

140
2 AUG 1888
ENCLOSURES
P. W. ACCOUNTS

440
8079

No. 2881C of 31 July 1888

To
C

+ put up
on 7/6/88

Forwarded, in
continuation of this
office No. 2326C dated
22 June 1888.

Dr. Wm
For W.

No. 2069 of 14. 88

To W.

Returned with the following
remarks in continuation of my
office note No. 1996 dated 1st.
August 1888.

2. Item 22. Please see
office note No. 2024 dated 7th.
August 1888 on the subject of
earnest money.

3. The other items call for
no remarks.

Wm

C.

Dr.
Mr.

From

The Chief Engineer
VII Circle
Trichinopoly

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.
Madras

No. 4045C

Dated 25th } July 1888
Sup 26th }
Recd 30-7-88
16

Encls 110

Subject

Mr. Rainer's inspection
Notes

Forwarded copy of letter
from the Chief Engineer
Trichinopoly No. 18926
23-7-88
giving explanation re-
gards certain items re-
quiring explanations
as per

Recorded
20.8.88

To

P.W.D.

Letter from J. Grimes Esq.
Executive Engineer, Indian
Navy to the Superin-
tending Engineer Circle
No 189^{SE} dated 23^d July 1888.

Sir,

In confirmation
of this office No 138^{SE} of the
15th ultimo, I have the
honor to reply as follows
to the under noted items
of the Examiner's Summary
of Inspection Notes.

Item No 22. Out of the 33
instances in which earnest
money is stated as not
recovered, I beg to state
that it was received in
about 27 cases. This
remark is therefore in-
correct and is perhaps
so noted as there has
been no record of their
recovery in the cash book.
Whenever tenders are
invited earnest money

is received but as these are returned then and there to the tenderers, there is no necessity for any record of them in the cash books. Any such record will be simply giving extra work and multiplying entries in the cash books by which no real advantage is gained. The other 5 were incomplete works of last year or emergent works given without recovery of earned money.

Item No 35. Since taking charge of the division I have checkmeasured and paid many liabilities. These 4 works were not finally inspected as they were scattered, and for want of time before February last. These liabilities have all now been settled.

The question as to whether earned money should or should not be credited in the Cash Book should be settled by the Committee. General instructions seem to be needed to secure uniform practice.

Out of the four works for which completion certificates are stated not to have been sent, the delay in the cases of Nos 1 & 2 are owing to the inattention on the part of the Accountant to prepare them in time. The completion report for Peruvalai Bharnul Regulating Dam, providing shutters &c, estimate Rs 63, said by the Overseer to have been submitted had not been received - hence the delay. There was an outlay of Rs 77-5-8 in February 1888 on the Damarasavalli Sunka Tank and therefore a completion report was sent on the 2^d March/88. The causes of delay in the first three cases were explained in the completion reports.

Item No 36. The delay in

in measuring the work
done to the compound
wall of the Munsiff's Court
at Kulitalai was owing
to a misunderstanding
on the part of the late
Lieut. S. Salvey, the sub-
divisional officer

Item No 38. The works being
scattered and as the
Executive Engineer's time
had been fully occupied
these works were not in-
spected before the end of
January, but the liabilities
have all been paid since.
a reconstitution of the sub-
divisions is necessary to
avoid such delay and
a separate reference has
been made to the Supt.
Engineer on the subject.

I have the
signed / J. Grimes
Exec. Engineer.

This will be sepa-
rately reported on &
has no connection
with the Engr's re-
marks in the Office.

J. W. Rundall
Supt. Engr
25 July 1888.

No 4042C

Submitted to the Chief Engineer
P. W. D., in continuation of this Office

No 299th
18.6.88.

Trichinopoly
25th July 1888
Wp 26.

J. W. Rundall
Superintending Engineer
VI Circle