Archives I-10,006—16-8 77.

(1) Number of pages 102

(2) Date of repair 19. 5 87

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P.W. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 2834

B.P. No.

Press.

Mis.

Dated 27-12-1882 197 .

AW

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No: 28
EW.

Supg. Engineer's Office, 4th Circle
Coimbatore, 24th January 1882.

2834/1

From,
The Superintending Engineer
4th Circle.

To,
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D. Madras

Sir,

11th January 1882

With reference to G. O. No. 71 d, I have the honor to report that I consider that the present system of Petty Construction and Repair work being carried out by the departments concerned and not by the Public Works will after some little time and practice ~~make~~ work well. I need not point out that unless the P. Works Department is considerably strengthened that this Department cannot undertake these works.

2 At present but few officers

in Charge of building understand that they have to carry out these petty works, to many it is distasteful and to all it adds a little extra labour occasionally. This being the case it is but natural that at the commencement of the system difficulties should occur.

3. From what I have seen of the work done in these repairs I consider it has been done very fairly and at reasonable rates.

4. I think however that orders should be issued from the Officers who carry out those repairs to confine themselves to ordinary petty constructions and repairs as in some cases alterations have been improperly executed. Any alteration should I consider have the sanction and approval of the Executive Engineer of the Division. 2834/2

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Most Obt. Servant

Major R.E.
Supg. Engineer, 4th Circle.

From
The Supd: Engineer,
Fourth Circle.

Dated 24th
Despd: 25th } Jany: 1882.
Recd 26

No: 28

Proposal for retransfer of Petty Construction and repair works to the charge of the P.W. Department:—

States with reference to the —— that he is of opinion that the present system of Petty Construction & repair work the execution of which is at present entrusted to the departments concerned will after some time and practice do well.

O. 12/7 Re 27/10
62 18.7
Ccri 20.10

2834/3

No. 409

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
3rd Circle ~~MADRAS~~,
~~Chepauk~~, 9th February 1882.

From

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
~~4th~~ 3rd CIRCLE,

To

THE Chief Engineer
Public Works Department.

Enclosures.

SIR,

With reference to G. O. No: 71 W of 11th January 1882 I have the honor to state that I should most strongly deprecate any proposal to retransfer to this Department the work of Petty Construction and Repair to Civil Buildings.

2 - The present practice was adopted with a view of relieving the Officers of this Department from a mass of petty work for the supervision of which no professional skill is required, and in connection with which the elaborate system of record and account necessarily adopted in the P.W. Department is quite out of place.

3. The intention was to place Civil Officers

in the same position as regards their offices as a private houseowner would be as regards his own house - No one would think of calling in an Engineer to advise on the whitewashing of his own house or the mending of his windows and there seems no reason why such advice should be any more necessary because the house is the property of the State and not of a private owner.

4. There is no evidence to show that the short outlay referred to in para 5 of G. O. (Financial Deptt) No: 2502 of 22nd December/81 was in any way due to neglect of necessary repairs; it was, in all probability due to the fact that the buildings were kept in order more economically than was expected and if so the short outlay is matter for congratulations, not for regret.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obdt. Servt.

J Pennycuick Major R.E.

Superintg. Engineer
3rd Circle.

From P. W. 6. No. 928

The Superintending Engineer,

~~III~~ 6th Circle,

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. Deptt.

Dated 9th
Recd. 11th } February 1882.

ENCLOSURES.

No. 409.

Reporting on the proposal of retransferring to the P. W. Deptt. the work of Petty Construction and Repair to Civil Buildings.

0-12/7 Re 27/10
or 1 8.7
Cir 20.10

2834/5

Superintending Engineer's Office 6th Circle

No. 1866 T.J. Camp Combaconum 11th February 1882.

From

Colonel J. Beatty R.E.,
Superintending Engineer, 6th Circle.

To

Colonel R. H. Sankey C.B., R.E.,
Chief Engineer, P. W. D.,
Madras.

Sir,

As directed in G. O. No 71 W. of 11th ultimo. I have the honor to report on the proposal to retransfer Petty Construction and Repair work to this department. I presume that this means the works for the construction or repair of Civil Buildings estimated to cost less than Rupees 1,000.

2. These works are so numerous and so scattered all over the country and generally of such a petty nature that with our present reduced staff it would in very many cases be impossible to undertake them. And I have only been applied to in two instances so far as I can recollect to carry out work which appeared properly

to belong to the Civil Officers. I have als known cases in which Civil Officers were prepared to undertake works much beyond the limit of Rupees 1000.

3. I have consulted with Divisional Officers on the subject, and they are of opinion that Civil Officers have or should have no difficulty in carrying out their own Petty Construction and Repair works; and that in the present state of the Department the Divisional Officers have not the means of undertaking them, generally.

4. I consider the proposed retransfer uncalled for, and highly inexpedient, and that it must lead to neglect of more important work, for the due performance of which we at present find our strength is totally insufficient.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedt. Servant

E. Beatty Colonel R.E.

Superintending Engineer 6th C

to belong to the Civil Officer. I have also known cases in which Civil Officers were prepared to undertake works much beyond the limit of Rupees 1,000.

3. I have consulted with Divisional Officers on the subject, and they are of opinion that Civil Officers have or should have no difficulty in carrying out their own Petty Construction and Repair works, and that in the present state of the Department the Divisional Officers have not the means of undertaking them, generally.

4. I consider the proposed retransfer uncalled for, and highly inexpedient, and that it must lead to neglect of more important work, for the due performance of which we at present find our strength is totally insufficient.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedt. Servant

G. Beatty Colonel R.E.

Superintending Engineer G.C.

to permanently to undertake these works in the large area outside the Delta, probably 2 special Overseers would be needed.

2. As regards Nellore, we have at present charge of some irrigation works in every Taluq, and thus in all parts of the District except the Zemindaries. We could therefore I believe undertake the Petty Construction and repairs of Civil Buildings in this District.

3. At the same time, I beg to state that, Ordinary annual repairs, such as white-washing, repairs to floors, & turning tiles, do not require professional supervision, and it would in every way be better that these should be carried out by the departmental Officers concerned, who should apply to the Public Works Department for aid only in the case of extensive repairs or failure of buildings.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedt Servant

J. W. Rundall

Superintending Engineer 2nd Circle

Compd JH.

From P. W. C. No 1216

The Superintending Engineer
2nd Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. Dept

Dated 17th February 182
Recd: M —

No. 2437 K.S.

Civil Buildings.
Petty Constn & Repairs of.
Offers his opinion regarding
the retransfer of — to the P.W.
Department.

0-12/7 Re 27/10
OL 1 R 7
Cir 20.10

2834

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,

No. 1443.

MADRAS,
5th Circle
Chepauk, 22d March 1882.

From
Col. A L Prendergast R.E.
~~THE~~ SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
5th ~~1st~~ CIRCLE,

To

THE Chief Engineer
D. P. W.

Enclosures.

SIR,

With reference to G. O. No. 712 of the 11th January 1882, I have the honor to report, that some addition should be made to the Executive Establishment, to allow of works of Petty Construction and Repair being brought again under the charge of the P. W. Department.

2 Thus at the Presidency, the Executive Engineer states that he would require the following addition to his Establishment

to bring it up to its former scale.

1 Assistant Engineer or Sub Engineer (so long as Lieutt Faber may be in charge of the Bangalore Sub Division).

3 Overseers.

1 Draughtsman.

3. In the South Arcot and Chinglepat Districts, probably one more Overseer would be enough for each.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt Servt
Alexr Lawder Lt Coll R.E.
Superintg Engineer
5 Circle.

to bring it up to its former Scale.

1 Assistant Engineer or Sub Engineer (so long as Lieutt. Falvey may be in charge of the Bangalore Sub Division).

3 Overseers.

1 Draughtsman.

3. In the South Arcot and Chingleput Districts, probably one more Overseer would be enough for each.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt. Servt.
Alexr. Henderson Coll. R.E.
Superintg. Engineer
5 Circle.

From P. W. C. No. 1110

The Superintending Engineer,
5th ~~1st~~ Circle,

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. Department
Madras.

Dated 22d March 1882.
Recd.

ENCLOSURES.

No. 1443.

Retransfer of Petty Construction and Repair Works to the charge of the P. W. Deptt.

Reports regarding the ——— & the additional Executive Establt required.

Or. 18. 7 Re 27/10
0. 12/7
Cir 20. 10

No. 11 G. L.

2834
11

FROM

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
FIRST CIRCLE.

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER
P. W. Department ~~FOR IRRIGATION.~~

Enclos.

Dowlaishweram, 12th April 1882

SIR,

With reference to G. O. No. 71 W. 11/1/82 which has remained so long unanswered chiefly because I wished to see the state of affairs in the Northern Districts of this Circle before replying, I have the honor to say that as regards Irrigation Works I am very strongly of opinion that where Minor Irrigation Works have been already transferred (as in the Godavari District) to the Revenue Department it would be inadvisable to retransfer them to this Department & that where they have not been transferred to the Revenue Department (as in the Vizagapatam & Ganjam Districts) it is advisable that they should be so at once.

2. I have ascertained that in these two Districts it is quite impracticable for this Department to attend properly to the wants of the hundreds of tanks & other irrigation works which individually are very petty but collectively are of great value, whilst the employee's of the Revenue Department are sufficiently numerous & widely distributed to secure prompt attention to the repairs necessary for these petty works - repairs which require no skill in execution beyond that available in nearly every village and which if dealt with directly they are required cost only a few Rupees.

3. In the Gumsur Taluq of the Ganjam District for instance the Asst. Govt. Agent assured me that during the last Jamabandi he had seen scores of tanks and small embankments along streams, classed as "irrigation channels", which have long required to have breaches closed & other earthwork done but which have never been visited for years by any member whatever of this Department & which considering their difficulty of access and time required to get to them are not likely to be visited or dealt with within reasonable time, by the one or two members of this Department who some-times enter that Taluq.

2834/12

4. As regards Petty construction & Repair works under other heads - I am of opinion that whilst Departments concerned should be able & expected to carry out promptly for themselves really petty work such as ordinary householders would get done through their Butlers - e.g. - Whitewashing, mending broken windows & so on, - the limit× fixed in Para 9 of G.O No. 2530 W. is too high & that it would be better to reduce it to say Rs 200 - beyond which sum the work required often requires professional skill in estimating for & supervising.

×Rs 1000

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Most obedient Servt.

Walch
Offg. Supt. Engr. 1st Circle

Compd. J.H.

From

The Offg Supg Engineer
1st Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. Dept.

Dated 12th }
Despd 12th } April 1882
Received }

No. 11 G. L.

Enclo:

17/4

Retransfer of Petty Construction & Repair Works to the charge of D. P. W. – Replies to G.O. No 71 W of 11-1-82 on the subject of –

O.C.S.P. 7 Re 27/10
-12/7 Cir 20.10

2834
13

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue,

Dated 27th June 1882.

No. 1631 ~~Miscellaneous.~~

READ the following letter from J. G. Horsfall Esquire Collector, Kistna District, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Masulipatam 16th June 1882 No. 1337.

—

I have the honor in reply to Board's proceedings No. 354 dated 2d February 1882, to state that in my opinion the present system of entrusting civil officers with Petty Construction and Repair Works should be allowed further trial.

2. I would where Public Works officers are available as in the Delta Talugs of the District utilise their skill and professional knowledge to the full.

and they might well undertake all such works in the following Talugs. Gudiwada, Bandar, Repalli, Bapatla & in the deltaic portion of the Bezwada Talug, leaving to Civil officers the Vinukonda, Palnad, Narsaraopett, Guntoor, Sattenapalli, Nandigama & upland portion of the Bezwada Talug.

3. I cannot see any reason why the services of the Public Works officers should not be used when they are on the spot, but on the other hand I consider it would be a great mistake to throw upon the existing staff the superintendence of petty works situated at a distance from their head Quarters and additional officers

could not be employed without an expenditure incommensurate with the object aimed at. To illustrate my meaning I would instance Vinukonda & Tumurikonda; these are situated at a distance of 70 & 90 miles respectively from the head Quarters of the nearest public works officer at Duggirala. It is obvious that petty works required at these places could not be placed with advantage under that officer's charge.

4. The short outlay incurred by Civil Officers in 1880 and 1881 was attributable to constant change of officers in the District & to the newness of the system and is not likely

	Grant	Expenditure
1880-81	2,500	1,818
1881-82	1,914	1,380
1882-83	10,660	"

to be repeated in future. I have no doubt that I shall be able to expend a large proportion of the grant in this year although it is largely in excess of the grants of the two previous years.

5. The sums shown above do not include repairs to minor irrigation works, short outlay on which has been due hitherto solely to the fact that the grants have not been made till close upon the end of the year.

6. I regret the delay that has occurred in replying to this reference due to the failure of Divisional officers to furnish me notwithstanding reminders with their opinions on the subject. Below are given the dates of their several replies.

2834/15

Head Assistant Collector 2nd May
Temporary Deputy Collector - 8th June
General Deputy Collector - 31st May
Sub Collector - not yet received.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings dated 7th June 1882 No. 1462.

(True Copy & Extract)
Ag Secretary

To
The Chief Secretary to Govt. F.D.

Prd.
Exd/ S. Vadivel

Go 470 R – 14 – 6 – 82
– " " 872 R – 21 – 5 – 82
– " 500 R – 9 – 5 – 82
170 – 27 – 1 – 82 Rev.
Go 871 – 20 – 4 – 80. Pub.
Bd's Pro 265 R – 2 – 2 – 80 – 84.

1882.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

To

The Chief Secretary
to Govt. F.D.

CURRENT No. 1795

Proceedings, dated 27th June 1882.
No. 1631.

Subject.

Submg to Govt. in continuation of Bd's Pros: of 7th June/82 No. 1461 letter from the Collr. of Kistna regarding retransfer of to the P.W. Dept. of Petty Construction & Repair of buildings attached to the Civil Dept.

2834
17

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue,

Dated 27th June 1882.
No. 1630 ~~Miscellaneous.~~

READ the following letter from J. B. Pennington Esquire Collector of Tinnevelly to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue dated Tinnevelly 14th June 1882 No. 346.

I have the honor to submit the report called for by the Board in their Proceedings No. 354 dated the 2d February 1882 regarding the proposal to retransfer Petty Construction and repair works to the charge of the Public Works Department.

2. The Divisional Officers consulted are all (with the exception of the General charge Deputy Collector,) not disposed to

advocate any change though the present system does not seem to work well.

3. The Deputy Collector's reason for the retransfer of these works to the Public Works Department is the want of professional knowledge on the part of the Revenue Officers, and he is afraid that the safety of the works may be endangered from causes which may escape the ken of non-professional men.

4. The Sub Collector (giving no reasons) proposes to give the present system a further trial.

5. The Head Assistant Collector and the Temporary Deputy Collector would allow the works to remain

as at present under the control of the Revenue Officers one great advantage being that they are in a position to satisfy their wants promptly without depending on the D. P. W. Officers or their greedy contractors who often look more to their profits than to the solidity of the work, not to speak of the vexatious delay in the execution of such petty repairs which generally require prompt attention.

6. The only circumstance that creates some difficulty at present is the want of knowledge and experience on the part of the non-professional officers in framing the requisite estimates and plans and if the D. P. W. Officers were directed to assist in this

direction and by giving completion certificates there can be no doubt of the present system working in a satisfactory manner.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings dated 7th June 1882 No. 1462.

(True Copy & Extract)

L. Gibson
Ag Secretary

To
The Chief Secretary to Govt. F.D.
Copy " Collector of Tinnevelly
" Secretary to Government, Revenue Dept.

Ex/ S. Vadulu

1882.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

To The Chief Secretary to Govt.

P.W.D. 5

4578

CURRENT No. 1794

Proceedings, dated 27th June 1882.

No. 1630

Subject.

Submg to Govt in continuation of Bd's Procdgs 7th June 1882 No 1462, letter from the Collr of Tinnevelly regarding retransfer to the P.W. Dept of Petty Construction and repair of Buildings attached to the Civil Depts.

20

List A.

1880-81.

By revenue Agency

		Rs
1	Jamabandy Pandal, Nellore Taluq	53-..-..
2.	1 Viss of putty supplied to the Taluq Cutcherry at Rapur	..-9-5
3.	Repairing Police Dy Tahsildar's Cutcherry	4-15-..
4	Do Ongole Sub Jail	5-6-3
5	Constructing a country wood door and frame for the Gudur Sub Jail	17-6-6
6	Repairing the ryots shed at Kandukur	18-..-..
		Rs 509-6-2

1881-82

By revenue Agency

1	Constructing a Jamabandy Pandal at Atmakur	17-12-..
2	Do at Darsi	12-6-..
3	Do at Nellore town	20-..-..
4	Do do before the Collector's Office	23-4-6
5	Repairing the Nellore Sub Jail	8-5-2
6	Do Udayagiri Alli Durga gate	13-9-8
7	Do the isolated tombs at Ramapatam & Singarayakonda	12-..-..
8	Do the Taluq Cutcherry and Sub Jail, Rapur	25-4-..
9	Do Taluq Cutcherry do	60-..-..
10	Whitewashing the Dy Tahsildar's Office & Sub Jail at Podili	15-..-..
11	Repairing the Nellore Sub Jail	6-5-6
12	Repairing the railings in front of the Sub Collector's court room	1-8-..
13	Sundry repairs to the Press Office and to the Huzur Treasury room	..-14-6
14	Nellore Jamabandy Pandals	50-..-..
15	Opening 4 windows in the Nellore Taluq Cutcherry	65-..-..
16	Repairing the gate of the Taluq Cutcherry at Kavali	5-..-..
17	Erecting Pandals behind the Huzur Treasury room	5-..-..
18	Constructing a Pandal at Gudur Tahsildar's Office	10-..-..
		351-5-4

Nellore
Collector's Office
12 June 1882

J. Lebrane
Ag Collector

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE, MADRAS.

2834/22

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue,

Dated 26 June 1882

No. 1618 ~~Miscellaneous.~~

READ the following No 2751.

From
J. Lee Warner Esquire
Acting Collector of Nellore.

To
E. Gibson Esquire
Acting Secretary to the Board
of Revenue Madras.

Sir.

With reference to the Board's Proceedings[+] noted in the margin, I beg to state that since the introduction of the new system in 1880-81 and up to the end of 1881-82 only 31 works were executed in this Department under Petty Construction and repair. The total outlay on them

[+] No. 354 of 2-2-82
No. 1400 of 30-5-82

was Rs 2748 out of an allotment of Rs 3883. Only a small portion (Rs 860) of the expenditure was incurred directly by this Department, the rest passing through the medium of the Local Fund Engineering Department.

2. It will be observed from the enclosed list that the works done by the Revenue Agency were of a very petty kind, costing less than Rs 100 in all but one case. The other works, which required skill and professional supervision, had to be entrusted to the Local Fund Engineering Department or payment of a Commission at the rates allowed under G. O. No 871 dated 28 April 1880, and it would indeed have been impossible to execute them satisfactorily without the aid of that Department.

3. Thus it will appear that at least so far as this District is concerned the new system has not worked well, as in most cases, unless they are of the commonest description the Taluq officials can not be trusted to prepare correct Estimates or to work them out without constant recurrence to the aid of the Local Fund Department.

4. I think a return to the old system is desirable, and this can be easily managed now that the D.P.W. Overseers have been re-appointed.

5. I regret the delay which has taken place in the submission of this report, which is owing to the time lost

in tracing some of the papers bearing upon the subject in the Records.

Nellore Collector's office }
12' June 1882 }

I have &c.
(Sd) J Lee Warner
Ag Collector.

Resolution

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Pro: dated 7' June 1882 No. 1462.

(True Copy & Extract).

D. Gibson
Acting Secretary.

To
The Chief Secretary to Govt. F.D. with one Enclosure in original to be returned.
Copy to the Secretary to Govt. R.D.
" " Collector of Nellore

Ex [illegible]
Copied S.Srinivasachary

Go 8742 28-4-83—

1882. 14 Sept

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

P. W. Sec. 4578

To

The Chief Secretary to Govt. F. D.

CURRENT No. 1797

Proceedings, dated 26 June 1882.
No. 1618

Subject.

Submitting to Govt. letter from the Collector of Nellore reporting on the works executed under Petty Construction and repairs in the Revenue Deptt in the Dt.

2834
25

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue,

Dated 26 June 188 .

No. 1619 ~~Miscellaneous.~~

READ the following No. 2718

From

F. E. Gibson Esquire
Offg. Collector of Tanjore

To

E. Gibson Esquire
Ag. Secretary to the Board of
Revenue, Madras.

Sir

With reference to Boards Proceedings dated 2d February 1882 No. 354, I have the honor to report that the present system has not had, I think, yet a sufficiently long trial to enable a cautious man to pronounce a decided opinion on its working or result;

2. All the Divisional officers, with the exception of the Deputy Collector Mayaveram, are in favour of it and

ascribe the nonutilization of the full allotment to want of experience &c.

3. I am, however decidedly disposed to apprehend that the minor irrigation works may well be retransferred to the D. P. W. officers who must necessarily see them at least as all Revenue officers are now more than ever closely tied down to their desk work, and are from various causes less able to move about than was the case even ten or fifteen years ago.

4. As regards all buildings personally I have not seen reason to suppose that the Revenue officers are likely to execute them more economically as a general rule than the D. P. W. officers.

Tanjore Collector's office
Negapatam
30th May 1882

I have &c.
(Sd) F. E. Gibson
Offg Collector

Resolution.

Submitted to Govt in continuation of Boards Pro: of 7th June 1882 No. 1462.

(True Copy & Extract)

Acting Secretary

To The Chief Secretary to Govt F. D.
Copy to the Secretary to Govt R. D.
" Collector of Tanjore

Copied A Srinivasachary

1882.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

M.E. 13
4570

To

The Chief Secretary to
Government F.D

CURRENT No. 1796.

Proceedings, dated 26 June 1882.
No. 1619

Subject.

Submitting to Government in continuation of Boards Pro; D/ 7 June 1882 No. 1462 letter from the Collector of Tanjore regarding re-transfer to the P.W. Dept of Petty construction and repair of buildings attached to the Civil Department

Copied A Srinivasachary

2834
27

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue,

Dated 20th June 1882.
No. 1584 Miscellaneous.

READ the following letter from N. A. Roupell Esquire, Acting Collector of Anantapur to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Madras dated 15th June 1882 No 64.

I have the honor to reply to Board's Proceedings No 354 dated 2d February 1882.

2. The acting Head Assistant Collector, Mr Thorburn, is of opinion that "the present system works very badly indeed" and remarks that Tahsildars have no leisure for these duties or the knowledge to make plans and Estimates or to supervise and check such work. He suggests that to each Taluq Establishment there should be attached an overseer or surveyor on Rs 40 or 50 a month with a lascar on Rs 6.

3. The Deputy Collector in charge of the Gooty Division reports "the present system of Execution of Petty construction and Repair Works appears to be working well. These works are generally let out on contract and executed under the immediate Supervision of the Talug Officers. In some cases they are supervised by Divisional Officers also."

4. Mr. Thorburn quotes no cases in point and I have been unable to obtain any satisfactory proof of the soundness of his views. The Board's instructions (Standing Order No. 150 para 2, Macleane's Edition) are clear that "the works entered in the budget should only be such as can be executed with the unskilled labor available on the spot", and so the scarcity of skilled workmen which Mr. Thorburn regards as a serious objection to the continuance of the present system is of comparatively little account.

5. In my opinion the present system has claims to retention as being at once more expeditious and more economical than that by which it is now proposed to supersede it.

2834/28

6. Referring to Board's Proceedings dated 30th May 1882, No. 1400, I have the honor to state that I have only lately returned from Privilege Leave and that the Acting Head Assistant Collector in charge during my absence not being aware of my views on the subject and finding his own opinion not in harmony with that of the Gooty Divisional Officer, thought it best to await my return. I deem it right to add that the Divisional Officer's replies to my references had been in my office for a month at the time of my going on leave, but the matter was, I much regret to say, for some reason unknown to me, overlooked.

Resolution

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings dated 7th June 1882 No. 1462.

(True Copy & Extract)

Ag Secretary

To
The Chief Secretary to Govt. F. D.
Copy " Secretary to Government R. D.
" " Collector of Anantapur

1882

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

To

The Chief Secretary to Govt F. D. &c

CURRENT No. 1729

Proceedings, dated 20th June 1882.

No. 1584

Subject.

Submitting to Govt in continuation of Board's Pro: d/2d February 1882, No 354, letter from the Collector of Anantapur intimating that the present system of Petty construction and Repair Works may well be left unaltered

---

Board of Revenue, 7th June 1882, No. 1462.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Read—again the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd February 1882, No. 354.

Read—the following G.O., dated 27th January 1882, No. 170, Financial:—

Read—the following G.O., dated 11th January 1882, No. 71 W., Public Works:—

Abstract.—Passing orders on proposal for the retransfer of Petty Construction and Repair Works to the charge of the Public Works Department.

Order—dated 27th January 1882, No. 170, Financial.

The Board of Revenue are requested to institute inquiries.

2. The powers of Civil Officers in sanctioning should be well known.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. D. MACLEANE,
Under Secretary.

To the Board of Revenue.

Resolution—dated 2nd February 1882, No. 354.

Communicated to all Collectors, who will report at an early date on the working of the present system.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) S. SRINIVASA RAGHAVAIYANGAR,
First Assistant.

To all Collectors, with copies of G.O., Public Works Department,
dated 11th January 1882, No. 71 W.

Read—also the following G.O., dated 31st May 1882, No. 572 (Routine), Financial.

Read—reminder from the Public Works Department, dated 25th May 1882, No. 71-2 W., requesting early reply to G.O., dated 11th January 1882, No. 71 W., regarding the retransfer of Petty Construction and Repair Works to the charge of the Public Works Department.

Order—dated 31st May 1882, No. 572 (Routine), Financial.

The Board of Revenue will now submit their report with reference to such replies* as are before them.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Acting Under Secy. to Govt.

To the Board of Revenue.

---

* Board's Proceedings, No. 354, dated 2nd February 1882.

READ—also the following letter from W. S. WHITESIDE, Esq., Collector of North Arcot, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chittoor, 6th March 1882, No. 89 :—

Adverting to Board's Proceedings of the 2nd ultimo, No. 354, received on the 4th instant, I have the honor to state that experience has convinced me that, in this district, the present system of carrying out the Petty Construction and Repairs under the supervision of the Revenue Officers works well and satisfactorily, and that there is really no necessity for their transfer to the charge of the Public Works Department.

2. The works falling under this head are generally of no great importance, and are capable of being conveniently and efficiently supervised by the Revenue Agency. Their retransfer to the Public Works Department will only result in much unnecessary correspondence between the officers of the two departments as well as delays in the execution of works with no corresponding advantage. I am therefore decidedly of opinion that the retention of Petty Construction and Repair Works in the hands of the Revenue Department is very desirable.

READ—also the following letter from A. CRUICKSHANK, Esq., Collector of South Arcot, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Bhavanigiri, 13th March 1882, No. 92 :—

With reference to the Board's Proceedings, dated 2nd ultimo, No. 354, I have the honor to report that, under the present system of allowing Civil Officers to carry out Petty Construction and Repair Works costing not more than Rs. 1,000, works are executed more expeditiously and perhaps more economically than before, but I am decidedly of opinion that, when there is a professional department, the works should be carried out by it.

READ—also the following letter from H. P. GORDON, Esq., Collector of Bellary, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 18th May 1882, No. 1712 :—

With reference to Board's Proceedings, No. 354, of 2nd February last, I have the honor to report that, in my opinion, it is not desirable to retransfer Petty Construction and Repair Works to the charge of the Department of Public Works.

2. The main advantage of the present system is the superior rapidity with which repairs may be executed under it. No difficulty is reported to have been experienced in getting work done, the works undertaken being such as do not require any noticeable amount of professional skill. The present strength of the Department of Public Works in this district would not probably allow of the Department undertaking such works, while the cost of increasing its strength would not be justified by this inconsiderable and fluctuating duty.

READ—also the following letter from J. STURROCK, Esq., Acting Collector of South Canara, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Mangalore, 11th May 1882, No. 1109 :—

With reference to the Board's Proceedings, dated 2nd February last, No. 354, I have the honor to state that in this district the outlay on Petty Construction and Repair Works which have to the departmently executed is usually small, and no difficulty has hitherto been experienced in executing such work as had to be carried out in pursuance of the order of Government, dated 2nd October 1879, No. 2483 W. The services of contractors are generally easily procurable, and the assistance of the Local Fund Engineering Establishment can be obtained when necessary, under G.O., dated 28th April 1870, No. 871.

2834/31

READ—also the following letter from J. F. PRICE, Esq., Collector of the Chingleput District, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Saidápet, 15th May 1882, No. 209 :—

I have the honor to submit the report called for in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 354, dated 27th January last.

2. Information is, I presume, only required in regard to repairs to Government buildings. I gather this from what is said in the closing portion of paragraph 5 of the Proceedings of Government, Financial Department, No. 2502, dated 22nd December 1881.

3. The system followed in this district is that, where there is anything simple, and not requiring professional supervision to be done, it is carried out by the Revenue officers. Where this is not the case, the Local Fund Engineer makes the estimates and plans and carries out the work under my sanction, the Local Fund Board receiving* from 5 to 20 per cent. on the estimate for the aid given by their employé.

* Paragraph 2, G.O., Financial Department, No. 871, dated 28th April 1880.

4. Nothing has hitherto gone wrong; the work done has been cheap and good, and we have worked out our annual allotments for repairs.

5. I do not wish any change. The work done is nearly always at a Revenue Officer's head-quarters, and he can therefore manage to watch its progress, &c.

READ—also the following letter from A. J. STUART, Esq., Acting Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 16th March 1882 No. 53 :—

I have the honor, in reply to Board's Proceedings, No. 354, dated 2nd February 1882, communicating G.O., No. 71 W., of 11th January, to say that I think what the Government surmise in paragraph 2 of their Order is the case, and that time and practice only is required for the full utilization by the Collectors of the amount allotted for Petty Construction and Repairs.

2. When works cost less than Rs. 1,000, I think they may most easily and with best economy and least correspondence, friction or delay, be left to the department concerned and interested in them to execute, and the works undertaken from Petty Construction and Repairs are of this character.

3. The allotment for last year for this district was fully utilized, and that for the current year will probably be nearly so. There is no reason why this should not always be the case.

I think it desirable for all reasons that petty repairs and small improvements be left in the hands of the officers whose subordinates inhabit the buildings which have to be provided for, and that this fact alone will secure sufficient attention to their proper up-keep and repairs, which means the utilization of allotments.

READ—also the following letter from L. R. BURROWS, Esq., Acting Collector of Cuddapah, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Ráyachóti, 18th April 1882, No. 154 :—

I have the honor to report on the proposed retransfer of Petty Construction and Repair Works to the charge of the Department of Public Works as directed in Board's Proceedings, No. 354, dated 2nd February 1882.

2. There has been no short outlay in this district.

3. The whole amount sanctioned for this district under Petty Construction and Repairs has been utilized within the year, and I believe very usefully.

4. The present system is working very well here, and it affords great facilities to the Revenue Department to put buildings requiring repairs at once in good

order, and also to make petty improvements if necessary. Under former system, buildings requiring immediate repairs were allowed to remain in the same state for years together either from the Department of Public Works Officer having no time to do the work, or being short-handed, or to some other defect in the system.

5. Under these circumstances I prefer the present system, and strongly protest against any change.

READ—also the following letter from H. ST. A. GOODRICH, Esq., Collector of Ganjam, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chatrapur, 24th May 1882, No. 1934:—

In reference to Board's Proceedings, No. 354, dated 2nd February 1882, I have the honor to report that, so far as my own experience goes, the system of entrusting the repair of Civil Buildings to the Revenue Department has not worked well owing to the practical inexperience of the disbursing and executing officials, such as Tahsildars and Deputies who, in their ignorance of estimate-making, get their designs prepared by the Local Fund Supervisor in the first instance and where they can rely on the same individual for supervision of the work when in progress with the result that over-worked Local Fund Subordinates are saddled with work they dare not refuse and the fund itself with indirect charge which was certainly not contemplated when the Act was introduced.

2. In the old days when such maramut fell to be executed by the Revenue Department, Taluk officers had less law but more useful knowledge and practical energy. The two northern districts are subject to a special disadvantage owing to the absence of contractors capable of executing works. This has been the complaint of every Engineer serving in the Northern districts during the seventeen years of my experience therein.

READ—also the following letter from W. H. GLENNY, Esq., Collector of Kurnool, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Orvakul, 25th March 1882, No. 138:—

With reference to Board's Proceedings, No. 354, dated 2nd February 1882, I have the honor to say that I am decidedly in favor of the retention by the Revenue Department of "Petty Construction and Repair." The marginally-stated figures show the allotments and expenditure of the last three years. The Board will see that the ratio of expenditure to allotment is increasing. I have personally superintended the work executed under this head within the last year, and I am satisfied that economy and promptitude are promoted by the present arrangement: and that as a very general rule the assistance of the Professional Department is not really necessary.

Years.	Sanctioned Amount.			Expenditure.		
	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.
1879-80 ...	100	0	0	12	4	0
1880-81 ...	6,100	0	0	2,884	0	4
1881-82 ...	6,730	0	0	5,011	9	7

READ—also the following letter from R. J. MELVILLE, Esq., Collector of Madras, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 18th April 1882, No. 126:—

I have the honor to reply to Board's Proceedings, No. 354, dated 2nd February 1882.

2. The Irrigation works in this district were never transferred to the Revenue Department, and are still under the charge of the Department of Public Works with reference to copy of a letter from that department, dated 21st February 1880, extract of which is given below. As the system in force works satisfactorily, I would not propose any alteration in the management:—

"Although in G.O., No. 265 W., dated 3rd February 1880, the Presidency Division is classed under Non-irrigation, the Chief Engineer for Irrigation in his Memorandum, No. 10, III, dated 12th instant (copy enclosed), has stated that, in those divisions in which it is intended to maintain a regular Public Works Establishment, *vide* G.O., No. 265 W., of the 3rd February 1880, the work of the Irrigation Department will go on as hitherto."

2834/32

3. The repairs to the buildings named in the margin, if the cost be under Rs. 1,000, is being undertaken by this department, and I am of opinion that this work might be, with advantage, transferred to the Department of Public Works, as there is an establishment of that Department on the spot.

Arrack Distillery	Royapuram.
Jaggery Godown	Do.
Sea Custom House	Black Town.
Custom House Iron Store ... Godowns	Do.

READ—also the following letter from C. S. CROLE, Esq., Acting Collector of Madura, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 20th May 1882, No. 198:—

I have the honor to report on Board's Proceedings, No. 354, dated 2nd February 1882, communicating G.O., No. 71-W, dated 11th January 1882. The present system of executing petty construction and repair works under the agency of Civil Officers has been working well and is deserving of continuance. The number of Revenue Officers being large, they have opportunities of inspecting the works while in progress and of satisfying themselves as to the manner of execution. The Public Works Department, from the smallness of the number of its officers, cannot attend to the work so well. One of the Divisional Officers considers that the estimates for these works should be framed by the Public Works Department, another that the work of measurement should be conducted by them, and a third considers that both those duties should be left to that department. I do not concur in these views. The works should be in the exclusive charge of either the one or the other department, and it is not good policy to allow the one to meddle with the work of the other. The Revenue Officers, from their general local knowledge, can see that prices of materials are not extravagant, and arrange for the speedy prosecution of the works. Moreover, the character of these works is exactly such as nearly every native officer is accustomed to in the management of his private property.

READ—also the following letter from C. L. B. CUMMING, Esq., Acting Collector of Malabar, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Calicut, 15th May 1882, No. 1382:—

With reference to the Board's Proceedings, dated 2nd February last, No. 354, communicating G.O., dated 11th January 1882, No. 71, Public Works Department, I have the honor to state that at present only petty repair works are undertaken by the Revenue Department, as, owing to the want of professional skill on the part of our subordinates, works, whether of repairs or construction, requiring a certain amount of proficiency, are seldom entrusted to them.

2. All the Divisional Officers whom I consulted on the point are unanimous in their opinion that the proposal to transfer petty construction and repair works to the charge of the Public Works Department is very desirable, as the present system throws a good deal of work on the Revenue subordinates to the detriment of their more legitimate duties.

My own opinion is in accord with that expressed by the Divisional Officers.

READ—also the following letter from R. W. BARLOW, Esq., Collector of Nílgiris, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Ootacamund, 18th April 1882, No. 84:—

Adverting to Board's Proceedings, No. 354, of the 2nd February, and G.O., No. 71-W, of the 11th January last, Public Works Department, I have the honor to report that since it was ordered that petty construction and repair works, not requiring professional agency, should be carried out by the Civil Department by means of private agency, some difficulty has been experienced in getting such work estimated for and carried out in this district, especially in the outlying parts of the South-East Wynaad.

2. The Board are aware that in this district labor is scarce and wages high, and materials for works difficult to procure, and for these reasons I am in favor of reviving the former system of having works carried out by the Public Works Agency wherever there is an organized staff, and whenever they can be undertaken without inconvenience to the department. The Public Works Department, having always a staff of trained men, can execute the works more expeditiously than other non-professional agencies, and ensure good work, and, so far as this district is concerned, at, I believe, cheaper rates.

READ—also the following letter from H. E. STOKES, Esq., Collector of Salem, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 5th April 1882, No. 737:—

With reference to Board's Proceedings, 2nd February 1882, No. 354, I have the honor to report that, in my opinion, the present system under which petty construction and repair works are left to Civil officers should be continued.

2. I enclose a statement showing grant and outlay under the several heads in this district for three years. In 1879-80 the work was under the Public Works Department, the change was made after a portion of the year 1880-81 had passed, and the outlay was very short of the grant; but in 1881-82 the grant for revenue and jail buildings was well utilized. There was no special effort made to spend the grant, and necessity was alone looked to. The expenditure is of a kind which cannot be anticipated with much certainty, and its amount must depend to a great extent on casual causes; and I do not think that exact correspondence between grant and outlay can be looked for.

3. No difficulty whatever has been found in getting the work required done in the Revenue Department; and I believe it to be done better and cheaper than the Public Works Department could do it. The gain in saving of time and correspondence and possibly of departmental friction is very great. I am strongly in favour of the continuance of the present system.

ENCLOSURE.

STATEMENT showing the particulars of Grant, &c., of Petty Construction and Repair in the District of Salem for the Years 1879-80, 1880-81 and 1881-82.

—	1879-80.			1880-81.			1881-82.		
	Budget Grant.	Appropriation sanctioned.	Actual Expenditure.	Budget Grant.	Appropriation sanctioned.	Actual Expenditure.	Budget Grant.	Appropriation sanctioned.	Actual Expenditure.
	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS. A. P.	RS.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.
Revenue Buildings.	D.P.W. 3,800	4,575	3,257	R.D. 4,100	1,211	1,210 7 6	3,450	3,241 13 0	3,064 4 1
	R.D. 300	300	173						
Jails	200	334	329	400	267	266 0 0			
Cemetery ..	..	234	209	1,100	*528	18 0 0	630	132 0 0	124 0 0

* Rs. 495 afterwards withdrawn.

READ—also the following letter from H. SEWELL, Esq., Collector of Trichinopoly, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 13th May 1882, No. 1369:—

With reference to Board's Proceedings, dated 2nd February last, No. 354, I have the honor to state that, in my opinion, petty construction and repair works may be allowed to continue in charge of Civil officers. As far as the works in charge of the Revenue Department are concerned, I have experienced no difficulty in carrying them out under the supervision of the Revenue officials.

283/83

2. The allotment for 1880-81 was Rs. 880 for new works and Rs. 2,672 for repairs. The whole of the former amount and Rs. 2,463-12-10 of the latter were expended. The balance is the savings in the estimated cost of several works carried out during the year.

3. The allotment for 1881-82 was Rs. 2,271 for repairs, of which Rs. 1,419-9-0 only were spent. The balance is a portion of the amount provided for repairing the treasury room in the Collector's Office. As it was subsequently decided to have a new treasury room built instead, I proposed to spend the amount in raising a compound wall around my office and submitted an estimate, but the Board's sanction was received on the 23rd March, too late to complete the work within the close of the year.

4. I believe that the officers using the buildings find no difficulty whatever in executing repairs to them, and it is in my opinion unadvisable to make any change in the system for the present.

READ—also the following letter from H. G. TURNER, Esq., Acting Collector of Vizagapatam, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 22nd May 1882, No. 528:—

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd February 1882, No. 354, I have the honor to state that the Tahsildar of Golgonda is the only subordinate who has hitherto had to carry out repairs to buildings. He has re-roofed the Subsidiary Jail at Narsapatnam, executed some repairs to his office, and is now repairing the Principal Assistant's Cutcherry building. The estimates have been prepared in imitation to that of the Public Works Department, and the work was executed by contract. If the work had been carried out by the Public Works Department, it would probably have been better done at a greater cost.

2. As far as the Revenue Department is concerned, I think there will be no difficulty in getting all the petty repairs as the buildings in this district are likely to require executed without the assistance of the Public Works Department. At the same time it must be admitted that the Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars are altogether without knowledge of plan-drawing, estimate-framing and building. The same may be said of the Police Officers, School-masters and Registrars, who may have to execute repairs to the buildings occupied by them.

3. Time and practice will no doubt enable them to do all that is required without professional assistance. There is no urgent necessity for retransferring the petty construction and repair works to the Public Works Department, if the strength or weakness of the establishment, Public Works Department, is still deemed undesirable to render the transfer prudent.

4. I would, however, observe that the transfer of the Minor Irrigation Works to the Revenue Department must, to an enormous extent, have relieved the establishment of the Public Works Department, in this district, and if it be possible for them to undertake the petty construction and repairs of buildings, it would be much better for them to do so when pucka works are to be done.

RESOLUTION—dated 7th June 1882, No. 1462.

In their Order, dated 22nd December 1881, No. 2502, Financial Department, paragraph 5, Government suggested the desirability of retransferring to the Public Works Department the petty construction and repair of buildings attached to the Civil Departments, and Collectors were accordingly called upon, with reference to G.O. of 27th January 1882, No. 170, Financial Department, to report their views on the subject. The letters read above are in reply.

2. Answers are still due from Godávari, Kistna, Nellore, Tanjore and Tinnevelly, and they will be submitted when received.

3. Of the Collectors who have replied, the majority are in favor of making no alteration in the existing arrangement, which is said to obviate delay, correspon-

dence and friction, and to be on the whole economical. The only Collectors who suggest the retransfer of the works to the Department Public Works are those of Ganjam, Madras, Nílgiris, Malabar and South Arcot. The Collector of Ganjam states that the Revenue officials have not the necessary experience, and that there are no contractors in the district capable of executing the works. The Collector of Madras remarks that, as there is a Public Works Department staff on the spot, the work might with advantage be executed by that department. The Collector of Nílgiris states that labor is scarce in the district, wages high, and materials difficult to procure, and that therefore he is in favor of having the works carried out by the Public Works agency wherever there is an organized staff and wherever they can undertake the duty without inconvenience. The Collector of Malabar thinks that the transfer of works is desirable, because the work interferes detrimentally with the more legitimate duties of Revenue officers. The Collector of South Arcot admits that under present arrangements works are carried out more expeditiously and economically than was the case before, but yet thinks that when there is a Professional Department, the work should be entrusted to its officers.

4. The Collector of Vizagapatam states that there is no urgent necessity for the retransfer of the work to the Public Works Department, but, considering that the transfer of minor irrigation works from their charge must have given them considerable relief, he is of opinion, in view of the want of professional experience on the part of Revenue officers, that "pucka" works should be undertaken by the Public Works Department.

5. The Board entirely agree with the majority of the Collectors. As observed by the Collector of Madura, the character of the works in question is only such as nearly every native officer is accustomed to undertake in the management of his private property, and the Revenue officers, from their general local knowledge and the interest they take in the works, can see that prices of materials are not extravagant, and that the works are executed with promptitude. It is true that the value of works actually executed in 1880-81 was much below the amount sanctioned, but it must be remembered that it was the first year in which the transfer was effected, and no fair conclusion can be arrived at therefrom. The Board have, however, no objection to the transfer of the works to the Public Works Department in districts so exceptionally circumstanced as Madras and Nílgiris.

	1880-81.
	RS.
Budget allotment	88,630
Expenditure therefrom	43,402

(True Copies and Extract.)

C. Gibson.

Acting Secretary.

To the Chief Secretary to Government, Financial Department.

Copy to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

" to all Collectors.

Exd. A. Grubert, and A. Raitt.

[illegible]
170 – 22 – 1 – 12
71 – 22 – 4 – 10
[illegible] – 0 – 2 – [illegible]
[illegible] – 12 [illegible]

1882.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

P.W. Est
457

CURRENT No. 1798

Proceedings, 7th June 1882, No. 1462.

Submitting Board's views regarding retransfer to Public Works Department, of *petty construction and repair of buildings attached to the Civil Department.*

~~Financial~~ DEPARTMENT.

Reference on No.   *of 188*

In replying the above should be quoted.

CHIEF SECRETARIAT. MADRAS.

2834/35

READ the following :-

Pro: of the Board of Revenue dated 7th June/82
Do ” 20th do
Do ” 26th do
Do ” 26th do
Do ” 27th do
Do ” 27th do

No 504

Transferred to the Public Works Department for the issue of orders.

2. To the list of Collectors given in the third paragraph of the Boards' Pro:, No 1462 dated 7th June/82 should be added the Collector of Nellore.

Ootacamund
5th July 1882

G. Master
Chief Secretary

[illegible] Re 27/10
[illegible] Cir 20.10

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue,

Dated 8th July 1882.

No. 5758 Miscellaneous.

READ the following letter from W. A. Happell, Esqre, Ag. Collector of Godavari to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue dated Cocanada, 30th June/82, No. 234.

I have the honor to furnish the report called for in Board's Proceedings, 2nd February 1882, No. 364. I regret the delay, which was due to the difficulty experienced in obtaining information from the Divisional Officers, especially the Head Assistant and General Duty Deputy Collectors. There is some excuse for the Head Assistant in the heavy work he has to do, as besides a division of three Taluks, he has charge of a Local Fund Circle and a Municipality. The Deputy Collector has only two not very troublesome Taluks. I did not receive charge of the District till after the close of the year, and did not myself know whether or not any difficulty had been experienced in carrying out petty construction and Repair Works.

2. I find that in 1880.81 the allotment was Rs 5,510 and the expenditure Rs 2,044.15.10 while in 1881.82, they were respectively Rs 4,711 and Rs 3,676.3.1. As far as I have been able to ascertain no work that was really necessary was neglected last year, and the saving on the allotment cannot therefore be considered a subject of regret. The divisional Officers are unanimously of opinion that the work should not be retransferred to the D.P.W.. I concur in this opinion. The

officers of the D.P.W. have not time to look after work of this description themselves. It is therefore left to a Maistry under the occasional supervision of an Overseer. It is consequently often badly done, and often more expensive than it need be. I have frequently seen chunam that always remained soft to the touch, and was in fact inferior to mud, tiles that crumbled to dust in your fingers, and the like materials used by these men. The head of an Office has a personal interest in the condition of the building he uses, and however little skill he may have, he will not be satisfied unless the work is equal to average native requirements. He will also execute petty repairs much more promptly. The need of them is forced on his attention every day, and he can himself get them executed with less expenditure of energy than is often needed to get a Public Works Officer to attend to them. The officer in charge of a range has usually a great many things waiting to be done, and the number of his subordinates too few. He naturally and properly attends to what is of most importance or interest to him, first, and petty repairs lie over until extensive repairs become necessary. When the repairs are in the hands of the departments concerned such delays can only occur through gross negligence, which is always preventible by due supervision.

3. One cause of slack outlay appears to be that the requirements of the District are not actually known when the Annual allotment is applied for.

Resolution

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings dated 7th June 1882, No. 1462

(True Copy & Extract)

E. Gibson.
Ag Secretary

To
The Chief Secy. to Govt. F.D.
Copy to the Collr. of Godavari

P.W.C. No. 4723

No. 548

Transferred to the P.W. Dept. in continuation of No. 504 dated 5th July for

Chief Secy

Returned 12/7/82

1882.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

To

The Chief Secretary
to Govt. L.D.

CURRENT No. 1945

Read 15th July/82

Proceedings, dated 8th July 1882.

No. 5755 Mis:

Subject.

Submg: to Govt. letter from the Collector of Godavari regarding the retransfer of Petty Construction and repair Works to the D.P.W.

Rec. 27/10
Cir 20 10 82

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE 4TH CIRCLE,

Coimbatore 21st August 1882.

No. 347

2834/38

From,

The Superintending Engineer,
Fourth Circle.

To,

The Chief Engineer
P.W. Depart.

Sir,

With reference to your memo No. 577E dated 18th August I have the honor to report that I see no objection to the retransfer to the P.W. Depart. of the Petty Construction and repair work in the Nilgiri District (this does not include the Malabar Wynad) provided some small assistance in establishment is given.

2. At present the Nilgiri Division consists of the Nilgiri District and the portion of the Wynad in Malabar Dist.

Distt the establishment allowed is 1 Executive Engineer and 4 Upper Subordinates: as 1 subordinate has to be constantly at Wellington and another (and occasionally 2 as soon as the working season recommences) in the Wynad this leaves only 1 under the Executive Engineer at Ootacamund this being the case and as the petty construction and repair works are scattered (over an area of nearly 1000 sqre miles embracing the stations of (Ootacamund, Coonoor, Kotagherry, Goodalore, Devalah) and as stated in your memo, labor is scarce and materials difficult to procure, there is no doubt but that these works must & will give trouble and take up much of the time of the subordinates and this I fear with the heavy works that are ordered and under contemplation in Ootacamund &c cannot be spared. I therefore request that if these works are to be carried out by the P. W. Departt an extra upper subordinate may be given to the Nilgiri Division and unless this assistance is given I recommend that the works be not transferred.

2834/139

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obt. servt.
Lt: Col: R E
Supg. Engineer IV Circle

C. No. calls for 23/8

No. 597 E. 18.8.82

From.
The Supg. Engineer
4th Circle

Dated
Dept } August 1882.

No.

Petty Construction and Repair work — Requesting sanction for an Extra Upper Subordinate to Nilgiri Division in Case of transferring the — to P.W. Department.

C.A.W.

For the present at least it will be unfavorable for the Dept. to take on these minor works [illegible]

24-8 [illegible]

[illegible] from 5th Circle [illegible] Remd. Secy. 5/10

No. 2480

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
5TH CIRCLE, MADRAS,
Chepauk, 9th October 1882.

2834/HD

From
THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
5TH CIRCLE,

To
THE Chief Engineer
D.P.W.

SIR,

Enclosures.

Memo. [illegible] 10/10

In reply to your Memo No. 597 of the 18th August 1882, I have the honor to report, that the Executive Engineer at the Presidency at first asked for some increase to his Establishment to allow of his undertaking the petty Construction and Repair works in general.

Now however the Executive Engineer writes, on this date, that under the modification of the Division ordered to take place, "it may perhaps be found possible to execute all Services to buildings."

2. I am of opinion that the Retransfer may be made.

I have the honorable
Sir
Your Most Obedt Servt
Newt Prendergast Coll R E.

Supd Engr 5 Circle

No 577 E. 18-8-82

C.A.W.

Please see W's note underneath of 14.7.82.

Para 1. S.E. I. has already transferred the Petty Irrigation works of Vizag^m and Ganjam to the Civil Officers. — vide G.O. No 425 I of 31st May 1882 — and Schedule C of the Irrigation, Navigation and Agricultural Ordinary Budget for 1882-1883 See foot-note.

	Rs
Ganjam =	10.000
Vizagapatam =	11.800

Para 2 of the note.

If the S.Es. have not already been referred to regarding the transfer of Petty Repairs to Building at Presidency and Nilgiris please refer the question now for early opinion.

14.8.82

Dl 13.10
Re 27/10
only 20/10
Cir 20/10

Summary of replies from Officers of the P.W. & Civil Depts to G.O. No 71 W d/11th January 1882, relative to the proposed retransfer to the D.P.W. of Petty Construction & repair Works.

S.E. I. With regard to petty Irrigation works, is of opinion that where such works have already been transferred to the Rev. Dept, it would be inadvisable to re-transfer them to the P.W.D. & that where they have not yet been transferred to the Civil dept (as in the Vizagapatam & Ganjam Districts) they should not be made over — it being quite impracticable for the D.P.W. to attend properly to the wants of hundreds of tanks, while the officials of the Rev. Dept are sufficiently numerous & widely distributed to attend promptly to necessary

only 12/7

W/ory

repairs. As regards other petty construction & repair works, they consider that while depts concerned should be able to carry out promptly for themselves really petty work, the limit of Rs 1000 is too high & that it would be better to reduce it to Rs 200, beyond which work often requires professional skill.

S.E. II – States that except in the upland talugs of his circle, where the D.P.W. have no establt:, petty work can be undertaken by the dept, but that at the same time it would in every way be better that such petty work should be carried out by Civil Officers themselves, who ~~should~~ should apply to the D.P.W. for aid only in cases of extensive repairs or failure of buildings.

S.E. III – Would strongly deprecate any proposal of the D.P.W.

(It may be here remarked that the Petty irrigation works of Vizag. & Ganjam have since been transferred to the charge of Civil Officers – vide G.O. 425 Id/ 31st May. 82).

& repair of Civil buildings –

S.E. IV – Considers that the present system will work well after some little time & practice, & that unless the D.P.W. be considerably strengthened it cannot undertake petty construction & repair works.

S.E. V – Expresses no opinion as to the advisableness or otherwise of the proposed measure, but states merely that if the work be retransferred to the P.W.D. it will be necessary to strengthen the Presy. Divn by 3 overseers & one draftsman, & (so long as Lt Falvey is in charge of the Bangalore Sub-Divn) by one Asst. or Sub Engineer – & that in the S. Arcot & Chingleput Divns. probably one addl. overseer will be required for each –

S.E. VI – Civil Officers should have no difficulty in carrying out their own petty construction & repair

Works – Considers the proposed retransfer uncalled for & highly inexpedient & that it would lead to the neglect of more important work, for the due performance of which even the present strength is totally insufficient.

In the Civil Dept, the majority of Collectors are in favor of making no alteration in the existing arrangement, which is said to obviate delay, correspondence & friction, & to be on the whole economical. The only Collectors who suggest the retransfer of the work to the P.W.D. are those of Ganjam, Madras, Nilgiris, Malabar, S. Arcot & Nellore. The Board of Revenue entirely agree with the majority of Collectors & remark that ~~[illegible]~~ 1880-81 being the first year in which such work was transferred to the Civil Dept, no fair conclusion

2804
745

can be arrived at from the short outlay which then took place. The Board however have no objection to the retransfer to the P.W.D. of petty construction & repair work in districts so exceptionally circumstanced as Madras, & the Nilgiris. In the former district the reason urged is that as there is a P.W.D. establt. on the spot, the work can with advantage be executed by it, & in the Nilgiris, that labor is scarce, wages are high, & materials difficult to procure.

For Orders

12/7/82.

D.W

The general opinion against any retransfer is I think sufficiently pronounced but before going up for the orders of Govt. it would be as well to refer
(1) to the [illegible] regarding the

districts so [illegible]

2

13-1/

advisability or otherwise of transferring the petty construction works in Vizag^m & Ganjam to the Civil Officers as proposed by SE I

(2) the retransfers suggested by the Bd. of Revenue of the petty repairs of Buildings at the Presidency and in the Nilgiris to the respective SEs for early opinion

2834 W.

14-7-82

No 2834 W

B & R
C Wks

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 27 October/82

Read the following;—

2834 / 426

Financial	Department	M.G. No 504	d/ 5th July 1882
do		" " 548	12th
From Supdg. Engr:	Fourth Circle	" 28	d/24th January 1882
do	Third "	409	9th February 1882
do	Sixth "	1866 T.J.	11th do
do	Second "	2437 K.S.	17th do
do	Fifth "	1443	22nd March /82
do	First "	11 G.L.	12th April 1882
do	Fourth	347	21st August /82
do	Fifth	2450	9th Octr 1882

In para 5 of Proceedings in the Financial Department No 2502 d/22nd December 1881, the large unexpended balance of the allotments made to Civil officers for works of Petty Construction and Repair was noticed, and it was suggested that this was probably due to the want of time on the part of Civil Officers to attend to work of this character which might, it was thought, be advantageously retransferred in some Districts to the P.W. Deptt

2. Before a final decision on the question was come to, it was considered desirable that enquiry should be made both from Public Works and Civil officers as to the workings of the present system, the partial failure of which might possibly be found to be due to Civil officers not properly exercising their powers of sanction, in which case time and practice would it was thought overcome the difficulty.

* G.O. 9 W d/ 11th Jany /82

3 The letters read above are the replies of the officers concerned, which are summarised as follows:-

Superintending Engineer First Circle

With regard to petty Irrigation works, is of opinion that, where such works have already been transferred to the Revenue Department, it would be inadvisable to retransfer them to the P.W. Dept, and that where they have not yet been transferred to the Civil Department (as in the Vizagapatam & Ganjam Districts) they should at once be made over, it being quite impracticable for the P.W. to attend properly to the wants of hundreds of tanks, while the officials of the Revenue Department are sufficiently numerous and widely distributed to attend promptly to necessary repairs. (It may here be remarked that the Petty Irrigation works of Vizagapatam & Ganjam have since been transferred to the charge of Civil Officers vide G.O. 425 I d/ 31st May 1882)

P2

2834
47

As regards other petty construction and repair works, the Superintending Engineer considers that, while Departments concerned should be able to carry out promptly for themselves really petty work, the limit of Rs 1,000 is too high, and that it would be better to reduce it to Rs 200, beyond which work often requires professional skill.

Superintend

2. Before a final decision on the question was come to, it was considered desirable that enquiry should be made both from Public Works and Civil officers as to the working of the present system, the partial failure of which might possibly be found to be due to Civil officers not properly exercising their powers of sanction, in which case time and practice would it was thought overcome the difficulty.

* G.O. 91 W d/ 11th Jany /82.

3 The letters read above are the replies of the officers concerned, which are summarised as follows:-

Superintending Engineer First Circle

With regard to petty Irrigation works, is of opinion that, where such works have already been transferred to the Revenue Department, it would be inadvisable to retransfer them to the P.W. Dept, and that where they have not yet been transferred to the Civil Department (as in the Vizagapatam & Ganjam Districts) they should at once be made over, it being quite impracticable for the P.W. to attend properly to the wants of hundreds of tanks, while the officials of the Revenue Department are sufficiently numerous and widely distributed to attend promptly to necessary repairs. (It may here be remarked that the Petty Irrigation works of Vizagapatam & Ganjam have since been transferred to the charge of Civil Officers vide G.O. 425 I d/ 31st May 1882) As regards other petty construction and repair works, the Superintending Engineer considers that, while Departments concerned should be able to carry out promptly for themselves really petty work, the limit of Rs 1000 is too high, and that it would be better to reduce it to Rs 200, beyond which work often requires professional skill.

Superintend

2. Before a final decision on the question was come to, it was considered desirable that enquiry should be made both from Public Works and Civil Officers as to the workings of the present system, the partial failure of which might possibly be found to be due to Civil officers not properly exercising their powers of sanction, in which case time and practice would it was thought overcome the difficulty.

* G.O. 92 W d/ 11th Jany /82

3 The letters read above are the replies of the officers concerned, which are summarised as follows:-

Superintending Engineer First Circle

With regard to petty Irrigation works, is of opinion that, where such work have already been transferred to the Revenue Department, it would be inadvisable to retransfer them to the P.W. Dept, and that where they have not yet been transferred to the Civil Department (as in the Vizagapatam & Ganjam districts) they should at once be made over, it being quite impracticable for the D.P.W. to attend properly to the wants of hundreds of tanks, while the officials of the Revenue Department are sufficiently numerous and widely distributed to attend promptly to necessary repairs. (It may here be remarked that the Petty Irrigation works of Vizagapatam & Ganjam have since been transferred to the charge of Civil Officers – vide G.O. 425 I d/ 31st May 1882) As regards other petty construction and repair works, the Superintending Engineer considers that, while Departments concerned should be able to carry out promptly for themselves really petty work, the limit of Rs 1000 is too high, and that it would be better to reduce it to Rs 200, beyond which work often requires professional skill.

P2
2834/47

Superintending

Supdg Engr II Circle States that, except in the upland talugs of his Circle where the D.P.W. have no establishment, petty work can be undertaken by the Depts, but that at the same time it would in every way be better that such petty work should be carried out by Civil Officers themselves, who should apply to the D.P.W. for aid only in cases of extensive repairs or failure of buildings.

Supdg Engr III Circle – Would strongly deprecate any proposal to retransfer to the D.P.W. the work of petty construction and repair of Civil buildings.

Supdg Engr. IV Circle – Considers that the present system will work well after some little time and practice, and that unless the D.P.W. be considerably strengthened it cannot undertake petty construction and repair works.

2884/449

Supdg Engr. V Circle. Expresses no opinion as to the advisableness or otherwise of the proposed measure, but states merely that if the work be retransferred to the D.P.W. it will be necessary to strengthen the Presidency Division by 3 overseers and one draftsman and (so long as Lt Talbey is in charge of the Bangalore Sub Division) by one Asstt. or Sub Engineer; and that in the South Arcot and Chingleput Divisions probably one additional Overseer will be required for each.

Superintending Engr. VI Circle – Civil Officers should have no difficulty in carrying out their own petty construction and repair works – Considers the proposed retransfer uncalled for, & highly inexpedient, and that it would lead to the neglect of more important work, for the due performance of which even the present strength is totally insufficient

In the Civil Department, the majority of Collectors are in favor of making no alterations in the existing arrangement, which is said to obviate delay, correspondence, and friction, & to be on the whole economical. The only Collectors who suggest the retransfer of the work to the P.W.D. are those of Ganjam, Madras, Nilgiris, Malabar, S. Arcot, & Nellore. The Board of Revenue ~~entirely~~ agree with the Majority of Collectors, and remark that, 1880-81 being the first year in which such work was transferred to the Civil Department, no fair conclusion can be arrived at from the short outlay which then took place. The Board however have no objection to the retransfer to the P.W.D. of petty construction and repair work in districts so exceptionally circumstanced as Madras and the Nilgiris. In the former district the reason urged is that, as there is a P.W.D. establishment on the spot, the work can with advantage be executed by it; and in the Nilgiris that labor is scarce, wages high, and materials difficult to procure.

4. It would thus appear that the general consensus of opinion, both among Public Works and Civil Offi, is against any general re-transfer of these Petty works to the charge of the P.W.Dept.

5. As regards such exceptional districts as Madras and the Nilgiris, further references were made to the Supdg. Engrs, and from their replies it would appear that Petty works in these localities might advantageously be carried out by the Agency of the P.W.Dept.

6. Orders will accordingly issue in the Financial

P4
2834/49

(Department transferring) the works in the Nilgiri and Presidency Divisions to the P.W. Department, with the unexpended balances of funds during the Current Official Year.

7. The question of increasing the Staff of the Nilgiri Division will be separately considered on renewed representation after the works have been taken over, and some experience gained as to the additional work involved.

140/12

Supdg Engrs. ✓ Despd 4-11-82.
Examiner P.W. Accounts ✓
Board of Revenue ✓
Financial Depts ✓
(To the Chief Secretary for counter-signature.)

R.S.

[illegible]

Mems
no. 5978 d/ 18. 8. 82

AB 37/10

Cr. 20/10

14-3-16
15-3-21
6-5-21

Rem
No.

19080
6884 Sen

Govt. of [1882] Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated

Pre'd 27/10
5-25 pm

Recd. Encl.

G. O. 27th Octr. 1882, No. 2834 W.

Nos.

Petty Constn and Repair Works.

Orders on the opinion of Works & Civil Officers regarding existing arrangements for carrying out and petty works in ~~the Presidency~~ Madras & Nilgiris to be carried out by the agency of the [illegible] [illegible]

6-10-6-85
N 7 110

Cer: 20/10