

(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. 372 (W)	Press ~~Mis.~~
Dated 7-7-	1877.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

7th July 1877, No 372 W

Buildings and Roads
Civil Works

Read the following paper —/

No 87. From W. S HARRINGTON, Esq., District Engineer, Madura, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Madura, 21st June 1877, No 59

I HAVE the honor to forward copies of correspondence as per margin, and, with reference to the action taken by the Court of Wards, and to my letter to the Collector, respectfully to request the orders of Government as to whether the repairs and improvements to the Bodinaickanoor Minor Zemindar's house at Madura are to be completed under my superintendence. If it is ordered that they are to be my best efforts shall be applied to the task, and I trust that the work may soon be completed in a tolerably satisfactory manner, but I earnestly beg that I may be allowed to employ such extra hands as I may find to be absolutely necessary for the purpose—altogether independent of the Range Officer and Overseer whose services, I with all deference submit, cannot be made available for this altogether extraneous work

From W S HARRINGTON, Esq., District Engineer, Madura, to W McQUHAE, Esq., Collector of Madura, dated Madura, 21st June 1877, No 74

Your Miscellaneous No 47 of the 9th instant

The query put by the Court of Wards as to who is responsible for the grave defects in the construction of the Bodinaickanoor Zemindar's house is a somewhat difficult one to answer. After wading through the mass of correspondence connected with it, I find that Colonel Roberts, when Superintending Engineer of the then 8th Division, originally undertook at your request in April 1872 the repairs to the "bungalow," then estimated to cost Rupees 1,780 only. On the 19th of that month, in reply to your letter, No 680, dated 16th idem, placing this sum at his disposal, Colonel Roberts states that, on inspecting the building, he found it in such an unsatisfactory state that the sum provided in the estimate prepared by the Overseer* was insufficient, and requests to be informed if a further sum of Rupees 2,000 "or so" could be allotted. I do not find your reply to this letter; but that it was replied to is mentioned by Colonel Roberts in his No 2,281, dated 12th August 1872, with which he forwards for sanction a third estimate, this time for Rupees 12,000 "for making the place a proper and fitting residence for a young gentleman of the minor's social position and means." This sum was sanctioned by the Court in the following month (September), and they approve of the plan. In December 1873 Colonel Roberts forwards to you with his No 3,899 a fourth estimate, amounting to Rupees 28,100, in lieu of that just alluded to, the excess over it "is principally due," he states, "to the thorough reconstruction of the front building instead of the additional story as was originally intended." The Consulting Architect

* M Chockalingam Pillai now employed as a Sub-Overseer in the Meylur Taluk

to Government now first appears upon the scene, for Colonel Roberts states in paragraph 5 of his letter that he "thinks it right to add that the new design for the frontage has been kindly furnished to me" by this officer. In your No 41, dated 14th January 1874, you ask whether this large estimate cannot be reduced, adding that when you approved of the undertaking you "had no idea that any such sum as Rupees 23,100 would be asked for from the Court of Wards." Colonel Roberts in his No 4,415, dated 26th idem, states that any reduction of the estimate is impossible, and gives his reasons, adding that "all the details of the estimate were very carefully gone into by Lieutenant Greer, R.E., who took particular pains in preparing a superior description of brick for the main buildings." The Court of Wards in their Miscellaneous Proceedings No 1,437, dated 25th February 1874, sanction this estimate, which on the 21st of the following month is forwarded to Supervisor Mooneappah Pillai, then in charge of the Madura Range, "for vigorous prosecution," the remark being added that, "considering the large amount of the sanctioned estimate, it must be distinctly understood that there must be no excess on the estimate." On the 2nd of February 1876, Colonel Fischer, who had succeeded Colonel Roberts as District Engineer, submits with his No 434 a comparative statement showing that a further sum of Rupees 4,815 is required to complete the building, and remarking that "Colonel Roberts had ordered several changes to be made." He was unaware on what grounds, but in paragraph 3 Colonel Fischer states that, at the request of the minor and with your approval, he (Colonel Fischer) ordered "certain changes to be made, and so long ago as May 29th, 1875, he directed a revised estimate to be prepared, which was only sent to him on the 18th instant" (sic), and he concludes his letter by requesting sanction for the amount of Rupees 4,815, "so that the work may go on at last." For these two last years Mr Paynter has been the officer entrusted with the execution of the work, "Soobroyaloo Naidoo," a very careless and extravagant man, being the working Overseer.

2 On the 8th May 1876 your successor, Mr Blais, forwarded this estimate of Rupees 4,815 to the Court of Wards, who in their reply say that "before sanctioning it they desire to be informed if it provides for everything required." Mr Paynter is desired by Colonel Fischer on the 18th idem to answer this query which he does on the 21st to the effect that it would have provided for everything required, but that some damage was done (by a storm) on the night of the 15th May, necessitating a further expenditure of Rupees 480, for which accordingly an estimate is submitted, this sum Colonel Fischer informs Mr Paynter in reply should be met from "savings or the ordinary five per cent on the sanctioned amount," and addressing the latter again on the 28th of June he says, in reply to a question from that officer dated the 7th idem, that the revised estimate of Rupees 33,460 "provides for everything required towards completing the Bodinaickanoor Minor Zemindar's bungalow at Madura," though he evidently labors under the apprehension that both work and accounts are not in quite a satisfactory or explainable state, as he remarks that "the comparative statement shows the omissions in the original estimate, the alterations made by Colonel Roberts, and the additions made at the request of the Zemindar," and that he has "endeavored to get a full account of the exact cost as well as I could from the state of the works, and I trust the work will soon be finished for the above sum." From the above date the work appears to have dragged its slow length along Rupees 610-13-5, being the expenditure of four months unreported upon by any one till the 8th of November last when Colonel Fischer visited it, and remarking on the dilatory way in which it was being conducted requested the Range Officer (Mr Paynter) to explain how it was being carried out. I do not find any answer to this question, but on the 6th March last, I having taken charge of the district from Colonel Fischer on the 18th December previous, I was requested by you "to state when the Bodinaickanoor Minor Zemindar's house will be ready for occupation." On the 9th of March I forwarded copy of your memorandum to Mr Paynter for immediate report, that officer replying on the 23rd idem states that "the work was stopped by him last January at the personal request of the Consulting Architect. Being much harassed with other work at the time I did not inquire what Mr Chisholm's powers were, and if he was in charge of the work, but from his authoritative action I concluded that he, and not I, had charge of it."

3 After this long preamble, which I have deemed it necessary to make for the full information of Government to whom I refer the entire question as I cannot think that they are acquainted with it in its various phases, I have now to state that I have not understood, and do not now understand, my position with regard to the construction of this building. The District Engineer is apparently held responsible by the Court of Wards for defects in it, but the Consulting Architect comes to Madura on three different occasions (perhaps on more) and gives his own orders to the Executive Engineer of the Range and the Departmental Overseer, the District Engineer under whose orders they both are and who may have, and has, other and far more important work for them to attend to not being even referred to. I am sure that the Consulting Architect who is a personal friend of mine and whose work and general talents I hold in high estimation deemed that he was not out of order in giving these instructions, but I do not find any where on the records that he had the authority of Government for giving them.

4 I presume that when Colonel Roberts was first asked (apparently as a kind of favor) if he would undertake the repairs originally estimated to cost but Rupees 1,780 he acquiesced because the work was trifling and could be done and supervised by this department. It seems to

have entirely escaped his notice, and I may add that of the Court of Wards and yourself that the extensive improvements and alterations afterwards estimated for and amounting first to Rupees 2,000 extra, then to Rupees 12,000, then to Rupees 28,100, and finally to Rupees 33,460, and on which Colonel Roberts would appear to have entered *con amore*, taxed far too much of the time of the one Public Works Department Officer and the Departmental Overseer who was then in charge of the town works. A few months after Colonel Fischer took charge of the district, this one man was ordered to look after both town and taluq works, and from that time the expenditure gradually decreased, Rupees 16,170 having been spent while Colonel Roberts was Superintending (or District) Engineer, and but Rupees 9,530 during Colonel Fischer's incumbency. Both officer and subordinate had their own legitimate duties to perform, and very heavy and multifarious they were and are, and I presume to state positively my opinion that, to absolutely ensure the proper construction of the building, it should have had the undivided time and attention of an officer or superior upper subordinate specially deputed for the purpose, even when the first revised estimate of Rupees 12,000 was sent in. Had this been done, and his salary charged in whole or in part to the Zemindar's estate the work should have been quickly carried out to completion, the cost would not have been what it is now likely to be, and the Zemindar would have been safely housed in his new domicile long ere this.

5 I do not consider that merely because I am District Engineer of Madura I am bound by any action of Colonel Roberts, and I think it due to myself to notice the results that have ensued from that officer's action, neither can I think that I am under the orders of the Court of Wards, the Consulting Architect, or yourself. I say this in no carping or cantankerous spirit, but I say it nevertheless, and in soliciting the orders of Government regarding the completion of this building I have respectfully requested them, if I am ordered to supervise it, to allow me to employ such extra superintendence as I may find to be necessary—the work to be directed by a thoroughly good and experienced upper subordinate or overseer who shall have this work and this only to attend to.

6 I can only reply to the question put by the Court of Wards as to who is responsible for the grave defects in the construction of the building by stating that the upper wall of the back verandah alluded to in the first part of Mr Chisholm's letter to the Court as unstable in the highest degree was built in 1876, at which time Mr Paynter was the Range Officer who supervised its construction, and Overseer "Soobroyaloo Naidoo" the working subordinate.


7 With regard to the remark made by the Court, as per margin, if I am the District Engineer referred to, I must entirely disown the impeachment, as already stated the work was stopped immediately after my arrival in the district by Mr Chisholm's orders and has never been resumed. I paid only one, and that quite a non-official, visit to the building with you on the 1st of February last, but I did not examine, much less "personally inspect," it. I may have remarked casually to you that some of the work was fairly done, which it was, but as I knew nothing whatever of the building and had not looked at any part of it, nor even at the plan and estimate, conceiving as I then did that it was entirely under Mr Chisholm, any remark I may have made was not made in my official capacity. I was not asked for my opinion on the whole work as an Engineer, Civil or District, had I been I should of course have called for plans and estimates, and have gone very minutely into the question, and I hope and believe that in that case the defects which have attracted Mr Chisholm's notice could not have escaped mine. I in fact noticed others on a somewhat careful inspection of the work this morning.

Proceedings of the Court of Wards, dated 31st May 1877, No 2,505

From R F CHISHOLM, Esq, Consulting Architect to Government, to the Secretary, Court of Wards, dated Madura, 4th May 1877

With reference to the Court's Proceedings, dated the 12th ultimo, I have the honor to state that I minutely inspected the Bodinaickanoor Rajah's residence both yesterday and to-day. The particular point which caught my eye as being unstable during my last visit I have now no hesitation in pronouncing unstable in the highest degree. It is the upper wall of the back verandah. I enclose a sketch elevation and section in order that the Court may themselves judge of the instability. The verandah consists of semi-circular arches in a 15-inch wall supported by upright stone columns rough dressed varying in diameter from 8 inches to 10 inches and set on end. I learnt on the work that this portion actually fell in May 1876, and I regret to say that it has been built up again without any alteration of design. The official

report states that the wall was "blown down," but the meteorological observations both before and after the 16th of May do not appear to exhibit anything unusual. The Overseer states that the verandah fell because the roof was not on, probably assisted by a gust of wind.




Date	RAIN		WIND	
	Inches.	Velocity in 24 hours	Direction	
8th	0 000	85	S S E	
9th	...	53	E by S	
10th	...	63	S by E.	
11th	...	46	S W	
12th	0 340	64	South.	
13th	0 000	54	S E by S	
14th	...	59	S W	
15th	0 188	75	S W	
16th	0 106	68	West	
17th	0 000	34	W by S	
18th	...	81	...	

The roof will hold the top of the wall and by its weight will prevent any catastrophe until the centre of gravity moves without the base when the whole thing will again collapse.

That this action is slowly going on I am convinced from the following measurements accurately taken by myself. There are four of these columns and piers. I measured the point A at the top of the verandah and the point B above the pillar cap over every column.


Above the first pier A measured 8' 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " & B 8' 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ "
 " second " 8' 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " 8' 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ "
 " third " 8' 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " 8' 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ "
 " fourth " 8' 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " 8' 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ "



applying a plumb = bob for confirmation, I found every pier "buckling" to the extent of from 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ inches to 2 inches.

The plan which shows no details of any kind nevertheless has circles marked for this verandah 1 foot 6 inches in diameter, and the Overseer could not satisfactorily explain why these dimensions were departed from.

Considering that the piers of the lower back verandah are now bearing 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ tons per foot superficial (3 tons I consider the maximum safe weight for country brick) I would not advise the Court to attempt to remedy the defects pointed out by supplementing the arches with triplets,



and so throwing more weight on the lower piers. I would recommend the substitution of the plan which I now submit for wooden supports and venetians. The specification describes the work in detail.

The original drawing is so meagre that it will be impossible in my opinion to turn out a neat piece of work. I have therefore made out a drawing correcting as far as possible defects which I noticed. The staircases are thrust away in corners, and at present the Overseer has a somewhat vague idea of how the roof is to be reached. The ends of the house are dead walls which convey the idea of a State Prison. As the object of the Court is to get the work out of hand without additional cost, I have allowed these matters to stand unaltered.

Pending the decision of the Court I have requested the Executive Engineer and the Overseer to go on with the work of the bungalow within the compound.

COMMUNICATED to the Collector of Madura who will report who is responsible for the grave defects in the construction of the Bodinaickanoor Zemindar's house. The Court were recently given to understand that the building had been carefully inspected by the District Engineer and the work pronounced to have been "very fairly done." The Court cannot reconcile this statement with Mr Chisholm's report, and consider that the execution of the work is not at all creditable to the officials who have been engaged on it.

2 The Court are much obliged to Mr Chisholm for his inspection and report, and direct that his suggestions be adopted and his instructions strictly adhered to.

(True Copy and Extract)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Sub-Secretary.

Miscellaneous No. 47.

COMMUNICATED to the District Engineer who is requested to answer the question asked by the Court of Wards and to follow the directions contained in paragraph 2 of the Court's Proceedings.

SHAMBAGANOO,
9th June 1877

(Signed) W. McQUHAE,
Collector.

No. 88.

ORDER THEREON, 7th July 1877, No. 372 W.

THE Government do not consider that the District Engineer can properly or satisfactorily supervise such work in addition to his legitimate duties. They will not, however, object to the Government Architect being asked to scrutinize any drawing or specification which may be prepared for the building.

2 The establishments already employed under the supervision of Public Works Officers have, it is presumed, been paid for by the estate.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

To the District Engineer, Madura.
 " Consulting Architect
 " Court of Wards
 " Revenue Department.

Exd. C. Howarth.
Spare Copies

2 questions arise
1st how to complete -
I consider the order of 1872
plainly the order of 1872
the (1st) plans from the
completing revision
or more or less complete
being written from any
alteration in the order
simply to complete the
+ make the order of 1872
complete.

2nd continuing officers - By the
+ the subcommittee - did
the first recall the order
any order in the mean
time.

By the subcommittee
the order of 1872
the order of 1872
the order of 1872
the order of 1872

to be by the order
the order of 1872
the order of 1872
the order of 1872
the order of 1872

the order of 1872
the order of 1872
the order of 1872
the order of 1872
the order of 1872

Letter from the District Engineer
Madura N^o 59 d/ 21st June 1877.

FOR ORDERS

Nothing is known
of this subject in the
Public Works Secretariat,
the Court of Wards having
apparently placed them-
selves in direct commun-
ication with Public Works
Officers.

E A Mrs Colonel F. E.

Secy: to Govt. P.M.O.

The Gr. Co. does not appear
to have been paid.

Peter upon the
 St. Bonds for their
 remarks. adding
 that the Gov. will
 be subject to the
 Eng. being to the
 completion of the
 building if desired
 by them. & that
 he would say that the
 estate must provide
 the necessary & education
 estate.

Revenue 1877 Depaile
Madura

No. 3428
P.W. Snowy. July 1771 at 4200

Proceedings of the
County of Wards
July 24th (July 1477)
Recd 25th -
W.L.
S.M.P.

to J. L. Brown in the
 further - or I have
 the business of paying
 for the work done
 It is the presumption
 that those employed
 have been paid for
 by the estate.

Yours
 L. B.

I am sorry to hear
 that the work done
 for the estate has not
 been paid for. It is the
 presumption that those
 employed have been paid
 for by the estate. I am
 sorry to hear that the
 work done for the estate
 has not been paid for.
 It is the presumption
 that those employed
 have been paid for by
 the estate. I am sorry
 to hear that the work
 done for the estate has
 not been paid for. It is
 the presumption that
 those employed have
 been paid for by the
 estate. I am sorry to
 hear that the work
 done for the estate has
 not been paid for.

District Engineer's office
 No: 74 Madras 21 June 1877
 From
 W. S. Harrington Esqre
 District Engineer Madras

To
 W. Mc Lachlan Esqre
 Collector of Madras
 Your Mis: No: 47 of the 9th instant
 Sir

The query put by the Court of
 Wards as to who is responsible for the
 grave defects in the construction of the
 Bodinaickanur zemindar's house is a
 somewhat difficult one to answer - After
 wading through the mass of correspondence
 connected with it, I find that Colonel
 Roberts when Superintending Engineer of
 the then 8th Division originally undertook
 at your request in April 1872, the repairs
 to the "Bungalow" then estimated to cost
 Rs (1780) one thousand seven hundred and
 eighty only - On the 19th of that month in
 reply to your letter No: 680 dated 16th Idem
 placing this sum at his disposal Colonel

Roberts states that on inspecting the Building
he found it in such an unsatisfactory
state that the sum provided in the Estimate
prepared by the overseer was insufficient
and requests to be informed if a further
sum of Rs (2000) two thousand "or so" could be
allotted - I do not find your reply to this
letter but that it was replied to is mentioned
by Colonel Roberts in his no: 2281 dated
12th August 1872, with which he forwards
for sanction a third Estimate - this time
for Rs (12,000) twelve thousand "for making the
place a proper and fitting residence for a
"young gentleman of the minor's social
"position and means" - this sum was sanctioned
by the Court in the following month (Sep-
tember) and they approve of the plan
In December 1873 Colonel Roberts forwards to
you with his no: 2899 a fourth Estimate
amounting to Rs (28,100) twenty eight thousand
and one hundred in lieu of that just alluded
to - the excess over it "is principally due" he
states "to the thorough reconstruction of the
"front building instead of the additional story

* M. Chelakalingam
Pillai now employed
as a sub overseer
in the Meylan
Taluk.

as was originally intended". The Consulting
Architect to Government now first appears
upon the scene - for Colonel Roberts, states in
para 5 of his letter that he "thinks it might
"to add that the new design for the frontage
has been kindly furnished to me" by this
officer. In your no: 41 dated 14th January
1874, you ask whether this large estimate
cannot be reduced, adding that when you
approved of the undertaking you "had no
"idea that any such sum as Rs (28,100)
"twenty eight thousand and one hundred was
"he asked for from the Court of Wards" - Col
Roberts in his no: 4415 dated 26th Idem,
states that any reduction of the Estimate
is impossible and gives his reasons, adding
that "all the details of the Estimate were
"very carefully gone into by Messrs Green & Co.
"who took particular pains in preparing a
"superior description of bricks for the main
"buildings" - The Court of Wards in their
Miscellaneous Proceedings no: 1437 dated 25th
February 1874, sanction this Estimate which
on the 21st of the following month is
forwarded to supervisor Mooneappa Pillai
then in charge of the Madhav Range
"for rigorous prosecution" the remark being

added that "considering" the large amount
of the sanctioned Estimate, it must be
"distinctly understood that there must be
no excess on the estimate" - On the 2nd of
February 1876, Colonel Fischer who had
succeeded Colonel Roberts as District Engineer
submits with his No: 434 a comparative
statement showing that a further sum of
Rs (4815) four thousand eight hundred
and fifteen is required to complete the
building and remarking that "Colonel Roberts
had ordered several changes to be made"
he was unaware on what grounds - but
in para 3 Colonel Fischer states that at
the request of the Minor and with your
approval he (Col: Fischer) ordered "certain
changes to be made and so long ago
as May 29th 1875; he directed a revised
"Estimate to be prepared which was only
sent to him on the 18th instant" (sic) and
he concludes his letter by requesting sanction
for the amount Rs (4815) four thousand
eight hundred and fifteen "so that the
work may go on at last" - for these two
last years Mr Paynter has been the
officer entrusted with the execution of the
work "Sobroyaloo Kaidoo" a very careless and

extravagant man being the working overseer
2. On the 8th May 1876 your successor
Mr Bliss forwarded this Estimate of Rs
(4815) four thousand eight hundred and fif-
teen to the Court of Wards who in their reply
say that "before sanctioning it they desire
"to be informed if it provides for every
"thing required" - Mr Paynter is desired
by Colonel Fischer on the 18th Idem to
answer this query which he does on the
21st to the effect that it would have
provided for every thing required - but
that some damage was done (by a storm)
on the night of the 15th May necessitating
a further expenditure of Rs (480) four hundred
and eighty, for which accordingly an esti-
mate is submitted - this sum Colonel Fischer
informs Mr Paynter in reply should be
met from "Savings or the ordinary five per
cent on the sanctioned amount" - and addressing
the latter again on the 28th of June he says
in reply to a question from that officer
dated the 7th Idem that the revised esti-
-mate of Rs (32,460) thirty three thousand
four hundred and sixty "provides for every
"thing required towards completing the

"Kodimaickanur Minor Zemindar's Bungalow
"at Madura" though he evidently takes
under the apprehension that both work and
accounts are not in quite a satisfactory or
explainable state as he remarks that "the
comparative statement shows the omissions
in the original Estimate the alterations made
by Colonel Roberts" and the additions made
at the request of the Zemindar" and that
he has "endeavoured to get a full account
of the exact cost as well as I could from
the state of the works and I trust the work
will soon be finished for the above sum."

From the above data the work appears to
have dragged its slow length along (Rs
610-13-5) six hundred and two annas thirteen
and pies 5 being the expenditure of four
months) unreported upon by any one till
the 8th of November last when Colonel Frisier
visited it and remarking on the dilatory
way in which it was being conducted re-
quested the Range Officer (Mr. Paynter)
to explain how it was being carried out—
I do not find any answer to this question
but on the 6th March last, I having taken
charge of the District from Colonel
Frisier on the 18th December previous, I

was requested by you "to state when the Bo-
"dimaickanur Minor Zemindar's house will
be ready for occupation" on the 9th of March
I forwarded copy of your memo to Mr.
Paynter for immediate report— that officer
replying on the 23rd I then states that "the
work was stopped by him last January at
the personal request of the Consulting Archi-
tect"— Being much harassed with other
work at the time I did not enquire what
Mr. Chisholm's powers were, and ^{if} he was
in charge of the work, but, from his
authoritative action I concluded that he,
and not I, had charge of it—

7. After this long preamble which
I have deemed it necessary to make for
the full information of Government to whom
I refer the entire question as I cannot
think that they are acquainted with it
in its various phases— I have now to state
that I have not understood, and do not
now understand, my position with regard
to the construction of this Building. The
District Engineer is apparently held res-
ponsible by the Court of Wards for defects
in it but the Consulting Architect comes
to Madura on three different occasions

(perhaps or more) and gives his own orders to the Executive Engineer of the Range and the Departmental overseer, — the District Engineer under whose orders they both are and who may have, and has, other and far more important work for them to attend to not being even referred to — I am sure that the Consulting Architect who is a personal friend of mine and whose work and general talents I hold in high estimation deemed that he was not out of order in giving these instructions — but I do not find anywhere on the Records that he had the authority of Government for giving them. —

4 - I presume that when Colonel Roberts was first asked (apparently as a kind of favor) if he would undertake the repairs originally estimated to cost but Rs. (1780) one thousand seven hundred and eighty he acquiesced because the work was trifling and could be done and supervised by this Department — it seems to have entirely escaped his

notice, and I may add that of the Court of Wards and yourself, that the extensive improvements and alterations afterwards estimated for and amounting 1st to Rs. (2000) two thousand (extra) then to Rs. (12,000) twelve thousand, then to Rs. (28,100) twenty eight thousand and one hundred — and finally to Rs. (33,460) thirty three thousand four hundred and sixty, and on which Colonel Roberts would appear to have entered "en amore" taxed far too much of the time of the Mr. P. W. D. officer and the Departmental overseer who was then in charge of the town works — a few months after Colonel Frischer took charge of the District this Mr. man was ordered to look after both town and Taluk works, and from that time the expenditure ^{gradually} decreased — Rs. (16,170) sixteen thousand one hundred and seventy having been spent while Colonel Roberts was Superintending (or District) Engineer and but Rs. (9530) nine thousand five hundred and thirty during Colonel Frischer's incumbency — Both officer and subordinate

had their own legitimate duties to perform, and very heavy and multifarious they were and are, and I presume to state positively my opinion that to absolutely ensure the proper construction of the Building it should have had the undivided time and attention of an officer or superior upper subordinate specially deputed for the purpose, even when the first revised estimate of Rs (12,000) twelve thousand was sent in; had this been done and his salary charged in whole or in part to the Zemindar's Estate the work should have been quickly carried out to completion, the cost would not have been what it is now likely to be, and the Zemindar would have been safely housed in his ^{new} domicile long ere this.

5. I do not consider that merely because I am District Engineer of Madras I am bound by any action of Colonel Roberts and I think it due to myself to notice the results that have ensued from that officer's

action — neither can I think that I am under the orders of the Court of Wards, the Consulting Architect or yourself. I say this in no carping or cantankerous spirit, but I say it nevertheless, and in soliciting the orders of Government regarding the completion of this building I have respectfully requested them, if I am ordered to supervise it, to allow me to employ such extra superintendence as I may find to be necessary — the work to be directed by a thoroughly good and experienced upper subordinate or overseer who shall have the work and this only to attend to.

6. I can only reply to the questions put by the Court of Wards as to who is responsible for the grave defects in the construction of the Building by stating that the upper wall of the back verandah alluded to in the first part of Mr. Chisholm's letter to the Court as unstable in the highest degree was built in 1876 at which time Mr. Paynter was the Range

officer who supervised its construction and over saw "soobroyaloo baidoo" the working subordinates.

With regard to the remarks made by the Court as per margin:

if I am the District Engineer referred to, I must entirely disown the impeachment -

as already stated the work was stopped immediately

after my arrival in the District by Mr Chisholm's orders and has never been

resumed - I paid only one, and that

quite a nonofficial, visit to the Building with you on the 1st of February last but I did not examine

much less "personally inspect" it - I may have remarked casually to you

that some of the work was fairly done -

which it was - but as I knew nothing whatever of the Building and had not

looked at any part of it nor even at the plan and estimate, concerning as

I then did that it was entirely under

"The Court were recently given to understand that the building had been carefully inspected by the District Engineer and the work pronounced to have been very fairly done. The Court cannot reconcile this statement with Mr Chisholm's report and consider that the execution of the work is not at all creditable to the officials who have been engaged in it"

Mr Chisholm, any remark I may have made was not made in my official capacity - I was not asked for my opinion on the whole work as an Engineer, Civil or District; had I been I should of course have called for plans and estimates and have gone very minutely into the question and I hope and believe that in that case the defects which have attracted Mr Chisholm's notice could not have escaped mine - I in fact noticed others, on a somewhat careful inspection of the work this morning.

I have &c

(Signed) W. S. Harrington
District Engineer

(True copy)

W. S. Harrington
District Engineer
Madura

P.W.D.

5 JUN 77

3200

Encls. 2 in a letter from the
Dist. Engineer Madras to the
Chief Engr. D. P. W. no. 59
of 21/12 Inst.

907- July 77 J.B.W. 87

Copy of a letter to
the Collector

No. 2505 Revenue Department

Proceedings of the Court of Wards

Dated 31st May 1877

Read the following

From

The Consulting Architect to Government


To

The Secretary, Court of Wards

Sir,


With reference to the Court's Proceedings
dated the 12th ultimo I have the honor to
state that I minutely inspected the Bodin
Kannor Rajah's Residence both yesterday & today.
The particular point which caught my eye as
being unstable during my last visit I have now
no hesitation in pronouncing unstable in the
highest degree. It is the upper wall of the back
Verandah. I enclosed a Sketch elevation & Section
in order that the Court may themselves judge
of the instability. The Verandah consists of
seven circular arches in a 15 inch wall sup-
ported by upright stone columns rough dressed
varying in diameter from 8 inches to 10 inches
and set on end. I learnt on the work that the

That this action is slowly going on I am



The plan which shows no details of any kind nevertheless has circles marked for the Verandah 1' 6" in diameter and the Overseer could not satisfactorily explain why these dimensions were departed from.

Considering that the piers of the lower
back Verandah are now bearing $2\frac{1}{2}$ Tons per
foot superficial. (3 tons & Consider the
maximum safe weight for Country brick.)
I would not advise the Comtee to attempt to
remedy the defects pointed out by Supple-
menting the arches with triplets.



and so throwing more weight on the lower
 piers I would recommend the substitution
 of the plan which I now submit for wooden
 supports and Venetians. The Specification
 describes the work in detail.

The original drawing is so meagre that it
 will be impossible in my opinion to turn out
 a neat piece of work. I have therefore made
 out a drawing correcting as far as possible
 defects which I noticed. The Chair Cases and
 thrust away in Corners, and at present
 the Reverend has a somewhat vague idea
 of how the roof is to be reached. The ends
 of the house and lead walls which convey
 the idea of a chapel. As the object of
 the Court is to get the work out of hand
 without additional cost, I have allowed
 these matters to stand unaltered.

Pending the decision of the Court I have
 requested the Executive Engineer and the
 Reverend to go on with the work of the Ban-
 -gala within the compound.

I have &c.
 Consulting Architect's Office }
 Camp, Madras } Signed, R. Chisholm
 4th May 1877 } County Architect to Govt

Communicated to the collector of
 Madras who will report who is responsible
 for the grave defects in the construction
 of the Boudha and Anurghama and how
 the Court were recently given to understand
 that the building had been carefully inspect-
 -ed by the District Engineer and the work
 pronounced to have been very fairly done.
 The Court cannot reconcile this statement
 with Mr. Chisholm's report & consider that
 the execution of the work is not at all credit-
 -able to the officials who have been engaged
 on it.

2 The Court are much obliged to Mr.
 Chisholm for his inspection & report and
 direct that his suggestions be adopted
 and his instructions strictly adhered to.

(True Copy & Extract)

1 Signed, to A. Galton
Sub Secretary

No 47 1 True copy 1

Communicated to the District Engineer With 3 original
enclosures
who is requested to answer the question to be returned
asked by the Court of Wards & to follow
the directions contained in para 2 of the
Court's Proceedings.

1 Signed, W. McDermid
Collector
Madras
Collector's Office }
Shembaganoor }
9 June 1877 }

1 True copy 1

W. Harrington
District Engineer

P.W.D.

Enc^{25 JUN 77} 25 JUN 77 In a letter
from the ⁶²⁰⁸ District Engineer
Madras to the Chief
Engineer D P W Madras
No 59 dated 21 June 77

copy of Court
of Ward Progs.

467: July 77 No. 87

No. 59

District Engineer's Office
Madras 21st June 1877

Dispatched 21st — D.

From,

W. S. Harrington Esquire
District Engineer, Madras

To,

Colonel E. A. Ford. R. E.
Chief Engineer D P W. Madras

Enclosures 2.

1 copy of letter to
the collector No 74
dated 21st June 1877

1 copy of Court of
Ward Proceedings
No 2505 dated 31st
May 1877

Sir,

I have the honor to forward copies
of correspondence as per margin and, with
reference to the action taken by the Court of
Wards, and to my letter to the collector, res-
pectfully to request the orders of Government
as to whether the repairs and improvements to
the Podinaickenoor Minor Zemindar's House
at Madras are to be completed under my
superintendence. if it is ordered that they are
to be my best efforts shall be applied to
the task, and I trust that the work may
soon be completed in a tolerably satisfactory
manner. but I earnestly beg that I may be
allowed to employ such extra hands as I may
find to be absolutely necessary for the purpose,
altogether independent of the Range Officer

and Overseers whose services I with all
deference submit cannot be made available
for this altogether extraneous work

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

W. Harrington

District Engineer,
Madura

37A

2

P.W.D.

26 JUN 77

6208⁵⁹

From

The District Engineer
Madura

To

The Chief Engineer
D.R.

Dated 21 June 1877
Received

Enc 2

Boonaidheroor
Minor agricultural
house - reporting
upon the.

967 (July 11) 1877

RA. 2.7.77
2.26.6.77 R.2.7.77.

No 3728

Building & Road

Public Works Department

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 9th July 1877.

Read the following:—

From

The District Engineer
Madura } (L.C. No 59 of 21 June 1877.)

The Government
do not consider that
the District Engineer
can properly or satis-
factorily supervise such
work in addition to
his legitimate duties.
They will not however
object to the Government
Architect being asked
to scrutinize any drawing
or specification which
may be prepared for the
building.

2 The establishments
already employed under
the

RA

the supervision of Public
Works Officers have, it
is presumed, been paid
for by the State.

eat
2/7

Govt. of Madras
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated

Issued

Recd

Encl

G O, 7th July 1877, No 372W

Nos. 87-88

Rodinaickenoor Minor
Zemindar's House at
Madura — Passages
on letter from the District
Commanding Correspondence
regarding the completion
of the repairs & improve-
ments to the —

Entered in Register
24-7-77