M.R.O. 1—77,005—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 42

(2) Date of repair 5-9-42

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1225	Press Mis.
240-241.		
Dated	12-6-	18 62.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 240. Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel S. O. E. LUDLOW, Deputy Chief Engineer, Northern Circle, to Lieutenant-Colonel W. H. HORSLEY, Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Chepauk, 15th May 1862, No. 306/N 61:—

SIR,

1. Letter from the District Engineer, Nellore, No. 960, dated 5th May 1862.
1. Copies of correspondence.
1. Statement.

1. I have the honor to forward for the information of Government a letter from the District Engineer Nellore, and correspondence between that Officer and the Collector on the subject of the statement called for by Government of the effects of the Pennár Anicut works, and to request that I may be favored with orders as to the form in which the said Statement is to be drawn up, on which point there is a difference of opinion between the Collector and Engineer.

2. It appears from this correspondence that these Officers are materially at issue, 1st, as to the facts of the case; 2nd, as to the proper mode of exhibiting the effects produced by the works.

3. That there has been an increase of revenue under the channels supplied by the Anicut, since the Anicut was first begun, is an admitted fact, but while the Engineer gives the credit of much of this increase to the Anicut, though damaged and imperfect, the Collector considers that none of the increase is due to the work, but attributes it mainly to the construction of Corumboos by customary labor. On this point the Engineer remarks, and as I think justly, that unless the amount of customary labor was increased, which is not alleged, after the construction of the Anicut, the increase of cultivation must be attributed to the effects of that work.

4. In paragraph 3 of his letter, No. 651, Captain Mullins exhibits a statement of the useful effects produced by the Anicut from the time of its construction in 1855 until that of its completion in 1861, which it is impossible to reconcile with the very different account given by the Collector in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, of his reply, No. 113. These discrepancies will have to be cleared up by further information and enquiry before a satisfactory report can be drawn up, but at present the question that presses for immediate settlement is the form of Return which will have to be furnished.

5. Captain Mullins proposes a form of Statement showing the average Revenue of *all* lands (and I of course understand him to mean all lands *now*) irrigated by the Anicut Channels for the ten years prior to 1855, and the revenue of such lands for each year subsequent to that date. These Returns, if no extraneous causes of disturbance existed, ought to exhibt the results of the work, but as such causes do exist, he requests information as to the effect which the orders relating to the liberty of giving up land, the diminution of the assessment and other causes may have had in influencing the extent of cultivation and amount of revenue.

6. The Collector objects to a comparison of the results prior to 1855 with those subsequent to that date, and thinks that it would be safe to commence to calculate the returns on the Pennár Irrigation from the current year. He however altogether omits to state what year or years, the current year is to be compared with, though in order to judge of the results, some comparison is indispensable. If the comparison is to be made between the current year and the average of ten years prior to 1855, the result would be too favorable to the Anicut, if with the average subsequent to 1855 too unfavorable.

7. In paragraph 10 of his letter the Collector raises sundry objections to Captain Mullins' proposals. His objection to the Statement called for, is I think fully and satisfactorily answered by Captain Mullins in paragraph 6 of his No. 906, and in paragraph 7 he explains in an equally satisfactory manner his reasons for asking for the other information he desired to have.

8. After weighing carefully the arguments adduced on both sides, I am of opinion that the actual results of the Anicut would be well elucidated if exhibited in the form of Statement proposed by Captain Mullins, and therefore recommend it for adoption.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department, 12th June 1862.

No. 211. ORDER THEREON, 12th June 1862, No. 1,335.

No. 329. 1. In paragraph 3 of the Despatch from the Secretary of State, dated 8th February 1862, information was called for of the effects on the cultivation and on the land revenue resulting from the Nellore Anicut and Channels.

2. In the above letter the Deputy Chief Engineer submits correspondence between the Collector and District Engineer, showing that those Officers are materially at issue, 1st, as to the facts of the case, and 2nd, as to the proper mode of exhibiting the results of the works, and recommends that the form proposed by the District Engineer be adopted.

3. The Government however are of opinion that the simplest proceeding will be to prepare a Return showing the area, and revenue derived from the Channels in question for 10 years prior to 1855, and for each year subsequently. The Government will then be able to form their own judgment from the actual cultivation and return. A separate Statement showing the effect produced by the reduction of assessment in increasing the area of land taken up might also be prepared. Entries in the column of Remarks of the state of the Anicut during each year will probably help to show how far the fluctuations of revenue were influenced by the accidents to that work.

(Signed) W. H. HORSLEY, Lieut.-Colonel,
Secretary to Government.

No 906

Hellows
5th May 1862.

From

Captain J. Mullins
District Engr Hellows

To Lieutenant Colonel J. Cruchterlony
dy Chief Engineer R.E.
Chepauk

Sir,

On the receipt of your order
No N.61 / 202 of the 25th March last, Commu=
=nicating the order of Government
No 485 of the 19th March 1862, by which
an annual Statement shewing the
effects of the Armair Anicut works
is required to be submitted, I examined
the returns of Remunerative works for
the last 2 years and found that, in
consequence of the damage which the
Anicut sustained in 1858, and its
subsequently incomplete state, the
Collector had considered that no
none of the increase of Revenue
obtained from the Channels under
it should be credited to the work.
I therefore wrote to that Officer on
the subject, with a view to obtain his
opinion as to the principles upon which
he considered that the returns
should be made out, and I have now
the honor to forward a Copy of my
letter No 651 of the 4th ultimo and of
the

Rec'd April 30th 1862
Chepauk
Letter to Engineer
dated 5th May 1862

Enclosure in a letter
No 906 dated 5th May 1862
from the Chief Engr Hellows

Recd 14th May 1862

Statement shewing the Average Revenue realized under the Head "Sale of Anicut Channel Water" during the years 1854-55 to 1860-61 for the purpose of ascertaining the increase or decrease of Revenue realized each year from 1855-56 to 1860-61 in relation to the Average Revenue of the 4 years 1854-55 to 1857-58 previous to the completion of the Anicut Repairs in 1858-59

Years	Revenue realized	Increase	Decrease
1854-55	1,05,000		
1855-56	1,05,000		
1856-57	1,05,000		
1857-58	1,05,000		
Average of 4 years	1,05,000		
1858-59	1,05,000		
1859-60	1,05,000		
1860-61	1,05,000		

Collector's Office
Chepauk
30th April 1862

Sd/ J. Bruce
Collector

the Collectors reply dated 20th idem, and, in requesting that I may be furnished with instructions as to the manner in which the revenue returns are to be made out, I beg to offer the following remarks on the correspondence now enclosed.

2 Para 3 of the Collectors letter is the first which calls for any remark. That Officer is mistaken as to the displacement of the stone thrown in across the Southern portion of the former breach in the Anicut. I remember well that when the freshet subsided both Mr. Sage and myself were surprised to find that the stone had not been displaced; I believe that the then state of the Anicut materially affected the question of the supply of water to the Saffer Laike, and that, had the condition of the river been what it was prior to 1855, the cultivation could not have been supplied. Much of the Corumbu which I laid out in 1858, and which was constructed principally, but not entirely, by customary labor, is still in existence, while it would certainly have disappeared entirely with the first freshet but for the presence

of the Southern portion of the Anicut which has always been, since 1855, full height.

3 The Collector lays considerable stress on the fact that customary labor was for the years 1858/59, 1859/60 and 1860/61 required to a large extent for the construction of Corumbos to raise the head of water at the head sluice. But the point in question is only to a small extent affected by this consideration, for the water for the revenue derived prior to 1855/56 was so raised, and unless the Collector is prepared to prove that the proportion of Customary labour to revenue was greater in the 3 years abovementioned than it was prior to 1855/56, I do not see that it is at all requisite to say that because the Anicut did not do every thing, therefore it did nothing. I by no means wish to depreciate the value of the Customary labour, but Anicuts are not built to do away with such labor but to increase the supply of water. There is the one plain fact that the revenue has increased very considerably on the whole period, and to some extent for each season even under very unfavorable circumstances

so

so far as the work itself is considered, for the ryots have, since 1855/56, been allowed to throw up their lands, the assessment has been lowered, and in 1860/61, in which year the anicut was completed to half height or to 1½ feet above the bed of the Sapperaile Channel, there was a very short monsoon the rain fall having been but 27.35 inches from July to December inclusive against 55.52 inches in 1859, and yet there was an increase of Revenue of Rs. 3562; this should not be attributed to customary labour I think as prior to 1855 that customary labour in a fair season could not produce the same revenue within Rupees 3562.

4 In paras 6 and 7 the Collector appears to think that were the anicut and its irrigation handed over to a private company, Customary labor would necessarily no longer be given, for, in para 7, he infers that its continuance is consequent upon the works remaining in the hands of Government. This supposition is supposed to affect the case I put in para 4 of my letter, but I think it hardly does so at all, for probably had it been considered inexpedient to allow customary labour to be continued when the works were transferred to a company, the labour would have been commuted to a money payment, by a slight increase in the water rate.

5. With regard to para 9 of the Collectors letter, I have already stated that in the first 2 of the 3 years to which he refers, the supply was partly due to the facility, which the state of the river bed, and the part of the anicut still standing afforded for the construction of Cummoos. In the last of the 3 years the supply was mainly due to the anicut itself. The expression "we are less likely to mislead the Government and be on the safe side, by commencing to calculate the returns on the Cauvery irrigation works from the current year" can only really mean that the Collector considers it better to ignore whatever probable Revenue has been derived from 1855/56 to 1860/61, in consequence of the operations on the anicut works, and the part of which belonging to the first two years fully, and to the last year principally, is actually attributable to those works, than to run the risk of crediting to the anicut for the years 1858/59 and 1859/60 some increase of Revenue, which might perhaps, with some show of reason, be considered due to other causes.

I

I do not agree with that Officer in that the amount at issue is a small matter, but, even were it so, I should feel it equally my duty to object to such an arrangement. It appears to me to be clear that if all increase of revenue, prior to the completion of the present anicut, is to be left out of the calculation, all expenditure which occurred before the anicut on its present section was commenced should be likewise omitted. This latter arrangement, I might suggest, would avoid all chance of misleading.

6 The Collector in para 10 of his letter says that the return of revenue on all lands under the Sapper Sail Channel for 10 years prior to 1855 & for each year subsequent to that date would mislead because the villages, not at the former time irrigated from that Channel, have received supplies subsequently to 1855, but it appears to me that this difficulty is easily got over by preparing the return in the form herewith enclosed, and marked A, which will show clearly the increase on each village which was in connection with the Sapper Sail for each year from 1855/56 and for all other villages from the first year of such connection, and, in fact, unless originally prepared in this way and afterwards yearly completed for additional villages, the general statement, to which the Collector refers as under preparation, in the same para of his letter, will be of little use as a comparative return of Revenue.

7 The information asked for under the 3d heads in para 5 of my letter is that to which the Collector refers in para 13 of his reply. It will be seen that I did not wish for "the effects of the anicuts as regards the relinquishment of lands" but the effect of the order allowing the relinquishment of lands on the revenue of the Villages under the anicuts. There may have been a falling off of Revenue in some villages consequent upon that order, and, if so, it is as well that the fact should be placed on record, for of course such decrease is not the fault of the anicuts, and though the result will be debited to it, in reality the debit should, rightly speaking, be carried back to the time prior to 1855. Similarly the production of the assessment cannot be introduced as an item affecting the entries in the tabulated statement of Revenue, but on the other hand it is an important matter, on which to have some tangible information,

information, for prior to 1865, the water was insufficient to admit of an increase of area, and consequently a decrease of Revenue on the then existing area would have caused an absolute loss of Revenue. Now the case is different, a lower assessment on a certain area has been more than compensated by extending the area from which revenue can be obtained. The information also can I think without difficulty be given. All I wish to know is - had the assessment been reduced prior to 1855, what deduction from the receipts of the 10 years would have resulted. It matters little whether this information be made out on the supposition that the production took place in the last year prior to the construction of the anicuts, for it is easy to calculate the average of 10 years with the coefficient thus supplied for one year. I do not wish to argue that the revenue would have been higher since the anicuts have been built had the rates of assessment remained what they were, but I do say that the average Revenue of 10 years previously, and against which the present revenue is to be exhibited, would have been lower, and though perhaps it is better that

3

that the Statement should be confined to actual facts, without admitting any modifications due to affecting causes, there will I hope be no objection to the amount receiving paper credit on these accounts.

I will now have a Statement of all expenditure, whether on the anicuts itself or on works connected with it for each year since their first commencement in 1854/55, prepared, in readiness for incorporation with the revenue returns in whatever way these may be directed to be made out.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obed[t] Servt
Colin Mackenzie Capt[n] R.E.
District Engr Kelaroo

Kistna

Deputy Chief Engr Office N. C.
Chepauk 15th May 1862

No 306

From,

Lieutenant Colonel S. C. E. Ludlow
Deputy Chief Engineer N. C.

To,

Lieutenant Colonel W. H. Horsley
Secretary to Government P. W.
Chepauk.

Public

Sir,

I have the honor to forward for the information of Government a letter from the District Engineer Nellore, and correspondence between that Officer and the Collector on the subject of the statement called for by Government of the effects of the Pennar Annicut works, and to request that I may be favored with orders as to the Form in which the said statement is to be drawn up, on which point there is a difference of opinion between the Collector and Engineer.

2. It appears from this correspondence that these Officers are materially at

have been differently exhibited - The facts however

Recd 5th May 1862.
Copies forwarded
Letter Recd

No 306 Dated 15th May 1862
From Lt Colonel S. C. E. Ludlow
Deputy Chief Engineer
To The Secretary Chief Engr (Pub. Wks)
N. C.
Dated 5th May 1862
Copy in a letter to England
Dated 11th November No 90
of 1862.

No 306

Copy forwarded to the Secretary
to Government Fort St George
for the information of
the Collector of Nellore
in this Office

Lt Colonel
Chief Engineer
N. C.

at issue. 1st as to the Facts of the case. 2nd as to the proper mode of exhibiting the effects produced by the works.

3 That there has been an increase of Revenue under the Channels supplied by the Annicut, since the Annicut was first begun, is an admitted fact, but while the Engineer gives the credit of much of this increase to the annicut, though damaged and imperfect, the Collector considers that none of the increase is due to the work, but attributes it mainly to the construction of Coumboos by customary labor. On this point the Engineer remarks, and as I think justly, that unless the amount of customary labor was increased, which is not alleged, after the construction of the annicut the increase of cultivation must be attributed to the effects of that work.

4. In para 3 of his letter No 651, Captain Mullins exhibits a statement of the useful effects produced by the annicut from the time of its construction in 1855 until that of its completion

in

in 1861, which it is impossible to reconcile with the very different account given by the Collector in paras 2, 3 & 4 of his reply No 113. These discrepancies will have to be cleared up by further information and enquiry before a satisfactory report can be drawn up, but at present the question that presses for immediate settlement is the Form of return which will have to be furnished.

5. Captain Mullins proposes a form of statement shewing the average Revenue of all lands, and I of course understand him to mean all lands now irrigated by the Annicut Channels for the 10 years prior to 1855, and the Revenue of such lands for each year subsequent to that date. These returns if no extraneous causes of disturbance existed, ought to exhibit the results of the work, but as such causes do exist, he requests information as to the effect which the orders relating to the Liberty of giving up land, the diminution of the assessment and other causes may

have

have been differently exhibited - The facts however

have had in influencing the extent of cultivation and amount of Revenue.

6. The Collector objects to a comparison of the results prior to 1855 with those subsequent to that date, and thinks that it would be safe to commence to calculate the returns on the Pennaur Irrigation from the current year. He however altogether omits to state what year or years, the current year is to be compared with, though in order to judge of the results, some comparison is indispensable. If the comparison is to be made between the current year and the average of 10 years prior to 1855, the result would be too favorable to the Annicut if with the average subsequent to 1855 too unfavorable.

7. In para 10 of his letter the Collector raises sundry objections to Captain Mullins' proposals. His objection to the Statement called for, is I think fully and satisfactorily answered by Captain Mullins in para 6 of his No. 906 and in para 7 he explains in

in an equally satisfactory manner his reasons for asking for the other information he desired to have

8. After weighing carefully the arguments adduced on both sides I am of opinion that the actual results of the Annicut would be well elucidated if exhibited in the form of statement proposed by Captain Mullins, and therefore recommend it for adoption.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant
F. J. Hudson Lt. Col.
Dy. Chief Engr. N. C.

To
Lieutenant Colonel H. H. Horsley
Secretary to Government P. W.
Chepauk.

have been differently exhibited - The facts however

No 651.

From

Captain John Inglis

District Engineer Nellore

To

J. W. B. Dykes Esqre

Collector of Nellore

Sir

In their order No 486 of the 19 March 1862 the Government direct, with reference to the despatch of the Secretary of State for India of 8th February 1862 No 3, that an annual Statement, showing the effects of the Permanent Amount upon the Assessment & Land Revenue of this District is to be submitted.

2 On looking at the Statements of remunerative works for the years 1859/60 & 1860/61, I find that you have stated that no benefits from the Amount were derived in either of those years while you doubt whether any of the increase of Revenues can be ascribed to the Amount.

3. Unfortunately neither yourself nor the late acting District Engineer were acquainted with the Circumstances, otherwise perhaps, these statements would have been differently exhibited - The facts however

× Remarks written in the Statement for 1859/60

Rec'd 14th March 1862. No 309 - 310 } G.S.C.
Ans'd in a letter to Govt dated 11th March 1862. No 190 &c.

To J. W. B. Dykes Esqre
Collector of Nellore
No: of 1862

Sir,

With reference to the Govt Order noted in the margin, I have the honor to forward herewith a Statement of the Works executed in this District during the year 1859/60 with the Amount allotted to each, and the Expenditure incurred thereon.

2. I have also the honor to forward a Statement of the Works executed during the year 1860/61 with the Amount allotted to each, and the Expenditure incurred thereon.

3. I have to request that the Statements may be returned to me for the purpose of being filled up.

Dated 15th May 1862
Rec'd 19th "
Ans'd 20th "
No 240

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
John Inglis
Capt
District Engineer

Nellore
15th May 1862.

Submits corrected Statements of the Works executed in this District during the years 1859/60 & 1860/61, with the Amount allotted to each, and the Expenditure incurred thereon, as called for by the Chief Engineer's Circular Orders of the 19th March 1862, and requests instructions as to the form in which the said Statements is to be drawn out.

No 1350-12 Cire.

Copy of Proceedings

are as follows. The Ancient on its original design was completed in August 1855. It afforded a full supply in the Monsoon of that year, keeping the water up to the Level of the Crown until the close of January 1856. There were Considerable freshes in July 1856, which it utilized. Similarly, during the Monsoon of 1856, the work afforded as much water as the Channels could carry, & again up to November 1857. In that Month it breached for a length of 102 yards, but this breach was quickly closed, & the water kept up. In 1858 the Ancient was 2/3rds destroyed, but under my own supervision a Coramba in Connection with the part at the South end, which remained standing, afforded a fair supply of water to the Jaffer Saib. In 1859 the breach was closed entirely across, to a height which materially aided in throwing a supply ~~aided in throwing a supply~~ into the Channels. In 1860 the Ancient was half its proper height in the middle, & full height for about one third of its length at the two ends, & this last year 1861 it was complete

4. I think myself that in estimating the value of an irrigation work some simple system must be adopted as a foundation for the preparation of the Statements of results. How supposed, as was at one time not very unlikely would be the case, the Construction of the Ancient and the irrigation under its Channels had been handed over to an Irrigation Company, in such case the sum to be paid yearly to Government would have been fixed with reference to the average yearly revenue derived prior to the Construction of the Ancient, & what increase this revenue subsequently attained would have been attributed to the work, whether it was entirely & essentially due to them in all its details, or not. The same course, it would seem to me, should be followed now, for if not & an attempt be made to distinguish between the work itself & the secondary causes in Connection with it, the task will be endless & a satisfactory agreement of opinion impracticable. For instance if, because in 1860/61 the Ancient was for a greater part of its length only half its full

height, & some assistance in increasing the head of water by Corambus was requisite, and on this account the value of the Amount be considered nothing, I can easily shew that such a Corambu would have been either impracticable or that a much more substantial work would have been necessary, without the protection of the incomplete dam & that moreover as even an Ancient 6½ feet high placed 1½ feet of water on the Head Sluice floor, when the water in the River was level with the crown of the work, that much advantage must have been derived.

The Monsoon again that year was a particularly short one, & yet Rupees 3,562 increase of revenue were obtained, & my argument therefore would have facts of much value for its support.

But again if on the one hand you endeavour by a detailed Examination to ascertain in each year what sum may absolutely be attributed as derived from the Ancient works, I would ask in what way you propose to Estimate the gain for 1861/62. From Conversations I have had with you, I believe you are aware that had not all the water in the River been turned to account by the dam, the whole of the crops under the Channels & the lands which they supply must have failed.— Do you propose than this year to credit the Ancient with only the difference between the former average Revenue, & that of this year, or with the whole Revenue of the year, if the former course be followed the treatment of the works will closely resemble that intended by the saying "heads I win, tails you lose" for it will have been shut out from all benefits to which it may perhaps be plausibly stated it was not directly entitled, & excluded from ⅔ths of those which are clearly due to its influence.

5. In any case whether our views agree or not, it will be advisable, even if not absolutely necessary to obtain the orders of Government, as to the mode in which the Calculations of Revenue are to be made. The returns for 1861/62 will shortly be due, and therefore early instructions should be obtained, and to enable me to bring the subject to the notice of the Deputy Chief Engineer, Northern Circle, with a view to it being laid before Government, I have the honor to request that you will furnish me with a statement shewing the average Revenue of all lands under the Jaffer Sait Channel for the 10 years prior to August 1855-56 the Revenue for each year subsequent

to that date; 3rd the effect as regards relinquish-
-ment of land, consequent on the promulga-
-tion of the orders allowing Ryots to keep or
give up their puttahs; 4th the Extent to which the
assessment on lands under the Channel has
been diminished within the 7 years since 1855-
5th information regarding any other Causes
which have tended to increase or diminish
the Revenue derivable from the lands, which
prior or subsequent to 1855 were under
cultivation by the Jaffer Sail Channel;
6th the average Revenue of the Ramreddi or
old Sumapalli Channel for 10 years prior
to 1860 - 7th the Revenue of the Lands under
that Channel for 1860/61, the first year that
they obtained water from the Jaffer Sail
by the new Sumapulley Channel, and lastly
with your opinion on the subject under discussion

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your Most obedient Servt

Nellore
4th April
1862

J. Mullins Captain
District Engineer Nellore

No. 113.

Nellore Collector's Office
Krishnapatnam 27
25th April 1862

From

J. W. B. Leykes Esquire
Collector of Nellore

To

Captain John Mullins
District Engineer of
Nellore

Sir

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 651 of the 4th Instant with regard to the course to be pursued in ascer-
-taining the returns on the Pennair Irrigation Works.

2. In making the remarks to which you refer in the Statement of Remunerative Works for 1859/60 & 1860/61, I proceeded on the information given me by the local Revenue authorities, and was certainly not aware that the Anicut had been in efficient condition for the Monsoon of 1855/56 and 56/57. - On the contrary I was informed that it had never been completed throughout.

3. In 1859 you observe the breach was closed entirely across and to a height which materially aided in throwing a supply into the channels. I joined the District in October 1859, and from the centre of the River to the south Sluice there was then a small Ridge of stones which

during

during the Monsoon was displaced close to the South Sluice.- Whilst no where was the anikat of such height save at either end where the old structure was still standing, as in my opinion to justify any credit being given to it for that years Irrigation.- In 1859/60 as I stated in the Statement of Remunerative Works, the Irrigation was in my opinion due to the heavy demand on Customary labor for the erection of the requisite Channel heads, which when the River fell, and the anikat could not possibly affect the levels, threw the requisite supply down the channel.- And in 1860/61 as similarly stated a very long & high Channel head built by customary labor saved a heavy loss of crops. —

4 In the 2d Paragraph of your letter under acknowledgment, you observe, that in 1858 under your own superintendence a Channel head was raised in connection with that part of the anikat which still remained standing.- But this Channel head was I presume raised, as in the subsequent years, by customary labor, and straight from the bank, and, if so, I have some difficulty in seeing from its connection with the portion of the anikat still standing, that the anikat was thereby of any assistance in the matter. —

5th. Of course any obstruction in the bed of a River below a channel head will probably tend to raise the bed of the River above the obstruction, and so increase the supply of water when the River is in fresh, and it may tend to facilitate the construction of the channel head subsequently. —

6.- In the 4th Paragraph of your letter you suppose what would have been the course pursued, had the construction of the anikat been landed over to an Irrigation Company, and argue that as the sum to be paid yearly to Government would have been fixed with reference to the annual average Revenue derived prior to the construction of the anikat; and whatever increase this revenue subsequently attained would have been attributed to the works, whether that increase was entirely due to the anikat or not; so in like manner the same course should be pursued you consider, the Work remaining under the direct management of Government. —

7. In the argument above referred to you seem to me however to have overlooked the fact, that

that the irrigation Company's accounts would most probably have shown pretty clearly the cost of the customary labor, which we both agree was rendered, and the work remaining in the hands of Government, has been rendered, as hitherto, free of cost, by right of usage — If a change had been made in the system, and the Ryots had been directed to pay Irrigation assessment to an Irrigation Company, and the Irrigation Company had failed to give them Irrigation for the excess cultivation which they contracted to supply with water, there would have been, I suspect, an adjustment of accounts before the irrigation cess was paid. The charge for the labor supplied would necessarily have been shown as so much additional expenditure, And the results of the anicut as a Remunerative Work would have been shown more accurately by the accounts of an Irrigation Company than you suppose. —

8 I fully agree with you that some simple system must be adopted as a foundation for the preparation of such a statement as that under consideration, and the

the anicut having been pretty nearly swept away in 1858, and of little use subsequently, it is simply a question of whether we are more likely to obtain correct results by commencing our calculations as to its effect on the country from 1858, when the first anicut was built and allowing for the customary labor, or 1861/62 when any increase in the supply has been wholly due to the anicut.

9. Had the anicut not been destroyed in 1858, I would unquestionably have recommended that our calculation should be sectioned from the date of its commencement. But the supply being chiefly if not entirely due for the last 3 years to the labor of the Ryots, I think myself we are less likely to mislead the Government, and be on the safe side by commencing to calculate the Returns on the Penner Irrigation Works from the current year. — The total amount at issue is a small matter. In the one case we produce an account against which there can be no cavil, in the other an account in which there can be no certainty.

10. — In the 5th Paragraph you request me to furnish you with a statement of the average

average Revenue of all lands under the
Jaffer Sahib Channel for 10 years prior
to August 1855 and secondly for the
Revenue for each year subsequent to
that date.- If however I gave you these
Returns I should mislead you; as the
number of Villages brought within reach
of the Jaffer Sahib Channel has increased
since that date; and a Return to be
trustworthy must be a comparison of
the Revenue for the subsequent years
with the Revenue from all the Villages
now irrigated for the previous years
whether irrigated by the Jaffer Sahib
Channel or not.- With a view of giving
the information you require correctly, in
the middle of last year I ordered the
preparation of one general Statement of
the whole Irrigation for the last 10 years
of all the Villages between the Oennar
and the Kandlere and east of Trunk
Road No 6.- This Statement will give
full information as to the land in occupa
=tion the extent to which it has been annu
=ally irrigated, the gross, and the adjusted
Revenue

Revenue.— It will include all Villages
held on favorable tenure such as Shotriems
&c and all Inam Tenures in Ryotwar
Villages. And it had been drawn out before
the Jamabandi.— But, on going into the
Statement at the Jamabandi, I found
what had been done did not by any means
bring forth the details requisite; and
I am now having it revised Village by
Village, and when it is completed we shall
have the means of comparing subsequent
results with the previous state of affairs,
not only as regards the direct pecuniary
return on a large outlay of the public Capital,
but what is equally important as regards
the extent to which the area of Irrigation and
the supply of food has been increased by the
outlay of Public Capital on the Oennar
Irrigation Works.—

11. In limiting the inquiry to the Villages
bounded as above, I have I believe anticipated
South of the Oennar, all probable increase
to the area of anicut Irrigation, but should
you think it necessary to include other Villages
and let me know, a similar Return shall
be prepared for them.—

12 Should it be determined to calculate the Return on the anikat and its subsidiary Works from the current year 1861/62 the Revenue now under preparation will be sufficient. — Should however the Chief Engineer be of opinion that the Government will be better able to form a correct idea of the results of this expenditure by Commencing the calculations from 1855, then it will be necessary to have similar Returns prepared for 15 instead of ten years. — In the first instance the Returns were Calculated I presume in communication with yourself for 5 years Viz. from 1849/50 to 1853/54. —

13. You further ask to be furnished with the effects of the anikat as regards the relinquishment of lands " Consequent in the promulgation of the orders for the Ryots to keep or give up their Puttahs. — I do not exactly know how you purpose that this effect should be calculated — whether you mean that the irrigated Villages should be compared with the District generally or with a more limited area, prior

Note 10.

prior and subsequent to the order to which you refer, but whatever you have meant, there are so many disturbing influences to be taken into consideration in such a Comparison, that I do not think any figured Statement could give the information you require correctly. — The occupation and revenue is more to the purpose. —

14. Neither do I see what is to be gained by my informing you of the extent to which the assessment of the lands under the Channels has been diminished since the year 1855. — Diminution of rates has not brought diminution of Revenue. — And by showing that on these Villages, or elsewhere, the rates have been lowered, you would by no means be able to argue, that had the old rates been maintained the increase of Revenue under the anikat would have been proportionately greater. —

15. You finally ask for information regarding any other causes which have tended to increase or diminish the Revenue on lands prior or subsequent to 1855 under cultivation by the Jaffer Khanah

Channel - a wide question and any reply to it must be more or less specu=lative. - The increase in the price of agricultural produce has had its effect - you will doubtless have observed in increa=sing the resources of Ryots, whether cultivating under the Jaffer Saheb or else where. - On the other hand, the orders, that give the refusal of all waste lands to the Ryots of the Villages tend seriously to check the extension of the area in occu=pation and the Return on any outlay of the Public Capital. - In this District the evil tendency of the order in question, is further aggravated by the extent to which the Village system still prevails with its full development in very many Villages in the Visabadi tenure. Again the more I see to of the Oennar Delta, the more I see how great will be our diffi=culties in preventing the additional supply furnished by the Anicut being appropri=ated by the various holders of Inam Tenures, whose previous supply we have little means of defin=ing, and whose claims we can only o=

satisfactorily dispose of by the imme=diate Completion of the Survey of this portion of the District. —

16. The information you require Regarding the Revenue of the Villages under the old Sarvepalli Channel for the last 10 years will be at your disposal as soon as the accounts referred to in Para. 10 are Completed. —

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most Obt Servant.

(Signed) J. W. B. Leyden

Collector

True Copies

Colonel Lieutenant Colonel

District Engineer, Nellore

Public Works Dept.

39

No. 1335

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 12th ~~May~~ June 1862

Read the following letter from the Deputy Chief Engineer Northern Circle.

Submits correspondence from the District Engineer Nellore on the subject of the statement called for by Govt. of the effects of the Pennair Anicut Works and requests instructions as to the form in which the said statement is to be drawn up.

(Here enter 15th May 1862 No. 306)

In Para 3 of the Despatch from the Secretary of State dated 8th February 1862 information was called for of the effects on the cultivation and on the land Revenue resulting from the Nellore Anicut

No. 309

It is a matter of such perfect indifference whether the Eng. or Collector is right in his opinion that I should not be disposed to enter any enquiry on the subject had not the Secy of State asked for information. All that is wanted it appears to me is a return of the area of land under irrigation below the Anicut as compared with that which existed previous to the completion of the work of the Anicut and ... only partially frese at ... a return in the course

Ordered No. 2060/15 May/62
Copy in a letter to England dated 11th September No. 90 of 1862.

N 61

P.W. 1469/62

Enclosure in a letter from the District Engr. Nellore No. 906 dated 5th May 1862

Copies of Correspondence took place between the Collector & District Engr. Nellore on the subject of the effects of the Pennair Anic.

and Channels.

In the above letter the Deputy Chief Engineer submits correspondence between the Collector and District Engineer showing that those Officers are materially at issue 1st as to the facts of the case, and 2d as to the proper mode of exhibiting the results of the works, and recommends that the Form proposed by the District Engineer be adopted.

The Government however are of opinion that the simplest proceeding will be to prepare a Return shewing the area and Revenue derived

you another year or two until that it is fully completed will test its value, but as the money has been expended upon it merely a matter of yields annually to enquire now whether it is yet or not

derived from the Channels in question for 10 years prior to 1855 and for each subsequent year. The Govt. will then be able to form their own judgment from the actual cultivation and return. A separate Statement showing the effect produced by the reduction of assessment in increasing the area of land taken up might also be prepared. Entries in the columns of Remarks of the State of the Canal during each year will probably help to show how far the fluctuations of Revenue were influenced by the

the accidents to Roads
& works.

Lt. R.E.

Chepstow
12th June 1862

13 Copies

To The Rt. Hon. the Chief Secretary
with 3 Encls. Disp. 13th
Revd Department

Regarding the Statement
of the effects of the Recent
Armament Works-

W. 1862. Despatch
Pro: of Govt. for June
No. 1335
Pro: of the Govt.
Rcd 12th June 1862

Pro. of recm. the Revd Depart. 81 Ens.
Ex. 2371 in Pro

From the Collr of
Nellore 17 Nov.
1862 Coll. 3523

Vol. No. 241

Copy in a letter to England
Date 11th September No. 190 of 1862.

Ex 29 Nov. 823 Lines