

G.O., No.

2298 W

Lxell



DATED 2nd September 29

Make after dated
by Monday morning ✓

Good

5/9/29

[Despatch Abstract.]

Steam Boilers and Prime Movers Act.

Appointing, with remarks, a committee of
certain officers, with the Sanitary Engineer to
act as President, to revise the rules for
granting certificates under the ———

290
40

Is

2469

Appointing, with remarks, a Committee of certain officers with the Sanitary Engineer to Government as President, to revise the rules for granting certificates under the—

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

READ—again the following paper:—

G.O., No. 1523 W., dated 13th June 1899.

READ—also the following papers:—

Note from the Sanitary Engineer to Government, dated 3rd July 1899, No. 893.
Letter from Messrs. Binny & Co., Madras, dated 13th July 1899.

ORDER—No. 2298 W., dated 2nd September 1899.

In G.O., No. 1523 W., dated 13th June 1899, the Sanitary Engineer was asked to revise the rules proposed for granting certificates under the Steam Boilers and Prime Movers Act. In his note recorded above, he indicates certain points on which further consideration is necessary.

2. Messrs. Binny & Co., in their letter recorded above, also suggest difficulties which should, in their opinion, be considered by a Committee to be appointed for the purpose.

3. His Excellency the Governor in Council is accordingly pleased to appoint a Committee composed as follows for the consideration of the various questions involved, including the amendment of the Act:—

President:

- (1) The Sanitary Engineer to Government.

Members:

- (2) The Locomotive Superintendent, Madras Railway, with the permission of the Agent and Manager.
(3) The Inspector of Steam Boilers and Prime Movers.
(4) An expert first-class Engineer from one of the largest industries in Madras.
An officer of the Public Works Department to be nominated by the Chief Engineer.

4. Messrs. Binny & Co. are requested to be so good as to suggest to the Sanitary Engineer the name of a mercantile Engineer member, and the Sanitary Engineer will thereupon apply to the proper authority for the services of the Engineer so named.

5. It is suggested to the Committee that they obtain in the first instance particulars of the men who are at present in direct charge of boilers in Madras and the mofussil, so that there may be some guide as to their capability of passing the tests that may be prescribed.

6. The Sanitary Engineer will place before the Committee all points on which a decision is necessary.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government.

To all Collectors.

- " the Judicial Department.
" the Local and Municipal Department.
" the Sanitary Engineer with tabular statements A and B,
and revised draft rules C to be returned.
" the Locomotive Superintendent, Madras Railway Company,
through the Agent and Manager.
" the General Superintendent, Public Works Workshops.
" the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Madras.
" the Chairman, Madras Trades Association.
" the Superintendent, Gun Carriage Factory.
" the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.
" Messrs. Binny & Co.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

Read ~~the following~~ againG. O. 1523 W., dated 13th June 1899.

Read also the following:—
 Note from the Sanitary Engineer to Government, No. 893, dated 3rd July 1899.
 Letter from Messrs Binny and Co., Madras, dated 13th July 1899.

Circulated to

ORDER.

No: 2298 W. 2-9-99

In G. O. No. 1523 W., dated 13th June 1899,

the Sanitary Engineer was asked to revise the rules proposed for granting certificates under the Steam Boilers and Prime Movers Act. In his note recorded above, he indicates certain points on which further consideration is necessary.

2. Messrs Binny and Co., in their letter recorded above, also suggest difficulties which should, in their opinion, be considered by a Committee to be appointed for the purpose.

3. His Excellency the Governor in Council is accordingly pleased to appoint a Committee composed

as follows for the consideration of the various questions involved, including the amendment of the Act:-

1. The Sanitary Engineer to Government,
2. The Locomotive Superintendent, Madras Railway, with the permission of the Agent and Manager.
3. The Inspector of Steam Boilers and Prime Movers:

President

Members.

4. An Expert first class Engineer from one of the largest industries in Madras.

Inspector of the P.W.D.

An ~~Superintending Engineer~~ to be nominated by the Chief Engineer.

President.

5. Messrs Binny and Co. are requested to be so good as to suggest to the Sanitary Engineer the name of a mercantile Engineer member, and the Sanitary Engineer will thereupon apply to the proper authority for the services of the Engineer so named.

5. It is suggested to the Committee that they obtain in the first instance particulars of the men who are at present in direct charge of Locomotives in Madras and the proposal, so that there may be some guide as to their capability of passing the tests that may be

be prescribed.

6. The Sanitary Engineer will place before the Committee all points on which a decision is necessary; and will, if required, act as Secretary to the Committee.

R.S.

L. H. H.
M. F. H.
W.

To

All Collectors

The Judicial Dept.

" L. & M. Dept.

" Sanitary Engineer with tabular statements A & B, and revised draft rules C. - to be returned.

" Loco. Supdt., Madras Ry. Co. through the Agent & Manager.

" Genl. Supdt., P.W. Workshops

" Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Madras

" ——— Madras Trades Association

" Supdt., Gun Carriage Factory

" Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

Messrs Binny & Co.

Read the following:—

Note from the Sanitary Engineer to Government, No. 893, dated 3rd July.Letter from Messrs Binny & Co., dated 13th July 1899.Rules for examinations for certificates
of Competency under the Boilers Act.

Circulated to

H.E. the Governor

The Hon. Mr. Willmott, C.S.I.

The Hon. Mr. Winterbottom

FOR ORDERS

8 Aug VIII

I think the proposed Committee might be
allowed. A.S.H. 14.8.99

Yes M.H. 17.8.99

H.W. 19.8.99

Sanitary Engineer's questions.(1) Para 2, Subpara (b) of his noteIs the examination to apply to
boiler-tenders, firemen, stokers &c, or is
it to apply only to Engineers or
persons in direct and immediate
management and charge of boilers?In G.O. No. 1523 W., dated 13th
June 1899, the Sanitary Engineer was
asked to revise the rules proposed
for granting certificates under the
Steam Boilers and Prime Movers Act.
In his note read above, he states
that there are difficulties in doing
this, and raises the following questions:Notes in the SecretariatThe Act only requires certificates
in the case of persons "in the direct
and immediate management and
charge" vide Section 14, i.e. of
an Engineer or "driver" with firemen
under him. Such men should be
quite capable of obtaining a 3rd
Class certificate under the Rules
now proposed, and, if not, the sooner
the

the obtaining of such certificate, is made compulsory, the better for the safety of all concerned. The examination is not intended to apply to boiler tenders, firemen and stokers, except that under Rule 19(b), they can, after 3 years' service, as such, obtain a 3rd class certificate if they prove themselves worthy of it.

2) Para 2, Subpara (2) of his note.

Are the rules for the Examinations of members' note on the last page for certificates to apply to the Profussil also? If so, the Act should be extended to the Profussil in the first instance. It is clear from the Honourable Member's note on the last page of Statement A that the intention is to apply the rules to the Profussil. Separate action is being taken as regards the extension of the Act to the Profussil. It is certainly advisable to extend the rules to the Profussil.

(3)

Para 2, Subparas (3) and (4).

Is rule 4 to be omitted or not? The Hon. Mr. Winterbottom desires its omission, but this has not been noted upon by the Hon. Mr. Wundel.

A similar query is made in regard to notes against rules 200 and 13.

3

I would omit Rule 4 and add to Rule 3 - "The Examiners shall receive such fees as Government may direct."

I would omit Rule 7 and add to Rule 6 - "all arrangements for the Examinations shall be made by the Sanitary Engineer."

I would omit Rule 13 altogether.

(4) Para 2, Subpara (5) of his note.

As regards the note to Rule 20, the Sanitary Engineer raises the following questions:-

- (1) Are Boiler tenders required to hold certificates?
- (2) The period that should be spent in practical work before a tender is eligible for examination.

(1) Boiler tenders are not required to hold certificates as explained in page 1 above.

(2) I thoroughly agree with the Sanitary Engineer that no boiler tender or fireman should be admitted to examination until he has been for at least three years employed as such. As Mr. Jones says, the period required on the Madras Railway before a

a

a fireman can become a driver is much longer.

(5) Para 2, Subpara (b) of his note.

Should not the rules provide for all the three classes of Certificates of Competency, seeing that a person holding a first Class certificate in Madras, and certificates of Competency under the Bombay Act will be entitled to a first class Certificate of Service under Section 18 of the Madras Act?

The case put falls under Section 14 of the Madras Act. Certificates granted in Bombay can be recognised of Competency issued here. I agree with the Sanitary Engineer that our rules should be in line with those in Bombay.

(6)

(b) In paras 3 and 4 of his note, he says "A further point is this, viz, that Government, under the powers given by Sections 23 (c) and (d) of the Act, can frame rules for the holding of Examinations for certificates, but if the Examination is at first to be permissive and no certificates are to be required, then the Examinations cannot be said to be Examinations for certificates."

"The only way in which such rules can come into operation is by declaring under Section 14 of the Act that no boiler shall be used unless it is in the direct and immediate management and charge of a person certified under the Act, but if all Examinations are to be permissive at first, no such notification can be issued and the rules will remain a dead letter. It seems therefore that it is desirable, if not imperative, that, for the purpose of holding the Examinations, Government should now determine to make at least the 3rd class Examination compulsory at a date 18 months after the issue of the rules"

(7)

5
I think, before proceeding any further in this matter, we had better refer the whole question of these rules and of the proposed amendments to Act III of 1893 to a Committee, as suggested by Messrs Binny and Company in their letter of 13th July 1899.

By so doing, we shall have this matter, which presents several difficulties, thoroughly threshed out and at the same time we shall conciliate the Trade and insure its acceptance of our final proposals with greater goodwill. The Committee should be instructed in the first instance to obtain particulars of the men who are at present in direct charge of boilers in Madras and Mofussil so that it may have some guide as to their capability of passing the required test.

Read the following:—

Note from the Sanitary Engineer to Government, No. 593, of 3rd July 1899

Letter from Messrs. Benney and Company, dated 13th July 1899.

Rules for examinations for certificates of Competency under the Boilers Act

Circulated to

H.E. B. Governor
The Hon. Mr. A. J. Arundel C.B.
The Hon. Mr. H. J. Winterbottom

FOR ORDERS

x Flag VIII

In G.O. No. 152310, dated, 13th June 1899, the Sanitary Engineer was asked to revise the rules proposed for granting certificates under the Steam Boilers and Prime Movers Act. In his note read above, he states that there are difficulties in doing this, and raises the following questions:—

Sanitary Engineer's questions.

Notes in the Secretariat.

(1) Para 2, Sub para (b) of his note.

Is the examination to apply to boiler-tenders, firemen, Stokers, &c, or is it to apply only to Engineers or persons in direct and immediate management and charge of boilers? The Act only requires certificates in the case of persons "in the direct and immediate management and charge". — vide Section 14.

Is it of an engineer or 'Driver' in the firmness under this. Such a man should be quite capable of obtaining a 3rd class certificate under the Rules now proposed, & if not, the former the obtaining of such a certificate is made compulsory, the better for the safety of all concerned. The same

(4) Para 5 of his note.

If it is the intention of Government to require of a person in charge of boilers only a third class certificate of Competency, and if he is to be allowed to be in charge of boilers of any horse power, the certificates of higher classes will be of no value. On the other hand, if such persons are to be in charge of boilers of limited power, who is to take charge of those of a higher power?

This matter should be referred to the Committee above proposed.

[Handwritten signature]

(2) Para 2, Subpara (2) of his note.

Are the rules for the Examinations for certificates to apply to the Profusail also? If so, the Act should be extended to the Profusail in the first instance.

is not intended to apply to the Profusail & shakers & deep test under Rule 19(6). They can after 3 years service as such, obtain a 3rd class certificate if they have themselves worked up.

It is clear from the Honorable member's note on the last page of Statement A that the intention is to apply the rules to the Profusail. Separate action is being taken as regards the extension of the Act to the Profusail. This is certainly admissible to extend the rules to the Profusail.

(3) Para 2, Subparas (3) and (4)

Is Rule 4 to be omitted or not? The Hon. Mr. Winterbottom desires its omission, but this has not been noted upon by the Hon. Mr. Arundel.

A similar query is made in regard to notes against rules Nos 7 and 13.

It is suggested that the rules be omitted for the reasons given by the Hon. Mr. Winterbottom.

As regards rule 13, the Sanitary Engineer might be directed to make the requisite provision in Rule 27.

I would omit rule 4 & add to Rule 3: "The Examiners shall receive such fees as for the day direct"

I would omit rule 7 & add to Rule 6: "All arrangements for the examination shall be made by the Sanitary Engineer"

(H) I would omit Rule 13 altogether

(4) Para 2, Subpara (5) of his note.

As regards the note to Rule 20, the Sanitary Engineer raises the following questions:-

- (1) Are boiler tenters required to hold certificates?
- (2) The period that should be spent in practical work before a tenter is eligible for examination.

(1) Boiler tenters are not required to hold certificates as explained in page 1 above.

(2) The period of practical work required by rule 20 may be reduced to one year for a third class certificate and to two years for the higher class.

I thoroughly agree with the San. Eng. that no boiler tenter in firemen shall be admitted to examine until he has been at least 3 years employed as such. As Mr. Winter says, the honor of the badge. Really before a fireman can become a driver is much longer.

Para 2, Subpara (6) of his note.

Should not the rules provide for all the three classes of certificates of Competency, seeing that a person holding a first class certificate of Competency under the Bombay Act will be entitled to a first class Certificate of Service under sections 18 of the ^{Madras} Act?

The case put falls under Section 17 of the ^{Madras} Act. Certificates granted in Bombay can be recognised in Madras, and certificates of Competency issued here. There is no need to go beyond our proposed rules, as to two classes of certificates. A man holding a first class certificate in Bombay would ordinarily obtain the higher certificate under the Madras Rules. But the matter is one which is left to the discretion of the Examiners under the second clause of Section 17 of the Act.

(6) I agree with the San. Eng. that our rules should be in line with those in Bombay.

(b) In paras 3 and 4 of his note, he says:-

"A further point is this, viz., that Government, under the powers given by Sections 23 (c) and (d) of the Act, can frame rules for the holding of examinations for certificates, but if the examination is at first to be permissive and no certificates are to be required, then the examinations cannot be said to be examinations for certificates."

"The only way in which such rules can come into operation is by declaring under Section 14 of the Act that no boiler shall be used unless it is in the direct and immediate management and charge of a person certified under the Act, but, if all examinations are to be permissive at first, no such notification can be issued and the rules will remain a dead letter. It seems therefore that it is desirable, if not imperative, that, for the purpose of holding the examinations, Government should now determine to make at least the 3rd Class Examination compulsory at a date 18 months after the issue of the rules."

There seems no legal difficulty here. Everybody who passes will get a certificate. The examinations will be permissive for 18 months in the first instance, after which it will probably will be declared that every boiler shall be in charge of a competent person as required by Section 14 of the Act. The practical effect will be that persons who have ^{Sec. 14 of} meanwhile qualified will then, i.e., when the Act comes into force, have a recognised legal status.

I think before proceeding any further in this matter we had better refer the whole question of these rules, & of the proposed amendments to the Act in 1900, to a Committee, as suggested in their letter of 12th of 98. - By so doing we shall leave this matter, which presents several difficulties, hanging over their heads, & at the same

(4) Para 5 of his note.

If it is the intention of Government to require of a person in charge of boilers only a third class certificate of competency, and if he is to be allowed to be in charge of boilers of any horse power, the certificates of higher classes will be of no value. ~~On~~ On the other hand, if such persons are to be in charge of boilers of limited power, who is to take charge of those of a higher power?

time, we shall circulate the Trade, & insure its acceptance of our final proposals with greater good will. The Committee should be instructed in the first instance to obtain sanction of the House who are at present in direct charge of boilers in India & Burma. So that it may ~~be a mistake~~. The higher certificate will be of more value in the estimation of employers and will no doubt secure for the holder higher pay and the charge of more important boilers. It is therefore a mistake to say that the higher certificate will be of no value. Here some point as to the capability of carrying the up test.

This matter shall be referred to the Committee above proposed.

2. Messrs Binny and Company propose to refer the whole question to a Boiler Commission. It is submitted that there are no sufficient reasons advanced for this proposal. Messrs Binny and Co. misunderstand the position.

Please re-write

12/7/11

is not intended to affect the

position. They ignore the fact that the rules are to be revised. The difficulty suggested in para 2 of their letter will not exist under the revised rules. A person holding a third class certificate will, under these rules, be competent to hold charge of any boiler.

3. The difficulty suggested in para 3 of their letter is also to some extent groundless. It is only the person in charge of a boiler who is, under the Act, required to hold a certificate, and not the fireman who is supposed to be subordinate to such person.

W

P. W.

(189) Department.

Current No. 81

From

The Sam Sany Sugnia

No.

Dated 3-7-99.

Received at Ootacamund } 8-8-99.

Registered at Madras

Enclosures { Plans } total
 { Other }

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Sending back the papers regarding the Ootacamund rules for further consideration.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
original	1523w		13.6.98
original	2702w		12.10.98
	2826w		9.10.97

CURRENT No. ^{5833.}
67

From Messrs. Birney & Co.
Madison

No.

Dated 13 July 98

Received at Ootacamund 15-7-91

Registered at Madras 17. 7. 99

Enclosures Plans and

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Protesting against the proposed
rules for the Grant of Certificates
of Competency to Engineers &
Boiler tenders.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

BINNY & CO
MADRAS.

S.M.

Madras, 13th July, 1899.

The Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department,
O O T A C A M U N D.

Sir,

With reference to G.O.No:1523 dated 13th June 1899, we have the honor to respectfully protest against the Proposed Rules for the grant of Certificates of competency to Engineers and boiler tenters. In our letter dated 22nd November 1898, various suggestions were made for the modification and alteration of the rules as then submitted. We now submit after a perusal of the newly proposed rules that before the Act comes into force the questions involved should be thoroughly threshed out by a Committee, to be appointed by Government, whose duty it would be to consider the subject from all points of view.

2 - To take an instance affecting our own particular case; our interpretation of G.O. No:1523 of 13th June 1899 is that the fireman in charge of each boiler is to have a 3rd Class certificate but the proposed rules only allow 3rd Class Certificates to take charge of boilers up to 20 N.H.P. How will this affect the Carnatic and Buckingham Mills where all the boilers are 50 N.H.P. and over?

3. Further if it becomes law for every fireman to possess a certificate, we submit that such a regulation would become a standing menace to trade. At present in the event of a strike among our firemen we can

It is only the person in charge who is required to hold a Certificate.

BINNY & CO
MADRAS.

2.

keep the work going by selecting other coolies to do the work of firemen, with an Engineer standing over them and personally superintending the feeding. But this course would be impossible if each fireman is to be a certificated man.

4 For the above and many other reasons we have the honor to suggest that Government should appoint a Boiler Commission to enquire into the present proposed Competency Certificate rules and into the Boiler Act, which latter we submit is deficient for one reason ^{at least} in that the final appeal lies to the Presidency Magistrate who can hardly be expected to be an expert on Boilers.

5- If a suggestion on our part would be considered, we would suggest that the Constitution of the Boiler Commission should be somewhat as follows:-

The Sanitary Engineer to Government.

The Locomotive Superintendent M.R.Co.

An expert first class engineer from one of the largest industries in Madras.

The Inspector of Prime Movers, Madras.

A Superintending Engineer to be appointed by Government and to act as President.

We have the honor to be,

Sir,
Your most Obedient Servants.

Binny & Co

Secretaries, To The Carnatic Mill Co: Ld:
Secretaries & Treasurers, To The Buckingham Mill Co: Ld:

B50

P. L.
Local & Munl. (189 *R*) Department.

CURRENT No. 571

Order

From
The Sanitary Engineer

No. 893.

Dated *3 July 98*

Received at *ootacumund 5-7*

Registered at *(made in 13-7-98)*

Enclosures *(Plans) what.*

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

*Stating that there are
difficulties in framing
rules for the examination
of boilers in the inspection*

650

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

itself?

(2) If so, then the Boiler act will also have to first be made applicable to the Mofussil boilers because it is only then that examinations can be required. It is not known whether Government propose to so extend the act, the papers regarding the examination of boilers being still before Government. If it is so intended additional rules in regard to boiler inspection will be required for the Mofussil.

It will be noticed that Hon: Mr. Spindell agrees that it is a tax on the trade in Madras as compared with that in the Mofussil if the act & rules be not so extended and applied, vide Hon: member's remark opposite "Preamble (2)". Messrs. Baring & Co. urge application of the examination rules to the Mofussil.

(3) Is Rule 4 to be omitted or not? The Hon: member Mr. Winterbottom desires its omission but this has not been noted upon by the Hon: Mr. Spindell.

(4) A similar query is made in regard to note against rules nos 7 & 13.

(5) Note to Rule 20 - If it is now intended, as it is gathered from the papers it is, that the men who fire boilers, that is

firemen or stokers, are to be persons who after 18 months from date of issue of order must hold a certificate of competency, the three years must be 18 months because no one, after the rules came into force and the elementary examination becomes compulsory, will be allowed to be in charge of a boiler without a certificate. The remarks & proposals of Mr. Shiff's on this rule have, it is thought, led to a misconception of the matter. It was pointed out that boiler tenders were never thought of in regard to these examination rules nor is it understood how they can be the persons to be examined for a certificate. Section 14 of the act says 'no boiler should be used unless it is in direct & immediate management of a person certified under the act but a stoker or a fireman cannot be considered as a person in direct and immediate charge & these are the persons Mr. Shiff's imagined were to be the persons to be required to hold certificates. Such persons were not allowed under the rules as drafted to be even examined for certificates until they had three years training & were otherwise qualified

itself class in this Presidency.
Such certificates are to be
granted says the act, according
as a man is qualified to the
like extent as the holder of a
certificate of competency of any
class which the Board in
such certificate of service
specifies".

Again as it is proposed
that no examination except
that for the 3rd class is to be
compulsory, there does not seem
to be any advantage in omitting
rules for the 1st class examination
which might be permissive as
well as the 2nd class. If not
there would be 1st class certifi-
cates of service in this Presidency
& no first class certificate of
competency.

3. A further point is this,
viz that Government, under
the powers given by Section
23 (c) & (d) of the act, can
frame rules for the holding
of examinations for certificates
but if the examination is at
first to be permissive & no
certificates are to be required,
then the examinations cannot
be said to be examinations for
certificates.

4. The only way in which
such rules can come into
operation is by declaring under
Section 14 of the act that no

boiler shall be used in ^{to be}
it is in the direct and ^{from} ~~im-~~
mediate management & charge
of a person certified under
the act but if all the exami-
nations are to be permissive
at first no such notification
can be issued and the rules
will remain a dead letter.
It seems therefore that it is
desirable if not imperative
that, for the purpose of holding
the examinations, Government
should now determine to
make at least the 3rd class
examination compulsory at
a date 18 months after the
issue of the rules.

5. The last point to which
consideration is requested is,
if there is only one certificate
to be granted & that a third
class to enable a person to be
in charge of a boiler (and
steam engine) is it to be a
certificate allowing such
person to be in charge of boilers
and engines of any unlimited
H.P., 50, 100, 500 &c, as the
case may be; if the certificate
is to be for a limited H.P.,
who is to be in charge of boilers
(and engines) of higher power
above that limit; if it is not
to be limited at all, what
advantage will a man get
by passing a permissive

for a second class certificate and what is this certificate to entitle him to do, if a third class certificate is to give unlimited powers to a fireman who may have done nothing more than put coals on for 18 months.

6. Until the points raised are settled, it is desirable to delay reframing the rules.

7. The file of papers are returned for favor of further instructions.

[Signature]

Sanitary Engineer, B.S.E.

202

[Handwritten notes]
C.S. to
S.E. to
S.E. to
S.E. to

Original of G.O. No. 1523 dated 13 June 1899
Called for 5 July 1899

By VIII Submitter
16/7/99

The person in the direct and immediate management & charge cannot be a boiler tender & must be an engineer, he is the person who ought to be certified.

Mr. Shipp & Col. Smart have, it is thought, obscured the real requirement of the Act & rule framed with reference to it and led to a misconception as to the status of the persons affected by rule.

The above is a most important point without even considering that our third class certificate would be of no use in the Bombay Presidency & place men who could pass a proper examination at a disadvantage in obtaining work there.

(6) It is now proposed that there should be two examinations, one of them, the higher, permissive. It is necessary, however, in any case that there should be 1st, 2nd, & 3rd class certificates, whether examinations are held for the first class or not, because certificates of service have, under Sec: 18, to be granted to certain persons. Any of these may hold a certificate of the first class, say from Bombay & therefore would naturally require are known

and three years is much less than a stoker or a fireman on the Madras Railway; thought to be fit to be a driver, that is a person in charge of a prime-mover.

Any man who obtains the certificate under the rules as now proposed to be amended would have to receive a certificate that he was fit to be in charge of a steam engine also because under the Act the word 'boiler' includes any apparatus closely attached thereto and subject to steam pressure (see Section 2 of the Act) so that it comes to this, say in a mill where the boilers are far from the engines that if a man, who has been simply putting coals for 18 months into a boiler, can pass what is called in the notes "the boiler tenders test", which requires no knowledge of engines whatever, a man who may never have been in and probably would not be allowed in the Engine Room, will nevertheless receive a certificate showing he is fit to take charge of the engine driven by his boiler.

* The Hon. Mr. Winterbottom notices this point as he says 'why should a fireman know anything about boilers - I would add "and much more engines".'

No. 893

Government of Madras,
OFFICE OF SANY. ENGR. TO GOVT.,
Stowe Hall, Poonamallee Road,
Madras, 3rd July 1899.

OFFICE NOTE.

From

THE SANITARY ENGINEER TO GOVT.,

Madras

To

The Secretary to Govt.,
Public Works Dept.
(unofficially).

After reading G.O. No. 1523 or dated 13th June 1899, it is found that there are several difficulties in framing rules as required and it is also not quite clear from the Hon. members' notes what has been decided upon as regards certain of the proposed rules evidently intended to be amended.

2. The following questions also arise

(1) Are the rules to be framed in view to examination in the Mofussil as well as in Madras

No. 1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

Office of Sanitary Engineer to Govt.,

POONAMALLEE ROAD (PARK TOWN),

Madras, 189 .

reference & if you agree with me in any degree I trust you will ask for reconsideration.

Mr Winterbottom seems to have made proposals ^{which} Mr Arundel did not see or remark on & there are no definite instructions given or conclusions come to in regard to certain of the rules.

I wish I had an opportunity of talking over this matter with the Hon. Members and yourself - I feel assured that the orders have been issued under a misconception

of the true state of affairs & the
intention of the rules.

Yours sincerely,

W. H. L. Grier

W. H. de Winton &

Secretary of the Board

No.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Office of Sanitary Engineer to Govt.,

POONAMALLEE ROAD (PARK TOWN),

Madras, 3rd July 1899.

My dear de Minton,

I am sending back to you the papers re: the Boiler examination rules for further consideration. The whole matter has been obscured by Shippo who did not understand the rules nor the persons to whom they were applicable and Smart followed him without, I think, considering whether the rules were really in accordance with the terms of the Act.

As Government propose the

rules now I do not consider
they are in accordance with the
Act. A fireman is not a man
"in charge & management of a
boiler" & we must go by the Act.
Then if it is not a fireman, who
must be a certificated man, the
man to be certificated is the Engineer
who is well able to undergo the
simple third class examination as
proposed.

Take for instance a mill-
saw with six or eight boilers. These
are all away from the Engine room.
& the firemen or more stokers never
enter it; they do nothing and know
nothing except to put on coals;
they are in fact coolies. Are these the
men to be certificated? Another point
has been lost sight of. "Boiler" includes

"engine" as it is under steam pressure connected to the boiler. An engineer & not a cooly must be in charge of this & no man, unless properly trained & having a knowledge far in advance of the requirements for a third class certificate, could look after an engine & repair it & set valves &c.

Again Smart has set far too low an estimate on the progress of the Presidency; look at the amount of steam power in it & then say whether our rules should not be as strict as those obtaining in Bombay. Why should Madras be put at such a low level in regard to the persons who look after the steam machinery throughout the Presidency. Is it not necessary that a man in Madras should

have as high requirements when in
charge of machinery here as in
Bombay? Are employers of labor
to be satisfied with men of inferior
qualifications because we live in
the benighted Presidency? And
what will other Presidencies think
of our qualifications - Why, they will
be utterly discredited & of no value
whatever to the men who get them
& employers will look on them
with suspicion especially if they
are to be given to an 18 months
old fireman -

I trust you will kindly
go through the papers yourself &
see if I am not justified in
delaying making rules as ordered
by Government without further