

Law Education (1925) Department.

MIS SERIES.

G.O. No. 2163

DATED 18-12-23

[Despatch Abstract.]

COLLEGE.

ENGINEERING, GUINDY.- CERTAIN ENGINEERING AND

UPPER SUB-ORDINATE STUDENTS - PRACTICAL TRAINING - RECOGNITION.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

CF 30

LAW (EDUCATION) DEPARTMENT.

Received 192 . Registered 192

Subject.

College of Engineering, Guindy - ~~Principal~~ ^{Practical} - Training
Training of students.



ENCLOSURES.

No.

Spare copies

R.O.C. No. 1411-A/25.

Station Madras. Dated the 12th November 1925

From (Name) R. Littlehales, Esquire, M.A.,

(Designation) Director of Public Instruction,
Madras.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras

Law (Education) Department.
Fort Saint George.

Sir,

I have the honour to submit herewith a copy of letter
No.R.C.1772/23 dated 14-10-1925 from the Principal, College
of Engineering, Guindy together with its enclosures and to
request that in the circumstances explained therein, -
Government will be pleased to accord the necessary sanction.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

[Signature]
For Director of Public Instruction

D.H.P. 13-11.

[Signature]
13-11

209

Copy of letter R.C.1772/23 dated 14th October 1925 from the Principal, College of Engineering, Guindy to the Director of Public Instruction, Madras.

I have the honour to request that sanction of Government may be obtained for recognising the practical experience gained by the following passed Engineer and Upper Subordinate students during a portion of their practical course in 1924-25 on the works noted against them for the purpose of awarding diplomas to them in accordance with Rule 69 of the College Rules.

Some of them were permitted to take up appointments during the period in anticipation of the sanction of Government on the distinct understanding that they would be recommended for diplomas only after obtaining a satisfactory report of their work and conduct from the officers under whom they were placed.

In the other cases where students were allowed to take their training in the works noted against their names I had ascertained and satisfied myself of the varied nature of the works on which they were likely to be employed.

As regards the Upper Subordinate student who had this practical course in the Salem Municipality, I consider the works are such as to afford facilities for getting suitable experience (Copy of the Chairman's letter No.2004/P.C.-24 dated 17-9-1924 enclosed) and that the course may be accepted.

Final reports on behalf of all the students mentioned below have been obtained from the respective officers under whom they worked and their progress has been satisfactory. I recommend that the courses of training may be considered to have been satisfactorily completed in all the cases and that Government be moved to grant the sanction sought for.

P. T. O.

3

List of Engineer and Upper Subordinate Students for Recognition
of Practical Experience.

Name of student.	Name of works.	Period of Train- ing.	Whether the course may be considered as satisfactorily completed.	Remarks.
Mechanical Engineering student.				
1. M. Ganapathi	Electrical De- partment M. & S.M. Railway, Madras.	Mths. Days 3 8	Yes	Underwent practical training course during the period.
Upper Subordinates.				
1. V. Ramayya	Bridge Engineer- ing section S.I. Ry.	5 6	Yes	Was employed during the period as Works Assistant in the Ry.
2. R. Vaidyanatha swami	M. & S.M. Railway Engineering Dept.	5 11	Yes	Was employed during the period as Pro. Permanent Way Ins- pector.
3. R. Srinivasa- raghavan	S.I. Ry. Construc- tion branch	1 26	Yes	He was employed as Sub Inspector of Works in the railway.
4. R. V. Subrah- manya Sastri	Ry. & General En- gineering Co. Bangalore	5 3	Yes	Underwent practical course.
5. D. Govinda- swami	Corporation of Madras	1 7	Yes	Was employed during the period as Over- seer.
6. M. K. Rajagopa- lan	Salem Municipa- lity	Whole course of 12 months	Yes	Underwent practical course.

A // (All the above students with the exception of No. 6 underwent
satisfactorily the remaining period of their practical course
in the Public Works Department.

4 (A)

Copy of letter No. 2004/P.C./24/17th September 1924 from
the Chairman, Municipal Council, Salem to the Principal, College
of Engineering, Guindy.

Your letter No. 1772/23 dated 9-9-1924. It is proposed to
place the apprentice overseer on the following works:-

	Amount of Estimate.
1. Repairs to Trunk Road within Municipal Limit	Rs. 2424
2. Constructing an additional tiled building to Komaraswamipatty boys' school	800
3. Constructing 2 sets of latrine in Chinnamuthu street as per Type Design No. 190 issued in G.O. No. 176 P.H. dated 30-1-1923	900
4. Encasing steel main from Cogai culvert up to Dadagapatty culvert in metal concrete	5200
5. Constructing a masonry drain in Shandipet road	3960
6. -Do- in Shevapet Bazaar street	4470
7. Opening new fountains	8556
8. Construction of new toll gate sheds	1125

2. In view of the varied nature of the works on which the
apprentice overseer will be placed in charge I think there is -
ample opportunity for him to learn work. I therefore request -
that you will permit the apprentice being trained here under the
Municipal Engineer.

13.11

For Director of Public Instruction.

DEPARTMENT.

Date.	Initials.
-------	-----------

College - Engineering, Guindy -
Certain Engineering and Upper Subordi-
nate students - Practical training -
Recognition -

READ AGAIN G.O. No. _____, dated _____ 192

” ” ” ” ” 192

READ ALSO :—

C. No. 3740/C From the D. P. I., R.O.C., No. 1411 - A/25, dated 12 - 11 - 1925

” ” ” ” ” ” ” ” ” 192

” ” ” ” ” ” 192

ORDER.

Misc.

No. 2163, dated 18-12- 192

The training undergone by the following ~~students of the~~ Engineer and Upper Subordinate ~~courses~~ ^{Students} of the College of Engineering, Guindy, during their practical course in 1924-25 in the works and for the period noted against them is recognised for the purpose of awarding diplomas to them in accordance with the rules relating to the College of Engineering.

Name of Student.	Examination Works.	Period.	Mths.	Days.
<u>Mechanical Engineering Standard.</u>				
1. M. Ganapathi	Electrical Deptt., M. & S. M. Ry. Madras.	3	3	8
<u>Upper Subordinate Standard.</u>				
2. V. Ramayya	Bridge Engineering Section, S. I. Ry.	5	5	6
3. R. Vaidyanatha Swami	Engineering Department, M. & S. M. Ry.	5	5	11
4. R. Srinivasa Raghavan	Construction branch, S.I. Ry.	1	1	26
5. R. V. Subrahmanya Sastri	Ry. & General Engineering Co., Bangalore.	5	5	3
6. D. Govindaswami	Corporation of Madras. Works in the	1	1	7
7. M. K. Rajagopalan	Salem Municipality. Works in the	12	12	"

To

The D. P; I.
" P. W. D.

DESPATCHED

19 DEC 1925

CR
2102
s

V.T.K
3.12

Note

Note:- P.W.D. w/o for acceptance of
draft on the previous page.

1.12.25

A
y n

Law (ed) no 3740 C/25-1
2.12.25

V.P. 12

P. W. D. A.O.



Two

Please see A on page 3 C.F.
All the students mentioned overleaf
except no. 7, have undergone the
major portion of their practical
course in the P.W.D. The training
undergone by them for the remaining
portion of the year may be recognized
as the institutions in which they
worked have got trained engineers
to supervise their work.

As regards No. 7, who underwent
the whole of his practical course
in the Salem municipality,
attention is invited to the
opinions attached A & B on
pages 3, 4 & 5 of L.O. 297 Law (Edn)
of 26.2.24, of the Chief Engrs
in an analogous case in 1923,
where they considered that
municipalities in general (except
the Madras Corporation) had no
trained engineers to exercise
supervision.

* detailed on p 4 C.F.

But nothing about
supervision.

expert supervision over the work of the student
and that the works there were not also of a
varied nature. In the present case the
Principal considers that the works in the Salem
Municipality were such as to afford facilities
for getting suitable experience, and that the
course may be accepted - vide C on p 2 C.F.
and the P.S. supports the proposal. For order
whether it may be accepted ~~as a whole~~ ~~the C.F.~~
~~may be considered.~~

Plm
4/12

Plm
4.12.25

Long

I am not prepared to accept any
unless C.F. agrees.

4.12.25

C.F. 10.

I do not think it at all
desirable that students select
municipalities for their course
of practical training, unless there
are fairly important works going on
& a competent engineer to instruct
the student. In this particular case
the student has done his full year's
course & from a report received today
from the Sanitary Engineer, ~~the student~~ he
has learnt how work in connection
with the Salem water supply should not

P.O. no. 7504 A-1
4.12.25



be carried out
I am in favour of granting
him his certificate

W.M.

14.12.25

C.G's 4072E/25-1

15.12.25




Suffragette

16.12.25

Letter

P.O. 4074-2

16.12.25



LE 4074/17.12.25

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed

192

READ AGAIN G.O. No. 192

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DETTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED OF, BRING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.-

- A = Copy in full.
- B = Not to be copied.
- P = Copy abstract only.
- Q = Copy heading only.