

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1601/161/162	415	Press Mis.
Dated	7.2.	1873.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
7th February 1873.*

Read the following papers:—

No. 160. From the Collector of Kurnool, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and Joint Secretary to Government, dated Kurnool, 17th December 1872, No. 1,309.

In reply to your letter* No. 153, dated 9th December 1872, I have the honour to inform you that it is not necessary to submit a supplemental Form E. for the season 1871-72.

* Enclosures returned.

2. The discrepancies referred to by Mr. Wilks at Nagatur and Cumbalapalli are owing to some mistakes in the Company's returns. These were pointed out by me to the late Acting Chief Engineer in my letter No. 804, dated 10th August 1872, and corrections have accordingly been made.

3. It certainly was decided at the settlement that the water-rate on the field at Vellala should be credited to the Company. But further inquiry showed that, though some water from the canal flows into the stream during the rainy season, it contains a continuous supply of water even during the hottest part of the year, when the canal is quite dry. The arrangement was on that altered, of which notice was given to Mr. Wilks at the time in my letter No. 620, dated 25th June 1872, and the water-rate accordingly on the field in question credited to Government.

From the Acting Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and Joint Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 5th December 1872, No. 291.

I HAVE the honour to hand you copy of a letter addressed by the late Acting Chief Engineer to the Collector of Kurnool, and of the extract of Mr. Wilks' letter therein referred to.

2. It would appear from these documents that there is a discrepancy (against the Company) to the extent of Rupees 218-14-8 between the amount of revenue of the upper section for 1871-72 agreed upon between Mr. Crawford (acting for Mr. Wilks) and the Collector, and the amount exhibited in the Collector's Form E. and credited to the Company.

3. I shall feel much obliged by your making an inquiry into the facts and causing a supplemental Form E. to be rendered, if it turn out that the Company have been short-credited.

From the Acting Chief Engineer of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Collector of Kurnool, dated Kurnool, 2nd August 1872, No. 11.

I HAVE the honour to enclose some extracts from a letter written to me by Mr. Wilks concerning the settlement of our Irrigation accounts for the past season.

2. From what Mr. Wilks says it would appear that after the questions were discussed with and settled by you several changes have been made, as shown by the enclosed extracts.

3. Perhaps an examination of the items now would enable us to avoid differences in future settlements.

4. If you prefer it I will be happy to examine the questions raised along with you at any time you find convenient.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
7th February 1873.*

Extract of a letter No. 180 of 23rd July 1872, from C. H. Wilks, Esq., Conservancy Engineer, to A. Browning, Esq., Chief Engineer.

I FIND that the following alterations appear to have been made since the settlement of remissions in April last.

In the village of Nagatur it was settled that there were—

	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.
80.44 acres of wet crops, at Rupees 6	482	10	3
39.05 acres of wet crops which were formerly said to be irrigated from Government tank-water now charged at Rupee 1 until the case has been settled by the Government	39	0	10
15.59 wet crops partially irrigated for second crop, at 3 Rupees	57	0	5
	578	11	6
Remissions... ..	19	7	2
The Collector's account, however, gives wet crops only	303	3	7
Wet crops said to have been partially irrigated by our water	71	13	4
Dry crops flooded	19	4	8
	394	5	7

Difference...

We have hitherto had to pay the Government tax of Rupees 4 per acre for about 33 (not 71.83) acres, which it is supposed we have cut off from the tank supply above, and Mr. Crawford had agreed to the charge of Rupee 1 per acre as 39.05 acres until the question was settled. This acreage has been altered from 39.05 to 71.83.

At Vellala a field was irrigated from our canal water, but it has been omitted in the Government accounts, although Mr. Crawford at the settlement had agreed with the Collector that the full tax should be paid.

This deduction is 7 3 2
172 1 11

At Cumbalapully it was settled as follows:—

First crop of wet cultivation 13.93, at Rupees 6 ...	83	9	3
Wet crops charged as floodings 40.82, at Rupee 1 ...	40	13	1
	124	6	4
The Collector's account gives no crops at Rupees 6 but for floodings	47	9	7
Difference... ..	76	12	9

The total difference between our settlement and the Collector's new account 248 14 8

(Signed) C. H. WILKS,
Conservancy Engineer.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department
7th February 1873.*

No. 161. From the Chief Engineer of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and Joint Secretary to Government, dated Kurnool, 14th December 1872, No. 3.

Settlement of 1871-72.

IN reference to Government Order No. 1,830 of 5th October 1864, paragraph 2, I have the honour to point out, for the information of Government, the way in which Clause VI. of the rules then sanctioned works. There is little doubt that some alteration of those rules is now required, and therefore it seems an opportune time for recording any defective working.

2. In short, then, the rules give the Company's officers no voice in settling the simple claim of the Company on the Government, and of the Government on the ryot, for water supplied. Copy of the Collector of Kurnool's letter* illustrates this. The local Revenue Officer (Mr.

* No. 1,222 of 28th ultimo.

Chase) and an officer of the Company (Mr. Crawford) investigated the claims to remission for Vellala village for last season (1871). Amongst other claims was one on a rice crop of a little over an acre, regarding which it was settled that no remission was due, and the full water-rate of Rupees 7-3-2 was put down to it. Afterwards Mr. Chase wrote instructions to strike out this field, on the ground that the field was naturally wet enough to grow rice, though it is admitted rice was never grown there before, and unquestionable that canal water had easy access to the field. In this case the water-rate is altered apparently after the adjustment of the remission, but the clause, I admit, gives no definition of when the "adjusted claim" is complete. In this case the Company's officers may, I think, fairly claim the Rupees 7-3-2 from Government as an adjusted claim.

3. The other is a case of some rice fields in Cumbalapully. The first correspondence originated in a mistake about 13.93 acres of rice grown to maturity under canal water, which Mr. Crawford understood at the settlement was to have no remission, and Mr. Chase understood was to be charged for one flooding only. However, this be, it is now clear that the water-rate charged by Government is Rupee 1 an acre for flooding this rice, and no claim for remission is of course made on that rate.

4. I have no intention of adding to the difficulties and confusion due to the existing rules (now I suppose on the point of being modified) by making any more objection to the above ruling, than to record here my protest against both the above decisions.

5. It seems to me that on one and the same day (or series of consecutive days) all settlement of the following claims should be made by the Revenue and Company's Officers appointed for the purpose for each village:—

(1).—The area and amount of water-rate chargeable for each case of irrigation in that village.

(2).—The area and amount of remission.

(3).—The area and amount of damage done by the works to crops not irrigated by the canal by flooding or by cutting off supply of water.

And that the adjusted claim on that day should be final as to facts, and only liable to alteration on points purposely reserved, or on points of law, for which cases there should be some appeal such as is already provided by the clause.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
7th February 1873.*

6. I am startled to-day (14th) to find that in a circular issued by the Collector (Mr. Chase) to all village curnams, and dated 3rd September last, the last sentence has the following meaning so far as I can learn (I translate from a copy authenticated by the Deputy Collector):—

"For flooding of chillies a rate equal to that of paddy fields of Rupees 6 an acre must be given for water. For all other, dry crops, for each flooding Rupee 1 must be given."

7. Even if I am wrong in the comma after "other," the sense is hardly affected; and it seems from Mr. Crawford's report to Mr. Wilks* that at least

* Velapanoor, 2nd instant.
some villages understand ordinary irrigation at Rupees 6 an acre to be absolutely prohibited for all crops except rice and chillies. Such mistakes and ambiguities, which nothing but a full code of rules can prevent, are certain to affect irrigation very sensibly throughout the Kurnool District, i.e., over 140 miles of canal. I do not see how a ryot can venture to cultivate raggi, pink kora, onions, wheat, garden vegetables, etc., or to plant topes, if he be under the impression that for each flooding (of which he may need ten or twenty in a season) he 'must' pay a rupee an acre.

No. 162.

ORDER THEREON, 7th February 1873, No 415.

IRRIGATION, No. 8.

COMMUNICATED to the Board of Revenue in continuation of letters recorded in Government Order, No. 2,993, dated 17th December 1872, with a view to these communications receiving consideration together with the rules lately submitted.

(True Extract.)

Captain, R.E.,

Officiating Under Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

„ Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

„ Revenue Department.

Exd. S. T. Austin.

Madras Irrigation and Canal Co.

Chief Engineers Office,

Kurnool 14th December 1872

No 3.

To

The Chief Engineer for Irrigation,
and Joint Secretary to Government

Fort St George

Madras.

Sr. Settlement of 1871-2

In reference to Government Order No. 1030 of 5th October 1864, para 2, I have the honour to point out for the information of Government the way in which clause VI of the Rules then sanctioned works. There is little doubt that some alteration of those rules is now required, and therefore it seems an opportune time for recording any defective working.

In short, then, the rules give the Company's officers no voice in settling the simple claim of the Company on the Government, and of the Government on the ryot, for water supplied. Copy of the Collector of Kurnool's letter* illustrates this. One local Revenue officer (Mr. Chase) and an officer of the Company (Mr. Crawford) investigated the claims to remission for Vellala village for last

* No. 1222 of 20th Dec.

last season (1871). Amongst other claims was one on a rice crop of a little over an acre; regarding which it was settled that no remission was due, and the full water rate of Rs 7.3.2 was put down to it. Afterwards, Mr Chase wrote instructions to strike out this field, on the ground that the field was naturally wet enough to grow rice, though it is admitted rice was never grown there before, and unquestionable that canal water had easy access to the field. In this case the water rate is altered apparently after the adjustment of the remission. But the clause I admit, gives no definition of when the adjusted claim is complete. In this case the Company's officers may, I think, fairly claim the Rs 7.3.2 from Government, as an adjusted claim.

The other is a case of some rice fields in Uambalapully. The first correspondence originated in a mistake about 13.93 acres of rice grown to maturity under canal water, which Mr Crawford understood at the settlement was to have no remission, and Mr Chase understood was to be charged for one flooding only. However, this is now clear that the water rate charged by Government is Rs 7 an acre for flooding this rice, and no claim for remission is, of course, made on that rate.

I have no intention of adding to the difficulties and confusion due to the existing rules (now I suppose on the point of being modified) ~~and~~ by making any more objection to the above ruling, than to record here my protest against both the above decisions.

It seems to me that on one and the same day, (or series of consecutive days,) all settlement of the following claims should be made by the Deverne and Company's officers appointed for the purpose, for each village.

- ①. The area and amount of water rate chargeable for each case of irrigation in that village.
- ②. The area and amount of remission.
- ③. The area and amount of damage done by the works to crops not irrigated by the Canal, by flooding or by cutting off supply of water.

And that the adjusted claim on that day should be final as to facts; and only liable to alteration on points purposely reserved, or on points of law, for which cases there should be some appeal such as is already provided by the clause.

I am startled to day (14th) to find that in a Circular issued by the Collector (Mr Chase) to all village Curnums, and dated

3rd September last the last sentence has the following meaning so far as I can learn (I translate from a copy authenticated by the Deputy Collector):-

"for flooding of chillies a rate equal to that of paddy fields of Rs 6 an acre must be given for water. For all other dry crops, for each flooding Rs 1 must be given"

Even if I am wrong in the comma after "other", the sense is hardly affected; and it seems from Mr Crawford's report to Mr. Wicks* that at least some

Velpamoor 2nd inst.

Villages understand ordinary irrigation at Rs 6 an acre to be absolutely prohibited for all crops except rice and chillies.

Such mistakes and ambiguities, which nothing but a full code of rules can prevent, are certain to affect irrigation very sensibly, throughout the Vennoor District; i.e. over 140 miles of Canal.

I do not see how a ryot can venture to cultivate raggee, pink Ura, onions, wheat, garden vegetables &c, or to plant topes, if he be under the impression that for each flooding (of which he may need 10 or 20 in a season) he must pay a rupee an acre.

I have the honour to be

Yours most Obedt. Servant

John W. Latham
Chief Engineer

Public Works Department
No. 1615

Proceedings of the Madras Government

From
The Collector of { H.E. No. 1309 d/17th Dec/72 }
Tirunelveli
The Chief Engineer { H.E. No. 3 d/14th Dec/72 }
Madras Irrigation & Canal Company

Communicated
to the Board of Revenue
in continuation of letters
recorded in Government
Order No. 2993 dated 17th
December 1872, with a view
to these communications
receiving consideration
together with the rules
lately submitted

Dec. 21/12/72

Approved

To The Board of Rev.
Ch. Engineer
Head Dept.
At Manager's Office of C.
Dec 22/12/72
Dec 22/12/72

No. 50 October 16/1872-203
No. 100072-357-352

P. M. B. 372
Chief Engineer
H. E. No. 3 d/14th Dec/72
The Chief Engineer
Madras

No. 3.

Dec 14th
Dec 18th Dec 21st

Regarding alter-
ation of Clause 44
to Rules for
Distribution
in S. 1820
Dec 1872
No. 115-7 d/17th Dec/72

6376
#241377
Govt. of 1873 Madras
PUBLIC WORKS.

The Board of Revenue

Dated

Recd.

Encl. 3

G. O. 7 Feb 1873, No. 415.

Nos. 160-161 & 162

Water rate. Papers on
the subject of the rules
for the supply & supply
of water from the
Madras S. P. Co's
Canal, Com^d to the
H. of Rev.