(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 32
(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 1/91
(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

71

P W D துறை

அரசாணை எண். / மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 1077 அச்சகம் / பலவகை

நாள் : 2-4-1892 198 .

16 sheets

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

DV

ஆவண, கா-1—13,006—15-6-87.

1

[illegible] January [illegible]

Madras

From

C. Doraswami Nadar
agent to Ratnaswami Nadar
Madras

1077/1

To

The General Superintendent
Public Works Workshops
Madras

1077/1

Sir,

With reference to your letter No: dated 8th Instant and your bill No. 604 of the Copper Still to Mr. T. Ratnaswami Nadar I beg to submit that when I and Mr. T. Ratnaswami Nadar had co- your office in July last and spoke about making a copper Still capable of distilling 200 gallons you referred to the old account of your office for the cost of the copper Still capable of distilling 250 gallons which was made in your office for our distillery at Tinnevelly, and seeing that its cost was about Rs. 1200 & odd you estimated that the Still distilling 200 gallons can be made for about Rs. 1500 and asked us to deposit Rs 1000 which we accordingly paid on 31st July 1891) and [illegible]so told us that if there be any balan[illegible]fter the completion of the work it wil[illegible] refunded to us. you promise to complete the [illegible]ll in 15 days owing to the urgency we ha[illegible] to open distilleries for the Calicut arrack [illegible]pply which the Government wa pleased to gran[illegible] to us from October last. B for Rs 1643-10-1. As this Sum is too much over the estimate you said to us, I dont want the Still at such a high cost.

I therefore beg to request that the deposit of Rs 1,000 we paid may be refunded to me

I beg &c

(Signed) C Arunasawmy Nadar

(True Copy)

L. Mackane
Genl Supt P.W. Workshops

E.S. 3216/91

---

4 [illegible]

To

The General Superintendent
Public Works Workshops
Madras

1077/2

Sir,

It is represented to me on behalf of T. Ruthnasawmy Nadar, Abkari Contractor, that on or about the 31st of July 1891 you agreed to manufacture at the Public Works Workshops a copper Still for my client capable of distilling 200 gallons of Arrack at time, to be delivered by you to my client before the 15th of August 1891, it being agreed that the price of such Copper Still should be estimated o the basis of the cost of a similar Still of 250 gallo capacity already manufactured by you for him for Rs 1160-0-0 or thereabouts, you stating that the still for the 200 gallons capacity would not cost a much as the other Still and that the cost would probably amount to Rs 1000 which sum my clien at your request advanced to you on the said 31st July 1891.

It is further represented to me by my client that you failed to carry out the terms of your contract and to deliver the said Cop still on the 15th August 1891, although repeatedl asked by my client to expedite the work, but

that

that such bill was accompained with a request that my client should remit you the balance due after crediting the advance of Rs 1000.

I am informed that my client drew your attention to the above facts in his letter to you of 15th January 1892 to which he has not yet received a reply.

I am under the above circumstances instructed by cl ent to apply to you for the refund of t sum of Rs 1000 advanced by him as a d with interest at 12 per cent.

My client has been put to much inconvenience by your failure to deliver the Still and in order to avoid further inconvenience is even willing to accept the Still at the price originally ulated if delivery will be made at once

Requesting your early attention to this

tter

Yours Faithfully

(Signed) Douglas Grant

.5/ 321/92

(True Copy)

L. L. Wickham
General Superintendent
P. W. Workshops

No. 2633 W

Presidency P. W. Workshops
Madras 5th March 1892

1077

From

L. L. Wickham Esqr.
General Superintendent
P. W. Workshops.

To

Douglas Grant Esqr.
Attorney at law
18th Second Line Beach
Madras

Sir,

With reference to your letter of the 4th Instant I have the honor to state that the rules of the Department are that any thing manufactured should be paid for at actual cost plus certain fix percentages and if any money remains from the depos it is refunded and if the cost exceeds the amount of deposit the difference is paid by the party before taking delivery of the article manufactured. Your Clien is aware of this rule and I would invite his attention to his letter dated 3rd January 1892 in which he claims the refund of the balance if any due to him out of the amount deposited & agrees to pay the exce if any. Jobs are therefore undertaken in this Workshop at the risk of the parties and no time is ever fixed for completion of Jobs. I may add that the Still is well worth the charge now made by the Workshop yours &c.

(Signed) L L Wickham
General Supdt P.W. Workshops

(True Copy)
L L Wickham
General Supdt P W Workshops

Presidency P. W. Workshops.

From
THE GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT,
PUBLIC WORKS WORKSHOPS,
Madras,

To

No. W.

Dated
Despatched
Received
189

No. of Enclosures.

Subject.

P. 4
3211/92

Madras 12 [illegible]

1377

L. L. Wickham Esqre
General Superintendent
Public Works Workshops
Madras

Dear Sir

I have communicated your letter dated 5th Instant No. 2633 to my client and am instructed by him to State that he was not aware of the rule you refer to and was never informed of it. My client States that he distinctly remembers that you informed him that the Cost of the Still for 200 gallons would amount to about Rs 1000/- and he certainly understood that it would not exceed the price of the 250 gallon Still. My client ordered the Still to be made at your workShop upon this representation and as he was anxious to obtain it quickly and he believed that the work would be done quickly as promised by you.

I do not understand your reference to my clients letter of 3rd January 1892. My clients request that you Should refund him the balance if the price of the Still was under Rs 1000/- and his offer to pay anything in excess does not mean that he ever agreed or intended to pay So large a Sum as Rs 1643..10..1 You had Stated that the cost would be about Rs 1000/- and my client

though

executed

Under the above circumstances my client declines to pay the price you demand for the still and he instructs me to apply to you for the refund of the said sum of Rs 1000 with interest as already applied for by him in default my client will hold the Government legally liable for all loss and damage he has sustained by the omission to deliver the still to him and he will take such action in the matter as he may be advised.

I am Dear Sir
Yours faithfully
(Signed) Douglas Grant

True Copy

L. Wickham
Genl Supdt P. W. Workshops

P.W.
833
[illegible]

No. 2712 W.

PRESIDENCY P. W. WORKSHOPS,
Madras, 21st March 1892.

1077/5

From
L. Wickham Esqr
GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT,
PUBLIC WORKS WORKSHOPS,

To
THE Superintending Engineer
5th Circle
Madras

SIR,

Enclosures 6-

With reference to your Endorsement No. 112 K.M.S. dated 12th instant, on the Chief Engineer's No. 1254 C dated 10th idem, (herewith returned), I have the honor to report as follows:-

(2) In the month of July 1891, one Ruttnasami Nadar, deposited a sum of Rs 1000, being the estimated cost of making a Copper Still, and its actual cost came to Rupees 1643-10-1, including Workshop centage, and the man was asked to pay the difference, and to take delivery of the Still, but he refuses to do so- Vide his Agent's letter No. 145, dated the 15th January 1892, on the grounds that the Still was not finished in 15 days time, and that its actual cost is very excessive

(3) The contention in regard to delay, cannot be entertained, inasmuch as no time had been warranted when accepting the order, and the man has therefore, no claim for the refund of the Deposit.

1. C.E. Endorsement No. 1254 C / 10-3-92
Copy of letter dated 15-1-92 from Duraisamy Nadar agent to Ratnasami Nadar
1-do- dated 4-3-92 from the Pleader to the G.l Supt
1-do- No. 2633 W / 5-3-92 of the G.l Supt P.W.W.
1-do- dated 12-3-92 from the Pleader
5

N.

As regards the excess of Rupees 643-10-1, over mount deposited, I have to state, that the following details are the items of work done:-

1675 lb Copper	Rs:	824-4-5
91½ lb Brass Castings	"	52-10-9
Sundry Stores	"	36-11-8
Labour	"	281-11-1
		1195-5-11
10% for General Charges		119-8-7
		1314-14-6
25% Centage		328-11-7
Total Rs:		1643-10-1

Copper Rs: 824-4-5

5) Copper used on the Still, is purchased locally, which, obtained from the P.W. Stores, would cost only Rs: 600, or would make 300 Rs: less, and the percentage charge in the P.W. Stores is only one per Cent for local purchases, but it is 37% in Workshop, or treated as Stores obtained from England; that if this percentage is correct for Materials obtained from the Stores, when charged on local purchase, the charge is excessive, and if this percentage is correct for Materials obtained locally, the Government are the losers, and will interfere with private Firms. I would therefore, remark in this connection, that the method of charging the value of stores to jobs, is not correct, as already reported.

Labor. Rs: 281-11-1.

6) I cannot pass the item of Labour, without being remarked upon, as the sum of Rs: 281-11-1,

is

---

is, in my opinion, decidedly three times what it should be. This is entirely due to slackness of supervision and I cannot help this slackness, as the major portion of the Still was executed during my late illness, when I was not able to look after the work, and there was no one to look after the work.

(7) If the job had been executed under proper supervision, and if the materials had been obtained from the Store Department, the cost of the Still would have been only Rs: 1069 as per details given below.

1677
6

	Rs.
Value of Copper	600
" of Sundry stores	36
" of Brass Castings	52
Labour	90
	778
10% for general charges	77
	855
25% for Centage	214
Total Rs:	1069

or Rupees 69 in excess of the amount originally estimated. Ruthnasawmy Nadar will I presume, be willing to pay this excess of Rs 69. But to make him liable for Rupees 643-10-1 is, no doubt, hard. The Still has not been taken over by him and is

(8) The Still I believe, is notwithstanding, well worth the money, but the fault does not lie in the estimating, but in the system of charging.

(9) The system of Accounts I propose to adopt is essentially to arrive at the prime cost of different classes of manufacture and base all the rates on that -

For instance copper Tape
Copper Stills
Do Lightning Conductor Rods
Small Copper articles

would all be put down in one head in Accounts and prices put for each article catalogued the rates would be raised or lowered according to the losses and gains

For the D.P.W. the charges will be

Prime cost less { Capital charges
Office &c

For other Departments

Prime cost

For Private parties

Prime cost + some %
or 10 or 20 % above Messrs Richardson & Cruddas
Catalogue

{677/1}

Catalogue prices. This, I believe, carries out the wishes of Government.

(10) For the D.P.W. the advantage is great as the Bills will become a priced measurement Sheet and every article can be checked

(11) The only difference between the method proposed and that in use in other Shops as Roorkee is, that the cost of the work, so as to meet the Estimate, will be fixed systematically in the office, instead of by the Maistries &c

(12) The present method is, I do not hesitate in saying, the bane of the Workshops, and leads to corrupt practices and I have not found one efficient check anywhere

N.B. By prime cost is meant
cost of labour + % for petty supervision
cost of Material + % Interest on Capital &c
Building charges
Machine charges
Supervision (Office &c)

(13) Ruthnaswamy Nadar has, since applied to me, through his Attorneys, claiming for the refund of the Deposit.

(14) Copies of this application and subsequent correspondence, are herewith submitted for perusal

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your most obedient servant
L. L. Wickham
Genl Supt P.W. Workshops

16/6

22/3

Presidency P. W. Workshop

From

THE GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT,
PUBLIC WORKS WORKSHOPS,
Madras,

To

The Superintending Engineer
5th Circle
Madras

No. 27/12 W.

1528

Dated 21st March 1892.
Despatched 21st March 1892.
Received

No. of Enclosures. 6

Subject.

Returns Chief Engr's Memo No. 1254 C, 10th March /92 and the Examiner (P.W. Acct.) representation that a sum of Rs. 643-10-1 in excess of estimated cost for making a Copper Arrack Still, is debited in Workshop Accts for Dec/91 to "Miscellaneous Advances" & that the matter will be referred to S.E. 5th Circle for orders & submits his report thereon.

R.W. $\frac{5.2}{3211}$/92

KEEP-WITH CURRENT No.

dated 189 .

(C. No. $\frac{1201}{8}$.)

1027/6

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1892. { P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 8 March 1892.

OFFICE NOTE No. 360 S.A.

To

W.

With reference to the orders of Government contained in G.O.No.3185 of 27th.November 1891, I beg to report the following case in the Presidency Workshops Madras;-

2. In the month of July 1891 a sum of Rs.1,000 was deposited by one M.R.Ry Rutnasawmy Nadar on account of the estimated cost of making a Copper Still. The job was completed at a cost of Rs.1,643-10-1 or Rs.643-10-1 in excess of estimated cost. The depositor now refuses to take delivery of the article, & to pay the excess cost. The General Superintendent has therefore in his Accounts for December 1891 debited the excess expenditure to miscellaneous advances with the remark that the matter will be referred to the Supg. Engineer 5th.Circle for orders, and a similar remark appears in the accounts for January 1892.

3. As the amount involved is large, and there is apparent difficulty in its

recovery, I beg that early orders may be issued for the adjustment of the item before the close of the official year.

A 8/3

C.

A 8/3

B 8/3

P. W. CURRENT No. ~~2644~~

324/92

R. No. 264 W / 11-3-92

R 9-3-92

No 1254C d/ 10-3-92

Referred to the Suptg: Engineer for remarks. It should be stated whether the demand for payment can be legally enforced.

Col. R.E.
Chief Engr PWD

R.C. 324/92

1139=409 W 9/2

SE V Circle - to be returned

No. 152 W

1077/9

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
V Circle, Madras,
Chepak, 23d March 1892.

From
Lt Coll D. McNeill Campbell R.E.
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, V CIRCLE,

To
THE Chief Engineer
P.W. Department.

SIR,

Enclosures. 2

1 Genl Supdts Letter No 2712 of 21-3-92 with four Enclosures, (Requested to be returned)

1 Original Endorsement No 1254C of 10-3-92 from the Chief Engr PWD.

With reference to your No 1254C dated 10th March 1892, I have the honor to forward herewith a letter from the General Superintendent P.W. Workshops.

2. I am of opinion that payment for the Copper Still cannot be legally enforced.

3. You will observe that the General Superintendent puts down the greater part of the excess to slackness of supervision at a time when he was not able to look after the work owing to sickness. I have therefore called on him to obtain the explanation

explanation of those Responsible and. Should this not be Satisfactory I would Suggest that the Still be sold for as much as it will fetch & the Loss made good by those Responsible for the high Cost.

4. With regard to the System of Accounts mentioned by the General Superintendent I can only Repeat the Suggestion I have before made that the Examiner of P.W. Accounts or his Deputy should inspect the Workshops Accounts and discuss the matter with Mr. Wickham as soon as possible.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt Servt

D. McE. Campbell Lieut Col R.E.

P.V. Superintdg Engineer
5th Circle

P. W. CURRENT No. 3211

From

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

V CIRCLE,

To

THE Chief Engineer
P. W. Department

Dated 23
Recd. 25 March 1892

No. 409 W of 9.2.92
27 W of 4.1.92
3192 W of 27.11.91
3185 W of 27.11.91
2872 W of 29.10.91
~~1252 C of 10.3.92~~
2092 W. 3-8-91
1139 W. 24-4-91
431 W. 16-2-91
2838 W. 27-10-90
1931 W. 17-7-90
3719. 25-5-86

Put up with No. 3582 R 2.4.92

ENCLOSURES. 6

No. 152 W.

Copper Still made at P. W. Work-shops. —

Reports on —

R 31.8.91.

257/3 W 28/3

W 5273

1077 W

For orders whether the draft order can issue at once, or should be submitted to the H. M. In the latter case, a note to accompany it will apparently be necessary in reply to the H. M.s remarks on the previous draft.

C. S.

2-IV-92

Not necessary I think. The order can issue at once

P. W. D.

P. W. CURRENT No. 3211

From

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

V CIRC

To

THE Chief Engineer
P. W. Departm

Dated 23 } March 18
Recd. 25 }

ENCLOSURES. 6

No. 152 W.

Copper Still made at P. W. Wor Shops —

Reports on —

P. W. D.

3211

For orders 1077/32

The S.E. is of opinion that the claim cannot be legally enforced – and seeing that so long a time has elapsed since the Still was ordered (July last) it is doubtful whether the Abkari Contractor can now be compelled to take the article even at the Estimated rate – viz Rs 1000 –

1077/32

He might be offered it at this rate, and if he refuses it, the Still might be sold otherwise – the loss being made good by those responsible, or written off, as may be decided –

It seems desirable that the system of charges should be investigated by the Examiner. It will be seen from para 4 of the Genl Supt's letter 2712 W d/21 March 92 that the 25% is charged to th

P.W. CURRENT No. 321

From

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

V Ci

To

THE Chief Engineer
P.W. Departm

Dated 23 } March
Recd. 25 }

ENCLOSURES. 6

No. 152 W.

Copper Still made at P.W. W
shops. —

Reports on —

---

only on the cost of labour and materials, but also on the 10% for "General Charges". This seems wrong. On the other hand, there seems no reason why private parties having jobs done at the Workshops should have materials supplied at Store Dept. prices. This would be in direct competition with private enterprise. Govt. Stores obtained through the Agency of the India Office are necessarily cheaper than the same articles purchased in the local market.

S.B.

25-III-92

P.W.D.

C No 3211

1077/13

Draft order submitted. The H.M.'s remarks were anticipated in part in my note of the 25-III-92.

As regards para 5 of the Supt's letter, the explanation seems to be that articles are sometimes drawn by the Workshops from the Stores. In cases of this kind, the price is much lower than if they are purchased in the local market. Had the Copper in the present case been thus obtained from Store, there would have been a saving in cost of Rs 300.

Again, when the Workshop makes local purchases it adds 37% for agency, while the Stores charges only 1% for making purchases. Assuming that 37% is the "correct" charge for agency, the Supt. [illegible]

1077/13

when articles of local purchase are drawn from the Stores for use on private jobs.

R.S.
2.iv.92

P. W. D.

Read the follg:—

Office Note from the Exr. P.W.A. No. 360 S.A. d/8.iii.92
Letter from the S.E. V Circle No. 152 W d/23.iii.92

5077/13

I don't understand [illegible] of the Supt's letter at all, nor why the 25% is charged on the 1315 Rs instead of on the 1175 Rs.

The letter of the 3 Jan 92 which must have an important bearing on the contract is not sent up but nevertheless I think it is obviously impossible to recover the absurd charge of Rs 1643 odd. I would return the deposit of Rs 1000 with interest at 4 or 4½% & try to dispose of the Still to the best advantage. Probably [illegible] would take it for Rs 1200.

I quite agree with W. that private work should be stopped. It is at any rate absurd to undertake it without distinct agreement as to terms.

I think it better to stop it altogether.

5077/14

5077/12

For Orders:

whether the still can be handed over to the Abkari Contractor for Rs 1000 or otherwise disposed of. No limit of time appears to have been fixed on for delivery.

2. The first rough estimate for the still was fixed at Rs 100 but that in no way guaranteed that its final cost should not exceed that sum. As it is, under existing rules of centage charges the value of the still is as billed for by the Supdt. P.W. Workshops, with the exception that the charges for labour appear to be higher than was

necessary to turn out the finished article.

3. It is not shown who are the persons responsible for the high cost.

4- I have always disapproved of the ~~W~~ execution of work for private parties in the P.W. Workshops, and think that the time has come when it should be absolutely prohibited without the express sanction of Govt, which would only be given in special and exceptional cases —

S 28.3

OW 25.3.92

FOR ORDERS.

From orders

No. 1077 W d/ 2nd April

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Genl Acct

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

1077 / 15

READ the following

Office Note from the Ex. P.W. Accts. (H.E. No. 360 S.A. d/ 18.iii.92)
Letter from the S.E. V Circle (" " 152 W d/ 23.iii.92)

The charge of Rs 1643 for the still seems excessive. It should not be enforced. The deposit of Rs 1000 will be returned to the depositor with interest at 6 per cent, and the still disposed of to the best advantage. Possibly Ratnaswami would take it for Rs 1200. If so he can have it at that price.

2. H.E. the Governor in Council considers that the time has arrived for materially

stricting the amount
f private work undertaken by the P. W.
Workshops, and is
accordingly pleased
to direct that no
work of this kind
shall in future be
received, without
the express sanction
of Government, which
will only be given
in special and
exceptional cases.

OWM
2.4.92

S. E. V Circle
Ex. P.W. Accts.

1077
⑥
74

C. Be. 3211

12. 6. 4.
4-11-12

Govt. of {1892} Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

4/4/92

16.12.08
1.4.10

Dated

Recd.

Encl.

G.O. 2nd April 1892. No. 1047. W.

Copper Still

Directing, ~~that~~ with remarks, that the —— made at P.W. Workshops be disposed of to the best advantage and the deposit of Rs 1000 returned to the depositor with interest at 6 per cent

26

60/4

3/4/4

T.C. 9/4