

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 28
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 16.1.89
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 10/1

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P.W.D துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	1989 W	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	21. 7. 1890	198 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

1989
1

21st JULY 1890, No. 1989 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Account.

READ—again the following paper :—

G.O., dated 28th May 1890, No. 1475 W., Public Works.

Read—also the following papers :—

From the Chief Engineer, Periyár Project, dated 20th June 1890, No. 1006 P. E.
From the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, dated 25th June 1890, No. 651 T. J.

ORDER—dated 21st July 1890, No. 1989 W., Public Works.

On reconsideration, the Government resolves to exempt piece workers and petty contractors from the operation of G.O., No. 1475 W., dated 28th May 1890. To such classes tools may be lent at the discretion of Executive Engineers, on such terms as they may choose to impose.

(True Extract.)

Major, R.E.,
Ag. 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. A. Aubert.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ACCOUNT.

Gobt. of 1890 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated July, 21st.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 21st July 1890, No. 1989 W.

JULY.

Lending of Tools

Authorising Executive Engineers to lend tools to piece workers and petty contractors at their discretion.

1989
Office of the Chief Engineer
Public Works
Kodaikanal 20 June 1890
Of 22

From

Colonel J. Perryman R.E.,
Chief Engineer Public Works

To

The Chief Engineer

P.W. Department.

Sir,

With reference to G.O. No. 1475 W. of 28 May 1890 I have the honor to enquire whether the term "contractor" is used in the same restricted sense as the term "contract" in para 1344 of the Code, or in the more extended sense which includes pieceworkers and petty contractors.

2 If the former, the course enjoined by the order in question is practically the one followed at present, as tools are very rarely lent to large

Contractors

Contractors.

3. If however the term is used in the latter sense I would earnestly solicit a reconsideration of the order, the enforcement of which will in many cases interfere with, if not entirely prevent, the employment of a most useful class of men, who have command of a small quantity of labour but who have not the capital necessary to purchase tools or even to give security for their full value if borrowed from Government.

4. Any interference with the employment of this class of contractors would be much to be regretted; for petty works they form by far the best, and in many cases the only possible agency, and even on larger works carried out by regular contracts they are often the real working contractors, the superior contractors being

1984/3
being ^{more} middlemen, who do little more than accept the financial responsibility in return for which they intercept a percentage of the prices out of all proportion to the real value of their services.

5. At the Peninsular I have no hesitation in saying that the enforcement of the order in question would very seriously increase the difficulty of carrying out work.

6. Whatever may be the theoretical objections to the loan of tools to petty contractors, in practice it frequently is of great use in facilitating and cheapening the execution of work, and I am bound to say that within my own experience I have never known it to lead to serious complications, tools are occasionally lost by contractors but their value is almost always recovered without difficulty, and I shall be surprised to

to hear that the average annual loss to Government from the existing practice amounts to any considerable sum.

7. The Examiner in para 2 of his note speaks of "great and undesirable variety of procedure," but the conditions under which, and the agency by which, work has to be executed, vary so much that variety of procedure is not only desirable but necessary; it is uniformity that would be undesirable.

8. I deprecate and have always deprecated any unnecessary fettering of Executive officers by hard and fast rules, and in this case I submit that the existing procedure, with all its variety, works well in practice and that no necessity has been shown for any interference with the

the discretion of Executive Engineers who can be trusted, subject to the general control of the Superintending Engineers to decide whether and under what conditions tools should be lent to a contractor. The only general condition necessary seems to be that they should not be lent without the sanction of the Executive Engineers.

9. Uniformity of records is however a different thing from uniformity of action, and though the latter is not desirable the former is; on this point the opinions of the Examiner would have a value which does not attach to his opinions on the question of practice.

10. I have the less hesitation in asking for a reconsideration of the order under discussion as it appears to have been passed without any reference to
Superintending

Superintending Engineers, of the
twenty nine Executive Engineers
consulted only one appears to
have suggested that the loan
of tools to contractors should be
prohibited and I am convinced
that an equally small proportion
of Superintending Engineers
would hold this view.

11 It is usual for the reports
and opinions of Executive
Engineers upon all matters of
executive practice to be submitted
to Government through the Super-
intending Engineers, and it is
to be regretted that the usual
course was departed from in this
instance. Had it been followed
Government would have had the
benefit of opinions based on
practical experience and have
avoided the appearance of discourtesy
to the senior officers of the department.

I have the honor to be
your most ^{Sir,} obedient Servant
J. B. [Signature] Col. R. E.
to his Eng. Secy. & Proprietor

No 1006. P.L.

From,

The Chief Engineer
Peninsular Railway

To,

The Chief Engineer
P.R.S.

Dated 20: }
Received 24: } June/90

Enc.

Loan of Tools to Contractors
Solicits reconsideration
of the order passed regarding
the — for the reasons
stated within —

P. No. 1475 W 720.5 90

B. 1225 W 724.4 90

Munro 5731 C 7 17.12.87

Munro 2777 C 7 8.5.90

8250 C 7 14.2.90

5876 C 7 15.12.87

1357 C 7 15.3.89

P. No. 3315 W 718.10.88

2567 W 720.8.88

Munro 3490 C 7 10.8.88

1835 C 7 9.8.88

P. No. 746 W 75.3.88

4023 C 7 11.11.87

Munro 2240 C 7 9.7.87

2041 C 7 17.6.87

P. No. 2769 W 721.10.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

2855 W 713.7.86

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

6TH CIRCLE.

Camp. No. 25 June

1890

2/7

No. 6517.

From L. J. A. C. Smith R. E.

The Superintending Engineer,

6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer

P. W. D.

Madras

Sir,

ENCLOSURES.

With reference to G.O. No 1475 W dated
28th May 190, on the subject of loan
of Tools to Contractors, I have the honor
to state that I have circulated the same
to the various Divisions in this Circle
for observance —

2. At the same time I wish respectfully
to point out that I think the question
is more in the province of Superintending
Engineers than in that of the Inspectors.
The latter cannot possibly be aware
of the frequent necessity for lending
out tools & he appears to recommend,
on the suggestion of one Executive Officer
only, that the practice of lending
tools should be forbidden & on this

ret 22/7
O/S 146-VI
25/6

To Mr. Eng. J. J. A. C. Smith

1989
7

one suggestion apparently the Govt order
under reference is based on.

3. Had the various information been
collated by the proper head of
the Executive Branch in each Circle
viz the Supt. Engineer the practicability
or otherwise of the course now ordered
would have been fully discussed
and considered. As it is I am much
afraid the order now passed will
be, in many cases, very obstructive
to work.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

Albion L. Fiske
Supt. Engineer

Alb

8. Aug 14 75 W 7 28.5.90

P.W.C. 6311

P. W. D. 6th CIRCLE.

From

The Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

No. 65172.

Dated 25 } June 1889
Received 4 } Aug - 1890.

1989W

Enclosure.

Loan of Tools & Equipment

Refers that the order
forbidding the - will be
obstructive to work for
reasons given within.

5/7 M 24/7

C.A.W. 5960
6311 015520

Did last note
some remarks on
letter on the subject
of No 1006 P.W. 20/3/90
from Chf Engr. Permitt
saying that I wished
the P.O. on the subject
had been referred to
me for remarks before
issue & that I
concord with Col.
Pennycook's remarks
in his letter. I enclose
a memo to do so.

For
11/7/90

To J

The slip on which was
noted has now been
put up.

Your previous note
therein referred to was
written on the draft 50.
on the subject submitted
by C. which C. has
been asked to hold over.
C
11-7-90

5940

1989
10

Low

Ever orders.

Cir

26.6-50

Perhaps the rule may
be made up fairly.
I have mentioned, &
fully mentioned special
instruments & equipment; but
I think that a certain
deduction should be
made from each payment
towards the wear & tear
of the tools ^{the} such of their
value is
eventually paid off,
could become the property
of the workmen.

Quess

26.6-50

To I for remarks.

I think I have already written
a note on some document
connected with this subject.
Saying I wished I had been
consulted, as I do not remember
to have seen, about this P.O.
before it was issued. I am sorry

A proposal to
Mr. might be
made enabling
free riders fully
to trade for
the products of
the rule.

2709
 2709

P. W. D.

Letter from the Chief
Engineer Perimeter Project.
No. 1006 P.R. of 20.6.90.

80 from S. S. VII Circle 1/2
6.51 J. J. 25. 6.90.

For order with reference
to G.O. no 1675 of 28.5.90.

It is recommended that piece workers and petty contractors be exempted from the operation of the order.

Phen
10-7-80

5/17 Al 24/7

Dr

For orders

*Ang 52-VII
H. VII
H. VII*

Printed

No. 1989 Wd 31 July 1890

Genl
Sect

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

1989
13

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

again
Read the following

Proceedings in the P.W. Department N.E. No. 1475 Wd 28 May 1890

Read also

From the Chief Engr. Periyar Project N.E. No. 1006 P.R. 20 June 90

From the Supp Engr. III Circle N.E. No. 651 J 25 June 1890

On reconsideration
the Govt. resolves to
exempt piece workers and
petty contractors from the
operation of G.O. No. 1475 Wd
dated 28 May 1890. To such
classes tools may be lent
at the discretion of Executive
Engineers, on such terms as
they may choose to impose.

Pass

17.7.90

To Supp Engrs
Chief Engr for Muz
Chief Engr R. Project
Consgr. Archt. to Govt.
Examiners P.W. Accts.

Cur

5940. 6311

Govt. of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated

23/7

Recd.

Encl.

G.O. No. 2184 of 1890.

Lending of Tools.

Authorising Executive Engineer to lend tools to piece workers & petty Contractors at their discretion.

180.
12

120 24/7 23/7