(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 20

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் ஜூலை 1991

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

PWD துறை

49

அரசாணை எண்.
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 1730 அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் : 11-6-1852 198/.

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

10 Sheet

A.H

ஆவண. கா-1—18,000—15-6-87.

11TH JUNE 1892, No. 1730 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

1730/1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Account.

READ—the following paper:—

From J. C. HANNYNGTON, Esq., Resident in Travancore and Cochin, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Trivandrum, 27th May 1892, Ref. on C. No. 296.

With reference to G.O., dated 11th December 1891, R. No. 195, I have the honour to forward copy of a letter and enclosure from the Diwan of Travancore, and request to be informed whether there is any objection to the course proposed by the Diwan.

2. The proposal now made seems to be that the Travancore Government contractor should proceed to fell and remove the timber standing at the greatest distance from the Periyár works, leaving untouched only the timber which is in the vicinity of the works to be felled and utilized by the Engineers of the project.

3. I feel pretty sure that the proposed course would lead to the misunderstandings contemplated by Colonel Pennycuick and referred to in para. 4 of Mr. Grigg's letter, embodied in G.O., dated 28th October 1891, No. 2862 W., unless the areas within which the Travancore contractor is to work are most clearly defined and marked.

4. It will be observed that Travancore cannot get a contractor to fell the timber for less than Rs. 2¾ per candy, or to fell and remove it to stated depôts at less than Rs. 4 per candy. These rates are far in excess of the rates which the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, agrees to pay (G.O., dated 3rd December 1891, No. 3241 W.,) and evidently would not pay the Travancore Government, but would result in such loss as to render it useless for them to undertake the work, and they would consequently have to abandon much timber (probably of considerable value) which would ultimately be entirely lost.

5. It would appear to me to be fair that the Travancore Government should fell all useful timber at such rates as they can get contractors to do the work, and that the Engineers should purchase at these rates such timber as they may require, or, as the Engineers seem to think that they can either fell or procure contractors to fell the timber at more moderate rates, let them do so, felling not merely the timber they themselves require, but also all timber pointed out to them by a Travancore officer, retaining for their own use what they require and handing over the remainder to Travancore at such rates as the felling may cost.

ENCLOSURES.

From the Diwan of Travancore, to the British Resident of Travancore and Cochin, dated Cape Comorin, 12th May 1892, No. 3664/124 P.

With reference to your letter No. 29, dated 8th January last, I have the honour to forward copy of one from the Conservator of Forests, No. 640 of the 23rd ultimo, reporting that he has failed to procure a contractor for felling and delivering the timber for the project works at the rates mentioned in your letter.

The Coomily depôt contractor is now engaged in felling in the vicinity of the project area and Mr. Bourdillon hopes to get him to fell at a slightly reduced rate the timber farthest from the works and remove it from time to time, leaving the timber in the vicinity of the works, or where they could be utilised by the Engineers, to be felled by those officers.

I request you will be good enough to let me know whether there is any objection to this course.

From the Conservator of Forests, to the Diwan of Travancore, dated Quilon, 23rd April 1892, No. 640.

In continuation of my letter No. 221 of 27th January last, and in answer to your No. 331—P. 32 of 23rd January, on the subject of the felling of timber on the Periyár project, I have the honour to inform you that though I have tried my utmost I cannot get any one to take up the contract to fell and deliver or merely to fell the timber at the rates mentioned by the Engineers of the project in the letter under reply.

In the petition forwarded to me by Angur Ravothen, the contractor for the Coomily depôt, a copy of which is herewith enclosed, he offers to fell the trees and cut the drag-hole for $2\frac{3}{4}$ rupees a candy, or to do this and collect them in fifties for $4\frac{1}{4}$ rupees a candy. I think I can get him to reduce the latter rate to 4 if I arrange that he should stack fewer logs together, and I think a contract may be made with him to undertake the work at these rates, leaving the trees in the vicinity of the works, or where they could be utilised by the Engineers, to be felled by them, as we cannot deliver at their rates.

If you agree with me I think it would be well to ascertain exactly from the Engineers if we can fell the timber in places where they are not likely to want it and remove it from time to time, as I have heard rumours that they do not wish us to remove any timber from the area of the lake until the project is completed.

If they impose such restrictions on us I think it would be better to make no special contract for the felling of the timber on the project area, at all events not at once. The contractor is felling in the vicinity, and will fell and remove timber from the lake area and bring it to the depôt unless prevented by the Engineers, so that it comes to very nearly the same thing, except that he will fell from the end nearest to the depôt and not from that nearest the river.

I have always maintained that the timber in the area of the project was poor both in quality and quantity, and, with high rates of felling and restrictions on our movements, I am a little afraid that we should not recover the outlay on felling operations.

No. 1004, Political.

Transferred to the Public Works Department.

4th June 1892.

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

ORDER—dated 11th June 1892, No. 1730 W., Public Works.

The conditions on which timber from the area covered by the Periyár lake may be felled and removed by the Travancore Government have already been stated in G.Os., Nos. 2862 W. of 28th October 1891, and 3241 W. of 3rd December 1891, and the Government is not prepared to consent to any modification of those conditions.

2. If the Travancore Government is not prepared to accept them, the timber must remain uncut.

3. In the face of the experience of the officers employed on the project work the Government is not prepared to admit that the rates stated in the Chief Engineer's note, recorded with G.O., No. 3241 W. of 3rd December 1891, are too low, but even if they involved a slight loss on the timber supplied to the project, this loss would be more than covered by the value of the remaining timber which will be lost entirely if the terms offered are not accepted.

4. The suggestion that the officers in charge of the project should fell timber beyond their own requirements for the benefit of the Travancore Government cannot be considered.

(True Extract.)

1730/2

Major, R.E.,
Under-Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintendent of Works, Periyár Project.
„ Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
„ Political Department.

Exd. S. J. Pereira.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of {1892} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated June, 11th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 11th June 1892, No. 1730 W.

JUNE.

Timber

Stating that the Government is not prepared to consent to any modification of the conditions already agreed to in connection with the felling and removal by the Travancore Government of — from the area covered by the Periyár lake.

No. 3664
D. 124.

Huzur Cutchery
on circuit, Cape Comorin
12th May 1892.

To

The British Resident
of Travancore and Cochin

1730/3

Sir,

With reference to your letter no. 29 dated 8th January last, I have the honor to forward copy of one from the Conservator of Forests no. 640 of the 23rd ultimo, reporting that he has failed to procure a contractor for felling and delivering the timber for the project works at the rates mentioned in your letter.

The Coonnily depot contractor is now engaged in felling in the vicinity of the Project area, and Mr. Bourdillon hopes to get him to fell at a slightly reduced rate the timber farthest from the works and remove it from time to time, leaving the timber in the vicinity of the works or where they could be utilised

by

by the Engineers to be felled by those officers.

I request you will be good enough to let me know whether there is any objection to this course.

I have &c.,
(Sd) T. Rama Row
Dewan.

No. 640.

Conservator's Office
Quilon, 23d April 1892.

To
T. Rama Row Esq. C.S.I.; F.M.U.
Dewan of Travancore

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No. 221 of 27th January last and in answer to your No. $\frac{331}{P.32}$ of 23d January on the subject of the felling of timber on the Periyar Project, I have the honor to inform you that though I have tried my utmost I cannot get any one to take up the contract to fell and deliver or merely to fell the timber at the rates mentioned by the Engineers of the Project in the letter under reply.

In the petition forwarded to me by Angur Ravothen the Contractor for the Coonilly depot; a copy of which is herewith enclosed, he offers to fell the trees and cut the draghole for 2¾ Rupees a candy, or to do this and collect them in fifties for 4¼ Rupees a candy. I think I can get him to reduce the latter rate to 4 if I arrange that he should stack [illegible] logs together, and I think a contract may be made with him to undertake the work at these rates, leaving the trees in the vicinity of the works, or where they could be utilised by the Engineers, to be felled by them, as we cannot deliver at their rates.

1230/4

If you agree with me I think it would be well to ascertain exactly from the Engineers if we can fell the timber in places where they are not likely to want it and remove it from time to time, as I have heard rumours that they do not wish us us to remove any timber from the area of the lake until the Project is completed.

If they impose such restrictions on us I think it would be better to make no special contract for the felling of the timber on the Project area, at all events not at once. The contractor is felling in the vicinity, and will fell and remove timber from the lake-area and bring it to the depot unless prevented by the Engineers, so that it comes to very nearly the same thing, except that he will fell from the end nearest to the depot and not from that nearest the river.

I have always maintained that the timber in the area of the Project was poor both in quality and quantity, and with high rates of felling and restrictions on our movements I am a little afraid that we should not recover the outlay on felling operations.

I have &c
(Sd) T. F. Bourdillon
Conservator of Forests.

(True copies)

(True copy)
(Sd) T. Rama Rao
Dewan

Resident.

Ref on C. No. 296 of 1892

Resident's Office,
Trevandrum 27th May 1892.

From

J. C. Hannyngton Esquire
Resident in Travancore and Cochin,

To

The Honorable J. F. Price
Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort St. George

Sir,

1270/4 11th

With reference to Government order dated 11th December 1891 R No. 195; I have the honor to forward copy of a letter and enclosure from the Dewan of Travancore, and request to be informed whether there is any objection to the course proposed by the Dewan.

2. The proposal now made seems to be that the Travancore Government Contractor should proceed to fell and remove the timber standing at the greatest distance from the Periyar Works,

leaving

leaving untouched only the timber which is in the vicinity of the Works, to be felled and utilized by the Engineers of the Project.

3- I feel pretty sure that the proposed course would lead to the misunderstandings contemplated by Col Pennycuick and referred to in para 4 of Mr. Grigg's letter embodied in Government Order 28th October 1891 No. 2862 W, unless the areas within which the Travancore contractor is to work are most clearly defined and marked.

4- It will be observed that Travancore cannot get a Contractor to fell the timber for less than 2 3/4 Rs per candy, or to fell and remove it to stated Depôts at less than Rs 4 per candy. These rates are far in excess of the rates which the Secretary to Government P W D agrees to pay (G.O. 3rd December 1891 No. 3241 W) and evidently would not pay the Travancore Government, but would result in such loss as to render it useless for them to undertake the work, and they would consequently have to abandon much timber (probably of considerable value) which would ultimately be entirely lost.

5- It would appear to me to be fair that the Travancore Government should fell all useful timber at such rates as they can get contractors to do the work, and that the Engineers should purchase at these rates such timber as they may require, or, as the Engineers seem

seem to think that they can either fell or procure contractors to fell the timber at more moderate rates, let them do so; felling not merely the timber they themselves require, but also all timber pointed out to them by a Travancore Officer, retaining for their own use what they require, and handing over the remainder to Travancore at such rates as the felling may cost.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obed^t servant

Resident

BW

1730/7

~~CURRENT No.~~ 704

P. W. CURRENT 1892. No. 5953

~~Political Department.~~

From

The Resident in Travancore & Cochin.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort St. George.

Dated 27 - May

Received 31st a

Ref. on C. No. 296

Enclosure. one.

Recd: 8. VI. 92

31 MAY 92

Felling and delivering of Timber for the Periyar Project Works -

27 - 4 . 83 - 3569
4 . 7 . 84 - 6259
1 . 12 . 85 . 2867 W
28 . 10 . 91 - 2862 W
3 . 12 . 91 - 3241 W

Endorsed

P. C. 669, d 10/11/91 ms
R 195. d 11/12/91
Lofd C. No. 1338, d 18/11/91

d 7th June 1892
No 1006
Transferred to the P. W. Department

Chief Secy

A.S.
2/6

Note for Hon: Member

123/8

The Travancore people are about as unreasonable as they can be. We have met them in every possible way, and each concession on our part has been met by some fresh demand on theirs.

They are now haggling over a (purely imaginary) trifling loss on the quantity of timber, quite insignificant as compared with the total quantity growing within the area of the lake, which we should buy from them forgetting that they get from us a free gift of all the remainder.

Please see especially para 5 of my note of the 1st December 1891, the last paper but one in the file.

L

9.6

W

1730 W

H.W. 9.VI
R 11/6

No. 1730 W d/ 11 June 1892

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Letter from the Resident in Travancore & Cochin (R.E. No. 296 d/ 27.V.92)

Endt. in the Pol: deptt. (" " 1004 d/ 4.VI.92)

1730/9

H.L.S
10 June

The conditions on which timber from the area covered by the Periyar Lake may be felled and removed by the Travancore Govt. have already been stated in G.O.s No. 2862 W of 28th October 1891 and 3241 W of 3rd December 1891, and the Government is not prepared to consent to any modification of those conditions.

2. If the Travancore Government is not prepared to accept them the timber must remain uncut.

3. In the face of the experience of the officers employed on the Project work

Hm

the Government is not prepared to admit that the rates stated in the Chief Engineer's note — recorded with G.O. No. 3241 W of 3rd December 1891 are too low; but even if they involved a slight loss on the timber supplied to the Project this loss would be more than covered by the value of the remaining timber, which will be lost entirely if the terms offered are not accepted.

4. The suggestion that the officers in charge of the Project should fell timber beyond their own requirements, for the benefit of the Travancore Government, cannot be considered. —

D.
9.6

The Supdt of Wks. P. P.
" C. E. for I.
" Poll: dept

1730
10

Cbco 5953

Govt. of 1892 Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 11th June 1892 No. 1730-W

Timber

Stating that the Govt is not prepared to consent to any modification of the conditions already agreed to in connection with the felling & removal by the Travancore Govt of —— from the area covered by the Periyar Lake.

(10)

(10)

12/4

2d n/6