

Educational (1912) Department.

ORDINARY MS. (Printed for Record only)

G.O., No. 18

DATED 16-1-12

Disbroy

~~Pres.~~ Please

~~Pres.~~ Please print and
send

986

18

[Despatch Abstract.]

Exemption from the examination rules.

Sanctioning the temporary exemption of A. Vaikunta Aiyar & D. Sivalvandar from the Lower Subordinate test of the College of Eng^s & requesting the ~~Chief~~ Chief Engineer to issue instructions that _____ must in future, be strictly applied for in advance

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

44
21
23

No. 18, EDUCATIONAL, 16TH JANUARY 1912.
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers:—

I
Application for exemption from the Examination Rules of an unpassed candidate for employment in the office of Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division.

1. Name, age and educational qualifications of the unpassed candidate for whose exemption sanction is sought.

A. Vaikunta Aiyar, age 28.
Passed the following Government examinations:—
(1) Surveying and levelling, intermediate grade.
(2) Building, drawing and estimating, elementary grade.
(3) Mensuration.
(4) Practical plane and solid geometry.
(5) Freehand outline drawing.
(6) Book-keeping.
(7) Commercial correspondence.

2. The post in which it is proposed to employ him and nature of the appointment, i.e., whether acting or sub. *pro tem.*, or temporary.

Temporary Surveyor on the Aliyar Project Investigation sanctioned in G.O. No. 1045 W., dated 23rd August 1911.

3. The pay of the post and the pay proposed to be given to the unpassed candidate.

Rs. 70.
Rs. 70.

4. The examination from which exemption is sought.

Lower subordinate test of the College of Engineering, Madras.

5. The period for which the appointment is expected to last.

Six months.

6. The period for which sanction is now sought (with dates of commencement and of termination).

Six months from 16th November 1911 forenoon to 15th May 1912 afternoon.

7. Is this a first application or one for a renewal of a previous sanction? If for renewal, quote the previous order granting sanction and state for how long the candidate has been already exempted.

This is the first application so far as this project is considered.
(Previously employed on another project and exempted from examination rules from 23rd May 1911 to 22nd September 1911.)
Vide Chief Engineer's Memorandum No. 4757 C., dated 22nd August 1911, G.O. No. R. 258, Educational, dated 7th August 1911.

For approval

SNR
27-2-12 Rg
27.2.12

25
21
16
2

21
16
2

copy

8. What steps have been taken to procure the services of a passed candidate and with what result.

Applications were invited by notification in *Fort St. George Gazette* and this man having been employed in the various project works in Public Works Department and considered to be fit was selected. He was also employed in the Ukkaram tank project. Sanctioned in G.O. No. 290 W., dated 23rd February 1911. A few applications were received from passed candidates without any experience.

9. Recommendation of the Head of the Department.

....

10. Remarks

....

Endt. No. 1116 S.F., dated 27th November 1911.

Submitted to the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, for transmission to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

R. W. FORMBY,
Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division.

Endt. No. 864-W/14-D., dated 29th November 1911.

Forwarded in duplicate to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, for favour of obtaining sanction of Government.

A. G. ROMILLY,
Superintending Engineer, IV Circle.

II

Memorandum No. 8014 C., dated 5th December 1911.

The Chief Engineer regrets that the exemption applied for on behalf of temporary surveyor A. Vaikunta Aiyar cannot be recommended to Government for sanction, it being the policy of Government not to sanction such exemptions when passed candidates are available.

(By Order.)

W. G. MOLESWORTH,
Deputy Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle.

III

Application for exemption from the Examination Rules of an unpassed candidate for employment in the office of Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division.

1. Name, age and educational qualifications of the unpassed candidate for whose exemption sanction is sought.

D. Srialvandar, age 23.

Passed the following examinations:—

- (1) Lower Secondary examination (1903).
- (2) Freehand outline drawing (1903).
- (3) Maistry's class in Consulting Architect's Division, Madras, in 1906-1907.

2. The post in which it is proposed to employ him and nature of the appointment, i.e., whether acting or sub. *pro tem.* or temporary.

Temporary Surveyor on the Aliyar Project Investigation sanctioned in G.O. No. 1045 W., dated 23rd August 1911.

8. What steps have been taken to procure the services of a passed candidate and with what result.

Applications were invited by notification in Fort St. George Gazette and this man having been employed in various projects in Public Works Department and considered to be fit was selected. He was also employed in the Urban tank project. Sanctioned in G.O. No. 200 W., dated 29th November 1911. A few applications were received from passed candidates without any experience.

9. Recommendation of the Head of the Department.

10. Remarks.

Submitted to the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, for transmission to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

R. W. FORMBY,
Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division.

Forwarded in duplicate to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, for favour of obtaining sanction of Government.

A. G. ROMILLY,
Superintending Engineer, IV Circle.

Memorandum No. 8015 C., dated 5th December 1911.

The Chief Engineer regrets that the exemption applied for on behalf of temporary surveyor D. Srialvandar cannot be recommended to Government for sanction, it being the policy of Government not to sanction such exemptions when passed candidates are available.

(By Order.)
W. G. MOLESWORTH,
Deputy Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

Application for exemption from the Examinations Rules of an unpassed candidate for employment in the office of Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division.

1. Name and educational qualifications of the unpassed candidate for whom exemption sanction is sought.

D. Srialvandar, age 33.

Passed the following examinations:—
(1) Lower Secondary examination (1903).
(2) Freshman entrance drawing (1903).
(3) Master's class in Commercial Arithmetic Division, Madras, in 1906-1907.

2. The post in which it is proposed to employ him and nature of the appointment, i.e., whether acting or sub. permanent or temporary.

Temporary Surveyor on the Alwar Project. Investigation sanctioned in G.O. No. 1045 W., dated 28th August 1911.

3. The pay of the post and the pay proposed to be given to the unpassed candidate.	Rs. 70. Rs. 70.
4. The examination from which exemption is sought.	Lower Subordinate Test of the College of Engineering, Madras.
5. The period for which the appointment is expected to last.	Six months.
6. The period for which sanction is now sought (with dates of commencement and of termination).	Six months from 17th November 1911 forenoon to 16th May 1912 afternoon.
7. Is this a first application or one for a renewal of a previous sanction? If for renewal, quote the previous order granting sanction and state for how long the candidate has been already exempted.	This is the first application.
8. What steps have been taken to procure the services of a passed candidate and with what result.	Applications were invited by a notification in Fort St. George Gazette and this man having been employed in various projects in Public Works Department and considered to be fit was selected. A few applications were received from passed candidates without any experience whatever.
9. Recommendation of the Head of the Department.	
10. Remarks	

Endt. No. 1117 S.E., dated 27th November 1911.

Submitted to the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, for transmission to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, Madras.

R. W. FORMBY,
Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division.

Endt. No. 865-W/14-D., dated 29th November 1911.

Forwarded in duplicate to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, for favour of obtaining sanction of Government.

A. G. ROMILLY,
Superintending Engineer, IV Circle.

IV
Memorandum No. 8015 C., dated 5th December 1911.

The Chief Engineer regrets that the exemption applied for on behalf of temporary surveyor D. Srialvandar cannot be recommended to Government for sanction, it being the policy of Government not to sanction such exemptions when passed candidates are available.

(By Order.)

W. G. MOLESWORTH,
Deputy Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle.

No. 18, EDUCATIONAL, 16TH JANUARY 1912.

No. 18, EDUCATIONAL, 16TH JANUARY 1912.

Letter—from Colonel W. M. ELLIS, (Late) R.E., Superintending Engineer, IV Circle.

To—the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

Dated—Coimbatore, the 18th December 1911.

No.—904 W./14-D.

With reference to your Nos. 8014 C and 8015 C of 5th December 1911, I address to ask you to make a special case of this and recommend the exemption of these two men. Both men are experienced surveyors and capable of working from instructions on project work without constant supervision. The passed applicants rejected by the Executive Engineer were inexperienced and no one was available to be sent to supervise their work on the spot.

It would have been waste of time and money to send inexperienced men alone on this work. Thus the alternatives left with the Executive Engineer were (1) to waste money by employing unqualified (although passed) surveyors; (2) to employ qualified although unpassed men; (3) to employ no one and let the work stand over until he had some one available to closely supervise the work of inexperienced passed men.

I have in the last three years had much experience of surveyors on investigation work and I think there is little doubt that many men fresh from the college although capable of quite good work under experienced guidance and supervision are generally quite unfit to make investigation surveys from instructions without constant guidance and assistance on the spot.

In this case the Executive Engineer employed the competent men in anticipation of sanction and they now have been a month at work. Much delay and extra expense will be incurred if they are dispensed with. I ask you to make an exception of this case.

If you feel unable to do so I request you to refuse by wire when I will order the Executive Engineer to dispense with the men employed which I am not doing pending receipt of further orders from you. A copy of the Executive Engineer's letter (No. 1189-S.E./60-I. of 15th December 1911) on the subject is enclosed.

ENCLOSURE.

Letter—from R. W. FORMBY, Esq., Executive Engineer, Coimbatore division.

To—the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, Coimbatore.

Dated—the 15th December 1911.

No.—1189-S.E./60-I.

With reference to your endorsement Nos. 1092 C.I. and 1093 C.I., dated 7th December 1911, I have the honour to request that you will be good enough to address the Chief Engineer specially, for favour of obtaining the sanction of Government to retain the existing men as a special case for the following reasons:—

- (1) The present surveyors understand the work and have been working for the last about a month.
- (2) It will take time to find and appoint fresh men.
- (3) The passed candidates who put in applications had no experience.
- (4) There is no special officer in charge of the project and I have already spent much time in explaining to the present men, what they have to do.
- (5) The completion of the investigation work will be delayed as passed men are to be selected and their arrival is to be awaited.
- (6) Of the two surveyors employed on the project, one was previously on the Ukkaram tank project investigation work, and the other man has been paid travelling allowance for joining the appointment. If fresh men are to be appointed, the two should again be granted travelling allowance for joining the appointment and returning, at the expiry of the period.

In anticipation of sanction I am still retaining these persons and request the favour of your approval.

10. Remarks	
8. Recommendation of the Head of the Department	
7. Is this a first application or one for a renewal of a previous sanction? If for renewal, state the previous order granted and state for how long the sanction and state for how long the candidate has been already exempted.	
6. The period for which sanction is now sought (with date of commencement and of termination).	
5. The period for which the appointment is expected to last.	
4. The examination from which exemption is sought.	
3. The pay of the post and the pay proposed to be given to the exempted candidate.	
2. The pay of the post and the pay proposed to be given to the exempted candidate.	
1. The pay of the post and the pay proposed to be given to the exempted candidate.	

Submitted to the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, for transmission to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, Madras.

Forwarded in duplicate to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, for favour of obtaining sanction of Government.

The Chief Engineer requests that the exemption applied for on behalf of temporary surveyors D. G. and S. should be recommended to Government for sanction, it being the policy of Government not to sanction such exemptions when passed candidates are available.

W. G. MALLSWORDH
Deputy Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

Handwritten signature

J. R. Application for exemption from the Examination Rules of an unpassed candidate for employment in the office of Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division.

1 Name, age and educational qualifications of the unpassed candidate for whose exemption sanction is sought.	Passed the following Government examinations 1 Surveying & Levelling, Intermediate Grade. 2. Building, Drawing & estimating, Elementary Grade 3. Mensuration. 4. Practical plane & solid geometry. 5. Freehand outline drawing. 6. Book-Keeping 7. Commercial correspondence. A. Vaikunta Aiyar, Age 28.
2 The post in which it is proposed to employ him and nature of the appointment, i.e., whether acting or sub. pro tem. or temporary.	Temporary Surveyor on the Aliyar Project Investigation sanctioned in G.O., No. 1045 W, dated 23rd August 1911.
3 The pay of the post and the pay proposed to be given to the unpassed candidate.	Rs. 70 Rs. 70
4 The examination from which exemption is sought.	Lower Subordinate Test of the College of Engineering, Madras.
5 The period for which the appointment is expected to last.	Six months.
6 The period for which sanction is now sought with dates of commencement and of termination.	Six months from 16th November 1911 Forenoon to 15th May 1912 Afternoon.
7 Is this a first application or one for a renewal of a previous sanction? If for renewal, quote the previous order granting sanction and state for how long the candidate has been already exempted.	This is the first application so far as this project is considered. (Previously employed on another project and exempted from Examination rules from 23-5-11 to 22-9-1911.) Vide Chief Engineer's Memo No. 4757 C, dated 22nd August 1911, G.O., R. 258/Edl., dated 7th August 1911.

Order—No. 18, Educational, dated 18th January 1912.
The following temporary exemption from the examination rules are sanctioned with retrospective effect as a special case:—
A. Vaikunta Aiyar and D. S. Aiyar from the Lower Subordinate test of the College of Engineering from 16th November 1911 to 15th May 1912 and from November 1911 to 15th May 1912 respectively.
2. The Chief Engineer will be requested to issue instructions to his subordinates that it must be a strict rule in future that exemptions from the examination rules must be applied for in advance and that no exemption whatever will be granted where unqualified persons are appointed without the prior sanction of the authority who is competent to sanction such exemption.
(Type Name)

To the Public Works Department.
FOR RECORD ONLY.
G.O. No. 18, 18th January 1912.
Exemption from the examination rules.
Sanctioning the temporary exemption of A. Vaikunta Aiyar and D. S. Aiyar from the Lower Subordinate test of the College of Engineering and requesting the Chief Engineer to issue instructions that—must in future be strictly applied for in advance.

18 E. 11

A. M. M. S. S. S.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Application for exemption from the Examination Rules of an unpassed candidate for employment in the office of the Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division

8 What steps have been taken to procure the services of a passed candidate and with what result.	Applications were invited by Notification in Fort St. George Gazette and this man having been employed in the various project works in P.W.D. and considered to be fit was selected. He was also employed in the - Ukaram Tank project, Sanctioned in G.O., No.290 W dated 23-21911. A few applications were received from passed candidates without any experience.
9 Recommendation of the Head of the Department.	
10 Remarks.	

No.1116 S.E., dated 27th November 1911.

Submitted to the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle for transmission to the Chief Engineer P.W.D.

Sd/ R.W. Formby,
Executive Engineer,
Coimbatore Division.

In duplicate
Forwarded to the Chief Engineer P.W.D. for favour of obtaining sanction of Government.

R. W. Formby
Superintending Engineer
28/11/11
From the Circle.

OFFICE OF THE

Dated

190

To the Secretary to Government, Educational Department.

Chief Engineer.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Wright
Memo No 8014-CD 5-12-1911
Cuo: 14044, from the S.E. IV Circle No 8644 d/29.11.11
140

The Chief Engineer regrets that the exemption applied for on behalf of Temporary Surveyor A. Vaikumba Aijer cannot be recommended to Govt. for sanction, it being the policy of Govt. not to sanction such exemptions when passed Candidates are available.

P.U.
2.12.11

W. M.
4.12.11
for Rev.

To the S.E. Fourth Circle
J.S.

Despatched on 6.12.11

Application for exemption from the Examination Rules of an ^{Executive Engineer,} ~~unpassed~~ candidate for employment in the office of ^{Coimbatore Division.}

CURRENT NO. 14083
PASSED ON BY

Passed the following Examinations:--

1 Name, age and educational qualifications of the unpassed candidate for whose exemption sanction is sought.	D. Srialvandar, Age 23 1. Lower Secondary Examination 1903. ii. Freehand outline drawing 1903. iii. Maistrizay's class in Consulting Architect's Division Madras in 1906-1907.
2 The post in which it is proposed to employ him and nature of the appointment, i.e., whether acting or sub. pro tem. or temporary.	Temporary Surveyor on the Aliyar Project Investigation sanctioned in G.O., No.1045 W, dated 23rd August 1911. <i>T (with sanction in 1911)</i>
3 The pay of the post and the pay proposed to be given to the unpassed candidate.	Rs. 70 Rs. 70
4 The examination from which exemption is sought.	Lower Subordinate Test of the College of Engineering Madras
5 The period for which the appointment is expected to last.	Six months.
6 The period for which sanction is now sought (with dates of commencement and of termination).	Six months from 17-11-1911 Forenoon to 16-5-1912 Afternoon.
7 Is this a first application or one for a renewal of a previous sanction? If for renewal, quote the previous order granting sanction and state for how long the candidate has been already exempted.	This is the first application.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Application for exemption from the Examination Rules of an unpassed candidate for employment in the office of Executive Engineer,
Coimbatore Division.

8 What steps have been taken to procure the services of a passed candidate and with what result.	Applications were invited by a Notification in Fort St. George Gazette and this man having been employed in various projects in P.W.D., and considered to be fit was selected. A few applications were received from passed candidates without any experience whatever.
9 Recommendation of the Head of the Department.	
10 Remarks.	

No.1117 S.E., dated 27th November 1911.

Submitted to the Superintending Engineer, Fourth Circle for transmission to the
Chief Engineer Public Works Department, Madras.

Sd/ R.W. Formby,
Executive Engineer,
Coimbatore Division.

No 86510/145 of 24/11 in duplicate Forwarded to the Chief Engineer P.W.D. for favour of obtaining sanction of Government.

[Signature]
Superintending Engineer, 7/11/11
Fourth Circle.

OFFICE OF THE

Dated

190 }

To the Secretary to Government, Educational Department.

Chief Engineer.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Memo No. 8015-C D 512-1911

Cuo: 14083. From S.E. IV Circle No. 86510 of 29.11.11
14D

The Chief Engineer regrets that the exemption applied for on behalf of temporary surveyor D. Sri Rao cannot be recommended to Govt. for sanction, it being the policy of Govt. not to sanction such exemptions when passed candidates are available.

P.V.
2.12.11

[Signature]
4.12.11
for S.E.

To the S.E. Fourth Circle
7.12.

Dispatched on 6.12.11

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT No. 14765

ENCLOSURES. { Plans No.
Others No.

Received 191

Registered 191

SPARE COPIES.

Total

Passed on by Registering Clerk

" " U. R. Clerk

" " Referencer

" " Record Superintendent.

" " Drafting Officer

*Exemption from examination rules of the two Temporary
Surveyors employed on Project work in the Coimbatore Dy.
Recommends — as a Special Case, and requests refusal
by you, so as to order the Chief Engineer to dispense with
their services.*

No. 90410

Station Coimbatore, Dated the 18th December 1911.

From (Name) Col. W.M. Ellis, (Late) R.E.,

(Designation) Superintending Engineer, IV Circle.

To The Chief Engineer
The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Public Works Department,

Sir,

*Level: 1 letter
+ p. 3 ante
o p. 6 ante*

With reference to ----
----- your No. 8014 C and 8015 C of 5th December 1911, I --
address ~~you~~ to ask you to make a special case of this and re-
commend the exemption of these two men. Both men are expe-
rienced surveyors and capable of working from instructions on
project work without constant supervision. The passed appli-
cants rejected by the Executive Engineer, were inexperienced
and no one was available to be sent to supervise their work -
on the spot.

It

It would have been waste of time and money to send inexperienced men alone on this work. Thus the alternatives left with the Executive Engineer ^{were (1)} ~~was~~ to waste money by employing unqualified (although passed) Surveyors (2) To employ qualified although unpassed men (3) to employ no one and let the work stand over until he had some one available to closely supervise the work of inexperienced passed men.

I have in the last 3 years had much experience of Surveyors on investigation work and I think there is little doubt that many ^{fresh} men from the College although capable of quite good work under experienced guidance and supervision are generally quite unfit to make investigation surveys from instructions without constant guidance and assistance on the spot.

In this case the Executive Engineer employed the competent men in anticipation of sanction and they now have been a month at work. Much delay and extra expense will be incurred if they are dispensed with. I ask you to make an exception of this case.

If you feel unable to do so I request you to refuse by wire when I will order the Executive Engineer to dispense with the men employed which I am not doing pending receipt of further orders -- from you. A copy of the Executive Engineer's letter (No.1189 S.E./60 I of 15th December 1911) on the subject is enclosed.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

Col.,
Suptg. Engineer, IV Circle.

Letter No.1189 S.E./60 I, dated 15th December 1911 from R.W. Formby Esq., Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division to -- the Superintending Engineer, Fourth Circle, Coimbatore:--

With reference to your endorsement Nos.1092 C.I., and - 1093 C.I., dated 7th December 1911, I have the honour to request that you will be good enough to address the Chief Engineer specially, for favour of obtaining the sanction of Government to retain the existing men as a special case, for the following reasons:--

- (1) The present surveyors understand the work and have -- been working for the last about a month.
- (2) It will take time to find and appoint fresh men.
- (3) The passed candidates who put in applications had no experience.
- (4) There is no special officer in charge of the project and I have already spent much time in explaining to the present men, what they have to do.
- (5) The completion of the investigation work will be delayed as passed men are to be selected and their arrival is to be awaited.
- (6) Of the two Surveyors employed on the project, one was previously on the Ukkaram tank project investigation work, and the other man has been paid Travelling Allowance for joining the appointment. If fresh men are to be appointed, the two should again be granted Travelling Allowance for joining the -- appointment and returning, at the expiry of the period.

In anticipation of sanction I am still retaining these persons and request the favour of your approval.

18/12/11

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 18, EDUCATIONAL,
DATED 16TH JANUARY 1912.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

[SUBJECT.—

From the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, dated 18th December 1911,
No. 904 W/14-D.

With his endorsements No. 864 W./14-D., dated 29th November 1911, and No. 865 W./14-D., dated 29th November 1911, the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle (Mr. Romilly) submitted applications for exemption, from the examination rules, of temporary surveyors A. Vaikunta Aiyar and D. Srialvandar employed in the Coimbatore division on the investigation of the Aliyar project. The particulars furnished in column 8 of the applications showed that these unpassed men had been selected

* Vide Memorandum, No. 8014 C., and No. 8015 C., dated 5th December 1911.

for the work in preference to passed candidates. The Chief Engineer there fore * declined to move Government to sanction the exemptions applied for, it being the policy† of Government not to sanction such exemptions when passed candidates are available.

2. In his letter read above (No. 904 W./14-D., dated 18th December 1911), the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle (Colonel Ellis) requests reconsideration of the matter and asks that the exemption applied for be recommended to Government as a special case. The grounds urged by the Superintending Engineer in support of his request are—

(1) that the passed candidates rejected were inexperienced, and no one was available to be sent to supervise their work on the spot;

(2) that many men fresh from the college, although capable of quite good work under experienced guidance and supervision, are generally quite unfit to make investigation surveys from instructions without constant guidance and assistance on the spot;

(3) that the men now recommended for exemption are both experienced surveyors and capable of working from instructions on project work without constant supervision—that they have now been a month at work—and that much delay and extra expense will be incurred if they are dispensed with.

3. The Superintending Engineer also requests that if the Chief Engineer still refuses to recommend the exemptions applied for, such refusal may be intimated to him by wire.

4. In the circumstances now explained by the Superintending Engineer, the exemptions sought may perhaps be recommended to Government for sanction. If so, the file may, it is submitted, be sent u.o. to Educational for orders.
P.V.—24-12-11.

W. G. MOLESWORTH—20-12-11.

Under the circumstances as now explained by the Superintending Engineer, I recommend that the exemption be granted on the grounds that although men technically qualified were available they were not really qualified whereas the unpassed men were really so and therefore the Executive Engineer's selection was correct.

C. A. SMITH—21-12-11.

To the Educational Department

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 522, Educational, dated 1st August 1911, is put up. The Honourable Member's orders in that case will be found on page 3 of the Government Order.

2. The practice obtaining in the Public Works Department of appointing unpassed candidates "in defiance of all rules as to

"qualifications—being thus not only against the definite orders of Government but to the prejudice of Government's "getting competent men for their work and also creating a plain discouragement to "other men to qualify"—has been the subject of criticism by Government on more occasions than one—vide Sir George Forbes' notes on page 2 of notes to G.O. No. 419, Educational, dated 15th July 1909, and on page 2 of notes to G.O. No. 244, Educational, dated 9th May 1910, and the Hon'ble Sir Murray Hammick's note on pages 5 and 6 of G.O. No. 670, Educational, dated 23rd September 1911.
P.R.—21-12-11.

No. 18, EDUCATIONAL, 16TH JANUARY 1912.

There do not seem to be sufficient grounds for sanctioning exemption in these two cases, as qualified men were available. But the Superintending Engineer puts the case strongly and the Public Works Department support the Superintending Engineer's recommendation.

R. SUNDARAM AIYAR—21-12-11.

For orders.

L. DAVIDSON—22-12-11.

There was absolutely no reason why sanction should not have been asked in this case before the men were appointed. Mr. Formby speaks of the expense in travelling involved in appointing new passed men now, it would be quite proper to make Mr. Formby pay the travelling, as his irregularity is the cause of the additional expenditure.

Public Works Department officers have a fascination for breaking the rules in this matter. It is absurd to suppose a passed man with sufficient experience could not have been found for these posts carrying a pay of Rs. 70.

I will sanction in this case, but I must ask the Chief Engineer to inform all Superintending Engineers to take note and let their subordinates know that it must be a strict rule in future that exemption in all these cases must be asked for in advance and that no exemptions whatever will be granted where non-qualified men are appointed without prior sanction in future.

M. H[AMMICK]—27-12-11.

A draft order is submitted for approval.

P.R.—3-1-12.

R.S.—3-1-12.

I am not certain that paragraph 2 should not run "orders [will issue in the Public Works Department etc., etc.]"

Public Works Department u. o. for acceptance of the draft and perusal of notes.

L. DAVIDSON—4-1-12.

Public Works Department.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Submitted that the notes may be perused and the draft order accepted.

P.R.—9-1-12.

P.V.—10-1-12.

W. A. MOLESWORTH—10-1-12.

Accepted in Public Works Department.

C. A. SMITH—10-1-12.

To the Educational Department.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

The draft order has been accepted by Public Works Department. For orders whether it may issue with paragraph 2 as it stands.

P.R.—12-1-12.

R.S.—12-1-12.

Yes.

L. DAVIDSON—13-1-12.

Issue.

R.S.—13-1-12.

[G.O. No. 18, Educational, dated 16th January 1912.]

P. Balakrishnan

C.No.14765. From the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, No. 904 W/14 D, dated 18th December 1911.

For the Under Secretary

With his endorsements No.864 W/14 D, dated 29th November 1911 and No.865 W/14 D, dated 29th November 1911, the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle (Mr. Romilly) submitted applications for exemption from the examination rules, of temporary surveyors A.Vaikunta Aiyar and D.Srialvandar employed in the Coimbatore Division on the investigation of the Aliyar project. The particulars furnished in column 8 of the applications showed that these unpassed men had been selected for the work in preference to passed candidates. The Chief Engineer therefore declined to move Government to sanction the exemptions applied for, it being the policy of Government not to sanction such exemptions when passed candidates are available.

2 In his letter read above (No.904 W/14 D, dated 18th December 1911) the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle (Col.Ellis) requests reconsideration of the matter and asks that the exemption applied for be recommended to Government as a special case. The grounds urged by the Superintending Engineer in support of his request are:

- (1) that the passed candidates rejected were inexperienced, and no one was available to be sent to supervise their work on the spot;
- (2) that many men fresh from the college, although capable of quite good work under experienced guidance and supervision, are generally quite unfit to make investigation surveys from instructions without constant guidance and assistance on the spot;

2/38
(3) that the men now recommended for exemption are both experienced surveyors and capable of working from instructions on project work without constant supervision - that they have now been a month at work and that much delay and extra expense will be incurred if they are dispensed with.

3. The Superintending Engineer also requests that if the Chief Engineer still refuses to recommend the exemptions applied for, such refusal may be intimated to him by wire.

4. In the circumstances now explained by the Superintending Engineer, the exemptions sought may perhaps be recommended to Government for sanction. If so, the file may, it is submitted, be sent u.o. to Educational for orders.

P.W.U.D No. 2356
21-12-11

P.U.
26-12-11

W.M.

20-12-11

W. J. Molesworth

W.

Under the circumstances as now explained by the S.E. I recommend that the exemption be granted on the grounds that although men technically qualified were available they were not really qualified whereas the unopposed men were really so. & therefore the E.E.'s selection was correct.

LCM-3170
Regd 21-12-11

This will have
to be done when
refused

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL
21 DEC 1911
SECRETARY

WPR

Educational u.o

21/12/11

Educational Department

G.

Gono 522 Bldy 1st August 1911 is put up. The H.M.'s orders in that case will be found on page 3 of the G.O.

2. The practice obtaining in the P.W.D. of appointing unpassed candidates in defiance of all rules as to qualifications — being thus not only against the definite orders of Govt. but to the prejudice of Government's getting competent men for their work and also creating a plain discouragement to other men to qualify — has been the subject of criticism by Govt. on more occasions than one — vide Sir George T. Forbes' notes on p. 2 of notes to Gono. 419 Bldy 15.7.09 and on p. 2 of notes to Gono. 244 Bldy 9.5.10 and Sir Murray Hammick's note on pages 5 and 6 of Gono. 670 Bldy 23.9.11.

PR 21.12.11 There do not seem to be sufficient grounds for sanctioning exemption in these two cases, as qualified men were available. But the Superintending Engineer puts the case strongly and the P.W.D. support the Sup^r Engineer's recommendation.

Re R. P. M. Ram Anjan 21.12.11. H.M. for order. 22.12.11

There was absolutely no reason why

Cf. para. 1 of Sir G. Forbes' note on p. 2 of notes to Gono. 244 9.5.10

Circled in Box No 40

A draft order is submitted for approval.

PP 3.1.12. Re I am not certain that para 2. shd. not read "order will issue in the P.W.D. re re"

P.W.D. no. for acceptance of the draft & perusal of notes.

LD 4-1-12

Davidson

Public Works Dept.

For the Secretary.

Submitted that the notes may be perused and the draft order accepted

Accepted - C.A. Smith

W.M. 10-1-12 W. J. Molesworth 10/1/12 Accepted in P.W.D.

To Educational no.

Educational Department

The draft order has been accepted by P.W.D. For orders whether it may issue with para. 2 as it stands.

LD 13.1.12

PP 12.1.12. Re (2.1.12.)

17 L.O. 188/161/10

Issue Re 13.1.12.

El no. 3170-1 51. 1.12

P.W.D. R No. 54 6.1.12

8 JAN 1912

WOL NOCLY 6-1-12

DW W

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL 12 JAN 1912 SECRETARIAT

PR

Then given for copying _____
Then copied _____
Then examined _____
Then signed _____ } 191

HAD AGAIN G.O., No. _____, DATED
191 _____

CURRENT No. _____

ENCLOSURES TO G. No. _____

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

P PERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

A A A A A A A

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy Heading only.