

- (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.	958	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
112-113		
Dated	13-6-1874	195-

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
13th April 1874.*

Read the following papers :—

No. 112. From Colonel E. A. FOORD, R.E., Inspecting Engineer for Civil and Military Buildings, to Colonel G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Tanjore, 24th February 1874, No. 301 :—

I HAVE the honour to forward for the orders of Government the plan and estimate for a coir godown to be built at Mangalore, which accompanied the letter from the District Engineer of South Canara, No. 128, of the 31st January, also a revised specification showing more clearly the construction of the building, than the specification first revised.

From A. C. LAWFORD, Esq., Officiating District Engineer, South Canara, to Colonel G. W. WALKER, R.E., Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Mangalore, 31st January 1874, No. 128.

ADVERTING to extract Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department, No. 2,918-A, dated 4th

- 1 Plan.
- 1 Estimate.
- 1 Abstract Estimate.
- 1 Comparative Statement.
- 1 Copy of original Estimate.
- 1 Specification Report.

December 1873, regarding the submission of a revised plan and estimate for the Coir godown to be built at Mangalore, I have the honour to submit the same herewith with an explanation of the circumstances connected with it.

2. The G. O., No. 1,120, of 17th April 1873, communicating the Provincial Budget sanctioning Rupees 6,000 for the current official year, was received on 24th April 1873, a date too advanced to do much in the way of collecting of material before the monsoon which burst on 29th May 1873. Some few days before Mr. Pringle's arrival I took up the original plan and estimate with a view to draw up a working specification, but, on tracing out the items, finding some slight discrepancy, I transferred it to the Draughtsman for further examination and check. Before he could complete this check Mr. Pringle arrived on 21st May, and all work connected with the range was transferred to him. Of course no work could possible be commenced before the close of the monsoon or the end of August at the earliest.

3. I embody the explanation of Mr. Pringle, and can only say that I am confident he would not needlessly delay

Masonry.—The end and corner dwarf walls indicated by dotted lines in the enlarged ground plan have been left out in the original estimate.

Plastering.—A round number has been allowed in the original estimate in which the sides of buttresses and the outside of basement have been left out.

Wood-work.—In the original estimate, purlins, ridgepole, hip rafter and wall plates have been left, and being included in roofing, but this item has now been provided for in the revised estimate.

Arch-work.—783 cubic feet against 576.1 cubic feet in the revised estimate.

his work, and submit that the delay is due to the discrepancies which do exist as noted marginally. The wrong idea regarding the section was, I admit, shared by myself, an error easily made from want of colouring to distinguish clearly parts in section; and parts in elevation also from the want of a specification report which is not on record. The estimate might also be somewhat clearer in giving numbers to the different

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
13th April 1874.*

items, as for instance 28 binding walls as also the section (*vide* pencil lines). The estimate now submitted shows however the necessity for a thorough revision, partly on account of rates and partly because items were clubbed together in the original estimate, involving different rates by which considerable excess would have been caused.

4. I trust the Government will see that there has been no intentional delay either on the part of myself or of the Mangalore Range Officer.

Mr. Pringle writes as follows:—

“Whilst forwarding revised estimate for the Coir godown at Mangalore, I have the honour to express my regrets that blame should have been accorded to me in G. O., No. 2,918-A, dated 4th December 1873, for delay in the matter of finding out and correcting the errors in the original estimate without my having an opportunity of offering explanation.

“As you are aware I only returned from Wynaad on the 21st of May 1873. On the first day on which I attended office, the Draughtsman brought up the plan and estimate which you had handed over to him, and stated that he could make nothing of the estimate. On the most cursory examination I found that it differed widely from the plan, and I then ordered him to recast it, as the most satisfactory way of rectifying the many errors in it. There was much urgent work in the office, and I myself was very unwell and had to take leave in July, so that on my return in August the revised estimate was still unfinished. The Draughtsman was told to put the matter in hand, but again other work which, considering that the Coir godown could be proceeded with under the old sanctioned estimate, was considered more emergent delayed it.

“In October or the beginning of November the rough draft estimate and plan were forwarded for my inspection, and now I regret that a mistake on my part caused a further delay. The sectional portion of section on C. D. (*vide* plan) is not coloured, and the drawing had given me the impression that the building was entirely floored above. The scantlings of the beams were evidently too small for the span in this case, so I returned the plan for the entry of central pillars to support the beams.

“On my return to Mangalore this error on my part was discovered and the new plan, then being drawn out, cancelled.

“I am free to admit that had I gone more deeply into the matter I should have discovered my mistake sooner, but the original estimate was so totally different to the plan, that I knew not where the error lay, and attributed that which was confined to the estimate, to the plan also.

“The real delay that has taken place is mainly attributable to the press of work my Draughtsman has.

“Hardly an estimate that has been drawn out two or more years ago that does not want thorough revision from alterations in rates, etc., and since the Local Fund Act came into force there have been calls for numerous estimates that were before carried out by the Revenue Department.

“Government in their order quoted above consider the expenditure already incurred as unauthorized, but I respectfully submit that that expenditure was incurred on a sanctioned plan and estimate, and with an allotment, and such expenditure I was under the impression was admissible even although revision from errors or change of rates should be necessary.”

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
13th April 1874.*

5. As the original plan is in no way altered, the allotment applied for in statement submitted on the 28th instant may be granted to enable me to carry on the work.

No. 113.

ORDER THEREON, 13th April 1874, No. 958.

CIVIL WORKS, No. 12.

THE District Engineer of South Canara submitted, under date the 31st January 1874, an estimate for a Coir godown at Mangalore, exceeding by Rupees 2,310, or 26½ per cent., the estimate of Rupees 8,700, sanctioned in Revenue Department Order No. 2,454 of 22nd September 1868.

2. The work was amply provided with funds in the Provincial Budget of 1873-74, which reached Mangalore on 24th April 1873; between which date and the 21st May the District Engineer states that he took up the papers connected with it, found some discrepancy in them, and handed them over to his Draughtsman to examine and check. From the 21st May to October, or the beginning of November, the work of revising appears to have been similarly remitted to a Draughtsman, without any apparent attempt on the part either of the District Engineer or Range Officer to assist him or accelerate progress. It does not appear that he reported his inability to understand the plan. But on the Range Officer at last attempting to deal with the subject, its intricacy appears to have baffled him, and the District Engineer confesses himself to have been equally puzzled. Their recourse therefore was to order a new plan to be drawn out, and to report, under date the 18th November 1873, that they could not spend half the allotment of the year.

3. The Government Order thereon, No. 2,918-A. of 4th December, appears to have had the effect of inducing the Range Officer at last to apply his mind to a less superficial consideration of the subject than it had ever before occurred to him to be necessary to give it, with the result that the plan has been sent up unaltered. Of the total excess of Rupees 2,310, the comparative statement shows a net excess of Rupees 61½ out of a total of Rupees 3,877-8 for masonry and archwork, and of Rupees 278, out of a total of Rupees 939, for roofing and wood-work, or Rupees 340 in all as being due to alleged miscalculations of the original estimate; the whole of the rest being due to higher rates.

4. Under these circumstances his Excellency the Governor in Council is neither able to concur in the District Engineer's statement, that the delay is due to discrepancies which have been found to exist; nor in that of the Range Officer, that it is mainly attributable to the press of work upon his Draughtsman. It is due wholly and entirely to their personal neglect in delegating to a subordinate duties which they should have undertaken themselves. The District Engineer especially is bound to see that works provided with funds are not deferred for want of timely scrutiny of sanctioned plans and estimates, if thought defective.

5. In the present case it is admitted that expenditure might have been proceeded with under the old sanctioned estimate; yet its defects are brought forward as reasons for giving up half the year's allotment. But so large an excess as 26½ per cent. of itself invalidates a sanction; for it raises the question whether the plan which turns out to be so costly shall be adhered to or not. Hence the Range

Exd. S. T. Austin;
Spare Copies

2. The G. O. No 1120 of 17 April 1872
Communicating the Provincial Budget
sanctioning Rs 6000 for the current
official year was received on 24th
April 1872 a date too advanced to
do much in the way of collecting
of material before the month when

burst on 29th May 1873. Some few
days before Mr Pringle's arrival
I took up the original Plan and
Estimate with a view to draw up a
writing Specification, but on tracing
out the items finding some slight
discrepancy I transferred it to
the Draftsman for further examina-
tion and Check. Before he could
complete the check Mr Pringle
arrived on 21st May and all work
connected with the Range was
transferred to him. Of course no
work could possibly be commenced
before the close of the museum or
the end of August at the earliest.

3. I embody the explanation of Mr
Pringle and can only say that I am con-
fident the
Chimney - The end and corner dwarf walls
indicated by dotted lines in the enlarged sketch of
ground plan have been left out in the original Estimate.
Plastering - A round number has been allowed in the original Estimate which
the sides of buttresses & the outside of
have been left out.
Footpath - In the original Estimate for the do-
lins, ridge pole hip rafters small plates & lay is dis-
have been left out being included
in roofing but this I have added to the dis-
perhaps for in the revised Estimate.
Archwork - 783 Against 171 which do
exist as noted marginally.

idea regarding the section was I
admit shared by myself and
not easily made from want of
coloring to distinguish clearly parts
in Section and parts in elevation
also from the want of Specifi-
cation Report which is not in
Record. The Estimate might also be
some what clearer in giving num-
bers to the different items ex-
instance 28 building walls as also
the Section (vide pencil lines). The
Estimate now submitted shows how
over the necessity for a thorough
revision partly on account of
rate and partly because items
were clubbed together in the original
Estimate in valuing different rates
by which considerable excess would
have been caused.

4. I trust the Government
will see that there has been
no intentional delay either on
the part of myself or of the
changeable.

Mangalore Range Officer.

Mr Pingle writes as follows:-

"While forwarding revised estimate for the ~~Box~~ Godown at Mangalore I have the honor to express my regret that blame should have been accorded to me in G.O. No 2918A dated 4 December 1873, for delay in the matter of finding out and correcting the errors in the original estimate without my having an opportunity of offering explanation."

"As you are aware I only returned from Mysore on the 27th of May 1873. On the 1st day on which I attended office the Draftsman brought up the plan and estimate which you had forwarded to him, and stated that he could make nothing of the estimate. On the next day on examination I found that it differed widely from the plan, and I then ordered him to recast it as the most satisfactory way of rectifying the many errors in it. There was much urgent work in the office & I myself was very unwell and had to take leave in July

"so that on my return in August, the revised estimate was still unfinished. The Draftsman was told to put the matter in hand, but again other work which, considering that the Box Godown could be proceeded with under the old sanctioned estimate, was considered more urgent delayed it."

"In October or the beginning of November the rough draft estimate and plan were forwarded for my inspection and now I regret that a mistake on my part caused a further delay. The sectional portion of section on CD side plan is not colored and the drawing had given me the impression that the building was entirely floored above. The scantlings of the beams were evidently too small for the span in the bay, so I returned the plan for the entry of central pillars to support the beams."

"On my return to Mangalore this error on my part was discovered, and the new plan then being drawn out, cancelled."

"I am free to admit that had
"I gone more deeply into the matter
"I should have discovered my mistake
"sooner but the original estimate was so
"totally different to the plan that
"I knew not where the error lay
"and attributed that which was con-
"fined to the estimate to the plan also."

"The great delay that has taken
"place is mainly attributable to the
"lack of work my draftsman had."

"Hardly an estimate that has
"been drawn out two or more years
"ago that does not want thorough
"revision from alterations in estimates
"and since the Local Fund became
"a law there have been calls
"for numerous estimates that were
"before carried out by the Revenue
"Department."

"Government in their order
"quoted above consider the expen-
"diture already incurred as unauthor-
"ized but I respectfully submit
"that that expenditure was incurred
"on a sanctioned plan and estimate."

"and with an allotment, and such
"expenditure I was under the impres-
"sion was admissible even although
"revision from error or change of
"rates should be necessary."

5. As the original Plan is in
"no way altered the allotment ap-
"plied for in Statement submitted on
"the 28th Instant may be granted to
"enable me to carry on the work."

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your Most Obedt Servt

W. L. L. L.

Off. District Engineer
Canton

No. 301

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTING ENGINEER
FOR CIVIL AND MILITARY BUILDINGS,
Tanjore, 24th February 1874.
Sri Chinniah

From THE INSPECTING ENGINEER
FOR CIVIL AND MILITARY BUILDINGS,

To The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department

SIR,

- Enclosure 5
- 1 Plan
- 1 Revised abstract estimate
- 1 Comparative statement
- 1 Revised specification
- 1 Letter to Chief Eng^r from Dist^l Eng^r N^o 128, dated 31st Jan'y 1874.

I have the honor to forward for the orders of Government the plan and estimate for a pair godown to be built at Mangalore, which accompanied the letter from the District Engineer of South Canara N^o 128, of the 31st Jan'y. I am, also, a revised specification showing more clearly the construction of the building, than the specification first received.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your Most Obedient Servant
E A and Colonel R.
Inspecting Engineer for
Civil & Military Buildings

From
The District Engineer
at Mangalore
To
The Chief Engineer
at Bangalore
19th Feb. 1874

11/2/74
To
The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Tanjore
P. M. 11/2/74
1. Estimate for the godown
2. Construction of pair
godown at Mangalore
with an explanation
of the circumstances
connected with it

W. P. ...

Off. Depy. Secy. 95-8

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the March 18/4.

Read the following

From the Inspecting Engineer
for Buildings.

(Here enter No. 301/21st Dec. 18/4)

The District
Engineer of South Canara
submitted under date the
31st January 18/4, an
Estimate for a Coir
Godown at Mangalore
exceeding by Rupees 23
or 26 1/2 per cent, the Esti-
mate of Rupees 8,700
sanctioned in Revenue
Department Order No.
2454.

M. 2/13

To
The Inspecting Engineer
for Buildings,
Government
To Secretary to
Government
From
C. 1874
No. 301/21st Dec. 18/4
2/1170.

4 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50 55 60 65 70 75 80 85 90 95 100
2000-21st February 1874.

Forward for orders
the same proportion for
constructing a coir godown
at Mangalore, South Canara
District, together with a
letter from the District
to the Inspecting Engineer.

No. 958-13 dated 1/4

10th March

11/12

2454 of 22^d September 1868.

The work was am-
ply provided with funds
in the Provincial Bud-
get of 1873-74, which
reached Mangalore on
24th April 1873; between
which date and the 21st May,
the District Engineer stated
that he took up the papers
connected with it, found
some discrepancy in them,
and handed them over
to his Draftsman to ex-
amine and check. -
From the 21st May to
October or the beginning
of November the work
of revising appears to
have been similarly
submitted

submitted to a Draftsman
without any apparent
attempt on the part of
of the District Engineer
or Range Officer to ap-
prove or accelerate pro-
gress. It does not ap-
pear that he reported his
inability to understand
the Plan. But on
the Range Officer on
last attempting to deal
with the subject, it be-
came apparent to him
that he was
baffled him, and the Dis-
trict Engineer confessed
himself to have been
equally puzzled. Their
recourse therefore was
to order a new Plan
to

Plan to be drawn out,
and to report under date
the 18th November 1873 that
they could not spend half
the allotment of the year.

The Government
Order Hereon No 2918 A
of 4th December appears
to have had the effect of
inducing the Range
Officer at last to apply
his mind to a less super-
ficial consideration of
the subject than it had
ever before occurred to him
to be necessary to give it;
with the result that the
plan has been sent up
unaltered. Of the total
excess of Rupees 2310
the

the Comparative Statement
shows a net excess of
Rupees 61½ out of a
total of Rupees 387-7-8
for masonry and arch
work, and of Rupees
278 out of a total of
Rupees 939 for Roofing
and woodwork or
Rupees 310 in all ad-
being due to alleged
miscalculations of the
original estimate; the
whole of the rest being
due to higher rates.

Under these
circumstances His
Excellency the Governor
in Council is recom-
mended to concur in the
District

District Engineer's Statement
that the delay is due
to discrepancies which
have been found to exist;
namely in that of the Gauge
Officers, that it is mainly
attributable to the progress
of Work which his Drafts-
man had. It is due
wholly and entirely to
their personal neglect
in delegating to a humble
subordinate duties which
they should have under-
taken themselves. The
District Engineer especially
is bound to see that works
provided with funds
are not deferred for
want of timely scrutiny

of sanctioned Plans
and Estimates, if thought
defective. In the present
case it is admitted that
expenditure might have
been proceeded with
under the old sanctioned
Estimate; yet its defects
are brought forward as
reasons for giving up
half the years allo-
ment. But so large
an excess as $26\frac{1}{2}$ per
Cent. of itself invalidates
a sanction; for it raises
the question whether
the Plan which turned
out to be so costly
shall be adhered to

or not. Since the
Range Officer is unquestion-
ably wrong in his
demand to the dictum
of Government that
the expenditure incurred
in the absence of sanc-
tion for a revised
Plan and Estimate
was unauthorized.
The District Engineer
is very much to
blame for not cor-
recting such erro-
neous ideas in his
Subordinates, his
want of judgment
in dealing with
whom has already
been adverted to as
disqualifying

disqualifying him
for the charge he holds.

The work will
be proceeded with on
the Revised Estimate
and report of its
progress up to the
ensuing ^{monsoon} month will
be made in due
course. —

Y.M.W.

Sure a more correct
letter was not enough
for Col. Ford - I have
sent him all the
points out there -
7/3 221

To the Inspector of Buildings
• D. C. S. Comar
• Controller
• Rev. Inspector
S. Copies despatched 20/4/14.

1170



Govt. of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

The Inspecting Engg
for Buildings

Dated

Recd.

Encl. 5

G. O. 12th April 1874. No. 958

Nos. 1124/13

Coin Godown at Mangalore

Passing orders on the
Plan and Estimate for
the construction of the Co.
godown at Mangalore &
the work order of to be
proceeds of work on the
revised Estimate & a report
of its progress up to the
incoming monsoon to be
made —