M.R.O. 1—77,005—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 4

(2) Date of repair

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2221 Press Mis.

Dated 9 18

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department, 1st September 1871.

No. 3. Read the following Endorsement of the Officer in charge of the Office of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Fort St. George, 10th August 1871, No. 61 :—

From the Agent and Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Under Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 7th August 1871, No. 345.

I HAVE the honour to request that you will be so good as to inform me if I am to take G. O., No. 2,008, of the 1st instant, as passing the whole of the expenditure upon the Lockinsula bungalow, the building to be dealt with as a permanent structure *is a charge against construction and must continue to be so*, and that there CAN be no question of a separate head of charge, it never occurred to me to make so extraordinary a proposition. My proposal was that the building should, according to the usual practice in such cases—a practice introduced upon very sensible grounds by Major Mullins—be "*transferred to*" (or placed in) "the *category* of permanent buildings," that is, that it should like many other buildings on the works be dealt with as a permanent structure, to be maintained by revenue for revenue purposes in contradistinction to those buildings which, put up for construction uses solely, are, while used for construction purposes, *maintained out of construction funds*, and, when no longer required for construction, allowed to fall to ruin.

3. I do not comprehend the allusion in the G. O. to a *re-imbursement* to capital of the cost of such a building, and to the inability of revenue to "*meet*" such a charge, for I do not see how the question can ever arise of revenue being called upon to "*meet*" the *cost* of *constructing* any portion of the permanent works of the canal. It is the province of revenue to maintain that which capital has constructed.

4. I have entered into these explanations, first, because the G. O. seems to imply that these very extraordinary ideas have emanated from *me;* and, secondly, because I wish to be quite clear what course it is that the order authorizes me to adopt.

5. I have, therefore, the honour to request that you will do me the favour to bring this communication under the notice of the Right Honourable the Governor in Council for the double purpose which I have just indicated.

SUBMITTED to Government.

I beg to point out that the Consulting Engineer in his letter No. 30, dated 8th June 1871, referred to in G. O., No. 1,735, of the 29th idem, recommends that a portion of the expenditure on the Lockinsula bungalow should be disallowed, and I have made a similar recommendation in my letter of the 18th July, No. 51, the amount specified by me being Rupees 412.

2. The order of Government on the above letter does not touch on the question of the proposed disallowance, and I request information as to whether or not the whole expenditure in excess of the Rupees 3,000 is to be a debit against the works.

(Signed) A. deC. SCOTT, Captain, R.E.,
Under Secretary to Government,
In charge of Office of Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

No. 4. ORDER THEREON, 1st September 1871, No. 2,227.

IRRIGATION, No. 1.

THE Government observe that the Lockinsula bungalow having been erected in connection with the construction of a certain portion of the Main Canal the whole of the authorized expenditure on it is properly debitable to the section of the canal in question, and while therefore the building will, under the order previously issued, be borne on the list of buildings at its estimated value of Rupees 3,000 and be in future maintained at the cost of Revenue, the whole of the expenditure incurred in its construction will remain charged to the portion of the Main Canal in connection with which it was built, unless any portion of the outlay should be wholly disallowed under orders on this subject which will be issued hereafter.

(True Extract.)

Captain, R.E.,
Under Secretary to Government.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Agent and Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Statement No 1

No 345. Madras Irrigation and C. C.
Madras 7 August 1871

3B

From
The Agent and Manager

To
Captain A. Scott R.E.
Under Secy to Government
for Acting Chief Engineer
for Irrigation
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to request that you will be so good as to inform me if I am to take G.O. No 2008 of the 1st instant as passing the whole of the expenditure upon the Lockinsula Bungalow the building to be dealt with as a permanent one at the valuation of Rupees 3000 and the difference between that sum and the entire cost to remain as a debit against the works of the Division as proposed by me.

While upon the subject of the above G.O. I beg to explain that I did not in my letter No 304 of 14th July 1871 propose that the bungalow should be

be transferred to a separate head of account - Knowing well that the cost of the structure is a charge against construction and must continue to be so and that there can be no question of a separate head of charge it never occurred to me to make so extraordinary a proposition. My proposal was that the building should according to the usual practice in such cases, a practice introduced upon very sensible grounds by the desire "not" to have the outlines be transferred to or placed in the category of permanent buildings" that is that it should like many other buildings on the works be dealt with as a permanent structure to be maintained by Revenue for Revenue purposes in contradistinction to those buildings which, put up for construction uses solely, are while used for construction purposes maintained out of construction funds and when no longer required for construction allowed to fall to ruin.

I do not comprehend the allusion to the G. O. to a reimbursement to Capital of the cost of such a building and

and to the inability of Revenue to "meet" such a charge for I do not see how the question can ever arise of Revenue being called upon to meet the cost of constructing any portion of the permanent works of the Canal. It is the province of Revenue to maintain that which Capital has constructed.

I have entered into these explanations first because the G. O. seems to imply that there is very extraordinary idea I have originated from me and secondly because I wish to be quite clear what course it is that the order authorises me to adopt.

I have therefore the honor to request that you will do me the favor to bring this communication under the notice of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council for the double purpose which I have just indicated.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obed Servant
Dr. Hartwell Kelsall
Agent and Manager

Chief Secretary

ADC.

No. 61.

713

Letter from Agent and Manager Madras Irrigation and Canal Company — No. 345 dated 7th August 1871.

Submitted to Government

I beg to point out that the Consulting Engineer in his letter No. 30 dated 8th June 1871 referred to in P.O. No. 1735 of the 29th idem, recommends that a portion of the expenditure on the Cockanada Bungalow should be disallowed and I have made a similar recommendation in my letter of the 10th July No. 57. The amount specified by me being Rs. 442.

The order of Government on the above letter does not touch on the question of the proposed disallowance and I request information as to whether or not the whole expenditure in excess of the Rupees 3000, is to be a debit against the works.

Actg. Lieut.
Capt. R. E.
Under Secy to Govt. in charge
of Office of Chief Engineer
for Irrigation

Office of the Chief Engineer
& Irrigation and Joint
Secretary to Government
at St. Thomas Mount 10th Aug. 1871.

To The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department

To the Chief Engineer dated 7th August 1871.

From The Agent & Manager
Madras Irrigation & Canal Co.

No 345

Dated 7th August 1871.
Received 9th idem.

Requests further instructions regarding disallowance of the Rupees 442 in the Cockanada Bungalow Expenditure.

P.W. 3802/71.

Public Works Department

No 2227

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 1st September 71

Read the following

From The Under Secretary to G.O.H.E. No 6 dated 10th August 1871

Sir

I am directed by the Governor in Council to acquaint you that the Government have received the Bungalow having been erected in connection with the Pachamalai Sanatorium

I am also directed to forward herewith a plan of the Mami Canal the whole of the authorised expenditure on which is provided for in the Estimate for the Division

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient
humble Servant
C. Brandreth
Secretary to Government

Pro 29th June 1871 No 501-502
" 1st Aug — 3-4.

P.W. 1871 Dept
No. Proc. of Govt dated 1st September
No. 3802.

From
The Under Secy to Govt

To
The Secy to Govt
P.W.D.

Dated 10th
Received 11th } Aug. 71.

Enclosure 1

Requests information as to whether or not the whole expenditure in excess of 3000 Rs on the Pachamalai Bungalow is to be a debit against the works of the Division

No 2227 - 1st Sept 71

No 3

C. Wats 11 Aug 71 - Note 282

section of the Canal
in question, and while
therefore the building
will, under the order
previously issued, be
borne on the list of
buildings at its
estimated value of
Rs. 3,000 and be
in future main-
tained at the
cost of Revenue,
the whole of the
expenditure incurred
in its construction
will remain charged

to the portion of the
Main Canal in
connection with
which it was
built, unless any
portion of the outlay
should be wholly
disallowed under
orders on this subject
which will be is-
sued hereafter—

To
The Chief Engineer &
Agent Manager
M. I. & C. Co.

Dept. 2/9/71

Recd. 16th

H.P.B. No 3802

Govt of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

The Chief Engineer for
Irrigation

Dated

Rec.d

Fort

the 1st Sept. 1871, No 2227.

Nos. 3 & 4

Lockintula Bungalow &c.

Annexed that the whole of the Expenditure incurred on the construction of the Lockintula Bungalow should be charged to the Portion of the M. S. & L. Main Canal in connection with which it was built pending further orders on the subject.