

is admitted that the
"virtual rebuilding" of
our fire engines -

The nature of the
engines is not stated,
but if they are of the
kind, and done up
in the style, usually
indulged in by wealthy
natives, the charge
is by no means remark-
able when allowance
is made for the
cost of transport, workshop
superintendence &c. -

The fact that the
cost exceeds what the
collector expected, merely
proves that officers are
very naturally ignorant
of the cost of such work

and it is not open
to him to escape the
consequences of his
own carelessness by
an official declaration
that the sum
"already paid ought
to amply pay for all
that has been done" -

An officer who is
guilty of such an
inconceivable piece
of folly as ordering an
expensive work like
this without even a
guess as to its
probable cost is hardly
in a position to

criticise other people's
proceedings -

The serious part of
the matter is the
continuance of the work
after Mr Kellogg had
ordered it to be stopped,
but the Collector's own
account of his visit to
the workshop on or
about the 23rd Feb
(from 8 of his letter
in ~~22~~ 23 of 11th December)
gives ground for supposing
that the workshop
Officers might in
good faith have believed
that this order was
withdrawn -

The enquiry in this
Department should I
think be strictly limited
to two points -
1st The continuance
of work after Mr
Kellogg's order to stop -
2nd The Whether or
not the labour and
materials charged for
were bona fide expended
or not -

If the latter question
be answered in the
affirmative we should
I think ignore altogether
the further question of
whether so much labour
and materials ought
to have been expended, in

Co
o
is
to
7
o
The work whether the
work was economically
done - If a person
chooses to employ an
engineer workshop to
build a carriage, without
even asking the probable
cost, he must not
expect economy -

S
Dr

L. W.

Please refer to
2 instructions as
forwarded after
which order of
Govt may be taken

Att

25/1/81

Public Works Department
No 190 dt 27th January 1881

Memorandum.

Endorsement from the Revenue Dept.
821st January 1881. on Pro. of the Court of
wards No 585 & 20 = idem -

Referred to the Superintendent of
works Kistna for careful inquiry and
report on the following points: -

- (1) Why the work of repairing the Carriages of
the Nazim Estate was continued after Mr
Kelsall's order of 9th July 1880. to cease all
further expenditure: -
- (2) Whether or not the labor and materials
charged for were bona fide expended.
- (3) See overleaf (By order)

S Major P.B.
Under Secy to Govt = P.W.D.

To The Supt. of works Kistna
with papers in original (to be
returned) - E with No 425
28-1-81

upon the subject were asked.

3. Bills amounting to \$3923 were paid or sanctioned for payment from time to time, and in July 1880 the Acting Collector (Mr. Hilsall) appears to have ordered the stoppage of the work on the ground that it was costing more than was expected.

3. Bills amounting in all to \$1949.10.2 were subsequently submitted by the workshops, and payment refused by the Collector.

4. The Collector's objections are based upon three

points:-

1st That the sums claimed were not bona fide expended.

2nd That if bona fide expended they are extravagant and unnecessary.

3rd That the stoppage of the work having been ordered by him in July he was not liable to any subsequent claims.

5. In his repudiation of the claims, and imputations against the workshops authorities, he is apparently supported by the Court of Wards, and the matter has been transferred to this

Department for enquiry,
which has accordingly
been made. Concerning
the first of the three grounds
above mentioned it is
sufficient to say that
no evidence has been
produced to support
the Collector's assertions.
With regard to the second
ground, namely the
extravagance of the
charges themselves, it
may be observed that
the work to be done
was the complete re-
construction of three
large carriages, two
buggies and a dog cart.

6. "Prima facie" an
engineering workshop
cannot form the
Constitution

Constitution be at all
a suitable or reasonable
place for work of a
highly special character
like carriage building,
and there would be
nothing astonishing in
the fact of its having
cost more than it
would have done
if executed by a proposed
workshop.

7. When however it is
considered that a large
portion of the work
was to be done by
workmen sent, and
materials supplied,
from Madras, by a firm
notorious for the ex-
pensive character of

its work, Brown
- 7. Cante blanche was
apparently given in the
matter of quantities
and prices, it is not
too much to assert that
an average cost of less
than \$1000 for the
complete reconstruction
of each carriage was
in reality much more
moderate than the
officer who gave the
order had a right to
expect.

8. It may be noted
here that out of the
total of \$5872.11.0, the
workshop charges proper
amount to only \$1445 in
all.

9. With regard to the

third point, namely
the continuance of the work
after its stoppage was
ordered by the Collector.
There appears to have
been a misunderstanding
between the Collector and
the Workshop Officers,
but there is no evidence
to show that this was
due to errors on the
part of the latter, ^{rather} than
on that of the former.
It is clear moreover
that the workshop esti-
mate of \$100 for each
of the ^{two} carriages remaining
to be finished at the
date of the Collector's
visit in July was
very accurate, the
actual expenditures

3- after that date being
only \$210.8-0, the remainder
of the bills being for charges
incurred before that
date.

10. It appears to the undersigned necessary that
the Collector should now
be called upon to pay
the amount due to the
workshops as soon as
possible.

11. As regards the charges
brought against the
workshop officers with-
out apparently any
sufficient foundation
and in reference to the
violation of the Collector
in incurring outlay
without having any
reliable estimate
framed

framed, and without
indeed so far as can
be ascertained from
the correspondence showing
the number of carriages
sent for reconstruction,
the undersigned would
have the decision in
the hands of Government.

W. S. Sankar
Colonel R. E.
Chief Engineer P. W. Dept.

18 Febry 81

Handwritten: No. 10-11-12

No. 488 W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the *22nd Feby 1881*

Read the following:—

*Indt of the Rev. Dept on
Prop of the Court of wards No 585 } (R No 309 d/ 21st Jan'y 1881)
dated 20th January 1881
From the Supd of the Kistna (— 2183 d/ 10th Feby 1881)*

*The papers will be
forwarded to the Court of
wards with the remark that
the charges appear to be
legitimate, and that the
Government do not ~~see~~ ^{consider}
that the workshop Author-
ities are to blame for the
heavy expenditure.*

*2. The workshop bill
should be adjusted without
delay.*

*The Court of wards
with papers in original:— with C 110 995 ⁸¹² _{21/2}
Rev. Dept *R.D.*
CH. *Perad*
*25-2-81**

Cir 18. 2. 81. R. 21. 2.

framed