

Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

Government of Madras

Public Works

DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1210	Press
B.P. No.		Mis. —
Dated	30-4-1951	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
30th April 1875.

Read the following papers:—

No. 734. From Major J. N. HUNTER, R.E., District Engineer of Salem, to Colonel G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Yercaud, 2nd April 1875, No. 1.

At the request of Supervisor and Conductor West, I beg to forward the accompanying papers regarding the Annasagaram

- 1 Copy of letter (with enclosure) from the Collector, No. 208, dated 13th November 1874.
- 1 Do. of letter from Collector of Salem, No. 219, dated 2nd December 1874.
- 1 Do. of Memorandum, No. 830, dated 16th December 1874, from this office to Conductor West.
- 1 Do. of letter, No. 205, dated 27th January 1875, from the District Engineer to the Collector.
- 1 Do. of Collector's reply, No. 24, dated 12th February 1875.
- 1 Do. of Sub-Collector's letter, No. 64, dated 10th February 1875, with an endorsement from the Collector.
- 1 Do. of District Engineer's letter, to the Collector, dated 2nd March 1875, No. 227.
- 1 Do. of letter from the Oosoor Range Officer, No. 1,196, dated 18th March 1875.

tank for the decision of Government, as the Conductor feels himself aggrieved at the expressions that Mr. Wilkinson uses in his letter, No. 64, dated 10th February 1875.

2. The history of the case is this:—

In September 1874 Government sanctioned an estimate of Rupees 3,640 for repairing the Annasagaram tank and extending its waste weir, and Conductor West, as Range Officer, gave the work on task to one Manikum Pillay who had done work before both for this Department and the Revenue, and done it well.

3. In November 1874 Mr. Wilkinson, the Sub-Collector, wrote* to the Collector regarding the work. He implies in his letter that Conductor West gave the job to Manikum Pillay from interested motives, and ventilates the opinions of himself and some Wudders regarding the rates given and taken by the job-worker where they discover that he is making too good a thing of the contract, pocketing 9 Annas out of every rupee for collection of stone, and 4 Annas out of 6 for building. This is all nonsense; and in my letter to the Collector, No. 227, dated 2nd March 1875, I pointed out the fallacies in Mr. Wilkinson's arithmetic.

But Mr. Wilkinson also made what appeared a very good suggestion, viz., that the contract should be given to respectable landholders under the tank itself, and he named certain men who were willing to take it. As this was supported by petitions from the landholders and other ryots, I directed†

† In Memorandum, No. 830, dated 26th December 1874.

Conductor West to give the contract for the work to the landholders named by Mr.

Wilkinson; and it was accordingly given to Hariya Gounden, Vertappa Naik, and Ramasawmy Naik. These men very soon got dissatisfied with their bargain, and, after doing some earth-work in a very inferior way, wrote to the Range Officer requesting to be relieved of the contract.

4. I visited the tank on the 26th January, and saw the contractors who asked to be allowed to withdraw from the earth-work contract, and positively refused to take up the stone-work. The villagers

who signed the petitions also came forward and said they had been induced to do so by certain people who gave them a petition to sign, and they signed it, that they were not personally interested, being weavers for the most part and not agriculturists.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
30th April 1875.

5. As the tank work was suffering from all this, and as the contractors named by the Sub-Collector would not go on with it, I naturally turned to the original task-worker, and sanctioned the re-employment of Manikum Pillay, and wrote to this effect to the Collector—see my letter, No. 205, dated 27th January, and this has drawn Mr. Wilkinson's letter, No. 64, dated 10th February 1875, which Conductor West desires to submit to the notice of Government.

6. In paragraph 2 Mr. Wilkinson says that Conductor West has done nothing, but write "whining" letters against the Tahsildar and the ryots. If Conductor West was of opinion that the contractor's work was not good and wrote to say so, I submit that he only did his duty, and that the expression used by Mr. Wilkinson is uncalled for and offensive.

7. Paragraph 3 of Mr. Wilkinson's letter dwells on the rates, and on this point District Engineer to Collector, No. 227, dated 2nd March 1875. I request a reference to my letter as per margin, which will supply the answer to this as well as the first part of the 4th paragraph; but at the end of this paragraph, Mr. Wilkinson charges Conductor West with having collected small stones and removed them before my inspection.

This Conductor West denies and brings it as a proof that no new stone-work had been done on the revetment; the work done is repacking the old stone. As this charge and that implied in paragraph 5 of Mr. Wilkinson's letter are of a nature to affect Conductor West's character, he has requested me to submit the matter to Government that Mr. Wilkinson may be required to substantiate his charges, or publicly withdraw them.

No. 735. From the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated 10th April 1875, No. 265.

No. 736. ORDER THEREON, 30th April 1875, No. 1,210.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 60.

His EXCELLENCY the Governor in Council is of opinion that the correspondence submitted fails to indicate that Mr. Wilkinson, the Sub-Collector of Salem, had any sufficient evidence before him when his letter, No. 64, of the 10th February 1875, was written to warrant his remarks on Conductor West, the Supervisor in charge of the range.

2. His Excellency the Governor in Council also considers the tone of Mr. Wilkinson's communication to the Collector in which he describes Conductor West as making whining complaints against the Tahsildar and ryots very unbecoming.

3. His Excellency in Council is of opinion that Conductor West has answered very completely the charges made against him, and that no further inquiry is required.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Revenue Department.
" District Engineer, Salem.
" Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Exd. A. Grubert.
Spare Copies

No. 64. Salem Sub Collector's Office,
Campaveripattanam, 10th February/75.
From.

The Ag. Sub Collector
of Salem.

The Collector
of Salem.

Sir,
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of letter No. 205 from the District Engineer, bearing your foot note dated 4th instant.

2. It is of course very easy for Major Hunter to inspect and condemn work performed by the ryots of Annasagarani and from the date of the giving over the work to them, Mr. West has done nothing but write whining letters against the Tahsildar and the ryots. As Major Hunter's is a professional opinion, I don't, for a moment, dispute it.

3. But I would point out that one of the chief things I complained

complained of in my letter of the 10th November last No. 742 was that Manickam Pillay was making far too good a thing of the contract, pocketing 9 annas out of every rupee, for the collection of stones, and 4 annas out of 6 annas for building up stones.

Mr. Williamson's
dearly settled in
unfortunate
very much better
full better.

The Widders employed by Manickam Pillay themselves gave me the information on this point, Major Hunter does not touch.

4. As to para 4 of my letter on which Major Hunter comments in para 5 of his, there was, I beg to state no misapprehension, when I spoke of new stone work, I spoke of the work of rebuilding the revetment which was going on at the time I visited the bund.

which was not
new work - more
ignorance

It was composed mainly of small stones, several of which I collected with the view of sending as specimens with my letter, but unfortunately changed my mind.

If

Very improper
Mr. Williamson's
could not know
except from
listening to a
she was wrong

Defamatory

Mr. Williamson
appears to have
suggested all
sorts of scandal
hangers to pour
out their tales
into his willing
ears.

If these small stones had disappeared when Major Hunter visited the tank. Two and a half months afterwards, Mr. West, who was so put out at my letter, that he procured the removal of Overseer Smith who was doing excellent work and just gaining a knowledge of the Taluk, may be able to point out where they have been removed to.

5. With reference to Manickam Pillay, I am informed that he entered into a partnership with Streenevasoolo Naidoo, the late overseer, who was prosecuted successfully by Mr. West, to share his gains. This I do know that after his removal from the post of Overseer Streenevasoolo Naidoo appeared before me and accused Manickam Pillai of cheating him and of submitting fudged accounts for the Chattram. As he stated that Mr. West was implicated in the

latter

latter affair, I told him he
should complain to the District
Engineer and as to the cheating,
ordered him to produce his
accounts. He went away and
did not turn up again.

a fitting con-
clusion -

I have &c
(Signed) F. Wilkinson
Ag. Subcollector.

True Copy forwarded to the
District Engineer of Salem in
continuation of this office letter 12th
dated 11th instant.

Salem Collector's Office, (Signed) C. J. Longley
15th February 1875. Collector.

(True Copy)

J. W. Sturges Major R.E.,

District Engineer.

Enclosure of
in letter of
dated 2nd April 1875
from the District
to the Commr. to
Government P. B.
P. B. 2182/75

to the District Engineer
Copy of letter re-
garding contract
or Mannam Jil-
-lay making too
good a thing of
the contract

No 830

District Engineer's Office
Salem 26th December 1874

Memorandum 98

With reference to his letter
No 1646 dated 21st December 1874, the Cooroor
Range officer is informed that whole
work of Arinasagaram Tank had
better be done by some responsible land-
holder under the tank, who may be
willing to take the contract.

Attention is invited to the names
mentioned in the Sub Collector's report &
if any difficulty or backwardness
is apparent on the part of the
contractor or contractors, the matter should
at once be brought to the notice of the
Sub Collector who has promised to render
every assistance in the work

(Signed) J. A. Hunter Major, R.E.
District Engineer

(True copy)

J. A. Hunter Major, R.E.
District Engineer

N^o 219
From Salem Collector's Office
Salem 2^d December 1874.

To The Collector
of Salem
The District Engineer
of Salem

Sir,
In continuation of my letter
N^o 208, dated 13th Ultimo, I have the
honor to forward a petition presented
to the Sub Collector by the ryots of
Annasagarum, complaining that the
present contractor is using bad materials
in repairing the tank and offering to take the
contract themselves.

I have ^{your}
Signed, C. T. Longley
Collector.

(True copy)

J. W. Tucker Major, R.E.
District Engineer

Enclosure N^o 3
in letter N^o 1

12th Dec 1875

From the District Engineer
to the Sub Collector
D. P. W.

D. P. W. 2182/55

Copy of letter
from the District Engineer
directing the ryots
over the Annasagar
to pay or amend
by the Sub Collector

Salem Collectors Office,
Camp Mullur 11th February 1875.
No 24
From The collector, 12/11
To The District Engineer,
of Salem.

Sir,
With reference to para 7 of your
letter, No 205, of the 27th Ultimo, I have
the honor to observe that it appears to
me that it was any thing but good
policy to re-employ Morikunpillai in
the face of the Sub Collectors statements
concerning the insignificant status
of the man. He was formerly a School
Master of a Village School and is a man
of straw. There must surely have been
other persons in Darampury of good status
and willing to take work of the description
you mention either on task or contract.

I have &c

(Signed) C. F. Longley
Collector.

(True copy)
J. W. Muller Major, R.E.
District Engineer

Enclosure No 2
in letter No 1
2d. sent from the
District Engineer to the
Salem Collector.

P.H. 2182/1
2/55

Copy of a letter
from the Collector
concerning a petition
from certain ryots
of Darampury
offering to take
the contract
themselves.

No 208

From

Salem Collectors Office

Salem 13th November 1874

The Collector

15th

of Salem

To

The District Engineer

of Salem

Sir,

I have the honor to forward, for your information and such action as you may deem requisite, a copy of a letter from the sub collector reporting upon the manner in which the repairs to the Annasagarain Tank in Darampoor Taluk are being carried out.

I have very

Respectfully
Signed, C. T. Longley
Collector.

Salem Sub Collectors Office

No 742

From

The S^g Sub Collector

of Salem

To

The Collector

of Salem

Enclosure 1:5

on 16th & 17th
Nov 2:3 & 19th
from the Sub.

Enclosures to the
S^g & to the District
Engineer.

P.R. 2183/55

Copy of a letter
from the Sub Collector
reporting on the
the expenditure of
the Annasagarain Tank
as to the cost of it.

Sir,

I have the honor to report that I this morning, inspected the Anasagaram Tank, for the repair of which I learn from the Tasildar, that an estimate of over Rupees 3000 has been recently sanctioned.

2. The contract for the repair of the tank has been given by the Range Officer Mr. West to a man named Manickam Pillai. This man was formerly a School Master at Palcode, and was dismissed by the Manager of the School for peculation. He appears, however, to be a favorite of the Range Officer for he has been given the contract for the Toppur Chitram and the Karimungalum Police Station, in both of which there has been great delay. Manickam Pillai is a man of straw and utterly ignorant of such work as he has contracted to do.

3. The Wudders employed by him informed me that they received 7 annas for the collection of new stones whereas the amount allowed in the estimate was Rupees 1, and that

while

He does not
with him, himself
utterly ignorant apparently
know this.

while in the estimate 6 annas was allowed per $\frac{1}{4}$ Square foot for building up the stones, they only received from the contractor 3 annas per $\frac{1}{4}$ Square foot.

4. I inspected the work done which is of the most wretched description. The new stone work is composed mainly of small stones, few of them much larger than my fist and the ryots justly complained.

5. I believe it is a standing order in the Department Public Works that repairs to irrigation works should as a rule be entrusted to the largest land-holders under the tank. They have every interest in doing the work thoroughly and efficiently.

6. There is no lack of large land-holders under the Anasagaram Tank who are most anxious to undertake the contract. I may mention the following: Hariya Gounder, Karedar of Anasagaram, Ramasami Naik, Karedar of a neighbouring Karav, Varadappa Naik and Pedda Naik. If the contract were given to these men, the money would be spent on the work instead of finding

Ignorance again

unfortunately a fallacy
generally

Ignorance again

its way into the pocket of the Contractor.

7. I learn that the Taluk Overseer who was not consulted by the Range Officer has reported in his Diary that Maricham Pillai is not a fit person to be the Contractor and has also remarked on the works.

8. It is I believe, 4 months since Mr. West visited the Darainpuri Taluk.

9. I venture to suggest that it would be well when large sums are sanctioned for the repair of irrigation works - that the Divisional Officer should be informed of the same. If I had not happened to visit Anasagarani this morning, I should not have heard of the tank being under repair.

(Signed) J. Wilkinson
Ag. Sub Collector.

True copy

(Signed) J. W. Johnston
Deputy Collector
for Collector.

(True copy)

J. W. Johnston Major R.E.
District Engineer.

No. 1096. Collector's Office.

its way into the pocket of a

Enclosure No. 1
in letter No. 1
of 19th April 1875
from the District
to the Secy. of the
D. P. W.

P. H. 2189/55

Copy of a letter
from the collector
objecting to the
repairs of the Am.
road as far as the
being given to
Mombwa Dillay
on Contract.

No. 1996
Cape Town Range Office,
Cape Town 18th March 1875.

To
The Officer in charge of
No. II or Cape Town Range,
Salem District.

To
The District Engineer,
Salem.

In reply to your endorsement
No. 985 dated 18th ult., on letter
No. 64 dated 10th idem from the acting
Sub. Collector, I respectfully sub-
mit the following reply.

I am not at all aware of having
sent any "whining letters" to that
officer, but seeing from the manner
in which he was treating me, that
some persons were in the habit of
carrying tales to him against me,
I wrote respectfully and asked
him to give me the chance of ex-
plaining such charges before he
took action on them (I mentioned
no names) and even now unable

to see that there was anything wrong or unbecoming. In doing so. I beg if necessary that copies of the "whining letters" complained of be procured...

With reference to para 3, I would beg to state that it is impossible the contractor can be making any such profit as Mr. Wilkinson makes out. That that officer has been completely misled in the matter, is plain from the fact that Captain Bailey, when he inspected the Tank on the 5th instant, when examining the work in taking over charge of the Range, found that no stone had been brought for the revetment - that which had been brought up to that date being for the surplus escape.

By the madders own shewing they have received 2 annas a square yard ($\frac{1}{2}$ yard thick or $\frac{1}{2}$ a Cubic yard) for repacking the old stone of the revetment. By Mr. Wilkinson's letter the new stone revetment (which has not yet been collected) is to be done for 7

annas

annas a cubic yard, and as 4 as of this amount at least will be paid for packing, there remains 3 as a Cubic yard for quarrying the stone and carting it about 2 miles, whether it is possible for the work to be done for that sum I leave it for you to decide. So far as I can learn, where stone has to be quarried that item alone costs 4 or 5 annas per Cubic yard.

As stated in the previous para, the madders received 4 as a Cubic yard for repacking the old stone of the revetment. at the very utmost therefore the contractor could only gain 2 as a yard but from that all the other expenses incidental to the work of pulling down the revetment, loss of advances, recovery of advances by civil suits, interest on money laid out &c. will have to be paid, so that his profits must be much less than is made out.

It seems to me anything but fair

fair on Mr. Wilkinsons part, to charge me as he has done in para 4 of his letter, with the disgraceful conduct of having allowed bad stone to be brought for the reurement, and then having had it removed when he noticed it, especially so, as the least inquiry would have shown him that he had not the slightest grounds for such a charge.

Considering that my letter No. 1495 of the 19th November 1874 was despatched to you on the 20th idem, and that your letter No. 721 forwarding the Sub Collector's

letter No. 742 of 10th idem (regarding bad work to the Annasagarani Tank) is dated Maonchanady the 18th of the same month and only reached me on the 24th idem, it is hard to understand how that officer's letter could have influenced me to apply for Mr. Smith's removal. Moreover, long before my No. 1495 was submitted I had already submitted another letter

No. 1450 dated 12th November 1874 applying for Mr. Smith's removal. With reference to para 5, I beg to state that I knew nothing of any partnership between Mannikun Pillay and overseer Streenevasoolo Naidoo, and I think it rather hard that if Mr. Wilkinsons had such information he should not have let me know of it, and so give me the chance of stopping any trickery that might be going on.

As Mr. Wilkinsons in his letter states that overseer Streenevasoolo Naidoo charged me with criminal breach of trust, with criminal breach of trust, so soon as he was removed (about Dec: 1/73 or 16 months ago) I have the honor to beg you will be good enough to submit the whole of the correspondence on the subject for the consideration of Government, and that the Overseer may be called upon to explain what grounds he had for making such a charge, and thus give me the opportunity of clearing

my character from the disgraceful
imputations made against me.

I regret being forced to
trouble you to refer the matter
to Government, but if no steps
are taken by me to clear my
character, the charge of Criminal
breach of trust being now
entered publicly in the records of
the office, any officer looking over
the correspondence could only come
to the conclusion that I really
was guilty and therefore afraid
to court an enquiry.

I extremely regret, through
being indisposed I was unable
to reply to your Memorandum
earlier.

I have &c.
(Signed) W. C. S. West,
Executive Agent.

(True Copy)

J. W. Hunter Major R.E.,
District Engineer.

to send by a letter
from the Collector
reporting on charge
brought forward
by the sub-division
and requesting
that the subject
be brought to the
notice of Govt.

of C. 17/12/10 - 30/4/13-

C. No. 2189/55-

Enclosure No: 8
in letter No: 1
2^d dated 1875 from
the District Engineer
to the Secy: to
Govt. S. D. W.

Enclosures

1 copy of letter with enclosure
from the Collector dated 13th Nov 1874.
1 - do - from Collector of
Salem No: 219 82^d Decr 1874
1 - do - Memo: No: 830 8 13th
Decr 1874 from this office to
Collector West.

1 copy of letter No: 100 8 27 Decr 1875
from the Secy: to Govt. to all Collectors
- do - of Collectors reply: 8 27 24
dated 12th Decr 1875.
1 - do - of sub-division letter No: 9 61
4 10 13th Decr 1875 with an endorsement
from the Collector

1 copy of Draft Letter
to the Collector 8 27
dated 1875 No: 224

1 copy of letter from the Secy:
to Govt. of Decr No: 1196 8
1875 dated March 1875.

No: 1

From

To

Sir,

District Engineer's Office
Yercaud 2^d April 1875.

The District Engineer of
Salem.

The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department.

At the request of Supervisor
and Contractor West, I beg to forward
the accompanying papers regarding the
Anmasafaram Tank for the decision of
Government, as the Contractor feels him-
self aggrieved at the expressions about
Mr. Wilkinson used in his letter No: 61
dated 10th February 1875.

2. The history of the case is
this. In September 1874 Government
sanctioned an Estimate of Rs: 3640
for repairing the Anmasafaram Tank
and extending its waste weir, and
Contractor West, as Range Officer,
gave the work on tank to one
Mankanna Pillay who had done
work before both for this Department
and

and the Revenue and done it well.

3. In November 1874, Mr. Wilkinson the Subcollector wrote to the Collector regarding the work. The implication in his letter that Conductor West gave the job to Manikam Pillay from interested motives, and ventilates the opinions of himself and some individuals regarding the rates given & taken by the job worker where they discover that he is making too good a thing of the contract - pocketing 9 annas out of every rupee for collection of stone, and 4 annas out of 6 for building. This is all nonsense; and in my letter to the Collector, N^o 227 dated 2^d March 1875, I pointed out the fallacies in Mr. Wilkinson's arithmetic. But Mr. Wilkinson also made what appeared a very good suggestion, viz., that the contract should be given to respectable landholders under the Tank itself; and he named certain men who were willing to take it. To this was supported by Petitions from the landholders and other Ryots, I directed Conductor West to give the contract for the work to the landholders named by Mr. Wilkinson; and it was accordingly given to Harrya Gorniden, Vethappa Naik & Ramaswamy Naik.

Letter N^o 742
dated 10th Nov.
1874.

In Memo. N^o 830
d/26th Dec.
1874.

Naik. These men very soon got dissatisfied with their bargain and after doing some earthwork in a very inferior way, wrote to the Range Officer requesting to be relieved of the contract. I visited the Tank on the 26th January and saw the contractors who asked to be allowed to withdraw from the earth work contract, and positively refused to take up the stone work. The villagers who signed the petition also came forward and said they had been induced to do so by certain people who gave them a petition to sign, and they signed it, that they were not personally interested being weavers for the most part and not agriculturists.

See letter from
Dist. Engineer
to Collector N^o 205
d/27th Jan'y
1875, para 4.

5. As to the earth work was suffering from all this, and as the contractors named by the Subcollector would not go on with it, I naturally turned to the original task worker, and sanctioned the re-employment of Manikam Pillay, and wrote to this effect to the Collector, see my letter N^o 205 dated 27th January, and this has drawn Mr. Wilkinson's letter, N^o 64 dated 10th February 1875 which Conductor West

West desires to submit to the notice of Government.

6. In para 2 Mr. Wilkinson says that Conductor West has done nothing but write "whining" letters against the Tahildar and the Ryots. If Conductor West was of opinion that the Contractor's work was not good and wrote to say so, I submit that he only did his duty, and that the expression used by Mr. Wilkinson is uncalled for and offensive.

7. Para 3 of Mr. Wilkinson's letter dwells on the rates, and on this point, I request a reference to my letter as per margin, ^{which} will supply the answer to this, as well as the first ^{+ District Engineer to Collector N. 227} part of the 4th para - but at the end of this para, Mr. Wilkinson charges Conductor West with having collected small stones & removed them before my inspection.

This Conductor West denies and brings it as a proof that no new stone work had been done on the revetment - the work done is repacking the old stone. To this charge and that implied in Para 5 of Mr. Wilkinson's letter are of a nature to affect Conductor West's Character

331
Character, he has requested me to submit the matter to Government that Mr. Wilkinson may be required to substantiate his charges or publicly withdraw them.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedt. Servt.

J. Wheeler Mayo R.E.
District Engineer.

N^o 227. District Engineer's Office,
Camp Nemah 2^d March 1875

To the Collector of Salem.

Sir, I have the honor to acknow-
ledge the receipt of your letter N^o 24
dated 11th February 1875 and a letter
from the Ind collector to your address
and bearing your endorsement N^o -
dated 15th February 1875.
With reference to the former,
I must say that we have no choice
but to pay at Paramporey.

of Contractors at Danbury
Those recommended by the Inspector
have turned out miserable failures,
while for task work such as is to
be given on this work when no pay-
ments are made in advance and
when all work is measured and
passed before it is paid for. The
status of the task worker appears
to be a matter of minor importance,
so immediately he does bad or
insufficient work, the task work
can be given to any one else. Five

2
Five months have been wasted by
the so called Contractors, and we
must remedy this loss of time as we
can.

3. Referring to Mr. Wilkin-
son's letter, I can only repeat with
reference to para 2 that the earthwork
done by Narya Gunden &c was
simply infamous; and if this was
the ground of Mr. Meets' complaints,
he had ample cause for "whimpering".

4. With regard to Para 3
of Mr. Wilkinson's letter, I can only
say that if I did not notice the
rates quoted by the Sub Collector in
his letter of the 10th November 742,
it was simply because a moment's
consideration would show any one
how completely Mr. Wilkinson had
been misled and hoodwinked by
the Mudders who gave him his
information. I quote from Para
3 of his letter, N^o 742.

"The Mudders employed
by him informed me that they received
7 annas for the collection of new
stone, whereas the amount allowed
in the estimate was Rs. 1". Now
the facts are these: - The rate al-
lowed in the estimate is Rs. 1 for

31
putting new stone pavement in a com-
plete form on the bund - in other
words for collecting and building -
the ingenious mudders seem to have
said nothing about building and
to have induced Mr. Wilkinson to
come to the manifestly incorrect
conclusion that the Contractor was
pocketing 9 annas out of every
rupie in the collection of stones.

I should say that if the
Contractor paid 7 annas for the
collection of stones, and then paid
the current rate say 7 or 8 annas
for building, his margin of profit
would be small.

5. The next case is more curious
- still. To quote again from Mr.
Wilkinson's N^o 742 para 3 "and"
"that while in the estimate 10 annas
"was allowed per one quarter square
"foot, they only received from the
"Contractor 2 annas per one fourth
"square foot." On this Mr. Wilkin-
son builds his charge that the
Contractor "was pocketing 4 annas
out of 10 for building up stones."

What are the facts?

The

The estimate has no such rate as
6 annas per one fourth square foot;
the real rate is 6 annas per cubic
yard, while the Contractor ac-
cording to Mr. Wilkinson and
his witnesses is paying 2 annas per
one fourth square foot or eight
annas per square foot or $8 \times 9 = 72$
annas, or $4\frac{1}{2}$ rupees per square yard;
and as the revetment is half a
yard thick, a square yard of
surface will be half a cubic yard,
so that the Contractor is pay-
ing twice $4\frac{1}{2}$ or 9 rupees per cubic
yard and receiving 6 annas, yet
Mr. Wilkinson complains that
he is pocketing too much.

6. With reference to para
4 of Mr. Wilkinson's letter, I
must point out again that the
work of rebuilding the revetment
is not new stone work. The rate
allowed is 6 annas per cubic yard,
and the work consists in pulling
down the stones of the old revet-
ment and repacking them. I
take this opportunity of saying
that I disagree in toto with Mr.

Wilkinson

31
Wilkinson in his estimate of Over-
see Mr. Smith's work; that he
should have allowed such extra
work to be done by Harry a
Kumder &c. would convince me,
even if other proof were wanting,
that he does not know good work
from bad.

7. I do not see how the facts
stated in para 5 of Mr. Wilkin-
son's letter bear upon the case.
It would appear that an Overseer
who was reduced and dismissed
brought a charge (false or true)
against Manikam Pillay and
in which he stated that Mr.
West was implicated; when chal-
lenged to produce his accounts,
"he went away and did not turn
up again."

8. In conclusion I beg to
reiterate my conviction that in
employing Manikam Pillay as
a back worker, Mr. West made
the best arrangements possible
that the interruption of the
work is much to be regretted
and that the interests of
Government was the Supervisor's
sole

sole object in working as he did.

I have the honor to be Sir,

Signed J. N. Hunter Major R.E.,
District Engineer.

(True copy)

J. Hunter Major R.E.,
District Engineer.

Kind as he did

Enclosure N^o 1
in letter N^o 1
of 2nd April 1875
from the Dist
Engineer Salem to
the Secy to Govt
D.P. W.

P.P. 2182/95
2/95

Copy of a letter
to the Collector
Commenting upon
the observations
of the Subcollector
regarding the
repairs to the
Amaraagar Tank
submitted by
Mamtha Pillay

N^o 205.

Dist Engr's Office Camp,
Sernafatam 27th January 1875.

To

The Collector of
Salem.

Sir,

Collector's Nos
208 & 219 of 13th
Nov. & 2nd Decr
1874 respectively,
and N^o 1689 & 2.
17th Decr. 1874

I have the honor to draw
your attention to the correspondence
1874 respectively, marginally noted.

I yesterday inspected the
Amaraagar Tank and saw all
the contractors. The contract is
in the hands of three of the land
holders named by the Subcollector
in his letter to you dated 10th Novem-
ber 1874, viz., Harya Gommen, Var-
appa Naik and Ramaswamy
Naik who have done nothing but
a quantity of earthwork; and that
is so badly done that, on inspect-
ing it yesterday, I refused to pass it.
The estimate allows for tamping &
watering, and the instructions to the
contractors are, that the earthwork
is to be raised from the bottom in
successive layers, each layer to be
watered and consolidated with heavy
cylindrical rammers.

No

431
No attempt at anything of this kind has been made, the earth (set from the tank bed) has been piled up loose and allowed to roll down the slopes any how. I have been obliged to order the whole to be re-done - the top to be cut off and added to the bottom width - the bank then to be built from the bottom.

3. As to contractors then the three landholders are not failures; they themselves have made the same discovery and were unanimous in begging me to relieve them of the contract. They had previously written to the Range Officer to this effect - the letter (to be returned) * 8²²? Jan'y/75. is enclosed for your information.

4. I also send a letter (to be * 8¹⁶? Jan'y/75 returned) from the villagers who signed the petition to yourself and the Sub-Collector - who appears to be the same who addressed me. These men (weavers for the most part) say that they were induced to sign the petition without understanding it, and seem to have been tools in the hands of the black man mentioned in the letter from the villagers whom I suspect to be Dorbraya Undellian a local contractor.

5. I think there must be some misapprehension regarding Para 4 of the Subcollector's letter. There is no new stone work done in the revetment -

The work done is the repacking the old stone as allowed in the estimate, for the size of which, the man who takes the work on task is not responsible.

And I take this opportunity of saying that the work given to Manikam Pillay was rather job than contract work - every piece has to be measured and passed before it is paid for.

6. I inspected the stones collected for the waste weir - they are very fair in quality and size - they will not be paid for till they are worked up in the balingulak when no undersized stones will be passed.

7. Under the circumstances recorded above, as 5 months have now been wasted by the present contractors with no results, I have approved of the re-employment of Manikam Pillay as a task worker; and while regretting the interruption of the work, feel bound to record my conviction, that, in executing the work by task work, as he had begun to do, Mr. West was actuated by no other motive than the desire to further the interests of Government.

I have &c.

Signed J. St. Hunter Major
R.E.
District Engineer
Trine

J. A. Kneel - Major R.E.,
District Engineer.

Enclosure No. 4
in Letter No. 1 of the
2nd April 1895 from the
British Legation
Calcutta to the Secretary
Government, D. D. W.

Q. R. 2152/55.

in the Collectors
Copy of Letter, upon
saying that he intended
sell the same as a
"same blank," and
that he had employed
William Steady as
Contractor on the
same reasons.

No. 365

hole by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

The proceedings of Mr. Wilkinson
the Sub Collector of Salem, as ex-
hibited in the correspondence sub-
mitted by the District Engineer, ap-
pear to me to be simply disgraceful
when misled by the Wuddars &
others, or perhaps misled rather by
his own ignorance of the import of
the circumstances mentioned by
them & of the details of the work he
had inspected, instead of stating
what he supposed to be the facts
and asking for any informa-
tion he desired, he proceeded to
draw entirely unfounded con-
clusions & to make insinuations
& imputations, the complete with-
drawal of which Conductor West
is entitled to demand. There

was not the slightest foundation
for them beyond the Sub Collector's
ignorance of the matter criticised,
and the scandalous tales to which
apparently he lent a willing ear.

Fort St. George. } Wm. G. R. R.
10th April 1875 } Chief Insp. for Trin

To
The Secretary to Government
P. W. Department

Pr. of the Indian Government
Read the following

From the De Eng's Salem (M.H. No. 1 d/2^o April 1875)
From the Chief Eng's for Eng's (— a — 365 d/10' — a —)

G.C no: 1210 of 30th April 1875

This Excellency the Gov.
in Council is of opinion
that the correspondence
submitted fails to indi-
cate that Mr. Wilkinson
the late Collector of Salem
had any sufficient evidence
before him when his
letter, No 64 of the 10th
February 1875 was written
to warrant any remarks
of a disparaging or con-
demnatory character
on Conductor West the
Supervisor in Charge of
the Range and that
his

Arch. 1875 alt.
No. 2532

45365

From
The Chief Engineer
for Singapore

To the Secretary to
Government
O. H. D.

Plates 10 & 11
Revised 17th April 1915

9.0.20:12/0.30-4-95

Note on letter from the
South Lodge before on the
subject of certain Engrs
= passed and approved in
= passed it by the Superior
west by the South Lodge
No will be in comparison
with the repairs works to the
sum of a year and a half

49.6.80 Schk 179 no 148
X149

473

e. 17-4175

in his attributing to the latter
the improper removal
of certain small stone
& hinting that he had
been implicated in falsi-
fying the accounts
of a Chattram, in the
absence of direct and

conclusive evidence, ^{in a manner to} ~~was~~ ^{imprudently & negligently} caused serious injury to
~~unbecomingly~~ ^{in a manner to} ~~imprudently & negligently~~ ^{caused} serious injury to
Conductor West
the highest degree.

2. Mr West asks that
the imputations on his
honesty & straight forward-
ness may be substan-
tiated or withdrawn
& this much he has clearly
a right to demand.
Failing their substan-
tiation he will be further
entitled to an ample
apology. The papers
will

His Excellency the Gov^r
in Council also considers
the tone of Mr. Wilkinson's
^{communication} letter to the Collector in
which he describes Conductor
West as making whining
complaints against the
Tahsildar & Ryots, very
unbecoming.

H. E. in Council ^{is of opinion} ~~decides~~
that Conductor West
has ^{answered very completely} ~~completely~~ ^{the}
~~the matter is very~~

will be remitted to the
Rev^d Dept for the issue
of the necessary orders.

May 14/4/75
C.M.W.

~~insufficient~~ The
charges made against
him, & ~~consider~~ that
no further enquiry is
required.
B.M.

To the Rev^d Dept
D.E. Salen
Chief Secy to Govt
Desp^d 8-5-75

21819
2532

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

PUBLIC WORKS.

The Secy. Dept.

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. 30 April No. 1240

No. 734-736

Mr. Wilkinson, Sub Collector of
em - Passing orders on the
letter from the District Engineer
requesting that he required
to substantiate certain charges
against Mr. West or publicly
withdraw them -

Q

17-1-75