

- (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. 1136	(W)	Press Mis. ✓
Dated 4-4-	1877.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

N^o 32

Machair Irrigation & Canal Co
Chief Engineer & Manager's Office
Kurrul 20 March 1877

Respected. Sir,
To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation
Fort St. George

①

Sir

DWA-16 March
1877

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of G.O. N^o 915 of 3rd instant. It is to the effect that the Collector's explanation is satisfactory.

I am unable to see to what explanation the order refers. There seems to be no explanation of the matters which I brought to your notice in my letter embodied in G.O. N^o 2,888 of 28th Oct. 1876. I will just re-state these, with the dates.

30th Sept. 1876. On this date Mr Foster wrote to me that he had sent instructions to the Deputy Collector of Mandial. In the terms used by the Board of Revenue ^(27 Sept 1876) it was stated that water-rate would be collected on irrigated dry crop only if the yield be "fair".

3rd Oct. Deputy Collector writes back to Ag. Collr (Mr Foster) to ask the meaning of "fair".

5th Oct. Dep^y Collr informs me at Mandial, that he cannot be sure what the Board of Revenue mean by "fair"; but that he has translated it, as usual, "half" in his Telugu circular just despatched to Taluk-dars.

Same day. On my arguing that the Govt certainly and the Board presumably, meant a (crop

crop better than "half", for that it had been the past practice to remit on crops not reaching the standard of "half", we agreed that in speaking to the people a $\frac{3}{4}$ crop should be spoken of. But in his official instructions he could not alter the usual translation "half", without authority.

6th Oct. I write my letter No 101 to you, begging (para 2) the Govt to give an authoritative order that irrigated dry crops of under $\frac{3}{4}$ will have remission.

Printed in N.
S. 6th 2888
28 Oct/26

8th Oct. The Talukdar of Kovilkuntha holds an assembly in my tent, and there reads the Belyar circular received by him from the Depy Coll^y, in which the remission is promised to irrigated dry crops of under "half" a full crop.

Date not stated; but before Christmas day. Mr Foster decided that "where the yield is $\frac{3}{4}$ or more of a full crop realised during ordinary years, it (viz) may be said to have yielded a fair crop"

3 It is curious that throughout Mr Davidson's letter, the Board's Statement, and the Govt order, under review ~~Mr Foster seems to be taken as~~ this decision of Mr Foster seems to be taken as if it decided something in dispute. For my part I do not see the object of quibbling this decision of Mr Foster. It seems to me simply to say that a yield of $\frac{3}{4}$ or more of a full crop is above half and is to be charged. It reads like the phrase of a man who intends in the future settlement to take a lenient view of the conditions laid down by the Rev. Board to regulate the water rate, and wished to convey that impression; but who was unable to speak out plainly in defiance of the (instructions)

instructions from the Board. It was for authority to enable him to speak plainly that I had written to you on the 6th Oct.

4. Mr Davidson's para 4 seems written under a mistake. The most liberal possible definition of "fai" somewhere towards Christmas could not have been foreseen by the ryots on the 8th October. Probably when Mr Foster's decision reached the Talukhs all the ryots were already wildly eager for water. (2)

5. It was in the 1st week of October, before the ryots had wholly given up hopes of rain, that the liberal conception would have been of real service, ~~by~~ⁱⁿ inducing the ryots to make sowing of dry crops by using canal water to sow or mature them, and so encouraging a brisk demand for water before the failure of the Goombruda began to curtail the supply.

6. Thus, turning to Enclosure No 2, under reply, the facts complained of by me on 6 Oct, described in para 2 of the Enclosure, remain true enough. In para 3 the first item was never cause of complaint. The second also is not to the point: and can hardly be admitted without qualification. The last item is incorrect, inasmuch as the distinct explanation did not accompany the publicity first given to the rectification, but followed at some subsequent time.

I have the honour to be

Sir

Your most obedt servant

John Hathorn

Chief Engineer & Manager

1877
REGISTRATION
N.Y.P.C.
P.W.D.
27 MAR 77
3281

Encls. 1

Submitted to Government with
reference to G. O. No. 173, 14th March 1877.

Office of the Chief Eng^r
for Irrigation, Fort St
George. 26 March 1877

Voluntarily Lieut. Col. R. E.
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

7.

The Secretary to Government.
P. W. D.-

Apr 4th April 7, 1875

PM

14.3.77 No 173 A
29.10.77 " 238.

1877 P.W.D.
27 MAR 77
No 3281

From
The Chief Eng. for Irrig.

Dated 26th } March 1877
Despd. 27

Encl. 1

N. 162-W.

Water-rate in Kurnool District
— Submits letter from the Chief
Engineer & Manager, M.S. RCO,
regarding payment of — in
reference to G.O. No. 915 of 3 March
1877.

404: April 77 10th 70

Cr 29/1/77

E. I. Form No. 24.

No 1136

Public Works Department.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT. 5

UNDER date the 4 April 77

Read the following:—

Memo. from the Chief Engineer (H.E. No. 162 W. 26th March 1877)
for Irrigation —

Communicated to the
Revenue Department with
reference to the Order in that
Department No. 915 of the 3rd
March 1877.—

by 27/3

Ch. E. for I. ✓
Ch. E. & M. Irig. Co. ✓
Rev. P. E. ✓

despd 25-4-77

540

3281

Govt. of 1877 Ma ras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

the Chief Eng^r for Eng^rs

Dated

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. 17th April 87. No. 1136

Nos. 75-76

Water rate in Kurnool Dist
Endorsement of the Chief
Eng^r for Eng^rs submitting
letter from the Chief Eng^r
& Manager, M S & Co
Regarding payment of—
Amount to the Res Dept.

Done in B.P.

16/3/77