

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1893	Press
131-133	Mis.
Dated 6. 7.	1865.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
6th July 1865.

Read the following papers:—

No. 131. Memorandum from the Superintending Engineer, 7th Division, dated Coonoor, 27th May 1865.

From H. BAILEY, Esq., Sub-Engineer, to Lieutenant-Colonel G. W. WALKER, R. E., Superintending Engineer, 7th Division, dated Poyly, 23rd May 1865, No. 62.

SIR,

1. With reference to my letter No. 625, of the 2nd instant, I have the honor to report for your information that having inspected and measured the works in charge of Overseer Soobooroyah, and heard what he has to say in explanation of the overcharges on them, I am unable to accept of his explanation as in the least degree satisfactory, and have therefore found it necessary to suspend him, pending your instructions. During my employment in the Department I have never met with such glaring overcharges as I have found on his work.

2. The first work inspected by me was the Quinlandy road; the following table shows the difference between my measurements and those charged by the Overseer, and for which he has forwarded vouchers, so that I am precluded from calling on the Contractors to make good the deficiency:—

	Earthwork. Rs. 0-1-0 per cubic yard.		Earthwork. Rs. 0-1-6 per cubic yard.		Earthwork. Rs. 0-2-0 per cubic yard.	
By Overseer's accounts.	9,326½	582 14 6	3,629	357 7 6	1,992	249 0 0
By my measurements...	7,027	439 3 0	1,604	150 6 0	1,825	228 2 0
Overcharged...	2,299½	143 11 6	2,025	207 1 6	167	20 14 0

or a total overcharge of 4,491½ cubic yards of earthwork and Rupees 371-11-0, yet the measurements allowed by me were certainly ample.

3. On the Poyly lock, there was expended to the end of 1863-64 Rupees 2,508-6-8 for masonry, but as materials to the value of Rupees 416-4-0 remained on hand at the end of that year, the amount chargeable for 14,258-8 cubic feet of masonry executed was Rupees 2,092-2-8, or at the rate of Rupees 14-10-9 per 100 cubic feet.

4. In 1864-65 the expenditure for masonry has been Rupees 2,340-5-7, to which is to be added the amount of materials from previous years, less the value of 10,000 seers of chunam said to have been carried away by the flood, Rupees 80, the expenditure therefore stands as follows Rs. 2,340-5-7 + 416-4-0 — 80 = 2,676-9-7 for 14,763-4 cubic feet of masonry executed, being at the rate of Rupees 18-2-0½ nearly per 100 cubic feet.

5. This extraordinary discrepancy between the cost of the work in the two years is easily accounted for when the accounts are examined.

6. By these accounts Rupees 69,000 + 2,750 + 2,500 (value of 1,000 largest stones paid for, but small ones received instead) are shown as the number of stones purchased and paid for, whereas by the same accounts only 66,000 stones were brought to the work, thus showing an overcharge of 8,250 stones, Rupees 121, as the deficient stones are not forthcoming.

7. The quantity of chunam charged for seemed also so excessive, that to check it, I counted the number of stones in a part of the wall and found that in 38' 10" x 38' 10" x 14' 5" there was 27½ stones laid lengthways, 53 laid across, and 38 courses in height thus giving 27½ x 53 x 38 = 55,385 stones in 21,730-8 cubic feet, or at the

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
6th July 1865.

rate of $2\frac{1}{4}$ stones per cubic foot. By this calculation 74,974 stones would be required for the work up to the date of my measurement, 29,022 cubic feet to masonry having been executed. The difference between the number of stones in this and that shown as brought to the work in paragraph 6 is accounted for by the stones from the old lock having been used again.

8. At Calicut and Malliaporam I find that three-eighths of a Pyolly measure or Edangally of chunam is quite sufficient for each stone, I have, however, in the following calculation allowed for half a measure instead, by this calculation the charge for chunam should be $74,974 \times \frac{1}{2} = 37,487$ measures, to which is to be added 10,000 measures washed away, or a total of 47,487 measures instead of 79,000 charged, the overcharge being therefore 31,513 Edangallys, Rupees 252-1-8.

9. It follows from the calculation in paragraph 7 that as there has been cubic feet 14,763-4 of masonry executed during 1864-65 only, 36,319 stones could have been used. For this number 1,688 Bricklayers have been charged being at the rate of 21 $\frac{1}{2}$ stones chipped and laid per man, whereas a second class Bricklayer would give an overcharge of 603 $\frac{1}{2}$ Bricklayers at Rupees 0-7-9 $\frac{1}{2}$ per man (the average obtained from the accounts) or Rupees 293-9-1 overcharged.

10. That I have not been too strict in my calculations in the last paragraph is I think plain from the fact that I have calculated only second class Bricklayer's work for such unusually high average wages as 0-7-9 $\frac{1}{2}$.

11. In 1863-64 I found the charge for labor was very high, I however passed the accounts, as the work of that year had been laying foundations and the people could not do their usual day's work amongst the mud and dirt, but even with this unusual allowance in that year I find that the work was done for Rupees 3-8-3 $\frac{1}{2}$ per 100 cubic feet less than the work of 1864-65.

12. The total overcharge shown above is as follows :—

Stone	...	...	...	RS.	A.	P.
Chunam	...	...	...	121	0	0
Bricklayers	...	...	...	252	1	8
	...	...	...	293	9	1
Total...				666	10	9

which if deducted from the total charge for masonry will reduce the rate to Rupees 14-2-2 per 100 cubic feet instead of Rupees 16-6-10 $\frac{1}{2}$ as it now is.

13. On the road from Perinkolum to Nadapuram, I found that the work had been badly done throughout, while in many places the quantity executed is much below that allowed in the estimate, yet the work is reported complete in the Overseer's Progress Report for last month, and not only that but he has now produced vouchers for the whole of the expenditure shown by him.

14. In one single item of this estimate I find that whereas the estimate allows for yards $100 \times 6 \times 2$ of cutting at 0-4-10 per cubic yard scarcely one-fourth has been done, and for that a rate of 0-2-10 ought to be ample being in overcharge on this one item of Rupees 225.

15. Other items are quite as glaring, though not to the same extent.

16. On the road from Nadapuram to Buddagherry though not quite to the same extent, in short I regret to say, that of the whole of the works in charge of Overseer Soobooroyah of not one can I say that it has been carried out fairly and honestly; that he has been able to produce vouchers for such overcharges merely shows the difficulty there is in finding proof of them when made.

17. To complete the works in progress I have placed them in charge of Overseer Vedamootoo, much against my will, as he is but just recovering from a severe attack of jungle fever.

18. A sum of Rupees 200 has been paid by Overseer Soobooroyah on account of security, but as the last instalment was only paid into the Treasury the day 1

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
6th July 1865.

left Calicut, and the bond has not been executed, I do not know whether that amount will be available to help to pay for the deficiencies shown above.

1. On careful perusal of these statements I am of opinion that Overseer Soobroyah can be successfully prosecuted on criminal charges as to the points noted in paragraphs 2, 6, and 13, 14, as such charges will be based on measurements and accounts, and not on questions of opinion, or which may more or less depend upon the mere carelessness of the Overseer.

2. I accordingly forward this paper at once for orders, whether to prosecute or to rest satisfied with the punishment of dismissal; also for instructions regarding disposal of the security money.

(Signed) G. W. WALKER, Lieut.-Colonel, R. E.,
Superintending Engineer, 7th Division.

Referred to the Government Pleader, who will be good enough to state his opinion as to whether Overseer Soobooroyah can be successfully prosecuted as proposed, and whether the amount of security in deposit can be retained under the circumstances reported.

FORT SAINT GEORGE,
30th May 1865.

(Signed) CHARLES A. ORR, Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government, P. W. D.

No. 132. From C. DALE, Esq., Government Pleader, Madras, to Colonel C. A. ORR, R. E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 20th June 1865, No. 100.

SIR,

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Proceedings of the Government, under the date and number 30th May 1865, No. —, Public Works Department, noted in the margin.

2. As I understand the matter, the works referred to were executed under contract, and that Overseer Soobooroyah was employed by Government to superintend the work and report upon it. That the works have been in many instances badly performed; and that the Contractor on the reports of the Overseer has been, in the opinion of the Taluq Engineer, paid for more work than he has performed; it is not surmised that the Overseer has benefited by these alleged overcharges, or that he has been actuated by corrupt or criminal motives. From the papers before me the allowance of these overcharges may have proceeded from incompetence of the Overseer, or probably from carelessness on his part, under such circumstances I am of opinion the Overseer Soobooroyah could not be successfully prosecuted as proposed.

3. As regards the retention by Government of any security lodged in their hands by the Overseer, that question can only be answered after a perusal of the document under which the security was lodged.

4. I return the letter of the Superintending Engineer, 7th Division.

No. 133. ORDER THEREON, 6th July 1865, No. 1,893.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 17.

1. Communicated to the Superintending Engineer, 7th Division, with reference to his endorsement of the 27th May

1865. As the Government Pleader is of opinion that Overseer Soobooroyah cannot be successfully prosecuted, the Government consider it sufficient to dismiss that Subordinate on the charges preferred against him by Sub-Engineer Bailey.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
6th July 1865.

2. Referring to paragraph 3 of Mr. Dale's letter, Colonel Walker will be requested to forward without delay a copy of the Security Bond therein referred to.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) CHARLES A. ORR, Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 7th Division.
" Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

N^o 100 5
From Clement Dale Esquire Government Pleader Madras.
To Colonel C. A. Orr R. E. Secretary to ^{Govt} Public Works Department.

Madras 20th June 1865.

Sir

Para 1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt
of the Proceedings of the Government under the
date and number noted in the Margin.

30th May 1865 No
Public Works Departt.

2. As I understand the matter, the works referred to were executed under contract, and that Overseer Soobroya was employed by Government to Superintend the work and report upon it. That the works have been in many instances badly performed; and that the Contractor on the reports of the Overseer has been, in the opinion of the Taluk Engineer, paid for more work than he has performed; it is not surmised that the Overseer has been fitted by these alleged Overcharges, or that he has been actuated by corrupt or Criminal motives. From the papers before me the allowance of these overcharges may have proceeded from incompetence of the Overseer; or probably from carelessness on his part; under such circumstances I am of opinion the Overseer Soobroya could not be successfully prosecuted as proposed.

3. As regards the retention by Government

4. "I return the letter of the Superintending Engineer & Division."

Lin

Sir
Your most Obedt. Servant
Wm. Hall.
Government Pleader.

Date } June 10

Y^{rs} M^y Secretary to Congress
D. D. McKim

[illegible]

1877-1878

Thos J. Gooden
M. Cunningham

510 2250 Mason

✓ My dearest to be remembered

P. C. McLean

1

Dated 20th June 1901

Dec 21

2

with an *holocent*

1

Of opinion that the

Quenden do Konga cont.

not be successful

insulated as possible

to the attention of the

Returning the Letter

of the paper on timber

Wagner & Deacon

100

[Faint handwritten notes and scribbles]

MS A.9.2.6 v.20 p.1863-6

(The page contains faint, illegible handwriting.)

With reference to my letter N^o 612 you
the Agent to report for your information that having inspected
measured the work in charge of Brecken Potbury, and heard what
he has to say in explanation of the overcharges on them, I am unable
to accept of his explanation so in the least degree satisfactory &
have therefore found it necessary to suspend him pending your
instructions. During my employment in the Dept. I have never
met with such glaring overcharges as I have found on his work.
The first work inspected by me was the Guilford Road
the following table shows the difference between my measurements
and those charged by the overseer, and for which he has forwarded
bills so that I am precluded from calling in the Contractors to
make good the deficiency -

Cartmow	Cartmow	Cartmow
£10 per cgd	£16 per cgd	£10 per cgd
1992	1992	1992
249	249	249

had more than the preceding
 years so that the preceding
 make good the deficiency -

	Carthwork	Carthwork	Carthwork
	5/10 per cwt	4/6 per cwt	4/2 1/2 per cwt
By Officers Accounts	4326 1/2	5824 1/2	3629
- By Measurements	7027	4323 1/2	1604
	22992	14811 1/2	2025

Carthwork 3577 1/2
 Carthwork 1992
 Carthwork 249 10 0
 Carthwork 1825
 Carthwork 228 2 0
 Carthwork 167
 Carthwork 20 10 0

Carthwork & 11-0 yet the

or a total shortage of 449 1/2 Cys. of flour.
 Measurements allowed by the were extremely ample.
 3 On the Supply Book, there was expended to the end of
 1863/64 Rs 2508-6-8 for masonry, but no materials to the value of Rs
 416-4-0 remained a hand at the end of that year, the amt. chargeable
 for 14258-8 Cys. of masonry executed was Rs 2092-2-8 at ab. the rate
 of Rs 15-10-7 per 100 cubic feet.
 4 In 1864/65 the expenditure for masonry has been Rs
 2340-5-7 to which is to be added the amount of materials from
 previous years, also the value of 10000 Pies of Chumam said to
 have been crued away by the flood Rs 80-0-0 the expenditure there
 for 14763-4 Cys. of masonry executed, being at the rate of Rs 18-2-0 1/2 per 100 cubic feet.
 5 This extraordinary discrepancy between the cost of the
 work in the 2 years is easily accounted for when the accounts are
 examined.
 6 By these accounts 69000 + 2750 + 2500 / value of 10000 lbs
 of stones purchased & paid for, whereas by the same accounts ab.
 66,000 stones were brought to the work thus showing an overcharge
 of 5250 Pies Rs 121-0-0 so the deficient stones are not paid for.
 7 The quantity of Chumam charged for seemed also to

excessive, that to check it I counted the number of stones in a part of the Wall and found that in $38'10" \times 38'10" \times 14'5"$ there was $2\frac{1}{2}$ ft Stones laid being 53 laid across and 38 courses in height thus giving $2\frac{1}{2} \times 53 \times 38 = 5335$ Stones in $21730-8$ Cft or at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ ft Stones per cubic foot. By this calculation $7497\frac{1}{2}$ Stones would be required for the Wall up to the date of my measurement, 29022 Cft of masonry having been executed. The difference between the number of Stones in this and that shown as brought to the Work in Para 6 is accounted for by the Stones from the old Lock having been used again.

8 At Calicut & Mallapooram I find that $\frac{1}{8}$ of a Pyally measure or Colangally of Chumam is quite sufficient for each Stone, I have however in the following calculation allowed for $\frac{1}{4}$ a measure instead, by this calculation the charge for Chumam should be $7497\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{4} = 18743\frac{1}{2}$ Measures to which is to be added 10000 Piers marked down or a total of 47487 Measures instead of 79000 charged the Merchants being therefore 31513 Colangallys No. 252-1-8

9 It follows from the calculation in Para 7 that as there has been Cft $14763\frac{1}{2}$ of masonry executed during 1864/65 only 36319 Stones could have been used. For this number 1688 Bricklayers have been charged being at the rate of $21\frac{1}{1000}$ stones shipped & laid per man whereas a second class Bricklayer should have shipped & laid at least $33\frac{1}{2}$ the difference on these rates of working would give an overcharge of $603\frac{1}{2}$ Bricklayers at $22\frac{1}{4}$ per man / the average obtained from the accounts / or No. 293-9-1 overcharged.

10 That I have not been too strict in my calculations in the last Para is I think plain from the fact that I have calculated only 2nd class Bricklayers Work for each unusually high average Wage as $7\frac{1}{4}$ per day.

11 In 1863/64 I found the charge for labor was very high, I however passed the accounts as the Work of that year had been laying Foundations & the people could not do their usual day's work amongst the mud & dirt, but then with this unusual allowance in that year I find that the Work was done for No. 3-8-3 per 100 Cubic feet less than the Work of 1864/65.

12 The total overcharge shown above is as follows.

Stone	No. 121-0-0
Chumam	" - 252-1-8
Bricklayers	" - 293-9-1
Total	" - 666-10-9

which if deducted from the total charge for masonry will reduce the rate to No. 14-2-2 per 100 Cubic feet instead of No. 16-6-10 as it now is.

13 On the Road from Perikolam to Madapuram I found that the Work had been badly done throughout, while in many places the quantity executed is much below that allowed in the estimate, yet the Work is reported complete in the Mercers Progress Report for last month, and not only that but he has now produced Vouchers for the whole of the expenditure shown by him.

14 In one single item of this estimate I find that whereas the estimate allows for $4\frac{1}{2} \times 100 \times 6 \times 2$ of cutting at $\frac{1}{4}$ per eye scarcely $\frac{1}{4}$ has been done and for that a rate of $\frac{1}{4}$ ought to be ample being an overcharge on this one item of No. 225-0-0.

15 Other items are quite as glaring though not to the same extent.

16 On the Road from Madapuram to Budday Kumbhaya, not quite to the same extent, a short regret to say, that of the whole of the Works in charge of Mr. Pootroya of not one can I say that it has been carried out fairly and honestly - that he has been able to produce Vouchers for each overcharge, merely shows the difficulty there is in finding proof of ~~that~~ when made.

17 To complete the Works in Progress I have placed them in charge of Messrs. Redmanston, much against my will, as he is but just recovering from a severe attack of lung fever.

18 A sum of Rs. 200-0-0 has been paid by Messrs. Pootroya in account of Security but as the last installment was only paid into the Treasury the day I left Calicut, and the Road has not been executed, I do not know whether that sum will be available to help to pay for the deficiencies shown above.

Yours most obedt. servt.
H. B. Bailey
D. 1865

Messrs.

On careful perusal of these statements I am of opinion that Messrs. Pootroya can be successfully prosecuted on criminal charges as to the points noted in paras. 2, 6, & 13, 14; no such charges will be based on measurements and accounts, and not on questions of opinion, or who may be more or less depended upon the mere conclusions of the overseer.

I accordingly forward this paper at once, for orders whether to prosecute, or to rest satisfied with the punishment of dismissal - also for instructions regarding disposal of the Security money.

Wm. L. J. Supp. 27th May

Controller
Dated 20 July 1865

211

4

[illegible]

work

4. The Subj. Ingr & Dir. 21
Controller
Drops & Subj. B. 3000

10.56
10.56
 10.56

Received
March 21st 1886

to the Hon. Secy of the
War of Gov. Ford

to the Hon. Secy of the
War of Gov. Ford

C. 2000/65

Constitution of the
United States
and the
rights of the
people

12
No 101 @ 133