(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 16

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 22/89

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

58

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

PWD துறை

அரசாணை எண்.
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 1156

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் : 30 . 4 . 1889

198 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

8 Sheets

ஆணை. எண்-1—18,000—15-8-89.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again G.O., dated 12th November 1888, No. 832, Financial, circulating invoice from Messrs. Baker and Co. for half-year ending 30th June 1888.

READ—also replies to the above Government Order.

ORDER—dated 23rd March 1889, No. 189A, Financial.

The Accountant-General will arrange for the payment of £155-0-9 to Messrs. Baker & Co. through the Agra Bank.

2. The following publications are reported not to have been received :—

Publication.	Officer.
Engineer of 16th March 1888	General Superintendent, Public Works Stores.
Supplement to the *London Gazette* of 16th June 1888.	Adjutant-General, Madras Army.
Butler's "Lives of the Saints" (volumes 1, 2, 5, one each).	Chaplain, Military Prison, Fort Saint George.
Fifty Catholic Tracts (1 copy).	
Power's Catechism (3 volumes).	
Law Times, vol. LIX, No. 1526, containing pages 841—872.	Registrar of the High Court, Appellate Side.

3. Enquiries will be made in the Local and Municipal Department as to whether the *Lancet* (six copies) and *Braithwaite's Retrospect* (five copies) have been received. They are by mistake entered as supplied to the Superintendent, Revenue Survey.

4. The copy of the *Monthly Army List* now being forwarded to the address of the "Field Paymaster, Mandalay," should be sent to the "Circle Paymaster, Rangoon," and the publications now addressed to the "Master Attendant" should be addressed to the "Presidency Port Officer, Madras."

5. The attention of the officers concerned will be drawn to paragraph 6 of G.O., dated 24th August 1888, No. 665, in regard to advising Messrs. Baker & Co. by a post-card whenever any of the periodicals do not arrive at the proper time.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Departments of the Secretariat.
„ Messrs. F. P. Baker and Co., London.
„ the Accountant-General.
„ Heads of Departments concerned.

Exd. A. Raitt.

[Appendix.

9
1156
2

APPENDIX.

Para. 6 *of G.O., dated* 24*th August* 1888, *No.* 665, *Financial.*

The officers concerned will be requested to adopt the suggestion made by Messrs. Baker and Co., and to advise that firm by a post-card of the non-receipt of any periodical.

J. F. PRICE,
Ag. Chief Secretary.

9

Govt. of {1889} Madras.

FINANCIAL.

Issued

Read. *Encl.*

G.O., 23rd March 1889, No. 189A.

MARCH.

Periodicals.

Directing payment of £155-0-9 only to Messrs. Baker & Co., and passing orders regarding the supply of certain —.

1156

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

READ—the following letter from Colonel R. C. B. PEMBERTON, R.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department (General), to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Simla, 2nd September 1887, No. 1721 G. :—

I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your No. 1147 W., dated 26th April 1887, with which you submit the estimate of establishment considered to be necessary under present conditions as to Work and Grants, for the Madras Public Works Department, together with the statement comparing this estimated cost with the cost brought out by charging Works and Revenue with the established percentage charge, as called for in this office No. 283 G., dated 5th February 1887.

2. It is observed that the total estimate of establishment amounts to Rs. 21,09,608 which is Rs. 4,13,740 in excess of the cost brought out by charging the establishment percentage on Works and Revenue. In regard to this excess it is stated in paragraph 3 of your letter under reply that the Madras Government is not influenced by considerations of present strength in maintaining so large an establishment, that this is shown by the fact of the estimate being $3\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs less than that of the year 1886-87, and that His Excellency the Governor is satisfied that no further reductions can be made; that the estimate is approximately the same as that sanctioned in 1881 as the normal cost of establishment in Madras, and that the necessity for this establishment has been repeatedly insisted on in the voluminous correspondence referred to by you, and practically admitted by the Government of India.

3. In regard to this explanation I am to observe that the reduction in this estimate as compared with that of the previous year is almost entirely in temporary establishment, for which a grant of Rs. 3,00,000 was provided in the year 1886-87; and that this temporary establishment was entertained principally for works for which special grants had been provided up to the end of that year, that is to say for the tanks and for drawing up new projects. Such reductions, I am to remark, are necessary in times of restricted outlay, and in no way indicate one way or the other whether the permanent establishment is moderate or not. In regard to the comparison drawn with the establishment sanctioned in 1881, I am to observe that the correspondence referred to, so far as this Government is concerned, had regard almost entirely to the question of the scale of Engineering establishment; and the Government of India is fully prepared under this head to admit that, so far as circumstances remain as represented in that correspondence, establishment of this class should not be reduced. As, however, the estimate submitted is so largely in excess of that which, according to the usual standard, is considered sufficient, it has been found necessary to examine carefully the present circumstances of the Engineering establishment and to analyse the estimate under other heads in order to suggest for the consideration of the Madras Government the direction in which reductions may possibly be made.

4. In regard to the Engineering establishment it is observed that the original number, 81 Executive and Assistant Engineers, is still maintained; but by comparing in detail the present divisions with those of 1881 it is observed that, while three

new divisions, the Godávari central, the Nílgiris, and Presidency Workshop have been formed, six, as shown in the margin, have dropped out. If the number of Engineers provided for the new divisions and those dropped out be allowed for, there should have been a net reduction of eight officers. The projects included under each of the A to D Project divisions are enumerated in Madras letter No. 1697 W., dated 9th July 1881, and it should be explained whether or no provision is still included for those or similar projects under other divisions, and if so, how far there is any likelihood of funds being provided for these projects in the next five years.

Salem division.	B Project division.
A Project division.	C " "
Sangam project.	D " "

5. Under upper sub-establishment it is observed that the original number of 185 is maintained, whereas allowing for the difference between new and old divisions as in the preceding paragraph, the numbers should have been reduced by ten men. I am to request that this matter may be similarly explained. Further I am to point out that the staff of upper subordinates is on a much larger scale than that allowed in any other province, the average for each division being seven in Madras against two in the North-West Provinces and five in Bombay. In some divisions, it would seem, there can be no question that the number is very large: thus there are two with 12 upper subordinates, one with 11, three with 9, four with 8, and so on. On the other hand the number of lower subordinates is very small as compared with provinces of the Bengal Presidency. The attention of the Madras Government is invited to this matter, and it is requested that the necessity for this large staff of upper subordinates may be explained, and that it may be stated why the less expensive agency of lower subordinates should not to some extent be substituted as in Upper India. Such a substitution could be made by degrees without any sudden reduction. In drawing attention to this matter I am to observe that this question does not appear to have been raised in the previous correspondence; it was observed by the Madras Government in its No. 2277 W., dated 1st October 1880, paragraph 40, that "the number (of upper subordinates) which has been strictly decided on the known requirements of the several divisions calls for no remark"; and the number so recommended appears to have been accepted without further question: some further inquiry therefore, I am to say, seems at the present time necessary.

6. Strictly speaking the Government of India has no concern with the other classes of establishment included in the estimate (except the Accounts staff which is noted on below) unless their salaries exceed Rs. 250. But under present circumstances it is considered desirable to draw attention to an apparent excess in certain classes. An analysis of the office establishment comparing the present scale with that of 1881 and that previous to 1881, which is given in the appended statement, seems to show that there has been a general increase in this branch of establishment of late years, and also that the office establishment attached to divisions and sub-divisions is now on a very large scale in numbers and in cost. It is to the latter point that the Government of India would draw special attention. In addition to the large establishment provided for the several divisional offices it is observed that sub-divisional and detached offices have each their own establishment, and that even overseers are provided with clerks. Amongst the divisional offices that of the Presidency, the Godávari and Kistna, the Consulting Architect's, the Kurnool, and the several Workshops divisions all attract attention by their large office establishments. I am to suggest that the question of reducing these establishments might be taken up by the Madras Government, and that the necessity of detached offices and overseers' clerks outside the divisional and sub-divisional office establishments might be considered.

7. I am also to draw attention to the following remarks regarding the staff of accountants of the Madras Presidency and the clerical establishment of the Examiner's office. The number of accountants (58), including two temporary men for test audit work, sanctioned in Public Works Department letter No. 867 G, of 4th May 1887, was based on the requirements of 29 divisions including Coorg; as it appears that the number of divisions including Coorg has now been reduced to 27,

a proportionate reduction in the staff should apparently be made and a revised scale submitted for sanction. In regard to the clerical establishment of the Examiner's office, I am to say that both number and cost appear excessive as compared with other provinces; moreover it is known that, under the special arrangements for 5th-grade accountants, the Madras Government has a larger number of accountants than allowed by rule, although at the same cost, and the extra men so obtained are almost wholly employed in the Examiner's office. Thus, instead of some 14 accountants, the Examiner's office has 27 or 28, which with the clerks bring up the strength of the establishment to the very high figure of at least 90 men. It is understood that one reason for collecting this very large establishment has been to reduce the accounts work in every possible way in the divisional offices and to throw it upon the Examiner; but it is observed that this has not tended to reduce the establishments in the divisional offices which, as pointed out in the preceding paragraph, are very large. I am to point out that, in the opinion of the Government of India, the establishment in the Examiner's office is susceptible of considerable reduction without practically impairing the efficiency of the office.

8. I am to request that an early reply may be given in regard to the questions raised in paragraphs 4 and 5 of this letter; and that the possibility of reduction in accordance with the suggestions of paragraphs 5 and 6 may be taken into serious consideration by the Madras Government, the result being in due course reported for information.

ENCLOSURE.

Table B.

	Prior to 1881.				Scale of 1881.				Present Scale.			
	No. of units.	No. of men.	Total cost.	Average per man.	No. of units.	No. of men.	Total cost.	Average per man.	No. of units.	No. of men.	Total cost.	Average per man.
Chief Engineers' offices ..	1	32	2,433	76	1	32	2,433	76	1	42	3,085	73
Joint Secretary's office ..	1	27	1,180	44	1	27	1,180	44	1	31	1,495	48
Superintending Engineers' offices.	3	33	1,240	38	6	72	2,631	37	6	84	4,161	50
Presidency Division office ..	1	8	273	34	1	16	485	30	1	17	555	32
Godávari and Kistna office ..	1	16	546	34	1	20	646	32	1	23	751	33
Consulting Architect's office.	1	6	270	45	1	6	270	45	1	11	503	46
Public Works Store's office.	1	9	305	34	1	9	305	34	1	9	465	52
First-class divisional offices.	6	48	1,638	34	7	63	2,086	33	8	72	2,384	33
Second-class divisional offices.	8	64	2,024	32	9	72	2,277	32	8	66	2,111	32
Third-class divisional offices.	2	16	441	28	5	40	1,102	28	3	25	686	27
Sub-divisional office ..	40	80	1,240	15	50	100	1,550	15	66	132	2,072	16
Detached Officers' offices ..	40	40	700	18	88	88	2,200	25	75	75	1,875	25
Overseers' offices	..	..	..	..	92	92	1,610	17	92	92	1,610	17
Examiner's office clerks ..	1	30	1,202	40	1	36	1,522	42	1	63	2,245	35
Presidency Workshop office.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	15	408	27
Kurnool division	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	13	437	33
Nílgiri	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	9	509	56
Dowlaishweram Workshop office.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	17	251	15

ORDER—dated 4th October 1887, No. 2610 W., Public Works.

The Government of India will be addressed in reply to paragraphs 4 to 6 of the foregoing letter.

2. Meanwhile Superintending Engineers will report on the following points:—

(1) Whether it would be practicable to substitute a certain proportion of lower for upper subordinates, and if so, to what extent the substitution should be carried out in each division of the several circles.

(2) Whether any reductions are feasible in existing sub-divisional establishments.

(3) Whether it is necessary to provide detached officers and overseers with clerks. If it is considered necessary, the reasons for such conclusion should be stated.

3. The question as regards possible reductions in division office establishments has already been fully considered,—*vide* Proceedings, No. 988 W., dated 15th April 1886, and No. 751 W., dated 11th March 1887. Superintending Engineers will, however, continue to give the matter their careful attention, and will bring to the notice of the Government such reductions as may from time to time appear feasible.

4. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation will report on the subject of the latter part of paragraph 4.

5. Paragraph 7 of the letter from the Government of India will be referred to the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, for careful consideration and report.

(Here enter No. 2611 W., dated 4th October 1887).

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. O. HASTED, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

To Superintending Engineers.
To the Consulting Architect to Government.
" Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

LETTER—to the Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, dated Ootacamund, 4th October 1887, No. 2611 W.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 1721 G., dated 2nd September 1887, relative to the estimate of establishment considered necessary for the Madras Public Works Department.

2. In reply to the observations in paragraph 4, I am directed to state that appendix A to this office letter, No. 1697 W., dated 9th July 1881, included thirty divisions, while appendix D to my No. 1147 W., dated 26th April 1887, shows twenty-seven divisions as now existing. The present number is therefore three less than that of 1881, but this reduction is more apparent than real as regards executive staff. Owing to the reduced grant for establishment allotted for 1887-88, it was found necessary at the close of 1886-87 to double up several divisions for purposes of office and accounts work, but with respect to construction some of the amalgamated divisions virtually remain two separate divisions. Thus, the Ganjam division includes the Rushikulya project, which is under a separate Executive Engineer, as well as the works on one large zemindari estate and several smaller ones, lately taken over from the Court of Wards; the Kistna Eastern division requires an additional Executive Engineer and an Assistant for charge of the important works in the recently closed Gudiváda division, and the Periyár division has just been opened. It may be said, therefore, that there are still thirty executive charges, while in addition there are four parties of the Tank Restoration Scheme, each of which requires an Executive or Assistant Engineer, and also the head office of the Scheme, to the charge of which an Executive Engineer has been posted in lieu of the Superintendent of Works formerly allowed. It will thus be seen that the requirements of the department, with respect to executive staff, have increased rather than decreased since 1881.

3. It may be argued that tank restoration being outside the ordinary work of the divisions, should be provided for by the appointment of temporary officers, but it is intimately connected with the work in the divisions. It is advisable to employ on it officers who are experienced in tank irrigation, and, as each river basin taken up by a Tank Restoration Survey party is taken out of the hands of the divisional officer and thus virtually reduces the extent of his charge, it allows of the employment of some of the general staff of the department on this work. The work moreover must take so many years to complete that it cannot be considered temporary.

4. With reference to the latter part of paragraph 4 of your letter, I am to state that a further report will be made regarding the projects formerly included in the late A to D Project divisions, but meanwhile I am to invite attention to this office letter, No. 1878 W., dated 26th July 1886, giving a brief retrospect of the work done by those divisions up to the time of their closure, and intimating what had been, and what was intended to be, done with respect to the several projects.

5. The point raised in the first sentence of your paragraph 5, relative to the upper subordinate establishment, appears to be sufficiently answered in my paragraph2 above. If the number of executive divisions be taken as thirty instead of twenty-seven, the average number of subordinates in each division would be reduced to six. That the average is higher in Madras than in Bombay and the North-West Provinces can only be explained by once again recurring to the different conditions of this Presidency; the large area covered by executive charges, the scattered nature of the works, and consequent difficulty of supervision. The two divisions shown in appendix D to my letter of 26th April last, as having twelve subordinates each, are Coimbatore and Madura. The former is of very large area, and includes the old Salem division and the Barur project. The Madura division has a large staff at present because in it are going on the construction of the Vaigai bridge and the Cumbum-Gúdalúr road, two large Local Fund works, which have been handed over to the Public Works Department for execution. Each of these two divisions moreover has a party of the Tank Restoration Scheme working in it. Similarly, the Kurnool division, with eleven subordinates, includes the Kurnool canal and the old Kurnool division, as also a party of the Tank Restoration Scheme. It seems needless to go into further explanation, but the other divisions with nine and eight subordinates are all heavy divisions, covering large areas.

6. The question of substituting lower for upper subordinates will receive careful consideration, and will be reported on hereafter.

7. With regard to divisional office establishments, I am to state that the question of effecting economies therein has not been lost sight of by this Government. The matter was carefully gone into in the summer of 1886, in connection with letter from the Finance Committee, No. 1, dated 22nd March 1886. Again, at the close of the year 1886-87, when reduction became imperative owing to the reduced grant for establishment for 1887-88, careful inquiries were made as to the scale of office and inferior establishments necessary for divisions and sub-divisions. Beyond discharging all temporary establishments however, it was not found practicable to effect material economy. Indeed the general complaint was that the divisional offices were as a rule undermanned, and this Government are still receiving applications from various divisions for assistance in the shape of temporary hands. The heavy work entailed on divisional and sub-divisional office establishments is mainly due to the great mass of accounts which must be rendered monthly in obedience to rules laid down by the Government of India. The possibility of reducing clerical and accounts work has received the earnest attention of the Chief Engineer and of this Government, since the beginning of 1884, and numerous suggestions on the subject have been received from officers of the department. With regard to clerical work, several reforms have been effected by the introduction of printed forms, &c., but as regards accounts, the result of nearly every inquiry has been to show that the number of forms, vouchers, &c., cannot be reduced without lessening that amount of control over expenditure which is prescribed by standing orders of the Government of India. The monthly accounts of the majority of the divisions systematically reach the Examiner's office long after due date, and the constant excuse which Executive Engineers make is that their office establishments are too weak to cope satisfactorily with the work. That this subject has received earnest attention will be seen from this office letter, No. 2247 W., dated 12th September 1884, in reply to which the Government of India stated that steps should be taken to increase establishments to admit of punctuality being attained. This has been done in some cases, while in others extension of time for the submission of accounts has been allowed, but the Examiner still reports monthly that a large

number of the accounts are late. In connection with this subject, I am to forward for perusal copies of the proceedings marginally noted, and to state that the question continues to receive consideration. At the present time this Government are inquiring into a scheme submitted by a Superintending Engineer involving important changes in the system of compiling the monthly accounts, but though no great results are likely to be effected, so far as at present can be seen, some of the points which promise to reduce office work will probably before long form the subject of correspondence with the Government of India.

No. 721 W., dated 23rd March 1885.
„ 1560 W., „ 21st June 1886.

8. With regard to the necessity of allowing clerks for detached officers and overseers, I am to say that a further report will be made, but that without clerical aid it will be impossible for subordinates, most of whom have considerable distances to travel, to devote sufficient time to their field duties.

9. The subject of paragraph 7 of your letter will be referred to the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, for careful consideration, and the result will be reported in due course.

(Signed) J. O. HASTED, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

Exd. J. Moses.
Spare Copies

7 1156 b

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of {1887} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated October, 4th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 4th Oct. 1887, Nos. 2610, 2611 W.

OCTOBER.

Madras Public Works Department

Submitting explanation relative to establishment charges in connection with the —.

R 3369/88

1156

1st April 1889, No. 243, Revenue.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—again the following endorsement, dated 6th March 1888, No. 1525, Revenue :—

Read—the following G.O., dated 30th January 1888, No. 345 W., Public Works :—

Read—the following letter from G. T. WALCH, Esq., Superintending Engineer, I Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Dowlaishweram, 24th October 1887, No. 1824 G.D :—

With reference to G.O., No. 567 W., dated the 25th February 1887, I have the honor to submit herewith copy of letter, No. 522, dated the 1st October 1887, received from the Executive Engineer, Godávari Eastern Division, from which it will be observed that there is no need to forward a revised estimate for the Kovur-Munjair junction canal.

2. The Division officer's suggestion relative to the portion of the outlay on the maintenance and repairs of the completed portion of the canal which should be debited to "Canal and Ferry Fund" is reasonable, and can be accepted.

Enclosure.

From J. E. PAUL, Esq., Executive Engineer, Eastern Division, Godávari, to the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, dated Dowlaishweram, 1st October 1887, No. 522.

With reference to your No. 35 G.D., dated 1st April 1887, on G.O., No. 567 W., of 25th February 1887, I have the honor to bring to your notice that the estimate of Rs. 1,45,525 sanctioned for Kovur-Munjair junction canal has not been exceeded, the actual outlay during 1886-87 being only Rs. 11,631 against the probable amount of Rs. 17,663 entered in the budget.

		Rs.	Rs.
Amount of estimate			1,45,525
Outlay to end of 1885-86		1,29,000	
Do.	of 1886-87	11,630	
Do.	of 1887-88 to end of August	2,490	
			1,43,120
Balance still available			2,405

2. All the works on the Kovur-Munjair junction canal which have been sanctioned from Canal and Ferry Funds are completed, and there are only a few items of land compensation to be paid for, the amount of which is not likely to exceed the balance still available on the estimate, as the most part of the land taken up for the canal is zemindary, for which compensation is generally settled by a reduction in peishcush payable by the zemindar.

3. The Collector has, however, been addressed on the subject; but in any case a revised estimate will not be necessary, as there is no more work to be done (*vide* paragraph 955 of the Public Works Code).

4. As regards paragraph 5 of the Government Order, I have the honor to state that the cost of the original works of the canal has been met from different funds in the following proportion :—

	Rs.
Canal and Ferry Fund	67,330
Local Funds	30,000
Imperial	...
43. Minor Works and Navigation	48,195
Total ...	1,45,525

5. I would therefore suggest that half of the outlay on maintenance and repairs of the canal be charged to "Canal and Ferry Funds" and one-third to "Minor Works and Navigation" and one-sixth to "Local Funds (Incorporated)."

No. 77 E.W.

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

2. It is considered that the cost of the maintenance of the Kovur-Munjair canal should be wholly charged to Canal and Ferry Funds, as, under the Government of India Resolution, Department of Finance and Commerce, dated 13th March 1884, No. 1274, communicated with G.O., No. 706, Financial, dated 28th March 1884, the apportionment between two or more service heads of charges hitherto shown under one head only is objectionable, except under very special circumstances.

3. It is as well to call attention to paragraph 33 of the notes of Inspection by Chief Engineer for Irrigation printed in G.O., No. 580 I., dated 29th September 1887, and the probable necessity of building the aqueduct over the Cholangi drain, estimated at Rs. 17,890 in the original estimate, see paragraph 2 of note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation printed in G.O., No. 621 I., dated 1st July 1884.

Chepak,
10th November 1887. (Signed) H. R. MEAD, Colonel, R.E.,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

No. 871.

It is necessary that Government of India sanction to the proposed distribution be obtained (*vide* Government of India Resolution communicated with G.O., No. 955 W., dated 7th April 1884).

Madras,
13th December 1887. (Signed) C. H. P. CHRISTIE, Major, R.E.,
Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Order—dated 30th January 1888, No. 345 W., Public Works.

Referred to the Revenue Department with reference to its Order, No. 22, dated 11th January 1887, paragraph 3, for decision as to the incidence of the charge for maintenance of the canal. It will be seen that, in the opinion of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, the whole charge for maintenance should be provided from Canal and Ferry Funds.

(True Extract.)
(Signed) W. L. C. BADDELEY, Captain, R.E.,
Under-Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Revenue Department.
,, Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
,, Superintending Engineer, I Circle.

Endorsement—dated 6th March 1888, No. 1525, Revenue.

Referred for the remarks of the Land Revenue Commissioners.

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Secretary to Government.

Read—also the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 17th December 1888, Mis. No. 7375 :—

W. S. Whiteside, Esq.

Read—Endorsement of the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated 6th March 1888, No. 1525, on Government Order, Public Works Department, dated 30th January 1888, No. 345 W., and the following Reference thereon, dated 24th March 1888 :—

Communicated to the Collector of Godávari for remarks.

Read—the following letter from the Collector of Godávari, dated 7th June 1888, No. 221 :—

In reply to reference on Government Register No. 577 of 1888, dated 24th March 1888, I have the honor to report as follows.

2. I think the apportionment of the cost of maintenance proposed by Mr. Paul perfectly fair and just and that it would be most unjust to burden the Canal and Ferry Fund with the whole cost of the maintenance of the work. The navigation dues must necessarily be credited to minor works and navigation, as one fee is charged for the use by boats of the whole canal system and it would be impossible to separate the charges. The canal is an important link in the system and there is no reason whatever why Imperial Funds should be relieved of a fair share of the cost of maintenance.

3. The Government Register under reference is returned.

Read—also official memorandum from the Under-Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated 12th November 1888, No. 110 R.

Resolution—dated 17th December 1888, Mis. No. 7375.

Submitted to Government, with reference to their endorsement No. 1525, dated 6th March 1888, Revenue Department.

2. The Board agree with the Collector and recommend that the maintenance charges of the canal in question be apportioned, in the manner proposed by the Executive Engineer, among the several funds that have borne the cost of its original construction. The objection to such apportionment, taken by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, appears only to refer to a question of convenience of account, and ignores altogether the equity of the case.

3. It has been necessary, more than once before, to hold Imperial Funds (G.Os., dated 6th October 1885, No. 1135, Revenue; 27th April 1886, No. 329, Public Works; and 15th July 1886, No. 505, Public Works) and the Local Fund Board (G.Os., dated 6th March 1885, No. 473, Financial, and 14th November 1885, No. 1033 L., Mis., Financial) to their bargain.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. A. SIM,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
Copy to the Collector of Godávari.

Order—dated 1st April 1889, No. 243, Revenue.

Irrigation, No. 5.

The Government consider that the charge for maintenance should be distributed in the same proportion as the original outlay.

(True Extract.)

Secretary to Government.

To the Public Works Department.
,, the Local and Municipal Department.
,, the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
,, the Accountant-General.
,, the Commissioner of Salt, Abkári and Separate Revenue.

Exd. P. L. Pereira.

95 Copies.

Govt. of {1889} Madras.

REVENUE.

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 1st April 1889, No. 243.

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
15 APR. 89
P.W. DEPARTMENT, MADRAS.

APRIL.

(8)

Kovur-Munjafr Junction Canal.

Considering that the charge for the maintenance of the — should be distributed in the same proportion as the original outlay.