

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Education

DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1798	Press Mis.
To	
Dated	18

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
7th July 1871.*

No. 96. Read the following letter from the Acting Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 21st June 1871, No. 35:—

I HAVE the honour to submit, for the orders of Government, 1st, a bill of expenditure incurred on the Jupad bungalow since the order of Government No. 1,208 dated 18th April 1866; 2nd, a statement of the stores supplied to the building from the commencement; 3rd, an explanatory letter from the Agent, Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, exhibiting the total cost of the building; and, 4th, my letter to which the former is a reply.

2.	The latter shows that the bungalow has cost Rupees 3,055 more than the amount* of the sanctioned estimate.
Rupees 7,178, cost.	Of this excess Rupees 2,396 had already
" 4,123, sanctioned estimate.	been incurred prior to the order of
3,055	Government above quoted, and was

disallowed by Government. The Agent now applies for the sanction of Government for the adjustment of the remainder, Rupees 659.

3. There is some discrepancy between the figures of the local account and those obtained from the books in the Agent's Office, and the amount brought forward from the beginning of 1867 does not tally with that recorded in the Consulting Engineer's letter No. 144 to Government, dated 23rd January 1866.

4. Taking the cash expenditure up to 1866 at the amount stated in the Consulting Engineer's letter and adopting for cash expenditure since the figures furnished by the local officer, and for value of stores supplied the figures furnished by the Agent's office, the total cost of the building would be Rupees 7,095 less Rupees 101 cash recovered, equals Rupees 7,494, instead of Rupees 7,178, as stated by the Agent, and the excess to be adjusted Rupees 975 instead of Rupees 659.

No. 97. ORDER THEREON, 7th July 1871, No. 1,798.

IRRIGATION, No. 6.

IN G. O., No. 1,208, 18th April 1866, the Government sanctioned Rs. 4,123 for the station buildings at Jupad of which Rupees 1,343 had to be accounted for, and a bill of cost amounting to Rupees 1,261-7-8 in part thereof is now submitted for sanction by the Executive Engineer, but by the addition of Rupees 1,005-6-10 for stores and store charges the Executive Engineer brings the expenditure up to Rupees 4,782-1-1 or Rupees 659-1-1 in excess of the amount sanctioned.

2. The Agent and Manager states that the figures given by the Executive Engineer are entirely wrong, and that any attempt to reconcile them with his figures would be fruitless, but strange to say he concurs in the opinion that the excess expenditure amounts to exactly the same sum, Rupees 659-1-1, while the Chief Engineer for Irrigation to Government estimates the excess at Rupees 975.

3. The Government cannot deal with a case in which there is such difference of opinion, and must withhold any further sanction for this work until the Company's officers are agreed as to what the exact expenditure has been since

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
7th July 1871.

April 1866, and have submitted a clear statement thereof; and as the sum of Rupees 2,395-13-0 for which no work could be shown was disallowed, there is no use in complicating the question by bringing this item forward; it should accordingly be omitted, and the revised statement should simply exhibit the previous expenditure of Rupees 2,400 as shown in the papers printed with G. O., No. 467, 7th February 1866, and the subsequent expenditure including stores and store charges.

(True Extract.)
(Signed) J. CARPENDALE, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Acting Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Agent & Manager for the Irrigation.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

N^o 35

Office of Chief Engineer for
Irrigation and Joint Secretary
to Government

Madras 21st July 1871.

From,

Major L. S. Rogers R.E.

Chief Engineer for Irrigation and
Joint Secretary to Government

To,

Colonel J. Carpendale R.E.

Secretary to Government D.P.M.

I have the honor to submit for the
orders of Government 1 a bill of
expenditure incurred on the proposed
Bungalows since the Order of Govern-
ment dated 18th April 1866. 2 A State-
ment of the stores supplied to the
building from the commencement.
3 An explanatory letter from the
Agent M. J. 466 exhibiting the total
cost of the building and a copy letter
to which the former is a reply.
2 The latter shews that the bungalow
has cost Rupees 3,055 more than
the amount of the sanctioned estimate.
Of this excess Rupees 2,396 had
already been incurred prior to the
order

N^o 1208

Rs 7178 — cost
Rs 4123 — sanctioned
3055 — estimate

Order of Government above quoted
and was disallowed by Government.
The Agent now applies for the sanction
of Government for the adjustment
of the remainder Rupees 659.

3. There is some discrepancy between
the figures of the local account and
those obtained from the books in the
Agent's Office and the amount brought
forward from the beginning of 1867
does not tally with that recorded
in the Consulting Engineer's letter to
Government dated 23 January 1866.

4. Taking the Cash expenditure
upto 1866 at the amount stated in
the Consulting Engineer's letter and
adopting for Cash expenditure
since the figures furnished by the
local Officer, and of the value of
stores supplied the figures furnish-
ed by the Agent's Office, the total
cost of the building would be Rupees
7,595 less Rupees 101 Cash recovered
against Rupees 7,494, instead of
Rupees 7,178, as stated by the Agent
and the excess to be adjusted —

Rupees

Rupees 975 instead of Rupees 659.

I have the honor to

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,
J. R. S. Major D. E.
At. Chief Engineer for
Irrigation and Joint Secretary
to Government.

1343 had to be ac-
counted for and a
bill of cost amounting
to Rs 1,261-7-8 in part
thereof is now submitted
for sanction by the
Executive Engineer
but by the addition
of Rs 100-5-6 for stores
and stores charges the
Executive Engineer
brings

1798

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 7th July 17
Read the following

From the Asst Chief Engr. for Rivers & E. No 35 of 21st June 1871
Joint Secretary to Govt

July 12th 18th

April 1866, the Govt.
sanctioned Rs 123
for the station buildings
at Jajrad of which Rs
1343 had to be ac-
counted for and a
bill of cost amounting
to Rs 1261-7-8 in part
thereof is now submitted
for sanction by the
Executive Engineer
but by the addition
of Rs 1005-6-10 for stores
and store charges the
Executive Engineer
brings

N.

Box of Remains 11th Mo 188
- 18 April - 188
- 325-376

1871 Dec 14
355 1/2
1000 for charity
2930.

the 24th of Sept. 1848

Secretary of State

Oct 21

23-
200
11/11/11

Subscribed at Court of Sessions
at Dublin, this 21st day of April 1791
James O'Connell Esq.

From the rear of
Row 2 of 15 a fine 6688 reports
a number for the assignment of

The exact representative of Myself
the same language

1798-7 July 171

1898

Doi: 10.1002/for.1247

up to 1866 at the amount stated in
the Consulting Engineer's letter and
adopting for Cash expenditure ~~the~~
since the figures furnished by the
local Officer, and ~~for~~ value of
stores supplied the figures furnish
ed by the Agent's Office; the total
cost of the building would be Rupees
7,595 less Rupees 101 Cash recovered
^{against} Rupees 7,494, instead of
Rupees 7,178, as stated by the Agent
and the excess to be adjusted ~~in~~
Rupees

bring the expenditure up
to Rs 482.1.1 or Rs
659.1.1 in excess of the
amount sanctioned.

The Agent and
Manager state that the
figures given by the
Executive Engineer are
entirely wrong and that
any attempt to reconcile
them with his figures would
be fruitless, but strange
to say he concurs in the
opinion that the excess
expenditure amounts to
exactly the same sum,
Rs 659.1.1 while the
Chief Engineer for Irru-
gation to Govt estimates
the excess at Rs 975.

The Government
cannot deal with a
case

case in which there is
such difference of opinion
and must withhold
any further sanction
for the work until the
Company's officers are
agreed as to what the
exact expenditure has
been since April 1866
and have submitted
a clear statement thereof,
and as the sum of Rs
2,395.13.0 for which
no work could be shown
was disallowed, there is
no use in complicating
the question by bringing
this item forward; it
should accordingly be
omitted, and the
revised statement
should simply exhibit

12. 6. 1866

11

30.
4 The Chief Engr. for Ordnance
a agent & manager for the same.

630 June 7, R. 1 July

Govt. of 1871 Adams.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To *Head Chief Eng. for
Irrigation*

Date

Re: *...*

Encl.

G. O. *July* 1871, No. *1798*.

Nos. *964 97*

[Faint handwritten text, mostly illegible]

