

Public Works (1899) Department.

RAILWAY BRANCH.

G.O., No. 113 *By*
DATED *7th Sept 1899.*

Includes Rules 876-77 of 8/8/89

80

T.C.C.

[Despatch Abstract.]

*Mr. W. Ward, Locomotive Draftsman,
Madras Railway.*

*Coming to the Agent & Manager's sanction
of the Govt. of India to the retention on the
termination of the agreement of
an salary of Rs 270 per mensem rising
to Rs 300 per mensem as approved by the
Board of Directors*

OFFICE OF THE CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAYS,
Madras, 12th August 1899.



No. 2542

OFFICE NOTE.

Letter from the Agent *Manager Madras* Railway, No. $\frac{8790}{13987}$
dated 11th August 1899, forwarded to the Examiner of Railway
Accounts for remarks.

for E. R.

EXAMINER'S REPLY.

The amount proposed to be paid to the *Tilgiri* Railway, may, if approved, be sanctioned by the Local Government.

Funds are available to meet the expenditure, but the Agent and Manager should be asked to report how it is proposed to allocate the amount between Capital and Revenue.

M.D.
for E.R.
16th 99.

N^o 2602
Jm ER 18-8-99.
7 AM

With reference to your letter
N^o 8790 of 11th August 1899, I
3987
have the honor to request
that you will kindly ^{inform} ~~advise~~
me if it is proposed to allocate
the amount therein men-
tioned between Capital
& Revenue.

JH
17.8.99.

A.R. In reply to your letter

18/8/99

17/8/99
18/8

(No. I.)

5000-15-3-83.

No. 10950
1048

MADRAS RAILWAY.

AGENT AND MANAGER'S OFFICE,

MADRAS, 26th August 1899.

From

The Agent and Manager,

Madras Railway Company,

To

The Consulting Engineer for Railways.

SIR,

Madras.

P

In reply to your letter N^o 2602
of the 18th instant, I have the honor to
inform you that if the undermentioned
sums are paid to the Nilgiri Railway,
the payment will be wholly from Mad-
ras Railway Capital funds from
which source the other portions of the
expenditure on the same works was
obtained:-

Transshipping platform ^{erected} at Mettur.
paldiyam Rs 11,945.
Alteration of Sidings at . . . do . . . 2,669.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obed^t Serv^t,

Edmund
Agent & Manager.

OFFICE OF THE CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAYS,
Madras, 30th August 1899.



No. 2717

OFFICE NOTE.

Letter from the Agent, Bangalore Railway, No. $\frac{10950}{1048}$,
dated 26th August 1899, forwarded to the Examiner of Railway
Accounts for remarks.

[Signature]
30/8/99
for E. R.

EXAMINER'S REPLY.

Noted and returned. Sanction may
now be accorded, if approved.

[Signature]
1-9-99.

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

P.O. N^o 2675 R 7 11th Dec. 1892

C & N^o 1497 17th January 1898

E R^o current N^o 4211 12-8-99

" " N^o 4448 7 29-8-99

ORDER. No 10/2. Dated 7/9/99

Sanction is accorded to the request to the Nalgia O^r from the Capital funds of the M.R. of the same amount originally paid by the former in connection with the following works at Mattupalayam.
Transshipping platform Rs 4,955
Alteration of bridge. - 2669

8/9/99

The Agents Messrs M. J. S. & Co. }
Examiners G. R. S. & Co. }
Cms: Supr for Rys

7/11/99 2.9.99

8/9/99

2/9/99

I can see no grounds for C.R.'s assumption that the provision of additional staff quarters at Villaparna is the alteration of the same place of the station goods, from parts of one project. The fact of both being referred to in one letter does not make them one project. They have no connection with each other any more, say, than the provision of Puntel's gas lighting at the Indian Central Station and the building of quarters for the Station Master at the same station. The mention of them both in one letter would not make them one project or part of one project.

The light was provided enough to run the gas in one letter. But the light being for instance is quite an isolated matter. As is the goods handling platform, so is the arrangement of sidings.

Staff quarters and locomotive buildings are certainly intimately connected, forming as they do part of one scheme in connection with the arrangement of engine running in the S.I.R. But even if I understood, in the absence of paper, that there is such a scheme in connection with Villaparna.

The office has taken no trouble, apparently, to put by the one project. How did this originate? Paper. Please see papers filed S.W. & Co. 60/ Johnson. But first show to C.R. light with Johnson & I shall be glad if he will not object to the stand of his objection to local first. Submitting the present estimate.

S. R. 419159. F.V.S. 11/7/99

S.R. From the fact that the

reading "Rearrangement" of, and additions to, Villaparna "parram Junction", it was inferred that they formed part of a single scheme in which they should be grouped together. Please see S.O.M. page 7 para 7 (C.S. 210177 of 1897). It, however, E. R. considers that they are not connected parts of a project, the local Govt. may sanction the estimate and such sanction will be accepted by this office. But if the extension of the transshipping platform is an isolated work and unconnected with the other items it should, being estimated to cost less than Rs 1000, be allocated to Reserve New minor works.

The extension of the transshipping platform is not an isolated work. The Staff Quarter already sanctioned are an undivided and separate scheme. The various alterations of Station arrangements of which a part is now submitted for

for C.R. 5/9/99