

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

Government of Madras

Public Works

DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	299- (3)	Press	<i>Original</i>
B.P. No.		Mis.	
Dated	7-2-	1874	195

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
7th February 1874.*

No. 130. Read the following Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated 28th October 1873, No. 764 :—

ABSTRACT.—Note on letter from District Engineer, Trichinopoly, bringing to notice the delay in disposing of estimates which will result from paragraph 9, Clause II. of Chapter IV., Public Works Code, communicated with G. O., No. 1,535, 11th June 1873.

No. 131. ORDER THEREON, 7th February 1874, No. 299.

IRRIGATION, No. 14.
Account.

THE Governor in Council is convinced that the restriction of expenditure on local sanction, upon the up-keep of irrigation works, is necessary, and that the limit prescribed in Clause II., para-

graph 9 of Chapter IV. of the Code is perfectly reasonable.

2. The Government have authorized District Engineers, with the concurrence of the Collectors, to sanction estimates, to the full yearly amount derived from works as revenue, within a period of five years, or in other words to dispose of 20 per cent. of the revenue annually on the up-keep of such irrigation works as it may be considered necessary or advisable to maintain by the outlay of so large a proportion of the income derived from them.

3. The reason for the rule is apparent. The provision for the repair of irrigation works generally is about 8 per cent. on the revenue, and is not likely to exceed 10 per cent. If an undue proportion of this allotment be spent on a few works or, as Major Vertue indicates to be required in Trichinopoly, on a great number of works, other works must go without even the moderate and reasonable amount required for their maintenance.

4. If an irrigation work cannot be maintained for 20 per cent. of its revenue, its circumstances require to be carefully inquired into, and the rule is intended to ensure this being done. It may be that the work itself is defective; some of the tanks referred to in paragraph 6 of Major Vertue's letter as "always being breached" are manifestly in want of radical improvement rather than of ordinary repair. Or the villagers cultivating under a tank or channel may not take proper care of it, letting their cattle tread down the bund or banks, leaving paths and crossings unrepaired, etc.; and, if so, it is clear that it would be improper to spend more money on this account. Again, the demand for large or repeated expenditure may possibly, or even probably, be the result of injudiciously framed estimates, or of inadequate, and perhaps wasteful, expenditure in the past.

5. Whatever therefore the reasons why an irrigation work may require, or be supposed to require, an outlay disproportionate to its revenue, these must be ascertained and stated, and it will then be seen how far such causes are temporary and accidental, or permanent.

6. Estimates submitted to Government for sanction under the rule referred to must include the entire outlay, on all descriptions of work, necessary to make the tanks or other irrigation works fully efficient, and thereafter capable of being maintained by a reasonable annual expenditure.

7. Major Vertue is altogether wrong in supposing that the Collector has no power to enforce attention to the duties of villagers in respect of the care and pre-

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
7th February 1874.*

ervation of irrigation works. Revenue Officers have very considerable direct and indirect power in connection with the grant of remissions and the punishment of village officers, and as Magistrates these officers can punish for mischief those who may wilfully or by culpable negligence endanger or damage irrigation works. It is the duty of a District Engineer to bring to the notice of the Collector of the district any neglect by the villagers of the irrigation works belonging to the village, or of damage to such works within the village limits, whether belonging to the village or not.

(True Extract.)

Lieut.-Colonel, R.E.,
Joint Secretary to Government.

To District Engineers.

To the Executive Engineer, Wynaut.

„ Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

„ Revenue Department.

„ Judicial do.

Exd. S. T. Austin.

Spare Copies

11^o 352 -
15 Oct 73

No. 784.
Note by the Chief Engineer, for Irrigation
In this letter the District Engineer, Pishchi,
unapologetically brings to notice the delay in disposing of
estimates, which will result from para 9 Clause 10
of Chapter IV of the Public Works Code, Commu.
unicated with Government Order of the 11th June
1873. No. 1535, and he has given his reasons for
recommending the removal of the restriction
of expenditure on the repairs of Irrigation work
on local sanction, to the amount of the average
Revenue once in 5 years.

2. If evidence were wanting of the necessity
of the rule, the District Engineer's letter would
appear to furnish it. The Government have
authorized District Engineers, with the con-
currence of the Collectors, to sanction estimates
to the full amount derived from works as
revenue within a period of 5 years, or in other
words to dispose of 20 per cent of the revenue
annually on the upkeep of such irrigation
works as it may be considered necessary
and advisable to maintain by the outlay
of so large a proportion of the income de-
rived from them.

3. The reason for the rule is sufficiently
apparent. The provision for the repair of
irrigation

irrigation works generally is about 8 per cent on the revenue, and is not likely to exceed 10 per cent. If an undue proportion of this allotment be spent on a few works or, as Major Vertue indicates to be required in Trichinopoly, on a great number of works, other works must go without even the moderate and reasonable amount required for their maintenance.

4. If an irrigation work cannot be maintained for 20 per cent of its revenue, its circumstances require to be carefully enquired into and the rule is intended to ensure this being done. It may be that the work itself is defective: some of the tanks referred to in para 6 of Major Vertue's letter as "always being breached" are manifestly in want of radical improvement rather than of ordinary repair. Or the villagers cultivating under the tank may not take proper care of it letting their cattle tread down the bund; leaving paths and crossings unrepaired, &c. and, if so, it is clear that it would be improper to spend more money on this account. Major Vertue is altogether wrong in supposing that the collector has no power to enforce attention to the duties of villagers in such respects.

Revenue

Revenue officers have very considerable direct and indirect power in connection with the grant of remissions, the punishment of Village officers &c., and as Magistrates these officers can punish for mischief those who may wilfully or by culpable negligence endanger or damage irrigation works. Again, possibly the demand for a large expenditure now, may possibly, or even probably be the result of injudiciously framed estimates or inadequate and perhaps wasteful expenditure in the past.

5. Whatever the reason why an irrigation work may require, or be supposed to require, an outlay disproportionate to its revenue, this must be ascertained and stated, and it will then be seen how far such causes are temporary and accidental, or permanent. From para 6 of his letter it is apparent that there are hundreds of tanks in the Trichinopoly District which, instead of being repaired at a heavy cost, ought to be otherwise dealt with, and instead of so treating them it would seem that, but for the restriction, which the rule so much objected to imposes, he would not object to sanction estimates amounting to even five times the annual revenue.

6. Whenever there may be good grounds for recommending an outlay on the repairs of irrigation

P.H.S.

irrigation works out of proportion to their revenue, the Government will doubtless give full consideration to the views of the local officers, and if the estimates be submitted in a complete shape the delay will not be material. It may be as well however that District Engineers should understand that it will be a waste of time to forward such estimates without full and complete Revenue and technical information, and that all such estimates must show the entire outlay on all descriptions of work, such as earthworks, revetments, sluices, escapes &c necessary to make the tanks or other irrigation works fully efficient, and thereafter capable of being maintained by a reasonable annual expenditure.

7 - The correspondence as per margin, antecedent to the letter from the District Engineer now submitted, is forwarded for the information of Government. If Major Vertrie supposed that an estimate so forwarded could be passed, it is not surprising that he should have suggested the abrogation of the rule in question.

Officer in Charge Engineer
in Irrigation
Dowlaiswaram 25 Oct. 1873 Chief Engineer in Irrigation

To the Secretary to Govt. M.D.

From Dist. Eng^r
No 297 of the 25th
August 1873.
To do No 588 of
5th September 1873.

irrigation works out of proportion to their revenue

P.W. 1873 Report
Pm of Govt for 1873
No. 8048.

The Chief Engrs
for Irrigation
to the Secretary
to Govt P.W.D.

No. 764

Dated 28 Oct
Recd of Nov 73
Encl 4

Note on letter
from Dist Engrs. Indus-
try bringing to
notice the delay in
disposing of estimates
which will result
from para 9 clause
II of Chapter IV P.W.
code. Communicated
with GO No 15-35-11
Jf. 299-7 Feb 74

No 138
10/5/73
12/5/74
No. 17302-242
Recd to City 7 Nov 73

P.W.D.
Pro. of the Madras Government.
Read the following:-

From the Chief Engr for Irrigation } H.E. No. 764 of 28 Oct 73

I think the undersigned reasonable
proposed estimates are readily
passed for repairs of 5 years
Rev. I feel sure however that
small tanks will be neglected be-
cause of the restriction and trouble
of providing the technical & Prin.
details. As like to see the
MO

I think the rule
is necessary. It appears

not to be the best
possible & I trust will
not L.D.S.

The Governor in Council is
convinced that the restriction of
expenditure on local sanction
upon the upkeep of irrigation
works is necessary, and that
the limit prescribed in Clause
II, para 9, of Chapter IV of the Code
is perfectly reasonable. The atten-
tion of the District Engineer of
Trichinopoly, and of all other
District Engineers will be called
to the remarks of the Chief Engi-
neer for Irrigation, and these
Proceedings will also be commu-
nicated to the Revenue Depart-
ment, in order that collectors
may be informed what is in-
tended by the restriction of ex-
penditure under the rule referred
to

to, and that measures may be taken to furnish full Revenue information regarding irrigation works, which it may be proposed to repair by an outlay in excess of the limit imposed by that rule.

2. District Engineers will bring to the notice of the Collectors of their Districts all instances of neglect by the villagers of the irrigation works belonging to the village, or of damage to such works within the village limits whether belonging to the village or not, and they will use their discretion in declining to sanction expenditure the necessity for which is clearly traceable to such neglect or damage.

Should embody the Chief Engr's note in the order. The last form for instance will only make a by order in the order.

10/1

30/10/73

[Signature]

D. Engr. [Signature]
Attested D. Engr.
Ch. Engr. for Dist.
Rev. Dept.

Maintenance of
Jangabur Station

Joint Secretary

22-11/73

30/11/73

22-11/73

11/11/73

N^o 299 P.M. Departt

Proceedings of the Madras East
Read the following:-

From

The Chief Engineer for
Irrigation

Keep orders n.b.c.
for work

(H-E-20764 & 28"
Oct 17/73)

Let this be taken into
11/11/73

L.S.

W.L.
27/12.

The Governor in Council is con-
vinced that the restriction of ex-
penditure on local sanction, upon
the upkeep of Irrigation works,
is necessary, and that the limit
prescribed in Clause II, para 9,
of Chapter IV of the Code is per-
fectly reasonable.

2 The Government have autho-
rized District Engineers, with the
concurrence of the Collectors, to
sanction estimates, to the full
yearly amount derived from
works

works, as revenue, within a period of 5 years, or in other words to dispose of 20 per cent of the revenue annually on the upkeep of such irrigation works as it may be considered necessary or advisable to maintain by the outlay of so large a proportion of the income derived from them.

3. The reason for the rule is apparent. The provision for the repair of irrigation works generally is about 8 per cent on the Revenue, and is not likely to exceed 10 per cent. If an undue proportion of this allotment be spent on a few works or, as Major Vertue indicates to be required in India, monopoly, on a great number of works, other works must go without even the moderate and reasonable amount required for their maintenance.

4. If an irrigation work cannot be maintained for 20

per

per cent of its revenue, its circumstances require to be carefully enquired into, and the rule is intended to ensure this being done. It may be that the work itself is defective: some of the tanks referred to in para 6 of Major Vertue's letter as "always being breached" are manifestly in want of radical improvement rather than of ordinary repair. Or the villagers cultivating under a tank or channel may not take proper care of it, letting their cattle tread down the bund or banks, leaving paths and crossings unrepaired &c., and, if so, it is clear that it would be improper to spend more money on this account. Again the demand for large or repeated expenditure may possibly, or even probably, be the result of injudiciously framed estimates

or

or of inadequate, and perhaps
wasteful, expenditure in the past.

5. Whatever therefore the rea-
sons why an irrigation work may
require, or be supposed to require,
an outlay disproportionate to its
Revenue, these must be ascertained
and stated, and it will then be
seen how far such causes are tem-
porary and accidental, or per-
manent.

6. Estimates submitted to
Government for sanction under
the rule referred to must include
the entire outlay on all descrip-
tions of work, necessary to make
the tanks or other irrigation works
fully efficient, and thereafter
capable of being maintained by
a reasonable annual expendi-
ture.

7. Major Vertue is altogether
wrong in supposing that the
Collector has no power to enforce
attention to the duties of

villagers

villagers in respect of the care and
preservation of irrigation works.

Revenue officers have very consi-
derable direct and indirect
power in connection with the
grant of remissions and the
punishment of village officers,
and as Magistrates these officers
can punish for mischief those
who may wilfully or by culpa-
ble negligence endanger or
damage irrigation works. It
is the duty of a District Engi-
neer to bring to the notice
of the Collector of the District
any neglect by the villagers
of the irrigation works belong-
ing to the village, or of damage
to such works within the
village limits, whether be-
longing to the village or
not, and he will use his dis-
cretion in declining to sanc-
tion expenditure the necessity
for

Should suit

or, for which is clearly traceable
wa to such neglect or damage.

5.

for

reg

an

Re

an

see

for

m

b.

g.

to

to

to

to

to

ca

a

to

y

u

to

a

mm.

by 5/12/73

To The O-lyp
Ch: Sup for Lu: with four buels
Reve Dept
Just Dept

Desp was - c 9/2/74

181

Humble J. D. Smith (L.S.)

Paper

125/1/74

Ac 20 Dec 73

Ac 20

616 Dec 73

C/6048 ★

Govt. of 1873 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

1. District Engineer

Dated

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. 7th Feb 1873. No. 299

No. 301/13

Estimates. Paper orders on
note by Mr. Whier for Disb.
on letter from the D. S. S. S.,
Trichinopoly, bringing to
notice the delay in dis-
posing of estimates which
with result from para: 9,
Clause II of Chapter IV of
the P. W. Code communi-
cated with L. G. No. 1535 of
11th June/73.