

- (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.	2262	Press
B.P. No:		Mis.
Dated	15-8-	195
		1876

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th August 1874.*

Read the following papers:—

No. 314. From R. E. NORFOR, Esq., Acting District Engineer, South Arcot, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. MULLINS, R.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation and Joint Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Cuddalore, 13th May 1874, No. 31.

In reference to your Nos. 306, 4th December 1872, and 296, 28th April 1874,

- 1 Copy of letter from Mr. Bell, No. 182 of 4th September 1872.
- 1 Extract from a letter from the Superintending Engineer, to Mr. Bell, No. 607, dated 13th September 1872.
- 1 Do. from Mr. Bell, No. 209, dated 20th September 1872.
- 1 Comparative Statement.
- 1 Copy of Abstract Estimate for a bungalow at Pelandorai.

I have the honor to submit the following explanations in reference to the comparative statement submitted to you by Colonel E. A. Foord, R.E., with his letter, No. 196, of the 23rd November 1872.

2. There has been very considerable delay in replying to this requisition from your office, but the fact of the matter is I have not been able to arrive at anything accurate in reference to the expenditure on the several sub-heads of estimate, neither the work register nor detail accounts kept at the anicut exhibit the distribution of charges as represented in the comparative statement for work executed up to March 1872; the station books have not been kept as they should have been, and the expenditure has not been debited under the correct heads. From the recent investigations held by you in respect to this comparative statement, you will have understood that a great deal of what is represented under the several heads is to a great extent fictitious. I had intended to have abandoned the idea of in any way correcting the statement under review and of preparing one for work executed up to the end of the past official year (which I shortly expect to get from the Range Officer), clearly setting forth what additional grant will be required to complete the work, and the circumstances under which the estimate is likely to be exceeded. As, however, you have called for a report on the original communication, No. 306, I now do myself the honor to comply with that request.

3. The estimate for the Pelandorai Project was prepared by A. Coopooosawmy under my supervision when Range Officer, No. 4 Range, in the year 1863, and the work was commenced about April 1870. I had no special officer for this work at the beginning, and Mr. C. H. Norfor, my brother, who had passed out of the Civil Engineering College, with an Assistant Engineer's Certificate, was employed by the authority of the then Superintending Engineer to superintend the work, and his salary charged to the estimate, in the same manner as the salaries of the rest of the work establishment; he remained in charge of this work from 15th April to 1st October 1870, when Mr. J. M. Bell was appointed to it; this officer had charge of it from 1st October 1870 to 22nd April 1871, with exception of one month, from 3rd November to 3rd December when Mr. C. H. Norfor (then on the permanent strength of the department) relieved him.

4. Overseer A. Coopooosawmy Moodelly then held special charge of this work from 22nd April 1871 to the 9th April 1872 (the comparative statement closes with March 1872).

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th August 1874.*

5. The comparative statement under review was submitted by Mr. Bell with his letter No. 182, of the 4th September 1872, and I cannot do better than send you a copy of this letter, in which he offers certain explanation in respect to the increases and decreases represented in the statement. Colonel Foord appears to have called upon Mr. Bell for further information, as will be observed from extract of his letter to that officer's address, No. 607, dated 13th September 1872; this Mr. Bell gives in his No. 209 of the 20th September 1872, extracts of which relating to this work I now submit.

6. *Excavating Foundation.*—The first item of excess in the comparative statement is excavating foundations; the estimate provides a sum of Rupees 600 for this item, and the amount is represented to have been exceeded by Rupees 1,057-12-0 up to March 1872, when, as Mr. Bell states in paragraph 5 of No. 182, 4th September 1872, most of the difficult work had been done and a length of 180 feet in the centre of the river remained to be done. Mr. Bell gives as the cause of excess in this item frequent freshes in the river repeatedly refilling excavations that had been made by washing into them the ring-bund formed in the river immediately above the excavations; this is to a great extent true, as, while I was in charge of the range up to March 1871, when the foundations had been commenced upon it, I saw the excavations so filled and work interrupted, but I must here add that the provision of Rupees 600 allowed in the estimate was intended by me for the excavation of body wall, ring walls, and retaining walls in the river; I considered that as the earth from these excavations would be used in the formation of the ring-bunds or temporary dams above excavations, the amount would have been sufficient, and that the item for temporary dams would have borne part of this cost in this way; but Mr. Bell has omitted to mention another cause for this excess; in the course of excavating foundations large limestone boulders were met with at a depth of 5 and 6 feet below surface level, imbedded in clay soil; this rendered the excavation very difficult, especially as the pits could not be kept clear of water. It has since occurred to me that provision for flood banks from wing walls has not been made in the estimate, and this the heavy flood in the cyclone 1871 showed to be necessary; this will have to be included in the supplemental estimate to be submitted.

7. *Bungalow.*—The next item of excess is Rupees 2,942-2-0, which is represented as the cost of the bungalow; there are no detailed accounts to show that this is really what the bungalow has cost, not having a detailed account. A. Coopposawmy Moodelly, who took charge of this work from Mr. Bell in April 1871, prepared an estimate for the same from measurement; a copy of this estimate is herewith submitted, and the rates allowed are those in force in the range; this estimate amounts to Rupees 2,440, but the amount in the comparative statement is given as 3,292-2-0; it was stated by Ponoorungum and A. Coopposawmy in their evidence before you that the amount was raised by Rupees 852 in consequence of expensive machine-made bricks having been used in the work; the accounts do not show what quantity of such bricks were really used in the work, but Mr. Bell's letter to Colonel Foord, No. 209, of the 20th September 1872, explains that about 20,000 bricks were manufactured; these, Mr. Bell states, cost not less than 15 Rupees the 1,000, and supposing they were all used in the bungalow it would add $(20 \times 15 = 300)$

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th August 1874.*

Rupees 300 to the cost and not Rupees 852, but as you are aware from personal inspection some of these bricks have been used in the construction of the head sluice, also in the tunnels on the road to the anicut. When Range Officer I

twice wrote* to Mr. Bell, who was in special charge of the work, informing him that the bungalow was a work not

specially provided in the estimate, and should be done as cheaply as possible, using bricks known to cost 15 Rupees a 1,000 is not certainly economical; he states that Mr. C. H. Norfor used them and not him, the bricks can now be seen in the upper courses of the main walls of the building; and Mr. Bell states in his letter to Colonel Foord, No. 209, 20th September 1872, that when he took charge of the project from Mr. C. Norfor the foundations were laid and walls raised 6 feet,†

† Total height 13 feet.

and that all the remaining work was done by him. Again, Mr. Bell states in No. 305, of the 20th December 1872, to my address, that "when the bungalow was under construction there was no work going on at the anicut, and the materials that were charged against the anicut‡ as also

‡ By himself and Mr. C. Norfor.

the outlay in labor which was debited to sundries were taken to represent the expenditure on the bungalow." In another letter to me, No. 378, 12th March 1873, he states:—"The anicut works were commenced about five months after the completion of the bungalow, and I fail to see how to alter the rate for brickwork for the anicut with a view to show the cost of the bungalow at a minimum."

8. The bungalow is reported* to have been commenced in June 1870 and completed in March 1871, and the range progress reports show the anicut foundations to have been commenced in April 1871, before which date cubes were made ready and concrete prepared; also A. Coopposawmy states† that when he took charge of the work from Mr. Bell in April 1871, "the foundations of

the head sluice with the brick flooring was completed, and the anicut contiguous with the head sluice was also in progress." These are rather conflicting statements, and I only put them forward that you may see I have endeavoured to get to the correct figures if possible, but have failed, and inasmuch as I have failed, I can only leave this figure as it is in the statement, though I know it to be incorrect.

9. This bungalow is not provided for especially in the estimate; I included in the estimate a sum of Rupees 350 for a building at the anicut, in which I had intended that the Anicut Overseer should live when the work was completed. I do not know whether Colonel Roberts, R.E., then Superintending Engineer, has any recollection of a conversation which passed between us on one occasion on the subject of a bungalow for the use of the officer superintending the work, and for the Department Public Works officers visiting the work. The anicut is situated in an out-of-the-way place, where no shelter in the way of topes is procurable, and Colonel Roberts suggested that a bungalow, with two rooms and a bath-room to

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th August 1874.*

each, with an entrance open verandah, be built, and that it be something decent. I informed him at the time that as there was a sum of Rupees 8,066 allowed in the estimate altogether for contingencies, I was of opinion the cost of such a building, which I calculated would be about Rupees 2,500, could well be met from this item, and that if afterwards it was found insufficient a further application could be made; accordingly the building was put in hand and finished in the early stage of the project work, and even at the time this comparative statement was drawn up, there remained a gross balance of Rupees 2,290 in this item unexpended.

10. I gave over charge of the range in April 1871, and foreseeing some difficulty would probably arise in reference to meeting this charge for the bungalow against the item of contingencies, owing to the slow progress the work was making, which would I thought probably entail all and more than the item in question for temporary establishment, I called on Mr. Bell in January 1871, A-1,000, to furnish me with an estimate for the bungalow with the view to submitting it to the Superintending Engineer, but this I could not obtain from him, and there was no estimate framed till June 1871 by A. Coopoosawmy Moodelly, who took charge of the work some months after I had given over charge of the range.

11. *Branch Road to the Anicut.*—The next three items of excess is Rs. 1,110 for a branch road to the anicut. This work was not provided for in the estimate as it was thought the Local Funds would meet the cost of the same, as in the case of the road from Virdachellum to Keenanoor anicut, and from the Oolundoorpett road to the stone quarry, both these

* Constructed for the purpose of conveying materials to the Keenanoor anicut then under construction.

works* were in the first instance executed from the Anicut funds, and the amounts subsequently covered by Local

Fund sanctions; they both lead to villages and are very useful as village roads, in like manner this road is also very useful to the villages lying on the west bank of the river near the anicut, and forms also a portion of the important line of communication between Pennadam and Streemustrum. As in the case of the other roads alluded to above, the cost of this was charged to the anicut works, not expecting there would be any difficulty in recovering the same from the Local Funds, but when application was made the Local Fund Board refused to sanction the outlay, although they have since been paying for maintaining it at a cost of Rupees 100 for the mile of road.

12. *Experiment on machine-made Bricks.*—Rupees 1,537-14-0 is said to have been expended in this. When Range Officer it was represented to me that there was very great difficulty in obtaining brick moulders, and as I had heard that a Clayton's machine had been successfully used at the Palar bridge near Chingleput, I asked permission to give such a machine a trial, and accordingly, with the authority of the Superintending Engineer, got one up from the Public Works Stores. Mr. Bell and myself tried hard to get this machine to work satisfactorily, but we could not succeed in getting it to turn out bricks more than on one side instead of two, and most of these were not good; we had therefore to give it up as the cost of the few good bricks that were turned out was excessive.

13. Regarding the iron roofing, I think you have already received a reply from Major Vertue, R.E.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th August 1874.*

No. 450-I.

No. 315. *Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.*

In a letter No. 196, of the 23rd November 1872, the Superintending Engineer of the late 5th Division submitted comparative statements for the Mehmatur and Pelandorai anicuts in South Arcot, showing that the estimate for the former, amounting to Rupees 55,800, was likely to be exceeded by Rupees 527, or less than one per cent. on the estimate, and that while it was too early to show what modification of the total estimated cost of the Pelandorai anicut works would be necessary, on a few items there had been a large excess.

2. With regard to the Mehmatur anicut a revised comparative statement, submitted by the District Engineer in December 1873, makes the excess to be

No. 13, 27th December 1873.

Rupees 535, and this requires no special notice.

3. The items of the Pelandorai anicut estimate, commented upon by the late Superintending Engineer, were as follows, and these, together with one or two others, have formed the subject of a correspondence which has only just been concluded:—

	Estimate. Rs.	Cost. Rs.
Anicut Bungalow	350	1,110
Branch Road		1,538
Brick experiments		1,805
Continuous iron roofing		7,745

4. In Mr. R. E. Norfor's letter, No. 31, of the 13th ultimo, will be found such explanation of causes of excess as have, after very considerable delay, been submitted. Mr. Norfor (paragraph 3) states that the sanctioned estimate* was

* Rupees 1,98,235.
" 2,00,555.

prepared by A. Coopoosawmy, an Over-

seer, under his supervision; that the work was commenced in April 1870; and that the charge of the project up to the time when the comparative statement was made out in 1872 was held by—

Mr. C. H. Norfor (temporary establishment) from 15th April to 1st Oct. 1870.
" J. M. Bell, Assistant Engineer " 1st Oct. to 3rd Nov. "
" C. H. Norfor (permanent establishment) " 3rd Nov. to 3rd Dec. "
" J. M. Bell " 3rd Dec. 1870, to 22nd April 1871.
" J. M. Bell " 22nd April 1871, to 9th do. 1872.
Overseer A. Coopoosawmy Moodelliar " 22nd April 1871, to 9th do. 1872.

These changes could hardly have tended to secure efficient management.

5. The accounts were, it appears, kept in a very unsatisfactory manner, and from them the proper distribution of the earlier expenditure is not ascertainable. For this state of affairs Mr. R. E. Norfor, the Range Officer at the time the project was started, is primarily responsible; it having been manifestly his duty to see that all arrangements for carrying on the work properly were made, and that such instructions as were necessary were given.

6. The provision for excavating foundations was Rupees 600, the cost being Rupees 1,658. No doubt frequent freshes would materially enhance the expendi-

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th August 1874.*

ture on this account. As the large limestone boulders met with in the excavation could be, and probably were, used for the outer apron, they should not have added to the cost of the excavations. Baling water and temporary dams were separately provided for by an item of 3,000 Rupees, and so can hardly be also included in excavation. Had the works been generally well managed, this excess would not have been deemed remarkable, but, under the actual circumstances, it is difficult to feel sure that the outlay shown was really necessary.

7. The excess on the anicut bungalow has been variously estimated, but in the comparative statement it is shown as Rupees 2,942, the amount allowed being Rupees 350 and that spent Rupees 3,292. As a matter of fact indeed, as explained in paragraph 9 of Mr. R. E. Norfor's letter, the estimate did not provide for anything more than an Overseer's bungalow or shed. The bungalow was apparently built without an estimate, and it is perhaps not surprising that it cost a good deal of money, that being usually the result of doing work without any of the needful precautions. It is not necessary to inquire very particularly what was the real cost of the bungalow, for the accounts were not kept so as to show this, and all that is requisite is to give a fair idea of its proper cost, which may, I think, without much risk of error be taken at Rupees 2,500. It having been mentioned in paragraph 9 of Mr. Norfor's letter that he had some conversation with Colonel Roberts, when the latter was Superintending Engineer, about this bungalow, a reference was made to that officer, and his reply will be found among the papers submitted. There is nothing in this communication which would tend to

No. 916, 6th June 1874. relieve Mr. Norfor of responsibility in the matter. He intended, it would seem, to meet the cost of the bungalow from the provision for contingencies; but it so happens that the estimate contains no item for general sundries, but only items for contingencies of particular works, and even had this estimate not been prepared under his own supervision, it ought to have been quite evident to him that these entries were intended for totally different purposes.

There are various other buildings constructed for purposes connected with the works which must have cost far more than the amount allowed for the Overseer's bungalow. These probably stand debited to anicut sundries, and many of them are no doubt rightly so charged, while others would more properly have come under the head of temporary buildings for stores, establishment, etc. The conclusion appears to be inevitable that Mr. R. E. Norfor, when Range Officer, allowed or authorized the bungalow to be built, without either preparing an estimate or applying for sanction, and that the responsibility to the extent at least of its assumed proper value of Rupees 2,500 rests with him. It seems to be necessary that the responsibility should be enforced in such a way as to prevent the rules against unsanctioned expenditure becoming useless.

8. The branch road constructed at a supposed cost of Rupees 1,110 is, as stated by Colonel Foord, a necessary work of permanent utility. By it much stone was brought to the anicut, and had its cost been estimated, the Superintending Engineer's sanction obtained, and thereafter a proper account of the expenditure maintained, no exception could have been taken to its construction. As it is the estimate was made after the work was done, and while it is very probable that this

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th August 1874.*

estimate is fairly correct, it is certain that this is not the proper way to carry out details of a project.

9. The loss of Rupees 1,538 on experimental manufacture of bricks with a brick-machine is to be regretted. The machine which has wire cutters requires very good soil, and it is probably not well adapted for use with the ordinary superintendence available. Were it not that of the expenditure on this account there was no proper record kept, and that, therefore, the amount put down as loss has been necessarily arbitrarily determined, it would be somewhat singular that so large a sum should have been spent when only a few thousand bricks were made.

10. The last item is an expenditure of Rupees 1,805 on continuous iron roofing. This outlay was incurred when Mr. Hawksworth was Range Officer, and the purchase of fifty rolls was duly sanctioned by Major Vertue, when Superintending Engineer, 5th Division, as reported in his letter* of the 12th December 1872,

* Vide from District Engineer, Salem.

No. 5. I do not concur with him in the opinion that the use of this material was likely to be advantageous, and after it was obtained it was not used. It requires a special framing to carry it, and thatched sheds are usually well adapted for providing the temporary shelter required for materials and tools, etc. Most of the cost of the continuous iron sheets will be recovered if this has not already been done.

11. Some plant which has not been of any use on this project, and which is not likely to be used, should be sent back to the Public Works Stores at Madras at once, there re-valued and the accounts adjusted.

12. It appears to be certain that a revised estimate for this project will have to be submitted for sanction, and it will be seen from the District Engineer's letter of the 13th ultimo, No. 31, paragraph 2, that it is expected that the necessary information as to the amount still required to complete the project will shortly be ready. At the present time, therefore, all that seems necessary is that such orders as the Government may be pleased to pass should be issued with regard to the unauthorized expenditure on the anicut bungalow.

OOTACAMUND,
26th June 1874.

(Signed) JOHN MULLINS, Lieut.-Colonel, R.E.,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

No. 316.

ORDER THEREON, 15th August 1874, No. 2,262.

IRRIGATION, No. 21.

THE Government have learnt with much dissatisfaction that the arrangements for carrying out the Pelandorai Project in South Arcot have been anything but creditable, that Mr. R. E. Norfor the Range Officer at the time the project was started in 1870 neglected to provide for the due record of expenditure, the result being that a considerable part of the outlay for the first two years cannot be properly distributed, and that two works not provided for in the estimates were carried out in a very irregular manner, without the sanction of competent authority and without their probable cost being in the first instance ascertained. One of these additional works was the construction of a permanent bungalow of considerable size, of the actual cost of which no

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
15th August 1874.

regular account was kept, on which an outlay of Rupees 3,292 is shown in the comparative statement, and which it is not likely could have cost less than 2,500 Rupees, which it would seem from measurements subsequently taken to be about its fair value. No building of this description was entered in the sanctioned estimate, and Mr. R. E. Norfor in allowing its construction incurred a responsibility from which the Government cannot allow him to be entirely relieved without encouraging inattention to the rules regarding unsanctioned expenditure. Under the circumstances, the refund of Rupees 1,000 must be directed, which will be repaid in five instalments and credited to the project.

2. The fact of no proper accounts of expenditure having been kept on this considerable project during a long period, and of work which had not been sanctioned being undertaken, is certainly far from creditable to the officers who successively held charge of the division during the time referred to. The repeated changes among the supervising officers may have rendered it difficult to exercise a full control; but, as this project was the most important work in the district, it doubtless was many times visited by the Superintending Engineers, and at any rate such palpable irregularities as those now noticed should have been detected and put a stop to.

3. The attention of the present District Engineer will be called not only to the remarks of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, but to the necessity for a thorough examination of the work and accounts of the project, so that the cost of the work already done may be ascertained and compared with the sanctioned estimate, and that it may be ascertained what further outlay will be needed to complete it, and to bring it into use at an early date.

(True Extract.)

Lieut.-Colonel, R.E.,

Joint Secretary to Government.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
,, District Engineer, South Arcot.
,, Officiating Controller of Public Works Accounts.
To Mr. R. E. Norfor.

Exd. S. T. Austin]

Spare Copies

N^o 450 J.

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation
In a letter N^o 196 of the 23rd November 1872 the Superintending Engineer of the late 5th Division submitted comparative statements for the Pehmatas & Pelandorai ariants in South Arcot, shewing that the estimate for the former, amounting to Rupees 55,800, was likely to be exceeded by Rupees 527 or less than 1 per cent on the estimate, and that while it was too early to show what modification of the total estimated cost of the Pelandorai ariant works would be necessary, ~~bringing the estimate~~ ~~that~~ on a few items there had been a large excess.

2. With regard to the Pehmatas ariant a revised comparative statement, submitted by the District Engineer in December 1873, makes the excess to be Rupees 535, and this requires no special notice.

3. The items of the Pelandorai ariant estimate commented upon by the late Superintending Engineer were as follows; and these together with one or two others have formed the subject of a correspondence which has only just been concluded.

	Estimated	Cost
Ariant Bangalore Rs. 350	—	3292
Branch road	—	1110
Brick experiments	—	1538
Continuous iron roofing	—	1805
		7745

In Mr. R. E. Norfor's letter, No. 31
 the 13th Ultimus, will be found such
 explanation of causes of excess as have,
 after very considerable delay, been sub-
 mitted. Mr. Norfor (para 3) states
 that the sanctioned estimate was
 prepared by A. Corporeaux, an over-
 seer, under his supervision; that
 the work was commenced in April
 1870 and that the charge of the pro-
 ject up to the time when the com-
 parative statement was made out
 in 1872 was held by

Mr. C. H. Norfor (Temporary Establishment) from 15th April to 18th Oct 1870
 -- J. M. Bell Asst Engineer 1st Oct to 3rd Nov --
 -- C. H. Norfor Permanent Establishment -- 3rd Nov to 3rd Dec --
 -- J. M. Bell 3rd Dec 70 to 22nd April 1871
 Overseer A. Corporeaux Mr. 22nd April to 9th Dec 1872

These changes could hardly have tend-
 ed to secure efficient management

5. The accounts were it appears
 kept in a very unsatisfactory man-
 ner, and from them the proper
 distribution of the earlier expendi-
 ture is not ascertainable. For this
 state of affairs Mr. R. E. Norfor, the
 Range officer at the time the pro-
 ject was started is primarily re-
 sponsible, it having been manifest-
 ly his duty to see that all ar-
 rangements for carrying on the
 work properly were made, and that

such instructions as were necessary
 were given.

6. The provision for excavating the
 foundations was Rupees 1,658. No doubt
 cost being Rupees 1,658. No doubt
 frequent freshes would materially
 enhance the expenditure on this
 account. As the large lime stone
 boulders met with in the excava-
 tion could be, and probably were,
 used for the outer apron, they
 should not have added to the
 cost of the excavations. Baling
 water & temporary dams were
 separately provided for by an item
 of 3,000 Rupees, and so can hard-
 ly be also included in excavation.
 Had the work been generally well
 managed, this excess would not have
 been deemed remarkable, but under
 the actual circumstances it is dif-
 ficult to feel sure that the outlay
 shown was really necessary.

7. The excess on the ancient Bun-
 galow has been variously estimated,
 but in the comparative statement
 it is shown as Rupees 2,942, the
 amount allowed being Rupees 350,
 and that spent Rupees 3292. As
 a matter of fact indeed, as ex-
 plained in para 9 of Mr. R. E. Norfor's
 letter

letter, the estimate did not provide for anything more than an Overseer's Bungalow or shed. The Bungalow was apparently built without an estimate and it is perhaps not surprising that it cost a good deal of money, that being usually the result of doing work without any of the needful precautions. It is not necessary to enquire very particularly what was the real cost of the Bungalow, for the accounts were not kept so as to show this, and all that is requisite is to give a fair idea of its proper cost, which may, I think, without much risk of error be taken at Rupees 2,500. It having been mentioned in para 9 of Mr. Norford's letter that he had some conversation with Colonel Roberts; when the latter was Superintending Engineer, about this Bungalow, a reference was made to that officer and his reply will be found among the papers submitted. There is nothing in this communication which would tend to relieve Mr. Norford of responsibility in the matter. He intended, it would seem, to meet the cost of the Bungalow from the provision

No 916-6 June 74

provision for contingencies; but it so happens that the estimate contains no item for general sundries, but only items for contingencies of particular works, & even had this estimate not been prepared under his own supervision it ought to have been quite evident to him that these entries were intended for totally different purposes.

There are various other buildings constructed for purposes connected with the works which must have cost far more than the amount allowed for the Overseer's Bungalow. These probably stand debited to annual sundries, and many of them are no doubt rightly so charged, while others would more properly have come under the head of temporary buildings for stores, establishments &c. - The conclusion appears to be inevitable that Mr. R. E. Norford, when Range Officer, allowed or authorized the Bungalow to be built, without either preparing an estimate or applying for sanction, and that the responsibility to the extent at least of its assumed proper value of Rupees 2,500 rests with him. It seems

seems to be necessary that the responsibility should be enforced in such a way as to prevent the risk against unsanctioned expenditure becoming useless.

8. The branch road constructed at a supposed cost of Rupees 1110 is as stated by Colonel Ford a necessary work of permanent utility. By it much stone was brought to the river, and its cost been estimated, the Superintending Engineer's sanction obtained, and thereafter a proper account of the expenditure maintained, no exception could have been taken to its construction. As it is the estimate was made after the work was done; and, while it is very probable that this estimate is fairly correct, it is certain that this is not the proper way to carry out details of a project.

9. The loss of Rupees 1538 on experimental manufacture of bricks with a brick machine is to be regretted. The machine which has wire cutters requires very good soil, and it is probably not well adapted for use with the ordinary superintendence available. Were it not that of the expenditure on this account there was no proper record kept,

kept, and that therefore the amount put down as loss has been necessarily arbitrarily determined, it would be somewhat singular that so large a sum should have been spent when only a few thousand bricks were made.

10. The last item is an expenditure of Rupees 1805 on continuous iron roofing. This outlay was incurred when Mr. Hawksworth was Range officer, and the purchase of 50 rolls was duly sanctioned by Major Yentue when Superintending Engineer 5th Division, as reported in his letter of the 12th December 1872 No 5. I do not concur with him in the opinion that the use of this material was likely to be advantageous, and after it was obtained it was not used. It requires a special framing to carry it, and thatched sheds are usually well adapted for providing the temporary shelter required for materials and tools. Most of the cost of the continuous iron sheets will be recovered if this has

vide from D.C.
Salem.

531.

P. W. 1874 Dept.
No. 2,660

From

The Chief Eng.
for Irrigation
Dated 26 June 1874
Recd. 27 July 1874
No. 4501 E. O.

Note on
correspondence re-
lating to the
Pelandarai Project
Project in the
South Arcot Dist.

G. O. No. 2252-15-874
+ 5 Encl.
15-15-874

Ch 3/5

Public Works Department
Proceedings of the Madras Government
From the Dy. Engineer
South Arcot (P. W. No. 31 dated 13th May 1874)
Do Chief Eng. for Irr. (P. W. No. 4501 dated 26 June 1874)

The Government
have learnt with much
dissatisfaction that the
arrangements for carry-
ing out the Pelandarai
project in South Arcot
have been anything but
creditable, that the
Kauf officers at the
time the project was
started in 1870 neglect-
ed to provide for the
due record of expendi-
ture, the result being
that a considerable
part of the outlay
for the first two years
cannot be properly
distributed, and that
two works not provided
for in the estimates
were carried out in a
very irregular manner,
without the sanction of
competent

was this not Mr. Norfor? I saw name
Mr. Norfor on the
Nal Subrail

The Secretary to Govt. P. W. D.

competent authority and without their probable cost being in the first instance ascertained. One of these additional works was the construction of a permanent Bungalow of considerable size, of the actual cost of which no regular account was kept, in which an outlay of Rupees 3292 is shown in the comparative statement, and which it is not likely could have cost less than 2,500 Rupees, which it would seem from measurements subsequently taken to be about its fair value. The building of this description was entered in the sanctioned estimate, and Mr R.L. Norfor in allowing its construction incurred a responsibility from which the Government cannot

Col. H's explanation is very unsatisfactory. He means of his expenditure Rs 5000 and he did not put it down as he ought.

cannot allow him to be entirely relieved without encouraging inattention to the rules regarding it. Under the circumstances the refund of Rupees one thousand must be directed, which will be repaid in 5 instalments and credited to the project.

2. The fact of no proper accounts of expenditure having been kept on this considerable project during a long period, and work which had not been sanctioned being undertaken, is certainly far from creditable to the officers who successively held charge of the Division during the time referred to. The repeated changes among the supervising officers may have rendered it difficult to exercise a full control, but

but, as this project was the most important work in the District, it doubtless was many times visited by the Superintending Engineer, and at any rate such palpable irregularities as those now noticed should have been detected and put a stop to.

3. The attention of the present District Engineer will be called not only to the remarks of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation but to the necessity for a thorough examination of the work and accounts of the project, so that the cost of the work already done may be ascertained & compared with the sanctioned estimate, and that it may be ascertained what further

further outlay will be needed to complete it, and to bring it into use at an early date.

Wm. 2/2/74

Wm.

35
35
To The Chief Engr for Irr. ✓
5- - D. L. South. Acct. ✓
3- - Controller M. Accts. ✓
To Mr. P. C. No. 100 ✓
S. Capin depts. 22/8/74.

11-11-31

Mr 4660

Govt. of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To
★
The C. Engr for
Madras

Dated

Recd.

Encl. 6

G. O. 15 Aug 14. No. 2262

Mos. 314-316.

Pelandorai Project, South

Arnot St. - Dissatisfac-

tion expressed as to the
arrangements for carrying
out the project; Mr.

R. Norford to refund

Rs. 1000 in account of the
unauthorized construction
of a bungalow; Attention

of the St. Engr. drawn to
the necessity for a thorough
inspection of the work and

to be made in the project.

314-316.

Recd 6/1/14 Retd 23/7/14