M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(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. 258-259	2945	Press / Mis.
Dated	12-12	1872.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1-3-3 1

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department, 12th December 1872.

5.3

No. 258. Read the following letter from the Acting Superintending Engineer, 1st Division, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Dowlaishweram, 8th November 1872, No. 2,828:—

ADVERTING to the observation in paragraph 2 of G. O. of the 23rd October last, No. 2,500, relative to the revised estimate for the Taluq Cutcherry at Yellamunchelly, I have the honour to state that the information alluded to was given to Government in a comparative statement submitted with my letter embodied in G. O. of the 17th February 1872, No. 458. The local Revenue Officers inquired of Mr. Laskey what the expenditure on the building had been, and he told them nearly Rupees 9,000. Without further inquiry of any one they represented this as the loss to Government. This was told me on my late visit to Waltair both by Mr. Melville and Mr. Laskey, and, as this has led the Government to condemn me in part in my administration of the division, I have the honour to request these Officers may be called upon to submit their explanations for making such vague representation to Government without satisfying themselves that it was correct in all respects.

No. 259. ORDER THEREON, 12th December 1872, No. 2,945.

CIVIL WORKS, No. 13.

ORDERED to be recorded.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the District Engineer, Vizagapatam.

Exd. A. S. Rodgers.

P.R.D.

3/

Proceedings of the Madras Govt

Read the following:-

From

The Supg Engineer
1st Dn. } (H. E. Dep. 28289 8-Dec 72)

His Excellency
the Governor in Council

I doubt the utility of doing more than recording Col Fisher's letter.- There can be no use in calling for explanations from the Collector & Pro. Agt. They had not before them the estimate of materials for use in rebuilding the Cutcherry - & the value of the foundations & spoke from such [illegible] information

cannot but attribute to a want of definite information from the Supg Engineer 1st Dn the impression conveyed to the Board of Revenue and Government that the entire original outlay of nearly Rs. 9000 on

on the Yallamunchelly Cut-
-chery would be a dead
loss. The Principal Assist-
-ant Collector, and Collec-
-tor, appear to have
shared the same impression
from the imperfect infor-
-mation given them on
the spot by the Range
Officer. The Supervising
and Executive Officers of
the Public Works Dept.
who now feel aggrieved
at the inaccuracy of the
statements put forward
in the Public Works Report
of the Revenue Officers
of the District, have
therefore to blame them-
-selves in some measure
for

as was available. There
has been an unintentional
error which has been
corrected by communicating
to the Board of Revenue
the real facts.
I should be very willing
to give an undertaking to
Revenue Officers to be very
careful in ordering without
the fullest information. The
work of the Dept of Public
Works. But I do not think
the present a very opportune
Case.

5

for the same.

It is to be re-
-gretted however that
the Collector and Prin-
-cipal Assistant made
such inaccurate statements
as to the length of time
the building was in
progress; and that these
were accepted by the
Revenue Board without
inquiry. The work ceased
stopped by order of
Government within 16
months of the date of
sanction; which was
only 4 years prior to
the date of the Assistant
Collector's report endorsed
by the Collector, that
it

it had been 6 years under construction. When the reports and decisions which have been approved by Government, and on which orders have been passed are, as in this case, animadverted on by a Junior Revenue Officer, and his opinion supported not only by his immediate Superior, but by the Revenue Board and especially by their first Member, it is manifestly desirable that their opinions should be based upon accurate knowledge. Statements have been made by them

7 ✓

as to waste of time and money which have proved to be quite inaccurate. And His Excellency the Governor in Council has no hesitation in affirming the course that has been adopted of rebuilding the Cutcherry on the original foundation, at an additional cost of Rupees 3,370, as the right one.

The Revenue Board will be requested to draw the attention of all Revenue Officers to the necessity for basing all statements

contained

contained in their Public Works Reports upon the full and accurate information, without which such reports are not only valueless, but occasion much trouble, controversy, and ill feeling.

Encl.

To
The Secy. 1st Dr
Contr. Genl
Rev Deptt.

Superintending Engrs Office 1st Dn
Cowlaveeram 8th Novr 72

No 2028 q/

From,

Lieutenant Colonel A. Fischer RE.
Asst Superintending Engineer 1st Dn

To,

Colonel G. T. Walker RE
Chief Engineer D.P.W
Madras.

Sir,

I do myself the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Memo No 2500 dated the 23rd October last, relative to the revised Estimate for the Palur Cutcherry at Pallamanchelly.

2. In reply I have the honor to state that the information alluded to, was given to Government in a Comparative Statement submitted with my letter embodied in G.O. of the 1st February 1872 No 458, the Board of Revenue Officers enquired of Mr Lashley what the expenditure on the Building had been, and he told them nearly Rupees 9,000. Without further enquiry of any one, they represented this as the loss to Government. This was told me

Rec'd 17th February Pc 293-298
" 23rd Oct — 416-417

P.W. 1872 Depart.

From

5611.

The Supg Engineer
1st Division

To

The Chief Engineer
D.H.W.

Dated 8th
Despatched 9 } November 1872
Received 15

No. 2828

Enclosure Notice
No 2945-12th Nov 72.

States that the required information relative to the revised Estimate for the Taluq Cutcherry at Nellore Munchely was given in a Comparative Statement submitted with letter Embodied in G.O. No 468 dated 17th February 1872

Return Rec'd

Dist Engr Nellore Vizagapatam.

Rec'd 13/12/72

6 22 Nov 72

Encl. Agt. Ganjam & Vizagapatam Letter 13/12/72

No. 5611

Govt. of 1872; Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To The District Engr.
Vizagapatam

Dated

Rec'd.

Encl.

G. O. 12th Dec. 1872 No. 2945.

Nos. 2584 & 2585

...ding Cutcherry at Yella-
...manchelly - Letter from
... Subordinate of the 1st Sec.
...garding the Calery
... Cutcherry at Yella-
...manchelly, Vizagapatam