

(1) Number of pages 24
 (2) Date of repair 1.9.86
 (3) Initials of the Referencer lady

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Public Works DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	2526.W.	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	15.6.1878	197

Not to be folded or roughly handled

2586
1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

15th June 1878, No. 2,526 W.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

Read the following paper:—

No. 159. From H. UNWIN, Esq., District Engineer, Cuddapah, to the Chief Engineer, Buildings and Roads Branch, dated Cuddapah, 10th June 1878, No. 590.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge your G.O., 13th May 1878, No. 2,137 W, calling for a report on the action to be taken in reference to the delay in preparation of plans and estimates for the Sub-Collector's Cutcherry at Madanapully.

2. To endeavor to find out the chief cause of the delay I have been carefully through the correspondence, and find that from July 1872 up to February 1875 the question of repairs was being discussed, when it was finally decided to have a new building. The plans were furnished to Government in July 1875, being five months in the preparation. They are returned by Government for revision six months afterwards in February 1876, and the enclosed letter from the Range Officer at Madanapully traces the progress up to April 1877, and in September he submitted the estimate to the District Engineer, who forwarded it to Government on 2nd October.

3. It was returned for revision on 12th December and finally submitted on 5th March 1878.

4. It will be observed that at every stage of progress there has been great delay and it is difficult to single out any individual for distinct censure.

5. The two periods of delay in the range office from February to June 1876 and from April to June 1877, were unfortunate; but the explanation given by the Range Officer is satisfactory, coming as it does from an officer whose general punctuality and attention to business is beyond question.

6. The extra amount of work thrown upon the department during the famine was I believe the chief cause of delay, and as the Range Officer states in the last paragraph of his letter, if this estimate had been taken up other matters of equal or greater importance must have been set aside, and judging from the amount of work done in the range during the famine pressure, I do not think the Range Officer is wholly responsible for the delay.

7. The Overseer may be considered blameless in the matter, but the Draughtsman of the range office certainly deserves great censure for his neglect, and my predecessor ordered him to resign in consequence, but, as no applications were made for his appointment, he has been allowed to remain, and I propose, as the Range Officer states he has improved, to fine him Rupees 5 as a warning.

8. I cannot certainly exonerate my own office from all blame, of course it would have been possible to have prevented much of the delay; but in justification I would point out from February 1876 to June 1877 no application was made by the Revenue authorities to expedite the submission of the plans, and I submit that, if the work was of great importance, a reminder should have been sent during that period, and it is hardly fair at the eleventh hour to throw the whole burden of the delay upon this department.

Copy of a letter from the Officer in charge of Madanapully Range, to the District Engineer, Cuddapah, dated 1st June 1878, No. 513.

I HAVE the honor to state, with reference to your No. 471, dated 28th May 1878, that the estimate for Sub-Collector's Cutcherry was returned to this office for revision in February 1876, or two and a half months before I took charge of the range. Nothing was mentioned to me concerning the building by the late Range Officer, and I did not even know whether the estimate was with the Draughtsman or the Overseer.

A reminder was received for the estimate in June 1876, when the District Engineer was in Madanapully and the plans were then looked for but could not be found, and the Draughtsman stated that they had not been received with the estimate from District Engineer. I then wrote for the plans with my docket No. 673, dated 24th June; they were received along with the District Engineer's No. C-64, dated 5th July, as also a data list and specification. I then explained to the Draughtsman all that was required to complete the estimate.

He was busy with irrigation estimates at that time and a good many were forwarded for sanction.

In September he informed me that he had so many irrigation estimates in hand that he had no time to attend to Sub-Collector's Cutcherry estimate, and as we were constantly about that time receiving letters from Chief Engineer for Irrigation regarding unsatisfactory progress on irrigation works, I deemed them the most important and did all I could to get in estimate rapidly for such work. I consequently landed over the Cutcherry estimate to Taluk Overseer, and in my No. 1,384, dated 22nd September 1876, I informed the District Engineer of my having done so and my reasons as above stated; at the same time I requested information upon certain points on which I was doubtful.

The District Engineer replied through his No. 1,450, dated 11th October 1876.

About the latter end of October the Overseer represented to me that he had further difficulties regarding the preparation of the estimate, and stated that in his opinion the foundations of present building were insufficient and that the whole ought to be demolished. I inspected the site on the first opportunity on returning from a tour in the district on the 14th November, and in my diary of that date I recommended that the whole of the present structure should be demolished. I received the District Engineer's approval of this proposal, and in my No. 1,591, dated 2nd December, I wrote to the Overseer telling him to allow in his estimate for demolishing all the old building, deepening the foundations, and rebuilding with stone in chunnai, ending up my letter with the "estimate should now be pushed on with rapidly."

The Overseer submitted the estimate with his No. 2, dated 12th April 1877, and considering that he had a large number of irrigation works in hand requiring constant inspection and measurement, as also the construction of a Post Office and a Taluk Cutcherry, to say nothing of twenty or thirty irrigation estimates which had been called for, and numerous calls upon him for his assistance in laying out and looking after relief-works, I do not think that he can be blamed for not submitting it sooner.

I was in camp in Kadery taluk on April 11th and till the 2nd May. When in camp all letters to my address are opened in head-quarters put up along with their files and sent to me for disposal. I invariably initial every docket that arrives, but on the District Engineer's arrival in Madanapully in June 1876, the estimate was produced from the range office by the Draughtsman the covering docket bearing the date of receipt (13th April) entered by my office hands, but no initial by me. It had never been sent out to me in camp and I had no idea that it had been received. When the District Engineer arrived in Madanapully I was absent on tour, and on my return he told me that he had discovered that the Draughtsman was incompetent and had ordered him to resign, meanwhile giving the estimate to his own Draughtsman to check. The Draughtsman's excuse for not checking the estimate was that his time was so much taken up by preparing weekly road maps for the Sub-Collector to submit to Revenue Board showing the progress made weekly on famine works, that he had no time to commence the Taluk Cutcherry estimate. He resigned in accordance with orders and District Engineer in accepting his resignation said that he would be struck off the strength of the department on the appointment of a successor. The successor has never arrived.

The Draughtsman is a slow but steady and hardworker and has improved considerably lately. Colonel Moberly evidently considered that his excuse about doing work for the Revenue Department in connection with famine maps was not altogether an idle one, for he wrote to the Sub-Collector stating that he could not any longer allow the Draughtsman's time to be taken up in that manner. In deciding upon cases of delay of this sort it ought I think to be borne in mind that this is one of the largest ranges in the Presidency, and that every subordinate in it has much more work than he can possibly get through.

If the staff were doubled it would take some years before all the unanswered references could be cleared off, and it therefore seems to be a mere matter of selection as to which of twenty or thirty important estimates, &c., should be undertaken first. If the Draughtsman had checked

the estimate for the Taluk Cutcherry as soon as it arrived he could only have done so by delaying several irrigation and other estimates for which reminders had been received more often than for the estimate in question, and, so long as he is working his hardest — and I certainly cannot blame him for laziness — he is not, I think, much to be blamed.

No. 160.

ORDER TILBORN, 15th June 1878, No. 2,526 W.

ORDERED to be recorded.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) E. A. FOORD, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

ERL. E. G. SHACKER.
Spurs Copies

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Gobt. of (1878) Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated June 1878.

Direct

Recd.

Recd.

On 15th June 1878 No. 2157 W.

JUNE

No. 155-160.

Madras Public Works, Civil Works. — The
expenditure of the District Engineer about
the delay in the submission of the plans
and estimates for the — recorded with a
2157.

Buildings & Roads

No 590.

District Engineer's Office
Cuddalore - 10th June 1878.

From

The District Engineer
of Cuddalore

To

The Chief Engineer
Buildings and Roads Branch
Madras

By

I have the honor to acknowledge
your G. O. 13th May 1878 No. 2157 W.
calling for a report on the action to be taken
in reference to the delay in preparation of
plans and Estimates for the Sub Collector's
Cutchery at Kandanapally.
In order to find out the chief
cause of the delay I have been carefully
through the correspondence and find that
from July 1872 up to February 1875
the question of repairs was lying

discussed when it was finally decided,
to have a new building. The plans were
furnished to Government in July 1875
being five months in the preparations.
They are returned by Government for
revision six months afterwards in
February 1876 and the enclosed letter
from the Orange officer at Madanapally
traces the progress up to April 1877 and
in September he submitted the Estimate to
the District Engineer, who forwarded it
to Government on 2nd October.

3. It was returned for revision on 12th
December and finally submitted on 5th
March 1878.

4. It will be observed that at every
stage of progress there has been great
delay.

172
delay and it is difficult to single out any
individual for distinct censure. *J. B. H.*

5. The two periods of delay in the Range
office from February to June 1876 and
from April to June 1877 were unfortunate
but the explanation given by the Range
officer is satisfactory coming as it does from
an officer whose general punctuality and
attention to business is beyond question.

6. The extra amount of work thrown upon
the Department during the Famine
was I believe the chief cause of delay
and as the Orange officer states in the last
para of his letter, if this Estimate had been
taken up other matters of equal or greater
importance must have been set aside and
judging from the amount of work done

in the Range during the Famine
pressure I do not think the Range
Office is wholly responsible for the delay.

7. The Overseer may be considered blameless
in the matter but the draughtsmen of the

Range Office certainly deserves great censure
for his neglect and my predecessor ordered

him to resign in consequence but as no
applications were made for his appointment

he has been allowed to remain and I
propose as the Range Office states he has

improved to fine him Rupees five as
a warning.

8. I cannot certainly exonerate my own
Office from all blame, of course it would

have been possible to have prevented much
of the delay but in justification I would

point out from February 1876 to June
1877

1877 no application was made by the
Revenue authorities to expedite the submission
of the plans and I submit that if the
work was of great importance a reminder
should have been sent during that period
and it is hardly fair at the eleventh
hour to throw the whole burden of the
delay upon this Department.

I have the honor to be
— Sir —
Your most Obedient Servant.
D. M. S. S.
District Engineer Cuddalore.

40 No 2137 W 13 May 178
 2 CC 1549 - 16 March 178
 " 339 - 18 Jan 178
 4 " 4416 - 12 Dec 177
 " 120 - 19 Jan 178
 " 237 - 3 Feb -
 " 524 - 13 July 174
 7 40 No 195 - 29 March 176
 " 797 - 20 March 178
 " 117 - 13 Feb -
 " 9 - 1 Dec 174
 " 3081 - 29 Aug 174
 " 1666 - 11 July 172

Buildings and Roads

From

The District Engineer
of Madras

To

The Chief Engineer
Buildings & Roads Branch
Madras

Dated 10th } June 1878.
 Recd

No 590
 Enclosure 1 (encl.)
 Sub Collector's Cutcherry
 at Madras

Report to the action
 taken on the delay in the
 preparation of the plans
 and Estimates of

To acty 11-6-78

By 11-6-78

Copy of a letter from the officer in
 charge of Madrasapally Range to
 the District Engineer Madras, dated
 1st June 1878 No 313.

I have the honor to state with refer-
 -ence to your letter 4th 11 of 28th May 1878,
 that the Estimate for Sub Collector's Cut-
 -cherry was returned to this office for re-
 -vision in February 1876, or 2¹/₂ months
 before I took charge of the Range. Nothing
 was mentioned to me concerning the
 building by the late Range officer and
 I did not even know whether the Estimate
 was with Draughtsman or the Curator.

A reminder was received for
 the Estimate in June 1876, when the Dis-
 -trict Engineer was in Madrasapally
 and the plans were then looked for,
 but could not be found and the

Draughtsman stated that they had not been received with the Estimate from District Engineer. I then wrote for the plans with my docket. No 673 of 24th June, they were received along with the District Engineer's. No 674 of 5th July as also a data list and Specification. I then explained to the Draughtsman all that was required to complete the Estimate.

He was busy with Irrigation Estimates at that time and a good many were forwarded for sanction.

In September he informed me that he had so many irrigation Estimates on hand that he had no time to attend to Sub Collector's Estimate.

about that time receiving letters from Chief Engineer for my opinion regarding unsatisfactory progress on Irrigation works, I showed them the best important and did all I could to get an Estimate rapidly for such work. He consequently handed over the Lutcherry Estimate containing survey and survey of 1384 of 22nd September 1878. I informed the District Engineer of my having done so and my reasons as above stated; at the same time I requested information upon certain points on which I was doubtful.

The District Engineer replied through his No 1450 of 4th October 1878.

About the latter end of October the Quarter represented to me that

he had further difficulties regarding
the preparation of the Estimate and
stated that in his opinion the founda-
-tions of present building were insuffi-
-cient and that the whole ought to
be demolished. I suggested the site on
the 1st opportunity on returning from
a tour in the District on the 14th Dec^r
-ember and in my Diary of that
date I recommended that the whole of
the present structure should be demolish-
-ed. I received the District Engineer's
approval of this proposal and in my
No. 1871 of 2^d December, I wrote to the
Quartermaster telling him to allow in his
Estimate for demolishing all the old build-
-ing deepening the foundations and
rebuilding with stone in Chumam.

sending up my letter with the Estimate
should now be flashed ^{off} with
speed!

The Quartermaster submitted the Estimate
with his No. 2 of 12th April 1877 and
Considering that he had a large num-
-ber of Irrigation works in hand
requiring constant inspection and
measurement as also the construction
of a Post office and a Salug batcherry
to say nothing of 20 or 30 Irrigation Esti-
-mates which had been called for, and
numerous calls upon him for his assist-
-ance in laying out and looking after
Relief works; I do not think that he
can be blamed for not submitting
it sooner.

I was in Camp in Sindoy Salug
on April 11 and till the 2^d May.

When in Camp all letters to my self
- dress are opened in Head Quarters
put up along with their files and sent
to me for disposal. I invariably in-
- deal every docket that arrives, but
on the District Engineer's arrival in
Madanapally in June 1876, the Esti-
- mate was produced from the Range
Office by the Draughtsman the Cover-
- ing docket bearing the date of receipt
(13th April) entered by my office hands
but no initial by me. It had never
been sent out to me in Camp and
I had no idea that it had been re-
- ceived. When the District Engineer
arrived in Madanapally I was
absent on tour and on my return

that the Draughtsman was in ^{charge}
- tent and had ordered him to re-
- sign, meanwhile giving the Estimate
to his own Draughtsman to check the
Draughtsman's excuse for not check-
- ing the Estimate was that his time
was so much taken up by preparing
weekly road maps for the Sub-
- Collector to submit to Revenue Board
showing the progress made weekly
on famine works; that he had no
time to commence the Sub-Collector's
Estimate. He resigned in accordance
with orders and District Engineer
in accepting his resignation said
- that he would be struck off the
strength of the Department on the
appointment of a successor. The suc-

successor has never arrived.

The Draughtsman is a slow but steady and hard worker and has improved considerably lately and I only suddenly considered that his excuse about doing work for the Revenue Department in connection with famine maps was not altogether an idle one for he wrote to the Sub Collector stating that he could not any longer allow the Draughtsman's time to be taken up in that manner. In deciding upon cases of delay of this sort I ought I think to be borne in mind that this is one of the largest Ranges in the Presidency and that every Subordinate in it has much more work than he can possibly get through.

If the staff were doubled it would take some years before all ^{of} the answered references could be cleared off and it therefore comes to be a mere matter of selection as to which of 20 or 30 important Estimates ^{etc.} should be undertaken first. If the Draughtsman had checked the Estimate for the Tulay Cutcherry as soon as it arrived he could only have done so by delaying several Irrigation and other Estimates for which reminders had been received more often than for the Estimate in question and so long as he is working his hardest and certainly cannot blame him for laziness, he is not I think much to be blamed.

Yours truly
D. M. S.

B. J. H.
Clock

No 2066 Public Works Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 14 June 1878 J. J. K.
Read the following:—

From the Sdho. Cuddapah (P. R. No 590 30 June 78)

Ordered to be re-
corded.

MA

Enclosure in Letter
No 590 of 10th June
1878 from the District
Engineer Cuddapah.

Note.
There has undoubtedly
been great delay in the pre-
paration of the plans and
estimates, but the corre-
spondence now submitted
shows that there was much
work to be done of a more
urgent character. The
Draftsman should have
been more closely super-
vised by the Range Officer.
The delay however

has been productive of no
inconvenience, as funds
are not available for
the construction of the
building.

Wt 14/8

2526
12

Apr 14-1878. Pte 15-17
and 18-19

6558

Dist. of (1878) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Amount

Recd.

Exch.

U. O. 15 June 1878, No. 2526 W

No. 15960

Mundanaipally Cutchery. Adolph

The explanation of the delay in the submission of the Plan & Estimate for the work recorded ~~in the~~

Intd. Rep.