

(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.	2508	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	4-9-	1874
		195-

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
4th September 1874.*

Read the following papers :—

- No. 86. From the District Engineer, Tanjore, dated 16th June 1874, No. 339.
No. 87. Do. do. do. do. 30th " " 395.
No. 88. From the Superintending Engineer, Tanjore, dated 3rd August 1874,
No. 531.

No. 580-G.

No. 89. *Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.*

WHEN Captain Montgomerie was called upon for information regarding the serious errors in the levels taken for the Ponavassel Project, he supposed that they were to be explained, at least for the most part, by a change of the line which he had selected for the channel, but it has been shown that the line on which the channel has been cut differs from the one originally selected only in certain parts, which do not affect the question of the incorrectness of the levels taken by Mr. Supervisor Stephens.

2. Lieutenant-Colonel Roberts appears to doubt whether after all Mr. Stephens' levels were wrong. It is, in my opinion, quite clear that they differ materially throughout, and very greatly at certain points, from those on which the channel has been cut. If the Superintending Engineer therefore thinks Mr. Stephens' levels are perhaps correct, he had better take steps for preventing the channel being altogether inefficient, which in that case it would be from the adoption of erroneous levels.

3. Mr. Stephens' levels have, as far as I am able to judge, been proved to be wrong to such an extent as to show that they were very carelessly taken, and on that account he was deserving of the censure passed upon him. Major Mead in the correspondence* which has taken place since the G. O., of the 21st May 1874, No. 1,350, was passed, expressed the opinion that such errors in levels

* From No. 339, dated 16th June 1874.
To No. 430, dated 22nd June 1874.
From No. 395, dated 30th June 1874.
Herewith submitted.

were not reprehensible; but such a conclusion appearing to be altogether inadmissible, I declined to make any recommendation to Government that Mr. Stephens' carelessness should be condoned, unless it could be shown that his general attention to his duties, and care in performing them, were such as to merit consideration, and Major Mead would not bring the case forward on these grounds. It is now reported that Mr. Stephens has been found by Mr. O'Shaughnessy during two years to have been "very careful and accurate in carrying out the orders he receives," and I see no objection to his promotion therefore in due course, but unless his levels can be shown to have been nearly and fairly correct, the notice which has been taken of their incorrectness cannot be cancelled, without allowing it to be supposed that such errors are of little importance, and it would be very prejudicial were this idea allowed to be entertained.

4. Lieutenant-Colonel Roberts is, I think, in error in supposing that the terminal level at the Munniyaur old head sluice which, as fixed by Captain Montgomerie, was found to be very nearly right, was obtained from Mr. Stephens'

Paragraph 8.

or work; and that I consider him to be
very careful and accurate in carrying out
the orders he receives. I consider it my duty
also to point out that in my opinion the
papers printed with the C. & O. under
reference do not by any means prove, that
Mr. Stephens' levels of the Tonawanda
project are wrong.

3. Captain Montgomery appears to be
very confident of their accuracy. Major
Parks expresses no doubt about the accuracy
of the terminal level, at the Mainiac
Head Sluice, and the Chief Engineer
for Irrigation admits that this terminal
level 169 above datum "is certainly
very nearly right." Major Meach checked
some of the levels himself, but he does not
state that his check extended from any
one fixed bench mark to another, and
the authority he has for saying that there

was an error of 2 feet in the terminal
level is not given.

4. The difference of level in the
intermediate sections is in my opinion
rightly attributed by Captain Montgomery
to the alteration of the line of the Channel,
and without the usual precaution of having
fixed bench marks erected at intervals, it
seems to me impossible that original and
check levels can be made to agree everywhere
in a distance of nearly 11 miles, and
from my own knowledge of the Mainiac
Head Sluice, which is an old native
work with numerous steps and offsets,
a difference in the terminal level is easily
accounted for, by the adoption of different
points for the terminal Bench mark.

The probability is, that both lines
of levels are really correct, but that they
have been taken in different directions,
and if Major Meach's check is correct
that

The very great difference
in the intermediate
levels are what
was expected

It has been shown
that the lines come
side very close,
except at particular
points

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
4th September 1874.

levels. Major Mead examined all the level books and showed me the results: it was because the terminal level 169.00 was not deducible from the levels as recorded in the level book, that, in paragraph 8 of the Note on the supplemental estimate, I mentioned that the way in which this had been obtained was not clear.

OOTACAMUND,
10th August 1874.

(Signed) JOHN MULLINS, Lieut.-Colonel, R.E.,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

No. 90. ORDER THEREON, 4th September 1874, No. 2,503.

IRRIGATION, No. 13.

Establishment.

The Government must decline to remove the censure passed on Mr. Stephens for great carelessness in taking certain levels for the Ponavassel Project, unless it can be shown that Majors Oakes and Mead were mistaken in supposing that those levels were materially wrong, and that the particulars given in paragraph 4 of the Note of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, printed in Proceedings of the Madras Government of the 21st May 1874, No. 1,350, are consequently incorrect. The result of such a demonstration would be that the levels on which the channel has been carried out would be altogether wrong, and if Colonel Roberts has really any doubt about the matter, it is manifestly his duty to obtain its removal, though it would seem that already all ordinary precautions have been taken by his predecessors, who have recorded in full the arrangements made for determining the levels correctly, and all the details are no doubt available for the Superintending Engineer's examination.

2. On the ground that Mr. Stephens' general conduct has been commendable, His Excellency the Governor in Council will not subject him to any additional punishment, and his promotion will not be delayed further on account of his connection with the Ponavassel Project.

(True Extract.)

Lieut.-Colonel, R.E.,
Joint Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, Tanjore.
,, Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

N^o 3 Range Office,
Changuabur 14th July 1874.
N^o 161.
From The Executive Engineer
N^o 3 Range Tanjore Dist.
To The District Engineer
Tanjore District.

Sir,
In reference to your Letter N^o 378 dated 26th June 1874, I have the honor to report that Mr. Stephens' Superior D. A. B. has consented to withdraw his appeal to the Secretary to Government against the reflections that have been cast upon him, as a surveyor in the papers printed with G. O. N^o 1350 dated the 21st May 1874; and against what he considers the grievous injury with which he is threatened in the concluding para of that order.

2. Mr. Stephens has worked under me for nearly 2 years, and I consider it my duty to state that I have found no errors of any consequence in his calculations or

that the B.M. on which the checks
 levels were terminated is not the same
 as the B.M. on which the original
 levels were terminated; at all events
 there is so much difference and doubt
 upon the subject that I do not think
 it is just to throw the whole responsibility
 on Mr. Stephens, and I request you
 will be good enough to bring the matter
 to Colonel Mullins' notice. I am
 quite certain that if the matter is clearly
 explained to Colonel Mullins, he will
 not withhold the promotion, for which
 Mr. Stephens has been several times
 recommended and which I think he
 fully deserves.

If there is such
 doubt, it might
 easily be ascertained
 by a simple
 level on the
 old benchmark
 and since
 Mr. Stephens
 levelled.

I have &c
 Signed J. M. Haughness
 Executive Engineer

True Copy!
 J. M. Haughness
 Superintendent Engineer Vangore

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten notes in the right margin.]

Enclosure in a letter
from the Sup^r Engr^r
Tanjore to the Sec^y
tary to Gov^t P.W.D.
No 531 dated 3rd Aug^r 74

P.L. 274 Sept^r 74
In W.A. 88.
Go No 2508-474
M.A. 4910/74
Co 1/1473/74

Copy of letter from
the Executive Engr^r
in charge of No 3
Range Tanjore -
No 161 dated 14th
July 1874.

No 531.

Superior's Office. -
Tanjore 3rd August 1874.

From,

Lieut Colonel. R.A. Roberts R.E.
Superintending Engineer.
Tanjore.

To,

Colonel G.W. Walker R.E.
Secretary to Government.
D. P. W.

I have the honor to forward
herewith a letter from Executive Engr^r
Messrs Mr O'Shaughnessy in charge
of the Trancubam Range of the
District on the subject of the Censure
passed in G.O. 21st May 1874 No 1350
on Mr Supervisor Stephens, and I
venture to solicit a reconsideration
of the question on the following grounds.
It should be mentioned
that Mr Stephens has been censured
and

and threatened to be passed over in promotion on account of certain levels taken by him, in connection with the Pomanael Project. These are alleged to be incorrect but, there is in my opinion, no positive proof of their incorrectness.

3 — When, moreover, it is remembered that the levels taken by the various officers and subordinates connected with the Project display a singular want of uniformity & considered, it certainly does appear somewhat hard that Mr. Stephens should be singled out for reproach and punishment.

4 — It will be observed that Major Montgomery R.E. in his letter printed with G.O. 21st May 1874, reports that "Mr. Stephens's levels agreed so well with those taken by the Surveyor, that I did not consider further check necessary, and they are

either not
Stephens's levels
were wrong or those
marked the Channel
has further S.E.
to determine
which are
correct.
Superior
with in P.M.
21 May 74
vide also
para 2 & 3
of Major Montg.
p. 968

are much more likely to be correct than any levels taken by Lieut. Greenaway, or by his still less experienced Overseer, Mahadeo Singh. Major Montgomery in the same letter goes on to explain that the differences between the levels submitted by him and those taken by Lieut. Greenaway are directly accounted for by the original line having been departed from by Lieut. Greenaway and he proceeds to point out that "a simple glance at the map and sections would convince any man of ordinary intelligence of the fact."

Major Montgomery further states in para 3 of his above mentioned letter to Lt Col. Mullins "why the simple fact of the whole project having been recast and the line of the Channel considerably altered."

vide para 2 of
Major Montg's 1898
The line was then
altered only at
certain definite
points which are
mentioned in para 3 of the letter printed with G.O. 21 May 74

"altered as clearly indicated in
 Major Oaker's letters could not
 suggest itself to your mind, as
 accounting for all the differences
 either in quantity of work or level of
 ground is to me unreplicable."
 6—Lt Colonel Mullins in Para 8
 of his letter also printed with the
 G.O. quote, "Admitted that the
 terminal level as fixed by Captain
 Montgomery (on the Stephens level)
 is certainly very nearly right"
 and that that level has since
 been retained.
 7—Major Mead. R.E. Henderson
 in Para 3 of his letter also printed
 with the G.O. under reference dis-
 putes the correctness of this ter-
 minal level as it shows "a
 difference of nearly 2 feet," and
 tested with certain levels taken
 by him in 1866.—
 8—Thus it will be seen that

"but then he
 admitted it is
 not clear
 follows the words
 quoted.

believe Major
 Henderson's
 levels shown in
 level book that
 that adopted
 by Captain
 Montgomery

the incorrectness of Mr. Stephens
 levels is based on two issues viz:
 A—According to Lieut. Colonel
 Mullins the intermediate
 levels were wrong but the
 terminal level was
 right.
 B—According to Major Mead
 the intermediate levels
 were not only wrong
 but the terminal level
 was also wrong, being
 out by 2 feet.
 9—The first of these charges
 is disposed of by Major Montgomery
 who has clearly pointed out that the
 intermediate levels could not
 possibly agree with each other,
 as they traverse different lines
 of Country; and the 2^d charge may
 also be considered not to be proven
 for the following reasons—Indeed
 it is rather difficult to understand
 what

the fact being
 the terminal level
 obtainable
 by Mr. Stephens
 is not the
 fact.

what that charge really is. -
Here we have 3 sets of levels
viz. Mr. Stephens, Lieut. Green,
Lieut. Greenaway and Major Meads. -
Major Meads says my levels agree
with Lieut. Greenaway's, but prove
Mr. Stephens's terminal level to
be 2 feet out. Nevertheless Mr.
Stephens's terminal level is adopted
by Lt. Colonel Mullins as it agrees
with Lieut. Greenaway's. Surely it
is not on such evidence as this
that a man's future prospects in
life are to be married. -

10. - I should not venture to
reopen the question, connected as
it is with so much unpleasant
correspondence as has passed
on the subject of the Poincaré
Project, but that after a careful
consideration of the papers connected
therewith, I cannot but think that
the censure that has been passed
upon Mr. Stephens in the matter
is

Colonel Roberts
has not examined
the level books
this is a
very rare
case

Colonel Roberts
has not examined
the level books
this is a
very rare
case

is unusually severe, the more so
as it would appear that he has
never been called upon for an
explanation of his levels. Feeling
satisfied moreover, that the Go-
vernment would naturally shrink
from any act that may savour
in the slightest possible degree
of injustice, I think it right
to bring the question again promi-
nently to their notice, with the hope
of their being pleased to withdraw the
censure that has been passed in the
G.O. under reference upon so careful
and well conducted a man as
Mr. Stephens is, on all hands re-
ported to be. -

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Your Most obed^t Serv^t
Lieut. Robert St. John
Superintending Engineer Tajor

How

..... Dietrichshagen

To
Lieutenant Colonel John Smith R.
Chief Engineer for Irrigation

Sir
 With reference to L.O. No. 1350,
 dated 21st May 1894, regarding Poria-
 varal project I have the honor to
 call your attention to para 3 directing
 the Chief Engineer to notice Mr. Stephens
 carelessness in regulating promotions.
 2- This I consider hard upon Mr. Stephens
 & shall be obliged therefore if you will
 give it your attention & should
 give such right address & con-
 sideration to the subject.
 3- Mr. Stephens was ordered to
 take a single line of levels along the
 proposed line for the Poravasal
 Channel

0.20. 1874. Debt

[illegible]

Stentine
2/14/73

to the Secretary

John D. Ford

1881

40-70-21-08-41-51

June 6
June 6
June 6

1781

Suburb with rice

and then a letter

the Sec. of the Board that all

Adelphi man

from the
from in 4.

22-4350-25 "May 19"

0-612508-4-9-76

Channel this he did and although
They did not agree with those pre-
viously taken they were accepted
and the project was resigned for
on his levels which unfortunately
have been found to be incorrect.
4. I would submit that it is hard
that a man's Champet should
rest on a single line of levels taken
by him, and unchecked and that
no Officer or man who has done
much levelling has done so without
making many mistakes, in fact
the more a man has levelled the
more he knows that he is liable
to error and is impressed with
the necessity of having his levels
checked and seen these mistakes
and errors are not in, there is no necessity
for me to quote examples.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your obedient servant

M. M. M. D. D. D.

District Engineer

10/10/10

10/10/10

10/10/10

10/10/10

10/10/10

10/10/10

10/10/10

10/10/10

10/10/10

10/10/10

10/10/10

to D. B. Sayre No 4308
22d June 74.

C. S. No 1106
from the District Engineer
Zanjore

To the Chief Engineer
for Irrigation
No 339.

Dated 16 June 1874
Received 18th June

Recommendation for his
consideration G.O. No 135,
dated 21st May 74 in which
Mr Stephens promotion
is ordered to be delayed
on account of certain
mistakes in taking levels
for the Darnool Channel
G.O. No 2508-4-9-74

Ch. 86

W 395 District Engineer's Office.

Sanjore 22d June 1874

Major H. R. Meade R. E.

District Engineer

To Lieut Col J. Abullos R. E.

Chief Engineer

for Irrigation

339

With reference to your Memo-

randum No 430, dated 22d June,

I have the honor to inform you that

as in my opinion (in which I

regret you do not agree) Mr Stephens

has not shown great carelessness

or inaccuracy, I must decline to

recommend that it should be

overlooked on the ground of care-

fulness attention and zeal

generally exhibited by him.

I regret much that you

consider that it is to be expected

that any levels taken without check

should be accepted, and I can

only add that my experience

merits much needed levels taken
by this reference that they be thoroughly
depend on, and I have had cases
of checked levels being found to have
mistaken in them.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant

M. M. Major R. E.
District Engineer

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten notes in the left margin of the left page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten notes in the bottom left of the left page.]

[Faint handwritten notes in the bottom right of the left page.]

No. 5809.
Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation

When Captain Montgomerie was
called upon for information regard-
ing the serious errors in the levels
taken for the Ponavapel project, he
supposed that they were to be explain-
ed at least for the most part by
a change of the line which he
had selected for the channel but
it has been shown that the line
in which the channel has been
cut differs from the one originally
selected only in certain parts, which
do not affect the question of the
incorrectness of the levels taken
by Mr. Superintendent Stephens.
Lieutenant Colonel Roberts ap-
pears to doubt whether after all Mr.
Stephens' levels were wrong. It is in
my opinion quite clear that they
differ materially throughout, and
very greatly at certain points, from
those on which the channel has
been cut. If the Superintending
Engineer

[Faint handwritten notes in the bottom right of the right page.]

Engineer therefore thinks Mr Stephens levels are perhaps correct he had better take steps for preventing the channel being altogether inefficient, which in that case it would be from the adoption of erroneous levels.

3. Mr Stephens levels have, as far as I am able to judge, been proved to be wrong to such an extent as to show that they were very carelessly taken, and on that account he was deserving of the censure passed upon him. Major Mead in the correspondence which has taken place since the L.O. of the 21st May 1844 N^o 1350 was passed, expressed the opinion that such errors in levels were not reprehensible, but such a conclusion appearing to be altogether inadmissible, I declined to make any recommendation to Government that Mr Stephens carelessness should be condoned, unless it could be shown that

* From N^o 339 dated 15th June 74
to N^o 1438 22nd June 74
From N^o 395 dated 30th June 74
herewith submitted

that his general attention to his duties and care in performing them were such as to avert consideration, and Major Mead would not bring the case forward on these grounds. It is now reported that Mr Stephens has been found by Mr O'Shaughnessy during two years to have been very careful and accurate in carrying out the orders he receives, and I see no objection to his promotion therefore in due course, but in his levels can be shown to have been nearly and fairly correct, the notice which has been taken of their incorrectness cannot be cancelled, without allowing it to be supposed that such errors are of little importance, and it would be very prejudicial were this idea allowed to be entertained.

4. Lieutenant Colonel Roberts is, I think, in error in supposing that the terminal level at the Munnigans

para 8.

Muntz's old head sluice which, as fixed by Captain Muntz, was found to be very nearly right, was obtained from Mr. Stephens. Major Muntz examined all the level books and showed me the results: it was because the terminal level 169.00 was not deducible from the levels as recorded in the level book, that, in para 8 of the Vote, in the supplemental estimate, I mentioned that the way in which this had been obtained was not clear.

Ootacamund 10th August 1894. *Whitburn* Lt Col R. B. Chief Engineer for Frigate.

The Secretary to Govt. P. M. S.

11. 11. 1971

சென்னை 1947

المستوفى ١٥٠٠٠٠
الروية ٣٤٠٠٠

10:250

Handwritten text in Urdu script, likely a signature or a note, appearing below the printed text.

P. W. 1874 Sept.
No: 5391

From

The Chief Engr.
for Irrigation

Dated 10th Aug 1874
Recd. 27th — 1874

No: 5806

Q. No: 2508. 4-9-74.

Regarding
the censure passed
on Mr. Stephens, Esq.
in connection with
the works taken for
the Porampet Project
in the Tanjore
Dist. —

No. 89

13.4.30.
Memorandum

The undersigned has the honor in reply to
the letter no 339 of the 16th inst. from the
D. E. Tanjore to observe that if the District
Can remember that Mr. Stephens' conduct
or inaccuracy in building should be looked
into from the conduct of the
and his ship finally exhibited by him
the undersigned will be glad to lay the same
under the eye of the District Officer. It is therefore
that no good would result from moving further
in the matter.

2. The undersigned is not altogether able to take
the general view expressed in the letter. Undoubtedly
the Dist. have a right to expect that a few miles
of work will be taken by a subordinate of Mr. Stephens
standing with fair accuracy, whereas the work
in question contained several serious errors &
it is, therefore, ^{are} not excusable — one mistake
might have been, not so several.

By. 29/6/74

21 May 74
S.O. 1350-21 May 74
Rev. 1106. 16 June 74

Public Lands Dept
 Proceedings of the
 From the Stage Survey

Public Lands Dept
 Proceedings of the
 Read the following

From the Stage Survey (H.C. 339 of 16 June 1874)
 Leo
 Leo Lufy Lufy Lufy
 & Chief Engineer for

(H.C. 339 of 16 June 1874)
 (H.C. 395 of 30 Dec 1874)
 (H.C. 531 dated 3 Aug 1874)
 (H.C. 531 dated 10 Aug 1874)
 (H.C. 2508 of 11 Dec 1874)

The Government
 must decline to re-
 move the course pass
 chain. Mr. Stephens
 for great carelessness
 in taking certain
 levels for the Puna
 vessel project, unless
 it can be shown that
 Majors Baker and Mead
 were mistaken in sup-
 posing that those
 levels were materially
 wrong, and that the
 particulars given in
 para 4 of the Note
 of the Chief Engineer
 for Irrigation, printed

W.H.

From the Stage Survey
 No. 4-30
 1106

W.D. & Langier

Sept 20th
 Sept 20th

Alvares that he will
 place by the recorder
 at the first point of the
 D. & C. (see recommendation)
 that Mr. Stephens case
 be removed in front of
 the recorder be substituted

4910⁺ 5391 x not sent to Press

Govt. of (1874) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

The Sup: Ingr.
Tanjore

Dated

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. *G. O.* 1874, No. 2508

Nos.

86-90.

Mr. Stephens - Supervisor

~~The~~ Declining to
remove the censure passed
on Mr. Stephens in
connection with the
levels taken for the
Ponavassal Project
in the Tanjore ~~Dn~~
with certain remarks -