

6.5

(1) Number of pages 18
 (2) Date of repair 5/1/49
 (3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1735	Press
501-02		Mis.
Dated	29. 6. 1871.	

60

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 501 Read the following letter from the Acting Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 8th June 1871, No. 30 —

I HAVE the honour to forward an application (with its accompaniments) from the Agent and Manager, Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, for sanction for Rupees 4,519-8-5, being the amount of first cost and subsequent

1 Letter from the Agent, in original, with accompaniments
1 Plan
1 Estimate

expenditure on repairs of the Lockinsula bungalow on the 6th Section of the Company's canal

2. This bungalow was built without sanction, its cost being charged to contingences of the 6th Section. It was completed in 1865, and Form H IV for October of that year charges Rupees 4,192-3-1 to the building. In 1870 it was repaired at a cost of Rupees 327-5-4, and the Chief Engineer took that opportunity to recommend that the expenditure on the building should be transferred from "construction" to "permanent buildings."

3. A bill of quantities has been furnished by the Executive Engineer which, at the rates assumed by that officer, would show that the amount charged in the account above referred to is a fair representation of the original cost. The rates assumed are no doubt high, especially those for rubble masonry and thatching, Rupees 5 per cubic yard and Rupees 10 per square respectively. The Executive Engineer explains that he assumed the apparently excessive rate of Rupees 5 for rubble, because the walls are very high, (his bill of quantities, however, shows that 80 per cent. of the wall work is below 8 feet above ground), and for the rate for thatching he gives a similar explanation, the steep roof being from 18 to 36 feet above ground.

4. Notwithstanding these and other reasons for unusually high rates, I am of opinion that the bungalow might have been constructed for less than the amount charged. I would estimate its cost at Rupees 3,750. Besides, apart from the question of the actual cost of this bungalow, it is, I think, very probable that a building of such an expensive character would not have been sanctioned by Government had their sanction been applied for before it commenced. I therefore recommend that if authority be granted for transferring the building to the list of permanent buildings, it should be at a reduced valuation of, say, Rupees 3,000. The difference, Rupees 1,192-3-1, to be disallowed.

5. The estimate for repairs executed in 1870, amounting to Rupees 327-5-4, appears unobjectionable, except that the rate for thatchers, 10 Annas per diem, is very high; the work might more properly have been styled "thorough renewal of thatch and sundry repairs"

From the Agent and Manager for the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Acting Chief Engineer for Irrigation dated Madras, 1st June 1871, No. 242

Lockinsula bungalow — In transmitting copy of the Chief Engineer's letter No. 694, dated 27th ultimo, together with copy of Mr Wilks', I have the honour to solicit sanction for Rupees 4,519-8-5 being cost and repairs to the above bungalow.

by

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
29th June 1871.*

2. An estimate and drawing accompanies this letter

From the Chief Engineer, to the Agent and Manager for the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Kurnool, 27th May 1871, No 694

Lockinsula bungalow—In continuation of my No 587 of the 1st instant, I now have the honour to forward estimate of the cost of the above bungalow, accompanied by a drawing and explanatory letter from Mr Wilks, and to ask you to apply for sanction for Rupees 4,519-8-5 on Capital Account, being Rupees 4,192-0-1 first cost of the bungalow, and Rupees 327-5-4 for repairs in 1867

P S—I remember that when the bungalow was commenced there was extreme difficulty in getting workmen owing to the want of water and its distance from Mittacondal

From Mr C H WILKS, Executive Engineer, to the Chief Engineer for the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Velapanoor, 17th May 1871, No 242

Lockinsula bungalow expenditure—With reference to your No. 275 of the 28th April 1871, I have the honour to inform you that I have searched through the accounts and letter books for the information called for and have entirely failed to obtain it. I cannot make a bill of cost, as the records of 1863 do not show the head of charge of each voucher. It is possible that some of the books were destroyed in 1866, when the almshouse at Bowanassy containing plans and books of 5th and 6th Sections was attacked by white-ants

2. In Mr Dodson's letter No 337 of 9th November 1869, he states in a marginal note that the cost of the Lockinsula bungalow, Rupees 4,192-3-1, was obtained from Form H IV for October 1865

3. There remains therefore no other way of explaining the expenditure in detail, except by an estimate showing the actual quantities and the probable rates

4. I have prepared such an estimate and forward it with a tracing of the bungalow. The estimate was made quite independently, and the rates, with one or two exceptions, are such as I should have entered were I required to estimate for a similar building

5. *Rubble masonry*—The rate of Rupees 5 for masonry is apparently excessive, but the walls are very high, and considerable scaffolding must have been employed, and I am told it was done by daily labour.

6. There is a large amount of carpenter's work in the building. The planks for flooring have been carefully squared, smoothed, and joined, and are all of very sound wood. This, when put together by the native sawyers and carpenters, will not be considered excessive at Rupees 25 per square

7. The rails to the verandah are all very carefully fitted and were made of teak.

8. The rate for the stair-case may appear high, but the remarks on flooring apply equally to this.

9. The great height and steep pitch of the roof rendered it very dangerous for the thatchers, and lately when it was repaired it was found very difficult to get coolies who would venture to work at it. In fact, I am told that those who went up were paid at the rate of 1 Rupee per day. I cannot find any information concerning the sanction, but have no doubt it was under instructions from the Chief Engineer that the building was commenced and charged to the contingencies of the 6th Section, as I find a remark in the Form H IV to the effect that the Nagatoor bungalow was sanctioned in letter No 51 of 7th August 1865 by the Chief Engineer to be charged to contingencies of the 4th Section

10. A bill of cost for repairs done since 1869 is also added to the estimate and requires sanction as well as the first cost.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
29th June 1871.*

No. 502 . ORDER THEREON, 29th June 1871, No. 7,135.

IRRIGATION, No. 42.

THE Government request that the officers of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company may be called on to explain with what object sanction is after so long a lapse of time asked for the debiting of this bungalow to Capital. If formal sanction had been applied for at the time, it is improbable that a building on so large a scale and at so high a cost would have been sanctioned for a divisional office, but from the correspondence now submitted it would appear that Rupees 4,192-3-1 was some six years ago actually charged in the Capital Account.

2. With respect to the item of Rupees 327-5-4, which the Company's Chief Engineer states was expended on repairs in 1867, while the Chief Engineer to Government reports the expenditure to have occurred in 1870, the Government observe that in either case the charge would be debitable to Revenue, and the amount is sanctioned as a charge against that account.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,

Secretary to Government.

To the Acting Chief Engineer for Irrigation
" Agent and Manager for the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company

Exd E. C. Shunker.

Enclosures.
1st from Agent in charge
with accompaniments
1 Plan
1 Estimate
3

Office of Chief Engineer
Public Works Department
Madras 8 June 1871

1000
To
The Chief Engineer
Public Works Department
The Secretary to Government

Have the honor to forward an application from the Agent and Manager, Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, for sanction of Rspees 4519-8-5 being the amount of first cost and subsequent expenditure on repairs of the Lockmoola Bungalow on the 6th Section of the Company's Canal. This bungalow was built without sanction its cost being charged to "Contingencies" of the 6th Section. It was completed in 1868 and Form H IV for October of that year charges Rspees 4192-2-1 to the building. In 1870 it was repaired at a cost of Rspees 327-5-4 and the Chief Engineer took that opportunity to recommend that the expenditure on the building should be transferred from "Construction" to "Permanent Buildings". A bill of quantities has been furnished by

by the Creative Engineers which at the rates assumed by that officer would show that the amount charged in the account above referred to is a fair representation of the original cost. The rates assumed are not out high, especially those for rubble masonry and thatching. Rupees 5 per cubic yard and Rupees 10 per square respectively. The Creative Engineer explains that he assumed the apparently excessive rates of Rupees 5 for rubble because the walls are very high. This bill of quantities however shows that 80 per cent of the wall work is below 8 feet above ground and for the rates for thatching he gives a similar explanation, the steep roof being from 10 to 36 feet above ground.

4. Notwithstanding these and other reasons for unusually high rates I am of opinion that the bungalow might have been constructed for less than the amount charged. I would estimate its cost at Rupees 7,500. Besides, apart from the question of the actual cost of this bungalow, it is I think very probable that a building of such an expensive character would not have been sanctioned by Government had their sanction been applied for before it commenced. I therefore recommend that authority

be granted for transferring the building to the List of Permanent Buildings, it should be at a reduced valuation of say Rupees 3,000. The difference Rupees 1,192-3-1 to be disallowed. 5. The estimate for repairs executed in 1870 amounting to Rupees 327-5-4 appears unobjectionable, except that the rate for thatchers, 10 annas per diem, is very high. The work might more properly have been styled "thorough renewal of thatch and sundry repairs."

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Obedient servant,
W. H. S. M. P. S.
J. H. S. for the Hon. Secy. &c.

Dec 1735: 29 June 1871:

[illegible]

1830
 1831
 1832
 1833
 1834
 1835
 1836
 1837
 1838
 1839
 1840
 1841
 1842
 1843
 1844
 1845
 1846
 1847
 1848
 1849
 1850
 1851
 1852
 1853
 1854
 1855
 1856
 1857
 1858
 1859
 1860
 1861
 1862
 1863
 1864
 1865
 1866
 1867
 1868
 1869
 1870
 1871
 1872
 1873
 1874
 1875
 1876
 1877
 1878
 1879
 1880
 1881
 1882
 1883
 1884
 1885
 1886
 1887
 1888
 1889
 1890
 1891
 1892
 1893
 1894
 1895
 1896
 1897
 1898
 1899
 1900

14/11/1871 93
 11-5-9-1
Memorandum
 The original Enclosures submitted with this
 Office Letters Nos 30 and 51 dated 8 June and 18 July 1871
 respectively, not having been returned with the
 Proceedings of Government thereon Nos 1785 & 2008 of
 29 June and 1st August 1871, I have requested that the Chief
 Assistant and Registrar - Civil Office @ P.W. will be
 good enough to order their transmission to this
 Office for record in the Office
 J. W. H. M. M. M.

Office of the Ch. Eng. for }
Long Island — }
24 September 1871 — }

Mr. Hartman
Head Clerk

September 1871 - J
To The Chief Agent & Registrar
Comptroller of P.B.
He called on to explain
with what object sanction
is asked so long a lapse
of time asked for the
debiting of this Bungalow
to Capital. If formal
sanction had been applied
for at the time, it is
improbable that a
building on so large

P. W. Department
1735
Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 29th June 1871

Read the following

From
Chief Engineer for Irrigation / G. E. N. 30 dated 8th June 1871

The Government request that the officers of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company may be called on to explain with what object sanction is asked so long a lapse of time asked for the debiting of this Kungelin to Capital. If former sanction had been applied for at the time, it is improbable that a building on so large

a scale and at so high
a cost would have been
sanctioned for a divi-
sional office; but
from the correspondence
now submitted it
would appear that
Rs 4,192-3-1 was
some six years ago
actually charged
in the Capital account.

With respect to the
item of Rs 327-5-4 which
the Company's Chief Eng^r
states was expended
on repairs in 1867,
while the Chief Eng^r
to Govt reports the expen-
-diture to have occurred

in 1870, the Govt observe
that in either case the
charge would be debita-
-ble to Revenue, and
the amount is sanctioned
as a charge against
that account.

Ch. 17

To
The Chief Eng^r for Indigo
Agent & Manager
Compt^y

Decr 30/67

Luther

Pro August 12/18208

60th of 1871 27th.

PUBLIC WORKS.

40. The by Chief Engineer for
irrigation

Water

No d

L. 1. 13

60 29 June 1871, No 1735.

Nos. 571/572

1. What is the purpose of the study?
 2. What are the research objectives?
 3. What is the research methodology?
 4. What are the results of the study?
 5. What are the conclusions of the study?
 6. What are the limitations of the study?
 7. What are the implications of the study?
 8. What are the future research directions?
 9. What are the references of the study?
 10. What are the acknowledgments of the study?