

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 10
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 8/88
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 27.7.88

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

பெரிய துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	<u>96</u>	அச்சகம் பலவகை
Bachano ~~68-69~~ 238-239		
நாள் :	<u>15-1-1879</u>	198 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

15th January 1879, No. 96.

Famine Re f.

Read the following paper:—

No. 238. Endorsement of the Acting Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Fort St. George, 8th January 1879, No. W.

Read the following letter from Major H. R. MEAD, R.E., Superintending Engineer, Fourth Circle, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. O. HASTED, R.E., Acting Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Coimbatore, 27th December 1878, No. 1,170-100.

With reference to G.O., No. 2,477 (F.R.), dated 5th December 1878, in which I am called on to explain how it can occur with proper estimating for the expenditure to be as much as three and even six times the amount of the original estimate, I have the honor to report that the estimates were not properly prepared; many of them were made hurriedly and by subordinates, and when the work was carried out much more work than estimated had to be done to do it effectually. This was done by the order of a competent officer, but owing to press of work supplemental sanction was not, as it should have been, asked for.

2. It must be remembered that when these estimates were prepared there was little or no extra establishment in the district.

3. In the case of Work No. 6 in the list printed it will be noticed that while the work was in progress it was damaged subsequent to the preparation of the original estimate and the work was done according to the personal order of Major Pennycuik, then District Engineer.

4. The estimates were prepared at normal rates and did not make any allowance for the extra cost of famine; therefore the charge chargeable to Public Works alone should be compared with the amount of the original estimate.

5. I trust that with this explanation the estimates will be passed.

TRANSFERRED to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with reference to G.O., No. 2,477, F.R., dated 5th December 1878.

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

No. 239. ORDER THEREON, 15th January 1879, No. 96.

Miscellaneous.

THE actual expenditure on the six works as detailed in the list submitted with the District Engineer's letter

recorded in G.O., 5th December 578, F.R. No. 2,477, amounting in all to Rs. 14,190-14-7, is sanctioned. This sanction to the original estimates, amounting to Rs. 4,750, are cancelled.

(The Extract.)

Addl. Under Secy. to Govt.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, with six enclosures returned.
,, the Public Works Department.
,, the Financial Department.
,, the Board of Revenue.
,, the Collector of Salem.
,, the Accountant-General,
,, the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, } with copy of G.O., No. 2,477, of 5th Dec. 1878.

Edw. J. W. Fisher,
Spurs Copying

No. 1170
100

Superintending Engineer
1st Circle
Coimbatore 27th December 1878

From The Superintending Engineer
4th Circle

To The Chief Engineer
for Irrigation No. 8.
Madras.

Sir,
With reference to G.O. No. 2177 (EB)
dated 5th December 1878 in which I am
called on to explain how it can occur
with proper estimating for the expan-
sure to be as much as 3 and even 6 times
the amount of the original estimate.
I have the honor to report that the esti-
mates were not properly prepared many
of them were made hurriedly and by
subordinates and when the work was
carried out much more work than
estimated had to be done, to do it ef-
fectually. This was done by the order.

Original
✓

of a competent officer but owing to press of work supplemental sanction was not as it should have been asked for.

2. It must be remembered that when these estimates were prepared there was little or no extra establishment in the District.

3. In the case of Work No 6 in the list printed it will be noticed that while the work was in progress it was damaged subsequent to the preparation of the original estimate and the work was done according to the personal order of Major Pennycook then District Engineer.

4. The estimates were prepared at normal rates and did not make any allowance for the extra cost of famine therefore the charge chargeable to Public Works alone should be compared with the amount of the original estimate

5. I trust that with this explanation the estimates will be passed.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient

Wm. M. Major R.E.

Superintending Engineer
4th Circle

N. 4. H.
 Transferred to the Secretary
 to Government Revenue Dept.
 with reference to G.O. No 2477
 F.R. dated 5th December 1878

Feb 1879 }
 8 Jan 1879 }
 Asst. Secy. to Govt.
 Asst. Chief Secy. to Govt.
 Encls 6 - Estimates

Rev. 1877 No 232
 From P.O. of 15th Jan 1879
 The Supy Engineer
 4th Circle
 To The Chief Engineer
 for Irrigation

No 1170
 99
 Dated 27th December 1878
 Recd 10 Jan 1879

Repy the Maichinon Marakha
 Jan 3.
 The Alapuram da 6.
 Reports the cause of
 excess expenditure on
 the works

- 1 Chief Eng for Supy with Encls 6
 - 2 Mr. Asst. Secy
 - 3 Mr. Asst. Secy
 - 4 Mr. Asst. Secy
 - 5 Mr. Asst. Secy
 - 6 Mr. Asst. Secy
- 9
 120

No 2381239
 C. 11/1/79 R. 14/1/79

F.R. 232.
 Supy Engineer

The Chief Engineer for Irrigation originally
 submitted for sanction 6 estimates
 for works in the Salem District. These
 estimates are mostly bills of expenditure
 the details of which are shown below.

No of Estimate	Total Expenditure	of Total expenditure		Amount of original estimate	Amount of revised estimate
		Original value of expenditure	Excess to be provided		
16.	1350. 7. 10	1350. 0. 0	341. 1. 0	800. 0. 0	330. 1. 10
75.	600. 0. 1	357. 0. 0	222. 0. 1	350. 0. 0	259. 0. 1
77.	2962. 4. 6	2211. 0. 0	1757. 4. 6	600. 0. 0	3. 252. 4. 6
78.	608. 7. 10	507. 0. 0	157. 7. 10	520. 0. 0	158. 7. 10
79.	1473. 8. 1	687. 0. 0	715. 8. 1	500. 0. 0	945. 8. 1
80.	6182. 8. 3	3977. 0. 0	2205. 8. 3	2000. 0. 0	1182. 8. 3
	14190. 11. 7	8820. 0. 0	5370. 11. 7	1750. 0. 0	3440. 11. 7

In order disposing of the estimates
 were passed in their first form
 and had no revision made. Instead
 explanation was called for from with
 proper estimating it can occur that
 expenditure amounts to these or even
 less than the estimate as in the case of
 items Nos 3 & 6. This explanation is
 submitted & is

- 1st That the original estimates were
 prepared & not properly prepared
 by the original staff of the
 District Engineer's office.
- 2nd That some work was done under
 the estimates but under the order
 of the District Engineer.
- 3rd That further labour was employed
 for explanation is submitted as to the
 work done under the estimates.

Recd. Dept

Proc of 15th Jan'y 1879

1879
G.V. 238-239

is explained as it was before that the
work was done in the past &
after the submission of the original returns
of the various districts of the country
the extra labour was however obtained.

It is submitted that no inference
follows from the comparison suggested
in para 4 of the 1st Rep. that
except that the amount of work done
varies from that estimated for.

When an opportunity.

Off.

It is no use pursuing the
subject the estimate should
be made, I understand

121

The actual expenditure on the
six works ^{as stated} in the list submitted
with the District Engineer's letter numbered
in 40. 3rd Dec. 78. J.R. 2471.
amounting to 14,190. 14. 7. is sanctioned
the amount in the original estimates
amounting to 14,400 are cancelled.

Off.

18.1.79. 15 Jan'y 79

Proc 238 & 239

11/1/79. R. 15/1/79