

Local & Munl. (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 1752.

DATED 29-1-98.

INDEXED.

DESPATCHED

[Despatch Abstract.]

Inspection Notes

Concurring with the remarks of the Accountant
General on the explanation of Chingleput
Local Fund Engineer to certain points of the
and communicating the same to the District
Board ^{Chingleput} for attention

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. L 7d

612
3306 L

From The Accountant General
Madras.

His Order No. 175 Lins d 29. 1. 78

The remarks of the Account-
ant General, in which the Government
concurs, will be communicated to the
district Board ^{Chingleput} for attention.

V.R.
29/1/78

Y.T.
29 1 78

No. L 7d
612

Dated *18 December 1897.*

Received 18 DEC - 1897

Registered

Enclosures *2*

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Remarks on the explanation
of Chingleput Local Fund
Engineer, to certain points
of the Inspection notes.

To The Accountant General
President, dt. Board, Chingleput. ✓

Dupd 1/2/78

7/1/98
21/1/98

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

LOCAL FUND DEPARTMENT.

Fort St. George,
Accountant-General's Office,
17th December 1897.

No. 270
612

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT.
CURRENT No. 3306

From

F. C. Harrison Esqr.

OFF: ACCOUNTANT-GENERAL

TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

THE Secretary to Government,

Local and Municipal Department.

Fort St. George.

SIR,

With reference to Government Order No. 199 L.M. dated the 14th October 1897 referring to me for remarks, the Chingleput Local Fund Engineer's explanation on certain matters referred to in the inspection report, I have the honor to state that the first objection raised in the letter was that payments for the supply of metal were being made irrespective of the actual quarries from which the materials were dug, or the distance they were carried. This the Engineer admits, but in extenuation he urges that as the adjacent quarries in Government waste lands have become exhausted, it has been found necessary to permit Contractors to make their own arrangements with private owners. To this there is no objection, provided the quarries are approved by the

Engineers. He further states, apropos of the quarries and leads entered in the rate book not having been altered (presumably to save trouble), that even if the rates are favourable in some cases, Contractors will generally be found to tender at a certain percentage below those rates. He therefore argues that no possible loss to the Board can occur, and that no objection need be taken to the existing arrangements.

This explanation cannot, I think be accepted, even if the conclusion at which the Engineer arrives is correct, as the fact remains that payments for metal are being made without reference to the spot where it is dug, or the distance to which it is carried. This is contrary to the recognised rules on the subject. As soon as a quarry is exhausted, the Engineer should either select another himself, or inspect one selected by the Contractor, and decide to which miles of the road metal should be supplied from it. This done, the necessary measurements leads etc should be taken and entered in the rate book, for check of supply bills.

* which require that a rate book showing the cost of supplying metal each mile of road to be kept in the Engineer's office & that bills should be paid out at the rates worked out with reference to the several leads (Flag B)

2. In regard to the second point viz: that payments for signorage allow a margin for profits to the Contractor the facts appear to be as follows:
Formerly the Forest Department charged signorage at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ annas per 100 Cfr., on the understanding that the capacity of a cart was 20 Cfr. i.e. at the rate of 6 pies per cart. It was subsequently found that an average cart only held 14 Cfr., and an arrangement was therefore made with the Forest Department to reduce the signorage to 4 pies, if the metal was removed on a requisition signed by the Engineer. Notwithstanding this however, the amount allowed to the Contractor, as reimbursement of signorage, continues to be at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ annas per 100 Cfr., or in other words he is allowed $1\frac{3}{4}$ pies as profit. This is tacitly admitted, the only arguments advanced in its favour being (1) that in cases where the cart holds less than 14 Cfr., the Contractor would suffer loss, and (2) that when the metal is removed without a signed requisition from the Engineer, it has to be paid for at the old rate of 6 pies.

In regard to the former plea, it seems to me that as the capacity of a cart has been fixed, after due

Consideration, at 14 Cfr., it must approximately represent the amount it can carry. This being so, the probability is that it just as often holds more than the fixed quantity, as less, and that the Contractor gains a little as frequently as he loses.

In regard to the second argument as to his having sometimes to pay at the old rate, I would suggest that arrangements be made, in the interests of the Board, for all removals to be made only on the Engineer's requisition.

There appears to be therefore no necessity for the continuance of the existing practice.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

W. Harris

Offs: Accountant General

PS

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____
 When examined _____
 When signed 31/7 } 189

READ AGAIN G.O., No. _____ DATED _____
 189

CURRENT No. _____

ENCLOSURES TO C. No. _____

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
 B = Not to be copied.
 P = Copy abstract only.
 Q = Copy heading only.