M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 6

(2) Date of repair

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2887 Press ~~Mis.~~

89—90

Dated 6—10— 1864.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department, 6th October 1864.

No. 89. Read the following letter from Captain J. MULLINS, R. E., Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company, to Colonel C. A. ORR, R. E., Secretary to Government, Department of Public Works, dated Madras, 28th September 1864, No. 112:—

SIR,

[In original, to be returned.]

1. I have the honor to transmit for the information of Government a copy of a letter No. 781 of the 19th instant, from the Chief Engineer, and which has been received through the Agent, in which Colonel Cotton objects to paragraph 18 of my letter No. 81 of the 2nd ultimo, reporting on the progress of the works for the quarter ending 31st July 1863, and to the Order of Government No. 2,616, of the 9th September 1864, thereupon.

2. I find a verbal inaccuracy in the order of Government, arising probably from two expenditures at different places being included in one sentence of paragraph 18 of my report, but the error is really very unimportant, and to be quite correct the latter part should run "especially in the case of the roads connected with the site selected for the Bŏwanassy station and on buildings at Kurnool." I may however be said to be verbally wrong here also, so I must further explain that the unauthorized expenditure on buildings, Rupees 1,244-13-3, was upon an Overseer's but, and not upon an engine shed and office as well, for the sums, totalling 2,082-0-2, expended on them and not alluded to by me, were refunded by transfer and appear to the debit of the head "Manufacture of Stores," The particulars of this sum have since been received and a copy of them is enclosed, and it will be seen that many of the items were improperly debited to the "Manufacture of Stores" and some were neither directly nor indirectly connected therewith. The mistake arose from my taking the expenditure shown on the three items, as separately totalled in the Progress Report, and not observing that on two of them there had been a complete refund though, as it turns out to be, a nominal one.

3. The Chief Engineer in paragraph 7 of his letter is therefore quite right in saying that the Bowanassy buildings had been sanctioned, and they were so in the Order of Government No. 2,075, 9th November 1861. He however omits all mention of the roads which have not been sanctioned, and which are therefore rightly classed as unauthorized expenditure; no notice is taken of the buildings on which unsanctioned expenditure was incurred, nor is a remark offered as to the numerous instances in which applications for sanctions required to cover additional expenditure were delayed or not sent in at all.

Colonel Cotton moreover says, "that authority was originally given to get up buildings without waiting for estimates," and this is referred to in paragraph 2 of the late Consulting Engineer's letter No. 49, 23rd October 1861, Proceedings Madras Government No. 2,075 of the 9th November 1861, but if the Proceedings Madras Government No. 2,500, of the 24th October 1859, be turned to, it will be seen at pages 1 and 2 what the "preliminary expenses" were, and that nothing is said of buildings. I am not aware of any other authority.

4. With regard to the Chief Engineer's remarks upon the site of the buildings, I adhere to what I have already said. The situation is a very pleasant one indeed, but it is not as convenient looking at the matter financially and supposing the buildings to be of permanent utility, as it should be. It was the best place for temporary buildings for the head quarters of the Officers employed in surveying, levelling and laying out the line of the canal, but when the line was fixed and found to be so far from the site, it would have been far better that all permanent buildings should have been built close to the canal, and had the total outlay proposed been put on paper at once, and the relative positions of canal and building shown with the cost of roads to get from one to the other, I have but little doubt that my predecessors in this Office would have noticed the objections, which of course are less apparent when only a fraction of the information on which a correct opinion can be based is presented at one time. I may also add that close to the canal water might have been obtained but very little below the surface.

9th Sept. 1864 No. 2618
Copy of a letter to England of
10th October 1864 64.

No. 2887

Robert Hall Esq. Foreign commr.
London. &c. &c. &c.

Sir,

I have the honor to transmit herewith
for the information of the Secretary of State for India
a copy of a letter from the Chief Engineer
Bombay Presidency, dated 10th Ultimo.

I have &c.
(Signed) Manager
Chief Engineer &c. &c. &c.
Bombay
6th October 1864.

No. 89. 90

1. 1st Oct. 1864 - R. 3rd Oct. 64

Oct. 1864 Letter
90 Copy of Corr. for Order
from No. 4231
The Consulting Engr. &c. &c.
To, The Secretary to Govt. D.P.W.

Dated 28th
Rec'd 30th } Sept. 1864.

Ques. 2.

Fr. Bombay Cer. 4 Oct
C.R. 200/65 5199/64

Transmits for inform.
copy of letter No. 781 of 19 inst. from
the Ch. Engr. in which he objects
to para. 18 of Consulting's letter No.
61 of 2nd ult. on the progress of the
works for the Dr. ending 31st July/64
year &c.

With an Order
No. 2887 - 6th Oct. 1864