

(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.	1704	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
23-23		
Dated	2. 7.	1843.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
2nd July 1873.*

No. 22. Read the following endorsement of the Chief Secretary to Government, Ecclesiastical Department, dated 5th May 1873 :—

By the Venerable J. GORTON, Archdeacon of Madras, to the Honourable W. HUDLESTON, Chief Secretary to Government, Ootacamund, dated Chetput, 2nd May 1873, No. 350.

With reference to Proceedings of the Madras Government, Ecclesiastical Department, 6th June 1872, No. 91, I have the honour to bring to the notice of the Government that the belfry of the Palghaut church has not been raised to the height proposed in my letter and approved in their order thereon.

2. Mr. Tomlinson, the Lay Trustee of Palghaut, who takes a great interest in the church, addressed me on the subject in the enclosed letter, dated 25th March, in which I wrote to the District Engineer referring him to the order of Government, and expressing a hope that it might not be too late to carry it out.

3. It was expressly ordered that "the base of the bell should be at least 12 feet from the ground." By some mistake the belfry now in process of construction (if not already completed) will not admit of more than 10 feet, which is considered to be quite inadequate for the purpose, and involves an unnecessary expenditure of public money.

4. The answer of the District Engineer to my letter is herewith submitted to the Government, together with a letter from the Lay Trustee of Palghaut to the Chaplain of Coimbatore, from which it will be evident to the Government that the mistake of the Officiating District Engineer is inexcusable, and the anxiety of the Lay Trustee on the subject justifiable.

5. Trusting that His Excellency the Governor in Council will be pleased to re-assert the order above referred to and enforce a strict compliance therewith.

From J. J. TOMLINSON, Esq., Lay Trustee, to the Venerable J. GORTON, Archdeacon of Madras, dated Palghaut, 25th March 1873.

ANNEXED is copy of a letter I have addressed to the District Engineer of Malabar, referring to my letter to your address of the 13th April 1872 and the Order of Government No. 91, 6th June 1872, on your recommendation. I offer no comment on the proceedings on that building for the new belfry further than that the orders of Government are not carried out, which distinctly orders the same should be raised 12 feet from base of bell when suspended to the ground instead of 10 feet, as now progressing, thus rendering unnecessary expenditure of Government funds; the end in view will not have been attained, and for which reason the former belfry would have answered all purposes.

2. As the work is progressing may I ask you to take immediate action in the case by which means a further expenditure of Government money will be saved; it will not now be either expensive or difficult to raise it further 2 feet.

From J. J. TOMLINSON, Esq., Lay Trustee, to Captain H. W. WOOD, R.E., Officiating District Engineer, Malabar, dated Palghaut, 25th March 1873.

With reference to Government Orders No. 91, dated 6th June 1872, you will observe the Government have passed their order on my representation, recommended by the Venerable the Archdeacon of Madras, that the belfry now under construction should be so raised as to give at least 12 feet from base of bell when suspended to the ground. I now find on measuring the work that

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
2nd July 1873.*

The District Engineer, Palghat, has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th inst. in relation to the proposed belfry at Palghat, and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the Government for their consideration.

The Government have been pleased to sanction the erection of a belfry at an expense of Rupees 150, for the protection of their own property, to be expended as follows, viz. :—

The Government have been pleased to sanction the erection of a belfry at an expense of Rupees 150, for the protection of their own property, to be expended as follows, viz. :—

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
2nd July 1873.*

2. I have entered so freely in all my correspondence on the subject of the proposed "belfry" now under construction at Palghat, and as you have personally inspected the same and formed your opinion as to its adaptation, or otherwise, for the purpose required, from the G. O. G., No. 91, dated 6th June 1872, you will have learnt the orders of Government. I must again ask that these orders as to height of the bell from the ground may be carried out; in the present state the sound been deadened is an equal obstacle, rendering the belfry perfectly useless.

3. It is much to be regretted that the informants of the District Engineer had not made themselves better acquainted with the merits of the various points in his letter.

1st—There was no bell in use during the period the station was garrisoned by troops, which were removed in 1857; it was in 1858 that the Rev. H. Taylor, Chaplain of Coonoor, applied for and obtained the sanction of Government for the bell and certain church furniture. The bell was not suspended until some considerable time had elapsed, when it was swung on a teak-wood crosstree, purchased from a subscription made by each member. On the timber becoming unsafe for the further suspension of the bell (it being a valuable one) I applied to Government, through the Rev. J. McKee, Chaplain of Coonoor, in letter dated Palghat, 26th November 1867, for the sanction of Government for the erection of a belfry at an expense of Rupees 150, for the protection of their own property, to be expended as follows, viz. :—

	Rs.
For Belfry	130
For a screen to protect the belfry during the heavy rain of the monsoon when exposed ringing the bell for Divine Service	20
Total...	150

This was sanctioned by G. O. G., No. 392, dated 19th December 1867.

The late belfry was built by the Department of Public Works, but not the screen.

In consequence of the continued complaints of the residents that the sound of the bell could not be heard a short distance even from the church, and at the residence of the Head Assistant Collector it could not be heard at all. On these complaints continually occurring, I considered it a duty due to all to bring the same to the notice of Government through the proper channel, i.e., the Venerable Archdeacon of Madras, who sanctioned the application by G. O. G., No. 91, 15th June 1872.

4. I would observe that being under the impression that the roof (tile) of the former belfry was the means of deadening what little sound might have remained, I requested the removal of the roof; it was so, but with no advantage.

5. The District Engineer is sadly mistaken in regard to the number of Sundays in the month that we are privileged to assemble in our little much-admired church.

6. The Rev. Missionary of the Evangelical Bible Mission gives his faithful services when in Palghat, and when duty calls him away into the district the Head Assistant Collector or any other gentleman who may be in the station are requested to officiate, so that the church is only occasionally closed to Divine Service unless when under repair.

7. It does appear strange how the District Engineer obtained such incorrect information. I regret I never had the pleasure of seeing him in our church, as it is probable a personal interview might have prevented this great mistake.

8. In conclusion, I respectfully beg to decline giving any further opinion, as you and the Venerable Archdeacon are in full possession of the whole affair given to you to the best of my humble abilities, than already given; if the belfry is continued and finished under the present construction, it will be a useless and far from pleasing ornament to our church, and I shall feel myself fully justified in withholding the usual note of approval when completed and applied for.

9. The bell of the Bible Mission is distinctly heard through the length and breadth of the station, as is also that of the Roman Catholic Chapel; it is therefore very annoying, after the liberality of the Government in offering a sufficiency of funds to render the Government Church (English Protestants) sound to hear in the station.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
2nd July 1873.

TRANSFERRED to the Department of Public Works.

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,

Chief Secretary.

No. 23.

ORDER THEREON, 2nd July 1873, No. 1,707.

CIVIL WORKS, No. 1B.

His Excellency the Governor in Council regrets that the general approval given by his order in the Ecclesiastical Department, No. 91 of 6th June, to the Lay Trustee's proposal to raise the base of the bell at Palghat to a height of 12 feet from the ground was overlooked in the Public Works Order, No. 393, of 6th February 1873, which sanctioned a plan that allowed for raising it only 10 feet. But as it is now $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 feet higher than before, and will be tolled by means of a wheel instead of being struck by a clapper, it is hoped that the original object of Mr. Tomlinson's application to Government will have been attained in spite of the neglect to carry out his proposal, and the order of Government approving it, evinced by the Range Officer and District Engineer. The latter officer would doubtless have remedied the neglect complained of had it been brought to his notice in time to modify the sanctioned plan: but the tone of the 3rd and 4th paragraphs of his letter to the Venerable the Archdeacon of Madras is calculated to give offence, and should be abstained from in future correspondence.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.

Secretary to Government.

To the District Engineer, Malabar,
Ecclesiastical Department.

Ed. S. T. Austin.

Spice Office.

Letter of Lay Trustee to Archdeacon.

Palghat 25 June 1873

No 1

Most Reverend, Archdeacon,

Perusing a copy of a letter I have addressed to the District Engineer of Malabar, referring to your letter by post addressed of the 13th April 1872 and the order of Government No. 393 of 6th Feb 1873 on your recommendation, I suffer no comment on the proceedings in the building for the New Bellry - further than to say, that the order of Government was not considered, which distinctly orders the same should be raised 12 feet from Batey's Bell when suspended in the ground, instead of 10 feet as now proposed. Thus involving unnecessary expenditure of money of funds, the end in view will not have been attained, and for which I believe the former Malabar would have answered satisfactorily.

As the work is progressing very fast, you will take immediate action, in the case, by which no further expenditure of Government money will be saved, it will not now be either expensive or difficult.

to write of further, 2 feet,

Dear Sir, your attendance, with all,

Ever Venerable and Dear Sir,

Very Respectfully,

John C. Goodwin, Esq.,

My Dear Sir,

La
Sir

Worcester & North Street, Boston

and Beacon St.

Worcester

City of Boston, 25 March 1873

Received 25 March 1873

With reference to Government Order No. 91 dated
October 1872, you will observe the Government having
found this order many representations, recommending
that the dam be the best place of the dam that the
dam and under construction should be so built
at a side at least 12 feet from the base of the dam,
when suspended to the ground. I am sure in such
cases the dam, that the base of the dam to the
ground will be only 10 feet a small addition
to the dam now removed, and on account
of the expenditure of Government funds, which
is very heavy, but for the circumstance
of building the dam to 12 feet at least, to carry
the dam a greater distance, the present dam
would have answered all the purposes required,
and have saved the Government funds.

No. 2 and 3 I have fully explained the
necessity of building the dam and which
would the Government be obliged to maintain,
an expense which would otherwise have been
unnecessary.

May I hope you will be pleased to find

Seller of Lay Trusts of Paul Grant to Chaplain of Corvallis No 4
 17th April 1873

Dear Sir

The accompanying letter from the District
 Minister received late yesterday evening, which comes to (copy of a
 letter from the District Minister of Malabar, dated 10th inst.) is by the
 following correspondence requesting they may be returned to
 me when my next arrives.

I have intended to reply in all my correspondence
 the subject of the request, but by accident it has been
 omitted. I am now writing to you, respecting the same
 and forward your opinion as to its expediency, or otherwise for
 the purpose required from the P. B. No 1st dated 6th inst 1872.
 I will have sent the order of Government, almost of course,
 and that this order as to height of the Bell from the ground,
 may be carried out in the present state the second bell,
 attached if an equal obstacle hindering the Bell by perfect
 utility.

It is much to be regretted that the representatives
 of the District Congress, had not made themselves better
 acquainted with the merits of the various projects in this letter.

There can be no doubt, as is during the period
 the station was attended by script, which were removed
 in 1857, about in 1858 that the Rev. Mr. Taylor (then
 being) formerly settled in, and attended the service
 of Government for the Bell, and certainly (thenceforward)
 there, the Bell was not suspended, could such
 confidential land had stayed to attend the same.

From order, that the Bell cannot be completed
 in accordance with the order of Government

above alluded to

Yours

Respectfully

Self

Respectfully

The District Congress

Malabar

in Council

Respectfully

Please observe that I am not at all
 forwarding a copy of this letter to the District
 of the Rev. Mr. Taylor

1873/4

12/3/77 A/73

H. A. S. Co.

Chelone
Cassidix

Superior Court, San Francisco, California:

~~12343~~

Electra Harris
1. April 1873.

To The District Engineer
Madras
in Circuit
Palay.

Sir: Mr. Tomlinson the Secy. Treas.
 of the Church at Palghat has
 felt it his duty to report to me
 that the Order of Government dated
 6th June 1873 No. 91 for the raising
 of the Bellry 12 feet from base of
 Bell when suspended to the ground
 is not being carried out, 10 feet only
 being the height contemplated in the
 plan which is in process of execu-
 tion, which in his opinion will
 not effect the end in view, and
 will therefore involve an unneces-
 sary expenditure of public money.

Mr. Tomlinson asks me to take immediate action in the case, with a view to save a further expendi.

there of money. I therefore put
myself in communication with you
in the hope that it may not yet
be too late to carry out the orders
of Government as to the height
of the Belfry, in which 2 feet would
make a great difference in regard
to the purpose of a Church bell.

I have the honor to be
Signed J. Gordon
Archdeacon.

(True copy)

J. Gordon
Archdeacon

Ms 317 & A/13

Letter of District Engineer to Archdeacon
No. 3.
Malabar District Engineer's Office
Cochin 12 April 1873

Dear Sir

The Offg. District Engineer

Archdeacon

I.

The Reverend the Archdeacon
Bachan

II.

I have the honor to acknowledge
the receipt of your letter of 31st March 2nd
inst. regarding the height of the belfry of
the Church at Calcutta.

The mistake has arisen in the
following way. Soon after taking charge
of the District Engineer's Office of Malabar, I
received a sketch plan of the way in which
it was proposed to heighten the bell. Looking
at the stability only of the plan, I directed
the bell to be raised 18" or 24". Mr. Potter,
the Engineer Charge Officer, should have
directed my attention to the fact, that
G. O. of 6th June 1872 No. 91 required that the
bell should be raised a certain height,
but he omitted to do so. The fault therefore
lies entirely with this Department or rather
with myself in having overlooked the
requirements of the G. O. mentioned.

I would however mention that
the congregation at Palghat numbers
at the most one dozen people who meet
once or twice a month. The members of
this congregation reside close to the church
and the bell formerly hung at a height
of 6 feet answered every purpose for many
years, while the station had a garrison
of troops with their complement of officers.

Now under the circumstances
detailed, Mr. Tomlinson says that to
raise the bell from 6 feet to 10 feet is an
unnecessary expenditure of public funds.
I am inclined to come out to agree
with him: but I cannot entirely concur
in his opinion that, to raise it to 10 feet
higher, is an absolutely necessary step
to be taken.

Unfortunately the word impos-
sible to such an extent towards com-
pletion as prevents the plan already
sanctioned by Government being carried out.
And I therefore hope that the explanation
offered may obviate further discussion on the matter.

I have the honor to be

Sincerely yours

Wm. J. Tomlinson

1873

No. 350

Chettipet, Madras.

2. May 1873.

From The Venerable
The Archdeacon of Madras
To The Honble W. H. H. H. H.
Chief Secretary to Government
Colonial Department

Sir,
With reference to Proceedings
of the Madras Government Ecclesiasti-
cal Department 6th June 1872. No. 1
I have the honor to bring to the notice
of the Government that the bell
of the Palghat Church has not been
raised ^{to the height} as proposed in my letter, and
approved in their order thereon.

2. Mr. Tomlinson, the Surveyor
General of Palghat, who takes a great
interest in the Church, addressed me
on the subject in the enclosed letter
dated 26th March, on which I wrote to
the District Engineer referring
him to the order of Government and
expressing a hope that it might not
be too late to carry it out.

3. It was expressly ordered that "the base of the bell should be at least 12 feet from the ground." By some mistake the Bellry now in process of construction (if not already completed) will not admit of more than 10 feet which is considered to be quite inadequate for the purpose, and involves an unnecessary expenditure of public money.

4. The answer of the District Engineer to my letter, is herewith submitted to the Government together with a letter from the Lay Trustee of Calcutta to the Chaplain of Calcutta, from which it will be evident to the Government that the mistake of the Officiating District Engineer is inexcusable, and the anxiety of the Lay Trustee on the subject justifiable.

Trusting that His Excellency the Governor in Council will be pleased to re-assert the order above re-

ferred to, and enforce a strict compliance therewith.

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Your most Obedt. Servant,

Horton.
Archdeacon.

1767 P.M.A.
 Pres. of the Madras fork
 Read the following:

From the Ven: the Archdeacon
 of Madras
 thro' Eccl. Dept. } H.E. No. 350 of 2 May 73

His Excellency the
 Governor in Council
 regrets that the general
 approval given by
 his order in the Eccl.
 -iaotical Departt
 No. 91 of 6 June to the
 Lay Trustees proposal
 to raise the base of the
 Bell at Palghat
 to a height of 12 feet
 from the ground
 was overlooked in

PK

5-11-1873
 1767 P.M.A.

1767 P.M.A.
 From the Ven: the Archdeacon
 of Madras
 thro' Eccl. Dept.
 H.E. No. 350 of 2 May 73

1767 P.M.A.

1767 P.M.A.
 From the Ven: the Archdeacon
 of Madras
 thro' Eccl. Dept.
 H.E. No. 350 of 2 May 73

the Public Works Order
No. 393 of 6th February 1873,
which sanctioned a
plan that allowed
for raising it only
10 feet. But as it is
now $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 4 ft. higher
than before, and will
be tolled by means
of a wheel instead
of being struck by
a clapper, it is hoped
that the original ob-
-ject of Mr. Pamblico's
application to Government
will have been attained
in spite of the neglect
to carry out his pro-
-posal, and the order

of Government ap-
-proving it, evinced
by the Range Officer
and District Engineer.
The latter officers would
doubtless have re-
-mediated the neglect
complained of had
it been brought to
his notice in time
to modify the sanctioned
plan; but the tone
of the 3rd and 4th paras
of his letter to the
Venerable the Arch-
-deacon of Madras
is calculated to give
offence, and should
be

be abstained from in
future correspondence.

G.W.

To The Ecclesiastical Record
Dr. Mulder

Dated 10/7/77

h-22.23.

C 23171 A

to Robert Gray
(Mason)

4

2^d July 1707.

2^d July

Letter from Robert Gray

Being ordered in relation
to the Locks and
Shed is relative to the
Construction of the Locks.