M.R.O. 1—10,006—28-2-50.

(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. 2438 Press Original
B.P. ~~No.~~ Mis. ~~—~~

Dated 13. 9. ~~195~~ 1876

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 185. Read the following letter from R. E. NORFOR, Esq., Officiating District Engineer, Salem, to Major-General G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Salem, 25th August 1876, No. 79 S.L. :—

I HAVE the honor to submit, for the sanction of Government, a revised estimate in the form of a comparative statement for the construction of an Overseer's Office at Uttengherry in the Tripatore Range, which is Rupees 161-12-0 in excess of the original estimate of Rupees 700 sanctioned in G.O., No. 3,140, of 4th November 1874.

1 Comparative Statement.
1 Estimate.
1 Plan.

2. The work was commenced in June 1875 and completed early in July 1876, and the Range Officer has incurred the additional expenditure of Rupees 161-12-0 without the sanction or authority of the District Engineer, and has not at any time during the progress of the work reported that there was any likelihood of the estimate being exceeded.

3. Mr. Supervisor West is the Range Officer, and Mr. Hollingsworth the Overseer who carried out the work.

4. I inspected the building myself yesterday, and can certify to the excellence of the work done; but I regret to say that, as far as can be ascertained from the accounts, the rates at which the various items of work has been executed are extravagantly high; although the comparative statement which accompanies this gives the expenditure under sub-heads of estimate, the Range Officer, Mr. West, is doubtful as to its correctness, as being a work under Rupees 1,500, the accounts were not kept under sub-heads.

5. *Concrete.*—An excess of Rupees 223-4 appears under this item, the quantity of work done is much the same as estimated; the rate allowed in the estimate is Rupees $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cubic yard, which is very good for non-hydraulic concrete, but it is said to have cost as much as Rupees $3\frac{3}{4}$ per cubic yard.

6. *Brick-in-chunam.*—The excess in this is Rupees 74-13-11; there is no work of this kind provided in the estimate; the superstructure was to have been all stone-in-chunam, but brickwork was used in the quoins of the building and all around doors and windows; there is a saving of Rupees 33-1-3 in the stone works, which makes actual excess in this item Rupees 4112-8. The rate of brick-in-chunam work here is Rupees 4-9-4 per cubic yard, and it should not have cost more than 4 Rupees the cubic yard.

7. *Circular Archwork.*—An archway is pierced in the partition wall; not in the plan or provided for in the estimate; this is said to have caused an excess of Rupees 4-9-4.

8. *Flat Archwork.*—Excess in this is Rupees 6-1-3 for $33\frac{3}{4}$ cubic feet, which is at the rate of 4-13-8 per cubic yard, and this is high. I consider the flat archwork over doors and windows necessary, but this appears to have been omitted in the estimate.

9. *Plastering.*—An excess of 12 Rupees is shown here; the estimate provides for plastering interior and exterior of building; the latter is omitted, and the stone

work pointed instead. Seventeen and a half squares of this work has cost Rs. 48-7-0, or Rupees 2-12-4 per square against the estimated rate of Rupees 1-6-0; this is very high, although, as the Range Officer explains in the comparative statement, more lime mortar was used than would be required for a brick wall with a smoother surface than could be obtained using rough stone.

10. *Pointing.*—There is an excess of Rupees 29-7-10 here. Estimate provides for pointing all round up to basement; but, as already stated, the exterior walls have also been pointed instead of plastered; the rate at which this work is done is Rupees 3-8-8 per square, against Rupees 1-8-0 in the estimate.

11. *Flooring.*—There is an excess of Rupees 17-15-10 in this item; but I think the rate allowed in the estimate, Rupees 5 per square of 6 inches square tiles flooring over 3 inches concrete bed is altogether insufficient; it is very difficult to get square tiles at Uttengherry, and the cost of flooring would be quite 5 Rupees the square exclusive of cost of 3 inches concrete below the tiles, which is another 3 Rupees per square.

12. *Doors and Windows.*—An excess of Rupees 44-2-6 is shown in these items; an extra door has been put in. I cannot say that this was necessary, but the rates allowed in the estimate are much too low; these doors and windows were procured from Madras, and the rates in the estimate would only cover the cost of the shutters at the Presidency, allowing nothing for the frames and bolts, hinges, &c. The windows have iron bars, very necessary, but not provided for in the estimate.

13. These are about the most important items of excess; whitewashing not provided for has been done, and the item of sundries has been exceeded.

14. I do not think the roof was done at 15 Rupees the square, as would appear from the comparative statement; it has not been done for less than Rupees 18 per square anywhere in the district, and I observe that bamboo matting had been used below the tiles which the estimate does not provide.

15. It does not appear that Major Hunter inspected this work at any time before he left the district in my charge in June, a few days prior to its completion.

No. 186.

ORDER THEREON, 8th September 1876, No. 2,438.

CIVIL WORKS, No. 14.

(a) *Heads of Service.*—Provincial.
Fund.—Ordinary.
Class.—Original Works.
Main-head.—Civil Buildings.
Sub-head.—L, Public Works Department.
Section.—i, Offices.
Name of Work.—Overseer's Office at Uttengherry.
Amount.—Rupees 862.
To be carried out by the Public Works Department.

WITH this letter the District Engineer, Salem, submits a revised estimate, amounting to Rupees 862, for the construction of an Overseer's Office at Uttengherry in the Tripatore Range, the original sanction for which amounted to Rupees 700, *vide* G.O., No. 3,140, dated 4th November 1874.

2. The causes of the excess, as explained by the District Engineer, are far from satisfactory, and the Range Officer's negligence in omitting to give timely intimation of the probability of the estimate being exceeded is inexcusable. The Range Officer and the Overseer will be warned that in future they will be held personally answerable, in such proportions as the District Engineer may decide, for all outlay in excess of 5 per cent. of the original estimate.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
13th September 1876. *No.* 2,438.

3. The expenditure up to the end of last year was Rupees 686. A specific appropriation of funds during the current year is accordingly unnecessary.

4. The above sanction has been registered as Provincial No. 139-W. of 1876-77.

(True Extract.)

Colonel,
Offg. Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the District Engineer, Salem.
,, Examiner of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. E. C. Shunker.
Spare Copies

No. 79 St.

District Engineer's Office
Salem 25th Augt. 1876.

From

The Offg: District Engineer,
Salem.

To

The Secretary to Government,
D. P. W.

Sir,

Enclosure 3
/ Comparative Statement
/ Estimate
/ Plan

I have the honor to submit for the sanction of Government a revised estimate in the form of a Comparative Statement for the Construction of an Overseer's Office at Uttengherry in the Tripatore Range, which is Rs: 161.12.0 in excess of the Original Estimate of Rs: 700 sanctioned in G. O. No: 3140 of 4th November 1874.

2. The work was commenced in June 1875 and completed early in July 1876, and the Range Officer has incurred the additional expenditure of Rs: 161.12.0 without the sanction or authority of the District Engineer, and has not at any time during the progress of the work, reported that there was any likelihood of the estimate being

being exceeded.

3. Mr. Supervisor West is the Range Officer and Mr. Hollingsworth the overseer who carries out the work.

4. I inspected the Building myself yesterday and can certify to the excellence of the work done; but I regret to say that, as far as can be ascertained from the accounts, the rates at which the various items of work has been executed are extravagantly high; although the Comparative Statement which accompanies this gives the expenditure under subheads of estimate, the Range Officer Mr. West is doubtful to its correctness, as being a work under Rs: 2500, the accounts were not kept under sub heads.

5. An excess of Rs: 22.3.4 appears under this item; the quantity of work done is much the same as estimated; the rate allowed in the estimate is Rs: 2½ per cubic yard which is very good for hydraulic concrete, but it is said to have cost as much as Rs: 3¾ per cubic yard.

6. The excess in this is Rs: 7.13.11; there is no work of this kind provided in the estimate; the superstructure was to have been all stone in Chunam, but brick work

Brick in Chunam

work was used in the quoins of the building and all around doors and windows; there is a saving of Rs: 33.1.3 in the stone work which makes actual excess in this item, Rs: 41.12.8. The rate of Brick in Chunam work here, is Rs: 4.9.4 per cubic yard, and it should not have cost more than 4 Rs: the cubic yard.

Circular Arch Work

7. An archway is pierced in the partition wall not in the plan or provided for in the estimate; this is said to have caused an excess of Rs: 4.9.4.

Flat arch work

8. Excess in this is Rs: 6.1.3 for 33¾ C: ft: which is at the rate of 4.13.8 per cubic yard; and this is high. I consider the flat arch work over doors and windows necessary; but this appears to have been omitted in the estimate.

Plastering

9. An excess of 12 Rs: is shown here: the estimate provides for plastering interior and exterior of building; the latter is omitted and the stone work pointed instead. 17½ squares of this work has cost Rs: 48.7.0 or Rs: 2.12.4 per square against the estimated rate of Rs: 1.6.0: this is very high; although as the Range Officer explains in the comparative statement, more lime mortar was

was used than would be required for a brick wall with a smoother surface than could be obtained using rough stone.

10. There is an excess of Rs: 29.7.10 here. Estimates provides for pointing all round up to 2 cement; but as already stated, the exterior walls have also been pointed instead of plastered; the rate at which this work is done is Rs: 3.8.8 per square, against Rs: 1.8.0 in the estimate. Pointing

11 There is an excess of Rs: 17.15.10 in this item, but I think the rate allowed in the estimate, Rs. 5 per square of 6" square tiles flooring over 3" Concrete Bed is altogether insufficient, it is very difficult to get square tiles at Ittiqberry; and the cost of flooring would be quite 5 Rs: the square, exclusive of cost of 3" Concrete below the tiles which is another 2 per square. Flooring

12. The excess of Rs: 44.2.6 is shown in these items: an extra door has been put in. I cannot say that this was necessary, but the rates allowed in the estimate are Doors and windows

are much too low; these doors and windows were procured from Madras, and the rates in the estimate would only cover the cost of the shutters at the Presidency, allowing nothing for the frames and bolts, hinges, &c^a. The windows have iron bars, very necessary, but not provided for in the estimate.

13. There are about the most important items of excess - while washing not provided for, has been done and the item of sundries has been exceeded.

14. I donot think the roof was done at 15 Rs: the square, as would appear from the Comparative Statement; it has not been done for less than Rs: 18 per square anywhere in the District; and I observe that bamboo matting has been used below the tiles which the estimate does not provide.

15. It does not appear that Major Hunter inspected this work at any time before he left the District in my charge in June.

a

a few days prior to its completion.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedt. Servant.

A. Ellerton

Offg. District Engineer.

GD 4-11-76 No 3160
10 Office hole.

P.W.D.
28 AUG 76
No 6153
1

(a) Heads of Service— Provincial

Fund. Ordinary

Class. Original Works

Main-head. Civil Buildings

Sub-head. L. Public Works Department

Section—1 Name of Work. Offices - Accountant's Office at Attanagalla -

Amount. Rs 862

To be carried out by the P. W. Department.

Print in the margin of G.L. No 2438 of 13-9-76 -

From
The Dy. Superintending Engineer
Kalutara.

Dated 25th Aug. 1876.
Recd. 28 AUG 1876

To
The Secretary to Govt.
P. W. D.

Sir

I have the honor to forward herewith a Copy of Estimate for the erection of a Cadjan shed at the Kachcheri Premises at Attanagalla for the Convenience of the Officers of the Kachcheri and Public Offices there.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient
Servant
[illegible]

Dy. Superintending Engineer

5 3 x x
x 1 Plan sent & Librarian
1 Plan sent up for C.L.
7539. d/76.
23.10.76

Cir - 9-9-76. Print 13-9-76
Desp to Ch - 6-9-76.

G04-11-74 No 3160

P.W.D.

P.W.D.

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1876. { P.W. DEPT.

SECRETARY.

Fort St. George, September 5 1876

OFFICE NOTE.

To C.

Please state the expenditure up to 31st March 1876 on the Overseers Quarters at Attengherry Salem District for Rs 700 sanctioned in G.O. 4 January 1874.

W. Shaw
S.G.

OF 187 .

Rs 686-2-11 to 31st March 1876.

L.C.
5/9

GO-13 September 1876 No 2438

Desp to Collr 6-9-76.

Public Works Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the

Read the following :—

From
The District Engr
Salem.

(P.E. Ecg No 2.L.Dg 25
Dated May 1876.)

The revised estimate of Rs 862 for constructing office and Overseers quarters at Attengherry in the Irrigated Range, Salem District is sanctioned in lieu of that sanctioned in Pub. No. 3140 of 4th November 1874.

2. The District Engineer's report on the causes of excess is far from satisfactory

satisfactory and the Range Officer's negligence in not reporting the unsuitability of the original Estimate being exceeded in unnecessarily 3 Rupees 686 leaving a Excess chargeable to 2/ Fc March 1876 Rs 176 are required in the current year as this amount is below 500 Rs no specific appropriation of funds is necessary.

4. This sanction has been registered in Pro. Finance Dept. Dr of 1876-77.

6.9.76.

C Rs 6193 — Salem Circle

Declining Expenditure ... Excess of ... 5 per Cent ... Estimate ... Public Officers ... Charges ... Repairs ... Original ... Estimate ...

715

D.E. Salem. Ex. & W. Accts.

1 Plan put up for C Rs 7539 23-10-76

Pro. Dept to Acct-6-9-76.

6

No. 2438 Public Works Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 13th Septr 1876

Read the following :—

From The Dist. Engr. Salem. (No. 79 S.L. dy 25th Augt 76)

With this letter the District Engineer Salem submits a revised Estimate amounting to Rs 862 for the construction of an Overseer's Office at Uttengherry in the Tripatore Range, the original sanction for which amounted to Rs 700 vide G.O. No. 3140 dated 4th November 1874.

2 The causes of the excess as explained by the District Engineer are far from satisfactory, and the Range Officer's negligence in omitting

to

PWD

to give timely intimation of the probability of the Estimate being exceeded is inexcusable. The Range Officer and the Overseer will be warned that in future they will be held personally answerable in such proportions as the District Engineer may decide, for all outlay in excess of 5 per cent of the original estimate.

The expenditure up to the end of last year was Rs 686. As specific appropriation of funds during the current year is accordingly unnecessary.

The above sanction has been registered as Provincial No 139 W. of 1876-77.

No 1856

Dist. Engr. Salem.
Exr. P. W. Accounts.

Dated 3/10/76

I am very averse to giving effect heavily under these circumstances. In any instance the Estimate was previously exceeded

W/A.

P.W.D.

6193 (H. with Vacant)

Govt. of {1876} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

The D. E. Salem

Dated

Issued

Read

1 Plan sent up for
C No 5539. 876
23-10-76
Encl.

G. O., 13th Sept. 1876, No. 2488

Nos. 185/86

Ex. Engr Roy C
4-10-76

Overseers Office at Vitteri-
gherry - Salem 8th

The revise of Estimate
for the — same) none
with the remark that
the causes of the excess
as explained are
far from satisfactory -
Supt