Archives 1—10,000—6-10-76.

(1) Number of pages 34

(2) Date of repair 13.11.86

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. ~~B.P. No.~~ 2653 W

Press. ~~Mis.~~

Dated 22.10.1879 ~~197~~

Not to be folded or roughly handled

2653

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

22nd October 1879, No. 2,653 W.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

Read the following papers:—

No. 41. From the Superintending Engineer, Second Circle, dated 18th December 1878, No. 878.
From do. do., dated 15th August 1879, No. 2,086.
From do. do., dated 10th September 1879, No. 2,465.

No. 42. ORDER THEREON, 22nd October 1879, No. 2,653 W.

WITH his letter No. 2,465, dated 10th September 1879, the Superintending Engineer, Second Circle, submits a revised estimate, in the form of a comparative statement, amounting to Rupees 34,222, for the taluk cutcherry and out-houses at Kanyagiri in the Nellore district, a work, the expenditure on which is shown as objectionable in the monthly statements submitted to Government by the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

2. It is observed that an estimate, amounting to Rupees 11,334, was first sanctioned for this work in G.O., No. 1,794, dated 21st June 1864.

3. It having been subsequently decided to build Taluk Cutcherries in accordance with the standard plans sanctioned in G.O., No. 232, dated the 23rd April 1872, a fresh estimate, amounting to Rupees 20,900, was substituted for the one first sanctioned, *vide* G.O., No. 2,539, dated 17th October 1873.

4. A first revised estimate amounting to Rupees 29,650, or Rupees 9,390 in excess of the original, was sanctioned in G.O., No. 3,229, dated 12th November 1875, the excess being due to alterations and additions authorised by Government subsequent to the commencement of the work, insufficiency as regards quantities and rates, and omissions in the original estimate.

5. The necessity for a second revised estimate, which the Superintending Engineer now submits, arose in March 1878, in which month the outlay was first reported to Government as objectionable. This second revised estimate, amounting to Rupees 34,222, is in excess of the first revised by Rupees 4,572, and as the expenditure has amounted to Rupees 32,179 already, the balance for further outlay is Rupees 2,043. In part of the additional requirement of Rupees 4,572 there are materials at site to the value of Rupees 400, so that the difference of expenditure remaining to be accounted for is Rupees 4,172.

6. From the comparative statement submitted and its accompaniments it is observed that there are several items of discrepancy between the work as carried out and that as provided for in the sanctioned estimate, but the savings and excesses balance each other so far that the real excess is principally accounted for in the loss on teak-wood and other materials at site, due to deterioration through exposure, and to the inferiority of the material as originally obtained through the neglect of the subordinate immediately in charge of the work who, it is observed, has since been dismissed the service,

7. In explaining in detail the loss on teak-wood, the Superintending Engineer remarks that "this work cost Rupees 4-14-0 per cubic foot against the estimate rate of Rupees 4, and hence the large excess. Mr. Sub-Engineer Ottman explains that the wood was purchased in 1869, and was left exposed till he came to the range in 1873. The wood was then found to be warped and cracked, and as it was at first cut up for a different plan, before the new standard design was sanctioned, the measurements of the scantlings did not correspond with the new plan and estimate. There was thus involved a great cost of labor in working up the wood, and superior carpenters were engaged from Madras at high rates of pay. Mr. Ottman considers that the Overseer, Vurdaraju Naidu, did not make efforts enough to introduce cheap workmen; and there were several omissions in the estimate as to the quantities of the wood-work."

8. In explanation of the delay in the completion of the work and the apparent want of proper supervision in its construction, it is generally explained that the cutcherry which was commenced in 1867-68 was, under the orders of Government, stopped in the subsequent year, and not resumed until 1873; since which date the work was carried on as funds became available, not continuously, but with intervals of some months in each year; that difficulty was experienced in obtaining skilled labor locally, and that it consequently had to be imported at high cost from Madras and Nellore; that the time and attention of the Overseer (Veerasawmy) in charge of the work and the Sub-Engineer in charge of the division were principally occupied in connection with famine-relief works, which left ordinary works more or less unattended to.

9. The delay in the submission of the present revised estimate, which was apparently mislaid for some months in the Superintending Engineer's office, is stated to be due to the confused state of the accounts of Overseer Vardaraju Naidu and of the Nellore workshops. The Superintending Engineer further reports that Mr. Sub-Engineer Ottman is responsible for the delay from March 1878 to March 1879, and that Overseer Vardaraju was accountable to him.

10. The circumstances connected with the delay are not altogether creditable to the officers and subordinates concerned. Considering, however, the peculiar circumstances of the district during the famine, the Government are not disposed to take any further notice of the matter.

11. With these remarks the revised estimate, amounting to Rupees 34,222, is sanctioned, and funds to the extent of Rupees 2,044, for the early completion of the work, provided from the Provincial Reserve at the disposal of Government for 1879-80.

12. This sanction has been registered as Provincial No. 62 B of 1879-80.

(True Extract.)

Major, R.E.,
Ag. Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, Second Circle, with explanatory statement.
" Examiner of Public Works Accounts, with comparative statement.
" Revenue Department.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

2653
2

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of [1879] Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
SECOND CIRCLE,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated October 22nd.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G. O., 22nd *October* 1879, *No.* 2,653 W.

OCTOBER.
Nos. 41-42

Taluk Cutchery and out-houses at Kanyagiri, Nellore District.—Sanctions with remarks the revised estimate, amounting to Rupees 34,222, for the —, and provides funds to the extent of Rupees 2,044 for the early completion of the work.

No. 878.

Supdg. Engrs. Office
Bellary 18th Dec

2653
3

From

The Superintending Engineer
2nd Division

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to G.O. No. 4250 W dated 6th November 1878 Item No. 5. Part I "First Class Taluq Cutcherry at Kanyagiri" I have the honour to report, that the Executive Officer Ongole explains that the delay in the submission of the revised Estimate is due to the outlay on the sub heads having been so confused in the Accounts of the Overseer and Nellore Workshop that it became necessary to go into the entire transactions from 1869, to arrive at accurate results — but all that it is necessary has now been done and the Estimate will be submitted in the course of the following week.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obdt. servant

Supdg. Engineer 2d Circle

From

The Supg Engineer
2nd Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.
G. O. No 2653⅞ of 22-10-79.

Dated 18th December 1878
Recd

No 878

Kanyagiri Talug
Cutcherry Nellore Dis

Reporting that the revis
Estimate for — will be subm
next week and explaining t
cause of delay

41

Outy 11-10-

No 2086

Supg Engineer's Office
Bellary 15th August 1879.

~~2653~~
4

From

The Superintending Engineer
2nd Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. Department
Fort St George

Sir,

With reference to your Memo. No 2693 of the 7th instant, I have the honor to report, that I then perceived with much concern that the revised Estimate for the Cutcherry at Kanighery had been received in March, and had been put aside in my Office. I cannot understand how it escaped my notice, that the papers had come in; and that the demand for them was upon myself, not on the Divisional

Officer.

For the period from March 1878 to March 1879, Sub Engineer Mr. Ottmann is responsible, and Overseer Varadarajulu Naidu was accountable to him.

I am going through the papers of explanation, and will lose no time in sending on the Estimate.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant.
Hew Prendergast Lieut Col R.E.
Superintending Engineer 2nd C.

Roly 11-10-

C.E. No. 2693-7-8-79

P.W.D.
16 8 79
No. 5990

From;

The Superintending Engineer
II Circle

To.

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

No 2086

Dated 15th August }
Recd } 1879.

G.O. 22-10-79 No. 2653 Tr.

Taluq Cutcherry at Kani-ghery, Nellore District:-

Explains that the papers connected with the revised Estimate of the; are in his Office and will lose no time in sending on them.

41

To Ooty, ~~11-8~~ 11-10

Ooty 11-10-

2653
6

P. W. SECRETARIAT—1879-80.

KEEP-WITH.

Current No. 5999

Letter No. 2086

Dated the 15th August 1879

from the S E 2nd Circle

To W

For information. As the S. E. promises to send on the Estimates without further loss of time, it does not appear necessary to take any further action in the matter at present; but the explanation given is very meagre, and not over satisfactory - D. of W 16-8

W.S.
16/8

Annl Ed: G
~~[illegible]~~
18/8/79

To Doty ~~[illegible]~~ 11-10

Doty 11-10-

No 2465. Supg. Engrs Office
Bellary 10th Septr 1879
265/7

From
The Superintending Engineer
2nd Circle

To
The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

Sir,

Enclosures 2
[illegible]
Statement
Explanatory
Statement

In continuation of my letter No 2086, dated the 15th August 1879, I have the honour to submit for sanction a revised Estimate, in the form of a Comparative Statement, for the construction of the Taluk Cutcherry at Ramagiri.

2. The Estimate sanctioned in G.O. No 3229 dated 12th November 1875 amounts to Rs 29,650: and the revised Estimate to Rs 34,222-3-10. The difference for which sanction is required, is thus Rs 4572-3-10, and as the expenditure has amounted to Rs 32,178-3-7 already, the balance for further outlay is Rs 2044-"-3.

In part of the additional requirement (Rs 4572-3-10) there are materials at site, to the value of Rs 400: so that the difference of expenditure remaining to be accounted for is Rs 4172-3-10.

3. There are many items of discrepancy

of work carried out, as compared with the sanctioned Estimate; these are described in the accompanying explanatory statement made out by Sub Engineer Mr. Oltmann; but savings and excesses balance each other so far, that the real excess is principally accounted for in 3 items viz

No. 11	Loss on Teak wood ——	Rs. 1502 - 4 - 1
61.	Loss on Materials	1075 - " - 9
	Further loss on excess Materials	549 - 6 - 8
		3126 - 7 - 6

The difference between this sum and that which remains to be accounted for Rs. 4172 3 10. on the revised Estimate, is Rs. 1045 - 12 - 4. or 3½ per cent upon the sanctioned Estimate.

4. It thus appears unnecessary for me to enter into explanation of the various discrepancies on the work items. But as regards the teak wood: this work cost Rs. 4 14 - per cubic foot against the Estimate rate of Rs. 4; and hence the large excess of Rs. 1,502 - 4 - 1 is caused. Sub Engineer Mr. Oltmann explains that the wood was purchased in 1869 and was left exposed till he came to the Range in 1873. The wood was then found to be warped and cracked and as it was at first cut up for a different plan, before the new standard design was sanctioned: the measurements of the scantlings did not correspond with the new plan and Estimate. There was thus involved a great cost of labour in working up the wood; and superior Carpenters were engaged from Madras at high rates of pay. Mr. Oltmann considers that the Overseer Vardaraju Naidoo did not make effort enough to introduce cheaper workmen; and there were some omissions in the Estimate as to the quantities of the wood work.

5. The loss on materials, Item 61 is divided into 4 heads. —

2653/8

on bricks ——	Rs. 329 - 11 - 10.
Palmyra reepers ——	48 - 12 - 4
Waste in Timber ——	576 - 10 - 5.
on pantiles ——	119 - 14 - 2.
	1075 - " - 9

The table-moulded square bricks were an entire loss. This is attributed to the neglect of the Overseer Seshachellum, since dismissed. Care was not used, in the preparation of the bricks; much lime stone grit was in the earth worked up; and on burning, the bricks were destroyed. The Palmyrah reepers appear to have been neglected, and they deteriorated so much, that teak reepers were ordered to be provided. The waste in timber is attributed to the working up of the teak wood originally on hand, and which from 4 years exposure, became to a certain extent useless.

Voly 11-10-

This item, thus belongs more properly to the previous item No 11. loss on teak. The pan tiles as the bricks were lost through the negligence of the Overseer Seshachellum, on account of the lime stone contained in the clay.

6 The further loss of Rs 549-6-8 expected to be incurred on the surplus materials, is explained in detail in the last para. added to the explanatory Statement. Sub Engr. Mr Oltmann, had set down the full value of materials at site, as recoverable in completing the work. But on a reference regarding a mistake in the figures: it now appears that only a part of the materials will be actually utilised; their value being Rs 333-6-11; while the rest consisting of rough stone, remnants of wood, concrete and tiles must be sold for what they will fetch and this sum cannot be expected to be more than Rs 70. Thus Rs 400 only will be recovered to credit, from the outlay of Rs 949-6-8.

7 The last item in the Comparative statement, Rs 164-8-6 is brought in, upon a recent reference as to the total expenditure up to date: this amount belongs to the items No 7, 27, and 100 B.C. as shown in the column of remarks in the statement: the charges having been brought to account after the statement was first drafted. Owing to the length of the paper, as to a fresh copy being made, and to the time the subject has been on hand, I have added this last item separately, instead of altering the three items and making out the whole statement again.

8 Mr Oltmann gives general explanation that the Cutcherry was carried on since 1873 as funds were available, not continuously but with intervals of some months in each year. The Overseers on the work from the beginning were Mr Plumb and Poornah, whose names are now not on the list of the Department, Seshachellum who was dismissed, Rungarow who joined the Department in 1875, and had little building experience, and Verdarajiu Naidoo, a good practical builder and whose work has been of excellent quality. Skilled labor was not to be obtained locally, so that it was imported from Nellore and Madras; while to bring the materials, there were no carts except those with stone wheels requiring two pairs of bullocks, and drawing only a small load. There was further a disadvantage in the famine time, that the Overseer had much duty in connection with relief works, while the Sub Engineer himself was engaged on the important work of the Buckingham

Canal for 7 months and not able to leave it.

9 The Sub Engineer does not give any particulars of increased cost of work owing to the Famine: although higher rates for buildings were sanctioned in G.O. No. 622 W of the 21st August 1877. The expenditure from August 1877 to March 1878, was Rs 3000-5-4, and as Nellore was a severely tried District, an excess expenditure of Rs 1000 might be debited to Famine, in reduction of the excess expenditure shown in para 8 above as Rs 1045.

10. With reference to your Memo No. 5760, of the 20th Decr. 1878, on the subject of the confusion of accounts, Mr. Oltmann has explained that this was due partly to the erroneous description of charges by Overseers, and partly to the non adjustment of materials, as the work under each sub head was carried on. The latter, the main cause of confusion occurred chiefly with Overseer Varadaraja Naidoo, who was employed on the work for 2 years. The Accountants are reported to be in no way responsible for the confusion, and it would have been useless to post the register, when the materials were remaining unadjusted

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obt. servant
A. Prendergast.
Lt. Col. R.E.
Superintending Engineer
2nd Circle

9653
10

G.O. No 2276 W - 5 - 9 - 79
" 4260 W - 6 - 11 - 78
" 3229 - 12 - 11 - 75 -
" 2539 - 17 - 10 - 73 -
" 1794 - 21 - 6 - 64
Mis. No 232 - 23 - 4 - 72
G.O. No 1486 - 18 - 7 - 75
" 2204 - 21 - 5 - 73

P.W.D. P.W.D. 2d Circle
1879. 11 SEP 79
No.

From The Supg Engineer
2d Circle

To The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

G.O. 22-10-79 No 2653 W

Dated 10th } September 1879.
Recd 11th }

2653 W

Enclo: 9.

No 2465

Talook Cutcherry at Kanyagerry Nellore District - Submitting a revised Estimate in the form of a comparative Statement for completing Work on the —— . —

41

Cir 14-10-79 . Rtd 20-10-79 -
To Coty 11-10 -

Circ

P. W. Department.

No 2653 W

2653
11

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 22d Octr /79

Read the following

From The Supg Engr Second Circle } (No 878 d/ 18th Decr /78)
" —— do —— do —— (" " 2086 " 15th Augt 1879)
" —— do —— do —— (" " 2465 " 10th Septr ")

With his letter No 2465 dated 10th Septr 1879 the Supg Engineer Second Circle submits a revised estimate, in the form of a comparative statement, amounting to Rs 34,222, for the Taluq Cutcherry and out-houses at Kanyagiri in the Nellore District, a work, the expenditure on which

X Superintending Engineer, 2d Circle with explanatory statement.
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
Consulting Engineer for Railways.
X Examiner, Public Works Accounts with comparative statement
" Railway Accounts.
Consulting Architect.
Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works.
General Superintendent, P. W. Stores and Workshops.
Do. do. P. W. Stores Department.
Chief Engineer and Manager, Madras Irrigation and Canal Company.
Examiner Irrigation and Canal Company's Accounts.
X Rev. Dept.

Docketed
29-10-79

is shewn as objectionable in the monthly statements submitted to Govt. by the Examiner P. W. Accounts.

2. It is observed that an estimate amounting to Rs 11334 was first sanctioned for this work in G.O. No. 1794 dated 21st June 1864.

3. It having been subsequently decided to build the Taluq Cutcherries in accordance with the Standard plans sanctioned in G.O. No. 232, dated the 23d April 1872, a fresh estimate amounting to Rs 20900 was substituted for the one first sanctioned - vide G.O. No. 2539 dated 17th October 1873-

2653/12

4. A first revised estimate amounting to Rs 29,650 or Rs 9390 in excess of the original was sanctioned in G.O. No. 3229 dated 12th November 1875, the excess being due to alterations and additions authorised by Govt. subsequent to the commencement of the work, insufficiency as regards quantities and rates, and omissions in the original estimate-

5. The necessity for a second revised estimate which the Supg. Engineer now submits, arose in March 1878, in which month the

outlay was first reported to Govt. as objectionable. This second revised estimate amounting to Rs 34222, is in excess of the first revised by Rs 4,572, and as the expenditure has amounted to Rs 32,179 already, the balance for further outlay is Rs 2,043. In part of the additional requirement of Rs 4572 there are materials at site to the value of Rs 400, so that the difference of expenditure remaining to be accounted for is Rs 4172.

6. From the comparative statement submitted and its ac-

companiments it is observed that there are several items of discrepancy between the work as carried out and that as provided for in the sanctioned estimate, but the savings and excesses balance each other so far that the real excess is principally accounted for in the loss on teakwood and other materials at site, due to deterioration through exposure, and to the inferiority of the material as originally obtained through the neglect of the subordinate immediately in charge of the work, who, it is observed, has since been dismissed the service.

7. In explaining

in detail the loss on teak-
wood the Supg. Engineer
remarks that "this work
"cost Rs 4-14 " per cubic
"foot against the estimate
"rate of Rs 4 and hence
"the large excess - Mr.
"Sub Engineer Ottman ex-
"plains that the wood
"was purchased in 1869
"and was left exposed
"till he came to the Range
"in 1873 - The wood was
"then found to be warped
"and cracked, and as it
"was at first cut up
"for a different plan,
"before the new standard
"design was sanctioned:
"the measurements of the
"scantlings did not
"correspond with the
"new plan and estimate.
"There was thus involved
"a great cost of labor in
"working up the wood
"and superior carpenters
"were engaged from
"Madras at high rates
"of pay - Mr. Ottman
"considers that the Overseer
"Vurdaraju Naidu did not
"make efforts enough to
"introduce cheap workmen;
"and there were several
"omissions in the estimate
"as to the quantities of the
"wood work"

8. In explanation of the delay in the completion of the work and the apparent want of proper supervision in its

construction, it is generally explained that the Cutcherry which was commenced in 1867-68 was, under the orders of Govt., stopped in the subsequent year, and not resumed until 1873 since which date the work was carried on as funds became available- not continuously, but with intervals of some months in each year- that difficulty was experienced in obtaining skilled labor locally and that it consequently had to be imported at high cost from Madras and Nellore - that the time and attention of the Overseer (Veerasawmy in charge of the work and the Sub Engineer in charge of the Division were principally occupied in connection with Famine Relief Works which left ordinary works more or less unattended to

9. The delay in the submission of the present revised estimate, which was apparently mislaid for some months in the Supg. Engineer's Office, is stated to be due to the confused state of the accounts of Overseer Vardaraju Naidu and of the Nellore Workshops. The Supg. Engineer further reports that Mr. Sub Engineer Ottmann is responsible for the delay from March 1878 to March 1879 and that Overseer Vardaraju

" was accountable to him.

10. The circumstances connected with the delay are not ~~[illegible]~~ altogether creditable to the Officers and Subordinates concerned. Considering however the peculiar circumstances of the district during the Famine the Govt. are not disposed to take any further notice of the ~~delay~~ matter.

11. With these remarks the revised estimate amounting to Rs 34,222 is sanctioned, and funds to the extent of Rs 2044, for the early completion of the work,

provided from the Provincial Reserve at the disposal of Govt. for 1879-80.

12. This sanction has been registered as Provincial No 62 B of 1879-80.

D
11.10

14-10-79

For communications see 1st page of the S/f.

To ~~The S.E. 2nd Circle~~
~~" Ex E. [illegible]~~

10.10

2653/17

Cir 14-10-79. Retd 20-10-79-
So Coty 11-10- Ccl. 14/10

Gos 6345 & ca

Govt. of {1879} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 22 Oct 1879, No. 2633W

Nos. 41-42

Taluq Cutchery and outhouses at Kanyagiri Nellore Dt. — Sanctions with remarks the revised estimate amounting to Rs 34222 for the —, and provides funds to the extent of Rs 2044 for the early completion of the work