(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 30

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 7.9.90.

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

132

P. W. D. துறை

அரசாணை எண்.
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 1069

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் : 17 - 4 - 1891 ~~198~~

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

15. Sheets

[illegible], கா-1—18,006—15-6-87.

No. 719 S.E. North Arcot Division office,
19th March 1891.

From,
Major C. C. Rawson, R.E.,
Executive Engineer,
North Arcot Division,

1069/1

To,
The Superintending Engineer,
4th Circle.

Sir,

With reference to your No. $\frac{215}{N.A.}$ of 16th March 1891 on G.O., No. 697 W of 11th March 1891, I have the honor to point out,

1st. That I had not two months to arrange for carrying out the work under reference. I received G.O. No. 301 W, dated 2nd February 1891 on the 21st February.

2nd. That I did not propose to delay putting the work in hand. On the 22nd February 1891, I wrote to the Arni Sub Divisional officer to send in the name of a good contractor who was willing to take up the work at once allowing a discount of 2½ per cent on estimated rates. I received the Sub Divisional officer's reply on the 7th March and on the 12th March I wrote to the Contractor

A

A. Theperumal Mudaliar of Arni to come to the office and sign the bond but he has not yet come.

3. I most respectfully beg to point out that in my opinion it would be impossible to spend Rs 4120 on masonry in the Wandiwash Taluq in the space of 5 weeks. I have first to find a contractor and then to get him to sign the bond. Stone has to be collected and lime burned before the work can be started.

4. Labor is exceedingly difficult to get in Wandiwash notwithstanding the scarcity. I am very doubtful indeed whether, I shall be able to spend the grant of Rs 4000 for the Chegar main channel before the end of the official year from want of labor, and this grant was given on 22nd February 1891 and it is certainly easier to spend money on Earth-work than on masonry.

5. I again request that you will move Government to withdraw the grant of Rs 4120 made during the current official year for this work. I cannot spend this amount in the time at

my disposal. I shall probably have to find a new Contractor as the one named by the Sub divisional officer does not appear to be willing to sign the bond.

6. I regret very much my conduct in this matter is not approved of by Government. I think, if the Chief Engineer will compare the expenditure in this Division during the current official year and the one before it, with the expenditure in the Division during the few years previous to 1889-90, he will find that I am not in the habit of giving up money because I do not want the trouble of spending it.

7. The work will be put in hand as soon as possible.

I have &ca,
(Sd) C.C. Rawson, Major R.E.,
Executive Engineer, N.A. Dn.

No. $\frac{146}{\text{E.W.}}$ of 23-3-91

Copy- Submitted to the Chief Engineer, P.W. Department with reference to G.O., No. 697W of 11th March 1891.

2. The G.O. referred to in para one of the foregoing letter was received in this office

1069/3

office while the undersigned was out in Camp on the 16th February and reached the Executive Engineer on the 21st idem.

3. In these circumstances the Explanation offered by the Executive Engineer is considered satisfactory and the undersigned recommends the acceptance of the surrender of the grant Viz: Rs 4,120 for the current year for the work.

Rneddale. Buchman,
Lt Col: R.E.
Supg. Engineer, 4 Circle.

P.W.C. No. 3327

From
The Supg. Engr.
4. Circle

No. 697 W d/ 11-3-91
301 W d/ 2.2.91

Dated 23.
Despd. 23. } March 1891
Rd. 24.3.91

No. $\frac{146}{E.W.}$

Arni Vandemash Road

Submitting copy of letter from the Ex. Engr. North Arcot Dn. giving explanation for giving up the grant for constg. a road dam on the —

Circ.
H.M.
26/3
R 28/3
R.7. 4.91
ordy 4-4-91

H.M.

For orders with reference to the remarks on the draft order on C No. 2443.

0043
25.3.91

267

This is rather fine. Major [illegible] received the G.O. on the 21st Feby. and on the following day he wrote the Sub Division Officer to get a contractor. But on the very same day, 22nd Feb. he also wrote to the Supd. Engineer to surrender the grant. A wise precaution which shows I think that he had no intention of spending the money. And what a curious way of giving out works! He asks the Sub division officer, who makes the estimate, to send up the name of a good contractor who will do the work 2½% less than the estimate rates. If this is the way contracts are disposed of in the P.W.D. I don't wonder that estimate rates go up, & that Sub division officers retire on fortunes.

27 Mar.

For orders 1069/4

The undersigned has the honour to request further instructions in connection with the subject of the Hon'ble's note of the 27th Inst., as he regrets that he is unable to deduce an order from that note and is doubtful whether he clearly understands the Hon'ble's meaning —

So far as the remainder of the grant is concerned Major Rennie's explanation appears completely and entirely satisfactory. He received the order sanctioning the estimate on the 21st Feby and at once took steps for giving out the work on execution of the same contract: at the same time, seeing that he could not spend any appreciable portion of the grant before the 3rd March he very properly reported the fact and surrendered the grant. It is not clear what more he could have done, and the undersigned thinks that the Hon. Member's remark that "he had no intention of spending the money" must have been made under a misapprehension. The fact was that he saw that he could not spend the money.

A certain amount of delay is inevitable when works are executed by contract; even if tenders are not called for by public advertisement, the contractor has to be selected and the agreement drawn up; the contractor has to make his arrangements for starting work, and a

1069 // 3

further delay occurs, and possibly also takes place before any payment is made. It is rarely the case that a considerable amount of work is done without any actual expenditure being incurred.

The undersigned has no hesitation in saying that there is nothing whatever in this case to indicate the smallest unnecessary delay on the Executive Engineer's part ~~to~~ in [illegible] getting the work started and considers that he should be told that his explanation is entirely satisfactory.

With regard to the giving out of the contract it may be admitted that in theory an Executive Engineer should select ~~his own~~ contractors for himself, but practically especially in the more distant parts of a large division he must depend to some extent on his subordinates for information as to the character and competence of contractors. ~~This account is not confined to the P.W. Department~~

The practice of tendering at a percentage on the estimate rates is one that the undersigned ~~formerly~~ personally dislikes very much, and which he has never ~~adopted~~ allowed in his own practice as an Executive or Superintending Engineer, but it is not forbidden by rule, it saves a great deal of trouble, and is well understood by native contractors; so there can hardly attach to any officer for following it –

The last sentence of the S.E.'s note the undersigned truly regrets to say he is entirely unable to understand. – ~~why~~ It is not clear why the acceptance of a tender at ~~a~~ rates below those of estimate should cause the latter to rise ~~is not clear~~ +

~~1089~~ 6

~~rise as a matter of~~

+ The undersigned is not acquainted with any "notorious officers" who have "retired on fortunes" nor does he believe that any considerable number of such cases exist. The subordinates of the P.W.D. are probably no more immaculate than those of the Revenue or other Departments, and among a large number it is possible that some corrupt individuals may exist, but when sweeping charges of corruption against a whole body of public [illegible] are brought, the bringer is liable to be challenged to prove them –

G. 21.7

3327
9406.15

1069
7

tender at rates below those of an estimate should cause the latter to rise. The undersigned is not acquainted with any "subdivision Officers" who have "retired on fortunes" nor does he believe that any considerable number of such cases exist. The subordinates of the P.W. Dept. are probably no more immaculate than those of the Revenue or other Departments, and among a large number it is possible that some corrupt individuals may exist, but ~~when sweeping~~ if a general charge~~s~~ of corruption is ~~are~~ brought against

the
~~a~~ whole body of public ~~accounts, the Engineer is likely~~ to ~~be challenged to prove them.~~

it will be the duty of the undersigned to ask for a formal enquiry into the matter.

S

W
5.4

Forward

Permit the Govt
[illegible]
view [illegible]

S

1069/8

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

READ the following :—

Letter from the Supg Engr., 1st circle, No 146 Est dated 23rd March 1891.

FOR ORDERS.

I think this note shows that Mr. Pennycuick very clearly understood my meaning.

I do not consider Major Rawson's Explanation satisfactory.. Even on the 21st Feb. he had five ~~also~~ weeks ~~at~~ least before him before the close of the official year, but though he wrote to get a contractor he at the same time surrendered the grant, which showed pretty clearly that whatever the result of the Subdivision Officer's proceedings in regard to a contractor, he was not going to spend the money.

As to the practice of allowing Sub division Officers to make Estimates and to "find" contractors willing to execute the work at rates below the Estimate, it seems to me that Mr. Pennycuick must be very [illegible] if he cannot see that it [illegible] a premium on high Estimates

The undersigned has the honor to request further instructions in connection with the subject of the Hon'ble Member's note of the 27th March, as he regrets that he is unable to draft an order from that note and is doubtful whether he clearly understands the Hon'ble Member's meaning.

So

2. So far as the surrender of the grant is concerned Major Rawson's explanation appears completely and entirely satisfactory. He received the order sanctioning the estimate on the 21st February and at once took steps for giving out the execution of the work on contract; at the same time, seeing that he could not spend any appreciable portion of the grant before the 31st March he very properly reported the fact and surrendered the grant. It is not clear what more he could have done, and the undersigned thinks that the Hon'ble Member's remark that "he had no intention of spending the money"! must have been made under a misapprehension. The fact was that he saw that he could not spend the money.

and on corrupt selection of contractors, and should therefore be entirely forbidden. I dare say it saves trouble and is well understood by native contractors but there are not points in its favour if it tends as it obviously must to waste of public money.

Ues
7.6.

3. A certain amount of delay is inevitable when works are executed by contract; even if tenders are not called for by public advertisement, the contractor has to be selected, and the agreement drawn up; the contractor has to make

They ought to be, and contracts should be allotted by the Executive Engineers alone.

Ues

his arrangements for starting work, and a further delay may and generally does take place before any payment is made. It is nearly always the case that a considerable amount of work is done without any actual expenditure being incurred.

4. The undersigned has no hesitation in saying that there is nothing whatever in this case to indicate the smallest unnecessary delay on the Executive Engineer's part in getting the work started, and considers that he should be told that

his explanation is entirely satisfactory.

5. With regard to the giving out of the contract it may be admitted that in theory an Executive Engineer should select contractors for himself, but practically (especially in the more distant parts of a large division) he must depend to some extent on his subordinates for information as to the character and competence of contractors.

6. The practice of tendering at a percentage on the estimate rates is one that the undersigned personally

dislikes very much and which he has never allowed in his own practice as an Executive or Superintending Engineer, but it is not forbidden by rule, it saves a great deal of trouble, and is well understood by native contractors; no blame can possibly attach to any Officer for following it.

7. The undersigned regrets to say that he is positively unable to understand the last sentence of the Hon'ble Member's Note. It is not clear why the acceptance of a tender at rates below those of our estimate should cause the latter to rise. The undersigned is not acquainted with any "Sub-division Officers" who have "retired on fortunes" nor does he believe that any considerable number of such cases exist. The subordinates of the P.W. Dept. are probably no more immaculate than those of the Revenue or other Departments, and among a large number it is possible that some corrupt individuals may exist, but if a general charge of corruption is brought against the whole body it will be the duty of

the undersigned to ask for a formal enquiry into the matter.

S

W.

4.4

OLS 40.4

Hw. 6.4.91

OOby 4-4-91

The undersigned has the honor to re-submit the papers bearing the Hon. Member's notes of 27 March & 7 April with the request that he will kindly reconsider the case.

2 In the most favorable places it will take some 3 or 4 weeks from the time of ~~th~~ issuing advertisements to get the contracts duly signed, & works started & the E.E. explains that in Wandiwash it is difficult to get a contractor at all, & it certainly would have been very difficult to get a contractor willing to bind himself down to spend any considerable portion of the Rs 4120 within a fortnight or so of the acceptance of his tender, especially in such a locality reported by the E.E. to be very

deficient in labor supply

The E.E. taking these things into consideration very properly, I submit, surrendered the allotment (Please note that by so doing he did not bind himself to do no work; any E.E. in such circumstances wd. do his best to push on the work – as soon as possible – & make payments therefor ~~[illegible]~~ on the 1st April from the next years grant – such cases constantly occur –)

3 E.E.s are always reprimanded when they "hang on" to allotments too long – even in some cases when they have every reason for hoping to show expenditure – & it seems scarcely fair to blame a man for surrendering in time when he ~~too~~ saw no hope of showing any expenditure in the current year

4 Another circumstance to be considered is – supposing the contractor had been able in a week or two to show any work capable of measurement, the SDO might not have had time at the last moment to go & check measure it & get the bills made out & without this no payments could have been made.

5 Major Rawson has shown good work since ~~his~~ holding ~~of~~ this Divn. & may feel disheartened if he is somewhat unjustly blamed & it is requested that the Hon. Mem. may be pleased to withdraw his censure

6 As to the matter of giving out contracts in the manner objected to, such cases are rare & as far as I know have never led to any waste of public money, & generally, much more care is now shown in these matters than formerly

A.W. 10/4

CN° 3327
H10 11. W

Fair copy for W.
[illegible]
10.4.91

1088
14

P. W. Department

Read the following:—

Letters from the Supg. Engineer, IV Circle, No. 146 EW dated 23rd March 1891

For Orders

The undersigned has the honor to re-submit the papers bearing the Hon'ble Member's notes of 27th March and 7th April with the request that he will kindly reconsider the case.

2. In the most favorable places it will take some three or four weeks from the time of issuing advertisements to get the contracts duly signed and work started, and the Executive Engineer explains that in Wandiwash it is difficult to

at all, and it certainly would have been very difficult to get a contractor

to get a contractor, willing to bind himself down to spend any considerable portion of the Rs 4120 within a fortnight or so of the acceptance of his tender, especially in such a locality, reported by the Executive Engineer to be very deficient in labor supply. The Executive Engineer taking these things into consideration very properly, I submit, surrendered the allotment. (Please note that by so doing he did not bind himself to do no work; any Executive Engineer in such circumstances would do his best to push on the work — as soon as possible — and make payments therefor, on the 1st April, from the next year's grant — such cases constantly occur.)

When vast numbers are reported to be wanting work!

Call upon Major Rawson to explain how it was that on the ~~very~~ day following that on which he received the orders he surrendered the grant.

3. Executive Engineers are always reprimanded when they "hang on" to allotments too long — even in some cases when they have every reason for hoping to show expenditure — and it seems scarcely fair to blame a man for surrendering in time when he saw his hope of showing any expenditure in the current year.

I don't think so. There is no need. They are always trying to get themselves acquitted which [illegible] for two months after as [illegible] during the last 2½ years.

1082/15

4. Another circumstance to be considered is — supposing the contractor had been able in a week or two to show any work capable of measurement, the Sub Divisional officer might not have had time at the last moment to go and check measure it and get the bills made out, and without this no payments could have been made.

5. Major Rawson has shown good work since holding this Division, and may feel disheartened if he is somewhat unjustly blamed, and it is requested that the Hon'ble Member may be pleased to withdraw his censure.

??

Vide supra

As

6. As to the matter of giving out contracts in the manner objected to, such cases are rare, and as far as I know have never led to any waste of public money; and generally, much more care is now shown in these matters than formerly.

A.C.A.

W

Very well. Let it slide.

Mo
12/4/91

132

B/
Dom orders
No. 1069 W d/ 17th April 1891

Recorded

A.C.A.
15/4

No. 301 W d/ 2-2-91
" 697 W " 11-3-91

13 May 91

(15)

H.W. 11.IV.91
W. Cowie 13.IV
M. 15.IV.91

C.B.
[illegible] 18/4
21/4