Public Works (1898) Department.

Vide G.O. 55 R / 30.4.98

RAILWAY BRANCH.

G.O., No. 662-63 Ry

DATED 29th April 1898.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Restoration of Bridge, N.W. line, Madras Railway

Ordered that the revised estimate amounting to Rs 35,980, for the — at Mile 107, be forwarded to the Govt of India 10-11 for sanction.

Forwarded

Indexed. 3/5/98

[P. W. 25. / 250—24-3-96.]

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

RAILWAY.

Government {1897} of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Print

Recd. } 1897.
Regd.

Enclosures
Spare copies

G.O., No. 336 R., 11th May 1897.

MAY.

Bridges

Estimates, amounting to Rs. 10,468 and 14,222, respectively, for the restoration of the — at 95/2-3 and 107/10-11 miles on the North-West Line of the Madras Railway, sanctioned.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Railway.

Read the following papers :—

From the Acting Agent and Manager, Madras Railway Company, to the Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 5th April 1897, No. E. 618/331.

Referring to your letter, No. 1076 of the 20th ultimo, I have the honour to forward herewith plans and estimates for the restoration of the bridges mentioned below :—

Name of work.	Plan number.	Amount of estimate.		
		Capital.	Revenue.	Total.
		RS.	RS.	RS.
Restoration of bridge No. 251 at 107/10-11 miles, North-West Line ..	332	3,851	6,617	10,468
Do. do. at 95/2 3 do. do. ..	333	7,672	6,550	14,222

2. As stated in this office letter, No. 247 of the 16th ultimo, these bridges were damaged by the floods in November 1896. Hence the necessity for the proposed works.

3. The matter was discussed at a meeting of officers held in my office on the 16th February last and approved.

4. It is requested that the sanction of Government to the required outlay of Rs. 10,468 and 14,222, respectively, may be conveyed to me at an early date.

5. Information as to provision in the budget and date on which sanction will lapse is given on the estimates.

From the Acting Agent and Manager, Madras Railway, to the Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 26th April 1897, No. E. 618/400.

With reference to your letter, No. 1334 of the 13th instant, I have the honour to forward herewith, for your information, copy of a detailed statement submitted by the Acting Chief Engineer showing how the revenue portions of the estimates for the restoration of the bridges at 107/10-11 and 95/2-3 miles, North-West Line, were arrived at.

Enclosure.

Details and calculations by which the Revenue portion has been arrived at in the estimates for the—

Restoration of bridge at 95/2-3 miles, North-West Line.

Earthwork—

Estimated quantity not washed away, 3,000 c. ft. = 111 c. yds.
Rate allowed in the original estimate = 4 annas per c. yd.

	RS.	A.	P.
∴ Cost of portion undamaged = 111 × 4 annas =	27	12	0
Amount allowed for excavation in the original estimate (*vide* page 16, 3rd Dist., Dist. Book, North-West Line) ...	422	0	0
∴ Estimated cost of the damaged portion which has now been charged to Revenue = Rs. 422-0-0 — 27-12-0 =	394	4	0

Masonry—

The estimated quantity not washed away, 4,850 c. ft. = 180 c. yds.
The rate allowed in the original estimate = Rs. 6 per c. yd.

	RS.
∴ Cost of portion undamaged = 180 × 6 =	1,080
Amount allowed for masonry in original estimate =	3,420
∴ Estimated cost of the damaged portion and which has now been charged to Revenue = Rs. 3,420 — Rs. 1,080 =	2,340

Restoration of bridge at 107/10-11 miles, North-West Line.

Earthwork—

Estimated quantity of portion washed away, 6,060 c. ft. = 224 c. yds.
Rate allowed in original estimate = Re. 1 per c. yd.
Estimated cost of portion demolished = 224 × 1 = Rs. 224 (Revenue).

Note.—In the original estimate no distinction was made between wet and dry excavation, but as this has now been done, Rs. 14 has been debited to dry excavation which is the only amount now estimated for under that heading (Rs. 14, dry excavation ; Rs. 84, removing bank ; total Rs. 98), and the balance of Rs. 210 to wet excavation.

Masonry—

Estimated quantity in the portion destroyed = 17,300 c. ft. = 641 c. yds.
Rate allowed in original estimate = Rs. 7 per c. yd.
∴ Estimated cost of portion destroyed = 641 × 7 = Rs. 4,487 (Revenue).

(Signed) H. J. THOMPSON,
Acting Chief Engineer.

24th April 1897.

Order—No. 336 R., dated 11th May 1897.

The estimates submitted by the Agent and Manager, Madras Railway, for the restoration of the bridges at 95/2-3 and 107/10-11 miles on the North-West Line, amounting to Rs. 10,468 and 14,222, respectively, are sanctioned.

2. This sanction has been registered as No. 5 R. of 1897-98.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) F. J. E. SPRING,
Offg. Joint Secy. to Govt.,
Railway Branch.

To the Agent and Manager, Madras Railway.
„ Examiner, Guaranteed Railway Accounts.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

[Form No. 5.]
[200—9-4-97.]

2 P

Print

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. P. W. DEPARTMENT.

RAILWAY BRANCH.

OFFICE NOTE.

No. 31

368
19-1-98

EXAMINER, GUARANTEED RAILWAY ACCOUNTS' OFFICE,
Madras. 18th January 1898.

To
E. R.

Has the honour to bring to his special notice that the outlay to end of October 1897 on the Restoration of Bridge No. 251, Madras Railway sanctioned in M. G. O. No. 336 R. dated 11th May 1897 is Rs 22.166 in excess of the sanctioned estimate as under:—

Flag C

	Capital Rs	Revenue Rs	Total Rs
Sanctioned Estimate	3.851.	6.617.	10.468
Outlay to end of Oct/97.	24.532.	8.102.	32.634.
Excess ...	20681.	1485.	22.166.

This excess has been repeatedly brought to notice in the monthly audit statement and the Company have promised to send in a revised Estimate at an early date but have not done so up to date.

As the total outlay is in excess of the powers of sanction possessed by the Local Government, it is requested that the matter be specially taken up with the Company's Agent and Manager.

E W Allen

C. R.

Form No. 10.

Railway Department.

Office of the Consulting Engineer for Railways,
Madras. 24 Jany 1898

To

The Agent Madras R. C.

3 P

No. 235 Reply No. E 618/198, dated 2/3/98

Print

Sir,

With reference to the accompanying copy of a Note dated the 18th Jan 98. of the Examiner of Gtd. R. Accounts. I have the honour to invite your attention to my letter ×No. 3721 dated the 6th Dec. 97. and to say that the discrepancy now brought to notice between the outlay and the estimate against which it was incurred require full explanation.

Reminders.

× in linked case

Printed in GO 336R
11/5/97

In your letter No. E. 618/331. dated the 5th April 97 you ~~obtained~~ sought and subsequently in Madras Govt. Order No. 336.R. dated the 11th May 97, obtained, the permission of Government to carry out a certain work at a cost of Rs 10,468. The [illegible] of hear of it is that you have already spent ~~[illegible]~~ more than three times that sum. I do not say that if you had originally asked for permission to spend thirty three thousand rupees Government would not have sanctioned your doing so. Nor do I say that the expenditure for the work done has been excessive.

What I insist on is that your estimates should approximate to actual necessity exactly and vice versa that the moment your men find that the estimate is a bad one they should promptly seek fresh orders.

Unless there are large adjustments to be made of the cost of plant and material it seems that in the present instance someone is seriously to blame, either the estimator, or the performer of the work, and in any case the latter in not asking for orders at a very much earlier stage.

I have &c

24/1/98

Despatched on 24/1/98

24/1/98

Extract from A.-D.'s letter to Board, No. C

No. 2350 ~~of 24-2-98~~

Print

"The Company's Locomotive Superintendent, however, suggests that it would be a still greater improvement to make the top corners of the table to a radius of ¾ inch, since this would make them practically accord to the radius of the tyre flange, but I consider it preferable to adhere to the radius of ½ inch as shown in the drawing submitted with the indent."

For reasons explained in my demi-official letter of the 17th instant, the indents have been kept back.

Restoration of bridges at miles $\frac{95}{2\cdot3}$ and $\frac{107}{10\cdot11}$ N. W. Line.

21. I forward for the Board's disposal, copies of letters addressed to me by the Consulting Engineer for Railways, in which special attention is drawn to excesses over estimates and to the delay in submitting revised estimates for sanction.

In the case of the bridge at the 95th mile, the amount sanctioned in G.O. No. 336 R. dated 11th May last, for renewing the bridge, was Rs. 14,222 and in the case of the bridge at the 107th mile, the amount sanctioned in the order above quoted was Rs. 10,468.

Revised estimates amounting respectively to Rs. 22,088 and Rs. 35,980, reached this office on the 23rd and the 17th instant.

The revised estimate for the bridge at the 95th mile does not exceed my powers of sanction; but as the complaints of delay in submitting revised estimates refer to the two bridges, and as the same Engineer, Mr. Ross Chisholm, is held to be responsible for the delay in both instances, I have decided to submit the two revised estimates to the Board for sanction.

Explanatory letters from Mr. Ross Chisholm upon the revised estimates for both bridges, an explanatory memorandum from the late Acting Chief Engineer, Mr. H. J. Thompson, upon the revised estimate for the bridge at $\frac{107}{10\cdot11}$th mile, and explanatory letters from the Chief Engineer, Mr. H. C. West, upon the revised estimates of the two bridges are forwarded for the Board's perusal.

Mr. Chisholm in his letter of the 25th January does not attempt to explain the delay in submitting a revised estimate for the bridge at the 95th mile, and I must, therefore, conclude that in this case he has no special explanation to put forward. The remarks contained in para. 3 of Mr. Chisholm's letter of the 14th January cannot be regarded as satisfactory, seeing that he was aware in September 1897 the estimate was likely to be largely exceeded.

It is admitted by both Mr. West and Mr. Thompson that in carrying out the reconstruction of the bridges, Mr. Chisholm has done very excellent work as a capable Engineer, and it is much to be regretted that in failing to submit in due course revised estimates immediately it was known the original sanctioned estimates were to be exceeded, he has departed from a rule to which the Government Officers attach much importance.

I do not gather from the Consulting Engineer, nor yet from the Company's Chief Engineer, that the money actually spent is considered to be excessive.

Mr. West recommends that Mr. Chisholm should be punished.

There are three ways in which punishment can be inflicted, viz. :—

1st—By adopting the Chief Engineer's suggestion and reducing Mr. Chisholm from the 1st to the 2nd class of his grade for a period of three months.

2nd—By placing Mr. Chisholm permanently below Messrs. Pawley and Strange, who are classed with (but below) Mr. Chisholm.

3rd—By inflicting a cash punishment upon Mr. Chisholm by reducing his salary in the sum of Rs. 100 for a period of, say, six months.

I think the latter punishment would, in Mr. Chisholm's case, be sufficient.

I understand from the Chief Auditor that the excesses over the estimates were brought to the notice of the Chief Engineer's Office immediately the estimates were exceeded, and the Board will doubtless agree with me in thinking that the letters from the Consulting Engineer's Office would have been unnecessary and would not have been written, if the Chief Engineer on hearing from the Chief Auditor, had addressed me officially, pointing out the sanctioned estimates were insufficient, and stating that revised estimates would be submitted for sanction at the earliest possible date. The Chief Engineer's Office seems to me in both of these cases to have failed to bring specially to notice the fact that the estimates were likely to be exceeded.

22. *Government Orders and Correspondence with the Consulting Engineer.*

G.O. No. and Date.	Letter No. and Date.	Subject.	Previous reference, if any.
		FROM THE CONSULTING ENGINEER.	
13 6-1-98.	...	Stating that all applications for admission to the benefits of exchange compensation should be accompanied by complete replies to certain questions specified.	
120 R. 21-1-98.	...	Communicating a letter from the Government of India conveying sanction to the temporary increase of expenditure on the Engineering Establishment, Madras Railway, due to the appointment of a Temporary Assistant Engineer in excess of scale, *vice* Mr. Pigott on furlough.	Para. 13 of No. 2343.
	324 2-2-98.	Forwarding returns of accidents on Indian Railways for the six months ending the 30th June 1897.	
154 R. 27-1-98.	...	Directing that the preliminary issue of the revised and budget estimates of the final location of the Shoranur-Cochin Railway Survey for the years 1897-98 and 1898-99, together with a note by the Examiner, Guaranteed Railway Accounts, Madras, be forwarded to the Government of India.	
		TO THE CONSULTING ENGINEER.	
...	106 9-2-98.	Enquiring if the provision made for rolling-stock in the Calicut-Cannanore estimate may, as suggested by the Board in paras. 6 and 7 of their letter, dated 13th August 1897, be eliminated, and an indent for the stock required, which will be a direct charge to the Madras Railway, be submitted.	
...	108 9-2-98.	Forwarding for countersignature Indent No. 819 for materials required for the construction of 200 open goods wagons.	Para. 12 of No. 2348.

(No. I.)

No. E618

182

5P

MADRAS RAILWAY.

AGENT AND MANAGER'S OFFICE,

Madras, 2nd March 1898

C. No. 1077
Recd. 3.3.98

CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAYS
RECEIVED
3 MAR. 1898
MADRAS.

Print

Ask for two tracings, one showing the bridge as originally constructed and the other as rebuilt with a schedule of quantities in each case.
HWA 3/3/98

EM we want this in order to check the allocation of the est.

From

The Agent and Manager.
Madras Railway.

To

The Consulting Engineer for Railways.
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 235 dated 24th January 1898, I have the honor to forward herewith, in duplicate, a revised estimate for the restoration of Bridge at $\frac{107}{10\text{-}11}$ miles, North West Line, and to request that the sanction of Government may be conveyed to me for the required outlay, Rs 35,980, chargeable in the proportion of Rs 26,391 to Capital and Rs 9,589 to Revenue.

2. The Revised Estimate exceeds the original estimate sanctioned in G. O. No 336 R dated 11th May last by Rs 25,512 and I enclose, for your information, copy of a note sent to me by the Company's Chief

Flag J

Chief Engineer explaining the cause of the excess.

3. The sanction of the Board to the Revised Estimate has been applied for.

4. Information as to provision in the Budget and date on which sanction will lapse is given on the Estimate.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Agent and Manager.

Enclo/ Estimate in duplicate.
2 Statements showing details of Revenue Expenditure

MADRAS RAILWAY.

From
The Agent and Manager.

To
The Consulting Engineer
for Railways.

No.

Dated 188

Recd.

Estimate for the Restoration of Bridge
at 107/10-11 miles, N. W. Line

The explanations of the Chief excesses under the subheads of the estimate are subjoined.

Bridge

Water excavation including dams and pumping — This excavation had to be made through a boulder 10.367 bed and necessitated continuous pumping during night and day by steam pumps and picottahs in consequence of the existence of strong springs which could not be foreseen when the estimate was originally prepared.

Print

In addition to this extensive Cofferdams puddled with clay, which had to be led from a distance, had to be resorted to, and special pumping machinery had to be hired from the South Indian Railway.

Masonry in Cement — The excess under this item is due to increased depth of 17 feet of foundations and to the substitution of Cement mortar for ordinary lime mortar, as the former was absolutely necessary inasmuch as the masonry as soon as it was completed, would have to at once bear the weight of the heavy traffic over the bridge.

15

		Rupees
Earth filling Breaking down old Masonry. dismantling piers &c	There is a slight increase under these heads which was unavoidable.	497-12-0
Contingencies	This item has been proportionately increased. 10 p.c. has been adopted as the work has not been completed and several miscellaneous charges have still to be brought to account.	7730-4-7
	Temporary Arrangement	
Taking up 55 ft girders & dismantling	This was found to be a much more troublesome and expensive operation than was expected, and the original method proposed for conveying the traffic over the temporary structure had to be considerably modified and extended. In this connection, it should be noted that the construction of the temporary works as also of the restoration of the bridge was carried out without interruption to traffic and in a feverish and unhealthy locality.	5434-6-0

Protecting piers and abutment.	This item was not originally estimated for but had to be adopted to ensure the safety of traffic over a partly demolished high embankment.	Rupees 3308-13-2
Houses for staff.	In consequence of the difficulty of securing labour locally, expenditure for housing the staff had to be incurred.	856-8-2
Carriage of Materials.	There is a slight increase under this item owing to additional materials having been conveyed.	96-2-4
Contingencies.	Have been estimated at 10 % for the reasons given above.	967-2-5

9 S P

Flooring and Curtain Walls.

This expenditure was not provided for in the original estimate but advantage was taken of the large excavations made for the foundations of the piers to introduce flooring and curtain walls to ensure the future safety of the bridge. 2488-0-0

In conclusion it is submitted that the work is of exceptional difficulty and the fact that through communication has had to be preserved considerably hampered rapid progress and free action which could only have been secured by the construction of a costly diversion through the bed of the river, but this was dispensed with.

10 S.P

Total Rupees 28,118 –
Less Credit — 2,830 –

Net excess Rs. 25,288 –

for Chief Engineer

MD

Eng. No. 2 to E. P.W. C. No. 1077 of 1898.
Letter No. 182 / 2. 3. 98
From Am

Eng. No. — to E. P.W. C. No. 1402 of 1898
Letter No. 243 / 21. 3. 98
From Am

Form No. 1.

No. 681

Madras, 9th March 1898.

original enter G.O. 661 R 29/4/98

From

THE CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAYS,

MADRAS,

Reminders.

Print

To

THE AGENT AND MANAGER, M. RY.

11 P

~~" " S. I. RY.~~
~~" H. H. THE N. G. S. RY.~~
~~" " AND CHIEF ENGR., N. RY.~~
~~" " S. M. RY.~~
~~" ENGR.-IN-CHIEF, B. M. RY.~~
~~" MANAGER, E. C. RY.~~

Reply No.——
dated——

SIR,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. $\frac{E\,618}{198}$ of the 8th March 1898, and in reply to return, approved, the two Estimates therewith enclosed, as follows. Your detail Estimate book is herewith returned.

Final Revised Estimate for Bridges at mile 107
N. W. line allocated as follows

To Capital	Rs 17155
To Revenue	" 18825
Total	Rs 35,980

Final Revised Estimate for Bridge at mile 95

N.-W. line, allocated as follows

To Capital Rs 11771
.. Revenue .. 10317
Total Rs 22,088

2. I take this opportunity of stating the principles by which I am guided in forming an opinion as to the allocation of expenditure on works of this sort, viz the restoration of works destroyed by floods &c or the replacement for any cause of old structure by new, wholly or partially. These principles are that additions and improvements are chargeable to Capital, while repairs restoration and renewals are chargeable to Revenue.

3. Properly speaking nothing ought in such cases as those under reference to be debited to Capital except the cost of the additional work, if any, provided for the purpose of making the new structure a better one than the old one. But difficulty will sometimes be experienced in deciding the proportion in which the cost of temporary or subsidiary work should be divided up. In such cases it is obvious that it is only fair to charge capital with the sum which it would probably have cost to make the addition or improvement if, apart from the occurrence of a breach and its consequence, it were deliberately decided to carry out such improvement. The allocation of the cost of diversion will usually follow that of the cost of the work itself.

J Havere
(Sd) F.J.-E-S

(No. I.)
No. E 618
247

MADRAS RAILWAY.

AGENT AND MANAGER'S OFFICE,

Madras, 21st March 1898.

RECEIVED
22 MAR. 1898
MADRAS.

1405
22.3.98

From 12 P

The Agent and Manager,
Madras Railway.

print

To

The Consulting Engineer for Railways.
Madras.

SIR,

With reference to your letter No. 681 of the 9th instant, I have the honor to forward herewith, for the sanction of Government, the final revised estimate[x] for the restoration of the bridge at $\frac{107}{10\text{-}11}$ miles, North West Line, together with a statement showing details of calculation of the revenue portion of the estimate.

Flag R

[x] in duplicate

2. The required outlay is Rs 35,980 and is chargeable in the proportion of Rs 17,155 to Capital and Rs 18,825 to Revenue.

3. The revised estimate exceeds the original by Rs 25,512 and the reasons for the excess are given in the enclosure to my letter No. $\frac{E\,618}{182}$ dated 2nd March 1898.

Flag E

The

4. The sanction of the Board to the revised estimate has been applied for.

5. Information as to provision in the Budget and date on which sanction will lapse is given on the estimate.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Thos. S. Moss
Agent and Manager.

Enclo/2.

MADRAS RAILWAY.

From The Agent and Manager.

To The Consulting Engineer for Railways.

No.

Dated 188

Recd.

(No. II.)
No. E. 618.

363

14P

MADRAS RAILWAY.

AGENT AND MANAGER'S OFFICE,

Madras, 26th April 1898.

C. No. 1988
Recd. 27.4.98

RECEIVED
27 APR. 1898
SECRETARY TO GOVT. OF MADRAS RYS.

From

Print

The Agent and Manager.
Madras Railway.

To

Dispatched 5005
26/4

The Consulting Engineer for Railways.
Madras.

To Ooty
[illegible]

SIR,

Adverting to the penultimate para of my letter No. E.618/247 dated the 21st March last, I have the honour to enclose an extract para. 11. from a letter from the Secretary No. 972 dated the 25th ultimo in which the Board's approval is accorded to the amount, viz. Rs. 35,980/- of the revised estimate for restoration of the bridge at the 107 Mile. N. W. Line.

Eo No
662-63
29/4/98

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servt,

[illegible]
Agent & Manager.

Enclo: 1. [illegible]

MADRAS RAILWAY.

From
The Agent and Manager.

To
The Consulting Engineer
for Railways.

Dated 188

Recd.

No.

Form No. 33.

OFFICE OF THE CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAYS,

Madras, 23rd March 1898.

No. 850/A

1003 R

OFFICE NOTE.

Letter from the Agent, & Manager, Madras Railway, No. E 618/247 dated 21st March 1898, forwarded to the Examiner of Railway Accounts, for favour of check as to allocation and budget provision.

Two currents

for E. R.

ER
CM 28/3

25.3.98

Resubmit on receipt of Board's sanction

28/3

EXAMINER'S REPLY.

The revised Estimate is correct as to allocation, and requires Govt: of India's Sanction.

Funds are available from the grant for unsanctioned works Schedule B Budget 1897-98.

EWallen

25th Mar 98

C. R.

Extract from a letter from the Secretary
№ 972. dated 25. 3. 98.

Restoration of Bridges at 95th and 107th miles, N.-W. Line.

11. The Board are much displeased to learn from para. 21 of your No. 2,350 that great neglect and carelessness have been shown by their officers in dealing with the very large excesses over estimates in respect of the two bridges on miles 95 and 107 North-West Line.

print

The amounts sanctioned for the renewal of these bridges in May 1897 were Rs. 14,222 for that on the 95th mile, and Rs. 10,408 for the other bridge on the 107th mile. The revised estimates, which the Board now sanction, amounted respectively to Rs. 22,088 and Rs. 35,980—the latter amount being over three times as much as the original estimate. The original estimate for the repair of the bridge on the 107th mile was framed, it is understood, by Mr. Stoney, but it was soon discovered, on commencing work, after he had left the country, that, owing to the nature of the ground and other unforeseen causes, the estimated amount must be largely exceeded. It was the duty of Mr. Chisholm, the Executive Engineer in charge, to inform the Chief Engineer of the state of the case at once, and to submit revised estimates for the reconstruction of these bridges at the earliest possible date, and to obtain provisional sanction for the excess expenditure; but he withheld the estimates till work was far advanced, though repeatedly asked for them by the Chief Engineer's Office.

For this grievous error and disregard of rules it is recommended that Mr. Chisholm should be punished.

Of the three alternatives named, the Board think it preferable to adopt the Chief Engineer's suggestion, and reduce Mr. Chisholm from the 1st to the 2nd Class of his grade for a period of three months, on the understanding that at the expiration of that period he reverts to the same position he held before, and they trust that it will prove a lesson to Mr. Chisholm to avoid similar neglect in the future.

It is noted with satisfaction that the quality of the work done by Mr. Chisholm is spoken of in high terms by the Chief Engineers—both Mr. Thompson and Mr. West—and the money spent upon the revised estimates of both bridges is not considered to be excessive.

Finally—the Board are greatly vexed to observe from the concluding paragraph of your letter above quoted, that the insufficiency of the sanctioned estimates, and the necessity for the submission of revised estimates, though reported to the Chief Engineer's office by the Chief Auditor, was first brought to your notice by the Government Consulting Engineer—no report having reached you from the Chief Engineer. Both Mr. West and Mr. Thompson are responsible for this omission.

It seems unaccountable that so important a matter should have been kept back from the Agent and Manager of the Company; and the Board regret that you should have been exposed to the mortification of learning from the Government Consulting Engineer of an irregularity which had taken place in the conduct of the business of the Company.

They desire that both Mr. West and Mr. Thompson be called upon to explain this grave departure from ordinary duty.

The Consg: Engineer.

Enc. No. 1 to P.W.D. No. 1988 of 1898
Letter No. 363 of 26.4.98
From Am

Form No. (2).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
RAILWAY BRANCH.

B/: Br

No. 662. Ry dated 29.4.98

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Indt G.O. No. 336 R d/ 11.5.97. 1 S.P.

READ ~~the following~~ again

Read also

Print Office Note from the Examiner Guaranteed Ry Accts No. 31 d/ 18-1-98

Print Letter to the Agent & Manager, Madras Ry, No. 235 d/ 24-1-98

Print Extract from Agent's letter to the Bd of Directors M.Ry No. 2350 d/ 24.2.98

Print Letter from the Agent and Manager Madras Ry No. E618/182 d/ 2.3.98 and enclosure

Print " to Do — Do — No. 681 d/ 9.3.98.

" from Do. — Do — No. E618/247 d/ 21.3.98

" from Do. — Do — No. E618/363 d/ 26-4-98.

16 P

The Government of India will be addressed.

H.E. No. 663. Ry dated 29.4.98

FM

R 29/4/98

R. Form No. 12.

18

No. 663-Ry

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

RAILWAY BRANCH.

17P

To

The Secy. to the Govt. of India,

P. W. Department.

Print

Simla

Ooty, the 29th April 1898.

Sir,

I am directed to submit, for favor of sanction, an estimate amounting to Rs. 35,980, chargeable in the proportion of Rs 17,155 to Capital and Rs 18,825 to Revenue, for the restoration of a bridge, partly destroyed by a flood, at Mile $\frac{107}{10-11}$ of the N.W. section of the Madras Ry. I am to enclose a copy of the Agent's letter No. $\frac{3.618}{247}$ of the 21st March 98, and also of para 11 of the Board of Directors' letter No 972, dated the 25th March 98 in which the Board's sanction to the estimate is conveyed.

2.— The Estimate now forwarded is a revised one. The first estimate, which amounted to Rs 10,468 only, and which was sanctioned by this Govt. in G.O. No. 336-Ry. dated the 19th May 97, turned out, for various reasons depending on floods, accidents and injudicious management, to be quite insufficient. The neglect of duty on the part of the officers of the Madras Ry. in not bringing the insufficiency to notice as soon as it became apparent was severely commented on by the Con. Engr., Madras as soon as it came to notice, and has, ~~[illegible]~~ in this Govt. opinion, been adequately dealt with by the Board of Directors in their letter to their Agent.

3.— The ~~[illegible]~~ adjustment of the various items of the expenditure between Capital and Revenue has been settled between the Con. Engr. for Ry. Madras and the Company's officers and has been approved of by the Govt. Examiner of Guaranteed Ry. Accts. so that it seems unnecessary to go into the details of it here.

4.— The Revised Estimate is practically a completion report and funds have been certified by the Examiner as being available from the grant for construction works. Schedule B. in the Budget for 1897-98.

I have &c

FWS

28/4/98

Documents accompanying.:—

(1) Letter from the Agent & Manager M. Ry No. E.618/247 of 21/3/98 with enclosures (estimate)

(2) Copy of para 11 of the Bd. of Directors letter No. 972 of 25/3/98

Despatched on 24 [illegible] 98