

- (1) Number of pages _____
(2) Date of repair _____
(3) Initials of the Referee _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Publications DEPARTMENT.

C.O. No.	Press
Dated	15

Not to be folded or roughly handled

A5

B5

A4

B4

A3

B5

A4

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
16th March 1870.*

No. 295. Read the following letter from the Superintending Engineer, 6th Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Tanjore, 22nd January 1870, No. 1,226:—

I HAVE the honour to reply to G. O., No. 3,739, dated 24th November.

2. The Acting Sub-Collector made an inquiry relative to the breaching of the Sunkalapuram Channel, and concludes his remarks as follows:—"I entertain no doubt but that the breach was accidental, such evidence as there is points to this conclusion; at all events a Magisterial inquiry would be useless."

3. I enclose a sketch, as directed, of the site of the breach, and on it the highest water-mark of November is indicated, when the gauge at Seringham read 10 feet 5 inches; the gauge at Seringham read 7 feet 7 inches on the 2nd July, the flood due to which was the occasion of the breach; during this flood the water-level in the Velappaur must have been from 2 to 2½ lower than is indicated in the section, and must have been from 4½ to 5 feet below the top of the bank. The Velappaur bank has been recently repaired in this neighbourhood, and the sites of the breaches of previous years cannot now be indicated.

4. As regards the Appenallur tank in the Trichinopoly District, the breach in which I attributed to a temporary sluice adjacent to the surplus calingulab, and from which a leading channel in rear of the bank attracted my attention, and by which some of the villagers present acknowledged that their lands had been supplied since the silting up of their sluice, the Head Assistant-Collector reports as follows:—"The Tahsildar reports that there is no evidence that a sluice such as that alluded to in Captain Oakes' letter existed, and accounts for the condition of the bank by the existence, for the last ten years, of the mettei or hole in the bank which had not been repaired. As the inquiry stands at present, my opinion is that the villagers were not to blame in the matter." Comment on the above is superfluous; a hole through an earthen embankment through which water has passed for ten years only to occasion a breach at the end of the tenth year, is something unique.

5. In my letter, No. 679, I stated that intimation, of the permanent sluice having become choked, was not made to this department; this information I obtained from the Range officer on the spot, but in this it appears from his letter, dated 3rd December, No. 84, that he was mistaken, and it further appears that an estimate was passed for building a new sluice in 1861 and the contract given to a Putta Monigar, and that, as the sluice was not built, the estimate was cancelled in 1864.

6. There is no doubt that the sluice ought to have been re-constructed, and that there has been neglect on the part of this department relative to the Appenallur tank.

7. With regard to the pot sluice in the Pilloor tank which occasioned the breach, it appears that it was provided to supply about three acres of land on a high level, but this land had previously been supplied by the existing permanent sluice, and hence the construction of a new sluice was not deemed necessary. The cost of a sluice would have been about Rupees 350, and the assessment of the three acres, even if it could not otherwise have been supplied, would only have been Rupees 21, the

sluice was put in merely to save the villagers a little trouble. The Tahsildar was requested to have the sluice closed by the Supervisor, and it would appear to have been so covered over when he examined the tank that he did not notice it.

8. With reference to paragraph 7 instructions have been issued to the Range officers; but, from my experience in Tirunelveli and in Trichiaopoly, I have no hesitation in saying that the formation of talingulaks or surplus weirs in each tank to discharge the whole of the drainage of the catchment basin above a long series of tanks, is out of the question, on the score of cost; it might be possible in the two or three upper tanks of a series, but even then the weirs would not provide for the discharge of the contents of the upper tanks which breached, and it is not often that the expedient of forming a natural outlet two feet above high water-mark could be adopted and, if it were, whether it would answer the desired end, for if the water rose to any depth over the ground a channel would be formed which would drain the tank as effectively probably as a breach in the bund would do.

No. 296.

ORDER THEREON, 16th March 1870, No. 790.

IRRIGATION, No. 21.

From the Superintending Engineer's letter and its enclosure it appears that at the place where the Velappaur, near the mouth of the Sunkalapuram Channel, breached in July last, when the Cauvery gauge at Seringham read 7 feet 7 inches, the embankment was from 2.50 to 2.60 feet above the water-level corresponding to a height of 10 feet 5 inches on the Seringham gauge. It appears also that the embankment on either side of the breach was at about the same level as the part which gave way, and that it was able to retain the higher fresh. These circumstances taken in connection with the fact that breaches, which could not readily be accounted for by the state of the embankment, have frequently before occurred in the same neighbourhood, make it not improbable that the Superintending Engineer may be right in attributing the breach of July to improper interference with the embankment, but as the Acting Sub-Collector has stated it to be his opinion that a Magisterial inquiry would be useless, all that the Government can do is to point out that the Superintending Engineer should in future take care that the Magisterial officer, to whom a report of such occurrences may be made, is furnished with such information as will enable him to make a complete investigation.

2. The Superintending Engineer should arrange for the early construction of the sluice required for the Appenallur tank. There can be but little doubt that Captain Oakes is right in attributing the breaching of this tank to water having been led through the bund at a place where no proper arrangements had been made to prevent damage, but as it appears that the necessity for an additional sluice was recognized several years ago, the villagers will not in this instance be held responsible. The Superintending Engineer will however, in communication with the Collectors of the districts in his division, take measures for preventing any unauthorized interference with the bunds of tanks, and the Range establishments should be required to see that the orders on this subject are obeyed.

3. With regard to the last paragraph of Captain Oakes' letter, it is to be remarked that every tank, which it may be deemed advisable to maintain as an irrigation work, should be provided with the means of discharging the whole of the surplus which may have to be disposed of under ordinary circumstances. If the expense, with the most economical arrangements possible, be too great, it will be necessary to ascertain whether there are any reasons for continuing to retain the tank. It should not be forgotten that the loss of revenue and the cost of repairs when a tank breaches are, taken together, often very considerable, and that it would be much better to spend two or three times this amount in rendering the tank secure than to allow such accidents to recur at longer or shorter intervals.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. MULLINS, Major, R.E.,
Acting Joint Secretary to Government.

Seringham read 10 5 inches

1226

Sup^r Eng^r Office C^t Division
Singapore 22nd January 1870.

From, Captain R. L. Baker. R.E.
Sup^r Engineer, P. D. W.

To, Colonel. C. D. Orr. R.E.
Secretary to Gov^t P. D. W.

Sir,

Enclosure
I have the honor to reply
to G. O. No 3739 dated 24th November.

The Acting Sub Collector made
an enquiry relative to the breaching
of the Penkalapuram Channel &
concludes his remarks as follows.
"I entertain no doubt but that the
breach was accidental, such evidence
as there is, points to this conclusion.
At all events a Magisterial enquiry
would be superfluous."

I enclose a Sketch, as directed,
of the Site of the Breach & on it the
highest water mark of November is
indicated when the gauge at Se-
ringham read 10' 5" the gauge at
Serilingham read 7' 7" on the 22nd July
the

the flood due to which was the occasion of the breach; during this flood the water level in the Velappan must have been from 2 to 2½ lower than is indicated in the Section & must have been from 4½ to 5' below the top of the bank. The Velappan bank has been recently repaired in this neighbourhood and the sites of the breaches of previous years cannot now be indicated.

As regards the Appanallur tank in the Trichinopoly District the breach in which I attributed to a temporary sluice adjacent to the surplus Caslingula and from which a leading channel in rear of the bank attracted my attention & by which some of the Villagers present acknowledged that their lands had been supplied since the silting up of their sluice.

The Head Assistant Collector reports as follows. "The Sahasidolan reports that there is no evidence that a sluice such as that alluded to in Captain Coker's letter existed & accounts for the

the Condition of the bank by the ^{strict} for the last ten years of the Quotri or hole in the bank which had not been repaired. As the enquiry stands at present my opinion is that the Villagers were not to be blamed in the matter". Comment on the above is superfluous. A hole through an earthen embankment through which water has passed for 10 years only to occasional breach at the end of the 10th year is something unique.

In my letter No. 679 I stated that intimation of the permanent sluice having become choked was not made to this Department - this information I obtained from the Revenue officer on the spot but in this it appears from his letter dated 3rd December that he was mistaken and it further appears that an estimate was passed for building a new sluice ^{in 1861} and the Contract given to a Putta Mowidar & that as the sluice was not built the estimate was cancelled in 1864.

There

There is no doubt that ^{the} sluice ought to have been reconstructed and that there has been neglect on the part of this Department relative to the Appanalore tank. —

With regard to the Pot Sluice in the Pilloom tank which occasioned the Breach, it appears that it was provided to supply about 3 acres of land on a high level, but this land had previously been supplied by the existing permanent sluice & hence the construction of a new sluice was not deemed necessary. The cost of a sluice would have been about Rs. 350 & the apportionment of the 3 acres, even if it could not otherwise have been supplied would only have been Rs. 21 the sluice was put in merely to save the villagers a little trouble. The Tahsildar was requested to have the sluice closed by the Supervisor and it would appear to have been so covered over when he examined the tank that he did not notice it. —

With

3
With reference to para 7 instructions have been issued to the Range Officer but from my experience in Simoorly and in Prichinopoly I have no hesitation in saying that the formation of Calingulas or surplus weirs in each tank to discharge the whole of the drainage of the Catchment basin above a long series of tanks is out of the question on the score of cost. it might be possible in the 2 or 3 upper tanks of a series but even then the weirs would not provide for the discharge of the contents of the upper tanks which breached and it is not often that the expedient of forming a natural outlet 2' above H.W. mark could be adopted & if it were where then it would answer the desired end, for if the water rose to any depth over the ground a channel would be formed which would drain the tank as efficiently probably as a breach in the

the bird would do.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obed^t Serv^t

W. Gates Capt R.E.

Sup Engineer O.D.

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

Under date the.

Read the following.

From The Superintending Engineer
S. Division

H. C. No 1226 of 22nd January 1879

The Govt consider that the information now furnished by the Superintending Engineer of the S. Division shows that it is extremely improbable that the breach in the Senkolaparam Channel was due to accident, and these papers will therefore be communicated to the Revenue Dept. with a view to the circumstances being enquired into judicially on the spot. The Superintending Engineer will take care that the Officer who may make the

The author of the report is not responsible for the accuracy of the statement of the facts as given in the report. The Superintending Engineer is confident in the statement of the facts as given in the report. The Superintending Engineer is confident in the statement of the facts as given in the report.

To The Secy to Govt
The Chief Engineer
S. Division
6th Dec

Dated 22nd Jan 1879
No 790-16 S. Division 1879
H. C. No 1226

Looking to G.O. No 3739, dated 24th Nov 1869, with a view to the causes of certain breaches in the Senkolaparam Channel District -

16 295
P.W. 28th Feb 1879
C. 14th Feb 1879

the enquiry is furnished with full information and shown the flood levels &c.

2. The Survey Engineer should arrange for the early construction of the sluice required for the Appenallaor bank. There can be but little doubt that Capt. Baker is right in attributing the breaching of this bank to maver having been led through the bank at a place where no proper arrangements had been made to prevent damage, but as it appears that the necessity for ^{an} additional sluice was recognized several years

P. H. Department.

No 790

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

Under date the 16. March 1870

Read the following.

From The Superintending Eng^r

7th Division

{H.E. No. 1226 of 22nd January 1771

From the Superintendant's letter and its enclosure it appears that at the place where the Vellapour, near the mouth of the Sunkalapuram Channel, breached in July last, when the Canvey gauge at Seringham read 7' 7", the embankment was from 2.50 to 2.60 feet above the water level corresponding to a height of 10' 5" on the Seringham gauge. It appears also that the embankment on either side of the breach was at about the same level as the part which gave way, and that it was able to retain the higher fresh.

~~Free~~

the completion of the
draft having been effected
I don't expect to see
you again.



These circumstances taken in connection with the fact that breaches, which could not readily be accounted for by the state of the embankment, have frequently before occurred in the same neighbourhood, make it not improbable that the Super. Eng^r was right in attributing the breach of July to improper interference with the embankment, but as the Acting Sub Collector has stated it to be his opinion that a magisterial enquiry would be needless, all that the Govt. can do is to point out that the Super. Eng^r should in future take care that the Magisterial Officer to whom a report of such occurrences may be made, is furnished with such information as will enable him to make a complete investigation.

2. The Super. Eng^r should arrange for the early construction of the sluice required for the Appenalloor bank. There can be but little doubt that Capt. Oakes is right in attributing the breaching of this bank to water having been led through the bund at a place where no proper arrangements had been made to prevent damage, but as it appears that

that the necessity for an additional sluice was recognized several years ago, the villagers will not in this instance be held responsible. The Super. Eng^r will however, in communication with the Collectors of the District in his Division, take measures for preventing any unauthorized interference with the bunds of banks, and the Range Establishments should be required to see that the orders on this subject are obeyed.

3. With regard to the last paragraph of Capt. Oakes' letter, it is to be remarked that every bank, which it may be deemed advisable to maintain as an irrigation work, should be

pro-

provided with the means of
discharging the whole of the
surplus which may have to
be disposed of under ordinary
circumstances. If the expense,
with the most economical
arrangements possible, be
too great, it will be necessary
to ascertain whether there
are any reasons for con-
tinuing to repair the bank.
It should not be forgotten
that the loss of Revenue and
the cost of repairs when a
bank breaches are, taken
together, often very considera-
ble, and that it would
be much better to spend
2 or 3 times this amount
in rendering the bank
secure

10411
secure than to allow such
accidents to recur at
longer or shorter intervals.

Wm. 11/14/20

Wm

7.

The S. Eng. 6' on S
" Rev. D. p. 11-1

Beaf 21/3/70

Cue 341

Govt. of 1870: Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

The Superintending Engrs.
to the Division

Dated

Recd.

Vol. 1

G. O. 16th March 1870, No. 790-

Nos. 295-296

Santhalapuram surplus channel

Referring to the letter from
the Supy Engr. of the B. & C. Div.
requesting the information
called for regarding the cir-
cumstances attending the
breaching of the bank of the
Santhalapuram surplus chan-
nel, in the Tanjore D. & C.