

Trichinopoly. 10th March 1887.
No. 686 T.C. 19/10/8

From J. W. Martin Esquire
The Superintending Engineer, in ch: of
6th Circle.

To
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

Sir,

ENCLOSURE.

Adverting to G.O. No 612 W dated 1st March/87, regarding, charging the pay of Temporary Maistries to works, I have the honor to state, respectfully, that I do not see how works can be carried out in future if the provisions of para 935 of the P. W. Code are strictly complied with, except by increasing very much the cost of petty supervision.

2. The system of the department is, as you aware, to put an Upper subordinate in charge of all the works in one or more taluqs; but as a taluq is a large area it is impossible for him to inspect, in general, each work more than

than once or twice a month, and as it is useless to leave a work to almost the entire management of ignorant coolies, it follows that Braistries must be employed in immediate charge of the works. At present there are no maistries or petty subordinates on the permanent establishment, so we are obliged to employ temporary men, charging their pay to works under the head provided for petty supervision. It has been the practice heretofore to provide in the estimates 5 per cent, on cost of actual work, for petty supervision, and this was found sufficient because the pay of a Maistry was charged proportionately to each work he superintended, the total amount of pay being limited to the salary fixed by the Executive Engineer. If in future however

each

each Maistry must be employed on only one work as laid down by the Examiner; it follows as a necessary consequence, that the cost for petty supervision will be largely increased. In general our works, individually, as distinguished by the Examiner, are small and cost from say Rs 100 to 500, while at the same time, for various reasons such as the presence of water, fever, difficulty about getting a large number of coolies for works situated in remote places &c &c, it often happens that a work is a comparatively long time in progress, and, therefore, a provision of 5 per cent on cost of actual work is frequently not sufficient to meet the salary of a Maistry, his pay being from Rs 15 to 20 per month.

3. In para 2 of his note recorded with the S.O. under reference the Examiner says, "it goes without saying that the men were not employed on different works simultaneously." Strictly speaking this is of course correct, but hardly so in actual practice, for as works are often comparatively near each other, and frequently contiguous, a masonry can often inspect more than one work each day or he may inspect a work say today and another tomorrow and so on -

In such cases to employ two or more men to do work which one man can easily do is clearly wasting money. Estimates for improving tanks and channels very often provide for repair and major or minor original works situated in

in, almost, the same locality, and these are generally carried out at the same time, so one masonry can easily look after them, but this will not be practicable if the Examiner's ruling is enforced, because from his point of view. Repair and Original works must be treated independently and without reference to whether they are close to or far away from each other -

4. Under these circumstances if the Examiner's ruling must be carried out in all cases, I think, there is no alternative but to employ a masonry for each work, and provide in every estimate a sum sufficient to meet the pay of a masonry to be employed during the whole time the work is expected to be in progress. It appears to me

that this will lead to a large, and, in my opinion, very unnecessary increase to expenditure for petty supervision, which is rather inconsistent if compared with the fact, that Government are doing every thing they possibly can to reduce expenditure for establishment -

5. As there will be numerous objections raised by the Examiner and much correspondence between him, this office, and Executive Engineers, unless clear & definite instructions are now given to the latter, I beg you will be good enough to inform me, if I may direct Executive Engineers to provide in each estimate a sum sufficient to pay the whole salary of maintain-
for

for the works during the time it is in progress, and that Draftsman must be employed on only one work in future -

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant.

L. W. Mayhew
Executive Engineer

in ch: Maile.

679-80 on 5.3.87.
2049 on 23.8.86.
1343 on 29.5.86.
2605 on 24.10.84.
612 on 1.3.87.
3021 on 15.11.87.

P. W. D. 6TH CIRCLE.

From
The Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No. 686.T.C

Dated 14.1 }
Received 7 } March 1887

Enclosure. —

Requests certain
instructions regard-
ing charging of
pay of temporary
maistris to works.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 12 March 1887

Read the following

Letter from the S.E. VI Circle (H.E. No 686 T.C. of March 4. 1887).

The Government of India
have recently been addressed
on the subject of the employment
of maistris, and a copy of the
Superintending Engineer's letter
above recorded will be forwarded
to that Government in further
explanation of the inconve-
nience caused by the restrictions
imposed in para 935 of the
Madras P.W. Code.

2. The proposal of the
Suptg Engineer to employ a
separate maistry for each
work will cause undue
expenditure of public money,
and can only be permitted
in the case of works which

670
2

1

are large enough to bear such
expenditure without extravagance
in the item of petty super-
vision. —

S. E. VI Circle. ¹²
12/3/87

(H.E. No 779 W d/ 12-3-87)

Copy of the above
forwarded to the Govt. of India
in continuation of this office
dept. No 680 W dated 5th
March 1887.

Wm

9.3.87

12/3/87
10/3/87

1389 779 W d/ 12-3-87
779

10/3

Wm

10/3/87
10/3/87



B5

A4