Archives I -10,006—16-8 77.

(1) Number of pages 108 ✓
(2) Date of repair 1-4.87 ✓
(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES.

OVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P.W DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. B.P. No.	1675-76	Press. Mis.
Dated	3 7 1882	197 .

A.H

ot to be folded or roughly handled

1675

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

No. 24.

Read—the following papers :—

From Colonel W. S. TREVOR, R.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department (Civil Works—Miscellaneous), to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Simla, 9th May 1882, No. 169 M.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 677 W., of the 16th March last, asking for a reconsideration of the orders of the Government of India deciding that the cost of extending the southern main drain across the sands north of Fort St. George should be borne by Provincial Funds.

2. In reply I am to say that, under the circumstances mentioned by you, the incidence of this and other charges will be finally considered as soon as the estimate for the whole of the charges to be incurred on the Harbour Works (including both direct and all incidental charges) is submitted for the sanction of the Government of India, and when the manner in which the further outlay that may be sanctioned is to be dealt with is determined. Until this is done the cost of the extension of the drain and all other similar incidental charges should be met from Provincial Funds.

No. 24-A.

From D. C. GORDON, Esq., Examiner of Public Works Accounts, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 5th June 1882, No. 40 W.

With reference to Government of India No. 169 M., dated 9th May 1882, to Government [copy received under Accountant-General's (Public Works Department) endorsement No. 266 G., dated the 18th idem], stating that the cost of extending the southern main drain across the sands north of Fort St. George and all other indirect charges against the Harbour should be met from Provincial Funds till such time as the revised estimate for the Harbour shall have been fully considered by the Government of India, I have the honor to request that a list of such indirect charges, as have already been sanctioned, may be furnished to me for guidance in making the necessary adjustment, and to inquire whether such adjustment should be made in the accounts for the past or current official year.

No. 24-B.

From N. St. B. BEARDMORE, Esq., C.E., Acting Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 6th June 1882, No. 11 W.

I have the honor to forward the statement requested in your memorandum, No. 144 E., dated 23rd May 1882.

2. I regret there has been some delay in sending this statement, but I did not understand what Item No. 2, "Share of drain lately ordered to connect with intercepting sewer," meant until I had inquired for, and received yesterday, G.O., No. 1290 W., of 22nd May, explaining it.

Enclosure.

Incidental Expenses in connection with Harbour in reply to Memorandum No. 144 E. of Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Ootacamund, 23rd May 1882.

No.	Particulars of Charge.	Amount. RS.	A.	P.
1	Expenses of setting Memorial Stone by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales in November 1875	8,654	0	0
2	Channel to carry off rain-water from the drain close to the south pier of Harbour	893	0	0
3	Law charges in connexion with the barque *James Aiken*	690	9	4
4	Gratuities awarded to relatives of men who died from accidents by the cyclone, &c., of 12th November 1881	5,858	0	0
5	The cost of a pipe to carry sewage from Main Drain near the Fort by the Municipality in July 1879	3,145	5	8
6	North Beach Protective Works at Ráyapuram and Cassemode to 31st March 1881	1,10,616	8	5
7	Extension of outfall sewer near Fort as now being carried out by the Municipality	13,663	0	0
8	Purchase of Mrs. Sadler's land at Ráyapuram	1,400	0	0
9	Theft from cash-chest at office	50	0	0
10	Compensation for loss and purchase of remaining land at Ráyapuram under G.O., No. 601 W., dated 8th March 1882 ...	51,341	9	2
11	Compensation for loss of four months' rent to Kathir Saib at Cassemode under G.O., No. 1037 W., dated 27th April 1882	240	0	0
12	Probable cost of revetment work north of Harbour	36,000	0	0
13	Cost of land at Cassemode proposed in Mr. Parkes's report of 4th February 1882 to be bought in order to save expense of protecting it from encroachment of the sea. *Note.*—There will probably be interest in shape of rent on this sum	2,08,149	0	0
14	Half cost of connecting Drain No. 5c, near High Court, with intercepting sewer, as directed in G.O., No. 1290 W., of 22nd May 1882, 30 yards	200	0	0
	Total ...	4,40,901	0	7

(Signed) N Sr. B. BEARDMORE, C.E.,
Ag. Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works.

No. 24-C.

Approximate general estimate for the Madras Harbour Works.

Reference.—Government of India letter No. 166 W., dated 9th May 1882.

REPORT.

The annexed estimates giving in abstract as far as possible the approximate total outlay required for the completion of the Madras Harbour Works are based on the actuals of past outlay, and as regards the rest on the best available details.

2. To meet the views of the Government of India the General Abstract divides the whole outlay, past and prospective, into two main heads—

(1) The Harbour Works proper.
(2) Incidental or Contingent works.

3. As regards the first head it may be observed that the original estimate for the work sanctioned by the Secretary of State amounted to Rs. 62,80,000, and though containing one item not provided by Mr. Parkes, viz., 2 lakhs, on account of extra rubble required for the bases of the piers, and the usual percentage allowance for "Contingencies," no specific sub-heads were separated under the latter.

4. The amount of estimate No. 1, which provides for the whole of the Harbour Works proper, amounting to Rs. 75,58,735, is, as will be observed, chiefly made up of the two items, (1) booked outlay to end of the last official year, and (2) 18¼ lakhs—Mr. Parkes's maximum estimate for completing the work after the storm of the 12th November 1881. If Mr. Parkes's minimum estimate be accepted, the total would be Rs. 72,33,735.

1675·7b
2

On the Chief Engineer's rough estimate of 25 lakhs for finishing the work, the outlay would be Rs. 82,33,735, and by Mr. Molesworth's of 27 lakhs, Rs. 84,33,735.

5. Estimate No. 2, amounting to Rs. 4,50,000, which is the first of the estimates for the incidental works, is for the protective operations found necessary north of the Harbour. The necessity for the works here has shown itself more and more as the Harbour Works advanced seaward, the effect of the south-west monsoon being to occasion such a set of the alongshore current, as to erode the shore and endanger property to nearly 2 miles north of the Harbour.

6. At first the cost of the works here was debited to ordinary contingencies, Rs. 1,13,624 being the total amount thus booked up to end of last official year. Since then, as will be observed from G.O., 17th March, No. 698 W., the subject has called for separate and careful consideration, the result of which has been that while it has been decided to carry the longitudinal revetment to a certain point north of the Harbour, the sea is to be allowed to act freely on the shore in advance of this—it being clear that it would be cheaper to acquire the rights in the land here than to execute protective works. Hence it will be seen that whereas Items 1 and 5 amount to Rs. 1,46,616, the remaining five items are for compensation.

7. Estimate No. 3 deals with another incidental charge not provided for in the original estimate, viz., the moorings.

8. The actual outlay debited to this head to end of last official year against supposed savings on the general sanction was Rs. 1,74,970, and the remainder of the estimate will have to be met for completion of the work.

9. Estimate No. 4, amounting to Rs. 45,000, for the intercepting sewer provides for a work also not entered specifically in the original estimate. The outlay, Rs. 34,352, as booked up to end of last official year, was treated as debitable to general contingencies of the work, the drain in question owing its origin entirely to the Harbour, for the sole use of which it has been constructed. This drain carries the whole of the sewage (not the storm waters) which formerly discharged into the sea south of, and along the present base of, the Harbour, and delivers it clear of the work to the north.

10. Estimate No. 5, amounting to Rs. 15,000, provides for a work of precisely analagous character and no less intimately connected with the Harbour scheme. It provides for the discharge of the storm waters not entered in Estimate No. 4, but no less essential. The booked outlay to end of last official year was Rs. 13,500, and though at first charged against the general contingencies of the Harbour Works, was not specifically provided for in the original estimate, as sanctioned by the Secretary of State.

(Signed) R. H. SANKEY, Colonel, R.E.,
Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

23rd June 1882.

MADRAS HARBOUR WORKS.

Harbour Works Proper.

Abstract Estimate No. 1.

Item No.	Particulars.	Cost. RS.	A.	P.
1	Booked Outlay up to end of 1881-82	57,17,640	0	0
2	Mr. Parkes's maximum estimate for restoring the Harbour on his monolithic system	18,25,000	0	0
3	Expenses of setting Memorial Stone by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales in November 1875	8,654	0	0
4	Channel to carry off rain-water from the drain close to the south pier of Harbour	893	0	0
5	Law charges in connection with the barque *James Aiken*	690	9	4
6	Gratuities awarded to relatives of men who died from accidents during the cyclone of 12th November 1881	5,858	0	0
	Total ...	75,58,735	9	4

2

Incidental or directly Contingent Works not provided for in the Original Estimate.

ABSTRACT ESTIMATE No. 2.

North Protective Works.

Item Nos.	Particulars.	Cost. RS.	A.	P.
1	Booked Outlay on the North Beach Protective Works at Ráyapuram and Cassemode up to 31st March 1881	1,10,616	8	5
2	Purchase of Mrs. Sadler's land at Ráyapuram	1,400	0	0
3	Compensation for loss and purchase of remaining land at Ráyapuram under G.O., No. 601 W., dated 8th March 1882	51,341	9	2
4	Compensation for loss of four months' rent to Kathir Saib at Cassemode under G.O., No. 1037 W., dated 27th April 1882	240	0	0
5	Probable cost of revetment north of Harbour	36,000	0	0
6	Cost of land at Cassemode proposed in Mr. Parkes's report of 4th February 1882 to be bought, to save the expense of protecting it from encroachment of the sea	2,08,149	0	0
7	Add for compensation and works not included in the above ...	42,252	14	5
	Total ...	4,50,000	0	0

ABSTRACT ESTIMATE No. 3.

Moorings.

Item Nos.	Particulars.	Cost. RS.	A.	P.
1	Booked outlay on moorings } up to end of 1881-82	1,71,310	6	8
2	Repairs to do. } up to end of 1881-82	3,659	15	10
3	Balance of estimate amounting to Rs. 2,20,750	45,780	0	0
4	Amount assumed for contingencies	14,250	0	0
	Total ...	2,35,000	6	6

ABSTRACT ESTIMATE No. 4.

Intercepting Drain.

Item Nos.	Particulars.	Cost. RS.	A.	P.
1	Booked Outlay on the Intercepting Sewer up to 31st March 1882 ...	34,352	0	0
2	Cost of a pipe to carry sewage from Main Drain near the Fort by the Municipality in July 1879	3,145	5	8
3	Half cost of connecting Drain 5c near High Court with intercepting sewer as directed in G.O., No. 1290 W., dated 22nd May 1882...	200	0	0
4	Add for completion and one or two minor junctions and other unforeseen work connected with the intercepting sewer	7,302	10	4
	Total ...	45,000	0	0

1675-76
3

ABSTRACT ESTIMATE No. 5.

Outfall Sewer, north of Fort St. George.

Item Nos.	Particulars.	Cost. RS.	A.	P.
1	Extension of outfall sewer near Fort as now being carried out by the Municipality	13,663	0	0
2	Estimated outlay to complete	1,337	0	0
	Total ...	15,000	0	0

Approximate General Estimate for the Madras Harbour Works.

Item Nos.	Particulars.	Cost. RS.	A.	P.
	Harbour Proper.			
1	Probable ultimate cost as detailed in Abstract Estimate No. 1 ...	75,58,735	0	0
	Incidental or Contingent Works.			
2	Protective Works north of the Harbour	4,50,000	0	0
3	Moorings	2,35,000	0	0
4	Intercepting Drain	45,000	0	0
5	Fort Outfall Drain	15,000	0	0
	Grand Total ...	83,03,735	0	0

No. 25.

ORDER—dated 3rd July 1882, No. 1675 W., Public Works.

Ordered that the following letter be sent to the Government of India.

(Here enter No. 1676 W., dated 3rd July 1882.)

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. H. SANKEY, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works, } with copy of letter to
" Examiner of Public Works Accounts, } Government of India.

Fin'l Deptt - supplied from [illegible]

Exd. A. F. Goodall
Spare Copies

3

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of [1882] Madras
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated July, 3rd.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 3rd July 1882, No. 1675 W

JULY.
Nos. 24-25.

Madras Harbour Works.

Completion of the —. The approximate estimate (in abstract) for the —, submitted with remarks, for the information and orders of the Government of India.

1675-76
4

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

No. 26.

Letter—from

Colonel R. H. SANKEY, C.B., R.E.,
Secretary to Government, Public Works Department,
Madras,

To

The SECRETARY to the GOVERNMENT of INDIA,
Public Works Department.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter, No. 169 M., dated 9th May 1882, I am desired to submit, for the information and orders of the Most Honorable the Governor-General in Council, the annexed approximate estimate (in abstract) for the completion of the Madras Harbour Works, accompanied by a General Report by the Chief Engineer.

Proceedings of Government, No. 1675 W., dated 3rd July 1882.

2. Your letter under reply directs that the expenditure on the southern outfall drain shall be borne by "Provincial" pending orders in regard to the whole of the charges to be incurred on the work, and this has, I am to say, been provisionally arranged for.

3. The Examiner of Public Works Accounts requires, however, that the other similar incidental charges adverted to at the close of your letter under reply shall now be defined, being of opinion that none of these should be debited against the provision of 2 lakhs sanctioned in your telegram dated 19th April 1882.

4. From the report herewith submitted it will be observed that in addition to the cost of the Harbour proper no less than 7½ lakhs are required for directly incidental or contingent works. Of this amount, Rs. 3,36,440 (including Rs. 13,500 for the work specifically under reference), the booked outlay to end of last official year, has already been debited against the general contingencies of the Estimate.

	Rs.
Estimate No. 2	4,50,000
" " 3	2,35,000
" " 4	45,000
" " 5	15,000
Total ...	7,45,000

5. By the ruling contained in your letter under reply, the difference between the estimated and booked outlay, viz., Rs. 4,08,556, would have now to be met from Provincial assignments, but, with reference to this, I am to submit that, with the numerous pressing demands on ~~Provisional~~ Provincial Funds to meet the ordinary requirements

of the Presidency, it is impossible for this Government to make the necessary provision, and the Right Honorable the Governor in Council therefore trusts that the Government of India will be pleased, on further consideration, to allow the whole of the charges for the incidental works directly connected with the Harbour, to be met as heretofore from Imperial.

6. No decision having as yet been received from the Secretary of State as to the plan of operations to be eventually followed in completing the works, it is out of the power of this Government to do more than furnish the best information at its disposal, and this has now been done.

7. To exhibit clearly the possible cost of completing the work, I am to submit the following table of estimates prepared by the officers named :—

Estimates for completing the works by different Authorities.	Total Probable Cost of works excluding the Incidental Charges.	Total Probable Cost of works including all Incidental Charges.	Remaining Outlay to be met after deducting from last column Total Booked Outlay to end of 1881-82.
	RS.	RS.	RS.
Mr. Parkes's minimum, 15½ lakhs	72,83,735	80,28,735	19,74,649
Do. maximum, 18¼ "	75,58,735	83,03,735	22,49,649
Colonel Sankey's rough approximation, 25 lakhs.	82,33,735	89,78,735	29,24,649
Mr. G. L. Molesworth's rough approximation, 27 lakhs.	84,33,735	91,78,735	31,24,649

8. From the above it will be observed that in order to complete the whole of the works by the end of 1884-85, an average annual provision of funds, varying from 6½ to about 10 lakhs will have to be made, and, pending final orders of the Secretary of State, the Right Honorable the Governor in Council requests that a further grant of 3½ lakhs may be made to meet the incidental charges of the current year.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) R. H. SANKEY, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

OOTACAMUND,
3rd July 1882.

Exd. A. F. Goodall.
Spare Copies

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of 1882 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated July, 3rd.

Recd. *Encl.*

3rd July 1882, No. 1676 W.

JULY.
No. 26.

Madras Harbour Works.

COMPLETION of the —. The approximate estimate (in abstract) for the —, submitted, with remarks, for the information and orders of the Government of India.

45/5

41

3RD JULY 1882, No. 1675 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

24 No.

READ—the following papers :—

From Colonel W. S. TREVOR, R.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department (Civil Works—Miscellaneous), to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Simla, 9th May 1882, No. 169 M.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 677 W., of the 16th March last, asking for a reconsideration of the orders of the Government of India deciding that the cost of extending the southern main drain across the sands north of Fort St. George should be borne by Provincial Funds.

2. In reply I am to say that, under the circumstances mentioned by you, the incidence of this and other charges will be finally considered as soon as the estimate for the whole of the charges to be incurred on the Harbour Works (including both direct and all incidental charges) is submitted for the sanction of the Government of India, and when the manner in which the further outlay that may be sanctioned is to be dealt with is determined. Until this is done the cost of the extension of the drain and all other similar incidental charges should be met from Provincial Funds.

24 A No.

From D. C. GORDON, Esq., Examiner of Public Works Accounts, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 5th June 1882, No. 40 W.

With reference to Government of India No. 169 M., dated 9th May 1882, to Government [copy received under Accountant-General's (Public Works Department) endorsement No. 266 G., dated the 18th idem], stating that the cost of extending the southern main drain across the sands north of Fort St. George and all other indirect charges against the Harbour should be met from Provincial Funds till such time as the revised estimate for the Harbour shall have been fully considered by the Government of India, I have the honor to request that a list of such indirect charges, as have already been sanctioned, may be furnished to me for guidance in making the necessary adjustment, and to inquire whether such adjustment should be made in the accounts for the past or current official year.

No. 24 B

From N. St. B. BEARDMORE, Esq., C.E., Acting Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 6th June 1882, No. 11 W.

I have the honor to forward the statement requested in your memorandum, No. 144 E., dated 23rd May 1882.

2. I regret there has been some delay in sending this statement, but I did not understand what Item No. 2, "Share of drain lately ordered to connect with intercepting sewer," meant until I had inquired for, and received yesterday, G.O., No. 1290 W., of 22nd May, explaining it.

b

1675-76
42

ENCLOSURE.

INCIDENTAL Expenses in connection with Harbour in reply to Memorandum No. 144 E. of Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Ootacamund, 23rd May 1882.

No.	Particulars of Charge.	Amount. RS.	A.	P.
1	Expenses of setting Memorial Stone by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales in November 1875	8,654	0	0
2	Channel to carry off rain-water from the drain close to the south pier of Harbour	893	0	0
3	Law charges in connexion with the barque *James Aiken*	690	9	4
4	Gratuities awarded to relatives of men who died from accidents by the cyclone, &c., of 12th November 1881	5,858	0	0
5	The cost of a pipe to carry sewage from Main Drain near the Fort by the Municipality in July 1879	3,145	5	8
6	North Beach Protective Works at Ráyapuram and Cassemode to 31st March 1881	1,10,616	8	5
7	Extension of outfall sewer near Fort as now being carried out by the Municipality	13,663	0	0
8	Purchase of Mrs. Sadler's land at Ráyapuram	1,400	0	0
9	Theft from cash-chest at office	50	0	0
10	Compensation for loss and purchase of remaining land at Ráyapuram under G.O., No. 601 W., dated 8th March 1882	51,341	9	2
11	Compensation for loss of four months' rent to Kathir Saib at Cassemode under G.O., No. 1037 W., dated 27th April 1882	240	0	0
12	Probable cost of revetment work north of Harbour	36,000	0	0
13	Cost of land at Cassemode proposed in Mr. Parkes's report of 4th February 1882 to be bought in order to save expense of protecting it from encroachment of the sea. *Note.*—There will probably be interest in shape of rent on this sum	2,08,149	0	0
14	Half cost of connecting Drain No. 5c, near High Court, with intercepting sewer, as directed in G.O., No. 1290 W., of 22nd May 1882, 30 yards	200	0	0
	Total ...	4,40,901	0	7

(Signed) H. ST. B. BEARDMORE, C.E.,
Ag. Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works.

1/

~~No.~~ Approximate General estimate for ~~Report by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, on~~ *the Madras Harbour* ~~Estimates, dated 23rd June 1882~~ works.

2/

The annexed estimates giving in abstract as far as possible the approximate total outlay required for the completion of the Madras Harbour Works are based on the actuals of past outlay, and as regards the rest on the best available details.

2. To meet the views of the Government of India the General Abstract divides the whole outlay, past and prospective, into two main heads—

(1) The Harbour Works proper.
(2) Incidental or Contingent works.

3. As regards the first head it may be observed that the original estimate for the work sanctioned by the Secretary of State amounted to Rs. 62,80,000, and though containing one item not provided by Mr. Parkes, viz., 2 lakhs, on account of extra rubble required for the bases of the piers, and the usual percentage allowance for "Contingencies," no specific sub-heads were separated under the latter.

4. The amount of estimate No. 1, which provides for the whole of the Harbour Works proper, amounting to Rs. 75,58,735, is, as will be observed, chiefly made up of the two items, (1) booked outlay to end of the last official year, and (2) 18¼ lakhs—Mr. Parkes's maximum estimate for completing the work after the storm of the 12th November 1881. If Mr. Parkes's minimum estimate be accepted, the total would be Rs. 72,83,735.

Reference
Govt of India letter No 169. [illegible] dated 9th May 1882 –
Report.

7

On the Chief Engineer's rough estimate of 25 lakhs for finishing the work, the outlay would be Rs. 82,33,735, and by Mr. Molesworth's of 27 lakhs, Rs. 84,33,735.

5. Estimate No. 2, amounting to Rs. 4,50,000, which is the first of the estimates for the incidental works, is for the protective operations found necessary north of the Harbour. The necessity for the works here has shown itself more and more as the Harbour Works advanced seaward, the effect of the south-west monsoon being to occasion such a set of the alongshore current/as to erode the shore and endanger property to nearly 2 miles north of the Harbour.

6. At first the cost of the works here was debited to ordinary contingencies, Rs. 1,13,624 being the total amount thus booked up to end of last official year. Since then, as will be observed from G.O., 17th March, No. 698 W., the subject has called for separate and careful consideration, the result of which has been that while it has been decided to carry the longitudinal revetment to a certain point north of the Harbour, the sea is to be allowed to act freely on the shore in advance of this—it being clear that it would be cheaper to acquire the rights in the land here than to execute protective works. Hence it will be seen that whereas Items 1 and 5 amount to Rs. 1,46,616, the remaining five items are for compensation.

7. Estimate No. 3 deals with another incidental charge not provided for in the original estimate, viz., the moorings.

8. The actual outlay debited to this head to end of last official year against supposed savings on the general sanction was Rs. 1,74,970, and the remainder of the estimate will have to be met for completion of the work.

9. Estimate No. 4, amounting to Rs. 45,000, for the intercepting sewer provides for a work also not entered specifically in the original estimate. The outlay, Rs. 34,352, as booked up to end of last official year, was treated as debitable to general contingencies of the work, the drain in question owing its origin entirely to the Harbour, for the sole use of which it has been constructed. This drain carries the whole of the sewage (not the storm waters) which formerly discharged into the sea south of, and along the present base of, the Harbour, and delivers it clear of the work to the north.

10. Estimate No. 5, amounting to Rs. 15,000, provides for a work of precisely analagous character and no less intimately connected with the Harbour scheme. It ~~is~~ ~~fact~~ provides for the discharge of the storm waters not entered in Estimate No. 4, but no less essential. The booked outlay to end of last official year was Rs. 13,500, and though at first charged against the general contingencies of the Harbour Works/was not specifically provided for in the original estimate/as sanctioned by the Secretary of State.

23rd June 1882

(Signed) R. H. Sankey Col. R.E.
Chief Engr [illegible]

MADRAS HARBOUR WORKS.

ABSTRACT ESTIMATE No. 1.

Harbour Works Proper. — This is [illegible]

Item No.	Particulars.	Cost. RS.	A.	P.
1	Booked Outlay up to end of 1881-82	57,17,640	0	0
2	Mr. Parkes's maximum estimate for restoring the Harbour on his monolithic system	18,25,000	0	0
3	Expenses of setting Memorial Stone by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales in November 1875	8,854	0	0
4	Channel to carry off rain-water from the drain close to the south pier of Harbour	833	0	0
5	Law charges in connection with the barque *James Aiken*	600	9	4
6	Gratuities awarded to relatives of men who died from accidents during the cyclone of 12th November 1881	5,858	0	0
	Total ...	75,58,785	9	4

1675·76
44

As a general heading in [illegible]

1

ABSTRACT ESTIMATE No. 2.

Incidental or directly Contingent Works not provided for in the Original Estimate.

North Protective Works.

Booked

Item Nos.	Particulars.	Cost. RS.	A.	P.
1	Outlay on the North Beach Protective Works at Ráyapuram and Cassemode up to 31st March 1881	1,10,616	8	5
2	Purchase of Mrs. Sadler's land at Ráyapuram	1,400	0	0
3	Compensation for loss and purchase of remaining land at Ráyapuram under G.O., No. 601 W., dated 8th March 1882	51,341	9	2
4	Compensation for loss of four months' rent to Kathir Saib at Cassemode under G.O., No. 1037 W., dated 27th April 1882	240	0	0
5	Probable cost of revetment north of Harbour	36,000	0	0
6	Cost of land at Cassemode proposed in Mr. Parkes's report of 4th February 1882 to be bought, to save the expense of protecting it from encroachment of the sea	2,08,149	0	0
7	Add for compensation and works not included in the above ...	42,252	14	5
	Total ...	4,50,000	0	0

ABSTRACT ESTIMATE No. 3.

~~Incidental Charges or directly Contingent Works not provided for in the Original Estimate.~~

Moorings.

Booked actg on

Item Nos.	Particulars.	Cost. RS.	A.	P.
1	~~Cost of~~ moorings } up to end of 1881-82	1,71,310	6	8
2	Repairs to do. }	3,659	15	10
3	Balance of estimate amounting to Rs. 2,20,750	45,780	0	0
4	Amount assumed for contingencies	14,250	0	0
	Total ...	2,35,000	~~0~~	~~0~~

ABSTRACT ESTIMATE, No. 4.

~~Incidental or directly Contingent Works not provided for in the Estimate.~~

Intercepting Drain.

Booked

Item Nos.	Particulars.	Cost. Rs	a	p
1	Outlay on the Intercepting Sewer up to 31st Mar '82	34,352	0	0
~~1~~	~~Intercepting Drain, Fort, to No. 10 Drain ... ...~~	~~10,028~~	~~7~~	~~2~~
~~2~~	~~Do. do. to No. 10 Outlet ... ...~~	~~4,420~~	~~9~~	~~0~~
2/~~3~~	Cost of a pipe to carry sewage from Main Drain near the Fort by the Municipality in July 1879	3,145	5	8
3/~~4~~	Half cost of connecting Drain 5c near High Court with intercepting sewer as directed in G.O., No. 1290 W., dated 22nd May 1882...	200	0	0
4/~~5~~	Add for completion and one or two minor junctions and other unforeseen work connected with the intercepting sewer	7,302	10	4
	Total ...	45,000	0	0

1675-76
45

ABSTRACT ESTIMATE No. 5.

~~Incidental or directly Contingent Works not provided for in the Original Estimate.~~

Outfall Sewer, north of Fort St. George.

Item Nos.	Particulars.	Cost.		
		RS.	A.	P.
1	Extension of outfall sewer near Fort as now being carried out by the Municipality	13,663	0	0
2	Estimated outlay to complete	1,337	0	0
	Total ...	15,000	0	0

APPROXIMATE General Estimate for the Madras Harbour Works.

Antiqual [illegible] space here

Item Nos.	Particulars.	Cost.		
	Probable Ultimate *Harbour Proper.*	RS.	A.	P.
1	Cost as detailed in Abstract Estimate No. 1	75,58,735	0	0
	Incidental or Contingent Works.			
2	Protective Works north of the Harbour	4,50,000	0	0
3	Moorings	2,35,000	0	0
4	Intercepting Drain	45,000	0	0
5	Fort Outfall Drain	15,000	0	0
	Grand Total ...	83,03,735	0	0

No. 25

ORDER—dated 3rd July 1882, No. 1675 W., Public Works.

Ordered that the following letter be sent to the Government of India.

(Here enter No. 1676 W., dated 3rd July 1882.)

(True Extract.)

Coll

~~Under~~ Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.,
~~Irrigation Branch.~~

To the Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works, } with copy of letter to
" Examiner of Public Works Accounts, } Government of India.

Civil Dept supplied from Copy 26/7/82

Madras Harbour Works.

Completion of the —. The approximate estimate (in abstract) for the —, submitted with remarks, for the information and orders of the Government of India.

Exd. A. F. Goodall.

1675-76
46

30/2

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

No. 1676 W.

No. 26

Letter—from

Colonel R. H. SANKEY, C.B., R.E.,
Secretary to Government, Public Works Department,
Madras,

To

The SECRETARY to the GOVERNMENT of INDIA,
Public Works Department.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter, No. 169 M., dated 9th May 1882, I am desired to submit, for the information and orders of the Most Honorable the Governor-General in Council, the annexed approximate estimate (in abstract) for the completion of the Madras Harbour Works, accompanied by a General Report by the Chief Engineer.

Proceedings of Government, No. 1675 W., dated 3rd July 1882.

2. Your letter under reply directs that the expenditure on the southern outfall drain shall be borne by "Provincial" pending orders in regard to the whole of the charges to be incurred on the work, and this has, I am to say, been ~~accordingly~~ provincial arranged for.

3. The Examiner of Public Works Accounts requires, however, that the other similar incidental charges adverted to at the close of your letter under reply shall now be defined, being of opinion that none of these should be debited against the provision of 2 lakhs sanctioned in your telegram dated 19th April 1882.

4. From the report herewith submitted it will be observed that in addition to the cost of the Harbour proper no less than 7½ lakhs are required for directly incidental or contingent works. Of this amount, Rs. 3,36,440 (including Rs. 13,500 for the work specifically under reference), the booked outlay to end of last official year, has already been debited against the general contingencies of the Estimate.

	Rs.
Estimate No. 2	4,50,000
" " 3	2,35,000
" " 4	45,000
" " 5	15,000
Total ...	7,45,000

By a/

5. ~~Under~~ the ruling contained in your letter under reply, the difference between the estimated and booked outlay, viz., Rs. 4,08,566, would have now to be met from Provincial ~~A~~ssignments, but, with reference to this, I am to submit that, with the numerous pressing demands on ~~it~~ to meet the ordinary requirements of the Presidency,

Provincial funds

11

1675-76
47

it is impossible for this Government to make the necessary provision, and the Right Honorable the Governor in Council therefore trusts that the Government of India will be pleased on further consideration to allow the whole of the charges for the incidental works directly connected with the Harbour to be met as heretofore ~~by an~~ Imperial ~~Grant.~~ fr

6. No decision having as yet been received from the Secretary of State as to the plan of operations to be eventually followed in completing the works, it is out of the power of this Government to do more than furnish the best information at its disposal, and this has now been done.

7. To exhibit clearly the possible cost of completing the work, I am to submit the following table of estimates prepared by the officers named :—

Estimates for completing the works by different Authorities.	Total Probable Cost of works excluding the Incidental Charges.	Total Probable Cost of works including all Incidental Charges.	Remaining Outlay to be met after deducting from last column Total Booked Outlay to end of 1881-82.
	RS.	RS.	RS.
Mr. Parkes's minimum, 15½ lakhs	72,83,735	80,28,735	19,74,649
Do. maximum, 18¼ „	75,58,735	83,03,735	22,49,649
Colonel Sankey's rough approximation, 25 lakhs.	82,33,735	89,78,735	29,24,649
Mr. G. L. Molesworth's rough approximation, 27 lakhs.	84,33,735	91,78,735	31,24,649

8. From the above it will be observed that in order to complete the whole of the works by the end of 1884-85 an average annual provision of funds varying from 6½ to about 10 lakhs will have to be made, and, pending final orders of the Secretary of State, the Right Honorable the Governor in Council requests that a further grant of 3½ lakhs may be made to meet the incidental charges of the current year.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
Colonel
~~Under~~ Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.,
~~Irrigation Branch.~~

OOTACAMUND,
3rd July 1882.

Madras Harbour Works.

COMPLETION of the —. The approximate estimate (in abstract) for the —, submitted, with remarks, for the information and orders of the Government of India.

Exd. A. F. Goodall.

12

Memo

May be printed & issued finally after making the emendations noted

10/7/82

Print

1675-76
24

No. 169 Me.

All communications should be addressed to the Secretary.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Civil Works.
Miscellaneous.

To,
The Secy to the Govt of Madras
Public Works Depart

Simla 9th May 1882

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 677 W. of the 16th March last asking for a reconsideration of the orders of the Government of India deciding that the cost of extending the Southern main drain across the sands north of Fort St. George should be borne by Provincial Funds.

2. In reply I am to say that,

13

that, under the circumstances mentioned by you, the incidence of this and other charges will be finally considered as soon as the estimate for the whole of the charges to be incurred on the Harbour Works (including both direct and all incidental charges) is submitted for the sanction of the Government of India, and when the manner in which the further outlay that may be sanctioned is to be dealt with is determined. Until this is done the cost of the extension of the drain and all other similar incidental charges should be met from Provincial Funds.

P.W.C. No 312

Recd 15 May 82

Mem. No 144 Ed/ 23-5-82

G.O. 1290. W. 22-5-82
G.O. 3180 G. 22-12-81
" 250 G. 30-1-82
G.O. 601 G. 8-3-82.
" 698 G. 17-3-"
[illegible] 677 G. 16-3-82
G.O. 1022 W. 26-4-82
" 930. W. 14-4-82
" 1997. W. 13-5-81
Disp. 94. W. 23.3.82
G.O. 3056 W. 9.12.81
G.O. 781 W. 23.3.82
788
" 1793. W 21.7.81
" 449. W 18.2.82
" 1289. W. 20.5-81
" 2721. W 3.11.81
" 712. W 16.3.81

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obed.t servant,
[illegible] Colonel R.E.
Secretary to the Govt. of India

O.L.S. 26/5
Ex. 20/6 R.26.6
Rec. 26/6 R 28/6/82
only 16/5

Print

1675-76 P
25

FROM THE EXAMINER P.W. ACCOUNTS,
MADRAS.

TO THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

NO. 40W

MADRAS, 5th JUNE 1882.

SIR,

WITH REFERENCE TO GOVERNMENT OF INDIA NO. 169 M. DATED 9TH. MAY 1882 TO GOVERNMENT (COPY RECEIVED UNDER ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S (P.W. DEPARTMENT) ENDORSEMENT NO. 266 G. DATED THE 18TH. IDEM) STATING THAT THE COST OF EXTENDING THE SOUTHERN MAIN DRAIN ACROSS THE SANDS, NORTH OF FORT SAINT GEORGE, AND ALL OTHER INDIRECT CHARGES AGAINST THE HARBOUR SHOULD BE MET FROM PROVINCIAL FUNDS TILL SUCH TIME AS THE REVISED ESTIMATE FOR THE HARBOUR SHALL HAVE BEEN FULLY CONSIDERED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. I HAVE THE HONOR TO REQUEST THAT A LIST OF SUCH INDIRECT CHARGES, AS HAVE ALREADY BEEN SANCTIONED, MAY BE FURNISHED TO ME FOR GUIDANCE IN MAKING THE NECESSARY ADJUSTMENT AND TO ENQUIRE WHETHER SUCH ADJUSTMENT SHOULD BE MADE IN THE ACCOUNTS FOR THE PAST OR CURRENT OFFICIAL YEAR.

I HAVE THE HONOR TO BE,
SIR,
YOUR MOST OBEDIENT SERVANT,
D. C. Gordon
EXAMINER P.W. ACCOUNTS.

Mem. No. 144 [illegible]

29 5/6

14

FROM THE EXAMINER P. W. ACCOUNTS,

MADRAS.

TO THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

No. 40 W.

DATED 5th JUNE 1882.
RECD.

INDIRECT CHARGES AGAINST HARBOUR WORKS----REQUESTS LIST OF ----SANCTIONED UP TO DATE AND ENQUIRES WHETHER EXPENDITURE AGAINST ----SHOULD BE TRANSFERRED IN ACCOUNTS FOR 1881-82 OR 1882-83.

Copy of [illegible] Superintendent Harbour [illegible] to Eo 1164 E dated 23rd [illegible]

A.S. 12/6 Recd: 26/6 R 28/6/82
Copy 6/6.
Cir. 24/6 R. 26.6.

---

with Encls

No. 11 W.

1675-W 4
27

FROM

THE SUPERINTENDENT,
MADRAS HARBOUR WORKS,

To The Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department,
Fort St George

MADRAS, 6th June 1882.

Sir,

I have the honour to forward the Statement requested in your Memorandum No 1164 E dated 23rd May 1882.

2. I regret there has been some delay in sending this statement but I did not understand what Item No 2 "Share of "drain lately ordered to connect with Intercepting Sewer" meant until I had enquired for, and received yesterday, G.O. No 1290 W of 22 May explaining it.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedt Servant
Nathl B Beardmore
Ag Superintendent
M. H. Works

P.W. Cons. 3679

Buildings & Roads

From
The Ag Superintendent
Madras Harbour Works

G.O. 1290 W. 24-5-82

No 11 W
Dated 6th June 1882
Recd 9/6

No of Enclosures One

5% Contingencies

Submits statement showing –

Recd 26-6 R. 28/6/82
[illegible] 23-6
O 8/6 Cr 24/6 Reb. 6

0/7/6

65

Madras Harbour Works

Incidental Expenses in connection with Harbour in reply to Memo 144 E of Chief Engineer P.W.D. dated Ootacamund 23 May 1882

1675/9
29

No	Particulars of charge	Amount		
1.	Expenses of setting Memorial Stone by H.R.H the Prince of Wales in November 1875. (H)	8,654	"	"
2.	Channel to carry off rain water from the Drain close to the South Pier of Harbour (H)	893	"	"
3	Law Charges in connexion with the Barque "James Aiken" (H)	690	9	4
4	Gratuities awarded to relatives of men who died from accidents by the Cyclone &c of 12.11.81 (H)	5,858	"	"
5.	The Cost of a pipe to carry Sewage from Main Drain near the Fort, by the Municipality in July 1879 (C)	3,145	5	8
6	North Beach Protective Works at Royapuram & Casemode to 31st March 1881 (a)	1,51,616	8	5
7	Extension of Outfall Sewer near Fort as now being carried out by the Municipality (a)	13,663	"	"
8.	Purchase of Mrs Sadler's land at Royapuram	1,400	"	"
9	Theft from Cash Chest at Office (a)	50	"	"
10	Compensation for Loss, & purchase of remaining land at Royapooram under G.O. No 601 W. of 8th March 1882 (a)	5,341	9	2
11	Compensation for loss of 4 months' rent to Kather Saib at Cassemode under G.O. No 1037 W. dated 27 April 1882 (a)	240	"	"
	18 Total Carried over	1,91,552	"	7

1675-76/30

	Brought forward	196,552 .. 7
12	Probable cost of Revetment work North of Harbour . . . . (a) . . .	36,000 .. ..
13	Cost of land at Cusemode proposed in Mr. Parkes' report of 4th February 1882 to be bought in order to save expense of Protecting it from Encroachment of the Sea - Note. There will probably be interest in shape of rent on this sum . . . . (a) . .	208149 .. ..
14	Half cost of Connecting Drain No. 5c near High Court, with Intercepting Sewer as directed in G.O 1290W of 22nd May 1882 30 yds. . . . . (c)	200 - -
		440,901 .. 7

Nath^l. B. Beardmore C.E.
Ag Superintendent
M.H. Works

Approximate General Estimate for the Madras Harbour Works.

Reference.

Govt: of India letter No. 169-M d/ 9 May 82

Report.

The annexed estimates giving in abstract as far as possible the approximate total outlay required for the completion of the Madras Harbour Works are based on the actuals of past outlay, and as regards the rest on the best available details.

2. To meet the views of the Govt: of India the General Abstract divides the whole outlay past and prospective into two main heads

(1) the Harbour Works proper.

(2) Incidental or Contingent works.

3. As regards the first head it may be observed that the original estimate for the work sanctioned by the Secy of State amounted to Rs: 62,80,000 and though containing one item not provided by Mr Parkes, viz. 2 Lakhs on account of extra rubble required for the bases of the piers, and the usual per centage allowance for "contingencies", no specific sub heads were separated under the latter.

4. The amount of Estimate No 1 which provides for the whole of the Harbour Works proper, amounting to Rs: 75,58,735, is as will be observed chiefly made up of the two items (1) booked outlay to end of the last Offl year, and

and (2) 18¼ Lakhs, Mr Parkes' maximum estimate for completing the work after the storm of the 12 Novr: '81. If Mr Parkes' minimum estimate be accepted the Total would be Rs: 72,83,735.

On the Chief Engineer's rough estimate of 25 Lakhs for finishing the work the outlay would be Rs: 82,33,735 and by Mr Molesworth of 27 Lakhs, Rs 84,33,735.

5. Estimate No 2 amounting to Rs: 4,50,000 which is the first of the estimates for the incidental works is for the Protective operation found necessary north of the harbour. The necessity for the works here has shewn itself more and more as the Harbour Works

advanced seaward, the effect of the South West monsoon being to occasion such a set of the along-shore current as to erode the shore and endanger property to nearly 2 miles north of the Harbour.

6. At first the cost of the works here was debited to ordinary contingencies, Rs: 1,13,624 being the total amount thus booked up to end of last official year. Since then as will be observed from G.O. 17 Mar: No 698. W. the subject has called for separate and careful consideration, the results of which has been that while it has been decided to carry the longitudinal revetment to a certain point north of the Harbour the sea is to be allowed to act freely on the shore in advance of this - it being clear that it would be cheaper to acquire the rights in the land here than to execute protective works - Hence it will be seen that whereas items 1 and 5 amount to Rs: 1,46,616, the remaining five items are for compensation.

7. Estimate No 3 deals with another incidental charge not provided for in the Original Estimate viz: the Moorings.

8. The actual outlay debited to this head to end of last official year against supposed savings on the general sanction was Rs: 1,74,970 and the remainder of the estimate will have to be met for completion

of the work.

9. Estimate No. 4 amounting to Rs: 45,000 for the intercepting sewer provides for a work also not entered specifically in the original estimate. The outlay, Rs: 34,352 as booked up to end of last official year, was treated as debitable to general contingencies of the work, the drain in question owing its origin entirely to the Harbour, for the sole use of which it has been constructed. This drain carries the whole of the sewage (not the storm waters) which formerly discharged into the sea south of, and along the present base of the Harbour, and delivers it ~~north and~~ clear of the work, to the south

1675-96/34

10. Estimate No. 5 amounting to Rs: 15,000 provides for a work of precisely analogous character and no less intimately connected with the Harbour Scheme. It in fact provides for the discharge of the storm waters not entered in Estimate No. 4 but no less essential. The booked outlay to end of last official year was Rs: 13,500 and though at first charged against the general contingencies of the Harbour Works was not specifically provided for in the original estimate ~~as~~ sanctioned by the Secy: of State.

C. W. Hanbury
Col: RE
Chief Engr. P.W.D.

23rd June 82

12

1675-76
35

Madras Harbour Work

Abstract Estimate No. 1

— Harbour Works proper —

Item No.	Particulars	Cost Rs.	a	p
1	Outlay up to end of 81-82	57,17,640	"	"
2.	Mr. Parkes' maximum estimate for restoring the Harbour on his monolithic system	18,25,000	"	"
3.	Expenses of setting Memorial stone by H.R.H. the Prince of Wales in Nov: '75	8,654	"	"
4.	Channel to carry off rain water from the Drain close to the South Pier of Harbour	893	"	"
5	Law charges in connection with the barque "James Aiken"	690	9	4
6	Gratuities awarded to relatives of men who died from accidents during the cyclone of 12 Nov: 81	5,858	"	"
	Total Rs.	75,58,735	"	"

1675-76
36

Madras Harbour Works

Abstract Estimate No 2

Incidental or directly Contingent Works not provided for in the original estimate.—

— North Protective Works.—

Item No	Particulars	Cost Rs	a	p
1	Outlay on the North Beach Protective Works at Royapuram & Cassemode up to 31 March 81	1,10,616	8	5
2	Purchase of Mr Sadler's land at Royapooram	1,400	-	-
3.	Compensation for loss & purchase of remaining land at Royapooram under G.O. 601. W. 8-3-82	57,341	9	2
4.	Compensation for loss of 4 months rent to Kathir Saib at Cassemode under G.O. 1037. W. d/ 27-4-82	240	-	-
5.	Probable cost of revetment North of Harbour	36,000	-	-
6	Cost of land at Cassemode proposed in Mr Parkes' report of 4 February '82 to be bought to save the expense of protecting it from encroachment of the sea	2,08,149	-	-
	Carried forward	4,07,747	1	7

Item No	Particulars	Cost Rs a
	Carried forward Rs	4,07,747 1 7
7	Add for compensation and works not included in the above	42,252 14 5
	Total Rs.	4,50,000 0

Madras Harbour Works. 14

Abstract Estimate No 3

1675-76/37

Incidental charges or directly contingent Works not provided for in the original Estimate:

— Moorings —

Item No	Particulars	Cost Rs a p
1.	Cost of Moorings } up to end of 81-82	1,71,310 6 8
2	Repairs to do } up to end of 81-82	3,659 15 10
3.	Balance of estimate amounting to Rs. 2,20,750	45,780 " "
4.	Amount assumed for contingencies	14,250 " "
	Total Rs:	2,35,000 0 0

— Madras Harbour Works —

Abstract Estimate No. 4

Incidental or directly Contingent Works not provided for in the Estimate. 1675:96/38

— Intercepting Drain —

Items No.	Particulars	Cost Rs a p
	Outlay on the Intercepting Sewer up to 31st May 83	34,352 - -
~~1.~~	~~Intercepting Drain East to No 10 drain~~	~~10,120 7 2~~
~~2~~	~~Ditto No 10 outlet~~	~~4,420 9 -~~
2	Cost of a pipe to carry sewage from Main Drain near the Fort by the Municipality in July '79 —	3,145 5 8
3 4	Half cost of connecting Drain &c near High Court with Intercepting Sewer as directed in G.O. 1290. W. d/ 22nd May '82 —	200 . .
4 5	Add for completion and one or two minor junctions & other unforeseen work connected with the intercepting Sewer —	7,302 10 4
	Total Rs.	45,000 0 0

16
1675-76
39

Madras Harbour Works.

Abstract Estimate No. 5

— Incidental or strictly Contingent Works not provided for in the original Estimate —

— Outfall Sewer North of Fort St. George —

Item No.	Particulars	Cost Rs. a. p.
1.	Extension of Outfall Sewer near Fort as now being carried out by the Municipality	13,663 " "
2.	Estimated outlay to complete	1,337 " "
	Total Rs.	15000 " "

Approximate General Estimate for the Madras Harbour Works

1675-76
40

Items	Particulars	
	Harbour Proper.	
1	Cost as detailed in Abstract Estimate No. 1	75,58,735 - -
	Incidental or Contingent Works.	
2	Protective Works North of the Harbour	4,50,000 - -
3	Moorings	2,35,000 - -
4	Intercepting drain	45,000 - -
5	Fort Outfall drain	15,000 - -
	Grand Total Rs:	83,03,735 - -

Epm 2/6

H.C.

1675/76
6

G.O. 1675 W of 3d July 1882 has been Comm^d to the Financial Dept^t with a copy of letter to Gov^t of India. Please have this noted on the Original & Spare copies at Madras.

In the bottom line of the first page of letter No. 1676 W Provicinal should be Provincial.

R. S.

CAW
26/7

OLS 58.7

13/6

8

CAW 1676/74
7

The C branch was replied about the two contingent items in the Harbour Estimate the S of S must be addressed in regard to the incidental charges. So soon as Mr. Bamburgh gives us the particulars of the charges due to the protection works — when complete then please send me the file with my last note

13/6/82

To W

All the papers sent back to the office are in the accompanying files, together with the recent replies.

R.S. 13/6.

3)

Statement showing the difference between Mr Beardmore's Statement and Appendix A of W's Note of the 29 May 82.

Correct Total of Items in Appendix A ———— Rs 7,97,000 – " – "

Add the following Items in Mr B's Statement not included in the above:–

No 1 — Rs 8,654 – " – "
2 — " 893 – " – "
3 — " 690 – 9 – 4
4 — " 5,858 – " – "
5 — " 3,145 – 5 – 8
9 — " 50 – " – "
11 — " 240 – " – "
14 — " 200 – " – "

Differ: between Item 10 & amount allowed under G.O. 698. F. 17.3.82 – 51341 – 9 – 2
50000 – 0 – 0 1341 – 9 – 2

Do do Item 12 &
amt: Sanctd: in G.O. quoted above —— 36000 – " – "
35600 – " – " 400 – " – "
" 21,472 – 8 – 2

Rs: 8,18,472 – 8 – 2

Deduct the following Items not included in Mr B's Statement:– Differ: between II (a) & Mr B's Items 6 + 8 + 10 + 12 + 13 i.e.:–
450,000 – " – "
405,765 – 8 – 5 44,234 – 7 – 7

33

1,10,616 – 8 – 5
1,400 – " – "
51341 – 9 – 2 — 1341 – 9 – 2 added above 50000 – " – "
36000 – 400 – do 35600 – " – "
405,765 – 8 – 5

Item II (b) — 2,35,000 – 0 – 0
(c) — 45,000 – 0 – 0
(e) — 52,000 – 0 – 0

Differ: between II (d) and Item 7 in Mr B's Stat: – 15000
13663 1337 – 0 – 0 3,77,571 – 7 – 7

1675-76
9

Mr Beardmore's Total Rs: 4,40,901 – 0 – 7

13.6.82.

10

Appendix (A)

34

1875/2
11

Approximate Revised Estimate of outlay on the Madras Harbour Works required for their completion with all incidental charges.

Main and Subsidiary Heads.	Proposed outlay to end of 1881-82 Rs	Estimated outlay to complete Rs	Total subsidiary Heads Rs	Total Main Heads Rs (in round No.)	Remarks.
I. Harbour Works proper (H)	57,17,640	* 18,25,000		75,50,000	* This is Mr Parkes' maximum Estimate for restoring the Harbour on his monolithic system. If his minimum estimate on same system of 15½ lakhs be taken, the amount in last column will be reduced to 72,75,000 – whereas if the Chief Engineer's rough estimate of 25 lakhs be taken for completing the work on the random block system the total will be Rs. 82,25,000. – Under Mr Molesworth's rough Estimate of 27 lakhs the amount will be raised to Rs 84,25,000
II. Incidental or Ancillary Contingent works not provided for in the original Estimate					
(a) Protective Works North of the Harbour	1 13 624	✠ 3 36,376	4 50000	8,00,000	✠ This amount is made up of two sums (1) Mr Parkes' estimate for completing the shore revetment North of Harbour & value of land to be acquired, see G.O. 17 Mar. 82 No 698. W. amounting to Rs: 2,94,000 and (2) a sum of Rs 42376 added for compensation & works not included in the above
(b) Harbour Moorings	174,970	£ 60,030	235000		£ This amount is made up of (1) the balance of the estimate of 28 Apl. 82 for Moorings Rs 2,20,750 & (2) an amount assumed for contingencies Rs: 14250
(c) Intercepting Drain	34,352	ø 10,648	45000		ø Amount estimated for completing one or two minor junctions & other unforeseen work connected with the intercepting sewer.
(d) Outfall Sewer North of Fort St George	13500	1500	15000		
(e) Compensation for land.					
		52,000			
Total Rs.	60,54,086	22,95,554		83,50,000	

& Included in II (a)

R. S. 26/5.

Ctte
28/5/82

12

The Hon W Huddleston

The Rt Honble the Governor

1675/96
12

For orders

The Examiner P W accounts brought× to notice that a small Estimate for extending the outfall of the drain north of Ft. St. George, amounting to Rs 13 663, though considered by this Government as an integral portion of the Harbour Works should be reported for the special sanction of the G of I.

The result after some correspondence has been (See letter from G of I No 169 W of 9th May 1882) that pending submission of the Complete Estimate for the whole of the charges (direct and indirect) to be incurred in the Harbour Works, the cost of the extension of the drain in question and of

31

× See G O 30 Jan 1882 No 250 W

I think that ~~that~~ what G.I. means is, that pending decision as to the mode of repairing & completing the Harbour Works & the framing & sanctioning of a final Estimate wh. shall cover all charges, direct & indirect, any intermediate expenditure that may be unavoidable - other than directly on the Harbour Works - shall be provided by Provl. subject to adjustment hereafter by inclusion in the complete Estimate.

I do not understand that G.I. proposes to impose any charges on Provl. as a final debit but simply that they object to providing supplementary grants without estimates for minor incidental expenses - until other similar incidental charges" shall be met from Provincial Funds

As under the ~~emphatic~~ tenor of the ~~instructions conveyed by the G of I~~ ~~[illegible]~~, the cost of meeting not only the ordinary incidental charges (in themselves aggregating a large amount) but also the completion of the Harbour Works proper may possibly be included it is clear that no time should be lost in obtaining a definite ruling from the G of I as to the precise bearing of the order above alluded to

At this moment owing to the divergent views of the several Engineers who have reported on the means to be adopted in completing the Harbour Works, it is impossible to frame the complete

the whole Estimate is before them - & the whole Imperial liability is known & measures can be taken to provide for meeting it.

I think this is not unreasonable. & I don't suppose that there in immediate essential contingencies will be many or costly. In fact I don't anticipate any exp. except perhaps of extension of a few drains. Nothing that can be postponed need be undertaken - And unless further large & inevitable incidental expendre. be anticipated before the complete Estimate can be framed - then I assume I think it wd. be better not to invite discussion with the G.I. as to what "other &c" incidental charges - they consider "similar" to the

Extension of the ~~[illegible]~~ South drain work of the Port.

The less we trouble the G.I. in the matter the better ultimately for Govt. I think.

I don't consider that the G.I. means retro:spective effect. Except as to the Drain extension = under Rs 16000 -

I certainly do not assume that it applies to the protective works to the North -

If it be imperative to complete all this possibly the work without delay - I wd. send the estimate to G.I. saying so. & that as we are not in a position now to frame the complete harbour Est. it is forwarded for G.I. considn. - as the amt. is such that Govt. is unable to make an immediate provision subject to future adjustment after Imperial - Lit.

Revised Estimate required by the S of S, but the attached Statement (A) most of the figures in which have been checked by the Examiner Circle is ~~thought~~ a sufficiently accurate & complete view of the financial liabilities on account of the work from first to last ~~as will~~ to serve the object immediately in view.

The original Estimate for the Harbour Works as sanctioned by the S of S, amounted to Rs 62,80,000

Out of this the total outlay to end of 1881-82 amounted to Rs 60,54,086 leaving thus an unspent balance of Rs 2,25,914

The amount required for completing the whole of the incidental or directly contingent works (See 3d. Column of Statement A)

~~[illegible]~~, excluding the cost of completing the Harbour works proper, comes to Rs 4,60,554

Had in fact the Harbour works stood the test of the 12th Novr Cyclone the whole Scheme could as then shewn have been completed for a sum not exceeding the original sanction by more than 2½ Lakhs or less than 4 per cent ~~[illegible]~~ a wide margin

Booked outlay	60 54 086
Incidental works to complete	4,60,554
Total	65,14,640
Sanction	62,80,000
Excess Rs	2,34,640

The several Estimates for completing the Harbour works proper are by

	Rs
Mr Parkes's maxm Estimate	18,25,000
ditto minimum	15,50,000
Colonel Sankey's rough approximation	25,00,000
Mr Molesworth's do	27,00,000

(which has just been received)

As regards the funds to be provided from the

commencement of the current off. year the following table shews the results according to whichever plan is adopted with ultimate cost of the works

under which plan for completion	Outlay to end of 1881-82 Rs	Required to complete including all incidental works Rs	Total ultimate cost of the works Rs (in round numbers)
1	2	3	4
Mr. Parkes's No(1)	60 54 086	22,85,554	83,50,000
ditto No(2)		20,10,534	80,50,000
Colonel Sankey's		29,60,554	90,00,000
Mr. Molesworth		31,60,554	92,00,000

The question at present for the decision of the Govt of is whether all or a portion of the sums given in Column 3 above are to be met by Provincial, or again whether the works are to be met as heretofore from Imperial Grants

To finish the works with any regard to Economy in Supervi it would be clearly undesirable that the years expenditure should be less than between 8 or 10 Lakhs as justified by the past experience of these works, but it need hardly be pointed out that assignments of funds to this extent from Provincial would at once necessitate the closure of nearly half the Provincial works in the Country — considering moreover that it has only become possible this year, from the slight two alteration made in the enhancement of Provincial resources, to commence the construction of some of the Civil buildings in the Presidency, the sanctions for which date as far back as 1872, it will be at once perceived that any curtailment of funds in order to meet the requirements of the harbour works would be fatal to administrative progress

In fact it may be questioned whether if this be the only alternative open it would not be much better to stop all operations at the harbour

In the annexed Statement (A) an effort it will be observed has been made to shew under head II (a), (b), (c), (d), & (e), all the incidental works separately

The aggregate cost of these amounts to 8 Lakhs of which about 4½ remains to be spent — The Estimates for these are nearly all in detail and the figures may be accepted as very fairly accurate — Some of the Sub heads viz (a) (b) (c) have all along been considered as portions of the original Estimate & to be provided for from the Imperial annual grants – They are known each and all integral and absolutely indispensable portions of the Scheme, and it is quite out of my power to assign any reason why any one should be eliminated from the General Estimate and be separately provided for

As regards "indirect" charges it is believed that none such as defined in Ch XV para 177 have to be taken into account. The whole of the Establt. employed on the works is temporary, and the leave & pension allowances have therefore not to be considered

R. W. Stanley

25 May 1882

× Initialed on the cover R.S. 28/6

C.A.W.

May issue at once as modified by H.E. the Governor

28/6

A.B.C.

4/7

Retd. from Secy: 28/6/82

× R.S. Hon. the Governor

1675-F
16

Memo

The latest decision in regard to the finance of the Harbour Works vide Proceedings G.O. 7th May 1880 No 936 Financial (Limited)

The Examiner's opinion in regard to this is

"Interest is to be charged only upon the sum given by Imperial and not upon any portion given by Provincial; further that no interest which has been borne by "Imperial" during construction or prior to the levy of dues, shall be claimed from Provincial, which (Provincial) shall be liable for interest upon Rs 62,80,000 only from completion of the work regardless whether or not dues are levied at once on such completion

"Interest can therefore in my opinion accrue only from date of completion"

He goes on to say (I quote from an office note of 15/5/82) that from the date of such completion Provincial will be liable at 4 per cent on Rs 62,80,000 or Rs 1,25,600, and thereafter will be liable for Rs 2,51,200 annually It will also be liable for maintenance &c.

It will be observed from the above that no question of providing for a sinking fund has entered latterly into the question however the matter may have originally been dealt with, and further that no question of interest in the [illegible] opinion

arise till the works have been completed

This is based on Clause III para 4 of the Order but it seems to me that if under the operation of the Port bill now being drafted we are levied the S of S may require the payment of interest

Another matter which has hitherto not attracted attention is the currency in which the Sanction has been given. This it will be noticed has invariably been in Sterling

In other words the Sanction is not for Rs 62,80,000 but for Rs 75,36,000 @ 1/8d which if correct would leave us with an available balance of Rs 12,56,000 total Expenditure to end of 81-82 being

4) Rs 565,000 on Harbour + Rs 336,446 [illegible]

works = Rs 59,86,446

There are thus it will be observed some complicated questions connected with the whole ~~question~~ finance of the work which I confess it appears to me unde-sirable to raise till the immediate question in hand viz: the provision of ways and means for the current year outlay has been settled.

This issue I have endeavoured in the draft now before H.E. the Governor to keep clear while at the same time showing the S of S that there are large liabilities now to be incurred in consequence of the accident to the works during the late Cyclone which it is quite out of the power of this Govt. to meet from its Provincial funds

28·6·82

1875-76/18

Special

To the Rt Hon'ble the Governor

"In accordance with the wish expressed by the H. M. the two drafts adverted to in the annexed note are herewith submitted for the approval of H.E. the Governor

26/6/82

: 26-6 R 25-6-82

Hon H E Sullivan
Special

Drafts for approval

The annexed draft of letter to the G of I and the accompanying Report on the Harbour works have been based on the marked portion of the Hon. Mr Huddleston's note (on my Office memo of 29th May) and on instructions which I received from H.E. the Governor on taking the case to him personally.

The fullest explanation in my power have in these papers been afforded to the G of I, and as it is essential ~~that~~ the case should be disposed of as quickly as possible I have marked ~~the~~ file Special — If I may venture to express an opinion it is not I think necessary ~~that~~ the file should be re-circulated to H.E. the Governor 23/6/82

I think H.E. should see it H.S.

Cir: 24/6 R 26.6

No 190

4 JUN 82

1675-76
19.

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1882. P.W. DEPT.

SECRETARY.

2nd June 1882.

OFFICE NOTE.

~~Regd No 175 4/5/6/82~~

To C.

In a recent office note in connection with expenditure on the Madras Harbour Work, you set down a sum of Rs. 15000 as expenditure on the outfall sewer North of Fort St George — please let me know how much of this amount has been spent up to the end of 81-82 — also the R.S.

43

o.s. 4/6

data on which you have entered the amount of Rs 52000 as Compensation for land in your late note

1/6/82

W.

No 205 of 6th June 1882.

W/

The outlay on the sewer to end of 1881-82 is Rs 13663. G.O. No 449 W of 10th February 1882.

2. As to the data on which I have entered Rs 52000/- as Compensation for land please see G.O. No 601 W dated 8th March 1882 which sanctions Rs 50142/- and against which sanction the Superintendent has spent Rs 51342/- or Rs 1200/- more which I have questioned in the Audit Note on March's Account.

C.

Ed. 6/6

1875-76

2P

Mis Eq. 1236 d. 25-5-80

G.O. " 712 d. 16-3-81

" " 698 d. 17-3-82

Bd No 966 W of 20/4/82

Memo - 977 C - 2-5-82.

See marginal pencil note to your prepared statement

No 72 Ed/C

C Reg. No 994 of 8 May

8 MAY 82

Having to submit soon a statement to Govt. of the financial position of the Madras Harbour Works I should be glad to have reliable information from your Office on one or two points

1st As regards outlay to date

Your last Comparative Statement for Feby gives total outlay at Rs 59,62,304-5-5

As it is desirable to separate the outlay on (a) Protective works works of the Harbour and (b) moorings I have taken

(a) ... Rs 109,490-15-8

(b) -- 174,493-0-1

283,983-15-9

leaving as nett outlay against Harbour works alone Rs 56,78,320-9-8

Is this correct?

2d As regards the cost of Protective works

see 17/5

of the Harbour this is made up jointly of Actual outlay jointly Estimated ditto w/t

Actual as per (a) above	Rs 1,09,490-15-8
Estimated see G.O. 17/3/82 No 698W	2,94,000-0-0
	Rs 4,03,490-15-8

+ probably some contingencies

Is this correct or should also the item Rs 4428-9-0 Repairs Sea damages see Schedule No 2 be also added in ?

3°. As regards the moorings I must I fear take the original ~~Estimate~~ of 2 Lakhs as sufficiently reliable

4°. As regards the liabilities of Government and Port Funds under the ruling of the G of I see Fin.l Despt No 936 of 7/5/80 I should wish to know as nearly as possible how the account matters will stand under

1875–76
21

the altered condition of matters entailed by the damage occasioned by the storm of the 12 Nov. 1881

(1) Future debits to Provincial under the above ruling

All excess over Rs 62,80,000 capital outlay less dues received is to be borne by Provincial.

The Capital outlay must very soon reach the above limit and judging from the actual booked outlay to date as above the ultimate expenditure cannot fall short of the following

Harbour works outlay	Rs
To date as above	56,78,320
To completion as Estimated *	25,00,000
Total Harbour Works	81,78,320
Protective works north (Estimated)	4,50,000
Moorings Estimated	2,00,000
	88,28,320

with contingencies say 88½ Lakhs

Under the Fin.l order above quoted it is ruled ~~that~~ after the limit of capital outlay Rs 62.8 Lakhs has been passed Provincial

* Mr Parkes's maximum Est. for the restoration is 18¼ and his minimum 15½ Lakhs. Mine is 25 and there is reason to believe ~~that~~ Mr Molesworth's is higher

will be charged or rather have to meet 4½ per cent on the outlay; it is however doubtful whether in the present State of the money market and with reference to late orders in regard to the interest on Productive Works Capital outlay more than 4 % will be demanded

If my Estimate of 88½ Lakhs be correct the annual charge at 4 % will be 3.54 Lakhs to which adding the maintenance charges underestimated probably at Rs 60000 per annum the total to be debited to Provincial would be 3.54 + 0.60 = 4.14 Lakhs

This however leaves out account all accumulations of interest charges while the work has been & probably will remain under construction

~~[illegible]~~ If these arrears be added as a lump sum to the Capital outlay how much will ~~[illegible]~~ they amount to ~~[illegible]~~ assuming that the work of restoration takes 2½ years from this

date and that the outlay yet to be incurred (say 28½ Lakhs) is equally spread over the interval ?

The order quoted also rules that the Govt. may levy port-dues in recompense of the outlay as follows

	Rs
4 % on Rs 628,0000 =	251200
maintenance ----	60000
Rs	3,11,200

If this be correct leaving out all charges on account of accrued interest it would appear that eventually Provincial will have to meet the difference 4.14 − 3.11 = about 1 Lakh per annum

Is this correct ?

I shall be glad to have any further remarks you may wish to offer in elucidation of the financial position & prospects of the work but in any case please let me have your reply very soon

5/5/82

TO M. No. 135 D/15/5/82
Regd 16/5/82
Enc. 6.

YOUR OFFICE NOTE NO.72 E. DATED 6TH.MAY I882 REGARDING THE HARBOR WORKS FINANCIAL POSITION.

TAKING YOUR PROGRAMME AND RESULTS TO END OF MARCH I882, THE OUTLAY ON THE WORKS AS A WHOLE IS RS.60,40,586 OF WHICH CONTINGENT WORKS HAVE COST AS FOLLOWS:-

NORTH PROTECTIVE WORKS..	I,07,796
REPAIRS DO ...	4,428
SALLER'S LAND............	I,400
	I,I3,624
MOORINGS,................	I,74,970
INTERCEPTING DRAIN......	34,352
	3,22,946

LEAVING AS OUTLAY ON HARBOR PROPER

TO END OF I88I-82.....	RS.57,I7,640
ADD TO COMPLETE.........	25,02,360
	RS.82,20,000

TAKING NOW THE CONTINGENT WORKS.

NORTH PROTECTIVE WORKS- OUTLAY TO

END OF I88I-82 AS ABOVE	RS.I,I3,624
ESTIMATE G.O. 690 W DATED I7TH. MARCH I882.......	RS.2,94,000
CONTINGENCIES SAY.......	RS. 42,376
	RS.4,50,000

MOORINGS-ESTIMATE SEE MY NO.I6 W.DATED 28TH.APRIL I882..	RS.2,20,750
INTERCEPTING DRAIN......	RS. 35,000
CONTINGENCIES SAY.......	RS. 24,250
	RS.7,30,000
ADD ITEM ~~OVERLEAF~~ above..........	82,20,000
GRAND TOTAL FOR THE WHOLE WORK......	RS.89,50,000

THE DISTRIBUTION OF THIS BETWEEN IMPERIAL AND PROVINCIAL AND THE ASSUMED ANNUAL EXPENDITURE DURING I882-83 AND UNTIL SUPPOSED COMPLETION IN SEPTEMBER I884 MAY BE TAKEN AS FOLLOWS:-

1675276
23

IMPERIAL.

OUTLAY TO END OF I88I-82.	RS.60,40,586
" IN I882-83.........	RS. 2,39,4I4
	RS.62,80,000

PROVINCIAL.

OUTLAY IN I882-83...	RS. 9,0I,600
" IN I883-84...	RS.II,45,600
" IN I884-85...	RS. 6,22,800
	RS.26,70,000
MAKING UP............	RS.89,50,000

CONTINGENT WORKS NOT REFERRED TO ABOVE, NOR INCLUDED IN THE OUTLAY TO END OF I882-83 ARE AS FOLLOWS:-

COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OF LAND SAY.....	RS.52,000
EXTENSION OF OUTFALL OF SEWER AT FORT TO SEA SAY......	RS.I5,000

WITH REFERENCE TO INTEREST CHARGES, AS I UNDERSTAND G.O.NO.936 DATED 7TH.MAY I880 FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT, INTEREST IS TO BE CHARGED ONLY UPON THE SUM GIVEN BY IMPERIAL AND NOT UPON ANY PORTION GIVEN BY PROVINCIAL; FURTHER THAT NO INTEREST WHICH HAS BEEN BORNE BY IMPERIAL DURING CONSTRUCTION OR PRIOR TO THE LEVY OF DUES, SHALL BE CLAIMED FROM

47

PROVINCIAL, WHICH (PROVINCIAL) SHALL BE LIABLE FOR INTEREST UPON RS.62,80,000 ONLY FROM COMPLETION OF THE WORK, REGARDLESS WHETHER OR NOT DUES ARE LEVIED AT ONCE ON SUCH COMPLETION OR AT ANY SUBSEQUENT PERIOD. INTEREST CAN THEREFORE, IN MY OPINION, ACCRUE ONLY FROM DATE OF COMPLETION. IN THIS VIEW, ASSUMING COMPLETION AND THE LEVY OF DUES TO TAKE PLACE IN SEPTEMBER 1884, PROVINCIAL WILL BE LIABLE FROM THAT DATE FOR INTEREST FOR 1884-85 AT 4 PER CENT (TAKING YOUR FIGURE) ON RS.62,80,000, OF RS.1,25,600, AND ~~THEREFORE~~ after WILL BE LIABLE FOR RS.2,51,200 ANNUALLY. IT WILL OF COURSE BE LIABLE FOR THE MAINTENANCE EXPENDITURE ESTIMATED AT RS.60,000 PER ANNUM, GIVING A TOTAL ANNUAL LIABILITY OF SAY RS. 3,11,200. TO MEET THIS, PORT DUES ARE TO BE LEVIED, AND SO FAR AS SUCH DUES FALL SHORT OF THE LIABILITY PROVINCIAL IS RESPONSIBLE FOR MAKING GOOD THE DEFICIT.

C.

No. 1675 W. [illegible] 18

1675-76 H.8

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 3rd July 1882

Read the following:—

From

the Govt. of India P.W.D. (H.E. No. 169. M. d/ 9.5.82)
" Exr: P.W. Accts: (" 40. W. d/ 5.6.82)
" Supt. M.H. Works (" 11. W. d/ 6.6.82)
~~Office Supt. Exr. P.W. Accts. (" 203 d/ 6.6.82)~~
Report by the Chief Engr. P.W.D. on the Madras Harbour Estimates (H.E. — d/ 23.6.82)

Ordered that the following letter be sent to the Govt. of India

(H.E. No. 1676 W. d/ 3rd July/82)

To

The Secy. to the Govt. of India P.W.D.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No. 169. M. d/ 9th May 82, I am desired to submit for the information and orders

48

I have no objection to make to the draft but am inclined to think that henceforth in addressing the Govt of India we should begin once at the beginning assume that they know nothing of the facts & even at the risk of being prolix explain everything as if we were ~~[illegible]~~ dealing with people whose minds were an absolute blank on the subject ~~[illegible]~~ which we were ~~dealing~~ treating. I believe time will be saved & friction diminished by adopting this policy. MB June 27/82

Supdt. M. H. Works } with copy of
Ex. S. Cr. a } letter to G. of I.

Fincl. Dept. – Supplied from Copy 26/7/82 of the Most Honorable the Governor General in Council the annexed approximate Estimate (in abstract) for the completion of the Madras Harbour Works accompanied by a General Report by the Chief Engineer.

2. Your letter under reply directs that the expenditure in the Southern outfall drain shall be borne by "Provincial" pending orders in regard to the whole of the charges to be incurred on the work and this has, I am to say, been accordingly arranged for.

3. The Examiner P. W.

Pro. Govt. No 1675 of 3d July 1882

1875-76
49

R19

-Accounts requests however that the other similar incidental charges adverted to at the close of your letter under reply shall now be defined, being of opinion that none of these should be debited against the provision of 2 Lakhs sanctioned in your telegram d/ 19 April '82

4. From the Report herewith submitted it will be observed that in addition to the cost of the Harbour proper no less than 7½ Lakhs are required for directly incidental or contingent

Estimate	No 2 —	Rs	4,50,000.
"	" 3 —	"	2,35,000.
"	" 4 —	"	45,000.
"	" 5 —	"	15,000.
		Total Rs	7,45,000.

49

works – Of this amount Rs: 3,36,440 (including Rs: 13,500 for the work specifically under reference) the booked outlay to end of last official year, has already been debited against the general contingencies of the Estimate.

5. Under the ruling contained in your letter under reply the difference between the estimated and booked outlay, viz, Rs: 4,08,556 would have now to be met from Provincial Assignments ~~of the current year~~, but, with reference to this, I am to submit that, which is quite out of with the numerous pressing demands on it to meet the ordinary requirements of the Presidency it is impossible for this Govt: to make the necessary provision and ~~the power of this Govt: with the numerous pressing demands which it has to meet for the general requirements of the Presidency, to provide for this demand~~, the Right Honorable the Governor in Council therefore trusts that the Govt: of India will be pleased on further consideration to allow the whole of the charges for the incidental works directly connected with the Harbour to be met as heretofore by an Imperial Grant.

15726-76
80

6. No decision having as yet been received from the Secy: of State as to the plan of operations to

be eventually followed in completing the works, it is out of the power of this Govt: to do more than furnish the best information at its disposal and this has now been done.

7. In order to shew clearly the possible demands for the work as a whole I am to submit the following table for the information of the Govt: of India shewing these according to whichever of the Estimates submitted may be accepted for the completion of the works after the injuries sustained by the cyclone of the 12th Novr: '81:—

To exhibit clearly the possible cost of completing the work I am to submit the following table of estimates prepared by the officers named

1875-76
51

P 21

Estimates for completing the works by different authorities	Total probable cost of works excluding the incidental charges	Total probable cost of works including all incidental charges.	Remaining outlay to be met after deducting from last column total booked outlay to end of 1881-82.
Mr. Parkes' minimum 15½ Lakhs	72,83,735	80,28,735.	19,74,649.
Do — maximum 18¼ —	75,58,735	83,03,735.	22,49,649.
Col: Sankey's rough approximation 25 —	82,33,735	89,78,735	29,24,649.
Mr. G. L. Molesworth's rough approximation 27 —	84,33,735	91,78,735	31,24,649.

8 From ~~this~~ the above it will be observed that in order to complete the whole of the works by the end of 1884-85 an average annual provision of funds varying from 6½ to about 10 Lakhs will have to be ~~provided~~ made ~~for~~ and ~~in the mean~~ ~~while~~ pending final

51

orders of the Secy: of State, the Right Honorable the Govr: in Council ~~would~~ requests that a further grant of 3½ Lakhs may be made to meet the incidental charges of the current year.

23/6/82

Recd. 26-6 R 28.6.82

Cir: 26/6 R 26.6.

Send the proposals (all) for reporters proposed :-

I think (?) sh. be addressed on Mr Parkes' proposals in re the beach

Cu. 1.3.82 R. 4.5.82

52

[illegible]

1675-76/52

For orders

The committee appointed to report on compensation for property injured by the erection of the Madras Harbour (See G.O. 8/3/82 No 601 W) reported in all cases of such excepting (para 6) that of Mr Vandeswart & B Vuttier Saib.

The Committee say that in Mr Vandeswart's case the damage due to a wall has been repaired and ~~that~~ his house has "not suffered any damage".

The Collector was by the order quoted authorized to adjust all the claims save the two mentioned and now Mr V. comes up with demands for compensation (See his petition of 23 March transferred to this Dept. on 29th idem) for encroachment of the sea, loss of valuable cultivation, loss of rent Rs 600 per annum — He adds ~~that~~ his compound ~~[illegible]~~ has not been fenced in

Sea side 2 —

Mr Beardmore's letters of the 14th and 24th inst. show clearly how the case stands —

It may be that the house was untenanted excepting by himself till the 1st April when it seems to have been let.

The sea though eroding up to his garden and outhouses never actually got further — such small injuries as were sustained by the outhouses were repaired, and the garden hedge (he seems to have had no wall as supposed by the Committee) is now being re-established by Mr Beardmore

As regards the claims for past damage it is of course not impossible that the house remained unrented, but as it stood well back from the sea line, it is improbable that this result was wholly due to the fear of encroachment and the more so as the place seems now to have been let — The loss of crops must also have been exceedingly trifling

Perhaps it would be best to refer the claim as it stands to the Collector of Madras?

The house falls within the area (beyond point A) which Mr Parkes proposes to buy up on account of Govt. (See GO 17/3/82 No 698 (W)) — Mr Parkes having already replied to para 6 the G.O. it might now if ~~thought~~ desirable be addressed on the subject in connection with the scheme for reconstruction of the Harbour the necessity for which has so far been admitted by the late grant of 2 Lakhs for purchasing materials

Were the Estimate for the total as roughly estimated by Mr Parkes at Rs 2,94,000 sanctioned Mr Vandinits and all other claims could be readily disposed of

29.4.82

3679 W

Govt. of (1882) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS

Passed orders

4/7

4-30 PM

Dated

Recd.

G. O. 8 July 1882, No. 1675 W / 876

Nos. [illegible]

Madras Harbour Works

Completion of the —

The approximate estimate (in abstract) for the — submitted ~~forwarded~~ with remarks for the information and orders of the Govt.

Recd Ditto