

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 8
(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 12/91
(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

PWD துறை

28

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 2477 அச்சகம் பலவகை

நாள் : 5-9-1892 198 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

4 Sheets

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE
(LAND REVENUE).

THE HON. MR. H. W. BLISS.
MR. E. GIBSON.

Read—the following Government Order, dated 28th March 1892, Mis. No. 1664,
Revenue:—

Read—the following Government Order, dated 8th March 1892, No. 762 W., Public
Works:—

Read—the following Government Order, dated 12th February 1892, Mis. No. 870,
Revenue:—

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated
21st August 1891, Mis. No. 5977:—

THE HON. MR. J. GROSE.
MR. G. MCWATTERS.

Read—the following papers:—

Board's Proceedings, dated 18th August 1890, No. 5218.

Government Order, dated 29th Sept. 1890, Mis. No. 5980, Revenue.

" " " 13th Mar. 1891, " " 1743, "

" " " 8th June " " 3347, "

Board's Proceedings, dated 13th July 1891, No. 2092, Routine.

ABSTRACT.—Requesting the Collector of Nilgiris by wire to report whether the statement of
forest materials removed by Public Works Department furnished monthly by Executive Engi-
neer to Forest officer, Ootacamund, may not be discontinued.

Letter from the Acting Collector of Nilgiris, dated 14th July 1891, No. 653.

Board's Proceedings, dated 13th July 1891, No. 2093, Routine.

ABSTRACT.—Requesting the Collector of Madura by wire to report whether the monthly
schedule of Incorporated Local Fund works submitted to him may not be discontinued.

Telegram from the Collector of Madura, dated 20th July 1891.

Your telegram thirteenth instant. Schedule may be discontinued.

Resolution—dated 21st August 1891, Mis. No. 5977.

In Government Order, dated 16th May 1890, No. 3019, Government asked
the Board of Revenue, among other authorities, if certain returns prepared by the
Public Works Department were still necessary. The returns concerning the Board
in this department were Nos. 13, 20 and 23 of the list in Government Order, dated
19th April 1890, No. 1150 W.

2. No. 13 is a statement forwarded monthly by the Executive Engineer to the Forest officer at Ootacamund showing the forest materials removed by the Public Works Department. The Collector of the Nilgiris, in reply to a reference made to him as to whether the return may be discontinued, reports that the statement was prescribed to enable the Forest Department to calculate the seigniorage on the forest produce removed from time to time by the Public Works Department and that it can be dispensed with only (1) if the Public Works Department undertakes to furnish the Forest Department with a memorandum on each occasion of the materials removed or (2) if cash payment is made in advance for stated quantities of the produce and permits are purchased from the Forest Department as is done by private individuals or (3) if the Forest Department undertakes to collect the materials in question by departmental agency and supply the Public Works Department with its requirements. The Collector adds that the last proposition is impossible at present as the Forest Department is short-handed. As regards the remaining two alternatives, the Board thinks that, if the first is adopted, it will only increase work and that the maintenance of the present return is preferable to the adoption of the second.

3. No. 23 is also a monthly statement containing a schedule of Incorporated Local Fund works furnished by the Executive Engineer of Madura to the Collector of the district. The Collector reports that this return may be discontinued and the Board concurs with him.

4. No. 20 is a monthly statement of repairs costing Rs. 200 and under, which the Collector of South Arcot had by agreement with the Executive Engineer substituted for the individual statement for each estimate, which the Public Works Department Code prescribes in paragraph 320 (b). The Collector of South Arcot asked the Board to continue this return, but the Board objected on the ground that it practically meant that the Collector gave up the control which he ought to exercise over the Public Works Department in his district in regard to irrigation expenditure.

5. In the second paper read above, Government, however, approved of the South Arcot procedure and considered that, for Major Irrigation works, the year's budget plus a monthly return of the estimates sanctioned by the Public Works Department would suffice for all purposes of control by the Collector and that the South Arcot practice might be generally adopted, no matter what the amount of the estimate might be. In a later Government Order, however, dated 8th June 1891, No. 3347, the Government calls for a report on the proposal to extend the practice from the present South Arcot Rs. 200 to Rs. 500, both figures being the limit of Executive Engineer's powers of sanction.

6. The matter involves the general question as to the degree of control to be exercised by the Collector over the Public Works Department of his district, not departmentally of course, but in regard to the selection of works to be executed.

7. So far as the Board can gather from the Public Works Department Code, the amount of control reserved to the Collector at present is provided for in the following paragraphs:—

Paragraph 267 (b) (2).—Superintending Engineer can sanction after approval by the Collector irrigation works costing Rs. 2,500 and under.

Paragraph 320 (b) (3).—Executive Engineer can sanction after approval by the Collector irrigation works costing Rs. 200 and under.

Paragraph 304.—Quarterly abstracts have to be sent by the Executive Engineer to the Collector showing progress made on irrigation works.

Paragraphs 306 and 307.—Executive Engineers have to give notice to the Revenue authorities and confer with them regarding increase of water-supply for irrigation.

Paragraphs 284—289.—Executive Engineers are to consider themselves general advisers of other departments.

Paragraph 291.—The Executive Engineer must draw up annually, for the approval of the Superintending Engineer and the Collector, a scheme of expenditure of the lump sum grants allotted in the budget for non-productive irrigation and navigation works.

Paragraph 1050-xiv.—The opinions of local Revenue officers are to be given in reporting on irrigation projects.

Paragraph 1329.—A Civil officer may call on Executive Engineer to report on proposals for additions and alterations to the buildings in his use.

8. The control which a Collector as head of the district and responsible for its administration and well-being ought to possess in respect to works in charge of the Public Works Department should, in the Board's opinion, be as follows:—

I. The District Public Works budget for the year should be prepared in consultation with him and his wishes in regard to the works to be executed should not be disregarded unless for very strong reasons.

II. Subsequent works initiated by the Engineer should, unless emergent, require his approval.

III. The professional advice of the Public Works Department should be wholly at his service if called for.

IV. The initiation of works should to a certain extent lie with him.

9. As regards point I, the provisions of paragraphs 267 (b) (2), 291 and 320 (b) (3) of the Public Works Code do not, in the Board's opinion, go far enough. There should be a clear and distinct paragraph in the Code to the effect that the entire budget estimates of the year should be drawn up in consultation with the Collector or must receive his approval. Government says it is sufficient if he gets the budget, but, as he only gets this about the beginning of July when the best part of the working year is over, this procedure does not, the Board thinks, meet the requirements of the case.

II. In regard to point II, the Board thinks that, except in cases of real emergency, no estimate likely to cost more than Rs. 500 and over and not provided for in the budget should be set on foot without the Collector's previous approval. In regard to works costing Rs. 500 and less, the Board, on reconsideration, thinks that a monthly statement of estimates sanctioned by the Executive Engineer and submitted for the Collector's information, such as is now done in South Arcot, will be sufficient, and that this statement might be adopted for all districts.

III. In regard to Collector's right to professional advice, the provisions of the Code are fairly satisfactory (*vide* paragraphs 284—289 and 1329), though they are rather too permissive and hardly peremptory enough.

IV. Lastly, there is the question of initiating work. The Code provides only for the Collector approving of works initiated by the Public Works Department. It gives him no power to initiate himself. There ought to be a distinct provision that the Collector should have a right to propose the construction or repair of any work involving the interests of the revenue or the well-being of the people, and that his expressed wishes in such matters should be only disregarded for reasons to be recorded by the Superintending Engineer.

10. It is stated in Government Order, dated 29th September 1890, No. 5980, that the representation of Collectors will always receive prompt attention in the Public Works Department. This may be so in theory, but, as matters now stand, most Collectors and Divisional officers of any experience could give instances in which their suggestions for expenditure on particular irrigation works have been set on one side by the District Engineer generally on the plea of want of funds. The Board is far from imputing any indifference to the well-being of the cultivator to the officers of the Public Works Department, but it is only natural that they should tend to expend their funds on the more interesting and accessible works connected with large irrigation system in preference to the humbler, but, in their degree, not less useful, rain-fed tanks. The Collector and his Divisional officers are better acquainted with the wants of upland taluks and they should have the means of providing that these do not suffer as compared with delta tracts.

11. In the fourth paper read above, Government in the Public Works Department inquires whether the statement of annual cost of establishment sent to the Collector should be continued. In reply, the Board begs to invite the attention of Government to the correspondence ending with Government Order, dated 9th July

1889, Mis. No. 4257, Revenue Department, from which it will be seen that the continued submission of the statement in question to the Board of Revenue, but not to Collectors, is necessary for the purposes of statistical return C published in chapter I, part III, of the Presidency Administration Report, which has to be submitted by the Board.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) W. S. MEYER,
Acting Secretary.

Order—dated 12th February 1892, Mis. No. 870, Revenue.
Transferred to the Public Works Department with the following remarks:—

(1) The Government concurs in the Board's remarks except as regards the limitation of the return of estimates to works costing Rs. 500 and less. In the opinion of Government the practice of forwarding estimates for the countersignature of Collectors may safely be discontinued in the case of every irrigation work entered in the Public Works budget.

(2) In framing District Public Works budget, Superintending Engineers should invariably consult the Collectors concerned. If in any case they are unable to adopt their suggestions, they should record their reasons for differing from the Collectors and submit the record to Government along with the budget.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. H. CAMPBELL,
Acting Assistant Secretary.

Order—dated 8th March 1892, No. 762 W., Public Works.
Communicated to Superintending Engineers for information and guidance, in continuation of Government Order, No. 3395 W., dated 17th December 1891.

Item 13.—Statement of forest materials removed by the Public Works Department on the Nilgiris.

Item 23.—Monthly schedule of Incorporated Local Fund works.

3. It will be seen from the order in the Revenue Department above recorded that it will no longer be necessary to forward to Collectors for countersignature estimates for irrigation works which find a place in the budget. Monthly returns of such estimates sanctioned by Superintending and Executive Engineers should be furnished to the Collector in each district. This disposes of item No. 20 as well as of item (4) in paragraph 1 of Government Order, No. 3395 W., dated 17th December 1891.

4. The submission of item No. 3 in paragraph 1 of Government Order, No. 3395 W., dated 17th December 1891, statement of annual cost of establishment, will be discontinued.

5. A copy of these Proceedings will be forwarded to the Government of India for information, in continuation of endorsement No. 3396 W., dated 17th December 1891.

(Here enter No. 763 W., Public Works, dated 8th March 1892.)
(True Extract.)

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

To Superintending Engineers.
To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" Revenue Department.

Order—dated 28th March 1892, Mis. No. 1664, Revenue.
Communicated to the Board of Revenue.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. H. CAMPBELL,
Ag. Asst. Secy. to Government.

To the Commissioners of Land Revenue.
" Commissioner of Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture.

RESOLUTION—dated 22nd July 1892, No. 374.

The Government Order read above will be communicated to all Collectors in continuation of Board's Proceedings, dated 20th February 1892, No. 83.

2. Collectors will see that Government has accepted the several recommendations made by the Board in paragraph 8 of its Proceedings, dated 21st August 1891, Mis. No. 5977. These were (1) that the District Public Works budget should be prepared in consultation with the Collector; (2) that works not provided for in the budget should not, except in cases of emergency, be commenced without his previous approval; (3) that the professional advice of the Public Works Department should be wholly at his service; and (4) that he should have a right to propose the construction of new works and the repairs of existing ones, and that his proposals should only be disregarded for reasons to be recorded by the Superintending Engineer.

3. In regard to the District Public Works budgets, it will be observed that Government has laid down that if any of the Collectors' suggestions are not adopted by the Public Works authorities, the case must be sent up for the orders of Government along with the budget.

4. It will also be observed that estimates for individual irrigation works entered in the district budget need no longer be submitted to the Collector for countersignature, whatever their amount. Now that it has been made clear that Collectors are to have a full voice in the preparation of the budget, the submission of such detailed estimates has become unnecessary. But in the case of works not included in the budget, the submission of the estimate to the Collector will of course continue.

5. The Board presumes that Government will take steps to have the present orders clearly set forth in the Public Works Code.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. S. MEYER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
" all Collectors.

Exd. W. J. Lewis.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

1892.

Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

MADRAS.

Current Number 7141.

Printed August th.

Recd. 15th August 92

Proceedings, 22nd July 1892, No. 374.

Endorsement No. 165

Transferred to the
Public Works Department.

Collected
25th August 1892

Enclosure

Ag. Under Secretary.

No. 762 W of 8-3-92
412-13 W of 14-2-91
748-49 W of 14-3-91
3078 W of 31-10-89
3395-96 W of 17-2-90

Communicating to all Collectors, with remarks,
Government Order, Public Works Department,
directing the discontinuance of the submission of
certain returns to officers of other departments.

With an endorsement

of 408
Am 30-
m 1-9.

No. 24774 of 5th September 1892

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following

Proceedings of the Board
of Revenue (Land Revenue) (No. 374 of 22. vii. 92)
Encl. in the Revenue Dept (" " 165 of 25. viii. 92)

Recorded with
the remark that since
the adoption of the
Govt of India Code -
purely local rulings
cannot be codified,
as suggested in para 5
of the Proceedings of
the Board.

Recd
in Aug.

The Revenue Dept. 5/9

out
80892

~~Handwritten mark~~

No. 2477d 15 September 1892

(4)

59/9.
2076

Am 30-
m 1-9.