

(1) Number of pages. 248

(2) Date of repair. _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer. _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1249	(W)	Press ~~Mis.~~
Dated	10-4-	1877.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following papers:—

No. 280. From J. O'SHAUGHNESSY, Esq., District Engineer, Nellore, to the Acting Joint Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, Buildings and Roads Branch, dated Nellore, 24th March 1877, No. 212.

IN reference to your letter No. 778, dated 21st March 1877, I have the honor to enclose copy of communication addressed by me to Messrs. Chockalingum Pillay and Co. When I receive a reply to that communication, I shall forward the bill referred to without any delay; in the mean time there is no objection that I know of to paying the Contractors Rupees 75,000 in part of their bill.

From the District Engineer, Nellore, to the Executive Officer, Kottapatam Division, dated 21st March 1877, No. 2,350.

IN reference to G.O., dated 19th December 1876, No. 3,485, I have the honor to request such information as you are able to give on the following points connected with Messrs. Chockalingum Pillay and Co.'s contract.

- I.—Was the rice taken over in the first instance by the Revenue Department as directed in the Government Order under reference?
- II.—Were samples of the rice tendered forwarded for comparison with the rice delivered, and was such a comparison made, if so by whom?
- III.—On what date was the rice delivered at Kottapatam and at Pakala?
- IV.—Why was 8,400 bags delivered at Kottapatam, when only 4,200 bags were contracted for at that port?
- V.—By whose request and on what authority did you take charge of the rice?
- VI.—At whose cost was the rice landed and stored?
- VII.—What reason, if any, have the Contractors given for not delivering rice at Kanuparthi according to their agreement?
- VIII.—Have they delivered rice at Ramapatam according to agreement and to whom?

(Signed) J. O'SHAUGHNESSY,
District Engineer, Nellore.

FORWARDED to Messrs. Chockalingum Pillay and Co., with a request that they will favor the undersigned with detailed information on the several points mentioned.

NELLORE,
21st March 1877. (Signed) J. O'SHAUGHNESSY,
District Engineer, Nellore.

No. 280-A. From J. O'SHAUGHNESSY, Esq., District Engineer, Nellore, to the Acting Joint Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, Buildings and Roads Branch, dated Nellore, 4th April 1877, No. 28.

IN continuation of my letter No. 212, dated 24th March 1877, I have the honor to forward Messrs. Chockalingum Pillay and Co.'s reply to the communication I made to them on the subject of their contract for the supply of rice to the Coast Canal.

I beg to forward copy of Lieutenant Rawson's reply to a similar communication to him on the same subject.

I am not quite satisfied that the terms of the contract have been sufficiently fulfilled to enable me to countersign the bills.

I do not think it was optional to the Contractors to deliver 8,400 bags of rice at Kottapatam or at Kanuparthi; I read this part of the agreement as giving the Contractors the option of delivering the first cargo of 4,200 bags either at Kottapatam or Kanuparthi, and the second cargo of 4,200 bags at either of those places at which the first cargo was not delivered.

I am also of opinion that the terms of the contract in regard to the examination of the rice have not been fulfilled. This may not be the fault of the Contractors, but their statement that the rice was compared with the sample, &c., is so far as the 4,200 bags delivered at Pakala is concerned apparently incorrect.

I have addressed the Collector on the subject,* but I have not received his reply yet. In order to save delay I now send all the information I possess regarding it, and if you think I may in the face of Lieutenant Rawson's report sign the bills I shall do so, immediately I hear from you to that effect.

I would observe in regard to the rice at Ramapatam that the 15 Rupees Gumastah who is styled Sea Customs Superintendent of that Port is not, in my opinion, sufficiently intelligent to decide a matter involving a sum of between 30,000 and 40,000 Rupees. The Customs Superintendent at Kottapatam is a man of higher standing and position, but I doubt if it was the intention of Government to leave the passing of bills for such large amounts to either of those officers.

From the Officer in charge, Kottapatam Division, to the District Engineer, Nellore, dated 25th March 1877, No. 37.

With reference to your No. 2,350, dated 21st instant, I have the honor to give the following replies to the questions in it:—

I.—The rice landed at Kottapatam was in the first instance taken in charge by the Sea Customs Superintendent. At Pakala the rice was landed on the beach by the Contractor, who wrote to me saying that no one would receive charge of it; I therefore ordered the Sub-Divisional Officer to take charge of it himself directly from the Contractor.

II.—Samples of the rice tendered were compared with the rice delivered by the Sea Customs Superintendent at Kottapatam, and was found to be satisfactory. The rice at Pakala was, I believe, not compared with the samples.

III.—The rice was taken over from the Sea Customs Superintendent at Kottapatam on the 13th February. At Pakala from the Contractor on the 14th February.

IV.—According to the written contract signed by General Walker, shown to me by the Contractor, it appeared that the rice could be delivered at either Kottapatam or Kanuparthi.

V.—The Sub-Collector had requested me to take over all Government rice for the Canal works before this particular rice arrived.

The rice at Pakala was taken over by me at the request of the Contractor, as he stated that no one else would do so.

VI.—The rice was landed on the beach at the Contractor's cost. We paid for storing it in the godowns.

VII.—The contract does not appear to specify that rice must be landed at Kanuparthi.

VIII.—I do not know anything about the rice at Ramapatam beyond the fact that the rice intended for that place was brought to Kottapatam at the same time that the rice for Kottapatam came here.

(Signed) C. C. RAWSON, Lieut., R.E.,
Officer in charge, Kottapatam Division.

From R. P. CHOCKALINGUM PILLAY and Co., to J. O'SHAUGHNESSY, Esq., District Engineer, Nellore, dated Madras, 26th March 1877.

We have the honor to acknowledge memorandum No. 349, dated 21st March 1877, forwarding true copy of your letter No. 2,350, dated 21st March 1877, to the address of the officer in charge of Kottapatam Range, containing certain queries to be replied by that officer in connection with our contract for the supply of rice for the ports at Nellore. Reference of the queries having been made to us we beg respectfully to state—

I.—The Sea Customs Superintendent took charge of the rice from us and gave us a receipt for its correct delivery, which receipt the Range Officer took charge of.

II.—Samples of rice were tendered for comparison with the rice delivered. The comparison was made, and made by the Sea Customs Superintendent, the Village Munsiff, and two Native merchants appointed by the Revenue authorities.

III.—At Kottapatam on January 30th, 1877.

At Pakala on February 9th, 1877.

IV.—Eight thousand and four hundred bags were delivered at Kottapatam, in accordance with the instructions of Government, viz., "delivery of the first and second cargoes of 4,200 bags each, to be made either at Kanuparthi or Kottapatam."

V.—To be replied by the Range Officer.

VI.—The cost of only landing the rice on the beach was incurred by us.

VII.—Please refer to reply No. IV above.

VIII.—The rice for Ramapatam was ready for delivery at that port on the 9th instant, but as far as we are aware it has not yet been taken charge of by the Sea Customs Superintendent; notice was duly given to this officer of the rice being ready for delivery, but he was prevented through indisposition from taking charge.

We trust that the explanation submitted above will be found satisfactory, and that you will be pleased to see to the early disposal of our bill, as the delay is causing us much loss by way of interest on the amount.

No. 281. ORDER THEREON, 10th April 1877, No. 1,249.

ACCOUNT, No. 9.

THE Government consider that if the District Engineer is satisfied that rice of the quantity and quality contracted for

has been delivered at the different places in the Nellore District, he should furnish the Contractor with the necessary receipts as early as possible.

2. It is observed that the Contractor was not bound by the contract to deliver the second cargo of 4,200 bags at Kanuparthi, he having delivered the first cargo at Kottapatam, and that he reported that 8,400 bags had been delivered by him at the last named place.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,

Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the District Engineer, Nellore.
" Revenue Department.

Exd. E. C. Shunker.
Spare Copies

No 212

En. 1

FROM

To

NELLORE,

District Engineer's Office,

24th March 1877

THE DISTRICT ENGINEER OF NELLORE,

The Chief Engineer
Roads and Buildings
Fort St. George

In reference to your letter
No 778 dated 21st March 1877 I
have the honor to enclose copy of
communication addressed by me
to Messrs. Chottalingum Pillay & Co
When I receive a reply to that
communication — I shall
forward the bill referred to
without any delay, in the meantime
there is no objection that I know
of to paying the contractors Rs 75000
in part of their Bill.

I have the honor to be
Your most obedient servant

Whispering
District Engineer

H. H. 46

M. O'Shaughnessy,
in his letter of the
26th March suggests
that the Contractor
should be paid 7000
super. Has this
suggestion acted on
or not?

Roads and Buildings
P.V.D.
27 MAR 77
From No. 3254

The District Engineer
Kellone
D, The Chief Engineer
Roads and Buildings

14/3/77
The slip within d/s/s dated 26 3 March 1877
explains why no action is
Red

The bill when received
will be transferred
to the Financial
Dept. for adjustment.

No 212
Enclosure one

Messrs. Shookalingum Pillay
and Co.

States that he will return
the bill of — when he
receives certain information
in the meantime recommends
that Rs 75,000 may be
paid.

By Mr. J. J. O'Shaughnessy
27/3
By Mr. J. J. O'Shaughnessy
28/3

Copy of letter No 2350 dated 21st March 1877
from the District Engineer Kellone to the
Executive Officer Kottapalam Division

In reference to G.O dated 19th December
1876. No 3485 I have the honor to request
such information as you are able to
give on the following points connected
with Messrs. Shookalingum Pillay & Co's Contract
1st Was the rice taken over in the
first instance by the Revenue Depart-
ment as directed in the G.O under
reference?

2nd Were samples of the rice tendered
forwarded for comparison with the
rice delivered and was such a
comparison made if so by whom?

3 On what date was the rice
delivered at Kottapalam and at
Pakkala?

4 Why was 8,400 bags delivered
at Kottapalam when only 4,200
bags were contracted for that Port?

5. By whose request and on what authority did you take charge of the rice?

P.W.D.

27/3/77

NA 3254

6 At whose cost was the rice landed and stored?

7 If that reason if any, have the contractors given for not delivering rice at Kottapatam according to their agreement?

8 Have they delivered rice at Kottapatam according to agreement and to whom?

Signature of J. B. Hughes
District Engineer

Forwarded to Mr. J. B. Hughes with a request that he will favor the undersigned with detailed information on the several points mentioned.

District Engineer's Office
Vellore
21st March 1877
District Engineer

Copy of the letter No. 37 dated 25th March 1877 from the Officer in Charge Kottapatam to the District Engineer, Vellore

Sir

With reference to your No. 2350 dated 21st Instant I have the honor to forward the following replies to the questions in it.

1st The rice landed at Kottapatam was in the 1st instance taken in charge by the Sea Customs Superintendent. At Pakala the rice was landed on the beach by the Contractor, who wrote to me saying that no one would receive charge of it, I therefore ordered the Sub Divisional Officer to take charge of it himself directly from the Contractor.

(Question No. 2 answered over leaf)

3 The rice was taken over from the Sea Customs Superintendent at Kottapatam on the 13th February. At Pakala from the Contractor on the 14 February.

4 According to the written contract signed by General Walker, shown to me by the Contractor, it appeared that

True copy of Mr. Hughes's letter
24-3-77

the rice could be delivered at either

Kottapatam or Kannurparthy. -

2 Samples of the rice tendered were compared with the rice delivered by the Sea Customs Superintendent at Kottapatam and was found to be satisfactory.

The rice at Pakala was ~~at~~ believe not compared with the samples. -

3 The sub collector had requested me to take over all Government rice for the canal works before this particular rice arrived.

The rice at Pakala was taken over by me at the request of the Contractor as he stated that no one else would do so. -

6 The rice was landed on the beach at the Contractor's cost. We paid for storing it in the Godowns.

7 The contract does not appear to specify that rice must be landed at Kannurparthy.

8 I do not know any thing about the rice at Ramapatam beyond the fact that the rice intended for that place was brought to Kottapatam

at the same time that the rice for Kottapatam came here.

Shaniva

Thos. J. Rawson
Officer in Charge Kottapatam

(True copy)

M. K. Srinivasan
District Engineer.

S.D. 134 /
Madras 26 March 1877

To
The District Engineer
Nellore

Sir
We have the honor to acknowledge
your letter No. 349 dated 21st March 1877
forwarding true copy of your letter No. 2850
dated 21st March 1877 to the address of
the officer in charge of Pottapattam Range
containing certain queries to be replied
by that officer in connection with our
contract for the supply of Rice for the
District at Nellore. Reference of the
queries having been made to us we
beg respectfully to state.

1 The Sea Customs Superintendent
took charge of the rice from us and gave
us a receipt for its correct delivery, which
receipt the Range Officer took charge of.

2 Samples of rice were tendered for
comparison with the rice delivered.

the comparison was made, and made
by the Sea Customs Superintendent,
the village Muneiff and two native
merchants appointed by the Revenue
authorities.

3. At Kottapattam on January 30th 1877

At Pakala on February 9th 1877

4. 8400 bags were delivered at Kottapattam
in accordance with the instructions of Government
viz. "Delivery of the 1st & 2nd cargoes of 4200
bags each, to be made either at
"Lamparthy or Kottapattam".

5. To be replied by the Range Officer.

6. The cost of only landing the rice on the
beach was incurred by us.

7. Please refer to reply No. 4 above.

8. The Rice for Rannapattam was
ready for delivery at that port on the
9th Instant, but as far as we are aware
it has not yet been taken charge of by
the Sea Customs Superintendent, notice
was duly given to this Officer of the rice
being ready for delivery, but he was
prevented through indisposition from

15th 8
Taking Charge

We trust that the explanation
submitted above will be found
satisfactory & that you will be pleased
to see the early disposal of our Bill as the
delay is causing us much loss by way
of interest on the amount.

We are &c

(Signed) M. Chockalingum Pillay &c
(True Copy)

W. H. M. S. S. S.
District Engineer

No 28
N

17th 3
District Engineer's Office
Nellore
4 April 1877

From
The District Engineer
Nellore

To
The Chief Engineer
Roads and Buildings
Fort St. George

Sir

In continuation of my letter No. 212
dated 24th March I have the honor to forward.

Messrs Chocalingum Pillay & Co's reply to
the communication I made to them
on the subject of their contract for the
supply of rice to the Coast Canal.

I beg to forward copy of Lieutenant
Rawson's reply to a similar communication
to him on the same subject.

I am not quite satisfied that the
terms of the contract have been sufficiently
fulfilled to enable me to countersign the
bills

4000: April 7) No. 280

I do not think it was optional to the contractors to deliver 8400 bags of rice at Kottapattam or at Stamparthi, I read this part of the agreement as giving the contractors the option of delivering the first cargo of 4200 bags either at Kottapattam or Stamparthi, and the second cargo of 4200 bags at either of those places at which the first cargo was not delivered...

I am also of opinion that the terms of the contract in regard to the examination of the rice have not been fulfilled. This may not be the fault of the contractors but their statement that the rice was compared with the sample &c., is so far as the 4200 bags delivered at Pakala is concerned, apparently incorrect.

I have addressed the collector on the subject, but I have not received his reply yet. In order to save delay I now send all the information I possess regarding it and if you ^{think} may in the face of Lieutenant Rawson's report sign the bills I shall do so,

+ with Chief Secy
memo. No 101
dated 16 January 1877

immediately I hear from you to that effect.

I would observe in regard to the rice at Ramapattam that the 15 Papes Gumastah who is styled Sea Customs Superintendent of that Port is not in my opinion sufficiently intelligent to decide a matter involving a sum of between 30 and 40 thousand Rupees.

The Customs Superintendent at Kottapattam is a ^{man} ~~man~~ of higher standing and position but I doubt if it was the intention of Government to leave the passing of bills for such large amounts to either of those officers.

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant

W. H. M. S. S.
District Engineer

Q. 19-12-76 No 3485
 - 26 - 3541
 Memo 27 - 1960
 No 6-1 77 58 hms
 Memo 9 - 56
 - 16 - 1017102
 No. 18 - 203 hms
 - 3-2 - 50
 Memo 2-3 - 541
 - 21-3 - 778

Roads & Buildings
 From

The District Engineer
 Nellore
 To
 The Chief Engineer
 Roads & Buildings
 Madras

No 28

Dated 4th April 1877
 Recd

Enc 2

Messrs Chockalingam
 Pillay and Co. Bilt.

Submits his remarks on
 the bill for rice supplied
 to Const Canal by —

4000 in April 77, 18780 A

When due 17-1

No 1249 Public Works Department
 PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 10 April 77
 Read the following:

Letter from the D^y Eng^r Nellore.

(H.E. No 212 of 24 March 77)
 (H.E. No 28 dated 4th April 1877).

The Government con-
 sider that if the District En-
 gineer is satisfied that the
 quantity and quality contract-
 ed for has been delivered at
 the different places in the Nel-
 lore District, he should fur-
 nish the contractor with the
 necessary receipts as early
 as possible.

2. It is observed that the
 contractor was not bound
 by the contract to deliver the
 second cargo of 4200 bags
 at Namparty having
 delivered.

ML 10/4
 10/4

738

he delivered the first cargo at 7
Kottapattam; and that ^{he} ~~the~~
~~contractor~~ reported that 8400
bags had been delivered by
him at the last named
place.

ELT
10/4/77

Dr. Ego. Kellone ✓
Rea Dept.

M. S. Copy recd 10-4-77.

103603
3254

Govt. of 1877
PUBLIC WORKS.

To *Mr. N. E. Bellare*
Dated *12-4*

Issued
Recd. *12/4/77*
Encl.
G. O. 10th April 1877 No. 1249
Nos. 280
281 *Station up*

*Rice supplied to East Coast
Canal - The Deputy Collector
instructed to furnish Messrs
Chookalingam Pillay & Co
with the necessary receipts
as early as possible for -*

J. V. M. M.

Sh. S. M. M.