1. Number of pages. 12
2. Date of receipt 14-7-37
3. Reference
M.R.O. 1—82,409—23-11-36
4

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

Con. 30-6-37

G.O. No. 1254 Press Mis.

4748

Dated 26-6- 18 37

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Fort Saint George, Public Works Consultation of 30th June 1857.

No. 47. Read the following letter from Colonel C. E. FABER, Chief Engineer; to H. FORBES, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, dated 12th May 1857, No. 251.

SIR,

With reference to Extract of Minutes Consultation dated 27th April 1854, No. 502, forwarding an extract from a general letter from the Honorable Court of Directors dated 1st March 1854, No. 1, which had reference to a Memorial from certain Merassidars of Pennaput in the District of Chingleput, complaining that the excavation of a certain channel had been suspended after it had received the sanction of the Government, I have the honor to inform you, that further investigations have been made, from which it seems that if the channel be cut, the profit from the work will probably be about 9 per cent. on the outlay estimated at Rupees (1,584) one thousand five hundred and eighty-four, irrespective of a sum of (160) one hundred and sixty Rupees Compensation for four Cawnies of ground at 40 Rupees the Cawnie.

2. In the year 1848 the Assistant Civil Engineer Lieutenant Foord framed an estimate amounting to Rupees 707-10-8 for cutting the above channel, and it received the sanction of Government on the 24th January 1850. When the work was about to be executed, objections were raised by the Merassidars of Woolaloor, Colattoor, and Manapaukum. The spring by which the channel was to be supplied has its origin in the course of the Manapaukum river channel, and to enable the Pennaput people to avail themselves of the spring it was necessary to cut a new line from the Manapaukum river channel for a considerable distance. To this the Manapaukum people objected, stating, that although the water of the spring was too low for irrigating their fields without artificial means, that it could be accomplished by the a genc of Picottahs.

3. In April 1850, Captain Collyer then the Civil Engineer of the 4th Division, on the requisition of Mr. Conway, again visited the spot, and was of opinion that the work should be suspended untill further enquiries were made respecting the sufficiency of the spring, respecting the amount of damage to the villages through which it would pass, and respecting the ability of the Pennaput people to cut the channel through their own lands, which they had agreed to do and lastly, he thought it worthy of consideration, whether it might not be more profitable to give the Manapaukum people the benefit of the spring by erecting a Tolacut and Picottah.

4. In the village of Manapaukum, the Ayacut is Rupees 2,659, the river channel was cut at a large outlay in 1847, but as the revenue is but 1,115 Rupees; the Civil Engineer inferred that they laboured under an insufficiency of water, and Mr. Freese suspended the project, considering that the profits were not likely to reimburse the outlay, the original estimate being clearly insufficient.

5. The subject was again however brought forward and re-submitted to Mr. Smollett in 1854, and he was informed by Captain Collyer, that there were no professional difficulties that it was not a question of Engineering, but of profit, and that the small amount of revenue alone caused him to look unfavorably upon the project.

6. Mr. Smollett was of opinion that the cost of the work being together with remuneration for land occupied, only (800) eight hundred Rupees, and the profit (291) two hundred and ninety one, or more than 30 per cent. Mr. Freese had been rather hasty in abandoning the subject, but that with the violent opposition of the Manapaukum villagers, it would be better to make additional enquiries before prosecuting the work.

7. The Board of Revenue on a further consideration of the subject (again brought before them by petition of the Pennaput Merassidars) resolved in the Proceedings No. 381 dated 14th April 1851, that the prosecution of the work was inexpedient.

8. On the 16th October 1855, the Government in Minutes of Consultation No. 678, again called the direction of the Chief Engineer to the subject. After some correspondence between the Central office, the Collector of Chingleput finally reports in a letter No. 88 dated 1st April 1857, that the land which will be occupied by the spring channel, is 6 Cawnies, 3 Annas of which 2 Cawnies and $2\frac{1}{3}$ Annas, being immemorial waste the amount to be paid for is 4 Cawnies 8 Annas, and that the value ought not to exceed 40 Rupees a Cawnie.

9. The Estimate amounts to Rupees (1,584) one thousand five hundred and eighty-four, and if to this be added (160) one hundred and sixty, the compensation for 4 Cawnies, the total expenditure will be Rupees (1,744) one thousand seven hundred and forty-four. He states that if the whole ground were cultivated, the revenue return would be Rupees 291, which is 16 per cent. on probable expenditure, but that taking all things into consideration, he cannot estimate it at more than 150 Rupees, which is only 8-5 per cent. He further observes that the villagers of Manapaukum are not likely to lay aside their objections, but that the ground can be taken possession of under Act XXII of 1852.

10. Should the Government on full consideration of all the foregoing circumstances, think it advisable to excavate this channel, which it thus appears will not only cost double the original estimate, but will yield but little more than half the return formerly stated, I shall at once forward the estimates for insertion in the Budget of 1858-59, and I beg to be honored with final orders on the subject.

No. 48. ORDER THEREON, No. 1254; dated 26th June 1857.

In this letter, the Chief Engineer explains the circumstances under which the excavation of the Pennapet Channel in Chingleput, sanctioned under date the 24th January 1850, No. 84, was suspended, and requests the orders of Government, with reference to the probable return from the undertaking, whether the project should be abandoned or carried out.

2. The estimate originally sanctioned amounted to Rupees 708, which with Rupees 160, the compensation for the lands required, gave a total cost of Rupees 868. The return was calculated at Rupees 291, or 34 per cent. The present Collector thinks it more safe to set it down at 150 Rupees, and the per centage will even then not fall short of 17. Colonel Faber states in para. 9 of his letter, that the estimate (apparently for the same work) amounts to Rupees 1,584, or to Rupees 1,744, with the compensation, and thus reduces the return to 8½ per cent, but he gives no explanation whatever of the circumstances which have led to the original estimate being doubled. The Government are unable to dispose of the question at issue in the absence of this information, and Colonel Faber will lose no time in supplying the omission.

(Signed) H. FORBES,
Acting Secretary to Government.

3

Central Office of P. Works,
Fort Saint George,
12th May 1857.

No. 257.

From,
The Chief Engineer.

Revenue

To,
The Secretary to Government P. W. D.

Sir,

With reference to Extract of Minutes
Consultation dated 27th April 1854 No. 502, forwarding an
extract from a general letter from the Honorable Court
of Directors dated 1st March 1854 No. 1, which had
reference to a Memorial from certain Merasidars of
Pennaput in the District of Chingleput, complaining
that the excavation of a certain channel had been suspended
after it had received the Sanction of the Government, I have
the honor to inform you, that further investigations have been
made, from which it seems that if the channel be cut, the
profit from the work will probably be about 9 per Cent on the
outlay estimated at Rupees (1,584) One thousand five
hundred and eighty four, irrespective of a Sum of (160) one
hundred and Sixty Rupees compensation for four Cawnies
of ground at 40 Rupees the Cawnie.

Issued 6
Original letter with 5

2 In the year 1848 the Assistant Civil
Engineer Lieutenant Foord framed an Estimate Amounting
to

to Rupees 707—10—8 for cutting the above Channel, and it received the Sanction of Government on the 24th January 1850. When the work was about to be executed, objections were raised by the Meerasidars of Woolaloor, Elattoor, and Manapaukum.

The spring by which the Channel was to be supplied has its origin in the course of the Manapaukum river Channel, and to enable the Pennaput people to avail themselves of the spring, it was necessary to cut a new line from the Manapaukum river Channel for a considerable distance. To this the Manapaukum people objected, stating, that although the water of the spring was too low for irrigating their fields without artificial means, that it could be accomplished by the Agency of Picottahs.

3 In April 1850, Captain Collyer then the Civil Engineer of the 2nd Division, on the Requisition of Mr Conway, again visited the spot, and was of opinion, that the work should be suspended until further enquiries were made respecting the Sufficiency of the Spring, respecting the amount of damage to the villages through which it would pass, and respecting the ability of the Pennaput people to cut the Channel through their own lands, which they had agreed to do. and lastly, he thought it worthy of consideration, whether it might not be more profitable to give the Manapaukum people the benefit of the spring by erecting a Tolacut and Picottah.—

In

4 In the village of Manapaukum, the Ayacut is Rupees 2.659, the river Channel was cut at a large outlay in 1847; but as the revenue is but 1115 Rupees, the Civil Engineer inferred that they laboured under an insufficiency of water, and Mr Freese suspended the project, considering that the profits were not likely to reimburse the outlay, the original Estimate being clearly insufficient.

5 The subject was again however brought forward and resubmitted to Mr Smollet in 1852, and he was informed by Captain Collyer, that there were no professional difficulties, that it was not a question of Engineering, but of profit, and that the small amount of Revenue alone, caused him to look unfavorably upon the project.

6 Mr Smollet was of opinion that the cost of the work being, together with Remuneration for land occupied, only (800) eight hundred Rupees, and the profit (291) two hundred and Ninety one, or more than 30. %, Mr Freese had been rather hasty in abandoning the Subject, but that with the violent opposition of the Manapaukum villagers, it would be better to make additional enquiries before prosecuting the work.—

7 The Board of Revenue on a further consideration of the Subject (again brought before them by petition of the Pennaput Meerasdedars) Resolved in the Proceedings

P 381

No. 381 dated 14th April 1851, that the prosecution of the work was unexpedient.

8 On the 16th October 1855, the Government in Consl. Cons. No. 678, again called the direction of the Chief Engineer to the Subject. After some correspondence between the Central Office, the Collector of Chingleput finally reports in a letter No. 88 dated 1st April 1857, that the land which will be occupied by the Spring Channel, is 6 cawnies, 3 annas of which 2 cawnies, and 2½ annas being immemorial waste. the amount to be paid for is 6 cawnies. 0. 8 annas, and that the value ought not to exceed 60 Rupees a cawnie.

9 The Estimate amounts to Rupees (1584) One thousand five hundred and eighty four, and if to this be added (160) one hundred and Sixty, the Compensation for 6 Cawnies, the total expenditure will be Rupees (1744) one thousand Seven hundred and forty four. He states that if the whole ground were cultivated, the Revenue return would be Rupees 291, which is 16 per Cent on probable expenditure, but that taking all things into consideration, he cannot Estimate it at more than 150 Rupees, which is only 8. 5 per Cent. He further observes that the villagers of Nanapaukum are not likely to lay aside their objections, but that the ground can be taken possession of under Act XXII of 1852. —

10 Should the Government on full Consideration

consideration of all the foregoing circumstances, think it advisable to excavate this Channel, which it thus appears will not only cost double the original Estimate, but will yield but little more than half the return formerly stated, I shall at once forward the Estimates for insertion in the Budget of 1858/59, and I beg to be honored with final orders on the Subject.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obt. Servt.

Central Office of P. W.
Fort Saint George,
12th May 1857.

W. Fisher Colonel
Chief Engineer.

GLL

To,
The Secretary to Government
P. W. D.

Copied W. Fisher Colonel

P.W.D

S. 1254

3

Extract from the Minutes of Council
Under date the 26th June 1857.

Read the following
letter from the Chief Engi-
neer -

Dated under 12 May/57 & 1257

In this letter the
Chief Engineer explains
the circumstances under
which the examination of
the Pamapet Channel
in Chingleput, sanctioned
under date the 24 January
1856 & 84, was suspended, and requests to
the orders of Govt with
reference to the probable
return from the under-
-taking, whether the
project

Public Works Department
Dated 18th May 1857
Rec'd 26th "
From The Chief Engineer.

To The Secretary to Government
P.W.D.

Dated 12 May 1857.
Received 18th "

Submits to Govt. Mr. Lord's
No 502 dated 27th April 1857
regarding the operation of the
Pamapet Channel in the
Chingleput District and
requests orders upon the subject.

Copy of Letter No 223 to
Copy of Letter from Mr. Lord dated 27th April 1857 No 502
Copy of Letter from Mr. Lord dated 10th October 1856 No 1254
Copy of Letter from Mr. Lord dated 4th April 1856 No 35

Copy of Letter No 223

project should be aban-
doned or carried out.

2 The Estimate originally sanctioned amounted to Rs 705 Rs 160 which with the commission Rs 865 for the lands required, gave a total cost of Rs 868. The returns were calculated at Rs 291, or 34 per Cent. The present Collector thinks, it more expedient to sell it down at 150 Rs, and the per Centage will even then not fall short of 17. Coll Taber states in para 3 of his letter, that the Estimate, (apparently for the same work) amounts to Rs 1,584

or to Rs 1,744 together with the Commission, and thus reduced, the returns to 8½ per Cent. but he gives no explanation whatever of the circumstances which have led to doubling the original Estimate. The Govt are unable to dispose of the question advised in the absence of this information and Colonel Taber will have no time in supplying the omission.

J Z

By Copies to the Chief Engr. with Drawings &c.

Public Works Dept.
Dn to Govt 30th June.

C.P. 1254.

Extract Minutes:

Dy 26th June/57

Sent Chief Engr 9th July 57
6 No 1398 in 6 Mary

Observing that Govt are unable to dispose of the question regarding the excavation of the Pennaket Channel in the Chingle-put District in the absence of the explanation of the circumstances which have led to the original estimate being doubled, & requesting the Chief Engr to lose no time in supplying the omission.

No 47 of 48.

C.P. Jun 1225