

(1) Number of pages 16
(2) Date of repair 17-8-43
(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	3626	Press
		~~Mis.~~
397-98		
Dated	19 - 11 -	1868.

An

Not to be folded or roughly handled

113

A

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
19th November 1868.*

No. 397. Read the following Endorsement of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Fort St. George, 30th October 1868.

Read the following letter from the Superintending Engineer, 1st Division, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Dowlaishweram, 19th October 1868, No. 132.—

1. While on duty, in Madura, I received a copy of G O, No 2,216,*
* Communicated with Department Public Works G. O, No 2,730, dated 26th August 1868 dated 20th August, but I have deferred writing what follows until I had the means of ascertaining numbers and dates of the orders, and chapter and paragraph of the Public Works Code under which I acted, and which not only empowered, but obliged me to dispose, as I did, of the tank repair estimates, which that G. O. refers to

2. Chapter XXIV of the Public Works Code states the Orders of Government giving sanctioning powers to Officers of the Public Works and Revenue Departments.

Paragraph 5 gives the Collector power to sanction repairs to irrigation works within the highest year's revenue derived from the work during the preceding five years.

Paragraph 1 gives to the Chief Engineer power to sanction repairs to irrigation works, the proposed expenditure being less than four years' revenue, except when the tank or channel has produced no revenue for three years.

3. By G. O, No. 958, dated 18th April 1863, the sanctioning powers of the Chief Engineer of the old Department Public Works were transferred to Superintending Engineers of the re-modelled Department, and, on a reference from the Revenue Department, proposing to give Collectors this power, Government so lately as last 13th November 1867, declined to alter the existing rules.
G O, No 3,507, 13th November 1867.

4. The estimated cost of the proposed repair of the seven tanks in question is Rupees 722, the Ayacut assessment of the lands under them Rupees 231-8-4, the responsibility of sanctioning the estimates, therefore, rested on me

5. I trust that the above statement will show that I have not exceeded my powers, and I still feel certain that, in refusing sanction to the estimates in question, I was exerting those powers as it was intended they should be exerted.

6. The information before me showed that as *repair*, the proposed work was not required; in the case of six out of the seven tanks, the whole Ayacut area of wet land under these tanks is, according to the Revenue Officer's own statement, under cultivation. As regards the seventh tank, the Ayacut area under it is only four acres, of which one only is entered as cultivated, the revenue is Rupees 5-9-6, the estimated cost of the proposed repairs Rupees 62, the estimate would, therefore, have to be sanctioned by Government, neither I nor the Collector having power to order the execution of the work.

7. Before concluding, I beg to submit some remarks regarding paragraphs 2 and 3, of Chapter XI of the Code, quoted in the G. O. under reference These

1/3

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
19th November 1868.*

No. 397. Read the following Endorsement of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Fort St George, 30th October 1868.

Read the following letter from the Superintending Engineer, 1st Division, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Dowlaishweram, 19th October 1868, No 132 —

1. While on duty, in Madura, I received a copy of G O, No 2,216,*
* Communicated with Department Public Works G. O, No 2,730, dated 26th August 1868 dated 20th August, but I have deferred writing what follows until I had the means of ascertaining numbers and dates of the orders, and chapter and paragraph of the Public Works Code under which I acted, and which not only empowered, but obliged me to dispose, as I did, of the tank repair estimates, which that G. O refers to

2. Chapter XXIV of the Public Works Code states the Orders of Government giving sanctioning powers to Officers of the Public Works and Revenue Departments.

Paragraph 5 gives the Collector power to sanction repairs to irrigation works *within the highest year's revenue* derived from the work during the preceding five years.

Paragraph 1 gives to the Chief Engineer power to sanction repairs to irrigation works, the proposed expenditure being less than four years' revenue, except when the tank or channel has produced no revenue for three years.

3 By G. O, No. 958, dated 18th April 1863, the sanctioning powers of the Chief Engineer of the old Department Public Works were transferred to Superintending Engineers of the re-modelled Department, and, on a reference from the Revenue Department, proposing to give Collectors this power, Government so lately G O, No 3,507, 13th November 1867 as last 13th November 1867, declined to alter the existing rules.

4. The estimated cost of the proposed repair of the seven tanks in question is Rupees 722, the Ayacut assessment of the lands under them Rupees 231-8-4, the responsibility of sanctioning the estimates, therefore, rested on me

5. I trust that the above statement will show that I have not exceeded my powers, and I still feel certain that, in refusing sanction to the estimates in question, I was exerting those powers as it was intended they should be exerted.

6. The information before me showed that as *repair*, the proposed work was not required; in the case of six out of the seven tanks, the whole Ayacut area of wet land under these tanks is, according to the Revenue Officer's own statement, under cultivation. As regards the seventh tank, the Ayacut area under it is only four acres, of which one only is entered as cultivated, the revenue is Rupees 5-9-6, the estimated cost of the proposed repairs Rupees 62, the estimate would, therefore, have to be sanctioned by Government, neither I nor the Collector having power to order the execution of the work.

7. Before concluding, I beg to submit some remarks regarding paragraphs 2 and 3, of Chapter XI of the Code, quoted in the G. O under reference These

Court. of 1868

PUBLIC WORKS

To

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

Dated November, 1914

Recd

G. O. November 1914 1508, N.

NOVEMBER

1914

132 Superintending Engineer Office
Dowlaisraam 19th October 1868

From

Captain J. G. Rymer R. E.

Superintending Engineer

1st Division

To

Col J. C. Anderson R. E.

Chief Engineer for Irrigation

Madras 21st Oct 87

While on duty in Madura, I received a copy of G. O. No 2216 dated 20th August but I have deferred writing what follows until I had the means of ascertaining numbers and dates of the Orders and Chapter and paras of the Public Works Code under which I acted and which not only empowered but obliged me to disburse as I did of the tank repair estimates which that G. O. refers to.

Chapter XXIV of the Public Works Code states the orders of Government giving sanctioning powers to Officers of the Public Works and Revenue Departments.

para

msd
14.6
date
not
8.

14.6
14.6
14.6

isi
In
F

Tank repairs - For work
Chief Engineer for Irrigation
with remarks, letter from Govt
showing that he has no
powers as Superintendent of
declining to carry out work
in the Vizagapatam District

para 5 - gives the Collector power to sanction repairs to irrigation works within the highest years' revenue derived from the work during the preceding five years.

para 1. gives to the Chief Engineer power to sanction repairs to irrigation works the proposed expenditure being less than four years' revenue except when the tank or channel has produced no Revenue for three years.

3. By G. O. 958 dated 18th April 1863 the sanctioning powers of the Chief Engineer of the Old Department Public Works were transferred to Superintending Engineers of the remodelled Department, and on a reference from the Revenue Department proposing to give Collectors this power Government so lately as last 13th November 1867 - declined to alter the existing rules.

4. The estimated cost of the proposed repairs of the seven tanks in question is Rs 722 the Ayacut assessment of the lands under them Rs 281-8-4, the responsibility of sanctioning the estimates therefore rested on me.

5. I trust that the above statement will

7B
will show that I have not exceeded my powers, and I still feel certain that in refusing sanction to the Estimates in question I was exerting those powers as it was intended they should be exerted.

6. The information before me showed that as repair the proposed work was not required; in the case of six out of the seven tanks the whole Ayacut area of wet land under these tanks is, according to the Revenue Officers' own statement, under cultivation. As regards the seventh tank the Ayacut area under it is only 4 acres of which ^{one} only is entered as cultivated, the Revenue is Rs 5-9-6. The estimated cost of the proposed repairs Rs 62-0-0 the Estimate would therefore have to be sanctioned by Government, neither I nor the Collector having power to order the execution of the work.

7. Before concluding I beg to submit some remarks regarding paras 2 and 3 of Chapter XI of the Code quoted in the G. O. under reference. These paragraphs state in general terms the recognised position

position of Collectors with regard to Irrigation works as it was when that Chapter of the Code was drafted, but they are not now and have not for many years been practically acted upon.

8. The Collector's opinion regarding the proper distribution of funds to the several works in progress and the choice of works to be undertaken whether new or repairs will of course always have great weight when fully and definitely expressed but in practice the choice of works to be undertaken falls upon the Superintending Engineer, and in the case of Repairs it is but reasonable that the Department which is responsible for the efficient maintenance of the Public Works should have full control over the repair operations and power to prevent waste by unnecessary or extravagant expenditure of the limited funds placed at its disposal for repairs.

I have
YR V. S. Captain
Superintending Engineer, Division

1. Annual 3
2. Annual 3
3. Annual 3
4. Annual 3
5. Annual 3
6. Annual 3
7. Annual 3
8. Annual 3
9. Annual 3
10. Annual 3
11. Annual 3
12. Annual 3
13. Annual 3
14. Annual 3
15. Annual 3
16. Annual 3
17. Annual 3
18. Annual 3
19. Annual 3
20. Annual 3
21. Annual 3
22. Annual 3
23. Annual 3
24. Annual 3
25. Annual 3
26. Annual 3
27. Annual 3
28. Annual 3
29. Annual 3
30. Annual 3
31. Annual 3
32. Annual 3
33. Annual 3
34. Annual 3
35. Annual 3
36. Annual 3
37. Annual 3
38. Annual 3
39. Annual 3
40. Annual 3
41. Annual 3
42. Annual 3
43. Annual 3
44. Annual 3
45. Annual 3
46. Annual 3
47. Annual 3
48. Annual 3
49. Annual 3
50. Annual 3
51. Annual 3
52. Annual 3
53. Annual 3
54. Annual 3
55. Annual 3
56. Annual 3
57. Annual 3
58. Annual 3
59. Annual 3
60. Annual 3
61. Annual 3
62. Annual 3
63. Annual 3
64. Annual 3
65. Annual 3
66. Annual 3
67. Annual 3
68. Annual 3
69. Annual 3
70. Annual 3
71. Annual 3
72. Annual 3
73. Annual 3
74. Annual 3
75. Annual 3
76. Annual 3
77. Annual 3
78. Annual 3
79. Annual 3
80. Annual 3
81. Annual 3
82. Annual 3
83. Annual 3
84. Annual 3
85. Annual 3
86. Annual 3
87. Annual 3
88. Annual 3
89. Annual 3
90. Annual 3
91. Annual 3
92. Annual 3
93. Annual 3
94. Annual 3
95. Annual 3
96. Annual 3
97. Annual 3
98. Annual 3
99. Annual 3
100. Annual 3

1. Annual 3
2. Annual 3
3. Annual 3
4. Annual 3
5. Annual 3
6. Annual 3
7. Annual 3
8. Annual 3
9. Annual 3
10. Annual 3
11. Annual 3
12. Annual 3
13. Annual 3
14. Annual 3
15. Annual 3
16. Annual 3
17. Annual 3
18. Annual 3
19. Annual 3
20. Annual 3
21. Annual 3
22. Annual 3
23. Annual 3
24. Annual 3
25. Annual 3
26. Annual 3
27. Annual 3
28. Annual 3
29. Annual 3
30. Annual 3
31. Annual 3
32. Annual 3
33. Annual 3
34. Annual 3
35. Annual 3
36. Annual 3
37. Annual 3
38. Annual 3
39. Annual 3
40. Annual 3
41. Annual 3
42. Annual 3
43. Annual 3
44. Annual 3
45. Annual 3
46. Annual 3
47. Annual 3
48. Annual 3
49. Annual 3
50. Annual 3
51. Annual 3
52. Annual 3
53. Annual 3
54. Annual 3
55. Annual 3
56. Annual 3
57. Annual 3
58. Annual 3
59. Annual 3
60. Annual 3
61. Annual 3
62. Annual 3
63. Annual 3
64. Annual 3
65. Annual 3
66. Annual 3
67. Annual 3
68. Annual 3
69. Annual 3
70. Annual 3
71. Annual 3
72. Annual 3
73. Annual 3
74. Annual 3
75. Annual 3
76. Annual 3
77. Annual 3
78. Annual 3
79. Annual 3
80. Annual 3
81. Annual 3
82. Annual 3
83. Annual 3
84. Annual 3
85. Annual 3
86. Annual 3
87. Annual 3
88. Annual 3
89. Annual 3
90. Annual 3
91. Annual 3
92. Annual 3
93. Annual 3
94. Annual 3
95. Annual 3
96. Annual 3
97. Annual 3
98. Annual 3
99. Annual 3
100. Annual 3

Revenue and
required to the ser. tanks in
question, are noted below
Ayacut.

11/12
ment with
the Revenue
20th August
Captain
he adopted
limits for
irrigation
that, he acted
to him, along
Engineers, in
November
provided formerly
given, a of
or, suggested
expenditure
in four years
present, actual
cost of repairs

8. The
the proper
works in
to be under
will of Cou
when fully
in practice
falls upon
in the case
that the Dep
for the office
Works should
repair opera
waste by un
of the limit
for repairs.

10/18/88
 10/18/88
 from
 the Supr Engineer
 1st Division

to the Secretary of the
 P. N. H. Co.
 Date 19 October 1864
 No 212
 No 21 -
 No 30 -
 No 132

do 30th No 132
Affords certain in-
formation regarding the
E.C. No 2286 dated 20th
August 1868. on the
subject of - Limiting
powers & Officers of
the D. P. Board -

the D. P. Sloan
No 2626-19-2 Nov 2/68

W. R. V. *Capt. U.S.A.*
Superintending Engineer 1st Division

1. Grundgesetz
 2. Grundgesetz Grundgesetz Grundgesetz

Submitted to Government with
reference to their order in the Revenue
Department No. 2216 dated 20th August
1868. In the above letter Captain
Ayres defends the course he adopted
with reference to certain Estimates for
repair of Tanks in the Nagapattani
District on the grounds that he acted
on the authority conveyed to him, along
with other Superintending Engineers, in
G.O. No. 5567, dated 15th November
1867, to the effect that the provisions formerly
pertaining to Chief Engineers, of
sanctioning Estimates for repairs
of tanks, except when the expenditure
exceeds more than four years
revenue, are dissolved, on his part.
The Ayacut assessment, actual
revenue, and estimated cost of repairs
required to the seven tanks in
question, are noted below

Agreed Amount Actual Revenue Estimated cost of repairs.

N ^o 1	22	6	5	7-6	62.
2	22	8	12	8	123
3	37	37	37		79
4	52	52	52		78
5	17	17	17		110
6	32	4	9	32	67
7	59	8	8	50	203.

... in the other proposals ...
 ... the first ... second ...
 ... the first ... second ...
 ... five years ... the estimates
 require the sanction of Government.
 On the other side the estimates
 are further the competence of the
 Superintendent Engineer.
 ... that the Director
 of Nagarkurnool had strongly urged
 the execution of the repairs to the
 seven tanks above mentioned.
 It is, I think, to be regretted that Capt
 Pym

(Pym had not addressed Govt
 Government on the subject in the first
 instance, submitting a full state-
 ment of the facts, accompanied
 by an expression of his own opinion

Fort H. Gens
 30th Dec 1865

Anderson (all R.E.)
 Chief Engineer for
 Irrigation

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten notes on the right page of the notebook.]

App. 1860 Oct. 11
Am. U.S. 1862

of the Chief Engineer
for migration

of the Secretary
to Govt. A.M. B.

Dated 30th
Nov. 31st October 1862

Enclosure 1

For the sub-
ject of the functioning
of officers of the
A.M. Schastinich.

1862-5-19-1862 1868

with an order

[Handwritten notes on the left page of the notebook, including a signature and various dates.]

