

(1) Number of pages 16
 (2) Date of repair 6-2-43
 (3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Relations DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. <u>52378</u>	Press Mis.
Dated <u>2-2-43</u>	<u>1862.</u>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

R

11

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
2nd October 1862.*

No. 25. Read the following Endorsement of the Officiating Consulting Engineer, Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Camp at Kurnool, 6th September 1862, No. 56 :—

Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel S. O. E. LUDLOW, R. E., Officiating Consulting Engineer, Irrigation and Canal Company, to F. AGNEW, Esq., Agent and Manager, Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Camp at Kurnool, 4th September 1862, No. 121.

SIR,

1. With reference to paragraph 2 of the Chief Engineer's letter No. 632, which accompanied your No. 83, dated 12th August, I have the honor to observe that the alterations in the land plans asked for in my letter* No. 82 had no reference to the cost of the works, of which no mention was made by me; what was required was that on the plans should be marked the quantity of land which would have been required had the Canal been constructed with two banks and that which will be taken up by the Canal and its outspread of water on the plan now being carried out, the difference between the two showing the extent of land which the Company will have to pay for.
2. The Chief Engineer is mistaken in supposing that I was under an impression that any reluctance had been shown by him to afford the means of determining the area of land; such was not the case nor can I find that I said any thing to this effect in my letter.
3. I certainly was led to suppose that the Company's Officers entertained erroneous opinions regarding the payment for the submerged lands, and therefore made the remarks I did as much with a view to the Company's interests as to those of Government.
4. I am glad to find from the Chief Engineer's letter that this supposition was erroneous, and regret that acting on it I made remarks which though well intended were considered objectionable by the Chief Engineer.
5. I am informed that the portions of submerged land immediately required have been transferred to the Officers of the Company subsequent to the date of Colonel Cotton's letter.
6. The matter alluded to in paragraph 5 of the Chief Engineer's letter will be noticed in another communication.

From Colonel H. C. COTTON, Chief Engineer, to F. AGNEW, Esq., Agent Madras, dated Kurnool, 4th August 1862, No. 632.

DEAR SIR,

1. Your letter of the 28th ultimo,* encloses the Consulting Engineer's letter of the 23rd and Mr. Minchin's of the 8th ultimo. The tracings referred to have not yet reached me.
2. I must however at once clear the mind of the Consulting Engineer on some points in which he is misled.

First.—As the Canal is laid out expressly on the plan of crossing valleys by single embankments, no true estimate can be formed of its cost if planned on another principle, without laying out the line with falls, and capacity in accordance with that principle. I can enter on Mr. Minchin's tracings the ground which would be required for crossing the valleys by masonry aqueduct, but it must be with the understanding that such aqueduct with the present fall and capacity would not carry the required supply of water. Had the Canal been laid out on the principle of non-interference with the local drainage, a greater fall must have been allowed, or much greater capacity. The cost of the work would have been much in excess of the present estimate, and the local supplies would have run waste to the Kistna.

estimate

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
2nd October 1862.*

I have fully explained this in former communications, and the Government has approved of the present arrangement. I cannot therefore undertake for the sake of comparison of cost, make any new plans but for the comparison of extent of land required. I will make the approximation I have mentioned, and I conclude it will be near enough for the Government purpose of deciding what area is chargeable to the Company.

Second.—The Consulting Engineer refers me to paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of Mr. Minchin's letter, and expresses his surprise that the Officers of the Company should entertain certain mistaken notions respecting the submerged land, and in his 4th paragraph refers me to the Government order stating the conditions upon which the work is sanctioned. If it were a fact that in my opinion and that of other Officers of the Establishment the Government will be obliged by the Company's contract to provide gratis the whole submerged land, I could see nothing in the fact bearing upon the question. The contract has never to my knowledge been completed, the Government order with its condition attached is plain enough, and Mr. Minchin's remarks as to my opinion of what the contract may prove to be is at least utterly irrelevant. But it is not a fact; I have written enough on the subject of those submerged lands, to show my views regarding them and to those letters I must refer the Consulting Engineer for his satisfaction, and with this further remark that Mr. Minchin has already been directed by the Government not to act upon the judgment or opinions of any one of the Establishment, but myself, and has written his remarks on this occasion without reference to me.

The Consulting Engineer is evidently under an impression from Mr. Minchin's letter, that I have expressed or shown a reluctance to give him the means of determining the area of land which the Government has decided, shall be paid for by the Company.

Mr. Minchin has misled the Consulting Engineer. I have shown no such reluctance, I have heard nothing, and said and written nothing on the subject of the 4th and 5th sections of the Canal, since those works were sanctioned, but to beg that pursuant to the Government Order of 11th April, No. 736, sanctioning them, the land may be made over to me. I deny having expressed a sentiment on the subject, and if the Consulting Engineer will refer to former correspondence he will find that I expressly requested that the question of payment for the land might not interfere with the project. The reasons why I consider it fair that we should be allowed to arrest the local drainage, have been always stated, and I view the decision of the Government on the subject as conclusive and am thoroughly prepared to act upon it. I only wait for the land.

3. In the 5th paragraph of the Consulting Engineer's letter, I am referred to Mr. Minchin's 2nd paragraph, and requested to state the probable date on which the Hindry aqueduct will be completed, and the works so far advanced as to admit of the Canal being used for irrigation.

Mr. Minchin in putting this question gives his own opinion, that water cannot be passed over the aqueduct till the beginning of 1864, and most probably not before July of that year. I wish Mr. Minchin would take a professional opinion on such a subject and quote his authority, I think he is about a year out in his reckoning. As my anticipation is called for I will say that I expect the aqueduct to be completed in June 1863.

With respect to the period of completion of the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th sections, the question is a very difficult one. Of course as to the 4th and 5th I cannot be expected to offer a surmise. They cannot be commenced till the land is given. The 2nd and 3rd are proceeding favorably, and labor is becoming more abundant, so that I have good hope of their completion by July next, I cannot venture upon a more decided opinion.

4. At the request of the Deputy Collector, he has been furnished with tracings showing what parts of the future submerged lands are required immediately, as sources of earth for the banks. This was to avoid as long as possible the necessity of interfering with the existing dry cultivation. It will be time to have the remaining land transferred when we can foresee with more certainty when such valley will require to be laid under water, and full notice will be given as the works proceed.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
2nd October 1862.*

5. Mr. Minchin in his 6th paragraph states that land under class B has in many cases been taken up, where the earth could be taken from land proposed to be submerged. I am not aware of any such, but will enquire into it. It would have been more convenient if Mr. Minchin had referred to the particular cases.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) F. AGNEW, *Agent.*

(True Copy.)

(Signed) S. O. E. LUDLOW, Lieut.-Colonel, R. E.,
Officiating Consulting Engineer I. and C. Company.

From F. AGNEW, Esq., Agent Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to Lieutenant-Colonel S. O. E. LUDLOW, Officiating Consulting Engineer, Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Madras, 12th August 1862, No. 83.

SIR,

No. 82.

1. I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 23rd ultimo.

• No. 632 of 4th August 1862.

2. I forwarded this letter together with tracings and other enclosures to the Chief Engineer and herewith enclose that Officer's reply.* The tracings when received shall also be forwarded to you.

† No. 1,155 of 26th May 1862.
" 1,333 of 12th June "
" 1,483 of 25th June "

‡ Proceedings of Board of Revenue No. 4,395 of 8th July 1862, paragraph 4.

3. I trust that pending this reference, the Collector of Kurnool has not delayed to obey the orders of Government† and the Board of Revenue to transfer "at once"‡ to this Company the necessary land.

4. I have not thought it necessary to act on your suggestion and to call the attention of the Chief and Executive Engineers to paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of Mr. Minchin's letter, the remarks of Government concerning "official reports"§ appear to be applicable to these paragraphs. I agree with Colonel Cotton that the questions therein raised are irrelevant.

5. In reply to your question the Chief Engineer states that he expects the Hindry Aqueduct to be completed in June 1863.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) S. O. E. LUDLOW, Lieut.-Colonel, R. E.,
Officiating Consulting Engineer, I. and C. Company.

Forwarded for the information of Government in continuation of a letter from this Officer dated 24th July 1862, No. 41.

(Signed) S. O. E. LUDLOW, Lieut.-Colonel, R. E.,
Officiating Consulting Engineer Irrigation and Canal Company.

No. 26.

ORDER THEREON, 2nd October 1862, No. 2,358.

Ordered to be recorded.

(Signed) W. I. BIRDWOOD, Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government.

3
No. 632

Madison Irrigation & Canal Company
Chief Engineer's Office
Kuenwol 4 August 1862. 5

L
J. Agnew-Inquire
Agent Madison

Dear Sir,

No. 402

Your letter of the 28th Ultimo, encloses the Consulting Engineer's letter of the 23rd and Dr. Minchins of the 8th Ultimo. The tracings referred to have not yet reached me.

2. I must however at once clear the mind of the Consulting Engineer on some points in which he is misled.

1st as the Canal is laid out expressly on the plan of crossing valleys by single embankments, no true estimate can be formed of its cost if planned on another principle, without laying out the line with falls and Capacity in accordance with that principle. I can enter on Dr. Minchins' tracings the ground which would be required for crossing the valleys by masonry Aqueduct, but it must be with the understanding that such Aqueduct with the present fall and Capacity would not carry the required supply of water. Had the Canal been laid out on the principle of non-interference with the local drainage, a greater fall must have been allowed, or much greater Capacity. The cost of the work would have been much in excess of the present estimate

estimate and the local supplies would have
been made to the Hindustani.

I have fully explained this in former
communications, and the Government has approved
of the present arrangement. I cannot therefore
undertake for the sake of comparison of cost, make
any new plans but for the comparison of extent
of land required. I will make the approximation,
I have mentioned, and I conclude it will be
near enough for the Government purpose of deciding
what area is chargeable to the Company.

2nd The Consulting Engineer refers me to
Paragraphs 3, 4, and 5 of Mr. Minchin's letter and
expresses his surprise, that the Officers of
the Company should entertain certain mistaken
notions respecting the submerged land, and in his
4th Paragraph refers me to the Government Order
stating the Conditions upon which the work is
sanctioned. If it were a fact that in my opinion
and that of other Officers of the Establishment
the Government will be obliged by the Company's
Contract to provide gratis the whole submerged
land, I could see nothing in the fact bearing
upon the question. The Contract has never to
my knowledge been completed, the Government
Order with its Condition attached is plain
enough and Mr. Minchin's remarks as to my
opinion of what the Contract may prove
to

to be is at least utterly irrelevant. But it is
not a fact. I have written enough on the
subject of those submerged lands, to shew my
views regarding them and to those letters I must
refer the Consulting Engineer for his satisfaction, and
with this further remark that Mr. Minchin has
already been directed by the Government not to
act upon the judgement or opinions of any one
of the Establishment, but myself and has
written his remarks on this occasion without
reference to me.

The Consulting Engineer is evidently under
an impression from Mr. Minchin's letter that I
have expressed or shown a reluctance to give
him the means of determining the area of Land
which the Government has decided, shall be paid
for by the Company.

Mr. Minchin has misled the Consulting
Engineer. I have shewn no such reluctance.
I have heard nothing and said, and written
nothing on the subject of the 4th and 5th Sections
of the Canal, since those works were sanctioned,
but to say that pursuant to the Government Order
of 11th April No. 736, sanctioning them, the land
may be made over to me. I deny having ex-
pressed a sentiment on the subject, and if the
Consulting Engineer will refer to former correspond-
ence he will find that I expressly requested
that the question of payment for the land
might

might not interfere with the project. The reasons why I consider it fair that we should be allowed to arrest the local drainage, have been always stated, and I view the decision of the Government on the subject as conclusive and am thoroughly prepared to act upon it. I only wait for the land.

2. In the 5 Paragraph of the Consulting Engineer's letter I am referred to Mr. Minchin's 2^d Paragraph, and requested to state the probable date on which the Hindry Aqueduct will be completed, and the works so far advanced as to admit of the Canal being used for Irrigation.

Mr. Minchin in putting this question gives his own opinion, that water cannot be passed over the Aqueduct till the beginning of 1864, and most probably not before July of that year. I wish Mr. Minchin would take a professional opinion on such a subject and quote his authority. I think he is about a year out in his reckoning. As my Anticipation is called for I will say that I expect the Aqueduct to be completed in June 1863.

With respect to the period of completion of the 2^d, 3^d, 4th, and 5th Sections, the question is a very difficult one. Of course as to the 4th & 5th I cannot be expected to offer a surmise. They cannot be commenced till the Land is given. The 2^d & 3^d are proceeding favorably and labour is becoming more abundant

5

abundant so that I have good hope of their completion by July next. I cannot venture upon a more decided opinion.

4. At the request of the Deputy Collector, he has been furnished with tracings showing what parts of the future submerged lands are required immediately, as sources of earth for the banks. This was to avoid as long as possible the necessity of interfering with the existing dry cultivation. It will be time to have the remaining land transferred when we can force with more certainty when such valley will require to be laid under water and full notice will be given as the works proceed.

5. Mr. Minchin in his 6 Paragraph states that Land under Class B has in many cases been taken up, where the earth could be taken from land proposed to be submerged. I am not aware of any such, but will enquire into it. It would have been more convenient if Mr. Minchin had referred to the particular cases.

I am ^{Yours}
(Signed) A. C. Cotton
Chief Engineer

(True Copy)

(Signed) J. Agnew
Agent

(True Copy)

J. B. Hudson Lt. Colonel R.E.

Offg. Cons. Engr. for I & C.C.

Madras Irrigation & Canal Company
Madras 12 August 1862

No 83

From

F. Agnew Esquire

Agent Madras I & C. C.

To Lt. Colonel S. B. C. Ludlow.

Offg. Consulting Engr. M. I & C. C.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 23rd ultimo.

No. 82.

I forwarded this letter together with tracings and other enclosures to the Chief Engineer and herewith enclose that Officer's reply - The tracings when received shall also be forwarded to you.

* No. 632 of
6 August 1862

3. I trust that pending this reference, the Collector of Kurnool has not delayed to obey the orders of Government and the Board of Revenue to transfer at once to this Company the necessary land.

* No. 1155 of 26 May '62
" 1333 of 12 June "

Proceeds of Board of Rev.
4345 of 8 July '62
para 4 -

4. I have not thought it necessary to act on your suggestion and to call the attention of the Chief and Executive Engineers to paras 3, 4 and 5 of Mr. Minchins letter, the Remarks of Government concerning in "Official Reports" appear to be applicable to these paras. I agree with Colonel Cotton that the questions therein raised are irrelevant.

* G.O. No. 1483
of 25 June 1862

5. In reply to your question the Chief Engineer states that he expects the Rindley Aqueduct to be completed in June 1863 -

I have the honor to be,
[Signed] F. Agnew.
Agent

(True Copy)

J. O. Muller Lt. Colonel R.E.

Offg. Consulting Engr. I & C. C.

Consulting Engineer's Office I & C
Camp at Hummel's September 62

No. 121

From

Lt. Colonel S. C. C. Andrew P. C.

Officiating Consulting Engineer I & C

To

J. Agnew-Loggins

Agent & Manager M. L. & C. Company

Sir

1. With reference to para 2 of the
Chief Engineer's letter No 622 which ac-
= companied your No 83 dated 12 August
I have the honor to observe that the alterations
in the Land Plans asked for in my letter
No 82 had no reference to the cost of the
works, of which no mention was made by
me. What was required was that on the plans
should be marked the quantity of Land which
would have been required had the Canal been
constructed with two Banks and that which
will be taken up by the Canal and the
outspread of water on the plan now being
carried out the difference between the two
showing the extent of Land which the Company
will have to pay for.

2. The Chief Engineer is mistaken in
supposing that I was under an impression
that any reluctance had been shown by
him to afford the means of determining
the

8/23 July/62

To Genl. Andrew, 12/12/56

Enclosure in letter No 56 dated 12/12/56

No 83

1862

From

Agent Andrew I & C

to Agnew-Loggins I & C

Re: 158 August/62

In reply to letter

No 82 of 1862 forwarded

Copy of Chief Engineer's

letter No 622 of 12 August

& regarding the transfer

of one of the necessary

land for the Company's

works.

Sept. 28/62

Forwarded for the information of Government
in continuation of a letter from this Office
dated 2nd July 1862 No 41-

Consulting Engineer's Office
I & C Company
Camp at Funnool
6th September 1862

J. O. Andrew
Lieut. Colonel R. C.
Offg. Consulting Eng. I & C Company

To the Secretary of Government
in the D.P.P.

*done yet
has been
done yet
done yet
done yet
done yet*

the area of land - such was not the case nor
can I find that I said any thing to this
effect in my letter.

3- I certainly was led to suppose that the
Company's Officers entertained erroneous opinions
regarding the payment for the submerged
lands and therefore made the remarks.
I did as much with a view to the
Company's interests as to those of Government.

4- I am glad to find from the Chief
Engineer's letter that this supposition was
erroneous and regret that acting on it I
made remarks which tho' well intended
were considered objectionable by the Chief
Engineer.

5- I am informed that the portions
of submerged land immediately required
have been transferred to the Officers of the
Company subsequent to the date of Colonel
Cotton's letter.

6- The matter alluded to in para 5
of the Chief Engineer's letter will be noticed
in another communication.

x x x

I have the honor to be, Sir,
(Signed) J. O. Andrew, Lt. Col. R. C.
Officiating Consulting Eng. I & C.

Forwarded

Pro. 11" April 1862 No. 205
 " 26" May - " 526-527 -
 " 12" June - " 236-237 -
 " 25" - " 565-566 -

Pro. 11" April 1862 No. 205
 No. of Good Hope
 No. 2807

The Capt. Consulting Engineer
 The Secretary of the
 Dept. of War.

Dated 6th September/62
 Dec. 17th No. 586

For the purpose of information
 copy of letter to the agent
 conveying certain remarks
 with regard to the information
 called for by Government
 on the subject of submarine
 cables. etc.

18225-26.

18225-26. 18225-26. 18225-26.

18225-26. 18225-26. 18225-26.

18225-26. 18225-26. 18225-26.

1822358

Recorded

2358

X 84

Disputed
 2nd October/62