

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 18  
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 2/90  
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 10/0

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

(69)

7.0.0 துறை

அரசாணை எண். 2670 அச்சகம்  
 மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். பலவகை

நாள் : 24 — 9 — 1889 198 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

9 Sheets

ஆவண, கா-1—18,000—15-6-87.

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION.

Madras, 8 July 1889.

OFFICE NOTE.

No. 177

Circulation Register.

| To    | From     | Despatch Date. | Receipt Date. |
|-------|----------|----------------|---------------|
| D. W. | D. E. S. | 9.7.89         |               |

KEEP-WITH.

No. dated 1889.

I think that the interpretation of the rules accepted in G. O. No. 1623N of 21<sup>st</sup> June 1889 applies to, all Supg. Engrs. within the limits of their powers of sanction. If so, the order <sup>I would suggest that</sup> should be communicated to all Supg. Engrs.

Atte  
8.7.

D. E. S.

B. N.  
8.7.89.

No 1009 27/7 July 1889

To V.

The interpretation of the rules will apply to all Supg. Engineers subject only to necessary variation of the limits of their special powers of sanction, and G.O. No. 1823 W. dated 21st. June 1889 might with advantage be communicated to all Supg. Engineers.

20

20  
19/7

Await reply to Mr

3232 C 2/16.7.89

MUM  
19.7.89

20

20

No 2670 W of 24.8.89

No. 3163 C of 11 July 1889

To

C

For favour of opinion.

MUM  
10.7.89

D.W.

Office of the Supg. Engineer,  
H.M.B.O.R.R. Sengar Project Works,  
Sengar 9<sup>th</sup> July 1889.  
D/10: 2670

From

Colonel J. Sengarick R.E.,  
Superintending Engineer,  
Sengar Project Works.

To

The Chief Engineer,  
P.W. Department.

Sir,

With reference to G.O. No. 1823 W of 21<sup>st</sup> June 1889 I have the honor to solicit a reconsideration of the decision therein conveyed as regards cases coming under head (C)

2. The Examiner insinuates that I might take advantage of the power asked for to evade the limit of Rs. 10,000 now imposed for sanction to new works; an insinuation of which I can afford to take no notice, but which I must say I am surprised at finding passed over by Government.

3. The cases which I have in view are

are those in which the original estimate (of less than Rs 10,000) have been sanctioned as part of the original project estimates; e.g. the latter provide, at a particular point, for an inlet costing Rs 4,100 and an outlet costing Rs 8,280; it is found that a culvert costing Rs 12,000 can with great advantage be substituted for these two works. It seems convenient that I should be able to sanction this alteration without the necessity of a special reference to Government.

B. You will doubtless understand, though the Examiner naturally does not, that the only object I have in view is to save correspondence and delay; I have no reason to suppose that any objection will be raised to such alterations as the example given above, and it is precisely for this reason that a reference to Government in each case appears unnecessary.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obt. Servt,

J. B. — J. Col. R. E.

Col. Supp. Engr. Supp. Prop.

2670

25

3491 W. 3-11-88  
 3333 W. 17-10-88  
 810 W. 12-3-88

1160. P.R

Received 16 July 1889

Copy of para 3  
 Copy of para 3  
 is forwarded to the Examiners  
 referred to the P. W. Accts for  
 P. W. Accts for opinion whether, on  
 the understanding that  
 the original estimates  
 have been sanctioned as  
 part of the project, the  
 permission sought under  
 heads (C) & (d) in G.O. No.  
 1623 W. 3 21 June 1889,  
 may be granted by  
 this Govt.

WOP  
 15-7-89

From, The Superintd Engr  
 Perambur Project

To, The Chief Engineer  
 P.W.D.

Dated 9<sup>th</sup> July 1889  
 Received 13<sup>th</sup> July 1889

No. 3233 C of 16 July 1889  
 2670 W of 24.8.89

Estimates— Requests  
 reconsideration of the  
 decision conveyed in G.O.  
 No 1623 W regarding the  
 sanction of ~~the~~ coming under  
 head (C) for the reasons  
 assigned—

Ex. No. 18,617

Ex. No.

2617

Submitted

[C. No. 8.]

2670

GOVT OF MADRAS. } 1889. { P. W. DEPT.  
 EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 14 August 1889.

OFFICE NOTE No. 1161

To E.W.

In reply to your memo No. 3233 C dated 16th. July 1889 regarding power of a Supg. Engineer to sanction a revised estimate in lieu of two or more estimates sanctioned in the original project estimate, I think that, if approved by Government, Supg. Engineer might be allowed to substitute a single cheaper work for two or more works previously sanctioned by higher authority, but it would hardly be advisable to introduce any modification of rules which would allow a Supg. Engineer to sanction himself two works separately and then substitute for them, one work which would originally have been beyond his powers.

C.

13/8

4. 14/8

OMC 7631

(7)

No. 2670W d/24. IX. 89

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

2670

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the  
again  
Read the following



G. O. No. 1623 d/21. June 1889

Read also

- Office note from C.E. for I. No. 177 d/1. July 1889
- Office note from the C.E. No. 1009 d/7. July 1889
- From the Supy. Engr. No. 1160 d/9. July 1889
- Office note from the C.E. No. 1161 d/14. Aug 1889

His Excellency the Governor in Council is pleased to declare that the increased powers of sanction granted to Subdy. Engineers under para 267 (a) of the P.W. Code shall be held to cover the following cases:-

- (a) Revised estimates exceeding the limit of sanction, when the revised estimate does not exceed the original estimate, provided the revision is due only to necessary alterations in the construction details of

of works (para 47 (d) M.C.C.)  
and not to any alteration  
in the general character  
of such works.

(b) Revised estimates  
exceeding the limit of  
sanction, when the  
amount of the revised  
estimate exceeds that of  
the original by not more  
than the limit of sanction,  
or 5 percent of the original  
estimate, whichever may  
be less, provided the ex-  
cess is entirely due to ne-  
cessary alterations of  
contingent details.

(c) Revised estimates  
comprising two or more  
original estimates, none  
of which exceed the limit  
of sanction, although the  
aggregate does so, when the  
revised estimate does not  
exceed the aggregate of the  
originals, and provided  
the original estimates have  
been sanctioned by higher  
authority as parts of a  
project.

(d) Revised estimates  
comprising two or more  
original estimates, when  
the revised estimate ex-  
ceeds the aggregate of the  
original estimates, but  
does not exceed the limit  
of

of the amount of the original estimate, or 5 percent of the original estimate, whichever may be less, provided the excess is entirely due to necessary alterations of contingent details.

the aggregate amount for the whole project, and not for any part of the project.

\* is taking the limit of sanction  
to be Rs. 10,000, the revised es-  
timate should not exceed  
Rs. 10,000, if it is a com-  
bination of two originals,  
or Rs. 10,000 if it is a com-  
bination of three or

of sanction for each of the  
original estimates, and  
provided that the original  
estimates have been sanc-  
tioned by higher authority  
as parts of a project.

To Messrs. Eng. for J.  
Subg. Eng.  
Exp. M.C.C.

6

Cu

EXAMINER  
27 AUG 1889

EXAMINER  
27 AUG 1889

No. 3750 C.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Madras, 20 August 1889

OFFICE NOTE.

From

W

To

C

Please favour me  
with your opinion as to the  
terms of the enclosed draft  
order.

W  
19.8.89

W

No 1266 of 30 Aug 1889  
To W.

There is no objection to the  
draft order. But in order to make the  
intention clearer, I would suggest the  
following alterations :-

In (b), for "the limit of sanc-  
tion or" in the seventh line, substi-  
tute "(1) the amount up to which the  
Supr. Engineer can sanction an original

Memo No. 3152 of 11-7-87  
 - 62320 of 16-7-87  
 P. No. 16234 of 21-6-87  
 - B - 34914 of 3-11-87  
 - 3533 of 19-10-88  
 - 315 of 19-10-88  
 Estimate of (2)

In (a) for "limit of sanction  
 for each of the original estimate" sub-  
 stitute "aggregate amount for which  
 the Supg. Engineer could sanction as  
 many separate original estimates".

No. 223304 of 16-7-87  
 - 31630 of 11-7-87  
 - 16234 of 21-6-87  
 - 13514 of 8-5-88  
 - 34914 of 3-11-87  
 - 33334 of 19-10-88  
 - 39984 of 21-12-88  
 - 35614 of 7-11-88  
 - 39994 of 21-12-88  
 - 33494 of 20-10-88  
 - 14764 of 5-6-87  
 - 39974 of 21-12-88  
 - 34984 of 3-11-87  
 - 33344 of 19-10-88

No. 26704 of 24-11-87

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the

of  
Read the following

G.O. No. 16234 of 21 June 1887

Read also

office note from the Chief Engr. for S.  
 office note from the Engr. P.W. Dept.  
 from the Supg. Engr. Kuzh Project  
 office note from the Engr. P.W. Dept.  
 to do do

A.L. No. 177 of 8 July 1889  
 do. 1009 of 17 July 1889  
 do. 1160 P.W. of 9 July 1889  
 do. 1161 of 11 August 1889  
 do. 1266 of 30 August 1889

His Excellency the Governor  
 in Council is pleased to declare  
 that the increased powers of  
 sanction granted to Superintend-  
 ing Engineers under para 267 (a)  
 of the P.W. Code shall be held to  
 cover the following cases:-

(a) Revised estimates ex-  
 ceeding the limit of sanction,  
 when the revised estimate  
 does not exceed the original  
 estimate, provided the re-  
 vision is due only to neces-  
 sary alterations in the  
 construction details of works  
 (para 267 (d) P.W. Code) and  
 not to any alteration in the  
 general character of such  
 works.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

2675

again  
READ the following

Read also -

The Government is  
not disposed to authorize  
any further delegation of power  
to Superintending Engineers for  
the present.

2. When alterations, such as those instanced by Col. Cunningham in para 3 of his letter above recorded, are proposed in the arrangements of works, the estimates for which have been sanctioned by higher authority, <sup>to be</sup> it is the duty of the Suppy Engrs to take the orders of the Chief Engineer on the subject.

9  
Phred  
11.9.89

Em

21-11-07

8-8-11

No 2670 Waf Sp. 14. 100

(9)

16-9-07

1000000 1000000