

- (1) Number of pages _____
- (2) Date of repair _____
- (3) Initials of the Referee _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	3351	Press
146-211		Mis.
Dated	22-10-	18-12-

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
23rd October 1872.*

No. 416. Read the following letter from the Acting Superintending Engineer, 1st Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Dowlaishweram, 25th September 1872, No. 2,327:—

ADVERTING to G. O. of the 14th August 1872, No. 1,936, I have the honour to forward, in original, Major Beatty's report (to be returned) on the Yellamunchelly Cutcherry, from which it will be observed I had correctly represented the loss to Government by the change I had recommended.

2. As Mr. Thornhill was at Yellamunchelly early in February last, and inspected this structure with the Collector and Principal Assistant, it is to be regretted the Revenue Board were unable to submit the matter for the consideration and orders of Government before the 14th August 1872.

3. I made the changes proposed after considerable deliberation, knowing well the loss the Government had to incur in the first instance, and consulted two professional officers on the matter; and had Mr. Thornhill inspected the school-house at the same station, built about six years' ago, he would most likely have agreed with me that, when good building stone was available, brick and chunam work should not be adopted, particularly in a building designed for a special object and purpose near the sea.

From Major J. BEATTY, R. E., Executive Engineer, Vizagapatam, to the Superintending Engineer, 1st Division, dated Waltair, 3rd September 1872, No. 79.

Your docket No. 1,983 of 27th ultimo, accompanied by G. O. No. 1,936 of 14th idem, regarding the Yellamunchelly Taluq Cutcherry reached me on the 30th. I at once placed myself in communication with Mr. Supervisor Laskey on the subject, and have now the honour to report the result.

2. The original estimate of the Cutcherry, amounting to Rupees 18,780, was sanctioned in G. O., No. 1,119, dated 6th April 1863. Work was commenced on 15th December 1863, and stopped in August 1869. The total expenditure up to the stoppage of work was Rupees 8,833. Of this, Rupees 3,040 only was for the brick walls and brick archwork over doors and windows; the remainder, Rupees 5,823, was for the rubble masonry of foundations and basement for doors and windows, and materials in hand when the work was stopped.

3. The work was not recommenced until April 1872. Meantime, the Superintending Engineer having occasion to visit Yellamunchelly in February and August 1871, inspected the brick walls of the Cutcherry and decided that they should be pulled down and more substantial walls substituted.

4. I left the district in June 1869 and did not re-visit Yellamunchelly until September 1871, so that the question of the state of the walls and their sufficiency to stand a roof arose and was settled in my absence.

5. The statements of the Revenue Department that the Cutcherry had "been slowly building for a period of over six years;" that "9,000 Rupees had been spent on work fit only to be pulled down;" and that, while my duties took me within sight of the building, the works "had to wait for years until the Superintending Engineer could find time to look at them," are incorrect. The Cutcherry has been in progress not more than one year altogether up to the present date, i. e., seven months of 1869 and five months of 1872; the total value of work that it was

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
23rd October 1872.

considered necessary to pull down and re-build was Rupees 3,010; and, lastly, while the work was stopped by order of Government and funds could not be found for completing it, the Superintending Engineer in the ordinary course of duty visited it and decided what was to be done.

6. A revised estimate for the entire building was sanctioned in G. O. No. 453 of 17th February 1872; work was commenced in April, and before I passed the place in June 1872 the brick walls had been demolished, and the rubble masonry ones had made some progress.

I am therefore unable to inspect the walls in question, with a view to forming an opinion as to "the possibility of completing the work as designed by removal of cracked arches, etc.," because those walls no longer exist.

7. I beg to bring specially to notice that the revised estimate was for the whole building, and not merely for pulling down part of what had been already constructed and completing it on a new plan. Consequently, the difference between the original and revised estimates, Rupees 3,370, represents exactly the loss to Government by the alteration of plan. This consists of the value of the old walls, Rupees 3,040, and the cost of demolition Rupees 330.

Original Estimate	...	Rs. 19,780
Revised Estimate	...	22,150
Difference...		3,370

According to the revised estimate, the new walls of rubble masonry, 21 inches thick, will cost the same as the old ones, which were of brickwork 15 inches thick.

No. 417. ORDER THEREON, 23rd October 1872, No. 2,500.

CIVIL WORKS, No. 22.
His Excellency the Governor in Council is glad to receive the information that, of the outlay of Rupees 8,863 incurred on the new Taluq Cutcherry at Yellamunchelly, Rupees 3,010 represented the net loss on defective brickwork; which amount with Rupees 330 for demolition is included in the sum of Rupees 22,150 for building a Cutcherry in stone and chunam, sanctioned in G. O. No. 453 of 17th February 1872.

2. Had this information been clearly given in the Superintending Engineer's letter submitting the revised estimate, the Local Revenue Officers would not have been led into the inaccuracies contained in their report.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 1st Division.
Board of Revenue.
Revenue Department.

By E. C. Shanber:

No. 2327
From

Lieut. Col. J. Fischer M.E.
Acting Superintending Engineer
1st Division

To
Colonel J. M. Walter M.E.
Secretary to Government D. P. W.
MADRAS

SIR,

Referring to G.O. of the 14th August 1872 No 1936, I have the honor to forward in original, Major Beatty's report on the Yellamunchelly Cutcherry, from which it will be observed, I had correctly represented the loss to Government by the change I had recommended.

As Mr. Thornhill was at Yellamunchelly early in February last, and inspected this structure with the Collector and Principal Assistant, it is to be regretted the Revenue Board were unable to submit the matter for the consideration and orders of Government before the 14th August 1872.

I made the changes proposed, after considerable deliberation, knowing well the loss the Government had to incur in the

Submission on 8th Feb on Collection of the cost of expenses of 17th report

x To be returned

In first instance, and consulted two professional
officers on the matter, and had Mr. Whithill
inspect the school house at the same station,
built about 6 years ago. He would most likely
have agreed with me that, when good building
stone was available, brick and common work
should not be adopted, particularly in a
building designed for official object and
purpose. Hence the error.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obt. servant

Wm. T. Linn

Adj. Sub. Engineer etc. D.

From the Supr, Engr (Here enter 8623270/25th Feb^r 1872)

This Excellency the Governor in Council is glad to receive the information that of the outlay of Rs. 8863 incurred on the new Talook Cutcherry at Yellamanchelly Rs. 3040 represented the net loss on defective brickwork, which amount with Rs. 330 for demolition is included in the sum of Rs. 22,150 for building a Cutcherry in

1872
 From
 The Superintending Engineer
 First Division

20

*The Secretary to Government
Department Public*

五

Received. 20 October 1955

No. 12

ENCLO.

Subject.

Handwritten: *Handwritten*

Dr. H. H. H. H. H.

of Location on the

Adelphi.

1102570-25" 22/22

No. 1: *Desm. & Desm.* (1811)

A. G. Sup. Engineer 1st Dn.

in stone and chunam.

Sanctioned in G.O.

No. 438 of 17th Feby

1872.

Had this information

been clearly given in

the Superintending Engr's

letter submitting the Re-

vised Estimate, the cri-

ticisms of the Local

Revenue Officers [and

Revenue Board would

probably have been much

less condemnatory

of the proceedings of

the Public Works Officers

with reference to the work.

But it is to be regretted

that the Collector and

should simply say -

"could have not

have led into

the inaccuracy

contained in

their report."

L.S.L.

Collector should have
made statements as
to the length of time
that the Culchery had
been under construction,
and the amount of loss
that its reconstruction
with other material
would involve, calculated
to mislead the Revenue
Board and Govern-
ment; and the inaccur-
acy of which they
might at any time
have ascertained from
Major Beatty or Mr
Lasker. Such random
statements are to be
deplored as con-
ducive to ill feeling
between

between the Officers
of the two Departments,
and productive of
need less references -

G.M.W.

48
4

To Mr. S. King 1st St. South on Esplanade
4 - 132 of Revue
8 - Revue de la
Desp. 28/10/77