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. / ~~B.P. No.~~	3607	Press / ~~Mis.~~	C874
Dated	22-12	~~195~~	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department, 22nd December 1874.

No. 464. Read the following endorsement of the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated Fort St. George, 2nd December 1874 :—

Read the following Proceedings of the Court of Wards, dated 24th November 1874, No. 3,374.

Read the following letter from R. DAVIDSON, Esq., Acting Collector of Ganjam, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Court of Wards, dated Chetterpore, 26th September 1874, No. 1,984.

In paragraph 4 of the foot-note which accompanied Major Smalley's letter, dated the 13th December 1873, No. 208, and which is embodied in the Proceedings of the Court of Wards, dated the 2nd February 1874, No. 191, the late Collector remarked that Overseer Veeramallesalingam should be called upon for an explanation on the points alluded to in the District Engineer's letter referred to.

2. On receipt of the Court's Proceedings, No. 191, the Acting Principal Assistant Collector was requested to obtain the requisite explanation and to forward it together with the District Engineer's remarks and an expression of his own opinion regarding the subject-matter in three parallel columns.

3. This he has done, and I have the honor to submit it for the information of the Court, accompanied with my own remarks on each head.

4. Mr. Grahame has afforded a very complete and, as I think, satisfactory explanation in regard to the transaction connected with each of the works animadverted on by the District Engineer, and the result tends, in my opinion, to exonerate Overseer Veeramallesalingam from the severe censure which the District Engineer attached to him, and regarding which Mr. Grahame has recorded the following opinion as the result of his inquiry and experience.

5. He remarks, among other things, as follows: "I regret to have to observe that the District Engineer's remarks are, for the most part, one-sided and apparently written without full knowledge of the facts connected with each work."

6. As directed by the Court of Wards the pay of Veeramallesalingam was reduced from Rupees 100 to Rupees 60 per mensem, and it appears he has since been dismissed at the instance of the District Engineer for reasons unknown.

7. In regard to his dismissal Mr. Grahame has made the following remarks :—

"In conclusion, I beg to reiterate my opinion that nothing specially wrong and deserving dismissal has been proved against Veeramallesalingam; that the District Engineer was biased against him, before he saw his work, by Ensign Lever's reports, and that, had he known all that I have stated in this report, he would hardly have recommended the dismissal of the man after such long service; that Ensign Lever has been prejudiced against Veeramallesalingam I know not why; and that several of his statements have been needlessly incorrect. I say needlessly, for a little inquiry would have taught him the facts of each case and prevented his making incorrect reports."

8. Judging by the light thrown on the subject by Mr. Grahame's remarks, and by the explanations which Veeramallesalingam has given, there are not wanting grounds for supposing that, had this information been before the Court at the time when they dealt with the District Engineer's denunciation of Veeramallesalingam's shortcomings, his conduct in the matter might have been susceptible of being viewed in a far more favorable aspect than it was.

9. The extreme measure applied by the District Engineer of dismissing him from the service on grounds which, in the Acting Principal Assistant Collector's opinion, are wholly inadequate, will completely ruin him.

10. Mr. Grahame has explained the cause of delay in submitting this report.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Explanation of Overseer with District Engineer's remarks.

VEERAMALLESALINGAM was Overseer in charge of the Purla Kimedy Public Works before they were handed over to the Department of Public Works; he had been in the estate under the late Supervisor T. Ramayya Naidu, who was removed for bad work and a variety of other causes. In reviewing the state of the works Major Smalley, District Engineer, commented very unfavorably on Overseer Veeramallesalingam's work, and has, it is stated, since dismissed him.

2. The works in connection with which he was censured were all constructed when the department was under the Principal Assistant Collector, who now writes at length to show that the Overseer has been unjustly blamed and unfairly treated, and that T. Ramayya was, in the majority of the instances, really responsible for the faulty work. The Collector concurs in Mr. Grahame's remarks. Overseer Veeramallesalingam is no longer under the Court of Wards; but, as he was censured for acts done whilst he was in the service of the Court, and has been probably dismissed in consequence of those acts, the Court resolve to submit the Collector's letter, with the explanation in original, for the consideration and orders of Government.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

TRANSFERRED to the Public Works Department with reference to the Proceedings in that Department, dated 18th April 1874, No. 1,009.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Secretary to Government, R.D.

No. 465. ORDER THEREON, 22nd December 1874, No. 3,607.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 38.

IT appears to His Excellency the Governor in Council that the explanation submitted by the Acting Principal Assistant Collector has reference to other points than those in which Overseer Veeramallesalingam's conduct was animadverted on by the District Engineer, and on which alone explanation was required. His name was connected by Major Smalley with only three of the twelve instances of mismanagement recorded, viz. :—

(1.) Weir on Corama Gedda.
(2.) A culvert on the road from Kimedy to Oopalada.
(3.) Two aqueducts on the Butteeseerpooram main channel.

It is pointed out by Mr. Grahame that Major Smalley was mistaken in supposing the Overseer to have intended to restore work No. 1 after its destruction. He appears to have realized the badness of its situation, design, and construction, and

to have predicted its ruin, in October 1872, when he proposed to lengthen the body walls, and apparently to strengthen it by repairs. Whether the works he proposed would have been effectual may be matter of doubt; but the Overseer is cleared of the imputation on him made by the District Engineer.

2. It is admitted that the work No. 2 was so badly built as to require reconstruction, which was all that Major Smalley alleged, and the course adopted by him to get the work done is not approved by Mr. Grahame. Ensign Lever's proposal, that he should be made to pay for the work, does not appear to have been, and should not be, acted upon.

3. Of the works numbered (3), the first appears admittedly to have been a failure, the second to be still incomplete. The Overseer does not appear to have been specially to blame for either; at all events his shortcomings are covered by the neglect or inability of his superior to check or correct them. Into the general question of the entire project it would be loss of time now to go.

Besides these charges as to works badly constructed by the Overseer, he is stated to have advanced, in the month of July 1873 alone, Rupees 1,821-4-0, without written agreements in most cases; in all without contract bond or security of any kind. In so doing it is evident that the Overseer simply followed up an existing system which he was powerless to stop of a sudden. He is therefore absolved from blame in the matter. But the fact of such advances remaining, the District Engineer will report specially as to the extent to which they were cleared off on the 31st March 1874, and as to the success met with in introducing a better system. Advances are probably necessary for the execution of work in a country where all skilled labor has to be imported; it is only necessary that they shall be properly regulated.

4. In the matter of drawing cheques Major Smalley appears hardly to have apprehended the Overseer's position at the time when he was Officiating Range Officer; in which capacity the amount of cheques drawn by him monthly cannot be considered very large, especially as much work was done in the months immediately before the monsoon, and had to be paid for. It would have been more to the point had the District Engineer reported unnecessarily large cash balances in the Overseer's hands at the end of each month.

5. The conclusion arrived at by His Excellency the Governor in Council is that nothing has been brought forward, still less proved, against Overseer Veeramallesalingam to warrant his dismissal from the post of Overseer on Rupees 60, to which he was properly relegated when relieved from the sub-divisional charge; and should such action have been taken, he directs that it shall be commuted into suspension, pending orders on a full and speedy report of all the circumstances under which it was taken.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the District Engineer, Ganjam.
" Controller of Public Works Accounts.
" Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Revenue Department.
Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

P. W. 1874 Depart.
Prosecution for Theft
No. 7595.

From.

The Revenue Dept.

Dated 2nd
Recd 4th } December 74.

Encl. 1.

Transferring
Petn. of the Board of
Revenue furnishing
information showing
that Paneer Vera-
-mallesalingam has
been unjustly punish-
-ed for faulty work
carried out on the
Parla Kimedy Estate
in the Tanjore
District -

No. 4464
Cir 10-12-74

No. 3607 - 22-12-74.

District Engineer's Remarks on Contractor's Claims	Overseer's Remarks on Claims	Superintending Engineer's Remarks on Contractor's Claims	Principal Remarks
Solely destroyed a few months after it was built by the Supervisor at a cost of Rs 1,45. This work was badly situated badly designed and badly constructed. Overseer Veeramalloolingam blindly following the blind was preparing to restore it. This I have objected as perfectly useless. The Maistry employed on this work S. Natesan which is evidently worthlessly performed before the little.	It is true that this work designed, and badly constructed by the Supervisor in my opinion I formed of the dated 28th October 1872 and Assistant Collector, a Copy of may be referred to. I prepared work and collected materials the work being very weak, heavy fall of rain, before commenced and I trust gone down had the Repairs	was badly situated, badly ed, it was entirely managed and with regard to the work para 6 of my letter No 998 dressed to the Principal Assistant which is herein enclosed, I prepared myself to repair this dia to that effect, but was totally destroyed by a the estimated Repairs were that the work would not have estimated for been effectual work was carried	The fault imputed to the Overseer in this case is that he blindly endeavoured to restore the ruined Caligula an incorrect charge. The Overseer did not endeavour to restore the Caligula after it was ruined, but was preparing to strengthen it before any damage occurred. He foresaw that the Caligula was weak and reported to me that it would be carried away in course of time unless the body walls were lengthened. He thinks that had the improvements he suggested been carried out the work would not have been damaged at least for a time. For further particulars vide By Court of Ward's Pro. No 2111 dated 15th October 1873 The damage occurred on 2nd June. Major Squibby inspected the work on 8th August 1873 and he could hardly then have formed a correct idea of the nature and utility

		I quite agree with the Principal Asst. R Davidson Executive	utility of the repairs originally intended by the Overseer. The Caliingaw had cracked & a view way and the Overseer attempted to strengthen and keep it up as long as possible. I do not consider the Overseer to blame in this matter.
(2) Road from Vikamandalam to Cakelima — A large tree has been allowed to lie across the Road for two months. Gumasta Kistniah in charge of this portion is responsible for this.	Gumasta Kistniah in charge the circumstances of the time I was in charge of - ported in August after	of this Road, did not report lying across the Road during the the Range and it was be- I gave up the charge.	I do not see how the Overseer himself can be held responsible for this. R. Davidson.
(3). Road to Dalakonda — Here the Supervisor attempted to build new arches on the top of the old ones of a bridge, near the boundary, and consequently brought the old work down on the new. Hence a new bridge was necessitated. This is	There is a large stream, across Goddas; and Captain Philips proposed to build a bridge the estimates sanctioned by - time. Ramayya Naidoo be- charge of the Range, complete estimate but the top of the than the upper banks of the	the Road, named "Medagentala and Supervisor Mr. Thorpe two arches of 25 ft. span and had that effect; but in the meaning a sanctioned Supervisor in the bridge in accordance with the bridge being about 15 ft. below stream; Supervisor Ramayya - naidoo	This history of this bridge is as follows. An estimate of Rs 27 152/ for a Road from Adubhangi on the Vakanasi Road to the Dalakonda boundary including masonry bridges and tunnels required on the Road was sanctioned in 1864 by

District Engineer's Re-
marks.

incomplete, though estimate has been sent. Should one if not above would have done very well for years to come.

Overseer's Ver-
sion in extenso

Raidro proposed to build new ones submitted the plans -tain Pyres the Su- for consultation; and wilt sanctioned and attempts in removing the centings the newly built arches were -vised instead of building ones raised the sides to the proposed height of into a flat form, and cons old bridge not being strong weight & cracked in several and a new bridge was ne- Captain Beckly, the Superin- -tion of the works in the Ray- -clared was useless propos the same place and prepar which he delivered to the sanctioned to the amount of had the abutments and wing of 10 ft with a cost of Rs 1979-1 work with the balance of Rupe the entire work with exception to meet the expenses of which balance of the estimated amou

Engineer's explanatory Remarks

arches on the top of the old and estc- mates to Ca- pe erected ing Engineer his advice had the estimates to complete the works, but after the arches were made destroyed. Then the Superi- the new arches on the old walls of the old bridge the new arches to convert it quently the foundation of the enough to bear the whole places and became useless ressidated. In the meantime tending Engineer in his inspec- visited the bridge which he de- a new bridge to be made in a Engh estimate and plan Superviser. This estimate being Rs 2798-0-0 the Superviser walls constructed to the height and then I took Charge of the 828-9-3 with which I completed & partly filling the approaches the provision of the law. passed into my hands was not

Proceedings Principal

by captain C. G Phillips late Executive Engineer Ganjam and passed by the Court of Wards in the same year; vide their Proceedings No 3065 dated 18th May 1864. From the Contents of these Proceedings, it seems that the above estimate was subsequently passed by the Superintending Engineer also. A few months after this that is to say in January 1865 Captain Phillips submitted a revised estimate for the bridge and changed the line of the Road The Proposed saving owing to the new line was Rs 870 and the cost of the bridge was Rs 1300. The excess Rs 430 were subsequently sanctioned and the whole Rs 1300 seem to have been spent upon the bridge. The work however was very bad. In accordance with the advice of Col. Mobely late Superintending Engineer a supplemental

not sufficient to show accurately what came into my hands. Together with the expenditure thereof in detail in the said works is herein enclosed for information. While I was preparing my supplemental estimate to get the work completed the charge of the Range was given up to me. The new works proposed are the addressing bridges or aniouts upon the new description the streams should be examined and levelled to the distance of a mile below and above the site where the bridge or aniouts is proposed to be built. If this had been done in this case there would be no necessity of this bridge which nearly cost above Rs 10000 before effectually completing the works as if a tunnel of 6 ft. spans were to be made on the same stream half a mile above the spot where the present bridges has been made and the road were to be bent to the distance of a few hundred yards which would altogether cost a sums not exceeding as now and Rupees, the stream could as conveniently be crossed as at present.

Executive Engineer's Office, Buxar, 15th Dec. 1883.

From Captain J. Pringle, R.E.,
Executive Engineer, Buxar,
To The Superintending Engineer, Patna Circle.

Memorandum.

With reference to the Superintending Engineer's letter No. 1473 of the 12th instant, I have the honor to report that the supplemental estimate of Rs 1882 was submitted for adding upper arches to the Bridges in question. The following is Mr Lemain's description of the bridge when submitting the above estimate. "The new works proposed are the adding of upper arches to a bridge built across the Meda Gantula Gedda, on the Dalcondah Road, at a cost of Rs 1882. This is necessary because the crown of the arch of the bridge, as it stands, is 6 feet 8 inches below one bank, and 17 feet 2½ inches below the other and the excavation of the banks to make a passable approach to the bridge will cost more than the building of the extra arches proposed. Besides which, the bridge as it now is, with the road way below the level of either bank is most unsightly. Estimate and plan enclosed." In their Proceedings No 1473 of

penditure | penditure | | | |

					No 4736 dated 24th July 1867 the Contr of Valdo passed this estimate. In
					November 1867 the new work was com-
					-menced. On 23rd April 1868, the
					upper arches over the Bridge were finish-
					-ed at a cost of Rs 1400, and on 29th
					idem while the centrings of the arches
					were being removed, both arches slipped
					at the piers where they meet, and the
					whole work fell down. As to what
					took place next, vide Mr Hopes letter
					embodied in Contr of Valdo Procdgs
					-ings No 6842 dated 25th November
					1870. The final estimate for Rs 2798
					was prepared in accordance with the
					suggestions of Captain Beckley R. E.
					and Captain Rynes Supdg Engineer.
					Of this estimate, the late Sub-
					-ordr Ramiah spent Rs 1979-6-9
					on the work and handed it over to
					Contractor Vitanallen Aligaru with a
					balance of Rs 818-9-3. The Overseer
					spent all this money and did as much
					work on the Bridge as he could.

			I do not think the Overseer is in any way to blame in this matter. The history of this bridge shows how diverse were the opinions entertained by different professional officers at different times as to the nature of the work to be done on the bridges and how averse to the interests of the Estate their opinions have been found to be after all
(4) On the same Road, a bridge lately constructed has been injured by sheer neglect - Centring not properly removed.	This bridge was built under the Supervision of Ramayya Naidu in 1864-5. The Cracks in the bridge were observed while I was in charge of the Range; and while I proposed to get the bridge repaired from the annual allowance I gave over charge in the beginning of the last year. Your Overseer clearly cannot be held responsible for any of these works. R. Davidson Executive Engineer		This bridge was built, & the Overseer was not in charge of the Range and there is nothing to connect him with the fault observed in the bridge R. Davidson
(5) Head sluice to Colama Gedda - Badly designed; far larger than necessary	This was designed and constructed by the Supervisor Ramayya Naidu. The Overseer is not to blame in the matter as he had nothing to do either with the designing or construction of the work R. Davidson Executive Engineer		The Overseer is not to blame in this matter. This was one of Ramiah Naidus doings for which Vikamalla - valingam

(6) Bridge over this Channel. Incomplete, though estimate has been shewn to. Badly designed the bridge is too large for the Channel or the Channel too small for the bridge.

This was designed by the Superviser Ramayya Naidu. The plans and estimates were submitted in Feb 28th October 1872 and a copy of which herein enclosed is marked A. I sent an estimate for the work according to the provisions. I sent an estimate for the execution of plastering it. The estimates made and the inspected by your honours

and estimates were submitted in Feb 28th October 1872 and at any rate to complete the proposal made by the Superviser to complete the work with and did accordingly complete work as the shot may be for full information

salingam cannot be made responsible.

The original estimate for the head sluice, the bridge and the Channel amounted to Rs 2126 of which Rs 2035-10-0 were spent by Ramiah Naidoo and Rs 63-13-4 only were spent by the Overseer. There remained a balance of Rs 31-8-8 when the Overseer noticed certain defects in the work and brought them to my notice. He further informed me that Ramiah Naidoo had collected certain materials for the work and did not pay for them. In order to settle the different claims and to complete the work the Overseer submitted a supplemental estimate for Rs 469-10-0 which was duly sanctioned. For the bad design of the work the Overseer is not

		not responsible. The plan and estimate were sanctioned some time before I came to this Division
(7) Road from Coselima to Kimidi - Bridges and Culverts fallen in. Jungle growing upon road. No one would think this road ever had a maintenance allowance.	This road was made and constructed by Mr Finiatzewsion of Captain Cunliffe and 3 other Roads on the Salub above termed the Collector of the Division 8th February 1862 to Captain Engineer in charge of opinion that the village us little amount of money according by Captain Cunliffe Roads constructed of and culverts to be crossed mats and earth placed Raoroo was in charge of the works performed on these that were made before and getting fresh estimates and From the annual allowance he had the old bridges	Bridges and Culverts were constructed by Overseer under the supervision of the Asst. District Engineer. This was later and not the new Division village Roads. Mr Forbes stated in his letter No 20 dated Captain Cunliffe the Assistant the Range expressed his Roads should be made with as could be possible and had the bridges over these flat forms, and the tunnels by the jungle wood with quite them. When Ramayya Range he had certain masonry Roads and repaired those strengthened these Roads sioned for these purposes supplied to these Roads repaired by replacing the flat
		I suppose the Road meant by the District Engineer is the Kimidi and Dadapuram Road. It is 13 miles long and the maintenance allowed is only Rs 50 per mile. The road was not originally gravelled and as it passes through jungle I should not be surprised if jungle is found growing up on the sides of the road. It is only a village road and not a District road. As for the distinction between the two species of Roads, vide Mr Forbes letter No 20 dated 8th February 1862 to Captain Cunliffe the Assistant Dt Engineer in charge of the Kimidi Range. The road would

District Engineer's Remarks	Overseer's Remarks	Name of Road	Remarks of Captain	Divisional Officer's Remarks
	platforms strengthened many Jungles on the sides of them where they are beginning. This Road is about 8 miles were gravelled here Cantiffe was in charge of visit Ramayya Raidu to the distance of about made in the annual visited this Road when and found a few Bridges old state and the Jungle the sides of the Road estimates for Repairing get the Jungles cleared from the Provision to be ance as usual, but as July, the beginning of do so and there is no to this Road	culverts by masonry Removed; the Road and gravelled not gravelled is the 13 miles long of which only 3 and there when Captain the Ranges; but the Subor- go of this Road gravelled 9 miles by the Provision allowance to this Road. I I was in charge of the Range and Culverts in Junions growing here and there on I Proposed to Name the Bridges fallen in, to und the Culverts to Repaired made in the annual allow- I gave up my Charge in the Facts I could not neglect on my part with Regard	would Probably by this time have a Mogelled disappeared had not Ramayya Raidu done his best to keep it up. We cannot expect much to be done on a Road with an allowance of Rs 50 per mile the Road would Perhaps have been in a better state had it been much used by bandies but there is no Traffic on it what there is being almost entirely pedestrian. Further the Road was damaged by the floods of 1872 only. I do not see that in the matter of this Road any blame can with fairness be specially attributed to neglect on the part of Overseer Veera- mallacalingam.
(8) Kimidi Subsidiary Jail — A Government building lately con- structed by the Superviors. Not very bad indeed, the building is in a dangerous state.	This building was construct- Ramayya Raidu the Range Offices	d under the Supervision of		R. Davidson. This Statement of the Overseer is true. I am not sure if the sub soil is really in a dangerous state. I saw it only a few days ago. There are some Cracks in the walls

/10/. Road from Remidi to Nikaladi. A culvert recently built by Overseer Veeramallasingam is so bad that it must be taken down again. Others also very bad.

(1)

The new tunnels over the before I was appointed and while Overseer, and by Mr Thorpe under the like as shown in my Supervisor Ramayya suspension intending to getting work done by Government Rangies, proper Contractors, employ for the purpose as mention dated 19th January 1873, pal Assistant Collector one named Bobbili Su advanced Rs 100 on the bid the Contractor not doing was advanced, in proper Completed from other urgency and demanded the advanced money but able to return the money to that effect and Con Contractor to Convert Kattula Kaula on this Road, into

road were made by me in charge of the Range the old ones were constructed Supervision of Captain Cun planation para 7. The Raidu after returning from introduced the system of tractors as is done in bid not being able to get ed common work men ed in my letter No 29 addressed to the Divice and of these Contractors taya a stone cutter was Rajah's Palace Road the work for which he time, I had the work sources owing to the the Contractor to return this Contractor not being promised to do the work quently I directed the flat form near the watch and he accordingly did in

The course adopted by the Overseer in this matter in regard to getting the work done by the Contractor does not seem to me a proper one. I however consider his explanation of the bad workmanship in one of the culverts satisfactory. It is most probable that the contrac- tor did work during the Overseer's absence at other works. My devers- ification (and consideration) to the con- trary notwithstanding I do not think that the Overseer ought to be made to pay for this bad work. There are several similar bad works in the State executed when the Remidi Public Works were solely under the Department Public Works. Al- though some of these works were sub- sequently found quite useless, it has never been proposed to recover their cost from the Public Works officers who executed or superviced the works originally. I do not see why

in June during my absence in an
I inspected this work in the beg in-
and consequently demanded the
properly obtained the money. All
of the District Engineers who
month after. The Contracto
-gineer that he would be res
of any damage happening to it,
the Assistant Engineer. Mr
the Overseer should replace
There are many old Culverts in
bad state; every year one or
new ones, which were constructed
in a proper condition with the
above owing to the negligence
-ployed by the Supervisor.

(11) Semple at Ramsaga Lan Sank-
Materials prepared by Supervi-
-sor very bad

The materials remarked by the
by Supervisor and my reports
for No 340 dated 29th July 1872
may be referred to for the opini

other division of the Salak. When
ning of July, it was unsatisfactory
workmanship to get the work done
the was brought into the notice
inspected the same work in a
Rao petitioned the District En-
sponsible for the work in case
the petition was referred to
Lever who endorsed on it that
this Road which are in a very
two of these were replaced by
ed by me, and which are still
exception of the one named
of the Contractor who was em-

District Engineer were collected
to the Principal Assistant Colle-
and No 29 dated 19th January 1873
I formed of these materials.

why we should not show a similar
indulgence in this single instance
in the case of the Overseer chiefly
because there is no complaint of dis-
against him. Further this
was not a matter which Mr Lever could
in case of the
off hand way he did,
to the Public Works not then having been
handed over to Government but being
from his own sources still under the Control of Wards.

R. Saunders.

This statement of the Overseer is true.
noticed the defects in the materials
before the District Engineer
and brought the same to my
notice. For further particulars with
of my letter to you No 345 dated
26th July 1872. The Overseer

(12) Buttaveerapooram Weir Main Channel.

Aqueduct ½ mile below weir has fallen down since my inspection. This work is altogether a shameful waste of money. It was designed and built by the Supervisor and Overseer Veeramallacoalingam. Aqueduct 2 miles below-weir. Also a waste of money being useless. Designed and built by the Supervisor and Overseer Veeramallacoalingam. The whole of this Buttaveerapuram project has been sadly mismanaged by the Supervisor. Money has been spent to no effect. The land intended to be benefitted by it has never had the water from it brought near it. Indeed as yet the work is said by many villagers concerned to have done more harm than good; their former sources of supply have been cut off, and the promised new supply has never reached them. Much water goes to waste.

Aqueduct half a mile below weir designed by the Supervisor, and Supervisor. My explanation to Letter No 3 dated 10th October may be referred to. As to the work, I beg to state that this work. Aqueduct 2 miles This work was designed by the and estimates were sent by This aqueduct being proposed to pass the Manager of the Assistant Collector to get the bandies pass over, from latter accordingly directed No 308 dated 15th October 1872 7872 to frame estimates and tion to that effect. The maide and submitted and the pervisor; and I afterwards ception of plastering and additional estimates not remained incomplete. This to irrigate the fields of Sola villages which would yield on account of the scanty rain made. The Manager and the entitled to with regard to and I am at a loss to know

at Singiseeram. This work was superintended by me and the the Principal Assistant Collec- 1873 with regard to this work honour has personally inspected I need not mention much upon below weir at Sola Gommadi. Supervisor Ramayya Naidu him and sanctioned last year. merely so as to allow water Sola wrote to the Principal this aqueduct widened to allow beyond the jungle and the the Supervisor by his memos and 348 dated 30th November submit the same for one- fresh estimates were accordingly work was commenced by the Su- completed the work with the ex- filling the approaches. The being sanctioned, the work has aqueduct has been very useful Gommadi and Uppiladi very little produce this year had not this aqueduct been adjacent villagers may be con- the usefulness of this aqueduct how the District Engineer

not to blame in this matter.

As to the first weir mentioned by the District Engineer, I beg to refer you to Proceedings of the Court of Wards No 300 dated 12th February 1874. I personally inspected the work and reported the result of my inspection to the Master in my No 359 dated 14th November 1873 Ramiah Naidoo was chiefly to blame in this matter.

As to the Sola Gommada aqueduct, the Overseer's explanation is correct. The report which I have received from the Manager about this aqueduct confirms the Overseer's story. As a matter of fact, the aqueduct was widened at the suggestion of the Manager and several bandies pass over it. I do not understand what the District Engineer means by calling this aqueduct "useless". The District Engineer's account of the Battiseerapuram project is not quite correct. He has exaggerated the real state of things and misrepresented

rehotted this aqueduct to be an
Buttiveripuram project. Though
by the Superviser I beg to insert
my knowledge. Before this An-
the fields in the Eastern Di-
waters from Brundavanam aga-
-in Kasha Ranta Kasha, Rudha
by those of Ramaagalam and
Kasha Sitinagala Seki China
Attuanku Ravita hatt of Palla
the north of Mahandatha
-sagaram and the fields of
passing over the Calingula
I in any years the supply of wate
for want of proper reasons a
across the Mahandra thanaya
of the river waters, which cau
in the Eastern Division of the
loss for want of water supply
the Superviser and the Distri
an anicut made over this river
and the Superviser and Captai
river in several places to find
-cut to be made and to turn
to have anicut ~~made~~ made
so as to turn the waters of the
Sagaram and thence to Palu
Estimates were accordingly
the work was commenced

less and mere waste of money.
this project was entirely manage
here some information with
was made three fourths of
visions of the Taluque by the
saw, the fields of Dalekka Seki, Kelan
kanta Seki and Ramaswamy Seki,
the fields of Chakravarthigudem
Bhaladevi Seki, Gopaulakoolam
Kasha and of Pala Palam to
naya by the waters of Seeta
Soda Muta by the waters
of Seela Sagaram, were irrigated
in the above tanks fall short,
dam of sand was to be made
near Burrasala to make
only be made to water the fields
Palak while the others retained
The Taluk Manager consulted
tal Assistant Collector to have
for the purpose of irrigation,
Philips thereupon cancelled the
a suitable position for the ani-
channels and at last settled
near Battiveripuram
rivers to feed Brundavana
through the sluices of that tank
submitted and sanctioned and
and while the Head Sluices and

ed them as worse than they actually
are. As Major Swalley remarks
in one place, "the whole of the Batte-
-cherlu Anicut project has been
sadly mismanaged"; but by whom
not only by the Superviser as
the District Engineer wrote but
also by Engineer Officers equal
to himself in rank. I cannot
better express the amount of mis-
-management that took place
in this matter than in the words
of Mr Forbes and Mr Leman
whose letters on the subject are
embodied in the Proceedings of
the Court of Wards No 1600 dated
15th March 1867. For the sake of
easy reference I quote their remarks
here in extenso vide enclosure A.

"Upon this the Court of Wards
called for some information to
shew what advantages the Pro-
-ject was likely to confer on the
Zemindary in case the work was
undertaken. When submitting the
above information, Mr Forbes
made the following observation
"The late Captain Philipps —
perused the execution of this
work

and channel were under progress. the District being on his tour found the waters of the tank the newly dug channel for want of the Channel being made and directed the Project to be was accordingly stopped, but -ed symptoms of failure in the Managers and Supervis- Assistant Collectors who Talukes, to make a dams of sand near Buttaikiputtam and to Brundavanasagaram made, and thence to the -ment of the said tank. and River water was effectu- the fields formerly fed Sutasagaram and Pamasagaram -tor was pleased with this- -posed to get an ancient Cu the sandy dam was made the Godda below - Brundha- accordingly made and com- -pleted. Since the ancient -tioned above never failed occurred in other parts of the were also allowed several

Mr Sobbe the then Collector of in the Talukes visited the work running into the River through of a proper fall and ow account before the ancient was built stopped as useless. Their work after two years there abbeat- Crops for want of Rains and for consulted the Principal was at that time in the across the Mahandra Tanaya to turn the waters thereof along the Channel already Taluk by removing the embank- The Proposal was agreed to- -ally conveyed to waters all by Brundavanasagaram the Principal Assistant Collec- mode of irrigation and pro- -structed on the spot where and to turn the channel along -vanasagaram, estimates were -tioned and the work was com- was made, the fields ma- in Crops though such failures Taluk and Remissions of Revenue times. The fields watered by

work on the then acting Collector Mr Fors and expressed himself in extremely sanguine terms as to the benefit likely to result from it. Mr Le- -mans letter now before the Court and my own observations in December last, shew that neither in an indiffe- -rent season nor in a good monsoon, could the proposed channel secure the Result anticipated by Captain Philipps. In fact the adoption of the plan was evidently an error of Judgment. It is a curious thing that the channel should have closed so as to drain instead of feed the tank as intended. As to what passed next, I beg to refer you to the undermentioned Pro- -ceedings of the Court of Wards and Correspondence therein embodied. Proceedings No 3285 dated 28th May 1867. In these Proceedings the Court ordered the abandonment of the Project after an expenditure of Rs 15328.

Proceedings No 2099 dated 17th July 1865 (which will show the nature of the Project).

by means of this ancient yield a-
-ness of the ancient Chaugh soo
has several times been brought
Assistant Collector and the
give full information of its

second Crop also. The useful-
ject is not yet completed
to the notice of the Principal
Managers of the Taluk cau
use.

Proceedings No 279 dated 18th January
1869. In these Proceedings, the Comtt
sanctioned an immediate expen-
-diture of Rs 10,000. They however re-
-quested the Collector to consult
the Superintending Engineer.
Proceedings No 4717 dated 2nd July 1869
The Superintending Engineer approved
the Plan and Estimate. At his in-
-stance, the estimate was raised
by Rs 19095. The Comtt sanctioned
the executions of the work, subject
to further information.
Proceedings No 7979 dated 27th Octo-
-ber 1869.
The Comtt finally sanctioned
the Project.
In reading through the whole
Correspondence connected with
the subject I have come across
a few inaccuracies in statements
made by different officers. For
instance in his letter embodied
in Proceedings No 1600 of 13th March
1867 Mr Fibbes said that both
the officers who planned the work
and the Overseer who took the
levels are now dead, so that
nothing more can be said regard-
-ing

The expenditure has been large exceeding that of many Public works Ranges yet none of the checks in the expenditure found necessary in them have been adopted in the Estate.

With regard to cheques I beg to state that since the commencement of Public Works in this Range nothing had been said by direct cheque even by Executive Officers in charge of this Range such as Captain Campbell and Captain Phillips, Captain Carlisle and I therefore adopted the system of my predecessors during the six months I was in charge of the Range.

The Overseer has misunderstood the word "Checks" in the District Engineer's letter and has given an explanation about the cheque system adopted in the Range. The checks meant by the District Engineer

Refers

-ing this unfortunate mistake." The Overseer Referred to here, is Sri Ramiah Raynder then Overseer and lately Supervisor. He is still alive Secondly Mr. Hopes statement that both Mr. Forbes and Mr. Leman made a mistake in calling Captain Phillips Project a wrong one. Mr. Phillips certainly made a mistake. His channel would have drained the Blundavana-vagalam tank if it had been continued into it. Instead of leading it into the tank, it was brought down into the fields below the tank which it now irrigates and finally taken to the Ramavagalam near Kinniele. The Project is not after all a mere waste of money as the District Engineer characterizes it. For further particulars vide my remarks in the budget for Fasle 1283.

There has been no monthly clearance, no
Register of works, not even subheads
shown in the Station books, no comple-
-tion Certificates, no Comparative
statements submitted with the
supplemental estimates. No accounts
of materials at site for past
years.

Advances have been made each Fasly
I find—

Rs 3,629-3-5 outstanding in the Fasli Fasli
1,292-1-8 do anni Fasli 1282
187-5-0 do do 1281
5,108-10-1

Besides which Overseer Veelaialla-
-o alingam when in charge in July
1873, alone advanced Rs. 1824-4-0. Fresh
advances were made before for-
-mer ones were worked off. In
most Cases no written agreements
were taken. In none a Contract bond
or security of any kind. The works
on which advances were made
were treated as completed in the
last months of the fasslies, though
sums of Rs 500, 200, 100, 70 and so
on were unaccounted for.

With reference to the accounts
-geneer as were not duly kept
of accounts directed by the
kept by my predecessors Re-
-ted by me

With reference to advances
Engineer as have been made
following explanation. In
workmen, such as excavators,
-sequently brought in from
-men coming from other Talukas
paid in advance. If these
advances and brought down
carried on in this hilly
this, that the officers in
the Commencement of
been in the habit of pay-
people coming down from
account of Carelessness.
in July were included in
-tees 3629-3-5 of the
was paid by me to the Head
Carting Gravel for different

Reference to Checks on Expenditure such as
Vouchers &c.

The Kimidi D. P. W. accounts were
in a Slightfulness before the
Public Works came under the
Control of the Principal
Assistant Collector which was in
1866. Only a few accounts with no
particulars of work done on each
work used to be received. On
11th September 1866 Mr Leman
after thinking over the matter
prepared a set of instructions
and forms of accounts for adop-
-tion by the Range officers and
the Overseers. In preparing
these Mr Leman closely
followed the Public Works
Manual published with
Government Order dated
19th August 1865 P. W. D.
He omitted a few of the forms
prescribed for Government Ran-
-ges, as being unnecessary for
the Kimidi Estate. Since
my joining the District, I
found it necessary to in Prove
the quality of information
furnished

Remarks exhaustive Principal

Reference Cash
Receipts R. Vencata
objected to by the District Engr
I beg to state that the forms
Principal Asst. Collector and
Mayya Raidu were duly adop-

Remarked by the District
Carelessly, I beg to submit the
this Taluk there are very few
Maistries &c and they were con-
other Talukas; and the work
would not proceed unless
men had not been paid in
here, works could not be
Talukas. It is on account of
charge of the Range since
Public Works here, have
-ing money in advance to
other Talukas and not on
Rs 7827-2-2 advanced by me
outstanding advances Pu-
Revenue Fasli; and this amount
-m of different villages for
roads. These villagers being in
the

the habit of receiving money in
for the purpose of carrying grand
work if not paid accordingly
means of livelihood and if
are no other means of ga-
The Supervisor now in charge
to get the work done by them
named outstanding and now
the work for which they
the remaining Rs 3287-6-1
remarked by the District
was advanced by the late
Hundred Rupees which
the workmen in small
whole advance due by
in this Range from the very
-ments only in the receipts
in cases in which money
workmen upon a work
it, and never such agree
Contractors who receipted the
-tion of materials and took
ted the course followed by
-gard to these agreements

advance from the Range offices furnished in the accounts in
will not now do this certain respects and I accord-
They have sufficient other -ingly gave instructions to the
they do not call grand there Supervisor on various occasions.
-velling the roads in the Taluk I can assure you that the
of the Range having refused accounts hitherto kept in
men the advances have re- the Kunidi Range are quite
the men are ready to do enough for all practicable
have been advanced and of purposes. If however the Dis-
outstanding in 3 Fuslies as trict Engineer thinks that
Engineer - grand portion more forms ought to be kept in
Supervisor except a few the Kunidi Range as in Govern
were now and then given to -ment Ranges there is nothing
sums as batta to clear the to prevent him from issuing
them. It has been a practice orders accordingly. In what
beginning to raise & agree- the District Engineer has
-ceived from the Contractors written I find nothing wrong
was advanced to certain specially attributable to the
to complete the whole of Overseer. He simply follow-
ments were taken from the -ed a course which was adopt-
advances simply for the collec- -ed by his predecessors ever
works, I consequently adopt- since 1866. This course has been
my predecessors. With re- as I have already said much
Contract bonds or securi- better than that followed when
-ties

ties of any kind, had been never
the Range by any
this system was consequently
the Contractors usually engaged
-table of procuring securities
Taluks would be unable to
It has been remarked by
" works on which advances were
-pleted" The works were
few cases in which portions of
-tement which was at first
to complete the work were
at the end of the Taluk by
the following year was al
of Wards for their approval
were not recovered from
to the credit of the work
-tion of the Court of Wards
till the budget for the
as such works which were
in the meantime lee da
were left with them in order
-ing of the same in the
will be completed with

taken before I took charge of
of my predecessor and
observed by me for fear that
in this Taluk who are not ca-
-being the inhabitants of other
procure such securities.
the District Engineer that
made were treated as com-
never so treated except in a
two amount of the budget al-
considered could be spent
remained with Contractors
which time the budget for
ready forwarded to the Court
and sanction. Such portions
the Contractors and remitted
as it would require the same
which could not be procured
next year is submitted and
almost completed would
-maged. But such portions
to complete the works Remark
Progress Reports that they
the outstanding advances and

the Range was under the District
Engineer's direct control in
former times. I enclose copy
of Mr Lemain's instructions
and forms above referred to.
The Overseer's explanation regard-
-ing advances is quite correct.
The present practice has been
in vogue for several years and
no real harm seems to have been
caused by it although in a few
cases difficulty was experienced
in getting the work done by
the Contractors who received
advances. We are not to blame
for the system, for it was
introduced by the
Public Works officers before
the works came under us and
we simply followed it as being
a convenient one.
Remark The District Engineer has
remarked that a The works
on which advances were made
were

and forwarding contract from
works executed and
-mained, to the Divi
-sion.

shewing the details of the
the balance Re-
-ceipt Assistant Collec

Collector

R. Davidson.

were treated as completed in
the last month of the Fiscal year.
This was certainly the case
before the works came under
us. The force of the previous
practice was so great that
it lingered on in the Range
for a time even after the works
came under us notwithstanding
repeated remonstrances. I
noticed the continuance of this
practice as soon as I came
to this Division, and sent
strict orders not once but
several times to the Subdivi-
-sion and had the unexpended
balances remaining at the
close of each fiscal brought
to account. I enclose copies
of my orders to the Subdivi-
-sion on this subject which
I sent him as long ago as
6th March 1872

District Engineer's Remarks

Gymnastas on Rupees 15 a month. With regard to advances made to Gymnastas receiving Rs 15/- a month in large sums — they were entrusted with payments to the amount of several hundreds of Rupees at a time. A considerable cash balance has always been kept in the Range office though the Treasury is close at hand

Supplemental estimates have been the rule not the exception by me during the time I was in charge of the Range

Nothing was paid by cheque direct to Gymnastas receiving Rs 15/- a month — that all the Range Officers in charge of this Gymnastas as Contractors as procured here. The officers of these Gymnastas minutely examined the sums given to the sub Contractors that is work respectively received in progress and personally examined the men who's amounts they certified to the work they did in connection with the short time

I concur in the opinion of the Executive Engineer

R. Davidson.

Executive Engineer

I never made a supplemental estimate during one submitted by me during the time I was in charge of the Range

R. Davidson.

Executive Engineer

Executive Engineer's Remarks

I quite admit the propriety of the District Engineer's remarks in this matter. But considering the peculiar difficulties in the way of obtaining trustworthy Contractors we cannot conveniently dispense with the present practice at once it has been long in use. As soon as a few trustworthy Contractors can be got a lot of the petty Gymnastas now employed can be dispensed with.

I do not remember that I sent in more than 3 or 4 supplemental estimates during the last 3 years I have been here, considering the number of supplemental estimates which used to be sent before that time, this number is a mere trifle For instance vide the remarks against No 3 item supra.

R. Davidson.

Executive Engineer

in the Overseer Vedamallaya Linga- mudaliar when in charge drew cheques for Rupees 500 - 1000 - 1500 and even 2000 at a time

I beg to state that the officer has always been in the habit of keeping a sufficient supply of money with them in the number of days in which they were away from the station in order to settle the Coolies' money & Gunny bags drawn & accordingly before I take leave I would sometimes take ten or fifteen days

In July he drew Rs 3000/- altogether

June Rs 6500/-

May Rs 5300/-

April Rs 5000/-

March Rs 3000/-

With regard to the amounts drawn in different months I remark that between March and June monsoon appeared in this quarter and the expenditure was larger than in other months and I was therefore obliged to draw as much amount as stated by the District Engineer & for the reasons above stated. During which period some important works such as buildings in the Palace which nearly cost about Rs 3000/- and all the irrigation works washed away by the floods of the Vanavadhalai were carried on. The required amount to always receive the sanction of the Deputy Collector on application for funds Requisitions for the months.

I draw from the Treasury as stated by the District Engineer in charge of the Range have kept a sufficient portion to the used to remain in cash in order to settle the Coolies' money & Gunny bags accordingly before I take leave I would sometimes take ten or fifteen days

I draw from the Treasury as stated by the District Engineer the works in much progress at the end of which the part of the County comes within those months and I was therefore obliged to draw as much amount as stated by the reasons above stated. important works such as Palaces which nearly cost the irrigation works washed of the Vanavadhalai were amount to always receive the for application for funds

Vedamallaya Linga- did in this matter. He was nothing new. During his short tenure of his office he followed his predecessor's practices in this as he did in other matters also.

N. Vaidyanathan.

District Engineer's Re- Overseer's Re- Remarks Ex Canatiew Dissipal Examination

Overseer Veeramallasalingam should I consider be at the very least at once reduced from Rs 100/ a month to Rs 60/ as before he was placed temporarily in charge of works in the Estate and should be stationed out of the town of Kirindi. He is a most indifferent Overseer and it would be well to remove him altogether from such an appointment.

This District Engineer stated that ... any by me has sustained any a tunnel on the Colpha gave an explanation a few months I was in charge plotted certain projects obstructed by my predecessor irrigation works and a few palace which were designed no objection has been engineer with regard Principal Assistant visited the portions and expressed his opinion the Estate for about seven years that seen position. On the gentleman who did it cautions taken by me charge of the Range pension of the Ranger

has in his report to where special ... work constructed loss with the exception of Kadala Road for which I have During the period of six of the Ranges I simply constructed designed and partly constructed. There are only certain buildings in the Rajahs and constructed by me. made by the District Engineer to these works. And the Collector who now and then works executed by me has thereof. I have been in 16 years and it is about I have been raised to Rank recommendation of Mr P bringing my long services during the time I was in consequently on the two said on the late Sub Divisions and

Not only in this letter but in one or two others the District Engineer has expressed an unfavourable opinion of Overseer Veeramallasalingam. He evidently formed his opinion originally on Engineer Lewis's reports and in my opinion I may say to my knowledge came to Kirindi prejudiced against the Overseer. Ensign Lever seems to have been prepossessed against the Overseer from the very beginning one of his accusations against the Overseer are incorrect and some unfounded. In one of his diaries Ensign Lever made a vague remark to the effect that Veeramallasalingam did not understand his works and

and satisfying with the
carrying on the duties
kindly pleased to get my
which I now receive in
from the above you
pleased to affirm a
innocent and that who-
partment may not be
emolument which has
the District Engineer

way in which I have been
of my last year honour was
pay increased to Rupees 100/
conclusion I trust that
honours will graciously be
the Conclusion that I am
I have been long in the De-
declined of my present
been recommended by
to be reduced.

and ought therefore to be re-
moved. The District Engi-
neer said that he quite
agreed with the Ensign Lever.
Neither of them gave any
reasons for arriving at a
conclusion as to their
carried out & to dissatisfactions
to the Subordinates concerned.
Upon this Ensign Lever
was asked for particulars
of the bad work he had seen in
the Estate. He named the
following works and attributed
the defects in those works to
ignorance of work on the part
of the Overseer.

1. A Caliguba across Coramandalla Ensign Lever remarks about this "The Overseer had sent in a supplemental

mental Estimate for the Repairs of a Ruined Caligula which was beyond the skill of any one to Repair if, and had I not accidentally seen it as publick sum of Eighteen Hundred odd would have been wasted by the Overseers for the want of a better knowledge of work". This is simply a misstatement. Engineers must have written either on some body's incorrect information, or without any information at all. In fact I explained when and under what circumstances the Overseer Collected the materials to Repair the Caligula and attempted to strengthen it. Instead of blame, Credit is due to the Overseer for having given timely intimation of the approaching destruction of the Caligula and for having prepared to strengthen it. But all of a sudden an unforeseen

flesh came down and swept it away. It was alleged by Ensign Lowe the Overseer had endeavoured to repair the Caliyngula after it was washed away the charge of ignorance of work might with justice have been made against him.

2 The second instance of bad work quoted and attributed to Veeramallaiyangaw is a tunnel on the Kinidi and Uppalada road. I have given the particulars of the work in para 10 supra. The only mistake of the Overseer in this, if mistake it can be called, is that he wanted to get the utmost he could, out of an untrustworthy and incompetent Contractor who had previously been engaged by and who had received an advance of Rs 100 from T. Ramiah Naidu. It seems that this Contractor did bad work during the Overseer's absence at other works in the Taluk and the Overseer directed the man to do the work over again. In case of any damage really occurring to it as inspected by that officer. The amount of such when this tunnel was only Rs ~. As I have already said I do not think it fair to make the Overseer suffer on account of this small work, which was not built by himself as stated by Ensign Lowe but by the aforesaid Contractor.

3 The third bad work attributed to the Overseer is the Singuparam Aqueduct. The Court of Wards have already received a full report on the ruinous

+ not known why

Mem. Like the Contractor seems to have made a petition to the District Engineer refusing to do the work again

of this aqueduct. It has been conclusively decided that Ramiah Naidu was to blame in this matter. The Overseer as directed by a written order from J. Ramiah let water too soon into the channel. This of Course weakened the work the plastering and Chunam being still wet when the water was let down. The design of the work was certainly Ramayya Naidus. The only instances of the Overseer's bad work quoted by the District Engineer himself in his letter to Mr Jones No 28 dated 24th January 1874 is the above work.

4. The fourth is the Chunam kiln for our Taylor's house and the windows of the Assistant Superintendents house — The Overseer's explanation* (accompanying Letter No 42 dated 6th February 1877 addressed to Mr Nicholetts) speaks for itself. They do not require any Comments from me. I cannot find any thing grossly irregular in this, nor in the entry of accounts. What the Overseer did is a common enough occurrence in Government Ranges also.

5. The fifth is that the Overseer did not work on the Chicacole bridge as stated by him. Engineer Lever may have made a mistake. I cannot believe that he can remember all the persons employed in 1857-8 and so large a work as the Chicacole bridge.

"On these grounds" Mr Lever says "I recommend

District Engineer's Re- Overseer's Rec- Remarks Remarks of Executive Officer Signature Date

marks marks

he should be dismissed" In to justify his dismissal of a Overseer in the Public Works Department grounds upon which the the Overseer I beg to refer you in which he makes the following observations.

"From what I have hereon have been forced to the Conclusion of the duties of a Overseer, not act out work or supervise duties about which there is no dispute the works which works he saw and his minute No 198 dated 2nd February 1874 the works mentioned by him herein. I think the information on a judgment in the observe that the District Engineer ly written without full knowledge information created on him my opinion) I have not much ther my wish nor my opinion facts of the case together matter and to enable you thinking that it is not exceed more or less by the District Engineer also seem whole Establishment to not Sai Ramiah Naidu" been so severe with Vella

any humble judgment the above reasons are not enough against the Overseer a trade who has spent 18 years of his life in the hope of bettering his prospects. Now as to the District Engineer has based his recommendation to dismiss you in his letter to Mr Master No 1 dated 2nd January 1874 following observations.

ally seen of his work and from Foreign Levels Reports I observe that Veeramallaswamy is quite ignorant that he does not know bad work from good that he can instead of. The remaining part of this letter relates to information given in para 13 supra may be referred to.

the District Engineer says he personally saw, the names of the thieves are embodied in the Proceedings of the Court of Inquiry. In the foregoing abstract I have given a history of each of as far as I could gather it from the Records now at my disposal furnished will be found sufficient to enable you to matter for yourself. For my own part, I regret to have to Engineers remarks are for the most part one sided and absolute ledge of the facts connected with each work. Now as to the by Foreign Levels Reports (of which I have already expressed to add in what I have written in this Report it is neither ject to defend Veeramallaswamy's Cause, but to put the in such a way as to give you a clear view of the whole to arrive at a conclusion. I quite agree with Mr Master in surprising that he (the Overseer) should have been influenced by the example and authority of Sai Ramayya Naidu" The to have had the same opinion, for he says "I believe the have become thoroughly demoralized under Sir Ker- But I think the District Engineer would not have Vellamallaswamy if when making his remarks he had remembered

marks

ot known that Veeramallasaling
13th June 1872 to 10th November
Therefore he could not av
evils of making many blunder
assistance of an Overseer. The
been conveniently supervised
have been. During the 6 months
of Fasle 1283. The information
before had a similar bud
were provided for in that
case alone, perhaps the sup
Remark that Subbiemen
apply to the Overseer and
the charges might be detected
the shortcomings of the Overseer now
of him and expressed the
16th April 1873 I do not
man. I recommended that
Range which was sanctioned but
allowance after he resumed
times I am informed that
this is true or, if true, upon
has been dismissed he has
service, with no dishonesty
to pledge myself that
his opportunities have
many others in this Depart
of there was much differ
applied for his pension
(if my information be correct)
with not many years less
his bread. From what I en

* I have found out that it is true
W.H.

am was in charge of the Range for only 9 months viz. one from
1872 and again from 6th January 1873 to 25th July 1873, and that
that short time have done much in the way of amending past
himself. He had to look after the whole Range without the
tunnel on the Uthiralu Road above referred to might have
of these had been two officers in the Range as there always
he was in charge of the Range the Overseer checked the budgets
he gave in for each work was so complete that I never
got from the Kimidi Range Office. Several important works
budget, and no fault has been found with them. In one single
Supplemental estimate had to be sent. The District Engineer's
Estimates have been the rule not the exception" does not
have not been the rule since I took charge of this Division.
with truth and considerable force. Before the occurrence of
brought to light I had a favourable opinion
came in para 3 of my letter to Supt Madura No 103 dated
can now see any reason greatly to alter my opinion of the
he should receive a hundred Rupees when in charge after the
I never intended that he should continue to draw the increased
the charge of his own post of Overseer. While I am penning these
Veeramallasaalingam has been dismissed. I do not know of
what grounds but I have no hesitation in saying that if he
been hardly and unjustly dealt with after nearly 20 years
charged against him that I know of. I should be sorry
he has never made money out of works under him, but
been few and small, Heinz worse in that point than
ment. As regards professional knowledge or ability I doubt
ence between him and Sai Pramiah Naidoo. The latter has
which will I presume be given. Veeramallasaalingam has
been turned adrift at a moments notice, & a middle aged man
service than Ramayya and with no means of earning
sign Lever has several times told me I cannot possibly
send

sition how I Ramiah was ne-
under Ensign Lewer's many
ons of Ramiah's for not
le an excavation pitching
- commenced for the hook.
In conclusion beleg to
describing discovery I has
District Engineer was
Lewer's Report and that
he would hardly have re
ceived that Ensign Lewer
not why, and that several
needlessly for a little enquiry
vented his making incorrect
As I said before I have
I have no bias for or against
known and that gives no
to enable you to form
the matter to you. In re-
last 3½ months I have

cluded for the charge of the Kumidi Public Works. He worked
years ago and the latter officer has more than once told me
ceived under him - A disobedience of orders which led
and killing several workmen I presume that he was re-
but it is surprising that he should have been.
Reference to my opinion that nothing especially wrong and
reprimand
been found against Verkamallavaligam, that the
brought against him before he saw his works by Ensign
had he known all that I have stated in this Report
commenced the dismissal of the man after such long
has been prejudiced against Verkamallavaligam, I know
of his not appearing to have been needlessly incorrect - I say
would have taught him the facts of each case and he
to refer to Verkamallavaligam's Cause - But
my only wish is that the Wells should be
may be done. What I have said is enough
own opinion and with these remarks I leave
to delay in submitting this Report but for the
been over the Wells with work

W. Graham
Ag. Principal Collector

Coll
Comp.

Enclosure in a letter
from the Acting Collector
of the Colony to the Colonial Secretary
of Guyana dated the
26th September 1874
No 1986

Leg Admin 6876/74

Rev 4182/74

P.W. 7595/74

G.O. 3607-22-12-74
In B No 464

Proceedings of the Board
Read the following
Rev. of Rev. 3607
the Rev. Despatt } (A. E. 22-12-74)
Appears to the
Excellency the Governor
in Council that the
explanation submitted by the
Acting Principal Assistant Collector
has reference to other
points than those in
which Overseer Ferreira
the allegations contained
was animadverted on
by the District Engineer
and on which alone explanation was required
His name was connected
by Major Donkley with
only

only 3 of the 12 instances of mismanagement recorded viz:

(1) Weir on Corama Gedda

(2) A Culvert on the Road from Kimedy to Oopalada.

(3) 2 aqueducts on the Butteeserpooram main Channel.

It is pointed out by Mr Graham that Major Smalley was mistaken in supposing the Overseer to have intended to restore work No. 1 after its destruction. He appears to have realized the badness of its situation, design, and construction, and to have predicted its ruin in October 1872, when he proposed to lengthen the body walls,

and apparently to strengthen it by repairs. Whether the works he proposed would have been effectual may be matter of doubt; but the Overseer is cleared of the imputation on him made by the District Engineer.

It is admitted that the work No. 2 was so badly built as to require reconstruction, which was all that Major Smalley alleged. And the course adopted by him to get the work done is not approved by Mr Graham. Ensign Lewis's proposal that he should be

be made a diary for the work done not appear & have been and should not be acted upon.

Of the 20 Remembered (3) the first appears admittedly to have been a failure the second the still incomplete. The Overseer does not appear to have been specially to blame for either - at all events his shortcomings are covered by the neglect or inability of his superior to check or correct them - Into the general question of the entire project it would be loss of time now to go -

Besides

Besides these charges as Dwarka had by construction by the Overseer he is stated to have advanced in the months of July 1873 alone Rs 1821-4-0 : without written agreements in most cases : in all without contract bond or security of any kind - In so doing it is evident that the Overseer simply followed the advancing system which he was powerless to stop of a Ruddell - He is therefore absolved from blame in the matter - But the facts of such advances

remunerating the District
Engineer will report
specially as to the extent
to which they were cleared
off on the 31 March 1874
and as to the success
met with in introducing
a better system. Ad-
vances are probably
necessary for the execu-
tion of work in a
country where all
skilled labor has to be
imported; it is only
necessary that they
shall be properly re-
gulated. I will in
the matter of drawing
Cheques Major Lavalley
appears hardly blame

apprehended the Overseers
proceeding at the time
when the over officiating
Range officer, in such
capacity the amount
of the cheque drawn by
him monthly cannot
be considered exemplary,
especially as much work
was done in the months
immediately before the
monsoon and had to be
paid for. It would have
been more to the point, had
the District Engineer
reported unnecessarily
large cash balances
in the Overseers hands
at the end of each month.

The conclusion ar-
rived at by His Excel-
lency the Governor in
Council

Council is that nothing
has been brought forward
still less proved, against
Overseer Veeramallen as
to suspend to warrant
his dismissal from the
Office of Overseer in R360.
Particulars he was properly
relegated when relieved
from the Sub Divisional
charge. And should such
action have been taken
he directs that it shall
be communicated into con-
sideration, pending orders
upon full and speedy
report of all the circum-
stances under which
he was taken.

GMW

D. C. Ganjam ✓
Controller ✓
Chief Engr for Irrn
Revenue Dept ✓
Despatch all 23/12/74

464-465

C. 10th Dec 1874

Govt. of [illegible]

PUBLIC WORKS.

The Asst. Engr.
Ganjam.

Dated

Recd. Encl. 1

G. O., 22 Dec. No. 3617

Nos. 464-465.

x mallesalingam

Overseer in charge of
Public Works of Varlac
Kunnedy Estate - Ganjam

wing that certain
brought against
seer have not been
ed to warrant his
ings at and directing
should such action
been taken it shall
mitted into
ion, Revolving order