

(1) Number of pages 1(2) Date of repair 18-6-68

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. //23

Press
Mis.

182-3

Dated 15-4

1868

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(P)

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th April 1868.*

No. 182. Read the following Endorsement of the Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Madras, 21st March 1868, No. 151.
Read the following letter from the Agent and Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Madras, 11th March 1868, No. 496:—

I have the honor to forward copy of a letter from the Chief Engineer, No. 1,170, dated 29th February 1868, containing remarks in explanation of the differences between the last and present estimates of the 3rd section, referred to in the correspondence attached to G. O., No. 593, dated 21st ultimo.

From the Chief Engineer, to the Agent and Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Kurnool, 29th February 1868, No. 1,170.

3rd Section. Explanation—G. O. No. 593 of 21st instant.

1. I feel it right to make a remark or two in explanation of some matters referred to in the correspondence attached to this order.

2. In Captain Mullins' letter, No. 132, attached to the G. O. in paragraph 3, he says:—
The Chief Engineer intended in paragraph 6 of his letter to explain the cause of the difference between the last and present estimates. That difference he puts at Rupees 1,01,090, but it will be noticed that the actual difference is Rupees 1,51,090 or Rupees 1,70,630.

The defect in my paragraph 6 lies in this that it refers only to real excess, and does not refer to a proposed transfer of account of half a lac.

The cost of plant for the 3rd section had been, I believe, borne by a sanction of a lac of rupees for plant for an abandoned work, the Kurnool anicut. In my first estimate of 1866 ("the last" above referred to) I proposed that Rupees 50,000 should be transferred from the sanction for the Kurnool anicut to that for the 3rd section, and I included no allowance for depreciation of plant in the 3rd section estimate. In the present estimates I thought it better to include the Rupees 50,000 in the 3rd section estimates, and to propose that Rupees 50,000 be struck off the sanction for plant for Kurnool anicut. Of course, this makes the present estimates Rs. 50,000

• For which sanction was asked in each case.

more than the former one, but does not affect the estimated total of expenditure,* which was what my paragraph 6 was intended to explain.

3. In paragraph 5, Captain Mullins remarks that Rupees 33,493, entered in the estimates of 1866 under the description maintenance, is not included in the present estimates. But it is manifest that the maintenance for the two years intervening between the estimates is included; the present estimates being for making up the banks completely. The difference unaccounted for, according to Captain Mullins' figures at the end of his paragraph 5, will therefore be Rs. 33,749, instead of Rupees 67,242.

4. I should add, that my letter accompanying the present estimates was not intended to enter on the question of the difference of the estimates sanctioned in 1865 and those submitted a year ago, but was confined to further increase of the present estimates over the latter. There is now no Engineer in the Company's service acquainted with the principle upon which the estimates sanctioned in 1865 were framed. I believe that they were estimates for completing the canal as then proposed, supposing it begun afresh; and the money spent up to date was deducted from the total, to leave the amount required to complete the works from that date. Whatever errors therefore existed in the construction or payments before 1865 (excepting Rupees 16,000 entered for abandoned works) they were, if I am correct, all carried into the estimates of 1865, and only errors in estimating the total cost of the whole canal from the commencement, strictly in accordance with the designs then submitted, were eliminated. This must render any investigation unsatisfactory, but I will endeavour to lose sight of no means of explanation.

1. Submitted for the information of Government, with reference to their Order of the 21st February last, No. 593.

2. The Agent forwards with this letter a communication from the Chief Engineer, affording explanation regarding some points noticed in the letter from this office, submitting revised estimates for the 3rd Section, Main Canal. Mr. Latham,

pro. Agent's Manager

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th April 1868.*

in paragraph 3 of his letter, shows that though maintenance is not separately provided for in the estimate of 1867, it is nevertheless included in that estimate, and that consequently, in making the comparison between the estimates of 1866 and 1867, in paragraph 5 of the letter from this office, the omitted items should have been put at Rupees 7,902, instead of Rupees 41,395: consequently the remainder of increase of the estimate of 1867 "due to alterations or modifications of the quantities and "rates for work common to both estimates" is Rupees 33,749, instead of Rs. 67,242. The mistake made was caused by the variation in the form of the estimates, and the difference of arrangement was not discoverable in this office. The great increase

* Cubic yards 28,44,203

† Do. 24,92,839

3. The Chief Engineer (paragraph 4) says that his "letter accompanying † 1867.

"difference of the estimates sanctioned in 1865, and those submitted a year ago, "but was confined to further increase of the present estimates over the latter." As, however, sanction was refused to the estimates of 1866, because no sufficient explanation was given of the increase shown in these above the estimates of 1865, it seems evident that, when estimates still larger than those of 1866 were submitted for sanction, there must have been an increased need of explanations accounting for the insufficiency of the sanction of 1865, and that merely to explain the relation of the new estimates to those which had been rejected in 1866, and which, therefore, were useless as a standard of reference, must have left the Government without the information which was desired, and to obtain which additional sanction had been postponed.

4. The Government will notice that although the Chief Engineer states that from the absence of any officers who are acquainted with the principle on which the estimates sanctioned in 1865 were framed, it must be difficult to obtain a satisfactory investigation, he will nevertheless "endeavour to lose sight of no means "of explanation."

5. In paragraph 17 of the letter from this office above referred to, the banking of the estimate of 1865 should be cubic yards 18,98,204 and consequently, in the last sentence of paragraph 18, the increase on earthworks due to extra quantities at former rates should be Rupees 81,951, instead of Rupees 78,300.

(Signed) J. MULLINS, Captain, R. E.,
Consulting Engineer, Irrigation & Canal Company.

No. 183.

ORDER THEREON, 15th April 1868, No. 1,123.

IRRIGATION, No. 6.

Ordered to be recorded.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) CHARLES A. ORR, Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company.
do. Manager for do.
do. do.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

N^o 496 Madras Govt. Co. ③
Madras 11th March 1868.

From
The Agents Managers
R. & C. Co.

To
The Consulting Engineer
R. & C. Co.

Sir,
I have the honor to forward
copy of a letter from the Chief Engineer
No. 1170 dated 29th February 1868 con-
taining remarks in explanation
of the differences between the last
and present estimates of the 3^d
Section referred to in the corres-
pondence attached to G.O. No. 598
dated 21st October

I have the honor to be
Sir
Yours most respectfully
A. B. Mullins
per. Agents Managers

No: 1170

Maori's Br. & Canal Co.
Chief Engineer's Office
Suva 29 Feb 1868.

J. H. Kuslowe Esq.
Agent, Suva
Maori's.

3rd Sect. - Viplanation
G. O. No. 593 of 2nd Inst.

I feel it right to make a remark
or two in explanation of some matters
referred to in the Correspondence
attached to this Order.

In Captain Dullin's letter
No. 132 attached to the G. O. in para
3 he says.

The Chief Engineer intended
in para 6 of his letter to explain
the Cause of the difference between
the last and present Estimates.
That difference he puts at
Rs.

Rs. 101,090, but it will be noticed that the actual difference is Rs. 157,090 or Rs. 170,630.

The defect in my para 6 lies in this that it refers only to real exp., and does not refer to a proposed transfer of account of half a lac

The cost of plant for the 3rd section had been, I believe, borne by a sanction of a lac of rupees for plant for an abandoned work the Numool Aincut. In my first Estimate of 1866 (the lastst above referred to) I proposed that Rs. 50,000 should be transferred from the sanction for the Numool Aincut & that for the 3rd section, and I included no allowance for depreciation of plant

in the 3rd section Estimate. In the present Estimate I thought it better to include the Rupees 50,000 in the 3rd section Estimate and to propose that Rs. 50,000 be struck off the sanction for plant for Numool Aincut. Of course this makes the present Estimate Rs. 50,000 more than the former one, but does not affect the estimated total of Rs. 4- which - pend there, which was what it was intended in each (my para 6 was intended to explain

3. In para 5 Captain Mullins remarks that Rs. 33,493 entered in the Estimates of 1866 under the description maintenance is not included in the present Estimates. But it is manifest that the maintenance for the

2 years intervening between the
Estimates is included; the present
Estimates being for making
up the banks complete.
The difference unaccounted
for according to Captain Smith's
figures at the end of his para
5, will therefore be Rs 33,749
instead of Rs 69,242.

I should add that
my letter accompanying
the present Estimates was not
intended to enter on the question
of the difference of the Estimates
sanctioned in 1865, and those
submitted a year ago: but
was confined to further
increase of the present
Estimates over the latter. There
is now no dispute in the Com-
pany's Service as regards
with

with the principle upon which
the Estimates sanctioned
in 1865 were framed. I believe
that they were Estimates for
completing the Canal as then
proposed, supposing it
began a fresh; and the money
spent up to date was deducted
from the total to leave the
amount required to complete
the works from that date.
Whatever errors therefore
existed in the Construction
or payments before 1865 (ex-
cepting Rs 16,000 entered
for abandoned works) they
were, if I am correct, all
carried into the Estimates
of 1865 and only errors in
estimating the total cost of
the whole Canal from the
Commencement.

Commencement strictly in
accordance with the designs
then submitted, were eliminated.
This must render any investigation
unsatisfactory, but I will
endeavour to lose sight
of no means of explanation.

I have &c
/ of John B. Latham
Chief Engineer

RM 1100/68

True copy
Madras
Opulthanas

of 11th 1868

11th 1868

11th 1868

Submitted copy of a letter
from the Chief Engineer to the
dated 29th July 1868
-ing 3 minutes in explanation
-tion of the said letter and the
the last of the said letter
of the 3rd of the said letter
to the 3rd of the said letter
to the 3rd of the said letter

Dated 11th 1868

11th 1868

11th 1868

11th 1868

11th 1868

11th 1868

11th 1868

11th 1868

11th 1868

11
N^o 151
Endorsement to a letter N^o 496 of the 11th March
1868 from the Agent and Manager Madras
Irrigation and Canal Company.
1 Submitted for the information of Govern-
ment with reference to their order of the 21st
February last, N^o 593.
2 The Agent forwards with this letter a
communication from the Chief Engineer, affording
explanation regarding some points noticed in
the letter from this office, submitting revised
estimates for the 3rd Section Main Canal. Mr.
Latham in para 3 of his letter shows that
though maintenance is not separately
provided for in the estimate of 1867, it is
nevertheless included in that estimate and
that consequently, in making the comparison
between the estimates of 1866 and 1867, in
para 5 of the letter from this office, the omitted
items should have been put at Rupees 7,902
instead of Rupees 4,139 5; consequently the
remainder of increase of the estimate of 1867
due to alterations or modifications of the
"quantities and rates for work common to
both estimates" is Rupees 33,719 instead of Rupees
67,242. The mistake made was caused by the
variation in the form of the estimates, and the
difference of arrangement was not discoverable
in

in this office. The great increase of quantities of earthwork in the estimate of 1867 above those of that of 1866 is to a great extent explained by the fact of the incorporation of allowances for maintenance in the former.

3 The Chief Engineer (para 1) says that his letter accompanying the present estimates "was not intended to enter on the question of the difference of the estimates sanctioned in 1865, and those submitted a year ago: but was confined to further increase of the present estimates over the latter." As however sanction was refused to the estimates of 1866 because no sufficient explanation was given of the increase shown in these above the estimates of 1865, it seems evident that, when estimates still larger than those of 1866 were submitted for sanction, there must have been an increased need of explanations accounting for the insufficiency of the sanction of 1865, and that merely to explain the relation of the new estimates to those which had been rejected in 1866, and which therefore were useless as a standard of reference, must have left the Government without the information which was desired, and to obtain which additional sanction had been postponed.

4 The Government will notice that, although the Chief Engineer states that from

the absence of any officers who are acquainted with the principle on which the estimates sanctioned in 1865 were framed, it must be difficult to obtain a satisfactory investigation, he will nevertheless endeavour to lose sight of no means of explanation.

5 In para 17 of the letter from this office above referred to the Banking of the estimate of 1865 should be Cubic yards 18,98,204 and consequently, in the last sentence of para 18, the increase on earthworks due to extra quantities at former rates should be Rupees 81,951, instead of Rupees 78,300.—

Consulting Engineer's Office
Irrigation and Canal Co.
Madras 21st March 1868
Complete

Whindum's Captain R.E.
Consulting Engineer, I.C.C.

The Secretary to Government
P.W.C.

