(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 6

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் Dec 89

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

29

P.W.D. துறை

அரசாணை எண்.
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 3215

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் : 12-11-1889 198 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

27

3. Sheets

ஆவண. கா-1—18,000—15-6-87.

3215

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

READ—the following papers:—

From Lieutenant-Colonel A. C. SMITH, R.E., Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department (through the Examiner, Public Works Accounts), dated Poriyur, 29th August 1889, No. 499 T.N.

A new latrine, at an estimated cost of Rs. 320, having been lately built, at the request of the Collector of Tinnevelly, in lieu of the one near the printing office, I have sanctioned the disposal, in public auction (with the exception of the site), of the old latrine; but the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, considers that, under para. 1033 of the Public Works Code, the building should not be dismantled or sold in public auction without the sanction of Government.

2. The old latrine has been condemned on account of its close proximity to the cutcherry, and the disposal of such a petty condemned building was not considered to require the sanction of Government.

3. I have the honor to submit, for the consideration of Government, the advisability of similar petty cases, coming under the head Provincial, being left for the disposal of Superintending Engineers.

4. I am also of opinion that sheds or buildings erected from contingencies of estimates for large works when in progress, should be disposed of under the orders of the Superintending Engineer, on the completion of the works when the buildings are of no further use.

Office note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated 19th September 1889, No. 1358.

Forwarded with remarks that it seems desirable to adopt the suggestions in paras. 3 and 4, if the exceptions can be satisfactorily defined.

2. I was at first disposed to think that, when an officer has authority to sanction the substitution of a new building for an old one, he might be held to have authority also to sanction dismantlement of the old one, and that sanction of Government would be unnecessary; but, on further consideration, it seemed that the rules did not warrant any such construction, and I thought it better to ask the Superintending Engineer to obtain sanction and at the same time refer the general question.

ORDER—dated 26th September 1889, No. 2688 W., Public Works.

In the case of provincial buildings classed as minor works, Superintending Engineers are authorized to sanction the demolition of any structure whose dismantlement is necessary for the construction of a new building.

2. The Government confirms the opinion expressed in para. 4 of the Superintending Engineer's letter.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. R. E. DRAKE-BROCKMAN, Lt.-Col., R.E.,
Ag. Joint Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To Superintending Engineers.
" the Consulting Architect to Government.
" the Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. P. L. Pereira.
Spare Copies

3815

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of {1889} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated September, 26th.

Read.

Encl.

G.O., 26th Sept. 1889, No. 2688 W.

SEPTEMBER.

Demolition of any structure for the construction of a new building

Authorizing Superintending Engineers to sanction, in the case of provincial buildings classed as minor works, the —.

[C. No. 8.]

3215

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1889. { P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 2? November 1889.

OFFICE NOTE No. 1567

To

W.

Genl. No.

188 .

The Supg.Engineer in his letter communicated with G.O.No.2688 W. dated 26th.September 1889 submits for the consideration of Government his sanction to the sale by auction of an old latrine " condemned on account of its close proximity to the cutcherry".

2. Para I of G.O.No. 2688 W.dated 26th.September 1889 authorizes the Supg.Engineer to sanction demolition as of structures classed " Provincial Minor Works " whose dismantlement is necessary for the construction of a new building".

3. As the Supg.Engineer's sanction does not fulfil this requirement the old latrine not having been dismantled to make room for the new, please let me know whether I may understand the G.O. to approve his proceedings or not.

3

4. If approval of his sanction be intended other than as a special case, the terms of para I of the G.O. require modification or amplification.

C.S.
2/11
for C.

M.
11
2/11

G.O 2688 W d/26.9.89

R 4.11.89
No 3215 W d/17 Nov/89

~~H.C.~~
B
W.S. Gloster

The Govt does not consider it necessary to modify the terms of Go. No. 2688 W d/26th September 1889.

2. The sale of the material of the old latrine referred to in the Supty Engrs letter No 499 T.N. d/29th August 1889 is approved.

W.S.
5.11.89

Brett
5.11.89

(3)

S.E.M. Cantle
Engr W.D.

12/11

H.W. 5.11.89

E.
11.
11
12/11