

(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.	547	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	25 - 2 -	CR 75 - 195 -

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
25th February 1875.*

No 623 Read the following endorsement of the Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 1st February 1875, No 74 —

From W. S. BETTS, Esq, Agent of the South Indian Railway, to Lieutenant-Colonel J H M SHAW-STEWART, R E, Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Negapatam, 29th January 1875, No 380

The Chief Engineer informs me he would have been glad to drop the subject alluded to in your letter No 18, of the 9th instant, had not Colonel Moberly affirmed that Mr Fox's statements were "utterly incorrect" In justice to the latter gentleman, however, his explanation (see copy of letter attached) should be recorded

From A D FOX, Esq, Assistant Engineer, South Indian Railway, to D Logan, Esq, Chief Engineer of the South Indian Railway, dated Madras, 18th January 1875

I HAVE the pleasure to acknowledge receipt of your No 394, of the 13th January, forwarding G Os, Nos 3,248 and 3,562, which I return after perusal

2 I observe that Colonel Moberly, in paragraph 1 of his letter, No 379, of the 25th November, to the address of Colonel Walker, R E, Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, remarks that my statement regarding his opposition to the survey for the salt siding from Holmes' Gardens Depot to the Sydapett Station is utterly incorrect, and in the succeeding paragraphs gives a version of what took place, which, I regret to say, appears to me to place the affairs in a false light

3 In paragraph 2 of the above letter, Colonel Moberly alludes to having been informed by the landowner's servants that I and my Assistant had been warned not to trespass on the property I can only say that no servant ever made the slightest objection to our coming on the ground until after the interview between Colonel Moberly and myself, alluded to in paragraph 4 of his letter On the contrary, the servants appeared to have no objection, and when my Engineering Assistant unwisely, I admit, and entirely contrary to my wishes, thought it necessary to cut down certain trees which impeded his progress, the servants consented to his doing so provided that a receipt was given for each tree so cut

4 The first intimation I received of any opposition being made to the survey was from my Engineering Assistant, who brought me a message from Colonel Moberly to the effect that if I, my Assistant, or any of my men, entered the premises again he would have us prosecuted As it appeared to me that Colonel Moberly had no right to interfere when those in charge of the land appeared willing for us to continue the work, I ordered the survey to be completed, and on finding from a letter that Colonel Moberly had written to Colonel Shaw-Stewart that he objected to have the line pass his out-buildings at the distance set out by me, I entered the premises with the intention of running a line at a distance of about 100 or 150 feet parallel to the one already ranged and along which the levels had been taken Whilst there the servants of the landowner and those repairing the house never made the slightest objection to our being on the ground, and it was not until after Colonel Moberly's arrival, late in the afternoon, that I received an intimation through Colonel Moberly from a native, who was said to be the brother of the landlord, who accompanied him from the house, that he objected to our being on the ground As Colonel Moberly remarks in paragraph 5 of his letter, I ordered the staves to be removed and left the ground after representing to him that it was my wish to complete the survey, to which I received a reply to the effect that I had been warned to leave and that I should be prosecuted by the landowner if I did not

5 In paragraph 9 Colonel Moberly states that I said that I would not have treated an Englishman in the same way as I did the native landowner This is incorrect, what I did say was that railways in England were often made through property, the owners of which strongly objected to the formation of the railway through land belonging to them, but that in England the trees, which I had already explained to Colonel Moberly had been cut by my Engineering Assistant, entirely contrary to my wishes, would not have been touched

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
25th February 1875.

6 In the latter part of paragraph 10, Colonel Moberly states that he attempted to save me from the effects of the trespass I am surprised at this statement, as Colonel Moberly gave me to understand that he hoped the landowner would bring the case into Court, but was afraid that he would not do so as his land did not lie within the jurisdiction of the High Court, and that it would be a troublesome matter for the man to proceed from Madras to, I think he said, Chingleput for the purpose of bringing an action either against me or the Company

7. You will gather two things from what I have above written Firstly, that neither the owner of the land nor any of his servants made the slightest opposition to my making a survey through the property until after Colonel Moberly appeared on the ground, and, secondly, that as no such opposition was made by any one connected with the property until after his appearance and when made that it was through Colonel Moberly, that I was correct in stating that I was unable to complete the survey owing to opposition from Colonel Moberly, who threatened prosecution on the part of his future landlord

SUBMITTED for the consideration of Government with reference to their Order, dated 18th December 1874, No 3,562

(Signed) J. H. M. SHAW-STEWART, Lieut.-Colonel, R.E.,
Consulting Engineer for Railways

No 624

ORDER THEREON, 25th February 1875, No 547.

RAILWAY, No 87

ORDERED to be recorded

(True Extract)

Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Consulting Engineer for Railways

Exd S T Austin
Spare Copies

For orders.

Read the following.

From
The Consulting Engineer
for Railways

(N.E. No 74 d/1st February 1875)

Subject

Submitting for consideration
remarks of Mr. J. W. Engineer
South India Railway, in
connection with Col. Moberly's
letter recorded with G.O. No 3,562
18th December 1874.

Circulated

for orders.

C. M. Mather (Col. R.E.)
Secretary to Govt.
P. W. Dept.

I have always taken a
strong view of Col. M's con-
duct - but under the
circumstances I
do not deem it right
to bring personal dis-
cussion

72

No. 74

SUBMITTED for the consideration of Government with

reference to their Order dated 18 December
1874 No 3562

Mantuaud

CONSULTING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
Madras, 1 February 1875.

J. H. R. E.
Consig Engineer for Railways.

Supd

To

The Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department,
Fort Saint George.

P. W. 1875 Sept.
RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

Pro-off for 1874 Feb

No. 731

From
The Consulting Engineer
for Railways,

To
The Secretary to Government,
P. W. Department,
Fort St. George

Dated *1st* } *Feb* 1875
Received *3* }

E. 2 ✓ No. *74*.

*Submitting for
the consideration of
Govt a further letter
from the Agent S.Ry
with regard to the
opposition made by
Col Proberly in the sur-
vey of the Rail Road
Nile Order*

Order to be recorded - 1875

Amn

C. 4-275 D. 9 - July 175

Eng for Ry
Dec 1875

✓
3-11-26 3/11

73/
Govt. of Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

To The Engineer-in-Chief

Date

Recd

For

25 Feb 1875 No 547

Nos. 623-624.

Colonel F. L. Moberly. Esq.

Letter submitted by the
Comd'g Supt for P.W. from
the Agent for the Indian
P.W. regarding further to the
opposition made by Col
Moberly in the Survey of
the salt siding at
Lydepott, records of -