(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 36

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 16.2.89

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

(56)

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P.W.D. துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	854	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	21-3-1889	198 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

18, Sheets

ஆவண. கா-1—18,000—15-6-87.

8th July 1889, No. 1806 W., Public Works.

854

854

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

Read—the following paper:—

From R. B. BUCKLEY, Esq., Under-Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department (Civil Works—Buildings), to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Simla, 21st June 1889, No. 239 B.

In reply to your letter No. 1522 W., dated the 8th June 1889, I am directed to say that the Government of India is pleased to accept the recommendations of the Government of Madras in regard to the rent which should be charged both now and in the future for the residence at Masulipatam, which is occupied by the Collector of the Kistna district.

Order—dated 8th July 1889, No. 1806 W., Public Works.

Communicated to the officers concerned for information and guidance. The rent of Rs. 150 per mensem already approved is now confirmed.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. R. E. DRAKE-BROCKMAN, Lt.-Col., R.E.,
Ag. Joint Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, II Circle.
„ Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
„ Revenue Department.

Exd. J. Henricus.
Spare Copies

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of {1889} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated July, 8th.

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 8th July 1889, No. 1806 W.

JULY.

Collector's Residence at Masulipatam

Letter from the Government of India approving the rent to be charged for the —, communicated to the officers concerned.

Memo

The rent to be fixed from 1st April 1889 for

... Residence at Masulipatam

... calculated according to the

... ned in G. O. No. 2981 W

... ber 1888.

	Rs.	Rs.
... money, ... ated	Rs. 20,000.	
... timate ... nctioned ... 14th ...	Rs. 4,638.	
... ed in ... ry 1888	Rs. 14,305	
		28,943.
... lishment and Tools ... 18943		3788 ~~7,788~~
... tal Capital Cost		~~46,731~~ 42,731
... the actual Capital Cost.		1869.24
(b) Add 3 per cent. on Rs. 46,731 for repairs		1401.93
(c) Add 20 per cent. on Rs. 1401.93 for Establishment and Tools and Plant		280.38
Total rent per annum		Rs. 3551.55

1282
256
3247
Rent 270.6

Rate per mensem —— Rs. 296.

Superintending Engineer's Office
II Circle
27th November 1888.

(Sd) A. B. Todd
Executive Engineer in Ch.
II Circle

"True Copy"

1099/89.

Kistna District
Collector's Office
Camp Bezwada
21st January 1889

A. S. Arundel
Collector.

4

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
27 MAR 89
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Masulipatam.
23rd March, 1889.

My dear Galton,

I have just found out a mistake in the letter I wrote to the Board about the rent of my house, forwarded to Govt. R.D. with B.P. 810 Mis. / 9th Feby, 89. In para 4 of my letter I said the rent of the Judge's

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of {1889} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated July, 8th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 8th July 1889, No. 1806 W.

JULY.

Collector's Residence at Masulipatam

Letter from the Government of India approving the rent to be charged for the —, communicated to the officers concerned.

---

house here is
Rs 80 a month,
whereas I find it is
Rs 100. The error is
of little consequence,
but as it is an error
which moreover tells in
favour of my argument,
perhaps you can
kindly order it to
be corrected. If
necessary I can

4

Of course correct it
officially. 8 5/4

Yours Sincerely

A L Arundel

3 3

---

6 5/4 Memo. 8 5/4

The rent to be fixed from 1st April 1889 for
the Collector's Residence at Masulipatam
calculated according to the
ned in G. O. No. 2981 W
ber 1888.

Rs. 8 5/4 Rs.

money,
tated
.... Rs. 20,000.

timate
nctioned
4th
.. Rs. 4,638.

ned in
ry 1888
Rs. 14,305

38,943.

lishment and Tools } 3788 ~~7,788~~
18943 ...

Total Capital Cost ~~46,731~~ 42,731

(a) 4 per cent. on Rs. 46,731 the actual Capital Cost. 1869·24

(b) Add 3 per cent. on Rs. 46,731 for repairs ...... 1401·93

(c) Add 20 per cent. on Rs. 1401·93 for Establishment and Tools and Plant ...... } 280·38

Total rent per annum Rs. 3551·55

1709
1282
256
3247

Rent 270.6

Rate per mensem —— Rs. 296.

4

Superintending Engineer's Office
II Circle
27th November 1888 — }

(Sd) A. B. Todd
Executive Engineer in Ch.
II Circle

"True Copy"

1
Dis. 1099/89.

Kistna District
Collector's Office
Camp Bezwada
21st January 1889 }

A L Arundel
Collector.

4

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of {1889} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated July, 8th.

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 8th July 1889, No. 1806 W.

JULY.

Collector's Residence at Masulipatam

Letter from the Government of India approving the rent to be charged for the —, communicated to the officers concerned.

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
28 MAR. 89
P.W. DEPARTMENT, MADRAS.

March 27

My dear Brockman.

The letter to the

Arundel's papers has been transferred to the D.P.W. with R. G.O.D. 28 Feb. No 1262. So I send this on to you.

Yours sincerely
Chelton

---

4 5th Memo. 8 5th

The rent to be fixed from 1st April 1889 for the Collector's Residence at Masulipatam will be as follows calculated according to the instructions contained in G. O. No. 2981 W dated 22nd September 1888.

		Rs. 8th	Rs.
A.	Capital Cost.		
	(1) Original purchase money, vide, G.O. No. 1589 J.D. dated 8th August 1878	Rs. 20,000.	
	(2) Expenditure on the Estimate amounting to Rs. 5744 sanctioned in G.O. No. 2265 W of the 14th August 1883	Rs. 4,638.	
	(3) Revised estimate sanctioned in G.O. No 372 W of the 1st February 1888 now under execution	Rs. 14,305	
			38,943.
B.	Add 20 per cent. for establishment and Tools and Plant — Sh. R. on R. 18,943		3788 ~~7,788~~
	Total Capital Cost		~~46,731~~ 42,731

1709	(a) 4 Per cent. on Rs. 46,731 the actual Capital Cost.	1869 · 24
1282	(b) Add 3 per cent. on Rs. 46,731 for repairs	1401 · 93
256	(c) Add 20 per cent. on Rs. 1401 · 93 for Establishment and Tools and Plant	280 · 38
3247	Total rent per annum	Rs. 3551 · 55
Rent 270.6		

Rate per mensem ——— Rs. 296.

4

Superintending Engineer's office
II Circle
27th November 1888.

(Sd) A. B. Todd
Executive Engineer in Ch.
II Circle

"True Copy"

1
Dis. 1099/89.

Kistna District
Collector's Office
Camp Bezwada

A. Arundel

4

Enclosure in lettter dated 21st January
1889 Extra No 19 from the —— Collector,
Kistna, to the Secretary to the Commissioners
of Land Revenue,
Madras.

pr $\frac{\text{No }3}{21\text{st}}$/89

Copy of a memo from the Executive Engineer in Charge II nd Circle.

G.R. 253/89

Extra No. 19

Kistna District Collector's
Office ~~Masulipatam~~ Camp Kondapally
21st January 1889.

854

BOARD'S GEN. REG. No 253 OF 1889
LAND REVENUE.

From,

A. T. Arundel Esquire,
Collector,
Kistna District.

To,

The Secretary to the Commissioners
of Land Revenue,
Madras.

Sir,

6 6

With reference to Board's Proceedings No. 895 dated 23rd October 1888 communicating orders of the Government of India on the subject of rent to be charged for official residences, I have the honor to request that the Board will be pleased to obtain the application of para I (6) of the new rules of ---- Resolution of the Government of India in the case of the residence provided for the Collector of this District. 6

G. 07/27-9-88 2.078148.

6

2. By G.O. No. 2662 W dated 29th October 1884 the rent of the house was fixed at

2
Rev. 1099/89

Rs. 150 which by G. O. No. 4863 dated 14th August 1886 was to become payable after completion of the repairs.

[illegible]

Please see B.P. 6991 of 8 Mar [illegible]

3. The rent thus fixed viz Rs. 150 per mensem is the maximum rent for a Collector's residence as laid down in G. O. No. 1380 dated 18th June 1884. Public.

+ See G.O. No 1957 W dy 11-8-84. This order was superseded by G.O. dy 20-11-84 No 2501 Public Cy

4. I enclose copy of a memo. from the Executive Engineer in charge showing that under the new rules the rent chargeable for this house would be Rs. 296 per month, which in case of the Collector will be Rs. 233 per month being 10 per cent. of his salary.

5. I beg leave to annex reasons for regarding this rent as inequitable and excessive.

6. The building was originally bought in 1878 from Nazim-u-dowlah, a political pensioner, for the sum of Rs. 20,000, the price asked by the owner, and although the then Collector represented the opportunity for purchase as favorable owing to the impecunious state of the owners he did not state his own opinion as to the price asked (G. O. No. 1589 dated 8th August 1878), and no formal valuation of the property was made before purchase. The late Superintending Engineer Mr Rundall (letter in G. O. No. 215 W Public works 27th January 1885) writes "I am informed that the building "was not originally purchased on a valuation, "but that the sum of Rs. 20,000 asked by the "Ex Nawab of Masulipatam was sanctioned "more to help the Nawab who was in difficulties than to acquire a property financially valuable. This appears to be the "case from the order sanctioning the "purchase (Proceedings of Madras "Government Judicial Department "No. 1589 dated 8th August 1878) and "from what I have seen of the building "and its out houses when we dismantled

"it the other day, I can hardly suppose "that, if valued and bought at a fair "valuation, as large a sum as Rs 20000 "would have been offered. The roof of "the main building was in very bad "order and the bulk of the walls consists "of brick in mud." To this may be added that the walls and roof were riddled with white ants.

7. In 1883 Mr Rundall made an Estimate for Rs. 5744 and his report (G. O. No. 2265 W Public Works dated 14th August 1883) explains the dilapidations and says that the restorations should be regarded as "Capital". In a letter to the Collector No. 805 dated 13th June 1883 Mr Rundall reiterates his opinion that too high a price was paid for the property.

8. In 1885 the Collector reported to the Superintending Engineer that the house was in a dangerous state. The Executive Engineer Mr Grant made a careful examination of it and wound up his report by saying, "Taking every thing "into consideration, I believe the cheapest "course would be to abandon the house and "build another of good materials either on "the same site or elsewhere as may be "determined by Government, for I see "no end to the repairs we shall have "to carry out on this building." The Superintending Engineer Colonel Morant in his letter to the Collector (No. 1685 / 26th November, 1885) wrote that he believed Mr Grant's "relation of the facts to be "perfectly accurate," and added "I "quite agree with Mr Grant that

"it would be cheaper to build "a new house."

9. The Board of Revenue (Proceedings No. 728 dated 25th March 1886 in G. O. 294 Revenue dated 21st April 1886) reviewed the position noting that "the whole structure "is evidently in a most unsatisfactory "condition; in fact the District "Engineer in his inspection notes "expresses grave doubts as to its stability.

" Para 6. This expression of opinion is "in the Board's view conclusive and "determines them to urge upon Government "the necessity of undertaking the construction "of an entirely new house for the Collector...."

10. In G. O. No. 540 dated 3rd June 1887, Mr Wybrow the then Superintending Engineer expressed the opinion that considering the large outlay already incurred, he did not recommend the stringent course advised by Mr Grant of abandoning the house. "I am of opinion that, if the present "estimate be carried out, the building "will be put into a secure and thorough "state of repair, and that there will be "no necessity for abandoning it." Final orders were subsequently passed for executing the complete estimates.

11. To the foregoing I may add that when Mr Rundall made with me a final inspection of the premises in December 1887 and revised the estimate, he expressed grave doubts as to whether Mr Grant's recommendation was not the wisest and whether the building ought not to be condemned outright even then.

12. The facts above narrated show that the large sum of Rs. 20,000 was expended in purchasing a very poor property

and it is, I submit, inequitable that the Collector for the time being should be a pecuniary loser by the financial mistake, or unremunerative outlay in favor of a political pensioner, as the case may be, which was made in 1878. If the house had been condemned and a new one built instead of it as recommended by two successive Superintending Engineers, the original outlay must have been written off, and the expenditure of the price of a new building on the old shell does not justify the levy of rent on the wasted purchase money as well.

13. I would also venture to add that Masulipatam has never been regarded as a place of residence to be sought after and that it is not desirable to add the pecuniary fine of an exorbitant rent to the other drawbacks of the station. The interests of the district will not be promoted if Collectors seek to avoid service in it or to obtain a transfer elsewhere at the first opportunity.

14. I do not quite understand how Rule II is intended to be applied but it may here be noted that the rent of private houses in Masulipatam is particularly low. The District Judge for instance pays a rent of Rs. 80 per month. A reduction of the rent of the Collector's residence may therefore be sought under Rule II as well Rule I (6).

15. For these reasons I trust that the Board will advocate the retention of the rent already

fixed by Government namely
Rs. 150 per month.

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

A. Arundel
Collector.

pw Ro 2/2120/89

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue).

Dated 9th February 188~~8~~ 9

No. 810. Mis:

The Honorable J. Grose M.A

Read letter from the Collector of Kistna, dated 21st January 1889, No: Extra 9.

Resolution

Submitted for the favorable consideration & orders of Government. The Board are of opinion that Mr. Arundel has shown very good grounds for maintaining the rent at Rs 150 per mensem.

(True Extract)

J Mannick
Secretary

To The Secretary to Govt. R.D
with letter & encl: in orig: to be retd.
Copy to the Collector of Kistna

[illegible] 2120/89

ABSTRACT.

857 857

12

12

Endorsement No. 1262.

Transferred to the Public Works Department

Capt.
Secretary to Government

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, P.W. DEPARTMENT, MADRAS. -4 MR 89

Fort Saint George,
28th February 1889.

248 W / 30/1/89
2981 R / 22/9/88
272 W / 1/2/88
1668 W / 21/6/87
81 D / 9/5/87
1994 W / 10/8/86
429 D / 21/7/86
1215 W / 13/5/86
215 W / 27/1/85

GR

M.L. No. 2120

(1889.)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 1099

From

The Board of Revenue.
(Land Revenue)

Dated 9th Feby
Received 11th Feby } 1889.
Enclosures 2.

No. 810 Mis.

SUBJECT.

Submitting, with remarks for the favorable consideration and orders of Government, letter from the Collector of Kistna, requesting the retention of the rent of Rs 150 per month, already fixed by Government, in the case of his residence

---

applied for to ~~[illegible]~~ base the rent on the valuation of the building.

85A

The Collector's argument that the rent of private houses at Masulipatam is proportionately much lower than that of his official residence, would apply to many stations ~~[illegible]~~ in the Mofussil ~~[illegible]~~ where Govt. buildings have been provided for officials.

CM
9.3.89

13

Note for orders

Collector's house at Masulipatam 85A

85A

This house was purchased by Govt for R 20.000 under G O No 1589 dated 8th Aug 78 and as far as can be seen this amt R 20.000 was the Vendors price and no report regarding the state or real value of the building was made.

In 1883 under G O No 2265 dated 14th Aug R 4638 was expended and it is stated that the bulk of the repairs were really restorations 16

The Collector paid a rent of R 100 for the house but in 1884 it was fixed at R 150 on G O No 2662 W 29th Oct 84

There have been constant complaints & references with regard to the Rent to be paid by the Collector for the house.

16

In G O No 1668 W dated 21st Jun 87 R 11.074 was sanctio[illegible] Repairs and im

Endorsement No. 1262.

Transferred to the Public Works Department

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, P.W. DEPARTMENT, MADRAS.
-4 [illegible] 89

[illegible]
Secretary to Government.

Fort Saint George,
28th February 1889.

248 W 30/1/89
2981 W 22/9/88
372 W 1/2/88
1668 W 21/6/87
81 W 19/7/87
1994 W 10/8/86
429 W 21/7/86
1215 W 13/5/86
215 W 27/1/85

CR

---

on the ground of prevailing low rates, were this being conceded, the local Govt. can fix the rents of each individual house at the station at such rate as may be deemed equitable.

In any case, an abatement of rent must be sanctioned by the Govt. of India, and if it be considered desirable to recommend a reduction in the case of the Masulipatam Collector's house, it would perhaps strengthen the application, if the S.E. were directed to revalue the house on completion of the repairs - the actual value would probably be much less ~~than~~ than the actual cost, & if such should prove to be the case, the sanction of the G. of I. might perhaps be

---

Calculation should be -

Cost of improvements in 1883	R. 4638
- do - now in progress	R. 14305
	18,943
add 20% for tools &c.	3788
add purchase money	20000
Total capital cost R.	42,731
4 percent for interest	1709.24
3 — " — " — repairs	1281.93
20 percent on repairs	256.38
Rent per annum	3247.55
Rent per mensem	270.62

This figure however is still very large, & in excess of the amount (Rs 233) which the Collector would have to pay under the 10 percent rule.

The Collector thinks that a reduction of the rent might be asked for both under Rule I (6) & Rule II.

14 Under Rule II, it is not necessary to ask for a reduction in any individual case. It is the Station that must be exempted from the operation of the rules

14 on

Note for orders

Collector's house at Masulipatam

85/A

This house was purchased by Govt for R 20,000 under G O No 1589 dated 8th Aug 78 and as far as can be seen this amt R 20,000 was the Vendors price and no report regarding the state or real value of the building was made.

In 1883 under G O No 2265 dated 14th Aug R 4638 was sanctioned and it is stated that the bulk of the repairs were really restorations 16

The Collector paid a rent of R 100 for the house but in 1884 it was raised to R 150 on G O No 2662 W 29 Oct 84

There have been constant complaints & references with regard to the Rent to be paid by the Collector for the house. 16

In G O No 1668 W dated 21st Jun 87 R 11,074 was sanctio[illegible] repairs and in

Endorsement No. 1262.

Transferred to the Public Works Department

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, P.W. DEPARTMENT, MADRAS.
-4 MAR 89

Secretary to Government.

Fort Saint George,
28th February 1889.

248 W of 30/1/89
2981 W of 22/9/88
372 W of 1/2/88
1668 W of 21/6/87
81 O of 19/7/87
1994 W of 10/8/86
429 O of 21/7/86
1215 W of 13/5/86
215 W of 27/1/85

CR

Circ 2120

Note

The file relating to the Collector's residence at Masulipatam is submitted.

The Collector's present letter gives a full history of the building.

The present rent is Rs 150 per mensem, & this rate was fixed in G.O. No 2662 W of 29th Oct 1884.

The Supdg Engr has prepared a statement showing that under the new Govt of India rules, the rent would be Rs 296 per mensem. A mistake has however been made in adding tools & plant charges to the original purchase money, Rs 20000 - the proper

---

In my opinion the whole case depends on G.O. 1589 Judicial of 8th Aug 78 - Apparently the building was purchased without any reference to the P.W.D. and without any valuation, except that of the vendor, and this was not likely to be a fair sum. It is awkward to have to go to the Govt of India now, & say that the sum paid for the building in 1878 was excessive; and I do not see how the S.E. or anyone else could make an accurate valuation now, as the old building must have been considerably altered. A valuation of the building as completed could be made, and a reference made to the Govt of India when this valuation has been recd.

11.3.89

15

Note for orders

Collector's house at Masulipatam

This house was purchased by Govt for R 20,000 under G.O. No 1589 dated 8th Aug 78 and as far as can be seen this amt R 20,000 was the Vendor's price and no report regarding the state or real value of the building was made.

In 1883 under G.O. No 2265 dated 14th Aug R 4638 was expended and it is stated that the bulk of the above were really restorations.

The Collector paid a rent of R 100 for the house but in 1884 it was fixed at R 150 in G.O. No 2662 W 29th Oct 84.

There have been constant complaints & references with regard to the Rent to be paid by the Collector for the house.

In G.O. No 1668 W dated 21st June 87 R 11,074 was sanctioned [illegible] R [illegible] and in

Endorsement No. 1262.

Transferred to the Public Works Department

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, P.W. DEPARTMENT, MADRAS.
-4 MR 89

Secretary to Government

Fort Saint George,
28th February 1889

248 W 7 30/1/89
2981 W 7 22/9/88
372 W 7 1/2/88
1668 W 7 21/6/87
81 W 7 7/5/87
1994 W 7 10/8/86
429 W 7 21/7/86
1215 W 7 13/5/86
215 W 7 27/1/85

Cor

purchase
20000 - the p

854

16

Note for orders

854

Collector's house at Masulipatam

854

This house was purchased by Govt for R 20.000 under G O No 1589 dated 8th Aug 78 and as far as can be seen this amt R 20.000 was the vendors price and no report regarding the state or real value of the building was made

In 1883 under G O No 2265 dated 14th Aug R 4638 was sanctioned and it is stated that the bulk of the repairs were really restorations 16

The Collector paid a rent of R 100 for the house but in 1884 it was fixed at R 150 in G O No 2662 W 29 Oct 84

There have been constant complaints & references with regard to the Rent to be paid by the Collector for the house 16

In G O No 1668 W dated 21 Jun 87 R 11.074 was sanctioned for repairs and in

G O No 372 dated 1st Feb 88
this sanction was raised
to R 4305 making
the total capital cost
or value R 38,943

I think that there is no doubt but that these extensions repairs or reconstructions must be considered as capital charges with regard to the house and that under the recent rules ~~two~~ of the Govt of India the rent which sh'd be R 270 a month

Govt have made a very bad bargain as has been often the case in the purchase of this house but if the Collector is to be allowed to pay less than R 233 - 10 per cent of his pay the sanction of the Govt of India must be asked for

I see no reason why the rent sh'd be fixed at R 150 if the house is worth more and I would suggest that before the Govt of India are asked to allow a reduced rent to be fixed that the Madras Govt sh'd find out what their officers consider a fair rent to be fixed ~~so~~

so I would [illegible] [illegible] the S E sh'd be directed to value the building as it stands without being re-valued and that on this valuation a fair rent sh'd be fixed

I do not know the house but I think it is more than probable that R 150 a month is not a fair rent for the accommodation the house affords

When this has been done and a fair rent fixed the Govt of India may be addressed

11/3/89

854

approved
[illegible]
12 Mar

854

17

17

R/ Immediate

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the [illegible]

READ the following

~~from the~~ Collector of Kistna No 19 of 21. 1. 89

Pros. of the Board of Rev. No 810 mis of 4. 2. 89

Endorsement Rev. Dept. 1262 of 28. 2. 89.

The estimated value of the buildings sh'd be made by taking an arbitrary rate per sqr ft of plinth area the rate to be that of similar buildings that have been erected in late years

~~The estimate sh'd be made on of areas of the plinth~~
~~The areas of the plinths of the different buildings sh'd be taken out and an arbitrary rate per sqr ft the sh'd be~~

The Supdg Engr II Circle is directed to value the Collector's residence at Masulipatam & to report the result as soon as practicable. The estimate should show the actual value of the building & out offices as they stand on completion of the improvements sanctioned in G.O. No 372 W of 1 Feby 1888.

WCB
19.3.89

S.E. II Circle

Cn

29/5/24 B III

P. W. D.

Issue