

(1) Number of pages 22
(2) Date of repair 22-5-87
(3) Initials of the Referencer lmb

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P. W. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	211 W	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	18 - 1 - 1883	197.

Ans

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

No. 195.

READ—the following papers :—

From the Superintending Engineer, Fifth Circle, dated 12th December 1882,
No. 3245.

No. 195-A.

From Lieutenant-Colonel W. H. BURTON, R.E., Executive Engineer, Presidency Division, to the Superintending Engineer, Fifth Circle, dated 8th January 1883, No. A-14.

With reference to your No. 3343, dated 19th December 1882, I have the honor to report that the chief reasons why that portion of the Chepauk Promenade work, which is being done by Public Works Department, cannot be finished before the date originally contemplated, 31st March 1883, are as follows :—

The tender for this work was submitted to you for approval on the 18th August 1882; it was received back, approved, on the 14th September 1882; as the tender was actually received from contractor on the 8th August, the calendar month, during which the tender was to be considered, had expired; it was necessarily delayed in my office ten days whilst I was making inquiries regarding the capabilities of this contractor and of sixteen others, without which I could make no recommendation as to the contract it was most advisable to accept.

Upon my having the interview with contractor necessary for the joint completion by him and myself of the contract bond, he represented that it was

* 16th September 1882.

then* impossible for him to complete the whole work by the 31st March 1883,

the date originally contemplated in his tender then expired as explained above. There were but two courses thus open to me, viz., either to give the reasonable extension of time asked for by contractor and accept the tender thus amended, or to report that the tender had lapsed by time and call for new tenders. The essential points for consideration were those of "time" and "ultimate cost of the work;" as to time, so much had been expended in the submission, &c., of the tender that to go all through that procedure again, if it could be avoided, seemed very undesirable, and might end in another collapse from same cause. As to ultimate cost of the work, by the contract now in force the work would cost less by Rs. 1,308 than it would if the next lowest tender were repeated by that of a man (of whom I knew nothing), and if reliable and approved by Chief Engineer.

It was under these circumstances that the date for completion was changed from 31st March to 10th June 1883, on which latter date I still expect the work will be completed, and at the contract price, if, that is to say, I am not compelled by higher authority to put in force the penal clause (22) of the contract on the plea "that he is not doing work to the value of Rs. 4,000 per mensem." I think it would not be to the interest of the Government for me to do so for this reason: by my doing so, the work will either cost more, or I might be involved in a vexatious law suit to which I should have no time to attend were I to pay for the work done departmentally, or by new contractor, out of the present contractor's guarantee fund. This guarantee fund now amounts to Rs. 3,000.

Again, the rate at which the contractor is doing the work is extremely low, even $20\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. under the cost estimated by the Consulting Architect; a low price nearly always means, in every country, slow work.

Again, granite work is always very slow, more especially so if (1) that granite has to be quarried from the mountain especially for the work, and (2) if each block has to be dressed on five sides; yet this is the case here, and whilst the estimated value of the work is Rs. 34,865, that of the granite stone is Rs. 19,215. The contractor has probably done (it is a fortnight since the work was last measured) Rs. 5,000 worth of granite work according to the estimated rates, i.e., more than one-fourth of the granite. Whilst the whole work done is now about Rs. 10,000 at estimated rates, and since the date of my report, No. A-8, 9th December, the contractor has made so much better progress than then anticipated, that I now expect to be able to pay him Rs. 22,000, of which Rs. 2,000 will be deposited as security before the 31st March; this will leave only Rs. 5,805 to be paid during next financial year.

I very much dislike interfering with a contractor if it can be possibly avoided; doing so upsets nearly all the benefit derivable from doing work by contract, and certainly tends to raise the rates of future tenders. Up till now the cost for work at Madras and Bangalore has lessened owing to the introduction, as I think, of the contract system, and if this Chepauk contract can be kept afloat, the rate for the Promenade work will have been lowered $20\frac{1}{4}$ per cent.

Moreover, it is unusual for a large Government Department to act otherwise than very tenderly towards a contractor so long as he is doing his work generally "according to the specification at contract rates." Personally I myself have no doubt that these essentials are observed, but I admit he does not work up to Rs. 4,000 per mensem.

No. 3554.

Endorsement on the above.

Submitted to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, with reference to his memorandum, No. 2362 C., dated 18th ultimo.

2. The amount now surrendered by the Executive Engineer from the grant for the South Beach Promenade is Rs. 13,000. It is requested that the application for re-appropriation, No. 3245, of 12th ultimo, may be altered accordingly.

(Signed) H. L. PRENDERGAST, Colonel, R.E.,
Superintending Engineer, Fifth Circle.

15th January 1883.

No. 195-B.

Chief Engineer's Memorandum on above, dated 18th January 1883, No. 180 C.

No. 196.

ORDER—dated 18th January 1883, No. 211 W., Public Works.

The allotment of Rs. 35,000 for improvements to the South Beach Promenade at Madras is reduced to Rs. 22,000, the balance of Rs. 13,000 being credited to the Provincial Reserve.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Superintending Engineer, Fifth Circle.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. A. F. Goodall.
Spare Copies

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of (1883) Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated January, 18th.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 18th Jan. 1883, No. 211 W.

JANUARY.

Nos. 195-196.

South Beach Promenade.

The allotment for improvements to the —
at Madras, reduced.

211/27
6TH JULY 1882, No. 1700 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

No. 42.

READ—the following letter from R. F. CHISHOLM, Esq., Consulting Architect to Government, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Chepauk, 15th June 1882, No. 221 :—

I have the honor to submit the plan and estimate* called for in your memorandum, No. 162, dated the 27th May 1882, providing for certain improvements in the Beach Road and Chepauk, together with a letter from the Municipal Commissioner, No. 826, dated 14th June 1882, who undertakes to construct and uphold a certain

portion of the design as explained in the report attached.

ENCLOSURE.

From A. T. ARUNDEL, Esq., President of the Municipal Commission, Madras, to the Consulting Architect to Government, dated 14th June 1882, P.W.C. No. 826.

In reply to your letter, No. 209, dated 10th June, I have the honor to inform you that the Municipality will construct the sea face wall of the proposed explanade opposite the Senate House in the manner indicated by you, and will maintain it in good order for the future.

2. The enclosures of your letter are herewith returned.

No. 43.

ORDER—dated 6th July 1882, No. 1700 W., Public Works.

The estimate, amounting to Rs. 45,400, for widening the promenade between the Napier Bridge and Triplicane Creek Bridge, and for other improvements at Chepauk, is sanctioned.

2. A sum of Rs. 35,000 is provided in the current year's Provincial Budget for this work, and if the balance of the estimate or further funds are required before the close of the year, timely application should be made to Government.

3. This sanction has been registered as Provincial No. 51 W. of 1882-83 and classified as Miscellaneous Public Improvement, Original Works.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Superintending Engineer, Fifth Circle, with two Enclosures.
" Examiner of Public Works Accounts, with duplicate Abstract Estimate.
" Consulting Architect to Government.
" Financial Department.

Exd. A. F. Goodall.
Spare Copies

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of (1882) Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated July, 6th.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 6th July 1882, No. 1700 W.

JULY.
Nos. 42-43.

Chepauk.

Widening the promenade between the Napier
Bridge and Triplicane Creek Bridge, and for
other improvements at —. Sanctions estimate
amounting to Rs. 45,400 for —.

C. A. W. & Co

What occasioned the
delay in this Office?

I accept much all
the explanation given
but not altogether in
regard to the business
of rate secured

It is of much greater
importance to commit
to secure & hold the
services of skilled
reliable contractors than
to insist on low rates

The Mr Engineer has
himself the best means
of judging on both
points and I shall
always be ready to
~~accept~~ his recommendation.
Supported by Mr S.E.

16.1.83

W. H. H.

To W
C No. 369 *JS*

The Tender was
received in the
Madras office on the
21st August. where
it was examined
and sent up to Rky
for approval on the
6th September. It was
returned to Madras
approved on the
11th Sept. and
issued to the Supty.
Brig on the 13th.

The examination in
the Technical Section
took longer than a
Document of this
kind should have
done. But there
was nothing on the
face of the Document
to indicate urgency.
There was no delay
elsewhere in the
passage of the
Document.

R.S.
16-1

N^o ^A/₁₁₄

From

To

Sir,

Ex: Engineer's Office, Presy.
8th January 1883.

The Executive Engineer,
Presidency D.

The Superintending Engineer,
V. Circle.

With reference to your N^o 3343
dated 19th December 1882, I have the
honor to report that the Chief engineers
why that portion of the lake park Pro-
menade Work which is being done by
D. P. W. cannot be finished before the
date originally contemplated, 31st
March 1883, are as follows:—

The tender for this work was
submitted to you for approval on
the 13th August 1882: it was received
back approved on the 14th September
1882, as the tender was actually
received from contractor on the 8th
August the calendar month, during

211H-

which the tender was to be considered, had expired: it was necessarily delayed in my Office 10 days whilst I was making enquiries regarding the capabilities of this Contractor and of 16 others - without which I could make no recommendation as to the contract it was most advisable to accept.

Upon my having the interview with the Contractor necessary for the joint completion by him & myself of the contract bond, he represented, that it was then, impossible for him, to complete the whole work by the 31st March 1883 the date originally contemplated in his tender. ^{then expired as explained above} There were but two courses thus open to me viz. - either to give the reasonable extension of time asked for by Contractor, and accept the tender thus amended; or, to report that the tender had lapsed by time & call for new tenders. The essential points for consideration

16th Sept/82

83 21/2
were those of "time" & "ultimate cost of the work": as to time - So much had been expended in the submission of the tender that to go all through that procedure again, if it could be avoided, seemed very undesirable, and might end in another collapse from the same cause. As to ultimate cost of the work; by the contract now in force the work would cost less by Rs. 1308/- than it would, if the next lowest tender were repeated by that of a man (of whom I knew nothing) and if reliable and approved by Chief Engineer. It was under these circumstances that the date for completion was changed from 31st March to 10th June 1883 on which latter date I still expect the work will be completed and at the contract price - if, that is to say, I am not compelled by higher authority to put in force the penal Clause (22) of the Contract on the plea that he is not doing work to the

"value of Rs. 4000/- per mensem". I think it would not be to the interest of the Government for me to do so for this reason; by my doing so, the work will either cost more, or I might be involved in a vexatious law suit to which I should have no time to attend were I pay for the work done departmentally, or by new contractors, out of the present contractor's guarantee fund. This guarantee fund now amounts to Rs. 3000/-.

Again the rate at which the contractor is doing the work is extremely low. Even $20\frac{1}{4}$ per cent under the cost estimated by the Consulting Architect: a low price nearly always means, in every country, slow work.

Again granite work is always very slow, more especially so if the granite has to be quarried from the mountain especially for the

work Diach block has to be dressed on 5 sides. Yet this is the case here & whilst the estimated value of the work is Rs. 34,865/- that of the granite stone is Rs. 19,215/-. The contractor has probably done (it is a fortnight since the work was last measured) Rs. 5000/- worth of granite work according to the estimated rates, i.e. more than $\frac{1}{4}$ of the granite. Whilst the whole work done is now about Rs. 10,000 at estimated rates - and since the date of my report Rs. $\frac{4}{8}$ 9th December the contractor has made so much better progress than than anticipated that I now expect to be able to pay him Rs. 22,000/- of which Rs. 2000/- will be deposited as security before the 31st March: this will leave only Rs. 5800/- to be paid during next financial year.

I very much dislike interfering with a contractor if it can be possibly avoided. doing so upsets nearly all the benefit derivable from doing work

211/3
by contract and certainly tends to raise
the rates of future tenders. Up till now,
the cost for work at Madras and
Bangalore has lessened owing to the
introduction, as I think, of the Contract
System: and if this Chepauk Contract
can be kept afloat the rate for the
Promenade work will have been
lowered $20\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Moreover it is unusual for
a large Govt Department to act other-
-wise than very liberally towards a
Contractor. So long as he is doing his
work generally "according to the
Specification at Contract rates."
personally I myself have no doubt
that these essentials are observed:
but I admit he does not work up to
Rs. 4,000/- per mensem.

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Yours Most Obedt. Servt.

W. H. Austin Lieut. Col. R.C.,

J.H.

2362 C of 18.12.82 80.17000-16.7.82
1842 C of 11.9.82 528.80.16.82
No. 3554
No 5288. 4.8.82
17000. 6.7.82

Submitted to the Chief
Engineer P.W. Dept.
with reference to his
Memorandum No.
2362 dated 18th
Ultimo.

2. The amount now
surrendered by the Exe.
-cutive Engineer from the
Grant for the South Beach
Promenade is Rs. 13,000.
It is requested that the
Application for Rep.
-paration No. 3245 of
12th Ultimo may be
allowed accordingly.

K. S. Sanderast
Supervising Engineer
5th Circle
15 January 1883.

No. 211 W of 18.7.83

8620/2
369
No 180 C of 18th Jan'y/83.

The explanations of the
Exe. Engr. in regard to the progress
of work in connection with the
improvements to the South
Beach Promenade are
accepted, but it is observed
with reference to the remarks
on the subject of reduction
of rates that it is of much
greater importance to hasten
to secure and retain the
services of skilled reliable
Contractors than to insist
on very low rates. The Exe. Engr.
has himself the best means
of judging on these points
and the Chief Engineer will
always be ready to affirm
well considered recommendations
made with this object
which may be supported
by the Supr. Engineer.

Of R. H. Sanyal Col. D.
Chief Engineer P.W.D.
18/1
The Supr. Engr. Fifth Circle

132B
CL & Ws
No. 211 W.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.
PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.
UNDER date the 18th January/83
Read the following:—

From,
The Supr. Engineer, Fifth Circle (No. 3245 of 12th Decr/82)
" " " do " " 3554 of 15th January/83)
Chief Engineer's Memorandum (No. 180 C of 18th January/83)

The allotment of
Rs. 35,000/- for improvements
to the South Beach Promen-
-ade at Madras is reduced
to Rs. 22,000/- the balance
of Rs. 13,000/- being credited
to the Provincial Reserve.

Sd. Fifth Circle
Examiner M. S. S. S.
18/1

17/1/83

A

No 211 wa / 18.1.83

B

Ch 1871

349
Govt. of (1882) Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated

Recd.

Encl.

G.O. 10th Jan'y 1883 No. 211-6

Nos. 195-196

Santa Beach Promenade

The allotment for im-
provements to the at
Madras, reduced

36 copies

3

Ento. in Receipts