

(1) Number of pages 20.

(2) Date of repair 10-1-39.

(3) Initials of the Referencer CP

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

Despatches to England

<i>Adm</i> G.O. No.	<i>11</i>	Press Mis.
Dated	<i>17-5-</i>	<i>1859.</i>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PUBLIC.

No. // of 1859.

TO
THE RIGHT HONORABLE LORD STANLEY,
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

MY LORD,

Para. 1. We have the honor to direct your attention to certain alterations which we have recently found it expedient to make in the Rules and practice of the Department of Public Works regarding the Establishments of Executive Officers, and regarding the appointment, promotion, and punishment of the Subordinate branches of that Department.

2. It will be seen by our Proceedings of the 8th February 1859 No. 330, that various questions have arisen in the consideration of the practice prevailing in the Department of Public Works as to the disposal of the Establishments of Executive Officers transferred from one District to another, and also of the system followed by the Chief Engineer in the exercise of the power committed to him of posting and transferring Officers. The main question concerned the Establishments of Executive Officers and the proper method of rectifying the admitted inconveniences, of the present practice regarding them; the other questions related, first to the transfer of Executive Officers from District to District; secondly to the mode in which the appointment of Officers to temporary vacancies was to be regulated; 3rdly to the reduction proposed by Colonel Lawford in the number of Executive Ranges; 4thly to the equalization of the Establishments for Executive Officers of all grades, proposed by the same Officer, and lastly to Colonel Faber's proposal to attach a Draughtsman to every Executive Officer.

3. All these questions were considered in our Proceedings of the 8th February 1859, and we beg to refer your Lordship to that paper for particulars. It is only necessary for us to state in this place that we resolved to uphold our previous order, directing that Office Establishments should be regarded as permanently attached to the Executive ranges; and that following the analogy of District Engineers' Establishments, we directed that the Executive ranges should be divided into classes and a scale of Office Establishment for each class fixed without reference to the rank of the Officer in charge of the range; that we declined compliance with Colonel Faber's proposal to add a Draughtsman to the Executive Establishments; and that we resolved to uphold the allotment of Officers to Districts fixed by the Notification of the 27th January 1857. In the selections for acting appointments, we determined to follow the principle observed in the Revenue and Judicial Departments, viz. that of nominating the Officer who had the best claims to advancement but with due regard to the public interests; and finally we considered it necessary to recall the power previously possessed by the Chief Engineer of posting Officers and of removing them from District to District. In adopting this last mentioned step we intimated to that Officer that it was by no means our desire to lessen his legitimate authority; on the contrary, that it was our intention in respect to the Subordinates of the Department to give him as well as the District Engineers a much larger measure of power than they had hitherto possessed.

4. In accordance with this last mentioned resolution we considered in our Proceedings of the 15th March 1859 No. 596, the existing rules and practice relating to the Subordinate branches of the Public Works Department. These rules are given in paras. 2 @ 4 of those Proceedings. We were satisfied that under these Regulations the power both of reward and punishment was too much centralized. The District Engineer who is both more nearly concerned for the efficiency of his Subordinates, and in the best position to judge of their merits, was almost wholly without the power to reward or punish them; and thus, especially as respects the lower classes, there was an absence of the strongest motives to exertion. From the power of promotion being central also, it often happened that when a man was promoted he was moved into another District; and this discouraged Officers from taking pains to train and instruct their Subordinates. We were of opinion that the better plan would be to leave the appointment,

prevailing

3

punishment, and dismissal, of the lower classes of the Executive Department to their local Superiors, subject to certain rules as to qualification, and to certain general instructions as to punishing, and subject also to the check afforded by the right of petition. We were satisfied that though under such a system there might be some disadvantages, yet that the evil would be much less than that springing from the previous system, and that the efficiency of the Department would be materially improved.

5. We accordingly passed certain amended Rules in supersession of all existing orders on the same subjects, and directed that they should have immediate effect. The Rules are detailed at length in our Resolution of the 19th and 28th March 1859 Nos. 596 and 730, to which we beg to refer your Lordship for full particulars.

6. The course hitherto followed in respect to the nomination of Sub-Overseers having been found erroneous, and at variance with the original intention, which was to the effect, that the pay in each class of the Sub-Overseers should depend on length of service in that class, we resolved to correct the error. The numbers given at each rate of pay in the Statement which accompanied the letter to the Government of India dated 10th October 1856 were expressly stated in para. 13 to have been inserted merely for the purpose of estimating the probable cost, and not as the numbers to be

* From Colonel Baker December
19th 1856 No. 5963.

maintained at each rate, and the Statement was approved accordingly by that Government.* But in the Nominal Roll contained in para. 13 of the Notification prepared by the Chief Engineer of the Establishment to be nominated under that sanction, which Notification was embodied in our order of the 27th January 1857, those numbers were taken as representing the numbers to be appointed to and maintained at each rate of pay. This error passed without detection at the time, and had been acted on since.

7. We resolved therefore to adopt the correct and intended practice, and directed that hereafter a Sub-Overseer on appointment to any class should receive only the lowest rate of pay of that class; after five years service in that class he would receive the next rate; and after ten years service in that class, he would receive the highest rate of pay of that class.

8. We however exempted present incumbents from the operation of the rule, so far as regards their present pay, but desired that no increase of pay should be allowed except in conformity with the Rule. Thus a Sub-Overseer of any class now receiving the lowest rate of pay of that class would receive the second rate after he had completed five years service in that class and not before; and similarly, a Sub-Overseer now receiving the second rate of pay of his class, would be raised to the highest rate after having completed ten years service in that class.

Fort Saint George, }
17th May 1859. }

We have the honor to be,

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's most obedient
humble Servants,

Exd. Wm. Thomas.

governing

FORT SAINT GEORGE
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Letter to the Right Honorable
the Secretary of State for India,
Dated 17 May,
No. // of 1859.

Requesting attention to certain alterations in the
Rules and practice of the Department Public Works
regarding the Establishments of Executive Officers and
the appointment, promotion and punishment of the
Subordinate branches of that Department.

To
The Right Honorable Lord Stanley
Secretary of State for India.

My Lord

107/100
H. We have the honor

to direct your attention to

certain alterations which
we have recently found it
expedient to make in the

Rules and practice of the
Department of Public Works

regarding ^{the} establishments
of Executive Officers, and

regarding the appoint-
ment, promotion, and

punishment of the Subor-
dinate branches of that

department.

2 It will be seen

by our proceedings of the
8 February 1859 N^o 330

that various questions
have arisen in the con-

sideration of the practice
prevailing

Cons 8 Feb/59 N^o 650 by

lastly to Colonel Faber's
proposal to attach a
draughtsman to every Exe-
cutive Officer.

3 All these ques-
tions were considered
in our proceedings of the 8th Feb'y. 1859
~~and have been finally~~
and we beg to refer your Lordship to that
~~disposal of with refer-~~
ence for full particulars of the circumstances
~~once to the particular~~
~~and bearings of each case and~~
~~circumstances and~~
~~the mode in which we~~
~~bearings of each. These~~
~~have disposed of these.~~
~~we need not recapitulate~~
It is only necessary
~~it will be sufficient~~

for us to state in this
place that we have
resolved to uphold our
previous order, directing that
Office Establishments should be
regarded as permanently
attached to the Executive
ranges; and that fol-
lowing the analogy of Dis-
trict Engineers Establishments,
we

we have directed that the
Executive ranges should be
divided into ~~a certain number~~
~~of~~ classes and a scale
of office Establishment
for each class fixed without
reference to the rank of
the officer in charge of
the range, that we have
declined compliance with
Colonel Faber's proposal
to add a Draughtsman to the
Executive Establishments;
and that we have resol-
ved to uphold the allo-
ment of officers to
Districts fixed by the no-
tification of the 27th Janua-
ry 1857. In the selection
for acting appointments,
we have determined to follow
the principle observed in
the Revenue & judicial
Department

^{that}
Departments, of nominat-
ing the officer who
had the best claims
to advancement but
with due regard to the
public interest, & finally we
considered it necessary
to recall the power pre-
viously proposed by the Chief
Engineer of posting
officers and of removing
them from District to
District. But in adopting
this last mentioned step
we intimated
to that officer that
it was by no means
our desire to lessen
his legitimate autho-
rity; on the contrary,
that it was our in-
tention in respect to
the Subordinates of
the Department.
their
to

Com 15 March / 59 No 135.
" 1st April " " 98 & 100. 4

their ~~entertainment~~
~~Punishment~~, and
~~dismissal~~, to give
him as well as the
District Engineers
a much larger
measure of power
than they ^{had} ~~his~~
~~shorts~~ possessed.

In accord-
ance with this
last mentioned
resolution we
considered in our pro-
ceedings of the
15th March
1859 & No 596,
considered the
existing rules
and practice
relating

relating to
the subordinate
branches of the
Public Works
Department. These
rules are given in
paras 2 & 4 of these
proceedings.
~~above resolution,~~
~~and having noticed~~
~~the practical work-~~
~~ing of the Depart-~~
~~ment for the past~~
~~three years.~~ We
were satisfied
that

that under these Regulations
the power both of reward and
punishment was too much cen-
tralized. The District Engineer
who is both more nearly con-
cerned for the efficiency of his
Subordinates, and in the best
position to judge of their merits,
was almost wholly without the
power to reward or punish them,
and thus, especially as respects
the lower classes, there was an
absence of the strongest motives
to exertion. From the power
of promotion being central also,
it often happened that when
a man was promoted he was
moved into another District;
and this discouraged officers
from taking pains to train and
instruct their Subordinates. After
observing the working of the existing
practice we were decidedly of
opinion that the better plan
would be to leave the appointment,
punishment, and dismissal, of
the lower classes of the Executive
Depart-

Department to their local Superiors,
subject to certain rules as to qualifi-
cation, and to certain general
instructions as to punishing,
and subject also to the check
afforded by the right of petition.
We were satisfied that though
under such a system there
might be ~~some~~ ^{occasional} ~~galling~~
~~disadvantages~~, yet that the evil
would be much less than ~~those~~
springing from the previous system,
and that the efficiency of the
Department would be materially
improved.

5. We accordingly passed
certain amended rules in super-
session of all existing orders on
the same subjects, and directed
that they should have immediate
effect. The Rules are detailed
at length in our Resolution of
the 19th and 28th March 1859
N^o 5967 730, to which we beg to
refer your Lordship for full
particulars.

6. The course hitherto
followed

Dy. 15th March 1859 N^o 75

* From Col^l Baker Decr 19th 1856
N^o 5963.

15
followed in respect to the nomi-
nation of Sub Overseers having
been found erroneous, and at
variance with the original in-
tention, which was to the effect,
that the pay in each class of
the Sub Overseers should depend
on length of service in that class,
we resolved to correct the error.
The numbers given at each
rate of pay in the Statement
which accompanied the letter
to the Government of India dated
10th October 1856 were expressly
stated in para 13 to have been
inserted merely for the purpose
of estimating the probable cost,
and not as the numbers to be
maintained at each rate, and
the Statement was approved
accordingly by that Government.
But in the nominal roll con-
tained in Para 13 of the
notification prepared by the
Chief Engineer of the Establish-
ment to be nominated under
that sanction, which notification
was

was embodied in our order of the 27th January 1857, those numbers were taken as representing the numbers to be appointed to and maintained at each rate of pay, though this interpretation was directly opposed both to the express intention of Government and to the very terms of the statement contained in Part of the same notification. This error passed without detection at the time, and had been acted on, since.

7. We resolved therefore to adopt the correct and intended practice, and directed that hereafter a Sub Overseer on appointment to any class should receive only the lowest rate of pay of that class, after five years service in that class he would receive the next rate, and after ten years service in that class, he would receive the highest rate of pay of that class.

We

8. We however exempted present incumbents from the operation of the rule, so far as regards their present pay, but decided that no increase of pay ^{should} be allowed except in conformity with the rule. Thus a Sub Overseer of any class now receiving the lowest rate of pay of that class would receive the second rate after he had completed five years service in that class and not before; and similarly, a Sub Overseer now receiving the second rate of pay of his class, would be raised to the highest rate after having completed ten years service in that class. We have &

Fort St George
17th May 1859

J. A. A.

W.

Letter to the Right Honble
The Secretary of State for
India
Dated 17th May 1859.
Orig^l } of Steamers Almas 21st May
Dup^s }
Trip: of Steamers Candia 9th June

Copy to the Gov^t of India on the
28th May 1859.

Requesting attention
to certain alterations in the
Rules and practice of the
Department Public Work
regarding the establishments
of Executive Officers & the
appointment promotion
& punishment of the
subordinate branches
of that Department.
No 24 Nov 1859 No 36 p 35.

26 May 1861