

(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 4

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் May 1990

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 6/2

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P.W.D.

துறை

அரசாணை எண்.

மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.

1507

0090

11

அச்சகம்

பலவகை

நாள் : 6/6/1893

198

மடிக்கவேண்டிய கையாளவேண்டிய கட்டாது

2 Sheets

S. Senthil Kumar

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following paper:—

G.O., dated 15th March 1893, Mis. No. 568 L., Local and Municipal.

Read—the following papers:—

From T. W. RAWLINS, Esq., C.S., Accountant-General, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 15th February 1893, No. L.F.D.-645.

With reference to G.O., Mis. No. 3030 L., dated the 23rd December 1892, I have the honour to state as follows.

2. The contents of the note of the Examiner of Public Works Accounts on paragraph 3 of G.O., No. 2414 L., dated 18th October 1892, have been communicated to all Presidents of District Boards for opinion in my Circular No. 2, dated 21st January 1893, and on receipt of their replies, I propose furnishing the report called for by Government.

3. As regards the Examiner's note on paragraph 2 of G.O., No. 2415 L., dated 18th October 1892, the objection urged at the end of the note to the Inspector's proposal in the case of large works spread over a series of years is not clearly understood. It is true that if the separate portions of such works given out each year were treated as separate works, and the contractor's account closed on the completion of each such portion, the Board would not have as strong a hold upon the contractor the following year for the continuance of the work as they would have if they retained his deposit. But, on the other hand, their hold on him would be no less than that upon contractors newly engaged for that year, who of course form the great majority. Again, the Examiner appears to assume the desirability of entrusting a work for several years to the same contractor at the same rates, whereas, particularly in districts like Ganjam where the opening of the railway is likely to largely influence the prices of both labour and material, it may frequently be found more economical to call for fresh tenders for the execution of successive portions of the same work every year.

4. If, however, this view does not commend itself to Government, I see no objection to the alternative suggested by the Examiner in paragraph 1 of the note in question.

Reference No. 107.

The Accountant-General is requested to return the papers forwarded to him with G.O., dated 23rd December 1892, No. 3030 L.

24th February 1893.

To the Accountant-General.

(Signed) A. T. PRINGLE,
Assistant Secretary.

1507
1
copy-1

From T. W. RAWLINS, Esq., C.S., Accountant-General, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort St. George, 3rd March 1893, No. L.F.D.-707.

With reference to Government memorandum, No. 107, dated the 24th February 1893, I have the honour to return the four enclosures received with G.O., No. 3030 L., dated 23rd December 1892, as requested.

Order—dated 15th March 1893, Mis. No. 568 L., Local and Municipal.

Paragraph 3 of the Accountant-General's letter, dated 15th February, will be referred to the Public Works Department for favour of remarks by the Examiner with reference to G.O., dated 1st December 1892, No. 3287 W.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GATTON,
Ag. Chief Secretary.

To the Public Works Department.

Read—also the following paper:—

G.O., dated 22nd April 1893, No. 1115 W., Public Works.

Read—the following papers:—

G.O., dated 15th March 1893, Mis. No. 568 L., Local and Municipal.

Office-note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, No. 1259 C., dated 15th April 1893.

Your office-note No. 1550 C., dated 6th April 1893.

The assumption on which Examiner's remarks (on paragraph 2 of G.O., Mis. No. 2415 L., dated 18th October 1892) in his office note No. 1825, dated 24th November 1892, were made, was that the *contracts* were for large works which were "likely to occupy several years in execution," and that the securities taken from the contractors for the due fulfilment of their contracts took the shape of centage deductions in bill from the value of work done and which were retained as balances due to the contractors. If these balances were paid in full at the end of each year, the result would be that the Local Fund Engineer would have no hold on the contractors.

2. If, however, the *contracts* are only for specific quantities of work to be executed during a year, there would be no objection to the securities (balances retained as such) being returned to the contractors when their accounts are closed at the end of the year.

3. If the men are only piece-workers (as would appear to be the case) and the agreement with them bears no reference either to the total quantity of work to be done or to the time within which any given quantity of work is to be executed, there would be no necessity for having any balances at all, the work done should be promptly measured up and paid for in full.

4. The Examiner had no intention of suggesting the "desirability of entrusting a work for several years to the same contractor or at the same rates," but simply took that to be the case in the matter referred to him for opinion.

5. It may also be observed that, in the case of regular contracts for execution of work, whether for a given period or until completion, a portion of the value of work done is retained as security for fulfilment of contract, the amount may be deducted from the bill and shown as balance due to the contractor in the contractor's ledger when the amount is *small* (a limit of Rs. 50 may be laid down), but if the amount is large it should be treated as paid in full on the bill and credited to "Deposits" as a cash recovery from the contractor—*vide* Government of India Code, Chapter XIII,

paragraph 91. The adoption of this procedure will prevent the accumulation of unpaid balances on contractors' bills and determine the total amount of security recovered in each case.

Order—dated 22nd April 1893, No. 1115 W., Public Works.

The Examiner's office-note will be communicated to the Local and Municipal Department with reference to G.O., dated 15th March 1893, Mis. No. 568 L., Local and Municipal.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. W. ASHPITEL,
Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Local and Municipal Department.

ORDER—dated 19th May 1893, No. 1095 L., Local and Municipal.

Communicated to the Accountant-General.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Accountant-General.

" Public Works Department.

Exd. J. Moses.

1507/2 Copy 2

Govt. of {1893} Madras.
LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL.

No 1307 Wd 6 June 193

Recorded.

(24) J. H.

W

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 19th May 1893, No. 1095 L.

MAY.

Accounts.

Communicating to the Accountant-General Government Order, Public Works Department, forwarding office-note from the Examiner of Public Works Accounts expressing his views in regard to the settlement of balances due to contractors for works.

Exr. P. W. Accts