

(1) Number of pages 8

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.**Government of Madras.***Public works* **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No.	1226	Press
52-53		Mis.
Dated	3-5-18	71

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
3rd May 1871.*

No. 52 Read the following Endorsement of the Revenue Department, dated
17th April 1871.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 5th April 1871, No 1,490

Read the following letters —

From the Officiating Collector of Vizagapatam, to the Acting Secretary to the
Board of Revenue, dated 13th March 1871, No. 227.

I HAVE the honour to refer the following matter to the Board of Revenue with
the view, if necessary, of its being submitted to Government.

2 In September last, while travelling along the road between Vizianagram
and Parvatipur at nearly every stage, I was met by petitioners who stated that
they had not been paid for road-work performed by them

3. I sent all such petitions and others on the same subject subsequently
received to the Superintending Engineer, as I conceived that the disposal of such
matters lay with the department who had hired the labour, and who had charge of
the construction of the road in question

4. Yesterday I received a letter, dated March 9th, 1871, (copy of which is
enclosed,) in which the Superintending Engineer, in returning the petitions,
informs me that as the "expenditures" referred to in the petitions were incurred
by a subordinate "without any sanction or allotment of funds, and against the
"express orders of the Range Officer" * * *

"the matter is entirely between the Overseer and the coolies or maistries who gave
"them their labour"

5 I submit that the coolies and maistries cannot be expected to be acquainted
with the departmental rules of the Department of Public Works, and that when
working under the orders of the Overseer, they were, as far as they knew, working
for Government. I would further submit that it is the duty of the authorities of
the Department of Public Works to see that the coolies employed by them receive
due pay for work done. It will not be for the advantage of the department or of
Government should it be generally known that coolies, who have not been paid,
are referred to their remedy at law against the subordinate of the department in
immediate superintendence of the work.

6. I may mention that the Overseer referred to in the Superintending Engi-
neer's letter was last year prosecuted by his superiors for breach of trust, and was
acquitted for want of evidence, and that on the trial a very loose manner of doing
business came to light

From the Acting Superintending Engineer, 1st Division, to the Collector of Vizagapatam, dated
9th March 1871, No S

WITH reference to your endorsement on the petitions herewith returned, I have the honour
to inform you that the expenditures therein referred to were incurred by the Local Fund Over-
seer Pudmanabhasawmy without any sanction or allotment of funds, and against the express
orders of the Range Officer, and this department therefore has nothing whatever to do with the
matter, which is one entirely between the Overseer and the coolies or maistries who gave them
their labour.

2 For his disobedience of orders in the most wilful manner, I shall deal with the Overseer's
conduct as soon as the further inquiry I am now making is closed.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
3rd May 1871.*

From the Officiating Collector of Vizagapatam, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 17th March 1871, No 216
In continuation of my letter, No 227, of the 13th instant, on the subject of non-payment of cooly-hire to the people who worked on the road from Gajapatinagrum to Parvatipur, I have the honour, at the request of the Superintending Engineer, to forward two letters, Nos E E and F F, dated 14th instant, on the same subject

From the Acting Superintending Engineer, 1st Division, to the Collector of Vizagapatam, dated, Vizianagram, 14th March 1871, No E. E
I HAVE the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter, No. 230, dated the 13th instant, and, in reply, I beg to state the grounds on which I informed you the matter of excess expenditure on the Ramabhadrapuram and Gajapatinagrum road was entirely between the Overseer and the Contractors, etc, and I request you will be good enough to communicate these to the Revenue Board

2. On making a thorough examination of the office records here, I find Serjeant Spencer ordered this Overseer verbally on the 18th January 1870 to stop all expenditure at once on that date, this statement is confirmed by the entries in the cash books and the monthly progress reports submitted to my office, on the 22nd February next I find Mr. Spencer writing to this same Overseer expressing his surprise he was continuing the work and directing him to stop, warning him that no funds were forthcoming to meet this outlay The man continued to incur further expenditure even up to April without any sanction or authority I may here note Serjeant Spencer was Acting Range Officer at this time, in the absence of Mr Hamnett, who had obtained privilege leave

3. I have reported all the circumstances, as far as I can ascertain them, to Government with my opinion on the conduct of Mr. Hamnett, which I consider most reprehensible, as well as that of the Overseer No blame, however, can attach to Serjeant Spencer, who did his duty in trying to stop this outlay, both by giving the necessary orders to the Overseer in charge, and by not issuing any more cheques on account of this work You have formed your own opinions on the subject, but these you have not been pleased to communicate to me at any time I am, therefore, unable to add anything further to what I have already stated

From the same Officer, dated Vizagapatam, 14th March 1871, No F. F.
In continuation of this office letter of the 9th instant, No. S, I have the honour to inform you that I find on a careful examination of the books, etc, of this range, that Serjeant Spencer ordered the Local Fund Overseer Pudmanabhasawmy to stop all expenditure on the road from Gajapatinagrum to Parvatipur verbally on the 18th January 1870, and the cash book clearly shows that after that date no further cheques were issued to that subordinate on account of that work Subsequently, on the 22nd February following, Serjeant Spencer wrote to the Local Fund Overseer expressing his surprise he was continuing to incur any further outlay on this road, and ordering him again this time in writing to stop, notwithstanding these instructions the Overseer continued the work up to April without proper sanction or authority, and if the contractors incurred the expenditure on his representations, they must recover from him, the Government are not responsible in any way for these proceedings

2 I have reported to Government the circumstances connected with these transactions, and stated what I consider ought to be done in the matter of providing this district with better supervision, as I consider the Range Officer's conduct to have been most reprehensible, and have recommended his removal

3 Pudmanabhasawmy will probably have to appear before a Magistrate on charges about to be preferred against him by the contractors. I do not think he is at all qualified for the post of Local Fund Overseer, and should have dismissed him had the Range Officer's conduct been less reprehensible, but should he be allowed to continue in the department, it must be in an inferior position.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
3rd May 1871.*

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. Although the Overseer's acts were unauthorized, the Board think it obvious that the coolies and contractors employed by him to do work for Government should be paid.

3. Whether the amount should be or can be recovered from the Overseer is another question.

TRANSFERRED to the Department Public Works for disposal.

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

No. 53.

ORDER THEREON, 3rd May 1871, No. 1,226.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 4.

Public Works Proceedings, 4th April 1871,
No 994
Revenue Proceedings, 13th April 1871, No. 667.

THE complaints of the Acting Superintending Engineer against Mr. Supervisor Hamnett and Local Fund Overseer Pudmanabhasawmy will receive consideration on the references made in the Orders marginally noted being replied to.

2. It appears from Major Fischer's letter of the 14th March 1871, No. F. F., that the contractors who carried out work on the road from Gajapatinagrum to Parvatipur are about to prefer certain charges against the Overseer before the Magistrate, including, it is presumed, the non-payment for work performed Meanwhile the Acting Superintending Engineer will ascertain and report the amount due to coolies and contractors for work executed by them.

(True Extract)

Colonel, R.E.,

Secretary to Government.

To the Acting Superintending Engineer, 1st Division.
,, Revenue Department
,, Board of Revenue.

Exd E C Shunker

Public Works Department.
No 1226
Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 3rd April 1871
Read the following

Pro. of the 13th of Revenue Dep^t. } H.E. No 14907 5th April 1871/
Revenue Dep^t.

The complaints
of the Acting Supg:
Engrs against a Mr.
Supervisor Tammett
and Local Fund Officer
Pulmanabhaswamy
will receive consideration

NW Pro: 4 April/71 No 994 on the references made
Rev-.. 13th Dec-.. No 667 in the order marginally
noted being replied to

It appears from
Major Fischer's letter
of the 14th March 1871
No F. F. that the Con-
tractors who carried
out work on the road

from Gajapatinagar
to Parvatipur are about
to prefer certain charges
against the Overseer
before the Magistrate.
including, it is presumed,
the non payment for
work performed - Meanwhile
the Ag. Superint. will
ascertain and report
the amount due to
Coolies and Contractors
for work executed by
them.

APB

Desp 4/5/71

L. Engr 1st on ✓
Rev Sepl ✓
B. J. Rev ✓

Gold a. 1871 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

20. Holzschuppenbildung (Ange-
hö. C. prini.

1872

He d

G. O. S. May 1871 A. 1726.

No3, 527 5.3

1. The first part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the paper. It discusses the various methods that have been used to study the topic and the results that have been obtained.

2. The second part of the paper is a description of the experimental methods that were used in the study. It includes a description of the subjects, the stimuli, and the procedures that were used.

3. The third part of the paper is a presentation of the results of the study. It includes a description of the data that were collected and the statistical analyses that were performed.

4. The fourth part of the paper is a discussion of the results of the study. It discusses the implications of the findings and the limitations of the study.

5. The fifth part of the paper is a conclusion. It summarizes the main findings of the study and provides some suggestions for future research.