

(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.	3507	Press	<i>Original</i>
B.P. No.		Mis.	
Dated	10-12-	1875	
		195	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
10th December 1875.*

No. 178. Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel J. F. FISCHER, R.E., District Engineer, Madura, to Major-General G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madura, 19th October 1875, No. 2,942:—

In returning the enclosed notes of remark on estimates submitted for the construction of a Racket Court at Madura, I have

- Eight Enclosures, viz.:—
- Comparative statement approved by Mr. Chisholm.
 - Revised estimate of Rupees 5,030 by Colonel Roberts, P.E.
 - Specification Report.
 - Comparative Statement showing the difference between the estimates of Rupees 4,200 and 7,410.
 - Comparative Statement, dated 4th August 1875.
 - Plan, dated 24th December 1874.
 - Note with the District Engineer's remarks.
 - Detailed Estimate.

the honor to inform you that I have duly filled in the remarks opposite to each item therein alluded to, the detailed estimate together with all other documents connected with it are herewith forwarded.

2. I beg to add, one Contractor who engaged to do the work has failed already, and says the rates are quite insufficient, and I only brought the matter to the notice of the Government at once in the

hope I might have avoided disappointing them after the work had made progress; but it was taken up in a very different spirit, as if I had wished to make things appear otherwise than they really were, and that at the instance of one of my subordinates, which I can only respectfully submit is very far from my practice.

No. 179. ORDER THEREON, 10th December 1875, No. 3,501.

CIVIL WORKS, No. 12.

No. 2,962, dated 8th Dec. 1873.
" 236 B., " 26th Jan. 1875.
" 1,118, " 20th April "
" 1,632, " 10th June "

THE previous Proceedings in regard to the Racket Court at Madura are recorded under the orders of Government marginally noted, and in reference to the last there entered Colonel Fischer forwards comparative statements and reports, in

which he seeks to establish the correctness of his previous assertion that the estimate submitted by Lieutenant-Colonel Roberts, amounting to Rupees 5,030, and sanctioned in G.O., No. 1,118, of the 20th April 1875, was insufficient, and that his own, amounting to Rupees 7,410, and forwarded to Government with his letter of the 26th December 1874, was correctly made out and provided only what was absolutely necessary.

2. The result of a careful examination of the detailed estimates has established the fact that the estimate of Colonel Fischer provided for the following additions to the details of the building as previously estimated for by Colonel Roberts:—

The gallery was increased in width from 8 to 12 feet, and partition walls were inserted for the lower room. This involved an increase in the stone-work, brick-work, wood-work, and roofing, plastering, and excavation, &c. Cut-stone flooring was entered for part of the court in lieu of brick paving.

Iron railings were provided for the front of the gallery in lieu of brick walling.

The cut-stone facing was estimated to be built further into the side walls, thus increasing the quantity used.

The court was terraced in part. Doors were provided in addition to those already sanctioned.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department.
10th December 1873.

Sundries and contingencies were entered in excess of the usual amount.

3. It cannot be considered that any of the above alterations or additions were necessary. The previous circumstances showed that the Government considered that they had already, in sanctioning the construction of the court on the first estimate in lieu of the court taken for public purposes, extended to the greatest possible degree their appreciation of the claims of the residents to having such a building erected at public expense, and Colonel Fischer should have refrained from pressing for additions, the only plea for which was the greater satisfaction or convenience of the players who, moreover, with the residents generally were at liberty to provide them at their own expense now or in the future.

4. Colonel Fischer's estimate exceeds that of Lieutenant-Colonel Roberts by Rupees 2,380. Of this amount Rupees 462 is due to the higher rate for cut-stone work stated to be necessary, and on a review of the data furnished the Government are disposed to admit the charge. Other items to the amount of Rupees 138 may also be passed, and it will be held that necessity for an aggregate excess of Rupees 600 has been made out. The balance charged, amounting to Rupees 1,780, is in the opinion of the Government clearly unnecessary on the grounds set forth by the District Engineer.

5. A revised estimate, made out on the basis above noted, will have to be prepared.

(True Extract.)

Major-General, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the District Engineer, Madura.

Exd. S. T. Austin.

Spare Copies

25
Precis of Orders & Correspondence relating to alladene
Racket Court.

G.O. 8th Decr 1873 No 2962
Sanctioning Estimate for
Rs. 4200 sent in by Mr. C.
Roberts for constructing the
Racket Court. This amount
being a charge of cost of
land. dimensions 41 x 42.
As a revised estimate for Rs. 5030
was afterwards sanctioned
by Mr. Col. Roberts, mem-
orandum of Rs. included Rs. 500
for land. The field need not
be detailed or explained.
It must be noted that Col.
Fischer took out the foundation
deeper than specified in the
1st est and compelled the

Adoption of the increased
dimensions in Col. N: 2
estimate.

G.D. 2363 4.26 July 1875.

Refers to two letters from
Col. Fisher of 26 Decr 1874
to 10 Jan 1875. The first
forwarding a revised letter
for W 410 & both admit
admitting on the insufficiency
of Col. Roberts letter for W 4200.
Col. H. ordered to proceed
to report on the matter.

G.D. 20 April 1875. Pending
Sgt. Roberts revised letter
for W. 5030 prepared so
for G.D. 2363 & ordered
to be presented with

Th. 1. 1.

G.D. 10 June 1875 W 1632
on letter from Col. Fisher offering
explanation in reference to
previous G.O. It desires that
revised order & desires that
the revised letter be received for
completion of the same.

No 1087 of 21 June 75 from H. T.
asks for letter & specification
of Col. H. (W 5130). Also sends
Memo. 155 of 1 July 75. See
state documents have been
sent.

Letter No 900 of 8 June 75 from
Fisher requests to return the
Memo 155 of 1 July 75. Also
Memo 94 returns letter, dated
18 June 75.

Letter No 576 of 17 May 75 from
Col. Fisher forwards copies
Statement sent to the
of one prepared with Mr. Childs
Memo of 18 June 75. Also
of explanation in Col. H. letter
regarding explanation.

Letter No 1079 of 26 June 75

for D.2. Ask to have returned
information to his letters 4182,
4577, 576 of 26 May 75, 16 June
75 & 17 May 75. Inquiries
of Comparative Statement
sent with his 17 May 75 will
be laid before Govt.

Items 219. See. returns con-
sidered & says plan not satis-
fying. Statement will be
laid before Govt. when full
explanations have been given.

Letter of 4 May 75 from D.2.
Refers to 219 & demands
Comparative Statement. See
Items 402 for D.2. Ch. 1/2
concludes on Estimates, ready
for reply.

Letter 19 Oct 75-2942 returning
revisers

11

Concrete
Crops No 90

but the nature of the soil is not
as claimed -

Remarks on Estimates

Col. Roberts estimate revised
amounts to Rs 5030.

It is sent in by Col. Fischer to
No 7410 & the difference

thereof to Rs 2380

The original estimate sent in by Col
Roberts was including land

compensation Rs 4700 the
crop in Col. Roberts estimate

the price of is therefore Rs 2710

The crop in estimate is in
quantity 39 cubic yards &

the amount Rs 98. It is partly
caused by the deepening of the

foundations by Col. Fischer who
says this is necessary on account of

the soil & by his widening without
authorizing the falling of 5 to 12 feet.

The depth of foundations was
under his left to the discretion of

his responsible Officer, but the
unauthorised increase of dimensions
in the revised estimate should have

T. D. 1.

for the whole of the floor:
Taking the floor of gallery
Curt we have.

Col. Fisher. Terrace	W. 214
Cut stone part of floor	$\frac{221}{44.435}$
Col. Roberts. Terrace	30
Brick on edge on inside for curb	$\frac{217}{240}$

No doubt a cut stone floor is
better for playing than a
brick on edge floor but it
is not absolutely necessary &
neither is terracing. When
he substituted the more
cutly work Col. Fisher should
have brought it to notice as
a saving increase in his
est. The excess W-195 is not
justified.

The excess in quantity in the
cut stone casing is 9 cut
for a Col. Fisher lot.

the
8
in
turn
6
only
up.

has clearly pointed out by Col
Fisher at the time he took
exception to Col. W. Est. When
the gallery is reduced the excess
disappears.
The excess in quantity is in quantity
only 37 3/4 cut yards in quantity
W-111. The same remarks
are applicable to this also the
amount.

The excess in Brick Work in Col
Fisher's lot is in quantity only
8 cut yards in quantity W-143.
But Col. Roberts includes steps
Col. Fisher does not.
The rate of the latter is 8 to a
cut yard higher for work under
15 ft for the ground & the District
Schedule supports Col. F.

Col. Fisher provides terracing
for the gallery floor & for a
part of the back court.
Col. Roberts only terraces the
front & has brick on edge

Cost in Amount \$478

The quantity is not justified the dimensions of Col. Roberts are ample

but the rate is probably too low. If the work is not well done it will be inferior

In paying to Masters & ~~Thompson~~ (at Fisher's)

Take what they have that

for the palace. Deducting

for excess in quantity not made good the excess justified is \$462.

Col. Fisher provides all stone for steps at an extra cost of \$43. This seems reasonable.

Plastering shows an excess for \$2.80 which is owing to

grout & has made the cage

Track to Lumber

the extra size of gallery designed by Col. F. & the partition walls. The excess is not justified.

Perforating gallery an excess of \$40. not justified for the same reason.

Vasey work not put up except in quantity 102 cub ft. Amount 357.

caused by increase of gallery & increased

scantlings. The former not justified & the latter very doubtful. The excess is reduced to authorized dimensions.

There are 6 doors in excess in Col. Fisher's estimate owing to their provision for side rooms by Col. Fisher. Col. H. allows no side rooms & Col. F. was not justified.

this appears when the gallery

~~Other stuff~~

Ch. Miller, Addition to 1860

to a very beautiful extent

Struck on the neck

be called upon to

for the Sanctified Church

restoration of No. 519 for
Cox Street and Sun.

[Handwritten signature]

The letter signed by the
"Rev. Mr. [illegible]" and dated
at Southey, 21st Dec. 1840
The letter is written in
1840. The letter is signed
his [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
with the signature of [illegible]
at [illegible].

* There is a pencil note to this effect on the Man.

Trackto Land

for Curacao. R. 90
111

Brick Work 143
Excavation: 51

Kingsey Work 357
Grass and Carb. Stone

for floor ———— 173
C. & S. for quantity

in playing well 316
 51

Increasing extra width
of floor ————— 37 1/2

Buildings	—	50
Don		20

4 cups in Sandrun.

All alterations or
additions to the
Sanitary Potentials.

Enclos: to letters Nos 4132, 4177
4576 of the O.E. Bangalore, sent to
him with reference to his letter

No 1179. 27 26 June 1951.

67.5

95
Theobald Lamb

Madama

By running the
gallon from 12 to 8'
the excess shown in
Colonel Fisher's Estimate
viz Rs 760 is almost 6
balanced Rs 10 only
remaining in excess.

C.M.R.

13
11
25

6/65
No. II.—PARTICULARS FROM
ESTIMATES.

Main Budget Head to which chargeable.

Provincial

Title and purpose of the work as given by
District Engineer. *Rack & Bench*

at Madura

Original sanction for the preparation of the
detailed estimate.

(Date and number in both sanctioning and Public Works
Department.)

*G. O. No. 2962 of
8-12-73*

Amount of original detailed estimate. *4200*

Number and date of sanction and endorse-
ment in Public Works Department.

*G. O. No. 305
of 7-2-74*

Amount of revised estimate ... *7410*

Do. of original do. ... *4200*

Excess over do. do. ... *3210*

Budget Head to which the work is charge-
able, in detail. *New Works*

Civil Buildings

Amount of current year's allotment ... *Funds*

to be provided from
~~Do. expended in previous years~~
the current year's allot-
ment of Rs 10000 for

the Madura Palace Works
Budget Item No. 68. Rea

Balance to be provided ...
see para: 4 of G. O. No. 1587
of 5 June 1875

Funds can be made available during the
current year.

(Yes or no, and state how in former case.)

Vide above para

Brought forward as urgent.

(Yes or no, and if so state by who.)

DOCUMENTS IN FILE.

From District Engineer—*Madura*

1 Covering letter No. *2962* date *19-10-75*

1 Letter from Range Officer, No. , date

1 Detailed Estimate.

1 Abstract do.

1 Plan.

1 Specification Report.

From Office—*Memo. No 219 of 13/7/75*
46. Nos 4285, 4133, 251,
1669, 3360 & 3854-

Original sanction, No. *303*, date *7-2-74*
 for detailed estimate preparation.

Orders and Proceedings.	No.	Date.	Under P. W. D. G. O.
P. W. Department	...		No. Date. <i>2962 8-12-73</i>
Public do.	...		<i>303 7-2-74</i>
Revenue do.	...		<i>1342 20-5-74</i>
Financial do.	...		<i>148 20-4-75</i>
Military do.	...		<i>1191 20-4-75</i>
			<i>2368 26-1-75</i>
			<i>1632 12-6-75</i>
			<i>1587 5-6-75</i>

No 3501

Civil Works

P.W. Dept.

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

Under date the 10 Decr 75

Read the following:-

From the District Engineer, P.W.D. No 2942 of 19 Oct 75
Madura

No 2962 d/sth Decr 1873

" *236B* " *26th Jan'y 1875*
 " *1418* " *20th April "*
 " *1632* " *10th June "*

The previous pro-
 ceedings in regard to the
 Packet Court at Madura
 are recorded under the
 Orders of Government mar-
 ginally noted and in re-
 ference to the last three
 entered Colonel Fischer
 forwards Comparative
 Statements and reports

in

in which he seeks to establish the correctness of his previous assertion that the Estimate submitted by Lieut. Colonel Roberts amounting to Rs 5030 and sanctioned in G.O. No. 1118 of the 20th April 1875 was insufficient and that his own amounting to Rs 7410 and forwarded to Govt. with his letter of the 26th December 1874 was correctly made out and provided only what was absolutely necessary.

2 The result of a careful examination of the detailed Estimates has established

12th
established the fact that that of Colonel Fischer provided for the following additions to the details of the building as previously estimated for by Colonel Roberts.

The Gallery was increased in width from 8 to 12 feet and partition walls were inserted for the lower room. This involved an increase in the stone work, brick work, wood work and roofing, Plastering and excavation 18th. But stone flooring was entered for part of the Court in lieu of brick paving. Iron railings were provided

provided for the front
of the gallery in lieu
of brick walling.

The cut stone facing
was estimated to be built
further into the side
walls thus increasing
the quantity used.

The court was tenaced
in part. Doors were pro-
vided in addition to
those already sanctioned.

Sundries and con-
tingencies were entered
in excess of the usual
amount.

3 It cannot be con-
sidered that any of
the above alterations or
additions were necessary.

The

135
The previous circumstan-
ces showed that the
Govt considered that
they had already in-
sanctioning the construction
of the Court on the first
Estimate extended to the
greatest possible degree
their appreciation of the
claims of the residents
to having such a building
erected at Public expense
and Colonel Fischer
should have refrained
from pressing for ad-
ditions the only plea
for which was the greater
satisfaction or convenience
of the Plazeros who more-
over with the Residents
generally

generally were at liberty
to provide them at their
own expense now or in
the future.

4 Colonel Fischer's es-
timate exceeds that of
Lieut. Colonel Roberts
by Rs 2380. Of this
amount Rs 462 is due
to the higher rate for
cut stone work stated
to be necessary and on
a review of the data
furnished the Govt are
disposed to admit the
charge. Other items to
the amount of Rs 738
may also be paid
and it will be held
that necessity for an
aggregate

14
aggregate excess of
Rs 600 has been made
out. The balance
charged amounting to
Rs 1780 is in the opinion
of the Govt. clearly un-
necessary on the grounds
set forth by the District
Engineer.

5 A revised Estimate
made out on the basis
above noted will have
to be prepared.

Adm.
G.M.V.

DE Madera ✓

Depd 22-12-75

Recd 17

8 Enclosures

referred to in letter from the
DE Madera N° 2942 of 19th Oct/75 re D to the
DE Madera 17-1-76.

6765

X

Govt. of 1875 Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

G. H. Madras

5/11/75

Date

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. 10 Dec 1875, No. 3501

No. 178-179

Quotat Cont. at Madras.
Drawing orders on the Sub-
-ject of excess on the Estimate
of the ———