FROM

P. W. Cwd 6

[illegible] 180 A.C. of 17. 4. 88
Do. No. 1117 W. of 13. 4. 88
No. 61 C. of 7. 1. 88
" 2565 C. of 2. 8. 87.

No. 2115 W.d/12th

B

The expenditure on the works in question may be finally passed by the Examiner without completion certificates

WCN
7. 7. 88

9/7/88

12/7

S.E. VI Circle
Examr PWA with
[illegible] W [illegible]

17.7

R 11-7-88

53
9.7

12/7

C. 7.7.88

to W. Deptt

P. W. Cwd 655

(11)

En/o

Recd: 5. 7. 88

No. 2115 W.d/12th July 1888

with the orders

P.W. Cu 06613

*To be returned when no longer required.

KEEP-WITH Genl, No.

dated 188 .

1,000—7-2-88.

[C. No. 8.]

GOVT. MADRAS. } 1888. { P.W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 4 July 1888.

OFFICE NOTE No. 1807

Enc: 1

To

W.

Please peruse the accompanying letter from the Superintending Engineer 6th. Circle No. 209* T. C. dated 31st. May 1888, anent the completion certificates required from the Military Authorities for the works therein referred to.

As under the circumstances explained, the Military Authorities cannot be expected to give completion certificates, please obtain the sanction of Government to enable me to finally pass the expenditure without them.

4/7

4/7

MGA: 3480

No. 2565 cd/12-8-87
" 61 C - 7-1-88
" 1117 W - 13-4-88

rests with Mr Martin who was the Executive Engineer at the time. Mr Martin and Mr Galvey were in charge of the Division while the work was in progress and the estimate was framed and the work carried out by Mr Supervisor Fonseca. Had it not been for the accident of Mr Galvey's death, the Government would have considered whether the officers concerned should not be called upon to make good the loss incurred. As it is, they will place on record their dissatisfaction that an officer of Mr Martin's standing should have allowed a defective estimate to be submitted, and work carried out at his Head Quarters, so improperly; and the Chief Engineer will note the matter against Mr Fonseca as rendering him unfit for promotion for some time to come.

(True Extract)

W C Baddeley Captn RE

Under Secretary to Govt P.W.D.

To the Chief Engr P.W. Deptt

17/4

No. 1604 cd/11 April 1888

B16.C

Recorded 17.4.88

17/4

This was explained to be due almost entirely to the omission to scrape the walls properly before putting on the wash. The verandahs had been used for cooking and were stained and discoloured to an extent that rendered useless any attempt to renew the wash without proper scraping. The plastering was defective, the tiled roof had been insufficiently repaired, and the *debris* had not been removed.

The Supdg. Engineer has already given orders to have the bad work done over again. The additional cost will be R 600 to the Infantry barracks alone. It is not proposed to spend anything more on the repair of the Artillery barracks at present.

The main cause for the unsatisfactory state of things brought to notice is as stated above, attributed by the Superintending Engineer to insufficient provision in the original estimate, for which the responsibility rests

rests

---

the Artillery barracks were sanctioned in 1886-87. The work consisted of white and colour washing, petty repairs to the roof, and other minor items. It was begun in August 1886 and completed in February 1887. The Officer Commanding was dissatisfied with the work and declined to sanction the completion certificate. He subsequently appointed a Committee to report on the matter. The proceedings of the Committee were sent to the Supdg. Engineer, who, in consequence inspected the building in July 1887. His opinion was that while some of the work had undoubtedly been very imperfectly done, the defects were for the most part due rather to insufficient provision in the estimate than to actual bad work. He found the interior white washing fairly done on the whole, but the colour washing to the outside walls was most unsatisfactory.

This

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the

READ the following

Letter from the Supt: Engineer VI Circle No. 224 I.C. d/ 23rd July 1887

—— do —— do —— No. 545 I.C. d/ 14th Decr/87

—— do —— do —— No. 662 I.C. d/ 30th Jany/88

Memos to the Supt Engr: VI Circle Nos. 557 and 560 C d/ 8th Feby 1888

Letter from the Supt Engr VI Circle No. 689 I.C d/ 11th February 1888

Letter from J.W. Martin Esqre Offg: Supt: Engr: IV Circle No. 73 E.W. d/ 28th Feby/88

—— do —— do —— No. 86 E.W. d/ 5th March 1888

Order thereon No. 1117 W. d/ 13th April 1888

The correspondence quoted above refers to bad work in connection with the repair of the European barracks at Trichinopoly. Estimates amounting to Rs 600 for the Infantry, and Rs 880 for

---

Dw

The Exr applies for copy of G.O. 1117 W d/13 Apr. 1888.

The G.O. relates to personal matters & does not appear to contain anything requiring action in the Cs office.

For orders whether copy shall be given, or Ce asked to state why he wants it.

Ce
14.6.88

A copy may be given.

14.6.88

O.L.S: 34/iv

Hw 6.2.88

Hm. 7.4.88
Im: 10.4.88.

1874

Hm.

Issue as altered

No. 1117 W. d/13th April 1888

I am not satisfied with this draft. Here is a work of the simplest character at the Ex. Engr's headquarters utterly mismanaged. Please get Mr Martin's explanation – also the Committee's report – then I'd like Col Hasted's opinion as to who is to blame or the proportion in wh. the two men are to blame.

PHH
7 Feb

× [illegible]

G 14/4

7/2/88

W 14/4

O.L.S: 34/iv

Hm 6.2.88

Hm. 7.4.88.
[illegible]: 10.4.88.

10/4

Hm

Issue as altered

No. 1117 W. d/13th April

I am not satisfied with this draft. Here is a work of the simplest character at the Engr's headquarters utterly mismanaged. Please get Mr Mar explanation – also the Committee report – then I'd like Col opinion as to who is to blame or the proportion in wh. the men are to blame.

PPH
7 Feb

× [illegible] for

L.S: $\frac{34}{iv}$

w 6.2.88

Hm. 7.4.88.
[illegible]: 10.4.88.

8-4-88
16/4

E 14/4

7/2/88

W/14/4

fairly done on the whole, but the colour washing to the outside ~~wall~~ walls was most unsatisfactory. This was explained to be due almost entirely to the omission to scrape the walls properly before putting on the wash. The verandahs had been used for cooking and were stained and discolored to an extent that rendered useless any attempt to renew the wash without proper scraping. The plastering was defective, the tiled roof had been insufficiently repaired, and the débris had not been removed.

The Superintending Engineer has already given orders to have the bad work

work done over again. The additional cost will be Rs600 to the Infantry barracks alone. It is not proposed to spend anything more on the repair of the Artillery barracks at present.

The main cause for the unsatisfactory state of things brought to notice as stated above, is attributed by the Superintending Engineer to insufficient provision in the original estimate, for which the responsibility rests with Mr Martin who was the Executive Engineer at the time; x but Mr Falvey was in charge of the division while the greater part of the work was carried out, and he should not have allowed it to be badly or insufficiently done. He admits that he noticed the unsatisfactory nature of the work. His failure, therefore, to rectify it is inexcusable. Blame rests with both officers, and the Government desire that this expression of their opinion be communicated to them.

4/2/88

Mr Martin & Mr Falvey were in charge of the Division while the work was in progress, and the Estimate was framed & the work carried out by Mr Supdt Farrell. Had it not been for the accident of Mr Falvey's death, the Govt would have considered whether the Officers concerned should not be called upon to make good the loss incurred. As it is, they will place on record their dissatisfaction that an officer of Mr Martin's standing should have allowed a defective Estimate to be submitted, and work carried out, at his Head Quarters, so improperly, and the Chief Engineer will ~~see that better reports are received of Mr Fonseca before he can receive any promotion.~~ ~~note the matter against Mr Fonseca as rendering him unfit for promotion for sometime to come~~

To:
The Supdg Engineer IV Circle
VI
" Chief Engr S.W. Dept
" Supdg Engr II Circle

14/4/88

R.S.

Copy supplied to the Exr P.W. Accts 19/6/88 with refce to his applcn dated 12/6/88.

other minor items. It was begun in August 1886 and completed in February 1887. The officer commanding was dissatisfied with the work, and declined to sanction the completion certificate. He subsequently appointed a Committee to report on the matter. The proceedings of the Committee were sent to the Supt'g Engineer, who, in consequence, inspected the buildings in July 1887. His opinion was that while some of the work had undoubtedly been very imperfectly done, the defects were for the most part due rather to insufficient provision in the estimate than to actual bad work. He found the interior white washing

fairly

~~H.W.~~ B

No. 1117 W.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 13th April /88

READ the following

Letter from the Supdg Engineer VI Circle } H.E. No. 224 I.C d/ 23rd July /87.
Do Do } H.E. No. 545 I.C d/ 14th Dec /87.
Do Do } H.E. No. 662 I.C d/ 30th Jany 1888.
memo to S.E. VI circle (" No. 559 & 560 C & 8th Feb 88)
do J.W. Martin Esqr, Offg S.E. IV Circle (" " 73 W d/ 28 Feby 1888)
From J.W. Martin Esqr do (" " 86 W d/ 5 March 1888)
From the S.E. VI Circle — 689 I.C. d/ 11th Feb 88

The correspondence quoted above refers to bad work in connection with the repair of the European barracks at Trichinopoly. Estimates amounting to Rs 600 for the Infantry, and Rs 880 for the Artillery barracks were sanctioned in 1886-87. The work consisted of white and colour washing, petty repairs to the roof, and other

---

could passed the work. Had Lt Fahey in Oct or Nov properly inspected and examined the work as he ought to have done so in Dec or Jany it would have been found bad and the matter brought to notice but neither of these officers seem to have done this.

To me the estimate not being sufficient is no excuse. Mr Frances ought to have brought this to notice and certainly it does not excuse him for passing bad work and sending in bills for it.

The instruction of Statement No I. regarding the European Barracks will show that the case is exactly similar

13/3/88

H.W. 14.iii.88 S. 15.iii.88
W. 15.iii.88

To be sent to H.E.
for disposal

Hw B

(no notice need be taken of the payments in Jany May & Aug as they are petty)

3 payments were made by Lt Fahey in Sept Oct & Nov they are payments on account and probably were paid on Mr Fonseca's measurements and instruction

In Dec Mr Hunter made a similar payment but the account shows that the work must have been practically completed, and a work of this sort should most certainly have been fully completed in the 4 months it had been in progress

Mr Hunter handed over charge of the Division to Lt Fahey on the 12th Feby

I consider that Mr Hunter was to blame for not having seen that the work was properly completed in Dec or Jany and in not drawing the accounts before he handed over charge

I cannot accept his excuse that he was absent from Trichinopoly the greater part of Dec & Jany

After the 12th Feby Lt Fahey was in charge of the Division until the completion and final settlement (practically) of the work in July (except for 5 days)

He as he states did nothing but endeavour to rectify the work but in May & July he paid the amounts that had been kept back from the contractor and signed a completion certificate stating that the work had been done properly and this I consider he must have known was not the case

I consider that Mr Supervisor Fonseca was responsible for the work. He was in direct charge of the work took the measurements

---

I wd make them pay up Rs 120 each.

PPH
15 Mar.

Send to H.E.

P.S. I see the completion certifte signed by Mr Martin is that for the Artillery Barracks, but as it is only an accident that prevents his being held liable on that also, I wd not change the decision to treat all three alike.

HW B

10

and passed the work
Had Lt Fahey in
Oct or Nov properly
inspected and examined
the work as he must have
done so in Dec or Jany
it would have been
found bad and the
matter brought to
notice but neither
of these officers appear
to have done this
To me the estimate
not being sufficient is
no excuse. Mr Fenner
ought to have brought
this to notice and
certainly it does not
excuse him for passing
bad work and sending
in bills for it
An inspection of Statement
No I regarding the
Ebrington Barracks will
shew that the case
is exactly similar

WR

13/3/88

HW 14.iii.88 R 15.iii.88
W 15.iii.88

To be sent to H Qr
to be disbursed

WR

Note for the H. M.

In accordance with instructions, I propose the enclosed alteration of last para of draft G.O. From last column I see Mr Fonseca was promoted 1st grade Supt. in Nov. 187.

7/4/88

I pass the order with a slight change making it somewhat stronger upon Mr Fonseca

12 Apr

Issue

10.10.88

To W.

I would submit that the punishment ordered by the H.M. does not bear equally upon the 3 officers concerned. Instead of 120 ~~Rs~~ each it would be more equitable to divide the 360 Rs in the proportion of the salary of the officers concerned.

15-3.88

W.L.

Before issue, please see that the latest C Nos are read at the head of the draft G.O.

7.IV.88

I have entered the latest C Nos. - Be careful to remove obj.ble slips before issue.

PWC № 1372

(50)

From

The Supt. Engineer
6th circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

15 88
DEPARTM

No. 689 T.D.
Dated 11th }
D 11th } February/88.
Recd. 13.2.88

No. 1117 W. d/13-4-88

Enclo: 2

European Barracks at Trichinopoly: —

Forwards the report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the bad work carried out to the —

Awaits reply to No 559 C.A.F. 8 Feby 88

16.2.88

No. 689 T.C.

Supdg Engineer's Office 6th Circle
Trichinopoly 11th February 1888
D 11.

From,
J. W. Rundall Esquire,
M. I. C. E.
Superintending Engineer 6th Circle
Trichinopoly

To,
The Chief Engineer
Public Works Departt.
Madras.

Sir,

Enclosure 2 Viz
1 Original letter No. 593/16-7-87 from the Officer Commanding Trichinopoly to the Supdg Engr with a copy of the Proceedings.

With reference to your memorandum No. 560C/8-2-88 asking to forward the report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the bad work carried out to the European Barracks at Trichinopoly I have the honor to forward the document asked for, together with the original letter from the Officer Commanding the Station.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
J. W. Rundall
Superintending Engineer VI Circle

Sd 352 TC / 87

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER 6th CIRCLE
16 JUL 87

204 T.C / 20-7-87

Trichinopoly Dn for full & early report on the points noticed in the accompanying Proceedings.

2. The undersigned will inspect the buildings named at 7. A.M. on Saturday the 23d Instant & the Exe: Engr is requested to be good enough to meet him there with all necessary papers.

3. The explanation called for in the first para of this endorsement should be ready at the same time.

20/7

E.1 / PW 1372/88

20/7/87

D/ 22d

~~No 87 C / 20-7-87~~

Deferred Telegram.

To, Exe: Engr, Trichinopoly Dn.
Dated 20th July 1887.
D 11

Please meet me at European Infantry Barracks 7 A.M on Saturday 23d July —

20/7

14, 15 & 16

STATION STAFF OFFICE
No. 59/B
DATE 16.7.87
TRICHINOPOLY

8 S.T.C. / 20.7.87

24 T.C. / 22.7.87

25 T.C. / 22.7.87

From Lieut Colonel J.H.M. Barnett
Commanding Trichinopoly

To The Superintending Engineer
6th Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir,

I have the honor to forward herewith, for information and return, Proceedings of Station Committee assembled at this Station on the 9th July 1887 to report upon the repairs executed by the Department Public Works to the old Royal Artillery and European Infantry Barracks, with reference to your No 187 S.C. dated 11th July 1887.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant

Lieut Col.
Commanding Trichinopoly

Rep. 37 T.C. / 23.7.87

No. 204 T.C.

Enclo: 1.
To be retd.

Forwarded to the Exec: Engineer

Enclo. 1
(to be returned)

Trichinopoly

E.2
PW/1372/88

the same whilst the Committee was going round the Barracks.

The rafters in the verandah of the workshop at the end of the Gunshed are much honeycombed by Bumble bees and one or two are quite rotten or broken, and if not quickly replaced the roof will fall in.

The following is a Memorandum of the repairs and estimated costs in the Royal Artillery Barracks.

1.	Whitewashing	Rs 301-11-9
2.	Bluewashing	„ 72-„-10
3.	Yellow washing	„ 101-6-„
4.	Shifting Tiles and in places required, new tiles	„ 69-„-„
5.	Sundry plaster	„ 92-4-„
6.	Bolts, fixtures, panes of glass &ca	„ 243-9-5
	Total Rs	880-„-„

The opinion of the Committee is that the white and color washing executed in Barracks has throughout been very badly done and in places not done at all. Out houses and Compound walls of Staff Sergeants Quarters, Harness room

Small

Small Magazine (outside and inside) Inside walls and ceiling of Guard and Lock-up rooms, stable for sick horses, gram boiling shed; and horse-line houses have not been touched with white or color wash.

Shifting Tiles. This has been very imperfectly done; a quantity of tiles are loose on the Gunshed roof; in the new wash house No. 24 E.A, a number of tiles have fallen from the eaves through the rottenness of the rafters; one cross rafter inside has fallen down and not been replaced. In the gram boiling shed and the stable for sick horses, the tiles have been removed and left in heaps; some on the roof and some on the ground.

The debris of the demolished cook house near plunge bath has not been cleared away.

(Sd) E. G. Blenkinsop Lt. Col.
IV Pioneers, President

(Sd) E. L. Holloway, Lieut. 4 Pioneers
Member

(Sd) B. A. Johnstone, Lieut. 21st M.I.
Member

Duplicate

Proceedings of Station Committee assembled at Trichinopoly on the 9th July 1887, by orders of Lieut. Col J. H. M. Barnett Commanding Trichinopoly for the purpose of reporting upon the repairs executed by the Department Public Works to the old Royal Artillery and Infantry Barracks

President

Lieut. Col E. G. Blenkinsop, 4th Madras Pioneers

Members

Lieut. E. L. Holloway, 4th Madras Pioneers
Lieut. B. A. Johnstone, 21st Regiment M. I.

In attendance

Lieut. D. Halvey, Executive Engineer.

The Committee having assembled pursuant to order proceed to examine the repairs executed to the old Infantry and Royal Artillery Barracks by the Public Works Department. A Completion certificate for which was sent to the Station Staff

Staff Officer on the 5th June 1887 by the Executive Engineer.

The following is a Memorandum of the repairs and estimated cost to the Infantry Barracks.

1.	Whitewashing	Rs 115
2.	Bluewashing	" 119
3.	Sundry plaster	" 77
4.	Shifting tiles	" 24
5.	Fixing fixtures	" 38
6.	Scraping	" 40
7.	Levelling mud	" 70
8.	Leaky Repairs	" 50
9.	Clearing dust	" 20
10.	Petty Supervision	" 20
11.	Contingencies	" 27
	Total	Rs 600

The Committee is of opinion that the White and Blue Washing has been very thinly laid on, leaving the smoke stains on the roofs and inside walls quite visible. In many places the walls have the appearance of not having had even one Coat of white or blue wash put on.

Plastering

Plastering. This has not been properly done; large portions of it have already fallen off which the Executive Engineer stated was due to there being Salt in the walls, but which in the opinion of the Committee was due to the inferior quality of the plaster used.

Shifting Tiles and Leaky repairs - This work has been very imperfectly done; in the North Corner of the Verandah in the Tiled Barracks, the tiles are cracked from top to bottom and the roof would leak very badly. In the verandah of the Bomb-proof Barracks there are also two or three leaky places untouched.

Scraping - This part of the work has not been done at all, the roofs, walls and pillars have all got their old stains of smoke &c. When the stains on the walls &c. were pointed out to the Exe. Engineer, he informed the Committee that this was not in the Estimate.

Clearing Dust and Debris. This work has not been done as stated in the Completion Certificate, for, coolies and carts were being employed removing the

the same whilst the Committee was going round the Barracks.

The rafters in the verandah of the workshop at the end of the Gunshed are much honeycombed by Bumble bees and one or two are quite rotten or broken, and if not quickly replaced the roof will fall in.

The following is a Memorandum of the repairs and estimated costs in the Royal Artillery Barracks-

1. Whitewashing	Rs 301-11-9
2. Bluewashing	" 72-"-10
3. Yellow washing	" 101-6-0
4. Shifting Tiles and in places required, new tiles	" 69-"-"
5. Sundry plaster	" 92-4-0
6. Bolts, fixtures, panes of glass &c.	" 243-9-5
Total Rs	880-"-"

The opinion of the Committee is that the white and color washing executed in Barracks has throughout been very badly done and in places not done at all. Out houses and Compound walls of Staff Sergeants' Quarters, Harness room

Small

the same whilst the Committee

P.W.C. No. 7240

From

J. W. Martin Esq:

Submitted to the Honorable Members in continuation of the previous papers containing Mr. Martin's explanation, circulated on . 111 - 88.

Dated 5th March 1888

R. 7. 3. 88

No. 1117 W. d/ 13 - 4 - 88

No: 86/EW

Royal Artillery and European Infantry Barracks, Trichinopoly

Forwarding certain further information in regard to the ——.

With Endorsement

Offtg Superintending Engineer IV circle in continuation of this Office No. 632 m of the 24th ultimo.

SUPG: ENGINEER
No. 97 25
5 MAR. 88
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

J Simms.

Executive Engineer

Supr

Trichinopoly Dn

21. 3. 88.

No: 86
Em

Po 3/3

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer in continuation of letter No 73 dated+ 28th ultimo from the Supty Engineer's Office IV Circle

+Ceo
2025

L W Martin

Ex Engineer

5th March
1888

15/B
28/2/88

From
Lieut. E. L. Holloway
Ag. station Staff Officer

To
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 630 M dated 24th February 1888, I have the honour to afford the information as therein called for –

The Royal Artillery Barracks were occupied by the 4th Madras Pioneers from the 26th February 1886 to the 3rd March 1886 –

[illegible] Mar 86
Work begun Aug 86

The Royal Artillery Barracks and European Infantry Barracks viz Bombproof Barracks and Tiled Barracks – these Buildings were occupied by the Depot & families of the 21st Regiment M.I. from the 4th March 1886 to the 9th May 1886 –

Certain European Pensioners & families are occupying a portion in the European Infantry Bomb-proof Barracks from the 20th January 1886 –

Certain European Pensioners & families are Occupying a portion in the European Infantry Tiled Barracks from the 1st August 1886 –

I have &c

(Signed) E. L. Halloway Lt.
Ag. station Staff Officer

No. 650 M

(True Copy)

PWC No. [illegible]25

No. 4835 Ca/21-12-87

From
The Offg. Sup. g. Engr:
Fourth circle.

No. 1117 M. d/13-4-88

Dated 28th Feby: 1888
Recd: 1-3-88

No: 73/ EW

Enclo: 7 with a file bearing Cir: 1045/87

Royal Artillery European Infantry Barracks Trichinopoly: –

Furnishing explanation in regard to the insufficiency of the estimates for repairs to the –

15/13
22/2/88

finally ten per cent from his bills. I made a proper contract on a Code form with him, and had ample power to fine him in case of bad work, and as I always do fine contractors for bad work, I believe, that I would have fined the man or made him do the work satisfactorily.

6. Regarding there being no provision for scraping the walls of the Royal Artillery barracks, I believe this is due to the walls not being very dirty at the time the estimate was made, for after the estimate was prepared I think European Pensioners were allowed to occupy the barracks. At any rate they were there while the repairs were going on and complicated matters to some extent as regards carrying out the works.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedt. Servt.

C. W. Martin

Compd

Offg. Supg. Engineer IV Circle

P.W.C. No. 2025

No. 4835 Ca/21-12-87

From
The Offg. Supg. Engr.
Fourth circle.

No. 1117 W. d/13-4-88

Dated 28th }
Recd. 1-3-88 } Feby: 1888

No. 73
E.W.

Enclo: 7 with a file bearing Ltr. 1045/87

Royal Artillery Euro=
=pean Infantry Barracks
Trichinopoly:-

Furnishing expla=
=nation in regard to
the insufficiency of
the estimates for re-
=pairs to the —

---

4 From the statements accompany-ing the papers showing the work paid for by me and Lieut. Fahey, it will be seen that I did not pay for shifting tiles, and of course I did not pay for "clearing away debris," for the repairs were not completed when I gave over charge. Apparently, therefore, I am responsible for only the colorwashing paid for by me as regards bad work.

5 Ten per cent was deducted from all the bills paid by me pending final approval of the quality of the work. I was not able to inspect the work while in progress because I was in camp the greater part of December/86 and January/87 the months in which I paid bills, but had I remained in charge of the division, I think, it is more than probable that, either I would have made the contractor re-colorwash the walls properly, or I would have deducted

finally

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE 4TH CIRCLE,
Coimbatore 28th February 1888.

No: 73/Ew.

From,
J. W. Martin, Esqr.
Offg. Superintending Engineer,
Fourth Circle.

To,
The Chief Engineer,
P. W. Department.

Sir,

Enclosures 7
1 Letter No. 662/7C of 30th Jany. 1888 from Supg. Engr. 6th circle with 6 enclosures

In reply to your Memorandum No. 559C dated 8th instant regarding repairs to the European barracks at Trichinopoly, I have the honor to state that I regret very much to learn that the repairs are considered unsatisfactory. It is rather difficult for me to give any particulars about the work for it was commenced in August 1886 and since then I have had five changes, so of course I do not remember now much about the subject.

2. The estimate was prepared in March 1886 by Mr. Fonseca Supervisor

under

under instructions from me, and subsequently the work was carried out by him. My orders to him were to attend to the directions contained in letter No. 4085A of 26th November 1885 from the Dy. Quarter Master General, and provide in the estimate only for such repairs as were absolutely necessary besides general cleaning up and white & color washing. From the Superintending Engineer's letter No. 545+ T.C. dated 14th December 1887 it appears that the extra expenditure required for the Infantry barracks is Rs 600 of which Rs 360 is due to bad work and Rs 240 to omissions in the original estimate. With regard to the omissions I do not know the particulars for there are no details given, but I think it should be borne in mind that some of the omissions may be due to the fact, that the estimate provided only for repairs considered necessary to preserve the buildings. As to what those repairs should be opinions may differ, and it is possible that what I considered was sufficient may not now be approved by the Supg. Engr., particularly as the estimate was prepared eighteen months before the date of his Report.

+4835 Cay 21/12/87

3. With regard to the work carried out, it consisted principally of

White washing
Blue washing
Sundry plastering in places
Shifting tiles
General cleaning up

The Superintending Engineer in his inspection notes says, he considers the interior whitewashing is on the whole good, but that the Color washing is unsatisfactory. Further that the defects in the plastering are due to salt in the walls, that the repairs to the tiled roof are nt satisfactory, and that the "clearing away of debris" was not properly carried out.

From

Enclo: 1–7 in
letter No: 73/Gnl from the
Supg: Engineer 4th Circl

Letter No. 662/IC of 30th
Jany: 188 from the
Supg: Engineer 6th
circle with 6 enclo:
:sures.

No. 559C d/8-2-88

No. 560C d/8th Feby 1888

C/

No. 560C d/ 8th Feby 1888

Memo.

The Superintending Engineer VI Circle is requested to be so good as to forward for reference the report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the bad work carried out to the European Barracks at Trichinopoly - and referred to in Col: Pennycuick's Inspection notes d/ 30th July 1887.

8.2.88

C. E.W.

8/2/88

To The Supg. Engineer
VI Circle

Dy 13/2.
Despd 9.2.88.

R.B.

No. 2938C d/ 1-9-87
" 4835C " 21-12-87
" 61C " 7-1-88
" 2565C " 2-8-87
" 560C " 8-2-88

No. 559C d/ 8th Feby 1888

Dy 14/2.

No. 559C d/ 8th Feby 1888

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

~~PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.~~

~~UNDER date the~~

Memorandum

~~READ the following~~

From the Supg.* Engr. II Circle.	H.E. No 224 T.C. d/ 25th July 1887
——— do* ——— do ———	" No. 545 T.C d/ 14th Decr 1887
——— x ——— ———	" No. 662 T.C. d/ 30th Jany 1888.

x. 2938C d/ 1-9-87
* 4835C - 21-12-87
x C. No. 1048.

Regarding the bad work in connection with the repair of the European barracks at Trichinopoly.

The above papers are referred to Mr. Martin for such explanation as he may have to offer as to the insufficiency of the estimate and the subsequent bad work in connection with the repairs to the European barracks at Trichinopoly.

8.2.88

E.W.

8/2/88

To The Supg. Engr IV Circle with papers to be returned.

Dated 19/2

R.S.

CM No 1048

HNo 6.2.88

To D.W.

For orders whether Mr. Martin's explanation should be called for as suggested by the Supdg. Engr.

R.S.
3.2.88

I would suggest ~~that~~ the matter be definitely settled by Govt. censure on the officer concerned - There can be no doubt that Mr Martin is partly responsible, but the chief blame rests with Mr Fisher

MCM
4.2.88

Approved.

J.C.
4/2/88

---

5 July 1888

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

~~OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.~~

~~Under date the~~

dum

~~Read the following~~

H.E. No 224 T.C. of 25th July 1887
" No. 545 T.C of 14th Decr 1887
" No. 662 T.C. of 30th Jany 1888

The above papers are referred to Mr. Martin for such explanation as he may have to offer as to the insufficiency of the estimate and the subsequent bad work in connection with the repairs to the European barracks at Trichinopoly.

MCM
8.2.88

E.W.

J.C.
8/2/88

dsptd
19/2

R.S.

E/

PWC No ~~1048~~
2025/88

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
NO. 134W
11 FEB. 88
P.W.D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

From Enclo: 1
The Supg. Engineer
6th circle.

To
The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

No. 662 TC
Dated 30th January } 1888
D 1/2
Recd 3 February }

E6

Royal Artillery and European Infantry Barracks.

Forwards statements showing the amount of work included in each Bill under each item of estimates for repairs to -

No. 662 T.C.

Office of the Supg Engineer 6th Cir
Pereakulam 30th January 188
D 1/2

From,
J. W. Rundall Esquire
M. I. C. E.
Superintending Engineer 6th Cir
Trichinopoly

To,
The Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department
Madras.

Encls: 3-
1. Lt. Falvey's original letter No. 109/27-8-87
2. statements.

Sir,

I have the honor to return herewith Lieutt Falury's original letter of the 27th August last, received with your endorsement No. 61 C of the 7th Inst and at the same time to forward 2 statements, one (I) shows the work done on the Royal Artillery Barracks, the second (II), the work done on the British Infantry Barracks during the time Mr. I. W. Martin Executive Engineer and Lieutt. Falury Asstt Engineer respectively held charge of the Trichinopoly Division.

2 It will be seen that the bulk of the works was carried out while Lieutt. Falury held charge, & that Mr. Martin made only part payments, the work billed for being subsequently passed and the balances paid by Lieutt. Falury

3 I do not feel myself competent

to

to decide what share of the money wasted on these Buildings is debitable to the 2 Officers concerned in carrying out the Repairs.

4 The original Estimate which was undoubtedly faulty, as it did not provide for properly scraping smoky & exceedingly dirty walls, was prepared by Mr Martin, but the faulty work to the roofs was done entirely in Lieutt Falvey's time.

5. There is no explanation from Mr Martin on record, he might be able to give some explanation regarding his connection with the work which would to some extent exonerate him from blame.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Most obedient Servant

J. W. Rundall
Superintending Engineer VI Circle.

Gvt: No: 946.T.C/88

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
9 JAN 88
6th CIRCLE

518

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S OFFICE
GEN'L NO. 840
29 AUG 87
TRICHINOPOLY

No. 61 C of 7th January 1888.

Returned to the Superintending Engineer VI Circle with remark that Lieut. Falvey's explanation is not satisfactory but that as Mr. Martin paid for a good deal of the work it should first be settled what share of the money wasted is debitable to the two officers concerned - The Superintending Engineer is requested to report his opinion accordingly

[illegible]
Colonel R.E.
Chief Engr: P.W.D.

To
The Supdg: Engr. VI Circle

From

Lieut. D. Falvey
Assistant Engineer
Musiri Sub Div:

To

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly

No. 109

Dated. 27th August /87

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
NO. 134 W
11 FEB. 88
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

Enclo. 2.
Incl: 2 Bills

E.7²

PW ~~1048~~
2025/88

European Infantry and Royal Artillery Barracks — Reporting on the repairs recently carried out to the —

File reqd S.W.D.
9.1.88

with a view to its being sent on to the Chief Engineer.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedt. Servant.

Lieut.
Assistt. Engineer

Enclo: 2.

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 134 W
11 FEB. 88
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

No. 144. St.

Forwarded.

4. 9. 87
Executive Engineer

d 5/9

P.W. Lett 3
~~1447~~/87
~~1448~~
3025

Musiri Sub Divn. Office
27th August /87.

No. 109

From

The Assistant Engineer
Musiri Sub Divn.

To

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly.

Sir,

Enc: 2 Copies of bills

With reference to your endorsement No. 759 S of the 15th Instant, on the Inspection Notes of the Supdg. Engineer No. 224 T. C of the 23rd ultimo, which bear the remarks of the Chief Engineer, No. 2565 C of the 2nd August, I have the honor to report, as follows, on the repairs executed to the European Infantry and R. A Barracks at Trichinopoly-

2. The Estimates in question were prepared by Supervisor Mr. J. Fonceca and forwarded for sanction by the then Executive Engineer, Mr. Martin, in March 1886-

3. The estimates were received back sanctioned, from the Supdg. Engineer on the 4th June 1886- The work was given out on petty Contract by Mr. Martin, at reduced rates, on the 11th August /86 to a Contractor named Renga Iyer - The work consisted

of blue and yellow washing, plastering and Shifting tiles; besides lump sums of Rs 40 & 50, respectively for Scraping and repairing leakages in the Infantry Barracks - The Clearing of the Compound of rubbish &c was to have been Carried out by the Supervisor in Charge by departmental agency-

4- The work was Commenced in August 1886, and Completed by the beginning of February/87.

5. I held charge of the Division
from 14th September to 29th November/86
" 12th February to 29th March/87
and from the 5th April to 25th July/87.
(ie) I took charge a Month after the work was Commenced and handed over charge of the Divn to Mr Martin two Months before the Completion of the work.

6- From the enclosed Copies of bills, it will be Clearly seen that the work Complained of, by the Military authorities was billed for by Mr Fonecca and paid for by Mr Martin - the then Ex: Engineer

7. The work was Completed when I took charge again, on the 12th February 1887; but on my inspection, I remarked on some parts of the work, and the Supervisor's explanation has already been submitted to the Supdg Engineer - vide para 2 of my letter No 101 SE / 22-7-87 - Not being satisfied with the work, I ordered another Coat of wash to be given. The wash, however, did not do much good, as the walls were very much stained by smoke; as the families of a Native Infantry Regiment lived in these Barracks for some time, and Cooked in them-

8- The estimate was approved of by Mr Martin, and from the extract as per margin * from the Dy Quarter Masters General's letter No 4085 A of the 26th November/85, it is thought that the estimate provided only for such repairs as were absolutely necessary-

* In which he said that only such repairs as are absolutely essential, besides general Cleaning and White washing should be Carried out to the Infantry Barracks-

9- Under the above circumstances, I beg to point out that I am in no way to blame; on the Contrary after taking charge of the Divn, I endeavoured to rectify the work as much as possible-

10- I Cannot see how any money has been wasted on the work, and if there has been, I am in no way responsible.

11- I request that this explanation may be forwarded to the Supdg Engineer with a view to its being sent on to the Chief-Engineer.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt. Servant.

Lieut.
Assistt. Engineer

Enclo: 2.

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 134 W
11 FEB. 88
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

No. 144. St.

Forwarded.

4. 9. 87
Executive Engineer
p 5/9

P.W. Encl. 3
~~1045~~/87
~~1047~~
2025

1/840
29 AUG

1/518/Le

6 SEP 87

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 134 W
11 FEB. 88
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

Enclo: 3.

P.W. Encl. 4
~~1045~~/87
~~1048~~/86
2025

European Infantry Barracks Whitewashing & Sundry repairs to two — Sets No 600.

Abstract

Quantity	Description of work	Rate			Per	amount		
1049.53	Unit of Whitewashing	.	1	3	100 sft	81	15	11
763.08	Do of Bluewashing (already billed 20-12-86)	.	1	10	Do	87	7	.
42.82	Do of Sundry plastering in places	1	6	.	Do	58	14	.
19.61	Do of Shifting tiles in places	1	5	.	Do	25	11	10
	Fresh bill Scraping smoking parts (as per tender approved d/ 11-8-86				x	40	.	.
	Total bill Rupees					294	.	9
	Deduct previous bill of 20-12-86					116	2	9
	Net Bill rupees					177	14	.

(Sd) Rengia
Contractor
21-12-86

(Sd) J. Fonseca
Supt DPW.
1st 2d Sub Do
21-12-86.

(Initd) J. W. M.

(True Copy)

D. M. Lt
Asst: Engn

Correct
21/2.

2/518/Lc

ENGINEER'S OFFICE
29 AUG 87
TRICHINOPOLY

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 134W
11 FEB. 88
P.W.D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

Enclo: 4

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
6 SEP 87

~~Vide E. 2/9 To 4 Bills~~

Ex ~~4~~ 5
~~10451~~
P.W. ~~1045~~
2-25/86

Abstract

Royl artillery Barracks, Whitewashing & Sundry repairs to the — Est. Rs 880.

Quantity	Description of work	Rate			Per	amount		
2561.62	Units of Whitewashing	.	1	3	100 sft	200	2	.
433.82	Do. of Bluewashing	.	1	10	Do.	49	11	4
631.98	Do. of Yellowwashing	.	1	9	Do.	69	2	.
58.39	Do. of Sundry plastering	1	6	.	Do.	80	4	7
71.74	Do. Shifting tiles	1	5	.	Do.	94	6	9
	Clearing doors & joists					10	.	.
	Scaffolding					50	.	.
	Removing rubbish					x 10	.	.
	Clearing smoke & dust					x 30	.	.
	Total Bill Rupees					593	10	8
	Deduct previous bill of 20-12-86					281	12	9
	Net bill Rupees					311	13	11

Completed

Sd/ Ringer
Contr. D.P.W.
19-1-87

Sd/ J. Fonseca
Supr. D.P.W.
1st Dn. Sub Dn. Trichy
19-1-87.

(Intld) J. W. M.

(True Copy)

Correct
2/9

11

1

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 134 W
11 FEB. 88
P.W.D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

Enclo: 5.

E.5

Abstract

Whitewashing & Sundr

I

Statement Shewing work done on Rep

Messers. Martin & Falvey

Subheads 1	Amount	In Mr. Martin's time Decr. / 86 2			Jany / 87 3			Total 4			In M Sept / 86 5			Au 6
1 Whitewashing	301.11.9	-	-	-	98	9	-	98	9	-	-	-		-
2 Bluewashing	72.0.10	-	-	-	49	11	4	49	11	4	-			-
3 Yellow - do	101.6.0	-	-	-	63	9	7	63	9	7	-	-		-
4 Cleaning doors joint & scraping and removing dust	-	-	-	-	50	-	-	50	-	-	-			-
5 Shifting tiles & in places required new tiles	69.0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	94	6	9	-
6 Sundry plaster	92.4.0	80	4	7	-	-	-	80	4	7	-			-
7 Scaffolding	-	-	-	-	50	-	-	50	-	-	-	-		36
8 Bolt fixtures, panes of glasses &c	243.9.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	12	3	3
9 Petty Supervision	-	-	-	-	15	-	-	15	-	-	2	-	-	
Total	880	80	4	7	326	13	11	407	2	6	141	3	-	39 7
		Paid with deduction			Paid with a deduction						Stand with a deduction			pa

Trichinopoly Division office
26th January 1888

9

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 134 W
11 FEB. 88
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

Enclo 6.

Supg Engr

21-12-87

II

Statement Shewing work done on Repairing Infantry Barracks Estimate Rs 600 under Mr Martin

Sub heads & Amount 1		Mr Martins time Decr/86 2	 Jany/87 3	 Total 4	In Mr Falvey's time Sept/86 5	 Octr/86 6	 Nov/86 7	 May/87 8	 July/87 9	 Aug/87 10	 Total 11	Grand Total Cols 4 & 11.	Remarks
1 Whitewashing	115	50 7 .	- . .	50 7 .	- -	- . .	31 8 11	. .	32 12 9		64 5 8	114 12 8	
2 Bluewashing	119	87 7 .	. .	87 7 .	-	-	-	-	31 12 8	. .	31 12 8	119 3 8	
3 Sundry plaster	77	36 6 6	. . .	36 6 6	-	-	22 7 6	- -	-	-	~~25 11 10~~ 22 7 6	~~25 11 10~~ 58 14	
4 Shifting tiles	24	. . .	. . .	. . .	25 11 10	-	-	-	-	- .	25 11 10	25 11 10	
5 Fixing fixtures	38	- -	- -	- -	- -	4 15 6	20 15 6	- -	-	- .	25 15 .	25 15 .	
6 Scraping	40	40 . .	- -	40 . .	- -	- -	-	- -	-	- .	-	40 . .	
7 Levelling mud	70	31 12 6	- -	31 12 6	- -	31 5 3	35 4 5	- -	-	- .	66 9 8	98 6 2	
8 Leaky Repairs	50	- -	- -	- -	-	- -	-	- -	29 12 10	- .	29 12 10	29 12 10	
9 Clearing dust	20	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	-	- -	-	- .	-	- . .	
10 Petty Supervision	20	. . .	5 . .	5 . .	2 . .	3 . .	5 . .	- -	-	- .	10 . .	15 . .	
11 Contingencies	27	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	10 4 .	[illegible] 6 .	6 14 .	29 8 .	29 8 .	
12 Scaffolding		- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	40 .	- .	40 . .	40 . .	
Total	600	246 1 . Paid with deduction	5 . .	251 1 .	27 11 10 Paid with a deduction	39 4 9 Paid in full	115 4 4 Paid with a deduction	10 4 . Paid in full	[illegible] 12 3 Paid in full	6 14 . Paid in full	346 3 2	597 4 2	

Trichinopoly Dn Office
26th January 1888.

J. Grimes
Executive Engineer

J. W. Rundall
Supg Engr
30-1-88

No 4835 C d/ 21 Decr 1887

Memo

The S. E VI Circle is requested to be so good as to forward Mr Galvey's letter of explanation referred to in para 3 of the S. E's letter No 545 T.C. d/ 14th December 1887. It did not accompany this letter as stated

20.12.87

Jell
21/12/87

No. 2565 C d/ 2-8-87
" 2938 C - 1-9-87

S. E VI Circle Sdespd 21-12-87

II

10451

Note

Bad work in repairing Infantry & R.A. barracks at Trichinopoly -

Lieut Falvey's explanation has now been submitted, & it remains to be decided whether his order on the inspection notes, to the effect that the money wasted shall be made good by Lieut Falvey, shall be enforced or rescinded.

For order. CM 30/12/87

Yes 6/1/88

The explanation is not satisfactory, but as Mr Morton paid for a good deal of the work, it should first be settled what share of the money wasted is debitable to the two officers concerned - and for this the papers should

Correct

No 4835 C d/ 21 Dec 1887

Memo

The S. E. VI Circle is requested to be so good as to forward Mr Falvey's letter of explanation referred to in para 3 of the S. E's letter No 545 T.C. d/ 14th December 1887. It did not accompany this letter as stated

20.12.87

21/12/87

No. 2565 C d/ 2-8-87
- 2938 C - 1-9-87

S. E. VI Circle 21-12-87

From,

Lieut Col. J Pennycuick R.E.
Supg Engr 6th Circle

To, The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.
Madras.

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
NO. 134 W
11 FEB. 88
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

Enclo 7.

File
P.W. 2025/88

Dated 14th } December/87
Despd 18th }

No. 4835 C d/ 21 Dec 1887

No. 545 T.C
61 C d/ 7-1-1888

Enclosure one

Reporting on the Infantry and Artillery barracks at Trichinopoly.

Memo

No. 5457C

Office of the Supdg. Engineer, 6 circle
Thakady - 14th December 1887.
Recd 18th

From

Lt Col J. Pennycuick R.E
Supdg Engineer, 6 circle.

To,

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

Enclo 1.

Sir,

With reference to my inspection Notes of 23d July last regarding the Artillery and Infantry Barracks at Trichinopoly and your remarks thereon No. 2565 C of 2d August 1887, I have the honor to report that the total extra expenditure required to the Infantry Barracks will be Rs 600 of which Rs 360 is due to bad work and Rs 240 to omissions in the original estimate.

2. It appears that out of the original expenditure of Rs 597-4-2, Rs 228-1-5 was incurred by Mr Martin and Rs 369-2-9 by Mr Falvey -

3. I enclose a letter of explanation on this subject, from the latter officer, which has been held over until receipt of the revised estimate.

This has not been received.
N.S.
20-12-87

4. The Artillery Barracks will

have to be separately dealt with as under G.O. No. 3371W of 8th December /87 they are to be handed over to the Revenue Department [illegible] and alterations will be necessary so that it is not desirable to expend any more money in repairs —

Cutt. C S No 10336
[illegible] 17-12-87

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant.

Lt Col RE
Supg. Engineer, Circle —

No 4835 C of 21 Decr 1887

Memo

The S. E. VI Circle is requested to be so good as to forward Mr Galvey's letter of explanation referred to in para 3 of the S. E's letter No 545 T.C. of 14th December 1887. It did not accompany this letter as stated

20.12.87

21/12/87

No 2565 C of 2-8-87
" 2938 C " 1-9-87

S. E. VI Circle ~~deep~~ 21-12-87

PWCR 10451

From,

Lieutt Col. J Pennycuick R.E.
Supg Engr 6th Circle

To, The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.
Madras.

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 134 W
11 FEB. 88
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

Enclo 7.

File

File P.W. 2025/88

Dated 14th
Despd 18th } December/87

Rg 20.12.87

No. 4835 C of 21 Decr 1887

No 545 T.C

61 C of 7-1-1888

Enclosure one

Reporting on the Infantry and Artillery barracks at Trichinopoly.

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 134 W
11 FEB. 88
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

Enclo. 8.

Executive Engineer

Trichinopoly Division

Statement showing the positions occupied in the European and the Royal Artillery Barracks, Trichinopoly

E.1
P.W. 10451/87

Memo

Sixth Circle

Trichinopoly Division

Statement showing the expenditure incurred in repairing the European Infantry Barracks and the Artillery Barracks at Trichinopoly—

	European Infantry Barracks									Artillery Barracks									
	Outlay incurred on the Estimate amounting to Rs 600.								Total	Outlay incurred on the Estimate amounting to Rs 880.								Total	Remarks
	Septr/86	Octr/86	Novr/86	Decr/86	Jany/87	May/87	July/87	Augt/87		Septr/86	Octr/86	Novr/86	Decr/86	Jany/87	May/87	July/87	Augt/87		
By Executive Engineer Mr. J. W. Martin —	-	-	-	× 223-1-5	5-"-"	"	"	"	228-1-5	"	"	"	72-4-7	(a) 295-13-11	"	"	"	368-2-6	Vide foot note
By Hony Asst Engineer Lieut D. Forbes —	24-11-10	39-4-9	111-3-11	"	"	10-4-"	176-12-3	6-14-"	369-2-9	131-3-"	39-13-9	120-4-5	"	"	4-10-"	178-2-"	7-15-9	482-4-11	
Total									597-4-2									850-3-5	

× Paid with a deduction of Rs 30 for check

(a). do do do do 59 do—

Trichinopoly
Decr 7th 1887

J. Simms

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 134 W
11 FEB. 88
P.W.D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

Enclo: 9.

PWC No 5843

6609

CE No 4243 C/87

4 AUG 87

From.

The Supg Engineer
6 Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D

No. 224 T.C

Dated 23rd July 87

~~R 28-7-87~~

R 23-8-87

No. 2938 C of 1-9-87

Inspection notes for the 23rd July 1887—

239
AUG 87

No 267 T.C
9-8-87 O/11:

Forwarded to the Exe: Engineer, Trichinopoly Dn — The Chief Engineer's remarks should be noted & returned

J. Cole
Lt Col
R.E.
Supg Engr VI Circle

noted & returned

J. Simms
Exe: Engineer
14.8.87

Inw L.S. 14/7

R 29.7.

Bellary 28.7.87 R. 1-8-87

3937

28.7.87

Sixth Circle

Trichinopoly have no doubt suffered by the frequent changes in the Executive charge; Mr Martin took charge of the Supdg Engrs Office from myself in September, handed it over to Major Smith in November, and relieved the latter again in February, each of these transfers involving a transfer of the Executive charge between Mr Martin and Mr Fahey.

It is expected that Mr Grimes will take permanent charge of the Division in a day or two, and his special & personal attention is requested to the subject of the foregoing notes.

Trichy 23rd July/87.

D/261

Supdg Engr, 6th Circle

No 2565C. 2/8-87. Lt Col R.E.

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
NO.
11 FEB. 88
P.W.D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

(5/

No. 2565C of 2-8-87

E

M 1.9

No. 2938C of 1-9-87

C

Recorded.

Recorded

Jw 25/8/87

Ew

23.8.87

No. 285 T.C

Noted & returned.

J. Grimes
Exec Engr

R

for Supg Engr 6th C 20/8/87 D/21

C. 23-8-87.

Sixth Circle

to admit the Executive Engineer's explanation that the falling off was due to the salt in the walls, but no satisfactory explanation has been given of the insufficient manner in which the repairs to the tiled roofs have been done; and I am obliged to agree fully in the remarks of the Committee regarding this point.

The Executive Engineer's explanation regarding the "clearing away of debris" is singularly unsatisfactory. He states that "of course it would have been done, and it has since been done. There was not time to do it before the Committee assembled." This should have been done before the completion certificate was forwarded to the Commanding Officer, and seeing that the work was completed in February, and the Committee did not assemble till July, the last sentence of Mr Fahey's explanation is absurd. It may very safely be said that, if the Officer Commanding had signed the certificate when it was first presented to him, the debris would never have been cleared away at all.

I have pointed out to the Executive Engineer the work that must be done over again, and this includes the greater part of the Verandah walls, which must be properly scraped before the new coat is put on. The cost of doing this must be charged against the original estimates, the report of completion of which must be considered as cancelled, and the excess on the estimates thus caused will be specially reported to Government for orders.

The main cause of this unsatisfactory state of things has been the insufficient provision in the original estimate for which the responsibility rests not with Mr Fahey but with Mr Martin, but the former was in charge while the greater part of the work was being done, and admits that he noticed its unsatisfactory nature which he should have taken steps to remedy.

The works in

The whole business is most discreditable to the Executive Engr. & his explanation especially so. The work must be properly done & the money that has been wasted must be made good by him. in [illegible] the clerical report promised the S.E. should state what the amount is.

It is most unsatisfactory that an officer of Lieut. Falvey's experience & character which it was considered fitted him for the post of Offg. Exect. Engineer has allowed work to be done in such a way as to bring discredit on the Dept. The most charitable supposition is that Lt. Falvey left the work entirely to subordinates.

Johnstone Col. R.E.
Chief Engr. P.W.D

30/7/87

Trichinopoly have no doubt suffered by the frequent changes in the Executive charge; Mr. Martin took charge of the Supdg. Engrs. Office from myself in September, handed it over to Major Smith in November, and relieved the latter again in February, each of these transfers involving a transfer of the Executive charge between Mr. Martin and Mr. Fealney.

It is expected that Mr. Grimes will take permanent charge of the Division in a day or two, and his special & personal attention is requested to the subject of the foregoing notes.

No 2565 C. 2.8.87. Lt. Col. R.E.

Trichy
23rd July/87
D/ 261/87.

Supdg. Engr., 6th Circle

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
NO.
11 FEB. 88
P.W.D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

C/5

No. 2565 C of 2-8-87

E

1-9

No. 2938 C of 1-9-87

C/ Recorded.

Recorded

25/8/87

23.8.87

No. 285 T.C

Noted & returned.

Exec. Engr.

for Supdg. Engr. 6th C.

C. 23-8-87. 20/8/87 D/21-

to the omission to scrape the walls properly before putting on the wash; the Verandahs have been used for cooking and are stained & discolored to an extent that rendered any attempt to renew the wash without proper scraping quite useless.

The Executive Engineer explains that the provision for scraping (Rs. 40 in the Infantry Barracks & nothing at all for the Artillery) was entirely insufficient, and this was undoubtedly the case, but the proper remedy was to apply for the sanction to an increased provision & not to omit this essential work altogether.

As regards the plastering I am disposed

No. 2565 C of 2nd. August 1887

C/

It was the duty of the Exec: Engr. then that the Estimate provided all that was necessary

table

the

Trichinopoly have no doubt suffered by the frequent changes in the Executive charge; Mr Martin took charge of the Supdg Engrs Office from myself in September, handed it over to Major Smith in November, and relieved the latter again in February, each of these transfers involving a transfer of the Executive charge between Mr Martin and Mr Fealney.

It is expected that Mr Grimes will take permanent charge of the Division in a day or two, and his special & personal attention is requested to the subject of the foregoing notes.

Trichy
23rd July/87.

Supdg Engr, 6th Circle

No 2565 C. 2/8-87. Lt Col R.E.

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No.
11 FEB. 88
P.W.D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

C5/

No. 2565 C of 2-8-87

E

1.9

No. 2938 C of 1-9-87

C/ Recorded.

Recorded

25/8/87

23.8.87

No 285 T.C

Noted & returned.

R

J. Grimes
Exec Engr
for Supdg Engr 6th Circle
20/8/87

No 224 T.C
23.7.87.

Inspection Notes of the Superintending Engineer 6th Circle, for the month of July 1887.

Dated 23rd July 1887

Repairs to European Barracks at Trichinopoly

Estimates for repairs to these Barracks, amounting to Rupees 600 for the Infantry, and Rs 880 for the Artillery Barracks, were sanctioned in 1886-87 under the general instructions contained in the Quarter Master General's letter No 4185 H of 26th November 1885 to the Officer Commanding Trichinopoly.

The work consisted of white & color washing, petty repairs to roof, plaster, and fixtures, and other minor items; it was begun in August 1886, and completed in February 1887.

The Officer Commanding declined to sign the Completion certificate, as he was not satisfied with the manner in which the work had been done, and after inspecting the work in company with the Officiating Executive Engineer (Mr Fahey) being still dissatisfied with the explanation offered by the latter, he appointed a Committee to report upon the whole matter.

The Committee's report was sent to me and reached me at Palamcottah on the 19th Instant; it was so exceedingly unfavorable that I thought it desirable to take advantage of being within reach of the Railway to go at once to Trichinopoly and inspect the work.

I am of opinion that, while some of the work has undoubtedly been very imperfectly done, the defects are for the most part due rather to insufficient provision in the estimate than to actual bad work, though with regard to the blue-washing in particular the former has induced the latter.

The interior whitewashing is on the whole fairly done, but the color washing to the outside walls is most unsatisfactory; this is due almost entirely

the

to the omission to scrape the walls properly before putting on the wash; the Verandahs have been used for cooking and are stained & discolored to an extent that rendered any attempt to renew the wash without proper scraping quite useless.

The Executive Engineer explains that the provision for scraping (Rs 40 in the Infantry Barracks & nothing at all for the Artillery) was entirely insufficient, and this was undoubtedly the case, but the proper remedy was to apply for the sanction to an increased provision & not to omit this essential work altogether.

As regards the plastering I am disposed

No. 2565 C of 2nd. August 1887

It was the duty of the Exec: Engr. to see that the Estimate provided all that was necessary

1887.