# Public Works (1896) Department.

G.O., No. 1424 W

DATED 5th May, 1896

[Despatch Abstract.]

Head Assistant Collector's Office at Tiruppattur
Revised estimate of Rs 22,500 for constructing a — in the Salem District,
Sanctioned.

[P. W. 28.
500—18-8-96.]

## BACK PAPERS

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

## FURTHER PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

---

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

# Govt. of {1896} Madras.

## PUBLIC WORKS.

*Dated May, 5th.*

*Recd.* *Encl.*

**G.O. No. 1424 W., 5th May 1896.**

**MAY.**

### Head Assistant Collector's office at Tiruppattur

Revised estimate of Rs. 22,500 for constructing a — in the Salem district, sanctioned.

No. 1424 W., 5TH MAY 1896.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

## PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

### Buildings and Roads.
### Civil Works.

READ—the following papers :—

From J. HANNAN, Esq., Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Ootacamund, 5th September 1895, No. 338/W.

I have the honour to submit, for sanction of Government, a revised estimate, amounting to Rs. 22,500, for constructing a Head Assistant Collector's office at Tiruppattúr in the Salem district.

The excess Rs. 5,600 over the original estimate of Rs. 16,900, sanctioned in G.O. No. 3159 W., dated 17th November 1892, is due to the following :—

| | RS. |
|---|---|
| (1) Substitution of Mangalore tiles and ceiling planks in place of ordinary flat and pan tiles ... ... ... ... ... | 3,516 |
| (2) Extra rate allowed for teak wood ... .. ... ... ... | 742 |
| (3) Tendered rates ... ... ... ... ... ... ... | 1,150 |
| (4) Petty excess in various items ... ... ... ... ... | 192 |
| Total excess ... | 5,600 |

The above excess is fully explained in the report, comparative statement and the Executive Engineer's letter No. 319 S.E., dated 14th August 1895, herewith forwarded.

---

From J. HANNAN, Esq., Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated 15th February 1896, No. 69/W.

With reference to your Memo. No. 579 C., dated 1st instant, I have the honour to state that the tender approved of by this office for constructing Head Assistant Collector's office at Tiruppattúr with ordinary flat and pan tiles was on the whole very little in excess of the estimated amount. The tender amounted to Rs. 11,410 exclusive of wood and iron work against the estimate amount of Rs. 11,211 for the same items omitting wood and iron work.

2. As the work was given out for execution on piece-work system, no contract report was submitted.

---

From J. HANNAN, Esq., Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Coimbatore, 17th March 1896, No. 127/W.

With reference to your Memo. No. 1435 C., dated 14th instant, I have the honour to state that the actual percentage of excess of tendered amount over the sanctioned estimate, including the provision for petty supervision and contingencies, being Rs. 258, or 2·31 per cent., the tender was accepted, and if it had not been for the substitution of Mangalore tiles for ordinary tiles the excess would not have amounted to more than 5 per cent. over the sanctioned estimate.

5

2. The amount of the revised estimate under reference exceeds that of the sanctioned estimate by (Rs. 22,500—16,900) Rs. 5,600, of which the actual excess in the item of roofing and record-racks amounts to Rs. 4,338, and the balance of the excess (Rs. 5,600—4,338) Rs. 1,262 will be nearly covered by the provision for petty supervision and contingencies, viz., Rs. 1,251.

3. In the above circumstances there was apparently no necessity to obtain sanction to a revised estimate at the time the tender was accepted.

4. The comparative statement received with your memorandum under reference is herewith returned duly verified.

*Note by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.*

The Superintending Engineer has included the whole amount, viz., Rs. 1,251, provided for "contingencies" and "petty supervision" in striking a comparison between tender and sanctioned rates for items exclusive of wood and iron works. "Petty supervision" being an item which has to bear its own legitimate charge should not be taken into consideration at all; while as regards "contingencies" only a percentage on the sub-heads referred to should be allowed. The tender will thus be as follows:—

| | RS. | RS. |
|---|---|---|
| Amount tendered ... ... ... ... ... ... ... | | 11,410 |
| Do. as per estimate ... ... ... ... ... ... | 9,901 | |
| *Add*—Contingencies, 8 per cent. ... ... ... | 801 | |
| | | 10,702 |
| Excess ... | | 708 |

or 6·7 per cent. over the estimate.

The Superintending Engineer, therefore, exceeded his powers as sanctioned under paragraphs 61 (*e*), chapter III, and 32, chapter VII, volume I of code.

(Signed) D. McN. CAMPBELL, Colonel, R.E.,
Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

10th April 1896.

ORDER—No. 1424 W., dated 5th May 1896.

The revised estimate, amounting to Rs. 22,500, for constructing a Head Assistant Collector's office at Tiruppattúr in the Salem district, is sanctioned, in supersession of the estimate of Rs. 16,900, sanctioned in G.O. No. 3159 W., dated 17th November 1892.

2. This sanction has been registered as Provincial No. 14 W. of 1896-97, and classified as Civil Buildings—Original Works.

(True Extract.)

Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, with twelve enclosures.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" Revenue Department.

Exd. C. M. Thumbusawmy Pillay.
Spare Copies

---

A/

No 1424 W dt 5th May 1896.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

B.O. Civil, wks

## PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Print

From the Suptg: Engineer, IV Circle, No 338 W dt 5th September 1895
Do No 69 W dt 15th February 1896
Do No 127 W dt 17th March 1896.
Note by the Chief Engineer P.W.D. dt 10-4-96.

5 P

1. The difference between the original and revised Estimates is very large, and in the case of the item for teak, increased by Rs. 742, ~~A.G.H.~~ ~~22.4.96~~ should have been foreseen.

2. The tendered rates exceed the Estimate by Rs. 1150. This ~~implies~~ indicates bad estimating.

3. I notice that the Engineer who prepared the Estimate has retired. In like cases in future, the Engineer should be made to explain.

4. The revised Estimate is sanctioned.

A.S.H.
22.4.96

The revised estimate, amounting to Rs 22,500, for constructing a Head Assistant Collector's office at Tirupattur in the Salem District, is sanctioned in supersession of the estimate of Rs 16,900 sanctioned in G.O. No 3159 W dated 17th November 1892.

2. This sanction has been registered as Provincial No 14 W of 1896-97, and classified

as Civil Buildings, Original Works.

10/4/96

20.4.96

Comm
10.4.96

Revised estimate for constructing a Head Assistant Collector's Office at Tirupattur

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
13 APR 96

I
BCM

The Revenue Secretary
for favour of consideration

DESPATCHED
16 MAY 96

Issue - with notes on separate slip
1 May 96

To
The S.E. IV Circle with 12 enclos:
" Exar P.W. Accts
" Revenue Deptt

S 12

Cn

St
Sor Cho - 2788.

SAW

Please send T's note on the above paper. Subject - "Revised estimate for the Head Asst. Collector's Office at Tirupattur".

14 Ap 96

16.3.

CAW

Notes on the subject forwarded herewith. They were retained in the Circulation L.O. box when ~~the draft order~~ ~~informing~~ of the revised estimate was sent in circ.

Cn
25/4/96

DW

Submitted. The increase of Rs 942 under woodwork, noticed by His Excellency, is due to the original estimated rate of Rs 3-8-0 being subsequently raised to Rs 4-8-0

30 Ap 96

0
28/4

## Public Works Department.

TECHNICAL NOTE.

Current No. 10677
Letter No. 4532
Dated 17 October 1892
From the Revenue Dept.
Name of Work Hd. Asst. Collector, Tirupattur.
District Salem
Taluk Tirupattur
Amount of Estimate Rupees 16900
Do. of Revised Estimate —.—
G.O. sanctioning original estimate No. —.—
dated —.—
Difference. More —.—
Less —.—

PARTICULARS OF ESTIMATE.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Main Building | Rs. | 15,117 |
| Wooden record racks & ladder ~~Subsidiary Buildings~~ | „ | 532 |
| Contingencies | „ | 801 |
| Petty Supervision | „ | 450 |
| Land compensation | „ | „ |
| Total Rs. | | 16,900 |

PARTICULARS OF CONSTRUCTION.

Surface soil gravel
Sub soil hard gravel
Foundations are proposed to be sunk 5 feet deep (as per Type design) the lower 2 feet is to be built of concrete & the upper 3 feet of burnt stone in chunam.
Basement is to be raised 2 feet high & built of burnt stone in chunam
Walls are to be raised as per Type design & built of burnt stone in chunam

as Civil Buildings, Original Works.

10/4/96

20.4.96

Circ[illegible] 10.4.96

Revised estimate for constructing a Head Assistant Collector's Office at Tirupattur

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
13 APR 96

I/BCM

The Revenue Secretary for favour of consideration

DESPATCHED
16 MAY 96

Issue - Pub. Works on separate slip
1 May 96

To
The S.E. IV Circle with 12 encls:
" Exar P.W. Accts
" Revenue Dept.

O/12

---

Estimate may be sanctioned the excess in rates being trifling - the excess in rates may however be pointed out in a memo & date asked for -

W.E.

P.C. [illegible] recommended [illegible] after the [illegible] Collector [illegible]

14.11.9[illegible]

S.A.W.

Submitted as directed.

16/11

## Public Works Department.

### TECHNICAL NOTE.

| | |
|---|---|
| Current No. | 10677 |
| Letter No. | 4532 |
| Dated | 17th October 1892 |
| From the | Revenue Dept. |
| Name of Work | Hd. Asst. Collector, Tirupattur. |
| District | Salem |
| Taluk | Tirupattur |
| Amount of Estimate | Rupees 16900 |
| Do. of Revised Estimate | — . — |
| G.O. sanctioning original estimate No. | — . — |
| dated | — . — |
| Difference. More | — . — |
| Difference. Less | — . — |

### PARTICULARS OF ESTIMATE.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Main Building | Rs. | 15,117 |
| Wooden record racks & ladder ~~Subsidiary Buildings~~ | " | 532 |
| Contingencies | " | 801 |
| Petty Supervision | " | 450 |
| Land compensation | " | .. |
| Total Rs. | | 16,900 |

### PARTICULARS OF CONSTRUCTION.

Surface soil gravel

Sub soil hard gravel

Foundations are proposed to be sunk 5 feet deep (as per Type design) the lower 2 feet is to be built of concrete & the upper 3 feet of burnt stone in chunam.

Basement is to be raised 2 feet high & built of burnt stone in chunam

Walls are to be raised as per Type design & built of burnt stone in chunam

~~Plastering~~

Pointing / the walls are to be pointed with chunam both interior & exterior.

Flooring / is to be of 6" of concrete throughout & the record room is to be asphalted 3/4" thick.

Roofing – is to be tiled with flat & pan tiles on teak reapers

Roof timbers are to be of teakwood

Scantlings are correct as per printed estimate

Doors and Windows are to be of teakwood & of the description detailed in the estimate

Lightning Conductors nil.

Rates are fair except those detailed below.

The plinth area of the main building is 5868 square feet, and the cost per square foot will be Rs. 2. 12. 7

The Plan and Estimate have ~~not~~ been countersigned by the Collector of Salem

and ~~not~~ approved in the Revenue Dept.

~~Department.~~

REMARKS.

This estimate has been framed with reference to G.O. No. 560 W dated 20th Feby 1892. It provides for constructing an Office for the Head Assistant Collector at Tiruppattur in the Salem Dist. as per type design approved in G.O. No. 2122 W dated 8th August 1891.

The office is to be constructed on Govt. land vide site plan, hence no provision is made in the estimate for compensation.

The building is to be built of burnt stone in chunams owing to good bricks not being available at site.

The [illegible]

The Divisional Schedule.

asphalte flooring – ~~1.8..~~ 20.... against ~~1.4..~~ 16....

Panel doors —— ~~20....~~ 1.8.. – do – ~~16....~~ 1.4..

Pointing with chunam 1.8.. – do – 1.4..

If schedule rates be applied the saving will be Rs 135 with contingencies & petty supervision.

Provision is made in the estimate for a 'date stone' complete at a cost of Rs 3. This item appears to be unnecessary but the cost is trifling

5. XI. 95

W. Forder.

There seems to be no reason why these excess rates should be passed. The Executive Engineer has no power to promise a contractor rates vastly in excess of the schedule rates of the division. If the schedule rates were insufficient the fact should have been pointed out and sanction to the enhanced rates obtained before the work was given out on contract. The Sup^g Engineer makes no comment on these irregularities which in fact it would seem that he condoned, for it is stated in the Executive Engineer's report that the tender rates were accepted and approved by the Sup^g Engineer in his No 129 dated 30-4-94.

An important deviation, causing an excess of Rs 3516, has been made on the responsibility of the Executive Engineer. However desirable this deviation may

## Public Works Department.

Current No. 6853

Letter No. 338/W

Dated 5th September 1895

From the Supdg Engineer IV Circle.

NOTE BY TECHNICAL SECTION.

Name of work Constructing Head Asst. Collector's Office at Tiruppattur. Salem District.

Amount of Estimate Rs 22,500.

The S.E. IV Circle, submits for the sanction of Govt. a revised estimate amounting to Rs 22,500 for Constructing Head Asst. Collectors Office at Tiruppattur in the Salem District in lieu of the original estimate amounting to Rs 16,900 sanctioned in G.O. No. 3159 W. dated 17th November 1892.

The excess of Rs 5600 or 33.14% over the original sanction is due to the following causes:–

| | |
|---|---|
| To tendered rates being in excess of Sanctioned estimated rates Rs | 1267 |
| To workshop charges on wooden record racks being in excess of estimated amount | 80 |
| To tendered rate for burnt stone in chunam & reduction in depth of foundations | 477 |
| To deviation in the description of roofing from flat & pan tiles to Mangalore tiles with planked ceiling | 3516 |
| To tendered amount for scaffolding not provided in estimate | 250 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Brought forward Rs | 5590 |
| To Contingencies & Petty supervision on increased totals | 131 |
| Total Rupees | 5,721 |
| Deduct savings partly due to reduced tendered rates on certain items & to reduced depth of foundation | 121 |
| Total excess Rs | 5,600 |

The report accompanying the revised estimate and the E E's letter No. 319/SE dated 14th August 1895 explain in detail the necessity for the excess.

The reduction in the depth of foundations from 5 to 4 feet is stated to be due to hard soil having been met at a higher level than anticipated.

It will be observed that an item of Rs 250 not originally estimated for, is provided for scaffolding; this item it is thought should be expunged, vide page 18, para 28 Chap XII of the Standard specifications, as the value for scaffolding should be included in the rate allowed for each description of work!

A copy of the rates tendered has been submitted but it will be observed that no rate for teakwood has been tendered by the Contractor & the EE now reports that the sanctioned rate of Rs 3-8-- per cft for teakwood is insufficient. The revised estimate provides a rate for Rs 4-8-- for this item, or Rs 1--- per cft in excess of the estimated sanctioned rate.

The tender was accept
the powers of the Supdg Engineer
the deviation in roof covering has apparently been ordered by the SE vide his circular quoted in the report (No. 269C dated 27th July 93). The excesses by the tendered rates & deviation in roof exceeded the powers of the SE. It is therefore submitted that the sanction of Govt should have been obtained before executing the work.

Aw.
11. Jany 96.

have been it was most irregular and the Executive Engineer's explanation is, it is submitted, very unsatisfactory. The Supdg Engineer altered the provision of Mangalore tiles - instead of ordinary tiles - in all future estimates, but this order could in no way justify the substitution of this class of roof for an ordinary tiled roof in an existing sanctioned estimate.

Code rules, as particularised by SAW, in the accompanying note dated 22/1/96, have been violated.

CKPS

23/1/96

---

St
for Cho: 2788.

SAW

Please send T's note on the above paper. Subject "Revised estimate for the Head Asst Collector's Office at Tirupattur".

R.S.
24 Ap 96

CAW

Notes on the subject forwarded herewith. They were retained in the Circulation L.O. box when the draft order disposing of the revised estimate was sent in circ.

Cy
25/4/96

DW

Submitted. The increase of Rs 742 under woodwork, noticed by His Excellency, is due to the originally estimated rate of Rs 3-8-0 being subsequently raised to Rs 4-8-0

R.S.
30 Ap 96

0/28/4.

---

Cho: 2788

HC

Has the Technical Section note been sent up from Madras?

R.S.
22 Ap 96

C. A. W.

T's note has not been sent up from Madras. The draft was sent to the Revy. Secy for counter-initi at Madras and T's note should have been removed then.

Maj
23/4/96

Submitted with referenc to H E's note d/22-4-96.

R.S.
23 Ap 96

T's note is wanted, to enable a reply to be given to H.E.

CWRS
23.4.96.

H. E's note does not seem to require any answer

23/4/96

DW

The note does not really

require an answer; but as the remarks made by H.E. reflect on the efficiency of the department, I thought that by calling for T's note we might explain how the matter has been dealt with.

CWRS
22.4.96.

T's note may be sent

24/4/96

Write Madras 26 Ap 96

---

W.

H.E's remarks are to the point apparently, for the estimating was defective. And as he does not call for an explanation perhaps the documents may be recorded.

CWBD
30.4.96.

1/5/96

---

Further explanation required.
CWRY
12.3.96

1435 C

Current 1587

Note

From the attached comparative statement prepared in office, it will be observed that the figures quoted by the SE appear to be incorrect.

The amount as per estimate exclusive of wood & iron work should be Rs 9,901 & not Rs 11,211 as stated, and as per tendered rates Rs 11,405 against Rs 11,410; from these figures it will be seen that the excess over estimated rates at the time of accepting the tender was Rs 1,504 or 15·2 % over the estimate rates; the acceptance of the tender was therefore objectionable & under para 61 clause 8 Chap III and para 32, Chap: VII Vol 1 of the P. W. Code, a revised estimate should have been submitted for Govt. sanction before executing the work

11-3-96

---

1200

Current 193.

"Note of remarks"

In reply to memo 4992 C dated 28th Novr. 92 pointing out certain high rates provided in the estimate for constructing Hd. Asst. Collectors Office at Tirupattur in the Salem Dist. the SE IV Circle replies thus:-

Item 1. "Asphalte flooring" The SE states that the schedule rate for this item is Rs 20 & not Rs 16 - Item No. 171 page 17 of the Coimbatore Divn. schedule, provides Rs 20 for "flooring with asphalte 3/4" thick laid on concrete 4" thick". The estimate for the work is based on the printed type estimate in which provision is made for a levelling course of concrete 6" thick to all the rooms, hence the rate to be allowed is merely for asphalting thus:-

3/4" asphalting with 4" of concrete — Rs 20
Deduct thickness of concrete 4" at Rs 12 per 100 cft — } - 4

Rate for asphalting 3/4" Rs 16 & not Rs 20 as provided in the estimate

Item 2. 'Panel doors'. There is no item as panel doors in the Schedule but item No. 261 "Teakwood doors 1½" complete &c" which precedes the item of pannelled & glazed doors is always taken for panel doors in checking rates ~~[illegible]~~. If it should not be taken for "panel doors" then it is not known why this item should be filled in the schedule when the description of the door is not mentioned. Again if a rate of Rs 1-8-0 was paid for panel doors in Sub Registrars offices, then the rates of Rs 1-8-0 for "panel & glazed" & "panel & venetian" doors should be increased accordingly, as these descriptions of doors involve extra labor.

Item 261 refers I think to panelled doors, the rate is expressly stated. 14.1.93

"Schedule of rates put up"

Od

For orders -

The estimate for the work was sanctioned in Go. No 315 G.W. of 17.11.92, & if no further action is considered necessary, Currently 193 may be recorded -

Yes Ce

---

A contract in excess of the estimated rates seems to have been accepted without being a revised est. being sanctioned & the sanction to the excess rates having been obtained. Moreover the rates of the contractor has been made, consequently the S.E. did not comply with the latter part of para 11 Ch VIII ~~III~~ of the Code, & he is failing [illegible] on this point. The S.E. is also liable to have to sanction the alteration in the work which was beyond his powers under para 61(c) of Chap III.

27/1/96

---

S.A.W.

My note is not quite complete, as I want to know what code rules have been violated.

C.W.H.S.

21/1/96

Od

The Ex. Engr. violated Code para 96(d). Chapter III Vol I in making the deviation in the roof causing an excess of Rs 3576. The deviation was beyond the Supdg. Engrs powers under para 61(c) of the same chapter.

We cannot find that the Supdg. Engr. submitted a report of the contract. He therefore did not comply with the latter part of para 11, Chapter VIII.

The grant of excess rates appears to be against the provisions of para 16 chapter VIII.

Ce

22.1.96

The estimate is sanctioned with the remark that the Supg Engineer has included the whole amount — viz: Rs 1201 provided for "Contingencies" and "Petty Supervision" in striking a comparison between tender and sanctioned rates for items inclusive of wood and iron works. "Petty Supervision" being an item which has to bear its own legitimate charges should not be taken into consideration at all; while as regards "contingencies", only a percentage on the sub-heads referred to should be allowed. The tender will thus be as follows:-

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Amount tendered | | Rs 11410 |
| Do as per estimate | 9901 } | 10702 |
| add contingencies 8% | 801 } | |
| | Excess | Rs 708 |

or 6.7 % over the estimate. The Supg Engineer ~~has~~ therefore exceeded his powers as sanctioned under paras 61(c) Chap II and 32 Chap VII Vol. of Code

CHBB
3.4.96.

80—200—18-12-96.

---

**Public Works Department.**

Current No. 2788

Letter No 127/W

Dated 17th March 1896

From the Supg Engineer IV Circle.

NOTE BY TECHNICAL SECTION.

Name of work. Head Assistant Collectors Office at Tirupatur: Salem District.

Amount of revised estimate 22500.

With reference to this office Memo. No. 1435 C dated 14th inst, the S.E. IV Circle states that the actual excess on the tendered amount is only Rs 258 or 2.31 % in excess of sanctioned amount, including Petty Supervision and Contingencies, consequently there was no necessity to obtain sanction to a revised estimate at the time of acceptance of tender.

The following figures shew the difference between sanctioned estimate and tendered amount:

| | as Sancd. Rs | as tendered Rs |
|---|---|---|
| Amount of items exclusive of wood & iron work | 9,901 — | 11,400 |
| Amount for wood & iron work | 5,748 — | not tendered for |
| Contingencies 5% = Rs 801<br>Petty Supn. 3% = Rs 450 | 1,251 — | " |
| Total Rs | 16,900 — | 11,400 |

It will be observed from the figures following that the S.E. has included the whole of the amount of "Contingencies" & "Petty Supervision", viz. Rs 1251 in striking out the per centage between tendered and sanctioned amounts for items exclusive of wood & iron works which amounts to Rs 9,901, without making any allowance for the amount under wood & iron work thus,

| | | Rs |
|---|---|---|
| Amount tendered less wood & iron work (actually the figures should be Rs 11400 & not 11,410) | | 11,410 |
| Amount sanctioned for items less wood & iron work | 9,901 | 11,152 |
| -do- Contingencies Rs 801<br>-do- Petty Supervision Rs 450 | 1,251 | |
| Excess Rs | | 251 |

Or 2·31% over sanctioned amount.

From the above, it will be seen, that the sanctioned provision of Rs 1251 under the sub heads "Contingencies" & "Petty Supervision" is entirely added to the amount of estimate for masonry works (i.e. estimate less wood & iron work) without any per centage being retained for timber & iron works, thereby increasing the per centage on masonry works Rs 9901 from 5% to 8% & petty supervision from 3% to 4½%. Further it is submitted that the sub head "Petty Supervision" amounting to Rs 450 is not an item that should be made available for unforeseen works, as that sub head has to bear its legitimate charge such as pay of maistry &c the expenditure on which will probably be large as it will take 11 or 12 months to complete the building

---

14244

It is therefore submitted, if "petty supervision" be not taken into consideration & allowing the whole of the item of "Contingencies" to masonry works, the excess at the time of accepting the tender will be as follows:-

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Amount as per tender | Rs | 11,410 |
| -do- as per estimate Rs 9,901<br>add Contingencies 8% 801 | | 10,702 |
| Excess Rs | | 718 |

or 6·7% over the estimate, thus exceeding the powers of S.E.'s sanction, under paras 61 (e) Chap III & 32 Chap VII of the Code.

A revised estimate should therefore have been submitted for Govt. sanction before putting the work in hand.

24.III.56

Dw

Enquire whether the revised estimate may now be sanctioned & if so what remarks should be made

26/3/56

---

P.W.D

## Note by the Chief Engineer P.W.D

40

The Suptg: Engineer has included the whole amount viz Rs 1251 provided for Contingencies and "Petty Supervision" in striking a comparison between tender and sanctioned rates for items exclusive of wood and iron works. "Petty Supervision" being an item which has to bear its own legitimate charge should not be taken into consideration at all; while as regards "Contingencies", only a percentage on the Sub-heads referred to should be allowed. The tender will thus be as follows:-

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Amount tendered | | Rs 11,410 |
| Do. as per estimate 9,901<br>add Contingencies 8% 801 | | 10,702 |
| | Excess Rs | 708 |

or 6.7 per cent over the estimate. The Supty: Engineer therefore exceeded his powers as sanctioned under paras 61 (c) Chapter III, and 32 chapter VII, volume I of Code.

10/2/96
E. W.

Cwws
10. 4. 96

---

No. 338/W

Superintending Engineer's office 4th Circle
Camp Ootacamund 5th September 1895

From

J. Hannan Esq
Superintending Engineer 4th Circle

1 Pce

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D

Enclosures 8.

- 1 Original estimate
- 1 -do- report
- 1 Revised estimate
- 1 -do- report
- 1 Data list
- 1 Tracing
- 1 Comparative statement.
- 1 Copy of E.E's letter.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit for sanction of Government a revised Estimate amounting to Rs 22,500 for constructing a head assistant Collector's office at Tripatur in the Salem District.

The excess Rs 5,600 over the original Estimate of Rs 16,900 sanctioned in G.O. No. 3159 W dated 17th November 1892 is due to the following:—

(1) Substitution of Mangalore tiles and ceiling planks in place of ordinary flat and pan tiles Rs 3516 ✓
(2) Extra rate allowed for Teak wood — — 742 ✓
(3) Tendered rates - — — — ? — 1150
(4) Petty excess in various items — — — — 192

Total Excess Rs 5,600

The above excess is fully explained in the report, Comparative statement and the Executive Engineer's letter No 319 S. E. dated 14th August 1895 herewith forwarded.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient Servant

Superintending Engineer 4th Circle

No. 2678 cd/20-7-93
367 w d/9-2-93
1849 cd/24-4-93
120 w d/17-1-93
3023 w d/11-11-91
121 cd/12-1-91
4262-3 cd/20-10-90

P. W. CURRENT No. 6853

No. 3159 w d/17-11-92

From
The Supg. Engineer,
4th Circle.

Recd: 9.9.95
Enclos: 11*
(*1 Tracing)

Dated 5th }
Despd 7th } September 1895

No. 338/W.

Enclos: 8.

Head Assist. Collector's Office at Tirupatur, Salem Distt.

Submits for Sanction of Government a revised Estimate amounting to Rs 22,500 for Constructing a —

406

5/10

---

Supg. Engineer's office, 4th Circle
15th February 1896.

No. 69/W

From,
J. Hannan, Esq.,
Supg. Engineer, 4th Circle,

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

Sir,

With reference to your Memorandum No. 579C, dated 1st instant, I have the honor to state that the tender approved of by this office for Constructing Head Asst. Collector's office at Tirupatur with ordinary flat and pan tiles was on the whole very little in excess of the estimated amount. The tender amounted to Rs 11,410 exclusive of wood and iron work against the estimate amount of Rs 11,211 for the same items omitting wood and iron work.

2. As the work was given out for execution on Piece work System no contract report was submitted.

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

Hannan
Supg. Engineer, 4th Circle

P.W. CURRENT No. 1587

From,

The Supg. Engr.,
4th Circle

Recd: 17-2-96

Dated 15th }
Rd } February 1896.

No 69/W.
No. 577 c d/ 1-2-96
120 w d/ 17-1-93
3023 w d/ 11-11-91
121 c d/ 12-1-91
4262-3 c d/ 20-10-94
Enc: -

Hd. Asstt. Collectors Office Tripatur - Reports that the work of - was given on Piece work System no Contract report was submitted -

X for verification
[illegible]
18-2-96

Vide note submitted
[illegible]

DW

For orders
a.
17-2-96

---

No 127/W

Supg. Engineer's office, 4th Circle,
Coimbatore 17th March 1896.

From,

J. Hannan, Esq.,
Supg. Engineer, 4th Circle,

To,

The Chief Engineer,
P.W. Department.

Enclosures
1 Comparative Statement with its enclosures

Sir,

With reference to your Memorandum No. 1435 C, dated 14th instant, I have the honor to state that the actual percentage of excess of tendered amount over the sanctioned Estimate including the provision for petty supervision and contingencies being Rs 258 or 2.31 per cent, the tender was accepted and if it had not been for the substitution of mangalore tiles for ordinary tiles the excess would not have amounted to more than 5 per cent over the sanctioned Estimate.

2. The amount of the revised Estimate under reference exceeds that of the sanctioned Estimate by Rs (22,500 - 16,900) 5,600, of which the actual excess in the item of roofing and record racks amounts to Rs 4,338 and the

balance of the excess (5600-4338) Rs 1262 will be nearly covered by the provision for petty supervision and Contingencies Viz Rs 1251.

3. In the above circumstances there was apparently no necessity to obtain sanction to a revised Estimate at the time the tender was accepted.

4. The Comparative statement received with your Memo under reference is herewith returned duly verified.

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

Supg. Engineer, 4 Circle

P. W. CURRENT 12788

From
The Supdg. Engineer
4th Circle

Recd 19.3.96
Encls: 12 (1. Plan)

No. 1409 W d/ 28-5-89
" 3023 W " 11-11-91
" 560 W " 20-2-92
" 3159 W " 17-11-92
" 4992 C " 28-11-92
" 120 W " 17-1-93
" 579 C " 1-2-96.
" 1435 C " 14-3-96

" 4265 C " 23-11-87
" 3286 C " 5-8-90
" 3426 C " 16-8-90
" 2895 C " 3-7-90
" 4262 C " 20-10-90
" 3750 C " 13-9-90
" 3787 C " 18-9-90
" 3813 C " 19-9-90
" 5065 C " 6-12-90
" 121 C " 12-1-91

Dated 17th }
despd 18th } March 1896
Recd }

No. 127/W

Encls: 12

Head Assistant Collector's Office Tirupatur. Returns comparative statement of — with explanation as to the cause of excess over sanctioned estimate.

J

For early remarks.

19/3/96