

Local & Munl. (1890) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 1645 M.

DATED 24-9-96

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Sanitation. Stating that the Sanitary Engineer was asked to explain the faulty construction of the Cobacarnund Intercepting Sewer, as Government was misled by the Municipal Council's statement in its resolution No XIV of 24th Sept. 1895 which appears to have been erroneous.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

in G.O., dated

189 , No.

Current No.

of 189 , dated

from the

Current No.

3648 m. of 1895, dated

26 November

from the

Saunder's Inquiries to Govt.

FOR ORDERS.

Please see the notes and orders in G.Os. Nos. 1390 m. dated 26 August 1895, 1754 m. dated 25 October 1895, and 1903 m. dated 18 November 1895.

1/28
4/12/95

From his explanation it appears that the San. Eng. did not supervise the construction of the sewer, as stated in the resolution of the M.C. of 24.9.95, but only designed it, & the San. Bd. approved of his design.

W.H.D.
5/12/95

I regret that this paper has been so long overlooked. I was under the impression that the S. Eng. had come up to see and seen the sewer when under construction and that there was some semi-official correspondence in regard to this but through a mistake search was made nothing came

I can't find this -

There are also other papers missing. E.g., in G.O. 819 m. dated 28.3.92. I find a reference to a G.O. of 8/1/91, which is not in the file. I cannot find anything in the file to show who designed the intercepting sewer. I was led by the notes of the C.E. of the late Govt. & I think that Mr. Jones supervised the execution of the work of the intercepting sewer. I always heard that he did - how he says he did not. Similarly, I always understood that he designed the sewer, but I see that in his original report on the subject (in G.O. 1035 m. dated 14.7.90) he recommended a stoneware pipe drain, whereas the existing drain is an iron one - there is nothing in the file to show who designed the drain & the next thing will, I suppose, be that Mr. J. will say that he did not. Let the file be made complete by a full note being put up. We must get to the bottom of this business, you know. Col. Langensieck should have seen to it, but did not.

W.H.D.
23/3/96

found: Here is nothing of an
use.

20
21/3/86.

Journal of the
21/3/86.

21/3/86.

21/3/86.

Journal of the
21/3/86.

Journal of the
21/3/86.

Journal of the
21/3/86.

Journal of the
21/3/86.

Journal of the
21/3/86.

Journal of the
21/3/86.

Journal of the
21/3/86.

Journal of the
21/3/86.

Explanation of the Construction of the City
Intercepting Sewer.

FOR ORDERS.

3648 m

H. M. Jones & Son in Force

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Gain G.O., dated 18th November 1895, No. 1903 u.

Current No. of 189 , dated from the

Current No. 3648 m. of 1895, dated 26th November from the Sanitary Engineer

FOR ORDERS.

In 1890 the Potacamund intercepting sewer became silted up, and the Sanitary Engineer (Mr. Jones) inspected it in June at the request of the Municipal Chairman and submitted a report to Govt. in July pointing out how the sewer had failed to work and suggesting measures to rectify the defects which were found to exist. One of these measures was to replace the portion of the sewer between Brown's stables and the Municipal markets by a closed stone-ware pipe sewer 9" in diameter, as the old brick sewer was of too large a size, and had too little inclination to work well. Mr. Jones desired that the Municipal Engineer should be asked to prepare the necessary plans and estimates to carry out his suggestions and send them to him for approval or remarks. This report of Mr. Jones was transferred to the Municipal Council with the request that steps may be at once taken to carry out Mr. Jones' scheme of a pipe sewer and certain

other suggestions made by him. The plans and estimates were accordingly prepared by the Municipal Engineer, and sent up to Mr. Jones, who in his letter to the Chairman dated 27th November 1891 suggested certain alterations. These were adopted by the Municipal Engineer and the revised plans and estimates were submitted to Govt. by the Sanitary Engineer with his letter of 4th February 1892. The Govt. in passing orders thereon directed that there should be no delay in restoring the main sewer as suggested by Mr. Jones, and in diverting the Lake channel. A grant of Rs. 10,000 from Provincial funds was made to the Municipal Council for this purpose and the Council was told to find the balance of Rs. 1300 required from current revenues.

The work was then taken up and completed by the Municipal Engineer Mr. Nery in 1892-93. In his administration report for the year 1892-93 the Chairman reported to Govt. that he doubted whether the new pipe sewer served its purpose as effectually as was intended. It was suspected that the pipe was too small, but the Sanitary Engineer whose attention was drawn to the matter stated that the pipe was large enough and that the fault lay in the gradient not being sufficient. The

Sanitary

* G.O. No. 1035 M. of 14-7-90.

Copy put in G.O. 673 M. of 7-4-92.

G.O. No. 619 M. of 28-3-92 and
No. 673 M. of 7-4-92.

(a) In G.O. No. 1283 M. of 23-9-93.

(a) G.O. No. 1601 M. of 22-11-93

(b) G.O. No. 739 M. of 11-6-94.

(c) Enclt. No. 1234
13-11-94 on Enr. No. 2743 M.

Sanitary Engineer's report was recorded but His Excellency the Governor and the Honble Mr. Garstin still thought that the fault was in the small pipe that had been used. Subsequently as the result of a conversation on the subject between Mr. Hammett and the Honble Mr. Bliss, the Chief Engineer was requested to report on the then existing state of the sewer and to suggest any remedial measures which may be adopted. He was also requested to fix the responsibility for the waste of public money which seemed to have occurred. Mr. Ellis the Sanitary Engineer then submitted a report at the request of the Chief Engineer about the defects in the sewer and the steps that should be taken to rectify them. When this was referred to the Public Works Deptt. for remarks, the Chief Engineer said that he would inspect the sewer and discuss the matter at a meeting of the Sanitary Board and then submit his report. No such report was

however received, but the Proceedings of a meeting of the Sanitary Board held to discuss the matter were sent up to Govt. the Chief Engineer having apparently thought that as he was a party to the proceedings no separate report from him was necessary. The Sanitary Board was of opinion that the pipe sewer had been properly designed, but had been incorrectly laid and that the blockage was due to this cause. The Board suggested that the 9 inch pipe should be replaced by a 12 inch pipe, and the sewer realigned with several alterations. On this the Govt. ordered^(a) that the Public Works Dept. should be requested to depute one of its officers to design and carry out the necessary alterations. The Chief Engineer was at the same time reminded of the Govt. order in G.O. No. 739 M. d/11.6.94 report who was responsible for the bad laying of the sewer. In reply to this he stated that the work had been done by

(a) G.O. No. 1390 M. d/24.8.95.

(a) G.O. No. 754 M. d/25.10.95

(b) (Vide H. Co. Note in G.O. 1754 M. d/25.10.95)

(c) (Vide Note in G.O. No. 1903 M. d/8.11.95)

(In Enr. No. 2960 M. in linked file)

(d) G.O. No. 1903 M. d/8.11.95.

I don't see that we can say anything but that we regret that we were misled by the M.C.'s statement which ~~appears~~ appears to have been erroneous —

x in its res. of 24/9/95

the Municipality and the Chairman reported that the Municipal Engineer Mr. Nery was the officer under whose immediate supervision the pipe had been laid. As however H. Co. and the Honble Mr. Bliss thought^(c) that Mr. Jones had supervised the work from time to time and the Municipal Council had in its resolution of 24th September 1895 stated that that had been the case, Mr. Jones was called upon to explain how it was that he did not discover the fault in the laying of the pipe. His reply is the current read above. He denies that he supervised the execution of the work and states that during all the time the pipe was laid, he did not go to Potacamund at all.

I certainly was under the impression that Mr. Jones did from time to time supervise the

laying of this sewer and the Council came in its Resolution (the latter file) says the same but nothing to show that he did ^{the fact} in record although careful search has been made and he denies that he did. An other map appears to have been made by the who thing. It would hardly have been better if iron pipes

had been used. It was Mr Jones
who suggested Stoneware-

LD
11/4/96

C.S.

Read again S.O. 1903 M
18.11.95

C. 3648 M.

Order No. 1645 Min 24.9.96

The fact reports that it was
mistaken by the Muni. Council's
District Statement in its resolution
of 24.9.95, which appears
to be erroneous.

(from orders)

WSD
21.9.96

HA
22.9.96

Resubmitted to H.M. with a note as
requested in his note of 23.3.96.

WSD
9.4.96

Resubmitted, with linked file, & H.M.

WSD
18.4.96

LD
21/4/96

To the Sanitary Engineer
20.8.96
25/9/96

D. 3 22/4.

S.E. 6-9-95-1,000.

No. 3517

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

OFFICE OF SANITARY ENGINEER,

Fort St. George, 26 Nov 1895.

3648 M

From

J. A. JONES, Esq., MEM. INST. C.E., F.R.S.E.,

SANITARY ENGINEER TO GOVERNMENT,

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Local & Municipal Department

SIR,

I have the honor to acknow-
-ledge receipt of G. O. No. 1903 M. Dis.
dated the 18th November 1895, Local
& Municipal.

2. I received the order with
much surprise & regret, because I
feel assured that, had Govern-
-ment had the correct facts
before it, no such order would
ever have been issued.

3. The order places upon the
Sanitary Engineer a respon-
-sibility which never devolved
upon him & also states that he
from time to time supervised
the

had been used. It was Mr Jones
who suggested stone ware-

LD
11/4/96

C.S.

FOR ORDERS.

Read again S.O. 1903 M
18/11/95

C. 3648 M.

Order. No. 1645 M mis d 24.9.96

The foot. reports that it was
mistaken by the Muni. Council's
District Statement in its resolution
of 24.9.95, which appears
to have been
to be erroneous.

(from orders)

LD
21.9.96

MA
22.9.96

Resubmitted to H.M. with a note as
requested in his note of 23.3.96.

LD
9.4.96

Resubmitted, with linked file, to H.M.

LD
18.4.96

LD
21/4/96

To the Sanitary Engineer
29.8.96
25/9/96

D. 3 22/4.

S.E. 6-9-95-1,000.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

No. 3517

OFFICE OF SANITARY ENGINEER,

Fort St. George, 26 Nov 1895.

Local & Municipal Dept.
3648 M

From

J. A. JONES, Esq., MEM. INST. C.E., F.R.S.E.,
SANITARY ENGINEER TO GOVERNMENT,

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Local & Municipal Department

SIR,

I have the honor to acknow-
-ledge receipt of G. O. No. 1903 M. Mis.,
dated the 18th November 1895, Local
& Municipal.

2. I received the order with
much surprise & regret, because I
feel assured that, had Govern-
-ment had the correct facts
before it, no such order would
ever have been issued.

3. The order places upon the
Sanitary Engineer a respon-
-sibility which never devolved
upon him & also states that he
from time to time supervised
the

the sewer. Neither of these remarks have any basis in fact.

4. In no order of Government was the Sanitary Engineer requested to supervise or inspect the sewer. G. O. No 673 W. Mis. dated 7th April 1892 L & W requests the Municipal Council to begin the work of carrying out the reconstruction of the sewer. Neither in that or order nor in any subsequent order was the Sanitary Engineer requested or authorised to control or inspect the work during its construction. Indeed the order is conspicuous on that account as generally when provincial funds are being spent on sanitary works the Sanitary Engineer is requested to supervise or else execute the work.

5. As to the second item - supervision - the Sanitary Engineer was not even in Botacamund at all during the time the pipe

sewer

sewer was being laid. He did not visit Botacamund between 13th July & 14th December 1892 while the sewer was laid between 20th July & the 20th August 1892.

6. Here I might end my defence as to this particular work, but as this circumstance has occurred it is only due ^{to} myself & my future that there should be a due understanding as to what Government expects of the Sanitary Engineer.

7. As Sanitary Engineer, many projects from Municipalities come before me in course of a year for report, revision &c, but it is obviously impossible that the Sanitary Engineer can, in any measure, supervise or check the construction of such works.

8. The Sanitary Engineer is not an executive officer, and if during the course of inspection he did see a pipe sewer or its

foundation

foundation laid he would not be likely to detect an error in levels which would not be readily apparent unless check levels were taken.

9. Coatacamund had an Engineer of its own, and I have always been most careful not to interfere with the carrying out of Municipal works over which I had no control.

10. As an inspecting officer I understand that I hold to Municipal & other officers simply the relative position that the Consulting Engineer for Railways bears to Railway Engineer officers, and the Consulting Engineer would never dream of attempting to check level measurements or otherwise of work under construction simply because it is not his duty to do so.

11. Even where projects are under

under construction by the officers of this department, I have assumed that the Engineer in charge is the officer responsible for levels and measurements & for carrying out the details of the work, my duties being those of advice & consultation as to the best means of carrying out the work economically and as to modification necessary from time to time &c, and in fact those duties which usually fall to the lot of an inspecting officer.

12. I can only believe that the order under reference is the result of a misconception in regard to the arrangements for executing the work - the Sewer & the Sanitary Board has already stated to have been properly designed.

13. I therefore most respectfully request that Government will be pleased to cancel an order which has caused me much pain as being the first occasion