(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 18

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் அதனைப் பார்க்க

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

# தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

வெளியீட்டுத் துறை

அரசாணை எண். 1348

மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் : 13-5-1890

198

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

ஆவண - கா-1—18,000—15-6-87.

Circ 2,78

The rule in para 249 Vol XI Madras Code is taken from para 34 Chapter III Vol Rules P.W. Code, and it is doubtful whether it can be modified as suggested by G.I. without the sanction of the Govt. of India

Considered

Cir
19-3-40

I think it will be advisable to refer the matter to the Govt of India, with a recommendation in the terms of G.I's note. As the rule now stands, it must be absolute unless in the Irrigation branch, which in the Buildings & Roads branch

It is practically never acted upon, as H.M. send all estimates for new buildings through the Chief Engineers Office and when the amounts are within the powers of the S.E. concerned the papers are forwarded (to S.E.) there for decision.

Burt
19.3.90

I think if the modification suggested by S.E. here made it would cover the ground of the Branch, and relieve S.E.s. of all fear that any contravention of the rule as it stand at present.

Rivers
19.3.90

Ord

2/1240

Please see the Hon remarks on the accy. draft.

The difficulty will apparently be met by the adoption of the Hon suggestion, for if there be no standard plans, the S.E.s will have no powers at all under Code para 249 as now worded.

Cw
25.3.90

The H.M. I think means I dream a distinction between standard plans & "type designs" assuming that the latter need not be closely adhered to. I think however it would be better to let the letter go as drafted, for it has always been understood

... but no type or standard design can be exactly followed in every part of the Pres^y even in the case of buildings — while in the case of Irrigation works the conditions vary with each work.

[illegible]
25.3.90

To M. Mo.
with ref to his
note of 24 inst.
[illegible]
27.3.90

But neither the Chief [illegible] ... [illegible] difficulty ... standard ... plans ... [illegible] ... what was meant was that where ... Standard plans ... be followed.

2778

Dw 3/1348

Proposed to send these papers to I again, with reference to the [illegible] note of 28-3-90.

[illegible]
31-3-90

Yes [illegible]
31.3.90

I

C. 2086.

Receipt of the A. Sec
28/3/90 Commr. -
Q. Has any body
to go to Indian
about making the
alteration & Stock
necessary?

3/2/90

4/
13496

E. I. Form No. 34-F.

GOVT. OF MADRAS. 18 . P. W. DEPT.

5/1345

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION.

*Madras,* 17/8 1890

OFFICE NOTE.

1543

Circulation Register.

| To | From | Despatch Date. | Receipt Date. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gr | Cl. | | |

KEEP WITH

No. dated 18

C/Para 249 of the Code the words "provided they are in accordance with standard plans" should entirely nullify, as far as the branch of the Department is concerned, the power & responsibility which the Clause is intended to confer on Sup'g Engrs.

2/ The conditions of irrigation works are so varied that

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

~~RAILWAY BRANCH~~

# PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT

UNDER date the

6/1345

READ the following

Office Note from the Chief Engr for Irrigation — (H.E. No. 43 dt 17.3.90)

Ordered that the Government of India be addressed.

(H.E. No. W dt )

To,

The Secretary to the Govt of India

P.W.D.

Is this really necessary? Cannot "I" call the standard plans "type designs" and withdraw all standard plans? SW

I am directed to request the sanction of the Govt of India to the following modification being made in para 24

US 24 mm

Ch: Engr for I.

Rd 1523-90

engines are to be very various also, and only in the case of standard plans be issued strictly followed.

(3) As far as this branch of the works under notice might with advantage be revised altogether and possibly as regards your branch also they must all be modified somewhat these ××× "provided they have been afforded by the head of the department for which the work is to be executed and in the case of buildings are in accordance with standard plans as have been issued for general adoption"

Gr. J.

of the Madras P.W. Code, which is based on para 34, Chapter III Volume I Gaz. of India P.W. Code:—

In lines 3 & 4 omit the words "are in accordance with standard plans," and in line 5, after the word "executed" add "and in the case of buildings are in accordance with such standard plans as have been issued for general adoption."

2. The rule as it stands at present must entirely nullify

1/1348

the power and responsibility which it is intended to confer on Supdg Engineers. The conditions of Irrigation works are so varied that ~~designs must be based~~ ~~also~~ only in rare cases can standard plans be issued or strictly followed. The case of buildings, it is thought, will be sufficiently met by the modified clause proposed.—

Russell 21.3.90 Lucas 21-3-90

a very large exception as is implied

[C. No. 8.]

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1890. { P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

*Madras,* 15th April 1890.

OFFICE NOTE No. 2156.

To

I.

Your office note No.66 of 31st. March 1890.

The rule is not at all clear, but it seems to me very doubtful whether your interpretation of code para 249 ( Government of India Code, volume I , chapter III, para 34) is correct . This para cannot be properly understood unless it is read in connection with para 226 ( Government of India Code , chapter III, para 10 ).These two paras are mutually complementary. What para 249 gives to the Superintending Engineer is simply what para 226 takes away from the Chief Engineer.

2. Now Government of India, chapter III para 10 is not at all clear, but it seems to me that the primary intention is to make the Chief Engineer professionally responsible in all cases in which the estimate requires the sanction of Government: and, if that is the primary intention, it seems to me that it would be absurd to at once make such a very large exception as is implied

KEEP-WITH Genl. No.

dated 189 .

I agree with what the Superior says & think it desirable to proceed with the Estimate.

300—17-1-90.

in the exclusion of all works for which there are no standard plans;& the absurdity of such a construction of the rule is,I think, proved by the fact,mentioned by you,that in the case of irrigation works,that is to say in probably the most important and difficult cases of all,there are no standard plans.

3. If you look only to Government of India Code,chapter III,para 34, as you seem to have done,your view of the matter may be reasonable enough —the view that the Superintending Engineer is finally responsible in every case ( under Rs.I0,000 ) in which he does not deviate from an existing standard plan; but if you look,as I think you should,to Government of India Code,chapter III,para I0 also,it seems to me that you must read the rules as relieving the Chief Engineer of responsibility only in those cases in which there is a standard plan and that standard plan is adhered to.

4. Whether it is,or is not, desirable that the rule should be as I interpret it,is another question altogether, I simply argue that,if the primary intention is to make the Chief Engineer responsible in all cases of estimates sanctioned by Government,it would be absurd to except at one stroke all the very cases in which his supervision is presumably most necessary. Moreover, it seems clear from the rules that the Superintending Engineer is not required



to submit the plans and drawings when he considers that he is conforming to standard plans,so that the responsibility of the Chief Engineer,on your reading of the rules,is whittled away to next to nothing; and it is very difficult to see any reason at all for the little that is left. It would be easy enough to understand that the Chief Engineer might be made responsible for deciding whether in a given case there is sufficient justification for ignoring the standard plan and adopting an independent design;but,granted the justification for adopting an independent design,it is very difficult to see any reasonableness in a rule which would make the Chief Engineer responsible for the details of the independent design of a Rs.5,000 for which there is a standard plan,but leave the Superintending Engineer entirely responsible for a Rs.I0,000 work when there happens to be no standard plan to depart from; & this, I think,is what the rule comes to on your interpretation.

5. Taking this view of the matter, I can only say,since you ask me the question,that I think the sanction of the Government of India is necessary before the rule can be altered in the sense proposed,because the proposed alteration would apparently involve complete abandonment of what seems to be the fundamental principle of the Government of

of India Code, chapter III, para 10, but the letter to the Government of India will, I think, hardly do as now drafted, because it is based on what seems to be an erroneous view of the existing rule.

C.

Enc: 4

P.R.C. No. 3990.

Political Office

Enclosure

Rec'd 29.4.90

No. 1348 W dy 13th May 1890

Recorded.

No further action will be taken in the matter.

29.4.90

30.4.90

Encl Drawn
Ch. S. for Dr