

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 10  
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் மே 1989  
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 10/9

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

பொதுப்பணித் துறை

|                                       |           |                  |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| அரசாணை எண்.<br>மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். | 936W      | அச்சகம்<br>பலவகை |
| நாள் :                                | 22-3-1890 | 198              |

*(Handwritten signature)*

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

Cu 2451

9364

$\frac{1}{936}$

27/5/70

Out

In orders.

The question is  
doubtful seems more  
an administrative one  
than one of account.

Cu

10.2.20

There can be no question  
that if contractors have  
to wait for payment, they  
for their prices as as 2-  
cover the loss of interest  
but the matter is only  
indirectly connected  
with accounts.

"Recorded" will be  
sufficient.

In the case in point,  
if the m. is trans out to  
be used when and up,

The contractor will  
decide in response  
on the ground that they  
have been so long in  
the possession of the logs

11.3.90

Recd.  
11.3.90

[C. No. 8.]

2/230

GOVT.  
OF MADRAS. }

1890.

(P. W.  
DEPT.)

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 24 February 1890.

OFFICE NOTE No. 978.

To

E.W.

I beg to bring to your notice,  
for such action as you may think neces-  
sary, the following case of delay in set-  
tling the claims of a contractor in the  
Tanjore Division -

2. The accounts up to August 1889  
showed a sum of Rs.460 as due to con-  
tractor T. Govinda Pillay, since the 31st  
March 1888, on account of teakwood logs  
supplied for the taluq eutcherry at Kum-  
baconum, Tanjore Division, and on be-  
ing asked in my letter No.710 S.E.8 of  
7th. October 1889 to explain the long  
delay in settling the claim, the Execu-  
tive Engineer explains in his letter No  
3368 dated 18th. October 1889 to the Su-  
perintending Engineer 6th. Circle that it  
is not safe "to pay fully for this  
till it (the timber) is cut up", the  
Superintending Engineer approves of the  
explanation and states in his endorse-  
ment No.1849 T.J. dated 22nd. October  
1889 to the Executive Engineer that the  
logs cannot be cut up now at any rate

KEEP-WITH

Genl. No.

dated

189



until the revised estimate for the cut-cherry is sanctioned. And the accounts received up to December 1889 show that the dues to contractor are still unsettled.

3. It seems to me that the department can hardly expect to get materials at economical rates, if a contractor is liable to be kept waiting for eighteen months or two years for payment, simply because this department does not find it convenient to cut up and use the timber supplied, which appears to be the only reason according to the explanation given.

*W.C.*  
C.

*W.C.*  
R<sup>24/2</sup>

No 1070.C dt 27 Feb 1890

Referred to the  
Superintending Engineer  
Circle for perusal of  
remarks.

*Frederick Buchanan*

Secy. R.  
Asst. Chief Engr. Road

*W.C.*  
16.2.90

*Encl*  
*P.W. Circle 1906*  
*24.5/90*

*Bud. 25.2.90*

No 26367.  
From

Superintendent Engineer's Office to Circle  
Kodakkannal. 6 March 1890  
D.S.

Countrol A. C. Smith Esq  
Superintendent Engineer's Office

To  
The Chief Engineer  
D.S.

Sir

In returning your endorsement No 1070.C of the 27 February 1890, on Engineer's Office Note regarding delay in settling the claim of Contractor Govinda Pillay, Tanjore Division, I have the honor to state that in this case the Executive Engineer is not to blame in any way for the delay.

This claim refers to the Taluk Cutcherry to be built at Kumbakonam. The sum of Rs 400 is the balance due to the Contractor on account of teakwood in the logs supplied in 1887.00, but the work was in the same year stopped, as the site was not finally decided on, and as the estimate was ordered to be revised. It was not therefore considered advisable to pay fully for the logs till it was cut up, as already explained to

to the Examiner

3. The finally revised Estimate was submitted through the Collector of Tanjore in this Office No. 2233.2.2 of 15<sup>th</sup> January 1890; it has not yet been sanctioned. I request its early sanction for settlement of the above claim and for proceeding with the work without further delay. There has been much correspondence in the Revenue Department regarding the site.

I have the honour to be  
Sir  
Yours most obedient.

Al Smith Lieut Col MR  
Superintendent Circle

P.S.

I would point out that para 3 of the Examiner's letter shows want of executive experience. Contractors are generally only too glad to get work on any conditions and the man in question is perfectly contented to wait; had he made any special application for further payment, no doubt

4/26  
Mr Garrett would have entertained it whereas the Examiner seems to assume that this man has been kept out of his money in a scandalous manner to the detriment of the public service. As before stated, I, as Superintending Engineer, am perfectly satisfied with Mr Garrett's explanation & I submit that in a purely executive matter of detail this should be quite sufficient for the Examiner.

Al Smith  
Lieut Col MR  
Superintendent Circle  
6-3-90

P.W. C No. 2451

To

The Supt. Engineer  
in circle.

To

The Chief Engineer  
P.W.D.

No 2636-8.

Dated 6<sup>th</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> March 1890.  
Desp. 8<sup>th</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> March 1890.

Re. 10-3-90

Encls. 1.

Contractor Govindasami  
Pillay: —

Explains the delay  
in settling the claim of  
a sum of Rs 450 due to —

The Examiner was certainly right in  
tripping undeducted claims of the  
kind to which. The delay in this case  
may have been unavoidable but  
it is proceedings of this sort which  
send up P.W. rates, & if not with-  
standing them the contractor is  
glad to get work & contented, he  
must have known in the rate  
he is allowed.

Wm  
13<sup>th</sup> Nov  
S.S. VI circle  
Encl. P.W.D.

H.L. 12-3-90 R 14-3-90

No 936 W of 22<sup>nd</sup> March 1890

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,  
RAILWAY BRANCH

# PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the

Read the following

Official note from the Examiner  
P.W.D. No. 978 of 24<sup>th</sup> Febry 1890  
from the Supt. Engr. in Circle No. 2636 L.J. of 6<sup>th</sup> March 1890.

Recorded.

2. The <sup>general</sup> explanation given  
for the delays in payment  
is unsatisfactory, for  
if Contractors are willing  
to wait several months  
for the settlement of  
their bills, it is evident  
that they have gauged  
themselves, in their rates,  
against loss of interest  
on their money.

Wm  
15.3.90

Recd  
15.3.90

To  
The Supt. Engr. in Circle  
Encl. P.W.D. 22/12

*Don*

No 936 W of 22nd Kansas  
1894

see 10/3. 827/3-  
17-3-20 R 20-3-20