over=
=payment, in as much as
the bills in question were
not submitted to him,
and that the payments
were evidently treated as
for work done by depart=
=mental agency.

5. The Government
desire that an expression
of their grave disapproval
be conveyed to Mr. Bird,
Assistant Engineer, for
the carelessness and laxity
displayed by him in this
case. Mr. Hughes, the Exe=
=cutive Engineer, must
also be censured for failing
to maintain a more care=
=ful watch over the ac=
=counts of the Sub Division.
Mr. Bird has since been
transferred to another Divi=
=sion, and he will now be
informed that his future
promotion will depend on
the manner in which he

conducts his duties.

6. As regards the proposal to give further work to Mr. Bulliard under certain conditions, the arrangement will be left to the Supty. Engineer, but the re= =sult should be re= =ported hereafter for the information of Government.

Cr / Cl. 20/12

Ll. 20.12.83.

No. 3684 W dated Dec. 22nd 1883

7 C
No 121 C 17.1.84
B. No. 517 W. 25-2-84.
" 1866 W-12-6-84.

Ll. 15/1

Dft W Dec 20/12

To

The Supty. Engineer /
Sixth Circle, with 24 enclos
Ear Roa (extract from
Entd in Rect Letts Vol 4)

49C

Ld 14/1

No. 680 Ed/ Sept. 30. 1885.

P. W. Dept.

Memorandum.

With adverence to para 5 of GO No: 3684 W dated 22nd December 1883, the Superintending Engi= =neer VI Circle is requested to report whether, in his opinion, the conduct and attention to duty of Mr. W. L. Bird Assistant Engineer 1st Grade, was such, before he proceeded on leave, that the presumption

restriction as regards his promotion may be removed.

30.9.85

No. 680 Ed/ Sptr 30. 1885.

To The S.E. VI Circle

30/9/85

Superintending Engineer's Office
Trichinopoly. 12th October 1885

No. 371, T.D.

From.

The Superintending Engineer
6th Circle.

To,

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to your Memo No. 680-E dated 30th September 1885, I have the honor to report that in my opinion the restriction as regards Mr. Bird's Asstt Engineer's promotion with reference to para 5 of G.O No. 3684 W dated 22nd December 1883 may be now removed as the case in question is now more than 2 year's old.

I regret I was not satisfied with Mr. Bird's work in Tinnevelly District during the time he was in

in charge of the Division but it has
to be remembered that he was not
in good health and he was detained
for 3 months after his furlough
had been granted to him owing
to there being no Officer available
to relieve him. In Conclusion I
have to remark that I believe
Mr Bird is not eligible for promotion
as he has not passed the necessary
language test.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obed't Servt

Col R.E.
Superintending Engineer 6th Div.

Rec'd 8967

From,

The Supg engineer

6th Circle

To,

The Chief engineer

P. W. D.

No. 371, T.D.

Dated 12: October/85

Rec'd 14 —

No. 2423 D of 24th October 1885

Mr. Bird asst. engr.

Requests that the restriction as regards promotion of — may be now removed for reasons given.

C. No. 8967

Note

Mr. W. L. Bird is entered in the Classified List as having passed the Departmental Standard in Hindustani & the colloquial examination in Tamil.

Under old para 97 of the P. W. Code his passing in Hindustani was enough to allow him being promoted E. E. 4th hnt under new para 97 of the Code (issued in 1884) an Asst. Engr: 1st grade must pass the Third Class (or Departmental Standard) test in Tamil, Telugu, Canarese, or Malayalam to entitle him to promotion to the E. E. 4th grade.

As Mr. Bird became an Asst: Engr: 1st grade

No. 2423 D.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Chepâk, 24th October 1885.

OFFICE NOTE.

From W

To C.

Kindly let me know whether Mr W. L Bird, Asst. Engineer 1st grade, is qualified for promotion to Exn. Engineer 4th Grade.

(Sgd) D McN Campbell.
Capta R.E.
D.W.

in 1881 The rule of 1884 was not considered as being a bar against his promotion in June 84.

Mr. Davidson has also only passed the Departmt: Standard in Hindustani & the colloquial exam: in Tamil. & he is now an Exec: Engnr.

W
14.10

No. 2423 D.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Chepâk, 24th October 1885.

OFFICE NOTE.

From W

To C.

Kindly let me know whether Mr W. L Bird, Asst. Engineer 1st grade, is qualified for promotion to Exr. Engineer 4th Grade.

(Sgd) D McN Campbell.
Captn R.E.
D.W.

No. 680 E. 30.9.85.

No. 2423 D. dated 24th October 1885.

E
W.
24.10

[Form No. viii.]

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1885. { P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 9th November 1885.

OFFICE NOTE No. 635.

To

W.

Your O.N.No. 2433 D. dated 24th. October 1885.

There is no record of his having passed the test prescribed by P.W.D. Code para 97, as modified by Standing Order No. 236 of 1884.

C.

Ex. 9.11

KEEP-WITH Genl. No.

dated 188 .

Rec'd 9728

Rec'd 10/11/83.

No. 2627 Day 18-11-83

P.W. Deptt

No. 2627 Day 18th Nov 1883

Office-Note

From

W

To

Please state when Mr W. L. Bird, Asstt Engineer, First grade, passed the Departmental Standard in Hindustani (vide page 12 of the latest P.W.D. Classified List).

I Dy Secy

DW

No. 2423 Dag 24-10-85

No. 2627 Dag 18-11-85

36

Statement showing the Engineer, Upper Subordinate and Accounts Establishment as they would stand probably on the 30 June /82

Name	Rank	Nature of Guard	Date of appointment: To Grade	Date of appointment: To Rank	Total Service in the Deptt	Station	Date of appointment to Division	Date of birth	European / Eurasian / or Native	Remarks
Engineer										
W Hughes Esquire MA AMJCE	Exe Engineer 3 grade	DST	Oct/81	June/68	13.10	Tanjore	April 1880	1 Nov/47	European	
W L Bird Esquire ———	Asst Engineer 1 grade	Do tt	— Do —	Oct/75	6.9. "	— Do —	— Do —	23 Sept/52	— Do —	
GB Saulez Esquire AMJCE ———	— Do —	Lieut Telugu tte.	— Do —	Oct/77	4.9. "	— Do —	April/82	22.12.82	— Do —	
Upper Subordinate										
M W J Baker ———	Sub Engineer 1 grade	DS Tett	— Do —	June/64	18 " "	Mayaveram	April/80	24.4.46	— Do —	
S Mahadeva Iyer ———	— Do —	3 grade		— Do —	April/72	10.2 "	Kumbaconum	— Do —	23.10.47	Native
Sergt A Temple ———	Supervisor 1st grade	DST	— Do —	June/74	8 " "	Grand Anicut	— Do —	18.6.46	European	
Mr E Daly ———	— Do —	2nd grade	+ te	— Do —	May/70	12.1 "	Kumbaconum			
R Rajagopala Iyengar —	Apprentice Supervisor			Nov/81	Nov/81	" 8 "	Tanjore	Nov/81	Feb: 58	Native
S. Ruthnasawmy Mudr —	Overseer 1st grade		Incld 81	Oct/81	June/68	14 " "	— Do —	April/80	17.1.46	— Do —
L Vettivalu Pillay —	——— Do ———		Do —	— Do —	Augt/68	13.10 "	Mayaveram	March/82	5 6 38	— Do —
RL Visvanatha Iyer —	— Do — 2 grade		April 80	— Do —	July/74	7.11 "	Tanjore	April/80	18.8.82	— Do —
M Moonesawmy Mudr —	——— Do ———		Oct 82	— Do —	April/86	16.2.4	Nannilam	— Do —	" 10.85	— Do —
I Iparasumbundum Pillay ———	— Do —		Do	— Do —	Augt/75	6.10 "	Shealey	— Do —	" 9.53	— Do —
Accounts.										
S. Krishnasawmy Iyer —	Accountant 1 grade		1st July/80	March/72	10.3 "	Tanjore	March/81	" 10.51	— Do —	

Transferred to Madura Division

Not yet joined

17 June /82

To

The Executive Engineer

Rs Accounts with reference to his Circular No 72826 dated 17 May /82

W Hughes
Executive Engineer
8/9/6

EXAMINER P.W.
No. 3945
26 NOV 1885.
ENCLOSURE 1
ACCOUNTS

D. P. W.

FROM
The Executive Engineer,
TANJORE.

To *The Examiner of P.W. Accounts*

Station *Tanjore*

No. 2573

Dated 24
Despatched 24 } November 85.
Received

ENCLOSURE. *1 Leaf.*

Reference. *Your Dto 210/586 20.11.85.*

Sir

In returning the enclosure received with the above I have the honor to

[C. No. 8.]

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1885. { P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras November - 30 - 1885.

OFFICE NOTE No. 696.

To

SECRETARIAT GOVERNMENT 1 DEC DEPARTMENT

Encls: 2. (To be returned)

W.

Your O.N.No. 3637 D. dated 18th. November 1885.

Please see accompanying letter from the Executive Engineer Tanjore Division No. 2573 dated 24th. November 1885. The Classified List now in Press has been corrected by omitting the letters D.S. against Mr. Bird's name.

C.

C. Note 30/11.

KEEP-WITH Genl. No.

dated 188 .

to inform You that, as far as it is known Mr. Bird assistant has not passed in Hindustani. The first Statement sent from this Office, showing the entry D.S. has been prepared hurriedly and incorrectly, and this has been printed in subsequent classified lists of Establishment.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedient

W Kaylee
Accountant

KEEP-WI

dated