(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 40

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 26.7.89

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P.W.D துறை

அரசாணை எண். 1972

மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.

அச்சகம்

பலவகை

நாள் : 19-7-1890 ~~198~~ .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

சென்னை, கா-1—18,006—15-6-87.

19TH JULY 1890, No. 1972 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

READ—the following papers :—

Proceedings in the Public Works Department,	dated 22nd August 1889,	No. 2307 W.
From the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle,	,, 16th April 1890,	No. 91 T.J.
Endorsement by the Chief Engineer,	,, 25th ,, ,,	,, 2021 C.
From the Superintending Engineer, I Circle,	,, 19th June ,,	,, 161 G.C.
,, ,, II ,,	,, 19th May ,,	,, 75 G.C.
,, ,, III ,,	,, 23rd ,, ,,	,, 403.
,, ,, IV ,,	,, 9th ,, ,,	,, 170 E.W.
,, ,, V ,,	,, 8th ,, ,,	,, 649.
,, Consulting Architect to Government,	,, 17th ,, ,,	,, 489.
,, Chief Engineer, Periyár Project,	,, 11th ,, ,,	,, 803 P.R.

ORDER—dated 19th July 1890, No. 1972 W., Public Works.

In modification of clause (2), para. 1 of G.O., No. 2307 W., dated 22nd August 1889, the Government is pleased to empower Executive Engineers to sanction, without further approval, the grant of authorised increments of salary to all members of office and petty establishments serving under their orders.

2. The Government does not consider it necessary to modify existing Code rules respecting the powers of appointment vested in Executive Engineers.

(True Extract.)

Major, R.E.,
Ag. Under-Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

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

Exd. A. Aubert.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of {1890} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated July, 19th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 19th July 1890, No. 1972 W.

JULY.

Increments of Salary

Empowering Executive Engineers to sanction the grant of authorised — to all members of office and petty establishments serving under their orders.

1972
2

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No. 2021 C., dated 25th April 1890.

MEMORANDUM.

Read—the following paper :—

From Lieut.-Colonel A. C. SMITH, R.E., Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Trichinopoly, 16th April 1890, No. 91 T.J.

In G.O., No. 2307 W. of the 22nd August 1889, it is laid down that "all officers of the department are competent to sanction, without further approval, the grant of increments to subordinates whom they are competent to appoint." This order was passed on the question raised by the Examiner regarding the grant of increments for clerks, &c.

2. The Code rules do not appear to invest Executive Engineers with full or absolute power of appointing any members of their office establishments; hence the submission of all recommendations for increments for sanction of the Superintending Engineer. This course is certainly a mere formality and appears unnecessary, as each Executive Engineer is the proper judge to deal with all claims for increments of subordinates under his charge.

3. By para. 169 of the Public Works Code, Executive Engineers are authorised (in the absence of special instructions) to appoint persons whom they may deem properly qualified to the situations of office clerks, draftsmen, &c., while under para. 170 they have full liberty to appoint cashiers and storekeepers; but under para. 320 (*f*) these officers cannot appoint persons to, or fill up vacancies in, petty and office establishments without the approval of the Superintending Engineer. It would, in fact, appear from paras. 320 (*f*) and 267 (*h*) that even the power granted in para. 170 cannot be exercised by Executive Engineers, without the approval of the Superintending Engineer. It appears therefore necessary to define, in the first instance, the powers of Executive Engineers to appoint members of the office establishments under their charge, before they can sanction increments.

4. It is desirable that Executive Engineers should be invested with power of appointing office members to a *certain* extent, and sanctioning *all* increments. I think they can appoint and promote clerks up to IV class, 3rd grade, appoint assistant draftsmen in Divisional offices, and appoint and promote channel superintendents up to Rs. 25, without any reference to the Superintending Engineer, merely reporting their procedure for his information. In filling up other appointments on higher pay in divisions, it appears, however, necessary to take into consideration the claims of senior clerks, &c., in the *whole* circle, and this power should therefore be left to the Superintending Engineer.

Copy forwarded to Superintending Engineers of other circles for expression of their views on Lieutenant-Colonel A. C. Smith's proposals.

(Signed) R. R. E. DRAKE-BROCKMAN, Lt.-Col., R.E.,
Ag. Chief Engineer, P.W.D.,
General, Buildings and Roads Branch.

To the Superintending Engineers, I to V Circles.
" Presidency Architect.
" Chief Engineer, Periyár Project.
" Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, for information.

Exd. A. Aubert.
Spare Copies

No 2821C 16-4-90

No. 161 G.R. 1922/3

FROM,

J. W. Martin Esqr.

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

FIRST CIRCLE.

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DOWLAISHWERAM, 19 June 1890

Despd 23rd

SIR,

Adverting to your Memorandum No 2821 C dated 25th April 1890, I have the honor to state I consider that Executive Engineers should have the power suggested by the Superintending Engineer VI Circle in para 4 of his letter.

Executive Engineers always have a better personal knowledge of candidates for first appointments than it is possible for a Superintending Engineer to possess, and therefore, I consider they should have power to appoint Clerks, Lascars, Messengers, Lock Superintendents and Channel Superintendents up to a Salary of Rs 25 without reference to the Superintending Engineer and of course grant leave to the same classes.

The question was never regards the grant of leave but of increments.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obdt. Servant

E W Martin
Supg: Engineer I Circle
20/6/90

JK

FROM, J. W. Martin Esq

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

FIRST CIRCLE.

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DATED 19
DESPATCHED 23 } June 1890
RECEIVED

No. 161 Gl.

ENCLOSURES

SUBJECT.

Appointments of Clerks Channel Supts &c up to a salary of Rs 25. Expresses an opinion that Ex. Engrs should make — without reference to the Supt Engr.

C.R.W.

0
2016

No. 7546

Supdg Engineer's Office,
2nd Circle.
19th May 1890.

1972/3

From,
J. Hannan Esquire,
Superintending Engineer,
II Circle

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

Sir,

With reference to your memo. No. 2021 C of the 25th April 1890, I have the honor to inform you that I concur with the Superintending Engineer 6th Circle regarding the proposals made by him of empowering Executive Engineers to make certain appointments of clerks &c but I would suggest that the power be restricted to appointments carrying a salary of Rs. 20 (Clerk 5th class 1st Grade &c) which is the limit fixed for the Division Officers of the Revenue Department, i.e., Sub-collector and Head Assistant Collector.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedt Servt,

J Hannan
Superintending Engineer
II Circle

19.5.90.

P.W. C. No. 4874

From

The Supdg Engineer
II Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W. Dept
Madras

Dated 19th May 1890
Recd. 22
No. 75 E6

Office clerks & drafts-
-men. appointments
of. by Ex. Engrs. Concurring
in the proposals of Col. Smith R.E.
regarding the

Complete
MM
22.5.90
D.W.

0
30/6

No. 403

Superintending Engineer's Office,
3RD CIRCLE.
Bellary 23 May 1890.

1972/6

FROM

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

To

THE Chief Engineer
P.W. Department
Madras

Sir,

Enclosures.

With reference to your Memorandum No 2021 C dated 25th April 1890, I have the honor to state that I agree with the proposals made in para 4 of Colonel Smith's letter printed in the above Memorandum.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant
H. Smalley
Col R.E.
Superintdg. Engineer 3d Circle

From, P.W.C. No. 49/51

The Superintending Engineer,
IIIrd Circle,
Bellary.

To,
The Chief Engineer
P.W. Department
Madras

Dated 23 } May 1890.
Received 28 }

Enclosures.

No. 403

Subject.

Certain powers to Exec. Engineers:

Informing that the Supertg Engineer agrees with the proposals made in para 4 of Col Smith's letter printed with Chief Engrs memo No 2021 C d/ 25-4-90 regarding

D.W.

30/6 R 19-7-90

No 170/E.W.

Supg Engr Office 4th Circle
Camp Coonoor 9th May 1890
Despd 12th -do-

197/7

From
Major D. McNeil Campbell R.E.
Superintending Engineer
4th Circle

To
The Chief Engineer
P.W. Department

Sir,

Adverting to your memorandum No 2021C of 25th ultimo, I have the honor to state that I am unable to agree with Colonel Smith's proposals to invest Executive Engineers with power of appointing Office members to a certain extent independent of the Superintending Engineer's Office, as in this department, it is ~~not~~ often the case that some Clerks have to be brought on the Supernumerary list owing to frequent changes in the Circle among the upper Subordinates.

In

2 In these circumstances I am disposed to think that the investure of the above powers to Executive Engineers will render the absorption of Supernumerary Clerks a matter of some difficulty and that moreover this system will in a measure entail additional Correspondence without any appreciable advantage.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most Obed^t. Serv^t.

D. McE. Campbell Major R.E.
Superintending Engineer
2d Circle

P.W.C. No. 4513

From

The Supg. Engineer
IV Circle

Dated 9th } May 1890
Despd. 12th }
R/ 14-5-90

No. 170
E.W.

Office Clerks, Draftsmen &ca.

States that he is unable to agree with Col. Smith's proposal to invest Ex. Engineers with the power of appointing — independent of Supg. Engr's Office.

Compiled

14.5.90

0
30/6

R. 19.7.90

1972
9

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
V Circle, Madras,
Chepâk, 8th May 1890.

No. 649

From
Lt. Coll. A. C. Clarke R.E.
Offg. SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, V CIRCLE,

To
THE Chief Engineer
P.W. Department

Enclosures.

SIR,

With reference to your Memo No. 2021 C dated 25th April 1890 calling for an expression of opinion on Lt. Coll. A. C. Smith's proposals — I have the honor to state that, I quite concur in Colonel Smith's suggestion that the Executive Engineers should be invested with full power to appoint all the Office Establishment — below a certain grade and others appertaining to the Petty Establishment and be held responsible for the making of such appointments as matters now stand – the Codal

Codal Rules are somewhat ambiguous.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your Most Obedient Servant

A. White Lt Col R.E.

Offg Supg Engr 5th Circle

1972/10

P. W. C. No. 4385

From
The Superintending Engr
5th Circle

To
The Chief Engineer
P. W. Deptt.

Dated 8th } May 1890.
Recd 9th }

No. 649.

Office Establishment &c.

States that he quite concur in Colonel Smith's Suggestion that the Executive Engrs should be invested with full power to appoint all the —

Complete
Wm
10.5.90

0
30/5

P. W. D.

Office of the Consulting Architect to Govt.,
Chepauk, Madras,
17th May 1890.

1922/11

No. 489

From
Henry Irwin, Esq., C.I.E.,
Consulting Architect
to the Government of Madras,

To
The Chief Engineer
Public Works Department

Sir,

Enclosures.

With reference to your Memorandum No. 2021 C dated 25th April 1890, forwarding a copy of letter from Superintending Engineer VI Circle regarding grant of increment and powers of Executive Engineers to appoint members of Office Establishment, I have the honor to state that the Code rules as they stand at present appear to me to sufficiently answer all requirements.

2. Under G. O. No. 2007 W dated 22nd September 1889, an Executive Engineer can grant increment to any member of his establishment without approval of Superintending Engineer, as under Code para 320(f); he has the power to nominate men to vacancies in his Office Establishment. The fact of the approval of

of Superintending Engineer, being required in the case of each such nomination made by Executive Engineer, does not affect the question.

3. In my opinion all appointments made by Executive Engineer should receive the formal Sanction of Superintending Engineer. This is necessary both in the interests of Government as also in the interests of the person affected. I say in the interest of Government, because it will enable the Superintending Engineer, to select a properly duly qualified man for the appointment from the Divisions in the Circle, which if left entirely to Executive Engineers, outsiders with little or no experience of Office routine will have to be appointed. In the interests of the men affected because, it will open out a wider field for promotion. The whole of the clerks attached to the several Divisions of the circle will be borne on one roll and the prospect of a wider field for promotion will certainly induce men of pretty good qualifications to join the Department.

4. If an executive Engineer can ~~could~~ secure the services of a Competent man, no difficulty will be experienced in obtaining the approval of Superintending

intending Engineer to the appointment of ~~the~~ such men. In some provinces all clerks belong to a Provincial Scale, and their promotions &c are regulated by Chief Engineer, for instance Punjab &c

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
Henry Irwin
Superintending Engineer
Presidency Architect

O.M.C. No. 4741

Public Works Department.

From

THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

THE Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

No. 489

Dated 17
Received 20 } May 1890.

No. OF ENCLOSURES.

Subject.

Giving opinion of the Presidency Architect as to the investure of powers to Executive Engineers for appointing office members &c & granting increment.

Compile

20.5.90

O
3 of 6

No 803. P.R

Office of the Chief Engr
Periyar Project Works
Kodaikanal 11 May 1890
D/ 13

From

Colonel J Pennycuick R.E.
Chief Engr Periyar Project

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W. Department

Sir,

With reference to your No 2021C of 25 April 1890 I have the honor to state that I concur in the opinions expressed in para 4 of Lt Colonel Smith's letter printed therewith -

2 Whatever may be the powers of appointment delegated to Executive Engineers there can be no doubt that they should be competent to sanction all increments of salary to members of

1972/15

of their own offices

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obdt Servt

Col R.E.

Chief Engr, Punjab Dept.

B6

PWC No 4593

From

The Chief Engineer
Periyar Project

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D
Madras.

No. 803. P.R.

Kodaikanal
Dated 11th May 90.
Rd 16.5.90

Increments of salary to members of Office Establishment

states that he concurs in the opinion of the Supg. Engr. VIth Circle and that whatever may be the powers of appointment delegated to the Exe. Engrs there can be no doubt that they should be competent to sanction all —.

Compile
16.5.90

30/6

P. W. D.

1992/16

Note.

In G.O. No 2307W of 22.8.89. it was ruled that all officers of the Dept are competent to sanction without further approval, the grant of increments to subordinates whom they are competent to appoint.

In his letter No 917.J. of 16.4.90. Lt. Col. A.C. Smith, S.E. VI Circle, pointed out that the code rules with respect to the powers of Executive Engrs to appoint members of office estabt. were not clear, & that it was necessary first to define these powers clearly, before their powers to sanction increments could be ascertained.

In para 4 of his letter Lt. Col. Smith expressed the opinion that Ex. Engrs

Engrs should be vested with power to appoint and promote clerks up to IV class 3rd grade (pay Rs 20–30), asst. draftsmen in divisional offices, & channel supdts. up to Rs 25 per mensem, and also to sanction all increments to members of divisional office estabts.

In this office memo. No 2021C of 25.4.90, these suggestions were referred to other Supdg. Engrs for opinion, and the following is an abstract of the replies received:—

Supdg Engr I Circle (Mr J. W. Martin) – Agrees –

Supdg Engr II Circle (Mr J. Hannan) Agrees, but suggests that the power of appointing clerks be limited to V class 1st grade (pay Rs 15–20) the limit fixed for division offices of the Rev. dept.

Supdg Engr III Circle (Colonel H. Smalley) Agrees –

Supdg Engr IV Circle (Major Campbell) Is unable to agree, as it is often the case that clerks have to be brought 1992 on the supernumerary list owing to changes arising upon subdivision units, and that the proposed change will render the absorption of such supernumeraries a matter of difficulty, & will probably entail additional correspondence without any appreciable advantage. Major Campbell offers no opinion with respect to increments.

Supdg Engr V Circle (Lt. Col. S.C. Clarke) Agrees –

Consg. Architect (Mr Irwin) Considers that the Code rules as they now stand sufficiently meet all requirements, & he further thinks that all appts. made by Ex. Engrs should receive the formal sanction of the Supdg Engr. He suggests this because the Supdg Engrs would then be able to select for vacancies men from the whole staff of clerks &c in the Circle, & all the clerks would be borne on one roll for promotion –

Chief Engr Periyar Project (Col. Pennycuick) agrees with Col. A. C. Smith.

—

The majority of the officers consulted agree with Col. A. C. Smith, but they do not appear to have thought of the ~~[illegible]~~ objection raised by Major Campbell, which seems to have considerable force.

Mr Irwin's argument does not seem quite clear. He says first that all appts made by Ex. Engrs should receive the Supdg Engr's sanction; that this will enable Supdg Engrs to select properly qualified men for vacancies, & that it will place all the men in the circle on one roll for promotion.

This would leave appt. pretty well entirely in the hands of Supdg. Engrs, but he goes on to say that if an Ex. Engr can secure the services of competent men, no difficulty will be experienced in obtaining the approval* of the Supdg. Engr to the appt. of such men.

*He means 'approval' — [illegible]

It is submitted that the best ~~[illegible]~~ plan would be to let the code rules regarding appointments stand as they are, and in modification of P.W.D. No 2307 W of 22-8-89, to empower Ex. Engrs without further approval to sanction the grant of increments to all members of office & petty establts serving under their orders.

This will suffice. [illegible] 11.7.90

This is the main point in Col. A. C. Smith's suggestions, & will probably meet the views of all Supdg Engrs.

For W's orders.

Ch

5-7-90

No 2307W. 22.8.89
2021C. 16.4.90

1972W

No. 1972 W d/ 19th July 1890

Genl Estab
1972/19

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

X
1205

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Proceedings in the P. W. Department H.E. No: 2307 W d/ 22nd August '89
From the S.E. VI Circle — H.E. No. 91 T.J. d/ 16th April 1890
Endorsement by the Chief Engineers H.E. No: 2021C d/ 25th April 1890
From the S.E. I Circle — H.E. No: 161 G.C. d/ 19th June 1890
From the S.E. II Circle — H.E. No: 75 G.C. d/ 19th May 1890
From the S.E. III Circle H.E. No 140B d/ 23rd April 1890
From the S.E. IV Circle — H.E. No: 170 EW d/ 9th May 1890
From the S.E. V Circle — H.E. No: 649 d/ 8th May 1890
From the Consg. Archt. to Govt: H.E. No: 489 d/ 17th May 1890
From the Chief Engineer Periyar Project H.E. No: 803 P.R. d/ 11th May 1890

1617 W
1889

In modification of clause (2) para 1 of G.O. No. 2307 W dated 22nd August ~~1890~~ 1889, the Govt. is pleased to empower Executive Engineers to sanction, without further approval, the grant ~~for~~ of authorised increments of salary to all members of office and petty C.T.

Establishments serving under their orders.

2. The Govt does not consider it necessary to modify existing Code rules respecting the powers of appointment vested in Executive Engineers

Recd 12.7.98

To

Supg. Engrs
Chief Engr for Irrign
Chief Engr Periyar Proj
Consg. Archt. to Govt.
Examiner P.W. Accts

D
30/

Ords 16.2.98
[illegible] 17.2.98

30/1