M.R.O. (Correction slip)

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Reference _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Finance DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1267 Press Mrs.

271-272

Dated 30 — 8 — 1876.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 271. Read the following letter from Colonel F. J. MOBERLY, R.E., District Engineer of Chingleput, to Colonel G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, Fort St. George, dated Guindy, 9th July 1874, No. 1154 :—

I have the honor to submit the following remarks with reference to Proceedings, Revenue Board, No. 1334, of the 3rd June, which I have seen as a member of the Local Fund Board, Sydapet Circle, as I observe that my No. 378 of the 7th May, in which I hoped that I had explained some points, is not included in the correspondence.

Enclosure one.

One copy of letter to the President of the Local Fund Board, No. 378, dated 7th May 1874.

2. The Board lay stress (paragraph 4) on my addressing Government direct, overlooking the fact stated in my No. 2743, recorded in G.O., No. 153, of the 29th January, that I was replying to G.O., No. 30, of the 7th January.

3. They consider my statement as to neglect of Rule LXXII. unreasonable. I understand the object of the rule to be, to forewarn members so that they may arrange their other duties with the view of attending such meetings only as concern them.

4. I will not go back to the case under notice of the Board, but observe that since that the following circumstances have happened.

5. On March 11th, Mr. Lowry sent me a letter regarding the material being used on the Conjeveram Road. This was forwarded by me on the 20th by mistake to the President of the Local Fund Board, instead of to the Collector as the head of the Revenue Department, the executive agents on this road. The notice convening the Local Fund Board meeting of the 31st March was issued on the 11th, and of course could not include this subject. The three matters named did not seem to require my presence.

6. The proceedings of this meeting were not signed till the 15th May, or published till the 30th May. I had, therefore, no clue to the meaning of the vague statement in the notice of the 2nd April, that the meeting of the 14th April would "receive the report of the Committee on the Conjeveram Road." I thought I had sent advice as to the use of inferior material to the Revenue Department, and never supposed that it had been brought as a complaint against the Tahsildar before the Local Fund Board.

7. I had, therefore, no idea that a Sub-Committee of non-professional members had proceeded to examine the material in the absence of every Departmental Officer; and having other business, which I thought more important, I abstained from travelling to Conjeveram to hear a report which did not, as I imagined, concern me.

8. My proceeding, I submit, was well-intentioned, and did not deserve the treatment it has received. As regards the opinion of the Committee, I have nothing to say; it is for the Government to decide on its value. I would only quote* from a letter of the Tahsildar of Conjeveram to the Sub-Collector, dated 19th March 1874, on the subject.

* *Vide* Tamil Extract A attached.

9. As regards Mr. Lowry's complaint of the attempt to take away coolies I can only observe that no inquiry has been made. I have not seen G.O., No. 394,

of the 30th March, and we have not been called on to substantiate our statements. Even the takeeds issued by the Tahsildar have not been called for; his simple denial has been accepted. Vallaveram, I would point out, is in the extreme north end of the taluq, and the Conjeveram road in the south; it is a short mile from the Tandalam Bridge, now in progress under Mr. Lowry. The remarks as to the 480 villages and large bodies of coolies being dragged by force were not made by us. They would have been overt acts easily proved. No attempt is made to show why coolies should go twenty miles for work which they could get at their own door, either on the bridge or the Kuam road.

10. The Sub-Collector, I would urge, must be very ill-informed as to the power and influence of a Tahsildar, if he expects to get complaints against him from the ryots direct. After a late Local Fund Board meeting, a member apologized to me for not supporting my amendment, because he was afraid of voting against the Tahsildar. I did not doubt him for a moment, and am fully persuaded that he would deny the statement if asked by me to repeat it before the Tahsildar.

11. I must protest against the statement that I refused to obtain Mr. Lowry's explanation of the Tahsildar's counter-complaint. In the first place I had already his version of the facts, and in the second, I did not understand the complaint. I referred to my clerks as to there being any hidden meaning in the expression "He is a man like you," but if there were, I felt sure, with my knowledge of Mr. Lowry's utter ignorance of Tamil, that he could not have used the words at all, and it seemed to be that my vouching for this must be stronger than even Mr. Lowry's denial. He has, however, since accepted my explanation as his own.

From Colonel F. J. MOBERLY, R.E., District Engineer of Chingleput, to R. W. BARLOW, Esq., President of the Local Fund Board, Chingleput District, dated Guindy, 7th May 1874, No. 378.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your No. 178, dated 30th April, and its enclosures, and beg in the first place to observe, with reference to paragraph 10 of the Vice-President's letter, that I have very scrupulously addressed myself to you on all Local Fund matters, and that Mr. Crole has not apparently noticed that my letter, No. 2743, commences by quoting a Departmental G.O., No. 30, dated 7th January, but for which I should certainly not have written. I trust that the Board of Revenue will not endorse the motives which have been attributed to me.

2. I am surprised at the assertion in paragraph 7. I pressed the condition of the road from Kuam to Tandalum, explaining how difficult it was to pass over the east end of it. In deference to my urgency I was allowed to spend Rupees 1,000 on the three miles near Tandalum. So far as I can remember, I made and supported my request; it was put to the vote and rejected. I would ask you to compare the resolution of the 18th December quoted, and that of the 24th February, and submit that the former, drawn up at the time, bears me out, and *that there was no discussion.*

3. I naturally expected that before the important general question remitted to us by Government in Order, No. 153, of the 29th January was discussed, I should, agreeably to Rule LXXII. have had due notice. I only received the Government Order a few days before the day on which the meeting was convened, and before I could apply to you for returns of traffic on the roads, of revenue from villages adjacent who pay cess, &c., I was informed in a private note from Mr. Lowry that the matter had been settled.

4. I submit that the subject has not yet been discussed.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Financial Department,
30th July 1874.

5. With all deference to the feelings of the members, I urge that we have merely their individual opinions. There is no argument brought forward that I can see from statistics by which fair comparison can be made. Mr. Crole relies on the age of the road from Conjeveram to Chingleput. I have not the dates of the various movements made by the Collector; but I can well believe that when the Cutcherry was at Chingleput, and the treasury at Conjeveram, the Revenue authorities thought it advisable to make a road. That in all the years that have elapsed since, neither they nor the Department of Public Works have suggested that it should be metalled, is, in my humble opinion, a point in my favor.

6. Ramakistna Iyer asserts the existence of petitions. I particularly asked as to this point on the 18th December, but receiving no reply, concluded that none had been received. I suggested these as one of the means of testing public opinion.

7. As regards my previous procedure mentioned by Venkatrama Iyer, I beg to point out that the Board made some remark as to delay in executing certain works. I disavowed responsibility, and suggested that application should be made to higher authority to expedite the sanction of estimates which I had duly forwarded. I cannot see how this act of mine can be interpreted into meaning that I preferred this road to any other.

8. As regards Mr. Crole's doubts in paragraph 13, I would beg that reference be made to the attendance list of members at the head of each minute of the proceedings of the Local Fund Board. If I have been rightly informed as regards the occupations of those members who really are regular, you may perhaps be satisfied as to my reasons for doubting whether the Board represented any general interest. I submit that I have no concern with those who rarely or never come.

9. I must particularly ask that my letter regarding the neglect of Rule LXXII., No. 2990, of the 6th February 1874, be forwarded with these papers. With very heavy business on my hands, it was far from easy for me to get to a Local Fund Board meeting of the Chingleput Circle, when I had very short notice, or when the Board met at Conjeveram, it was really difficult; and if I saw that no important matter was entered, I gladly avoided a troublesome journey. Even the proceedings of the Board did not reach me for many days; reference to District Gazettes will bear me out. I have seen those of the 24th February for the first time on May 4th.

Transferred to the Financial Department, with reference to the under-mentioned Orders in that Department, dated 13th December 1873, No. 1813, and 29th January 1874, No. 153.

OOTACAMUND,
20th July 1874.

(Signed) G. W. WALKER, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government, P. W. D.

No. 272. ORDER THEREON, 30th July 1874, No. 1267.

Recorded with reference to G.O., dated 3rd July 1874, No. 1108.

2. It will be considered in the Public Works Department how far Mr. Lowry's "utter ignorance of Tamil" is compatible with efficient service in a Tamil District.

(True Extract.)

Acting Chief Secretary.

To the Public Works Department.

Exd. J. Wright.

No. 378

Chingleput Dt. Engr. Office
Guindy 7th May 1874

From,

The District Engineer
Chingleput

To,

The President
of the Local Fund Board

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your No. 178 dated 30th April and its enclosures, and beg in the first place to observe with reference to para 10 of the Vice President's letter that I have very scrupulously addressed myself to you on all Local Fund matters and that Mr. Crole has not apparently noticed that my letter No. 2743 commences by quoting a Departmental G. O. No. 30, dated 7th January, but for which I should certainly not have written. I trust that the Board of Revenue will not endorse the motives which have been attributed to me.

I am surprised at the assertion in para 7. I pressed the condition of the road from Kuam to Vandalam explaining how difficult it was to pass over the East end of it. In deference to my urgency I was

was allowed to spend Rs. 500 on the 5 miles near Tandalam. So far as I can remember, I made, and supported my request, it was put to the vote, and rejected — I would ask you to compare the translation 18th December quoted, and that of 25th January, and submit that the former, drawn up at the time, bears me out, and that there was no discussion.

Naturally expected that before the important general question remitted to us by Government in Proc. No. 153 of 29th January was discussed, I should agreeably to rule LXXV have had due notice - I only received the Government Order a few days before the day on which the meeting was convened, and before I could apply to you for returns of traffic on the roads, of revenue from villages adjacent who pay cess &c. I was informed in a private note from Mr. Lowry that the matter had been settled.

I submit that the subject has not yet been discussed.

With all deference to the feelings of the members I urge that we have merely their individual opinions - There is no argument brought forward that I can see, from statistics by which fair comparison can be made. Mr. Crole relies on the age of the road from Conjeveram to Chingleput. I have not the dates of the various movements made by the Collector, but I can well believe that when the Cutcherry was at Chingleput and the Treasury at Conjeveram, the revenue authorities thought it advisable to make a road. That in all the years that have elapsed since, neither they nor the Department Public Works have suggested that it should be metalled, is, in my humble opinion, a point in my favour

Ramakistna Iyer asserts the existence of petitions. I particularly asked as to this point on the 18th December but receiving no reply, concluded that none had been received. I suggested these as one of the means of testing public opinion.

As regards my previous procedure mentioned by Venkatrama Iyer, I beg to point out that the Board made some remark as to delay

in

in executing certain works. I disavow responsibility, and suggested that application should be made to higher authority to expedite the sanction of estimates which I had duly forwarded. I cannot see how this act of mine can be interpreted into meaning that I preferred this road to any other.

As regards Mr. Crole's doubts in para 13, I would beg that reference be made to the attendance list of members at the head of each minute of the proceedings of the Local Fund Board. If I have been rightly informed as regards the occupations of those members who really are regular, you may perhaps be satisfied as to my reasons for doubting whether the Board represented any general interest. I submit that I have no concern with those who rarely or never come.

I must particularly ask that my letter regarding the neglect of rule I. XXII. No. 2990 of 6th February 1874 be forwarded with these papers. With very heavy business on my hands it was far from easy for me to get to a Local Fund Board meeting of the Chinglepet Circle when I had very short notice or when the Board met at Conjeeveram it was really difficult, and if I saw that no important matter was entered I gladly avoided a troublesome journey. Even the proceedings of the Board did not reach me for many days - reference to District Gazettes will bear me out. I have seen those of 24th February for the first time on May 4th.

I have the honour &c.

(Signed) F. J. Moberly Col. R.E.
District Engr. Chingleput.

(True Copy)

F. Moberly Col. R.E.
District Engr. Chingl.

A

P. W. 4238/74
2

Chingt. Dt. Engrs. Office
Gundy 9th July 1874

No. 1154.

From,

Colonel F. J. Moberly R. E.
District Engineer Chingleput

To,

Colonel G. W. Walker R. E.
Secretary to Government P. W. Dept.

Sir,

Enc: 1
1 Copy of Letter to the President Local Fund Bd. No. 3754/74 dated 8th May 74.

I have the honor to submit the following remarks with reference to proceedings, Revenue Board No. 1334 of 3rd June which I have seen as member Local Fund Board Sydapet Circle-as I observe that my No. 378 of 7th May, in which I hoped that I had explained some points is not included in the correspondence.

The Board lay stress (para 4) on my addressing Government direct overlooking the fact stated in my No. 2743 recorded in G. O. No. 153 of 29th January that I was replying to G. O. No. 30 of 7th January.

They consider my statement as to neglect of rule XXII unreasonable. I understand the object of the rule to be,

C

to forewarn members so that they may arrange their other duties with the view of attending such meetings only as concern them.

I will not go back to the case under notice of the Board - but observe that since that, the following circumstances have happened.

On March 11th. Mr. Lowry sent me a letter regarding the material being used on the Conjeveram road. This was forwarded by me on the 20th by mistake to the President Local Fund Board, instead of to the Collector as the head of the Revenue Department, the Executive Agents on this road. The notice convening Local Fund Board meeting 31st March was issued on the 11th and of course could not include this subject the 3 matters named did not seem to require my presence.

The proceedings of this meeting were not signed till the 15th May or published till the 30th May. I had therefore no clue to the meaning of the vague statement in notice 2nd April, that

that meeting 14th April would "receive the report of the Committee on the Conjeeveram road." I thought I had sent advice as to the use of inferior material to the Revenue Department, and never supposed that it had been brought as a complaint against the Tahsildar before the Local Fund Board.

I had therefore no idea that a Sub Committee of non-professional members had proceeded to examine the material in the absence of every Departmental officer, and having other business which I thought more important, I abstained from travelling to Conjeeveram to hear a report which did not, as I imagined, concern me.

My proceeding I submit was well intentioned, and did not deserve the treatment it has received as regards the opinion of the Committee I have nothing to say; it is for the Government to decide on its value. I would only quote from a letter of the Tahsildar of Conjeeveram to the Sub Collector dated 19th March 1874 on the subject

* Vide Tamil extract A attached.

As regards Mr. Lowry's complaint of the attempt to take away police, I can only observe that no enquiry has been made. I have not seen G. O. No. 394 30th March, and we have not been called on to substantiate our statements. Even the Kaifeeds issued by the Tahsildar have not been called for - his simple denial has been accepted. Kallakurichi I would point out is in the extreme South End of the taluq, and the Conjeeveram road in the South - it is a short mile from the Vandalam bridge, now in progress under Mr. Lowry - The remarks as to the 4-50 villages and large bodies of Coolies being dragged by force were not made by us. They would have been overt acts readily proved. No attempt is made to show why Coolies should go 20 miles for work which they could get at their own door, either on the bridge or the Kuam road.

The Sub Collector I would urge must be very ill informed as to the power and influence of a Tahsildar if he expects to get complaints against him from the ryots direct - After a late Local Fund Board meeting a member apologized to me for not supporting my amendment, because he was afraid of voting against the Tahsildar. I did not doubt him for a moment, and was fully persuaded that he would deny the statement if asked by me to repeat it before the Tahsildar.

I must protest against the statement that I refused to obtain Mr. Lowry's explanation of the Tahsildar's counter complaint - In the first place I had already his version of the facts, and in the second I did not understand the complaint - I referred to my clerks as to their being any hidden meaning in the expression. "He is a man like you" - but if there were, I felt sure, with my knowledge of Mr. Lowry's utter ignorance of Tamil, that he could not have used the words at all - and it seemed to me that my vouching for this must be stronger than even Mr. Lowry's denial - He has however since accepted my explanation as his own.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servt
F. Lindesay Col R.E.
District Engr Chingleput

P. W. 1874 Depart.

From No. 4238.

The District Engineer
Chittagong

To

The Secretary to
Government B.P.W.

Dated 9th July 1874.
Recd 11th July 1874.
Regd. 20.
No. 1154.
Enc: 2.

No 1500

Submits further remarks with reference to Proceedings of the Board of Revenue No. 1334 of 3 June on the subject of the road from Chittagong to Doorapoorie Choudhry.

Transferred

W.M. wtr.

Transferred to the Financial Depart. with reference to the undermentioned orders in that Department dated
13th Dec. 1873 No. 1818
29th Janry. 1874 " 158.

W. Mackenzie Offg. R.C.

Secy: to Govt.

B.P.W.

Cotacamund
20th July 1874

Depr. to Cy. 11 July 1874

Cottacs 30 July 1874 No 1267.

Recorded with reference to B.P.W. 3d July 1874 No 1108.

It will be considered in the Public Works Department how far the Surveyor's "letter ignorance of Tamil" is compatible with efficient service in a Tamil District.

H
23/7

The Govt. Department Dy/s

Financial

To The Public Works Dept.

Rec'd July 30 1874 No 1267.

Nos. 271. 272.

Road from Chingleput to Conjeeram. The letter of the Dt. Engr. Chingleput in explanation of his action in connection with this road as affecting the Local Fund Board recorded & the question is to how far Mr. Lowry's "utter ignorance of Tamil" is compatible with efficient service in a Tamil Dt. referred

for consideration in the P. W. Dept.