M.R.O. 1—10,006—28-2-50.

(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. 3059 Press

~~B.P. No.~~ ~~Mis.~~

331-332

Dated 20-12-1873 ~~195~~ .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 331. Read the following letter from Colonel F. J. MOBERLY, R.E., District Engineer, Chingleput, to Colonel G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Camp at Chingleput, 27th September 1873, No. 1,624:—

I HAVE the honour to submit the following remarks in reference to G. O., No. 1,043, dated 16th August.

2. In pursuance of what I considered my duty as Superintending Engineer, I proceeded to Vellore to inspect the town and cantonment injured by the cyclone of May 1872, and the tanks which it was said had caused the damage to life and property. I found two moderate-sized reservoirs irrigating a small area of land with utterly insufficient surplus weirs, or means of discharging any extraordinary fall of rain in the hills which formed their catchment area; one barred the valley entirely, the other received a supply from it and from another small valley, neither of them were of any importance except to the cultivators of irrigated land, paying some 800 Rupees rent, under them.

3. The upper tank contained some 12 feet of silt, which would probably be washed down into the breaches, or the fields below, where it would be valuable as manure. Its removal would increase the capacity of the tank, and in three or four years might make the tank large enough to justify the construction of efficient weirs. Another idea occurred to me, which I mentioned to the Collector and other members of the Municipality, that in that time the townspeople might learn to value the possession of a supply of water at a good height above their houses, and make it worthwhile to restore the tanks, which I thought it would not answer to restore immediately.

4. The material point was however to get rid of the water which, either through the breaches or over the new weirs, had no sufficient channel. This had always passed by two courses, both were obstructed and had silted up in the years that had passed since the last inundation which breached these tanks. One channel could be repaired and improved as a purely irrigation work, to the estimate for which sanction could be accorded by the Collector and myself.

5. The other traversed the cantonment, and needed special sanction and allotment of funds. The plan and estimate for this I sent with my No. 1,548, 13th July. It is true that the orders which I quoted at the head of my letter had not specifically mentioned the subject of the regimental lines, nor called on me for a report on them, but they were under my charge as Superintending Engineer; no professional officer had examined them, or the cause of injury to them, and I should have considered myself wanting if after my inspection I had forborne from reporting because I had not been ordered to do so.

6. My plan and estimate were however returned to me on these grounds by the Chief Engineer, with his memorandum No. 24, 2nd August. This office, as distinct from the Secretaryship to Government, had been abolished in 1863, and I have no instructions as to the power of the Secretary in this capacity. In my ignorance I bowed to his authority and took back my papers.

7. The next Government Order, which I have is No. 2,917, dated 10th December 1872. In this I was ordered to take up the subject of the tanks again; had I been left free I should at once have decided, for the reasons above stated, on

not restoring them; but the Government did not trust me with the duty, but desired the Chief Engineer for Irrigation to give his personal attention to the subject. I submit that it would have been presumption in me to have moved in the matter till the Chief Engineer saw the work.

8. I accompanied him over it on the 31st March, on which day Captain Pennycuick relieved me of the charge of North Arcot. Colonel Mullins saw me for himself and discussed my projects. I have never seen his report and can only gather from the Quarter Master General's letter, embodied in G. O., No. 2,043, dated 16th August, that he agrees with me in not restoring the tanks and in strengthening, etc., the cusbah nullah.

9. I respectfully submit that if my plans, forwarded on 13th July with my No. 1,548, had been sanctioned the work might have been completed by October 1872. I fail to understand on what grounds I am held responsible for delay caused entirely by the rejection of my plans by the Chief Engineer—plans in accordance with which I believe the works have been carried out since. I certainly did not understand G. O., No. 2,917, to lay the responsibility on me, or I should have forwarded this protest at once. I submit that I was superseded by the instructions to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

10. I cannot conclude without pointing out a mistake in the Quarter Master General's letter. Not having seen Lieutenant-Colonel Mullins' report, I cannot explain it, but I have inquired personally of Colonel Mullins, and I learn, as I expected, that he has never seen the regimental lines, and has not given any opinion as to their being rebuilt on the same site.

11. Colonel Mullins saw the site of the pensioner's lines in the cusbah, I presume that these are what are referred to. The regimental lines are above the cusbah nullah, and were very slightly affected by the overflow from the Suriagunta nullah, not from the tanks to which Lieutenant-Colonel Mullins confined his attention.

No. 332.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 33.

ORDER THEREON, 20th December 1873, No. 3,059.

UNDER the explanation afforded, His Excellency the Governor in Council resolves to withdraw the censure conveyed in G. O., No. 2,013, dated 16th August 1873.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R E,
Secretary to Government.

To the District Engineer, Chingleput.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

P.W. Deptt

Proceedings of the Madras Govt.

Read the following

From,
The District Engineer
Chingleput

(No. E. dtd 16 24 of 27 Sept 1873.)

The site on which certain Military Lines have been rebuilt at Vellore has been pronounced by the District Engineer of North Arcot, free from danger under the new conditions established by G. O. No 1612 of 20th June. These conditions are

that the restoration of the
Veroopatchi Agraharam
and Allapuram Tanks
shall not be attempted;
and they were laid
down on the reports
from the Chief Engineer
for Irrigation and
Collector of North
Arcot dated in April
1873, or nearly one year
after the Tanks were
breached.

Col. Ironside has
been blamed for not
enabling the Govt.
to come to a much
earlier decision
on the subject by
failing to report
whether the Tank Os

the same letter
he said (para 1)
that he saw no
reason for abandoning
the limitation with
which Colonel
Ironside started
in 1873 - viz
one year after
the breach -
any blame at
tached to him -
with to 10 Dec. 72.
That G.O. attributes
Col Ironside with
him in the words
and of no one else
Pointed blame in Para
Col Morton Cy. para
Col Mullin - in para

I think the latter
is correct & I blame
him for not
doing so. I think the
blame of the Chief
Engineer for Irrigation
was also due
in a minor degree.
It is - that he was
allowed to finish
his leave before he
knew that Col Mullin
& the Govt. objected
to the re-construction
of the tank - of course
it was known
that Col Ironside
had left
before the Govt. letter

should be repaired or
not - such postponement
of the main
question having
been sanctioned
after issue of G.O.
No. 2917 of 10th Dec 1872
on which he was
distinctly ordered
to "take it up at once".
He now defends his
action in the matter
by referring to an
estimate submitted by him in
July 1872 for improving
the drainage
of Vellore; and by
asserting that he
was set aside by

L.D. 16/10

the instructions given
to the Chief Engineer for
Irrigation in the
same order, & see
that the question
of the restoration
of the Santa Rosa should
not remain longer
in abeyance.

His Excellency
the Governor in
Council regrets
to remind Colonel
Inderly that the
action of the Chief
Engineer in calling his
attention to the real
point requiring
decision pending
which his drawings

I quite agree with
Lt Sir: but then,
if we are right,
the order 1/6 Jan/13
"for it stands"
is wrong: and let
Inderly see "right"
& know that we
consider his explanation
satisfactory.

Dec-17/12

20/10

As the matter was well
disposed of before Spring
Council I asked Mr. Lewis
& Jervis to C.E. Secretary

Re adheres to his views of
the case and sees not a jot
that new of the case
18/11

Estimates must
stand over was en-
dorsed by G. O. in
2530 of 28th Oct/12.
He still more re-
grets that Colonel
Inderly should
after receipt of his
order of the 16th Dec.
have allowed nearly
4 months to elapse
without disposing
of the subject in
correspondence with
the Chief Engineer for
Irrigation. The in-
structions by whom
were not in super-
session of those
issued by himself.

Lt Inoberly will distinctly understand that all his departmental work is subject to the control of both those officers, by whose instructions he will be guided when necessary. The reference which he has thought it necessary to make on the present occasion is in the worst taste, and damaging to himself; as shewing wrongheaded persistence in defence of a course already several times reprehended by the Government.

Gww

under certain conditions
which the proposal to reduce
the Company's establishment by an estimate of £5000 for
supplying the local demand
was based. He has communicated to the
Chief Engineer a Memo
of 2d Sept. that the question
of retaining the Tanks
for the use that has hitherto
been made of them will
involve questions of
fortification & the
position of Bellary depended—
No action in the matter
having been taken
reported to Govt. the
during October 1872
impeded for want of
information as to the
state of the Tanks by
P.W. Officer Lt. Roberts
in G.O. No. 2917 of 10 Dec.
directed at once to take up
the question of the restoration
of the Tanks which had to
long been kept in repair and
the personal attention of the
Chief Engineer was called to the subject
he was not to suffer himself
longer in abeyance —
On Lt. Col. Mathews endorsement
of 19th April on correspondence

between himself and the
Collector, G.O. No. 1672 of 20th
June 1873 settled that the
restoration of the Tanks was
not be attempted
till there could be decided
whether the low level channel
at Bellary should be perma-
nently reconstructed or aban-
doned, or otherwise dealt with
& the locality taken
consideration — &
Gen. Smith to take
all Mobely had pointed
out in his memo on the
the precise question the
P.W. Dept. should be put
states that he did not
dered by G.O. of 10 Dec.
became Govt. did not
but superseded by instructions
their instructions to the
Chief Engr. for Dr. Smith
It is respectfully submit-
ted that the Hon'ble Mr. Smith
remarks are based on the
misconception that Colonel
Roberts' drainage plans
and proposals for perma-

nently reconveying the low lying grounds could possibly be considered till the question of abandoning or retaining the Tanks had been settled — and at the Govt. Order of 28th October did not demur, as Mr Simson did not the postponement was because of opinion then The Chief Engr's Memo of 2d Augt had instructed Lt. Col. Moberly — that the question of retaining was to be gone into fully and the Govt. before sent was Lt. Col. Moberly's action in declaring to provide Drng accommodation at first, because behind was made up his mind that the removal of the families to that place was immediately from date of his D.O. of 18th May till that of Mr Simson's Memo of 2d Augt. Indeed in that of 10th Dec. mentd, Moberly cautioned under orders subsequent to the Govt's Resolln of 31st Oct. 72 the present question of retaining or abandoning the Tanks — His action, or rather studied avoidance of the exercise of discretion was it was, it is submitted, highly reprehensible

Govt. 31.10.72

Revised Draft. 15

Colonel Moberly, having been blamed by the Govt. for not enabling them to come to a much earlier decision on the question of retaining or abandoning the breached Tanks at Lohara, expostulates with himself in this letter by referring to his letter of the 13th July 1872; in which he proposed to defer the consideration of that subject for further study, and became the following grounds as well as damage by floods

by improving the Drain-
age at a cost of about
£ 5000 -

N.B. The S. in C. considers
but regrets the miscon-
ception for determining the
tion of the main ques-
tion at issue, under wh.
Colonel Mobert, was led
to rest satisfied with the
partial treatment; but
as that Officer appears to
have disposed of the
subject so fully as appear-
ed to him to be necessary,
in July 1872, the respon-
sibility for subsequent
delay imputed to him
in G.O. No. 2043 of 16th Sept.
1873 is withdrawn, and
his explanation accepted
as satisfactory -

G.H.V.

17

Answered by
Under Secretary of
State Home Dept. &
Sent Col. Mc Q. C. Works &
with Dress the Census copied

Yes - -

W.D.

3/12

Despatch rec'd 20/12/73.

...rewith reconveying the

3552

...submitted, highly monumental

3059

Public Works Department

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Read the following

From The District Engineer
Chingleput. } H.E. No. 1624 / 27th Sept. 1873

Under the explanation afforded His Excellency the Governor in Council resolves to withdraw the censure conveyed in G.O. No. 2043 dated 16th August 1873.

To The Dt. Engr. Chingleput

Despd. site 1-e 20/12/73.

No 535

Govt. of {1873} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To the District Engr
Chingleput

Dated

Recd. Encl.

G. O. 20th Decr 87. No. 3059.

Nos. 331 & 332

Sanctn. with Remarks

Censure passed on Col Rotherly in
Rb. No 2043 of 1873 in
respect to the repair
& the or abandonment
of certain Banks
in Vellore.