Number of pages: 52
Date of report: 4.6.88
6w

P.W.D.

G.O.M. 3452-W
of 17.12.1885

Com. 8

17th December 1887, No. 3452 W., Public Works.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

Read—the following papers :—

From the Chief Engineer for Irrigation,		dated	31st Oct. 1887,	No. 72 E.W.
,, Superintending Engineer,	I Circle,	,,	31st ,, ,,	,, 292 G.I.
,, ,, ,,	II ,,	,,	21st Nov. ,,	,, 149 C.
,, ,, ,,	III ,,	,,	14th ,, ,,	,, 1677.
,, ,, ,,	IV ,,	,,	11th ,, ,,	,, 455 E.W.
,, ,, ,,	V ,,	,,	24th ,, ,,	,, 3482.
,, ,, ,,	VI ,,	,,	29th ,, ,,	,, 1412 T.J.
,, Consulting Architect to Government		,,	2nd ,, ,,	,, 1022.

Order—dated 17th December 1887, No. 3452 W., Public Works.

Vizagapatam.
Central Godávari.
Eastern Kistna.
Buckingham Canal.
West Coast.
Coimbatore.
Nilgiris.
Presidency.
North Arcot.
Consulting Architect.

The foregoing papers are replies to the inquiry made in G.O., No. 2827 W., dated 21st October 1887, as to whether the head-quarters sub-divisions of the divisions named in the margin, should be placed in direct charge of the divisional Executive Engineers, and also whether the rule implied in paragraph 1831 of the Public Works Code should be generally observed.

2. The majority of Superintending Engineers are of opinion that an Executive Engineer should be free to devote equal attention to all parts of his division, and should not therefore be placed in immediate charge of any particular portion of it. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation considers that as a general principle, the rule that an Executive Engineer in charge of a division should also have direct charge of the head-quarters sub-division, may be accepted as suitable and satisfactory, but that there are many divisions which should form exceptions, as in them the rule can only be enforced at the cost of efficient supervision of the division by the Executive Engineer.

3. The Government agree in opinion with the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, and consider that while paragraph 1831 of the code may remain unaltered, the case of each division must be considered on its merits.

4. With respect to the particular divisions mentioned above, the Superintending Engineers concerned show sufficient reasons, except in the case of the Vizagapatam division, for not placing the head-quarters sub-divisions in charge of the Executive Engineers, and the present arrangements will therefore be continued. With regard

to the Vizagapatam division, the Superintending Engineer is of opinion that the head-quarters sub-division can, with advantage, be placed in the Executive Engineer's immediate charge, and arrangements will be made accordingly.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. O. HASTED, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
To Superintending Engineers.
To the Consulting Architect to Government.
„ Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. P. L. Pereira.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of 1887 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated December, 17th.

Read. *Encl.*

G.O., 17th Dec. 1887, No. 3452 W.

DECEMBER.

Head-Quarters Sub-divisions

Orders on correspondence relating to the subject of placing the — *of certain divisions* in direct charge of the divisional Executive Engineers.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

READ—the following papers :—

Proceedings of the Court of Wards, dated 23rd May 1887, No. 678.

Read—the following letter from J. G. HORSFALL, Esq., Collector of Ganjam, to the Secretary to the Board in the Department of Land Revenue, dated Berhampore, 16th April 1887, No. 112 :—

Referring to Court of Wards' Proceedings, dated 2nd November 1886, No. 1388, I have the honor to state that the late Acting Collector, Mr. Sewell, asked the Executive Engineer of the then Rushikulya division to state which of the buildings in the estates of Chinna Kimedi, Dhárákót and Bodagada estates he would hand over to the estate managers. The enclosed is a copy of the now Ganjam Division (which comprises the whole district) Engineer's reply, dated 9th instant, No. 2-R.

2. The Engineer says that all the repairs which have been sanctioned since he took over charge would be executed by him, and suggests that future repairs to the buildings in these estates be executed by the estate managers.

3. In my opinion all the buildings should remain in the charge of the Public Works Department, and any urgent repairs which cannot at once be undertaken by the Public Works Department be executed by the estate managers under orders of the Collector.

4. As regards the irrigation works, I agree with the Executive Engineer that works for tanks irrigating less than 50 acres might be undertaken by the estate managers with a small establishment. I would recommend this proposal for Board's sanction not only in the case of Dhárákót, Bodagada and Chinna Kimedi, but also in the case of Urlam, Jarada and Kurla, Tarlipeta, Aska and Chakepilli estates recently taken under Court's management.

5. The proposal of entertaining one establishment for more than one estate does not commend itself to me.

6. There should be a separate establishment for each estate, and it should be subordinate to the manager of that estate. I therefore recommend that the Collector may be authorised to entertain such establishment for each estate as he may consider necessary provided that the cost of the establishment may not exceed 15 per cent. of the total expenditure as in the case of Government minor irrigation works.

7. I may add that in the estates of Chinna Kimedi, Dhárákót and Bodagada little or nothing has been done by the Public Works Department for the last two years, and that repairs are urgently needed. I have therefore, in anticipation of Board's sanction to the above proposals, instructed the managers of the three estates in question to undertake at once the necessary repairs to tanks with ayacut of less than 50 acres.

5. The Ganjam division head-quarters to be at Berhampore.

6. As regards the Engineering staff, I would propose that it should be arranged thus :—

—	Executive Engineers.	Assistant Engineers.	Upper Subordinates, permanent.	Lower Subordinates, permanent.	Upper Subordinates, temporary.	Remarks.
Now sanctioned	2	3	9	..	..	See G.O. No. 913 W., dated 25th March 1887.
Do.	..	..	..	2	..	Out of six allowed for circle.
Do.	..	..	..	..	5	Of which four for estate works.
Proposed.						
For Rushikulya division.	1	2	* 5	† 1	* 1	* 2 Russellkonda reservoir works. 1 Gumsur head works. 1 Mahanadi canal. 1 Inuamilly head works and 10 miles Rushikulya canal. 1 Godahollow aqueduct and canal near at hand. † 1 Shergadda cutting.
For Ganjam division ..	1	..	‡ 4	§ 1	‖ 3	‡ 2 Berhampore sub-division. 2 Chicacole sub-division. § Berhampore sub-division. ‖ 2 Parlakimedi. 1 Other estates.
Total ..	2	2	9	2	4	

From which it will be seen that as long as the Surada reservoir works are in abeyance, I consider the Engineering staff may be less than that sanctioned under the present arrangement by one Assistant Engineer and one temporary upper subordinate.

7. As regards the permanent office and office petty establishments, the enclosed proposition statements will show that there is a slight excess of Rs. 2 per month in the proposed over the existing arrangements, but one of the clerks proposed for the Rushikulya division on average pay of Rs. 27½ would be required solely in the interests of "accounts," to which, as in the case of similar clerks in many of the divisions, he ought really to be charged.

8. To lessen the amount of trouble in redistribution of budget grants and office work generally and the liability to confusion in accounts, I would recommend that the alterations now proposed should not come into force till the close of this official year by which time the establishment quarters at Doegam might be ready.

9. I would remark that, if the proposals now made are carried out, it may be advisable that general Public Works Department works in and about Russellkonda and Aska should be carried out by the *Rushikulya* division staff, but this would probably be most simply arranged for by special requests in each case from the *Ganjam* division, to which would be given all allotments for such works in the budget.

No. 76 E.W.

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

As requested in [Chief Engineer's endorsement, No. 2758 C., of 16th August 1887, the detailed proposals for constituting the present Ganjam division into two divisions are forwarded. Mr. Walch's proposals are approved of by me, and they ought to meet all requirements. It is, I consider, absolutely necessary, in order that the Rushikulya works may be properly carried on, that it should be made a separate division and that the Executive Engineer should have his head-quarters at Doegam and not be, as at present, liable to be called away from the Rushikulya works on other duty.

2. I regret that the Superintending Engineer does not see his away to make these changes until the end of this official year, but for the reasons given accept that the division shall remain as it is for this official year.

CHEPÂK,
10th November 1887.

(Signed) H. R. MEAD, Colonel, R.E.,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

To the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

ORDER—dated 24th November 1887, No. 3208 W., Public Works.

As recommended by the Court of Wards in their Proceedings of the 23rd May 1887, No. 678, the buildings on the estates in question will be placed in charge of Public Works Department officers, who will also undertake all works for tanks irrigating 50 acres and above.

2. To admit of proper effect being given to these orders, the Ganjam division will, with effect from the 1st April next, be reconstituted as follows :—

(*a*) Rushikulya division, with head-quarters at Doegam.
(*b*) Ganjam division, with head-quarters at Berhampore.

3. The Rushikulya division will have three sub-divisions, but only two sub-divisional officers at present, the Surada sub-division being temporarily in abeyance. The Ganjam division will have four sub-divisions, the head-quarter sub-division being directly under the Executive Engineer.

4. The re-arrangement of the Engineering staff proposed in paragraph 6 of the Superintending Engineer's letter, No. 487 G.N., dated 27th October 1887, and the proposals for working the new divisions, are approved ; and sanction is accorded to the revised scale of office and petty establishments shown in the proposition statement submitted by the Superintending Engineer. The net increase is Rs. 2¼ per mensem.

5. The sanction accorded in paragraph 4 of these proceedings is registered as Provincial, No. 46 W. of 1887-88, and classified as Establishment, Permanent.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. O. HASTED, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, I Circle.
" Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts, with proposition statement.
" Revenue Department.

Exd. J. Moses.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of (1887) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated November, 24th.

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 24th Nov. 1887, No. 3208 W.

NOVEMBER.

Estate Works in the Ganjam Division

Orders directing that the buildings on certain — be placed in charge of the Public Works Department officers who will also undertake all works for tanks irrigating 50 acres and above, and reconstituting the Ganjam division.

308/C

I have ascertained from the books of C.E.'s office that the only head qrs sub-divisions which are now held by Ex. Engrs are the following —

Ganjam
Cuddapah
Chingleput (with an attached supervisor in the sub-division under the Ex. Engr.)
Trichinopoly
Negapatam
Madura
Tinnevelly.

In the case of the Tanjore division, the S.E.'s proposal to remove the charge of the head qrs sub-division from the E.E. was sanctioned in G.O. No 2051 W of 1.8.87.

I think that on the order as drafted, S.E.'s will report any particular case in which they think the

---

Ch. 2 Encl

308/

---

division may be instanced, in t

head qrs sub division
should be removed from
the S.E.'s charge, but
it does not seem necessary
in any of the few cases
above mentioned, to
~~make~~ expressly invite
the S.E.'s opinion whether
any change should
be made. —

[illegible].12.87

Yes — this makes the
matter quite clear

[illegible].12.87

Nº 72 Encl.

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation;

In his office note Nº 619 of 6th October 1887, communicated with G. O. Nº 2827 W. of 21st October 1887, the Examiner of P. W. Accounts, draws attention to the several cases in which Executive Engineers in charge of divisions do not also hold charge of the headquarter sub divisions; he points out that the existing arrangement is in direct contravention of the rule implied in para 1831 of the Madras Public Works Code, and requests the orders of Government whether the rule is to be observed. The undersigned is of opinion that as a general principle, the rule, that an Executive Engineer in charge of a division should also have direct charge of the head quarter sub. division, may be accepted as suitable and satisfactory; he however considers that there are many divisions in the Presidency which should form exceptions, as in them the rule can only be enforced at the cost of efficient supervision of the division by the Executive Engineer; as an example of these the Tanjore division may be instanced, in this office

office note No. 41 E.W. printed with G.O. No. 2051 W. of 1st August 1887, it was recommended that the Tanjore Division Executive Engineer be relieved of the charge of the head quarter sub division

Chepauk }
31st Oct/1887 }

Colonel R.E.
Chief Engineer for Irrigation

To

The Chief Engineer Public Works Deptt.

E. I. Form No. 5.

O.W.C.K. № 8711

Former Cases.

G.O. No. 3208W dated 24-11-1887.
B " 2827W " 21-10-1887.
G.O. " 2051W " 1-8-1887
G.O. " 1137W " 25-4-1887.

Later Cases.

No. dated 188 .
" " 188 .
" " 188 .

1887.

From

The Chief Engineer for Irrigation,

To

The Chief Engineer P.W.D.

Printed in P.M.G., No. dated

No. 728W
Dated 31-10-87
Despatched
Received 1-11-87

Reminders received.

No. 1, dated 188 .
" 2, " 188 .
" 3, " 188 .
" 4, " 188 .
" 5, " 188 .

Enclosures.

Subject.

Stating that as a general principle the rule regarding H. Quarters Sub Divns. being placed under the personal charge of Ex. Engineers may be accepted as suitable & satisfactory with certain exceptions

2-11-87

Keep-withs.

circ 15-12-87

No. 292 G.b

FROM
G. T. Walch Esq.
~~THE~~ SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
FIRST CIRCLE.

TO
THE CHIEF ENGINEER
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DOWLAISHWARAM, 31st Octr. 1887

Recd 1-11-87

SIR,

With reference to G.O. 2827/W 21st Instant I have the honor to say that the only existing Sub Divisions in this Circle which I consider can with advantage be placed under the personal charge of the Executive Engineers is the Vizagapatam or Head Quarters Sub Dn. of the Vizagapatam Division; but if the proposed separation of the Ganjam Dn. into two be carried out I consider that also in the Berhampur Division the Berhampur or Head Quarters Sub Dn. may well be managed direct by the Executive Engineer. See para 3 of my No. 487 dated 27th Instant.

This has already been ordered

x To Chief Engr. for Irrigation.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient Servt.
GTWalch
Supdg. Engr. 1st Circle.

G.M.C No 8953

From
The Supdg Engineer
1st Circle

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

Dated 31st }
Desp 1st } Oct/87 Nov/87
Recd 7/11 }

No 2929 C

Enclo. Nil

Sub Divisions.

—

Considers certain — can with advantage be placed under the personal charge of the Executive Engrs.

Comp W 8/11/87

No 149 C

Superintending Engineer's Office
2nd Circle, Kodavalur
16th November/87.

From
J. W. Rundall Esq.
Superintending Engineer
II Circle.

To
The Chief Engineer
Public Works Department
Madras

Sir,

I have the honor, with reference to G.O. No 2,827 of the 21st October, to report that I do not consider that the Executive Engineers concerned can with advantage hold charge either of the Kistna Eastern Head Quarter Sub Division or the Pulicat sub Division of the Buckingham Canal.

2. In the first place, the Head Quarter Sub Division of the Kistna Eastern Division comprises charge of the Workshops, the quarries and the Anicut all of which works require daily personal supervision by an officer; when at Head Quarters the Executive Engineer is necessarily much engaged in Office Work, and when absent from Head Quarters, the charge of the Workshops and quarries, would, were there no sub Divisional Officer, devolve on subordinates. As you are personally acquainted with the constant

and heavy work required from the Kistna Eastern Division Officer, ~~which~~ whose duties are much heavier now, with a large expenditure on new works, than they were 7 or 8 years ago, I need not enlarge on this matter.

3. As regards the Pulicat Sub Division, I beg to state that the work is heavy and will be heavier next Year, when it is proposed to have 4 Flood Gates in progress and to carry out earthwork to the extent of a lac of Rupees. These works require the presence & frequent inspection of a responsible & Capable Officer. If the Executive Engineer makes, as is desirable, frequent inspections of the Canal these works would be left without proper supervision should the Pulicat Sub Division be abolished. At present the Sub Division is in charge of a senior Sub Engr, and Mr Wright mentioned by the Examiner returns to it as a detached Officer. There is also one Overseer & one sub Overseer employed in it.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

J. W. Rundall
Superintending Engineer
II Circle

P.W. Circ 9430

From

The Supg Engineer
II circle

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

Dated - 16th November/87

Received [illegible]

No. 149 C

Sub-Divisions - Head Quarter charge of - States reasons against the Executive Engineers in charge of Divisions holding the -

Complete
[illegible]
21.11.87

fw

circ 15-12-87

No. 1677 28/17

Superintending Engineer's Office.
3RD CIRCLE
Bellary 14th December 1887.

FROM,

Col H Smalley R.E.
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
IIIrd CIRCLE.

To,

THE Chief Engineer
P.W.D.
Madras

SIR,

G.O. No. 2827 W. dated Oct. 21 1887

I have the honour to report on para 2. of the above order that as a general rule I consider Executive Engineers should not have a Head quarter Sub Division under their immediate charge and that the freer their hands are for general duties of their Divisions the better.

2. There are Divisions however in which I consider the Executive Engineer should take charge of a Head quarter Sub Division, and of those with which I am best acquainted Bellary is one & St. Thomas Mount another. In both of these stations there are constant additions and improvements and repairs going on to the Military and Civil Buildings and there is much correspondence and personal intercourse with the Military authorities, and I consider that the Executive Engineer himself is the proper officer to conduct business

Enclosures.

in such stations and not a Sub Divisional Officer, who might be a native gentleman, or might be a Military non commissioned Officer, either of whom might not improbably fail to work well with the Military authorities.

3. In a Division like N. Arcot I see no necessity for a Head Quarter Sub Division. In Kurnool the Executive Engineer deprecates having charge of a Hd Qr. Sub Division and I have no doubt he is right, though whether the town of Kurnool might not be in his special charge I am not prepared to say for want of acquaintance with the Division. In Cuddapah I see no necessity for a Hd Qr Sub Division, though here again I do consider that for the present at least the town of Cuddapah should be in the special charge of the Executive Engineer. In such cases the Executive Engineers must have overseers attached to their Hd Qr. Station.

4. This report only deals with Sub Divisions as now constituted and would have to be greatly modified if the present system were changed and Sub Divisional charges were confined to Assistant Engineers.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedt servt
H Smalley Col R.E.
Supdg Engineer 3d Circle

P.W.C. No 9264

From,
The Superintending Engineer,
IIIrd Circle.

To,
The Chief Engineer
PWD
Madras

Dated 14th } Novr 1887.
Received 15 }

Enclosures.

No. 1677

Sub Divisions

Reporting on the feasibility of reduction in the

Complete
WW
16.11.87

C.S.C-15-11-87

Supdg. Engineer's Office, 4th Circle,
Coimbatore 11th October 1887

No: 455/W

3451/15

From

Colonel J. Beatty, R.E.,
Superintdg. Engineer 4th Circle

To

The Chief Engineer,
P.W. Department.

Sir,

As directed in G.O. No: 2827 of 21st October 1887, I have the honor to report on the subject of Head Quarter Sub Divisions being held by the Executive Engineers in charge of the Divisions.

I As regards No. 1 Sub Division of the Nilgiri Division by far the larger part of the work of the Division goes on in that Sub Division, the payments in it are practically continuous, and they and the works

connected

connected with them occupy fully the time of the present energetic Officer Mr. Bragg. It would not be possible for the Executive Engineer to attend to the work of that subDivision and at the same time carry on effectually the work of the Division

II. In the Coimbatore and West Coast Divisions, I consider it quite impossible for the Divisional Officer to perform the duties of Head Quarter SubDivisional Officer; i.e., make frequent inspections of the works, check all measurements, and make all payments in addition to the ordinary duties of a Divisional Officer, and at the same time exercise any check on the proceedings of the other subDivisional Officers

2. In the Divisions of this Circle also para 1831 of the Code does not apply in regard to the Head Quarter subDivisions. It has been found impracticable to carry on the work of these Divisions without giving all the subDivisional Officers drawing Accounts. But para 1831 of the Code runs as follows:– "The payments of Imprest holders under the Executive Engineer, and his own payments are to form one subDivision of Account under the Executive Engineer to be called the Head Quarter subDivision." I can only suppose that this rule applies to Divisions of limited extent and comparatively small expenditure where the Executive Engineer is the only Officer having a Drawing Account.

3. On the general question of the expediency of throwing on the Executive Engineer the duties of Head Quarter SubDivisional Officer, and at the same time expecting him to conduct the general duties of Divisional Officer, and be responsible

responsible for the working of some two or three other subdivisions, I consider the enforcement of such a rule utterly impracticable, and that it must be a total failure. It is just possible that it maybe practicable in some Divisions of limited extent and small expenditure with which I am unacquainted, but in the Divisions of this circle, I feel quite sure it is out of the question, altogether.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedt. servant.

L. Beatty - Col, RE,
Supg. Engineer, 4th Circle.

3052/17

P.W.C. No. 9171

From
Col: J. Beatty R.E.,
Supg. Engineer,
Fourth Circle

dated 11th Nov: /87.
R 14.11.87

No. 455
Est

Head Quarter Subdivisions:-

Reporting on the subject of being held by the Executive Engineers in charge of Divisions.

Combine with [illegible]

Circ. 15-12-87

No. 3482. 3452/18

Superintending Engineer's Office,
V Circle, Madras,
Chepák, 24th November 1887.

From
Colonel H. M. Vibart R.E.
Superintending Engineer, V Circle,

To
The Chief Engineer
P. W. Department.

Enclosures.

Sir,

With reference to G. O. No. 2829 W dated 27th October 1887, I have the honor to state that the reasons against the charge of the Head Quarters Sub Division of the Presidency Sub Division being held by the Executive Engineer are explained in this Office letter No. 3 dated 1st April 1887.

2. The arrangement reported in this Office No. 6029 of 8th March 1887, by which the Executive Engineer North Arcot has been left without direct charge of a

a Sub Division, was made with a view that the Executive Engineer might have more time for the general duties connected with his Division.

3. As regards the general question as to the expediency or otherwise of Head Quarters Sub Division, being placed under the personal charge of Executive Engineer, it is to be observed that the Officer in charge of a Sub Division must either measure or check measure all work, lay out work or see that all work is laid out properly. It will be very difficult for an Executive Engineer to do all this and also inspect frequently the works of his Subordinates. An Executive Engineer holding direct charge of a Sub Division is thus prevented from inspecting the Works in his Division as frequently as might be desirable while he is engaged on Work which an Upper Subordinate would do equally as well. Moreover under the present system of Accounts an Executive Engineer has a good deal of Office Work. He pays all Contractors, examines and either initials or signs all Vouchers, besides answering numerous references from the Examiner's Office. I consider that it is not advisable to place Executive Engineers in direct charge of their Head Quarters Sub Division.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedient Servt,

Henry Tulloch
Col. R.E.
Superintending Engineer
5th Circle

No 3482.

From

The Superintg Engr
5th Circle

28 NOV 87

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

Dated 24th } November
Recd 〃 } 188

Head Quarte
Sub Division

Considers that
it is not advisa
to place Exe
cutive Engineer
in direct charg
of them

No 1412 T.T. Office of the Supg Engineer 6th Circle
Trichinopoly 29th October 1887

27/10 295/R.E.

From
The Superintending Engineer
VI Circle
Trichinopoly.

To
The Chief Engineer
Public Works Department
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to G.O. No 2827 W of 21st Instant, I have the honor to state that I consider that an Executive Engineer should be able to devote equal attention to all parts of his Division and should not be specially concerned with a particular portion of it, that is to say that the Head Quarter Sub-division should not be under his personal charge.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
J Leavitt Col. R.E.
Superintending Engineer 6th Circle

P.W.C No. 8758

From

The Supg. Engineer
VI. Circle

To.

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

No. 1412. T.S

Dated 29th October 1887.

A 2-11-87

Reports that the Head Quarter Sub Division should not be under Ex. Engineer's personal charge

Complete
2.11.87

re · 15-12-87

P.W.D

385/2

Consulting Architect's Office,
Chepauk, Madras,
2nd November 1887

No. 1022

From J. W. Brassington Esqr
The Consulting Architect
to the Government of Madras.

To

The Chief Engineer
Public Works Department.

Sir,

Enclosure.

In reply to G.O. No. 2827W dated the 21st October 1887, I have the honor to state that the duties of the Consulting Architect, are of such a nature that it will not be possible for him to take charge of his head quarter Sub Division.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most obedient Servant

J W Brassington
Consulting Architect
to Government

P.W.C. No 8818

Public Works Department.

From

THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D

No. 1022

Dated 2nd November 1887
Received 3-11-8

No. OF ENCLOSURES.

Subject.

stating that it will not be possible for the Consulting Architect to take Charge of his head quarter Sub Division

Cons[illegible] mcn 3.11.87

rc-15-12-87

Genl Estabt P.W.D.

VI

No 3462 W dated 17th December/87

Read Cirs 8711, 8933, 9430,
9264, 9171, 9678, 8758 &
8818.

Order.

Vizagapatam
Central Godavari
Eastern Kistna
Buckingham Canal
West Coast

Coimbatore
Nilgiris
Presidency
North Arcot
Cons. Architect.

The foregoing papers are replies to the enquiry made in G.O. No 2827 W dated 21st October 1887, as to whether the head quarters sub divisions of the divisions named in the margin should be placed in direct charge of the divisional Executive Engineers, and also whether the rule implied in para 1831 of the P.W. Code should be generally observed.

2. The majority of Supdg Engineers are

OPH 16 Dec

of opinion that an Executive Engineer should be free to devote equal attention to all parts of his division, and should not therefore be placed in immediate charge of any particular portion of it. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation considers that as a general principle, the rule that an Ex. Engr. in charge of a division should also have direct charge of the head quarters sub-division, may be accepted as suitable and satisfactory, but that there are many divisions which should form exceptions, as in them the rule can only be enforced at the cost of efficient supervision of the division by the Ex. Engr.

3. [illegible] The Govt. agree in opinion with the Ch. E. for I. & consider that while para 1831 of the Code may remain unaltered, the case of each division must be considered on its merits.

4. With respect to the particular divisions mentioned above, the Supdg. Engrs. concerned show sufficient reasons, except in the case of the Vizagapatam division, for not placing the head quarters sub-division in charge of the Ex. Engr., and the present arrangements will therefore be continued. With regard to the Vizagapatam Division, the Supdg. Engr. is of opinion that the head quarters sub-division can with advantage be placed in the Ex. Engr.'s immediate charge, and arrange-

ments will be made [illegible]

accordingly,

14.12.87

14/12/87

17.12.

Seen
11/1

To The Ch. S. for inform
- Supply [illegible]
- C.A. to Govt.
- [illegible]

Circ. 15-12-87

PUBLIC WORKS

17/12
Recd 19/12

17 Dec 3452 W

Head Quarters to divisions

Orders on correspondence relating to the subject of placing the ___ of ~~the divisions~~ certain divisions in direct charge of the divisional Ex. Engineers

17
12