16TH JUNE 1883, No. 1699 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

READ—the following letter from G. H. W. WALKER, Esq., Officiating Under Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department (General), to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Simla, 21st May 1883, No. 742 G. :—

In reply to your letter, No. 1132 W., dated 16th April 1883, I am directed to communicate sanction to the temporary establishment marginally noted for a period of one year for the execution of the Rushikulya Project, and to request, should it be found necessary to retain the establishment for a longer period, that application for renewal of sanction may be submitted three months before the expiry of the present sanction.

	RS.
1 Executive Engineer	650
1 Assistant do.	450
1 do. do.	350

2. As regards the request that the Government of India will obtain the services of qualified persons for the appointments now sanctioned, I am to state that the Governments of Bengal and the North-Western Provinces and Oudh have been asked if they can recommend any Engineers who would answer both for this and the tank systems, and if so to inform you direct, giving full particulars of their qualification; meanwhile, the Government of India will not object to the Madras Government engaging Royal Engineer Officers temporarily in the fourth grade of Executive Engineer from the Madras Sappers and Miners if they can be spared, but I am to say that it is considered the local Government might do more towards supplying the temporary Assistant Engineers required from amongst the passed students of its own Civil Engineering College.

3. The rest of the temporary appointments which do not exceed Rs. 250 a month can be sanctioned by the Madras Government under Public Works Code, I, 88.

4. I am to add that these sanctions are not to be taken as affecting the general question of the strength of the permanent establishment for Madras, which is being separately considered.

ORDER—dated 16th June 1883, No. 1699 W., Public Works.

Communicated to officers concerned.

2. The Superintending Engineer will at the proper time report on the subject of paragraph 1 of the foregoing letter.

3. The question of the provision of the necessary Engineer Establishment for the project will be dealt with separately.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Superintending Engineer, First Circle.
,, Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
,, Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. C. Howarth.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of (1883) Madras

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated June, 16th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 16th June 1883, No. 1699 W.

JUNE.

Rushikulya Project

Temporary establishment for the — of one Executive and two Assistant Engineers. — Letter from the Government of India sanctioning a —, communicated, with remarks, to officers concerned.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

Read—the following letter from G. H. W. WALKER, Esq., Officiating Under Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department (General), to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Simla, 21st May 1883, No. 741 G. :—

		RS.
2 Executive Engineers	... ...	650 each.
1 Assistant Engineer	... ...	450
1 Sub-Engineer	... ...	300

In reply to your letters, Nos. 1134 W. and 1212 W., of 16th and 23rd April 1883, I am directed to communicate sanction to the temporary establishment marginally noted, required for dealing systematically with the tank system for the period of one year, and to state that should it become necessary to retain the establishment in question for a longer period, application should be made for renewal of sanction three months before the expiry of the present sanction.

2. As regards the appointment of a Superintending Engineer for this work, I am to remind you that a Superintendent of Works, and not a Superintending Engineer, has already been sanctioned by the Government of India in Public Works Department, No. 459 G., of 19th March 1883, and you were informed in Public Works Department letter, No. 502 G., of 4th April 1883, that the local Government was at liberty to employ one of its Superintending Engineers on this duty if it was considered necessary, filling up his place by a Superintendent of Works; no further orders are therefore required on this point.

3. The rest of the temporary establishment to which sanction is asked can be sanctioned by the Madras Government under Public Works Code, I, 88.

4. As regards appointment of officers to fill these posts, I am to refer you to paragraph 2 of Public Works Department letter, No. 742 G., of 21st May 1883, and to add that the present sanction must not be taken as affecting the question of the strength of the permanent establishment which is being separately considered.

Order—dated 16th June 1883, No. 1700 W., Public Works.

Communicated to officers concerned.

2. The Superintending Engineer will at the proper time report on the subject of paragraph 1 of the foregoing letter.

3. The question of the provision of the necessary Engineer Establishment for the project will be dealt with separately.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
„ Superintending Engineer, Tank Maintenance Scheme.
„ Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. C. Howarth.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of {1883} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated June, 16th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 16th June 1883, No. 1700 W.

JUNE.

Tank Systems

Temporary establishment of one Assistant and two Executive Engineers and a Sub-Engineer for dealing systematically with the —. The sanction of the Government of India to the entertainment of a —, communicated, with remarks, to officers concerned.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

4th September 1879, No. 491 I.

Irrigation.
Account.

Read the following paper :—

No. 15. Endorsement of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Ootacamund, 23rd August 1879, No. 223 I.

From J. W. RUNDALL, Esq., Acting Superintending Engineer, Fifth Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Alenagaram, 18th July 1879, No. 300 T.C.

I HAVE the honor to bring the following circumstances to your notice, and request that the orders of Government may be obtained in the matter.

2. On the 17th January last I received a petition from one Mannarsawmy Iyer, claiming Rupees 1,800 as due on an estimate of Rupees 3,300 for planting nanel on the left bank of the Coleroon in the Trichinopoly District, and Rupees 400 for extra work done on the same estimate.

3. I requested the Executive Engineer, Trichinopoly, to be good enough to inquire into and report on the claims put forward. On the 14th June I received from Major Smalley, R.E., a report from Sub-Engineer Syed Yusuf, together with a number of documents, from which, with the papers subsequently called for by me, the following facts are elicited.

4. An estimate, amounting to Rupees 3,300, of which there is only a rough copy to be found, was prepared by Sub-Engineer Syed Yusuf for planting nanel grass on the left bank of Coleroon, between 42nd and 66th mile stones. The date marked on this estimate is 6th December 1876, but this is manifestly wrong, as the amounts of this estimate are referred to in the contract bond dated 20th November, hereafter referred to.

5. Sub-Engineer Syed Yusuf was moved to Bellary in November 1876, and Overseer Manikam Pillay was in temporary charge of the Udiarpoliem Range, and while in charge made a contract with one Mannarsawmy Iyer for executing the planting work according to the Sub-Engineer's estimate; the amounts of the items being copied into the bond. This contract was never submitted to the District Engineer nor formally approved by him; the conditions are absurd, as the contractor was to work according to the specification when there was no such document, and to complete the work before the 20th December, that is in one month, and to be paid after inspection, no date being fixed for the inspection.

6. This contract was dated the very day Mr. Evans, Assistant Engineer, then recently arrived from England, relieved Overseer Manikam Pillay from charge of the range. Mr. Evans states that he was directed by Colonel Vertue to revise Syed Yusuf's estimate, and was under the impression he had considerably reduced it. In this he is wrong, as the total of Mr. Evan's estimate (including sundries) is the same as that prepared by Sub-Engineer Syed Yusuf, viz., Rupees 3,300; the two differ only in the quantity of nanel to be planted with channels and without channels.

This estimate was sanctioned in March 1877. Mr. Evans states that he believes the contractor carried out the work on his estimate, and, as far as he inspected the work, it was properly done. The late Colonel Vertue inspected the planting in company with Mr. Evans during the months of January and February. It is stated also that Colonel Vertue inspected the work again in June 1877, and that in February he directed some further planting in the 68th mile, for which the contractor now claims Rupees 400.

7. The exact date on which the contractor completed the work on the main estimate cannot be ascertained, nor are there any measurements of Mr. Evans to be found on record. Mr. Evans, to whom references on this subject have been made, states that he left the Udiarpoliem Range for Musiri in February or March 1877, and though he continued to hold charge of the former range till the 5th April 1877, he was never in Udiarpoliem again.

8. On the 31st March a part payment of Rupees 1,500 was made by Mr. Evans, but no measurements are attached to the office copy of the receipt, which is stated distinctly to be in *part* payment.

9. The contractor contends that he finished the work on the 20th December 1876, and that when he was paid the Rupees 1,500 he was told that no more funds were available. It is true that Rupees 1,500 was the amount appropriated in 1876-77 on the estimate of Rupees 3,300.

10. I can only account for Mr. Evans making a payment of Rupees 1,500 without, as far as can now be ascertained, any measurements being taken, on the supposition that Mr. Evans was new to the country and was not acquainted with departmental rules. It is not however likely he would have paid the money unless satisfied that a considerable amount of work had been done. Mr. Evans now says he cannot state from memory what portions of the work were inspected and measured by him. This of course is not to be wondered at. On 27th, 28th, 29th January, Mr. Evans remarks in his diary that nanel at Madavacurichi and Karupur is growing satisfactorily.

11. On the 5th April 1877 Sub-Engineer Muniappa Pillay took charge of the Udiarpoliem Range.

12. The work having been stated to be complete, and being entered in the progress report for April 1877, signed by Sub-Engineer Muniappa Pillay as "almost completed," it was clearly this subordinate's duty to have checked the work and settled with the contractor. No step in this direction seems to have been taken by the Sub-Engineer himself, though in May 1877 a Sub-Overseer made some measurements to be presently referred to. On the 19th October 1877 the contractor petitioned Captain Morris, R.E., then Acting District Engineer, for payment of the balance due to him, stated to be Rupees 1,800. This petition was sent for report to Sub-Engineer Muniappa Pillay, who replied in a long letter throwing doubt on the amount of nanel which should be paid for, as Colonel Vertue's instructions were that only such nanel as grew properly was to be paid for. The Sub-Engineer does not state that he had made any measurements or in any way checked the contractor's work himself, but refers to measurements made by a Sub-Overseer, Thavacoty Pillay, which he states prove that "nanel plantation to the extent of Rupees 1,210-7-4 only is growing." The Sub-Engineer concludes by stating that, in his opinion, the contractor had been paid as much as he was entitled to. This opinion unsupported by measurements checked by himself, to show the extent of nanel growing at the time the measurements were made, is, in my opinion, worthless.

13. Captain Morris' reply to this letter was a memorandum* addressed to the Sub-Engineer, in which he is informed that the extra planting ordered by Colonel Vertue should be paid for, and that as regards work on the original estimate, the Sub-Engineer is to do his best to arrange the matter amicably with the contractor. In reply† Muniappa Pillay points out that the original estimate had not been cancelled, and says he will endeavour to arrange the matter. The contractor, on the 25th February, again petitioned Captain Morris for a settlement, and Captain Morris endorsed this petition to the effect that the Sub-Engineer had been ordered to pay for the extra work ordered by the late District Engineer; but Captain Morris gave no reply regarding the sum claimed as balance of the original estimate. On the 25th February 1878 Sub-Engineer Muniappa Pillay reports that he has paid Rupees 162-13-6 for the extra work. This was measured by Sub-Overseer Thavacoty Pillay, who reports that the measurement was "entirely based on the guidance of his last visit," as the nanel had all been covered with silt. The planting in this case at least answered its purpose. In his petition to me the contractor claims Rupees 400 for this extra work, but as no sum was claimed in his previous petitions to Captain Morris, and as the receipt he gave was for *final* payment on this account, I do not think anything more should be paid.

14. As regards the sum claimed as balance of the original estimate, I think that the contractor should be paid the balance of the estimate without sundries, as revised by Mr. Evans under Colonel Vertue's orders, *viz.*, Rupees 3,216-10-4 — Rs. 1,500 = Rupees 1,716-10-4. There seems to be no reason to doubt that the contractor worked in good faith, and that Mr. Evans, though prevented from or neglecting to take proper measurements, was yet satisfied with the work done. Sub-Engineer Muniappa Pillay, who relieved Mr. Evans on 5th April 1877, should at once have made the necessary measurements, and I do not think we could base a refusal to pay on the unchecked measurements of a Sub-Overseer.

15. The contractor's claim cannot be supported by any measurements whatever, and I request the favor of orders on the subject.

SUBMITTED to Government.

In this letter the Superintending Engineer reports on claims made by a contractor named Mannarsawmy Iyer on account of nanel planting on the left side of the Coleroon in the Trichinopoly District.

2. Mr. Rundall's report is so full that it is unnecessary to do more than very briefly recapitulate the leading features of the transactions :—

1st.—Sometime in 1876 an estimate of Rupees 3,300, of which only a rough copy is to be found, was framed by Sub-Engineer Syed Yusuf for the planting of nanel.

2nd.—In connection with this estimate a contract was entered into in November 1876 by Overseer Manikam Pillay, then temporarily in charge of the range. The contract was not submitted to the District Engineer for approval, and it referred to a specification which was not drawn up.

3rd.—Mr. Evans, Assistant Engineer, took charge of the range on the same day as the date of the contract, and he states that he was directed by the late Colonel Vertue to revise the estimate. The only revision made appears to have been in the manner of doing the work. This estimate was sanctioned by the District Engineer in March 1877, that is several months after the date of the contract. The work was inspected by the District Engineer, Mr. Evans being with him, in January and February 1877, and some additional or extra work in the 68th mile was then ordered to be done.

4th.—No measurements of work done by the contractor appear to have been taken, but on the 31st March 1877 a part payment of Rupees 1,500 was made by Mr. Evans. That it was a part payment is shown by the receipt.

5th.—The contractor states that he finished the work on the 20th December 1876, and that the reason why he was not paid more than Rupees 1,500 was because there was no more money available. This was the amount appropriated to the work in 1876-77.

---

* Dated 21st January 1878.

† Dated 24th January 1878.

6th.—In April 1877 Sub-Engineer Muniappa Pillay took charge of the range, and in the progress report for April the work was noted as "almost completed." In May 1877 some measurements were taken by a Sub-Overseer.

7th.—In October 1877 the contractor petitioned Captain Morris, the then District Engineer, for payment of Rupees 1,800, the claim was referred to Sub-Engineer Muniappa Pillay, who took no steps personally to verify the work done, but referred to the Sub-Overseer's measurements as showing that nanel of the value of Rupees 1,210-7-4 only was growing.

8th.—In February 1878 the contractor again petitioned Captain Morris, who informed the contractor that the Sub-Engineer had been directed to pay him for the extra work, and Rupees 162-13-6 were paid on this account, but nothing was done to settle the contractor's claim on the original estimate.

3. The Superintending Engineer recommends the payment to the contractor of Rupees 3,216-10-4 less the 1,500 rupees already paid, the difference between the 3,216-10-4 and the 3,300 rupees of the contract of November 1876 being due to the striking out of sundries when the estimate was revised by Mr. Evans under the late Colonel Vertue's order; but the undersigned considers that the contractor has been very badly treated, and that he should receive the 1,800 rupees claimed by him with interest at 5 per cent. from the 1st May 1877, by which date at latest his work ought to have been finally examined and his claims settled.

4. In paragraph 6 of his letter the Superintending Engineer remarks that Mr. Evans bad in November 1876 only recently arrived from England, but the Departmental list shows that he was posted to Trichinopoly in December 1875, so he ought by November 1876 to have become acquainted with the ordinary duties of a Range Officer. Muniappa Pillay is no longer in the department, he having died just when his dismissal from the department had been approved by Government, or it would certainly have been recommended that he should be required to pay the interest now proposed to be allowed to the contractor, as some compensation for the trouble he has had in obtaining a settlement of his claims, and for being kept out of his money so long.

5. It will be necessary to authorise the Examiner of Public Works Accounts to pass the whole of the expenditure without completion certificate, as no measurements are in existence except those taken by a Sub-Overseer long after the work was done.

6. The submission of the Superintending Engineer's letter has been delayed, as it was supposed that specific instructions regarding nanel planting had been given to the District Engineer, but it is found that these were of later date* than the period referred to in these transactions.

*1878.
Proceedings, Madras Government, No. 766 I.,
3rd October 1878.

(Signed) JOHN MULLINS, Col., R.E.,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

No. 16. ORDER THEREON, 4th September 1879, No. 491 I.

THE circumstances reported on in the foregoing papers show that for a period extending over fully two and-a-half years, the claims of a contractor, who had undertaken in November 1876 the planting of nanel in the Coleroon, were left without proper investigation, and that at the time the work was done the duty of its examination was neglected successively by Mr. Evans, Assistant Engineer, and by Muniappa Pillay, a Sub-Engineer, who succeeded him in the charge of the range. Also that the District Engineers, the late Colonel Vertue and Captain Morris, neglected to exercise any proper control over the Range Officers, or to ascertain for themselves what the circumstances were.

2. The recommendations of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation that the contractor should be paid Rupees 1,800, the balance due on the work included in the original estimate, together with interest at 5 per cent. on this amount from the 1st May 1877 are approved, and had Muniappa Pillay been still in the department he would have been required to pay the interest as a punishment for his neglect.

3. The Examiner of Public Works Accounts is authorised to admit the expenditure without the usual completion certificate.

4. These Proceedings will be communicated to all Superintending Engineers, who will take care that Divisional Officers and their subordinates are warned that neglect to measure and check the measurements at the proper time, of work done, will entail personal responsibility for claims which cannot be supported by proper vouchers; and that interest will be awarded, at the expense of the members of the department concerned, to contractors whose claims are improperly and unnecessarily left unsettled.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) JOHN MULLINS, Colonel, R.E.,
Joint Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.,
Irrigation Branch.

To the Superintending Engineer, Fifth Circle.
To other Superintending Engineers.
To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.
" Examiner of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

IRRIGATION.
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of 1879: Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

The SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
FIFTH CIRCLE.
&c., &c., &c.

Dated September 4th.

Issued

Read. *Ent.*

G. O., 4th September 1879, No. 491 I.

SEPTEMBER.

Nos. 15-16.

Claims of a certain Contractor for [illegible] Road in the Cobroon.—Approves with regards the recommendations of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for the settlement of the —

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

15th March 1881, No. 709 W.

General.
Establishment.

Read the following paper :—

No. 41. From Lieutenant-Colonel J. BEATTY, R.E., Superintending Engineer, Third Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Trichinopoly, 24th February 1881, No. 2,325 T.J.—(Through the Examiner of Public Works Accounts).

The Executive Engineer, Negapatam Division, reports that a sum of Rs. 167-1-5 is due to a maistry and coolies employed on the maintenance of the Vedarniem Canal in November and December 1879, and he states that as there were then no funds available payment was postponed until the current official year. As the maintenance of the canal was subsequently transferred to the Salt Department, the Executive Engineer forwarded the station books, &c., on the 12th May 1880, to the Assistant Salt Commissioner for payment, who declined to do so on the ground that the Salt Department had nothing to do with the work done on the canal when it was under the charge of this department.

2. As there is no doubt the amount is due I have directed the Executive Engineer to pay it at once, and I herewith submit an application for the additional allotment required to cover this expenditure.

No. 806 S.E. 3rd.

Submitted to Government with the applications duly endorsed.

28th February 1881. (Signed) D. H. TRAIL, Major, R.E.,
Offg. Examiner, P.W.A.

No. 42. Order thereon, 15th March 1881, No. 709 W.

G.O. No. 666 W. of 13th March 1881.

The sum applied for has been allotted in separate orders.

2. It is observed that the Superintending Engineer has already ordered the coolies to be paid, but the Government consider that the conduct of the Executive Engineer in allowing them to remain unpaid for a single day after he had satisfied himself that payment was due is directly contrary to orders and deserving of severe censure.

3. Distinct orders upon this subject were given in the Chief Engineer's Circular No. 1,273 of 4th May 1880, to which attention is again directed.

4. Officers of all ranks will understand clearly that it is the incurring of liabilities without due sanction, and not the actual payment of money, which constitutes irregularity, and that the error involved in the former proceeding is intensified by delay in satisfying legitimate claims.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Superintending Engineer, Third Circle.
To " " " First and Second Circles.
To Superintendents of Works.
To the Consulting Architect to Government.
Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of (1881) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS

To

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
THIRD CIRCLE,
&c., &c., &c

Dated March, 15th.

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G. O., 15th March 1881, No. 709 W.

MARCH.
Nos. 41-42.

Withholding from coolies wages fairly earned by them.—Directs the attention of officers of the Department to the serious irregularity of—.

Office Note No. 228 Eng 13/6/82

Cl No. 3428 - from the S.E. III Circle submitting for orders letter from the E.E. Kurnool reporting that the Sub Divl officer - Cumbum - has incurred liabilities in excess of allotments on Trunk road No. VI in the Cumbum Sub Division.

—

To,
C

Is there anything to account for these liabilities not having been brought to light on the last Examination of the Executive Engineers' office?

(Sd.) R.H.S.
W

Despd in Original 13/6
O.L. 314.

To W. C. No. 3498

C.S. reply submitted with previous orders regarding deferred payments for work.

R.S.
19-6

D.W.

This in the face of previous orders is a very aggravated case and I think Mr. French must be degraded to 2nd grade Super-visor as an example. You can draft the order if you see no sufficiently extenuating circumstances — I can see none.

20/6/82

D.W.

Very good. Fine him as proposed, but warn him well and say that he will incur the additional penalty of de-gradation.

22/6

vide No: 315-E
26.6.82

W.

I can see nothing to excuse Mr French — but — instead of degrading him to 2nd Grade Supervisor as an example — Would you be disposed to recommend his being ~~[illegible]~~ ordered to pay the Contractors 5 per cent on the sums due ~~by him~~ to them — We have a precedent for such a course in G.O No 491. I. of 4th September 1879. Para 2 —

21.6.82

Executive Engineer's Office
Kurnool 26th May 1882.

No 330

From
The Executive Engineer
Kurnool Division

To The Superintg. Engineer
3rd Circle Bellary.

Sir,

I have the honor to report that the Sub Divisional Officer Cumbum has incurred liabilities[x] in excess of allotments on Trunk Road No. VII to the amount of Rs 1573-9-5; this sum is due to Contractors. A further sum of Rs 668-13-10 is due for the adjustment of famine metal and gravel used on the road, in all Rs 2242-7-3. The fact was first brought to the notice of this Office by Mr. French in his Administration Report received on the 7th April 1882, Extract enclosed, as also copies of all correspondence that has taken place on the subject up to 18th Instant. Mr Frenches' letters

[x] These liabilities were all incurred in the month of March 1882.

are sent in original, to be returned, from which it will be seen that the Supervisor is entirely responsible for this irregularity.

16 JUN 82

I have &ca.

(Sd.) W. Jackson Captain
Offg. Executive Engineer.

No 342.

Copy of a letter No 330 dated 26th May/82 from the Executive Engineer Kurnool Dn.

Submitted for orders.

2. It appears from the correspondence that accompanied the above letter, that in Feby last, the Overseer in immediate charge of this road was transferred from Kurnool to Bellary

3 Mr French did not obtain from the Overseer a detailed statement of the sums due to contractors and others, but accepted apparently without any enquiry the Overseers statement that about Rs 1,000 was due for labour, and not only accepted it but assumed that it was exaggerated and reserving ~~securing~~ only Rs 700 to meet these liabilities, made arrangements for spending the full balance of the allotment at his disposal.

4 It appeared however that not Rs 700 but Rs 1385 was actually due for labour and that in addition sums were owing for famine material and to contractors the net result appearing to be that liabilities

to the extent of Rs 2242 in addition to the grant for the year (Rs 3850) have been incurred.

5. Mr French in his correspondence with the Executive Engineer attempts to throw the whole blame upon the Overseer but this view cannot be accepted. In the first place it was clearly Mr French's duty to see that complete and accurate information was given by the Overseer before he was allowed to hand over charge, and in the second, whatever force this excuse might have as regards the dues for labour it can have none as regards those to contractors and for famine materials concerning which it was the subdivisional Officers duty to have information without the necessity of obtaining it from an Overseer.

6. So far Mr French is greatly to blame; but in my view a still more serious offence lies in the fact that the admitted dues to contractors have not been paid, in spite of the repeated and positive orders of the Govt as well as of the Chief Engineer.

7 The idea that no harm is done as long as unauthorised expenditure is not actually incurred seems so deeply rooted in the mind of most of our subordinates that some strong measures seem necessary to eradicate it and to make them understand that they must face the consequences of their own actions and not try to evade them by defrauding labourers and contractors of their dues.

8 Twice during this correspondence Mr French alludes to the fact that the money has not actually been paid, as something more than an extenuation, in fact as reducing his fault to a mere trifling irregularity, instead of being, as it really is an immense exaggeration of it.

9. There are only two points which may be looked upon as extenuating Mr French's conduct; the first is that his view seems to be shared by the Executive Engineer, for throughout the correspondence there is not a word of reprobation upon this particular point, nor does he appear to have ordered payment to be made at once.

10 The second excuse is that the present system which transfers to the Examiner of

15 JUN 82

accounts a large proportion of the duties which ought properly to devolve on the Superintending Engineers under the control of the Chief Engineer only, and which authorises the Officer to interfere in numberless matters altogether foreign to his legitimate province, almost infallibly leads to the belief in the minds of subordinates that the Examiner is the one Officer whose criticism is to be feared and that so long as irregularities do not appear in the accounts, they are no irregularities at all.

11. I should add that there is no reason to doubt that the expenditure in this case has been incurred in good faith and that full value has been received for it.

J Pennycuick Major R.E.
Supdg. Engineer 3rd Circle

Supdg Engrs Office
Bellary 30th May/82

To
The Chief Engineer
P.W.D. Madras

IT WOULD BE IMPRACTICABLE FOR AN INSPECTING OFFICER TO ASCERTAIN WHAT THE TOTAL ARREARS UNDER WAGES MIGHT BE AT ANY GIVEN DATE.

C.

29.
16/6

16/6

R. No. 210 | D/ 15.6.82
Enc One

No. 228. L. D/ 13 June 82

To C.

Is there anything to account for these liabilities not having been brought to light on the last examination of the Executive Engineer's Office?

W

12/6/82

No. 230 D/ 16th June 1882
TO Repd 17/6/82
Enc One
W.

THE LIABILITIES REFERRED TO ARE STATED TO HAVE ALL BEEN INCURRED IN MARCH 1882, AND THE INSPECTION OF THE DIVISIONAL OFFICE TOOK PLACE EARLY IN THE SAME MONTH. THE INSPECTION REPORT NOTICED THE OUTSTANDINGS DUE TO, AND BY CONTRACTORS.

IT

O. 17/6

---

15 JUN 82

From

The Supdg Engineer
VII Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.
Madras

No. 315 Ed/ 26.6.82
D/ 30th May 1882

Recd

No. 342

Trunk Road No. VII in the Cumbum Sub Division

Forwarding copy of a Letter from the Ex. Engineer Kurnool Division reporting that the Sub Divl. Officer Cumbum has incurred liabilities in excess of allotments on —

W. For orders.

1.6.82

O 17/6

---

paid, - recovering the total amount of interest so paid from Mr. French through the Examiner of P.W. Accounts in the usual way.

The Chief Engineer considers that, holding in view the nature and gravity of his offence Mr. French is being most leniently dealt with and that he well merited the additional penalty of degradation.

23.6.82

Desp: 26/6/82

G.O. 491 I d/ 4/9/79.
" 739 W d/ 21.3.82
" 709 W d/ 15.3.81
Circular 1273 d/ 4.5.80
No. 228 E d/ 13.6.82

No. 315 E d/ 26th June 1882

To the Supdg. Engr. IIIrd Cle

In the Case reported by the Supdg. Engr III Cle in his letter No 342 of 30th May 1882. Mr French has been shown to have acted in direct opposition to the repeated orders of Government and of the Chief Engineer —

The Superintending Engineer will be good enough to cause the sums due to the Contractors in question to be paid at once — He will also in accordance with G.O. No 491. I of 4th September 1879. pay to the Contractors, 5 per Cent on the sums due to them, from the dates upon which he considers Mr French should properly have paid them - up to the dates upon which the sums will now be

---

CHIEF SECRETARY
4 FEB 86

Madras. February 2nd 1886.

To

His Excellency The Right Honorable
Mountstuart Elphinstone Grant Duff C.I.E.
Governor in Council
Fort St. George
Madras.

The humble petition of Camilla French

Humbly sheweth

That your petitioner is the wida of the late Henry Arthur French 1st uncovenented Assistant to the Chief Secretary to Government who served the Government faithfully for thirty three years, and died in harness on the 3rd January 1866.

That your petitioner twice applied for a pension for herself and fatherless childre being left in a destitute condition excepting a pension of Rs.30 for herself and Rs.20 for her youngest son, then aged 12, till 18 years from the Widows' and Orphans' Fund, the latter has lapsed, and the former reduced to Rs 17.8.- owing to the failure of the Fund.

That both the Madras and India Government recommended a pension of Rs 30 for your petitioner and 15 for each daughter till marriage or death. But the Home Government refused granting the Pension.

That owing to the high estimation in which your Petitioner's husband's services were held, and the inability of the Government to grant your petitioner and fatherless children pension, the then existing members of the Government viz. The Honourable Sir Thomas Pycroft, A. J. Arbuthnot, J. D. Sim promised that if your petitioner educated her children they would help her in finding suitable employment for them.

Your petitioner begs to state that she has educated her youngest son for the Grade of a Assistant Engineer, that he holds a Certificate qualifying him for such a Grade from the Civi Engineering College Madras.

Your petitioner hears that the appointment of some temporary Assistant Engineers is in the gift of the Madras Government, and your petitioner humbly begs that Your Excellency will confer one of these appointments on her son E. A. French who is now her sole support.

Your petitioner begs to state that her son has been in the Department of Public Works for ten years, and a Supervisor of the 1^{st} Grade for the past four years.

Decl 977

Your petitioner does not presume to quote a precedent in this case, but it is not uncommon where the faithfully meritorious but unrecognised services of a servant of your Government, are compensated for by the advancement of some member of his family.

6 FEB

Rev 6/2/86

Your petitioner believes that the present members of your Government are not entirely unacquainted with her late husband's merits.

In conclusion, your petitioner humbly prays that your Excellency in Council will give her case your kind consideration, as any benefit conferred on her son is virtually one conferred on her, and for which your petitioner as in duty bound will ever pray.

Camilla French

No 491 I d/4.9.79
" 799 W d/15.3.81
" 315 E d/26.6.82
" 2311 W d/16.8.83

Mrs Camilla French

No 5 Menouds Lane Pursewalkum

Madras.

No 1699 W d/16.6.83
" 1700 W d/16.6.83
" 1230 C d/29.6.83

Ans. 10.2.86 R 13.2.86.

W.

Mr A. E. French has been not recommended in the last 3 rolls and his name has been omitted from all previous rolls. I think he should apply to his D. E. for a transfer as that officer will know if the statement about his bad health is correct

D.W.C.
7/11/85

9/2/86

977

Note

Mr French is not fitted
for the post of an A.E.
he has been not
recommended in the
last 3 rolls. He was
classified in Memo No 315
dd 26/6/86, and the opinions
formed of him by the officers
under whom he has
served are not good.

The petitioner should I
think be informed that
nt regret that his
request that he may
hould be made A.E.
cannot be complied
with, unless he be recommended
by the S.E. of the Circle.

9/2/86

1230 cd/29.6.83

R 13.2.86.

977

C.N. 977

Note

Mr E. A. French passed the A.C.E. Examination in 1875, and entered the P.W.D. as Overseer 3rd grade in April 1876. He was promoted to

Overseer 2nd grade in Augt 1876.
" 1st " temporary in Janry 1877
" 1st " permanent in July 1877
Supervisor 2nd " in March 1880
" 1st " in Octr 1881.

Since his promotion to Supervisor 1st grade his name has not been entered in the recommendation rolls.

He was censured for non-payment of contractors in Memo: No 315 Ed/26.6.82.

The Supdg Engineer's reply to Mr French's fitness for the grade of tempy. Engineer is herewith put up (vide C.N. 6262/83). ——

/8.2

1230 C d/29.6.83

Circ. 10.2.86 R 13.2.86.

C.N. 977

In Cov. 10-2-86.

DW

For orders —

Mr French is an A.C.S., if he were [illegible] himself fit, he would doubtless have obtained a temporary Engineership before this —

[illegible] apparently stand on his own merits, instead of his mother petitioning on his behalf —

8-2-86

No. 400 W. PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the February 13 1886

READ the following

From Mrs. C. French dated 2nd Feby/86.

The Government regret that Mrs. French's request that her son Mr. E.A. E. French may be appointed a temporary Asst. Engineer, cannot be complied with, unless he be recommended by the Supdg Engineers under whom he is serving.

D 13/2

Mrs. C. French.

10/2/86

10-2-86

In Her Mts [illegible]

No. 400 Wd Feby. 13. 1886

13.2

3/3

Cuc. 10.2.86 13.2.86