M R O. 1—10,000—24-5-54

(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. / B.P.—No.	1377	Press / —Mis.—	Original
Dated	22- 5-	1874 —— 195—	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 477. Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel W. T. F. FAREWELL, Inspecting Engineer for Ports and Communications, to Colonel G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 31st March 1874, No. 743-70 :—

As directed in G. O., No. 363, dated 14th February 1874, I have the honour to re-submit the estimates therein referred to, and to report that, after careful examination of all the station books of the Cochin Range having reference to the Cruz Milagre Gap Works, the total Rupees 72,310 sanctioned in Government Order under reply represents the amount spent upon maintaining the perimeter of the gap, closing it, and maintaining it until January 1874.

1 Original Estimate, Rupees 59,230, with Specification.
1 Revised Estimate, Rupees 72,310, with Specification.
1 Bill.
2 Letters marked A and B (to be returned).

2. The omission of Rupees 2,999-9-9 is due to a mistake in transfers to meet credits from and to "deposits," the transactions took place in May and August 1872, before the formation of Cochin into a range, and the first progress report for the Cochin Range for the month of October 1872 shows the expenditure to have been entered at Rupees 6,890-4-11 instead of Rupees 9,889-14-8, as accounted for to the Controller, Rupees 2,999-9-9 the difference not appearing ; the error was not discovered till August 1873, or some time after the submission of the first estimate for Rupees 59,230, in which it did not appear. In framing the estimate the Range Officer does not appear, as he ought to have done, to have taken the actual expenditure from the station books of the work which should correctly show the amount spent, but from the progress reports, in which the omission of Rupees 2,999-9-9 had been made ; and again, even in re-framing the estimate he neglected to refer to his station books, and evidently simply added the amount omitted in his progress report, and seeing that the amount to be accounted for had been spent on rough-stone and sand-bags, and that his range rates of Rupees 4-12-0 per cubic yard for stone and Annas 1-11 per cubic foot for sand-bags, the rate he had worked at with this new material, stating that he merely looked upon the paper submitted in the light of a probable estimate, roughly made up the total, and the rates were increased accordingly ; this I did not know until when, under the orders of Government, I lately examined the station books, these and the vouchers supplied to the Controller's Office show that 1,077 cubic yards of stone were used and paid for, the cost being only about Rupees 4-10-8½ per cubic yard, which the Range Officer accounts for by some small stone which is paid for at a cheaper rate having been used on the work, thus the quantity is increased and the over all rate cheapened.

3. My reasons for considering the Range Officer's explanation satisfactory are as follow : the omission of Rupees 2,999-9-9 was explained to have been caused by some oversight in transfers to and from one head of accounts to another. The omission was at first discovered by the District Engineer, who adjusted the matter through the Range Officer with the Controller ; the Range Officer's letter

Range Officer's letter, No. 362, 11th August 1873, A.
Controller's memorandum, No. 459, August 1873, B.

and the Controller's memorandum on the subject, marked A and B, are attached.

District Engineer's letter, No. 36, 20th August 1873.
Do. No. 42, 30th August 1873.

The District Engineer then submitted an estimate for Rupees 65,115, and a few days afterwards another for Rupees 67,770, pointing out that some error had crept into the former estimate. I then directed him to proceed to Cochin and satisfy himself that the second estimate was correct; he did so, and reported the estimate was sufficient. Then, with reference to a statement of

Inspecting Engineer's letter, No. 124 A, 12th September 1873.
District Engineer's letter, No. 49, 20th September 1873.

expenditure furnished by him on Cochin works generally, as I observed further errors, I returned both estimates and statement to him calling for clearer explanation regarding additional charges, etc., etc., and in reply he submitted another and the last estimate for Rupees 72,310 with statement of additional charges as printed in my letter published with the Government Order under reply. The District Engineer was called upon to furnish the assurance certificate that everything necessary had been provided for in the estimate, and he reported such was the case, remarking that the work was of such a peculiar nature as to render it impossible to state positively that nothing further was required.

Inspecting Engineer's letter, No. 130A, 6th October 1873.
District Engineer's letter, No. 60, 17th November 1873.

Inspecting Engineer's letter, No. 331-30, 22nd November 1873.

District Engineer's letter, No. 62, 5th December 1873.

4. Not having a copy of the estimate for Rupees 59,230, forwarded to Government with my letter printed with G. O., No. 363, dated 14th February 1874, the retention of copies of such papers not being customary, it was not in my power to compare the rates of the last estimate with those of the first, and therefore I did not detect how the difference between the first and last estimates had been made up, as pointed out in paragraph 1 of the Government Order under reply.

5. From personal inspection I knew generally that the work charged for in the estimate had been executed, that the rate of Rs. 4-12-0 per cubic yard for stone was that of the range,* and Annas 1-11 per cubic foot for sand-bags did not appear to me to be excessive, and I very naturally concluded that the station books for the work contained the omitted expenditure debited to the proper sub-head of estimate, and thus the whole matter had been correctly and easily adjusted, and that the District Engineer, who had been directed to satisfy himself as to the sufficiency of the estimate, had seen to this. Thus, under the circumstances now reported, I trust Government will see that I took every reasonable precaution to ensure the correctness of the estimate before submitting it to them for sanction.

* *Vide*, G. O., No. 3,055, dated 4th December 1871, sanctioning a stone groyne.

6. The question of the data for stone and sand-bags I frequently discussed with the Range Officer when I was at Cochin, but I did not think it was incumbent on me to examine his station books and other accounts; indeed, to do so, except by the direct orders of Government, I believe would have been viewed as a piece of unwarrantable interference on my part, and, therefore, it was only when I did so under the orders of Government under reply that I was for the first time aware of the careless way in which the station books have been kept for this work. The vouchers are many of them unattested by the Range Officer's signature, and several of the coolie rolls are neither ticked off nor signed; vouchers for other works are mixed up with them, without note of the correct portion chargeable to each work, and the works register, form B. B. I., was not made up until I called for it. In addition to the printed orders of the department, as Superintending Engineer of the 7th Division, I issued detailed and most positive orders on these points, so the Range Officer, I regret to say, can have no excuse for not having attended to them. Generally the station books were in such confusion that I have had to seek the aid of the Controller in unravelling them. The Auditor of the Malabar District and my Manager have been engaged in preparing from the station books a bill herewith forwarded, the total amount of which agrees with that of the estimate, viz., Rupees 72,310, and their joint report confirms what I have stated regarding the unsatisfactory condition of the station books; these, in order to allow of closely examining, I brought with me from Malabar, and they are now in my Office. The rates in the bill differ slightly with those in the estimate, one of the chief causes of which is that stone is noted in cubic yards in the estimate, while in the station books and petty contractor's accounts all stone is entered and paid for by weight, a practice always, I believe, adopted in Cochin, one cubic yard being taken to weigh $1\frac{7}{8}$ tons. In all future estimates it would be as well therefore to estimate in tons and not cubic yards; it is easier to weigh irregular blocks than measure them.

7. With reference to the other remarks in the Government Order under reply, I beg very respectfully to state that it was my anxiety that the wishes of Government as therein pointed out should be met as accurately as possible that involved much correspondence and consequent delay; no less than three amended estimates were submitted before I was in a position to address Government on the subject, and my doing so earlier was also much interfered with by my having been almost incessantly travelling from the time I left Cochin till December 1873. I would also add that, though my letter printed with G. O., No. 2,138, dated 27th August 1873, did not give the cost of the work subsequently carried out, it will be found that in paragraphs 6 and 7 of my letter I noted what under certain circumstances would be required to be done, while the cost of completing the dam as then contemplated was included in the first estimate.

8. I never dreamt of assuming to myself a responsibility to which I was not entitled, but, at the same time, I felt that Government would have looked to me had any accident happened to a work which had been constructed at so great an expense and under such difficulties, and I never ceased to urge those who had immediate charge of it at all hazards to maintain it intact, and it was only the delay that occurred, through the omission in the first estimate, which permitted the Range Officer to see that under changed conditions it was necessary for the security of the work to add to the original estimate *minus* the omission, the amount by which it has been increased.

9. The District Engineer now clearly understands that any expenditure which may in future be required for the security of the dam should be estimated for, and the estimate submitted to Government for sanction, and that in all emergent cases that may occur, when work cannot be delayed, a full report as to the causes of the emergency shall be made to Government.

10. The question of the non-submission of the paper of sections C, referred to in paragraph 2 of G. O., No. 363, dated 14th February 1874, was explained in my letter No. 483-43, dated 17th January 1874, printed with G. O., No. 363, of the date in which the G. O. No. 363 was passed.

11. I am reporting further on the Cochin Works which report shall be submitted in a few days.

No. 473. Order thereon, 22nd May 1874, No. 1,377.

CIVIL WORKS, No. 32.

In this letter the Inspecting Engineer for Harbours offers explanations in regard to the discrepancies appearing in the estimates submitted for closing the Cruz Milagro Gap, the subject of which was reviewed in the orders of the 14th February 1874, No. 363. Notice was there taken of the want of satisfactory explanation of the difference of Rupees 3,000 between the estimate prepared in July 1873 and the returns of actual expenditure up to the end of that month, and it is now explained that the discrepancy was due to the actual expenditure having been taken from the progress reports of the range, from which this sum had been omitted by a mistake in transfers, instead of from the station books in which the correct figures were given. This omission might have been excusable on the part of an officer newly appointed to the work, but the Range Officer, Mr. Grimes, was transferred from the Palghaut Range for the special charge of the Cochin Harbour Works which he had previously carried out as Palghaut Range Officer; it shows that he was not so thoroughly acquainted with his accounts as he should have been.

2. It appears that in re-framing the estimate the Range Officer simply added the sum of Rupees 3,000 and altered the rates in the estimate to correspond with the enhanced total, viewing, it is stated, the revised document as a probable estimate only; but he should not have contented himself with a probable estimate when the work had been actually carried out, and was, it is presumed, attested by vouchers and properly recorded in the station books, which were doubtless available for reference. Additional work only had to be *estimated* for, and this should have been recorded distinctly from work already completed, the amalgamation of the two in one estimate having evidently led to the confusion which has arisen. It is to be regretted that Lieutenant-Colonel Farewell, to whose presence on the spot and personal exertions are alone due the successful completion of the works, should not have taken advantage of his lengthened stay at Cochin to thoroughly overhaul the Range Officer's accounts and get him to prepare an authentic bill of the cost of the work actually done (and already greatly in excess of sanction) as well as a separate estimate of the further work required for the preservation of the dam. Such action, so far from being regarded as an unwarrantable interference, is no more than is

expected of a controlling officer vested with the powers and responsibilities of an Inspecting Engineer.

3. The Government are greatly displeased with the state of affairs which the examination of the Inspecting Engineer has now disclosed. The vouchers are stated to have been in many cases unattested by the Range Officer's signature, several of the coolie rolls, station books, and miscellaneous vouchers show evidence of habitual neglect, and the register of works was not brought up to date. His Excellency the Governor in Council resolves to warn Mr. Grimes that if he is again reported guilty of keeping his accounts in the discreditable state now brought to notice he will forfeit his position in the Engineer Establishment, to which he was promoted in 1871 from the Upper Subordinate grade, and the special attention of the Controller is called to the accounts of his range, with a view of critical examination and report on the occasion of the next inspection of the offices in the Malabar District.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Inspecting Engineer for Ports and Communications.
" District Engineer, Malabar.
" Officiating Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Lsd. S. T Austin
Spare Copies

Inspecting Engineer's Office for
Ports & Communications.
Chepauk Madras.
31st March 1873.

From
The Inspecting Engineer for
Ports & Communications.

To
The Chief Engineer and
Secretary to Government
Public Works Department.

Sir

As directed in G.O. No. 363
dated 11th February 1874, I have the
honor to resubmit the estimates
therein referred to, and to report
that, after careful examination
of all the station-books of the
Cochin Range having reference
to the Cinx Milagre Ga[illegible] works,
the total Rs. 12,310 sanctioned in
G.O. under reply represents the
amount spent upon maintaining
the perimeter of the Gap, closing it,
and maintaining it until January
1874.—

2. The omission of Rs. 2999-9-9
is due to a mistake in transfers to
meet credits from and to "Repeats"

transactions took place in May and August 1872 before the formation of Cachar into a Range, and the first Progress Report for the Cachar Range for the month of October 1872 shows the expenditure to have been entered at Rs 6890-15-11 instead of Rs 9889-14-8, as accounted for to the Controller, Rs 2999-9-9 the difference not appearing; the error was not discovered till August 1873, or some time after the submission of the first estimate for Rs 59,230 in which it did not appear. In framing the estimate the Range Officer does not appear, as he ought to have done, to have taken the actual expenditure from the station books of the tracts which should correctly show the amount spent, but from the Progress Reports in which the omission of Rs 2999-9-9 had been made, and again even in re-framing the estimate he neglected to refer to his station books and evidently simply added the amount omitted in his Progress Report, and seeing that the amount to be

accounted for had been spent on rough stone and land bags, and that his Range rates of Rs 1-12- per cubic yard for stone and Re 1-11 per cubic foot for land bags, the rate he had worked at with the new material, stating that he merely booked upon the paper submitted in the light of a probable estimate roughly made up the total and the rates were increased accordingly. How I did not know, under the then system of Government, as I lately examined the station books, these and the vouchers supplied to the Controller's Office show that 10½ cubic yards of stone were used and paid for, the cost being only about Re 4-10- 8¾ per cubic yard, which the Range Officer accounts for by some small stone, which is paid for at a cheaper rate having

been used on the main O. Line the quantity is increased and the next all rate cheapened.

My "reasons for considering the Ranger Officer's explanation satisfactory" are as follows: The omission of Rs 24,99,9:9 would exceed planned to have been covered by some overweight in transfers to and from one head of account to another. The omission was at first discovered by the District Engineer who adjusted the matter through the Ranger Officer with the Controller. The Ranger Officer's letter and the Controller's memorandum on the subject, marked A and B, are attached. The District Engineer then submitted an estimate for Rs 65,415, and a few days afterwards the

Inspecting Engineer's letter No 124 dt 12 Septr 1873

District Engineer's letter No 149 20th Septr 1873

Ranger Officer's letter No 362 11th August 1873 A

Controller's memo No 459 dated 18th Augt 1873 B

Inspecting Engineer's letter No 130 dt 6th Octr 1873

District Engineer's letter No 60 17th Novr 1873

District Engr's letter No 36 20th Augt 1873

Do No 42 30th Augt 1873

for Rs 67,770, pointing out that some error had crept into the former estimate & then directed him to proceed to Cochin and satisfy himself that the second estimate was correct. He did so, and reported the estimate was sufficient. Herewith reference to a statement of expenditure furnished by him on Cochin works generally. Cochin works & further items as I observed further items I returned both estimate and statement to him calling for clear explanation regarding additional charges &c &c; and in reply he submitted another and the last estimate for Rs 67,770 with statement of additional charges as printed in my letter published with the G.O. under reply. The District

Engineer was called upon to furnish the assurance Certificate that every thing necessary had been provided for in the estimate; and he reported such was the case, remarking that the work was of such a peculiar nature as to render it impracticable to state positively that nothing further was required.

Superintending Engineer's letter No 361 SC 22 Nov 73

District Engineer's letter No 6 5 Dec 73

4. Not having a copy of the estimate for Rs 69,230 forwarded to Government with my letter printed with G.O. No 363 dated 14th February 1874, the retention of copies of such papers not being customary, it was not in my power to compare the rates of the last estimate with those of the first, and therefore I did not detect how the difference between the first and last estimates had been made as pointed out in para 4 of the G.O. under reply.

5. From personal inspection I knew generally that the works charged for in the estimate had been executed, that the rate of Rs 12 per cubic yard for stone was that of the Range, and Rs 1-11 per cubic foot for sand bags did not appear to me to be excessive, and I very naturally concluded that the book for the work contained the omitted expenditure debited to the first sub head of estimate, and thus the whole matter had been correctly and easily adjusted, and that the District Engineer who had

* vide G.O. No 355 dated 4 December 1874 sanctioning a stone groyne

been directed to satisfy himself as to the sufficiency of the estimate had been to this. Thus under the circumstances now reported, Honble Govern-ment will see that I took every reasonable precaution to ensure the correctness of the estimate before submitting it to them for sanction.

6. The question of the data for stone and sand bags I frequently discussed with the Range Officer whose duties at Cochin, but I did not think it was incumbent on me to examine the station books and petty accounts, indeed, to do so, except by the direct orders of Government.

I believe would have been viewed as a piece of unwarrantable interference on my part, and therefore, it was only when I did so under the orders of Government under reply that I was for the first time aware of the careless way in which the station books have been kept for two years. The vouchers are many of them unattested by the Range Officer's signature, and several of the Coolie Rolls are neither struck off nor signed, vouchers for other works are mixed up with them, without note of the correct portion charge-able to each work, and the works Register Form P.B.P.I. was not made use until I called for it. In addition to the printed orders of the Department,

154

as Superintending Engineer of the 4th Division, I received detailed and most specific orders on these points, so the Range Officer, I regret to say, can have no excuse for not having attended to them. Generally the Station books were in such confusion that I have had to resort the aid of the Controller in writing them. The auditor of the Malabar District and my manager have been engaged over preparing from the Station books a bill herewith forwarded, the total amount of which agrees with that of the estimate viz. Rs 7/2,310; and their joint report confirms what I have stated regarding the unsatisfactory condition of the station books; these in order to allow of closely examining I brought with

me from Malabar, and they are now in my office. The rates in the bill differ slightly with those in the estimate, one of the chief causes of which is that stone is noted in cubic yards in the estimate, while in the station books and petty contractors accounts all stone is entered and paid for by weight, a practice always I believe, adopted in Cochin, one cubic yard being taken to weigh 1½ tons. In all future estimates it would be well therefore to estimate in tons and not cubic yards; it is easier to weigh irregular blocks than measure them.

With reference to the other remarks in the G.O. under reply, I beg most respectfully to state that it was my anxiety that the wishes of Government as

therein pointed out should be met as accurately as possible that invalved much correspondence and consequent delay, rather than three amended estimates were submitted before I was in a position to address Government on the subject and my doing so earlier was also much interfered with by my having been almost incessantly travelling from the time I left Cochin till December 1873. I would also add that though my letter printed with G. Oct 2138. dated 29th August 1873 did not give the cost of the work subsequently carried out, it will be found that in paras 6 and 7 of my letter, I noted what under certain circumstances would be required to be done, while the cost of completing the drain as then contemplated was included in the first estimate.

8. I never disclaimed of assuming to myself a responsibility to which I was not entitled, but at the same time, I felt that Government would have looked to me if any accident happened to the work which had been constructed at a great expense and made under such difficulties, and I never ceased to urge those who had immediate charge of it at all hazards to maintain it intact, and it was only the delay that occurred through the omission in the first estimate which permitted the Range Officer to see that under changed conditions it was necessary for the security of the work

to added to the original estimate minus the omission, the amount by which it has been increased.—

9. The District Engineer now clearly understands that any expenditure which may in future be required for the security of the dam should be estimated for and the estimate submitted to Government for sanction, and that in all emergent cases that may occur, when work cannot be delayed, a full report as to the causes of the emergency shall be made to Government.—

10. The question of the non-submission of the plans & sections referred to in para 2 of G. O. № 365 dated 14th February 1874 was explained in my letter № 483/43 dated 17th January 1874, printed with G. O. № 360 of the date in which the G. O. № 363 was passed.—

11. I am reporting further on the Cochin works which report shall be submitted in a few days.—

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obed Servt.
W. Lyster Lieut-Colonel
Inspecting Engineer for
Ports & Communications.

1377 Public Works Department 250 10
Cr 2 Cr 10

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Read the following

From
The Supdg Engr for Ports
and Communications (Here Enter No 743/70 of 31 Dec 1874)

I Have the
Inspecting Engineer for
Harbours offers explana-
tions in regard to the
discrepancies appearing
in the estimates submitted
for closing the Cruz Mala
-gee Gap, the subject of
which was reserved in
the orders of the 11th Febry:
1874 N: 363. Notice was taken
of the want of
satisfactory explanation
of the difference of Rs. 3000
between

2. Supdg Engr's letter dated 18th Novr 1874 Rs 6983
From Asst Engr Ports
The Inspecting Engineer
for Ports & Harbours

Dated 31st March 1875
Recd 2nd April 1875

To
The Chief Engineer &
Secretary to Government

Recommending
Estimated for closing
the Cruz Malligai
Gap with the Ex-
-planation as to
rates &c called
for. —
Rs 0-0-0 1377-22-5-75

Ve. No. 1377. 22-5-75.

between the estimate prepared in July 1873 and the returns of actual expenditure up to the end of that month, and it is now explained that the discrepancy was due to the actual expenditure having been taken from the Progress Reports of the Range from which this sum had been omitted by a mistake in transferring instead of from the station books in which the correct figures were given. This omission might have been excusable on the part of an Officer newly appointed

appointed to the work, but the Range Officer, Mr. Grimes, was transferred from the Palghaut Range for the special charge of the Cochin Kanhom works which he had previously carried out as Palghaut Range Officer; it shows that he was not so thoroughly acquainted with his accounts as he should have been.

It appears that in re-framing the estimate the Range Officer simply added the sum of Rs 3000 and altered the ratio in the estimate to correspond with the enhanced total, viewing

viewing, it is stated, the revised document as a probable estimate only but he should not have contented himself with a probable estimate when the work had been actually carried out and was it is presumed, attended by vouchers and properly recorded in the Station books which were doubtless available for reference. Additional sums only had to be estimated for and this should have been recorded distinctly from work already completed. The amalgamation of

of

applies as one estimate having evidently led to the confusion which has arisen. It is to be regretted that Colonel Farewell, to whose presence on the spot and accessibility attributes are due the successful completion of the works, should not have taken advantage of his length of sick leave to thoroughly overhaul the Camp Officer's accounts and get them to prepare an authentic bill of the cost of the work actually done (and already greatly in excess of sanction)

ad

as well as a separate estimate of the further work required for the preservation of the dam. Such action, so far from being regarded as an unwarrantable interference, is no more than is expected of a Controlling Officer vested with the powers and responsibilities of an Inspecting Engineer.

The Government are greatly displeased with the State of affairs which the examination of the Inspecting Engineer has now disclosed. The vouchers are stated to have been in many cases unattested by the Range officers respecting the nature, receipt of the Cooli Rolls, Station books and miscellaneous vouchers and evidence of habitual neglect, and the Register of works was not brought up to date. His Excellency the Governor in Council accepts the report of Mr Grieves that if he is again selected to fill the post of Resident Engineer he will not be allowed to [illegible] the duties of that office unless he establishes himself at Seik he was promoted

1983

Govt. of India

PUBLIC WORKS.

To The Superintendent Engineer for Ports & Buildings

Dated

Rec'd. Encl.

G. O. 22nd May 1874, No. 1377

Nos. 477-478.

Cruz-Milagre Gap.

Passing orders relative to discrepancies in the Estimates for closing the Cruz-Milagre Gap — Mentioning the Grimes regarding the state of his Roads and requesting the Controller's special attention to the accounts of this Range on the next inspection. The Officers in the Malabar Dr. —

Chief Engineer for Ports & Buildings

Dept. Engineer Malabar

Controller with Estimates & Bills 4 Encs

S. Capies despatched 2/6/74.

477-478.

ion 1874 from the Upper Subordinate grades and the special attendance of the Controller's called to the accounts of his Range, with a view of critical examinations and report on the occasion of the next inspection of the Offices in the Malabar District.

Chief