Public Works (1899) Department.

G.O., No. 1420 W

DATED 2nd June 1899

6/9/99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Excess outlay

Authorising the Examiner of P.W. Accounts to admit the outlay of Rs 993 incurred in excess of the estimate of Rs 11,990 for constructing a Deputy Tahsildar's Office at Tirupati, North Arcot District.

T
B
CS

90/4

Al 3/6

[P. W. 26,
250 - 27-4-99.]

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 (1899) of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Recd.	1899.	*Enclosures*
Regd.		*Spare copies*

G.O., No. 1420 W., 2nd June 1899.

JUNE.

Excess Outlay

Authorising the Examiner of Public Works Accounts to admit the outlay of Rs. 993, incurred in excess of the estimate of Rs. 11,990 for constructing a Deputy Tahsildar's office at Tirupati, North Arcot district.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

Read—the following papers :—

From the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, dated 4th March 1899, No. 124/W.
Office-note from the Examr., Public Works Accts., dated 28th April 1899, No. 1322 B./A.

Note by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

In G.O., No. 863 W., dated 6th April 1895, an estimate, amounting to Rs. 11,990, was sanctioned for constructing a Deputy Tahsildar's office at Tirupati, North Arcot district. The Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, now forwards a completion certificate for Rs. 12,983-4-2, showing an excess of Rs. 993-4-2, or 7·64 per cent. on the original estimate. With the completion certificate, a comparative statement of excesses is furnished, accompanied by a memorandum explaining the causes of such excesses.

2. The total excess is small being only 2·64 per cent. over the permissible limit, and in ordinary circumstances would not call for detailed notice. But it is evident, from the papers submitted, that the excess might have been altogether avoided, but for the bad management of Assistant Engineer R. Vythianatha Iyer who, it is observed, has taken an inordinate time to submit his explanation of the causes of excess, and has entirely failed to justify the outlay incurred on the principal items of excess.

3. The Superintending Engineer states that the Assistant Engineer has already been censured for his mismanagement of the work, and for the great delay made by him in explaining the causes of excess.

(Signed) W. B. deWINTON,
Chief Engineer.

9th May 1899.

Order—No. 1420 W., dated 2nd June 1899.

The Examiner of Public Works Accounts is authorised to admit the outlay of Rs. 993, incurred in excess of the estimate of Rs. 11,990 sanctioned for constructing a Deputy Tahsildar's office at Tirupati, in the North Arcot district.

2. Government concurs in the censure passed by the Superintending Engineer on Assistant Engineer R. Vythianatha Iyer.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, with four enclosures.
„ Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. A. F. Eccleston.

1/4

P.W. DEPARTMENT.

1 Draft

Read the following :—

From the S. E. IV Circle, No. 124/W, dt 4th March 1899.
Office Note from the Examiner, P.W. Accounts, No. 1322 B/A, dated 28th April 1899.
Note by the Chief Engineer, P.W.D. dt. 9th May 1899.

Circulated to

His Excellency the Governor

ORDER. No: 1420 W dt 2-6-99

3 P

Rs 1 Cl

The Examiner of P.W. Accounts is authorised to admit the outlay of Rs. 993, incurred in excess of the estimate of Rs. 11,990 sanctioned for constructing a Deputy Tahsildar's office at Tirupati, in the North Arcot Dt.

AKR
5.5.99

W

2. Govt. concurs in the censure passed by the Supdg Engr on Asst. Engr Mas R. Vythianatha Iyer

A.G.H.
29.5.99

Note
5.5. The causes of excess have been detailed in the comparative statement and are reviewed in the Chief Engineer's note.

AKR
5.5.99.

W 5.5.

Mas

(4)

To
the S. E. IV Circle with encls.
– Exr. P.W. Accts.

P. W. 42-A.
1,000—2-3-99.

H.E. 10.5.99 R 30/5.

Completion Report for Cons-
ing Dy: Tahsildar's off
at Tirupati.

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

In G.O. No: 863 W, dated 6th April 1895, an Estimate, amounting to Rs 11990, was sanctioned for Constructing a Dy: Tahsildar's office at Tirupati, N. Arcot Dt. The Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, now forwards a Completion Certificate for Rs 12983.4.2, showing an excess of Rs 993.4.2, or 7.64 per cent on the original Estimate. With the Completion Certificate, a Comparative Statement of Excesses is furnished, accompanied by a memorandum Explaini the Causes of Such Excesses.

2. The total excess is Smal being only 2.64 per cent ove the permissible limit, an in ordinary circumstances would not call for detailed notice. But it is eviden

n the papers submitted,
t the excess might have
een altogether avoided but
for the bad management
of Assistant Engineer R.
Vythianatha Iyer, who, it
is observed, has taken
an inordinate time to
submit his explanations
of the causes of excess,
and has entirely failed
to justify the outlay incurred
on the principal items of
excess.

3. The Superintending Engineer
states that the Assistant
Engineer has already been
censured for his mismanage-
ment of the work, and
for the great delay made
by him in explaining the
causes of excess.

ASK
8.5.99.

G. S. El

E.W.

W ~~C No 3492~~

Compl. Report of Dy Tah. Office Tirupati

For some reason, which
is not apparent, the G.O.
has not been drafted as
Col. Smart advised.

2. The excess in
this case is clearly owing
to the bungling of the
Asst. Engr., & the fact
that the S.E. has already
censured him is no
reason why Govt. did
not notice his mis-
management.

ASK
5.5.99.

I have added a 2nd
para which will
meet the case

S. S. El

Fair copy with note &
send in circulation
ASK
5.5.99

Public Works Department.

Current No. 2003
Letter No 124/IV
Dated 4th March 1899.
From the Supdg. Engineer IV Circle

1420 W

NOTE BY TECHNICAL SECTION.

Name of work. Completion report for constructing Dy Tahsildar's Office at Tirupatti.

Rs. 12,983-4-2 ~~12974-7-8~~

Note by E.C.

In G.O. No. 863 W, dated 6th April 1895, an estimate, amounting to Rs. 11,990, was sanctioned for constructing a Dy Tahsildar's Office at Tirupati, North Arcot Dist. ~~[illegible], but the completion certificate quotes Rs. 12,226 as the amount of the original estimate~~

The S.E. IV Circle now forwards a ~~this estimate during execution~~ completion certificate for ~~has been increased~~, to Rs. 12983-4-2 ~~12,974-7-8~~, showing ~~causing~~ an excess of Rs. 993-4-2 ~~748-7-8~~, or 7.64 ~~6.73~~ per cent on the original estimate.

With the completion certificate a comparative statement of excesses is furnished, accompanied by a memorandum explaining the causes of such excesses ~~differences~~ which may be grouped under the following main heads.

(a) Increase in rates & quantity Rs. 305-12
(b) Increase in quantity & decrease in rates Rs. 2.1

W

The Compl. Report may be sanctioned with the remark that the Govt. view with displeasure the ~~dilatory~~ and unsatisfactory manner in which Asst. Engr. R. Vythianatha Iyer has carried out the work, and the great delay made by him in submitting explanation for excesses

ASK
11.4.99.

DW

P. W. 60.
[5-9-98.]

(c) Increase in rate & decrease in quantity — Rs 100-2-9
(d) Increase in purchased heads — Rs 584-3-9
(e). Increase in supervision — Rs 100-6-6
Rs 1093-5-8
Savings Rs 344-14-0
Net Excess 748-7-8

The explanation of differences afforded by the Assist Engineer in his memorandum accompanying does not admit of classification in the usual manner.

The principal excess is on wood-work and this is commented upon in paras 2 & 3 of Executive Engineer's letter.

The excess on Mangalore Tiling is commented upon in para 4 of E.E's letter & is considered unsatisfactory.

In para 5 the Executive Engineer comments on the increase on the sub. heads which is attributed to the uncertainty of labor in the Tirupatti market.

The Assistant Engineer Mr. R. Vythianatha Iyer having already been censured for his mismanagement of this work, & the great delay in submitting this completion report the Executive Engineer considers the Estimate may be passed.

The Supg. Engineer IV Circle in his No $\frac{124}{W}$ dated 4th March 1899 is of the same opinion.

2. The total excess ~~is~~ small, being only ~~0.7~~ 2.64 per cent over the permissible limit, and in ordinary circumstances would not call for detailed notice: But it is evident, from the papers submitted, that the excess might have been altogether avoided but for the ~~[illegible]~~ bad management of Asst. Engr. R. Vythianatha Iyer, ~~who, it is observed has already been censured~~ who, it is observed, has taken an inordinate time to submit his explanations of the causes of excess, and has entirely failed to justify the ~~excess on Wood work & the~~ outlay incurred ~~[illegible]~~ on the principal items of excess.

3. The SE states that the Asst Engr. has already been censured for his mismanagement of the work, & for the great delay made by him in explaining the causes of excess.

A.H.P.
11.4.99.

11/4/99

Public Works (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 3492

From The Examiner P.W. Accounts, Madras & Coorg

Order

No. 1322 B/A

Dated 28th April 1899
Received } 1.5.99
Registered }
Enclosures ~~5~~ 6
Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Deputy Tahsildars Office at Tirupathi – Returns verified with remarks the Completion Report for Constructing the —

0L372

12/6

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
~~2003~~	
2120C	24-4-99
863 W	6-4-95

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

Letter from Mr S. D. Pears, Executive Engineer, North Arcot Division No. 106 S-E, dated 24th February 1899.

Enclosures. 4

1 Completion Report.
1 Memorandum showing explanation of differences.
2 Comparative statements.

I have the honor to submit the completion report for Tirupati Dy Tahsildar's Cutcherry, and with it a comparative statement and explanation received from Mr R. Vythianatha Iyer, Assistant Engineer who was in charge of the work.

2 The principal excess is on woodwork. The Assistant Engineer's explanation of this is not satisfactory and amounts in effect to saying that a great part of the excess on this head should not have been debited to it at all, but should have been distributed over certain other heads.

3 It would appear however that 217 Cft of teak wood was transferred from the Vellore Circular Kitchen at a book value of Rs 3-4-0 per C.ft, whereas had it been locally purchased it could have been got-

as was nearly all the rest of the teakwood for Rs 2-14-0. How far the book value of Rs 3-4-0 was due to cartage to the Vellore circular kitchen &c which should rightly have been borne by that work; how it came to be ordered for the Vellore work if it was after all not required for it; why it was transferred to Tirupati and not sold or kept in stock till opportunity arose for its use on some other work in Vellore are questions which it is now perhaps useless to ask and to which it can only be assumed that satisfactory answers could have been given at the time. But the fact of its having been charged at its higher book value, plus trainage from Vellore, accounts for about Rs 111 out of the excess of Rs 269 on this sub head.

With regard to the Mangalore tiling I can find no reason to

to suppose that the area covered was less than the estimate as stated by Mr. R. Vythianatha Iyer. But even taking the estimated area of 63 squares the tiles required at 150 to the square would be only 9450 whereas 10,000 tiles were purchased which would indicate an undue amount of waste in transport and building. On this head the Assistant Engineer's explanation is therefore not satisfactory and is the less so since when asked to explain this point about 18 months ago he could only reply that the extra tiles would not have been got if they had not been wanted. If the area covered was really only 60.82 squares the Assistant Engineer's present explanation leaves still more to be desired.

On the grouped sub heads the Assistant Engineer's explanation

of

as of the excesses on the items shown
by him as No 1 + 2 on his sheet No 2
viz, that the rates were insufficient,
is entitled to some weight. Some little
allowance may also be made for
this same cause on all other sub
heads as well. The circumstances
are much the same as at Tirupati
water works when Asst Engr
Mr S. Krishnamachariar finds,
owing to the fluctuating character
of the population of the town
and neighbourhood that the
labour never very easy to get
is at times almost impossible
to procure even at extorbitant
rates. The explanation of the
small excess of Rs 25 on iron
doors is due to the rates being
insufficient. Mr R. Vythianatha
Iyer has wrongly debited to this
sub head in his statement, the
expenditure of Rs 193 incurred in March
1898 for rectifying the defects pointed
out in your predecessor's inspection

---

notes for April 1897.

6 The excess shown by
Mr Vythianatha Iyer on contingencies
is a mistake. There was no excess,
but on the contrary an expenditure
of Rs 115-5-6 against a provision
of Rs 277.

7 An excess on Petty super
vision, when it occurs is nearly
always difficult to explain and
is especially so in this case as it
is now nearly 4 years since the
work was begun. It is usually
attributable to length of time in
construction and this may be
taken to explain the excess in
the present instance as the work
was 2 1/2 years in progress.

8 Not having been in
charge of this Division at the
time and having no personal
acquaintance with Mr R. V
thianatha Iyer's work or methods
I

I am unable to form an opinion as to how far these may have been unbusinesslike or extravagant. He cannot avoid responsibility for having failed to foresee an excess and to submit a revised Estimate but considering that the net excess is only 5.73 per cent on the estimate that the labour market at Tirupati is most uncertain that the Asst. Engineer could possibly have given a more satisfactory explanation of the excesses 2 years ago than he can now and that he has already been censured for his management of this work, the Completion certificate may perhaps be accepted without further comment. The delay in its submission has been due to a long correspondence with Mr. Vaythianatha Iyer.

out in

Copy

No. $\frac{124}{W.}$ dated 4th March 1899

Encl 4

Copy submitted to the Chief Engineer, P.W.D., with a request that the excess outlay may be passed.

2. The Assistant Engineer has already been censured for his mismanagement of the work, and the extraordinary delay in submitting this Completion Report is a further indication of his unsatisfactory methods of doing business.

Suptg. Engineer
IV. Circle

To
The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

9/— B

Public Works (1899) Department.

3-6

CURRENT No. 2003

3427/83

From A. H. Garrett Esq Supg Engineer 4 Circle

No 2120 C d/ 24.5.99

~~Order~~

To C

For favour of verification of the outlay shown in the completion report.

AHK 19.4.99.

May

Dw

No. 124/W

Dated 4th March 1899

Received } 7.3.99
Registered }

Enclosures 4

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Dy Tahsildar's office at Tirupathi

Forwards Completion report for constg:— and requests that the excess outlay may be passed

T/B.

T for check AHK 9.5.99.

Dw

8/3/99

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
863 W	6.4.95

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

E- No. 27.
1,000—16-5-98

KEEP-WITH CURRENT No.

dated 189 .

GOVT. OF MADRAS. 1898. P.W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 28th April 1898.9

OFFICE NOTE No. 1322 B/A

To

W.

Your O.N.No.212[illegible] C of 2[illegible] April 1899.

Verified - The amount of -- estimate for the work is Rs: II,990/- and not Rs: I2,226/- please see G.O.- No.863 W of 6th: April.I895 - The total outlay Rs: I2,983-4-2 and not Rs: -- I2,974-7-8 - The expenditure of Rs: 8-I2-6 incurred in May I898 appears - to have been omitted.

N. R

Offg: C.

28.4.99