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.		Press / Mis.
295,296	2964	
Dated	14-12-	1892.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department, 14th December 1872.

No. 295. Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel J. F. FISCHER, R. E., Acting Superintending Engineer, 1st Division, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Dowlaishweram, 19th November 1872, No. 2,970 :—

I REGRET to have occasion to bring to the notice of Government the very unfavourable opinion I have formed of Mr. Supervisor Laskey during my recent visit to his Range in the matter of rates for the Taluq Cutcherry at Yellamunchelly, and which Government will be convinced of on perusing the papers which accompany this report.

One copy of a report, No 112, dated 7th November 1872, from Major Beatty, R. E.
One copy of data for rubble masonry per cubic yard at Vizagapatam and Yellamunchelly.
One copy of list of rates for rubble masonry.
Mr. Supervisor Laskey's explanations regarding rates of material, No. 419, dated 13th November 1872.
Mr. Supervisor Laskey's letter, No. 487, dated 29th November 1872.

2. It will be observed from paragraph 3 of Major Beatty's report on this subject that Mr. Laskey pleads inexperience as the cause of his providing such a high rate as 3 Rupees per cubic yard of rubble masonry. This plea should not hold good when I mention that I had personally instructed Mr. Laskey to get his rough stone by opening a quarry on the hill side close by, which instructions he has set aside, or did not give effect to, from a spirit of obstinacy, and by which the cost of the building will be greater than otherwise—Rupees 3,000 instead of Rupees 1,750, as per paragraph 5 of Major Beatty's report.

3. Mr. Laskey has also put forward another reason for not having quarried for stone at a much shorter distance than he had, namely, that Major Beatty's subordinates had gone to the distant hill, and it follows consequently he allowed his men to go to the same place. It will be evident from this that Mr. Laskey did not look to the interests of Government, as he ought to have as a Range Officer, by opening out a new quarry at the place pointed out by me, when, as Major Beatty observes, he would have saved nearly all carriage.

4. I beg to state that, as I have every reason to think Mr. Laskey has not consulted the interests of Government at all in this matter, I have directed Mr. Assistant-Engineer Turner to relieve Mr. Laskey of charge of the Range. The latter will for the present be under the orders of Mr. Turner on sub-divisional duties.

5. I have further to add that whilst I was lately at Waltair Mr. Laskey informed me for the first time that he had disobeyed my orders to get his stone material from the adjacent hill at Yellamunchelly. I went to that place with Major Beatty and Mr. Turner, and was surprised to find he was paying 7½ Annas a cubic yard for stone material, of which 4½ Annas was for carriage alone, when he had an abundance of good stone at hand. I then directed Major Beatty to send me a comparative statement of his rates for similar work, and the enclosed is his report. It was Mr. Laskey who informed Messrs. Thornhill, Melville, and Kelsall that the outlay on this cutcherry had been Rupees 9,000 and omitted to show what the actual loss would be, and they took no trouble to inquire further but led the Government to suppose I had misled them; and it was Mr. Laskey who would insist upon using brick of the worst quality when splendid stone at far cheaper

rates was available at hand. I have, therefore, removed him from charge of a Range after the fullest and most careful inquiry and investigation.

6. I beg to forward some explanations Mr. Laskey has sent in since he was furnished with a copy of Major Beatty's report, and on these I have made some notes. I have only to add Mr. Laskey totally fails to explain why he had kept this office in ignorance of his proceedings though he had been called upon to explain the excessive rates he was charging, and it was only on finding I was in Waltair and likely to visit his Range he admitted he was using other stone than I had directed him to take and for which he had no authority, and I do not consider he had any sufficient reason.

See his letter, No. 487.

No. 296. ORDER THEREON, 14th December 1872, No. 2,964.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 23.

MR. TURNER's services being required elsewhere, and the importance of the Golconda Range not such as to allow of a Sub-Divisional Officer being entertained in it, other arrangements for its charge than those proposed by the Superintending Engineer, 1st Division, must be made. That which commends itself most to the judgment of His Excellency the Governor in Council is Mr. Laskey's removal to the Chingleput District in place of Supervisor Ramiah Naidoo. The unfitness of Mr. Laskey for charge of a Range having been already noted in Lieutenant-Colonel Fischer's letters of 14th March and 21st December 1871, and in G. O., No. 2,006, of 29th August 1872, his name will be placed at the bottom of the list of Supervisors of the 1st Grade. And he will be warned that further bad report of him will lead to his reduction to the rank of Overseer.

2. It is incidentally brought to notice by this and former correspondence that a practice has arisen in the 1st Division of giving a Range Officer charge of special works beyond the limits of his own Range. The practice is contrary to the system of the Public Works Department of this Presidency, and is strictly prohibited for the future without the special sanction of Government.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. W. WALKER, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the District Engineer, Vizagapatam.
To all other District Engineer.
,, Controller of Public Works Accounts

Exd. A. S. Rodgers.

No. 31

Calug Overseers Office
Yellamunchilly
11th November 1872

From
The Calug Overseer
Nursapoor Calug
Yellamunchily

To
The Officer in Charge
No. 1 Range.
Vizagapatam District

Sir

With reference to your Memo No. 442 concerning the Yellamunchily Subordinate Jail and Calug Cutchery I herewith furnish you with a reply to the questions therein described

Firstly; the cubical contents of the walls as they now stand at this date is 4.91 Cubyds. The cost of the Rough stone work in Chunam is something under Rs 2½-

Secondly; At present I am obtaining by Contract 5⅓ parahs of Chunam for 1 Rupee or an 80 parah Garee for Rs 15 delivered on the spot. This as well as being cheap, is also objectionable if not trashy. It is adulliralid with ash and sand and so neely is the adullirallion performed that it is with difficulty we are enabled to detect it. The Lime stone which up till lately we had been procuring and manufacturing into Chunam cost us Rs 6½ per Garee of 60 Parahs of the raw material when manufactured into Chunam its cost was about 15 Rupees per Garee of 60 Parahs. although we are at present obtaining 20 parahs more for the same money by Contract, I decidedly prefer our own manufacture from the fact, that it is not adullirated, and we see it manufactured under our very eyes. Charcoal we procure from the neighbouring

Except

neighbouring hills by contract at the rate of 60 Parahs Garce for 3 3/4 Rs. This material cannot be procured cheaper any where in this Range at present. You have been labouring under a slight mistake Sir concerning the price of the Rough stone. We pay 2 annas a Cubic yd excavating & digging, & 5 annas Carting. A cubic yd of Rough stone delivered on the work we now obtain for 7 annas. Sand we procure for about 1/4 Anna per parah we then have to sift it & by this process we loose 40 or 50 per Cent on the whole bringing it & close to 1/2 anna per parah the prepared material. With reference to the stone found at Ellamunchilly hill I can say but a few words Sir, from the fact that my knowledge of the science of Geology is very very limited. If asked my opinion concerning this stone, & judging from the surface Stratum I should unhesitatingly say that it has not the appearance of stone as would justify its being placed in a building like the Ellamunchilly Culchery, in whose stability the Heads of the Department, & Government undoubtedly look for, as the Taluq Overseer & being partly held responsible for the stability of a building under my immediate Superintendence I should feel somewhat reluctant to its being used. To appearance this stone appears to be in a state of decay and if the Sub Strata resemble the surface Stratum, it is I think unreasonable for us to go to the expense of quarrying & blasting and going deeper into the Sub Strata with only the hopes of finding a suitable material

for

for our pillar drums, floor paving, & arch work. As far as we have excavated no signs of improvement are yet met with in the Sub Strata, moreover, if we actually work this hill, as in the manner of a quarry Viz; by blasting I entertain great doubt as to whether we would procure the material as cheap and as suitable as we are at present using.

I beg to remain
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
Geo. Bennett.
Taluq Overseer.

Except

No 1 or Golgondah Range
office nellamanchelly
13th November 1872.

No 449

From

The Officer in Charge of
No 1 or Golgondah Range

To

The Superintending Engineer
1st Division

List

Enclo 1

With reference to the List of prices of Materials furnished to Major Beatty the other day, I have respectfully to observe that as the Overseer was not in there at the time I could not get very correct information as to the prices of the materials used on the nellamanchelly Cutchery. I was myself at the time laid up with "dengue" and the information I collected through the maistry who was only recently appointed to the work was consequently not very correct.

Mr Overseer Kelly I see from the accounts has been paying 7 as per cubic yard of stone and not 7-6

The sand has been obtained at 40 paras for 11 as this sand is not coarse enough.

enough and it has to be sifted the fine particles contained are more than 50 per cent, when this is removed and sifting completed the price of the sand at the work comes up to 7 or 8 piece a parah.

The cost of Chunam averages at 3¾ as a parah, but the article is quite fine and good, it is manufactured on the spot, the cost being a little high hitherto for this material is to be attributed to the wet season in which it was mostly manufactured what you see built of the Cutchery you must know was done during the wet season, as for getting my supply of Chunam through contractors, I have my fear and suspicion that it is never pure, sand and ashes are mixed up, it was my distinct instructions to the Overseer, that if the cost did exceed the market rate that he should see to the chunam being burnt on the spot to secure its being good, lime stones vary very much in their properties and contractors are not particular in these matters, no more than seeing

to

9a

to stones producing a good bulk; again Chunam supplied by contractors always contain a large quantity of small stones which is the "refuse" of the Kiln mixed up. I have for all these reasons a decided objection to chunam being obtained through contractors.

The man who supplied Major Beatty's Overseer on the bridge works at Rs 6/8/- for 50 parahs was paid Rs 12-8-- for 60 parahs and after the first grace was received I stopped the Overseer getting any more from him. Major Beatty's Overseer got the chunam at a uniform rate for works both near and far within 5 or 6 miles on Trunk Road, but having to bring it 10 miles from the Kiln, the rate 12/8/- given for the Cutchery was not too high, discontinuing the contractor supplying the chunam was not owing to the rate, but the quality of the material did not please me.

Regarding the question of the stones from the adjacent hill to the building not being used, I have respectfully to observe that the stones of this

this hill plainly exhibit the appearance of being in a state of decomposition, there is over a thousand cubic yards that was recently dug up for the use of metalling Junk Road, and it can be seen from them that they are not good building stones, a random rubble wall may be built with them, but they would never allow the least regard to their being set up in courses nor would they allow any great regard to bond being attended, which in ordinarily stable masonry you know is not very perfect, this hill in some places, it can be seen has been worked down to a couple yards in depth and the quality of the stones turned up has proved no better than those presented on the surface, the dimensions of the stratum are extremely various thick where not alternating with shistose or rocks and the strata are so contorted that they break up and split in all directions and thus present stones of various sizes and shapes which are not at all adapted for running up walls that demand attention to good bond the

Mr Simm in his letter says the Stone of the immediate quarries is not suitable but Brickwork has been executed many years ago by Quarrying in better quality Stone not likely to be met with.

the hill a mile away from the building, & furnishing good stones and in slabs warranted, my sanctioning the overseer procuring the stones from that distance.

Mr Assistant Engineer Turner on instructions from Major Beatty the other day inspected both the hills in company with me and expressed his opinion that the stone from the hill obtained was no mistake superior to the other

— To say that if a quarry was opened on the side of the hill near yellaman chelly, I would likely get good stones costing perhaps 3½ as a cft, on this subject I would respectfully say that it should be tried to see if this expectation could be realized, we have no instance in the district of having obtained stones by quarrying, they are simply dug up and rolled down the hill, where ever they are worked easily by the coolies or wudders, we get them at hill side at 2 as a cft but where the work is hard, & according to the time of the year, the rates raise to 3 as, but to work a quarry with .

Jan 1872

No 4 — the

new

tes for Page 2 of

wing

to fly

timate

ibly

rate

ties

ing in

rates

to high

ies in

yard

Except

with blasting operations and to get down to a stratum below the top which already to a depth of 2 yards has been ascertained to be in a deteriorating state will I am afraid result to the expense of a cubic yard costing a great deal more than at present and the stones may not after all prove as good as those now in use, by my experience from the appearance of what is to be seen of the formation of the top stratum leads me to doubt meeting with anything in the shape of slabs, deeper down may present the rock in a less decomposed form.

I called on the Overseer as he is personally in charge of this work to answer a few questions on this subject and I am desirous that his letter should accompany mine I have ordered Mr. Bennett to discontinue getting any further Chunam by contract and to continue the practice of burning it at the site of the work as before.

I have also in this explanation to ask your consideration to one more fact that is that men in rubble masonry where the chunam is pounding and the removing of all earthy matter from the sand is carefully attended to, and where the hammer is freely used and even the stone mason chisel called to use in fitting stones to bring their joints close and where the stones are laid in regular courses will I must respectfully say effect a material difference in the cost between this sort of work and walls carried up often with simply the aid of nothing more than a trowel in the hand of the bricklayer.

I beg to remain
Sir
Your most Obd.t Servant
W.m Cosserly
Range Officer

No 487

No 1 or Golgonda Range
Office Camp Yellamunchily
29th November 1871

From

The Officer in Charge of
No 1 or Golgonda Range
Vizagapatam District

To

The Superintg Engineer
1st Division

losures
a
ard Plan No 1 &
ual Estimate
is Estimate

Sir

In reply to your memo No 2613,
of the 21st Instant, I beg leave respectfully
separate cover to state that if you will kindly look into
the "Statement of Prices" submitted from this
Range for 1871-72, you will find rates for
stone in Chunam and stone in mud entered
at Rs 2/1/- & Rs 1/6/-

2. I respectfully submit copy of a Data
from which you will see the average of the
last three Nos 4, 5 & 6, gives Rs 3-- which
was the rate used in this Estimate. The
difference of rate between Chunam or Clay in
stone is effected only by the prices of the two
materials; the labor remains the same. In
building thin walls and carrying them up
high, an increase is effected in the rates
occasioned by the labor being tedious and
the expense of Scaffolding.

3 With reference to your observation in the
first para of your memo I beg to state
that

Upper Sketch
Plan

The Officer in Charge
of Golgonda
Range

To
The Executive Engineer
1st Division.

Rajahmundry
Dated 13th Dec 1871
Recd 15th " "
No 449

Submitting report
&c. regarding
certain rates of
materials in said
Agency Talukas

that I have observed in my letter that bond in rubble masonry is imperfect and I don't, by saying so, convey that it is entirely void of such. Slab stones are procurable from the hill adjacent the building, but at a more increased rate than those at which the stones of the ordinary kind are obtained. The rocks of these hills are gneiss they have a foliated appearance and split more in one direction than another, the dimen- -sions of the Strata are extremely various being thick where not alterating with other Shitose rocks, and the Strata are so con- -torted that in breaking them they split up on all sides and thus present stones of all size and shape.

4 The rate used in this Estimate is Calculated to enable the builder paying regard to these walls receiving its due share of attention to stones in their courses lapping properly over joints, but what I allude to in my letter is to the difference in work between this which is called "random rubble" and the other "coursed work," in which the stones will be roughly squared and sorted in sizes and arranged in courses the cost of such work will be

be Rs. 7/8/-.

17a

Offic

5 With the above explanation, I respectfully resubmit the papers received yesterday.

I beg to remain
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
J. W. Dudley
Range Officer

No 1172

From Executive Engineer Office
Vellore, the 27th November 1872

To The Executive Engineer
Cuddapah Range

Sir I have the honor to forward herewith
for your perusal and favorable consideration
the Indents noted in the margin for the
undermentioned articles required for the use
of the Establishment employed in the
Cuddapah Range for the year 1873.

2. Should any of the articles be found
unprocurable in the Cuddapah Bazar, the
Indents should be returned for the
favor of cancellation.

Enclosures as noted in the margin.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
Executive Engineer

Memorandum

The Sanitary Inspector has intimated the
necessity of making a Well in the Compound
of the Hospital at Rayachoty, and has
requested a Grant of Rs 300 for the purpose.
Estimate and Plan for the same are
submitted herewith.

The Sanitary Inspector has also intimated
the necessity of making a Well in the
Compound of the Hospital at Cuddapah
and has requested a Grant of Rs 300 for
the purpose. Estimate and Plan for the same
are submitted herewith.

The Sanitary Inspector has also intimated
the necessity of making a Well in the
Compound of the Hospital at Rayachoty
and has requested a Grant of Rs 300 for
the purpose. Estimate and Plan for the same
are submitted herewith.

Executive Engineer

No 2947

Secretary to Govt
of
Madras
Dated 29th November 1872

From P.W. 5828/72
The Officer in Charge
No 1 Range
Vizagapatam Distt

To
The Supdg Engineer
1st Division

Dated 29th
Desp. 29th } November 1872
Rec.

No 487
Enclosure 5

Respectfully replies
to Memo No 2613 dated
21st Instant
P.W. 6136/71

except in one instance in the Town of Vizagapatam where Municipal Candy tax, and the higher price of labor affect the rates, Mr. Superviser Cormac has never had to pay more than 6 Annas. I consider that Mr. Lackey should have got his supply of stone by opening a Quarry in the hill side within two hundred yards of the Cutcherry; and that if he had done so, it would not have cost him more than 3½ Annas. The stone he is now using, which is obtained from a hill about one & a half miles distant, at a cost of 7½ annas, appears to be of precisely the same quality and description as that in the hill close at hand. Mr. Lackey considered himself justified in going to that distant hill for stone by the fact that my subordinates took some stone for the Jeedagedda bridge parapets from that place, but the quantity required for the parapets of the bridge (about 100 Cubic yards) was so small that it was inexpedient to open a new Quarry, while for the 1500 Cubic yards or more wanted for the Cutcherry walls and foundations, it was decidedly advisable to do so, and thus save nearly all carriage. Besides this, I find from my

my accounts that the stone used on the Bridge, to which it had to be carted about 3 miles, cost only 7¼ annas, while Mr. Lackey has been paying 7½ annas, when it has only to be carted half the distance.

II Chunam. The cost of Chunam in this Range varies from 6 Rupees to 9 Rupees per Garce of 80 parahs delivered on the works. At Yellamanchelly Chunam can be obtained from Yelsiri about 6 miles off, or from Kuruvoolpalem, which is 10 miles from Yellamanchelly. The price paid for Chunam on the Yedlagedda bridge, 1½ miles from Yellamanchelly, was 7½ Rs.

According to the list given me by Mr. Lackey, he is paying 4 annas per parah for Chunam which is at the rate of 15 Rupees a garce, while 2½ annas per parah should be sufficient.

III Sand. The Cost of sand for works in this Range varies from 1 pie to 5 pies per parah, 3 pies should be ample at Yellamanchelly where it has not to be carted above a mile.

5. Applying these rates for materials, to the quantities of labor and materials found necessary in this Range, I am of opinion that

that rubble masonry at Gellamunekelly should not cost more than Rs:1·12·-, at most, and consequently that 1,000 Cubic Yards would cost Rs:1750, and not 3,000 Rupees as estimated by Mr. Lastley.

Have the honor

/Signed/ J. Beatty Major R.E.
Dy. Engineer Vizianagrum Range
Malliah

/True Copy/

[signature] Captn. R.E.
for A.G. Supdg. Engineer 1st Dn.

D.No. 5824/72

Data for Rubble-Masonry per Cubic yard at Vizagapatam and at Yellamunchelly.

No or Quantity	Nature of Materials or Labor	Actual cost at Vizagapatam			Probable cost at Yellamunchelly			Do according to the rates paid by Mr Parker.			Remarks
		Rate	Per	Amount	Rate	Per	Amount	Rate	Per	Amount	
1 1/8	Cubic yards of Stone	" 6 "	Cyd	"	6 9 "	3 6	Cyd " 4 "	" 7 6	Cyd "	8 7	
3 1/2	Parahs of Chunam	" 2 8	Parah	"	9 4 "	2 6	Parah " 8 9 "	7 "	Parah "	14 "	
7	—Do— of Sand	" " 4	Do	"	2 4 "	" 3	Do " 1 9 "	1 "	Do "	7 "	
1	Bricklayer	" 5 6	Each	"	5 6 "	6	Each " 6 "	" 5 8	Each "	5 8	
1	Man Coolys	" 2 "	Do	"	2 " "	2 "	Do " 2 "	" 1 10	Do "	1 10	
3	Women	" 1 "	Do	"	3 " "	1 "	Do " 3 "	" 1 "	Do "	3 "	
	Total Cost of one Cubic Yard Rs.	1 12 11			Total Rupees	1 9 6		Total Rupees	2 8 1		

Executive Engineer's Office
Waltair 7th November 1872

(Signed) J. Beatty Major R.E.
Executive Engineer Vizianagram Range
Waltair

True Copy

H. H. Rund Captn R.E.
for Actg Subdy Engineer 1st Dn

List of rates for Rubble Masonry, furnished by Mr. Lackey and his Head Accountant.-

Particulars		Per	Rate
Bricklayers 1st Class		each	" 7 "
Do.	2d Do.	Do.	" 6 "
Do.	3d Do.	Do.	" 4 "
Men Cooly		Do.	" 2 "
Do.		Do.	" 1 8
Woman Cooly		Do.	" 1 "
Boy	Do.	Do.	" " 8
Churnam		Parah	" 4 "
Sand		Do.	" 1 "

Manufacture of Churnam.

2 Parahs of Charcoal	" 2 "
1 Do. of Lime Stone	" 3 "
Cooly	" 1 "
For 1/2 Parah	" 6 "

/ Since Copy/
/ signed J. Bradley Engineer R.E
Apparitor Engineer -

No. 1 or Golgonda Range Office,
Yellamunchelly 4th Novr 1872.

/ signed / J. W. Lackey
Range Officer

Rate per Rough stone in No. 1 Range for Yellamunchelly Cotcherry.-

Rough stone at Quarry per C.yd.	" 2 6
Do. carriage for 2 1/2 miles	" 5 "
Total P C.yd	" 7 6

These rates for quarrying and carting stone were furnished by the Head Accountant of the Range

/ True Copy /
W. R. Shand Captn R.E.
for A.G. and Supt Engr 1st Div

P.W. 5-Aug/72

No. 2970. Supg. Engrs Office 1st Division
Nowlaveshwaram 19th November 99
Despd 20th D.

From

Lieutt Colonel J. F. Fischer R.E.
Asst Supg. Engineer 1st Division

To

Colonel G. W. Walker R.E.
Chief Engineer W.P.W.
Madras

Sir,

I regret to have occasion to bring to the notice of Government the very unfavorable opinion I have formed of Mr Supervisor Lackey, during my recent visit to his Range, in the matter of rates for the Taliq Cutcherry at Yellamanchelly, and which Government will be convinced of on perusing the papers which accompany this report.

2. It will be observed from para 3 of Major Beatty's report on this subject, that Mr Lackey pleads inexperience as the cause of his providing such a high rate as 3 Rs per Cubic Yard of Rubble masonry, this plea should not hold good when I mention that I had personally instructed Mr Lackey to get his rough stone by opening

P. No. 5845/99
Rec'd 24th Nov 1899

Enclosure in a letter
No. 2970 dated 19th Nov 99
from the Asst Superintending
Engineer 1st Division
to the Chief Engineer
W. P. S. Madras

opening a quarry on the Hill side, close by, which instructions he has set aside, or did not give effect to, from a spirit of obstinacy, and by which, the cost of the Building will be greater than otherwise. R3000 instead of R1750 as per para 5 of Major Beatty's report.

3. Mr Laskey has also put forward another reason for not having quarried for stone at a much shorter distance than he had, viz: that, Major Beatty's subordinates had gone to the distant hill, and it follows consequently, he allowed his men to go to the same place: It will be evident from this, that Mr Laskey did not look to the interests of Government as he ought to have as a Range Officer, by opening out a new quarry at the place pointed out by me, when, as Major Beatty observes, he would have saved nearly all carriage.

4. I beg to state that as I have every reason to think Mr Laskey has not consulted the interests of Government at all in this matter, I have directed Mr Assistant Engineer Turner to relieve Mr Laskey of Charge of the Range. The latter will for the present be under the orders of Mr Turner on sub-divisional duties.

5. I have further to add that whilst I was lately at Walltair, Mr Laskey informed me for the

the first time that he had disobeyed my orders to get his stone material from the adjacent hill at Yellamunchelly. I went to that place with Major Beatty and Mr Turner and was surprized to find he was paying 7½ annas a Culie Yard for stone material, of which 4½ annas was for carriage alone, when he had an abundance of good stone at hand. I then directed Major Beatty to send me a Comparative Statement of his rates for similar work, and the enclosed is his report. It was Mr Laskey who informed Messrs Thornhill, Melville & Helsall that the outlay on this Cutcherry had been Rs 9000 and omitted to shew what the actual loss would be, and they took no trouble to enquire further, but led the Government to suppose I had misled them; and it was Mr Laskey who would insist upon using brick of the worst quality when splendid stone at far cheaper rates was available at hand. I have therefore removed him from charge of a Range after the fullest and most careful enquiry and investigation.

6. I beg to forward some explanations Mr Laskey has sent in since he was furnished with a copy of Major Beatty's report and on these I have made some notes, I have only to add

Mr

Mr Lackey totally fails to explain why
he had kept the officers in ignorance of his proceedings though he had been called upon
to explain the excessive rates he was charging and
it was only on finding Isaac Walker was
likely to visit his Range he admitted he was
using other stone than I had directed him to take
and for which he had no authority and I
do not consider he had any sufficient reason.

See his letter
No 487.

I have the honor to be

Your Most obedient Servant

Lieut Col R.E.

Asst Engineer 4th Div

Public Works Department.

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

Read the following.

From The Actg Supg Engr 1st Dn { No. 2970/19 dated 19th November 1872

Mr Lerners services being required elsewhere, and the importance of the Chicacole Range not such as to allow of a Sub Divisional Officer being entertained in it, other arrangements for its charge than those proposed by the Superintending Engineer 1st Division must

P.W. 1872 Dept.

From No. 5848

The Acting Supg Engineer
1st Division

To The Chief Engineer &c &c
Madras

Dated 19 November 1872
Rec'd 22

No. 2970

Enclosures five

Reports that for inefficiency of Mr Supervisor Lasky to be a Range Officer under circumstances stated in connection with his deliberate disobedience to orders issued regarding Salig Cutcherry at Yellamunchelly he has relieved him of the charge of Range.

No 2964 - 16 Decr/72

Chf Decr/72 Rec'd Decr 24 Reply 7 Dec 72

must be made. That which commends itself most to the judgement of His Excellency the Governor in Council is the removal to the Chinglepet District in place of Superviser Ramiah Naidoo.

The unfitness of Mr Lackey for charge of a Range having been already noted on Lieut. Colonel Fischer's letters of 14th March and 21st December 1871, and in G.O. No 2266 of 29th August 1872, his name will be placed at the bottom of the list of Superviseurs of

of the 1st Grade - and he will be warned that further bad report of him will lead to his reduction to the rank of Overseer.

It is incidentally brought to notice by this and former correspondence that a practice has arisen in the 1st Division of giving a Range Officer charge of Special works beyond the limits of his own Range. The practice is contrary to the system of the Public Works Department of this Presidency, and is strictly prohibited for the future.

-Ellis-

28
3

Desp.a 19/12/72

Cr 5848

Govt. of 1872 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated

Recd. Encl.

G. O. 14th Dec 1872, No 2964.

Nos. 295 & 296.

Wm Spencer Lawkey.

Passing orders on letter from the Superintendent of the Nilgiris & the Superintending Engineer of the Southern Circle.