

- (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. <i>2953</i>	Press <i>Original</i>
B.P. No.	Mis.
Dated <i>15. 10</i>	195 <i>1876</i>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th October 1875.*

Read the following papers :—

No. 254. From Colonel F. J. MOBERLY, R.E., Superintending Engineer, Chingleput, to Major-General G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Guindy, 24th September 1875, No. 2,605.

I HAVE the honor to enclose letters received from Mr. Lowry as desired by him. One letter from the Executive Engineer, Chingleput Range, to Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, No. 1,400, dated 21st September 1875, with six enclosures.

You will observe that he has been desired by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and myself to forward certain documents to me in support of his claim for payment to a Surveyor and his establishment, and

that instead of doing so he appeals to Government.

From R. J. LOWRY, Esq., Executive Engineer in charge No. 3 or Chingleput Range, Chingleput District, to Major-General G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Camp Karangooly, 21st September 1875, No. 1,400.

I HAVE the honor to forward, for the consideration of Government, the correspondence as per margin. It will be seen that Colonel Moberly

R. O. No. 118, dated 16th April 1875.
Do. 14th July 1875.
Superintending Engineer's No. 163, dated 13th April 1875
" " 847, " 15th July "
" " 782, " 7th " "
One Survey Plan.

stopped from my pay for the month of June the sum of Rupees 50-9-2 which, acting to the best of my judgment for the good of the public service, I had paid to a Surveyor who had been sent me by Colonel Moberly for the

Survey of the Chingleput Kalavoy tank, but who was found after sufficient trial incapable of making the survey.

2. I now forward the paper on which the portion of the catchment basin surveyed by the Surveyor was plotted, which is not accurate, and as only some 5 miles were done in twenty-five days, I came to the conclusion it was better to dismiss him and pay him up than that further loss should accrue from keeping him on. In memorandum No. 284, without date, the Chief Engineer is pleased to remark that if I found the Surveyor's works altogether inadequate, I was right to discharge him, but that it is not at all apparent why I thought it necessary to pay him. I may have been wrong in doing so, but as the man had a second-class certificate as a Surveyor, and also a certificate from Captain (now Colonel) H. L. Prendergast, stating his competency, I thought it better to pay and dismiss him at once, there only being a small sum due, rather than give him a claim for further salary by delaying payment, which delay would probably result in my being dragged into Court and Government having to pay a considerable further amount in costs. I can only say that I thought, under such circumstances, I was justified in using my own judgment. If I have been guilty of an error of judgment, I beg to express my regret, but would submit that mulcting my pay of this amount is a punishment which the offence (if offence it be) does not deserve.

No. 1,143.

No. 254-A.

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

MR. LOWRY had the instructions of the Circular No. 62, under the provisions of which the Survey Establishment referred to was sanctioned, as his guide. It was necessary that he should report the work done when transmitting the bill for the cost

11/10/75

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th October 1875.*

of this establishment, and he should at the same time have given any explanations he had to offer regarding the disproportion between the work done and the amount of the bill.

2. The undersigned has now seen for the first time the survey plan showing what the Surveyor did during the time for which pay was disbursed to him, and it is clear that Mr. Lowry did not give the Surveyor proper instructions, and that the latter was directed to set about the survey in a way altogether inappropriate. The work to be done was extremely simple; the selection and measurement of a base line was altogether unnecessary, a traverse with a few bearings to a few prominent points or objects on or in the neighbourhood of the line would have secured sufficient accuracy. The Surveyor may or may not have been incompetent. There is nothing in the papers submitted to show what his qualifications may be, but that he was wrongly instructed is sufficiently plain, and it may be supposed therefore that his former employers were right, and Mr. Lowry wrong, in the opinions formed of him.

3. Mr. Lowry has been in the wrong from beginning to end. He did not, in the first place, understand how the work required should have been done, and consequently the Surveyor wasted his time; he did not attend to his instructions, and the resulting retrenchment was inevitable; he thereafter did not do as he was told and forward a report of work done; he disbursed money contrary to the rules and quite unnecessarily, as it would have been according to the usual practice to have remitted to the Surveyor the amount due to him after the bill had been passed.

4. One point however is tolerably clear, and that is that the Surveyor was entitled to his pay; also that the retrenchment has not been unjust to Mr. Lowry, except apparently that he has not received credit for the value of the little work done, which may be taken at 3 Rupees a mile. It is recommended therefore that an adjustment to this extent should be permitted.

5. The undersigned would have been quite prepared to recommend the removal of the retrenchment altogether had Mr. Lowry been amenable to the instructions given to him, and had he taken the proper course of affording the information required, when his errors would have been pointed out and he would have been told what to do in the future. His neglect to attend to the instructions both general and special has led to a great deal of trouble and waste of time, and he does not, it is thought, deserve to be relieved from the consequences of his own errors.

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

OOTACAMUND,
2nd October 1875.

No. 255.

ORDER THEREON, 15th October 1875, No. 2,953.

IRRIGATION, Nos. 25 & 26.

Establishment.

ment of the amount disbursed by him contrary to rule to the Surveyor employed on the Kalavoy tank of Chingleput.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th October 1875.*

2. The actual value of work done may be allowed, and the Superintending Engineer will submit a bill for this to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, the rest of the retrenchment will stand.

(True Extract.)

Major-General, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, Chingleput.
„ Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
„ Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

11/2/43
Enclosure 8.

No. 1143

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Mr. Lowry had the instructions of the Circular No. 63, under the provisions of which the Survey Establishment referred to was sanctioned, as his guide. It was necessary that he should report the work done when transmitting the bill for the cost of this Establishment, and he should at the same time have given any explanations he had to offer regarding the disproportion between the work done and the amount of the bill.

2. The undersigned has now seen for the first time the survey plan showing what the Surveyor did during the time for which pay was disbursed to him, and it is clear that Mr. Lowry did not give the Surveyor proper instructions, and that the latter was directed to set about the survey in a way altogether inappropriate. The work he done was extremely simple; the selection

and measurement of a base line was altogether unnecessary, a traverse with a few bearings to a few prominent points or objects on or in the neighbourhood of the line would have secured sufficient accuracy. The Surveyor may or may not have been incompetent: there is nothing in the papers submitted to show what his qualifications may be, but that he was wrongly instructed is sufficiently plain, and it may be supposed therefore that his former employers were right and Mr. Lowry wrong in the opinions formed of him.

3. Mr. Lowry has been in the wrong from beginning to end. He did not in the first place understand how the work required should have been done, and consequently the Surveyor wasted his time; he did not attend to his instructions, and the resulting retrenchment

was inevitable; he thereafter did not do as he was told and forward a report of work done; he disbursed money contrary to the rules and quite unnecessarily as it would have been according to the usual practice to have remitted to the Surveyor the amount due to him after the bill had been passed.

4. One point however is tolerably clear, and that is that the Surveyor was entitled to his pay; also that the retrenchment has not been unjust to Mr. Lowry, except apparently that he has not received credit for the value of the little work done which may be taken at 3 Rupees a mile. It is recommended therefore that an adjustment to this extent should be permitted.

5. The undersigned would have been quite prepared to recommend the removal of the retrenchment altogether

had Mr Lowry been amenable to the instructions given to him, and had he taken the proper course of affording the information required, when his errors would have been pointed out and he would have been told what to do in the future. His neglect to attend to the instructions both general and special has led to a great deal of trouble and waste of time, and he does not it is thought deserve to be relieved from the consequences of his own errors.

Wm. L. L. L.
Chief Engineer for Irrigation

Oatacamund
2nd October 1876

To The Secretary to Government
S.M.

No 2953

1876
S.M. 6 Oct 1876

Proceedings of the Madras Govt.
Under date the 15th Oct 1876

1st Oct 1876

2nd Oct 1876

like the
Council
order that
success was
tension
any
the matter
element
to disband
ary to
prayer
the

many are coming from the
company house - All

employ
Kalavay tank of
Chingleput

had Mr Lowry been amenable to the instructions given to him, and had he taken the proper course of affording

the information
errors were
and he should
do in the
to the in
special
trouble
not it
relieved
owner

P. W. 1895 Sept.
No: 6658

From

The Chief Engr.
for Drighat.

20 2 Oct.
D. 18th 1895.

E. 8 No: 1143.

Note on Mr. Lowry's
claim for payment
to a Surveyor and his
Establishment.

14-254

G.O. No 2953-15-10-75.

Ootaca
22nd Oct

To The Secretary to Government
S.M.

No 2953

S.M. 6th Estab

Proceedings of the Madras Govt.
Under date the 15th Oct 1895

Read the following:-

From the Ch. Engr. for S. H. E. D. 1143 of 2nd Oct 1895

The Honorable the
Governor in Council
does not consider that
the circumstances war-
rant the extension
of Mr Lowry of any
indulgence in the matter
of the retrenchment
of the amount disbursed
by him contrary to
rules to the Surveyor
employed on the
Kalamoy tank of
Chingleput.

M. J. W.
S. B.

Subways for which I have
with regard to this case
I think is desirable - Mr Lowry
is in my opinion inclined
to be indiscreet. I give
no many occasions for un-
necessary trouble - All

2-. The actual value of
work done may be al-
-lowed, and the Super-
-intending Engineer will
submit a bill for this
to the Chief Engineer for
Irrigation, the rest of
the retrenchment will
stand.

W. W. May 5/10

12-25/55

* with 8 Encls

19. Chinglet - 6
Chinglet for Irrig + 5
Cento Rhaceto 5

Sept 17

8858
5215



Vol. of 1873

PUBLIC WORKS

Supg. Supg.
Chingfut
2/10/12

G. O. 15/11 1875, No. 2953

No. 254-255
257/10/11/12

Mr. R. J. Looney, Secy. Gen.

Chingfut Range. - Receiving

extended any indulgence to

in the matter of the

retrenchment of the amount

referred by him contrary

rule to the surveyor

employed on the station

of Chingfut, by

dictating that only the actual

use of work done may be