

(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.	1819	Press	Original
B.P. No.		Mis.	
Dated	19. 7.	1957	1876

Not to be folded or roughly handled

15

1

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
19th July 1876. No. 1,819.*

No. 297. Read the following endorsement of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation,
dated 22nd June 1876, No. 90-W :—

*Statement of Outlay on Repairs and Minor New Works, Agricultural, for the Month of March
1876.*

Districts.	REPAIRS.					MINOR NEW WORKS.				
	Budget Estimate.	Revised Grant.	Allotment up to end of Month.	Amount of Estimates sanctioned.	Amount expended.	Budget Estimate.	Revised Grant.	Allotment up to end of Month.	Amount of Estimates sanctioned.	Amount expended.
	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
Ganjam ...	40,000	39,000	39,000	63,568	33,535	2,500	2,000	2,500	5,441	2,412
Vizagapatam ...	17,500	17,500	17,447	17,808	16,917	2,000	1,600	1,600	2,009	1,881
Godavery ...	1,76,200	1,72,000	2,01,000	2,67,686	2,15,277	17,000	13,600	13,600	10,558	7,769
Kistna ...	1,20,000	1,27,000	1,60,000	2,28,326	1,63,263	10,000	8,000	8,000	1,470	1,372
Nellore ...	71,000	84,000	84,000	2,11,704	85,343	8,300	6,640	8,700	11,523	7,108
Bellary ...	51,500	50,000	55,000	83,332	63,340	10,000	8,000	8,000	10,517	6,880
Cuddapah ...	60,000	58,000	48,000	48,000	44,561	12,000	9,600	7,000	7,000	5,040
Kurnool ...	40,000	39,000	40,000	56,234	38,691	5,000	4,000	5,000	5,696	4,856
Presidency ...	3,000	3,000	3,000	2,415	2,485	...	...	...	...	...
Chingleput ...	1,10,000	1,10,000	1,10,000	1,89,950	1,22,999	15,000	12,000	9,400	21,919	14,929
North Arcot ...	1,35,000	1,32,000	1,32,000	1,76,064	1,24,627	15,000	14,000	41,000	44,511	39,595
South Arcot ...	1,20,000	1,17,000	80,000	1,02,564	76,633	15,000	12,000	10,000	18,545	10,041
Salem ...	60,000	58,000	50,000	75,549	50,380	15,000	12,000	13,000	15,843	13,384
Tanjore ...	1,68,500	1,64,000	1,46,687	2,95,216	1,79,422	10,000	8,000	9,000	6,019	2,529
Trichinopoly ...	90,000	88,000	90,000	1,33,956	89,925	8,000	6,400	5,200	13,547	5,303
Coimbatore ...	75,000	73,500	46,000	64,840	58,841	6,000	4,800	9,300	8,918	8,621
Malabar ...	1,000	1,100	1,750	1,714	1,708	500	400	200	...	...
Madura ...	50,000	48,500	48,500	1,33,669	47,342	8,000	4,400	4,200	9,243	3,479
Tinnevely ...	1,00,500	98,200	1,05,000	1,60,760	1,08,403	15,000	12,000	15,000	15,863	13,332
		14,66,800	...	...	...	Unallotted ...	5,000	...	...	...
						Total ...	1,39,440			
Deduct amount transferred to Survey Establishment. Vide G.O. No. 3,186, dated 8th Nov. 1875 ...		5,000	...	Add amount transferred from State Outlay. Purchase of Land, Irrigation and Canal Company. Vide G.O. No. 321, dated 12th November 1875 ...		1,500	...	...	...	...
				G.O. No. 19, dated 6th January 1876 ...		5,000	...	...	...	...
Total ...	15,00,000	14,61,800	14,57,384	24,12,295	15,33,698	1,74,800	1,45,940	1,60,500	2,03,621	1,43,532

Fort St. George,
22nd June 1876.

(Signed)

JOHN MULLINS, Lt.-Col., R.E.,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

SUBMITTED for the information of Government.

The statement has been delayed by the non-receipt of the return from Vizagapatam, the entries opposite which district have to prevent further delay been filled up from the Progress Report.

2. The general results shown by the statement are as follows :—

Repairs.

Districts in which expenditure has fallen short of grants and allotments.

	Grant.	Allotment.	Expenditure.	Difference.
	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
Ganjam ...	39,000	39,000	33,535	5,465
Vizagapatam ...	17,500	17,447	16,917	530
Cuddapah ...	58,000	48,000	44,561	3,439
Kurnool ...	39,000	40,000	38,691	1,309
Presidency ...	3,000	3,000	2,485	515
South Arcot ...	1,17,000	80,000	76,633	3,367
Madura ...	48,500	48,500	47,342	1,158

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
19th July 1876. No. 1,819.

Districts in which the outlay was less than the grants but in excess of allotments.

	Grant.	Allotment.	Expenditure.	Difference.
	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
Salem...	58,000	50,000	50,380	380
Coimbatore ...	73,500	46,000	61,840	18,840

Districts in which expenditure exceeded grants, but was within the allotments.

	Grant.	Allotment.	Expenditure.
	RS.	RS.	RS.
Trichinopoly....	88,000	90,000	89,925
Malabar ...	1,100	1,750	1,708

Districts in which expenditure exceeded both grants and allotments.

	Grant.	Allotment.	Expenditure.	Differences.
	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
Godavery ...	1,72,000	2,01,000	2,15,277	14,277
Kistna ...	1,27,000	1,60,000	1,63,263	3,263
Nellore ...	71,000	84,000	85,343	1,343
Bellary ...	50,000	55,000	63,346	8,346
Chingleput ...	1,10,000	1,10,000	1,22,999	12,999
North Arcot ...	1,32,000	1,32,000	1,34,627	2,627
Tanjore ...	1,64,000	1,46,687	1,79,422	30,735
Tinnevely ...	98,200	1,05,000	1,08,403	3,403

	RS.
The total grant was ...	14,61,800
Do. allotment was ...	14,57,384
Do. expenditure was ...	15,33,698

Excess above grant ... 76,314

The District Engineer, *Ganjam*, has afforded no satisfactory explanation of short expenditure, though he applied for and received allotments to the full amount of the grant. He attributes short outlay to damage done by floods and want of labor. The sum unutilized is 14 per cent. of the grant.

In *Vizagapatam* the difference is small, 3 per cent.

The *Cuddapah* statement is blank as regards explanation of short outlay, which was 7 per cent. on allotments, and 23 per cent. on grant. The outlay in 1874-75 was 16 per cent. short of the grant.

In *Kurnool* the expenditure approximated closely to the grant, though 1,309 Rupees of the allotment remained unspent.

The short outlay in the *Presidency* District was due to delay in settling compensation and to the dryness of the weather preventing turfing and grass planting being executed.

In *South Arcot* the outlay was 4.21 per cent. less than the allotment and 34.5 per cent. below the grant.

The explanation given is "the balance under Repairs was left in the *Virdachelum* Range, it was owing to the Executive Engineer, Mr. O'Ratigan's illness." It is supposed that this remark applies to outlay short of the allotment; it would not explain the very inadequate progress compared with the grant. The district was in a very inefficient state when the present District Engineer joined about the middle of the year. Cholera which was prevalent had also some effect on progress.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
19th July 1876. No. 1,819.

In *Madura* the difference is not important.

Explanation of short outlay in districts in which allotments to the full amount of the grant were not applied for were clearly necessary.

In *Salem* the allotments were slightly exceeded, but the expenditure fell short by 13 per cent. of the grant. It would take many years to put all the Salem irrigation works to rights were the grant doubled and fully utilized. There has been a great want of energy in this district for a long time.

The outlay in *Coimbatore* was Rupees 8,660 or 11.8 per cent. less than the grant, but greatly in excess of the allotments. The explanation given as regards short expenditure is that it was chiefly due "to the Caroor Range Officer not expending the amount placed to his credit, and failing to telegraph that he could not from unforeseen circumstances spend the money." The unforeseen circumstances have not been explained, and the reason adduced is inadequate and unsatisfactory. That progress was insufficient was apparent for months before the close of the year, and measures should have been taken to secure improvement.

It is somewhat remarkable that in all the districts to which allotments were made in excess of the grants, the allotments also were exceeded; sometimes by such a small percentage on the whole amount made available as not to need notice, but in other cases by sums which could hardly have been spent without authority had the arrangements for communicating and distributing allotments to Ranges and Sub-ranges been satisfactory. District Engineers must understand fully that money must not be spent on repairs until funds have been regularly provided and appropriated. In *Tanjore* there was neglect in applying for funds, and apparently great want of information as to the progress of expenditure.

3. The total amount available for expenditure on Minor New Works during the year was Rupees 1,45,940, and the expenditure was slightly in excess, *viz.*, Rupees 1,48,532. The distribution of expenditure was very different to that intended when the Budget was framed, first, because in those districts in which completion estimates have been sanctioned for systems or sections of systems of works, the district grants have not been allowed to be considered available for such systems, it being desirable that all work required should be done in connection with those estimates and not under separate sanctions. Secondly, in *Tanjore*, *Cauvery Delta*, and to some extent elsewhere, Minor New Works chargeable to Revenue were, under a misapprehension, ordered to be charged to the Repair grant, whereas whether chargeable to Capital or Revenue all such works being Original Works, are not properly debitable to Repair funds under the rules in force.

In several districts the funds made available were fully utilized or slightly exceeded, and the expenditure in March was about three times that of February which, as pointed out in the review of that month, was not satisfactory. In *North Arcot* nearly three times the grant of Rupees 14,000 were spent, and could something like the same progress be made in the tank districts generally, there would be some chance in the course of a few years of immunity from breaches on recurrence of heavy, but in tropical latitudes not unanticipated rain-fall.

OOTACAMUND, (Signed) JOHN MULLINS, Lt.-Col., R.E.,
22nd June 1876. Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
To the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department.

No. 298.

ORDER THEREON, 19th July 1876, No. 1,819.

IRRIGATION, No. 30.

Account.

case of several districts the progress made was far from satisfactory. Cuddapah, South Arcot, Salem and Coimbatore are the districts in which the failure to utilize the funds provided in the Budget is most marked.

2. Referring to the similar statements for March 1874 and 1875, it is to be noticed that in Cuddapah and Salem there was a similar absence of proper progress with this important description of work.

G.O., 3rd July 1874, No. 1,779.
 „ 19th June 1875, „ 1,733.

G.O., 3rd July 1874, No. 1,779.
 „ 19th June 1875, „ 1,733.

					Budget Grant.	Expenditure.	
Cuddapah	...	...	...	...	65,000	28,672	1873-74.
Salem...	...	...	...	...	53,000	30,357	
Cuddapah	...	...	...	...	65,000	54,278	1874-75.
Salem...	...	...	...	...	53,000	39,905	
Cuddapah	...	...	...	...	58,000	44,561	1875-76.
Salem...	...	...	...	...	58,000	50,380	

The attention of District Engineers has been repeatedly called to the subject, and His Grace the Governor in Council cannot permit warnings to remain unheeded. For the current year the Budget grants have been placed at the disposal of District Engineers, and if at end of the first-half of the year the expenditure in districts in which the progress in 1875-76 is shown to have been unsatisfactory should indicate want of energy and good management, it will be necessary to take such notice of shortcomings as will serve to convince the officers and subordinates concerned that their position in the department must depend upon the success with which these and other duties are performed. It is observed that in nearly all the districts in which the grants for the repair of Irrigation works have not been worked out, the total outlay on Public Works was small, and the District Engineers cannot therefore be relieved of direct responsibility for unsatisfactory results in connection with any of the works for which funds were provided.

3. Again, the explanations regarding short outlay, when any have been submitted, are for the most part very inadequate, and seem to show either a want of knowledge of the facts or a very erroneous apprehension of the duty of a District Engineer in connection with all Public Works operations under his supervision. From month to month every District Engineer should be completely acquainted with everything that is going on in his district, and whenever any particular work or description of work is found to be making inadequate progress, it is his duty to personally investigate the circumstances and apply a suitable remedy.

4. In eight districts the expenditure on Repairs is shown to have been much in excess of the grants which, so far as these had been regularly supplemented, indicates a satisfactory and commendable degree of energy, but in five out of eight districts the

outlay was so greatly in excess also of the allotments made available as to show that due attention was not paid to the selection and arrangement of work to be done with reference to the money at the disposal of the district officers. In Tanjore especially great inattention was exhibited to the requirements of the rules relating to expenditure. Complete regularity as regards appropriation prior to expenditure being incurred will be expected for the future. The Repair grant for 1876-77 has been increased to Rupees 15½ lakhs, and District Engineers will take care that, while on the one hand arrangements are made for carrying out repairs to as many works as can be put into proper order within the allotments to the several districts, on the other hand no excess outlay whatever is permitted to take place without the express sanction of Government, and a corresponding provision of additional funds.

5. The special attention of all District Engineers should be given to the judicious and full utilization of the Minor New Works grant of 1876-77. Although in 1875-76 the total grant was slightly exceeded, this was due mainly to the exertions made with success in a few districts. The sum as yet made available is so small, and the need of the provision of adequate surplus weirs and sluices so great and almost universal, that in every district the real difficulty cannot be to spend the allotments made, but to find the means of carrying into execution more than a very few of the improvements known to be urgently required for the safety of existing works. In paragraph 3 of G.O., 19th June 1875, No. 1,733, it was remarked that District Engineers should be prepared to show, in sending up their Budget Estimates for 1876-77, that they had taken the necessary steps for determining what works most needed to be constructed, but it does not appear that this instruction obtained due attention. They will now submit to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation a list of—

1st, all the Minor New Works for which estimates have been sanctioned showing the expenditure (if any) incurred on each up to the 31st March last, and the outlay contemplated in the current year.

2ndly, the works for which designs and estimates have been prepared, but not yet sanctioned, and the extent to which it is intended or will be practicable to carry them out this year.

Also, another list showing the works which have been ascertained to be required, but for which designs and estimates have not yet been prepared.

The subjoined Forms will be made use of for these lists.

First List.

Names of Irrigation Works.	Description of Minor New Works.	Amount of Estimate.	When sanctioned.	Expenditure up to 31st March 1876.	Expected Outlay in 1876-77.	District Grant of 1876-77.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
19th July 1876. No. 1,819.

Second List.

Names of Irrigation Works.	Description of Minor New Works required.	PROBABLE AMOUNT OF ESTIMATES FOR			Total.
		Surplus Weirs.	Sluices.	Other Minor New Works.	

These lists will be due in the Chief Engineer's office within six weeks after the date of this order, and those received will be reviewed and submitted by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation two months after that date.

(True Extract.)

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

To District Engineers concerned.
To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Rd. W. H. French.
Spare Copies

Encl. 1.

11:40. W.
Submitted for the information
of Government. 04087. —
The statement has been de-
layed by the receipt of the
returns from Madras, the
entries opposite which District
have to prevent further delay been
filled up from the Progress Report.
The general results shown
by the statement are as follows:
Districts which expenditure has
fallen short of grant and allot.
Districts which expenditure has
exceeded grant and allotment. Difference.

Madras 39,000 59,000 20,000 x 5465.
Madrass 17,500 17,447 53.
Coimbatore 58,000 48,000 10,000 x 3439.
Tamilnadu 39,000 48,000 9,000 x 1309.
Presidency 30,000 30,000 0 x 575.
South Arcot 11,000 80,000 69,000 x 3367.
Madrass 18,500 48,500 30,000 x 1158.
District in which the outlay was less
and over.

than the grants but in excess of
allotments

Salem - 58,000 - 50,000 - 52,380 - 380
Coimbatore - 73,000 - 70,000 - 64,840 - 18,840

Districts in which expenditure ex-
ceeded grants, but was within the
allotments

Trichinopoly - 88,000 - 90,000 - 89,900 - 100
Malabar - 11,000 - 1,700 - 1,708 - 292

Districts in which expenditure exceeded
both grants and allotments

Grant. allotment. Expenditure. Differences

Godavery - 172,000 - 201,000 - 215,277 - 14,277

Kistna - 1,27,000 - 1,62,000 - 1,63,263 - 32,263

Kithore - 71,000 - 84,000 - 85,243 - 14,243

Beltary - 23,000 - 30,000 - 63,346 - 13,346

Chingleput - 110,000 - 120,000 - 122,999 - 22,999

North Arcot - 132,000 - 132,000 - 134,627 - 2,627

Tanjore - 196,000 - 146,687 - 179,422 - 30,735

Tinnevely - 98,200 - 1,45,200 - 1,08,402 - 36,800

The total grant was Rs. 1,41,67,800

Allotment - 1,41,67,800

Expenditure - 1,52,33,698

Excess above grant - 76,314

The District Engineer, Ganjam, has
afforded no satisfactory explanation
of short expenditure, though he
applied for and received allotments
to the full amount of the grant.
He attributes short outlay to
damage done by floods and want
of labour. The sum mentioned
is 14 per cent of the grant.

In Nizagapatam the difference
is actually 3 per cent.

The Buddapah statement is
blank as regards explanation
of short outlay, which was 14
per cent in allotments and 23
per cent in grant. The outlay in
1874-75 was 16 per cent short of the
grant.

In Kurnool the expenditure ap-
proximated closely to the grant,
though 1,309 Rupees of the allotment
remained unspent.

The short outlay in the Presidency

district was due to delay in settling
implementation and to the dryness
of the weather preventing turfing
and grass planting being executed.
South of the district the outlay was
21 per cent less than the allotment
and 34.5 per cent below the grant.
The explanation given is "The balance
under repairs was left in the hands
of the District Engineer, Mr. O'Riordan
and the Executive Engineer, Mr. O'Riordan
and it is supposed that this
remark applied to outlay short
of the allotment, it would not
explain the very inadequate pro-
gress compared with the grant.
The district was in a very in-
sufficient state when the present
District Engineer joined about the
middle of the year. Cholera which
was prevalent had also some
effect on progress.
In Madras the difference is not

important.

Explanation of short outlay in
districts in which allotments to
the full amount of the grant were
not applied for were clearly necessary.
In Salem the allotments were
slightly exceeded, but the expenditure
fell short by 13 per cent of the
grant. It would take many years
to put all the Salem irrigation
works to rights were the grant
doubled and fully utilized. There
has been a great want of energy
in this district for a long time.

The outlay in Coimbatore was
Rupees 8000 or 11.8 per cent less
than the grant, but greatly in
excess of the allotments. The
explanation given as regards
short expenditure is that it was
chiefly due to the Caroor Range
Officer not expending the amount
placed to his credit and failing

20.24.4.76.1023
 27-74-1779
 75-1788
 25-8-2484
 14.12-3520

1870 Repair
 N. 90. W.

The Chief Engineer

The Secy to Govt

Dated 22 June 1876
 Received 21 July

Enclosure

Statement of Expenditure
 M. N. Works & Repairs, et
 — Submits, with rema
 for March 1876.

K 297

Read on Oct 26-76
 Retd 18.7.76
 Cir-12-7-76. H. Shet

L. Form No. 22.

July 1876
 No 1819

177

Public Works Department.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 19 July 76

Read the following:—

From the Chief Engr for
 Mysore

H. dated 22 June 76

The statement of
 expenditure on Repairs
 and Minor New Works
 for March last shows
 that in the year 1875-76
 the variations from the
 Budget grants for
 repairs were numerous
 and that in the case
 of several Districts
 the progress made was
 far from satisfactory.
 Cuddapah, South Arcot,
 Salem and Coimbatore
 are the Districts in
 which the failure to

utilize the funds provided in the Budget is most marked.

2. Referring to the similar statements for G.O. 3rd July 1874. No 1749
March 1874 and 1875 " 19 June 1875. " 1733

it is to be noticed that in Buddapak and Salem there was a similar absence of proper progress with this important description of work.


	Budget Grant	Expenditure	
Buddapak	65,000	28,672	} 1873-74
Salem	53,000	30,357	
Buddapak	65,000	54,278	} 1874-75
Salem	53,000	39,905	
Buddapak	58,000	44,561	} 1875-76
Salem	58,000	50,380	

The attention of District Engineers has been repeatedly called to the subject, and His Grace the Governor

198

in Council ~~cannot~~ permit ~~warnings~~ to remain unheeded. For the current year the Budget grants have been placed at the disposal of District Engineers and if at end of the first half of the year the expenditure in Districts in which the progress in 1875-76 is shown to have been unsatisfactory should indicate want of energy and good management it will be necessary to take such notice as short coming as will serve to convince the officers and subordinates concerned that their position in the Department must depend upon the success

with which these and other duties are performed. It is observed that in nearly all the Districts in which the grants for the repair of irrigation works have not been worked out, the total outlay on Public Works was small, and the District Engineers cannot therefore be relieved of direct responsibility for unsatisfactory results in connection with any of the works for which funds were provided. To ascertain the explanations regarding short outlays, whenever any have been submitted, are for the most part very inadequate, and seem to show either a want of knowledge of the facts



21 9
or a very erroneous apprehension of the duty of a District Engineer in connection with all Public Works operations under his supervision. From month to month every District Engineer should be completely acquainted with everything that is going on in his District, and whenever any particular work or description of work is found to be making inadequate progress, it is his duty to personally investigate the circumstances and apply a suitable remedy.
4. In eight Districts the expenditure on Repairs is shown to have been much in

excess of the grants which, so far as there had been regularly supplemented, indicates an satisfactory and commendable degree of energy, but in five out of eight districts the outlay was greatly in excess also of the allotments made available as to show that due attention was not paid to the selection and arrangement of work to be done with reference to the money at the disposal of the District officers. In Tanjore especially great attention was exhibited to the requirements of the rules relating to expenditure, and complete regularity as regards

appropriation prior to expenditure being incurred will be expected for the future. The repair grant for 1876-77 has been increased to Rupees $15\frac{1}{4}$ lakhs, and District Engineers will take care that, while on the one hand arrangements are made for carrying out repairs to existing work as can be put into proper order within the allotments to the several districts, on the other hand no excess outlay whatever is permitted to take place without the express sanction of Government, and a corresponding provision of additional funds.

5. The special attention of all District Engineers should be given to the

judicious and full utilization of the minor new works grant of 1876-77. Although in 1875-76 the total grant was slightly exceeded, this was due mainly to the sections made with success in a few districts. The sums yet made available is so small, and the need of the provision of adequate surplus moneys and advances so great and almost universal, that in every district the real difficulty cannot be to spend the allotments made, but to find the means of carrying into execution more than a very few of the improvements known to be urgently



25 // required for the safety of existing works. In para 3 of G.O. 19th June 1875, No. 1733, it was remarked that District Engineers should be prepared to show, in sending up their Budget estimates for 1876-77, that they had taken the necessary steps for determining what works must be constructed, but it does not appear that this instruction obtained due attention. They will now submit to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation a list of
1st all the minor new works for which estimates have been sanctioned showing the expenditure

for these lists.
First List.

Names of Irrigation Works.	Description of Minor New Works	Amount of Estimate	When sanc- tioned	Expenditure to 31st March 1876	Expected Outlay in 1876-77	District Grant of 1876-77
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Second List.

Names of Irrigation Works	Description of Minor New Works required	Probable amount of Estimates for-			
		Surplus years	Sluices	Other minor New Works	Total.

These lists will be due
in the Chief Engineer's
Office within 6 weeks after
the date of this order,
and those received will
be reviewed and submitted

(if any) incurred on
each up to the 31st
March last and the
outlay contemplated
in the current year.
2^{ndly} the works for
which designs and
estimates have been
prepared but not yet
sanctioned, and the
extent to which it is
intended or will be
practicable to carry
them out this year.
Also another list showing
the works which have
been ascertained
to be required, but
for which designs
and estimates have
not yet been prepared.
The subjoined forms
will be made use of

Mrs. H. J. Ellis C. 18
 Mrs. S. C. Robinson R. C. S. 1
 Mrs. Grace the fireman

Wm. 1072

24/12/1914

115-10000

2000

N^o 297-298

St. George's concerned ✓
C. E. for St. ✓

5/8/71

R^{te} 18. 7. 76
 Can. 22. 7. 76