

Public Works (1898) Department.

RAILWAY BRANCH.

Print
G.O., No. 1548. *Ap.*

DATED 16th Decr 1898

100/3
[Despatch Abstract.]

Bridges on the S. I. Ry.

*Sanctioning with remarks, the excess
expenditure of Rs 4692-13-3 in raising the
overhead braciings of certain*

Government {1898} of Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 1548 Ry., 16th December 1898.

DECEMBER.

Bridges on the South Indian Railway

Sanctioning, with remarks, the excess expenditure of Rs. 4,692-13-3 in raising the overhead bracings of certain —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Railway.

Read again the following paper:—

G.O., No. 385 R., dated 10th July 1894.

Read also the following paper:—

From—the Agent, South Indian Railway.
To—the Consulting Engineer for Railways, Madras.
Dated—Trichinopoly, 8th December 1898, No. 1102.

With reference to G.O., No. 385 R., dated 10th July 1894, I have the honour to forward a completion report (No. 780) for the work of raising the overhead bracings of the Tondiyar, Ponniyar, Gadilam, Old Vellar, Old Coleroon and Madagu bridges. The estimate was originally sanctioned for Rs. 6,604, but the expenditure incurred on the work has amounted to Rs. 11,296-13-3, being an excess of Rs. 4,692-13-3. In explanation of the increased outlay, I forward a copy of letter No. B. 789A./2510, dated 3rd December 1898, from the Chief Engineer. I much regret that this explanation is not more satisfactory than it is, but as the estimate was prepared under the direction of an officer now deceased but little responsibility for the bad estimating can be considered as resting on officers now in the service. I trust Government will be pleased to sanction the excess expenditure under the circumstances now explained.

When replying, please return the completion report.

ENCLOSURE.

From—the Chief Engineer, South Indian Railway.
To—the Agent, South Indian Railway.
Dated—3rd December 1898, No. B. 789 A./2510.

Raising overhead bracings of Whipple Murphy Girder Bridges.

[Your letter No. 11573/1400 of 27th July 1894.]

I forward herewith completion report No. 780 for the above work as audited by the Chief Auditor.

When framing the estimate provision was not made for the stays shown in red in the accompanying tracing which it was deemed necessary to add when the indent was submitted and in execution at home rather heavier iron was used than shown in the drawing of the bracings first got out from England; these two items caused an excess in weight of about 5½ tons on 30 tons estimated for.

We only allowed an average of Rs. 180 per ton and through an oversight omitted to make any provision for freight and charges in India for landing, customs, &c.

The bracings was let in England for Rs. 174 per ton and the gross debit to the work amounts to Rs. 280 per ton, Rs. 99 per ton is therefore due to freight and miscellaneous charges in India—an altogether abnormal charge and one which we should not have thought of providing for; it amounts to nearly 57 per cent. on the English cost of the bracings, whereas the freight and miscellaneous charges on the plate girders received by the same ship for the Devanady bridge amount to only 24 per cent. on the English cost. The greater portion of the excess debit appears to be due to the freight having been charged for the bracing by *measurement*, whereas the freight for the Devanady girder was paid for on dead weight.

The large excess on labor is due to the exceptional circumstances under which the work of fixing the bracings had to be carried out. The scaffolding employed projected beyond the girders and had to be shifted for the passage of every train and it was almost impossible to arrive at a reliable estimate of the cost of work carried out under such conditions.

I very much regret the omission to provide anything for freight in the original estimate. The work was reported completed on 27th February 1896 and completion report for audit was called for on 8th June 1896, but the Resident Engineer was not able to submit the report before the 29th July 1898 as the expenditure incurred on this work was erroneously debited to maintenance Revenue instead of to this sanction, which entailed much correspondence and time in getting the outlay adjusted.

Will you please obtain the sanction of the Government to the expenditure of Rs. 4,692-13-3 incurred in excess over the estimate being admitted to audit and return the completion report.

ORDER—No. 1548 Ry., dated 16th December 1898.

The excess expenditure, amounting to Rs. 4,692-13-3, incurred in raising the overhead bracings of the bridges, referred to in the letter read above, is sanctioned.

2. The Government observes that what is blameworthy is not so much the insufficient estimating, because an estimator cannot always anticipate everything, far in advance, but the failure to bring to notice the anticipated excess as soon as it became obvious that it was inevitable.

(True Extract.)

FRANCIS J. E. SPRING,
Joint Secretary.

To the Agent, South Indian Railway, with completion report.
" Examiner, Guaranteed Railway Accounts.
" Consulting Engineer for Railways.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

Copy continued.

South Indian Railway.

Copy of a letter, No. B $\frac{789}{2510}$ A, dated 3rd December 1898
 from the Chief Engineer, S. I. Ry.
 to the Agent, South Indian Railway.

788 Raising overhead bracings of Whipple Murphy -
 Girder Bridges
 Your letter No. $\frac{11573}{1400}$ of 27th July 1894

I forward herewith Completion Report No. 780 for
 the above work as audited by the Chief Auditor.

When framing the estimate provision was not
 made for the stays shown in red in the accompanying
 tracing which it was ^{deemed} necessary to add when the indent
 was submitted and in execution at home rather heavier
 iron was used than shown in the drawing of the bracings
 first got out from England; these two items caused an
 excess in weight of about $5\frac{1}{2}$ tons on 30 tons estimated for.

We only allowed an average of Rs 180 per ton and
 through an oversight omitted to make any provision for freight to
 and charges in India for landing, customs &c. &c.

The bracings was let in England for Rs 174 per ton
 and the gross debit to the work amounts to Rs 280 per ton, Rs 99
 per ton is therefore due to freight and miscellaneous charges in
 India an altogether an abnormal charge and one which we
 should not have thought of providing for; it amounts to
 nearly 57 per cent on the English cost of the bracings
 whereas

Copy continued.

whereas the freight and miscellaneous charges on the plate girders received by the same ship for the Devanady bridge amount to only 24 per cent on the English cost. The greater portion of the excess debit appears to be due to the freight having been charged for the bracing by measurement whereas the freight for the Devanady girder was paid for on dead weight.

The large excess on labor is due to the exceptional circumstances under which the work of fixing the bracings had to be carried out. The scaffolding employed projected beyond the girders and had to be shifted for the passage of every train and it was almost impossible to arrive at a reliable estimate of the cost of work carried out under such conditions.

I very much regret the omission to provide anything for freight in the original estimate.

The work was reported completed on 29th February 1896 and Completion Report for audit was called for on 8th June 1896, but the Resident Engineer was not able to submit the report before the 29th July 1898 as the expenditure incurred on this work was erroneously debited to Maintenance Revenue instead of to this sanction, which entailed much correspondence and time in getting the outlay adjusted.

Will you please obtain the sanction of the Government to the expenditure of Rs 4692-13-3 incurred in excess over the estimate being admitted to audit and return the Completion Report.

AGENT'S OFFICE,
TRICHINOPOLY,
8th December 1898.

Accompaniment to the Agent's letter

No. 1102 of 8-12-1898.

True copy.

M. Le Mayeur
for Agent.
Mad.

Encls No 1 TO E.R.S. No 5807 of 1898
1102 8/12/98
From A.

No. 1102

South Indian Railway Co., Ltd.,

AGENT'S OFFICE,

TRICHINOPOLY, 8th December 1898.

From

The AGENT,

SOUTH INDIAN RAILWAY,

To

The CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAYS,

MADRAS.

Sir,

With reference to Government Order No 385 R dated 18th July 1894 I have the honor to forward a Completion report (No 780) for the work of raising the overhead tracings of the Tondiyar, Ponnayar, Gadilam, Old Vellat, Old Coleroon, and Madagu bridges. The estimate was originally sanctioned for Rs: 6,604, but the expenditure incurred on the work has amounted to Rs: 11,296-13-3 being an excess of Rs: 4,692-13-3. In explanation of the increased outlay I forward a copy of letter No B 789 A dated 3rd December 1898 from the Chief Engineer. I much regret that this explanation is not more satisfactory than it is, but as the estimate was prepared under the direction of an Officer now deceased but little responsibility for the bad estimating can be considered as resting on Officers now in the service. I trust Government will be pleased to sanction the excess expenditure under the circumstances now explained.

When replying please return the Completion Report.

2 Enclosures - one to be returned.
M.D.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant,

A. G. Shetty

Capt. R. E.
Agent.

OFFICE OF THE CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAYS,
Madras, 10th December 1898.



No 3413

OFFICE NOTE.

Letter from the Agent, South Indian Railway, No 1102,
dated 8th December 1898, forwarded to the Examiner of Railway
Accounts, for *favor of remarks.*

for E. R.

10/12/98

EXAMINER'S REPLY.

E. R.

The excess over estimate requires
the sanction of the local Govt.

The officer by whom the work
was carried out should have
taken steps to obtain sanction to
a revised estimate as soon as
a large excess was evident.

*Drift G.O. sanctioning the same expenditure, with
the remark that what is blameworthy is not to mind
the insufficient estimating, because an estimator cannot
always anticipate everything far in advance; but the failure
to bring to notice the anticipated excess as soon as it
became obvious that it was inevitable.*

FWS
17/12/98

C. R.
13/12/98

*To R for sanction.
It appears to me that
the Agent is not quite
right in shifting all the
blame on to the estimator.
An estimate is not a document
to be framed, sanctioned & then
rigidly held till the completion
report is made up. It is meant
to be a guide to the Engineer
carrying out the work.*

JL
14.12.98.

From
The Agent,
South Indian Railway,
Trichinopoly.
To
The Consulting Engineer for
Railways,
Madras.

Dated
Received
No.
Enclosure.

18

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

A
1904

Again G.O., dated

10th July

1894, No.

385R Quote

Again G.O., dated

189 , No.

R

Current No.

5807

of 1898, dated 9-12-97, from

Agent S. & Ry

,, 189 , "

,, , "

,, 189 , "

,, , "

ORDER.

Sp. 1548. Ry dated 16/12/98

The excess expenditure amounting to Rs 4692-13-3 incurred in raising the overhead bracings of the bridge, referred to in the letter read above, is sanctioned.

2. The Government observes that what is blame worthy is not so much the insufficient estimate because an estimator cannot always anticipate everything far in advance, but the failure to bring to notice the actual excess as soon as it became obvious that it was in excess.

Despatched on 2/1/99.

To Agent S. & Ry
-a- Ex. S. & Ry
-a- Consgring for Ry