

(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. | 2130 | Press  |
| 99,100   |      | Mis.   |
| Dated    | 7 9  | 18 12. |

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 99. Read the following letter from the Superintending Engineer, 3rd Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Camp at Kalkada, 11th August 1872, No. 1,045 :—

WITH reference to G. O. No. 2,790 under date the 21st November 1870, I

\* Letter No. 486, dated 30th July 1872. have the honour to forward a copy\* of Lieutenant Taylor's explanation regarding the purchase and repair of a tent he had purchased in 1868 when in charge of the Cumbum Range.

2. It does not appear that any repairs were made since the last expenditure referred to in paragraph 9 of Colonel Moberly's letter printed with G. O. above quoted, and as a period of from two to four years has elapsed since the purchase of the tent and the time the expenditure had been incurred in its repair, I think the matter may be allowed to drop, and the entry in the divisional list of unanswered letters omitted from future lists.

From Lieutenant R. F. TAYLOR, R. E., Officer in charge of Kurnool Range, to the Superintending Engineer, 3rd Division, dated 30th July 1872, No. 486.

IN reply to G. O. No. 2,790, dated 21st November 1870, demanding an explanation regarding a tent purchased by me in 1868, I have the following remarks to offer.

2. I purchased a good second-hand tent from Captain Cox, I think, for 80 Rupees, this being by far the best of several tents which

\* I tried to get a bechoba, but there were none to be had. I cannot understand Colonel Moberly's remarks about not making inquiry, etc. I purchased the tent after I had seen it pitched along with several others; the price asked for it was Rupees 150. I saw and personally inspected when in Kurnool.\*

3. The tent was used on an average twenty days in every successive month for two and twenty months, and as might reasonably be expected was by the end of that time considerably out of repair. My own tents were in bad condition; but as I could not have all repaired at once, and judging that by using mine and repairing the range tent I would be best serving the interests of Government, I sent in an estimate for sanction and commenced repairs in anticipation. The work was cheaply executed, and the tent was certainly worth the expenditure. Mr. Hudson has, I think, put a very low valuation on the property; at any rate about the time Mr. McCarthy purchased mine for Rupees 250, and, in my opinion, the one belonging to the range was a far better one, I saw several dozens of tents but lately in Madras and Kurnool priced from Rs. 150 to 350, and I can honestly say that not one of them was equal to the range tent.

4. The remark (in paragraph No. 5 of Colonel Moberly's letter) was not written by me; at least I have not the faintest recollection of having penned the words. I remember distinctly being asked by one of the Revenue Survey Officers to dispose of the tent to him.

5. In repairing the tent without sanction, I no doubt acted too hastily (and am quite willing to suffer the consequences); my only reason in doing so was to save further damage\* being done to it.

\* A terrific storm in the early part of 1870 swept over Cumbum Range; all the tents were terribly damaged by it hence the real cause of the great expenditure. My tents in repair on this occasion cost me Rupees 220. Mr. Meniman's tents were blown to shreds and he offered to purchase the range tent for Rupees 80, though at the time it was in bad condition, it stood out the storm better than any other tent, and chiefly for this reason I determined to have it repaired.

6. In conclusion, I beg to observe that I acted to the best of my ability and judgment in this matter; but should Government arrive at a different conclusion, I shall be most happy to refund the whole amount, namely, Rupees 125.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,  
7th September 1872.

No. 100.

ORDER THEREON, 7th September 1872, No. 2,130.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 6.

LIEUTENANT Taylor's explanation  
is accepted, and the subject may be  
removed from future Unanswered Refer-  
ence Lists.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,

Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 3rd Division.

Exd. E. C. Shunker.

Copy of letter No. 486 dated 30<sup>th</sup> July 1872 sent  
to the Officer in Charge of Kurnool Range to  
the Superintending Engineer 3<sup>rd</sup> Division.

In reply to G.O. No. 2790 dated 2<sup>nd</sup> November 1871  
demanding an explanation regarding a  
tent purchased by me in 1868. I have  
the following remarks to offer.  
I purchased a good second hand tent from  
Captain Cox (I think) for 80 Rs this being  
by far the best of several tents which  
I saw and personally inspected when in  
the Kurnool Range.

\* I tried to get a Kurnool  
Bechoia tent but there  
were none to be had. The tent was used on an average 20 days  
I cannot understand in every successive month for two and  
Colonel McCarty's remarks  
about not making twenty months and as might reasonably  
be expected, was by the end of that time  
I had seen it spoiled  
along with several  
others. The price of the tent was in bad condition, but as  
for it being 150 Rs.

I could not have all repaired at once  
and judging that by using mine and  
repairing the Range tent I would be  
best serving the interests of Government  
I sent in an estimate for sanction and  
commenced repairs in anticipation.  
The work was cheaply executed and the  
tent was certainly worth the expenditure.  
Mr Hudson has I think put a very low  
valuation on the property. At any rate  
about the time Mr McCarty purchased

mine for Rs/200. and in my opinion the  
one belonging to the Range was a far  
better one. I saw several dozens of tents  
but lately in Madras and Kurnool  
priced from 150 to 350 and I am thinking  
say, that not one of them was equal  
to the Range tent.

The remark (in para No 5 of Colonel  
Moberly's letter) was not written by me:  
at least I have not the faintest recollection  
of having penned the words. I remember  
distinctly being asked by one of the  
Revenue Survey Officers to elipso of  
the tent to him.

In repairing the tent without success,  
I no doubt acted too hastily (and am  
quite willing to suffer the consequences),  
my only reason in doing so was to save  
further damage being done to it.

In conclusion, I beg to observe  
that I acted to the best of my  
ability and judgement in this  
matter, but should have arrived at  
a different conclusion, I shall be  
most happy to refund the whole  
amount viz Rs/125.

True copy  
Wm. J. G. 1/23  
Capt. R. B.  
Offg. Supy. of the  
S. Division

A large claim in  
the early part of  
1870, I kept over  
the tent was badly  
damaged by rain  
the last cause of the  
great expenditure  
my tent in replacing  
this season. Colonel  
R. B. Moberly  
tents are then to  
be purchased the Range  
tent for Rs/125. I have  
at the time it was  
in bad condition it  
was more than  
better than any other  
tent and I should  
this season I should  
be able to replace it.

No. 1045

Superintending Engineer's Office.

3rd Division.

Camp Kalthada, ~~Belgaum~~ Talook:

~~Adilapuri~~ District.

The 11<sup>th</sup> August 1872.

From,

The Superintending Engineer

3rd Division.

To,

The Secretary to Government

Public Works Department

Fort Saint George.

Sir,

With reference to G.O. No. 2790 under date the 21<sup>st</sup> November 1870, I have the honor to forward a copy of Captain Taylor's explanation regarding the purchase and repair of a tent he had purchased in 1868 when in charge of the Cumbum Range.

2. It does not appear that any repairs were made since the last expenditure referred to in para 9 of Colonel Protherby's letter printed with the G.O. above quoted, and as a period of from 2 to 4 years has elapsed since the purchase of the tent, and the time & expenditure had been incurred in its repair, I think the matter may be allowed to drop, and the entry in the Divisional list of unanswered letters omitted from future lists.

I have &c.

James F. M. D.

Capt. R. E.

Asst. Secy. to Govt. Secy. Bd.

closures. /

Letter No. 686 dated 11-11-1872

P. M. 4/4/72.

Enclosure to letter No. 2790 of 21-11-1870  
to the Secy. to Govt. Secy. Bd.  
for forwarding to the Secy. to Govt. Secy. Bd.  
for forwarding to the Secy. to Govt. Secy. Bd.



16/11/72

No 4044

Govt. of 1872 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To the *Superintending Engineer*  
*3rd Division*

Dated

Recd

Encl. 1

G. O. 7<sup>th</sup> Sept 1872. 2130.

Nos. 99 & 100

Genl. Engr. Taylor's explanation

tion regarding the purchase  
& repair of tent in 1868 when  
in charge of the Tumkur  
Range accepted, and  
permanence marked for  
the removal of the tent  
from future un-  
covered Reserve sites.