(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 72
(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 12/89
(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P.W.D துறை

அரசாணை எண்.
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 40

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் : 6-1-1891 ~~198~~.

கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

36 Sheets

32+4 statement

-18,000—15-6-87.

CAIB

HE 17.xii

Dw

Please see C's note.
When the C first
brought up this question
after the G. of I. had
consented to the amend-
ment of the rules, it
was proposed to say
that the appts. made
by Supply Surgns were
in accordance with the
spirit of the rules, &
that further orders
were not necessary.
The Hon. Mr Stokes
however said that ~~[illegible]~~
the C had probably
hit on a serious abuse,
& directed that reference
should be made to
Supply Surgns as to whether
anything of the kind
was going on - vide
the ~~[illegible]~~ cancelled draft
& [illegible] order attached
to Mr 320 C of 17.1.
The subsequent
papers are the res

JH

of that office – & as they are the outcome of an order by Hon. Member, it is perhaps necessary to submit the papers to Govt. & to frame a G.O. thereon.

Ch
16.12.90

D.W.

Yes – If any 40 G.O. is to issue at all it can be in the terms of your note – but why cannot we simply leave the matter alone? We ought to get out of the way of issuing a G.O. upon every committee that C. takes it into his hand to enter-

S 16/12

CWR

W agrees that it will be as well to settle the matter by a G.O.

W.W. 16.12.90

W

I see no use in prolonging this discussion. It is certain that maistries must be employed for petty supervision & there is not the slightest ground for supposing that the system is in any way abused by the officers of the Dept. ~~30~~

The rules in para 935 of the Code are clear & I would not make any alteration in them; with the increased powers now given to S.Es & E.Es, the limits of ~~Rs~~ 100 & ~~Rs~~ 25 in clause 5 are by no means high.

I think a G.O. might issue to the effect that the Govt is of that para 935 of the Code as amended by S.O. 816 requires no further alteration & that the powers given to Depty & Executive Engineers under this para are necessary for the proper performance of their duties. It might also be added that the Govt. consider that further discussion on the subject should now cease –

KES

16.12.90

P.S.

The spirit of the Govt of India rule is the same as that of our Code, but it defines the powers of the different classes of upper subordinates [illegible] responsibility [illegible] from duty [illegible]

Circ 11112.

SP

Note.

The question of the employment of maistries on works has been the subject of much correspondence between this Govt. & the Govt. of India, & has led to many audit difficulties – Under Rule I, para 935 P.W. Code, as formerly worded, works establt. had to be specially employed for the subordinate supervision of only one work – This restriction led to continual objections from the Exr. of the transgression of the rule, & the O.I. statements were full of such items X.

X/11 X Deputy Engrs were unanimously of opinion however that the strict letter of the law could not be obeyed in the manner required

2/

40

Reg C. — A number of small works in the same neighbourhood would have for their supervision a single mistry whose pay would be distributed among the works. Each individual work could not possibly afford to pay for a separate mistry, yet each work required some sort of supervision — After more than one strong representation to the Govt of India, the clause restricting the employment of mistries to one work was expunged (vide G.O. No 318 W.I 5.2.89) & it was thought that all audit difficulties would be removed. ~~[illegible]~~

The Exr has however continued to raise such difficulties, writing —

being able to quote specific instances, he shows 40 theoretically how the rule may be abused.

The fact however that works establt. must be paid from the provision in estimates for "petty supervision" seems a sufficient safeguard against abuse. vide the notes attached to No 320 C.R 17.1.90.

The end & aim of the Engr's objection appears to be to get such establts. brought under the head "temporary establt." so that the sanction of Govt. must be obtained in each case to the employment of mistries or other works establt. The effect of this would be to impose on Provincial funds the cost of a large number of workpeople which

40

is now borne by "Imperial" or "Local", & to increase the proportion which "Establt" bears to "Works" materially.

The theoretical difficulties, or rather abuses, which the Exr portrays will be found in the printed paper attached to No 5218 D of 29. VII. 20

In this office note No 5218 D of 29. VII. 20, what was thought to be a simple solution of the difficulty was offered for Cr's opinion.

In his office note No 6822 of 19-11-20, he admits that the suggestion would be an improvement but he goes on to ~~[illegible]~~ suggest further difficulties - [illegible]]

In para 4 of his office note, the C says that expenditure on works establt. in excess of the provision

5

in the estimate can be met by a revision of the estimate or by sanction to excess on completion report. This however can be counter-acted by ruling that the expenditure on works in the case of any one work estimate, shall not, without the special sanction of Govt. exceed 2½ or 5 per cent (or any other limit) on the total cost of the work.

For orders whether the Govt. of India should be addressed in the sense of office note No. 5248 D of 29.7.90.

14.12.90

It will be seen from the file of papers attached to No. 5248 D of 29.7.90, that all Supdg. Engrs. have been asked whether the abuses stated by the Engr. exist in

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No. 320 C, dated 17th January 1890.

MEMORANDUM.

READ—the following papers :—

Office note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 16th August 1889, No. 1173.

The Superintending Engineer, V Circle, having sanctioned, under Code para. 935 and G.O., No. 318 W., dated 5th February 1889, the appointment of a maistry on Rs. 40 per mensem from 1st June 1889 in place of W. Masilamoney Mudaliar, Overseer, transferred from South Arcot to Rushikulya division (*vide* notification No. 180 published in part II of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 9th April 1889), I pointed out that the sanction was irregular as it was a sanction for a maistry on general duties and not for specified works.

2. The Superintending Engineer states in reply that "the sanction under Code para. 935 of the employment of a maistry for supervising the execution of works in place of an overseer absent," does not seem to him to be irregular, and that "if necessary, the works on which the maistry is employed can be specified."

3. The Superintending Engineer, V Circle, has apparently overlooked the provisions of Code para. 935 in which it is laid down that the persons employed must be for the *subordinate supervision*, &c., of one or more works, the subordination contemplated being, by reason of the constitution and organization of the department, necessarily subordination to an overseer.

4. Moreover the latter part of rule 2 of Code para. 935 seems to be entirely ignored in such a sanction, as also the implied condition which remains in spite of the recent modification of the rule 1, that the establishment sanctioned under Code para. 935 shall be sanctioned for specific works. To specify afterwards the particular works on which the maistry is considered to have been employed for the purpose of charging his pay is quite a different thing.

5. Also rule 4 of Code para. 935 implies that the pay of such establishments must be covered by provision in the estimates for the works to which the establishment is chargeable, which condition cannot be secured unless the works are known and specified at the time of sanction.

6. I submit the matter for orders as it seems to me that if the Superintending Engineer's interpretation of Code para. 935 is correct, the control of Government over the Provincial Public Works establishments is a farce. On a previous occasion, when I reported a somewhat similar case, Government said that they did not wish to interfere with the entertainment by Superintending Engineers of these *petty* establishments. But these establishments are not *petty* at all. If a Superintending Engineer can sanction them at all, he can sanction them up to a salary limit of Rs. 100 a month in each case. A Superintending Engineer cannot sanction the appointment of a single temporary overseer, not even of the third grade on Rs. 60 a month, he cannot even sanction the appointment of a temporary sub-overseer, 3rd grade, on Rs. 25—35 a month, but, as Superintending Engineers now not uncommonly apply Code para. 935, a Superintending Engineer can sanction the entertainment of *any number* of men who are overseers or sub-overseers in everything except the name, on salaries of Rs. 100 a month each.

7. Government nominally fixes the scale of subordinates permanent and temporary for the Presidency, but the Superintending Engineer claims the right to virtually augment the scale, by appointing a maistry to take the place of any overseer who is transferred from his circle to another.

Office note to the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 2nd September 1889, No. 3897 C.

With reference to the latter part of para. 6 of your office note No. 1173, dated 16th August 1889, please specify the cases within your knowledge, in which maistries have been appointed by Superintending Engineers since February last, on salaries of Rs. 100 per mensem, or on other rates of pay which you consider excessive; and in which the pay is not covered by the estimates for the works on which the men are employed.

Office note from the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, dated Madras, 8th January 1890, No. 69.

Your inquiry seems to suggest that you may have somewhat misunderstood the drift of the remarks in office note No. 1173, dated 16th August 1889. I never said that any maistries have been employed on rates that I consider excessive; it is no part of my business to consider the propriety of the rates of salary allowed for work, about the character of which I cannot possibly know anything. Nor did I say that the pay of the men was not covered by the estimate for the works *on which they are employed*, which, for any information that I have access to, simply means *to which they are charged.*

2. What I desired to point out was that it is not an uncommon practice—the specific instance which led to my office note No. 1173 being a particularly conspicuous instance of the practice—to sanction, under cover of Code para. 935, the entertainment of establishment for what are really general purposes, and without any apparent reference, *at the time of sanction*, to the necessities of any specific works, and then afterwards, by way of a colourable compliance with the requirements of Code para. 935, to specify the work or works on which these men are from time to time employed, which in some cases at any rate means nothing more than the work or works to which it is from time to time most convenient to charge their pay.

3. As to whether this is desirable or not, I express, and I have expressed, no opinion whatever. It is purely a question of the extent of the authority that Government think fit to delegate to Superintending Engineers and Executive Engineers; a question that does not at all concern me. I simply say that the practice appears to me incompatible with the control of Government over establishments entertained for general purposes, the general understanding being that such establishments, especially when entertained year after year, can be sanctioned by Government only, and that it seems to be in accordance neither with the letter nor with the spirit of Code para. 935.

4. Practically I take it, the view which has been very extensively, if not universally, adopted, is that under Code para. 935, subject only to the specified limits of pay, an Executive Engineer or a Superintending Engineer may entertain any establishment whatever, provided that he can manage to debit the charge directly or indirectly to some head of account other than "Establishment," *e.g.*, works or tools and plant or stock, or workshop jobs. And in accordance with this view, there has come to be, certainly in several divisions and perhaps in many, a practically permanent establishment of maistries whose pay is charged to such works in progress as can best afford to bear the charge; also practically permanent establishments of stores watchers, charged to tools and plant or stock; also boat office and quarry establishment charged to stock manufacture; and maistries, draftsmen, &c., of workshop divisions charged directly or indirectly to jobs; none of which are in any way controlled by Government.

5. It may be that this is what Government desire, but in that case I submit that it would be better to say so plainly; to say, that is, that, within the limits of pay specified, an Executive Engineer or a Superintending Engineer may entertain any

establishment that he can charge off to his grants for works, or for tools and plant or suspense; and to drop once for all the nominal restrictions of rules 1 to 4 of Code para. 935, which, as far as I can see, serve no purpose whatever except that of producing irritating but useless audit objections.

6. If you ask me again for specific instances, I may say at once that it is very difficult to give them. I can easily give you instances of establishments such as are referred to in para. 4 in connection with stores, workshops, boat offices and quarries, but as regards the works of maistries it is almost impossible to do so, because I have no information whatever about the employment of these men except what I can get from vouchers, and it is obviously almost impossible to work out the continuous history of any individual in this way. Moreover it would not even be sufficient to trace out the history of the individual, because there may be a break in the employment of the individual without any interruption of the post filled by him. I have, however, very little doubt that such practically permanent establishments of maistries and others are kept up, and that the Executive Engineers of certain divisions could tell you all about them.

7. It is equally difficult for me to *prove* that, in many cases, the after-specification of the works on which the sanctioned establishment is employed, is simply a statement of the works to which they are *charged*; but I think many Executive Engineers if asked will at once admit that it is so. I of course have no information as to the employment of these men; I only know what works they are charged to, and it is only now and then by the merest accident that I can show that *bonâ fide* employment and allocation of charge are not the same thing; as for instance in the case noticed, about a year ago, in an inspection report of the Presidency division, in which, according to the accounts, a work that had no petty supervision whatever throughout the period of its active progress, got the services of three maistries simultaneously for some weeks after its practical completion.

Copies of the foregoing notes are forwarded to Superintending Engineers for remarks and for report whether the practice described by the Examiner is adopted in their circles.

(Signed) R. R. E. DRAKE-BROCKMAN, Lt.-Col., R.E.,
Acting Chief Engineer,
General, Buildings and Roads Branch.

To Superintending Engineers.
To the Consulting Architect to Government.

Exd. J. Moses.
Spare Copies

2960
12 MAY 1890

PW [illegible]/690

PUBLIC WORKS SECRETARIAT
OOTACAMUND

No 421 S.E. Rushikulya Division offi
Doigam Camp 11th March

From

W. C. de Morgan Esqre
Executive Engineer
Rushikulya Di

To

The Superintending Engineer
First Circle
Dowlaishweram

Sir

With reference to your No 658 G.
dated 16th February 1890, I have the
honor to inform you that maistries in
this division are charged to specific
works.

2 So long as there are a number of works
in progress in a division, there is no difficulty in complying with both the letter
and the spirit of para 935, P.W. Code.
When however works are scattered, and
any delay in sanctioning of estimates
or appropriation of Funds, occurs, a
difficulty may arise.

3. As far as the execution of works is

Continues

concerned, maistries are in my opinion, the most important subordinates in a division & it is yearly growing more difficult to obtain good specimens of the class, particularly in remote districts.

4. A good maistry can always command employment, and consequently in order to retain his services, it is necessary to pay him his salary regularly, otherwise he will migrate elsewhere.

5 It is therefore quite possible that a case may arise where there is no work in progress in a division to which to charge a maistry's pay; and the Executive Engineer is consequently obliged to choose between contravening a rule and losing a valuable subordinate. If he choose the latter alternative, both progress and quality of work must suffer.

6. In my opinion one or two selected maistries, (in proportion to the size and requirements of the division), should be permanently appointed and charged to establishment; other maistries being appointed and charged to works, according as their services are required.

7 It would, of course, be necessary to relax existing rules or make special rules, regarding the limit of age, the necessity of passing and qualifying examinations &c. The old maistry who was really a practical craftsman, is gradually disappearing, and his place has to be filled by a man who regards a knowledge of English, and some experien of the routine of the department, as more important than actual dexterity a a mason or bricklayer. It is the former class whose services it is desirable to retain, and into which we must infus new blood, and encouragement.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedt. Servt.

(Signed) W. C. de Morgan

Executive Engineer.

(True Copy)

Executive Engineer

Incharge 1st Circle.

TK

40

2960
12 MAY 1890

Ex3
Mr 3906/90
6901/90

x

No. 449 L,

FROM, C. Mitford Smith Esqr.
Executive ~~SUPERINTENDING~~ ENGINEER
In Charge FIRST CIRCLE.

Enclosure: /
1, Copy of Rushikulya Dn office no 427 80
11/3/90,

40

TO,
THE CHIEF ENGINEER
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DOWLAISHWERAM, 17th April 1890

SIR,

With reference to the Examiner's Office Note printed with your Memorandum, No. 320C dated 17th January 1890, I have the honor to inform you that temporary maistries are employed in this Circle from time to time when their services are required & their pay charged to the works on which they are employed.

2. The Executive Engineer, Ganjam Dn. states it is hard to obtain good maistries so that when a good man is obtained, it is advisable to keep him on. In order to do this from the completion of one work to the commencement of another, it is necessary to charge his pay to the head petty supervision of some estimate on which the maistry may not have been employed.

4/13

4/11

3. I enclose copy of Rushikulya Division Officer's letter No. 421 dated 11·3·90, giving his opinion with regard to the entertainment of Maistries and how to charge their pay. I concur in his suggestion that one, or, two selected Maistries (in proportion to the size & requirements of the Division) should be permanently employed and charged to the Establishment; other Maistries being appointed and charged to works when their services are required.

4. The entertainment of temporary Maistries on works has not been in existence in the Vizagapatam Division.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

Executive Engineer in charge

I Circle.

JK

P.W.C. No. ~~3906~~ 698/90.
Enc 2

FROM,
C. Mitford Smith ~~Esquire~~
Executive
~~SUPERINTENDING~~ ENGINEER
In charge FIRST CIRCLE.

TO,
THE CHIEF ENGINEER
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DATED 17th
DESPATCHED 19th } April 1890
RECEIVED 24

No. 44 G.L.

ENCLOSURES 1,

SUBJECT.

Employment of Temporary Maistries in the I circle
Reporting regarding the —

Compile
21.4.90

Memo no 320 C d/ 17-1-90
F. Bus 832 W d/ 19.3.89
Fr. Bus 318 W d/ 5.2.89
" " 3038.39 W d/ 26.9.88
Memo 3897 C d/ 2.9.89

2960
12 MAY 1890
ENCLOSURES

0/6/6

Superintending Engineer's Office

No. 8 G6

II CIRCLE, Bezvada.
Dated 3rd April 1890.

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

To,
The Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department,
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to your No. 320.C dated 17th January 1890, I have the honor to inform you that the establishment entertained for the supervision of works in this Circle are all employed on specific works and not on general duties.

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

15 J. Hannan 7
Superintending Engineer
II Circle

2.4.90

2960
12 MAY 189

From

The Supdg Engineer
II Circle

To

The Chief Engineer,
P.W. Dept,
Madras

Dated 3rd April /90.

No 881

Establishment enter-
tained for the supervision
of works - Reports that
is only for specific works
& not for general duties

Complete 5.4.90
D.W.

0
6/5

No. 3882

Superintending Engineer's Office,
3rd Circle.
Bellary 25th March 1890.

From
Col. H Smalley R.E. 40
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
IIIrd CIRCLE.

To
THE Chief Engineer
P.W.D.
Madras

Sir,

Enclosures.

Your Memo No. 320C. dated 17th Janry: /90.

I have the honour to report that I have got lists of all employées in this Circle paid from Estimates, and I find that all are charged to particular works, some to more than one work as allowed in G.O. No 318W 5th February 1889, such as several petty works in Cantonment or to a sub group of tanks under the T.K.S.

~~8~~
8

2. I understand that the Inspector Genl of Military works has sanctioned the employment of Maistries on general duties for his Branch, and I am of opinion the same

6 measure should be adopted in the other

Branches of the Department and that we should have a quasi—permanent staff of maistries in each Division available for general duties, to be charged against particular works in the case of Major works, and against the lump grants in the case of Minor Original Works and Repairs.

3. If this be thought objectionable for any good reason, then we had better engage maistries by the day from 4 ~~annas~~ Rupees a day downwards and charge so many days of their pay against particular works.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obdt. servant

H Smalley Col RE
Supdg. Engineer 3rd Circle

P. W. C. No. ~~3142~~
6901/90

2960
12 MAY 1890

From,

The Superintending Engineer,
IIIrd Circle,
Bellary.

To,

The Chief Engineer
P. W. Dept.
Madras

Dated 26 } March 1890.
Received 27 }

Enclosures.

No. 3882

Subject.

Maistries employed on Public Works

Suggesting certain proposals as to the way in which pay of ditto should be charged.

Compile

27.3.90

No. 92
E. W

Supg: Engrs office 4th Circle
Coimbatore 7th March 1890

40

From

Major D. MacNeil Campbell R.E.
Superintending Engineer
4th Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.
Madras

Sir,

Adverting to your Memo No. 320 C of 17th January 1890, I have the honor to state that the practice of employing a Maistry for supervising the execution of works in place of an Overseer absent does not exist in this Circle.

2. As a rule in the Coimbatore and West Coast Divisions Maistries are employed on particular Works and their pay charged to those works; while in the Nilgiris where works are concentrated each Maistry has a number of works to supervise but his pay is charged

month

month after month to different works of importance on which he has been employed with reference to the balance available under the head petty Supervision.

3. In all other cases when the men are expected to discharge the duties of an Upper subordinate sanction of Government is invariably obtained to the entertainment of temporary subordinates and such being the case I do not think it necessary to effect any change in the existing system.

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

Jno Campbell Major R.E.
Superintending Engineer
4th Circle

Sec 6
P.W. C No. ~~2449~~.
6901/90

From
The Supg. Engr.
4th Circle

2960
12 MAY 1890

Dated 7th
Desp'd 8th } March 1890
Rd 10-3-90

No. 92
E.W.

Maistries

Informing that the practice of employing — for supervising the execution of works in place of an Overseer absent does not exist in this Circle.

Campbell
MCB
10.3.90

0/615

0/6/5

Tabular Statement shewing the names, date of employment, pay &c of Maistries drawing more than Rs 25 each in the Fifth Circle.

Item No	Names	Date of employment	Pay	Names of Specific Works on which now employed	Superintending Engineer's authority	Name of the Deptl rank of officer or Upper Subordinate under whose orders each of the Maistries is employed at present	Remarks
				Chingleput Division.			
1	Kandasawmy Naicker	Not known but during about the last 30 years.	30 „ „	All Military Works and Roads in the Cantonment of Mount	S.E. No 4884 dated 25th October 1889	Mr Berlie Sub Engineer	4°
2	Mr Pereira	22d July 1889	30 „ „	Uettramallur Tank Sluices	S.E. No 4990 d/ 29 October 1889	Overseer Subroyalu Naidu	Services of this Maistry have since been dispensed with.
				South Arcot Division.			
3	Sevajee Row	1st June 1889	40 „ „	Sluice in Antharasipalian Thangal	S.E. No 2208 dated 14 July & No 2510 dated 14-7-89.	Under the orders of Sub Divisional Officer Tindivanam.	
4	Kandasawmy Pilly	11 May 1889	40 „ „	Veedoor Anicut Improvements Mungalput Tank Improvements.	S.E. No 2218 d/ 4 July 1889	Under the orders of Sub divisional officer Chidambaram and Kuppusawmy Iyengar Supervisor	13 Employed as Surveyor in Chidambaram Sub Division from 5th November 1889. Salary Rupees 60 under Sub Divisional officer's orders

Tabular Statement shewing the names, date of employment, pay &c of Maistries drawing more than Rs 25 each in the Fifth Circle.

4°

Item No	Names	Date of employment	Pay	Names of Specific Works on which now employed.	Superintending Engineer's authority	Name of the Deptl rank of officer or Upper Subordinate under whose orders each of the maistries is employed at present	Remarks.
							4°
5	Ganapathy Iyer	March 1889	30 ..	Zemapur Tank Repairs Puthur Tank Repairs.	S.E. No 6321 d/ 16 March 1889	Under the orders of Overseer V. Govindarajulu Nd.	Dismissed from 4th December 1889

North Arcot Division

Nil

14

Col R.E.

Supt g Engineer Fifth Circle

Tabular Statement shewing the names, date of employment, pay &c of Maistries drawing more than Rs 25 each in the Fifth Circle.

4°

Item No	Names	Date of employment.	Pay	Names of Specific Works on which now employed.	Superintending Engineer's authority.	Name of the Deptt rank of officer or Upper Subordinate under whose orders each of the Maistries is employed at present	Remarks.

12 MAY 1890

P.W. Enclos.
~~2110~~
6901/90

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
V Circle, Madras,
Chepâk, 2^d^ April 1890.

No. 57

From
Coll. W.H. Burton R.E. 4o
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, V CIRCLE,

To
THE Chief Engineer
P.W. Department.

SIR,

Enclosures. 1

With reference to Examiner's office Note No. 1173 dated 16th August 1889, I have the honor to forward a List of the Maistries employed in the 5th Circle drawing more than Rs. 25 each and whose appointment has been sanctioned by me under Code para 935 Rule 5. In each Estimate provision is made for such Superintendence and considering the No. and localities of the works, as also the No. of upper Subordinates in each Division the employment here & there of these men, ie those whose pay exceeds Rs. 25 a month, is imperative in order to ensure Executive Engineers having proper control over the works. ~~16~~ 21

2. It will be seen from the Statement that every man is in

in a Subordinate position to either an Overseer, Supervisor, or Sub Engineer.

3. All those whose pay is less than Rs 25 a month are appointed by the Executive Engineer whilst those whose pay is between Rs 25 & 100 are appointed by myself and hitherto each of these men have been nominated for employment by solely at the instance of the Executive Engineer concerned.

It seems to me inexpedient that the former should only act under an Overseer and not under a Supervisor or Departmental Officer of higher rank. Sometimes it may happen that the Executive Engineer himself may be from paucity of Upper Subordinate Establishment the only permanent D.P.W. Officer available for immediate charge of a work in such case he would require the assistance of a Maistry to an equal if not to a greater degree than if there were a Sub Engineer and an Overseer also concerned with such work.

4

The Works must be carried on properly and the Regulations should be adapted to the necessities of the former rather than that the Supervision of the works be starved into inefficiency in order that the mere letter of the Regulations may be observed.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Yours Most Obedt Servt

WH Burton.
Coll. R.E.
Superintg. Engr.
5th Circle

47 22

6901/90

29/

12 MAY 1890

From

The Supdg Engineer
V Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. Deptt.

Dated 2 }
Recd. } April 1890.
Enc. 1.

No. 51.

Maistries — Forwards a list of — employed in the 5th Circle drawing more than Rs 25 each with certain observations.

Complete
9.4.90
D. W.

0/6/5

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE.

Trichinopoly 5th February 1890.

No. 241/7-8.

From Lt. Col. A. C. Smith R.E.
The Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

Sir,

ENCLOSURES.

With reference to your memorandum No. 320. C. of the 17th January 1890, regarding employment of Maistries on general duties and not for specified works, I have the honor to state that such practice as described by the Examiner is not adopted in this Circle, nor does it appear that the rules in para 935 of the P. W. Code have ever been in any way infringed.

~~18~~ 2

2. Maistries are employed on specific works and their pay is charged to the works concerned. It is very seldom, if ever, that maistries above Rs: 25 per month are applied for or sanctioned.

I.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most obedt. Servant.

A. Smith Lt. Col. R.E.
Superintending Engineer

P W C No ~~1276~~ [illegible]
6901/90

P. W. D. 6TH CIRCLE.

No. 2960
12 MAY 1890

From

The Supdt. Engineer
VI circle,

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No. 2417-8
Dated 5 }
Desp.d 6 } February 1890.
Recd. 8

From

The Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To

The ______

______

No.

Dated }
Received } 188

Enclosure.

Maistries: —

states that the practice described by the Examiner is not adopted in this circle regarding the employment of — on general duties —

Compiled -
10.2.90

Dw

P. W. D.

Office of the Consulting Architect to Govt.,
Chepauk, Madras,
2nd May 1890.

No. 329

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 printed Memorandum No. 320 C dated 17th January 1890 and reminder thereto dated 24th April 1890 on the subject of the Employment of maistries and the debit of their pay, I have the honor to state that so far as this Division is concerned there have been no cases in which a maistry is engaged to do the duties of an overseer.

2. Maistries are engaged for the subordinate supervision of works in progress and dispensed with cessation of works. The provisions of Code para 935 are observed strictly as far as possible.

~~20~~
25

12 MAY 1890

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedient Servant
Henry Irwin
Supg: Engineer
Presidency Architect

40

~~21~~ 26

P.W.C. No. 4187

Public Works Department.

6904/90

2960
12 MAY 1890

From

THE CONSULTING ARCHITECT
TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

To

THE Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

No. 329

Dated 2nd }
Received 3 } May 1890.

No. of Enclosures.

Subject.

Reporting on the practice of Employing maistries on works in place of overseers

4

0/5

Detailed List of miscellaneous permanent work~~shop~~ Establishment to accompany Examiner's office note No.
dated

40

Godavari Eastern Division

Boat office Establishment

1 Bill writer	Rs 30	per mensem
1 writer	" 15	"
1 Do	" 12	"
1 Assistant writer	" 8	"
1 Lascar	" 6	"
1 Do	" 5	"
1 Watcher	" 5	"
Total	Rs 81	

Quarry Establishment

2 Gumastahs at Rs 12/-	Rs 24	"
1 Do	" 10	"
3 Watchers at 5/-	" 15	"
1 Assistant bill writer	" 17	"
Total	Rs 66	

Workshop Establishment

1 Draughtsman	Rs 35	"

Kistna Eastern Division

Quarry Establishment

~~22~~ 27)

3 Quarry writers at Rs 10/-	Rs 30	"
1 Maistry	Rs 20	"
1 Do	" 13	"
1 Do	" 10	"
1 Stock writer	" 11	"
2 Tools writer at Rs 8/-	" 16	"
Total	Rs 100	

Workshop Establishment, Bezwada.

1 Workshop Accountant	Rs 50*	per mensem
1 Clerk	" 25	"
1 Do	" 24	"
1 Do	" 20	"
1 Draughtsman	" 17	"
1 Time keeper	" 12	"
1 Office lascar	" 7	"
2 Do at Rs 6/-	" 12	"
1 Storekeeper	" 20	"
1 Assistant Storekeeper	" 15	"
1 Maistry (Carpenter)	" 25	"
1 Do (Smith)	" 25	"
1 Do (fitter)	" 25	"
1 Gate keeper	" 7	"
8 Do at Rs 5/-	" 40	"
Tutor of apprentice	" 10	"
Total	Rs 334	

* This is a clerk employed in the Bezwada Sub-Divisional Workshop styled Accountant who prepares Bills &c connected with the Workshop.

Presidency Workshops

1 Smith Maistery	Rs 40	"
1 Turner Maistry	" 40	"
1 Assistant Turner Maistry	" 35	"
1 Filer	" 47-8-0	"
1 Carpenter Maistry	" 40	"
1 Instrument Department Maistry	" 60	"
Total	Rs 262-8-0	

Encl
PW 6901/90

Nellore Workshops

40/23

1 Workshop Superintendent	Rs 45	per mensem
1 Clerk	" 19	"
1 Foreman	" 20	"
1 Assistant Store keeper	" 15	"
2 Gate Lascars at Rs 5/-	" 10	"
1 ~~Engineer~~ Engine Lascar	" 5	"
1 Store Lascar	" 4	"
1 Sweeper	" 4	"
Total	Rs ~~112~~ 122	

Coimbatore

1 Watchman at Rs 7/- for watching famine tools in the Coimbatore store shed

1 Watchman at Rs 5/- for watching famine tools store in the Bhavany bungalow

2 Watchmen ~~at~~ Rs 12/- ~~and~~ (2 watchmen at Rs 6/- each) for watching famine tools stored at Salem & Tripator

North Arcot

1 watchman at Rs 6/- for famine tools in Vellore fort

Madras
July 1890

M. C. Sayer
~~Major R.~~
Offg Dy Examiner
for Examiner of P. W. Accounts, Ma
Mz

~~3~~ 28

2960
12 MAY 1890

No. 102 D. 40

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Ootacamund, 8 May 1890.

OFFICE NOTE.

From W.

To C

Letter from the S.E. I Circle No. 44 G.L.
d/ 17.4.90
" " " do II Circle No. 8 G.L.
d/ 3.4.90
" " do III Circle No. 3552
d/ 26.3.90
" " do IV Circle No. 92 G.L.
d/ 7.3.90
" " do V Circle No. 57
d/ 2.4.90
" " do VI Circle No. 2417
d/ 5.2.90
" " Consy. Architect No. 329
d/ 2.5.90

~~JH~~

Before submitting these letters for the orders of Government, I forward them to you for any further remarks you may desire.

To

29

offer, with reference to your office notes No 1173 d/ 16-8-89 and No 69 d/ 8-1-90.

A copy of memo: No 320 C d/ 17-1-90 to which the letters are replies, is also forwarded

8-5-90

W.

No 4375 d/ 21-7-90.

To
W.

Enc 9

There are two descriptions of work establishments referred to in this correspondence namely:-

(1) maistries employed for the supervision of works, and

(2) the miscellaneous establishments referred to in the latter part of para 4 of my office note No 69 dated 8th January 1890.

2. Without exception Superintending Engineers have confined their remarks to establishments of the former kind, and, with possibly the single exception of the Superintending Engineer 1st Circle they all seem to have missed the point

point of my remarks, which was the distinction between (1) sanctioning and entertaining establishments with express reference in each case to employment on specific works, according to what seems to be the plain ~~instruction~~ intention of Code para 935, and (2) keeping up a permanent or semi-permanent establishment of maistries for employment as occasion may require and charging them to specific works.

3. The Superintending Engineer 1st Circle forwards a letter from the Executive Engineer Rushikulya Division, and gives the substance of another from the Executive Engineer Ganjam Division, from both of which it is plain that the practice in those divisions at any rate is as I have stated it; and the Superintending Engineer is evidently of opinion that it is desirable to recognize the practice. The remarks of other Superintending Engineers, as far as I can see, are in no case at all to the point. Thus the Superintending Engineer 2nd Circle merely says that the maistries are "employed on specific works and not on general duties": the Superintending Engineer 3rd Circle says they are "charged to particular works": the Superintending Engineer 4th Circle says they are not employed in the place of

30

absent

absent overseers, and that they are generally "charged to those works on which employed", but shows exception even to this; the remark of the Superintending Engineer 5th Circle scarcely seems to bear at all on the main question: and the Superintending Engineer 6th Circle says they are employed on and charged to specific works

4. As I have already hinted, if not plainly stated, the existing practice is in my opinion perfectly reasonable, and my object is not to put difficulties in the way of continuing a reasonable and probably necessary practice; but if possible to get the Code rule brought into conformity with the practice or with such modification of it as may be considered proper; in order that I may be relieved from the necessity of either continually raising useless and irritating questions and objections, or on the other hand ignoring what seems the plain intention of the Code rule.

5. No doubt if you take Code para 935 as it now stands, ignore its past history, and look only to isolated parts of it, it is possible to argue with some plausibility that the existing practice is in strict conformity with the rule; because in the second line the reference is simply to incidence of charge, and

in

in Rule I the reference is only to employment. But if you consider Rule I as it originally stood, it is quite plain that the intention was that the establishment must be specially entertained (the wording is "employed for" not "employed on") for a specific work; and it is perfectly well known that the object of the alterations introduced by Standing Order No. 816 was simply to remove the restriction to one specific work. Moreover nobody in his senses would have drafted rule II as it stands if the meaning had been simply that the employment was to cease when the man was no longer wanted; "cessation of the work" obviously means completion of the specific work (now works) for which entertained.

6. I submit that, if the intention is such, it would be much better to alter the rule accordingly, and to state plainly that, subject to such ? restriction retention (if any are necessary) as may be specified or may be prescribed by specified authority, whether as regards total number or as regards total monthly cost, in any division or circle, and subject to specified limits for individual salaries, Executive Engineers may keep up a permanent non-pensionable establishment of maistries

and

and charge them, as far as possible according to employment to works in progress. Possibly the rule as it stands does mean this; but if so it is a most peculiar way of stating it, and one which decidedly suggests that the intention is very different.

7. The view taken and acted upon by the Superintending Engineer 5th Circle that under Code para 935 he could appoint a man in the place of an overseer transferred, is of course a very extreme one, and it was hardly likely that such an interpretation of the rule would be generally adopted.

8. As regards the second description of cases (2) of para 1 above, I enclose a detailed statement of permanent establishment of this sort according to the latest information available, and it will be seen that the monthly cost may be summarized thus, according to divisions and classes of establishment:—

Divisions	Workshops	Quarry	Boat Office	Famine Tool watchers	Total
	Rs	Rs	Rs	Rs	Rs
Godaveri Eastern	35	66	81	"	182
Kistna Eastern	334	100	"	"	434
Presidency	262½	"	"	"	262½
Nellore	122	"	"	"	122
Coimbatore	"	"	"	24	24
North Arcot	"	"	"	6	6
	753½ ~~730½~~	166	81	30	1030½ ~~1007½~~

I do not for a moment suggest that these establishments are unnecessary, or that the rates paid are excessive. I simply desire to point out that, as far as I can discover there is no authority whatever for their entertainment, code para. 935 being, I think clearly inapplicable to such cases the operation concerned being in all cases permanent or indefinitely continuous. Nor do I mean to suggest that they ought to be directly controlled and regulated by Government, but simply that if they are to be regulated by Superintending Engineers or by Executive Engineers, there should be some code authority for the necessary delegation of powers, stating clearly the limits (if any) of such delegated powers and the restrictions (if any) on their exercise. These establishments are of course over and above any that may be sanctioned and recognized under the budget head "Establishment". I may also observe that there appears to be some diversity of practice, which is of itself undesirable if only as tending to vitiate comparisons; for instance there is a boat office in one of the Kistna Divisions the establishment of which is differently provided for, and there are store watchers in most divisions but they are generally treated as "Establishment".

~~37~~

32

(Enc 9)

21/7

21/7

for k. 17/7

P.W.C. No. 6901.

T

Rd 22-7-90
Enc. 11

No. 40 W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

P3/ PROCEEDING IE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

① 40/36 ② 40/11 40/36

READ the following

Office note from the Examiner P. W. Accts A.C. No. 1173 d/ 16th August 1889

Do ________ Do ________ A.C. No. 69 d/8th Jany/90

Memo from the Chief Engineer P.W.D. No. 320 C d/17th Jany 1890

From the Supty Engr. Circle A.C. No. 444 G L d/17th April 1890

From the Supty Engr Circle A.C. No. 8 G L. d/3rd April/90

From the Supty Engr III Circle A.C. No. 3882 d/26th March 1890

From the Supty Engr IV A.C. No. 92 AW. d/7th March 1890

From the Supty Engr: A.C. No. 51 d/2nd April/90

From the Supty: Engr VI Cir A.C. No. 2417 D.J. d/5th Feby 1890

From the Consg. Archt Gov No. 329 d/2nd May/90

Office note from the Exr: P.W. A.C. No. 4375 d/ July/1890

Do ________ Do ________ No. 6822 d/19th Nov/

~~333~~6/11

36/11

Res
9 Sw

After full consideration of the foregoing papers, the Government is of opinion that para 935

of the P. W. Code, as
amended by S. O. No
816 requires no further
alteration, and that
the powers given
Superintending
Executive Engin
under that para
necessary for t
proper performa
of their duties.

2. The Governme
considers that
discussion on t
bject should
e.

WW
17.12.90

D 17.12

HE. 17. XII. 90
R 5. 1. 91

Ch

3/7

[illegible]

36

dated 6th Jany 1891

36

The Examiner P. W. Accts

D 8/1

EEC 10/1

D 12/1