Public Works (1896.) Department.

G.O., No. 627W

DATED 20/2/96.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Govt Secretariat office Fort St George
Correspondence relative to the recovery
from the officer responsible of the cost
of painting the stairs of the — and of
subsequently removing the paint and
varnishing them as directed, recorded.

[P.W. 25. 2,000—23-10-96.]

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

H.E.

Painting staircases in the Secretariat at the Fort

Read Cons.
735
1149
1192

B
From orders

No 627 W. of 20 Feby 1896.
Recorded.
Recorded

CO. OS
18. 2. 96
18/2/96

Cs

note for H.E. – the estimates which form enclos. to Con. 1192 should be returned to C.A. under [illegible]. Cee

Done

INDEXED

H. E. 15/2.

Public Works Department.

Note for H.E. the Governor.

With reference to His Excellency's rescript on the accompanying note for orders, it has been ascertained that the cost chargeable on account of painting the staircases in the Secretariat and of removing the paint, will be a mere trifle, probably less than 10 Rupees.

2. It is suggested therefore that the matter be allowed to drop.

W. 13/2/96

Yes - it is not worth while making any more fuss.

W
17 Feb

C.W.M.
14.2.96

S.A.W.

Before this goes on could we not ascertain what the cost to pay amounts to? I doubt whether it will exceed Rs 10.

C.W.M.
16.2 96

Out

I have ascertained from Mr Stephens that if paid for the cost would have a mere trifle, not 10 Rs, but that it has not been paid for, & [illegible] work to be done (at least I presume he ran through the items to satisfy himself) I consider he should pay.

I should therefore ask him if he can show cause why he should not be charged with the cost of this work.

W
10 Feb

43—500-6-3-94.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

READ the following:—

º 181 dated 23rd January 1896.
" " 514 C " 29th " "
" 268 " 4th February "
L " 4258 " 4th " "

DERS.

In Memo No. 181 Public dated 23rd January 1896 it is requested that the cost of painting the stairs of the Government Secretariat and of subsequently removing the paint and varnishing may be recovered from the officer responsible for the work.

2. The painting of the staircase was included in the estimate for General Repairs to the Secretariat offices, which was countersigned by the Chief Secretary and sanctioned by the Consulting Architect.

Note for H

there is no intention to pay.—

For orders whether the C.A. should be asked officially to state the cost, or whether a note may be prepared for H.E. stating that no payment has been made & suggesting that the matter be allowed to drop—

Yes

Mention these points 12/2/96 in ~~an~~ a note to H.E. & ask him if under the circumstances the matter may not be allowed to drop. CWWS 12.2.96

Note to Chief Sec^y to be held in abeyance [illegible]

CWWS 14.2.96

Yes - it is not worth while making any more fuss.

W
17 Feb

Read the following:—

Memo: in Public Dept. No. 181 dated 23rd January 1896.
Office note to the Chief Secy: " 514 C " 29 " "
— do — from — do — " 268 " 4 February "
Letter from the Cons. Architect " 4258 " 4 " "

FOR ORDERS.

In Memo No. 181 Public dated 23rd January 1896 it is requested that the cost of painting the stairs of the Government Secretariat and of subsequently removing the paint and varnishing may be recovered from the officer responsible for the work.

2. The painting of the staircase was included in the estimate for General Repairs to the Secretariat offices, which was countersigned by the Chief Secretary and sanctioned by the Consulting Architect.

I take it that the Chief Secretary is responsible for all alterations etc. inside the Secretariat - and as he ordered this work to be done (at least I presume he ran through the items to satisfy himself) I consider he should pay.

I should therefore ask him if he can show cause why he should not be charged with the cost of this work.

W
10 Feb

~~H.E.~~

FOR ORDERS.

The Subdivisional officer thus did the work under proper authority, and it does not seem right to mulct him in the cost, because the painting was subsequently not approved.

8/2/96

W

Cost of painting stairs in the Govt. Secretariat Dept –

CH 183
8.2.96

Cr

H.E. 8/2 R 11/2

P.W. Dept:

Note for His Excellency the Governor.

With reference to His Excellency's rescript on the accompanying note for orders, it has been ascertained that the cost chargeable a account of painting the staircases in the Secretariat and of removing the paint, ~~would,~~ will be ~~if paid, have cost~~ a mere trifle, probably less than 10 Rupees, but that the work has not been paid for, and there is no intention of paying for it.

It is well understood that in large estimates, petty items whic

~~which are not approved and have to be redone are struck out when final payments are made.~~

It is suggested therefore that the matter be allowed to drop.

W.

The Contractor can claim payment if he insists, for the fault was certainly not his. I have therefore corrected the draft which shd. be fair copied.

CWBH
12.2.96

Cm

H.E. 8/2.

H.E. 1192

Painting staircases in the Secretariat

Done —

No.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Madras, February 1896.

OFFICE NOTE.

From

The Joint Secy: to Govt: P. W. Dept.

To

The Hon'ble the Chief Secretary

With reference to memo: No. 181 Public dated 23d Jany: /96 the following note was circulated to His Excellency for orders:—

"In memo: No. 181 Public dated 23d January /96 it is requested that the cost of painting the stairs of the Government Secretariat and of subsequently removing the paint and varnishing may be recovered from the officer responsible for the

(48—1,000—17-12-95.)

work.

2. The painting of the stair case was included in the estimate for General Repairs to the Secretariat offices, which was countersigned by the Chief Secretary and sanctioned by the Consulting Architect. The Subdivisional officer thus did the work under proper authority, and it does not seem right to mulct him in the cost, because the painting was subsequently not approved."

On this His Excellency has noted:—

"I take it that the Chief Secretary is responsible for all alterations etc. inside the Secretariat - and as he ordered this work to be done (at least I presume he ran through the items to satisfy himself) I consider he should pay.

I should therefore ask him if he can show cause why he should not be charged with the cost of this work."

Will you please reply to His Excellency's note.

The estimate in question is enclosed for inspection & favour of return.

Col: R.E.

Jt: Secy: to Govt: P.W.D.

CHMS
11.2.96.

Cu

To stand over

[G/69]
1,000—15-8-95.

Public DEPARTMENT.

CHIEF SECRETARIAT, MADRAS.

Memorandum. No. 181.

~~READ the following~~

The undersigned is directed to request that the cost of painting the stairs of the Government Secretariat and of subsequently removing the paint and varnishing may be recovered from the officer responsible for the work.

Fort St. George.
23rd January 1896.

W. W. Phillips
Ag: Assistant Secretary

To
The Public Works Dept.

81

CURRENT No. 735

No 3379 Cd/ 8-11-95
3271 Cd/ 2-11-95

Recd: 24-1-96

24/1 96

No. 17.

Office of the Consulting Architect
to the Government of Madras,

No.

Chepak, 189

Copy of a communication from the Sub Divisional Officer No 1 Sub Division. to the Consulting Architect to Government, No. 441 dated 6th November 1895.

With reference to your No 3037 dated 4th Instant I have the honor to report that white paint was used in the place of Sticky wood oil, which as is known, cannot be washed, and always looks dirty, whereas the paint can be washed and kept clean. The doors are painted white. The hand rails to the Staircases were thoroughly scrubbed and varnished, but to varnish all the other parts of the Staircases would have been very expensive, as the Scraping and varnishing would have cost twice as much as the painting. If it is desired the wood oil can be restored, but in that case no washing of Staircases can be done without discolouration

True copy

Henry Irwin

Consg: Archt to Govt.

Enl
P.W. ~~8714/45~~ 1169/56

1895
Pub. Dept.
Enclos. No. 1
To
O. No. 3801

CURRENT No. 406 Pu

No. 514 C.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Madras, 29th January 1896.

OFFICE NOTE.

From

The Joint Secy. to Government
P.W.D., General Branch.

To

The Chief Secretary.

With reference to Memorandum No 181 Public, dated 23rd January 1896, the undersigned has the honour to request that the sub-divisional officer's explanation forwarded with this office No. 3379 C. dated 8th November 1895, relative to painting the stairs of the Government Secretariat, may be retransmitted for perusal.

D. McD. Campbell Lt. Col: R.E.,
Joint Secy. to Government, P.W.D.

CHIEF SECRETARY
31 JAN. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

(48—1,000—11-8-93.)

~~Pub~~
~~CURRENT No. 406~~

P. W. CURRENT No. 1149

Enclo 1

Recd: 5-2-96

Endt. No. 268.

Retransmitted as requested

Ag. Asst Secy

From

P.W.D.

No. 514C

Dated 29} January '96.
Recd. 31}

F.D.B.
3/2/96

Fort St. George
4th February 1896

Subject

Requesting that the Sub. Divisional Officer's explanation relative to painting the stairs of the Govt. Secretariat may be retransmitted for perusal.

C.A. 1. 10-13-12-04.

No. 4258

Office of the Consulting Architect to Govt.,
Chepauk, Madras,
4th February 1896

From

~~Henry Irwin, Esq., C.I.E.,~~
The Consulting Architect
to the Government of Madras,

To

The Chief Engineer
Public Works Department

Sir,

1 Enclosures.

With reference to your Memo: No. 513.C dated the 29th January 1896, I have the honor to submit the Estimate for repairs to the Chief Secretariat building, approved by the Chief Secretary. The painting of the staircase was included in the item "Painting 2 coats &c" on page 1 of the Abstract Estimate. The painting objected to detailed on page 12 of the detailed estimate has since been removed and wood oiled as before.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

3/2/96
Lt: Colonel R.E.
In charge Consulting Architect's Dt.

C. A. / 7. 200—6-5-95.

P. W. CURRENT No. 1192

Enclos 2

Recd: 6.2.96

From

THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

THE Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No. 3271 C d/2-11-95 ✓
" 3379 C " 8-11-95 ✓
" 513 C " 29-1-96 ✓
" 514 C " 29-1-96 ✓

No. 4258

Dated 4th
Despatched } February 1896.
Received

No. OF ENCLOSURES. 1

Subject.

Submitting for inspection the Estimate for repairs to the Chief Secretariat Office Fort St: George, approved by the Chief Secretary.