

(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.	1111	(S)	Press
B.P. No.			Mis.
Dated	5. 5.		1876.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th May 1876.*

No. 58. Read the following endorsement of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Fort St. George, 6th April 1876, No. 45 W. :—

From Captain L. CONWAY-GORDON, R.E., Examiner of Public Works Accounts, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. MULLINS, R.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Fort St. George, 31st March 1876, No. 43 I.

On discovering from recent Orders of Government that this office is expected to carry out a detailed audit of the expenditure on large irrigation schemes, I at once placed myself in communication with certain District Engineers for the purpose of ascertaining what detailed estimates had been sanctioned against the lump sum sanctioned by the Government of India as communicated to this office, and I have now received from the District Engineer, Godavery, a statement, of which a copy is forwarded herewith, showing that estimates aggregating Rupees 13,482 and 52,533 have been sanctioned by the District Engineer, Godavery, and by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation against lump sanctions accorded by the Government of India under 'Extraordinary' for certain sections of the Godavery Delta system.

2. My object in now addressing you is to ask if there is any special authority under which these estimates have been sanctioned by these two officers. As far as this office is aware, the only rules bearing upon this question are contained in Government of India Circular, No. 56 of 1871, printed with Government Order, dated 4th November 1871, No. 2,792. These rules give no powers whatever, as far as original works are concerned, to Chief or Superintending Engineers; nor do they give even to the Local Government power to sanction under Extraordinary detailed estimates against lump sum sanctions for sections of a scheme, as distinguished from lump sum sanctions for individual works.

3. It appears to me therefore that in sanctioning these estimates the District Engineer, Godavery, and the Chief Engineer for Irrigation have been exercising powers which have not even been entrusted to the Local Government; and further, on reference to the abstract statement forwarded herewith, it will be seen that these two officers have in several cases exceeded even the limits of the lump sum sanctions, whilst the detailed statement shows that they have sanctioned works of a different description from those provided for in the lump sum sanctions by the Government of India.

*Statement showing the Estimates passed against the lump sums sanctioned under the head "Capital"
"Extraordinary" for distributaries on the several Canals in the Eastern Delta, Godavery.*

Names of Canals.	Particulars of Estimates.	AMOUNT SANCTIONED.		Total.	Lump sum sanctioned by Government of India.	Remarks.
		By District Engineer.	By Chief Engineer for Irrigation.			
Coomada Canal.	Head Sluice and Dividing Dams.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
	Constructing a culvert on Woondur road south of Madapad lock.	...	1,690	...	...	Chief Engineer's memorandum No. 51 of 3rd Feb 1873.
	Do. head sluice to side channel from Thosipudi lock on north side.	...	995	...	...	Do. No. 139 of 3rd Mar, 1873.
	Do. do. south do. ...	...	942	...	...	Do. do.
	Do. an aqueduct over side channel from Thosipudi lock on north side.	...	805	...	...	Do. do.
	Do. do. on south do. ...	...	748	...	...	Do. do.
	Do. a tunnel under Sumparabodi channel.	270	...	...	...	District Engineer's No. 1,174 of 11th March 1873.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th May 1876.

Statement showing the Estimates passed against the lump sums sanctioned, &c.—(Continued.)

Names of Canals.	Particulars of Estimates.	AMOUNT SANCTIONED.		Total.	Lump sum sanctioned by Government of India.	Remarks.
		By District Engineer.	By Chief Engineer for Irrigation.			
Cocanada Canal.—(Continued.)	<i>Head Sluice and Dividing Dams.</i> (Concl'd.)	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
	Constructing a head sluice to Palthodi-bodi channel.	500	—	—	—	District Engineer's No. 369 of 3rd May 1873.
	Do. an aqueduct over do.	450	—	—	—	Chief Engineer's No. 812 of 19th November 1873.
	Do. do. over Madapad south high level channel.	—	500	—	—	
	Do. a regulating dam for Vaindra channel.	—	800	—	—	
	Do. do. to Yendamur do.	—	500	—	—	
	Do. do. to Sampara and Karapabodi channels.	—	1,400	—	—	Do. No. 450 C of 26th June 1874.
	Do. a head sluice west of Chintapilli lock.	—	1,000	—	—	
	Do. a regulating dam across Kytavola channel.	600	—	—	—	District Engineer's No. 2,958 of 15th December 1874.
	Do. a sluice at the head of the north side channel from 7th to 9th mile.	700	—	—	—	Do. No. 2,972 of 15th December 1874.
	Do. head sluice to Mount Clair Irrigation channel.	233	—	—	—	Do. No. 3,832 of 24th March 1874.
	Do. sluice No. 1 a little below 5th mile stone on the right bank of Cocanada canal.	540	—	—	—	Do. No. 733 of 7th June 1875.
	Total ...	3,373	10,124	13,497	21,690	
	<i>Minor Channels.</i>					
	Thorsipudi north side channel	—	2,410	—	—	Chief Engineer's No. 159 of 3rd March 1873.
	Do. south do.	—	2,370	—	—	Do. do.
	Widening Karapabodi channel	—	250	—	—	Do. No. 450 C of 26th June 1874.
	Extension of do. do.	1,150	—	—	—	District Engineer's No. 1,303 of 21st March 1873.
	Completing the Madapad south high level channel.	—	2,370	—	—	Chief Engineer's No. 812 of 19th November 1873.
	Excavating a side channel from Mount Clair channel sluice on the south bank of Cocanada canal.	—	210	—	—	Do. No. 211 of 19th February 1876.
	Do. north side channel above Madapad lock.	—	750	—	—	
	Total ...	1,150	8,780	9,930	8,000	
Coringa Canal.—(Continued.)	<i>Head Sluices and Dividing Dams.</i>					
	Constructing a head sluice to Kongada channel.	400	—	—	—	District Engineer's No. 365 of 3rd May 1873.
	Do. a sluice to Vella north high level channel.	—	1,170	—	—	Chief Engineer's memorandum No. 265, of 2nd April 1874.
	Supplemental for do.	—	138	—	—	Do. No. 671 of 24th June 1875.
	Do. a regulator No. 1 on Yaramatala Irrigation channel.	—	680	—	—	Do. No. 231 of 29th April 1874.
	Do. do. No. 2 do.	—	—	—	—	
	Do. do. No. 1 on Yendamur channel.	—	125	—	—	
	Do. do. No. 2 do.	—	—	—	—	
	Do. a head sluice to Yendamur channel.	550	—	—	—	District Engineer's No. 5,545 of 24th March 1874.
	Do. do. to Karur No. 3 do.	—	—	—	—	Do. No. 3,312 of 29th January 1875.
	Do. do. to Rapudi do.	—	1,510	—	—	Chief Engineer's No. 161 of 6th February 1875.
	Do. a taskwork through to every Irrigation channel over the taskwork near Munjur lock.	600	—	—	—	Chief Engineer's No. 5,519 of 24th March 1874.
	Do. do. on Worabode Bodi channel over Chodavaram dike.	600	—	—	—	Do. No. 2,410 of 24th March 1874.
	Do. a head sluice to Vellah north side high level channel.	210	—	—	—	Do. No. 5,541 of do. do.
	Supplemental for do.	—	—	—	—	Chief Engineer's No. 671 of 24th June 1875.
	Do. do. above Allamur lock on the right bank of Coringa canal.	—	800	—	—	Do. No. 211 of 19th February 1876.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th May 1876.

Statement showing the Estimates passed against the lump sums sanctioned, &c.—(Continued.)

Names of Canals.	Particulars of Estimates.	AMOUNT SANCTIONED.		Total.	Lump sum sanctioned by Government of India.	Remarks.
		By District Engineer.	By Chief Engineer for Irrigation.			
Coringa Canal.	<i>Minor Channels.</i>	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
	Deepening and widening Seela drainage channel.	410	—	—	—	District Engineer's No. 3,613 of 6th March 1874.
	Itapudi Irrigation channel	—	1,020	—	—	Chief Engineer's No. 1,198 of 8th October 1875.
	Cazulur do.	—	990	—	—	Do. No. 93 of 24th January 1876.
Mundapetta Canal.	Channel from Yerupilli sluice to Vellah south side sluice.	—	1,350	—	—	
	Total ...	440	3,360	3,800	8,000	
	<i>Head Sluices and Dividing Dams.</i>					
	Constructing a tunnel under Nadurubada Irrigation channel.	300	—	—	—	District Engineer's No. 368 of 8th May 1873.
	Constructing regulating dam to Munda-petta Irrigation channel.	820	—	—	—	Do. No. 392 of 7th May 1875.
	Do. from channel to Matsaveram village.	—	87	—	—	Chief Engineer's No. 397 A of 8th June 1874.
	Misery of the estimated cost of Rupees 900 for a head sluice to Chodavaram channel.	—	450	—	—	Do. No. 1,079 of 21st December 1874.
	Constructing tunnel No. 3 below Yeditha sluice on the right bank of Munda-petta canal.	600	—	—	—	District Engineer's No. 783 of 7th June 1875.
	Constructing tunnel No. 4 near the 11th mile sluice on the left bank of Munda-petta canal.	620	—	—	—	
	Constructing sluice for channel No. 1 on the left bank of Mundapetta canal.	580	—	—	—	District Engineer's No. 783 of 7th June 1875.
	Total ...	2,420	537	2,957	9,000	
	<i>Minor Channels.</i>					
	Channel from Chodavaram channel	157	—	—	—	District Engineer's No. 608 of 23rd May 1874.
	Do. for Matsaveram village	—	2,080	—	—	Chief Engineer's No. 897A of 8th June 1874.
	Channel No. 1 on left bank of Munda-petta Canal.	—	2,600	—	—	Do. No. 125 of 31st January 1876.
	Drainage channel to drain Somesweram lands.	350	—	—	—	District Engineer's No. 3,325 of 10th February 1874.
	Total ...	507	4,680	5,187	2,000	
Bank Canal.	<i>Masonry Works.</i>					
	No estimates are sanctioned against this sum.	—	—	—	5,600	
	<i>Earthwork.</i>					
	No estimates are sanctioned against this sum.	—	—	—	7,500	
Injeram Canal.	<i>Head Sluices and Dividing Dams.</i>					
	Head sluice on the right bank of Injeram canal at 22nd mile.	620	—	—	—	District Engineer's No. 125 of 12th April 1875.
	Do. on the left bank at do.	660	—	—	—	Do. No. 3,679 of 27th February 1875.
	Sluice at the head of Irrigation channel on the right bank of do.	730	—	—	—	Do. No. 125 of 12th April 1875.
Injeram Canal.	Total ...	2,010	—	2,010	9,000	
	<i>Minor Channels.</i>					
	Channel from sluice on the right bank of Injeram canal from 22nd to 24th mile.	—	900	—	—	Chief Engineer's No. 788 of 17th July 1875.
	Do. from 24th to 27th mile	—	1,920	—	—	
	Total ...	—	2,820	2,820	2,000	

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th May 1876.

Statement showing the Estimates passed against the lump sums sanctioned, &c.—(Concluded.)

Names of Canals.	Particulars of Estimates.	Amount sanctioned.		Total.	Lump sum sanctioned by Government of India.	Remarks.
		By District Engineer.	By Chief Engineer for Irrigation.			
Santalotta Canal.	Masonry Works.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Chief Engineer's No. 1,874 of 21st December 1874.
	Regulating weir for Pandulapaka channel.	...	610	...	...	
	Sluice No. 1 at 7 1/2 mls.	...	650	...	...	
	Do. " 2 at 9 " "	...	650	...	...	
	Do. " 3 at 12 1/2 " "	...	1,040	...	...	
	Do. " 4 at 14 " "	...	1,050	...	...	
	Do. " 5 at 22 1/2 " "	...	1,200	...	...	
	Do. " 6 at 26 1/2 " "	...	1,160	...	...	
		...	6,400	8,400	8,600	Chief Engineer's memorandum No. 1,284 of 6th November 1875.
	Earthwork.					
	Channel from sluice at 12 1/2 mls.	...	3,800	...	...	
	Do. from do. at 19 " "	...	2,050	...	...	
	Do. from do. at 22 1/2 " "	...	2,700	...	...	
		...	8,610	8,610	15,200	

(Signed) J. BEATTY, Major, R.E.,
District Engineer, Godavery.

EASTERN DELTA, GODAVERY, CAPITAL.

DISTRIBUTARIES.

Statement showing the lump sums sanctioned by Government and the Estimates passed by District and Chief Engineers.

Particulars of Estimates sanctioned.		Amount of lump sums sanctioned.	Amount of Estimates passed.	Balance.	Excess.
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Coomada Canal	{ G.O. No. 2,322 of 24th Sept. 1870, 21 I of 1871-72, G.O. No. 1,523 of 6th June 1871.				
C. Head sluices and dividing dams	...	21,000	17,675	7,305	1,850
L. Minor channels	...	8,000	2,900	...	...
Coringa Canal	{ G.O. No. 2,322 of 24th Sept. 1870, 21 I of 1871-72, G.O. No. 1,523 of 6th June 1871.				
C. Head sluices and dividing dams	...	19,000	10,796	7,214	...
L. Minor channels	...	8,000	3,800	4,200	...
Mandapeta Canal	{ G.O. No. 2,322 of 24th Sept. 1870, 21 I of 1871-72, G.O. No. 1,523 of 6th June 1871.				
C. Head sluices and dividing dams	...	9,000	2,927	6,043	3,157
L. Minor channels	...	2,000	5,187	...	...
Bark Canal	{ G.O. No. 661 of 19th March 1874, 5 I of 1874-75, G.O. No. 1,217 of 7th May 1874.				
C. Masonry works	...	5,000	...	5,000	...
L. Earthwork	...	7,500	...	7,500	...
Injaram Canal	{ G.O. No. 2,322 of 24th Sept. 1870, 21 I of 1871-72, G.O. No. 1,523 of 6th June 1871.				
C. Head sluices and dividing dams	...	2,100	2,010	6,000	...
L. Minor channels	...	2,000	2,820	...	...
Santalotta Canal	{ G.O. No. 1,870 of 14th June 1874, 21 I of 1871-72, G.O. No. 1,523 of 6th June 1871.				
C. Masonry works	...	8,500	6,400	3,100	...
L. Earthwork	...	15,200	8,610	6,590	...
		1,14,800	68,015		

Fort St. George,
5th May 1876.

(Signed) L. CONWAY-GORDON, Captain, R.E.,
Examiner of Public Works Accounts.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th May 1876.

SUBMITTED for the consideration and orders of Government.

The works for which lump sum provision was made in the Godavery Delta completion estimates are distribution works, and this provision was made by canals probably with reference to the additional acreage to be irrigated, and was divided arbitrarily between masonry works and earthworks.

2. At first, the District Engineer appears to have sanctioned all detailed estimates against these lump sum provisions; but in the memorandum as per margin, the No. 218, dated 8th October 1872.

the Acting Chief Engineer for Irrigation instructed the District Engineer to submit for approval all designs and estimates for distribution works estimated to cost more than Rupees 750, that being the general limit for local sanction for Minor New Works. The practice since then has been in accordance with these instructions.

3. Further, the sub-division of the lump sum provision for distribution works having been made in the first instance arbitrarily, the total for each canal has been considered available for works of either kind, and on due cause shown, estimates have been approved for earthworks or masonry works in excess of the provision under the particular sub-head, provided the lump sum sanctioned for distribution was not exceeded.

4. The order to which the Examiner of Accounts has called attention shows G.O., 4th November 1871, No. 2,792, and that the practice has been irregular, and Government of India Circular No. 56. that all such estimates ought to have been submitted to Government for sanction.

The undersigned does not however concur with the Examiner in the opinion that this Government had not authority to dispose of such estimates under the Circular, No. 56, of the Government of India. Rule III. of that circular does not provide directly for the particular circumstances, and had in that circular provision for distribution been made for, say, the Godavery Eastern Delta generally instead of for each canal separately, the sanction of the Government of India to detailed estimates or estimates for particular distributaries might have been deemed necessary. As it is, the requirements of the last paragraph of the Rule and of Rule I. appear to have been sufficiently met, the provision having been originally so far sub-divided as to keep the sanctions within definite and safe limits.

5. It is, however, probably questionable whether this Government could sanction excess under either of the sub-heads (Masonry—Earthwork) unless an actual saving on the other sub-head were reported. It appears nevertheless to be desirable that this power should be allowed, and that it should be limited within the total provision made for any canal under the two sub-heads or under the sub-heads generally if there be more than two, by the proper average charge of the cost of distribution per acre, e.g., if the distribution under a canal be estimated by lump sum provision to cost Rupees 20,000, the acreage being 5,000, and if this provision be shown as—

9,500 for Masonry works,
10,500 for Earthworks,

it is thought that provided the average of 4 Rupees an acre be not exceeded, estimates for particular distributaries should be sanctioned irrespective of the proportion for the two sub-heads. On the other hand if the average be exceeded in the case of the estimates for particular distributaries then a definite saving elsewhere should be demonstrated before sanction should be accorded. It might, for instance, be shown that estimates for other distributaries had been passed as follows:—

	Rs.
No. 1 for 950 acres	2,850
" 2 for 1,250 "	4,750
" 3 for 320 "	1,100
2,520.	8,700

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT. 2.4

UNDER date the

READ the following:—

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th May 1876.

And then if the next estimate were for 760 acres, its amount should not exceed $(2,520 + 760) \times 4 = 8,700 = 13,120 - 8,700 = 4,420$, unless it were shown that there had been actual savings to cover excess. In practice some such elasticity is necessary to prevent injurious delay and the waste of the time of the officers engaged in carrying out the details of works.

(Signed) JOHN MULLINS, Lt.-Col., R.E.,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

No. 59.

ORDER THEREON, 5th May 1876, No. 1,111.

IRRIGATION, No. 7.

Account.

From the foregoing papers it appears that the practice hitherto in dealing with detailed estimates for works to be carried out in the Godavery Delta against lump sum provision, in the estimates of particular canals, for distribution works, has not been in accordance with the requirements of Circular 56 of the Government of India, which was communicated to the department in Proceedings, Madras Government, No. 2,792, of the 4th November 1871. The attention of District Engineers will therefore be called to that order, and all estimates for works provided for by lump sums will be submitted, for the future, for the sanction of Government.

2. The second part of paragraph 4 of the endorsement of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation will be referred to the Examiner of Accounts for report.

3. The District Engineer, Godavery, will now be required to show in the subjoined form how the sanctions for distributaries at present stand with reference to the new acreage irrigated or to be irrigated by them, and he will be particular to give similar information in the case of all future estimates for distributaries:—

Canals.	Provision for Dis- tributaries.		Total.	Additional Acreage to be irrigated.	Rate per Acre.	ESTIMATES ALREADY SANCTIONED.		
	Masonry.	Earthwork.				Amount.	Acreage.	Rate per Acre.

N.B.—The number of columns under "Provision for Distributaries" will depend upon the numbers of sub-heads in the lump sum sanction.

(True Extract.)

Colonel,

Offg. Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the District Engineer, Godavery.
To all other District Engineers.
To the Examiner of Public Works Accounts.
" Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Exd. E. C. Shunker.

Spare Copies

P. J. Linn 22

From

The Chief Eng. for } (H.E. No. 145th April/76.)
Irrigation

Brl

1/11

From the foregoing papers it appears that the practice hitherto in dealing with detailed estimates for works to be carried out in the Godavery Delta against lump sum provision in the estimates of particular canals, for distribution works, has not been in accordance with the requirements of Circular No. 56 of the Government of India which was communicated to the Department in P.M. of No. 2792 of the 4th November 1871. The attention of District Engineers will therefore be called to that order, and all estimates for

13. The number of columns under "Provision for distribution" will depend upon the number of sub heads in the lump sum sanction.

My. 25/4

3360

No 208 dated 8th
October 1872

To The Dist Engr Godavery
All other District Engineers
Examiners of P.W. accounts
Chief Engr for Irrigation

No 45 W.

11/1
25

Encls. 3. Submitted for the consideration and orders of Government.

The works for which lump sum provision was made in the Godavery delta completion estimates are distribution works, and this provision was made by Canals probably with reference to the additional acreage to be irrigated and was divided arbitrarily between masonry works and earthworks.

2. At first the District Engineer appears to have sanctioned all detailed estimates against these lump sum provisions, but in the Memorandum as per margin, the Acting Chief Engineer for Irrigation instructed the District Engineer to submit for approval all designs and estimates for distribution works estimated to cost more than Rupees 750, that being the general limit for local sanction for Minor New works. The practice since then has been in accordance with these instructions.

3. Further the subdivisions of the lump sum provision for distribution works having been made in the first instance arbitrarily, the total for each canal

canal has been considered available for works of either kind, and on due cause shown, estimates have been approved for earthworks or masonry works in excess of the provision under the particular sub-head, provided the lump sum sanction for distribution was not exceeded.

The order to which the Examiner of Accounts has called attention shows that the practice has been irregular, and that all such estimates ought to have been submitted to Government for sanction. The undersigned does not however concur with the Examiner in the opinion that his Government had not authority to dispose of such estimates under the Circular No 56 of the Government of India. Rule III. in that Circular does not provide directly for the particular circumstances, and had lump sum provision for distribution been made for, say, the Godavery Eastern Delta generally instead of for each Canal separately the sanction of the Government of India to detailed estimates or estimates for particular distributaries might have been deemed necessary. No it is, the requirements of the last paragraph

12
paragraph of the Rule and of Rule I appears to have been sufficiently met, the provision having been originally so far subdivided as to keep the sanctions within definite and safe limits.

5 It is however probably questionable whether this Government could sanction excess under either of the sub-heads (Masonry - Earthwork) unless an actual saving on the other sub-head were reported. It appears nevertheless to be desirable that this power should be allowed, and that it should be limited within the total provision made for any Canal under the two sub-heads or under the sub-heads generally if there be more than two, by the proper average charge of the cost of distribution per acre, e.g. if the distribution under a Canal be estimated by lump sum provision to cost Rupees 20,000 the acreage being 5000 and if this provision be shown as

9,500 for Masonry works.
10,500 for Earthworks.

it is thought that provided the average of 4 Rupees an acre be not exceeded, estimates for particular distributaries should be sanctioned irrespective of the proportion for the two sub-heads.

on

On the other hand if the average be exceeded in the case of the estimates for particular distributaries then a definite saving elsewhere should be demonstrated before sanction should be accorded. It might, for instance, be shown that estimates for other distributaries had been passed as follows

1	for 950 Acres	Rs 2850
2	1250	4750
3	320	1100
	<u>2520</u>	<u>8700</u>

and then if the next estimate were for 760 Acres, its amount should not exceed $(2520 + 760) \times 4 - 8700 = 13,120 - 8700 = 4420$, unless it were shown ^{that} there had been actual savings to cover excess. In practice some such elasticity is necessary to prevent injurious delay and the waste of the time of the Officers engaged in carrying out the details of works.

W. H. Mullins
Chief Engineer for Irrigation

Fort St. George
6 April 1876

To The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department

No 1111

Public Works Department
14

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 5 May 76.

Read the following:—

From
The Chief Engineer for
Irrigation

H. E. N. 15 W dated 6 April 1876.

From the foregoing papers it appears that the practice hitherto in dealing with detailed estimates for works to be carried out in the Madras Delta against lump sum provision, in the Estimates of particular canals for distribution works, has not been in accordance with the requirements of Circular 56 of the Government of India, which was communicated to the Department in P.M. L. No. 2792 of the 1st November 1871. The attention of District Engineers

for distributaries.

Engineers will therefore be called to that Order, and all estimates for works provided for by lump sums will be submitted for the future, for the sanction of Government.

2. The second part of para 4 of the endorsement of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation will be referred to the Examiner of Accounts for report.

3. The District Engineer, Godavery, will now be required to show in the subjoined form how the sanctions for distributaries at present stand with reference to the new acreage irrigated or to be irrigated by them and he will be particular to give similar information in the case of all future estimates

Canals	Provision for distributaries		Total	Additional acreage to be irrigated	Rate per acre	Estimates already sanctioned		
	Masonry	Earth work				Amount	Rate	Rate per acre

N.B. the number of columns under "Provision for distributaries" will depend upon the numbers of subheads in the lump sum sanction.

To the Dist. Engr. Godavery.
The Dist. Engrs.
All other District Engineers
Examiners of P.W. ac etc.
Ch. Engr. for design with 3 Encl.

33401 (K)

Gobt. of Madras
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

The W. & Godavery

Date

By

For

6.5 May 1878

Nos. 58/9

Irrigation Estimates

Passing orders on the
dorsement of the Chief Engr. for
Engr. submitting for orders
letter from the Dy. P. & R. Co.
requesting to be informed if
there is any special authority
for Dy. Engr. & the Chief Engr.
to sign to sanction detailed
Estimates under Engr. from
imp. sums accorded by the
Govt. India under "Expenditure"

No. 58-59