M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 216

(2) Date of repair 28.6.79.

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2411 Press ~~Mis.~~

356-57

Dated 21-9-1871.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 356. Read the following letter from the Superintending Engineer, 5th Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Cuddalore, 3rd August 1871, No. 94 :—

1 Comparative Statement.
1 Supplemental Estimate.
1 Original letter of the Executive Engineer, No. 421, dated 24th July 1871.
1 Copy of Superintending Engineer's Memorandum.
2 Data for masonry and roofing.
1 List of materials lost, etc.
1 List of details of sundries, etc.
1 Letter of Overseer Mr. Hennessy.

In G. O., No. 92, dated 12th January 1869, an estimate of Rupees 4,970 was sanctioned for the construction of a Subsidiary Jail at Oossoor in the Salem District, and this amount was raised to Rupees 6,790 in G. O., No. 937, dated 4th April 1870. It was fairly expected that the building would have been finished within the latter amount, but now to my great disappointment I am compelled to forward another supplemental estimate of Rupees 610 (with a comparative statement and the letter in original received therewith from the Executive Engineer, Mr. Paynter,) for its full completion.

2. From the comparative statement it may be observed that the excess has been occasioned by an increase of rates for "excavating foundation," "brick-in-chunam," "stone-in-chunam," and "sundries," and by an addition to the quantity of work in the compound wall, hospital shed, etc., and the cause of these Mr. Paynter ascribes, first, to the failure of Mr. Wilson (who was acting for him for two months) to exhibit in the revised estimate the actual rates at which each item of the work was executed; secondly, to the stoppage of the work; and, lastly and particularly, to the inexperience and carelessness of the Overseer, Mr. Hennessy.

3. It is true that the revised estimate, sanctioned in G. O., No. 937, dated 4th April 1870, was prepared by Mr. Wilson when he was in temporary charge of the range during Mr. Paynter's absence on leave from the 8th October to the 8th December 1869; but this estimate was checked and approved of by the latter, and, in fact, it was re-submitted by him with certain alterations with his letter dated 21st February 1870. The Executive Engineer now states that he did not check every item in it carefully! but it need hardly be said that it was his duty to have done so before approving of the estimate. The rates allowed in the present estimate, and at which the work is said to have been executed, appear exorbitant. For instance, the excavating of foundations of a building in ordinary soil the rate of 3 Annas and 11 Pice per cubic yard is extreme!

4. In the comparative statement, submitted by the Executive Engineer on the 9th May 1871, it was shown that brick-in-chunam, flat arch, and circular arch work were executed at Rupees 5-0-1 per cubic yard, and stone-in-chunam work at Rupees 4-1-8; whereas, in the present statement, the rates are put down at Rupees 4-15-6 for the first, Rupees 5-0-1 for the second and third, and Rupees 3-15-0 for the fourth. This contradiction is at least strange. These rates are also above the prevailing rates of the talook.

5. It is stated that, owing to the stoppage of the work, materials to the value of about Rupees 499 were damaged and lost, and that the mud walls of the latrine fell down! The work being at the head-quarters of the Range Officer and the Overseer, it is difficult to understand how this loss could have occurred had proper precautions been taken for the care and safety of the incomplete building and of the materials on the spot.

6. Mr. Paynter states that the chief cause of the excess was due to the inexperience and carelessness of the Overseer Mr. Hennessy. I cannot bring myselve to agree in this view. From the Inspection Reports of this Officer it would appear that, during the time the work was in progress, from December 1868 to September 1869, the Executive Engineer remained at Oossoor a great part of each month (as per margin), and, therefore, he had ample opportunities of controlling all causes of superfluous outlay and of checking the ignorant action of his subordinate. I am, therefore, disposed to attribute the excess in expenditure rather to the Range Officer's deviation from the original sanctioned estimate, and to the want of due supervision of the building in question than to any thing else.

	Days at Oossoor.
December 1868	8
January 1869	22
February ,, ...	14
March ,, ...	24
April ,, ...	14
May ,, ...	5
June ,, ...	18
July ,, ...	16
August ,, ...	15
September ,, ...	15
	152

7. Under this view of the case, in my memorandum No. 165, dated 15th June 1871, on the comparative statement submitted by the Range Officer on the 9th May 1871, I felt that I was not exceeding my powers as a Superintending Engineer in remarking that "the throwing of the blame on the Overseer while the work was under the Range Officer's own nose," a distance of, I think, less than half a mile from his place of residence, "was disingenuous and proved more clearly the latter's neglect and mismanagement of his duties." To this memorandum Mr. Paynter takes objection, and wishes it either to be withdrawn or submitted to Government for their orders. The latter is the course I have thought it right to adopt, for I can see no just reason for cancelling any remarks that I have made. So far from it, I consider this especially a case where the Executive Officer should be held to a certain extent personally responsible for the enhanced outlay (as was done in the cases of Major Fischer and Captain Beckley some years ago) as a warning to others who similarly transgress.

8. In conclusion, I would observe that this is not the only instance of irregularity in the Oossoor Range, but a reference to the records in this office shows that deviation from the sanctioned estimates, involving additional outlay, has been almost a rule in this range, and that very few of the new works executed therein under Mr. Paynter have been carried out within the original estimates, as may be observed from the following table:—

Work.	Estimate.	Expenditure.	
	Rs.	Rs.	
Improvements to the Subsidiary Jail at Kistnagherry	2,050	2,075	Work under suspension.
Do. do. at Denkenicottah	3,740	2,511	Rupees 1,230 granted for the current year, but the work will not be completed without a supplemental grant.
Extending the Southern Range of Stabling, Remount Depôt at Oossoor, original estimate ...	14,720		
1st, revised estimate	20,400	18,786	Work under suspension.
2nd, do. do.	27,200		

Work.	Estimate.	Expenditure.	
	Rs.	Rs.	
Mullapady Bridge on Trunk Road No. 1 ...	2,600	2,208	Work under suspension.
Revised Estimate	3,300		
Bridge across the Penniar at Bagalore	10,900	11,712	Approaches not yet fully completed.
Supplemental	810		
	11,710		
Constructing a Rest-house for Troops at Jollarpet (in the late Oossoor Range)	3,410	3,662	
Supplemental	394		
	3,804		
Constructing a gram-boiling shed at the Remount Depôt	607	645	
Supplemental	49		
	656		
Improving and extending the channel from the Allalum anicut across the Penniar river ...	4,680	5,253	
Supplemental	580		
	5,260		
Re-constructing the anicut and clearing the channel of the Agraharam tank near Natrumpully	1,080	1,526	
Supplemental	420		
	1,500		
Constructing a small building for the residence of the Deputy Post Master at Jollarpet (in the late Oossoor Range)	335	382	

No. 357. ORDER THEREON, 21st September 1871, No. 2,411.

CIVIL WORKS, No. 20.

WITH this letter the Superintending Engineer of the 5th Division submits a supplemental estimate of Rupees 610 for the Subsidiary Jail at Oossoor in the Salem District for which an estimate of Rupees 4,970 was sanctioned in January 1869 and a revised estimate of Rupees 6,790 in April 1870.

2. According to the comparative statement submitted, the excess is shown to be due chiefly to the inadequacy of the rates provided in the former revised estimate in the items of "brick-in-chunam" and "stone-in-chunam." That estimate, although prepared by Mr. Wilson when in temporary charge of the range, was yet approved by Mr. Paynter, the present Range Officer, who appears to have taken it for granted that the estimate had been framed with reference to the rates at which each item of work was being actually carried out, whereas it would now appear that this could not have been the case. The responsibility for the

neglect clearly rests with Mr. Paynter, who, as pointed out by the Superintending Engineer, should have carefully examined and checked every item before submitting the estimate for sanction.

3. The excess is also explained by Mr. Paynter to be partly due to damage and loss of material sustained by the stoppage of work, and partly to the inexperience and carelessness of the Overseer Mr. Hennessy, who carried out some portion of the work at higher rates than should have been found sufficient. The Government cannot admit that the latter plea relieves Mr. Paynter to any extent from the responsibility which undoubtedly rested with him to exercise that control over the proceedings of his subordinate which is expected of Range Officers, and which, in the case under notice, the proximity of the work to Mr. Paynter's residence afforded him every facility for doing.

4. Mr. Paynter considers that the remarks of the Superintending Engineer on the revised estimate for the Oossoor Subsidiary Jail, and the tone in which they are couched, were uncalled for. The Government hold Superintending Engineers primarily responsible for the proper conduct of departmental duty and conformity to rules and orders, and observe that it is quite within the province of a Superintending Engineer to censure or pass such comments on the proceedings of his Range Officers as the circumstances of the case may warrant, consistently with the recognized courtesy which should be maintained in all official correspondence.

5. With these remarks sanction is accorded to the revised estimate of Rupees 7,400.

(True Extract.)

Captain, R.E.,
Under Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 5th Division.
„ Controller of Public Works Accounts.
„ Judicial Department.

Ext. S. T. Augustin.

Details of Sundries and Petty Establishment of the Oossoor Sub Jail.

No	Description	Per	Rate	Amount
1	Maistry for 2 months and 23 days	Each	20	55
2	—do— for 1 month	"	15	30
1	—do— for 8 months and 19 days	"	15	129 9
1	—do— for 1 month	"	12	12
1	Temporary Shed	"		17 12
6	Straight edges	"	0 6	2 12
6	Masons levels	"	1 8	9
6	Plumb boards	"	1	6
3	Water casks	"	3	9
1	Ladder			1
1	Watchman for 4 months			20 8
			Total Rupees	292 4

Separate accounts for the Jail and for the Compound wall were not kept.

Oossoor Range Office
Oossoor 24 July 1871

Executive Engineer

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department, 21st September 1871.

subject clearly rests with Mr. Paynter, who, as pointed out by the Superintending Engineer, should have carefully examined and checked every item before submitting the estimate for sanction.

3. The excess is also explained by Mr. Paynter to be partly due to damage and loss of material sustained by the stoppage of work, and partly to the inexperience and carelessness of the Overseer Mr. Hennessy, who carried out some portion of the work at higher rates than should have been found sufficient. The Government cannot admit that the latter plea relieves Mr. Paynter to any extent from the responsibility which undoubtedly rested with him to exercise that control over the proceedings of his subordinate which is expected of Range Officers, and which, in the case under notice, the proximity of the work to Mr. Paynter's residence afforded him every facility for doing.

4. Mr. Paynter considers that the remarks of the Superintending Engineer on the revised estimate for the Oossoor Subsidiary Jail, and the tone in which they are couched, were uncalled for. The Government hold Superintending Engineers primarily responsible for the proper conduct of departmental duty and conformity to rules and orders, and observe that it is quite within the province of a Superintending Engineer to censure or pass such comments on the proceedings of his Range Officers as the circumstances of the case may warrant, consistently with the recognized courtesy which should be maintained in all official correspondence.

5. With these remarks sanction is accorded to the revised estimate of Rupees 7,400.

(True Extract.)

Captain, R.E.,
Under Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 5th Division.
" Controller of Public Works Accounts.
" Judicial Department.

Erd. S. T. Augustin.

Details of Sanction and Petty Establishment of the Oossoor Sub Jail.

No	Description	Per	Rate	Amount
1	Mistry for 2 months and 23 days	Each	20	55 5
2	do for 1 month	"	15	30 "
1	do for 8 months and 19 days	"	15	129 4
1	do for 1 month	"	12	12 "
1	Temporary Shed	"		17 12
6	Straight edges	"	" 6	2 4
6	Masons Levels	"	1 8	9 "
6	Plumb boards	"	1 "	6 "
3	Water casks	"	3 "	9 "
1	Ladder			1 "
1	Watchman for 4 months			20 8
			Total Rupees	292 4

Separate accounts for the Jail and for the Compound wall were not kept.

Oossoor Range Office
Oossoor 24 July 1871

S/ Paynter
Executive Engineer

| | | |

Civil Buildings
Salem District

5th Division P.W.D.
Coonoor Road

Nilgiris
Coonoor Taluk

13A

Comparative Statement Shewing the difference between the original and revised estimates for constructing a Jail and Subsidiary buildings at Coonoor.

Description of work	Unit	Estimate sanctioned in G.O.s Nos. 92 and 937 of 12/4/69 & 4/4/70. Quantity	Rate	Amount	Revised Estimate Quantity	Rate	Amount	Difference Increase Quantity	Increase Amount	Decrease Quantity	Decrease Amount	Balance	Remarks.
Excavating foundation, Earth work	Cyds	110	1 4	9 2 8	110	3 11	26 14 10		17 12 2				
Brick in Chunam	"	308 25/72	4	1233 13 9	308 1/2	4 5	1532 13 9		299				
Circular Arch work	"	17/8	5	9 6	17/8	5 1	9 6		1				
Flat Arch work	"	5	4 8	22 8	5	5 1	25 5		2 8 5				
Plastering with 2 Coats of Chunam	Square	67	3 8	234 8	67	3 8	234 8						
Whitewashing	"	67	2	8 6	67	2	8 6						
Flooring with asphalte	"	7/16	20	144	7/16	20	144						
Roofing with teak wood Couples, rafters, braces, Summers, wall plates, flat and panelled and Chunam borders	"	28/4	55	1553 12	28/4	55	1553 12						
Flooring with 8" square bricks, laid in chunam and stained	"	8 3/125	8	64 15 4	8 3/25	8	64 15 4						
Iron barred windows without Shutters complete made of teak wood	No	6	16 7 4	98 12	6	16 7 4	98 12						
Venitian windows with frame complete made of teak wood 4'×6' each	"	1	39	39	1	39	39						
Teak wood doors with frames complete 1/3 panelled and 2/3 iron bars 4'×6½' each	"	4	59 12 6	239 2	4	59 12 6	239 2						
Venetian doors with frames complete made of teak wood 4'×7'	"	1	44	44	1	44	44						
Jungle wood weather boards	"	7	6	42	7	6	42						
Sundries and Petty Establishments				195 6 3			207 5 7		11 15 4				
				3938 12			4270		331 4				
Compound Wall													
Excavating foundation	Cyds	142	1 4	11 13 4	142	3 11	34 12 2		22 14 10				
Stone in Chunam	"	411/2	3 8	1440 4	421	3 15	1657 11	9/2	217 7				
Plinth in Halves	No	1	60	60	1	60	60						
Sundries and Petty Establishment				107 14 8			107 8 10				5 10		
				1620			1860		240 5 10				

* This exceeds the Estimate as some of the work had to be pulled down.

No 165. Supg: Engineers Office, 5th Division
Cuddalore, 15th June 1871.

5th Division D.P.W.
Salem District
Ootacamund Range

PWD 3735/71

From
Lieut. Colonel A. Taylor, R.E.
Executive Engineer,
5th Division D.P.W.

To
The Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department,
Fort St. George.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit herewith a Comparative Statement shewing the difference between the original and revised estimates for constructing a Jail and Subsidiary buildings at Ootacamund.

Brought forward 5558 12 0

Hospital Shed

Earth work								
Brick in clay	Cur	32	0	1	4	2	10	32
Arch work in chunam	"	50	2	12	0	137	8	50
Flooring with brick jelly in chunam	"	2	4	0	0	8	0	2
Plastering with two Coats of Chunam	Sqm	5	6	0	0	30	0	5
Roofing	"	12½	3	0	0	37	8	12½
Removing the roof and renewing	"	5/6	16	0	0	131	3	2 9/16
Jungle wood wrought and put up	Cft	"	"	"	"	"	"	8½
Concrete work	Cft	46	1	3	0	69	0	46
Sundries and Superintendence	Cft	1	2	0	0	2	0	1
						22	2	2
						440	0	0

Jail Latrine

Earth work								
Concrete work	Cft	11	0	1	4	0	14	8 11
Mud wall	"	1/2	2	0	0	8	0	4
Brick in chunam	"	32	0	6	0	12	0	0 24
Flooring with granite bedded in sand and coated with tar	Sqm	35	4	0	0	140	0	0 35
Roofing	"	4 3/4	13	0	0	47	8	0 4 3/4
Jungle wood wrought and put up	Cft	6½	16	0	0	104	0	0 6½
Smoothing and white washing	Sqm	103	1	8	0	154	8	0 103
Sundries and Superintendence		12	0	8	0	6	0	0 12
						27	1	4
Cooke Shed						500	0	0
Compensation for land						230	0	0
						61	4	0

Ootacamund Range Office
Ootacamund 24 July 1871

...dum.
...ative Statement
...No 1184
...diary Jail
...
...the State-
...d in a
...ment shew-
...) Increase)
...te sanctioned
...970. A
...companied
...was submitted
...ember 1869,
...ary charge
...ecember 1869, of the Revenue Department, and this
was applied for by Mr. Saynter in his
No 1189 of the 21st February 1870, and
the revised estimate was sanctioned in
G. O. No 937 of the 4th April 1870. It is

Brought forward ——— 5558 12 "

Hospital Shed

Earth work ———	Cu.	32	.	1	4	2	10
Brick in clay ———	.	50	2	12	.	137	8
Rock work in [illegible]			2	4			8
Flooring with [illegible]							
Plastering with [illegible]							
Roofing ———							
Plumbing the [illegible]							
Jungle wood work [illegible]							
Concrete work [illegible]							

Sundries ——— 5

Jail &

Earth work ———						
Concrete work ———						
Mud wall ———						
Brick in cha[illegible]						
Flooring with [illegible]						
and coated [illegible]						
Roofing ———						
Jungle wood [illegible]						
Smoothing and [illegible]						

Sundries

Cook Shed[illegible]

Compensation [illegible]

Cossoor Range Office
Cossoor 24 July 1871

13 P

No 165. Supdg: Engineer's Office, 5th Division
Cuddalore, 15th June 1871.

Official Memorandum.

Remarks on the Comparative Statement submitted by the Executive Engineer, Cossoor Range, with his letter No 118 of the 9th May 1871, for the Subsidiary Jail under construction at Cossoor.—

Enclosure 1 Copy of Overseer Mr Hemessy's letter No 11 of 23rd May 1871.

2. In the first place the Statement has not been prepared in a proper form. It has no columns shewing the original estimate, the Increase and Decrease thereon.—

3. The original estimate sanctioned for the work amounted to Rs 4,970. A revised Estimate of Rs 6,790, accompanied by a Comparative Statement was submitted in his No 935 of the 27th November 1869, by Mr Wilson while in temporary charge of the Range for 2 months, and this was approved of by Mr Paynter in his No 1189 of the 21st February 1870, and the revised estimate was sanctioned in G. O. No 934 of the 4th April 1870.- It is

* from 8th October to 8th December 1869.

No 165. Supdg: Engineer's Office, 5th Division
Cuddalore, 15th June 1871.

5th Division D.P.W.
Salem District
Cossoor Range

P.P. 3735/71

From,
The Executive Engineer,
No 1184.
Judiciary Jail

To the Superintending Engineer,
5th Division,
Cuddalore.

Comparative Statement shewing the difference between the original and revised estimates for constructing a jail and subsidiary buildings at Cossoor.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit herewith a comparative statement shewing the difference between the original and revised estimates for constructing a jail and subsidiary buildings at Cossoor.

The original estimate for the above work was submitted to you under my No 1184 of the 3rd December 1869, and was approved of by Mr Saynter in his No 1189 of the 21st February 1870, and the revised estimate was sanctioned in G. O. No 957 of the 4th April 1870. It is

Brought forward							5558	12
Hospital Shed								
Earth work								
Brick in clay	Cyds	32	.	1	4	2	10	8
Rock work in chunam	"	50	2	12	.	137	8	.
Flooring with brick jelly in chunam	"	2	4	.	.	8	.	.
Plastering with two Coats of Chunam	Sqrs	5	6	.	.	30	.	.
Roofing	"	12½	3	.	.	37	8	.
Removing the roof and unroofing	"	8½	16	.	.	131	3	2
Jungle wood wrought and put up	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
Concrete work	Cft	46	1	3	.	69	.	.
	Cyd	1	2	.	.	2	.	.
Sundries and Superintendence							22	2
							440	.
Jail Latrine								
Earth work								
Concrete work	Cyd	11	.	1	4	.	14	8
Mud wall	"	16	2	.	.	8	.	.
Brick in chunam	"	32	.	6	.	12	.	.
Flooring with granite bedded in sand and coated with tar	"	35	4	.	.	140	.	.
Roofing	Sqrs	4¾	13	.	.	47	8	.
Jungle wood wrought and put up	"	6½	15	.	.	126	.	.
Smoothing and white washing	Cft	103	1	8	.	154	8	.
Sundries and Superintendence	Sqrs	12	.	8	.	6	.	.
							27	1
							500	.
Cooly Shed							230	.
Compensation for land							61	4

Cossoor Range Office
Cossoor 24 July 1871

...tive Statement
...ference
...original and
...mates for constructing
...subsidiary buildings
...submitted
...1869,
...charge
...and this
...Saynter in his
...February 1870, and
...estimate was sanctioned in
...4th April 1870. It is

No 165. Supdg: Engineer's Office, 5th Division
Cuddalore, 15th June 1871.

5th Division D.P.W.
Salem District
Cossoor Range

PP 3735/71

Brought forward ——— 5558 12 "

Hospital Shed

Earth work								
Brick in clay	Cyd	32	.	1	4	2	10	8 · 32
Rock work in chunam	"	50	2	12	.	127	8	1 · 50
Flooring with brick jelly in chunam	"	2	1	.	.	3	.	. · 2
Plastering with two Coats of chunam	Sqyd	5	6	.	.	30	.	. · 5
Roofing	"	12½	3	.	.	37	8	. · 12½
Removing the roof and reroofing	"	8⅘	16	.	.	131	3	2 · 8⅘
Jungle wood wrought and put up	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	" · "
Concrete work	Cft	46	1	3	.	69	.	. · 46
	Cyd	1	2	.	.	2	.	. · 1
Sundries and Superintendence						22	2	
						440	.	.

Jail Latrine

Earth work								
Concrete work	Cyd	11	.	1	4	.	14	8 · 11
Mud wall	"	1	2	.	.	8	.	. · 4
Brick in chunam	"	22	.	6	.	12	.	. · 44
Flooring with granite bedded in sand and coated with tar	"	35	4	.	.	140	.	. · 35
Roofing	Sqyd	27¼	13	.	.	47	8	. · 54¾
Jungle wood wrought and put up	"	6½	16	.	.	104	.	. · 6½
Smoothing and white washing	Cft	103	1	8	.	154	8	. · 103
Sundries and Superintendence	Sqyd	12	.	8	.	6	.	. · 12
						27	1	4

Cook Shed ——— 500 . .
Compensation for land ——— 230 . .
——— 61 4 .

Cossoor Range Office
Cossoor 24 July 1871

Comparative Statement shewing the difference between the original and revised estimates for constructing a Jail and Subsidiary buildings at Cossoor.

) Increase)

…te Sanctioned …g/70. A …companied …was submitted …cember 1869, …rary charge …and this …was approved of by Mr Saynter in his No 1189 of the 21st February 1870, and the revised estimate was sanctioned in G. O. No 937 of the 4th April 1870. It is

already gone on part of the work. Full details should be furnished of the sums Rs. 1875. 6. 3 & 976. 14. 2.—

5th. Details of each of these buildings must be given, as done for compound well in the Statement under reference as in Mr. Wilson's Statement dated 21st November 1869. The Hospital Shed is stated to have been badly constructed & that a considerable portion must be pulled down. This is not clear enough. It should be distinctly stated when it was built, where Mr. Painter was at the time and who was the overseer. Nothing is said about the Cook Shed.

Hospital Shed
Cook Shed
Ladrine

6th. As regards the Ladrine, it is stated that the mud wall has been destroyed. It is presumed that the Executive Engineer covered it with mats and tried to preserve it in every way in his power.—

10th. In the comparative Statement very small fractions are entered. This practice should cease at once. No fractions smaller than 1/4 & 1/2 should be admitted in future.—

4. The revision of the original Estimate appears to have been occasioned by Mr. Painter's unauthorized substitution of Teak for Jungle wood roofing, &c, and no excess appears to have been ever anticipated in the rates for masonry. The Range Officer himself admits in his No. 1189 of the 21st February 1870, that the rates allowed for masonry were ample and in fact so liberal that he expected a saving therefrom to cover the excess in the wood work, but that it could not be effected on account of the interference and carelessness of the overseer Mr. Hennessy. And now the revised estimate having been passed, advantage appears to have been taken to exceed the items of masonry, throwing again the blame on the unfortunate overseer!

5. This proceeding of the Range Officer is very irregular and quite opposed to the rules of the Department. He should not have exceeded the sanctioned rates without authority. And the throwing

already gone on part of the work. Full details should be furnished of the sums Rs. 195. 6. 3 & 96. 14. 2.—

8th. Details of each of these buildings must be given, as done for compound wall in the Statement under review, viz. as in Mr. Wilson's Statement dated 27th November 1869. The Hospital shed is stated to have been badly constructed & that a considerable portion must be pulled down. This is not clear enough. It should be distinctly stated when it was built, where Mr. Saunter was at the time and who was the overseer. Nothing is said about the Cook Shed. Hospital Shed Cook Shed Latrine.

9th. As regards the Latrine, it is stated that the mud wall has been destroyed. It is presumed that the Executive Engineer covered it with mats and tried to preserve it in every way in his power.—

10th. In the comparative Statement very small fractions are entered. This practice should at once be put a stop to, and no fractions smaller than 1/4 & 1/2 should be admitted in future.—

4. The revision of the original Estimate appears to have been occasioned by Mr. Painter's unauthorized substitution of Teak for Jungle wood roofing, &c, and no excess appears to have been ever anticipated in the rates for masonry. The Range Officer himself admits in his No. 1189 of the 27th February 1870, that the rates allowed for masonry were ample and in fact so liberal that he expected a saving therefrom to cover the excess in the wood work, but that it could not be effected on account of the inexperience and carelessness of the overseer Mr. Hennessy. And now the revised estimate having been passed, advantage appears to have been taken to exceed the items of masonry, throwing again the blame on the unfortunate overseer!

5. This proceeding of the Range Officer is very irregular and quite opposed to the rules of the Department. He should not have exceeded the sanctioned rates without authority. And the throwing

of the blame on the Overseer, while the work is under the Range officers own nose, is disingenious and proves only more clearly the latter's neglect and mismanagement of his duties.- It is moreover observed that the whole outlay on the Jail was incurred during the incumbency of Mr Saynter, and that during the progress of the work it is believed he remained the greater part of each month at Cossoor!-

6. It would also appear that this is not the only instance of infraction of the rules of the department by Mr Saynter, but that Estimates sanctioned for the other sub jails, &c, in this Range, have also been deviated from without authority, occasioning thereby additional and unnecessary outlay.- The Executive Engineer should now distinctly understand that such irregularities in the face of the repeated and stringent orders of Government cannot be permitted, and that they will be brought to the special notice of Government on

21 P

Data for the undermentioned description of works for

Cossoor Sub jail.

19 P

receipt of the Estimate daily expected.-

[Signed] A. Boileau, Colonel R.E.,
Supg: Engineer, 5th Division.

To,

The Executive Engineer,
Cossoor Range

(True Copy)

A. Boileau Colonel R.E.,
Superintending Engineer,
5th Division.-

Sundries		"	4 5
Total cost for one cubic yard			4 1 8

Cossoor Range Office,
Cossoor 24th July 1871

[Signature]
Executive Engineer.

of the blame on the Overseer, while the work is under the Range officer's own
[illegible] dimensions and proves only
[illegible]

6.
[illegible]

Enclosure in G.C.O. No. 94 dated 3rd August 1871, from the Chairman Public Works Committee & Divisional Executive Engineers to Government Secretary.

Received 7th Aug 1871

occasioning thereby unnecessary outlay. The Executive Engineer should now distinctly understand that such irregularities in the face of the repeated and stringent orders of Government cannot be permitted, and that they will be brought to the special notice of Government on

21 A

Data for the undermentioned description of works for

Coosoor Sub jail.

Materials and labor.

Description of work.	Nos. or quantity.	Description.	Rate	Amount
Brick in chunam	467	Bricks $8\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{4} \times 2\frac{3}{4}$ per 1000.	4 " "	1 13 10
	2	Parahs of chunam per parah.	" 7 6	" 15 "
	1·42	Bricklayers. each	" 8 "	" 11 5
	10·85	Coolies. do	" 1 8	1 2 1
	·66	Carts. do	" 8 "	" 5 4
		Sundries.		" " 3
		Total cost for one cubic yard.		5 " 1
Burned stone in chunam	1	Parah of chunam per parah.	" 7 6	" 7 6
	·95	Bricklayer each	" 8 "	" 7 8
	1·6	Widders. do	" 8 "	" 12 10
	1·15	Coolies. do	" 1 8	" 15 3
	·69	Cart. do	" 8 "	" 5 7
	·31	Cart-load of wood for burning stones, per cart.	2 8 "	" 12 5
		Sundries		" 4 5
		Total cost for one cubic yard.		4 1 8

Coosoor Range Office
Coosoor 24th July 1871

Executive Engineer.

Brought forward

Salem District

Revised District Estimate for 1871-72.

Work. Constructing a subsidiary jail and out buildings at Bassoor.

No or quantity	Description of work.	Per	Rate	Amount	Total.
	Jail				
110	Cubic yards of excavating foundation	Cyd	3 11	26 14 10	
308½	Do of brick in chunam	do	4 15 6	1532 13 9	
1⅞	Do of circular arch work	do	5 . 1	9 6 1	
5	Do of flat arch work	do	5 . 1	25 . 5	
67	Squares of plastering with 2 coats of chunam	Square	3 8 .	234 8 .	
4	Do of white washing	do	. 2 .	8 6 .	
7⅛	Do of flooring with asphalte	do	20 . .	144 . .	
28¼	Do of roofing with teakwood couples, rafters, braces, ummers, wall plates, flat and pan tiles and chunam borders	do	55 . .	1553 12 .	
8 2/5	Squares of flooring with 8" square bricks laid in chunam and tarred	do	8 . .	64 15 4	
6	Iron barred windows without shutters complete, made of teakwood	Each	16 7 4	98 12 .	
				3698 8 5	

Brought forward

Salem Division Dec.

Office of Engr

Received for Rs

Received payment

Rs

Paid

Rs

Paid Rs

Rs

Paid Rs

Rs

Paid Rs

Vs P

Data for a Square of roofing for Cossoor Sub Jail.

No of Quantity	Description of Labor and Materials	Per	Rate	Amount
12	Cubic feet of Teakwood	Cft	3 4	39 "
1800	Arcot tiles	1000	3 4	5 13 7
730	Flat tiles	"	2 12	2 " 1
3	Paras of Chunam	Para	" 7 3/8	1 6 6
6	—do— of Sand	"	" 1 "	6 "
4	Boys for pounding do	Each	" 1 "	4 "
4	Bricklayers	"	" 8 "	2 " 4
4	Women coolies	"	" 12 "	4 8
4	Carpenters	"	" 8 "	2 " 4
4	lbs of Nails	lbs	" 3 "	" 12 "
				53 11 1
	Sundries			1 1 2
	Total Rupees			55 "

Cossoor Range Office
Cossoor 24 July 1871

S/d Dempster
Executive Engineer.

Value of materials damaged and lost belonging to Cossoor Subsidiary Jail.

5th Division P.W.

Salem District

Coimbatore Range

Cossoor Sub Jail.

P/W 3735/71

5th Division D.P.W.

Salem District — Possoor Pass

Revised Abstract Estimate &c of 1871-72.

Work. Constructing a subsidiary jail and out buildings at Possoor.

c. for quantity	Description of work.	Pr. Plate	Amount Estab.
	Jail		
110	Cubic yards of excavating foundation Exd	3 11	26 15 10
308 1/2	Do of brick in chunam Do	5 15	1532 13 7
1 7/8	Do of circular arch work Do	5 1	9 6 1
5	Do of flat arch work Do	5 1	25 5
67	Squares of plastering with 2 coats of chunam. Square	3 8	234 6
4	Do of white washing. Do	2	8
7 1/8	Do of flooring with asphalte. Do	20	144
28 1/2	Do of roofing with teakwood couples, rafters, kressummers, wall plates, flat and pan tiles and chunam borders. Do	55	1553 12
8 3/25	Squares of flooring with 8" square bricks laid in chunam and tarred. Do	8	64 15 4
6	Iron barred windows without shutters complete, made of teakwood. Each	16 7 4	98 12
			3698 8 5

5th Division D.P.W.
Salem District
Date 30th Aug 1871
Approved
Executive Engineer

Plan for a gaol
Examined for Supt
Supt Engr C.

	Brought forward				3598 8 5
1	Venition window with frame complete made of teakwood 4×6	Each	39	" "	39 " "
4	Teakwood doors with frames complete ⅓ pannelled and ⅔ iron bars 4×6½	do	59	12 6	239 2 "
1	Venition door with frame complete made of Teakwood 4×7	do	44	" "	44 " "
7	Jungleswood weather boards	do	6	" "	42 " "
					4062 10 5
	Sundries and Petty establishment				207 5 7 4270 " "

Compound wall.

142	Cubic yards of earthwork foundation	Cyd	"	3 11	34 12 2
421	Do of stone in chunam	do	3	15 "	1657 11 "
1	Gate iron leaves	Each	60	" "	60 " "
	Sundries and Petty establishment				107 8 11 1960 " "

Hospital shed.

32	Cubic yards of earthwork	Cyd	"	3 11	7 13 4
50	Do of brick in clay	do	2	12 "	137 8 "
2	Do of arch work brick in chunam	do	5	" 1	10 " 2
5	Squares of flooring with brick jelly and chunam	Square	6	" "	30 " "
12½	Do of plastering with lime coats of chunam	do	3	" "	37 8 "
8⅓	Do of roofing	do	16	" "	131 3 2
8⅓	Do of removing the roof and re-roofing	do	5	" "	41 " "
46	Cubic feet of jungleswood wrought and put up	C. feet	1	8 "	69 " "
	Carried over				464 " 8 6130 " "

	Brought forward				464 " 8 6130 " "
1	Cubic yards of concrete work	C yard	2	" "	2 " "
					466 " 8
	Sundries and superintendence				23 15 4
					490 " "
	Total estimate Rupees				

Jail Latrine.

11	Cubic yards of Earthwork	C yard	"	3 11	2 11 11
4	Do of Concrete work	do	2	" "	8 " "
64	Do of Stud wall	do	"	6 "	24 " "
35	Do of Brick in chunam	do	5	" 1	175 2 11
4¾	Squares of flooring with granite bed dot in sand and coated with tar	Square	10	" "	47 8 "
6½	Do 4" roofing (as per specification)	do	16	" "	104 " "
103	Cubic feet of jungle wood wrought and put up	C feet	1	8 "	154 8 "
12	Squares of smoothing and white washing	Square	"	8 "	6 " "
					521 14 10
	Sundries and superintendence				28 12 "
					550 " "
	Total Amount of Estimate Rupees				7170 " "
	Cook shed according to original estimate			250 " "	250 " "
	Grand Total				7420 " "
	Deduct amount sanctioned in G.O.C.S. 92 and 93 of 12th January 1869 and 4th C April 1871				6750 " "
	Balance requiring sanction				670 " "

Coonoor Range Office
Ootacamund 24 July 1871

Executive Engineer

Colonel R.E.
Superintending Engineer 5th Dn

No 94. Supg: Engineer's Office, 5th Division,
Cuddalore, 3rd August 1871.

From,

Colonel A. J. H. Boileau, R.E.,
Supg: Engineer, 5th Division.

To,

Colonel J. Carpendale, R.E.,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.,

Sir,

In G.O. No 92 dated 12th January 1869, an Estimate of Rs 11,970 was sanctioned for the construction of a Subsidiary Jail at Cossoor in the Salem District. This amount was raised to Rs 12,990 in G.O. No 937 dated 4th April 1870. It was fondly expected that the building would have been finished within the latter amount, but now to my great disappointment, I am compelled to forward another Supplemental Estimate of Rs 610 (with a comparative Statement and the letter in original received therewith from the Executive Engineer Mr Sanders) for its full completion.—

2. From the Comparative Statement

Enclosures 9
1 Comparative Statement
1 Supplt Estimate
1 Original Letter of the Exec: Engr: No 421 of 24th July 1871.
1 Copy of Supg: Engr's Memo:—
1 Data for masonry and roofing.
1 List of Materials lost, &c.—
1 List of details of Smdries, &c.
1 Letter of Overseer Mr Hennessy.—

Taken down & Plinthed
Re-set
Repaired, Altered & Extended
Estimate for Constructing a Subsidiary Jail and Out Buildings at Cossoor
Enclosures to P.L. 6

it may be observed that the excess has been occasioned by an increase of rates for "Excavating foundation", "Brick in chinam", "Stone in chinam", and "Sundries", and by an addition to the quantity of work in the compound wall, Hospital Shed, &c; and the cause of these Mr Paynter ascribes, first to the failure of Mr Wilson to exhibit in the revised estimate the actual rates at which each item of the work was executed, secondly, to the stoppage of the work, and lastly and particularly to the inexperience and carelessness of the Overseer Mr Narrainsamy.

3. It is true that the revised estimate, sanctioned in G.O. No. 937 dated 4th April 1890, was prepared by Mr Wilson when he was in temporary charge of the Range during Mr Paynter's absence on leave from the 8th October to the 8th December 1889; but this estimate was checked and approved of by the latter, and in fact it was resubmitted by him with certain alterations with his letter dated 21st February 1890. The Executive Engineer now states that he did not check every item in it carefully! but it need

hardly be said that it was his duty to have done so before approving of the Estimate. The rates allowed in the present Estimate, and at which the work is said to have been executed, appear exorbitant. For instance, the excavating of foundations of a building in ordinary soil the rate of 3 annas 4 pice per cubic yard is extreme.

4. In the comparative Statement submitted by the Executive Engineer on the 9th May 1891, it was shewn that Brick in chinam, Flat arch, and Circular arch work were executed at Rs. 5-11-1 per cubic yard, and stone in chinam work at Rs. 4-1-8; whereas in the present statement, the rates are put down at Rs. 4-15-6 for the first, Rs. 5-11-1 for the 2nd and 3rd, and Rs. 3-15- for the 4th. This contradiction is at least strange. These rates are also above the prevailing rates of the Taluk.

5. It is stated that owing to the stoppage of the work materials to the value of about Rs. 499 were damaged and lost, and that the mud walls of the latrine

fell down! The work being at the Head Quarters of the Range Officer and the Overseer, it is difficult to understand how this loss could have occurred, had proper precautions been taken for the care and safety of the incomplete building and of the materials on the spot.—

6. Mr. Saynter states that the chief cause of the loss was due to the misperience and carelessness of the Overseer Mr. Hennessy. I cannot bring myself to agree in this view.- From the Inspection Reports of this officer it would appear that, during the time the work was in progress from December 1868 to September 1869, the Executive Engineer remained at Cossor a great part of each month [as per margin] and therefore he had ample opportunities of controlling all causes of superfluous outlay and of checking the ignorant action of his subordinate. I am therefore disposed to attribute the excess in expenditure rather to the Range Officer's deviations from the original sanctioned estimate and to the want of

	Days at Cossor.
December 1868	8.
January 69	22.
February "	14.
March "	24.
April "	14.
May "	5.
June "	18.
July "	16.
August "	16
September "	15.
	152.

due supervision of the building in question than to any thing else.

7. Under this view of the case, in my Memo: No. 165 dated 15th June 1871 on the Comparative Statement submitted by the Range Office on the 9th May 1871, I felt that I was not exceeding my powers as a Superintending Engineer in remarking that "the throwing of the blame on the Overseer while the work was under the Range Officer's own nose," a distance of, I think, less than half a mile from his place of residence, "was disingenuous and proved more clearly the latter's neglect and mismanagement of his duties." To this Memo: Mr. Saynter takes objection and wishes it either to be withdrawn or submitted to Government for their orders. The latter is the course I have thought it right to adopt, for I can see no just reason for cancelling any remarks that I have made.- So far from it, I consider this especially a case where the Executive Officer should be held to a certain

certain extent personally responsible for the enhanced outlay (as was done in the cases of Major Fischer and Captain Beckley some years ago) as a warning to others who similarly transgress.

8. In conclusion I would observe that this is not the only instance of irregularity in the Cossoor Range, but a reference to the records in this office shews that deviations from the sanctioned estimates, involving additional outlay, has been almost a rule in this Range, and that very few of the new works erected therein under Mr. Sarjeiter Home's Agency carried out within the original estimates, as may be observed from the following table:—

Work	Estimate	Expenditure	
Improvements to the Subsidiary Jail at Kistnagherry	2050.	2075.	Work under suspension.
Do. Do. at Denkenicottah	3740.	2511.	Rs.1230 granted for the current year, but the work will not be completed without a supplemental grant.
Extending the Southern Range of Stabling, Remount Depôt at Cossoor, Original Estimate	14,720.		
1st Revised Estimate	20,400.	18,786.	Work under suspension.
2nd Do. Do.	24,200.		
Millapaddy Bridge on Trunk Road No.1	2600.		Work under suspension.
Revised Estimate	3300.	2208.	
Bridge across the Seminar at Bagalore	10,900.		Approaches not yet fully completed.
Supplemental	810.	11,712.	
	11,710.		
Constructing a Rest House for Troops at Jollarpet (in the late Cossoor Range)	3410.		
Supplemental	394.	3,662.	
	3804.		
Constructing a Grain boiling shed at the Remount Depôt	605.		
Supplemental	40.	645.	
	656.		
Improving & extending the channel from the Allalum anicut across the Seminar river	4680.		
Supplemental	580.	5253.	
	5260.		
Reconstructing the anicut & clearing the channel of the Agaharam tank near Nahmm.			
Supplemental	1080.		
	420.	1526.	
	1500.		
Constructing a small building for the residence of the Dy. Asst. Master at Jollarpet (in the late Cossoor Range).	335.	382.	

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.

C. Boileau Colonel R.E.,
Superintending Engineer, 5th Division.

certain Agent personally responsible for the enhanced outlay (as was done in the cases of Major Fischer and Captain Beckley some years ago) as a warning to others who similarly transgress.

8. In conclusion I would observe that this is not the only instance of irregularity in the Cassoor Range, but a reference to the records in this office shews that deviation from the sanctioned estimates, involving additional outlay, has been almost a rule in this Range, and that very few of the new works erected therein under Mr Sarpiter have been carried out within the original estimates, as may be observed from the following table:—

Work	Estimate	Expenditure	
Improvements to the Subsidiary Jail at Kistnagherry	2,050.	2,075.	Work under suspension.
Do. Do. at Denkenicottah	3,740.	2,511.	Rs 1,230. granted for the current year, but the work will not be completed without a supplemental grant.
Extending the Southern Range of Stabling, Remount Depôt at Cossor, Original Estimate	14,720.		
1st Revised Estimate	20,400.	18,786.	Work under suspension.
2d Do. Do.	27,200.		
Millapoochy Bridge on Trunk Road No 1	2,600.		Work under suspension.
Revised Estimate	3,300.	2,208.	
Bridge across the Seminar at Bagalore	10,900.		
Supplemental	810.	11,712.	Approaches not yet fully completed.
	11,710.		
Constructing a Rest House for Troops at Jollarpet [in the late Cossor Range]	3,410.		
Supplemental	394.	3,662.	
	3,804.		
Constructing a Grain boiling shed at the Remount Depôt	609.		
Supplemental	49.	645.	
	658.		
Improving & Extending the channel from the Alcalum adjacent to the Seminar river	4,680.		
Supplemental	580.	5253.	
	5260.		
Reconstructing the anicut & clearing the channel of the Agharam tank near Vaniam-pully	1,080.		
Supplemental	420.	1526.	
	1500.		
Constructing a small building for the residence of the Dy Asst Master at Jollarpet [in the late Cossor Range]	335.	382.	

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant.

L Boileau Colonel R.E.,
Superintending Engineer, 5th Division.

P. W. D. 397 5

Govt of Ind. No. 2411.

Proceedings of the Indian Govt.

Read the following

from

The Supt Engineer 5th Div } (Ex. E. Letter No. 3 Aug 4/71)

With this letter the Supt. Engineer of the 5th Division submits a supplemental estimate of Rs. 610 for the Subsidiary Jail at Dacoor in the Salem District for which an estimate of Rs. 4970 was sanctioned in January 1869 and a revised estimate of Rs. 6790 in April 1870.

According to the comparative Statement submitted the excess is shown to be due chiefly to the inadequacy of the rates provided in the former revised estimate in the

Rec'd Aug 5th 1871

Rec'd Aug 5th 1871

From Supt Engineer 5th Division

To Secy to Govt

No. 2411 dated 3rd August 1871

Enclosures 9

Subsidiary Jail at Dacoor

Amending Estimate

Rs. 610

Submitted for sanction

Duplicate

Rec'd Aug 5th 1871

Read Aug 21st 1871

Recommended

Sanctioned

Rs. 350

Copy to Auditor Gen Aug 28th 1871

Copy to Examiner of Estimates 10 Sept 1871

Copy to Executive Engineer Salem 27 Sept 1871

items of brick in chimneys
and flues in Chimneys.
That estimate, although prepared by Mr. Wilson when
on temporary charge of
the Range, was yet approved by Mr. Paynter
the present Range Officer
who appears to have
taken it for granted
that the estimate had
been framed with reference
to the rates at which
each item of work was
being actually carried
out, whereas it would
now appear that this
could not have been
the case. The responsibility
for the neglect clearly
rests with Mr. Paynter,
who, as pointed out by

(112)

6

the Supt Engineer, should have
carefully examined and
checked every item before
submitting the estimate for
sanction.

The Excess is also explained by Mr. Paynter to
be partly due to damage
and loss of material sus-
tained by the stoppage of
work, and partly to the
inexperience and careless-
ness of the Overseer Mr.
Hennessey, who carried
out some portion of the
work at higher rates than
should have been found
sufficient. The Govern-
ment cannot admit that
the latter plea relieves
Mr. Paynter to any extent
from the responsibility
which undoubtedly
rested with him to

exercise that control over the proceedings of his subordinate which is expected of Range Officers, and which, in the case under notice, the proximity of the work to Mr Paynter's residence afforded him every facility for doing.

Mr Paynter considers that the remarks of the Supt: Engineer on the revised estimate for the Ooperr Subsidiary Jail and the tone in which they are couched, were uncalled for. The Govt hold Supt Engineers primarily responsible for the proper conduct of departmental duty and conformity to rules and orders, and observe that it is quite within the province of a Supt: Engr to censure or pass such comments on the proceedings of his Range Officers as the circumstances of the case may warrant, consistently with the recognized courtesy which should be maintained in all official correspondence.

With these remarks sanction is accorded to the revised estimate of Rs: 7400.

J. Aug: 28th

35
41

To Supt Engr 5 Duplicate
Controller 5 Original letters
Jail Dept 5

Dept 22/9/71

&c &c- 3755

Govt. of {1871} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To The Superintending Engr.
5th Division

Dated

Fwd. 7

Recd.

G. O. 21 Septbr. No. 2411.

Nos. 3556 & 3557

Subs Jail at Dharwar
Dismissed Estimate &c
Not sanctioned with
Remarks