7649, 4803

Public Works (189) Department.

G.O., No. 3200 W.

DATED 9. Nov. 1896.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Mr. W. C. Lewis, Executive Engineer; Passing orders on explanation from — in regard to certain charges brought against him by the Supdg: Engineer IV Circle.

T.C. 10/11

[P.W. 26.
3,000—23-10-96.]

INDEXED.

10/12

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Public Works (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 9449

R.35–II

Order

From Major W. L. C. Baddeley R.E.
Supg Engr. II Circle

No. 1894 KW

Dated 13 October 1896

Received 16–10–96
Regd: 20.10.96

Enclosures 531

Spare copies 1193D

SUBJECT.

Mr. W. C. Lewis Ex. Engr.
Forwarding explanation from – reg charges brought against him in connection with certain works in Coimbatore Dn.

To SAW–
The letter is intended for W–

BR
W.S.
[illegible]

BR
26-10-96

17/10

papers

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
G.O.	290 W	P. W.	24-1-96 ✓
"	181 D	"	16-5-96 ✓
"	364 D	"	6-6-96 ✓
"	1214 D	"	4-9-96 ✓

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

No 287 S

To
Col D. McNeil Camp. R.E
Chief Engineer I. D.

From W. C Lewis Esq
Executive Engineer

Dated Guntur Oct 8 1896

Through Suptg Engineer II Circle

Sir,

With reference to your No 1214 D of September 4. 1896, I have the honor, to submit what further information I can gather on the subject:

a I have enquired for any revised Estimates or Completion Reports for the two sluices and enclose the papers received from, which it will be seen that no revised Estimate was ever prepared but it will appear from perusal of the papers, within that the excesses were entirely due to the change of site. The change was made by Major Smart. I verbally opposed the change but as he insisted I gave way. Mr Hannan's remarks about his usually failing to confirm verbal orders are beside the point as the change was authorized in the most explicit way as Mr Hannan himself admits by a sanctioned revised site plan.

4 Inclosures.

As regards delay it was due to the impossibility, completely ringbunding as these two channels the wo^d ever closed being 3 crop channels and any attempt to do so would have caused great loss to the ryots. They were consequently entirely at the mercy of the Cauvery floods.

As regards want of personal supervision I can only repeat that I did not consider it advisable to leave the Kallan bridge foundation works to inspect two paltry works which might have been presumed to be within the competency of the Sub Divisional officer. I may have been wrong but even now I cannot think so seeing what trouble might have resulted at Kallan by my absence.

b As regards the Talliar. Chinnar road, I beg to point out that the papers were sent on by Mr Hannan on January 9th with an order to report on the condition of the road in Travancore Territory

I wrote to the Supdg Engineer and to the L. F. Engineer to ask details about the road as there was absolutely nothing to shew where it ran and could get no information from either. I finally sent a sheet of the Atlas of India to the President Kannan Devar Planter Association and he returned it shewing roughly the direction of the road, just as I received Mr Hannan's reminder. Mr Hannan says I ought to have inspected the road during that interval less than 2 months.

I beg to submit that I did not shirk the job in the least. When I got the order I looked forward to a pleasant march through the Travancore hills and was disappointed at not getting information to permit me to start. I did not consider it would be a reasonable proceeding to start on a tour of uncertain distance (I think it would have taken 3 weeks steady marching) in the middle of the busy season especially as I was compelled to attend the District Munsiff's Court at Karur on January 23rd to defend the Karur Channel case on behalf of Government.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient
Servant
W Lewis
Executive Engineer

8/10

1751 KW
95
P.W.D.
SECOND CIRCLE

To

Col. D. McNeil Campbell
R.E.
Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

From

W. C. Lewis Esquire
Executive Engineer

Dated 8th October 1896

Through Superintending Engineer
Second Circle

No. 2878.

Enclosures. 5

1 File as per letr from chief Engr
See within 4 (1 Comp. Report
2 Comp. Statements
1 letter No $\frac{3203}{24-9-96}$ from S.E. C. Dn

Subject.
Submitting explanation in connection with points asked by Chief Engineer about certain works in Coimbatore Division

No. 1894 KW
13.10.96

Encl 5

Forwarded

McBaddeley
Major R.E.
Supdtg Engineer
II Circle

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION.
15 OCT 96
No. 35-II

No. 179 C.S.

Superintending Engineer's office 4th
28th March 1895

SUPG. ENGR'S OFFICE
No. 7/1145
8 SEP 96
P.W.D.
SECOND CIRCLE

From

J. Hannan Esq
Superintending Engineer
4th Circle

To

The Executive Engineer
Coimbatore Division

Sir,

On my recent inspection of the Vangal and Naruv Head sluices the Overseer Mr. Ramachandra Sastri informed me that on his taking charge of these works he brought to your notice that there their was an excess over Estimate on each of these works of about Rs 1,000 and that he did not find that the work done represented anything like the expenditure incurred on them and that owing to the initial accounts and measurements being in such confusion he was unable to show how the excess expenditure had been incurred. These excesses should have been known to you when the work was stopped last June and if what the overseer informs me is correct that the

Estimates

-timates would be considerably exceeded should have been apparent even at the end of the previous working season. Assuming the Overseer's statements to be correct it seems extraordinary that you should have disregarded Code rules to such an extent as not even up to date to have submitted revised Estimates. You are now proceeding on leave and it is very desirable that before you give over charge you should clear up the accounts of those works of which you have been in execution charge since their inception and submit revised Estimates for same work and explanations for the great excesses over Estimates. That there were frequent changes of Sub-Division officers, that one of them was inexperienced and perhaps another rather incompetent was a reason why you should pay more rather than less personal attention to the works, especially as they were so readily accessible by Railway.

2. The sites of both sluices have been altered most unnecessarily, involving an additional expenditure of Rs 500 on each Sluice in the shape of revetments.

3. I observe you have sanctioned separa Estimates for these revetments. This is irregular. The Estimates are cancelled and the cost of the revetments must be included in the revised Estimates for the Sluices. Assuming that work remaining to be done in this working season will be done at the Estimate rates or only a little over. (The Overseer informs me that he considers the Estimate rates were sufficient) this will make an excess on each sluice of about Rs 1,500/— Unnecessary expenditure of probably Rs 500 or Rs 600 has been incurred in digging a diversion channel at Vangal sluice in the wrong place.

4. Both myself and the Chief Engineer for Irrigation have animadverted more than once on the extraordinary slow progress made with these works.

I have &c &c

(Signed) J. Hannan
Supg Engineer 4th Circle

(True copy)

J C [illegible]
Supg. Engineer 4 Circle
20/5/90

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION.
10 OCT. 96
No.

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 7/1457
8 SEP. 96
P. W. D.
SECOND CIRCLE.

Letter No 179 C. I dated 28th March 1895
from the Superintending Engineer 4th Circle
to the Executive Engineer Coimbatore Division

—

Copy to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for information. It seems unlikely that the Executive Engineer will be able to clear up the accounts of these works before being relieved.

(Signed) J. Hannan
Superintending Engr.
4th Circle
23/3

(True Copy)

J C Darcie
Supg Engineer, 4 Circle.
20/5

Oct 3
9 Oct 96

SUPDG. ENGR'S OFFICE
No. 4/145
-SEP. 96
P.W.D.
SECOND CIRCLE

Endorsement by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation No. 23-I.W. dated 2nd April 1895 to the address of the Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

"Forwarded to the Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

"It is presumed Mr. de Winton will thoroughly "satisfy himself as to the state of affairs in the "Coimbatore division before he takes charge, "until which time, it is thought, that Mr. "Lewis' departure on furlough should be "deferred."

(Signed) - A. W. Drake-Brockman
Colonel R.E.
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

No. 45 I.W.

True copy forwarded to the Chief Engineer, Buildings, Roads and General Branch, P.W.D., with reference to his memorandum No. 181-D dated 16th May 1896.

Wilson
for Chief Engineer for Irrig.

Chepauk
23rd May 1896.

Ree 23/5

1896

P. W. CURRENT No. ~~4803~~ 5-4

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION
No.........

9245/96

Recd: 27.5.96

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

No 45 Ew

Dated 23d May/96

Despatched 23 -do-

Subject

Construction of Kerur and Vangal sluices - Copy of E.I's endorsement No 23 Ew d/ 2.4.95 regarding certain irregularities in connection with the —

Forwarded as requested.

W.
Forwarded
Copd 23.5.96

ok 130

DW

5/1457/EW
6 SEP 95
SECOND CIRCLE P.W.D.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

From the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, No 179 C.I., dated 28 March 1895.

From the Chief Engineer for Irrigation No 23 EW, dated 2 April 1895.

Order No 998 W dated 29 April 1895.

The papers submitted to Government show a discreditable amount of carelessness and neglect of rules on the part of Mr Lewis the late Executive Engineer of the Coimbatore Division, and he will be called upon (through the Secretary of State) to submit such explanation as he may desire to offer.

× × ×

(True Extract)

(Sd) ~~Jhon~~ John Pennycuick Col. R.E.,
Secretary to Govt P.W.D.

(True Copy)

M. A. Jayarama Iyer

Head Clerk P.W.D.

(40—4,000—2-11-95.)

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION.
15 OCT. 96
No.

OLSS 5
9445/56

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 3/145
8-SEP. 96
P.W.D.
SECOND CIRCLE

No. 1341

Executive Engineer's office
Coimbatore Division
Coimbatore, 4th April 1895

From

W. C. Lewis Esq.,
Executive Engineer,
Coimbatore Division,

To

The Superintending Engineer,
Fourth Circle, Coimbatore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 179 C. I dated the 28th Ultimo, I have the honor to report that the Site of the two head sluices was altered by order of Major Smart, Superintending Engineer, after personal inspection, vide his Inspection Report for May 1893, dated 6th June 1893.

2 A complete revised Estimate was called for as soon as the excesses were brought to notice and promised months ago by Overseer Ramachendra Sastri, the Overseer Dyrianatha Mudr whom Ramachendra Sastri relieved is at Bhavani and has

been

been called upon to explain the discrepancies of measurements.

3 As I believe you yourself saw the sluices covered with silt during the monsoon, you will understand that all progress for that period was necessarily stopped.

I have &c &c

(Signed) W. B. DeWinton
Executive Engineer

Note.- The above letter was drafted by Mr. Lewis on 1st Instant. I am going to inspect the two sluices shortly and will report further if necessary

(Initialled) W. B DeW

(True copy)

Superintending Engineer
20/5/96 4th Circle

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION.
15 OCT. 95
No.......................

[illegible]

No. 721 D

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 7145
8 SEP. 95
P. W. D.
SECOND CIRCLE.

MEMORANDUM.

Dated ~~Madras~~ Ootacamund, 9 August 1895.

Inspection notes of Lt. Col. A. W. Smart R.E., dated 27 May 1893.

Letter from the Superintending Engineer IV circle 2 264 W dated 5 July 1895

Copy of the above forwarded to Mr Lewis, Executive Engineer, Public Works Department with reference to his application dated 25 May 1895.

(s/d) J. Pennycuick, Col. R.E.
Chief Engineer

Extract from the Inspection notes of Lt. Col. A. W. Smart R.E., Suptg. Engineer, IV circle, dated 27 May 1893:—

"27. Nerur channel Head. Diversion channel being cut to enable foundations of new sluice to be got on on new cut a sheet of rock × appears on which new sluice might very well be built. This will save cost of foundations and

× There was rock at old or sanctioned site as well. It was probably covered with silt at Col. Smart's inspection
(Sd) J. Hannan.

[P. W. 41 / 2,000—6-3-96.]

and enable work to be carried out during the time of low freshes in the Cauvery. I directed overseer to submit a survey sketch marking thereon position of rock &c so that site of sluice may be fixed with reference to old channel line. This is a very late time of the year for foundation work especially on such a river as the Cauvery."

(True Copy)

M. A. Jayarama Mudr.

Head Clerk P. W. D.

E. D. M.

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION.
15 OCT. 96
No.........

8cs7
9cu5/96

SUPDG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE SECOND CIRCLE 8/457 95

W

Letter from the Superintending Engineer IV Circle, No 264 W d/5 July 1895:—

With reference to your memorandum No 427 D dated 22 Instant I have the honour to submit an extract from the inspection notes of Lt. Col: A. W. Smart R.E. regarding the Nerur channel head sluice. Col. Smart sanctioned a revised site plan for the Nerur sluice, he doubtless also sanctioned the alteration of the site of Vangal sluice but there is nothing on record to show this.

It was customary for this officer to give verbal orders on his inspection which were not always confirmed afterwards in writing.

(True Copy)

M. A. Jayarama Mudr.

Head Clerk P. W. D.

E. D. M.

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION.
[illegible]
No.

Recd. 8 / Secy 9/96

To The Secretary to the Govt. of Madras, P.W.D

From W. C. Lewis Esq:

SUPG. ENGR.'S OFFICE No. 2/145 14 Sep 95 P.W.D. SECOND CIRCLE

d/ 5. September 1895.

Ref. G.O. 998 W d/ 29.4.95 and my letter of 25/5/95. and memo 721 D of 9. Aug.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your memo No. 721 D and to remark that the extract of the inspection note referred to refers only to Nerur sluice. There was also to the best of my belief a para referring to the Vangal sluice.

2. Mr. Hannan's strictures may be divided into two heads.

(a) The most unnecessary change of site.

(b) The confusion of initial accounts.

3. With reference to (a)

It will appear from the enclosures to your memo that with reference to Nerur head I acted absolutely under the orders of his predecessor in having a revised site plan prepared and approved by him according to which the situation of the sluice was changed and I therefore maintain that Mr Hannan had no right to make any such statement, and as he has chosen to incorporate it in a document which he made use of to attempt to delay my departure on furlough I request that he may be ordered to withdraw the

the statement in question officially and apologise for having made it and that in case my request is not complied with it may laid before the Rt. Hon. the Governor in Council.

4. As regards (b) the question of the initial accounts. I have to point out that the initial accounts are entirely in the Subdivision officer's hands in accordance with the recent repeated orders of Government and owing to the excessive number of changes (of S.D.O's) I found it impossible to enforce strict responsibility for the accounts. At the same time during the working season of 1894 when the accounts were got into the muddle I was engaged in getting in the foundations of the Kullar bridge which required my personal supervision every few days owing to the novelty and importance of the work, and it was impossible for me personally to see to the muster rolls of two minor works in progress 100 miles from my head quarters in an opposite direction, especially as I had no reason to anticipate any delay or difficulty with them, and during the remainder of the year the works were lying under sand from the Cauvery and no personal inspection would have been of any use.

5. Up to the time of leaving I had not the requisite information for preparing a revised estimate & I have no reason to believe the excess will be serious apart from that due to change of site and the diversion channel in which I was acting under the Superintending Engineer's orders.

I have &c.
(S/d) W. C. Lewis
Ex. Engineer P.W.D

True Copy
M. A. Jayarama Mudr
Head Clerk S. W. D

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION.
15 OCT. 96
No.

Ob E.S. 5/10/96

500-8-1-9

Local and Municipal Department.

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 11/145
8-SEP.95
P.W.D.
SECOND CIRCLE.

CHIEF SECRETARIAT, MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ ~~the following paper~~ :—

Again G.O., No.1360 L., dated 8" June 1892.

Read also the following:-

Letter from the President, District Board, Coimbatore, dated 21st. November 1894, Ref. on C.No.1606-D.B.:-

With reference to G.O., dated June 8" 1892, No.1360 L. Mis., I have the honour to enclose a copy of a letter, dated November 11" from the President, Kanan Devan Planters Association, announcing the fact that the road to the frontiers from Travancore is approaching completion and to request that a grant may be given as promised in the above G.O.

Enclosure.

Letter from the President, Kanan Devan Planters Association, to the President, District Board, Coimbatore, dated 11" November 1894:-

Some two years since an order of Government was, I believe, passed and circulated to your District Board giving a provincial grant for cutting a road from the Udamalpet road system to the Taliar-Chinnar road to be cut by the North Travancore Society.

It was stated that this road would be cut whenever the Taliar-Chinnar road approached completion. I have the honour to inform you that all the earth-work with a slight interval has been completed on the Taliar-Chinnar cart road, that blasting and revetting operations have been commenced, that the Society (North Travancore &c.) has spent some 26,000 Rs. in these operations and that the Travancore Government have guaranteed some

12,000 Rs/

12,000 Rs. more towards completing it.

We may therefore well claim that this road is approaching completion, and would ask your Board to take steps to join it to the road system of Udamalpet as soon as possible.

We pre-suppose that the District Board will help and possibly the Forest Department so that the road may be made a thoroughly cartable ~~ever~~ one throughout. I may mention that the continuation of the Chinnar-Taliar road has been traced at a cart-road gradient into Travancore, and that it is now being made into a thoroughly good bridle path, with a view to turning it into a cart-road as soon as possible, thus opening possibilities of easy cart-road traffic between not only our estates and your district but between your district and Travancore.

Trusting to receive an early reply.

Regd: 17-1-96

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION
10 OCT.96
No.

++++++++++++++++++++++

ORDER, No.2638 L.Mis., dated 17" December 1894.

The Public Works Department will be requested to obtain and forward a report on the condition of the road made by the Planters' Association up to the frontier of Travancore and Coimbatore, and as to the route that should be followed by the suggested road from that point to Manupatti in Coimbatore district, and the sufficiency of the estimates originally prepared for that road by the Coimbatore District Board Engineer.

(True Extract)

(Signed) J. F. Price
Chief Secretary.

TO

The Public Works Department, with two estimates to be returned.
,, President, District Board, Coimbatore.

(True copy)

W. W. Phillips
Ag. Assistant Secretary,
for Chief Secretary.

Head Clerk's O.D.

Exe. Engineer's Office,
Coimbatore Divn
9th March 1895.

No. 951.

From
W. C. Lewis Esq.
Executive Engineer,
Coimbatore Division.

to
The Superintending Engineer,
Fourth Circle.

Sir,

With reference to your No. 12 C.I. of 9th January 1895 and your reminder of the 4th instant, calling for a report on the condition of the road made by the Planters' Association up to the frontier of Travancore and Coimbatore, I have the honor to state that I have only just succeeded in getting a rough sketch of the line of the road. Any marching through these low hills at this time of the year must be most Unhealthy and would be at least three weeks march from here, so that my personal inspection just at present

is

is out of the question.

I have &c.

signed W. C. Lewis

Executive Engineer.

No. 114 W. dated 10th March 189

Copy Forwarded to the Chief Engineer, with reference to G.O. No. 2 W of 3rd January 1895, Border at Madras

The undersigned is of opinion that the Division Officer should have inspected the road ere this and that his reasons for not doing so are unsatisfactory.

As this is the last month of the official year he cannot well do so now, without prejudice to his other duties, but he might if the Chief Engineer considers it desirable be directed to inspect the road after being relieved next April by Mr. de Winton

(signed) J. Annan

Supg. Engineer, 4 Circle

True

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No.
8 - SEP 96
SECOND CIRCLE

No. 277/W d/10-6

(True copy) Forwarded to the Chief Engineer P.W.D. with reference to his Memorandum No. 362 D dated 6th June 1896.

Superintending Engineer, 4 C

Letters pottery
10/6

EF ENGINEER
IRRIGATION.
10 OCT. 96
No. 31-W

5/757 KW

P. W. C. No. ~~9349~~
A

(24)

From

The Supg: Engineer
4th Circle.

Recd Jul 16
Regti: 20.10.96

ated 10th
esp 15th } June 1896

No. 277/W

66.96

Taliar-Chinnar Road.

~~Forwards copy of explanation from Mr. Lewis, Ex: Engineer Coimbatore Division for not inspecting the~~

OWS. 27
Renew 9/86

OS 182

await receipt of the diaries called for in Memo: 364 Dd 6th June 1896.
CMS
17.6.96.
Dnt

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S OFFICE
Regr. No. 691 W
5 - OCT. 96
GUNTUR
KISTNA WESTERN DIVISION.

No. 3203

Executive Engineer's Office,
Coimbatore 24 Sept. 1896.
Despd 28/9

FROM
A. A. G. Malet Esq.
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
COIMBATORE DIVISION.

TO
THE Executive Engineer
Kistna Western Dn.

Enclosures. 3
1. Completion Report for
2. Comp: Statements

SIR,

With reference to your No. 865 of 12th September 1896, I have the honor to state that no revised estimates for the Nerur & Vangal sluices were prepared. Completion Statements explaining excess were sent to the Supg: Engineer and Copies are herewith attached for your information. As the estimate for these works are below Rs 5,000 details by Sub Heads were not maintained. Copies of Comparative Statements received from the Sub Divisional Officer are herewith sent.

I

500—20-9-94.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
your most obedt. servt.

Executive Engineer

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
No. A/1251
10 OCT. 96
P. W. D.
SECOND CIRCLE.

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION.
10 OCT. 96
No. 35-II

Take copies of this
carefully & send to me
M
2/10/96

Pwe 31
Sc 2/96

23/9

ESTIMATE FORM.—Comparative Statement of Differences.

Description of Work.	Original Estimate.			Revised Estimate.			More.	Less.	Explanation of Difference.
	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
Concrete in Chunnam	5853	12-„-„	702	180		22		680	Savings due to rock having been met with
Rough stone in Chunnam	6259	10-„-„	626	4718		485		141	-do- quantity of Rough stone having been reduced by the increase in thickness of burnt stone facing from 1 to 1¼' - vide C.E. No 3840 of 12-10-
Burnt stone in Chunnam	2858	17-„-„	486	4979		922	.436	~~436~~	Excess due to thickness having been increased from 1 to 1¼' and increased length of wing. Slight excess in rate owing to stones having been brought from a distance of about 5 miles and workmen from 10 miles.
Cut stone work	400	1-„-	400	453		494	.94		Excess due to estimate not having provided for Coping stones over rear wings & returns and to the increased length of one wing. Stones carted from a distance of 13 miles from quarry.
Arch work	360	25-„-„	90	315		76		14	Savings due to Calculation mistake in Estimate.
Pointing	4300	1.8.-	65	4300		65			
Shutters	3	150-„-„	450	3		409		41	Calls for no remark
Excavating foundation		L. S	60	97815		400	340		Excess due to Change of site
Baling		-Do-	60			131	71		Excess found necessary
Demolishing existing Rough stone work	9920	1.8.„	149	6480		108		41	Less quantity was demolished
Diversion Channel Rock Cutting		L. S	50	21955		309 958 1267	259 958 1217		Diversion Channel having been originally excavated in rocky soil this excess was caused.
Earthwork on either side			33	58376		305	272		Owing to bank having had to be formed on both sides above the original nose.
Cutting grooves						25	.25		Found necessary for the working of shutters

ff. 2319

Centering for Arch.						82	82		No provision in estimate for Centering Found necessary-
Naval revetment				4130		93	93		Found necessary to protect the bank of muddy soil
Durbah Rolled				210		18	18		Do. Do. Do
Pegs				71		4	4		Do. Do Do.
Gabions filled with stones.				31		12	12		Do Do Do
Throwing stones in front of revetment				1600		20	20		Do. Do
Turfing				934		4	4		Found necessary.
Concrete metal				1000		50	50		surplus at site. Concrete work not having been done as estimated
Putting shed for stones				No. 1		40	40		Found necessary.
Total			3171			5032	2778	917	
Contingencies			132			"	"	132	
Petty Supervision			127			90		37	
Grand Total			3430			5122	2778	1086	

2778
1086
1692 net excess

From annexed monthly reports this seems to be [illegible]
[illegible] 24

Note. The above figures may not be quite accurate Accounts by sub heads have not been maintained before I took Charge and the expenditure incurred then has been distributed and showed into several Sub heads as per orders of the Sub Divisional Officer for the disposal of a Comparative statement. Expenditure by Sub Heads has been maintained since I took Charge. A statement of the probable expenditure and the work done prior to my taking Charge already submitted-

(Signed) S. K. Ramachandra Sastry
Overseer D.&W.
24-8-95

(Signed) C Smith
28-8-95. S. Do.

STATION
Dated 189

10,000—9-12-95.

Executive Engineer.

No. 35-IV/4

E. No. 127.

10,000—9-12-95.

CIRCLE— IV

DIVISION— Coimbatore

DISTRICT— Coimbatore

ESTIMATE FORM.—Comparative Statement of Differences.

To accompany the Revised Estimate

No. of 189 -9 , for*

For Nerur Head sluice.

2/692

8 OCT. 96
GUNTUR.
KISTNA WESTERN DIVISION

3/1057

---

* Here enter the Name and Description of work in full.

ESTIMATE FORM.—Comparative Statement of Differences.

Description of Work.	Original Estimate.			Revised Estimate.			More.	Less.	Explanation of Difference.
	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
Concrete	4767	12-〃-〃	572	2192		263		309	Savings due to rock having been met with
Rough stone in mortar	5386	12-〃-〃	646	574		69		577	Bricks having been substituted for stones
Burnt stone in Chunam	2518	17-〃-〃	428	840		143		285	as good stones were not available.
Cut stone work	301	1-〃-〃	301	188		214		87	saving caused as no Coping was necessary
Arch work	240	25-〃-〃	60	203		47		13	slight mistake in Calculation
Pointing	2932	1.8.〃	44	2950		44		〃	
Shutters	2	150-〃-〃	300	2		264		36	Calls for no remark
Excavating foundation	— L. S. —		50	48000		217	167	〃	Excess owing to Change of site
Baling	— Do —		50			152	102		Found necessary.
Diversion Channel Cutting rock	. Do —		50	106038		816	766		A new diversion Channel was made which was to be all rock & hence the excess
Forming bank	— Do —		200	136073		507	307		Both sides of head sluice had to be made & bank widened for formation of revetment
Table moulded brick work in Chunam				6955		1530	1530		Vide Savings in items 2 & 3 Excess due to cost of brick work in place of Cheap Cut stone work & owing to the increased length of one wing
Sand revetment				1515		38	38		Found necessary to protect the mud bank.
Durbah roller				128		16	16		
Pegs.				58		4	4		
Cutting [illegible]				18		5	5		Found necessary to facilitate the

									working of Shutters
Centering for arch.						35	35		Estimate provided for no Centering which was found necessary.
Building rough stone revetment				4860		326	326		Found necessary to protect the Head sluice on the left side in Continuation of the old revetment
Gravel backing				1418		21	21		Due to above.
Building store shed						50	50		Found necessary for storing materia
Stone metal				2500		112	112		Collected for Concrete work which not having been necessary was used for backing rough stone revetment
Contingencies			76					76	
Petty Supervision			~~77~~ 73			90	13		
			2850			4963	3492	1383	

3492
1383
Left Channel 2109
Old Sluice

apparently illegal though the monthly report for May 1896 shows the balance as Rs 2299 [illegible] 24-10-96

Note. The above figures may not be quite accurate. Accounts by sub heads were not maintained before I took Charge and the expenditure incurred then has been distributed and Charged to several sub heads as per orders of the Sub Divisional Officer. A Statement of the probable expenditure and work said to have been done before my taking Charge of the work was already submitted.

(Signed) S. L. Ramachundra Sastry
Overseer
24-8-95

(Signed) C. Smith
Sub Divisional Off
28-8-95

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION
10 OCT. 96
No. 35-IV/3

E. No. 7.

3/691 m / 5.9.96

10,000—9-12-95.

CIRCLE— IV

DIVISION— Coimbatore

DISTRICT— —Do—

ESTIMATE FORM.—Comparative Statement of Differences.

To accompany the Revised Estimate

No. of 189 -9 , for*

For Constructing a Head Sluice at the head of Vangal Channel

4/751 ke

84529 / 9445/96

---

* Here enter the Name and Description of work in full.

P. W. D. Form No. 45E.

Coimbatore DIVISION.

Monthly report of works completed during the month of May 1896.

Item No.	Name of estimate.	Sanction.			Amount of estimate.	Expended.	Saving.	Excess.	Percentage of excess, if any.	Remarks.
		Authority.	No.	Date.						
					Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		
1	Constg. a head sluice at the head of the Vangal Channel.	S.E.	18	92-93	2850	5249	,	2399		Excess due to Chan of site, cutting dive -sion Channel through rocky soil & in substi-tuting brick work inst of rough stone in mortar.
2	Constg. a head sluice at the head of Nerur Channel.	S.E.	190	92-93	3430	5713	,	1683		Excess due to change of site, cutting diversion channel in rocky soil, increasing the thickness of burnt stone facing & in doing earth work & other items not provided in the esti-mate.
+	+	+	+		+		+			

(True Extract)

Ex. Engineer.

(Sd) J. W. Ashpitel
Ex. Engr.
17-8-96.

NOTES.

Reference to P. W. D. Code.

Vol. I, Chap. III, para. 80 and Chap. IX, paras. 38 to 41 and 43.

1. After the despatch of the monthly accounts a report should be submitted to the Examiner of all works and repairs completed during the month for which detailed reports in Form No. 45 A. or 45 C. are not required.

2. Separate forms should be used for works and for repairs.

3. The amount expended should be entered to the nearest rupee (omitting annas and pies), and should accord with the up-to-date outlay shown in the Schedule of Expenditure of the month in question and with the closing entry in the Register of Works.

4. In the case of contribution works, proposals should be submitted as to the disposal of the unexpended balance, if any.

5. When work has been executed for the Civil or Military Department, the countersignature of the Civil or Military authority concerned should be obtained to the form of certificate, Form No. 45 B. or 45 D., and the certificate should be attached to this monthly report.

6. In the case of petty works executed on requisitions (Form No. 8A), the completion certificate at foot, takes the place of the completion report.

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION
15 OCT. 96
No. 35/IV 2

2/1757 KW

Rs. 30
9 Oct/96

C G P—No. 269 I W—3-12-95—21,000.

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S OFFICE
Regr. No. 691 W
5 OCT 96
GUNTUR.
KISTNA WESTERN DIVISION.

P. W. D. Form No. 45E.

________ DIVISION.

Monthly report of* Works

Completed during the month of May 1896.

Forwarded to the Examiner ________ for verification as this Office No. ________ dated ________ 189 .

Executive Engineer.

Transmitted to the Superintending Engineer, ________ duly verified as this Office No. ________, dated ________ 189 .

Examiner of Accounts.

Transmitted to ________ for record as this Office No. ________ dated ________ 189 .

Superintending Engineer.

* Here enter works or repairs as the case may be.

List of papers furnished to Mr. Lewis to enable him to frame his reply to certain charges (Accompaniment to memo No 1214 D dated 4 September 1896).

1. Letter from the Superintending Engineer IV Circle to the Executive Engineer Coimbatore Division, No 179 C.I dated 28 March 1895, drawing attention to certain irregularities.

2. Endorsement of the Superintending Engineer IV circle forwarding a copy of the above letter to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

3. Endorsement by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation No 23 IW. dated 2 April 1895 forwarding with remarks the above correspondence to the Chief Engineer, P W. Department.

4. G.O. No 998 W dated 29 April 1895 (para 1 only) calling upon Mr Lewis to submit explanation

5. Letter from the Executive Engineer Coimbatore Division to the Superintending Engineer IV circle No 1341 dated 4 April 1895 replying to the latter's letter No 179 C.I dated 28 March 1895 (Item 1 above)

6. Chief Engineer's memo No 721 D dated 9th August 1895 furnishing Mr Lewis with an extract from from Col. Smart's Inspection notes dated 27th May 1893 — together with the extract in question.

7. Letter from the Superintending Engineer IV Circle No 264 W dated 5 July 1895 furnishing the Inspection notes referred to above.

8. Mr Lewis' letter dated 5th September 1895 submitting the explanation called for in G.O. 998 W dated 29 April 1895.

9. Mr Lewis' Journals from January 1894 to April 1895.

10. G.O. No 2638 L. mis of 17 December 1894 calling for a report from the P.W.D on the Talliar Chinnar road.

11. Letter from the Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division to the Superintending Engineer IV Circle No 951 dated 9. March 1895 refusing to inspect the Talliar Chinnar road

12. Endorsement of the Superintending Engineer IV Circle No 114 W dated 10 March 1895, forwarding with remarks, the above letter (Item 11) to the Chief Engineer P.W. Department.

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION
13 OCT 96
No.

W. Excess on the Sluices.

A reference is invited to the two sheets giving a comparison statement of differences (flagged I). It is stated that these figures may not be quite accurate as details of expenditure were not maintained by sub-heads. From the Superintending Engineer's letter No 179 C.I dated 28th March 1895 — addressed to the Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division (Copy of document in the file and flagged C) it will appear that the excess expenditure on revetments was incidental to the change of site. While from Mr Lewis's letter, dated 5th Sept 1895, addressed to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, it will be seen, on referring to the last para, that the diversion channel may also have been incidental thereto. The change of site is, moreover, stated to have caused an excess in excavating foundations, and it may have done so in baling too, and in the item "Forming bank", both of which exceeded. There are some minor items besides which may have been affected by the change of site. It would, therefore, be simpler to consider the items which could not have been affected by change of site. They are as follow:-

Vangal channel Sluice.

	Excess Rs	Saving Rs
Table moulded brickwork in chunam	1530	
Rough stone in mortar		577
Burnt stone in chunam		285
Cut stone work		87
Archwork		13
Shutters		36
	1530	998
	998	

Therefore we have Rs 532 net excess on items unconnected with change of site. According to the comparative statement, which is supposed to be only approximate, the net excess is Rs 2109 on the whole work.

	Rs
	998
Add centering for arch	35
Building stone shed	50
	1083

1530
1083

Thus Rs 532 is reduced to Rs 447 or about a fifth of the total excess.

N.B. According to the monthly statement of accounts for works completed up to May 1896, the excesses are as follows:-

Vangal Channel Sluice ... Rs 2399
Nerur do. " 1683

According to the approximate statements they are:-

Vangal Sluice - Rs 2109
Nerur " - " 1692 -

Nerur Channel Sluice.

	Excess Rs	Saving
Cut stone work	94	
Cutting groves	25	
Centering for arch	82	
Shed for stone	40	
Arch work		
Shutters		4
	Rs 241	5
	55	
	Rs 186	

Therefore only Rs 186 out of
total net excess of Rs 1692 ca
be shewn as unassignable
change of site, though probably
shall also consider the follow
items:-

	Excess	S
Burnt stone in chunam	436	
Rough stone in chunam		
	436	
	141	

Net additional excess Rs 295

The saving on rough stone in chunam
was due to the adoption of mort
in chunam, the excess on which
stated to have been caused by
increase of thickness from 1' to 1¼
This, of course, may have been
due to alteration of section a
to change of site. But this excess
also attributed to the distance
from which labour and materi
had to be brought. If the two si
were fairly close to one another
prices of labour and material

would ~~[illegible]~~ remain unchanged. However, it is not clear that anything, but a small proportion of the excess, was unaffected by the change of site. And if the site had not been changed, it is just possible that Mr Lewis might have made a saving in certain items, and that he is therefore ~~not~~ correct in saying that the excess was entirely due to change of site.

Talliar–Chinnar Road

Mr Lewis in his letter No 957 (document flagged J) dated 9th March 1895 says "I have only just succeeded in getting a rough sketch of the line of the road". Up to then the delay had been only two months, the order having been communicated by the Superintending Engineer on 9th January 1895. This is all that there is to support the statements made in his letter dated Octr 8th 1896 (flagged B).

CHWS
24/10/96.

Charges against Ex. W. C. Lewis, Ex. Engr

P. W. Department.

Read the following:—

No 287 S.

Letter from W. C. Lewis Esqre, Ex: Engr:, dated 8 October 1896.
Endt thereon by the S.E. II Circle No 1894 K.W. " 13 " .

FOR ORDERS.

A full precis of previous papers on this subject, with His Excellency's remarks, are given in Note for orders dated 4 July 1896 flagged A.

2. It having been considered that Mr Lewis should be given a chance of further explanation, in the light of complete records which he had not access to while on furlough, when his first explanation was given, he was again called on for explanation and his reply is contained in his No 287 S dated October 8th 1896. flagged B.

3. The explanation is not

Having re-considered this case, I concur in the Secretary's proposal in para. 5 of this Note.

A.H.
30.10.96

I agree – I may add that para 3 of Mr Lewis's letter of 5/9/95 is a very impudent production

4/11/96

4/11/96

43—500-22-1-96.

satisfactory, he imputes the large excesses entirely to the change of site ordered by Colonel Smart, the Supdg Engineer, but this is not correct, no doubt some of the excesses ~~said~~ were due to change of site but how much it is difficult to say but it is certain that a sum of over Rs 600 was not due to that cause, and it is likely that a considerable further sum was not due to that cause but this cannot be said for certain, it is therefore Evident that Mr Lewis is not justified in saying that the excess is *entirely* due to change of site.

FOR ORDE

4. Mr Lewis gives no further information regarding his delay in submitting a revised estimate after he knew there would be an excess.

5. Mr Lewis again excuses his want of personal supervision on the grounds that he had to be present at the construction of the Kullar bridge but I have already shewn in my previous note that he only inspected that bridge 18 days between January & December 1894 and that he was 177 days at Ooty during that year. I therefore consider that Mr Lewis has been guilty of carelessness and neglect of ~~orders~~ rules and I recommend that his promotion should be postponed for two years from × 1st October 1895 and that he should be reported on after that period.

6. The correctness of Mr Lewis' explanation

× The date on which he became entitled to promotion to 1st grade Executive Engineer.

about the Tallian Chinnar road cannot be verified but it appears to me that he should have been able (had he really been anxious to) to obtain information about the road in less than two months. He now states that he did not ~~wish~~ shirk the work: but in his letter in answer to the Supdg Engineer's reminder dated 1st March 1895 he reported that he could not inspect the road at the time owing to the unhealthiness of the season.

However I do not think that Mr Lewis should be further ~~punished~~ punished on account of his apparent neglect of duty.

28/10/96

W.

H.E. 29/10

B for orders

DEPARTMENT.

No 3200-W of 9th November/96

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

From the S.E. IV Circle No 179 C.I. of 28.3.95.
Endt. by the Ch. E. for Irrn No 238.W. of 2.4.95
Pros. of Govt. No 998W dated 29th April 1895.
From Mr W.C. Lewis dated 5th Septr 1895
„ —— do —— „ 14th April 1896
From the S.E. IV Circle No 237W of 20.5.96
„ „ Exy P.W. Acct „ 1836 D/S of 25.6.96.
„ Mr W.C. Lewis. „ 2875 of 8.10.96.
Endt. from the S.E. II Circle No 1894 K.W. of 13.10.96.

The foregoing papers relate to certain charges brought by the Supdg. Engr IV Circle against Mr W.C. Lewis, Ex. Engr, Viz:-

(A) Carelessness and neglect of rules in connection with the execution, during the years 1893-95, of the two works, Vangal & Navanur Head sluices, in the Coimbatore division.

(B) His omission to inspect the Tallian-Chinnar road

P. W. 40.
50—3-9-96.

in Travancore territory, in connection with a proposal to connect that road with the roads in the Coimbatore district.

2. As regards the first charge (A), about the end of March 1895, the S.E. IV circle brought to the notice of the Chief Engr for Irrn the following irregularities in connection with the construction of the Vangal & Nerur Head Sluices:—

(1) Expenditure of about Rs 1000 in excess of sanctioned estimate, had been incurred by the end of June 1894 on each of the works, & yet the Ex. Engr did not submit revised estimates, as required by rule, ~~until~~ up to March 1895, when the necessity for such estimates had to be pointed out by the Supg Engr.

(2) Failure to pay as much personal attention to the works as was practicable, & as the circumstances of the case required

(3) Unnecessary alteration of the sanctioned sites, involving additional outlay of Rs 500 on each work.

(4) Sanctioning separate estimates to cover the additional outlay, instead of including the sums in revised estimates.

(5) Digging a diversion channel at Vangal Sluice in the wrong place, & thereby incurring an unnecessary expenditure of Rs 500 or 600.

(6) Extraordinary delay in carrying out the works.

~~(3)~~ 3. In G.O. No. 99 Irr of 29th April 1895, Mr Lewis was held to be guilty of a "discreditable amount of carelessness & neglect of rules" & he was called upon for explanation.

4. Meanwhile, Mr Lewis in a letter dated 4th April 1885, No 1341, had answered some of the charges contained in the Supdg Engr's letter of the 28th March 1885, explaining that he did call for revised estimates from the overseer in charge of the works as soon as the excess outlay on the works was brought to his notice; that the sites of the Sluices were altered under the orders of the Supdg Engr, Major Smart, and that the works could not be proceeded with during the monsoon, as the Sluices were then covered with silt.

5. The explanation as given in this letter is exceedingly meagre and unsatisfactory, the fact of Mr Lewis having called on the overseer in charge of the works for a revised estimate does not absolve him from blame for not having seen that it was submitted during the long period from March 1884 to March 1885. As regards the alteration of sites, it is clear that Mr Lewis was not to blame, as he acted under the orders of the Supdg Engr. There was no doubt great delay in carrying out the works, and the fact that the sites were at certain periods covered with silt, is not sufficient excuse.

6. Mr Lewis explanation of 5th Sept 1885 in answer to G.O. No 995W

dated 29th April 1895, is still more unsatisfactory. He divides Mr Harman's charges into two main heads, (a) the most unnecessary change of site & (b) confusion of initial accounts - As regards (a) he was no doubt not responsible, but with respect to (b) he remarks that the initial accounts are in the hands of sub-divisional officers; though this may be the case, it is the duty of the Ex. Engr. to see that no confusion exists, & if it ~~does~~ did exist, as Mr Lewis appears to have been aware, he should have carefully inquired into the cause, & examined the accounts. His excuse that he could not do so because during the working season of 1894, he had to inspect the Kullar bridge every few days cannot be accepted, as from an examination of his official diary it is found that from January to Decr 1894, he only inspected the Kullar bridge on 18 days, & that instead of attending to his duties in the plains and frequently visiting those subdivisions where irregularities existed, he appears to have spent most of his time at Ootacamund, for his journal shows that he was altogether 177 days at that place during the year.

7. As regards the second charge (B), - on the 17th Decr 1894, the Govt.

in the Local & Munl. Dept ordered ~~that~~ a report should be obtained in the P. W. Dept on the condition of the Tallor-Chinnar Road – this order was communicated to the Supdg. Engr. IV Circle by Pro. No. 2 W 7 dated 3rd January 1895, & the Supdg. Engr. called for the required report from the Ex. Engr. on the 9th Jany 1895, & again on the 6th March 1895. In reply to the call of 6th March, the Ex. Engr. reported that he could not inspect the road at the time owing to the unhealthiness of the season, but it is observed that he took no notice of the calls made on him until the 9th March, shortly

before his departure on furlough.

8. It ~~was then~~ having been decided that Mr Lewis should be given a chance of further explanation in the light of complete records, to which he had not access while on furlough, when his first explanation was given, he was again called on for remarks, & his reply is contained in his letter No. 2875 of 9th Octr 1896. This explanation also is not satisfactory. He imputes the large excesses on the head Sluices entirely to the change of site ordered by Col. Smart, the Supdg. Engr., but this is not correct. No doubt some of the excesses were due

to change of site; how much it is difficult to say, but it is certain that a sum of over Rs 600 was not due to that cause, & it is probable that a further sum was also not due to the same. It is therefore evident that Mr Lewis is not justified in saying that the excess expenditure was entirely due to change of site.

9. Mr Lewis gives no further explanation with respect to his failure to submit revised estimates for the head sluices. He again excuses his want of personal supervision on the ground that he had to be present at the construction of the Kullar bridge, but it has already been shown that he only inspected the bridge 18 days in 1894, & that he was at Ootacamund 177 days in that year.

10. On a review of all the facts of the case, H.E. the Govr in Council considers that Mr Lewis has been guilty of carelessness & neglect of rules, & resolves that his promotion shall be postponed for two years from the 1st Octr 1895, the date on which he became eligible for promotion to Ex. Engr 1st Grade. At the expiration of the two years the Chief Engr will obtain & submit to Govt. a report on

Noted 8.12.96

E to note this in the establt. register, & to bring forward the matter at the proper time.

Mr Lewis.

11. As regards the Tallur - Chinnur road, Mr Lewis states that he could get no information or details about it, & that he did not shirk the work, but it appears to the Govt. that he should have been able, had he really been anxious to do so, to obtain the required information in less than two months. His previous explanation was that he could not inspect the road at the time owing to the unhealthiness of the season. However, H.E. the Govr in Council does not desire to take any further action on this point.

6/11/96

Issue at once & submit to D.W. after issue.
7/11

S.a.W.
8.12.26

To W. C. Lewis Esqr
(through the S.E. II Circle)
S.E. IV Circle
Ch. E. for Irrn

Desptd 9/11/96

Copy sent to
Mr. Lewis direct, Buckingham Hotel
Madras on 11.11