

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 16
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 5/89
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கெழுப்பம் lax

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

பொதுப்பணி துறை

அரசாணை எண்.	146(10)	அச்சகம்
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.		பலவகை
நாள் :	18-1-1890	~~19~~

⑧

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

செய்யு

No. 2578

166
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,

V Circle, Madras,

Chepák, 14 July 1899.

From

Colonel W. A. Burton R.E.

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, V CIRCLE,

To

THE Secretary to Government
The Department.

SIR,

Enclosures.

In reference to Chief Engineer's Memo No. 393 I dated 24th ultimo, I have the honor to inform you that whilst Committees pure and simple are not more numerous at Bangalore than at Madras, the personal conferences necessary between the Executive Engineer and Heads of the Civil and Army Departments in order to meet efficiently the requirements of those officers is constant at Madras: further that the heretofore practice of the Executive Engineer deputing one of his Subordinates

Subordinates at Madras to represent him at such conferences causes great delay to public business - and imposes on such Subordinate a duty which is normal to the Committee to guarantee himself.

2. The Sub Divisional Officer at Bangalore being an Assistant Engineer and a fully Commissioned Officer would be perfectly competent to serve on Committees at that station, and the presence of the Engineer's own presence at Bangalore would very seldom if ever, in that case, be required: a Lieutenant or Captain R.E. would in short, adequately represent the R.E. Department on almost any Committee I can conceive likely at Bangalore. But as a matter of fact the presence of a D.P.L. Officer on a Committee either at Madras or Bangalore is not frequent, nor would it ever except in the case of the Standing Barrack

Committee

Committee (one is assembled equally at each station) which requires a great deal of approximate estimates impede him, in the execution of his ordinary duties.

3. In this connection however, I would say that in 1882 General Pryn, then commanding the Bangalore Division, represented to His Excellency the Commander in Chief and frequently mentioned to me the inconvenience he experienced in obliging to accept the Sub Divisional Officer then an Honorary Lieutenant, as the R.E. representative on the Committee assembled at Bangalore under his orders, whilst the President and other members would, probably be Senior Field Officers also that he frequently wanted the professional assistance of an officer of the Royal Engineers. All this led to the removal in that year of the Head Quarters of the Presidency Division from

Madras

Madras; but this removal was, when sanctioned by Government so ordered not to take place, until such time as a Royal Engineer Officer could be released from certain other duties in order to act as the Executive Engineer assistant in Madras.

4. In my former letter of the 13th June 1889, and by statement A attached thereto, I showed that irrespectue of the Executive Engineers payments on account of Establishment Bills amounting to 5th lakhs of Rupees in Madras as against only Rs 44,000 in Bangalore the expenditure on works of all kinds at Madras was Rs 260,000 against only Rs 74,000 at Bangalore i.e. the expenditure at Madras on works is nearly 4 times what it is at Bangalore, but all the arrears of office work and delay in execution of works at Madras is also very great. I mean in office work

148/3

work relating to reports and estimates concerning buildings and things at Madras, and is caused inevitably by reason of the Office being so far from those who have direct charge of the works: So instead of the Executive Engineer verbally asking for some information, however trivial, he has to write for it and someone else has to write and record an answer, and often those who write and those who should reply forget all about it and nothing is done: and when I enquire I am gravely and repeatedly told such and such things are under reference with the Assistant Engineer, and my work in addition to Presidency Division work is thrown back.

5. As regards the duration and method simply of the Executive Engineers inspections of works at Madras concerning which

which you very properly conclude
that the Superintending Engineer
is responsible. I did not complain
so much in my letter of 13th of
the manner in which the late
Executive Engineer made his
inspections of works, but I do
think that he should not
confine his duty at Madras
solely to inspecting checks
measuring and passing final
bills for any large work there,
and this is what he did and
it cost Government Rupees
36 per diem for each full
day he so spent in Madras
last year.

6. An Executive Engineer of the
Presidency Division must, in
addition to an inspection and
a practical measurement of
each work on completion, also
form a personal acquaintance
with the needs and requirements
of all public buildings in his
charge upon the occasion when
he may have to alter or repair

them

166
4
them: he must give frequent and
detailed verbal instructions
regarding new works in progress
upon the site, and not pretend
to do so from elsewhere: he must
frequently, even daily almost,
meet some one of his subordinates
upon their work in the early morn-
ing or in the afternoon: he must
interest himself generally in
those works and show that he
does so by sometimes looking
at them: he must be in a
position to verbally instruct
his subordinates as to the scope
and general nature of the
large repair estimates he requires
them to submit from time to
time: and he cannot do so
unless he will look at the
building to be dealt with;
and he, with the subordinates,
should sometimes meet con-
tractors and especially those
who complain of not being
paid promptly also upon the
works.

7. Neither I, nor any other Super-
intending Engineer will, ~~as I think,~~
prevent a recurrence of this neglect
so long as Executive Engineer has his
Head Quarters at Bangalore, for
that is the immediate cause of all
this neglect of duty - and the only
way to effectually remove an evil
is to get rid of the cause of it.

8. You ask, writing as Chief
Engineer on 24 June, whether the
Superintending Engineer cannot
"detain Executive Engineer at Madras,
"until a thorough inspection of works
"has been made" - there is nothing
to show me that a proper inspection
has not been made but there is
constant evidence to show that
all the other equally essential
duties of an Executive Engineer at
Madras, which I have named,
are and have been neglected and
the only means I have to prevent
a repetition of this neglect is to
obtain the necessary authority
of the Madras Government to

remain

remove the Head Quarters under
para 277 of Code on the sole ground
that Madras is the most conve-
nient place for the transaction
of Executive Engineer's business

9. In fact, in order to carry on
the office work properly the Execu-
tive Engineer must be daily in his
office - a few days absence will
cause a mass of arrears equally
at same time he must have an
acquaintance with $3/4$ of his works
and buildings and the portion
which gives rise to nearly all his
correspondence in order to carry
on the works and the office work
satisfactorily to himself and to
Government rather than an ac-
quaintance with ^{the} $1/4$ of the works
concerning which very little corres-
pondence is ~~ever~~ caused and
most of which ^{work} consists of mere
periodical repairs to barracks.
But the works he must see
between 6 and 9 A.M. and the
office he must remain in between

11/11/11

11 A.M. and 5 P.M. or nothing
is done, and as there are 216 miles
of Railway between the present office
and the works I claim to represent
the public necessity of removing
the office to the latter. I cannot
help the Madras climate being
what it is, but as long as we profess
to keep an Executive Engineer to
execute public works there, there
seems to me to be no reason
why the Executive Engineer
should absent himself on the
nearest hill any more than for
the Executive Engineers in North
Arcot, South Arcot, Chingleput,
or the General Superintendent.
Mr. Hanks says, doing so - what
may be said notwithstanding
about Committees at Bangalore,
or inspections at Madras.

10. But of all these reasons
for placing the office at Madras
are sufficiently and properly ap-
plicable to every one of such officers.
How much more so are they when
applied to Mr. Dainton to one
who

168/6

who is not at all ambitious of
being posted to the Presidency
Division. for a few days back
as I was told he was an appli-
cant for other duties of an
entirely different nature with more
comfort outside the Madras De-
partment altogether, and had he
been successful he would have
avoided both nominally and in
reality ^{all duties} at Madras.

11 If Mr. Dainton will suffer
seeing his 3 chief Madras sub-
ordinates at Chingleput during
office hours as also confer
with Heads of Departments at
Madras when necessary he will
save himself when the latter
seek his advice, and his sub-
ordinates, Clerks, Accountant,
and Draftsmen the trouble of
many letters, references, mistakes
otherwise entirely necessary as
also he will avoid the necessity
of complaints from the Ordnance,
Military, Revenue and other De-
partments concerning neglect of
their

their business and delay in at-
tending to their wants. I have
no wish to work in this strain
of an officer such as Mr. Selwinton
and I fully sympathize with
him in his loss of the Kilgini
Division, but notwithstanding
there is a great public necessity
for his office being located
at Malabar.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt Servt

W H Burton Colpa
Suptg. Engineer & Comdr

6538/89 $\frac{146}{7}$

W

146W 8/18-190

These papers might
now perhaps be
"recorded" & taken
off the "in over"
list

Cu

16-1-90

All these may be
recovered, as the
fragmentation of the
Mr W. Papers in Malabar
has collected the question

W H

16-1-90

yes -
P. H. 16-1-90

CO
P.S. 10/10/89

H.M. In orders.

In continuation of his
note of 21 June, and Ch.
Supt. Memo. N. 393 of
24 idem.

Ordered
19.7.89

There is no doubt that there is more
expenditure and more important
work at Madras than at Bangalore
But with a division of the charac-
ter there must always be in con-
sequence at one place or the other.
The Chief Engineer is at Madras,
+ this it seems to me should con-
tribute to some extent to the reason
the Engineer being at Bangalore.
Since if both officers were at
Madras, would be left without any
superior officer.

The matter should be considered
the matter discussed at the
Council.

What has become of the report by
H.E. the C. E. to the effect of a Chief
Engineer to Bangalore.

W.H.
20 July 1889
P.S. 10/10/89

From
The Suptg. Engineer
V. Circle
(3) (24)

The Chief Engineer
S.H. Department

Dated 14th } July 1889
Received 16 }

Enclosures -
No 2588.

Removal of Head-
Quarters in the
Presidency Division
from Bangalore to
Madras -

It affords
explanation asked
for the -

The S.E. & Circle is in charge
also of the North and South District
District and is a good deal away
on inspection duties from Madras.
Ordered
20.7.89

W-4-11

Recorded.

Recorded
the formation of
the formation of the
the military is
military world
Dept having dispo
Dept having
of the question

Recd
16.1.87

Noo 179-1729w-1.7.87
323 D- 24.6.87
182 D- 16.8.87

Recd 24/1- 24/1-