# Public Works (1897) Department.

G.O., No. 3440 W

DATED 8 December 97

[Despatch Abstract.]

**Office**: Revised estimate of Rs. 31,000 for constructing a combined office for the Dy Collector and the Stationary sub magistrate at Tiruvallur in the Chingleput Dt. Sanctioned.

110/1

9/8/12/97

Indexed. + Fwd 9/12/97

[P.W. X. 1,500—10-11-96.]

## 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.

# Government {1897} of Madras.
## PUBLIC WORKS.

*Recd.* } 1897. *Enclosures*
*Regd.* } *Spare copies*

## G.O., No. 3440 W., 8th December 1897.

**DECEMBER.**

**Office**

Revised estimate of Rs. 31,000 for constructing a combined — for the Deputy Collector and the Stationary Sub-Magistrate at Tiruvallúr in the Chingleput district, sanctioned.

### GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

### PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

**Buildings and Roads.**
**Civil Works.**

Read—again the following paper:

G.O., No. 856 W., dated ~~10th January~~ 25th March 1897.

Read—also the following papers:—

From Lieutenant-Colonel C. C. RAWSON, R.E., Superintending Engineer, V Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Chepák, 10th January 1897, No. 9 W.

I have the honour to submit, for sanction, the enclosed revised estimate of Rs. 31,000 with comparative statement, for constructing a combined office for the Deputy Collector and Stationary Sub-Magistrate at Tiruvallúr, Chingleput district, showing an excess of Rs. 7,060 over the original estimate of Rs. 23,940 sanctioned in G.O., No. 1185 W., dated 18th May 1895.

2. The cause of excess is explained in the report attached to the estimate.

From the Superintending Engineer, V Circle, dated 21st August 1897, No. 340.
" " V " " 12th Nov. " " 460.

Order—No. 3440 W., dated 8th December 1897.

The revised estimate amounting to Rs. 31,000, for constructing a combined office for the Deputy Collector and Stationary Sub-Magistrate at Tiruvallúr in the Chingleput district, is sanctioned in supersession of the estimate of Rs. 23,940 sanctioned in G.O., No. 1185 W., dated 18th May 1895.

2. The outlay on the work to end of 1896–97 was Rs. 22,214, and the current year's grant is Rs. 8,765.

3. This sanction has been registered as Provincial No. 70 W. of 1897–98, and classified as Civil Buildings—Original Works.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government.

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

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

---

A

[500—14-10-97.]

vide [illegible] R 23.3.97 [illegible] 25.3.97

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated 25th March 1897, No. 856 W

~~Again G.O., dated~~ [illegible] 406 [illegible] of 10 Jany 1897, ~~No.~~ ~~from~~ [illegible] S.E. V circle

Current No. 8410 of 1897, dated 21st August 1897, from the S.E. V circle

" " 11335 " 1897, " 12th November 1897, " — Do —

" " " 189 , "

B. P. [illegible]

4 P

ORDER. No 3440 W, 8.12.97

The revised estimate amounting to Rs 31,000, for constructing a combined office for the Deputy Collector and Stationary Sub-Magistrate at Tiruvallur in the Chingleput District is sanctioned in supersession of the estimate of Rs 23,940 sanctioned in G.O. No 1185 W dated 18th May 1895.

2. The outlay on the work to end of 1896-97 was Rs 22,214, and the current year's grant is Rs 8765.

3. This sanction has been registered as Provincial No 70 of 1897-98, and classified as Civil Buildings, Original Works.

2.12.97

To

~~The Secretary to Govt~~

~~Revenue Dept for favour of countersignature.~~

The draft is accepted.
[illegible] 2/12/97

To Do [illegible]

To

The S.E. V Circle with 7 enclos:

" Exar. P.W. Accts.

" Revenue Dept.

28/11/97

3/12

CHRY 2/12/97

REV. DEPT.

3440W ✓
8/12/97
Chw 11335

Dy

When His Excy's note on the paper flagged G. was written, the revised estimate was not before him – the question was whether the contractor might be paid according to the rates entered in the revised estimate –

On His Excy's note, this was sanctioned in the G.O. immediately above G. The revised estimate itself could not be sanctioned then, as it had previously been returned for further information with memo No 1393C

---

For favour of orders.

ructing a combined office
the Deputy Collector and
tionary Sub Magistrate at
allur. The revised estimate
returned to the Supg Engineer
further explanation with memo
393C of 11-3-97. This was
ed by the Supg Engineer in his
340W of 21-8-97 with which
forwarded a copy of an
anation from the Executive Engineer
meanwhile His Excellency had,
-3-97 remarked on the
y and careless estimating,
– called for the names of
officers responsible, ~~and~~ but
neither the delay nor the
arent carelessness in preparing
original estimate, were satisf
xplained in the comparative
ement, under instructions
Colonel Campbell, the Resident
further official correspondence
be waste of time, I

dated 11-3-97-F

H.

The revised estimate was re-submitted with the S.E.'s letter No 340W of 21-8-97, but again it was not sanctioned, for memo No 1624 D (Flag C) of 8.10.97 was sent to the S.E. asking for explanation of the delay.

The explanation has now been received, & if it is accepted, sanction to the revised estimate might go out at once, but a note for His Excy will be required answering his question about careless estimating & delay.

Cz

29.11.97

---

10. For favour of orders.

Constructing a combined Office for the Deputy Collector and Stationary Sub Magistrate at Trivellur. The revised estimate was returned to the Supdg Engineer for further explanation with memo

"Flag" H. No 138CC of 11-3-97. This was replied by the Supdg Engineer in his

"Flag" N No 340W of 21-8-97 with which he forwarded a copy of an explanation from the Executive Engineer. But meanwhile His Excellency had,

"Flag" G on 23-3-97 remarked on the delay and careless estimating, and called for the names of the officers responsible, ~~and~~ but as neither the delay nor the apparent carelessness in preparing the original estimate, particularly as regards the reason why the necessity for a different class of work could not have been foreseen, were satisfactorily explained in the Comparative

"Flag" C Statement, under instructions from Colonel Campbell, who considered that further official correspondence would be waste of time, I

wrote demi-officially to
Col: Rawson whom I gathered
from the correspondence to be the
Superintending Engineer responsible
with Mr Marshall under him
as Executive Engineer. This letter
was addressed to Col: Rawson
out of consideration for himself,
but from his reply - herewith under
cover - it will be seen that he
did not accept it in a friendly
spirit, for he makes the most
of the fact - and it is, I admit,
a fact - that we were mistaken
as regards the individuals
responsible for the preparation of
the original estimate. This answer
from Col: Rawson I handed over
to Colonel Campbell for reply and
I believe the latter officer told the
former that he would not corres-
pond with him demi-officially on
such matters again, and at the
same time he instructed me to
write memo No 1624 D of 8-10-97 "Key" C
drawing attention to the delays in
submitting a revised estimate -

attached to the [illegible] the file

This memo is replied to
in the Superintending Engineer's
letter No 460 W of 12th Nov 1897
and the explanation given
for the delay may, I think, be
accepted; and, as Colonel
Rawson was in no way
responsible for the original
estimate, it will probably
be necessary to go back to
Mr Larmine's time for a
proper explanation. The
question is, is it worth while
to do so? He may say that
the rates and class of
work were suitable, and
that, if he had been
connected with the execution of
the work, he could have
kept expenses within the
prescribed limit. It seems
doubtful whether it would
be possible to hold him or
his Executive Engineer under him responsible
for excess expenditure

in work with the execution of which they had nothing to do.

CWB
30/11/97

I don't think any further need be done in this matter – H.S. only orders to note the names of those responsible – not inform them – Mr Lar– name was apparently responsible for the estimate, but not for carrying it out. a C.A. seems to have been responsible for the latter – I think the matter may now be recorded

L Bell
1-12-97

S.A.W.
Please have sanctions order drafted –
CWB
1.12.97

---

# lic Works (1897) Department.

**CURRENT No.** 11335

3440W

Order

**From** The Superintending Engineer I Circle

**No.** 460W

**Dated** 12th November 1897 –
**Received** 15.11.97
**Enclosures**
**Spare copies**

SUBJECT.

Combined Cutcherry at Tiruvallur –

Reporting there has been no delay in the submission of the revised estimate for under the circumstances explained –

Sub/ Forwarded
CWB
16/11/97

| BACK PAPERS. | | FURTHER PAPE | IRS. |
|---|---|---|---|
| No. | Date. | No. | |

(ND) 1.12.97

---

Copy of a letter from J. P. Davidson Esquire, Executive Engineer, Chingleput Division, to the Superintending Engineer, V Circle, No. 2409 dated 8th November 1897.

---

In reply to your endorsement No. 417 C.N. dated 13th October 1897 communicating Chief Engineer's Memo No. 1624 D. dated 8th October 1897, I have the honour to state as follows:—

2 The sanctioned plans and estimates for the "Combined Cutcherry work" and G.O. No. 1955 W. dated 7th August 1895 allotting funds were received in this office on 8 June 1895 and 27 August 1895 respectively. The work was given out on piecework on 14 September 1895. When the work was about to be started, the question of proper site came in, the site originally selected having been found unsuitable, as it was once a pond. After some correspondence with the Superintending Engineer and the Revenue Department, a fresh site was selected and this was approved by the Collector on 3rd March 1896. An application for the acquisition of land required was thereupon submitted to the Collector on 20 March 1896. A portion of the land was handed over by the Revenue Department on 3rd April 1896. Excavation for foundations was then commenced and completed

or

on or about 12th May 1896. Thus it will be seen that the work was practically commenced in May 1896 i.e. seven months after the first allotment of funds was made.

3. As the work progressed, several deviations were found necessary, (please see my letter No 1353 dated 2nd August 1897), and a revised estimate was accordingly prepared by the Sub Division Officer who submitted it to this office on 13th September 1896 i.e. about four months after the work was actually started. This was checked in this office and forwarded to the Superintending Engineer, V Circle, with No 2257 dated 21st October 1896.

4. Under these circumstances I submit that there has been virtually no delay in the submission of the Revised estimate.

---

No 460W

To the Chief Engineer, P.W. Department, with reference to his No. 1624 D. dated 8 October 1897.

12/11/97

Colonel R.E.

Suptg. Engineer 5 Circle

11/11/97

---

C. No. 8410

P. W. Secretariat.

## Note by Budget Section.

Work Construction of a combined office for the Deputy Collector for the Deputy Collector and Stationary Sub Magistrate at Tirvalla

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Fund | | Provincial |
| Service Head ... ... .. | | Civil Buildings |
| Departmental Head ... ... ... | | Original Works |
| Amount of Estimate ... ... | Rs | 31.000 (Revised). Original estimate Rs 24 |
| Expenditure in previous years ... | " | 22.236 |
| Allotment in current year ... | " | 2.724 |
| Balance required to complete the revised estimate | " | 6.040 |
| Total Rs ... | | 31.000 |

Note of available Funds.

The excess over the original estimate viz Rs 6.040 will have to be provided if the revised estimate be sanctioned. The Provincial reserve with Govt is only Rs 6.074 exclusive of Rs 9000 proposed to be allotted to the Consulting Architects Division

H.C.

Before sending this up
E.W. please look through
the file and see whether
there is anything explanatory
of the delay referred to.
Also when were funds
available to start the
original estimate?

CARY
6/9/97

Dw,

(1) None

(2) 1895-96, but the exact
date will have to be
ascertained from Madras

MAJ
6/9/97

(2) Funds were first provided in G.O. No: 1955W d/7-8-95. The delay in submitting this reply is due to the first requisition for this paper having been missed. Please see slip attached
MAJ 5/10/97

This is wanted
CARY
6.9.97

Wrote to Madras
MAJ
6/9/97

Wrote again
1/10/97

---

B

I sent you a slip on the 6th September 1897, inquiring when the first allotment for the combined office of the Dy. Collector and stationary submagistrate at Trivellore in the Chingleput District was made. It was made, I believe, in 1895-96. Please send up the papers soon. ~~I thank~~

MAJ
1/10/97

H.C.
6

Herewith the papers required by you. The first allotment was made in 1895-96. I have not sent you the papers regarding the allotments made in 1896-97 and 1897-98 since you do not want them.

2 I never received your slip dated 6th September 1897, and I should have been quite ignorant of the call but for the above requisition

P.K.S.
5/10/97

thro' S.A.W.
CM
5/10/97

---

# Public Works (1897) Department.

**CURRENT No.** 8410

D/

**Order** Memo
No. 1624 D., d/8th October 1897

**From** The Supdg. Engineer
5th Circle

**No.** 340 W.

**Dated** 21st August 1897.

**Received** 24.8.97

**Enclosures** 7 (1 Plan)

**Spare copies**

**SUBJECT.**

Combined Office for the Deputy Collector and Stationary Sub magistrate at Tiruvallur.

Resubmitting with explanation the revised Estimate for constructing a-

The undersigned has the honour to observe that the original estimate of Rs. 23,940 was sanctioned on 18th May 1895, but that the revised estimate was not submitted by the Supdg. Engineer till 10th January 1897. It is therefore requested that the delay of nearly 20 months may be explained.

2. It is observed that funds were first provided in G.O. No. 1955W of 7th August 1895: thus if work had then been commenced the necessity for a revised estimate might, it is thought, have become apparent before the following January Year

CARY
6/9/97

CARY
7.10.97

To the S.E. V Circle 7/10/97

To The S. E. V Circle

D 8/10/97

o.d. 5418

## BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 856 W | P.W. | 25-3-97 |
| | 1185 W | – | 18-5-95 |
| | 1319 W | – | 25-5-94 |
| | 794 C | – | 2-3-95 |
| | 2984 W | – | 17-11-93 |
| | 2103 W | – | 18-7-96 |

## FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Copy of a letter from J. P. Davidson Esquire Executive Engineer, Chingleput Division, to the Superintending Engineer, 5 Circle, No. 1353 dated 2nd August 1897.

With reference to Chief Engineer's memorandum No. 1383 C. dated 11 March 1897 communicated with your No. 33 CN/c dated 18th idem, I have the honour to state as follows:—

Para 1 of C.E's memo. Estimates are sent to the Collector for countersignature usually from the Superintending Engineer's Office after approval and not from this office. The site plan of the new site for the building, approved of and countersigned by the Collector is herewith forwarded. Please see also G.O. No. 2103 W dated 18 July 1896.

Para 2 of C.E's memo. The original estimate was prepared by the Superintending Engineer in consultation with the Consulting Architect to Government, on pencil plans furnished by this office. The foundations provided for therein were apparently found sufficient in the case of the new site also. It was the original site that was subsequently found to be made earth and not the new site, the nature of the soil of this latter was dark loam to a depth of 4½ ft and more and more clayey at every extra foot below that depth.

Para 3 of C.E's memo. The building was originally

proposed

proposed to be constructed in the compound of the Taluq Cutcherry Building at Tiruvallur (i.e. at the back of the Cutcherry). Hence no provision for compensation was made in the original estimate. But this site having been subsequently (i.e. at the time when the work was about to be commenced) abandoned owing to its being all made soil to a great depth, a new site was selected and compensation had to be paid for the same. In this office No 2884 dated 14 December 1896, it was reported that compensation for the new site would amount to about Rs 1,000/- as award statements received from the Collector till ~~there~~ then amounted to Rs 752/- provision was accordingly made in the revised estimate. In his No 1982 dated 12th July 1897 just received, the Collector reports that no payment beyond the Rs 752/- already made will have to be paid.

Para 4 of C.E.'s memo. The only deviations from the sanctioned sub-heads are the following:—

| | net excess |
|---|---|
| (1) Concrete in surki mortar — | Rs 478 |
| (2) Cuddappah slabs "Damp proof course" | " 320 |
| (3) Cut stone dressed for steps — | " 355 |
| (4) Sand filling to basement — | " 85 |
| (5) Flooring with 6" Madras Pressed tiles to interior<br>(6) + Paving with Cuddapah slabs to Verandah | " 329 |
| (7) Levelling the site | " 100 |
| | " 38 |
| (8) Gravelling all round | |
| | . 1,000. |

Of these items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 + 8 have all been ordered by the Superintending Engineer. The necessity for item 1 has been explained in the comparative statement and item 9 was necessary owing to change of site. Nothing was allowed in the original estimate for levelling the site and cleaning up the compound + hence item 7 has been provided in the revised estimate. The excess on account of the above deviations was only about Rs 2,700. It is the increased rates allowed for almost all the items of the estimate which are the cause of the heavy excess over the original estimate. Why these increased rates should be allowed has been explained in the comparative statement and in the report accompanying the revised estimate.

2. It will not be out of place if I mention here that the rates current in the Division are too low to admit of first class work being done. For instance the highest schedule rate for brick-work is Rs 25 while the actual working rate (as allowed in the revised estimate for the combined Cutcherry) was Rs 29-14-0.

3. The delay in replying to this reference was due to the site plan of the new site countersigned by the Collector and the original sanctioned estimate having been mislaid and only recently found.

4. The enclosures received with Chief Engineer's memo under reply are herewith returned.

No 340 W.

Copy forwarded to the Chief Engineer P. W. Department with reference to his memo No 1383 C. and G.O. No 856 W. dated respectively 11th and 25 March 1897.

2. The revised estimate has been countersigned by the Collector of Chingleput.

3. The estimate &c. with site plan are resubmitted for sanction.

Enclosures 7.
1 site plan
1 Report
2 Data sheets
1 Detailed estimate
1 abstract do
1 comparative statement
7

Dated 21st Aug/97 21/8/97 Lt Col R.E.
Suptg. Engineer 5 Circle

---

# Public Works (1897 ) Department.

**CURRENT No.** 406

**Order**

**From** The Supdg Engineer 5th Circle.

**No.** 9 W.

**Dated** 10th January 1897.

**Received** 13.1.97

**Enclosures** 6.

**Spare copies**

## SUBJECT.

Combined Office for the Deputy Collector and Stationary Sub Magistrate Tiruvallur Chingleput Dist

Submits for Sanction the enclosed revised Estimate of Rs 31,000 with comparative Statement for constructing a –

I/ for scrutiny
CWB 18/1/97
Dir
m/

## BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1185 D/ | 18-5-95 | |
| | 794C | 2-3-95 | |
| | 1319W | D/25-5-94 | |
| | 2984W | 17-11-93 | |

## FURTHER PAPERS.

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

---

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
V CIRCLE, MADRAS,
Chepák, 10 January 1897.

No. 9W.

From
Lieut Colonel C.C. Rawson R.E.
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
V CIRCLE,

2P

To
THE Chief Engineer
Public Works Department

SIR,

Enclosures. 6
1 Report
2 Data sheets
1 Detailed estimate
1 Abstract estimate
1 Comparative statement
6

I have the honour to submit for sanction the enclosed revised estimate of Rs: 31,000/. with comparative statement, for constructing a combined office for the Deputy Collector and Stationary Sub Magistrate at Tiruvallur, Chingleput District, showing an excess of Rs 7,060/. over the original estimate of Rs 23,940/. sanctioned in G.O. No. 1185.W. dated 18 May 1895.

2. The cause of excess is explained in the report attached to the estimate.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
C C Rawson
10/1/97
Lieut Col R.E.
Superintending Engineer 5th Circle

8.1.97

1,000—25-2-96.

From

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

V CIRCLE,

To

THE

Dated
Recd. 189 .

ENCLOSURES.

No.