

would ask whether it is the intention of Government that the rule should be read as granting a general permission to Superintending Engineers to authorize wholesale reductions, such as those now brought to notice, (irrespective also of the fact whether the Contract for work was within their competence to deal with, vide my O.N. No. 164 of 1st. June 1887), or, if they would not prefer to have each case considered and decided on its own merits.

3. I cannot say positively that the Supg. Engineer has not considered the case of each Contract, but it does not look like it, and if separate consideration is required, I think the sanction should afford some evidence of it.

4. The Contract for the Roman Catholic Church at Wellington is known to be beyond the Supg. Engineers' competence, and probably that for the Breeks Memorial School (Estimate Rs. 38,180) is also beyond his competence.

C.

21.6.87

27.1876

21.6.87, R. 1.7.87.

P.W.C. No. 702

(5)

R. 21.6.87

* S. 1

* Returned to C. vide Cl. 5293

1927

KEEP-WITH

Genl. No.

dated

188

1000-12-5-87.

[C. No. 8.]

GOVT. OF MADRAS. }

1887.

{ P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 1st June 1887.

OFFICE NOTE No. 164

To W.

In the audit of the accounts of the West Coast Division for December 1886 it was observed that the percentage withheld from Messrs. Mitchell and Mackenzie, Contractors for the Calicut-Vyitri Road has been reduced to 5 per cent of the value of work done by them, and the Executive Engineer on being asked to quote the authority for the reduction, has furnished a copy of the Supg. Engineer's No. 902 W. C. of 2nd. December 1886, in which that Officer sanctions the reduction under note to clause (b) of Code para 1364.

2. The amount of the Contract is not known, but the last bill in favor of the Contractors received in this Office, shews that it is over Rs. 90,000, so that the Contract must

or

or presumably have been accepted by you as Chief Engineer, under Code para 1350, and the percentage deduction determined at the time.

3. I am not at all sure that the Code rule quoted by the Supg. Engineer is intended to apply in such cases, that is, where contracts are accepted and percentage deductions determined by higher authority than Supg. Engineers, and solicit the favor of orders on the point.

4. I would also take the opportunity to point out that the rule in note to clause (b) of Code para 1364 might be made more clear, as to its intention, which I understand to be that Supg. Engineers may reduce the deduction to any percentage between 10 and 5, but not lower than 5 per cent.

5. It was argued before me the other day that a Supg. Engineer could dispense with security altogether, i.e. reduce the deduction to nil. I do not think this is intended.

P.W.C. No. 4166
4.6.1887



R 2.6.87
P. W. Dept.
To be returned with reply.

No. 1939C d/9 June 1887

Referred to the
Suptg. Engineer, IV circle,
for remarks. Messrs
Mitchell & Mackenzie's
tender was accepted
by the Chief Engineer
in Memo. No. 3638 dated
14 July 1885.

(By order)
W. B. Addis, Capt R.E.
Dy. Chief Engineer P.W.D.

Joel
7/6/87

Superintending Engineer's Office 4th Circle.

Coimbatore, 15 June 1887.

No. 251

EW

FROM,

COLONEL J. BEATTY R.E.,

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

FOURTH CIRCLE.

To,

The Chief Engineer
P.W. Departt

SIR,

Enclosure

* Herein
returned
x note to
clause (b)
of para 1364

Adverting to your Endorse-
ment No. 1939C of 9th Instant
on Examiners office No. 164 of 1st
idem, I have the honor to state that
the provisions of the Code appeared
to me quite clear; and I authorized
the reduction of the deductions, from
10 per cent to 5 per cent, as I con-
sidered the latter rate would
be a sufficient security without
unduly hampering the contractors.

2 The rule quoted by the Exa-
miner is apparently the only one
on the subject, and it gives the
Suptg.

No 3524 C d/11-10-86

85.53.11

4.7.6.87

4.7.6.87

4.7.6.87

4.7.6.87

Superintending Engineer, I
understand, power to reduce the
security to a minimum of 5 per
cent, if he considers it advisable.

3. Cases occasionally occur in
which owing to a large work being
nearly finished, or to other causes, it
is unnecessary to keep back large
deductions, so that the present rule
appears to be all that is required.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obt servant

L. Beatty. Colonel R.E.
Supy. Engineer IV Circle

BB

364(6)
ear-
of
n of
w

11 Nov 1916

PWC No 4618

FROM

COLONEL J. BEATTY R. E.,
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
FOURTH CIRCLE.

(2)

Dated. } 15th June 1887.
Recd: } 17.6.87

No. 251
EW

No 1768 w a 2^d July 1887

ENCL: 1

Calcutta-Vayidri Road

Offering his observations on the Engineer's Office Note regarding the reduction of the deductions from 10 to 5 per cent which he has authorised from the Bills of the contractors of the —.

div.

Orders are requested on two points:-

1/ whether a S.E. has power under 1364 (b) to reduce the percentage in the case of a large contract which has been accepted by the Chief Engineer.

2/ whether 5% is the minimum security, and if so whether the Code para should be ~~not~~ altered as it is not quite clear on the point.

HB.

18/6/87.

Please see India Code Ch. VIII. para 21 & S.O. 38 of 1886.

cast n.s.

IV

It seems to me very undesirable that the power of S.E.s in regard to Contracts & the Security required should be curtailed - The S.E.s are the officers responsible for the work being properly carried out, and they are the best judges of the Security required from the Contractors.

Any attempt at increasing the amount of control over the S.E.s, would I ~~think~~ think be most unhelpfully considered, as in such cases it must be a step in the wrong direction

W.C.

21.6.57

These papers right be
used into time in linked file.
We don't add deals into file.

C's note 164 & 1.6.57 is
going to City today
with draft order.
This file should be
linked to it.

11/11

3. In 692W 5.3.87 3022 16.11.86 In 3824C
In 653C 25.2.87 7914792W 24.3.87 7/11.10.87

1887.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Current No. 4166

From

The Examiner

P. W. Accts.

ENCLOS.—

No. 164

Dated 1st June 1887

Received 2—do—

SUBJECT.

Offering remarks —
Regarding the reduction
of the percentage withheld
from Messrs. Mitchell &
Mackenzie, Contractors for
the Calicut - Vaythiri road,
to 5 p.c. of the value of
work done by them.

DISPOSAL.

No. 1939 Dated 9th June 1887

Referred to the Suptg.
Engineer, IV circle, for
remarks. Messrs Mitchell
& Mackenzie's tender
was accepted by the Chief
Engineer in Memo. No. 363E
dated 14th July 1885.

(By order)

(Sd) W. L. C. Baddeley

For R. E.

21.6.87 24/6/87

21.6.87 21.7.87

3. 692W 5-3-87 3. 2021W 16-11-86 3. 3824C
653C 25-2-87 7914712W 24-3-87 9711-10-87

N^o 3524C d/ 11-10-86
B N^o 692W " 5-3-87
N^o 655C " 25-2-87
" 418C " 5-2-87
" 111C " 13-1-87
B. " 6W " 6-1-87
" 3077W " 20-11-86
" 3031-32W " 16-11-86
" 791-2 W " 24-3-86
G.O. N^o 155W " 19-1-85
N^o 2181C " 17-12-85
G.O. N^o 1527W " 1-7-85
" 806W " 31-3-85
" 1356W " 10-6-85
A
" 3043W " 12-12-84
" 524W " 26-2-84

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

N^o 1768W
PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 2^d July 1887

READ the following

Office Note from the Examiner P. W. Accounts N^o 164 d/ 1st June 1887.
Letter from the Suply Engineer IV Circle N^o 251 d/ 15th June 1887.
Office Note from the Examiner P. W. Accounts N^o 229 d/ 18 June 1887.

The Govt are of opinion that
under Code para 1364 (b) a Suply
Engineer has the power to reduce
the security to any percentage
not less than 5 per cent, even
though the contract was beyond
his powers of acceptance.

2. The Code para quoted 1364 (b)
appears to be sufficiently clear.
It lays down a maximum of
10 per cent and a minimum of

5 per