[L. & M.
3,000—19-11-96.]

Local & Munl. (1896) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 1234 L

DATED 8th July 1896

[Despatch Abstract.]

Establishment.

Sanctioning with remarks, the employment for one y~~n~~ year of an upper subordinate of the Public Works Department for ~~b~~ the preparation of type drawings and standard designs of sanitary works.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

URGENT.

No 1103/S

Office of the Sanitary
Commissioner for Madras.
June 6th 1896.

Local & Municipal Dept.
CURRENT No 1602 L

From

Surgeon Lt Col W. G. King. D. P. H.
Sanitary Commissioner for Madras.
Fort St George

To

The Chief Secretary to Government
Local and Municipal Department ,
Fort St George.

Sir ,

I have the honour to request that Government will do me the kindness of not passing orders upon the matter referred to in my letter No.832 ,dated 20th April ,1896, and opposed by the Sanitary Engineer to Govt. in his letter No 1417 , dated 7th May 1896, without kindly also taking into consideration this my reply thereto . Mr Jones informs Government that he writes in "self-defence " ,and desires that Government should carefully distinguish the difference between the "inability " to effect work and "refusal". The Office Notes referred to by him are as follows ;-

" The plans of a Vaccination Depot are not begun nor can they be so owing to press of work of all kinds for some time yet " .

" It is impossible for me to at present name a date by which a plan for a dead -house can be prepared . My staff has work already for many months . TheConsulting Architect is framing a plan in connection with the Hospital types I presume . Meantime as perhaps the house is required , some indications of the improvements necessary in the plan might be given . I suppose the building should be made suitable for post -mortem room and there is no ventilation ."

In G.O. 3592
21-2-96

" The Sanitary Engineer begs to refer the Sanitary Commissioner to Rule No 9 ofthe Sanitary Bd Rules. The Muni

2-6-96

cipality should make their own design. There is no special reason for the Sanitary Engineer doing this particular work ".

There is nothing in these Notes to imply, as now explained by Mr Jones, that he merely meant to delay until he got a reference answered. On the opposite, the suggestion conveyed was either that the work could not be attended for "many months", or "for some time yet" - which latter is as indefinite as the Greek Kalends. In any case, there was no insistence in my letter upon the word "refused", nor did I imply that refusal was maliciously intended; on the opposite, the only deduction laid before Government, which, I maintain, is perfectly accurate, was simply that it was incorrect to conceive that plans for petty and standard works were so rapidly evolved by the Sanitary Engineer that the appointment conditionally sanctioned in G. O. No-268 .L.Mis.dated 10th Feb 1896. was no longer necessary. As to the claim that the Vaccine Depot plans were in progress before I wrote this, it is perfectly correct; but this does not affect the fact that I had been told on the 3rd April 1896, the Sanitary Engineer was - as I put it - "unable to attend &c" and that not until about the 18th apl did I hear more of the matter. The word "refusal" in this special connection was not however used by me. I concluded my argument by saying that "progress is therefore actually hampered" - referring solely to the question of time consumed, and not to the motives of the Sanitary Engineer.

2. It remains now, however, for Government to judge whether the Sanitary Engineer's "inability" is due to overwork to such an extent that he could not have approached these petty matters in a more cordial spirit of helpfulness of sanitary advance, and have been able to give me an approximate idea, at least, of when matters could be arranged. It is, however, a question I did not raise in my letter.

3. Para 5 of the Sanitary Engineer's letter is on a par

with frequent Notes received from him as a Member of the Sanitary Board, in which he would attempt to lay down and define my duties. Such attempts, in my opinion, arise from his absolute "inability" to grasp the rudiments of the relations which should subsist between the sanitarian and the Sanitary Engineer. It is not the duty of the sanitarian to personally undertake field work, and "to calculate levels and measurements" of his own finding; but, when with the object of effecting sanitary ends, a Sanitary Engineer presents a scheme which is ~~supp~~ supposed to follow principles - not ascertained by the labour of the Sanitary Engineer but by that of the sanitarian - it is the duty of the latter to see that these are correctly effected leaving the mechanical matters of strength of materials and proposed mechanical methods of putting these in position to the Engineer. To do this and suggest safely alternate schemes, it ought to be possible for the sanitarian "to calculate measurements and levels &c" - not that he might usurp the duty of the Engineer, but that he might be able to make his sanitary proposals on a sound basis to that officer that he might deal with them from an engineering point of view. This is the principle on which the present Sanitary Board Rules are based. So fully is this simple fact held by all educational bodies in the present day, that no candidate for a degree in Public Health would be passed, unless he were able to satisfy his Examiners that on a sanitary engineering scheme being placed before him, he was able to clearly show where it failed to effect sanitary ends and, in doing so, to interpret the plans, levels, and measurements used by the Engineer. Indeed, such requirements are even demanded of ~~t~~ the Licentiate in Sanitary Science of the Madras University. I do not see, under these circumstances, if I express the wish to Government that I be aided in making such calculations so as to fulfil my ordinary duty, that the Sanitary Engineer has any right to offer his opinion on the subject, and to attempt to define the duties of my office by his estimate of what I should be allowed to do.

4. Again, in raising objections in his para. 6 to my adding to my staff so humble an individual as "an ordinary engineering overseer " destined to help me in making proposals for works that will subsequently have the great advantage of being criticized from an engineering point of view by him , it cannot be reasonably supposed that there is danger of my "entrenching on " the duties of the highly paid Government engineering expert. Had I proposed that I should get rid of the Sanitary Engineer's help as to sanitary works , he might have reason to feel this nervousness as to results. But, if by instructing "an ordinary engineering overseer " as to his requirements so as to present plans to the Sanitary Board ,the Sanitary Commissioner would "entrench on " the duties of the Sanitary Engineer ,it is but logical that for the same reason local authorities should at once be prevented from adopting so erroneous a procedure ,and thus afford the Sanitary Engineer the monopoly desired by him.

5. Of course, if the Sanitary Engineer would go with me to each Municipality and himself undertake these petty designs ,I should be delighted ; but it is evident ,in the absence of such an arrangement , my demands ,as prophesied by him , will doubtless -when met with statements of "inability " and cries of overwork - gradually become "less and less as time goes on " - a result not necessarily for the benefit of sanitary advance .

6. In short, Mr Jones seems neither prepared to undertake the work himself nor let anyone else do it . In the Bengal Presidency, the Sanitary Engineer has never been allowed to be a Member of the Sanitary Board for obvious reasons , and is thus described in an Order by the Bengal Government on the relation which should subsist between the Sanitary Commissioner and the Sanitary Engineer ;-" * . * . * . * - The function of this officer (Sanitary Engineer) will be to accompany the Sanitary Commissioner on his tours ;to work in concert and concurrence with him in the preparation of designs ,plans and estimates; to guide the Municipalities in getting up projects ,and , after these have been approved by the Board ,and under the advice of the Chief Engineer, to inspect the works whilst in course of construction and report to the Board on the progress made. It is intended that he should be the right hand man of the Sanitary Commissioner in all matters involving engineering knowledge and experience ". But the Sanitary Engineer in this Presidency is not the "right hand man" of the Sanitary Commissioner . On the opposite , he spends much of the time of the Sanitary Board in defining what the ~~///~~ duties of the Sanitary Commissioner should be !

Please see the enclosure marked with red tape in G.O. 2380 R 16-11-94

7. Mr Jones ,in his para. 6, chooses to represent to Government that there are certain reasons expressed by the President, Sanitary Board, which he feels so great delicacy in stating, that he asks Government to obtain them from the President, Sanitary Bd. This statement is deliberately couched in a manner ~~to lead Government~~ to lead Government to consider that I had special reasons for concealing them . I had certainly no reason for concealing them from Government ,but I had reasons for not utilizing them . As I have been practically challenged to do so , I quote these accordingly ;-

Had I entered into the matter ,I should have had to explain that the Sanitary Engineer in agreeing to a Proceedings of the Sanitary Board ,No 2539 dated 5th Sept . 1895 ,advising that an Upper Subordinate should be attached to my office, and subsequently disagreeing thereto on the 13th Feb 1896, was so inconsistent in his opinions that little value could be placed upon them, seeing that, as shown by his now insisting upon his "inability " to attend to Minor Works ,no change in the state of affairs has occurred between the 5th Sept. 1895 and the 3rd Feb .1896. Had I commented upon that change of opinion ,I should have stated that in my estimate it was due not to better outturn of work, but to a complete alteration in Mr Jones' views owing to change in the duties and organization of his Dept. that he had not calculated upon at time of agreeing with the Board's proposal . If I may be permitted to give a further reason for not referring to the Sanitary Engineer's opinion ,I would state that I consider the extraordinary opposition which this simple proposal has evoked seems to be unconsciously founded upon a form of professional conservatism that has failed to keep up with the march of time , and not upon an unbiassed desire to advance the sanitary interests of this Presidency . I considered Mr Jones would not like me to make comments of this sort ,so I thought it

G.Os 2073 M 9-12-95 + 847 M 15-5-96

better ,out of considerations of courtesy to him ,not to drag his views before Government .

8. As to the views held by the President ,I should have had to explain that before he had consulted me on the matter,he came to the Meeting in which the subject was discussed with his Note of dissent already written , but that I understood when I placed before him the proposal of not following Col Pennycuick's ~~orig-inal~~ original suggestion of having a Supervisor but contenting myself with "an ordinary engineering overseer " ,I had his concurrence . Indeed , so fully did I consider that he agreed with me that directly I left the Meeting ,I wrote Note No 69 of the 22nd Feb 1896,in which I named the subordinate I wished attached.. The President's subsequent Note in reply (No46 of the 20th March 1896) and which I quoted to Government in full inthe letter under reference,certainly gave me no reason to suspect that he had withdrawn concurrence withthe minor suggestion made.

9. There was therefore no real object in my dragging these views before Government -simply that I might explain them,or express my non-concurrence with them ,and I fail to see anything "curious " in the matter - as more than suggestively remarked by the Sanitary Engineer .

10. I would invite the attention ~~of~~ of Government to the fact that whilst it would seem perfectly legitimate for the Sanitary Engineer to explain or deny any statements made by me concerning him personally , there can exist no ground upon which -uninvited by Government - he should take it upon himself to give his opinions as to whether an office independent of his control should be supplied with extra hands or not . Should Government consider him justified ,I presume it would not be improper of me,the next time the Sanitary Engineer asks for an increase of his office staff,to forward to Government my views of the amount and nature of work done by the Sanitary Engineer, and express my disapproval - should I think this necessary !

I have the honour to be Sir,

Your most obedient Servant ,

Surgeon Lt Col --- Sanitary Commissioner for Madras.

URGENT.

Local & Municipal DEPARTMENT.

Local & Municipal Dept.
CURRENT No. 1602 L

From

SURN.-LT.-Col. W. G. KING, M.B., C.M., D.P.H.,

SANITARY COMMISSIONER FOR MADRAS,

To

THE Chief Secy to Govt,
Local & Municipal Dept,
Fort Saint George.

No. 1103
S

Dated 6th }
Despatched } June 1896
Received }

ENCLOSURES.

Subject.

Submits further remarks on Correspondence regarding the appointment of an Upper Subordinate of the D. P. W. for the office of the Sanitary Commissioner.

Plea
enclo
with
in G.O.

(with Endt.)

[500—16-4-96.]

H. M.

No.

Referred to the President, Sanitary Board, for remarks, in continuation of G.O. No. 1017 L, dated 2nd June 1896.

(By order)
W W Phillips
Ag Assistant Secretary

P.R.
6/6/96

Fort St. George }
June 1896 }

To
The President, Sanitary Board.

6/6

G.
Z.A.
1,000—21-3-96.

DEPARTMENT

C. No.

FOR ORDERS.

I ~~don't~~ cant see exactly what to say until I get back the former correspondence which is now with the San. Bd. I imagine Dr. K. should be well wigged, but one can't be sure without the former papers.

9/6/96

To lie over pending receipt of reply to G.O. 1017 L dated 2.6.96

10/6/96

Dr. King & Mr. Jones appear to be in need of another slap from Government. They are wasting their own time and that of other highly paid officials with what is but a twopenny squabble.

If they had the least common sense one would never have been troubled with this matter.

Sending this letter on to the President of the Sanity. Bd. will probably add fuel to the flames and give rise to further correspondence of the same acrimonious type as the communication now under disposal.

8/6/96.

Preparation of Standard plans
for Sanitary works

FOR ORDERS.

1602 L

H. M.

1216 W
95

1457 L
95

For A. S.

should this file be kept at Ooty or may it be sent down to Madras office please?

J.W.
10/6/96

To Madras office

10/6

ordered to be over

11/6

C 9/6

Local and Municipal Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following papers:—

From the Sanitary Commissioner for Madras, dated 20th April 1896, No.832/S.

From the Sanitary Engineer to Government, dated 7th May 1896, No.1417.

ORDER No.1017 L.Mis., dated 2nd June 1896.

The letters read above will be referred to the President, Sanitary Board for remarks.

(True extract)

Under Secretary, P.W.D.,
for Chief Secretary.

To

The President, Sanitary Board,
with C.Nos.1150 L.x & 1333 L.in original
to be returned.

x in G.O. 1017 L
2-6-96

Sanitary Current No 99

Recd 5.6.96

90.

Local & Municipal Dept
CURRENT No. 1682 L

No. 100 S. d 9th June 1896

Retransmitted to the Local and Municipal department with the remark that the views of the undersigned are contained in his note No. 29 S, dated 25th February 1896, copy of which is herewith forwarded.

S. McW. Campbell Colonel R.E.
President, Sanitary Board

12 JUN. 96

To
The Local & Municipal Deptt.
with the referred papers
and copy of No. 29 S; dated
25 February 1896

Pl 12/6 OLS 152

From the Joint Secretary, Sanitary Boar Engineering Branch, dated 13th February 189 forwarding for favour of remarks Local and Municipal G.O stating that Government is not prepared to incur further expenditure in order to expedite the preparation and issu of type drawings or standard designs for th guidance of Municipal Councils and Local Boards, as plans for various sanitary works have been issued by the Sanitary Board and fair progress is apparently being made.

Note by the President, Sanitary Board, No. 29 S, dated 25th February 1896:—

The Sanitary Commissioner states that practically latrines, slaughter houses, wells or Cinerators, minor sewage farms, house connections, markets &c, complete the list of minor works for which type designs are required, surely nearly all of these works have been built somewhere or another in the Presidency and the defects ascertained, if so, as I presume they were built on sanctioned plans there should be no difficulty in modifying these plans so that they will answer as type designs or perhaps it will be possible to get designs of works of a similar nature that have been carried out in other parts of India and proved successful.

successful. The proposal to place an upper subordinate of the Public Works Department at the disposal of the Sanitary Commissioner for the purpose of drawing up type designs for minor works would be practically to make the Sanitary Commissioner Sanitary Engineer for minor works and I think this would be a mistake as it would lead to endless discussion. I think it would be better if the upper subordinate were placed at the disposal of the Sanitary Engineer. There is no reason why the Sanitary Commissioner should not draw up sanitary specifications for each description of minor works such as slaughter houses, latrines &c, the plan could then be prepared in the Sanitary Engineer's office in accordance with these specifications, and if the sanitary conditions were fulfilled, the engineering details should not be questioned by the Sanitary Commissioner.

The late President apparently approved of centralisation but I am inclined to think that the time has come when more power must be given to Municipal and District Boards as regards Sanitary Works. These works are being pushed on so rapidly all over the Presidency that it will soon be impossible for a central office to keep control over all of them and it will be

necessary

G.O. 24642
21-12-95

necessary to allow local bodies to estima for and carry out works under a certai sum without reference to the central office. The Sanitary Commissioner mak some proposals as to how this could b done but I doubt if these are feasible The question of putting the Local Fun Engineering Establishment on a better footing and getting more efficient men is now being considered and when that is done perhaps the District Engineer in consultation with the District Surgeon might be given the power of estimating for and carrying out works costing say less than Rs 500 without reference to the central office. The District Engineer might also have the maintenance of sanitary works including water supply and drainage.

(Sd) D. McNeil Campbell, Col. R.E.,
President Sanitary Board.

To, The Sanitary Commr }
" Sanitary Engr } for remarks

12 JUN. 86

1/16824/96

P1/1b

[9]

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Local & [illegible] Dept.
CURRENT No. 1682 L

From

The President
Sanitary Board

No. 1005

Dated 9/6

Received 12/6.

Enclosures 1 & C Nos 1150 L & 1333 [illegible] Stitched with G.O. 1017 [illegible]

SUBJECT.

Resubmitting with remarks papers reg. the addition of an Engineering Upper Subordinate to the Sany. Commr's Staff.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Agai G.O. No. 1017 L, dated 2nd June 1896.
& Current No.s 1602 L and 1682 L.

From

FOR ORDERS.

In his letter No.1411 dated 17" May 1895, the Sanitary Engineer raised the question whether it was the intention of Government that his office should prepare the designs of all works required by local bodies, as in that case the staff should be greatly increased. This letter was referred to the Sanitary Board for consideration with reference to para.3 of G.O., No.2380 L., dated 16th November 1894, in which the Board was requested to draft detailed rules on ~~all~~ the general principles laid down by Government and all other points which appeared to require distinct definition - Vide G.O., No.1103 M., dated 12th July 1895. In reply to this the Sanitary Board stated that all standard type drawings should be prepared in the Board's office, that as the Sanitary Engineer's office had already sufficient

work

work to get through, matters would be expedited if the Sanitary Commissioner had placed at his disposal for one year an Upper subordinate of the Public Works Ddpartment who could put the Sanitary Commissioner's ideas into shape and working form, before being sent to the Sanitary Engineer for their completion and issue, that the Chief Engineer was willing to grant this help, and that though the Local bodies were entitled to call for type-drawings or standard designs, any further design required for these works, excepting, of course, major schemes of water-supply and drainage, should be prepared by the local officers themselves and submitted to the Board for revision and approval. On this the Government observed that as a number of standard plans for various sanitary works have been issued by the Sanitary Board and as fair progress in this direction was being made, it was not prepared to incur further expenditure in order to expedite it and that the Boards' suggestion may be carried out if an upper subordinate of the Public Works Department can be spared from other duty, without the necessity for additional expense -Vide G.O.No.268L. dated 10"February 1896.

2. Col.Campbell, the present chief Engineer, having told the Sanitary Commissioner that no upper subordinate of the Public Works Department could be placed at his disposal without additional expense, the Sanitary Commissioner requested

the

the sanction of Government for the emplo ment of an overseer on Rs. 80 with two lascars, to accompany him on his tours and prepare plans and estimates of minor sanitary works on the spot, so that they may be laid before, and discussed with, the local bodies before he leaves the station and also to help him in dealing with the plans and estimates submitted to him under No.4 of the rules for the Sanitary Board issued in G.O., No.359 L., dated 21st February 1896. With reference to this letter of the Sanitary Commissioner, Mr. Jones, the Sanitary Engineer, addressed Government, raising the question whether it is necessary for the Sanitary Commissioner, when there is a Sanitary Engineer, to calculate measurements ~~on~~ and levels etc, when plans and estimates are submitted to the former by the local bodies under the rule above referred to. Mr. Jones added that the Sanitary Commissioner's proposal to add to his staff an overseer for the purpose of taking levels, drawing plans and estimating seemed to be entrenching on duties which appertain to other officers by whom they would be much better performed. These two letters having been referred to the President of the Sanitary Board for remarks (G.O., No.1017 L. dated 2nd June 1896), he has submitted his views in the second of the currents read above. He thinks that the Sanitary Commissioner's proposal to place an upper subordinate of the Public Works Department for the purpose of drawing up type

designs

designs for minor works would be practically to make the Sanitary Commissioner the Sanitary Engineer for minor works, that this would be a mistake as it would lead to endless discussion, and that it would be better to place the upper subordinate at the disposal of the Sanitary Engineer. The Chief Engineer says that there is no reason why the Sanitary Commissioner should not draw up sanitary specifications for each description of minor works, such as latrines, as the plans could then be prepared in the Sanitary Engineer's office in accordance with these specifications, and if the sanitary conditions were fulfilled the engineering details should not be questioned by the Sanitary Commissioner. Colonel Campbell thinks that more power should be given to local bodies as regards sanitary works, as it will be impossible for a central office to keep control over all of them and that when the Local Fund Engineering establishment is placed on a better footing, perhaps the District Engineer, in consultation with the District Medical and Sanitary officer, might be given the power of estimating for and carrying out works costing, say, less than Rs.500 and the District Engineer might also have the maintenance of sanitary works including water-supply and drainage. In the first of the currents read above the Sanitary Commissioner submits his remarks on the letter of the Sanitary Engineer above referred to and requests that this may also

be

I think the San: Comm: had better let designing alone

BS
26/6/96

JG
28/6/96

A.SH
1.7.96

be taken into consideration before orders are passed on his previous letter of 20" April 1896, No.832. This current has already been circulated to H.M. who wished to see the previous papers before passing orders.

I.R.
18/6/96

As the preparation of standard designs is apparently not proceeding very fast (vide C 1150 L in G.O. 1017 L / 2.6.96) it is submitted that extra hands may be temporarily employed for the purpose, & if necessary the cost recovered from Local Boards & Municipalities for whose sole benefit they will be employed. These hands, Col. Campbell thinks, should be placed at the disposal of the San. Engineer, & not of the San. Commr., as proposed by the San. Board (vide Resolution in C. 2572 L in G.O. 268 L / 10.2.96). It is submitted that the original proposal is the better, as with the aid of an upper subordinate ~~the~~ of the P.W.D. the San. Commr. could prepare designs, which would not require much alteration by the San. Engr., whereas if the designs were prepared by the San. Engr. they would have to be referred to the San. Commr. for approval from a sanitary point of

BS

A.SH
1.7.96

view & this would probably entail considerable delay & perhaps friction also.

W.W.D.
20.6.96

I submit that the Sanitary ~~Engineer~~ Commissioner should not have the establishments which he proposes. It will only lead to squabbling and loss of time to every one of he has it: further I agree with Col Campbell that it would be an usurpation of the functions of the Sanitary Engineer.

H.P.
24/6/96.

Yes.
A.S.K.
7.7.96

Order No 1234 Lmis dy 8.7.96

Order.

1. The proposals contained in the letter of the S.C. No. 832/8 dated 20th April 1896 do not meet with the approval of Govt.

2 The employment for one year of an Upper Subordinate of the Public Works Dept. for the preparation of type drawings & standard designs of sanitary works is sanctioned. ~~for one year~~. His services will be placed at the disposal of the Sanitary Engineer & ~~his~~ the ~~and~~ charges incurred on acct of ~~[illegible]~~ ~~Expenditure incurred [illegible]~~ ~~work~~ ^ their offices will be recovered from the local bodies ~~from local Boards & Municipalities~~, for ~~whose sole~~ the benefit of which he ~~will be~~ is employed.

(from orders) H.P.
3/7/96

W.W.D.
2.7.96

6/7/96

To
The President Sanitary Board
" Sanitary Commissioner
" Sanitary Engineer
" Public Works Deptt.
" Accountant - General

Dup 13/7/96

P of G.O. No 1017 L. 7/2 6 96, P of currents &c

P of G.O., P. currents &c
P of G.O., P. currents &c
P of G.O., P. currents &c
P of G.O., P. currents &c

Appointment of an overseer under
the Sanitary Commissioner to prepa
plans & estimates of min[illegible]sanitary
works.

From
~~FOR~~ ORDERS.

1602 & 1682 L

C.S. L1234

This should go to the P.W.D.
for Counterinitial - The
C. E. has already [illegible]
[illegible]

17

3/7

To the P.W.D. for favour of
Counter initials
WWS
4-7-96

6/7/96

When given for copying ______
When copied ______
When examined ______
When signed ______
189

Read again G.O., No. 189 dated

Current No.

Enclosures to C. No.

Order of Government .. .. .. A A A A A A A

Letter of Government

Statement with ditto

Papers not filed up, being meant for despatch in original.

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