Public Works (189) Department.

G.O., No. 1748 W

DATED 8th July 1889

4/7/9

[Despatch Abstract.]

Boat No: 8:

The price of Rs 752 fixed by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation on ——— transferred from the Chingleput Dn to the Lighthouse Dy accepted, and its payment from Port Funds directed.

B

11/6

P. W. 26.
250—27-4-89.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

GENERAL.
ACCOUNT.

Government {1899} of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

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

G.O., No. 1748 W., 8th July 1899.

JULY.

Boat No. 8

The price of Rs. 752 fixed by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation on — transferred from the Chingleput division to the Lighthouse division, accepted, and its payment from Port Funds directed.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Account.

Read—the following papers :—

From the Superintendent of Works, Lighthouse division, dated 7th Jan. 1899, No. 2004.
„ Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated 20th Feb. 1899, No. 82.
„ Superintendent of Works, Lighthouse division, dated 6th April 1899, No. 31.
„ Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated 11th May 1899, No. ——.

Order—No. 1748 W., dated 8th July 1899.

In December 1896, the Superintendent of Works, Lighthouse division, submitted an estimate, amounting to Rs. 2,050, for a house boat for the use of the Lighthouse division, but Government in G.O., No. 394 W., dated 9th February 1897, declined to sanction the estimate.

2. Ultimately as it was found that boats Nos. 7 and 8 of the Buckingham canal division were not required, Mr. Ashpitel was instructed to ascertain from the Executive Engineer, Chingleput division, whether these boats could be devoted to the use of the Lighthouse division. Mr. Ashpitel took boat No. 8, and now submits for orders the question as to the price to be paid for it by Port Funds.

3. The Executive Engineer, Chingleput division, fixes the price of the boat as follows :—

	RS.
Book value of the boat at the time of transfer	294
Cost of copper sheathing	500
Total ...	794

Mr. Ashpitel points out that the total cost of the boat to the Buckingham canal division is as follows :—

	RS.
Original cost	700
Copper sheathing	500
Total ...	1,200

But as Rs. 375 were spent on repairs by the Lighthouse division at the time of transfer, the cost of the boat to Port Funds will amount to Rs. 1,169, as shown below :—

	RS.
Price demanded by the Executive Engineer, Chingleput division ...	794
Cost of repairs executed by the Lighthouse division	375
Total ...	1,169

This sum, Mr. Ashpitel observes, is only Rs. 31 less than the original cost of a boat which has been in use for years. As the boat was in bad order and not worth its book value, Mr. Ashpitel suggests that the price of the boat may be fixed at Rs. 794—375 or Rs. 419, as, under ordinary circumstances, the fees collected should have been sufficient to pay for repairs, and no fees have been handed over with the boat.

4. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation is of opinion that the boat was not in very bad order when it was transferred to the Lighthouse division; that Rs. 294 cannot be much if at all above its book value; and that the copper sheathing which was nearly new could not be worth much less than its original cost. He would therefore fix the price of the boat at Rs. 752 arrived at as shown below :—

	RS.
Book value	294
Cost of copper sheathing added in 1896–97 less $\frac{1}{12}$ cost	458
Total ...	752

5. His Excellency the Governor in Council accepts the price fixed by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and directs that it be paid from Port Funds.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. B. deWINTON,
Secretary to Government.

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

Mrd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

P. 1

READ the following:—

From the Supdt. of Works, Light House Division, …
7th January 1899

.. Chief Engineer for Irrigation, No. 82 dated …

.. Supdt. of Works, Light House Division, No. 317 of 6th April …

.. Chief Engineer for Irrigation, No. — of 16th May 9…

Circulated to

Genl & Acct ~~A.E.~~

ORDER. No. 1798 dated 8-7-99

In December 1896, the Superintendent of Works, Light House Division, submitted an estimate amounting to Rs. 2,050 for a house boat for the use of the Light House Division, but Government in G.O. No. 394 W dated 9th February 1897 declined to sanction the esti…

x Flag - B

2. Ultimately, as it was found that boats Nos. 7 and 8 of the Buckingham Canal Division were not required, Mr. Ashpitel was instructed to ascertain from the Executive Engineer, Chingleput Division, whether these boats could be devoted to the use of the

x Flag - C

B.C.M.

Light Hou…

[P. W. 42-A. 1,000—2-3-99.]

of a boat

ision. Mr
boat No. 8, and
its for which the
s as to the price to be
paid for it by Port Funds.

The Executive Engineer, Chingl-
ut Division, fixes the price of
the boat as follows:—

Book value of the boat at the time of transfer.	Rs. 294-0-0
Cost of copper sheathing.	.. 500-0-0
Total	Rs 794-0-0

Mr Ashpitel points out that
the total cost of the boat to the
Buckingham Canal Division
is as follows:—

Original cost —	Rs. 700
Copper sheathing —	.. 500
Total	.. 1200

But as Rs. 375 were spent in
repairs by the Light House Divi-
sion at the time of transfer,
the cost of the boat to Port
Funds will amount to
Rs. 1,169, as shown below:—

Price demanded by the Executive Engineer Chingleput Dn ..	Rs. 794-0-0
Cost of repairs executed by the Light House Division	375-0-0
	1169-0-0

This

ok value —	Rs. 294
st of copper sheathing added in 896/97 less 1/12 cost	.. 458
Total Rs.	752

∴ His Excellency the Governor
in Council accepts the price
fixed by the Chief Engineer
for Irrigation and directs
that it be paid from
Port Funds.

To The Supdt. of Works, L. H. Dn
.. S. E. V Circle
.. Exr. P. W. Accts.
.. Chief Engineer for Irrig

This sum Mr Ashpitel observes, is only Rs. 31 less than the original cost of a boat which has been in use for years. As the boat was in bad order and not worth its book value, Mr. Ashpitel suggests that the price of the boat may be fixed at Rs. 794-375 = Rs. 419, as, in ordinary circumstances, the fees collected should have been sufficient to pay for repairs, and no fees have been handed over with the boat.

4. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation is of opinion that the boat was not in very bad order when it was transferred to the Light House Division, that Rs. 294 cannot be much if at all above its book value, and that the copper sheathing which was nearly new could not be much less than its original cost. He would therefore fix the price of the boat at Rs. 752 arrived at as shown below

Book

28

---

of a boat

P.W. DEPARTMENT.

READ the following:—

174 G.O.

From the Supdt. of works, Light House Div., No 2004 d/ 7.1.?
" " Chief Engr. for Irrigation No 82 d/ 20.2.99
" " Supdt. of works, L.H. Div. No 31 d/ 6.4.99
" " Chief Engr. for Irrigation No — d/ 16.5.99

Circulated to H.E. the Governor

FOR ORDERS.

In Decr. 1896 the Supdt. of works, Light House Division submitted an estimate amounting to Rs 2050 for a house boat for the use of the Light House Division but Govt. in G.O. No 394 W d/ 9.2.97 flagged B declined to sanction the estimate.

2. Ultimately as it was found that boats Nos 7 & 8 of the Buckingham Canal Division were not required, Mr Ashpitel was instructed to ascertain from from the Ex. Engineer, Chingleput Division, whether these boats could be devoted to the use of the Light House Division. Mr. Ashpitel took boat No 8 and now submits for orders the question as to the price to be paid for

P. W. 43
600—14-11-98.

hpitel

it by Excluded Local Port
unds.

The Ex: Engineer, Chingleput Division, fixes the price of the oat as follows:–

Book value of the boat× at the time of transfer – Rs 294-0-0
Cost of copper sheathing – „ 500-0-0
Total Rs 794-0-0

× Original cost – Rs 700

Mr. Ashpitel points out that the ~~original~~ total ~~cost~~ cost of the boat to the Buckingham Canal is as follows:–

Original cost – Rs 700
Copper sheathing „ 500
Total „ 1200.

But as Rs 375 were spent on repairs by the Light House Division at the time of transfer, the cost of the boat to Port Funds will amount to Rs 1169 viz:

Price demanded by the Ex: Engineer, Chingleput — Rs 794-„-„
Cost of repairs executed by the Light House Division „ 375-„-„
Rs. 1169-„-„

This sum, Mr. Ashpitel observes is only Rs 31 less than the original cost of a boat which has been in use for years. As the boat was admittedly in bad order & not worth its book value, Mr. Ashpitel suggests that the price of the boat may be fixed at Rs 794–375 = 419 as under ordinary circumstances the fees collected should have been sufficient to pay for repairs & no fees have been handed over with the boat.

4. The Chief Engr. for Irrigation is of opinion that the boat was not in very bad order when it was transferred to the Light House Division & that Rs 294 cannot be much if at all above its book value & the copper sheathing which was nearly new could not be worth much less than its

original cost. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation would fix the price of the boat as follows:-

Book value — Rs 294
Cost of copper sheathing added in 96/97 less× in cost .. 458
total Rs 752

× Because of a years wear, I presume

As regards the large expenditure of Rs 375 spent in repairing & improving the boat, the Chief Engineer for Irrigation thinks that this is a matter which rested with Mr. Ashpitel.

5. The questions for decisions are

(1) whether the price fixed by the Ex: Engr., Chingleput Division, viz Rs 794, should be allowed to stand,

or (2) whether that suggested by Mr. Hughes viz: Rs 752 should be adopted

and (3) whether the Light-House Division should allowed to deduct the cost of repairs (Rs 375) executed by it from either the above sums,

or (4) whether that Division should be made to bear the cost of repairs & improvements (Rs 375) which it carried out apparently to suit its own convenience.

Rd.

I think that E.I's proposals are fair. The Supt. H.L. Divn gets a boat at about 1/2 the price he would have to pay for a new one; and it does not follow because with the cost of repairs carried out by himself the price comes near the original cost of the boat that the amount asked is excessive. These repairs may well include improvements and additions not in the boat originally.

This recommended that H.L.F. should pay Port Funds Rs 752 for the boat

26/6

28-6-98

App.
A.E.H.
30.6.99

Public Works (1899) **Department.**

CURRENT No. ~~2979~~ 4130

at - maidrad

No. 2315 C dated 10th May '99.

C/

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION.
12 MAY. 1899
No. 103

From The Supt: of Works Light House Dn:

No. 31

To E.I.
For favour of further remarks.

W

WHS

E.E.
W

Dated 6-4-99.

Received } 23.5.99
Registered } ~~8-4-99~~ ~~18th May 1899~~

Enclosures ~~4~~ 5

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Staff Boat:- Pointing out with remarks that the charge for — cannot be accepted and requesting to refer the matter to Govt.

I dont see any reason to alter my opinion - If the boat was not in an utter state of decay R 294 cannot be much if at all above its value and the Copper Sheathing which was nearly new could not be worth much less than its original cost - The large expenditure in repairing & improving it is a matter which rested with Mr Ashpitel
15.5.99 W.H.

E.I. JB 16th

017

JAW/

O L S 236 R 6/7

[P. W. 29.
1,000-29-11-98.]

10-6-77 Extracted for ci 13/6 16/6 0 L S 198

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	2315 C	PW	10-5-99
	693 C	"	31-1-99
	1836 C	"	28-3-99
	2457 C	"	9-5-98
	5507 C	"	17-12-97
	1029 C	"	17-2-98

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	5508 C	PW	17-12-97
	394 W	"	9-2-97
	118 I	"	5-2-97
	329 C	"	20-1-97
	9 I	"	4-1-97

P. W. D.,
Chingleput Division Office,

No. 3180 M

Madras, 14th November 1898.

From
J. E. Paul Esqr.,
Executive Engineer,
Chingleput Division,

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION
12 MAY 1899
103

To
The Superintendent of Works,
Light House Division,
Madras.

Enclosure.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 1354 dated 21st October 1898, I have the honour to state that a reduction in the cost of the Travellers' boat transferred to your Division is not possible.

2. From the following statement it will be seen that the boat was correctly valued.

Original cost is	Rs 700-"-"
Book value of the boat at the time of transfer	" 294-"-"
Cost of Copper sheathing	" 500-"-"
Total	" 794-"-"

1/21

I have the honour to be,
Sir
your most obedient Servan

J E Paul 11/11/98
Executive Engine
Chingleput D

11/11/98

OFFICE OF THE SUPT. OF WORKS, LIGHT-HOUSE D

Egmore, Madras,

Dated 7th January 1899

No. 2004

From

F. W. ASHPITEL, Esq.,
SUPERINTENDENT OF WORKS,
LIGHT-HOUSE DIVISION,
Madras,

To

The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Madras.

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION
12 MAY 1899
1053

Flag C.

Sir,

With reference to your No. 5508C dated 17th December 1897 I have the honor to forward letter No. 3180 M dated 14th Novr 1898 from the Executive Engineer ~~Buckingham Canal~~ Chingleput Division in which he states that the book value of Travellers boat No. 8 is Rs 794 and to request orders regarding the price which should be paid by Port Funds for this boat which was admitte ly in bad order and not worth its book value.

(2) The original cost of the boat was Rs 700 + Rs 500 for Copper sheathing or Rs 1200/- in all and according to an estimate prepared by the Buckingham Canal Division the cost of necessary repairs at the time of transfer: Rs 37 The sum Port Funds are required to pay is Rs 79 + Rs 375 or Rs 1169 or Rs 31 less than the original co of a boat which has been in use for years.

CHIE
FOR I
25 FEB 18

241

Under

Under the circumstances I would
uggest that the price of the boat may be fixed
t Rs 794 – Rs 375 = Rs 419 as under ordinary
ircumstances the fees collected should have
een sufficient to pay for repairs and no fees
ave been handed over with the boat.

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

W Ashpitel
Superintendent of Works
Light House Division

Copied SL
Compared C

Public Works (1899) Department.

CHIEF ... 12 MAY 1899 103 3

...EER ...ION. 2 FEB 1899 21

LIGHT-HOUSE DIVISION, 7 APR. 1899 P. W. D. MADRAS.

CURRENT No. E.3 ~~262~~ ~~1805~~/99 ~~2979~~ 4130

No: 693 C – d/31st Jany 99

~~Wt C 1497~~
~~Sent to HC~~
~~m 20-2-99~~

From the Supdt of Works
Light House Div.
Madras

~~**Order**~~

To
E.I.

No. 2004

Dated 7th January '99

Received
Registered 9.1.99

Enclosures 1

Spare copies

For favour of remarks.

AJK
10-1-99.

DW

Rmk No 82 d/ 20-2-99

The boat was very little used and was not in very bad order when transferred. The SE states that it would not have been repaired but that Mr Ashpitel wanted it put in thorough good order. I do not see why the Lighthouse Divn. should not pay for the special repairs. The charge would then be
Depreciation on original cost Rs 406 leaving book value 700 – 406 — Rs 294
Copper sheathing added in 96/7 less 1/12th cost 458
Rs 752 + actual cost of repairs

WLt 20/2

SUBJECT.

Staff boat –

Requesting to fix the price of the — at Rs 419/-

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

No. 1836C

Government of Madras.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Madras, 28th March 1899.

OFFICE NOTE.

From The Acting Secretary to Govt
P. W. Department.

To The Superintendent of Works,
Light-House Division
(Un officially).

C. E.
FOR IRRIGATION.
12 MAY. 1899
No. 103
A

Please state whether you are prepared to accept the charge proposed by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

2. If you still think the charge is excessive, the matter will be submitted for the orders of Government

Col: R.E.
Ag: Secretary to Govt.

P. W. 48.
500 - 24.3-98.

Xd
25.3.99

6.5:4
2028/99
4130

Office of the Supt. of Works, Light-house Di
Egmore, Madras,

Dated 6th April 1899.

No. 31

From
F. W. ASHPITEL, Esq.,
Superintendent of Works,
Light-house Division,
Madras,

To
The Chief Engineer
Public Works Department
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No 183 CC dated 28th March 99. I have the honour to to inform you that the Chief Engineer for Irrigation has evidently been mis informed as the boat was repaired by Conductor Smith at False Point Divi after it had been handed over to this Division. I also think that the Chief Engineer must have made some mistake when he says that the boat was very little used and was not in very bad order when transferred as I believe that when Mr Russell was in charge of the Buckingham Canal Division it was a question whether the boat should not be broken up as unserviceable. Under these Circumstances I do not think that I should pay the price of a new boat and shall be glad if you will refer the matter to Government.

Even broken up the copper sheathing must be [illegible] value and the Repairs Rs 375

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedt Servant

Superintendent of the Light House Di

Capt. S. I.
Compt. Cl. 6.4.