

(1) Number of pages 43

(2) Date of receipt 17-9-80

(3) Initials of the Receiver

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	<u>1134</u>	Press
	<u>179-80</u>	<u>Min.</u>
Dated	<u>7-4-</u>	<u>1889.</u>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
7th April 1869.*

No. 179. Read the following letter from the Collector of Malabar, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Calicut, 5th March 1869, No. 28 :— *

* Collector to Government, 7th July 1868.
G. O., dated 24th July 1868, No. 2,378.
† Dated 4th February 1869, No. 114.
‡ Dated 2nd March 1869, No. 39.

Collector, ‡ on the subject of the Palayad and Katampalli dams in the Kurumbranad talook of this district.

1. Adverting to the correspondence noted,* I have the honour to forward letters from the Superintending Engineer, 7th Division, † and my Sub-

From 19th February 1866 to 7th January 1867.
From 29th April 1867 to 26th September 1867.
2. The dates noted show that the estimates for the works were delayed for some time in my office, partly because I knew there were no funds, and partly from oversight. This I regret, especially considering the sequel. I have only to submit that the estimates were not of especial emergency or importance. Still they should not have escaped notice.

They were sanctioned under G. O., dated 23rd October 1867. It was arranged that the works should be carried out by the Revenue Department. The Superintending Engineer ordered Rupees 695 to be placed at the disposal of the Revenue Department on the 1st November 1867.

3. January and February are the best months for such work to be undertaken, and orders were sent on the 22nd January to the Tahsildar of Kurumbranad to commence the works; but he was not able, owing to press of other work, to visit the spot till the middle of February. He applied at once to the Department Public Works for plans and advice. On the 7th March an Overseer was sent to assist the Tahsildar. No plan seems to have been furnished. The Overseer considered revised estimates necessary and prepared them. They were received by the Sub-Collector on the 12th and 18th March, and on the 19th idem that officer directed the Tahsildar to proceed with the works on these revised estimates.

4. It has been subsequently questioned whether the estimates required revision or not. On this point I beg reference to the portions of the enclosures noted. I think it clear they did require revision. But whatever opinion may be come to on that point now, the Overseer's opinion at the time was clear; the season for work was then far advanced, the amounts involved were petty, and, under the circumstances, I think the Sub-Collector was quite right in acting as he did, *i. e.*, in ordering the Tahsildar to go on with the work as recommended by the Overseer deputed to assist him.

5. Several minor points raised in the Superintending Engineer's letter are explained by the Sub-Collector's letter enclosed, and I have entered reference to the explanations in the margin of Colonel Walker's communication.

Colonel Walker complains of the manner in which his refusal to pay the balance of the Government contribution to the workmen employed was brought before Government by me. He thinks I might have advanced the money; but I thought and think that his disbursement of it under such protest as he deemed necessary was the most natural course to be pursued.

and I regret saying

the

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
7th April 1869.*

File Sub-Collector's letter, paragraph 2.

*He also says that there was
contribution unspent, but in this he is mistaken.*

In one letter, from the Sub-Collector to me, there was a hearty expression of regard to the Superintending Engineer's wisdom and conduct, and I forwarded this letter in original, as it contained a long report of the matter of the dam, to Colonel Walker, without noticing the objectionable phrase. When Colonel Walker animadverted on the expression, I apologized for it, and disclaimed any intention of discourtesy on my own part or on that of the Sub-Collector. I think, that at this point might have been allowed to rest.

6. Finally, I most fully allow that generally it would require very strong grounds indeed to justify a Revenue Officer in ordering departure, on the order of an Overseer, from an estimate sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer, when the original estimate had been sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer.

But in such petty works as these under notice, I must repeat that I cannot think the Sub-Collector was in any way to blame in proceeding on the revised estimate as he did. Such blame as the delay in getting estimates formally sanctioned bears, rests principally with me; but the works were really so comparatively insignificant in themselves, that I think it will be allowed that they might have escaped notice in almost any office. If the Superintending Engineer is right in thinking I should have advanced the balance of money due to the workmen, instead of requesting him to pay it, and, on his refusal, referring to Government in order that he should be directed to pay that money from the sanctioned funds, then my reference to Government at the time was unnecessary, and the Superintending Engineer is not to blame. But I made the reference in good faith. I believed it was the Superintending Engineer's refusal that kept the people out of their dues, and my eagerness and hardness was caused to them thereby. If my premises were right, my conclusion was right. If my premises were wrong, the eagerness and hardness were not attributable to the Superintending Engineer, and I regret that, thinking they were, I attributed them to him.

From the Superintending Engineer, 7th Division, to the Collector of Malabar, dated Telicherry, 4th February 1869, No. 114.

1. I have the honour to request that you will be so good as to submit, for the information of Government, the following remarks on the subject of their Order No. 2, 27th, of 24th July, to accompany the full report promised by you in paragraph 2 of your letter printed with that Order.

2. From the rough drafts of the estimates, they appear to have been made by the Range Officer on the requisition of the Sub-Collector on the 18th February 1868. They were forwarded to me with your letter No. 970, of 26th April 1867, (one late for submission in that calendar year,) and submitted by you for sanction, in conformity with my recommendations, on the 26th September 1867. A sum of Rupees 605, out of the total of Rupees 822-4-1 contributed by Government, (being all the funds at the time available,) was ordered by me, under date the 1st November, to be paid to you by the Range Officer; and the remainder was to be supplied at a later date. The long interval between the preparation of the estimates and their sanction, included in the 1st paragraph of your letter to Government, during which the dams had sustained greater damage, was entirely due to your own retention of the papers; and this, I think, should have been fairly stated.

3. From November 1867 to February 1868, no action seems to have been taken, and as you had expressly desired that the work should be carried out by the Revenue officials, no action was

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
7th April 1869.*

expected to be taken by the Public Works Officers. On the 19th February 1868 the Kurumbranad Tahsildar applied to the Calicut Range Officer for the plan of the work, and for assistance in carrying it out. Mr. Supervisor Grime was at that time in charge of Calicut Range in addition to the Palghat Range, in consequence of Lieutenant Manwaring's absence on service in Abyssinia. He could not, therefore, inspect the works himself, as they lay at the northern extremity of his double charge, and he deputed Overseer Vedamuttu to give the assistance required. The Overseer visited the dams on the 7th and 11th March, and to use his own words "prepared revised estimates to suit the sanctioned amounts."

4. As stated in your letter to Government, the Sub-Collector took on himself the responsibility of acting on estimates so revised, forwarding them to you on the 28th March, as you state "with intimation of his order, for submission to the Superintending Engineer." They bear your simple endorsement to me of the 29th April (one month latter), "For approval," without a word of explanation of the circumstances under which the revision had been necessitated, or how it had been carried out. On the 2nd May I called on the Range Officer for report, which was made under date the 11th May. I had then to call for the original estimates, and to institute a close comparison of both sets to find out the nature of the alterations made; and in my letter to your address of the 19th June, I stated very fully the reasons why I could not make the payment called for by you, and my opinion that it should be advanced by those who took on them the responsibility of the work. One result of my investigation was Overseer Vedamuttu's removal from the talook which had so long been his home, as a mark of my disapprobation of his unauthorized proceedings.

5. I consider your Department answerable to Government for the delay throughout November and December 1867, and January to 19th February 1868, in neglecting to call on the Public Works Department for revision of estimates, which delay alone led to unauthorized action and the failure of the Katampalli dam. That any revision of the estimate for that (the larger work) was absolutely necessary, is denied by the Cannanore and Calicut Range Officers (Messrs. Bailey and Nordmann), whom I deputed to report on the subject. Their joint opinion is that "had the

See paragraph 5 of the Sub-Collector's letter to Collector, dated 2nd March 1869, No. 39.
Enclosure No. 2.

(Initialed) G. A. B. "work been carried out as originally proposed, "it would in all probability have stood, without injury, the very exceptional flood there has been "in the river this monsoon, the loss of water-way by the change having been 300 square-feet." They state, moreover, that "so far as they are able to judge, the work as carried out was not according to the revised estimate, the masonry allowed for rebuilding the abutment having apparently "been used for facing the new earth work." Not that they lay any stress on this, for the reduction of water-way allowed was fatal. But in your letter to Government you have stated that the works were completed on the new estimates, which statement I cannot reconcile with the entry on the bill for the Katampalli dam, of "600 stones" (equivalent to 300 cubic feet of masonry) "not having been used, as the dam was destroyed in the beginning of June."

6. And this brings me to the consideration of the manner in which you have laid before Government the subject of my refusal to pay for unsanctioned work. You load me with the responsibility of having caused "extreme inconvenience and hardship" to the workmen employed; and in doing so, you take up the point of view assumed by the Sub-Collector in his letter to your address, wherein he takes the liberty of characterizing my conduct as "extraordinary and unjustifiable." I would now desire of you, in reporting to Government, frankly to relieve me of the onus of your charge; on the two-fold consideration that it was quite competent to you, and the natural course, to order an advance of the money pending the decision of Government; and secondly, that Rupees 45 out of Rupees 167-11-7, the private contribution to the

See paragraph 2 of the Sub-Collector's letter as above.
(Initialed) G. A. B.

Kattampalli dam still remain unspent, in spite of your statement that "all money subscribed by the Ryots has been expended, of course." That sum presumably was at Mr. Logan's disposal to relieve the distress which he attributed to my action; and I trust it will now be credited as a recovery to the

no regret upon

the

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
7th April 1869.*

Government contribution; part of the work also appears to have been given on contract to the Kokallur Adigari: probably a man largely interested in the cultivation, and well able to wait for his money. The more I look into the matter the less justification do I find of your Sub-Collector's action before and since the execution of the work, and of the manner in which you have brought my name before Government in connexion with it.

From the Sub-Collector of Malabar, to the Collector of Malabar, dated on Circuit at Kuttuparamba, 2nd March 1869, No. 39.

1. In reply to your Memorandum No. 405, dated 19th ultimo, I have the honour to observe with reference to the remark in the concluding portion of paragraph 5 of the Superintending Engineer's letter No. 114, dated 4th ultimo, that the 600 stones alluded to were collected (under Overseer Vedomuttu's directions for the purpose of constructing a sluice at the southern end of the Katampalli dam, to enable the ryots, whose lands lie below it, to irrigate their fields. The construction of this sluice seems to have been omitted in the original estimate, for what reasons, I don't know, as the ryots would (in the event of the dam having stood) have had either to breach the bund at the southern end, or to construct a sluice such as was proposed. The work, as per the revised estimate, and as pointed out by the Overseer, was, I believe, fully carried out, and the Tahsildar applied to me to obtain an additional grant from Government for the purpose of making this sluice, as it was not then known that there would be a saving on the whole work. Thinking, however, that the people most interested should, under supervision, construct this sluice themselves, I wrote to the Tahsildar to that effect, and did not make an application for more funds. As it turned out, if all the money sanctioned for the work had been put at my disposal at the time, the construction of this sluice (which was an essential portion of the dam) could have been effected from savings on the whole work.

2. Regarding the next point alluded to in your Memorandum, viz., how Rupees 45 of the private contribution remained unspent, the Superintending Engineer seems to have been misled by a mistake made in the final bill for the work, which was submitted to the Calicut Range Officer for the usual certificate. The saving of Rupees 45 on the whole work is a portion of the last sum of Rupees 127-4-5 received from you in August last, and sanctioned in G. O. (Public Works Department) No. 2,378, dated 24th July 1868. The whole of the first sum received from you, Rupees 435 (out of Rupees 695) for the two works (Palayad and Katampalli), and the whole of the private contribution, Rupees 167-11-7, was spent by the 4th May 1868, the last sum of Rupees 8-15-7 having been disbursed from the treasury on that day. With reference to the Superintending Engineer's final remark in paragraph 6 of his letter, he is wrong in presuming that the Kokallur Adigari is largely interested in the work. None of his lands are irrigated by water from the Katampalli dam. He is, however, as well able to wait for his money as any man not in indigent circumstances can be supposed able to wait for money which he has worked for and earned.

3. Having explained the points to which you called my attention, I beg to be allowed to make some observations regarding the matter now under discussion, as I conceive that otherwise the Superintending Engineer's letter may lead to an incomplete view being taken of it.

4. The order for Rupees 695, alluded to in paragraph 2 of the Superintending Engineer's letter, was received by me on 17th January 1868, and forwarded to the Tahsildar on the 22nd idem. The Tahsildar being then busy did not visit the works till the 14th and 16th February: on the 17th he wrote to Captain Bailey at Cannanore (who had framed the estimate) to send him the plan, and some one to show what there was to be done. On the 19th he received a reply, directing

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
7th April 1869.*

him to apply to the Range Officer at Calicut, and on the same day he applied by report to the Calicut Range Officer to the same effect as previously to the Cannanore Range Officer. To this no reply was received, and after the Tahsildar had again written, the Overseer Vedomuttu arrived on 7th March, inspected the works Palayad and Katampalli, on 9th and 13th idem; prepared revised estimates, which were received by me on the 12th and 18th respectively, and on the 19th March the Tahsildar was ordered by me to go on with the works. The estimates were forwarded to you on 28th March.

5. The Superintending Engineer says in his letter of 4th ultimo, paragraph 5, "That any revision of the estimate for that (the larger work) was absolutely necessary, is denied by the Cannanore and Calicut Range Officers (Messrs Bailey and Nordmann), whom I deputed to report on the subject." If you will refer to the Overseer Vedomuttu's report No. 27, dated 11th May, which is included in the correspondence herewith returned, you will observe that he found on inspecting the dam that "The earthen embankment had been breached in two other places during those two intervening years, besides the one in the estimate to be built with stone revetment," and further on he says, "A large hole, about 150 feet long 35 feet wide and 15 feet deep, has been made by the side of the permanent dam * * * by the rush of water through these breaches during the last two years; and found it was necessary to fill it, at least one-third of it, to secure the permanent one from being damaged." All of which refers to the large breach in the natural bank of the stream a little to the south of the calingulah, alluded to in my previous letter of 10th August. The filling up of this large breach; the measurement of which in the revised estimate was 45 feet by 45 feet by 18 feet, though the actual space was larger, was certainly not included in the original estimate as you may see on perusing it. The Range Officers say in their report, that if the work had been carried out as originally proposed, the dam would in all probability have stood; but in saying so they are clearly forgetting that a breach of 45 feet by 45 feet by 18 feet was unprovided for in the original estimate. It is clear that some alterations of the estimate was required, and that being so the Tahsildar adopted the natural course in applying to the Range Officer for assistance. Again, the Range Officers say "So far as they are able to judge, the work as carried out was not according to the revised estimate, the masonry allowed for rebuilding the abutment having apparently been used for facing the new earthwork." To which I reply that, as will appear further on in this report, the original estimate, unaccompanied by a plan, was liable to misinterpretation, and was misinterpreted by Overseer Vedomuttu, who does not seem to have been aware that by the original estimate it was intended to move back the southern abutment of the calingulah some 30 feet, and did not, in preparing the revised estimate, intend that it should be moved back.

6. I quote the following portions of the Superintending Engineer's letter to you, No. 114, dated 4th ultimo:—"The Overseer * * * prepared revised estimates to suit the sanctioned amounts," (paragraph 3). "As stated in your letter to Government, the Sub-Collector took on himself the responsibility of acting on estimates so revised"—"in my letter to your address of the 19th June, I stated very fully the reasons why I could not make the payment called for by you, and my opinion that it should be advanced by those who took on them the responsibility of the work," (paragraph 4). "I consider your Department answerable to Government for the delay throughout November and December 1867, and January to 19th February 1868, in neglecting to call on the Public Works Department for revision of estimates, which delay alone led to unauthorized action and the failure of the Katampalli dam," (paragraph 5). Further on it is stated, as the result of the Calicut and Cannanore Range Officers' investigation of the causes of failure of the larger work, the Katampalli dam, that "the reduction of waterway allowed was fatal." The cause of failure of the work, as ascertained by the Officers deputed by the Superintending Engineer for the purpose of investigating it, is, you will therefore perceive, the same as that mentioned by me in paragraph 3 of my letter to you, No. 208, dated 10th August last. The Superintending Engineer's reasons for refusing to sanction the revised estimates for both works were as follows:—(Vide his letter to you, No. 32, dated 19th June 1868), "He" (meaning

the I regret especially concerning the

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
7th April 1869.*

Overseer Vedamuttu "has ventured to reduce the thickness of the masonry throughout, simply in order that he might bring the whole cost of the work within the limits of the sanction"; "he appears to me to have seriously endangered the stability of the works thereby," (paragraph 2). This, the Superintending Engineer's sole objection to the revised estimates (it should be remembered) applied equally to the Palayad dam, which stood, and the Katampalli dam, which succumbed to the very heavy flood in June last. From the above it will be seen that the actual failure of the Katampalli dam was caused by quite another mistake than that made by the Overseer in revising the estimates: and I think it follows that if the mistake, which was undoubtedly made in not allowing sufficient waterway for the stream in a very heavy flood, can be shown to have arisen (as I think it can) from want of clearness in the original estimate, and other causes which the Revenue Department could not have avoided, it is the Public Works Department, and not the Revenue Department, which is responsible for the failure of the Katampalli dam.

7. It is agreed on all hands that the actual cause of failure of the Katampalli dam was an insufficient allowance of waterway for the stream. In paragraph 3 of my letter to you, No. 208, dated 10th August last, I informed you that I was quite unconscious that any mistake as regards the waterway of the dam had been made when I visited the work then in progress, in April last, and until after the receipt of the copy of the Superintending Engineer's letter of the 19th June, and after I had seen a rough sketch of what Captain Bailey, who prepared the estimate, had proposed to do to the dam. Subsequently to that I again visited the work with the Tahsildar, and it was quite evident to me, on my explaining Captain Bailey's design to him, that up to that moment he too had been in ignorance of what the work provided for in the estimate really was. It should be remembered that when I visited the work in April it was for the first time, and I think it was quite natural that what appeared to Captain Bailey so obvious an alteration as that proposed in the waterway should not have occurred to me so readily as to Captain Bailey, who had annually seen the dam breached, and who had repaired it for years previously. I asked the Tahsildar whether the Overseer who had been deputed by the Calicut Range Officer to advise him as to the carrying out of the work had not pointed out the alteration required in the calingulah of the dam, and the following is his official reply on the subject:—"When the Overseer, Vedamuttu, consulted with me personally about carrying out the work, he did not point out that the abutment should be removed backwards, so as to allow additional 300 feet of waterway for the stream as your honour showed me in August last and mentioned in the order, nor did he afterwards point it out to the Revenue Inspector who carried out the work when he visited the work while in progress."

8. It will thus be seen that the Overseer himself did not understand what was designed in the estimate, and when the matter comes to be looked into it is apparent that this misinterpretation of the design was owing—

Explanation of the Overseer's mistake.

I. Chiefly to there being no plan. The Tahsildar applied both to Captain Bailey, who prepared the estimate, and to the Calicut Range Officer for the plans of both the works, Palayad and Katampalli, but was unable to obtain them if they existed at all.

II. To the Overseer's inability to interpret correctly the estimate of which copy was forwarded to you with my letter No. 208, dated 10th August last. In the estimate the words "Abutment southern side" are used, referring to the southern side of the calingulah, but this must have been interpreted by the Overseer as meaning the southern side of the dam, as under his directions that portion of the earthwork was faced inside and out with masonry, and he directed the men carrying it out to do the same to some other portions of the embankment which seemed to require it most, to prevent the wash of the stream and of the monsoon rains from injuring the earthwork. The heading of the estimate for "increasing the waterway" was doubtless interpreted by him as referring merely to the 300 cubic yards of cutting laterite rock, a portion of the design which was carried out under contract.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
7th April 1869.*

9. Looking at these facts, I consider that little blame can attach to the Revenue Department for carrying out the work as it did in accordance with the directions of the Overseer who

Concluding remarks.

was deputed by the Calicut Range Officer to advise the Tahsildar, and I think that I am justified in assuming from the stability of the Palayad dam, that if the design of the original estimate had been carried out, even though the thickness of the masonry had been reduced, the work would have, like the Palayad dam, successfully withstood the June floods. It could be said, doubtless, that the Overseer's mistake might have been discovered had less delay in applying for revised estimates taken place, but that proceeds on the assumption that the Range Officer would have visited the work while in progress, which he certainly did not do between 19th February and the date of completion of the work, though I think it was his business to visit it and see that all was going on right.

No. 180.

ORDER THEREON, 7th April 1869, No. 1,134.

IRRIGATION, No. 8.

1. Ordered that these papers be communicated to the Commission on Public Works.

2. Colonel Walker will report whether the breach in the Katampalli dam has been repaired, and if not he will adopt early measures for the restoration of the work.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Commission on Public Works.

.. Collector of Malabar.
.. Superintending Engineer, 7th Division.
.. Revenue Department.

Chief Eng. for Irrigation

Rd. S. T. Augustin.

This I regret especially

Govt. of Madras

PUBLIC WORKS

THE COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WORKS

Dated April 7th.

No. 179

G. O. No. 179 April 1867, No. 179.

APRIL

Nos. 179-180

Palayad and Katampalli dams. - Forwarding orders on the letter from the Collector of Malabar forwarding papers on the subject of the Palayad and Katampalli dams in the Karambranad Taluk.

No. 28

Malabar Collectors office
Calicut 8 March 1867.

From

G. A. Ballard Esqre
Collector of Malabar

To

Colonel C. A. Orr R. E.
Secretary to Government
P. W. Works.

Madras.

Sir,

Adverting to the correspondence noted, I have the honor to forward letters from the Superintending Engineer of Division and my Sub Collector on the subject of the Palayad and Katampalli dams in the Karambranad Taluk of this District.

The dates noted show that the estimates for the works were delayed for some time in my Office partly because I knew there were no funds and partly from oversight. This I regret especially considering the

Collector to Govt. 7 July 1868
G. O. Dated 14 " " No. 2378.

14 February 1869 No. 116.

27 March 1869 No. 939.

From 19 Feb¹⁸⁶⁶ to 7 Jan¹⁸⁶⁷
19 April 1867 to 26 Sept¹⁸⁶⁷

the sequel. I have only to submit that the estimates were not of especial emergency or importance.

Still they should not have escaped notice.

They were sanctioned under G. O. dated 23rd October 1867. It was arranged that the works should be carried out by the Revenue Department. The Superintending Engineer ordered Rs 695 to be placed at the disposal of the Revenue Department on the 1st November 1867.

3. January and February are the best months for such work to be undertaken, and orders were sent on the 22 January to the Tahsildar of Kurrambranad to commence the works, but he was not able owing to prep of other work to visit the spot till the middle of February. He applied at once to
The

the Department Public Works for plans and advice. On the 7th March an Overseer was sent to assist the Tahsildar. No plan seems to have been furnished. The Overseer considered revised Estimates necessary & prepared them. They were received by the Sub Collector on the 12 & 18th March, and on the 19th idem that officer directed the Tahsildar to proceed with the works on these revised Estimates.

4. It has been subsequently questioned whether the Estimates required revision or not. On this point they reference to the portions of the enclosures noted. I think it clear they did require revision. But whatever opinion may be come to on that point now, the Overseer's opinion at the time was clear; the season for work was then far advanced; the amounts involved were petty,

Supg. Engineer's letter para. 5
Sub Collector's letter para. 5

and

and under the circumstances I think the Sub collector was quite right in acting as he did i.e. in ordering the Tahsildar to go on with the work as recommended by the Overseer deputed to assist him.

5. Several minor points raised in the Superintending Engineer's letter are explained by the Sub collector's letter enclosed, and I have entered reference to the explanations in the margin of Colonel Walker's communication.

Colonel Walker complains of the manner in which his refusal to pay the balance of the Government contribution to the workmen employed was brought before Government by me. He thinks I might have advanced the money; but I thought and think; that his disbursement of it under such protest as he deemed necessary was the most natural course to be pursued.

He

Vide Sub Collector's letter
para. 2

He also supposes that there was a balance of Rs 45 of the Rayat's contribution unspent but in this he is mistaken.

In one letter from the Sub Collector to me there was a hasty expression with regard to the Superintending Engineer's action - and inadvertently I forwarded this letter in original as it contained a long report of the matter of the dams to Colonel Walker without noticing the objectionable phrase.

When Colonel Walker announced on the expression I apologized for it and disclaimed any intentional discourtesy on my own part or on that of the Sub Collector. I think therefore this point might have been allowed to rest.

6. Finally. I must fully allow that generally it would require very strong grounds indeed to justify a Revenue Officer in ordering departures on

on the advice of an Overseer from an Estimate committed to the Revenue Department for execution when the original estimate had been sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer.

But in such petty works as those under notice I must repeat that I cannot think the Sub Collector was in any way to blame in proceeding on the revised estimates as he did.

Such blame as the delay in getting estimates formally sanctioned deserves, rests principally with me; but the works were really so comparatively insignificant in themselves that I think it will be allowed the matter might have escaped notice in almost any office. If the Superintending Engineer is right in thinking I should have advanced the balance of money due to the workmen instead of requesting him to pay it; and on his refusal referring to Government in order that he should be directed to pay that money from the sanctioned funds

funds; then my reference to Government at the time was unnecessary and the Superintending Engineer was not to blame.

But I made the reference in good faith. I believed it was the Superintending Engineer's refusal that kept the people out of their dues; and inconvenience and hardship was caused to them thereby. If my premises were right my conclusion was right. If my premises were wrong the inconvenience & hardship were not attributable to the Superintending Engineer, and I regret that, thinking they were, I attributed them to him.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obt. servant

Gammack
Collector of Malabar

Copd. S.M.

B. & S. A.

Oct 1999
C. 1379 mm. 1889. C. 2.

W. Sargam Coypine
Sub Collector of Malabar

G. A. Ballard Esq.
Collector of Malabar.

In reply to your Memo. No 1105 dated 17th Ultimo I have the honor to observe with reference to the remarks in the concluding portion of para 5 of the Superintending Engineer's letter No 114 dated 4th Ultimo that the 600 stones alluded to were collected (under Overseer Vedamuttu's directions) for the purpose of constructing a sluice at the Southern end of the Kallimpalli dam to enable the ryots whose lands lie below it to irrigate their fields. The construction of this sluice seems to have been omitted in the original estimate: for what reason I don't know as the ryots would (in the event of the dam having stood) have had either to breach the bund at the Southern end or to construct a sluice such as was proposed. The work as per the revised estimate and as pointed out by the Overseer, was I believe, fully carried out and the Tahsildar applied to me to obtain an additional grant from Government for the purpose of making this sluice

Regarding the
remark in para
5 of the Supd.
Engineer's letter

1879
+ 1880
The Collector
of Malabar

The Secretary to Government
R. P. Meekins.

Dated 5 March
No. of ————— days

no. 28
books: 2

Received
of Mrs. J. C. Smith \$100.00

Forward letters from the
Supt. Engineer, Dr. & Col
Collector of Madras on the
subjects of the Palayakot
Kutnam & other places in
the Kurnool District & letters
of the District.

C. 13 m. 1900. 1869. 22

21/11/99

4th District

Regarding the
remarks in para
6 of the Supd.
Engineer's letter.

as it was not then known that there would be a saving on the whole work. Thinking however that the people most interested should under supervision construct this sluice themselves. I wrote to the Tahildar to that effect and did not make an application for more funds. As it turned out of all the money sanctioned for the work had been put at my disposal at the time the construction of this sluice (which was an essential portion of the dam) could have been effected from savings on the whole work.

Regarding the next point alluded to in your Memo, viz. how Rupees 107 of the private contribution remained unspent the Superintending Engineer seems to have been misled by a mistake made in the final bill for the work which was submitted to the Calcutta Range Officer for the usual certificate. The saving of Rs 107 on the whole work is a portion of the last sum of Rupees 127-4-5 received from you in August last and sanctioned in G. O. (J. M. S.) No 2518 dated 21st July 1868. The whole of the first sum received from you Rupees 435 (out of Rupees 695 for the two works Talagadd and Kattampalli) and the whole of the private contribution Rupees 167-11-7 was spent by the 1st May 1868 the last sum of Rupees 8-15-1 having been disbursed from the treasury on that day. With reference to the Supd. Engineer's final remark in para 6 of his letter he is wrong in presuming that the Kottalloor Adifari is largely interested in the work. None of his lands are irrigated by water from the Kattampalli dam. He is however as well able to wait for his money as any man not in indigent circumstances can be supposed able to of

C. 1379 November 1869. 22

010 1719

from

Delay in commencing the work.

wait for money which he has worked for and earned.

3 Having explained the points to which you called my attention, I beg to be allowed to make some observations regarding the matter now under discussion as I conceive that otherwise the Superintending Engineer's letter may lead to an incomplete view being taken of it.

4 The order for Rupees 690 alluded to in para 2 of the Superintending Engineer's letter was received by me on 17th January 1868 and forwarded to the Tahsildar on the 22nd Idem. The Tahsildar being then busy did not visit the works till the 14th and 16th February. On the 17th he wrote to Captain Bailey at Cannanore (who had framed the estimate) to send him

the plan, and some one to show what there was to be done. On the 19th he received a reply directing him to apply to the Range Officer at Calicut and on the same day he applied by report to the Calicut Range Officer to the same effect as previously to the Cannanore Range Officer. To this no reply was received and after the Tahsildar had again written the Overseer Pedomattu arrived on 7th March, inspected the works Pulayad and Kallampalli on 9th and 13th Idem: prepared revised estimates which were received by me on the 12th and 16th respectively and on the 19th March the Tahsildar was ordered by me to go on with the works. The estimates were forwarded to you on 28th March.

Necessity for a revised estimate for Kallampalli dam.

5 The Superintending Engineer says in his letter of 4th ultimo para 3 "That any

revision of the estimate for that (the larger work) was absolutely necessary is denoted by the Command and District Range Officers (Messrs. Bailey & Ardman) whom I deputed to report on the subject. If you will refer to the Officer Vedamullu's report No 27 dated 11th May which is included in the correspondence herewith returned you will observe that he found on inspecting the dam that "the earthen embankment had been breached in two other places during those 2 intervening years besides the one in the estimate to be built with stone revetment" and further on he says "A large hole about 150 feet long 35 ft. wide and 15 feet deep has been made by the side of the permanent dam xxxxxx by the rush of water through these breaches during the last 2 years and found it was necessary to fill it at least 3/4 of it to secure the permanent one from being damaged" all of which refers to the large breach in the natural bank of the stream a little to the south of the salingula alluded to in my previous letter of 10th August. The filling up of this large breach the measurement of which in the revised estimate was 150' x 15' x 15' though the actual space was larger was certainly not included in the original estimate as you may see on perusing it. The Range Officers say in their report that if the work had been carried out as originally proposed the dam would in all probability have stood, but in saying so they are clearly forgetting that a breach of 150 x 15 x 15 was unprovided for in the original estimate. It is clear that some alterations of the estimate was required

C. 137 Nov 1867

and proposed
the estimate
the estimate

and that being so the Tahildar adopted
the natural course in applying to the
Range Officer for assistance. Again
the Range. So far as they are able to
judge the work as carried out was
not according to the Revised estimate
the masonry allowed for rebuilding the
abutment having apparently been used
for facing the new earthwork to which
I reply that as will appear further on
in this report the original estimate
unaccompanied by a plan was
liable to misinterpretation and was
misinterpreted by Overseer Vedamathu
who does not seem to have been aware
that by the original estimate it was
intended to move back the southern
abutment of the Colingula some 30 feet
and did not in preparing the
revised estimate intend that it should
be moved back.

b. I quote the following portions
of the Superintending Engineer's letter to
you No 114 dated 4th ultimo. "The
overseer x x x x x prepared revised esti-
mates to suit the sanctioned amounts"
(para 3) "as stated in your letter to
Government the Sub Collector took on
himself the responsibility of acting on
estimates so revised" - "in my letter to
your address of the 17th June I stated
very fully the reasons why I could
not make the payment called for
by you, and my opinion that it
should be advanced by those who took
on them the responsibility of the work"
(para 4) "I consider your Department
answerable to Government for the
delay throughout November & December
1867

actual cause of
failure of the
Atampalli dam
as an insufficient
low water quarter.
may not the
reduction of the
thickness of masonry
in the revised
estimate -

1879 March 1869, 02-24

1869 and January 1879 February 1869 in
neglecting to call on the Public Works Dept.
for revision of estimates which delay alone
led to unauthorized action and the failure
of the Kattampalli Dam" (para 5) Further in
it is stated as the result of the Calicut lands
and Kattampalli Range Officers investigation
of the cause of failure of the
larger work, the Kattampalli dam, that
"the reduction of waterway allowed
was fatal". The cause of failure of the
work as ascertained by the Officers de-
puted by the Superintending Engineer
for the purpose of investigating it is
you will therefore perceive the same but
as that mentioned by me in para 2
3 of my letter to you 10.30.8 dated 10
10 August last. The Superintending
Engineer's reasons for refusing the
sanction the revised estimates for
both works were as follows (vide
his letter to you 10.32 dated 19 June
1869. "He (concerning Overseer Vedamallu) says
has ventured to reduce the thickness
of the masonry throughout simply in
order that he might bring the whole
cost of the work within the limits of
the sanction". He appears to me to
have seriously endangered the stability
of the works thereby" (para 2). This
the Superintending Engineer's sole objection
to the revised estimates (it should be
remembered) applied equally to the Palagad
dam which stood and the Kattampalli
dam which succumbed to the very
heavy flood in June last. From the
above it will be seen that the actual
failure of the Kattampalli dam was
caused by quite another mistake
than that made by the Overseer in

C. 1877 Nov 1869 27.2

revising the estimates: and I think it follows that if the mistake which was undoubtedly made in not allowing sufficient waterway for the stream in a very heavy flood can be shown to have arisen (as I think it can) from want of clearance in the original estimate and other causes which the Revenue Department could not have avoided it is the Public Works Department and not the Revenue Department which is responsible for the failure of the Mattampalli dam.

The overseer did not point out that the estimate provided for additional 300 feet of waterway

1. It is agreed on all hands that the actual cause of failure of the Mattampalli dam was an insufficient allowance of waterway for the stream. In para 3 of my letter to you of 20th August last I informed you that I was quite unconscious that any mistake as regards the waterway of the dam had been made when I visited the work then in progress in April last and until after the receipt of the copy of the Superintendent Engineer's letter of the 19th June and after I had seen a rough sketch of what Captain Bailey who prepared the estimate had proposed to do to the dam. Subsequently to that I again visited the work with the Tahsildar and it was quite evident to me, on my explaining Captain Bailey's design to him that up to that moment he too had been in ignorance of what the work provided for in the estimate really was. It should be remembered that when I visited the work, unspilled it was for the first time, and I think of

C. 137. 2nd ed. 1889. 22

it was quite natural that what appeared to Captain Bailey as obvious an alteration as that proposed in the waterway should not have occurred to me so readily as to Captain Bailey who had annually seen the dam breached, and who had repaired it for years previously. I asked the Tahsildar whether the Overseer who had been reported by the District Range Officer to advise him as to the carrying out of the work had not pointed out the alteration required in the Calingula of the dam, and the following is his official reply on the subject. "When the Overseer Vedamuttu consulted with me personally about carrying out the work he did not point out that the abutment should be removed backwards so as to allow additional 300 feet of waterway for the stream as your Honor showed me in August last and mentioned in the order now. Did he afterwards point it out to the Revenue Inspector who carried out the work when he visited the work while in progress?"

Explanation of
the Overseer's
mistake

It will thus be seen that the Overseer himself did not understand what was designed in the estimate and when the matter comes to be looked into it is apparent that this misinterpretation of the design was owing

I. Chiefly to there being no plan. The Tahsildar applied both to Captain Bailey who prepared the estimate and to the District Range Officer for the plans of both the works

The estimates and their sanction, alluded to

C. 1875 November 1869. C. 2

design of the original estimate had been carried out even though the thickness of the masonry had been reduced the work would have like the Palmyra dam - successfully withstood the same floods - all could be said doubtless that the Overseer's mistake might have been discovered had less delay in applying for revised estimates taken place, but that proceeds on the assumption that the Range Officer would have visited the work while in progress which he certainly did not do between 19th February 1869 and the date of completion of the work, his own thought at that time it was his business to visit it and see that all was going on right.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant

W. Hagan

Sub Collector

order.
Estimate
Range
Victor an
led to
867/100
of and
unity
timber 167
288.2 to 5
at the
order
and
den
The
on of
alluded
to

Supy Engineer's Office 7th Bn
Tellicherry 4th February 1869.

From,

Colt G. W. Walker R.E.

Supy Engineer 7th Bn

To,

G. A. Ballard Esq.

Collector of Malabar

Sir,

I have the honor to request that you will be so good as to submit for the information of Government the following remarks on the subject of their Order No. 2378 of 24th July, to accompany the full report promised by you in para 3 of your letter printed with that order.

2 - From the rough drafts of the Estimates they appear to have been made by the Range Officer on the requisition of the Sub Collector on the 13th February 1866. They were forwarded to me with your letter No. 990 of 26th April 1866 (too late for execution in that calendar year) and submitted by you for sanction, in conformity with my recommendations, on the 26th September. A sum of Rs. 695 out of the total of Rs. 882.4.5 contributed by Govt. (being all the funds at the time available), was ordered by me, under date the 1st November, to be paid to you by the Range Officer; and the remainder was to be supplied at a later date. The long interval between the preparation of the Estimates and their sanction, alluded to

Encls. 2

In a letter from the

Collector of Malabar

dated 5th Nov. 1869

No. 20

17th 9 23/69

Very respectfully &c

Original letter from
the Sub Collector of
Malabar dated 2nd
March 1869 No. 39 on the
subject of Palangul &
Kasturkutti demands
known known Palangul

13th Nov. 1869. 23

C-137
to in the 1st para of your letter to Govt., during which the damis had sustained greater damage, was entirely due to your own retention of the papers; and this, I think, should have been fairly stated.

3. From November 1867 to February 1868, no action seems to have been taken, and as you had expressly desired that the work should be carried out by the Revenue Officials, no action was expected to be taken by the Public Works Officers. On the 19th February 1868 the Koorumbanaad Tahsildar applied to the Calicut Range Officer for the Plan of the works, and for assistance in carrying it out. Mr. Supervisor Grime, was at that time in charge of Calicut Range in addition to the Palghat Range, in consequence of Lt. Hanwaring's absence on service in Abyssinia. He could not therefore inspect the works himself, as they lay at the northern extremity of his double charge, and he deputed Overseer Bedamoottoo to give the assistance required. The Overseer visited the Dams on the 7th and 11th March, and to use his own words "prepared revised Estimates to suit the sanctioned amounts."

4. As stated in your letter to Government the Sub Collector took on himself the responsibility of acting on Estimates so revised, forwarding them to you on the 28th.

March, as you state "with intimation of his order, for submission to the Supy Engineer." They bear your simple endorsement to me of the 29th April (one month later) "For approval", without a word of explanation of the circumstances under which the revision had been necessitated, or how it had been carried out. On the 2nd May I called on the Range Officer for Report which was made under date the 11th May. I had then to call for the Original Estimates and to institute a close comparison of both sets to find out the nature of the alterations made; and in my letter to your address of the 19th June I stated very fully the reasons why I could not make the payment called for by you, and my opinion that it should be advanced by those who took on them the responsibility of the work. One result of my investigation was over-seeing Bedamoottoo's removal from the Talook which had so long been his home, as a mark of my disapprobation of his unauthorized proceedings.

5. I consider your Department answerable to Govt for the delay throughout November and December 1867 and January to 19th February 1868, in neglecting to call on the Public Works Department for revision of Estimates, which delay alone led to unauthorized action

and the failure of the Katampully Dam.
That any revision of the Estimate for that
(the larger work) was absolutely necessary
is denied by the Cannanore and Calicut
Range Officers (Messrs Bailey & Fordmann) whom I deputed to report on the subject.
Their joint opinion is that "had the work
"been carried out as originally proposed, it
"would in all probability have stood, without
"injury, the very exceptional flood there
"has been in the River this monsoon, the
"loss of waterway by the change having been
"300 square feet." They state moreover that
"so far as they are able to judge, the work as
"carried out was not according to the Revised
"Estimate, the masonry allowed for rebuilding
"the abutment having apparently been used for
"facing the new earth work." Note that they
lay any stress on this, for the reduction of
waterway allowed, was fatal. But in your
letter to Government you have stated that the
works were completed on the new Estimate,
which statement I cannot reconcile with the
entry on the bill for the Katampully Dam,
of "600 stones" (equivalent to 300 cubic feet of
masonry) "not having been used, as the Dam
"was destroyed in the beginning of June."

6. And this brings me to the
consideration of the manner in which
you

See para 5 of the
Sub Collector's letter to
Collector dated 2nd March
1869 No 39 -
Enclosure No 2.
E.A.M.

See para 1 of the
Sub Collector's letter
as above -
E.A.M.

See para 2 of the
Sub Collector's letter
as above -
E.A.M.

you have laid before Government the sub-
ject of my refusal to pay for unsanctioned
work. You load me with the responsibility of having caused "extreme inconvenience and hardship" to the workmen
employed; and in doing so, you take up
the point of view assumed by the Sub-
Collector in his letter to your address wherein by
he takes the liberty of characterizing my
conduct as "extraordinary and unjustifiable".
I would now desire of you, in reporting to
Government, frankly to relieve me of the
onus of your charge; on the twofold consid-
eration that it was quite competent to
you, and the natural course, to order an
advance of the money pending the decision
of Government, and 2nd that Rupees 45 out
of Rupees 167-11-7, the private contribution
to the Katampully Dam still remains un-
spent, in spite of your statement that "all
"money subscribed by the Ryots has been ex-
pended, of course." That sum presumably was
at Mr Logan's disposal to relieve the distress
which he attributed to my action; and I
trust it will now be credited as a recovery
to the Government contribution. Part of the
work also appears to have been given on
contract to the Kakathur Adigharry;

probably a man largely interested in the cultivation, and well able to wait for his money. The more I look into the matter the less justification do I find of your Sub-Collector's action before and since the resumption of the work, and of the manner in which you have brought my name before Government in connexion with it.

See last part of para. 2 of the Sub-Collector's letter as above

R.M.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedt servant

W. Mather & Co
Superintending Engineer

Original communicated from the Supy. Engineer 21st Dec. in the Suby. letter of 14th Aug. 69 to the Comm. Works.

Received 11/9 & 11/9

11/9 923/69

In a letter from the Collector of Malabar dated 5 March 1869.

Encl. 1.

Public Works Department

N^o 1134

18

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 7th April 1869
Read the following

From the Collector of Malabar J. & E. Esq. 28 dated 5 March 1869

Ordered that these papers be communicated to the Commission on Public Works.

Col. Walker will report whether the breach in the Katampalli Dam has been repaired, and if not he will adopt early means for the restoration of the work.

W. M.

The Commission on Works
Collector of Malabar
Lt. Col. J. Esq.
Rev. Depy. Secy.
Ch. Engineer & Dy. Secy.
11/9 923/69

Public Works Dept.

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the

March 1869

Read the following

From the Collector of
Malabar.

(Received 18th 28th 5th March 1869)

The affair appears to have been merged by the Revenue authorities & the overseer. I do not see any proof that a regular plan was furnished but nothing is extracted. If the plan of the work was altered to bring it within the estimates, the work of the last year has proceeded with authority the sanction of the Range Officer or Superintendent Engineer. I would like to know who has

These papers relate to certain repairs and improvements which were carried out to the Palayad and Kakampalli Dams in the Kurnumbund Talook of the Malabar District.

Estimates of Rs. 1250 were framed for the works in February 1866, but they were not forwarded by the Collector to the Board of Revenue until September 1867. The estimates were laid before Government

in

in October 1867, and sanctioned in Proceedings No. 3284 dated 23rd Dec. It was intimated that the works should be carried out by the Revenue Department from a sum of Rs: 427-11-7 contributed by private individuals and Rs: 822-4-5 to be provided by Govt. To admit of the works being proceeded with, the Supt. Engineer placed a sum of Rs: 695 at the disposal of the Collector in November 1867, but orders for the commencement of the works were not issued by the Collector till January 1868, and it appears that, owing to a preasure of work, the Tahildar was

orders have been given to proceed with the restoration of the dam work. We must not let it rest with donors under the defeat. This is not a very large sum for the agency of Revenue of authority in the repair or construction of waterworks. I hope the Draft will help my colleagues to record the papers and under the repair of the dam (supposing it will be repaired) no objection. N.

There has been a great delay on the part of the Collector, but it seems to me that the main error was that of the overseer who prepared the amount which he submitted to the sanctioned estimate. Instead of the increased estimate of Rs: 1000 I must order the papers to be recorded & affirm that the repair will be well executed though any thing remains to be done. W. A.

I must adopt this revision prepared amended estimates to suit the sanctioned amounts as the Supt. Engineer points out, quoting the words of the Overseer. The revised estimates were forwarded to the Sub. Collector on the 12th and 18th March, and on the 19th the latter ordered the works to be proceeded with.

unable to visit the spot till the middle of February. On the 19th of that month he applied to the Collector who was Range Officer for the Plain of the works, and for aid in carrying them out. An Overseer was accordingly sent, who visited the works on the 7th March, and finding that the estimates needed revision prepared amended estimates to suit the sanctioned amounts as the Supt. Engineer points out, quoting the words of the Overseer. The revised estimates were forwarded to the Sub. Collector on the 12th and 18th March, and on the 19th the latter ordered the works to be proceeded with.

with on the revised esti-
mates (which were not
forwarded to the Supg.
Engineer until the end of
April) and they were ac-
cordingly completed, but
the Collector reports that
heavy rains having set in
before the work of the
Kattampalli Dam had
time to set a serious breach
occurred.

Subsequent to the
failure of the Kattampalli
Dam, the Collector applied
to the Supg Engineer for the
balance of the Govt. contri-
bution (Rs. 127.4-5) as the
amount was actually
due for the workmen em-
ployed, but in reply Col.
Walker stated that he
did

24 July 1868, No 2378.

did not feel himself autho-
rized to make the pay-
ment, and maintained
that the amount should
be advanced by those who
took on them the responsi-
bility of the work. The
Collector accordingly ad-
dressed the Govt. on the
subject, and His Excellency
in Council directed the
Supg Engineer to disburse
the amount, pending the
receipt of the further report
promised by the Collector,
which is now before Govt.
with letters from the Supg.
Engineer and Pub. Collector.

The Collector acknow-
ledges that there was con-
siderable delay in his
Office in the disposal of
the

the estimates, and in
ordering the commence-
ment of the works, which
he did not, however, con-
sider of any urgency.
Col: Walker remarks that
the Revenue Dept. had
ample time to call upon
the Public Works Dept.
for a revision of the estimates
if such were necessary, but
points out that, in the
opinion of the Cannanore
and Calicut Range Officers,
had the Kattampalli Dam
been constructed on the
original estimates it
would in all probability
have withstood the ef-
fects of the floods as the
change of design involved
the

the loss of 500 square feet
of waterway. Mr Ballard
explains that he did not
think the Kattampalli
Dam to be a work of such
importance as to render
it absolutely necessary
to follow the course refer-
red to by the Superintendant
in obtaining an amended
estimate, and that as
the season was advanced
and the outlay small,
the Sub. Collector was
justified in directing
the Tahsildar to proceed
with the work on the
Superintendent's revised estimate.
Considering that the
original estimates were
framed in February 1866
that of

that the works were
not commenced till
March 1868, and that
the Dams sustained
some damage during
the interval, the fort.
are satisfied that the
estimates needed revision,
but in undertaking to
revise them in the ab-
sence of a Plan, the
Overseer acted in igno-
rance of the exact nature
of the works which it
was at first proposed to
carry out, and by reducing
the ^{waterways} thickness of the
masonry throughout for
the sole purpose of
restricting the outlay to
the amount of the former
estimate, he endangered
the

53
the stability of the work.
The inadequate provision
of waterway, to which the
failure of the Dam is un-
questionably due, was
the result of the first of
these errors. Seeing that
the Collector did not con-
sider the works either
urgent or important, and
that their execution was
partly on this ground de-
layed, the fort. are of
opinion that the esti-
mates should have been
returned to the Superengi-
neer for revision when
the Overseer reported
that such was necessary.
Col. Walker complains

of

of the remarks of the Col-
lector and Sub. Collector
with reference to his Refu-
sal to pay the balance
of the Govt. Contribution
on application. He states
that, under the circum-
stances, the Collector
should have advanced
the money pending the
decision of Govt., but
the Collector on the other
hand maintains that
the Superintendence's dis-
bursement of it under
protection was the proper
course. The Govt. are of
opinion that viewing the
matter of the departure
from the sanctioned

25-

estimates in the light
of the rules laid down for
the guidance of the Dept.,
Col. Walker was correct
in objecting to make
the advance, but His
Excellency in Council
is willing to accept the
Collector's plea of having
acted in good faith.

W.B.

To the Superintendence -
" Collector of Malabar.
" Revenue Dept.

Acc 923

Govt. of 1869

PUBLIC WORKS.

To the Commission on
Public Works

Dated

1869

Page 2

7 April 1869 No 1134

Nos 179-180

Palayad & Kottampalli Dams
Paying orders on the Collector
for the Collector of Malabar for
the amount of Rs. 1000/-
on the Palayad & Kottampalli
Dams in the River Godavari
District.