1. Number of pages. 58
2. Date of repair. 26-3-38
3. Initials of Reference.
M.R.O. 1—82,400—22-11-30

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue Works DEPARTMENT.
Cau 8/5/35

G.O. No. 477 Press Mis.

Dated 2—3— 18 35

Not to be folded or roughly handled

26/3/38

Read again letters from the late Officiating Chief Engineer, dated 4th August and 27th October 1858, and recorded in Diary to Consultation, dated 7th September and 7th December 1858, Nos. 1814 and 2624.

No. 3. Read also the following letter from Lieutenant Colonel E. LAWFORD, Officiating Chief Engineer; to the Secretary to Government, dated 21st December 1858, No. 6472.

SIR,

In acknowledging the receipt of Extract Minutes Consultation, No. 2624, dated the 6th Instant, I have the honor to represent, that although I called for a "full and complete report", on the excess in the cost of the Murdayaur under-Tunnel, yet I received

No. 4890. no other information than that laid before Government, with my letter of the 27th October 1858, which has been returned to me.

2. Captain Moberly seems to have considered that the enquiry into the alleged overcharge of materials was all that he had to make, and in truth, I think it will be very difficult to give any more precise account of the causes of this excess, than that already furnished in Captain Ryves's letter of the 26th July 1858, No. 607.

3. These causes are as follows, viz.,

1st. Stoppage of Work in July 1857.

2nd. Delay in the sanction for its resumption and loss of the three best working months of 1858, viz., January, February and March.

3rd. Want of method in the executive arrangements, and scarcity of labour in the vicinity of the work.

4th. Deficiency in the Accounts.

4. Assuming the excess at the date of Captain Ryves's report, (July 1858,) at 7,500 Rupees, I calculate the following as the proportions to be assigned to each cause. First, 20 per cent. Second, 60 per cent. Third, 5 per Cent. Fourth, 15 per cent.

5. For the two first causes the local Officers are of course wholly irresponsible, for although it may be said that seeing the delay that had taken place, they should have deferred the work until the following Season to ensure fine weather, yet it was very desirable to use up the materials then on the ground, and the Season proved uncommonly wet in April and May.

6. As to the third cause, it was chiefly owing to want of experienced Officers to superintend the work, and the last is due to a considerable degree of laxity and irregularity in the system of Accounts, during the operations, the responsibility for which it is very difficult to determine individually, although I consider the District Engineer principally in fault.

7. It is to be borne in mind that this work has been carried on during a very unsettled condition of the Department, and that it is situated almost at the extremity of the Trichinopoly District; that Mr. Ricketts, the Executive Officer chiefly concerned, had little experience in Irrigation Works, and that he was succeeded by Lieutenant Mead, a very young, although promising Officer, and while I do not think that the District Engineer's arrangements were satisfactory, I believe the untoward result reported by Captain Ryves, to have been produced by causes very much beyond his control.

8. I must here beg to notice that the letter returned by Government, was drawn up by the Officiating Superintending Engineer, Southern Circle, and although I do not seek to avoid the responsibility of the position I have lately held, I think that this case affords an additional instance of the inconvenience resulting from the present constitution of the Department. If I had not adopted Major Birdwood's draft, I must necessarily have gone into the whole subject myself, and then the time of that Officer would have been entirely lost, and his position lowered, but if, instead of writing in my name, the Superintending Engineer had addressed his report *to me*, I should either have forwarded it to Government, with my simple countersignature in token of approval, or returned it for those additions which might have seemed necessary. The responsibility

of sending up an imperfect paper would then have been fairly mine. I pointed out the anomalies produced by the present system in my report* on the Bengal Code. The Chief Engineer is publicly and personally made responsible for the work of the Superintending Engineers, who although Officers of very nearly his own standing and official rank, take the place only of Secretaries, as I think to the disadvantage of the public service.

* No 5886, dated 30th November 1858.

9. I regret to add to this letter an expression of my conviction, that the expenditure on the Murdayaur Tunnel, will amount to even more than the sum already reported, for the work has since been exposed in its unfinished state, to more severe and disastrous inundations than any previously known. The Acting District Engineer's attention is, however so occupied at present, with the repairs of damages caused by those floods, that I cannot expect an early report on this work in particular, and my object in now addressing Government, is to point out the imperative necessity of permitting the work to be completed *at once*, without awaiting the result of that reference to the Government of India, which experience has shewn may be so long delayed. The next three months will almost certainly be fine, and I would earnestly recommend the prosecution of this and all other unfinished works, liable to injury, with the utmost vigour during that period.

10. If the Government will be pleased to pass early orders on this my strong recommendation, I will convey such instructions to Major Birdwood, the Officiating Superintending Engineer, now on duty in Tanjore, as to enable that Officer to act promptly and decisively in the case, before he returns to the Presidency.

No. 4. ORDER THEREON, No. 477; dated 2nd March 1859.

The letter here recorded is the reply of Colonel Lawford, the late Officiating Chief Engineer, to the order* of Government calling for explanation regarding the causes which led to a large excess in the expenditure on the Murthayaur Under-Tunnel in the Trichinopoly District, he having previously reported that Rupees 15,054, had been spent on the work, and that Rupees 2,500 more would be required to complete it, making Rupees 17,500, in all, or about 70 per cent. in excess of the cost estimated by the District Engineer,† viz., Rupees 10,720.

* Extract Minutes Consultation, 6th Decr. 1858, No. 2624.

† From the Officer in charge Central Office, Public Works Department, dated 7th April 1858, No. 8781, para. 2.

No new information is now submitted, as Colonel Lawford was unable to obtain any from the Acting District Engineer Captain Moberly; and the letter contains only the Acting Chief Engineer's opinion on the information previously laid before Government.

2. The causes of the excess are detailed by the District Engineer Lieutenant Ryves in his letter of the 26th July 1858 No. 607, and are summed up by Colonel Lawford as follows:

1st. Stoppage of work in July 1857.

2nd. Delay in the sanction for its resumption, and loss of the three best working months of 1858, viz., January, February and March.

3rd. Want of method in the Executive arrangements, and scarcity of labor in the vicinity of the work.

4th. Deficiency in the accounts.

There is another cause of excess mentioned by Lieutenant Ryves, in para. 6 of his letter, viz., the direct loss of Rupees 2,948, being the value of work in the river carried away by floods; and it is not improbable that some portion of the excess was also the result of an imperfect and ill-considered estimate. Colonel Lawford rightly exempts the local Officers from blame in connection with the first two of the four causes mentioned by him; the third he ascribes to the want of an experienced Officer to superintend the work; the blame of the last he considers to belong mainly to the late District Engineer Lieutenant Ryves.

3. The Right Honorable the Governor in Council is of opinion that much allowance is properly to be made for the peculiar circumstances under which the work was undertaken and carried on. It's stoppage after expensive preparations had been made, and the delay of permission to go on with it which prevented its resumption at the right season, must have greatly

contributed to increase the cost. The Governor in Council cannot agree with Colonel Lawford in treating so lightly the want of method in the Executive arrangements of this work, (the third of the four causes of excess of expenditure stated by him); the immediate blame of this must rest on Mr. Ricketts who was in direct charge, but it was clearly Lieutenant Ryves' duty to correct any defect in the arrangements, and that Officer must bear the blame of neglecting to do this.

4. But the last of the four causes is the most serious. It is briefly described by Colonel Lawford as a deficiency in the accounts, signifying in reality however a large discrepancy between the materials entered in the accounts as received and paid for, and those forthcoming. It appears from Colonel Lawford's special report on the subject dated 27th October 1858, that certain materials were prepared in March to June 1857, which remained unused in consequence of the stoppage of the work, under the general restrictive order of the 17th July. On the resumption of the work in 1858, a considerable portion of the materials appearing in the accounts as prepared was not forthcoming. The responsibility for this deficit is laid on Mr. Ricketts, the Assistant Engineer, under whose orders and control the operations in 1857, were conducted. Mr. Ricketts however in his letter dated 26th July 1858, No. 83, repudiates all responsibility in connection with the transactions in March and April 1857, on the ground chiefly of Assistant Overseer Rungasawmy Naidoo's repeated disobedience of his orders. But the facts adduced by Captain Ryves in paras. 4 to 6 of his report dated 29th July 1858, clearly show that Mr. Ricketts was the responsible Executive Officer in charge of the work from 1st March to 30th April 1857. With respect to the Assistant Overseer's neglect of orders, Captain Ryves states (para. 7) that Mr. Ricketts made no report to him on the subject till the 13th of May; and he justly observes that the Overseer's alleged disobedience cannot be held to relieve Mr. Ricketts of responsibility for an absolute error in accounts of materials supplied during the two preceding months, viz, March and April.

5. The Governor in Council has carefully perused the correspondence on the subject submitted by the Officiating Chief Engineer with his report of the 27th October 1858, and he is compelled to agree with Colonel Lawford (para. 16) that Mr. Ricketts is justly chargeable in the matter with serious neglect of duty and carelessness. Under these circumstances, and with the view of maintaining the efficiency of the Department and marking his sense of Mr. Ricketts' disregard of the public interests, the Governor in Council resolves to direct that he be degraded from his Acting appointment of Executive Engineer to his permanent Office of Assistant Engineer, until he shall prove by diligence his fitness for promotion to the higher grade.

6. Adverting to Mr. Ricketts' letter to the District Engineer, dated 26th July 1858, the Governor in Council desires that Assistant Overseer Rungasawmy Naidoo be called upon for an explanation of his neglect to keep Station Books and other Vouchers as directed by Mr. Ricketts. In laying this explanation before Government the Chief Engineer will state his opinion whether the loss of materials on the Under-Tunnel may not to some extent be attributed to the lax and careless manner in which the Assistant Overseer is represented to have conducted his duties.

7. The Government see with displeasure that when charge of the work was transferred in April 1858, from Mr. Ricketts to Lieutenant Mead, the materials present were not examined.¶ This was a neglect of duty on the part of both those Gentlemen. The Chief Engineer will point out to all District Engineers the duty and necessity of enforcing exactness and punctuality in such transfers. Any District Engineer omitting to do so will incur the serious displeasure of Government; and Executive Officers taking over materials or cash without actual verification will become liable for all that is shewn in the documents.

¶ From Colonel Lawford, 27th October 1858, para. 5.

8. In para. 4 of Colonel Lawford's letter of the 27th October 1858, it is stated that when the work was resumed in that year, Mr. Ricketts was unwilling to undertake it, on the ground that the project would not succeed, and that Captain Ryves thereupon relieved him and placed Lieutenant Mead in charge. The Governor in Council observes that Mr. Ricketts had no option in the matter; it was his duty to obey the orders of his Superior Officer, and do his best to execute the work entrusted to him in an efficient manner, with liberty however to state for the consideration of the District Engineer such objections as he saw to the project.

Fort Saint-George, Public Works Consultation of 8th March 1859.

9. In para. 7 of his letter of the 21st December, Colonel Lawford states his expectation that the expenditure on the Under-Tunnel will exceed the amount already reported, in consequence of the work having been exposed in its unfinished state to inundation; and he urges the necessity of permitting it to be completed at once.

10. In a Minute dated 22nd December|| 1857, Colonel Lawford stated that the construction of the Marthayaur Under-Tunnel was absolutely necessary to the success of the Ponairy Channel, on which upwards of 54,000§ Rupees has been spent, and as delay in its completion, besides adding to its own cost, is likely to compromise the utility of the Channel, His Lordship in Council authorizes the Chief Engineer to issue instructions for the immediate completion of the Under Tunnel from the general funds conditionally apportioned to the District. He will immediately, however, submit a careful Estimate of the amount required for this purpose, in excess of the sum already sanctioned, in order to an application being made to the Gevernment of India on the subject.

|| Submitted by the Chief Engineer with his Proceedings of the 24th Decr. 1857, in Consultation 26th January 1858.

	Rs.
§ Estimated cost..	52,952
Excess above estimate sanctioned by Government of India in letter dated 15th February 1858, No. 794.	1,120
	54,072

11. Colonel Lawford having been deputed to the Neilgherry Hills to inspect and report on the Jackatalla Barracks, the Governor in Council resolves to direct that on the completion of that duty he shall inspect the Murthayaur Under-Tunnel and submit a report upon it, as well as on the present condition of the Ponairy Channel, stating particularly whether it is now of use and to what extent.

(Signed) J. D. BOURDILLON,
Secretary to Governmet.

as on the present condition of the Ponairy Channel.

No. 3-4.

Extract Minutes of Consn.
No. 1411.
Dated 2nd March 59.

From the Chief Engr. No. 6
[illegible]

Mr. Pickell [illegible]

Central Office of Public Works,
Fort St. George, 21st December 1858

No. 6472

From Lieut. [illegible]
The Offg. Chief Engineer,

To
The Secretary to Government
Public Works Depart.

Public

Sir,

In acknowledging the receipt of Extract Minutes Consultation No. 2624, dated the 6th instant, I have the honor to represent that although I called for a "full and complete report" on the excess in the cost of the Murdayaur Under Tunnel, yet I received no other information than that laid before Government with my letter of the 27th October 1858, which has been returned to me.

No. 4890.

2. Captain Moberly seems to have considered that the enquiry into the alleged overcharge of materials was all that he had to make, and in truth I think it will be very difficult to give any more precise account of the causes of the excess than that already furnished in

in Captain Pigou's letter of the 26th July 1838 No 607.

3. Three causes are assigned viz.

1st Stoppage of work in July 1837.

2d Delay in the instructions for the resumption and close of the three best working months of 1838 viz. January, February & March.

3. Want of method in the Executive arrangements, and scarcity of labour in the vicinity of the Work.

4. Deficiency in the Accounts.

4. Assuming the correctness of the data of Captain Pigou's report July 1838 of 7500 Rupees, I calculate the following as the proportions to be assigned to each cause: — First 20 per Cent. Second 60 per Cent. Third 5 per Cent. Fourth 15 per Cent.

5 For the two first causes the Local Officers are of course wholly irresponsible, for although it may be urged, that seeing the delay that has taken place, they should have deferred the work until the following season to ensure fine weather, yet it was very desirable to use up the materials then on the ground, and the season proved uncommonly wet in April and May.

&c.

6. As to the third cause, it arose chiefly owing to want of experienced Officers to superintend the work, and the last is due to a considerable degree of laxity and irregularity in the System of Accounts, during the operations, the responsibility for which it is very difficult to determine individually although to a certain extent the District Engineer principally in fault.

7. It is to be borne in mind, that this work has been carried on during a very unsettled condition of the Department, and that it is situated almost at the extremity of the Trichinopoly District; that Mr. Pichetts, the Executive Officer chiefly concerned, had little experience in Irrigation Works and that he was succeeded by Lieutenant Reed, a very young although promising Officer, and while I do not think that the District Engineer's arrangements were satisfactory, I believe the untoward result reported by Captain Pigou to have been produced by causes very much beyond his control.

8. I must here beg to notice, that the letter returned by Government was drawn up by the officiating Superintending Engineer Southern Circle, and although I do not seek to avoid the responsibility of the portion I have lately held, I think that this case affords an additional instance of the inconvenience resulting from

from the present constitution of the Department. If I could not adopt Major Birdwood's draft, I must necessarily have gone into the whole subject myself and then the time of that Officer would have been entirely lost, and his position towards the Superintending Engineers would have been altered for the worse, if instead of writing in my name, the Superintending Engineer had addressed me to me, I should either have forwarded it to Government with my humble comments thereon for approval, or returned it for those additions which might have seemed necessary. The responsibility of sending such an interpolated paper would then have been fairly mine. I pointed out the anomalies produced by the present system in my Report on the Bengal Code. The Chief Engineer is publicly and personally made responsible for the work of the Superintending Engineers, who although Officers of very nearly his own standing and official rank, take the place only of Secretaries, as I think, to the disadvantage of the public service.

9. I regret to add to this Letter an expression of my conviction that the expenditure on

* See Letter dated 3rd November 1848.

on the Irrigation Canals will amount to even more than the sums already sanctioned for the work have been exposed in its unfinished state to more severe and destructive floods than any previously known. The neglecting Detail of Engineer attention is however not confined at present with the Repairs of damages caused by those floods that I have not expected in my Report on this work in particular, and my object in now addressing Government is to point out the imperative necessity of permitting the work to be completed at once, without awaiting the result of that reference to the Government of India which cannot be long delayed. The next three months will almost certainly be fine, and I would earnestly recommend the prosecution of this and all other unfinished works to be pushed to injury with the utmost vigour during that period.

10. If the Government will be pleased to pass early orders on this my Memorandum, I will convey them to the Executive to Major Birdwood, the

Line [illegible]

to be added after the word

large

the Executive Superintending Engineer now on duty in Fauquier, as to enable that Officer to act promptly and decisively in that case, before he returns to the Presidency. —

Central Office 28th
Fort St. George,
21st December 1858

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedt Servt
Lumsden Lieut-Colonel
Offg Chief Engineer.

To
The Secretary to Government
Public Works Dept.

Copy III

P. W. D.

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation
Under date the January 1859.

Cancelled
W. R. Rogers

Read the following letter
from the Offg. Chief Engineer

(Here enter 21st December 1858 No 6472)

The Government
are not prepared to pass
orders respecting the world
of the Murdaujur under
Tunnel on the imperfect
and unsatisfactory explan-
nation afforded in this
Communication; they
must therefore request that
Colonel Faber will give his
attention to the subject, and
that after instituting a
thorough enquiry into the
causes which led to the
large

large Excess in the cost of the Annual furnish a full report. It will be for Colt & Faber to consider with reference to the Statements in paragraphs 6 & 7 respecting the then Engineer of the District and the Officers by whom the work was carried on, whether the Officers have not disqualified themselves for the position assigned to them in the Department Public Works. Captain Ryves, it is observed, is now District Engineer of Madura; Mr Ricketts though an Assistant Engineer for four years in the department and now acting 4th Class Executive Engineer is stated to have little Experience in Irrigation works, and Lieutenant Mead is a Probationary Assistt Engineer

Engineer who like Mr Ricket
should not have been entru
:ed with a work requiring
Engineering skill and ex
Experience.

W H D

Former draft

Draft - Vol. 17

Note - A draft was formerly circulated merely calling for information but there seems to be enough in the main points; or at least as much as is likely to be obtained.

Queen's

These papers relate to the Embankment under Tunicherry Dist. The Estimate has been largely exceeded; about 17,000 Rupees have been spent instead of 10,700, & still more remains to be done.

Part of this is due to work in the mine carried away & flooded part apparently to the neglect of the work under the restriction order; part is probably the consequence of an ill-considered Estimate; but there is also a considerable amount of incidental work carried on

c3 Jany 1910 c9 Feby 1914 c19 1925

-bjects if not wrong, as the part
of the evening - the officer princi-
-ally responsible for this seems to be
Lt. Richetts who was the acting
Offr. of the Range - He responsible
responsibility, but it seems to be clearly
established against him - the conclu-
-sion of the case against him will be
evidenced two officers Enquiry &c.
I is a general abstract, & has it
contains information or complaints
not sufficiently brought in the
first -

There is much want
of clearness as to the facts as exam
-ined: but that materials were
either for finding evidence or not as

were made away with afterwards,
seems clear; & also that Lt.
Richetts is responsible for -

The question is which
I or? now asks for the order of
Govt. is whether he ought not,
for the sake of the efficiency of the
Dept. to resign & feel his responsi-
-bility - Besides the correspondence
which led to the Orders, it will be
seen that he was negligent of the
Dist. Govts. orders - He is now acting
Ex. Govr. - ought he not to be
deprived of that appt & put back
to his permanent grade of Capt.
Govt. till he shall have proved his
-self his fitness for the higher -
The conduct of the Sub-
-ordinate Engineering Officers

C3 Jany 1810 Cy Feby 1814 C19 Mar 25

in the matter needs further Report.

Capt. [illegible] seems to have augmented the quantity of Chunam taken for a cub. yd. of masonry, in order to screen Lieut. Nicholls –

The works shd. go on & be completed without delay – but immediate Report shd. be called for, as to the probable time required – I think it will be a good thing also to desire Col. Crawford to look at the works & report on it, on his way from the Neilgherries – He might also state the present condition of the Paumben Channel, & whether it is of width & to what extent –

J. D. H. Feby. 9 –

There was culpable laxity also on the part of Lt. Mead in taking over charge of the works. This also should be noticed – J. D. H.

23d Jany / R10th C9th Feby / R14th C19th R25th

Memo - No 1.

Two bills amounting together to Rs 5319 (as shown in statement A which accompanied Captain Ryves letter of 20th July 1858) were submitted by Mr Ricketts for certain materials prepared for the work, but which were not used in consequence of the restrictive orders of July 1857.

When charge of the work was made over to Lieutenant Mead, the materials were neither examined nor counted. Subsequently a list was made out by these Officers conjointly, showing the quantity of materials on hand, out of those used on the work by Smith and Mead after assuming charge. On comparison of the quantity used and on hand with that which should have remained as charged for in the bills, there was a deficiency of the following materials of the value of Rupees 1207, as shown in Statement D.

Bricks burnt	Value	Chunam	Value	Raw bricks	Value	Firewood	Value	Chunam stone	Value
No	Rs	Parahs	Rs	No	Rs	Bandies	Rs	Parahs	Rs
3,54,180	694	1468	309	63,365	33	490	146	209	26

No.

For half year ending 30th April 57 — 1157
For half year ending 21st October 57 — 4132
5319

* Statement B.

Mr Ricketts having been called upon to explain, repudiated all responsibility with respect to the first bill, on the ground that he was not in charge of the work but Assistant Overseer Rungasamy Naidoo. The District Engineer however in his letter of the 29th July 1858 has shown that he was in charge from 1st March 1857, and Colonel Sandford in para 9 of his letter of 27th October 1858 has expressed his opinion to the same effect. Mr Ricketts admits his responsibility for the materials charged for in the second bill, but alleges that no allowance has been made for those used in the construction of other works.

The Officiating Chief Engineer then directed Captain Moberly the Officiating District Engineer, to enquire into the matter, and the following appears to have been the results of that Officers investigation.

In regard to Bricks, after deducting the quantity expended, and making allowance for wastage, Captain Moberly considers

	Bricks		
Entered in bills	8,74,650		
Expended	6,59,517		
Missing	2,15,133		
Deduct for wastage	15,133		
Total unaccounted for	2,00,000		
Entered in bills		8,74,650	
Expended	6,59,517		
Deduct bricks used on other works	31,424		
		6,28,093	
Unaccounted for		2,46,557	
Deduct for wastage		15,133	
		2,31,424	
Add missing to be replaced by the Contractor		56,000	
Total unaccounted for		2,87,424	

Total unaccounted for as per Statement D		Rs
Burnt Bricks	3,64,480 value	694
Raw Bricks	53,365 —	33

will be Rupees 382, and of 2,87,424 Rs 549

With regard to Chunnam, Captain Ryves showed in Statement D that 1668 paras of the value of Rupees 309 were unaccounted for. Captain Moberly differs from him in regard to the quantity considered necessary for 1000 bricks, and calculates that 1920 paras have been used on the works. Deducting this from 2900, the number of paras charged for in the bills, he considers 980 paras, the value of which is not given, to be unaccounted for. But the Officiating Chief Engineer, agreeing with Captain Ryves, considers the quantity of Chunnam missing

considers the number unaccounted for to be 2,00,000. The Officiating Chief Engineer however makes it 2,87,424; but neither gives the value of these bricks. Taking the value of 8,74,650 bricks as given in the bills at Rs 1679 the value of 2,00,000

missing to be, as represented by the Officers, 1468 paras, of the value of Rupees 309.

In paras 12 to 16 Captain Moberly refers to a discrepancy brought to Lieutenant Meade's notice by the Assistant Overseer, viz that the number of Cubes charged in the bills did not agree with those in the foundations and on the ground. It appears however that there are no means of ascertaining the extent of work executed up to the 27th April 1858, or of the numbers washed away by a flood which occurred three days after, but supposing the correctness of the Assistant Overseers statement, the difference amounts only to 22,000 bricks.

With regard to the other items in the bills, viz Foreward, raw bricks and Chunam alone, it appears from Captain Moberly's letter (paras 3 and 5) that the Foreward was given to the brick contractors in consideration of a reduction made in the price of the bricks, and that nothing certain is known of the other two items.

The Officiating Chief Engineer.

Engineer's conclusions on the matter are given in paras 16 and 17 of his letter of 27th October 1858.

Item No 2—

1 Was Mr Richells actually in charge of the work in 1857- trial fools prove this!

In support of this Statement that Mr Richells was actually in charge of the Penang works from the 1st March 1857, Captain Hynes advances the following facts:

1st He alleges that on the 23rd Feby 1857, he divided the District into four separate Executive ranges, of which the Officers were to take charge from the 1st March 1857; and that in his letter to Mr Richells, defining the limits of his range, he specified the Penang channel as one of the works to be under his charge, and named Assistant Overseer Rungasamy Naidoo as one of his subordinates. 2dly that, in addition to the above, he gave Mr Richells full and particular information both in charge official notes and by personal communication; and that there was not at the time the slightest doubt on either side that he was in full charge of the Northagain under Annul- 3dly He appeals

Letter from Captain Hynes to the Chief Engineer dated 29th July 1858 paras 4 to 6 and Letter to Mr Richells therein enclosed dated 23 February 1857.

+ 23rd February 1857

9 July R14 to 19 R25

appeals to Mr Richells Inspection list for March 1857, in which it is stated that he was engaged from the 4th to the 9th March "in inspecting the Penang Channel and the materials in preparation for the construction of the under tunnel."

Captain Ryves adds that from the 9th March to the 11th May 1857, Mr Richells neglected the Penang works, and though requested to meet him at the under tunnel on the 18th and 20th April, he failed to do so, and that he was in consequence obliged to communicate several orders direct to the Assistant Overseer in charge of the works.

The two bills submitted by Mr Richells, amounting together to Rupees 5319, relate to transactions in the last half-year of 1856/57 and first half of 1857/58, being confined to materials prepared for the under tunnel in the months of April May and June 1857, as stated by Captain Ryves in para 4 of

2 What plea does he urge to avoid the responsibility?

For half-year ending 30th April 1857	Rs. 1187
For half-year ending 31st October 1857	4132
	5319

+ The charge of the Penang works was made over to Mr Richells from 1st March 1857

of his letter of 20th July 1858. Mr Richells disclaims responsibility for the materials charged for in the bill for the half year ending 30th April 1857, on the following grounds:

He urges that the bill merely passed through him ex officio, Mr Horgan having been in charge of the work during November and December 1856, and Apothecary Overseer Rungasawmy Naidoo during January and February 1857; and that he cannot be held responsible for the transactions in March and April, in consequence of Rungasawmy Naidoo's repeated disobedience of his orders in not keeping station books and other vouchers by which he could check the expenditure, as brought to the notice of the District Engineer in his letter to that Officer dated 13th May 1857, annexed. He also states that the Assistant Overseers rates and mode of working were notoriously extravagant; that, besides the independent charge of the Penang channel, which is almost-

almost an executive charge in itself),
he had also these other Talooks in his
range, and that under these circumstances,
it is hardly fair to hold him responsible
for the expenditure on a work, the
executive Subordinate of which for two
whole months disregarded his repeated
orders.

Captain Rynes in his Ltr of
after showing that Mr Richetts was
responsible from 1st March to 30th April
1857, observes (para 6) That the work was
commenced only at the very end of
February, orders for the preparation of
materials having been given to Rungasamy
Naidoo on the 23rd February, which orders,
he says, were binding on Mr Richetts
when he took charge of the 4th Circle on
1st March 1857. With regard to Mr Richetts
report of Rungasamy Naidoos Misconduct,
Captain Rynes observes that the report
in question was made only on the 13th
of May; and that we disposed only
to incredulous and tardy in keeping
accounts

Why allow him Rs 7?

+ 29th July 1858.

×

× orders

×

×

×

×

×

accounts according to the new System
(which irregularities for a few months after
the transfer of the executive from the
Collector were general throughout the
District, and which could be overcome
only by the care and watchfulness of the
Officers) it cannot justly be made to relieve
Mr Richetts of responsibility for an abso-
lute error in accounts of materials
supplied during the two preceding months.
Captain Rynes further states that in the
1st Half years bill, the responsibility of which
Mr Richetts repudiates, the principal part
of the deficiency shown in his Statement does
not occur; the total charge for bricks in
that bill being Rupees 400, and for Chunam
Rupees 100 (evidently advances) and the
whole amount of the bill Rupees 1857; —
whereas in the bill for the 2nd half year,
for which Mr Richetts appears willing
to be responsible, the charges for brick and
chunam amount respectively to Rupees
1269 and 488, the grand total of the
bill being Rupees 4132. Captain Rynes
adds

D.E. ending April 30th 57 —
Rs 4 to be credited in Divisional Deposit —
Recovered from Contractor finally
as per case
Ltr of 1st March 58
in abstract —

× No Divisional Engineer
26th July 1858 para 13

adds that Mr Ricketts should state distinctly how far the value of work done and materials prepared up to 30th April 1857 falls short of Rupees 1857; and why this difference of value and expenditure was not then enquired into and immediately reported.

The materials found on the work and those used are deducted from the quantity charged for in the bills, and the difference is the quantity of missing materials, the value of which is calculated at the average rates charged in the bills. According to Captain Rynes, the following is the extent and value of missing materials, in regard to the two principal items as shown in Statement D, dated 3rd July 1858.

	Bricks (Burnt) Nos	Value Rs.	Chunam Maunds	Cubic Yds.
Charged in bills	871,650	1669	2900	588
Value of materials on the work	5,19,170	975	1432	280
Difference	3,64,480	694	1465	308

Captain Moberly gives the

3 How is the calculation of the quantities and amounts of missing materials made?

the following Statement of the bricks used so far as he has been able to calculate the quantity;

	Bricks
Made up in Cakes on the road Tunnel	288,168.
Used in Sluices	11,424.
Bricks 1st Sort	105,200.
" 2d "	98,700.
Used before the numbers were counted	19,800.
Do Do on the Woolavercherry Tunnel	20,000.
More steel	30,000.
Holes	25,000.
Chunnam tubs	4,925
Missing and damaged to be replaced by Contractors	56,300
Total	6,59,517.

Charged for in the bills ---- 874,650.
Deduct quantity expended -- 6,59,517.
2,15,133.
Deduct for wastage & loss in counting -- 15,133.
Number of bricks missing, according to Captain Moberly's calculation --- 2,00,000.

As regards chunnam, Captain Moberly first calculated the quantity of work executed; and allowing 6 pounds to the yard he reckons that 1920 pounds have been used, leaving 980 unaccounted

accounted for as shown below:

	Pounds
Charged for in the Bills	2900.
Used	1920.
Shortage missing	980

The officiating Chief Engineer makes the following calculation, after disallowing the quantity used on other works amounting to Rupees 31424, as well as the 5000 missing and to be replaced by contractor, making together Rupees 87,424:

	Bricks
According to bills	2,14,650.
Expended as shown by Captain Peabody	6,59,517.
	2,15,133
Deduct for wastage and counting as again to by the Bibbits	15,133
	2,00,000
Add the items disallowed as above shown	87,424
Total accounted for	2,87,424

With regard to shortage Col. Crawford considers the quantity allowed by Captain Peabody for a cubic yard far too much; and agrees with Captain Ryves that 1465 pounds of the value of Rupees 309 must

× on shores 111,424.
on the Lowering tunnel 20,000.
31,424.

be considered as the quantity missing

The following table shows the different calculations made

Quantity supposed to be missing	Bricks	Value	Shortage	Value	Remarks
By Capt. Ryves as per Statement D.	35,480.	594	1455.	309.	These values are not given by Capt. Peabody or Col. Crawford but they are calculated at Rupees 6 per thousand charged in the Bills.
By Capt. Peabody — — —	2,00,000	×382	980	×205	
By Officiating Ch. Engr.	287,424	5749	1455.	309.	

There other items are in Statement D. but they are omitted on account, and are noticed by Captain Peabody in paras 4 and 5 of his letter.

On the 3rd Sept. 1858. no further bricks were shortage

On the 4th & 5th Sept. 1858 a list of materials was prepared by Sirdar Ahmed & the Bricklayer conjointly as per Statement B. which papers Col. Crawford & Capt. Ryves refer to Officg Chief Engineer 20th July 1858.

On the 23rd and 24th June 1858 Capt. Ryves inspected the Aundeer Tunnel, and took the

b When were the workmen before overlay to Sirdar and with what permissions

5 When was the deficiency discovered and what was then done?

× Letter of Officg Ch. Engr 20th July 1858

the opportunity to examine the accounts of the work, and to compare them with the work done and materials supplied. The result was a large difference between the cost, as given in the accounts, and the value of the work done. although part of this difference (how much is not stated) and in part cannot be given (and to be examined) by the Clerks who keep away temporary and trifling items, there still remained a very large sum for which the Clerks could not account and the value of which could not be ascertained by the Officers employed by the Board. On the 3rd July 1838 Capt Rice called upon the Clerks for explanation, and desiring upon the 20th idem that he would be prepared to report to the Board the matter to the Officers employed Chief Engineer, and accordingly forwarded to

the Clerks explanation with his letter of 29th July. Upon this Colonel Sandford requested Capt Moberly to investigate the matter and the result has already been given

P.W.D.

№ 477

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation

Under date the 2d ~~February~~ March, 1859.

Read again letters from the late officiating Chief-Engineer dated 4th August and 27th October 1858, and recorded in Diary to Consultation dated 7th September and 7th December 1858 №1814 & 2624.

Read also the following letter from the officiating Chief Engineer.

/Here enter 21st December 1858 №6472/

The letter here recorded is the reply of Colonel Sanford, the late officiating Chief Engineer, ~~to~~ to the order of Government calling for explanation regarding the causes which led to a large excess in the expenditure on the Murthagunr under-tunnel in the Trichinopoly District, he having

+ Extt Minrs Cons. 6th Dec. 1858 №2624.

Vide No 2

C9 Feby R14 C19 R25

having previously reported that Rupees 15054 had been spent on the work, and that Rupees 2500 more would be required to complete it, making Rupees 17,500 in all, or about 70 per cent in excess of the cost estimated by the District Engineer, Viz. Rs. 10,720.

From the Officer in charge Central Office Letter dated 7th April 58 No 3751 Para 2.

No new information is now submitted, as Colonel Lawford was unable to obtain any from the Acting District Engineer Captain Nobbs; and the letter contains only the Acting Chief Engineer's opinion on the information previously laid before Government.

2. The causes of the excess are detailed by the District Engineer Lieut. Ryves in his letter of the 26th July 1858 No 607, and are summed up by Colonel Lawford as follows:

1st Stoppage of work in July 1857.

Delay

2d Delay in the sanction for its resumption, and loss of the three best working months of 1858, Viz. January February and March.

3d Want of method in the Executive arrangements, and scarcity of labor in the vicinity of the work.

4th Deficiency in the accounts.

There is another cause of excess mentioned by Lieut. Ryves in para 6 of his letter, Viz. the direct loss of Rupees 2948, being the value of work in the river carried away by floods; and it is not improbable that some portion of the excess was also the result of an imperfect and ill-considered estimate. Colonel Lawford rightly exempts the local Officers from blame in connection with the first of the four causes mentioned by him; two the third he ascribes to the want of an experienced Officer to superintend the work,

work; the blame of the last he considers to belong mainly to the late District Engineer Lieut. Rynes.

3. The Right Honorable the Governor in Council is of opinion that much allowance is properly to be made for the peculiar circumstances under which the work was undertaken and carried on. Its stoppage after expensive preparations had been made, and the delay of permission to go on with it which prevented its resumption at the right season, must have greatly contributed to increase the cost. The Governor in Council cannot agree with Colonel Sandford in treating so lightly the want of method in the executive arrangements of this work, (the third of the four causes of excess of expenditure stated by him); the immediate

blame of this must rest on Mr. Pickette who was in direct charge, but it was clearly Lieut. Rynes' duty to correct any defect in the arrangements, and that Officer must bear the blame of neglecting to do this.

4. But the last of the four causes is the most serious. It is briefly described by Colonel Sandford as a deficiency in the accounts, signifying in reality however a large discrepancy between the materials entered in the accounts as received and paid for, and those

Rose forthcoming. It
appears from Col Sandford's
special report on the sub-
-ject dated 27th October
1858, that certain mate-
-rials were prepared
in March to June 1857,
which remained unused.
in consequence of the
stoppage of the work,
under the general res-
-trictive order of the 17th
July. On the resump-
-tion of the work in
1858, a considerable por-
-tion of the materials
appearing in the accounts
as prepared was not
forthcoming. The res-
-ponsibility for this
deficit is laid on
Mr Ricketts, the
Assistant Engineer,
under

under whose orders and
control the operations
in 1857 were conducted.
Mr Ricketts however
in his letter dated 26th
July 1858 No 83, repudiates
all responsibility in
connection with the
transactions in March
and April 1857, on the
ground chiefly of Assist-
-ant Overseer Runga-
-sawmy Naidoo's re-
-peated disobedience
of his orders. But the
facts adduced by
Captain Ryves in paras
4 to 6 of his report dated
29th July 1858, clearly
show that Mr
Ricketts was the
responsible Executive
Officer in charge of
the

the work from 1st March to 30th April 1857. With respect to the Assistant Overseer's neglect of orders, Captain Ryves states (para 7) that Mr Ricketts made no report to him on the subject ~~regarding that subordinates were such~~ ~~made~~ till the 13th of May; and he justly observes that the overseer's alleged disobedience of ~~it~~ cannot be held to relieve Mr Ricketts of responsibility for an absolute error in accounts of materials supplied during the two preceding months, viz March and April.

5. The Governor in Council has carefully perused the correspondence on the subject submitted by the Officiating Chief Engineer with his ~~special~~ Report of the 27th October 1858, and he is compelled to agree with Colonel Lawford (para 16) that Mr Ricketts is justly charged in the matter with serious neglect of duty and carelessness. Under these circumstances, and with the view of maintaining the efficiency of the Department and marking his sense of Mr Ricketts disregard of the public interests, the Governor in Council resolves to direct that he be, degraded from his

his acting appointment of Executive Engineer to his permanent Office of Assistant Engineer, until he shall prove by diligence his fitness for promotion to the higher grade.

6. Adverting to Mr. Ricketts letter to the District Engineer dated 26th July 1858, the Governor in Council desires that Assistant Overseer Ramaswamy Naidoo be called upon for an explanation of his neglect to keep station books and other Vouchers as directed by Mr. Ricketts. In laying his explanation before Government the Chief

Chief Engineer will state his opinion whether the loss of materials on the Undertunnel may not to some extent be attributed to the lax and careless manner in which the Assistant Overseer is represented to have conducted his duties.

7. The Government see with displeasure that when charge of the work was transferred in April 1858 from Mr. Ricketts to Lieutenant Mead, the materials present were not examined.* This was a neglect of

* From C.E. Crawford 27th Oct 1858 para 5.

of duty on the part of both those Gentlemen. The Chief Engineer will point out to all District Engineers the duty and necessity of enforcing exactness and punctuality in such transfers. Any District Engineer omitting to do so will incur the serious displeasure of Government; and Executive Officer taking over materials or cash without actual verification will become responsible for all that is shewn in the accounts.

9. In para 4 of Colonel Lawfords letter

letter of the 27th October 1858, it is stated that when the work was resumed in that year, Mr. Ricketts was unwilling to undertake it, on the grounds that the project would not succeed, and that Captain Ryves thereupon relieved him and placed Lieut. Mead in charge. The Governor in Council observes that Mr. Ricketts had no option in the matter; it was his duty to obey the orders of his Superior Officer, and do his best to execute the work entrusted to him in an efficient manner, with liberty however to state for the consideration of the District Engineer such

such objections as he
have to the project.

9 In para 7 of his letter of the 21st. December, Colonel Lawford states his expectation that the expenditure on the under-tunnel will exceed the amount already reported, in consequence of the work having been exposed in its unfinished state to inundation; and he urges the necessity of permitting it to be com-pleted at once.

10 In a Minute dated 22d. December 1857, Colonel Lawford x stated that the con-struction of the Mar-thayaur under tunnel was absolutely necessary to

x Submitted by the Chief Engineer with his Proceedings of the 24th Dec. 57/57 in Cons: 26th Jany 1858.

to the success of the Ponnairy Channel, on which upwards of 54,000 Rupees has been spent; and as delay in its completion, besides adding to its own cost, is likely to compromise the utility of the Channel, His Lordship in Council authorizes the Chief Engineer to issue instruc-tions for the immediate completion of the Under-tunnel from the general funds conditionally ap-portioned to the District. He will immediately, however, submit a care-ful Estimate of the amount required for this purpose, in excess of the sum already sanctioned).

	Rs
* Estimated Cost	52,952
Excess above Estimate sanctioned by Govt. of India in letter dated 15th February 1858 No 794	1,120
	54,072.

* Estimated Cost 52,952
Excess above Estimate sanctioned by Govt. of India in letter dated 15th February 1858 No 794 — 1,120
54,072.

sanctioned, in order to
an application being
made to the Government
of India on the subject:

" Colonel Lawford
having been deputed to
the Neilgherry Hills to
inspect and report
on the Jackatalla
barracks, the Governor
in Council resolves to
direct that on the com-
pletion of that duty he
shall inspect the Mur-
thayaur under tunnel
and submit a report upon
it, as well as on the present
condition of the Ponairy
Channel, stating particu-
larly whether it is now of
use and to what extent.

+0 Copies to the Rev. Secy. Dated 3
" " Paul Audus

Cons: 7th December/58 At. 96-97.
" 4th May — " — 116-117.
" 7th Sept.r — " — 72-73

Public Works 1859 Depart.t
Dr. to Cons 8th March.

No. 477.

Extract Mins of Cons:
Dy 2d March/59.

From the Chief Engineer 22nd
March/59 & No. 678 in Cons: 1st Appl.

From the Chief Engr. 13th May 1859
& No. 1086. in Cons.

Directing that Mr Ricketts
Acting Executive Engineer of Trichinopoly
be degraded to his permanent Office
of Assistant Engineer for his Neglect
of duty in the under Tunnel work -
Calling upon Assistant Overseer
Ramga Sammy Naidoo for an explan-
ation of his disobedience of
Mr Ricketts orders - Authorizing
the Chief Engineer to issue instruc-
tions for the immediate comple-
tion of the under Tunnel and
directing that Coll. Lawford on the
Completion of his duty on the
Jackatalla Barracks shall
inspect the Mint the your under
Tunnel and submit a report upon
it as well as on the present Con-
dition of the Buairy Channel -

From the Surveyor of the
Audit and Account
Department 15th May/62
No. 1499 -

No 384 -

19 July/62