OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE.

Camp Periyakulam 20th September 1889
D 24/-

No. 258 RN.

From Lieut Col A.C. Smith R.E.
~~The~~ Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

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

Sir,

ENCLOSURES.

With reference to G.O No. 2531 WD of 12th Sept/89, calling for explanation of short outlay on Public Works in the Estates under the charge of this Department in 1887-88, I have the honor to state, as regards the Ramnad Estate in this Circle, that the causes for short outlay in the year, were fully explained in the Administration Report for the year submitted in this Office No. 106 RN dated 29th May/88, and no further explanation can now be given.

2 The amounts of allotment and expenditure given in Enclosure A to statement IV of the Pro: of the Court of Wards and in their para 28, do not correspond with the figures given in the Administration Report

Report above alluded to; it is not understood how the Court's figures have been arrived at. As may be observed from the above Report, the total Grant for and Expenditure on, works above amount to Rupees 1,20,265 & Rs 76,723, respectively, as shown in the margin, while those entered by the Court are Rs 90,434 and Rs 63,480, respectively, including Establishments. This latter sum is said to represent outlay under Aiyan only; but this also differs from the figure of this Department.

	Grant	outlay
	Rs	Rs.
Buildings		
Aiyan	14,154	7,418
Devastanam	21,846	9,941
Chittram	14,260	9722
	49,760	27,081
Irrigation Works	22679	
Aiyan	52,366	43,626
Devastanam	9,712	4,874
Chittram	1,427	1,142
	70,505	49,642
Total Rupees	1,20,265 (20863)	76,723

43542

3. Considering the difficulties they had to contend with Vizino house or accommodation fit for an Officer to live in, bad roads, lack of any sub-division officer or subordinate duly qualified to render their proper assistance, scarcity of labour, & total absence of any respectable contractors in the Zemindari and a general want of morale, I think the Executive Engineers concerned have done as well as could be ~~expected~~ of any officers placed

placed in such a position.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,
H Smith Lieut Col R.E.
Superintending Engineer 6th Circle

Cir. 9025

H.W. 11.+89

To W

Please see the Hon'ble remarks on the draft order -

For orders whether the last para & the order may be cancelled, & the following para Substituted -

"The Govt. cannot accept the explanation submitted, & consider that better results might have been attained if the officers in charge of the works during the period reviewed had displayed greater energy & interest in their works." -

Yes - Revise 10.10.89 Ch 10/10/89

P.W.C. No. 9025

P. W. D. 6TH CIRCLE.

From

The Superintending Engineer,

6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer P.W.D.

No. 258 RR.

Dated 20 September 1889.
Received 24 / 26

Read 30-9-89

Enclosure.

No. 2928 W dt 17. x. 89

Submits explanation for short outlay on Public works in the Rammad Estate under the charge of this Deptt in 1887-88.

B/

E. I. Form No. 22.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

X/

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the

READ the following :—

From the Superintending Engineer VI Circle. No. 258 RR dt 20 Sept 1889.

Communicated to the Revenue Dept. with reference to para 7 of the Proceedings in that Department of No. 686 dated 9th August 1889.

2 | In the Administration Report for 1887-88 submitted by the Supdg Engineer with his letter No. 106 RR dated 29th May 1888, the short outlay under Buildings was explained to be due (1) to failure of contractor (2) to scarcity of labour and (3) to permission to inspect the Temple works by the Executive Engineer having been refused by the Temple authorities.

The

The short outlay under Agricultural Works was attributed to (1) early and heavy rains by which the tanks were filled for an unusually long period, (2) Scarcity of labor, which was almost all engaged in extended cultivation and harvesting operations, and (3) want of sufficient estimates for works entered in the budget.

3. — The short outlay in the estate appears to have been due to circumstances beyond the control of the officers of the P.W. Department.

HCW 7.10.89

Awesy 8.10.89

No. 2928 W dt Oct. 17, 1889

I omit para this. The cause was the inefficiency of the officers and the inordinary difficulties.

HWS 9 Oct

The
Supg Engineer VI Circle.
Revenue department.

Ch

HWS 8.X.89

R10.X

Dy/AM

May

P/C

No. 2928 W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

October 17, 1889

READ the following

From the Supg. Engineer III Circle N.E. No. 258 R.M. dt 20th Sep. 89

Communicated to the Revenue Department with reference to para 7 of the Proceedings in that Department No. 686 dated 9th August 1889.

2. In the Administration Report for 1887-88 submitted by the Supg. Engineer with his letter No. 166 R.M. dated 29th May 1888, the short outlay under Buildings was explained to be due to 1/ to failure of contractor 2/ to scarcity of labour and 3/ to permission to inspect the Temple works by the Executive Engineer having been refused by the Temple authorities.

3. The short outlay under Agricultural Works was attributed to 1/ early and heavy

HWS 1865

heavy rains by which the tanks were filled for an unusually long period, 12/ Scarcity of labour, which was almost all engaged in extended cultivation and harvesting operations, and 13/ want of sufficient estimates for works entered in the budget.

3. The Govt. cannot accept the explanation submitted and considers that better results might have been attained if the officers in charge of the works during the period reviewed, had displayed greater energy and interest in their work.

Dam

No. 2928W of Oct 17, 1889

To the Supg. Engr VI Circle
" Revenue Dept.

Recd 17-+-89

Ch Rlw 11-+-89 RM