

22/11/20

3049 h 8th Dec. 1871.

20812

2. Charges all told
be similar works in
South India

(a) A charge in the P.W.D.
of 27% on against
works or grant

(b) - Nil -

(c) Charges in the Civil
Department against
revenue of the works
on account of assessment
and collection, all of
which must be much
less than 7.2% of
the revenue (*vide supra*)

In submitting my
reply lately on the
subject of the late de-
centralization order
of the S.P.I. I have
ventured to draw
attention to this among
other points in which
Sindras has been
placed in a position
of marked disadvantage

and it is clear that unless the S of S assents to some equitable adjustment of the charges adverted to not only will Madras be taxed unduly but the advantage of other more favored provinces, but we shall be charge with Extravagance

This charge has as a fact been preferred lately both by the S of S and by the Popl when as one would suppose that the most cursory examination of the figures ~~proved~~ ^{showed} absolutely the reverse is the case

The first necessity will of course be to have the accounts

E.g. Bombay is understood to charge off $\frac{1}{2}$ the civil charges against the head "Law and Justice" whereas in Madras I believe only $\frac{1}{5}$ of the total is so debited — Inequality of this nature necessarily vitiate all efforts at comparison

I have lately reported this point to the President
J.H.

Exhibiting Charges and revenue based on the same data in all provinces, but as this is a question affecting directly the Financial Department I can only respectfully submit that no effort should be spared towards its accomplishment

As regards the present telegram it is only necessary to "Record" it in the Department, and follow the injunction it conveys

Plt

3/12/81

is much too high
as applied to the
true charges in Civil
Administration of the
Special works devoted
to *.

The true comparison
consequently between the
charges in North India
and Madras will be
found somewhat
as follows

1st Charges all told in
the works classed as
Productive and Irrigation
& Navigation in North India

(a) A charge in the P.W.D.
of 25% as against
works a part -

(b) Charges varying from
10 to 25% against
revenue of the works
which are treated as
a contribution to the
General P.W.D. Estab^t.

(c) Charges in the Civil
Department against rev-
-enue of the works on account
of Collection of the revenue &c.

*. Mr. Wilson hopes
to be enabled to work
out the true percentage
for one for the Godavari
& Krishna delta works
if not obtain - It is
a very important point
and should receive
his early attention

is all that appears
against the Budgets
of the P.W. Dept.

All charges in excess
of this are debited
against and borne as
a Revenue Charge against
the revenues of the
works

In some cases this
residuum amounts
to 10% on the revenue
in others to 29% the
average however being
(see para 9. S.O. No 22674)
about 16 per cent

Madras has hitherto
known nothing of such
a charge against revenue
in her P.W. Establish.
The whole charges actually
amounting to 25% +
a small charge in
Decontaminat. of 2%
as against works
only

A cursory examination
of the Question shows
that the mode of
charging off Establishment
in North India entirely
conceals the true amount
of the whole charges
incurred in Estab^t.

If applied to Andras
the charge against
revenue would stand
somewhat thus

(See para 17 S.O. 2267 W)

16% on Productive
works revenue Rs
of say 60 Lakhs 9,60,000

8% ditto Irrigation
& Navigation works
also 60 Lakhs 4,80,000

Total 14,40,000

In other words we
should receive a
contribution from Revenue
alone of nearly 14 1/2
Lakhs as against
our total Charge

in Establishment which
under the latest Sanction
Scale only amounts to
20.64 Lakhs!

The extreme moderation
of the actual demands
put forward may be
at once seen from this
fact alone

But what will be
even still more evident
is the extremely low
charges incurred by
Andras in actual
outlay on Civil Admin-
istration which as seen
in para 10 of the letter
quoted on the authority
of the Board of Revenue
only amounts to 7.2
per cent of the total
revenue collections!

Even this figure
which has been derived
from the lumped
accounts of all revenue
receipts and charges

lost and Imperial
has gained no less
than $8\frac{1}{2}$ Lakhs of
Rupees in three years

G. O. 15th Sept. 1881 No
2267 W which sums
up the whole case
should here be read
and I need only briefly
advent to one or two
points in further
elucidation

As the only feasible
measure of relief we
have been anxious to
obtain for the Madras
Migration works the
same arrangement as
obtains in all the
Provinces of northern
India & Bombay

The charge for
Establishment in these
Provinces as against
works is limited to
25 per cent, and this

B
No 3079 WPA 8 Jan 1881

Revised

Edel

7/12/87



I wonder if formal communication would get rid of some of these difficulties with the Govt of India. The Governor of Bombay told me that his Govt had declined made advantage from putting some of his Secretaries under direct oral communication with the Secretaries at Simla or Calcutta.

Ans 3.12.87

For information

It will be observed
from the annexed
telegram of the 1st inst.
from 'Works' India
that as yet it has
been found impossible
to obtain a relief
from the S of I in regard
to the incidence
of the charge for an
Irrigation Establishment

The G.O. Committee
put-up will show
at a glance the
very voluminous
and important
character of the
correspondence which
the consideration of

this subject has
given rise to

The question actually
at issue is however
easily explained
For the sake of
convenience all
Establishment inter-
ests is treated pri-
marily as a Provincial
Charge, and in relief
of this contributions
are made from
Imperial & Local
Funds for such work
as may be carried
out by the General
Establishment

Among other branches
it was agreed in
some years ago that
Imperial should
contribute a charge
equivalent to 25
per cent on the

amount expended or
granted (which ever
might be the greater)
in "productive" work
irrigation

So long as the outlay
on works was large and
other conditions exis-
-ted (needless here to
explain) the contribution
answered sufficiently
well, and Provincial
was not very unduly
burdened; with
however the great falling
off of Imperial Grants
under "Productive" and
the separation of Local
Fund work generally
from this department
the Charges have told
with the greatest dis-
-advantage against
Provincial

As shown in the
correspondence the
Cut is practically

Telegram

To Works.

To. Calcutta.

Date of 29th Nov 1881.

Early settlement of
incidence of charge for
Irrigation Establish-
-ment is of pressing im-
-portance — Serious diffi-
-culty about funds for
Provincial Works and
preparation of Budgets
is being felt.

/s/ R. H. Sankey
Collector
Secy to Govt. P.W.D.

From (Station) *Mount Road*

To (Person) *Madras Works*

From (Person) *W. N. K.*

Day. *1* Hour. *16* Minute. *36*

OFFICIAL INSTRUCTIONS.

(P. I. L.)—Govt. Tel. Press, — No. 531, — 19-11-79, — 1000000.

Your telegraph 20th
 prepare budgets as
 usual + changes
 on account of
 irrigation establishment are
 sanctioned budget. Can
 be altered +

RECD. FROM *L N* SENT TO *L N*

At Hrs. Mts. By At Hrs. Mts. By

MOUNT ROAD 1-12-8

90. 265 Waf 3. 2. 80.
" 456 Waf 16. 7. 80.
" 456 B Waf 16. 7. 80.

" 225 Waf 27. 1. 81

" 479 Waf 22. 2. 81

" 480 Waf 22. 2. 81

" 269 Waf 12. 4. 81

" 270 Waf 12. 4. 81

" 348 Waf 2. 6. 81

" 349 Waf 2. 6. 81

Dispatch to Sup. R. 34 of 1881

90. 1697 Waf 9. 7. 81

" 1729 Waf 14. 7. 81

" 1860 Waf 28. 7. 81

" 2922 Waf 23. 4. 81

" 2267 Waf 15. 9. 81

P. M. C. No 707

Recd. 2^d Dec. 81

Received

~~Att~~

3/12/81

Subd. in Receipt Repr.

3. 12. 81. R. 7. 12. 81

Class.

To

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

GENERAL.

No. 102

SERVICE MESSAGE DESPATCHED BY ELECTRIC TELEGRAPH.

FROM *Calcutta*

To *Madras*

FROM *Works*

To *Madras Works*

*Your telegram 29th - Prepare Budgets
as usual - If changes on account of
Irrigation Establishment are sanctioned
Budgets can be altered. -*

No. 1024.

Copy forwarded by Post for information.

CALCUTTA,

The *1st* December 1881. }

M. Laupers

Under Secy. to the Govt. of India.

7075 B. 12 3049. W. 8/12/91.

both original