

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 10
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 12th 2-1989
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 10/9

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

உருவம் துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	<u>143</u>	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	<u>20-1-1879</u>	<u>198</u>

10/9

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

143
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

20th January 1879, No. 143.

Famine Relief.

Read the following paper:—

No. 353. Endorsement of the Acting Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Fort St. George, 8th January 1879, No. 3-W.

Read the following letter from Major H. R. MEAD, R.E., Superintending Engineer, 4th Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Public Works Department, dated Coimbatore, 27th December 1878, No. 1,169-99:—

With reference to G.O., No. 2,475 (P.R.), dated 5th December, I have the honor to report that cause of the excess of expenditure on the original estimates on the works Nos. 1 and 7 in the list communicated with Public Works Department No. 1,019-1, dated 18th December 1878, printed with the Government Order is as follows:—

- No. 1. Estimate prepared at normal rates without allowance for famine, and also prepared incorrectly. During the progress of the work the tank was breached, and this caused large excess; there is no record to show how much is due to the breach and how much to the incorrect estimate.
- No. 7. The original estimate was not correctly prepared; the value of the work at normal rates and at the rates the original estimate was prepared is however only 25 per cent. in excess of the estimate. On this work the excess due to famine is such that it usually has been in Salem District.

Of course in both these cases supplementary sanction ought, according to rules, to have been applied for, but press of work in Salem District prevented this. I request that the seven estimates may be sanctioned.

TRANSFERRED to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with reference to G.O., No. 2,475, F.R., 5th December 1878.

(Signed) D. HASTED, Lieut.-Col., R.E.,
Acting Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

No. 354. ORDER THEREON, 20th January 1879, No. 143.

Miscellaneous.

letter recorded in G.O., F.R. No. 2,475, dated 5th December 1878, amounting to Rs. 13,517-0-5, is sanctioned in supersession of the estimates already sanctioned, aggregating Rs. 4,870.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) G. STOKES,
Addl. Under Secy. to Govt.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, with
" the Public Works Department.
" the Financial Department.
" the Board of Revenue.
" the Collector of Salem.
" the Accountant-General.
" the Examiner of Public Works Accounts.

Enclosures.

Copy of G.O., No. 2,475, dated 5th December 1878.

Exd. A. F. Goodall.

¹¹⁶⁹
N^o 99 ^{2/143} Superintending Engineer's Office
4th Circle
Coimbatore 27th December 1878.

From The Superintending Engineer
4th Circle

To
The Chief Engineer for Irrigation
P.W.D.
Madras

Sir,

Communicated
with P.W.D. No. 10475
of 13th December 1878

With reference to G.O. No. 2475/1878 dated 5th December I have the honor to report that the cause of the excess of expenditure on the original estimates on the works Nos 1 and 7 in the list printed with the G.O. is as follows:-

No. 1 Estimate prepared at normal rates without allowance for famine and also prepared incorrectly. During the progress of the work the tank was breached and this caused a large excess; there is no record to show how much is due to the breach and how

much to the incorrect estimate.

No. 7 The original estimate was not
correctly prepared; the value of the
work at normal rates and at the
rates the original estimate was
prepared is however only 25 per cent in
excess of the estimate. On this work
the excess due to famine is near that
it usually has been in Salem District.
Of course in ^{both} ~~this~~ these cases supplemental
sanction ought, according to rules, to
have been applied for, but prep of work
in Salem District prevented this.

I request that the 7 estimates may
be sanctioned.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most obt servant

M. M. Major R. B.
Superintending Engineer
H. Circle

No. 3. N.

Transferred to the Secretary
to Govt, Revenue Department,
with reference to G.O. No. 2475 F.R.
5 December 1878.

For as sent

L.C. 1878

Intd. Copy
8 January 1879

As Chief Eng. for Eng.

Under Secy to Govt.

For as sent

£ 143 G.O. No. 353-354

The actual expenditure on the
in the last submitted with
Sup. & Eng. letter received in G.O.
F.R. No. 2475 dated 5th Dec.
To amounting to 13,527. 0. 5
is sanctioned in supersession of
the estimate already sanctioned
affidavit 1878. 0. 0.

G.O. 20 Jan 1879

18.1.79.

Chief Eng. for Eng. with 7 snots

to the Secy to Govt.

Quick

to the Secy to Govt.

to the Secy to Govt.

to the Secy to Govt.

to the Secy to Govt.

Recd. 1879. Dec 10
From No. 19
The Supy Engineer
to the Secy to Govt.
The Chief Engineer
for Irrigation
Madras

In the Press

No. 1169
99

Dated 27 Dec 1878
Dec 9 Jan.

Repd. Pharampuram Vada-
manary tank 10
Yegor Pootagoundery 10
tank 7

Reports the cause of
excess expenditure
on the original esti-
mates on the works

with copy of
G.O. No. 2475
of 5 Dec 1878

720

REVENUE (FAMINE) DEPARTMENT.

No. 193.

From

C. S. J. L.

Dated 27th Dec 1878

FOR ORDERS.

The Supy Eng. 4th Dec. submitted
the Rs. 1000 a bid of 7 months
for six of these three years sanctioned
estimate amounting to Rs. 1870.
He was an earnest work for
land without estimate.
On the 7th Dec.

The actual expenditure = 13,527. 0. 5
The sanctioned estimate = 1870. 0. 0
Excess requiring sanction = 8647. 0. 5
of the actual expenditure
Excess requiring sanction = 8647. 0. 5
Excess requiring sanction = 8647. 0. 5
Excess requiring sanction = 8647. 0. 5

18.3.11

Rev. 1877. Dp¹⁰⁰
From N^o 19
The Supy Engineer

The farming excess was therefore
40 per cent of the expenditure.

The Sanctions (Six) were in
order.

Explanation was called for in
the excess was estimate an
order No 1 & 2 are the original
list.
As to 1.

The explanation is that the
estimate was incorrectly prepared
that no allowance for farming
was made and that the work
a tank was breached while in
progress.

As to 2.

That the estimate was incorrectly
prepared and at incorrect rates.

The normal value of the work
done compared with the estimate,
when there was one as follows:

Annual value.	6828.
Estimate	4870.
Excess.	1958.

$\therefore$ Excess = 40 per cent on estimate

Q.

13.1.79.

Must be seen close

1 month

14/1

Yes

157

No. 3. W

Rev: 1879: Dp¹⁰
From No 19
The Subg Engineer

FOR ORDERS.

Q. O. Geo. 143 of 20 Jan 1879

C. 12/1/79. R. 18/1/79.