

(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 8

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 5/89

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 6/89

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

⑦

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P. W. D. துறை

அரசாணை எண். 1621
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் :

20-6-1889

188

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

101

4. sheets

No. 121
Camp

Nelson Collector's Office
29th April 1889.

From C. D. Maclean, Esq.,
Collector of Nelson.

To the Secretary to the Board of Nelson
(London House).

Sir,

I have the honour to reply
to Board's Proceedings Reference No. 785 Dated
18th April 1889.

2. I do not consider the Superintend-
ing Engineer to be quite correct in saying
with regard to this office letter No. 66 Dated
20th March 1888 that "no reason or excuse
was given." This office furnished the
Superintending Engineer with a full
statement of dates, indicated the officer
with whom the delay had principally
rested, and said that enquiries had
been made of that officer. Nothing fur-
ther was at that time known.

3. The case being now closed I am
able to give a complete account of it.

4. Enclosure gives a list of all
the dates involved as far as this office is
concerned.

5. The case was one of petty com-
pensation in connection with a miscellaneous
public work in the Cedar Teahua Completion
certificate of the work ~~was not~~ ~~of the~~

the compensation money, therefore the P. W. Department asked for prompt payment of the latter.

6. The papers came into this office ready for payment on the 13th February 1886. Thereupon ensued correspondence containing much circumlocution between five different offices as shown in Enclosure A down to 11 January 1887. The main point discussed was a technical one on the subject of the letter of credit having expired at the end of the official year 1885-86. The circumlocution was aggravated in my opinion by the fact that the offices of the two Deputy Collectors, Treasury and Head Quarter, were at that time treated as distinct from the Collector's office; an arrangement which ceased in April 1887.

7. On the 11th January 1887 orders to pay were finally sent to the Gyona Taksildar. According to the then custom of the office, the office copy of this paper was after despatch put into record, being thereafter not liable to be again seen until some further paper quoting it was received from an outside office.

8. The system of this office prevailing at that time with regard to the check of arrears of correspondence was as follows. The Quarterly unanswered list to the Board showed what letters were due to the Board at the end of each quarter. The quarterly unanswered

lists

162
lists from Divisional offices showed what Communications were due to Divisions at the end of each quarter. The half-yearly "business statement" rendered to the Board showed various statistics twice a year; but these last even if supposed to be correct are of no use for checking current work. For officers other than the Board and Divisions there was no internal check. And the above-mentioned checks are, as I have said, not current. The real working principle of this office in regards correspondence was to wait until some other office interested or some other office with a superior organization such as the Board or Government, sent a reminder; and then to pass on this reminder to sub-ordinate offices. If no other office sent a reminder there was a prospect with a considerable number of papers, of their lying over indefinitely.

9. For the above system was substituted shortly after I joined the district which was at the end of March 1887, a system which was more or less automatic. The distinction was introduced for every paper in the head-quarter office between "References" (or papers for which this office, including offices subordinate to it were still responsible), and "Disposals" (or papers for which the above offices were

no longer

no longer responsible). Registers were introduced in which the
series distinction was clearly displayed and could be seen at a
glance. Forms were introduced thereunder in which some
one person (later being over 100 drafting clerks in this office)
was made responsible for each paper down to the date of its
technical "disposal".

10. This system has been gradually enforced in all departments
of work in this office, and at the present date I beg to say
that I think very little is left to be desired. But the difficulty
has always been to trace out and to bring forward into the
new system the old papers. The paper of 11th January 1887,
was an old paper, and was not found or brought forward.

11. The above will explain why no action was taken in
this office from 11th January 1887 till 18th August 1888. The
Tahildar did not reply and the Executive Engineer did
not enquire, and according to the principle on which
correspondence was conducted in January 1887 the paper
had been put away in final record, where it was no one's
business to disturb it. Whatever responsibility attaches
on that account to this office, attaches also I submit to
the P.W. offices, which were silent for an equal time,
viz. from 11th January, 1887 to 18th August 1888.

12. This matter was brought first to my knowledge on the
12th October 1888, since when 9 communications have gone to the
Tahildar of Gudur.

13. Enclosure B gives a list of all the dates involved as far as
the Gudur Tahildar's office is concerned.

14. I have made a special examination of the Tahildar's office
and of the persons concerned in the connection. Just as the
paper of 11th January 1887 ^{was dropped} in the Huzar, so the Huzar
dated after issue of notice to parties to attend for payment
or after an entry to that effect had been made in a note-
book was dropped in the Taluk office. The parties if summoned
did not appear and nothing further was done. The orders were
renewed as above mentioned on the 12th October 1888, but when
received in the Taluk office they were passed from hand to
hand and nothing was done upon them. On 26th January
1889 a clear order summarizing what had happened before
and giving strict orders for instant payment was sent to the
Gudur Tahildar. Even on this the Tahildar took no
personal action beyond writing instructions to his clerks,
and they spent two months more in discussing who had the
papers and searching for them. On the 14th March 1889 I sent
such instructions that the Tahildar could no longer avoid
taking

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following:—

Read again Mis. G. O. No 2347 of 12 April.

Read also Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, Saidaram, dated 17 May 1889, No 2952 Mis. on the following:—

1. G. O. Revenue Department, dated 12 April 1889, No 2347 Mis., and the following reference thereon dated 18 April.

Forwarded to the Collector of Bellary who is requested to submit at once the desired explanation.

* Copy attached.

2. Letter from the Collector of Bellary, dated 29 April 1889, No.

151
CampResolution:—

Submitted to Government with reference to their Order, dated 12 April 1889, No 2347.

2. The Tahsildar of Gudalur appears to be responsible for the greater portion of the delay (i.e.) for more than 2 years and the Collector has fined him Rs 5 and warned him. As the punishment is light, it seems

taking the case up, and the parties were finally paid over the 30th April 1889. I have fined the Tahsildar Rs 5 for these proceedings and warned him that if a similar case occurs again his name will be sent up to the Board for reduction of grade. I should have punished the Tahsildar more severely, but first he has been recently engaged on Jummahbundy, and secondly I know that he has been impeded by an almost impossible system of records and office-books, and this is the same all over the district.

15. The system of disposal and reference, and personal responsibility mentioned in para 9 above was introduced with suitable modifications into the Gudalur and Bellary taluk offices from 1st January 1889, as many old arrears as possible being brought into the new books. The change would have been made earlier, but I have had to wait many months before there was sufficient leisure in the gazetted Press to get the necessary forms through.

16. I regret the great delays which have taken place over this trifling matter, and have endeavoured above to trace the different gradations of responsibility.

I have the honor to be,
Your most obedient servant,
J. E. Scott

Asst. Collector

[True Copy]

Ch. J. Scott
Secretary to Govt.

10. 10. 1131 47/6. 4. 89
Memo no 33/887 10. 4. 89

MC 5382

unnecessary to do anything further
on this occasion.

(1)

Order thereon, 5 June 1889, No. 3452.

The delay in the disposal
of the claim brought to notice in
this case reflects great discredit on
the conduct of business in the
Collector's office and in the Judry
Taluk Cutcherry. The Government
trusts that the improved system
introduced by Mr. Maclean will
effectually prevent the recurrence
of such delays in future. The
Tahsildar of Judry who is chiefly
to blame in the matter should
be reprimanded and warned
that a repetition of such delays
will entail severe punishment.

R. 15. 6. 89
E1

True Extract

Secretary to Govt.

1624 W. Dated 20 June 1889.
To the Secy to the Govt.
Engr. H. Circle with ref to
letter to the Secy to the Govt.
of 15 April 89.

The Comr of Land Rev
Public Works Dept.

2/16. 89
LH

22/6. 89
T. 15. 6. 89
T. 17. 6. 89