

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	2241	Press
353-354.		Mis.
Dated	25-9-	1842.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
25th September 1872.*

No. 353. Read the following letter from the Acting Superintending Engineer, 1st Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Dowlaishweram, 29th August 1872, No. 2,007 :—

IN continuation of this office letter No. 1,986, dated 27th August 1872, I have the honour to forward copy of a letter from the Executive Engineer in charge of No. 1 or Eastern Delta Range of this district, reporting a loss of Rupees 302-10-3 on the brick-work of

the new Covoer lock near Cocanada. As I have withdrawn my recommendation in favour of the Overseer for promotion, in accordance with the principle approved by Government in G. O. of the 2nd November 1871, No. 2,774, I am unable to support the Range Officer's request that the Overseer should be further called upon to make good the loss, and the more so as the locality is most easy of access, and the work should have been far better checked. I must therefore solicit the Government to permit me to write this off to "profit and loss."

2. I regret to say I am unable to endorse the Range Officer's excuse that he was unable to attend to this work. I have been unable to make any favourable mention of the discharge of his range duties, and have allowed, the circumstance of two deltas being in his hands at once, some consideration, but further I cannot admit.

3. The Overseer is an old Government servant, and has been employed on the works since the anicut was begun; and I regret very much I have been unable to recommend him for promotion on this occasion, for he has done, in former years to my certain knowledge, right good work.

From the Executive Engineer in charge of No. 1 Range, Godavery, to the Acting Superintending Engineer, 1st Division, dated Dowlaishweram, 24th August 1872, No. 342.

I HAVE the honor to bring to your notice the high cost of brick-work on the Covoer lock. I regret to say that Overseer Venkataratnam cannot afford any satisfactory explanation regarding it. I forward a letter and enclosures from Overseer Venkataratnam from which it appears that he throws the whole blame on the Maistry and Lock Superintendent, and forwards a statement showing that some work has been incorrectly charged to the item of brick-work; this is, I believe, partly true, but the statement sent is not true. I forward a revised one, and the result is that I consider an amount of Rupees 302-10-3 has been lost to Government, and should be made good. In the Overseer's statement credit is given for Rupees 155-3-0 on account of filling in dam, etc., charged in error to brick-work. I regret to say that his measurements are utterly wrong. Mr. Larminie (who knows more of the work than I do, having inspected it oftener) has, as well as he, measured the filling in dam, the result is a total of 1,724 cubic yards. For this money has been paid and charged as follows :—

	RS.	A.	P.
699 Cubic yards, at 1 Anna...	43	9	0
Daily Coolies, say 1,008 cubic yards, cost...	63	0	9
1,707 yards.	106	9	9

As this comes so near Mr. Larminie's measurement, I do not think that there can have been any error in the accounts regarding the filling in, but I consider Rupees 10 may fairly be allowed for cutting channels, Rupees 20 for centrings, Rupees 15 for the labour of the plastering, and Rupees 10 for contingencies, making a total of Rupees 55. This makes the cost of labour for 40 cubic yards of brick-work, Rupees 442-10-3, about Rupees 11 a yard.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
25th September 1872.*

2. The work done is very good; all the bricks were cut; similar work at Thossipoody and Chintapilly locks cost Rupees 3-4-0 and 4-14-0 per cubic yard for labour. I think that a fair allowance for Covoor lock is Rupees 3-8-0 a cubic yard, or Rupees 140 for the 40 cubic yards, leaving Rupees 302-10-3 unaccounted for.

3. I regret to say that after every inquiry and examination of the books, I can give no satisfactory explanation of the case, but can only say that I do not for a minute believe that the number of bricklayers and coolies entered in the books ever worked on the lock. Venkataratnam lays the whole blame on the Lock Maistry and Maistry on the work ; he reports that he himself paid the coolies and bricklayers charged for, but acknowledges that he never attempted to check the work done by them, and in fact according to his account left it entirely to the 2nd Maistries. K. Venkataratnam is a very old Government servant, has been for years carrying on masonry works, and I cannot for a moment believe that he himself paid this money away (at the rate of about 20 bricklayers for a cubic yard of work), without knowledge or examination. I am well aware that he does not understand much of accounts, and in fact can only just read and write ; but I think that he understands from his experience better than most how much work a bricklayer should do, and as a rule makes him do it.

4. I can therefore do nothing else but impute to Overseer Venkataratnam either fraud or gross carelessness and neglect of duty; as he is of long service and bears a high character, I prefer doing the latter and with your sanction propose that he should be directed to pay this money into the cash chest to be credited to the work; if it were not for Venkataratnam's long service and good character, I would propose his dismissal.

5. The Lock Maistry who kept the Nominal Rolls has been removed to Yerrapotharam lock ; the Bricklayer Maistry dismissed.

6. I regret much that I have not been able to report this before ; the reason of the delay is as follows.

7. In June it was brought to my notice that there was a heavy overcharge on the item of brick-work. I wrote to Mr. Larminie to make inquiries; in July I received his report, and wrote to Venkataratnam for explanation. I went to Covoor lock as soon as I could (at the end of July), but was unable to report upon the matter until I could obtain from Mr. Larminie the measurements of the filling in.

8. I certainly ought to have known of the excess before June. I had visited the work in May, but I regret to say I did not then go into the brick-work accounts. I was fully engaged the day I was there in settling the accounts of the materials in hand, owing to a dispute regarding them between Overseers Venkataratnam and Ramanah.

No. 354. ORDER THEREON, 25th September 1872, No. 2,271.

ACCOUNT, No. 37.

THE loss of Rupees 302-10-3 reported in this correspondence will remain charged against the Covoer lock and be passed by the Controller.

2. His Excellency the Governor in Council draws the conclusion from these papers that the reconstruction of the Central Delta as an independent Range, ordered in G. O. No. 1,586 of 1st July, has been opportune, and trusts that it will result in better supervision of work than is now reported to prevail.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,

Secretary to Government.

To the Superintendent Engineer, 1st Division.
 .. Controller of Public Works Accounts.
 Exd. T. O'Connor.

N^o 342 ~~31~~ Don. laishwerau
Excentue Inqis Offici^o
24th August 1872

From
Captain A. R. Mead R. C.
Executive Engineer
in charge of R-1 Range Gode,

1
Lieut. Col. J. L. Fisher R. E.
Acting Superintendent Engineer
1st Division

Sir,
 I have the honor to bring to Your
 notice the high cost of brick work on the
 Iron Lock. I regret to say that Engineer Venkata-
 ratnam cannot afford any satisfactory ex-
 planation regarding it. I forward a letter &
 enclosures from Engineer Venkataratnam from
 which it appears that he throws the whole
 blame on the Maistry & Lock Superintendent &
 forwards a statement showing that some
 work has been incorrectly charged to the item
 of brick work, this is I believe partly true
 but the statement sent is not true. I forward a
 revised one & the result is that I consider an
 amount of Rupees 202-10-3 has been lost to
 Government & should be made good. In the
 Engineer's statement credit is given for Rupees
 5-3-0 on account of filling in dam &c
 charged in error to brick work. I regret
 to say that his measurements are utterly
 wrong.

wrong. Mr. Sammie (who knows more of the work than I do having inspected it - often) has as well as he measured the filling in dam the result is a total of 8724 Cysd. For this money had been paid & charged as follows

699 Cysd @ 1 anna Rs. 43-9-0

Daily Coolies

Long 1008 Cysd Cost 63-0-9

1707 Cysd

106-9-9

As this comes so near Mr. Sammie's measurement. I do not think that there can have been any error in the accounts regarding the filling in. But I consider Rs. 80 may fairly be allowed for cutting channels Rs. 20 for Contingencies Rs. 15 for the labor of the plastering & Rs. 10 for Contingencies making a total of Rs. 55. This makes the cost of labor for 40 Cysd of brick work Rs. 442-10-3 about Rs. 11 a yard.

The work done is very good all the bricks were cut, similar work at Thriipoodry & Chintapilly Lochs Cost Rs. 3-40-0 & 4-14-0 per Cysd for labor. I think that a fair allowance for Corder Loch is Rs. 3-8-0 a Cysd or Rs. 140 for the 40 Cysd leaving Rs. 302-10-3 unaccounted for.

I regret to say that after every en-
quiry & examinations of the books I can
give

give no satisfactory explanation of the case but can only say that I do not for a minute believe that the number of bricklayers & Coolies entered in the books ever worked on the Lochs. Venkataratnam lays the whole blame on the Loch Maistry & Maistry on the work he reports that he himself paid the Coolies & bricklayers charged for but acknowledges that he never attempted to check the work done by them & in fact according to his account left it entirely to the 2^d Maistries. N. Venkataratnam is a very old Government Servant has been for years carrying on masonry works & I cannot for a moment believe that he himself paid this money away (at the rate of about 20 bricklayers for a Cysd of work) without knowledge or examination. I am well aware that he does not understand much of accounts & in fact can only just read & write but I think that he understands from his experience better than most how much work a bricklayer should do & as a rule makes him do it.

I can therefore do nothing else but impute to Venkataratnam either fraud or gross carelessness & neglect of duty. as he is of long service & bears a high character I prefer doing the latter & with your sanction proposed that he should be directed to pay this money into the
Cash

Overser

No. 2047
From

Sir Col. J. F. Ficken R.E.
Acting Superintending Engineer
1st Division

To

Colonel J. M. Walker R.E.
Secretary to Government D. P.
MADRAS

SIR,

In continuation of this Office letter No 1986 date 27th August 1872, I have the honor to forward copy of a letter from the Engineer in charge of No 1 or Eastern Delta Range of this District reporting a loss of 302.10.3 cu the brickwork of the New Cross Lock near Cocanada. As I have withdrawn my recommendation in favor of the Overseer for promotion, in accordance with the principle approved by Government in G.O. of the 2nd November 1871 No 2774. I am unable to support the Range Officer's request that the Overseer should be further called upon to make good the loss, and the more so, as the locality is most easy of access, and the work should have been far better checked. I must therefore solicit the Government to permit me to write this off to "Profit and Loss".

*To be returned

P. N. 4367/92.
Enclosed in a letter
No 2007 date 27th August 1872
from the Acting Engineer
in charge of the
Eastern Delta Range
to the Secretary to Govt
D. P. Madras
Dated 25th Sept 1872 and 1873

2. I regret to say, I am unable to endorse
the Range Officers excuse that, he was unable
to attend to this work. I have been unable to
make any favorable mention of the discharge
of his Range duties, and have allowed, the cir-
-cumstance of two Deltas being in his hands
at once, some consideration, but further, I cannot
admit.

3. The overseer is an old government
servant, and has been employed on the works since
the project was begun, and I regret very much,
I have been unable to recommend him for promotion.
His excuse, for he has done, in former
years, to my certain knowledge, right good
work.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obt. servant

W. T. Tucker, Supt. Col. R. L.

A. G. Sup. Engineer, 1st Division

Public Works Deptt
 Proceedings of the Madras Govt
 Read the following

From the Suptg. Engineer
 of the 1st Division

H.C. 2007 29th Aug 1912

13

The loss of Rs. 302-10-3 reported in this corres-
 pondence will remain
 charged against the
 Cooor Lock and be
 passed by the Controller
 The promotion of
 Overseer Ven Ratnam
 to 2nd Class will be
 cancelled, but no pro-
 motion will be made
 in his stead until
 receipt of next Quarterly
 Statement from all

L.S.

For 2nd Division for 1912

P. H. 1872
 From
 The Superintending Engineer,
 First Division.

To
 The Secretary to Government
 Department Public Works
 MADRAS

Dated 29th August 1912
 Received 7th September 1912

1-8-1912 NO. 2007

ENCLOSURE

Subject.

Forwarded copy of a letter from
 the Assistant Engineer in charge of
 the 1st Range Godavery reporting
 the loss to Government of Rs.
 302-10-3 on the brickwork of the
 new Cooor Lock near Coimbatore
 and requests that the amount be
 sanctioned to be written off to
 "Major and Minor"

10853

1022375-2526/12

Districts, when the
Chief Engineer will
 promote the most
 deserving, according
 to Superintending Engineers
 recommendations and
 seniority in the List

His Excellency the
 Governor in Council
 draws the conclusion from
 these papers that the
 reconstruction of the
 Central Delta as an
 independent Range
 ordered in G.O. No.
 1886 of 1st July has
 been opportune; and
 trusts

Is this right? If the
 promotion are to be
 made by the Chief
 Engineer, the Govt. have
 nothing to do with them,
 if by the Govt. it should
 be decided.

A.A.

Amil this from the
 Govt. order, to write
 a Memo. from the
 Chief Engineer
 to the same effect.
G.M.W.

that it will result
 in better supervision
 of work than is now
 reported to prevail.
G.M.W.

32
 3

1/2 The Dipos Engineer & the four Encls.
 3 " Controller
 Desd 30/9/72

Oct 367

Govt. of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To The Superintending Engineer
Public Works

Dated

Recd.

Encl

G. O. 25 Sept 2271.

Nos. 353 & 354

New Coroor Lock near

Cocanada. The loss
of Rs. 502-10-3 incurred on
the brickwork of the New
Coroor Lock to be charged
against the work and
certain observations made
with reference to the com-
position of the central
Petta as an independent
cause.

Cor 114