

(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. 539-40	Press Mis. <i>Per</i>
450-53	
Dated 28. 2	18 2.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

N^o 3196 Sup^y Eng^r's Office 4th D^r
Madras 4th November 1871

From

Colonel E. V. Wilkinson R. E.

Superintending Engineer 4th D^r

To

Colonel J. Carpendale R. E.

Secretary to Government P. W. D.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit for

Enclosures 5:

1. Set of Revised Estimates

1. Comparative Statement

2. Reports in original

1. Statement shewing the

high labour charged in

the workyard at the

Mount by different

Quarriers.

1 List with plans.

the sanction of Government

revised Estimates amount

ing to Rupees 23,885

together with a Comparative

Statement for the new

Baracks for a second

Field Battery of Artillery

at St. Thomas' Mount.

2.

The original Estimate for

this work amounted to Rupees 20,500

as sanctioned in G. O. N^o 3399 dated

29th

29th October 1860. The revised Estimate
now submitted amounts to Rupees
237,885 exhibiting an excess of Rupees
32,875 which is about 16 per cent
on the amount originally
sanctioned.

Revised Est. Rs 237,885
Original Est. Rs 205,010
Difference Rupees 32,875

3. This excess is due to the
following causes as explained in para
11 of Captain Meads' report here-
with submitted in original.

1st Rise of rate.

2nd Additions and alterations in
the original plan and Estimate.

3rd Materials and labour charged
improperly to the Artillery Barracks
though used on other works and

4th Heavy cost of work done in
the workyard at Mount.

4. The comparative statement
clearly explains the causes of increase of
on

on each item of the original Estimate
and the report of Lieutenant Doward
which is also herewith submitted in
original gives additional explanation
as to the increase of rates and the high
price of work done in the workyard
at the Mount.

5. A statement shewing the
high price of labour charged in the
workyard at the Mount, which
has been prepared by Lieutenant
Doward is also herewith sent.

6. As the greater part of the
expenditure in Timber work was
incurred by Overseer Punganatha
Moodelhar now employed in No. 1
Range Chingleput District. he has
been called upon to explain the cir-
cumstances under which high rates
were paid by him, and his explanation
will be submitted for the orders of
Government.

Government as soon as it is received in this Office.

7. The late Temporary Overseer Abboye Naidu who had charge of the work at the commencement also comes in for a share of the charge of recklessness in paying high rates for labor, but as he was dismissed under orders of Government no notice can be taken of his conduct now in this Office.

8. Armoogum Moodally who has been in charge of the Artillery Barracks from the commencement of the work is also a responsible party for the great excess in Masonry and other items, but it is left to the Government to pass such orders as they may see fit on his case from the perusal of the statements before them.

5 3
9. A sum of Rupees 120,177 was expended on this work up to the end of last official year. Adding to this, the sum of Rupees 4,000 allotted in the current years' Budget a total of Rupees 160,177 is made out leaving a balance of Rupees 77,708 as shown in the margin to be provided for completing the works. I beg that the amount of Revised Estimate Rs. 237,885. Past years expenditure Rupees 120,177 Current years allotment Rs. 4,000 160,177 Balance to be allotted - 77,708. This sum may be granted in the ensuing years Budget. On the whole I am inclined to consider the explanation of excess as satisfactory. Large building works of the permanent character of the Barracks can be scarcely be constructed ^{without} supplemental Estimates. I must however add that I cannot entirely exonerate Captain Rogers from

from blame in this matter. He was
wrong in debiting to this work the
materials used on other works and
his supervision of the Overseers
appears to have been lax.

10. They also state for the
information of Government that this
excess was caused previous to my
taking charge of the Division.

11. As the revised Estimates and
Comparative Statements submitted
by Captain Rogers R. E. were not
in a proper form this had to be
returned for revision more than
once, to enable this Office to lay the
papers before Government in a complete
manner.

12. I have the honor to be

Yours Most Obedient Servant
C. R. E.
W. W. Rogers
Superintendent

Sup. Engr. Office 4th D.
Madras 8 December 1871

N^o 3705.

From.

Colonel L. V. Wilkieson R. E.
Superintending Engineer 4th D.

To,
Colonel J. Carpendale R. E.
Secretary to Government P. W.
Fort Saint George

Sir,

X 5299-
Enclosures of my letter N^o 3196 dated 4th November 1871. I have the honor to submit a letter
1 letter from Lt. Dorward R. E. in original from the Executive Engineer
with 4 enclosures. Mount Range, together with two letters
2 letters from from the Overseers Ranganatham Moodley
Capt. Rogers R. E. and others, regarding the excess in the
timber work of the Artillery Barracks
at Saint Thomas' Mount, a portion of
which was stated to have occurred
during the time that these Overseers had
charge of the Workyard.

2 Lieutenant Dorward R. E.
has clearly commented on each of the
points put forward by Ranganatha Moodley
and in his remarks thereon, I generally
concur. The Overseer evidently tries
to shift the blame off from his shoulders,
but

N^o 3705
To the Secy to Govt
P. W.
Fort Saint George

The Secy to Govt
P. W.
Fort Saint George

Colonel J. Carpendale R. E.

Encl. 4

1 letter from Lt. Dorward R. E.

with 4 enclosures

2 letters from from the Overseers Ranganatham Moodley

Capt. Rogers R. E. and others

regarding the excess in the

timber work of the Artillery Barracks

at Saint Thomas' Mount

a portion of which was stated to have occurred during the time that these Overseers had charge of the Workyard.



but giving full weight to all that he has urged, I do not think that the circumstances stated by him exonerates his fault.

3 From the records of this Office it is observed that all the Officers under whom this Overseer was employed have pronounced him as "careless and incompetent to be entrusted with important works"; Captain Rogers R. E. has especially reported that "he (the Overseer) has not nearly sufficient ability or energy" for cantonment works". In August 1870 the Executive Engineer, also reported that the Overseer through carelessness permitted his workyard Gomastah to make an overcharge of Rupees 21-6-6 in the accounts. The charge being a clear one, my predecessor Colonel Bean dismissed the Gomastah, and, at the same time recorded that the Overseer Ranganatham Moodely will be transferred to a less important Range. This however was not done until lately, when I transferred him to N^o 1 Range to fill up a vacancy. With so many facts before me, I cannot acquit the Overseer of having displayed gross carelessness and inefficiency in the discharge of his duties in connection with

with the Mount Barracks, and the workyard.

11
A Of the three other Overseers, connected with this transaction, Alboye Naidoo has been dismissed as already reported. Chengalroya Moodely held charge of the work for so short a time that he had little or nothing to do with it. The only Overseer who had equal if not a greater share in the Barrack works is, Armoogum Moodely, nearly the whole of the excess in masonry works was incurred during the time this Overseer had charge of the construction of the Barracks. The incorrigible carelessness of this man and the irregularities practised by him has been frequently animadverted upon by my predecessor Colonel Bean, and by the Executive Officers under whom he was employed. Various instances of these irregularities have been brought to notice in the several petitions addressed to Colonel Bean, and though the charges cannot be proved from want of direct evidence,

Still

still I do not think the Overseer
is worthy of confidence. It is my
opinion that he should be removed
to a far outlying and less important
Range in this or any other Division
of the Department.

I have the honor to be

Sir
Your most obedient servant

Wm. A. Lusk

Supy. Engr. U.S.G.

GP

Public Works Department
 From Mr. of Govt. Secy. 28-5858
 The Superintending Engineer
 to the Govt.

To,
 The Secretary to Government
 Public Works Office
 Fort Saint George

Dated 8th December 1871
 Recd. 9th 5

By No. 375

Submitting an original
 letter from the Executive
 Engineer Mount Range
 together with 2 letters
 from the Overseer Run-
 ganatham Moodely
 and others regarding
 the receipts in the timber
 work of the Artillery
 Barracks at Saint
 Thomas' Mount.
 Nos 539-540-28 Feb

No 451

Recd. 9 Feb 72 No. 132
 103 Feb 72 No. 9

15

I was directed by the Memo.
 No 344 dated 30th June 1869 from this
 Office to take charge of the duties
 of the Suspended Overseer Abboy
 Naidu & to be careful to see
 that the stores at the Work shop
 & as well as materials for
 buildings in progress agree
 with the Overseers books & the
 Station books.

I did accordingly & had
 prepared usual charge papers
 & a teak wood statement for the
 signature of both of us for sub-
 mission to the Range Office.

As Abboy Naidu did
 not make his appearance after
 his suspension I did not
 submit usual charge papers
 to the Range Office.

The Teakwood statement
 of the Work Yard prepared as
 stated above I had reason
 to believe to be correct, as it
 did not vary much from the
 statements

Statements prepared two months
previous to that time when
Captain Rogers R. E. took
over charge of the Mount
Range.

Rungavada Indily joined
this Range by the 22nd
August 1869 when I handed
over charge of all the
works to him with all papers
& statements I had prepared
to his entire satisfaction.

Mount Range Office
St. Thomas Mount
18th November 1869
Locat Fund Overd

11/11/888/11

17
I recollect perfectly well
that when Cheyleroya Indily
took charge of the work yard
and Cantonment works. I prepared
charge papers on his directions.
Among them one was regarding
Leak wood transaction.
When Rungavada Indily took
over charge from Cheyleroya Indily
I know those papers were handed
over to him —
18th August 1869
J. D.
C. M. Linn
Enly 10th 20th

utter
in
took

11/1888/19

No 344. To Mrs.
Draftsman and Surveyor.
Chunglroya Woodlilly.

In consequence of temporary
Dresser Attye Smiths having been
suspended by the Executive Engineer
All further orders Chunglroya
Woodlilly will at once take charge
of the duties of the suspended Dresser.

Chunglroya Woodlilly will be
careful to see that the Stores at
the Workshop &c as well as all
materials for buildings in progress
agree with the Dressers books and
the Station books.

Mount Range
Office
30 June 1869

/Signed H. J. Byers
Es Engineer Mount Range

/True Copy/

J. J. Donward
Es Engineer Mount Range.

10^e Novem ber 71
Vriendlaas



W. A. Goodchap Esq
Executive Engineer Nat Range

10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532

With reference to your Memo¹ 746
dated 6th November 1871 accompanied with
a copy of Memo from Superintending Engineer
No 3193 dated 4th November 1871, calling
for an explanation regarding the great
excess rupees (13000) of expenditure in the
timber work yard at Saint Thomas Mount
while I was in charge of it for upwards of
2 years.

I beg most respectfully to submit the following explanation regarding the great excess as follows.

When I joined the Mount Range
no accounts of the timber work yard was
given to me by my predecessor Chugulroya
Modally

Modelly who was in charge of said
workyard, nor any papers appertaining
to these accounts, no transfer papers were
run up between myself and Cheugulroya
Modelliar, nor any papers and such
produced by his predecessors for my
guidance, the Range Officer is aware
of these transactions that a formal
charge was given to me, and no written
order was issued to me by the Range
Officer to receive charge from Cheugulroya
Modelly, nor any such written ~~orders~~
orders to that individual to this effect.

2^d Owing to the high rate of timber
purchased by the Range Officer from
100 to 107 Rupees for the first year and
84 Rupees for the 2^d year, the timber
purchased in the 2^d year was not so good
as in the first year and which was
sanctioned

sanctioned by the Range Officer, great
wastage has been caused in working out
those timber logs.

3^d The nomination of the work people
of the timber workyard was not solely rest
on my shoulders but the Range Officer has
taken a part of that duty also, a matter that
a very small excess might have been
accrued under the head of labor in
consequence of employing additional work-
people and of turning out works in such a
substantial and satisfactory manner, the
Range Officer had consistently visit the
work yard and inspected the works while
in progress and after completion, the cost
of which was reported to him, the enhance
price of labor paid owing the demand of
labor in the Presidency and in Mofussil,
and

and in one occasion I had to send for workmen from Madras paying them very high rate to compensate their expenses when the work had to be executed very rapidly at the express orders of the Range Officer.

4th To the best of ^{my} recollection I beg to state that certain charges were debited against the New Barracks, in the books of Range Office which does not appertain to the expenditure actually incurred to that account on reference to the ledger kept in the Range Office for that work will evince you the fact.

5th The whole timber work was not executed in my time but was carried out prior to my joining the Range by the undermentioned individual.

1st Overseer Mr. Aroomooga Modelly

2nd Temporary Overseer Akbay Isidoo
3rd Local fund Overseer Chengulraya Modelly
latter by myself.
6th With regard to the latter part para 1, contained in Superintending Engineer's Memo above adverted to states "notwithstanding that there was a detailed data for all timber works for his guidance in the Range Office" this I know nothing of, no any data for any works was furnished to me from the Range Office for my guidance at any time, I have repeatedly asked for it, but my poor request was not complied with, nor any Estimate for work required but only indents without rates were received from the Overseer who was executing the New Barrack works, and from the Range Officer also at times.
7th It is not apparent to me how the calculation arrived at to the extent of Rspees 13000 as an excess on timber workyard while

while there is a stock in the yard
roughly valued at the time of Captain Mead. & E.
~~Expenses~~ to the extent of Rupees 9000 and odd
In conclusion I beg to state that my
explanation as above will I believe
satisfy the Superintending Engineer on the
points therein noted.

I beg to remain
Sir
Yours most Obedt Servt
James Smith
Overseer D.M.

P. 1204

From: *John S. J. Howard Esq.*
Executive Engineer Mount Range
To: *The Supt. Engineer A. D. ...*
Madrid.

Enclosed I have the pleasure to return the enclosed explanation of the process in the timber yard by *Orsuer* *Pinaga-nathan* *Modelly*, and to offer the following observations thereon:
1. He states that his predecessor *Ching-paya* *Modelly* gave him no accounts when he took charge. Attached to this letter are statements by *Ching-paya*, and by the *Owners* *Modelly*, which go to prove that certain accounts were made out at the time of transfer; a copy of the *Drums* alluded to by the *Local Fund Orsuer* is attached; but I regret that none of the *Charge papers*, or papers prepared by *Ablooye* *Rindoo* can now be found. The loss of so many records, of whose existence once there is good proof, can hardly have been accidental, and I cannot avoid the suspicion that they

No 3334

Forwarded
last letter to
Mr. Howard
Birmingham
Perryville
Whit's building
house to make
Birmingham

From
J. P. ...
Village Creek

Do
Mr. A. ...
Date 10 ...
Record

Mr. ...
Howard and ...

Regarding the ...
of ...
yard.

1899 5888/41

Super ...
this is no
...
...
...

14 & ...

...
...
...

they have been purposely destroyed.
3. He adduced the variations in the price of timber as one cause of the excess. This goes to account for the excess in Materials, as was explained in para 13 of my report forwarded with letter No 877 dated 9 October 1891. So also does the more than ordinary wastage attributed to by the Overseer. But that the Range Officer would purchase inferior timber is hardly credible.

4. The third fact advanced by him, I think, some truth in it. It is certainly not a satisfactory one and in one or two instances I have found that word which has been worked up has been affirmatively reported. It is also probable that, at times, the Overseer had to pay his workmen higher wages than is usual. But that the Overseer was incapable of controlling his subordinates, was, I understand repeatedly reported, and led to his removal from the Range. Specially would I call your attention to my predecessor's letter

No

No 815 dated 31 August 1890, in which an overcharge of Rs 21.6.6 is brought to your notice.
5. In addition to what has already been reported, I have not found any charge such as that alluded to in the 4th Allegation, except some minor improvements in the Workshop. The pieces of timber used to build the sheds belong to the Parraikto, but this item is comparatively small. The list given by the Overseer does not show any such charges. Perhaps your Rangaraj, if again called upon, could give more information on the point.

6. The names of the different individuals concerned in the timber work are already known to you. The Overseers are detailed in the 5th paragraph of the letter under reference.

7. I cannot credit the statement made in the 6th paragraph, that the Range Officer neglected the application for the data. And I cannot find any thing to show that such an application

was

was soon made

8. I have already reported that the item of the previous timber was estimated too lightly. Up to 15 Oct-ber last it had been reduced by nearly one quarter. And other items in the Comparative Statement, such as brick work, were also exaggerated, apparently from the difficulty of valuing stock on the site, so that if the revised estimate is sanctioned Government, there will, ultimately, saving in it of some thousands.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your Most Obedt Servt

J. Donald Smith M.E.
Esq Engineer Mount Range

Mount Range Free
22 November 1871

From N. 3736.
The Executive Engineer
Mount Range.
The Supy Engineer
H. D. Sanders.

Sir, I have the honor to request the favor of your transferring Messrs Pung and the Monthly to some other Range where the work is less onerous and less difficult than it is at the Mount. This Messrs has not nearly sufficient energy or ability for Cantonment Works. I shall be much obliged therefore if you will replace him by some other Messrs more fitted for his position.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Mount Range
Office
20 Aug 1870

Your Obedt Servt
J. W. Rogers Esq
Esq Engineer Mount Range.

No. 815

25

From The Executive Engineer
Mount Range.
To The Supt. Engineer
S. D. Madras
Sir,

I think it my duty to report
to you the following circumstance
I was given to understand that
if I paid the Work people employed in
the Work yard, on the full from the
16 to 31 of July I should find a
greater amount set down in it
than what would be claimed.

I accordingly paid the men my-
self and found that there was Ru-
pees 21. 6. 6 over and above what
the men themselves claimed.

The only explanation that the
Jomastah Veeraswamy Pillay who
was in charge of the Work yard account
could give of this very suspicious cir-
-cumstance was that the men were
really entitled to the money and had
plotted against him to ruin him.

but

17935-8/11
at 20-8/10 & 4/10

From The Executive Engineer
Mount Range
To The Supt. Engineer
S. D. Madras
Sir,
I have the honor
to acknowledge the receipt
of your letter of the 11th
inst. in relation to the
above subject.

From The Executive Engineer
Mount Range
To The Supt. Engineer
S. D. Madras
Sir,
I have the honor
to acknowledge the receipt
of your letter of the 11th
inst. in relation to the
above subject.

but as this would have required the
connivance of 13 different workmen
I could not for a moment credit so
extraordinary a statement and ac-
cordingly dismissed him from the
post office establishment.

With regard to the Officer's
share in the transaction, the man
is such a poor creature and so en-
tirely in the hands of his subordi-
nates without whom he really ap-
pears able to do nothing that it
is not any use further to press
this matter against him than to
impress upon you more strongly my
already expressed wish that he
may be removed to some other
Range where his duties would
be more within his capacity.

He is quite young in the De-
partment and may turn out
some day a fair Officer but I
do not think so myself.

Mount Range
Office
31 Aug 1830.

Yours the honor to be,
Sir,
Gives much Res: Serv:
J. M. W. Jones Capt. M.
De Range Mount Range.

From
The Engineer
to Mount Range
The Supg Engineer
Lt D. Andrews
Dated 22^c
Recd 3 Apr/11

Encls. 4

11204

Returns Messrs.
Punganatha Mudg
Explanation with
Associations Thereon.

This affair appears
due getting more
complicated. one must
advise Mr. [unclear] and [unclear]
that will clear up [unclear]
[unclear] [unclear]

P/W 5358/71
Dec-28-11/12. Lt 457

Memo

43

Requests to return the enclosures which forwarded
in Supg. Eng^r No. 3196 of 4 Nov/71 embodied
in G.O. No. 539 of 28 Feb/72 regarding the
Barracks at St. Thomas Mount.

Supg Eng^r Office }
Lt D. }
Madras 5 June/72 }

S. Francis' Manager

Supg Eng^r Office Lt

To

195 G.O. No. 444-3-6-72

The Chief Assistant and Registrar
to the Secretary to Govt. P.W.D.
Fort.

11/11/11 No. 539 P.H.D.
Proceedings of the Madras Court
Read the following

From

The Super Engineer } (H.E. No. 3176 of 4th Dec/11)
4th Dec

do

do (H.E. No. 3705 of 8th Dec/11)

In his letter

No. 992 M, dated 3rd 11/11

October 1868, the Inspec-

tor General of Military

Works communicated

the sanction of the

Government of India

to Estimates amounting

in the aggregate to

Rs. 2,05,010, for

the construction of

three

three blocks of double
storeyed barracks, with
the necessary auxiliary
and subsidiary build-
ings, for a second Field
Battery of Artillery at
Saint Thomas' Mount.

2 With the first
of the letters recorded
at the head of these Pro-
ceedings the Superintending
Engineer of the 14th Di-
vision submits a revised
Estimate for the project
amounting to Rupees
2,37,885, which, as com-
pared with the original
sanction, shows an excess
of Rupees 32,875.

3

On an examination
of

of the details of the
Comparative Statement,
the Government observe
that the principal
items making up this
excess are as follows.

Lower Story.

	Rs.
1 Demolishing old buildings and remov- ing rubbish _____	1185
2 Flooring with granite Slabs. _____	1072
3 Granite Stone work. _____	2928
4 Teakwood, wrought and put up. _____	4740
5 Doors, windows, and shutters. _____	4631
6 Sundries. _____	3344

Upper Story.

7 Brickwork in Chumand. _____	2920
8 Asphalting floor. _____	747
9 Teakwood wrought and put up. _____	2020
10 Doors, windows, and weather boards. _____	3675
11 Iron Railing. _____	637
12 Ladders for centre stair case. _____	958
13 Sundries. _____	1123

4 No provision
for the first item was
made in the original
Estimate, it having
been understood when
that Estimate was prepa-
red, that the Barracks
would be built on an
open plain. The Com-
mittee appointed to
examine and report upon
the site, however, subse-
quently recommended
that the old Troop Hospi-
tal, with out Offices, Can-
teen, Skittle Alley, &c., should
be removed, and the
Barracks erected on the
sites of those buildings.

5. The increase
on

10
on the second item is
due to a rise in the
price of granite slabs
and to the pavements
being "three line" instead
of "two line dressed."

6 As regards
the 3^d item, the excess
in respect to the rate
is very trifling, but the
quantity originally
estimated for has been
increased, it having
been deemed advisable
to put curb stones round
the Verandahs, and to
increase the dimensions
of the front steps.

7 In respect to
items 4-5-9 & 10, which
may

may be taken together,
various reasons are assigned
for the large excesses appear-
ing against them, but
the principal are noted
below:-

1st The high price of
work done in the Engineers
work yard at St. Thomas
Mount.

2^d Want of economy evinced
in cutting up the timber
charged to the Barracks.

3^d The issue of stock
purchased for the
Barracks to other works
in the Range, without
adopting the precaution
of crediting ^{the Barrack Estimate} with their
full value, and correspondingly
debiting

debiting the works con-
cerned. 57

4th Increase in the
scantling of the joists
Y^{ea}.

5th Rise in rates.

6th Omissions in
the original Estimate
and alterations of the
original plan.

8 The explanations
afforded in respect to
the first three of these
causes are meagre
and unsatisfactory.

The present Range
Officer admits that the
wood work is both
substantial and
satisfactory, and that
it

may be taken together,
various reasons are assigned
for the large excesses appear-
ing against them, but
the principal are noted
below:-

1st The high price of
work done in the Engineers
work yard at St. Thomas
Mount.

2^d Want of economy evinced
in cutting up the timber
charged to the Barracks.

3^d The issue of stock
purchased for the
Barracks to other works
in the Range, without
adopting the precaution
of crediting ^{the Barrack Estimate} with their
full value, and correspondingly
debiting

debiting the works con-
cerned. 57

4th Increase in the
scantling of the joists
Y^{ea}.

5th Rise in rates.

6th Omissions in
the original Estimate
and alterations of the
original plan.

8 The explanations
afforded in respect to
the first three of these
causes are meagre
and unsatisfactory.

The present Range
Officer admits that the
wood work is both
substantial and
satisfactory, and that
it

it is quite possible that
owing to the great de-
mand for skilled labor

in and about the Presi-
dency town, and to the
necessity which existed for
pushing on the construction
of the Barracks, the Over-
seer in charge of the work
yard paid higher wages
than usual to the workmen
employed. Lieutenant Doreward
is, however, inclined to the
belief that the Overseer's in-
-capability of controlling his
subordinates led to much of
the excess on wood work, and
from the papers before Govern-
ment, it appears that
owing

owing to this cause, the
Overseer was removed to
a less responsible charge.
There is nothing to show
under what authority
the practice of issuing
materials specially pur-
chased for the Barracks
to other works was brought
into operation, or how it
happened that their value
failed to be recovered. The
responsibility of this omission
clearly devolves upon the
Range Officer, whose duty
it was to have seen, when
other works were supplied
from the stock purchased
for the Barracks, that
the

the timber was cut up in the most economical manner possible. — The increase in the scantling of the joists is said to have been found necessary in consequence of joists of the dimensions provided for in the Estimate not having been found to be sufficiently stiff. It is not practicable to separate those portions of the excess on the items under notice which are due to "increase in rates," but to the lack of the causes above enumerated, viz. omissions in the original Estimate and alterations of the original plan, most of the increase

ad

Iron Barred Venetian	
Windows	216.
Batten doors	53.
Venetian Windows	403.
Glazed Attic Windows/Ceiling Lights	454.
Weather Boards	945.

Sum

as per margin appear to ascertain.

9. The excesses (Rupees 3344 + 7123) amounting together to Rupees 4467 appearing under "Sundries" against items 6 and 13 are due to the Range Officers provision of 5 per cent in the original Estimate having been reduced in the Supy Engineers' Office to 2½ per cent. The former rate is explained to be the usual allowance in the case of ordinary works, and looking to the lofty scaffolding which had to be provided

provided, the Pango Officer considers, and in this opinion the Government consent, that the allowance of 5 per cent was moderate.

10. The increase under "Brickwork in chunam, Item 7, is stated to be due to a decrease in the size of the bricks purchased from a supplier, necessitating the use of a larger number per cubic yard, and to a provision of 2 annas 10 Pice, per cubic yard having been found necessary for "laying out work and for the cartage of materials" owing to the height of the structure.

The

14
The use of Shell lime from the Government Kilns at Madras for the manufacture of Chunam has also probably tended to raise the cost of the Madam, as it appears from the papers laid before Government that, instead of an outturn of 12 parabs of lime at a cost of Rupees 4, as was anticipated, no more than 9 parabs were realized for that amount. The Shell is reported to have been measured at the Kilns, and remeasured at the site of the works after

after it had been skated,
and the late Range
Officer, Captain Mead,
in giving it as his opinion
that there is no room for
suspicion, adds that the
fact is, that Govt. Churnam
was found to cost more
than was supposed.

8 11 The rate \$10.
per square provided in
the original Estimate for
Asphalting floor $\frac{1}{2}$ " thick
(Item 108) was found
to be inadequate, the
present data being \$12,
and the estimated average
rate for the work executed
up to 30" April last, -
and that remaining to

15-10
57 be performed being \$12.62
12 Against Item
No 11, Iron Railings,
there is a saving in quantity
owing to the opening
adjoining the spiral stair
case having been blocked
up, but the rate of
\$2.4. per running
yard originally provided
for being found inade-
quate, it is necessary
to increase the rate to
Pipes 3.1.1, and the
result is an excess of
Pipes 637.

13 The treads for
the centre stair case
Upper story" on which
an excess of Pipes 958,

It is anticipated is the only
 other item* requiring special
 notice. The Range Officer
 explains that the design of
 the stair case has been
 changed, and that detailed
 plans of the alterations
 have been submitted to
 the Supy Engineer. A
 width of four, instead of
 three feet has been allowed,
 and the stair case is said
 to be "altogether of a more
 substantial construction"
 than was originally pro-
 vided for.

14. The construction
 of the Barracks was
 commenced in January
 1868, and the work has
 been

* No 12.

Lieut Dorward
 from January 1868 to
 end of March 1869.
 Captain Rogers
 from April 1869 to end
 of April 1871.
 Mr. Sub Engineer Walsh
 Captain Mead & Capt Vertue
 from May to 27 Sept 1871.
 Lieut Dorward from
 28 Sept 1871.

67
 16
 been interruptedly continued

since that date under
 the directions of the
 Officers named in the
 margin. The total
 outlay incurred up to
 the 30th November last
 has been Rupees 14,3292,
 for which the Officers
 named are responsible
 to the extent indicated
 below.

Lieutenant Dorward	Rs. 13000
Captain Rogers	80563
Mr. Walsh, Capt. Mead & Vertue, and Lieut Dorward	19729
	143292

15. The expenses no-
 ticed in these Proceedings
 appear

appear to have occurred chiefly during Captain Rogers administration of the Range, and that Officers lax supervisions over the proceedings of his subordinates is admitted by the Superintending Engineer. His Excellency in Council is greatly disappointed to find that an Officer of Captain Rogers standing and experience should have evinced such utter disregard of long established Rules, and of his duties and responsibilities as a Range Officer, as to have permitted

omit N?

Late Colonel Boileau from
1st Jan'y 1868 to 23rd Jan'y 1869.
Colonel Beaw from 24th Jan'y 1869
to 3rd Sept'r 1870.

63

permitted deviations from sanctioned designs, and excesses over estimated rates, leading to an increase of expenditure beyond the competence of this Government to sanction. The alterations in the designs to which reference is made in the explanatory remarks and reports accompanying the revised Estimate were all probably approved of by the Superintending Engineer late in charge of the Division under

under the conviction that
they would not involve
an excess in the aggre-
-gate of more than 5
per cent, but it was
clearly the duty of the
Range Officer to have
thoroughly satisfied
himself on this point
before committing
Government to the ex-
-penditure regarding
which they are now
called upon to address
the Government of India.

16 There is nothing
on the records of Govt
to shew that the altera-
-tions in design other
than those adverted to
in

vide also Para 1. Sec IV
Chap. XV. P.W. Code.

5
in paras 3 & 7th of the
letter from the Govern-
-ment of India record-
-ed in Proceedings
No 3399 dated 29th
October 1868, which have
led to part of the ex-
-cess under notice, were
ever submitted for
their sanction, and the
Superintending Engineer's
letter, which, agreeably
to the Notification
at Page 774 of the
Fort St. George Gazette
of the 25th May 1869,
should have been
complete in itself, is
silent upon this very
important point,
and

and is so meagre in
respect to the details
of the expenses making
up the total increase
of Rupees 32,875 that
the Government have
been compelled to refer
to each important item
in the comparative
Statement, and to
wade through the several
enclosures accompany-
ing the Supy Engineer's
communications, in
order to glean the par-
ticulars recorded in
paras 4 to 12 of these
Orders.

17. The Superin-
tending Engineer will
communicate

Armooga Moodelly
and
Ranganada Moodelly

19
69
communicate to
Captain Rogers the
disapproval of His
Excellency in Council
of his proceedings in
the present case, and
he will with reference
to the two Overseers
named in the mar-
gin dispense with
the services of both
men if he has not
confidence in them.
Abbye Naidoo hav-
ing already been
dismissed, no further
notice is necessary
in respect to his share
in the over charges
reported by the
Supy.

Superintending Engineer.

18 With these
remarks the revised
Estimate will be sub-

mitted for the sanction
of the Government of
India.

H. J. Long

65
4

4
9 The S. Eng. Co. in
5 " Controller of m. a. v.

dispt 2-72

D. C. 9 July 1720 130
1874 D. C.

20

69

18540

To
The Secretary to the
Government of India
P. W. Department

Sir

I am directed by the
Right Honorable the Governor
in Council to forward, for
the sanction of the Government
of India, a revised Estimate,
in the form of a Compara-
tive Statement, amounting
to Rs. 237,885, for the
construction of three blocks
of

N

187

of double storeyed barracks,
with the necessary, anc-
iliary, and subsidiary build-
ings, for a second Field
Battery of Artillery at
St. Thomas' Mount.

2. The original Estimate
for this project amounted
to Rs. 205,010, and sanction
to that amount was com-
municated to this Govern-
ment in the letter from the
Inspector General of Military
works No. 992 M, of the
3rd October 1868.

3. The anticipated
excess over the original
sanction is Rs. 32,875.—
The causes which have
led to that excess, and
the explanations furnished
by

by Superintending Engineer the
and Executive Officers will have
be found reviewed in
Pro. No. enclosed, which
also contain the orders
passed upon the subject
by this Government.

4. His Excellency
in Council regrets that
the explanations forth-
coming in respect to the
excesses, appearing against
the item of wood-work
are, by no means, satisfactory,
and, as respects that portion
of the increase which
is alleged to be due to
stock purchased for the
Barracks having been issued
to other works without a
corresponding credit to
the

The Barrack Estimate,
I am to state that the
Madras Manual of P.W.
Accounts prescribes that
materials "purchased for
general purposes, or the
subsequent application of
which cannot be ascertained
at the time of purchase,"
shall "be brought on to the
Stock accounts." The
proceeding of the Officer
in executive charge of the
Mount Range in charging
to the Barrack Estimate
the value of timber not
required for those buildings
was, therefore, unauthorized,
and irregular, and it
was clearly his duty,
having deviated from the
rule

Section II
Para IX

rule, to have reported the
circumstance, and to have
arranged for recovering
the value of the Stock
which, charged to the
Barrack Estimate, had
been issued for use on
other works. —

5 I am to add that
the expenditure on the
Buildings under notice
up to 31st March last,
amounted to Rs 120,177,
and if the current year's
grant of Rs 14,000, be
fully utilized, of which
there is every prospect,
the sum remaining to
be provided in future
years will be Rs 77,708.
Looking to the exceptionally
small

75

small assignment for
 next year for Military
 works, it has not been found
 possible to do more than
 include the Estimate in
 the outgoing Budget, with
 a nominal allotment of
 Rs. 2000.—

H. E. J. 10/1/72

Desp 4/3/72 with 15 plans,
 * 1 Comparative state & 31 C. P. in
 of Govt 539 of 1872 -
 * 15 Plans received vide L. No 984
 of 9 April 1872

25
 12

C/2 5299 + 5858

Govt. of 1872 Madras.

18 PUBLIC WORKS.

To the Superintending Engineer
4th Division

and
To the Secretary to the
Govt. India

Dated

Recd.

Encl.

G. O 28th July 1872. N 539-540.

Nos. 450 (452 + 453)

For the Foreys Barracks &
for a second Field Battery
at Kilby at St Thomas Mount.

Following orders in letter from
the Engineer of the 4th Div. sub-
jecting with remarks, &
estimated for the con-
struction of three blocks of
double Foreys Barracks &
at St. Thomas Mount.

D.C. 9. July 1872 R. 130
e. 3rd July 1872 R. 9.