

Public Works (1893) Department.

RAILWAY BRANCH.

G.O., No. 131-32 R

DATED 20th January

[Despatch Abstract.]

*Detailed estimate for individual works —
Explanation from the Engineer-in-chief, East
Coast Railway, regarding his omission to
comply with orders as to the submission of —
ordered to be forwarded to the Govt of
India.*

*Forwarding Explanation from the Engineer
in-chief, East Coast Railway, regarding
his omission to comply with orders as to
to the submission of —.*

Indexed.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	1948	R	5-12-90				
	2049	R	20-12-90				
	1277-8	R	1-6-91				
	2798	R	20-11-91				
	2000-1	R	15-8-92				
	2081	R	25-8-92				
	2566-7	R	1-11-92				
	2741	R	16-11-92				
	2761	R	17-11-92				
	3084	R	23-12-92				

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

In your reply please quote the number and date of this letter.

No. 8940
1165

From

THE ENGINEER-IN-CHIEF,
EAST COAST RAILWAY.

To

THE Joint Secretary to the Government of
Madras, Public Works Department,
Railway Branch.

Dated Wallair, the 16 Decr. 1892.

Sir,

With reference to G. O. no. 2741 dated 16th November 1892 communicating a letter from the Government of India, Public Works Department, no. 596 A.R. dated 13th October 1892 and calling for an explanation as to the omission of the Engineer-in-Chief of the East Coast Railway to comply with the orders contained in P.W.D. Circular no. 16 R. of 1891 which with certain modifications was reissued as Circular no. 6 R. of 1892 — I have the honor to state as follows.

2. With the original estimates of the line were submitted complete detailed estimates for each work. The Government of India provisionally accepted these estimates, and thereupon sanctioned provisionally the detailed working estimates, calling at the same time for their revision.

3. When, shortly afterwards P.W.D. Circular no. 16 R. of 1891 was issued giving power to the Engineer-in-Chief to sanction detailed working estimates

Enclosures Nil.

estimates up to Rs. 50,000, the question arose as to whether the Engineer-in-Chief should authorize the Examiner to accept as finally sanctioned by him all the original estimates for works up to Rs. 50,000 and thus enable him to open the registers or to wait till the revision of the estimates had been carried out.

4. In the first case - the sanction of the Engineer-in-Chief would have had necessarily to be cancelled by a second sanction, as the revised estimates were not ready and sent forward; and it was therefore thought advisable to defer taking action on Circular no. 16 R. till the preparation of the revised estimates was complete, the Examiner in the meantime auditing the expenditure against the original estimates which had already been sanctioned, though provisionally, by a higher authority than the Engineer-in-Chief, i.e. by the Government of India.

5. The revised estimates are now in the press, and all detailed working estimates amounting in cost to not more than Rs. 50,000 have received formal sanction, and are duly entered in the register kept by the Examiner of Accounts.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

- No. 23.12.92
- No. 2049 R. 4/20-12-90 ✓
 - 2798 R. 20-11-91 ✓
 - 2081 R. 25-8-92 ✓
 - 2741 R. 16-11-92 ✓
 - 1748 R. 5-12-90 ✓
 - 1277 R. 1-6-91 ✓
 - 2566 R. 1-11-92 ✓
 - 2761 R. 17-11-92 ✓
 - 3084 R. 23-12-92 ✓

Engineer-in-Chief,
East Coast Railway.

No. 131 R. 20 Jan 1903.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
RAILWAY BRANCH.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following

Letter from the Sup^y No. No. 8940 of 16 Dec 892
in: Chief Est Cont^y 465

Ordered that the above letter be forwarded to the Govt. of India with reference to para 2 of its letter No. 546 A.R. of 15th October 1892 embodied in Prop. No. 2741 R, dated 16 November 1892.

J
P. R

Recd
21/1/03

2. The Comptroller for Rs
- Engr. in Ch. & Chy.
- Engr. C. Ry. & Sd.

No. 132R

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
RAILWAY BRANCH.

To

THE SECT. TO THE GOVT. OF INDIA,

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

20th January 1893.

SIR,

With reference to
para 2 of your letter No
546 P.R. dated 13th Oct 1892.
I am directed to forward
herewith the explanations
of the Engineer in Chief
East Coast Railway as au-
thorised in his letter No.
8940 dated 16th Decr. 1892,
regarding his omission
to comply with para 108,
in accordance with which
detailed or working estimates
for individual works should
have been sanctioned by him.

J. G. R.

B.

No. 131-32R 20th Jan 1893.

17/1

B.
No. 131-32 R 20 Jan 1913.

Ham 9/12/11

Inst J.C. 14/1