Public Works (1899) Department.

1221

G.O., No. 553 } 554 }

DATED 30 June 99

urgent

23/4/99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Classification of Irrigation Works: Approving for adoption from the current official year in all official reports & accounts the classification proposed by the Chief Engr for Irrign for works dealt with by the Irrigation Branch of the P.W.D. & directing that a copy of the Pro: be forwarded to the Govt of India.

Classification of Irrigation Works: Forwarding copy of Pro: approving for adoption from the current official year in all official reports & accounts the classification proposed by the Chief Engr for Irrign for works dealt with by the Irrign Branch of the P.W.D.

P. W. 86,
250-27-4-89.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Public Works (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 4716

Order

From

The Chief Engineer
for Irrigation

No. 122 I

Dated 1-6-99

Received
Registered 13.6.99

Enclosures 4

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Classification & nomenclature of Irrigation works — Note regarding the —

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

3/

H2.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the

Classification & nomenclature of Irrign works

READ the following

To Board of Rev, Rev Settt Land Records & Agriculture, No 112 M, d/ 12. 4. 99.
From do. No 1985 Mis, d/ 17. 4. 99
To do. 118 M, d/ 25. 4. 99
From do. 2440 Mis, d/ 19. 5. 99

No. 1223 / 1-6-99.

Note by the Chief Engr for Irrigation.

It has been brought to notice that there is a considerable want of uniformity in the nomenclature of the different classes of works dealt with by the Irrigation Branch of the P. W. Dept in different annual statements, lists of

1P

Issue

WH

2

9.6.99

[illegible]

To
The Secretary to Govt,
Rev Dept, for favour
of counter initials -

WH

of works, accounts & reports, some of which are issued by the Board of Revenue & others by this dept. It seems highly desirable that this want of uniformity should be remedied & especially is this the case with the Board's annual review of the Irrigation accounts & the Administration Report issued from this office, both of which must be read together to arrive at a complete knowledge of the transactions of the year with reference to the works dealt with.

2. In the Board's review for 1897-98 the following classification & nomenclature is adopted:—

Class I. Productive Public Works for which Capital & Revd. Accounts are kept.

Class II. Agricultural Works for which Capital & Revd. Accounts are kept.

Class III. Agricultural Works for which individually a continuous record is to be maintained.

Class IV. Works for which neither Capital & Revd. Accounts nor a continuous record of expenditure is kept:—

(a) Imperial,

(b) Minor.

3. In the lists of irrigation sources published by the Board of Revd. for each district

these same classes are referred to.

4. In the Administration Reports issued from this office the following classification & nomenclature has been adopted:—

Class I. Major Works Productive & Protective.

Class II. Minor Works & navigation.—

1. Minor Works for which Capital & Rev. Accounts are kept.

2. Minor Works for which neither Capital nor Rev. Accounts are kept, P. W. D.

3. Minor Works, Rev. Dept.

4. Agricultural Works.

The Rev. Board's Class I.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
IRRIGATION BRANCH.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the

READ the following

3 P

is the same as Class I of the Administration Report, but the wording of the title used by the Rev. Board does not indicate that it includes "Protective" works.

The Rev. Board's Class II is the same as the Administration Report Class II. 1.

The Rev. Board's Class III is not mentioned as a separate class in the opening pages of the Administration Report, but as the works are specially treated in the matter of record of expenditure & revenue & are separately dealt with in the body of the report, they really form a separate class as treated by the Board of Rev.

The term "Agricultural" used by the Board of Rev. as applied to its classes II & III renders them liable to confusion with the P.W.D. Class II. 4 – viz, "Agricultural Works". These works are not irrigation works & are defined as follows in the Madras Manual of Administration –

"Agricultural Works are those which do not yield revenue, but which are necessary for the safety or prosperity of Agriculture".

Generally they consist of flood banks & works connected with river conservancy. It would be better, therefore, not to use the term with reference to the Rev. Boards' Classes II & III.

The two subdivisions of "Imperial" & "Minor" of the Rev. Board's Class IV. are the same as the Classes II. 2. & II. 3 of the P.W.D. Administration Report. The Rev. Board's treatment of these works as two sub divisions of one Class seems a more correct & better classification than that hitherto adopted in the P.W.D. administration report –. From an accounts point of view the two subdivisions are treated in the same way; works are constantly being transferred from one sub division to the other & the T. R. Scheme deals with both sub divisions. The names applied to the two subdivisions by the Board of Revd., viz "Imperial" & "Minor" are, however, open to objection. The only works to which the term "Imperial" seems to be properly applicable are those of Class I, the expenditure on which is met from Imperial funds; and in P.W.G. No. 854 I, d/ 3 Novr./91, the discontinuance of the use of this term as applied to the first subdivision of the Board's Class IV. was decided on. The

Hay K

E. I. Form No 1 (a)—100—3-5-99.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
IRRIGATION BRANCH.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the

READ the following

58

expression has no doubt survived this order from its simplicity as compared with the title ordered to be substituted, viz:- "Minor Works for which neither Capital nor Rev. Accts. are kept, P.W.D."; but if the Class is numbered as is done by the Rev. Board, when brevity is required the works would be referred to as Class IV. P.W.D. which seems simple enough.

The term "Minor" used by the Rev Board to denote the second sub division of its class IV, that is works in charge of the Rev. Dept, is open to the objection that in all P. W. Accounts & reports the term is applied to all the Classes other than "Major" that is to classes II, III & IV.

It has also been noticed that the term "Major Work" is sometimes used to denote an original "Provincial" work costing more than Rs 2500, the use of the word "Major" in this sense should be discontinued.

5 It is proposed that the following classification of works dealt with by the Irrigation Branch of the P. W. Dept be adopted from the current official year in all official reports & accounts:—

this classification having been accepted by the Board of Revenue in its Proceedgs read above

68

Imperial.	Class I. Major Productive & Protective Works.
Provincial.	Class II. Minor Works & Navigation for which Capital & Rev. Accounts are kept.
"	Class III. Minor Works & Navigation for which neither Capital nor Rev. Accts are kept, but for which continuous records of expenditure & revenue are maintained individually.
"	Class IV. Other Minor Works for

which neither Capital
nor Revᵉ: nor individual
accounts are kept —
(a) In charge of the P.W.D.
(b) In charge of the Rev Deptᵗ.
" Class V. Agricultural Works.

Order thereon. — No: 553 Dd 30.6.99.

The proposal made in the last para of the foregoing note by the Chief Engʳ for Irrigation is approved.

A.E.H.
7.6.99

2. Ordered that a copy of these Proc: be forwarded to the Govt of India for information.

Endorsement — No: 554 Dd 30.6.99.

Forwarded.

1/6/99

WH
1.6.99

To
The Chief Engʳ for I
Do T.R.s.
Supg Engrs
Ex P.Ws
Rev Dept

lcw
30/5/99

1221 not

not

Public Works (189) Department.

CURRENT No. 190 M

From The Board of Revenue,
Rev Sett: Land Records & Agriculture

Order

No. 2440 Mis:

Dated 19 May 1899
Received
Registered } 27 — do —
Enclosures
Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Classification and nomenclature of Irrigation works — Acceptance the — as proposed by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Pa D E s

lcw
30/5/99

wh 29/5/99

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
I 118 Mr	25-4-99
R 139 Mr	d/ 17-4-99
I 112 M	d/ 12-4-99

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION.
27 MAY. 1899
No. 190 M

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture),

Dated 19th May 1899

No. 2440 Miscellaneous

READ Again Board's Proceedings No. 1985 dated 17th April 1899.

Read also letter from W. Hughes Esquire Chief Engineer for Irrigation No. 118 Mr dated 25th April 1899.

Resolution.

In the circumstances explained by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation in his letter read above the Board will accept the classification and nomenclature of Irrigation works proposed by him.

(True Extract)

C Benn

For secretary.

To

The Chief Engineer for Irrigation

Entd. WR.
25/5

(Sett. 11—2,000—30-1-99.)

1899.

Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records
and Agriculture),
MADRAS.

To

The Chief Engineer
for Irrigation.

No. of Enclosures.

Proceedings, dated 19th May 1899
No. 2440 Miscellaneous

Subject.

Accepting the classification and nomenclature of irrigation works as proposed by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation

CWE/
4/6/55

Public Works (1899) Department.

RIGATION BRANCH.

R 68 M 9.9.99
9 13 CD 9.9.99 put up
R 19 CD
19-4-99

ISSUE No. 118 M.

To

The Secy, Bd Rev Settlt.

(Reply to ~~letter~~ Procs No. 1985 Mis. dated 17 4/99)

Dated 25-4-99.

Despatched 2-5-99

Enclosures* nil.

* Particulars of Enclosures.

SUBJECT.

Nomenclature of Irrigation works – Replying to the Board's proposals for the simplification of the –

R. I. Form No. 13—4,000—7-1-99

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
R 139 M.	20-4-99

FURTHER PAPERS

No.	Date.
R 190 M	d/19-8-99

Sent to Government with No. I.,
dated 189 .
Printed with G.O., No. I.,
dated 189 .

REMINDERS ISSUED.

No. 1, dated 189 .
„ 2 „
„ 3 „
„ 4 „
„ 5 „

KEEP-WITHS.

G1

No 118 M. d/25-4-99

To
The Secy. to the Commr.
&c (Rev. Sett. L.R. & A.)

Sir,

I have the honour to make the following remarks on the Board's Resolution No. 1985 Mis. d. 17 April 1899 —

The only differences between the nomenclature now proposed by the Board of Rev: and that proposed in my note of the 12th inst: are —

(1) The omission of the words Major & Minor in the names of classes I II & III —

(2) The omission of the words ~~[illegible]~~ "and Navigation" in the ~~name of~~ nomenclature of Class II.

(3) The omission of the words "but for which continuous

records of Expenditure"
+ revenue are maintained"
individually" in the
nomenclature of Class III

(4) The omission of the
word "other" ~~before~~
~~minor works~~ in the first
word of the nomenclature
of Class IV and the
omission of the words
"nor individual" after
"nor Revenue" in the
nomenclature of the same
class —

(5) The omission of ~~III~~
Class V Agricultural
works —

As regards (1)
It is understood that
the Boards proposal
is to call only Class IV
"minor" ~~only~~ thus doing
away with the words
drawing a distinction
between Classes III & IV
entered in ~~the~~ nomenclature
proposed in this office and leaving the description
Imperial + Provincial as
sufficient distinction between
Class I + the other Classes
If we were starting afresh
and if Class I is always Imperial
in all provinces + the other
Classes always provincial the
proposal would undoubtedly be simpler
~~The objection to the~~
~~proposal is that the~~
term "minor" is now

than the present nomenclature
but unfortunately the

~~If it were~~

~~and~~ To propose an
alteration would probably
lead to more correspondence
than ~~it is worth~~ the
alteration is worth.

applied to all Provincial
works in all accounts codes
reports & budgets submitted
to the Govt. of India & to
the Secy. of State from
the Presidency & other
provinces and in which
it is necessary that
there should be uniformity
The proposal seems therefore
inadmissible and the
term Major as applied
to Class I, and minor
to Classes II III & IV
seem necessary —

As regards (2) as Capital
+ Rev: accounts are also
kept for navigation works
as distinguished from irrigation
works the inclusion of the
words "and navigation"
are necessary to describe
~~the~~ Class II dealt with
by the Irrigation branch of
this depart. and it is
suggested that it would be
better that the nomenclature
of the Class used by the
Board of Rev: should be
identical with that used

in the P. W. depart.
although the Rev: Board may not be concerned with that portion of the Class relating to Navigation –

As regards (3) & (4) as for the reasons given above it seems necessary to apply the term "minor" to classes II III & IV it becomes necessary to insert the ~~[illegible]~~ words proposed by the Board to be omitted to distinguish between classes III & IV and the reason – for omitting ~~it~~ the word minor in the nomenclature of class II disappears –

As regards (5) although the Board of Rev: may not be concerned with this class of works it seems ~~necessary~~ advisable for the Board to recognise its existence – ~~[illegible]~~ chiefly ~~to~~ to prevent the term "agricultural" being applied to any other class of works ~~and especially because~~

the simple

~~it is [illegible]~~ that
Also as the class exists and finds a place in P. W. D. accounts & reports, it seems ~~necessary~~ advisable for Rev: Officers to understand to what it refers –

Under these circumstances I have the honour to request that I may be informed whether the Board will accept the classification as proposed by me & which I repeat below –

Although the nomenclature ~~in the~~ is somewhat long I consider there are suffic. reasons for adhering to it and if the Rev: Dept. and all departs. will always adhere to exactly the same letters the ~~works will~~ classes will soon become known to all concerned by the number of the Class and it will not be necessary to use the long definitions in all cases.

Class I Imperial – Major Productive & Protective works

Class II – Provincial – Minor works & Navigation for which Capital and Revenue Accounts are kept.

Class III – Provincial – Minor works for which neither Capital nor Rev. Accounts are kept but for which Continuous record of Expenditure and Revenue are maintained individually –

Class. IV Provincial – Other minor works for which

Neither Capital nor individual accounts are kept.

(a) In charge of the Public works Dept

(b) In charge of the Revenue Dept.

Class. V. Agricultural works.

J.H.
25/4/99

W.H.
25.4.99

Ob. 2
27/6/99

Public Works (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 139 M.

From Bd. Rev Settlmt

Order

No. 1985 Mis

Dated 17-4-99.

Received
Registered 20-4-99.

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Nomenclature of the several classes of Irrigation works. Enquiring whether the —— cannot be simplified as shown by the Board.

Ta D.E.S.

27/10/1899

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
I 112 M	12-4-99
K 10 CD	15-3-99
I 13 CD	27-2-99

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

(Sett. 12—2,000—3-11-98.)

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION
20 APR. 1899
139 M.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture),

Dated 17th April 1899

No. 1986 Miscellaneous.

READ letter from W. Hughes Esquire, Chief Engineer for Irrigation, No 112 M dated 12th April 1899.

Resolution.

The Chief Engineer for Irrigation is requested to state — whether the nomenclature of the several classes of Irrigation Works may not be simplified as shown below:

Class I Imperial — Major Productive and Protective Works

Class II Provincial — Minor Works for which Navigation Capital and Revenue accounts are kept.

Class III — Do — Minor Works for which

neither Capital
nor Revenue accounts
are kept but for which continuous records
of expenditure
these are
maintained
individually

Class IV Provincial – Other Minor Works for
for which neither
capital nor Revenue
not individual
accounts are kept.

(a) In charge of the
Public Works Department
(b) In charge of the
Revenue Department.

Class V Agricultural Works

(True Extract)

R. V. Srinivasier
Secretary

To,
The Chief Engineer for Irrigation

Letter from the Chief
Engineer for Irrigation No. 11 dated
12th April 83.

Irrigation

The Chief Engineer for
Irrigation is requested to state
whether the nomenclature of the
several classes of Irrigation
may not be simplified as shown
below:

Class I Imperial – Productive and
Protective Works

Class II Provincial – Works for which
capital and Revenue
accounts are kept

G.O. 5. / 4774/55

Ecd / 1814

(Sett. 10—2,000—30-1-99.)

1899.

Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records
and Agriculture),

MADRAS.

To

The Chief Engineer for
Irrigation.

No. of Enclosures.

Proceedings, dated 17th April 1899.
No. 1985 Miscellaneous.

Subject.

Irrigation Works

Requesting the Chief Engineer for Irrigation to state whether the nomenclature of the several classes of —— may not be simplified as herein shown.

Public Works (1899) Department.

IRRIGATION BRANCH.

ISSUE No. 112 M

To

The Secy to the Commr
of Reve Sett L R Agr

(Reply to letter No. , dated)

Dated 12-4-99
Despatched 14-4-99
Enclosures * 1 Note

* Particulars of Enclosures.

SUBJECT.

Nomenclature of Irrigation works — Forwards a copy of a Note on the subject of the — with a request to be informed whether the Board are ready to accept the classification and nomenclature proposed

1. Form No. 13—4,000—7-1-99

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
R 10 CO/99	

Sent to Government with No. I., dated 189 .

Printed with G.O., No. I., dated 189 .

REMINDERS ISSUED.

No. 1, dated	189 .
" 2 "	
" 3 "	
" 4 "	
" 5 "	

KEEP-WITHS.

FURTHER PAPER

No.	Date.
R 139 Rev	17-5-99
R 190 Irrg	19-5-99

Urgent

No 112 M. of 12-4-99

To
The Secy. to the Commrs.
&c &c.
Bd. Rev.

Sir,

I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of a note on the subject of the nomenclature of irrigation works and to request that I may be informed whether the Board of Rev. are ready to accept the classification & nomencla proposed —

11/4

WH
12.4.99

On receipt of reply from Rev. Board Enclos. if no objection Enclos is made — an order may be drafted approving of the proposal which may if necessary be referred to Rev. for concurrence

11/4/99

7 8