Financial (189~~6~~7) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 428

Dated 31-5-97

INDEXED.

20/20

102
3/6/97

[Despatch Abstract.]

Informing the Military Secretary to H.E. the Governor that the Govt regrets its inability to take action on his letter requesting that the Sanction of the Govt of India may be obtained for an annual increase of Rs. 1,500 from 1st april 1896 to the Contract allowance of H.E. the Governor or that the Order No.175 Financial d/ 17-8-96 be rescinded.

T 3/6/97

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Financial (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 1711

From

The Mily Secy to H.E. the C

Order

No. 240

Dated 18 July } 1896
Received 19 Dec " }
Registered 20 "
Enclosures --
Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Urging that an application be made to the Govt of India for an annual increase of Rs 1500 to the Contract Allowance or that G.O. No. 175 Dd 17-3-96 be rescinded.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

14-DEC-1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

18th July 1896

From

Major F. W. Romilly D.S.O.
Military Secretary to H. E. the Governor

To

The Chief Secretary
to Government
Stonehouse Hill.

Sir,

It having recently been suggested that certain fresh charges should be met from the Contract Allowance, it becomes necessary, in order to remove present misapprehension regarding the purposes for which the Contract Allowance is granted, again to point out, that, it can never, on an average, be made to meet more than the authorised annual charges against it, and, that even were it so intended, there can be no balance against which unauthorised ✕ charges, ordinary or extraordinary, could be debited.

2. If the Madras Government Order No 175 Financial, dated 17th March 1896, is to be carried out, provision must be made for an annual addition of at least Rs: 1500/- to the Contract Allowance, so as to form a fund from which such ✕ extra charges can be met.

page 5 of the G.O

B

✕ But India has ruled (in effect) that the charges on account of a Viceroy's visit are not unauthorized or extra charges
RS
22/8/96

3. I am not aware how such extraordinary charges are met in the Bombay Presidency, but reference to the two budgets will show that in Bombay there are many items outside the Contract Allowance of Rs: 91,000/-, which in Madras have either to be met from the Contract Allowance of Rs: 90,000/-, or else from His Excellency's private purse. Notably servants' wages and uniform, a Sumptuary Allowance and certain travelling allowances.

~~108~~ 107 p. 74 of C B.E
for 1896-7.

The Government of India, has once apparently con[illegible] it reasonable to meet the extraordinary charges consequent on a Viceroy's visit, by means of a special grant, for in sanctioning as usual, the last special grant, it merely remarked that it "should be charged to the same head of account," and whilst accepting the arguments stated in para (+) 15 of Madras Government letter No. 28 22 of 9th January 1896, markedly abstained from replying to, (+) or commenting on the contrary arguments in para 14, quoted from the terms of the Government of India letter of 26th April 1878.

vide para 2 of letter on page 5 of G.O. No 175 Finl 17.3.96. B

(+) Para 3 ibid B

5. The further argument in para 14, that a Viceroy's visit cannot now as formerly be considered an exceptional event, surely tells rather in favour of raising the Contract Allowance than of fixing on it a fresh charge, merely because it is inferred that such charge has become an ordinary and normal one; and especially so when it is remembered that in 1878 the amount of the Contract Allowance was fixed at Rs. 90,000/- on the average expenditure in the years 1861-2 to 1870-1, i.e. on that of from 35 to 25 years ago.

Not so - I find that when fixing this sum, India pointed out that it "greatly exceeded" the average expenditure in the years named

6. The mere fact that the Government of India again, for a fourth time since the date of that letter, sanctioned a special grant in order to meet these charges, without, as suggested by the Government of Madras, making any order as to recovery from the grants for subsequent years, seems of itself a sufficient indication of its dissent from the views advocated.

7. I would therefore suggest, either, that the sanction of the Government of India be obtained for an annual increase of at least Rs. 1500/-, from 1st April 1896, to the

[illegible] of the [illegible]

* pages 5 of the G.O. B

Governor, or else that the order No. 175, Financial, dated 17th March 1896, be rescinded.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obdt Servant
F. Romilly. Major,
Military Secretary.
15th/7

CURRENT NO. 774

From, The Mily Secy to H.E. the Governor

CHIEF SECRETARY
19 JUL 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

No. 240

Dated 18th }
Recd 19th } July 1896
Reptd 20th }
Encl: nil

Subject

Requesting that provision be made for an annual addition of at least Rs 1,500 to the Contract allowance to meet certain extra charges.

Ref
Put up C.B.E. (Indian)
for 96-7. with Bombay
estimates
Vol put up.
[illegible]
21.7.96

21/7.

[illegible] the 10th [illegible]
[illegible] arguments advanced by H.E. Ld Wenlock & Maj. Lawley in one of the files now put up.

2.) I entirely agree with their views, though the increase in the C.A. which I have recommended falls far short of that of the late Mil. Sec.

3.) The suggestion that the charges incidental to Ld Elgin's visit should be debited to the C.A. & be recovered from that of the next year, was precisely that made to the Govt. of India, although it was pointed out that this would involve a large legacy of debt to H.E. the new Governor.

4.) Had they considered that their ruling "It is" "the essence of such arrangements" (i.e. a C.A.) "that" "they be not subject to casual excesses such" "as this, which defeat the primary object of the" "arrangement" applied to charges of this description, they would have accepted the suggestion & ordered recovery, as in the precedents of Rs 6,400 for restoration of Parel gardens in 1880, & as requested of Rs. 17,888 on account of glass & china in 1882 ordered by the deceased Governor of Madras.

5.) I admit that the present C.A. should suffice for the purposes for which it is intended, but the contention is, that these Viceroy visit charges are not, & never have been included among those purposes.

6.) With regard to furnishing information as to how C.A. money is spent, I would remark that the undesireability of referring, for the decision of the Govt. of India, petty matters relating to the household establishments & expenses of T.E. the Governors of Madras & Bombay, was pointed out, when, for the very purpose of avoiding such necessity, a certain annual sum was allotted for such expenditure, all distribution of details being left to T.E. the Governors, & all charges within a certain maximum being passed by the Acct. Genl. without enquiry.

7.) I am not aware that there has been any reason to question "the audit of the Private" "(now Military) Secretary, on whose economi" "cal management the Govt. of India would" "implicitly rely".

8.) It is probably true that the C.A. charge for renewal of furniture in Govt. Houses Madras & Ooty, which includes linen, plate & china, could not be set down at an average amount of more than Rs 5,000. It is one necessarily subject to fluctuations, due to occasional large orders; (e.g. the £15,000 for china & glass referred to above)

G.O. - 9.1.6 - nos 21 - 22.

A
v. his memo of 8.11.95
forwarded above 17.3.9[illegible]
Original put up
B.

para 14 of 1 letter to Sec. to G. of I. no 22 - 9.1.96.
B

v. Mil. Sec's memo. 5.11.95 & H.E's of 9.11.95.
C D

G. of I., Fin. Dept. 1878 no 215 para 2. - no 1683 - 7.7.77
IX E

F
G of I., F.D. 1880. no 843 para 7 - no 2152 - 13.8.80.
G of M., P. 1882, no 146 P. 11.2.82 & no 490. 5.5.82
G

c.f. G of M. no 115 - 17.5.78
H

I quite agree. But the present question is not of furnishing infn as to the details of sanctioned expenditure but of showing the necessity of increased expenditure. For this purpose, detailed infn ought, I consider, to be furnished to India, & still more so to H.E.'s colleagues who are asked to concur in the recommendation
J

F.D. 1873
G. of I., no 27 - 31.10.71 no 4731 - (80 774) 13.12.71
& do. no 39. 24.1.73 no 521 para 4.
K | (D. 201 [illegible] 11.2.73)

G of M. 1878. F. no 115 para 7 - 17.5.78 } H
G of I. 26.4.78. no 2312. }

G. of I. F. 1873. no 36 para 4 - 13.12.71. no 774 J

c.f. para 4 of this memo.

[illegible] tour of office.

in the present year the sum of Rs. 10000 [illegible]
e entirely inadequate, owing to the dilapidated
unserviceable condition of the furniture &c.
Already the C.A. Rs 5,000 is much exceeded,
the P.W.D Rs 5000 is nearly exhausted.

0.) It may be noted with regard to this ant sum, added in 1872 to the provincial llotment for the household furniture proper of Govt. Ho., that "it was not the intention of the Gov. of" "India to interfere with the discretion of H.E. the Govr." "in C. or limit the amount that might be spent" "in any year to a maximum of Rs 5,000"

Had the Govt. of India ordered the charges connected with Ld Elgin's visit to be debited to the C.A. for this year, it would have been necessary to ask for a special grant on account of furniture.

11.) I agree that the allusions to Bombay are not very relevant, though the sums granted for Bombay are now as in 1873 largely in excess of those voted for Madras, for the reason then given by the Gov. of India, when fixing the Bombay C.A. at Rs 15.000 more than for Madras viz:- "The allotment to Bombay is higher" "than to Madras only because the" "expenditure of that Govt. has always largely" "exceeded that of Madras &c"

The Govt. of India at the same time wrote to Madras & Bombay " that the allotment of Rs 60,000 75,000 | x "should not be regarded as final"

The present Civil votes in Bombay exceed those in Madras, as well as I can compare them by Rs 52,540

12.) With regard to one of my proposals, I note that the Hon. Mr. Grose agrees that "the papers" "seem to show that if the C.A. is intended" "to meet the expenditure on such visits it" "should be increased"

Personally I think preferable a reversion to the system recognised ever since the C.A. was fixed on the average expenditure of from 35 to 25 years ago, by which extraordinary charges such as those necessitated by Viceroy's visits, which may follow rapidly one on another, & not be exceptional as in those days, are subject to official audit.

F. Romilly Major
Military Secretary

10.8.96.

apparently [illegible]

Sr. 1.9.80 [illegible] it has happened that, while [illegible] of the [illegible] fell on the Bombay C.A. the P.W.D. this year expending money outside the C.A. in [illegible] [illegible] Bs

G. of M. 1878. F. No 115 – 17.5.78 – No 875 para 5.

G. of I. 1873 F. No 39. – 24.1.73 No 521 para 6.

G. of M, 1896. F. G.O. 175 17.3.96. No 22, 9.1.96 para 15

x Just so, and it has since been raised. But taken India used the words quoted, it meant that Rs 75000 was not to be drawn unless actually spent. Bs

G. of I. 1873. F. No 39. 24.1.73 No 521 para 7

do do do. do para 8

x do No 38 do No 520 do.

	Bombay	Madras
Salary of the Govr.	125,000	124.100
Staff & Household	1.14.000	46.900
Contract Allce.	91.000	90.000
Tour Expenses	6.000	5.600
Surgeon to H.E.		12.000
Asst. Surgeon &c.		4.860
	3.36.000	2.83.460
	2.83.460	
	52540	

v. endorsement of 20.11.95.

Hardly so long ago. The C.A. was fixed at Rs 90000 in 1878 Bs

P.W. E. 2 1127/96

Mr. G.
25 A.
1,000—21-3-96.

Financial DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 1711

FOR ORDERS.

With refce to para 6 of the current, I cannot remember how the suggestion came to be made that the supplemental grant of 1895-96 (v. para 14 of the letter of 9/1/96) should be recovered from the allce of the next year – As a general rule, I think it should be, but in the particular instance it is evident it could not be, for Lord Wenlock was just leaving & the effect would have been to throw the burden of his expenditure on ~~the~~ H.E. the present Govr. – Apparently the G. of I. perceived this error & so made no comment on the point – The statement should have been made in general, not in particular, terms.

I regret that I cannot join in urging the G. of I. to increase the Contract allce. – In the absence of detailed infn as to how the money is spent, it seems to me ~~that~~ the allowance should be ample for the purposes for which it is intended, if administered with due economy. I would specially draw attention to the enormous grant of Rs 10000 per annum for furniture (half in the contract allce & half in the P.W.D.) –

I do not think that a comparison can reasonably be made with the expenditure in Bbay, where it is notorious that expenses generally are far higher than in Madras.

Bs
7/8/96

O.S.
22.7.96

Please see Note marked A. by the Military Secretary, with which I concur.

A.E.H.
12.8.96

The order of the G. of I. about the sum spent on the last G.G.'s visit seems to me to show that they considered the part of the expenditure with regard to which this Govt. was divided in opinion shd be charged to the Contract Allowance x

+ ignored in the Military Sec's letter

Rd
5/8/96

x but under the peculiar circumstances of that special case, they wd allow an additional grant if it could be made from Provincial Revenues. This negatived my opinion formed from the papers then before us, that if the C.A. was intended to meet the expenditure on such visits it seemed true that it shd be increased. Accordingly I do not think we could ask India to raise the contract allowance unless we see a detailed account of how the present allowance is spent, & can demonstrate that it is insufficient.

J.G.
14/8/96

I do not follow this – It seems contradictory

Bs
22/8/96

I would let the matter rest for the present, reserving the right to revive the question when occasion arises.

A.E.H.
27.8.96

apparently com

Contract Allowance

FOR ORDERS.

H. E. THE GOVERNOR. ②

THE HON'BLE MR. H. W. BLISS, C.I.E. ①

THE HON'BLE MR. J. GROSE, C.I.E. ③

C 6/8
14/8

[G. / 25 A.]
1,000—21-3-96.

Financial DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 1711

Contract Allowance

The Hon'ble Mr. Bliss C.I.E.
H.E. the Governor. — has noted within

FOR ORDERS.

× dated 12/8/96

*

So far as I can see, the only new ~~[illegible]~~ B
arguments advanced by the Mil. Sec:
H.E. the Govr. are those contained in
a 4 of his memo. of the 10th inst.,
i.e. one to the effect that if India had
idered that its ruling of 1878 (that the
should not be subject to casual excesses)
ed to extra grants required to meet the
ses of a Viceroy's visit, it would have
ated the suggestion made in para 14 of
Govt's letter of Jan 9, 1896, & have ordered
overy of the extra grant applied for in
t rent year, as was done in two instances
B.T. But he has omitted to note that
is not an isolated pronouncement
[illegible] thought when I wrote my note
[illegible]) but must be read with para 15, as the
approv points out. Taking the two together
and then with para 2 of India's letter
9, 1896, it is quite clear that what
meant was that the extra grant of
ld be sanctioned only because the
ld otherwise have to be recovered from
than the person who had in-
expenditure. The first sentence of
2 is clear & unqualified in any

that I must maintain my opinion
d not be increased

I init.

HWB
22/8/96

Recirculated to the Hon'ble Mr. Bliss, C.I.E, with reference to H.E. the Governor's note× and to H.E. the Governor with reference to Hon'ble Members' notes*.

As regards para 14 of letter No. 22 Fin. of 9.1.96 ~~and~~ attention is solicited to para 15 of the same ~~[illegible]~~ where the objection to a supplemental grant was stated

C.S.
15.8.96

JG 25/8/96

C 25/8
28/8

FOR ORDERS.

H. E. THE GOVERNOR.

THE HON'BLE MR. H. W. BLISS, C.I.E.

THE HON'BLE MR. J. GROSE, C.I.E.

R 579

The question of the head to which the expenditure now being incurred on the gardens at Guindy should be debited needs to be settled — See my note at the top of page 2 of the Mil. Sec's memm.

HB
1/9/96

JG
2/9/96

If Hon. Members see no objection, I would rather, as I have said in my note of 27.8.96, that the matter should be allowed to rest for the present, i.e. that the papers should be simply recorded.

A.H.
5.9.96

I don't think it will quite do to "record" the Mil: Sec's letter of July 18. To do so would be hardly civil, especially with ref. to his para 7 which requires an answer — I think that the draft already put up should issue.

As to the expenditure by the P.W.D. of money which, according to the usual precedent should be found by the Contt: Allce, in deference to H.E.'s wishes, & as the sum is not a large one, I will not press the matter. But as responsible for the Prov. finances, I feel it my duty to express a hope that care will in future be taken not to ~~[illegible]~~ defray from the P.W. grant expenditure which should apparently be met from the C.A.

HB
10/9/96

Perhaps it wd be best for the Military Secretary to withdraw his letter.

~~[illegible]~~
~~[illegible]~~
~~[illegible]~~

withdraw

JG
12/9/96

I withdraw my objection to the issue of the order as long as it is

in

Financial

C. No. 1711 2648 & 3276 of 1896.

Order ~~Dt~~ Mis. No. 428 of 31st May '97

The Govt. regrets that it is unable to take the action indicated in para 7 of the letter from the Mily: Secy. to H.E. the Governor.

[From Orders]

C.S.
28.8.96

31/8/96

Mily. Secy. to H.E. the Governor. (1711 = 9 + A)

(From Orders)

Cmd
6/5/97

Desp
5/6/97

Resubmitted to Hon'ble Members with reference to H.E. the Governor's note of the 5th instant. The Hon'ble Mr. Bliss's query as to the expenditure on the gardens at Guindy will, if he still desires the point to be raised, be referred to the Public Works Dept. for report.

C.S.
7.9.96

8/9/96

Resubmitted to H.E. the Governor with reference to Hon'ble Members notes

14/9/96

C.S.
14.9.96

...ed that by so doing, I do not imply concurrence with the order.

I am unable to understand para. 2 of the Hon. Mr. Bliss's note of 10.9.96. I do not know to what expenditure he alludes. I am not aware of any expenditure chargeable to the Contract All.ce which is defrayed by the P.W.D. I believe the garden and grounds at Guindy are kept up out of the Contract All.ce. Roads, fences and buildings are, I think, maintained by the P.W.D, but I understand that such items form a legitimate charge on the P.W.D. funds. I should be greatly obliged to the Hon. Mr. Bliss if he will specify the expenditure to which he refers.

ASH

21.9.96

Submitted to the Hon'ble Mr. H.W. Bliss, C.I.E., with reference to H.E. the Governor's note d/ 21.9.96

C.S.
22/9/96

A.A. 22.9.96

P.W. E.3/11276/96

The paper is not in the file but in a recent order in the P.W.D. will be found an item of expenditure sanctioned out of P.W. funds for creeper stands, or some similar purpose, in the garden at Guindy. By the analogy of the Panel case the expenditure should be defrayed from the C.A. — I can't remember the exact amt. but it can be ascertained in the P.W.D.

HB
24/9/96

To.
The Secretary P.W.D.

Will you please forward to Financial a copy of the order referred to by the Hon'ble Mr. Bliss C.I.E. in his note of the 24th September

C.S.
25.9.96

A.A. 28.9.96

Financial

~~**Public Works**~~ **(1896) Department.**

CURRENT No. ~~9238~~ 2648

D

P.W. E.4/11276/96

~~**Order**~~ Endorsement
No 1621 Dy 16 October 1896

Transferred to the Chief Secretary Financial Dept. with reference to his office note dated 25-9-96.

From The Consulting Architect to the Government of Madras

No. 3632

[illegible]
Colonel R.E.
Secty to Govt.

Dated 13th October 1896

Received 14.10.96

Enclosures

Spare copies

With Finl. CNo. 1711 & file
Copy of memo No. 1546 W Dd/ 9 Oct 96
Do G.O. 2115 W dd/ 21 July 96

SUBJECT.

Reporting the expenditure incurred & contemplated on the "creeper stands" at Govt. House Guindy

Recd 17/10/96
Regd 17.10.96
Encs: 2 & C.No. 1711 with orig. note & file retd.

O.L.S. 500

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
1544 P.		P.W.	9.10.96
2557-SW.		P.W.	3.9.96
2116 W.	Copy	P.W.	21-7-96
2115 W	Copy	P.W.	21-7-96
1824 W.	Dar	Do	19-6-96
Finl	CP. 17th Feb 96		
21-22	Finl	orig	9.1.96
175	Finl	Copy	17.3.96
146	Pub.	Copy	11-2-82
1313	Pub.	Copy	1.9.80
970	Pub.	Copy	20.6.79
875	Do	Copy	17.V.78
~~182~~ 306	Finl	Copy	18.2.78
1737	Pub	Do	27.12.77
1700	Do	Do.	18.12.77
1559	Do	Do.	16.11.77
1516	Do	Do.	10.11.77
1487	Do	Do	6.11.77
1486	Do	Do	6.11.77
945	Do	Do	14.7.77
715	Do	Do	22.V.77
339.40	Do	Do.	16.3.77
426-7	Do	Do.	29.2.76
484.	Do	Do	1.V.74
159	Finl	Finl	12.2.74
158	Pub.	Do	12.2.74
165	Finl.	Copy ~~Do~~	3.2.74
897	Pub.	Copy	22.8.73
693	Pub.	Copy.	3.7.73
692	Do	Do.	3.7.73
269	Finl	Copy.	1-3-73
201	Finl	Copy.	11.2.73
1200	Finl	Copy	12.9.72
511	Do	Do	12.4.72
774	Do.	Do.	13.12.71

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

No. 2115 W., 21st July 1896.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

READ—the following paper:—

From Lieutenant-Colonel C. C. RAWSON, R.E., Acting Consulting Architect to Government, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Chepâk, 9th July 1896, No. 1882.

With reference to paragraph 2 of G.O. No. 1824 W., dated 19th June 1896, I have the honour to report that the necessity for special repairs to Government Houses, Madras and Guindy, was the outcome of a letter received from the Military Secretary to His Excellency the Governor, who in sending a sample of dry rot removed from one of the beams in the Marine Villa, remarked that, "if the rest of the roof timbers were in the same state, the building must be in a dangerous state."

I directed a thorough examination of the roof timbers with the following results.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE, MADRAS.

Main Building.—The floors and roofs are terraced on teak beams and joists except the drawing-room and sky bed-room which have sloped roofs of Bengal terracing supported on teak trusses. In the first floor and terrace roof above second floor, the bearings of timbers were found to be in a very fair state of preservation, with the exception of a few joists the ends of which were decayed, which are being replaced. In the lower terrace roof above first floor, chiefly of the dining-room situated over the carriage porch and side verandahs, the beams and joists were found to be very much decayed; the whole of the timbers and terracing is being renewed. About three years ago nearly 40 joists and 3 beams were replaced. The roof here leaks much during rains; hence the cause of the decay of timbers.

Banquetting Hall.—Many of the joists supporting the floor are decayed at their ends, and are being replaced in the roof of the hall which is covered with Mangalore tiles; a number of rafters and some purlins are decayed and are being replaced.

Private Secretary's Office.—A few joists in the lower verandah were decayed at their ends and are being replaced; all the timbers in the upper storey are in good conditions.

Aide-de-Camp's Bungalow.—With the exception of two rooms and verandahs in the lower storey, the whole of the beams and joists supporting the floor are decayed and are being replaced; the timbers supporting the roof of the upper storey, which was constructed about ten years ago, are in good condition.

Out-houses.—The kitchen and store have terraced roofs supported on teak joists; some of them were found to be decayed. The east verandah of the head coachman's quarters has a Bengal terrace roof supported on palmyrah rafters; these are all much decayed, and the roof itself cracked; it is proposed to replace the palmyrahs with teak rafters and cover the roof with Mangalore tiles. The ends of many of the palmyrah rafters of the horse stalls are decayed; it is proposed to fix brackets and purlins to support these. The same is to be done to support the ends of the joists in the body-guard room.

Police Station near West Entrance Gate.—The roof of the verandah which was entirely of wood was found to be much decayed; Mangalore tiles are to be substituted on teak rafters.

RS.

FURTHER PAPERS

Department. Date.

Marine Villa.—A few of the joists supporting the terrace floor are decayed at their ends; they will be replaced, but the whole of the timbers supporting the terrace roof (except those in the south verandah which appear to be of a more recent date) are in an advanced state of decay, the wall plates imbedded in the wall on which the ends of the joists rested were entirely reduced to powder. It is found necessary to remove the whole of the timbers and terrace, and re-terrace with new teak beams and joists.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE, GUINDY.

Main Building.—The joists to the ground floor of passage between second and third blocks are of palmyrah; most of them are decayed and few have already left the roof. It is proposed to remove the palmyrah joists and to insert teak joists instead, without removing the terrace. In the passage between first and second blocks the teak rafters are not only decayed, but also sagged very much. Provision is made to remove the roof and joists and to replace the same. This is all the special repairs to the main building itself.

Military Secretary's Office.—The verandah has a Bengal terrace, a portion of which is supported with palmyrah joists; these joists are partially decayed and are not strong enough to support the roof, many of the joists show signs of twisting; provision is therefore made for removing that portion of the Bengal terrace verandah supported by palmyrah rafters, and replacing the same with teak rafters, the same as the other portion of the verandah.

Kitchen.—This comprises not only kitchen, but stores, servants' godowns, &c.

The roof of the verandah in the court-yard is of flat and pan tiles with palmyrah rafters. The rafters are completely decayed, the outer shell of hard wood only remaining, and the ends which enter the wall are completely eaten away in most of the rafters. Three out of the four valley rafters are decayed at the end where they are fixed in the wall. The bressummers are in good order. It is proposed to replace the palmyrah rafters by teak, as good palmyrah cannot be had in the local market at present.

The main rooms of the kitchen are terraced, the timber work of which are decayed at the ends including the beams. Provision has been made for removing and replacing the terrace over these four rooms and for new teakwood. Most of the old joists which are rotten at the ends only will be utilized on other works in Guindy Park, for which provision has been made in other estimates.

Creeper Stands.—These were of teakwood, and during the past ten years were twice replaced; so it is proposed to erect them of wrought iron.

Cisterns.—The lotus cistern is about 70 feet in diameter, but very shallow; consequently the Victoria Regia lotus cannot be got to grow to any perfection, so it is proposed to sink four wells 4′ deep in the bed of the cistern for the lotus plants.

The other lotus cistern near the fern-shed leaks so badly that it is difficult to keep any water in it; provision is therefore made for plastering the same with cement. The Military Secretary asked that the creepers stands and cisterns be attended to.

Stables.—The roof is covered with flat and pan tiles supported with palmyrah couples. The couples are completely decayed, the ends of most of them where they enter the wall are eaten up and have sunk, a few pieces nailed on to strengthen them, and some of the collar pieces have already fallen down.

During the past ten years two sides of the stables were raised and improved, and it is only this one side that now remains to be done. Owing to the difficulty in getting good palmyrahs it is proposed to use teakwood instead. A portion of the roof has palmyrah reepers; these are completely decayed, so much so, that the flat tiles keep falling down.

Servants' Quarters.—Provision is made for re-roofing two of the oldest blocks which are in a very shaky condition. The roof consists of pan tiles supported with palmyrah couples with a ridge ventilator. The couples are twisted, the palmyrahs are much decayed, only the outer skin remaining. Provision is made for re-roofing

these two blocks with the best of the palmyrahs to be removed from the kitchen and the stables, but I fear the requisite quantity will hardly be had from the buildings above referred to.

Gate Lodges.—These are all terraced, but the teak joists are so rotten at the ends that, with a single crack of a hammer, every one of them can be removed. Provision is made for removing and replacing the terrace and for using the old teak that is to be removed from the kitchen.

Farm-yard.—This is the oldest building in Guindy Park, and most of the buildings forming it are in bad order. The building called the Superintendent's office is two-storied, the joists to the lower storey are decayed at the ends and are supported by purlins along the wall. The joists in the upper storey are also in much the same condition. Last year three joists completely left the roof and were replaced with new joists. The Superintendent's quarters in the farm-yard is in a worse condition. Here also the joists can be removed with very little force. Godowns are covered over with flat and pan tiles supported by palmyrah rafters which are much decayed, the roof outside having a wavery appearance owing to the rafters having sunk in places.

Eastern Bungalow.—In this bungalow two of the Aide-de-Camps to his Excellency the Governor reside. This roof consists of flat and pan tiles supported by palmyrah rafters which are all decayed, especially those over the main rooms. The ends where they enter the wall are completely eaten away and are supported by purlins running along the wall. Provision is made for removing this roof entirely and for placing a Mangalore tiled roof instead with a teak ceiling. The roof supports to be of teak.

ORDER—No. 2115 W., dated 21st July 1896.

His Excellency the Governor in Council is of opinion that, under the circumstances brought to notice in this letter, it is desirable that no time should be lost in renovating these residences which have been allowed to fall into a state of disrepair which threatens their safety in some cases. The estimated cost of these repairs, which must, in some cases, be regarded as "special," is likely to exceed the limit of expenditure (Rs. 15,000) prescribed in paragraph 10, chapter VI, Volume II of the Public Works Code. The sanction of the Government of India will accordingly be requested to the immediate commencement of the work of renovation, in anticipation of the submission of complete estimates of the cost; a schedule of which should be framed and submitted by the Consulting Architect on account of each residence, separately.

[Here enter No. 2116 W., dated 21st July 1896.]

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. McNEIL CAMPBELL, Colonel, R.E.,
Joint Secretary to Government.

To the Consulting Architect to Government.
„ Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
„ Military Secretary to His Excellency the Governor.

Ex'd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

Spare Copies

(1) The Creeper Stands

BS.
BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of {1896} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated July, 21st.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O. No. 2115 W., 21st July 1896.

JULY.

1896
Jul
Enclos 2
C. No. 2648-

P.W. E.G. / 11278/96

Government Houses, Madras

Ordered that the Government of India be requested to sanction the immediate commencement of the work of renovating the —, in anticipation of the submission of complete estimates.

CHIEF SECRET.
No. 2150

Cns 17114 26

Fi. Financial Dept.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

MEMORANDUM.

Dated Madras, 9th October 1896.

The undersigned is directed to request that the Consulting Architect will be so good as to report the expenditure incurred, and contemplated, on the creeper stands at Government House, Gundy, mentioned on page 2 of Go. 2115 W dated 21 July 1890, and to state whether the stands in question are placed in the grounds so as to form an adjunct of the garden, or whether they are an attachment to the residence.

(Sd) D. McNeil Campbell
Col. R.E.,
Secretary.

The Consulting Architect.

Seen

[P. W. 41
2,000—6-3-96.]

1896
[illegible]
1
2648

P.W. 3/11278/140

Q 14/8

No. 3632.

Chepauk, Madras,
13th October 1896.

From
Lt Col C. C. Rawson R.E.
Ag Consulting Architect
to the Government of Madras,

To
The Chief Engineer
Public Works Department

Enclosures.
Abstract not recd.

Sir,

With reference to your Memorandum
No 1544 D dated the 9th Instant I have the hon
to report that the Estimate "Special Repair
to Creeperstands and Cisterns in the garde
at Government House Guindy Rs 1410" in
cludes Rs 1021 on account of Creeper Stands
up to date bills to the extent of Rs 284-12-9
paid on account of the above work has
it is expected that bills for the remaining
portion will be received shortly. The Stand
were to replace old decayed ones in the
garden and they were ordered to be ma
in the Public Works Workshops.

I.

Sir

Your most Obedient Servant

C. A. Lawson(?) Lt Col R.E.
12/10/96

Ag Consulting Architect to Govt

P.W. E.I. / 1127B/96

C. No. 1711 & 2648

CHIEF SECRETARY GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
24 NOV 1896

Financial Dept.

Contract Allowances

The Hon'ble Mr. Bliss C.I.E.

H.E. the Governor.

Seen. I see that this is not the first occasion ~~of~~ on which these creeper stands have been repaired from P.W. funds, instead of from the C.A.

H.B.
23/10/96

These creeper-stands are, I think, in the nature of permanent structures. I should say that the cost of their original construction and upkeep are legitimate charges against the P.W.D. In fact, I was not aware that the Contract Allowance was charged with the cost of the up-keep of gardens or garden structures at all. I can find no such item in the list of items of expenditure chargeable against the Contract All^ce. (See para. 7 of G.O. No. 175, 17th March 1896). I should like information on this point.

I should like to know if any money, and if so how much, has been expended on repairing the Farm-yard. I withhold sanction of the item. If any money has been expended, the A.G.'s authority should be quoted. G.O. No. 2115W. of 21 July 1896 would not be sufficient authority.

A.E.H. 28.10.96

C 23/10 | C 24/10

C. No. 2648 (flagged N) is submitted with reference to the notes of H.E. the Governor d/ 21.9.96 and of the Hon'ble Mr. Bliss C.I.E. d/ 24.9.96 (flagged M).

C.S.
21.x.96

A.S.A.
22.10.96.

To.
The Secretary, P.W.D.

Will you please note with reference to H.E. the Governor's note d/ 28.x.96.

C.S.
28.10.96

A.S.A. 29.10.96

Financial Dept.
CURRENT No. 3040
No. 4317C d/ 21st Novr 1896.

Reply.

The Consulting Architect reports as follows:—

(1) The creeper stands are

of the nature of permanent structures.

(2) A sum of Rs 100 is being expended monthly on the maintenance of park roads &c at Govt. House, Guindy. No expenditure is incurred on the upkeep of the gardens or garden structures at Govt. House Madras.

(3) No expenditure has been incurred in repairing the farm yard at Guindy.

D. W. Campbell Colonel R.E.
Secy to Govt. P.W.D.

Cir

Recd 23-11-96
Enclo (a file of papers)

Submitted to H.E. the Governor with reference to his note of 28. 10. 96.

AH 25.11.96

Cud
23. 11. 96

I should like to see the authority under which the Contract Allowance is charged with any portion of the cost of the up-keep of the garden and grounds at Govt. House, Madras and Govt. House Guindy. There is no such item in the distribution of the Contract All^ce.

A.H. 28.11.96

Vk
Note the orders
Cud

Financial Dept

H.E. the Governor

Note

With reference to His Excellency's Note dated the 28th ultimo as to the authority under which the Contract allowance is charged with any portion of the cost of the upkeep of the gardens and grounds at Govt House, Madras, and Govt House, Guindy, it is submitted that from paras 3 + 4 of the Govt of India Resolution recorded in G.O. No 1313 Public, d/ 1st September 1880, the charges ~~referred to~~ in question would seem to fall against ~~"Household Contingencies" for which Rs 18,500 are allotted. Vide page 2 of G.O. No 175 Fin'l d/ 17th March 1896 flagged~~ the Contract allowance

Cud
2.12.96

AH 3.12.96

marked Z.
in margin.

Z is 11.10.
11.11. is on the next page

B This is so, but the actual household and other purposes for which the Contract All^ce is chargeable are specified in No. 175 Fin'l., 17th March 1896. The upkeep of parks and gardens is not one of those specified purposes; and the date of this arrangement being more recent than that of the G.O. quoted in the note, it is to be presumed that the latter is superseded by the former. Further search must be made for the authority asked for in my notes of 28.10.96 and 28.11.96. Surely there is some rule in the P.W.D. Code or elsewhere regarding the up-keep of Govt. House Gardens and other premises belonging to the Govt.

A.H. 6.12.96

C 4/12

R 7/12

E.G.
P.W. 12/7/96

[F. / 28]
1,000—29-7-96.

Financial (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 3276

From P.W.D.

Order

No. 4836 C

Dated 14
Received 14 } Dec. 96
Registered 16
Enclosures
Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Stating that there is no definite rule in the Public Works Dept. regarding the head to which the cost of the upkeep of Govt. House Gardens and parks should be debited.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Pwd

4836C

14 } Dec 96
14
16

Cm8

Stating that there is no definite rule in the Public Works Dept regarding the head to which the cost of the upkeep of Govt House Gardens and parks should be debited.

[G/73]
500—1-8-96.

Financial DEPARTM

OFFICE NOTE No. 2606

Dated 10th December 1896.

From

THE Ag: CHIEF SECRETARY,

To

THE SECRETARY, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

With ~~er~~ reference to His Excellency the Governor's note dated the 6th instant, will you please let me have information at an early date as to whether there is any rule in the Public Works Code or any ruling of the Public Works Department regarding the head to which the cost of the up-keep of Government House gardens and parks should be debited.

A L Arundell

Ag: Chief Secretary.

Cm8
9.12.96

CURRENT No. 3276

No. 4836C of 14-12-96.

Reply.

There is no definite rule on the subject in the P. W. Dept.

Colonel R.E.
Secretary to Govt

Recd 14-12-96
Regd 16-12-96.
Enclos – 1 file.

Public Works (1896) Department

Current No: 11276

Recd: 11.12.96

Enclos: 9

S. aw.

Financial Department

Govt. House Gardens
and Contract Allowance

H.E. the Governor

G°

B

This does not throw light on the question. Perhaps the Mil. Sec. would ascertain informally from what sources the upkeep of the Govt. Houses in Bombay, Poona and Mahabaleshwar ~~—~~ is met.

A.G.H.
15.3.97

F

B

The Mil. Sec. has shown me a letter from the Mil. Sec. to the Governor of Bombay, from which it appears that the cost of keeping up the gardens at Bombay, Poona &c is charged to the Contract All^ce. This question may be allowed to drop.

A.G.H. 21.4.97

C 25/4/97

R 22/4/97 R 1/4/97

C.No 3276

In his note dated 5th December 1896, H.E. the Governor remarked;

" The actual household and "other purposes for which the contract "allowance is chargeable are speci-"-fied in G.O., No.175 Financial "dated 17th March 1896. The upkeep "of parks and gardens is not one of "those specified purposes, and the "date of the arrangement being more "recent than that of the G.O., "quoted in the note [No.1513 Public "d/1st September 1880], it is to be "presumed that the latter is super-"seded by the former.

2. His Excellency refers apparently to para 7 of this Govt's letter No.22 Finl, d/9th January 1896 which is reprinted on pages 1 to 4 of G.O., No.175 Finl, d/17th March 1896. But it is respectfully submitted that the earlier paras of that letter merely summarized past correspondence. The printed copy of the G.O. of March 1896 has been flagged and it will be seen that para 7 of letter No.22 Finl., d/ 9th January 1896, shows how the present contract allowance was arrived at . Para 4 of that letter states that the allowance was placed at Rs.75,000 in 1871, being chargeable with certain items. Of the items specified in

para

para 4, the expenditure on the Private Secretary's office establishment (Rs.5,196 per annum) was excluded in 1873 (para 6); office contingencies and telegraph charges (Rs.800) were eliminated in 1878 (para 7); and in the same year tour expenses were raised from Rs.20,000 to Rs.35,000 and the assignment for the remaining items from Rs.49,004 to Rs.55,000. The contract allowance was then fixed at Rs.90,000 * and has remained at that figure since. This was in 1878, please see G.O. No.875 Finl., d/17th May 1878 flagged H . The G.O. quoted in the previous note [No.1513 Public d/1st September 1880] which contains the ruling of the Govt. of India that "it is the duty of Their Excellencies "the Governors of Madras and Bombay "so to apply the public money placed "at their disposal for house-hold and "other *ex-officio* purposes as to main"-tain their official residences in "proper order" is of later date than the order of 1878 which placed the contract allowance at Rs.90,000. It will be observed from para 8 of the Govt. of India resolution in G.O. No.1513 Public d/1st September 1880 that allusion is made to the "sanctioned allowance of Rs.90,000 "for the household and tour allowances "of His Excellency the Governor of "Madras".

5. His Excellency also directed that further search should be made for a ruling regarding the up-keep of Government house gardens &c.,. The P.W.Dept. has been referred to but reports that there is no definite rule on the subject in that depart-ment. If there were any definite ruling beyond that in the G.O. of 1880, the P.W.Dept would, it is submitted, have it on record.

*

Grant in 1871................	75,000
Deduct P.S.'s office.............	5,196
	69,804
Deduct office contingencies & telegraph charges	800
	69,004
Add Extra Grant for Tour....	15,000
" " " for remaining items (55,000-49,004).....	5,996
	Rs.90,000

F

4. It may be mentioned that a grant of about Rs.2,000 per annum is ~~annually~~ made for the upkeep of the "Upper Norwood" park [Govt. House now occupies the site of "Upper Norwood"] at Ootacamund as is done in the case of Sim's Park and other gardens (please see page 158 of the Civil Budget Estimate for 1896-97) The grant for "Upper Norwood" park appears to have originated with G.O. No.2101 Finl., d/ 13th August 1877.

H²

Cws
18.1.97

Para 4 above was written in consequence of my having drawn attention to a grant of Rs 2000 a year for Ootacamund. A further search has been made and nothing ~~further~~ regarding the parks and gardens at Government Houses can be found. When H.G. the Duke of Buckingham was Govr of Madras it was a personal matter looked after [illegible] Park and Gardens. The P.W.D. then had nothing to do with them. I had coolies when I wanted them for any particular job. I do not know from what source they were paid. I gave the Superintendent my orders and he found the men. I never had anything to do with the gardens at Govt. House Madras.

23/1/97.

Finan

①

[G./25]
500—23-11-96.

C. Nos.1711, 2648 & 3276 of 1896.

(1) H. E. THE GOVERNOR. ✓
(2) THE HON'BLE MR. BLISS, C.I.E.
(3) THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.

CS

For orders

SUBJECT.

Govt. House Gardens and Contract Allowance.

FOR ORDERS.

W

With reference to H.E. the Governor's note of the 21st instant, in which he states that the question of expenditure on the gardens of Govt. Houses may be allowed to drop, orders are solicited as to the ~~disposal of the~~ Mily. Secy's letter No.240, d/ 18th July 1896, (C.No.1711), which still remains undisposed of in the file. As regards this, attention is invited to the draft order and the notes flagged M. The Hon'ble Mr. Bliss, C.I.E., was of opinion that the draft should issue. The Hon'ble Mr. Grose, C.I.E., considered that it would be best for the Mily. Secy. to withdraw his letter. H.E. the Governor withdrew his objection to the issue of the orde so long as it was understood that by doing he did not imply concurrence wi the order. The point for orders now is whether (i) the papers should be recorded (ii) the draft flagged M issue. If the Mr. Grose's suggestion were adopte

the

S

Note for the CS

The draft flagged M (now put below this) may issue?

CMS
7/5/97

The draft should issue subject to this proviso.

A.G.H.
30.4.97

JS
5/5/97

I have taken orders of HE in Council and the draft is to issue.

3/5/97

RD
28/5/97.

26/4

C
R 1/5/97

C 8/5/97
R 6/5/97

the recording of the papers would, it is submitted, meet the necessities of the case.

Cwd. 28/4/97

26.4.97.

Financial Department.

C. Nos. 1711, & 3276 of 1896

O R D E R:- No. 428, dated 31st May '97

Mis.

The Govt. regrets that it is unable to take the action indicated in para. 7 of the letter from the Military Secretary to H.E. the Governor.

(From Orders)

(Id.) J.F.P.
31/8/96.

(Id) C.S.
28/8/96.

To the Military Secretary to
H.E. the Governor (1711-Q & O)

Paper taken … e charge of the Referencer.

DATED

Dat

3

C. No

ERNMENT .. .. A A A A A A A

ERNMENT.

NO.

NO, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH

IN

n full.

be copied.

abstract only.

Copy heading only