Archives I—10,006—16-8 77.

(1) Number of pages 16

(2) Date of repair

(3) Initials of the Referencer Casi

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P. W DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. B.P. No.	1673 W	Press. Mis.
Dated	7. 7. 1881	~~197~~ .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

B. S. G.

1673/1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

7th July 1881, No. 1,673 W.

General.
Establishment.

Read the following paper :—

No. 5. Despatch from the Most Honorable the Secretary of State for India.

India Office, London,
2nd June 1881.

Public Works,
No. 14.

Sir,—I have recently had under my consideration in Council two Public Works letters from your Excellency's Government, Nos. 14 and 17, dated, respectively, 15th March and 19th April last.

2. By the first of these letters, copies of correspondence which has passed between your Government and the Government of India on the subject of strengthening the staff of the Madras Public Works Department is transmitted for my information, with a request that I should address the Government of India in the sense of the view urged by your Excellency's Government, viz., that your Public Works Department is insufficient for the general purpose of the province, and should, therefore, be increased in numbers. The second of the letters from your Government transmits the budget estimates of expenditure during 1881-82 in your Public Works Department under the three following heads :—

1. Provincial Services.
2. Irrigation Productive Works.
3. Irrigation, Navigation, and Agricultural Works.

3. An examination of the figures in these three budgets shows that a total outlay of Rs. 26,77,021 on works and repairs is estimated for during the year, while the cost of the establishment to be employed in carrying out these works is estimated at Rs. 22,60,501, giving therefore a percentage of establishment cost to actual outlay of 84·4 per cent.

4. This percentage is so startling and apparently so inconsistent with the representations made in your first-quoted letter, that the Public Works Department under your Government is inadequate to perform the work required of it, that I must request to be furnished with a full explanation and to be informed how it has come to pass that establishments under the heads included in these three budget estimates are maintained in such disproportion to the work accomplished.

5. I can hardly doubt that there are facts which, if stated, would in greater or less measure explain this. But when a disproportion so manifestly requiring explanation presents itself, I feel some surprise that the necessary explanation is not anticipated.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) HARTINGTON.

His Excellency the Honorable the Governor in Council,
Fort St. George.

No. 6. Order thereon, 7th July 1881, No. 1,673 W.

Ordered that the following reply be sent : —

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. H. SANKEY, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D

Exd. E. C. Shunker.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of {1881} Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated July, 7th

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G. O., 7th July 1881, No 1,673 W.

JULY.
Nos. 5-6.

High percentage of Establishment cost to actual outlay on Public Works.—The Secretary of State furnished with explanation in respect to the —.

W

With reference to this Despatch from the Secretary of State now "in circulation" it may be as well to explain at once that the India Office have strangely confused the figures under "Establishment". Instead of deducting the Contributions under Irrigation they have added them to the total cost as shown in the Provincial Establishment Budget, thus.

Total cost of Estabt. as shown in the Provincial Budget	Rs 16,13,266
Contributions under Irrigation and Navgn. & Agricultural Drainage	(a) 3,95,833
-Do- under Irrigation Productive	(b) 2,51,402
and thus arrived at a total of	Rs. 22,60,501

The Provincial Budget clearly shows that (a) & (b) are recoveries.

The Statement I made out on Friday shows that the Budget provision under "Works" is also far greater than that found by the India Office who have apparently omitted "Imperial" and "Local" Funds from their calculations. R.R. 2/6.

1673W

1623/3

India Office,
London, 2nd June 1881.

Public Works,
No. 14

To His Excellency The Honourable The Governor in Council, Fort St. George.

Sir,

Para. 1. I have recently had under my consideration in Council two Public Works Letters from your Excellency's Government, Nos. 14 and 17, dated respectively 15th March and 19th April last.

2. By the first of these letters, copies of correspondence which has passed between your Government and the Government of India on the subject of strengthening the staff of the Madras Public Works Department is transmitted for my information, with a request that I should address the Government of India in the sense of the view urged by your Excellency's Government, namely, that your Public Works Department is insufficient for the general purpose of the Province, and should, therefore, be increased in numbers. The second of the letters from your Government transmits the budget estimates of expenditure during 1881-82 in your Public Works Department under the three following heads:—

1. Provincial Services.
2. Irrigation Productive Works.
3. Irrigation, Navigation, and Agricultural Works.

3. An examination of the figures in these three budgets shows that a total outlay of Rs. 26,77,021 on works and repairs is estimated for during the year, while the cost of the establishment to be employed in carrying out these works is estimated at Rs. 22,60,501, giving therefore a percentage of establishment cost to actual outlay of 84·4 per cent.

4. This percentage is so startling and apparently so inconsistent with the representations made in your first quoted letter, that the Public Works Department under your Government is inadequate to perform the work required of it, that I must

5599. I. 1804.

request to be furnished with a full explanation, and to be informed how it has come to pass that establishments under the heads included in these three Budget Estimates are maintained in such disproportion to the work accomplished.

5. I can hardly doubt that there are facts which, if stated, would, in greater or less measure, explain this. But when a disproportion so manifestly requiring explanation presents itself, I feel some surprise that the necessary explanation is not anticipated.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient, humble Servant,

Willingdon

G.O. 336 W. 8th Feby/81.
Reprint of correspondence
P. W. Establishments.
G.O. 54 - 11th Jany/81 - Fin
" 224 W. 27th — do —
" 225 W. - 27 — do —
Despatch No. 5 - 27th Jany/81
G.O. 337 W. 8th Feby/81.
Despatch No. 14 - 15 March/81.
G.O. 480 W. 22nd Feby/81.
" 269 I. - 12th April —
" 270 I. - 12th — " —
Despatch No. 17 - 19th — " —
do - - 36 - 24th June —

O.L.P. 2/7

No. 2

P. W. C. No. 3877

Public Works

2nd June 1881.

The
Letter to Fort St. George
No. 14.

Recd: 4 July 81

2

A/ No. 1673 W of 7th July 1881

Ordered that the following reply be sent.

R.S.

Recd 24 June 81

Aw/

R.S.

No. 41 of 16 July/81 3

1623/5

To,

The Right Hon'ble
the Secretary of State for India

My Lord Marquis,

We have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordships' Despatch of the 2nd June 1881 No. 14 in which it is stated that an Examination of the figures of the Public Works Budgets shows that the total outlay on Establishment as compared with that on Works gives a percentage of Establishment cost to actual outlay of 84·4 per cent.

2. We have the honor to point out that the figures given in para 3 of your Lordships' Despatch from which this

percentage is worked out do not agree with those shown in the Public Works Budgets. To the sum of Rupees 26,77,021 quoted as the outlay on Works has to be added the Expenditure under Imperial, Military, Imperial Other Services, and Local Funds.

3. The following is a correct statement of the Budget provision under each head:—

	Works.	Tools & Plant.	Establishment	Total.
Imperial				
Military	3,68,628 ✓	9,215 ✓	92,157 ✓	4,70,000 ✓
Other Services	2,65,100	6,627 ✓	66,275 ✓	3,38,002 ✓
Irrig^n. & Navig^n. & Agricultural, Ordinary	12,72,407 ~~[illegible]~~	31,760 ✓	3,95,833 ~~[illegible]~~	17,00,000 ✓
Irrig^n. Spl: Public Works ...	5,20,595	71,003 ✓	2,51,402 ✓	8,43,000 ✓
Provincial				
General	5,36,047 ✓	27,962 ✓	6,46,599 ✓	12,10,608 ✓
Navigation	2,55,972 ~~[illegible]~~ ✓	7,000 ✓	65,000 ✓	3,27,972 ~~[illegible]~~ ✓
Local Funds Incorporated				
Local Funds (Acts [illegible] 1871)	1,87,880 ✓	4,770 ✓	46,970 ✓	2,39,620 ✓
Canal & Ferry Fund	20,000 ✓	5,000 ✓	5,000 ✓	30,000 ✓
Convict Labor Fund	4,817 ✓	121 ✓	1,204 ✓	6,142 ✓
Excluded				
Port Funds	14,000 ✓	350 ✓	3,500 ✓	17,850 ✓
Educational	15,065 ✓	376 ✓	3,766 ✓	19,207 ✓
Add Lithographic Department	"	"	6,000 ✓	6,000 ✓
Total provision Rs	34,60,511 ~~[illegible]~~	1,64,184	15,83,706 ~~[illegible]~~	52,08,401 ~~[illegible]~~
Cost of Establishment Rs			16,13,266	
Deficit to be provided Rs			29,560 ~~[illegible]~~	

4 Your Lordship will also observe from page 31 of the Provincial Budget of Establishment that the total estimated cost of the Public Works Establishments for 1881-82 is not Rupees 27,60,501 as given in para 3 of the Despatch under reply, but Rs 16,13,266, and that the percentage of Establishment cost, therefore, to actual outlay is about 47 1/7 per cent.

5. Even this may possibly be regarded as a very high rate, but your Lordship will see from the papers which accompanied our Despatch No. 14 of the 15th March 1881 as well as those since transmitted with our Despatch No. 34 of the 18th June 1881, that this high percentage is due not so much to excessive numbers as to the great area over which works have to be supervised to the undue curtailment of the grants for works, and to the system adopted in Madras of

debiting Establishment charges—

~~8~~ 7 As further elucidating the question of the cost of Establishment as compared with the outlay on Works, we beg to invite attention to our Secretary's letter to the Government of India forwarding the Provincial and Local Incorporated Budgets, No. 225 W dated 27th January 1881, a copy of which is appended to this Despatch.

~~7~~ 8 The slight differences between the figures quoted in this letter and those given in the present Despatch are due to the fact that the letter was written before the Budgets were all finally issued, and that the percentage of Establishment charge which is there brought down to 40.84 per cent

6 Regarding the latter point the principle followed in other Provinces of charging off a certain proportion of the Imperial Irrigation Establishments against the Revenue of the works on whose maintenance they are employed has not as yet been admitted by the G of I as applicable to Madras, but as the question is now under reference hopes are entertained that an arrangement which operates with such injustice towards this Presidency will ere long be changed

has been calculated with more exactness after exclusion from the account of certain illegitimate items of cost.

9 The general question of P W Establishments to which your Lordships special attention was invited in our Despatch No 14 dated 15th March 1881 has with the increase of Protective works lately formed the subject of further correspondence with the G of I, and from the manner in which our representations have been met we are induced to hope that results of the most promising character for the future prosperity of this Presidency will be attained at an early date — Copies of this correspondence will shortly be forwarded for your Lordships

information in con-tinuation of the Despatch above ad-verted to

~~The Hon the Governor~~
~~The Hon R Davidson C.S.~~

2/7/81

Desp'd with Ltr $\frac{2256}{27-1-81}$

16/7/81

B.C. / Figures should be carefully checked
L.S. 6/7

O.S.S. 3/7

20/1/26 BIII

3877

Govt. of (1881) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G. O. 7 July 1881, No. 1673 W

Nos.

High percentage of Establishment cost to actual outlay on Public Works — The Secy of State furnished with Explanation in respect to the

---

5 of 5

High percentage of Establishment cost to actual outlay on Public Works.