Public Works (1897) Department.

√ G.O., No. 753 I

DATED 16 August 1897

8/18/97

[Despatch Abstract.]

Olayur tank. Revised Estimate of
Rs. 2,670 for constructing a weir and
new stone revetment in —, Chingleput
Dt., Sanctioned with remark.

~~10~~

90/2x

D.C.
16/8

P.W. 26.

Indexed 16/8

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

IRRIGATION.
ACCOUNT.

Government (1897) of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

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

G.O., No. 753 I., 16th August 1897.

AUGUST.

Olayur Tank

Revised estimate of Rs. 2,670 for constructing a weir and new stone revetment in —, Chingleput division, sanctioned with remark.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.
Account.

Read—the following papers :—

From Lieutenant-Colonel C. C. RAWSON, R.E., Superintending Engineer, V Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Camp Lower Anicut, 28th May 1897, No. 76 E.I./C.

I have the honour to submit, for sanction, the enclosed revised estimate in the form of a comparative statement, amounting to Rs. 2,670, for constructing a weir and new stone revetment in No. 273, Olayur tank, Conjeeveram taluk, Chingleput division, showing an excess of Rs. 650 over the original estimate of Rs. 2,020 sanctioned by me in Register No. 12 of 1896–97.

2. The cause of excess is explained in the remark column of the comparative statement.

To the Superintending Engineer, V Circle, dated 17th June 1897, No. V/30 C.N.
From „ „ V „ „ 13th July „ No. 158 E.I.

No. 157 I.

Submitted to Government. The excess of Rs. 650 occurs on stone work the sanctioned rate for which it has been found necessary to increase from Rs. 9–14–0 to Rs. 14–10–0 per 100 cubic feet. The Executive Engineer states: "The rate allowed in the original estimate was an office rate; the Sub-Divisional officer's data were apparently altered and cartage which he had put at 12 miles reduced to 7 miles, without any reference being made to the Sub-Divisional officer whatsoever. If he made so glaring an error in his cartage he ought to have been called on to explain it." * * * *

2. "On the estimate being forwarded for execution, a correspondence with the Sub-Divisional officer ensued, the revised estimate now submitted is the result."

3. In the circumstances stated the excess may be passed.

12th June 1897.

(Signed) W. HUGHES,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Order—No. 753 I., dated 16th August 1897.

The following revised estimate is sanctioned in supersession of the estimate of Rs. 2,020 previously sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer, V Circle :—

Irrigation.
43. Minor Works and Navigation.
Minor Works for which neither Capital nor Revenue Accounts are kept, P.W.D.
Original Works.
Constructing a weir and new stone revetment in Olayur tank, No. 273 of the list of works in the Chingleput division appended to G.O., No. 407 I., dated 6th July 1887.

	RS.
Estimate	2,670

2. This sanction is registered as No. 69 I. of 1897–98.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government,
Irrigation Branch.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
„ Superintending Engineer, V Circle.
„ Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

Public works (1897) department

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

IRRIGATION BRANCH.

No. 753 I.D 16-8-97

Current number 7297

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Revised estimate for constructing a weir to Olayur Tank. Chingleput Dt.

Recd: 23.7.97

UNDER date the

READ the following

From Supg Eng. V Circle. No. 76 E.I / C, d 28.5.97 (No 157 I d 12-6-97)

(To S.E. V No. 30 C.N d 17.6.97
From do 158 E.I d 13.7.97)

Quote

Submitted to Govt. The excess of Rs 650 occurs on stone work the sanctioned rate for which it has been found necessary to increase from Rs 9.14.0 to Rs 14.10.0 per 100 cft. The Ex. Eng states "The rate allowed in the original estimate was an office rate; the S. D Officer's data were apparently altered & cartage which he had put at 12 miles reduced to 7 miles, without any reference being made to the S. D. O. whatsoever. If he made so glaring an

error in his cartage he ought to have been called on to explain it." The fault lies with the system then in vogue, under which the Draftsman (not the Overseer) altered rates.
* * * * *

2. "On the estimate being forwarded for execution a correspondence with the S.D.O ensued, the revised estimate now submitted is the result."

3. In the circumstances stated the excess may be passed.

No. 753 I, D/ 16th August 1897

Order thereon.

The following revised estimate is sanctioned in supersession of the estimate of Rs 2020 previously sanctioned by the Supg Engr, V Circle:—

Irrigation

43. Minor Works & Navign.

Minor works for which neither

E. I. Form No. 1—1,000—2-2-97.

The E.E. was responsible.

Please name the E.E. and the S.D.O. referred to.

A.S.H 16.6.97

A.S.H

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

IRRIGATION BRANCH.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the

READ the following

Capital nor Revenue Accounts are kept, P.W.D.

Original Works.

Constructing a weir & new stone revetment in Olayur tank. No. 273 of the list of works in the Chingleput Dn. appended to G.O. No. 407 I of 6 July 1887.

Estimate Rs 2670

2. This sanction is registered as No. 69 I of 1897-98

A.S.H 16.6.97

Issue.
WH
16.6.97

12/6/97

WH 12.6.97

To The Chief Engr for I.
Supg Engr V
Ex. Engr I.W.R.

10/6/97

H.E.

Re-circulated

I's note with refce to H.E.'s remarks of 16.6.97 on the Estimate of Olayur Tank – Chingleput Dt

From the Superintending Engineer, Fifth Circle, No. 158-E.I. dated 13th July 1897.

Submitted to His Excellency the Governor with reference to H.E.'s remarks dated 16 June 1897 on P.W.C. No. 7297[×], with the remark that the Subdivisional Officer does not appear to have been responsible in any way for the mistake made. Under the circumstances reported, it is recommended that Mr. Marshall may not be named in the Order.

× flagged H.

I find that Mr. Marshall had five years' service or more when this mistake was made by him. Surely, he ought to have been able to do work of this kind correctly? If five years' experience is not enough to enable a man to ~~avoid~~ exercise better check over his office, what length of service would be deemed sufficient by the C.E.I.?

A.G.H
28.7.97

I did not mean to excuse Mr. Marshall but I consider his fault, that of accepting too readily the information given by his Draughtsman, to be a venial one. His intention which was to save Government unnecessary expense was good and his mistake has cost Government nothing. If he were blamed in a Govt. order which would go against him all his service, while others who too readily accept over-estimates escape censure a bad effect would be produced.

2.8.97 W.H.

1. I cannot agree that Mr. Marshall's fault was exactly a venial fault. But I will not ~~press~~ insist upon the mention of his name in the G.O.

W.H.
24.7.97

I
24 July 1897.

2. If others too readily accept over-estimates, it is for the C.E.I. to detect such faults and to correct office and punish them.

A.H
8.8.97

Recd from Madras office on 6.8.97. Issued the G.O. [illegible] 10/8 Recd 10/8

W.H.S 24/8/97

E. I. Form No. 1—1,000—2-2-97.

Public Works (189) Department.

CURRENT No.

Order 753

From The Chief Engr for Irrn

No. 1579

Dated 12- 6- 97

Received [illegible] 6- 97

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Constructing a weir & new stone revetment in Clayar tank — Revised estimate for — Submitted with remarks —

329 / Regd. 17/8/97

17/8/97

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

P. W.

~~Revenue~~ (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 60. CN

From The Supg Engineer 5th Circle

Order

No. 158. L. I.

Dated 13th July 1897

Received 14 – 7 – 97

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT

Olayur Tank —
Explaining the cause of reduction of rates in the original Estt for —

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

No. 169 of 30 april 1897
1 May.

From
The Sub Divisional Officer,
Mount.

To
The Executive Engineer,
Chingleput Division

Sir,

With reference to your No. 176 d/ 21.4.97, I beg to state that the distance from Melpadavur to Olayur is 10 miles by cart track + 2 miles metalled road = 12 miles in all – the distance from Molasur would be greater: 12 miles by metalled road + 2 miles cart track = 14 miles. The Overseer originally prepared a data for stone from Molasur, but I altered it to Melpadavur; apparently the name of the quarry had not been altered by oversight.

I do not know how the Division Officer makes the distance from Melpadavur to Olayur only 7 miles. It is 8 miles from the Quarry to the Trunk Road + 2 miles along the Trunk Road + 2 miles off the Trunk Road.

I beg etc.
(Signed) R. W. MacAlister
Sub Divisional Officer

(True copy)

13/7/97 Lt Col R.E.
Suptg. Engineer 5 Circle.

10.7.97

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION
14 JUL. 1897
No 60 C.N.

Copy of a letter from J. P. Davidson Esquire, Executive Engineer, Chingleput Division, to the Supdg. Engineer, V Circle No. 1091 dated 7 July 1897.

In reply to your No. 237 C.N. of 26.6.97, I have the honour to explain that it was more the system than anything else that was at fault. The Sub Divisional Officer submitted the estimate for the Clayur Tank in 1895 (29-10-95) the rate allowed by him for cartage was altered in the division office by the then division draftsman without any reference to the sub Divisional Officer. The estimate with its altered rate was sanctioned by Superintending Engineer, and it was not till the sanctioned estimate was sent out for execution that the Sub Divl. officer learnt that his rate had been altered.

2. In his letter No. 58E/10-4-97 he reported he could not get the work taken up at the rate allowed. On enquiring into the matter in the office I found that the rate had been altered, as already stated, in the division office without any reference to the sub Divisional Officer. A copy of the sub Divisional Officers letter No 169E/30-4-97 in reply to this office No. 176/24.4.97 is forwarded.

3. The Executive Engineer in charge of the division at the time was Mr. Marshall, but as he was then only an Assistant Engineer 2nd grade,

of

of very limited service, I am not surprised that he accepted the draftsman's alteration, considering that this man had a very lengthy acquaintance with the division. Had Mr. Marshall called on the Sub Divisional Officer to explain his incorrect rate, no revised estimate would have been necessary; Mr. Marshall erred through inexperience, no real blame that I can see attaches to him; given the requisite experience Mr. Marshall in my opinion had the makings of an excellent Officer.

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION.
14 JUL. 1897
No. 60 C.N.

No. 158 E.I.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation with reference to his memo No. $\frac{VI}{30\ C.N.}$ dated 17 June 1897.

Examd.

13/7/97 Lt. Col. R.E.
Supdg. Engineer 5 Circle

Dated 13th July 1897.

7.97

No. $\frac{VI}{30\ C.N.}$

Memo –

With reference to letter No. 76. $\frac{E.I.}{C}$ d/ 28th Ult. to from the E.E. V, forwarding for sanction a revised Estimate for constructing a weir &c to the Olayur Tank Conjeeveram Taluq, of the Chingleput District the undersigned has the honor to request that the S.E. will be so good as to report the names of the Ex. Engr. ~~& Sub Divl. officer~~ who ~~were~~ appears to have been responsible for the alteration in the rate in ~~in the preparation of~~ the original estimate of the above tank.

2. It is understood that the present Ex. Engr. has ascertained the correct distance from Mel Podavur to the work spot to be 12 miles & not 7 miles, in which case the S.D.O. is not responsible for the wrong rate. If ~~the distance 12 miles is wrong~~ the S.D.O. was in any way responsible ~~the~~ his name ~~of the S.D.O.~~ should be reported – with the facts of the case.

17/6/97

W.H.
17.6.97

To
The Supdg. Engineer
5 Circle

I did not notice that the passage was a quotation. I prefer it omitted – Some extracts may be inserted –
17/6

E.I.

I think you did not notice that the words crossed out by you from the note were a quotation from the Ex. Engr's. remarks on the Comparative Stat.–

The quotation might be left intact with your opinion recorded in para 3 of the note –

In this connection however it is to be noted that it is not quite clear from Mr. Davidson's remarks what the facts of the case were & as H.E. directs the E.E. & S.D.O. to be named it is necessary to know these before issuing the memo – vide draft to S.E.

17/6

CE.3
31-5-97

Public Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. ~~48CE~~ E.1
7297

Order

From
The Supg Engineer
5th Circle

No. 76 E3/C

Dated 28th May 1897.

Received ~~31.5.97~~
Regd: 23.7.97

Enclosures Two.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Olayur Tank – Conjeeveram Taluq Chingleput Dt.

—

Submitting for Sanction a revised Estimate in the form of a comparative Statement amounting to Rs. 2670 for constructing a weir & a new stone revetment for –

31/5/97

31-5-97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
R	60	eN 7/13	7 97

No. 76 E3/C

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
V CIRCLE, MADRAS,
Camp Lower Anicut
Chepâk, 28 May 1897

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

1P

To
THE Chief Engineer
for Irrigation

SIR,

I have the honour to submit for sanction the enclosed revised estimate in the form of a comparative statement, amounting to Rs 2670/. for constructing a weir and new stone revetment in No 273 Olayur tank, Conjeeveram taluq, Chingleput Division, showing an excess of Rs 650 over the original estimate of Rs 2020/. sanctioned by me in Register No 12 of 1896-97.

Enclosures. 2
1 Data sheet
1 comparative statement
2

2. The cause of excess is explained in the remark column of the comparative statement.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obed! Servant
C C Rawson
28/5/97
Lt Col R E
Suptg Engineer 5 Circle

500—31-3-97.

27.5.97

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION.
31 MAY. 1897
No. 148 CN