

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 20
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 18-5-1989
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 10/10

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

பெரியவாணத்தி குறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	1475 W	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	28-5-1890	1890

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Account.

READ—the following paper :—

Office note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 2nd May 1890, No. 2500.

With reference to para. 4 of G.O., No. 2568 W. of 17th September 1889, I submit an abstract or analysis of information furnished by Executive Engineers regarding the procedure in connection with loans of tools to contractors and others.

2. Executive Engineers were not asked to report under any specified heads, and the heads of information under which the abstract has been arranged were drawn up only after receipt and examination of the reports. The information is consequently very incomplete under almost every head; but it is quite sufficient to show that there is a great, and I think undesirable, variety of procedure, and in some details the procedure in some cases seems decidedly open to objection. Also the information obtained is, I think, sufficient for the purpose in view.

3. The first question to be decided seems to be whether it is necessary to allow the practice at all, or whether, as one officer suggests, contractors should not in all cases be required to make their own arrangements. Should the latter view be adopted, the simplest plan would be to prohibit the practice altogether, except perhaps in connection with famine works, or (and then only as a very temporary measure) in connection with emergencies involving risk to life or property, *e.g.*, repairs of breaches in tank or canal banks.

4. If, on the other hand, it is considered necessary or desirable to recognize the practice, then the following procedure would, I think, be found to give all necessary security with the minimum of trouble :—

(a) Require in all cases a deposit (beforehand) of the full value of the tools lent, and charge *for use* (any damage being separately paid for) a practically prohibitory rate of hire, that is to say, a rate which will effectually prevent contractors making a regular practice of providing themselves with tools by such means, without however preventing them from borrowing them for a short time, in an emergency, pending receipt of their own supplies.

(b) In fixing the amount of deposit allow something for the trouble to the department on issue and return of tools.

(c) Let the scales whether for deposit or hire (the latter at so many pias for every month or week or for any part of a month or week) be fixed once for all (uniformly for all divisions), at so much for each description of tools ordinarily lent, so that the rates (together with other conditions of the loan) may be easily shown (printed for the most part) on the form of receipt to be taken from the contractor.

(d) Have a special form of receipt, to be taken from the contractor, and print on it the conditions of the loan.

(e) Let the deposit be repayable (subject to necessary deductions for hire and damage) only on production by the contractor of (1) the original deposit receipt and (2) a receipt by a storekeeper or other subordinate for the tools returned, said receipt to state damage if any.

(f) Write all tools off returns when lent, and bring them on again when received back.

(g) Keep no record except (and this probably in divisional office) the file of receipts for tools lent, on each of which should be noted the number and date of the corresponding deposit receipt, whilst each deposit receipt should quote the date and divisional office file number of the corresponding (previously given) receipt for tools.

(h) Prohibit any mixing up of tool loan transactions and transactions connected with contracts, the legality of any deduction from a contract bill on account of tools lent being questionable unless specially provided for.

(i) Have all tools suitably marked in future; but it seems doubtful whether the receipts could conveniently be made to show the year of issue (*i.e.*, manufacture I suppose) of each lot of tools.

ENCLOSURE.

ANALYSIS of information furnished by twenty-nine Executive Engineers regarding the procedure in connection with the lending of tools to contractors and others, with reference to para. 2 of G.O., No. 2568 W., dated 17th September 1889.

(a) *Frequency of practice.*—In four divisions there is no such practice; in five it is stated to be very rare; as regards the remainder there is no specific information as to frequency, but it exists in all of them.

(b) *Authority for lending.*—In five divisions tools are lent on the authority of sub-divisional officers or subordinates; in two divisions on authority of Executive Engineer only; for eighteen divisions there is no specific information.

(c) *Whether receipts are taken.*—Apparently receipts are taken in all cases.

(d) *Record.*—In three divisions the receipts are stated to be registered and filed in the office of the sub-divisional officer or subordinate concerned; in two divisions the same is done in the divisional office; in one division a personal ledger is kept (apparently in the divisional office); in two divisions it is stated that no record is kept (but presumably the receipts are filed); for seventeen divisions there is no specific information.

(e) *Security taken.*—In six divisions a deposit of the full book value of the tools is taken; in one division a deposit is taken according to a fixed scale (one rupee for a mamooty and apparently 8 annas for any other tool); in one division the subordinate concerned is held personally responsible; in eight divisions no security is taken, but if the tools are not returned their value is recovered from sums due on contracts, &c.; for nine divisions there is no specific information.

(f) *Charge for use.*—In one division a prohibitory charge (scale not stated) is made; in three divisions it is stated that no charge is made; in two divisions the value of damage done is said to be recovered on return; and for nineteen divisions there is no specific information.

(g) *Procedure in respect of Tools and Plant returns.*—In one division the lent tools are said to be noted in the remark column of the tools and plant returns; in three divisions they are treated like any other tools; in two divisions they are borne on the return like other tools treating the contractor's receipt as a substitute for the tools; in one division they are treated as issued to the subordinate concerned; for nineteen divisions there is no specific information.

(h) *Whether tool loan transactions are mixed up with contract transactions.*—It appears that this is very commonly done.

(i) *Suggestions by Executive Engineers.*—Several officers suggest that the tools be written off the returns, and their value charged to contractors by deduction from bills for work; others suggest a deposit of full value and a percentage charge for use; one suggests a deposit of one-fourth or one-eighth of value, and a charge (apparently irrespective of time) of 3 to 6 pies per tool; two officers suggest that all tools be marked with the Government mark and with the year of issue, the latter to prevent substitution of old tools for new; one officer suggests that contractors should make their own arrangements.

(Signed) C. H. P. CHRISTIE, Major, R.E.,
Examiner of Public Works Accounts, Madras.

Office note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated 17th May 1890, No. 2849.

ORDER—dated 28th May 1890, No. 1475 W., Public Works.

The Government considers that the practice of lending tools to contractors is objectionable, and leads to complications, and that ordinary tools, such as mamooties,

picks and crowbars which are in common use, should in no case be lent to contractors, who should be required to make their own arrangements for the supply of such articles.

2. Tools not readily procurable in the local market should, if available in Government stores, be lent to contractors only in cases of real emergency, and in such cases a deposit to the extent of the full value of the articles should be obtained.

3. The substance of this order will be embodied in the Public Works Code.

(True Extract.)

Captain, R.E.,
Under-Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To Superintending Engineers.
To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Chief Engineer, Periyár Project.
" Consulting Architect to Government.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. J. Moses
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of {1890} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated May, 28th.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 28th May 1890, No. 1475 W.

MAY.

Tools

Passing orders on the subject of lending
— to contractors.

2 MAY 1890

ENCLOSURE

ACCOUNTS

No. 2177 C.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Madras, 8th May 1890.

OFFICE NOTE.

From

W

To

C

Please state if
you have not misquoted
G.O. No. 2568 W of 17th Sept.
1889 in your office
Note No. 2500 of 2nd
May 1890 - the subject
of Good Tools being
lent to Contractors
having apparently
been disposed of
in No. 1357 C of 15th
March 1889.

W. S. S. 90
D.W.

No. 2549 d/17.5.90

P.W. C. No. 4723

To W.

G.O. No. 2568 W. of 17th. September 1889 is not a misquotation. In para 4 of this G.O. my proposal to report separately on items 27 and 28 of the summary of inspection report of Presidency Division (regarding procedure in lending tools and plant to contractors) was approved of, and it was with reference to this that I reported on the matter in my office note No. 2500 dated 2nd. May 1890.

C.

11/11
17/5

Memo 2177 C d/ 8.5.90
fr. Bns 1225 W d/ 24.4.90
Memo no 5931 C d/ 17.12.89
fr. Bns 454 W d/ 11.2.90 sent to C.P.D. on 16.6.90
" " 3595 W d/ 10.12.89
" " 2568 W d/ 17.9.89
Memo. 2385 C d/ 17.5.89
" " 1357 C d/ 15.3.89
fr. Bns 2315 W d/ 15.10.88
" " 2567 W d/ 20.8.88
Memo no 3119 C d/ 16.2.88
" " 1835 C d/ 9.5.88

0/30/5

4
11/75

W.

In office note No. 2229 of 14th Sept 1889, the Engineer brought forward the subject of lending tools to contractors, but Col. Mead considered that the matter should lie over in reference to G.O. 3315 W of 18th Oct 1889 - an order which was rendered necessary by the mass of general questions brought forward by the Engineer.

The question referred to above has now come up again in consequence of the remark in para 4 of G.O. 2568 W of 17th Sept 1889 and evidently there has been a deal of correspondence between the Engineer and the Executive Engineer on the subject.

Looking at the replies received from the Executive Engineer I think it would be a mistake to pass any general orders at all with a view to uniformity of practice. The Executive Engineer will lend tools to a contractor if the contractor can provide them for himself.

The matter might either be postponed indefinitely with reference to G.O. 3315 W of 18th Oct 1889 or else an order might

might issue to the effect that
Government desires to dis-
courage the practice of
lending tools to contractors,
except in emergency cases,
and it looks to Executive
Engineers to carry out
the spirit of this rule by
refusing to supply con-
tractors who are unable
to provide their own tools.

W. S. 90

I have always considered
that the rule is not to be
applied to the extent of
refusing tools to contractors
who are unable to provide
their own tools, but that
the rule is to be applied
to the extent of refusing
tools to contractors who
are unable to provide
their own tools.

W. S. 90

20/6
2901

C. No. 6311
5460
02152 VII
1475
9.11
11.11

[C. No. 8.]

GOVT.
OF MADRAS.

1890.

P. W.
DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 2nd May 1890.

OFFICE NOTE No. 2500

To

W.

With reference to para 2 of G.O.
No. 2568 W. of 17th. September 1889, I
submit an abstract or analysis of in-
formation furnished by Executive Engi-
neers regarding the procedure in con-
nection with loans of tools to contrac-
tors and others.

2. Executive Engineers were not ask-
ed to report under any specified heads,
and the heads of information under which
the abstract has been arranged were
drawn up only after receipt and exami-
nation of the reports. The information
is consequently very incomplete under
almost every head; but it is quite suf-
ficient to show that there is a great,
and I think undesirable, variety of pro-
cedure, and in some details the proce-
dure in some cases seems decidedly open
to objection. Also the information ob-
tained is, I think, sufficient for the
purpose in view.

3. The first question to be decid-
ed seems to be whether it is necessary

KEEP-WITH

Genl. No.

dated

189

to allow the practice at all, or whether, as one officer suggests, contractors should not in all cases be required to make their own arrangements. Should the latter view be adopted, the simplest plan would be to prohibit the practice altogether, except perhaps in connection with famine works, or (and then only as a very temporary measure) in connection with emergencies involving risk to life or property, e.g. repairs of breaches in tank or canal banks.

4. If on the other hand it is considered necessary or desirable to recognize the practice, then the following procedure would, I think, be found to give all necessary security with the minimum of trouble.

(a) Require in all cases a deposit (beforehand) of the full value of the tools lent, and charge for use (any damage being separately paid for) a practically prohibitory rate of hire, that is to say a rate which will effectually prevent contractors making a regular practice of providing themselves with tools by such means, without however preventing them from borrowing them for a short time, in an emergency, pending receipt of their own supplies.

(b) In fixing the amount of deposit allow something for the trouble to the department on issue and

6
1475
return of tools.
(c) Let the scales whether for deposit or hire (the latter at so many pices for every month or week or for any part of a month or week) be fixed once for all (uniformly for all divisions), at so much for each description of tools ordinarily lent, so that the rates (together with other conditions of the loan) may be easily shown (printed for the most part) on the form of receipt to be taken from the contractor.
(d) Have a special form of receipt, to be taken from the contractor, & print on it the conditions of the loan.
(e) Let the deposit be repayable (subject to necessary deductions for hire and damage) only on production by the contractor of (1) the original deposit receipt and (2) a receipt by a storekeeper or other subordinate for the tools returned, said receipt to state damage if any.
(f) Write all tools off returns when lent, and bring them on again when received back.
(g) Keep no record except (and this probably in divisional office) the file of receipts for tools lent, on each of which should be noted the No. and date of the corresponding deposit receipt, whilst each deposit receipt should quote the date

and divisional office file No. of the corresponding (previously given) receipt for tools.

(h) Prohibit any mixing up of tool loan transactions & transactions connected with contracts; the legality of any deduction from a contract bill on account of tools lent being questionable unless specially provided for.

(i) Have all tools suitably marked in future; but it seems doubtful whether the receipts could conveniently be made to show the year of issue (i.e. manufacture I suppose) of each lot of tools.

4/5

C.

4/5

Di/s

(enclure)

PAC No 4185

B 3. 5. 90
E. 1

Analysis of information furnished by 29 Executive Engineers regarding the procedure in connection with the lending of tools to Contractors and others, with reference to para 2 of G. O. No 2568 W, dated 17th September 1889 —

(A) Frequency of practice. In 4 divisions there is no such practice; in 5 it is stated to be very rare, as regards the remainder there is no specific information as to frequency, but it exists in all of them.

(B) Authority for lending. In 5 divisions tools are lent on the authority of Sub Divisional Officers or Subordinates; in 2 divisions on authority of Executive Engineer only; for 18 divisions there is no specific information.

(C) Whether receipts are taken. Apparently receipts are taken in all cases.

(D) Record. In 3 divisions the receipts are stated to be registered and filed in the office of the Sub Divisional Officer or Subordinate concerned; in 2 divisions the same is done in the Divisional Office, in one division a personal ledger is kept (apparently in the Divisional Office); in 2 divisions it is stated that no record is kept (but presumably the receipts are filed); for 17 divisions there is no specific information.

(E) Security taken. In 6 divisions a deposit of the full book value of the tools is taken; in 1 division a deposit is taken according to a fixed scale (1 rupee for a masonry and apparently 8 annas for ~~every~~ ^{any} other tool); in 1 division the subordinate concerned is held personally responsible; in 8 divisions no security is taken, but if the tools are not returned their value is recovered from sums due on

contracts

Contract 42, for 9 divisions there is no specific information.

(F) Charge for use. In one division a prohibitory charge (scale not stated) is made, in 3 divisions it is stated that no charge is made, in 2 divisions the value of damage done is said to be recovered on return; and for 19 divisions there is no specific information.

(G) Procedure in respect of Tools and Plant returns. In one division the lent tools are said to be noted in the remark column of the Tools and Plant returns; in 3 divisions they are treated like any other tools; in 2 divisions they are borne on the return like other tools treating the Contractor's receipt as a substitute for the tools; in one division they are treated as issued to the subordinate concerned; for 19 divisions there is no specific information.

(H) Whether tool loan transactions are mixed up with contract transactions. It appears that this is very commonly done.

(I) Suggestions by Executive Engineers. Several officers suggest that the tools be written off the returns, and their value charged to Contractors by deduction from bills for work; others suggest a deposit of full value and a percentage charge for use; one suggests a deposit of $\frac{1}{4}$ or $\frac{1}{8}$ of value, and a charge (apparently irrespective of time) of 3 to 6 pias per tool; two officers suggest that all tools be marked with the Government mark, and with the year of issue, the latter to prevent substitution of old tools for new.

420.
now, one officer suggests that contractors should make their own arrangements.

8/14/75

[Signature] Major R. E.
Examiner of P. W. Accounts, Madras

51/5
50/5

for the supply of such articles.

~~Done~~

10
1475

2. Tools not readily procurable in the local market should, if available in Government stores, be lent to contractors only in cases of real emergency, and in such cases a deposit to the extent of the full value of the articles should be obtained.

Recd
25 May

210/6

3. The substance of this order ^{will} be embodied in the P.W. Order.

Suply Engineers ✓
Ch: Engr for S. P. Engr
Ch: Engr for P. P. Engr
Cons: Architect to Govt
Engrs to Engrs

Can

Prud

23.5.50

26.5.50

4722.

26-9-23 B111

Govt. of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Date

Recd.

By

G.O. 28th May 1890 No. 1475W.

Tools.

Passing orders on
the subject of lending
to Contractors.

1890
1475

1003

220/5
220/5