(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 30

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 10/91

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

PWD துறை

192

அரசாணை எண். — அச்சகம்

மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 2709 பலவண்ண

நாள் : 29-9-1852 19 8 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

15 Sheets

ஆவண. கா-1—18,006—15-6-87.

2709/1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Account.

READ—the following papers :—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), dated 4th May 1892, Mis. No. 2736.

MR. E. GIBSON.

Read—the following letter from W. A. WILLOCK, Esq., Collector of Vizagapatam, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated 23rd April 1892, No. 1187 :—

I have the honour to bring the following matter to the notice of the Board with a view to its taking such action as it may deem fit to prevent similar waste of public money in future.

2. An anicut across the Koppaka river has been under construction for some time past. The work is a large one and is estimated to cost Rs. 38,000. The river (that which drains the greater part of the Golgonda taluk) here passes between two hills, one of which belongs to the Koppaka proprietor. The latter is closest to the work and was used to quarry stone from. The stone has been excavated from an area of a little under an acre, but no steps were taken to take the land up as a quarry till August last, when I was asked to take the necessary steps under the Land Acquisition Act. The land is practically valueless and the compensation will be only nominal, but I find from the mokhasadar that Rs. 745-11-1 have already been paid to him on measurement of the materials removed and between Rs. 400 and 500 are said to be still due. A loss of over Rs. 1,000 has been incurred here owing to neglect to provide a quarry in time. The rate paid, 8 annas per 100 cubic feet, is also excessive, as the railway gets all its stone in precisely similar localities for 3 annas per 100 cubic feet for good stone and 1 anna for ballast.

3. In the compensation claim for Rs. 3,33,766 recently decided at Vizagapatam the fact that the Department of Public Works was paying this rate was proved and would have had a very serious effect had the quarries then under consideration not been proved to contain only worthless stone.

Resolution—dated 4th May 1892, Mis. No. 2736.

Submitted to Government with the request that the attention of the Public Works Department officer concerned may be drawn to the matter.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) H. A. SIM,
Acting Secretary.

No. 66, Revenue.

Transferred to the Public Works Department.

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary to Government.

11th May 1892.

No. 2541 C.

Referred to the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, for report.

(Signed) J. PENNYCUICK, Colonel, R.E.,
14th May 1892. Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

From G. D. WYBROW, Esq., Superintending Engineer, I Circle, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Dowlaishweram, 13th September 1892, No. 448 V.Z.

In reference to your endorsement, No. 2541 C., dated 14th May 1892, on Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 2736, dated 4th idem (herewith returned), relative to the high rate of compensation allowed by this department for the stone required for use on Koppaka anicut work in the Vizagapatam district, I have the honour to forward herewith two letters,* in original, one received from Executive Engineer Mr. C. J. Ussher, who was in charge of the Vizagapatam division at the time, and the other from Mr. Moss, Assistant Engineer in charge Yellamanchili sub-division, explaining the circumstances which led to the payment of a rate of 8 annas per 100 cubic feet for the supply of stone for the work in question.

No. 442, dated 21st August 1892, from Mr. Moss.
* No. ——, dated 31st August 1892, from Mr. Ussher.

2. It would appear from their explanations that the prevalence of a higher rate, viz., 11 annas a hundred cubic feet, would have had to be paid to the Forest department in the same locality, and this was the chief cause for the acceptance of the comparatively low rate of 8 annas.

3. It was doubtless a fact that the mokhasadar took advantage of the then urgency under which this department was placed for the material and refused to curtail the rate of 8 annas, which rate he was persuaded to agree to after some difficulty.

4. As regards the alleged failure to apply to the Revenue department to take up land for quarrying purposes, Mr. Ussher explains that—

(1) The transfer of land invariably involves great delay and the work was one which, in the interests of Government, did not admit of delay.

(2) He considered that, in the then condition of affairs, when nothing was settled regarding the extent of work to be done, it was not advisable to open out a regular quarry involving blasting operations, &c., when plenty of good stone being then available from the surface of the hill at the cost of conveying it to site *plus* the fee of annas 8 per 100 cub. feet.

5. The land in question has since been taken up and it is doubtless a pity that it was not acquired in the first instance.

6. The Collector in para. 2 of his letter states that "the land is practically valueless and the compensation will be only nominal." The compensation, however, settled by the Collector amounts to Rs. 1,003 for only 90·2 cents of land. I have addressed the Collector on the subject with a request to be furnished with the reason why so exorbitant a price as it appears to me to be should be paid for land which he has himself stated to be practically valueless.

ENCLOSURES.

From H. MOSS, Esq., Assistant Engineer, Yellamanchili Sub-division, to the Executive Engineer, Vizagapatam Division, dated Narsapatam, 21st August 1892, No. 442.

[*Reference*—Division Office No. 521 of 27th May 1892.]

I have the honour to report that the compensation for rough stone for the Koppaka anicut was settled on the spot by Mr. Ussher in person in December 1889.

2. The then Tahsildar, Kothanda Rao Pantulu, was present on the occasion, and I believe it was only with difficulty that the mokhasadar was persuaded to accept 8 annas a hundred cubic feet. He demanded the same fees as the Forest department charge, *i.e.*, 1 anna a bandy-load which would amount to at least 11 annas a hundred cubic feet.

2709/2

3. If Government considers the rate of 11 annas a hundred cubic feet a fair one, then 8 annas a hundred cubic feet cannot be thought excessive.

4. As much of the stone was collected before any royalty was demanded and for which nothing was paid; the rate resulting from the total quantity of stone obtained is much less than 8 annas per 100 cubic feet.

5. When this rate of 8 annas was settled, railway works had not been commenced, and their were no other rates with which to compare except those of the Forest department and these are much higher. Had it not been for these forest dues we should probably have obtained the stone for nothing. By going further afield, as the Railway department has done, we might possibly have got the stone for less, but the extra cost of cartage would have more than made up the difference.

6. What part the revenue officials took in the settlement of this, of 8 annas per 100 cubic feet, I do not know, but I do know that when we asked them to settle the rate for gravel taken from the same quarry, they fixed it at 4 annas per 100 cubic feet which rate we have been paying.

7. If, as stated by the Collector, the Railway department was paying only "3 annas per 100 cubic feet for *all its stone*," it is not apparent why the rate of 4 annas per 100 cubic feet for gravel (which should be much cheaper) was settled as a rate of compensation to be paid by this department.

8. I cannot say why Mr. Ussher did not apply to the Revenue department to take up the land as a permanent quarry. Very likely former dealings with it had convinced him that there was little to be saved either in money or time by doing so and that the best plan was to endeavour to come to some arrangement with the mokhasadar himself, especially as the work was very urgent. Such has been my experience in this district.

9. As this arrangement had been made with the mokhasadar by the Executive Engineer, I did not consider myself justified in interfering with it. But in July 1891 the mokhasadar began to give trouble and to hinder the work by preventing us from taking gravel on the pretext that compensation for gravel had not been settled. We therefore applied to the Collector to take up the land permanently and to the Tahsildar to settle the compensation which should be paid for gravel meanwhile.

10. Although the land was applied for in August 1891, it was only obtained and paid for on June 20th this year.

11. I expected that the price of the land would be small and that we should save something by taking it up permanently. It is of no value to any one but ourselves, and, though it will always be useful to us (as we shall need stone from time to time for repairs of neighbouring works), I think Rs. 1,000 is rather a heavy price to pay for it. The land is "practically valueless" (*vide* Collector's letter) and the compensation *ought to be* "only nominal."

From C. J. USSHER, Esq., Executive Engineer, to the Superintending Engineer, I Circle (through the Superintending Engineer, II Circle), dated Bezváda, 30th August 1892.

With reference to your letter No. 340 V.Z., dated 26th July 1892, I have the honour to state that the following are the circumstances, so far as I recollect, which led to the agreement made by me in November or December 1889, with the mokhasadar of Koppaka village for the supply of stone for the work at Koppaka anicut.

2. In March 1889 an estimate, amounting to Rs. 5,210, for reconstructing the head sluice at left flank of Koppaka anicut was sanctioned. Some time afterwards the collection of stone for the work was commenced from the adjacent hill which was the property of the mokhasadar and from which it was usual to take stone required for the anicut works. No quarry was opened and stone was merely collected from the surface of the hill. In the month of September 1889, there occurred an extraordinarily high flood which very largely exceeded the calculated M.F.L. and which necessitated a reconsideration of the original proposal, which was to rebuild the head sluice without extending the anicut. The necessity for extending the anicut was brought forward by me and was still under correspondence with the Superintending Engineer when I was transferred from the division in December 1889.

3. It was, I think, in the month of September that the mokhasadar first raised objection to our taking stone from the hill and demanded the fee of 1 anna per bandy-load which the Forest department charged for stone taken from hills in their charge in the same taluk. The collection of stone was put a stop to, and I arranged an interview (I think in the month of November) with the mokhasadar and Taluk Tahsildar in view to make an arrangement allowing the collection of stone to be proceeded with, as it was urgently necessary that work should be put in hand the ensuing working season.

4. The mokhasadar demanded the full rate levied by the Forest department and was with difficulty persuaded to accept the much lower rate of As. 8 per 100 cubic feet of stone

actually built into the work, and, so far as I recollect, the fee was to be paid for stone collected after the date of the interview and was not to be levied on stone already collected.

5. I did not apply to the Revenue department to have a specific area taken up for a quarry because (1) the transference of land invariably involves great delay and the work was one which, in the interests of Government, did not admit of delay, and (2) because I considered that in the then condition of affairs, when nothing was settled regarding the extent of work to be done, it was not advisable to open out a regular quarry involving blasting operations, &c., plenty of good stone being then available from the surface of the hill at the cost of conveying it to site *plus* the fee of As. 8 per 100 cubic feet.

6. However, the agreement I considered it advisable to make was in no way binding on my successor, and the quantity of stones collected under the terms of the agreement before I left the division could not have been great. From the fact that my successor (Mr. Traill) appears to have continued the work under the terms of the agreement until July 1891, I conclude that he also was of opinion that, under the circumstances, it was the most suitable arrangement that could be made.

7. With reference to the letter from the Collector of Vizagapatam to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, so far as I am concerned, I strongly protest against that officer bringing a charge of waste of public money in connection with this matter. That it was necessary to pay any royalty for the stone was, I am convinced, entirely due to the charges then lately introduced by the Forest department, the existence of which charges the Collector does not mention in his letter.

8. In conclusion I have to point out that the Collector states that in August 1891 application was made to him to acquire "an area of a little under an acre" of land "practically valueless and the compensation for which will be only nominal." For this piece of land it appears that, after a delay of ten months in acquiring it, compensation has now been paid by the Collector amounting to Rs. 1,000.

No. 1382 K.S.

Forwarded to the Superintending Engineer, I Circle.

2nd September 1892.

(Signed) J. W. MARTIN,
Superintending Engineer, II Circle.

ORDER—dated 29th September 1892, No. 2709 W., Public Works.

It is stated in these papers that the Forest department charged a seigniorage of 11 annas per 100 cubic feet for stone removed from Government land. If this be so, Mr. Ussher had some justification for agreeing to pay the mokhasadar at the rate of 8 annas per 100 cubic feet, and, with reference to the smallness of the work originally contemplated and its urgency, he may be excused for refraining from opening a quarry in the first instance. But when the large work, estimated to cost Rs. 38,000, was decided on his successor, Mr. Traill, should not have continued the arrangement; nor is Mr. Moss free from blame in this matter. The fact remains that more has been paid as royalty to the mokhasadar than the acquisition of the quarry has cost, even at the enormous rate of more than Rs. 1,000 per acre which has been settled.

2. As to this settlement the Collector's explanation will be called for in the Revenue department.

(True Extract.)

Major, R.E.,
Under-Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, I Circle.
" " II "
" Revenue Department.

Exd. S. J. Pereira.
Spare Copies

2709/3

GENERAL.
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of {1892} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated September, 29th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 29th Sept. 1892, No. 2709 W.

SEPTEMBER.

Koppaka Anicut Works

Orders on correspondence regarding the high rate of compensation settled for the stone required for use on the — in the Vizagapatam division.

No. 1187

VIZAGAPATAM COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,

Dated 23rd April 1892.

From

W. A. Wedlock Esqr.

Collector

Vizagapatam District.

1220 92

To

H. A. Pino Esqr.

Secretary to the Commissioners of

Land Revenue,

Madras.

2209/4

Sir,

I have the honour to bring the following matter to the notice of the Board with a view to its taking such action as it may deem fit to prevent similar waste of public money in future.

2 An anicut across the Koppaka river has been under construction for some time past. The work is a large one and is estimated to cost Rs 38,000. The river (that which drains the greater part of the Gudlugonda Taluk) here passes between two hills one of which belongs to the Koppaka proprietor. The latter is closest to the work and was used to quarry stone from. The stone has been excavated from an area of a little under an acre but no steps were taken to take the land up as a quarry till August last

last, when I was asked to take the necessary steps under the Land Acquisition Act. The land is practically valueless and the compensation will be only nominal but I find from the Mokhasadar that Rs 745. 11. 1 have already been paid to him on measurements of the materials removed and between Rs 400 and Rs 500 are paid to be still due. A loss of over Rs 1000 has been incurred here owing to neglect to provide a quarry in time. The rate paid, 8 annas per 100 cubic feet, is also excessive as the Railway gets all its stone in precisely similar localities for 3 annas per 100 cubic feet for good stone and 1 anna for ballast.

3 In the Compensation claim for Rs 333766 recently decided at Vizagapatam the fact that the Department of Public Works was paying this rate was proved and would have had a very serious effect had the quarries then under consideration not been proved to contain only worthless stone.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servt.
[illegible]
Collector.

BOARD OF REVENUE OFFICE MADRAS.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
(Land Revenue),

Dated 4. May 1892.

No. 2736 Mis. / Routine

Mr: E. Gibson

Read letter from F. A. Willock Esqr, Collector of Vizagapatam, dated 23. April 1892, ero: 1187.

Resolution

Submitted to Government with the request that the attention of the D. P. W. officer concerned may be drawn to the matter.

(True Extract)

Ag: Secretary

To

The Secretary to Govt. R.D. /
with letter in orgl: to be retd:
Copy to the Collr of Vizagapatam

P.W. CURRENT No. ~~5493~~

Revenue 1892 Dept 5478/92

Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

MADRAS.

Current Number 4138.

To

The Secretary

to Government,

Rd 6 May

Recd 14-5-92

Proceedings, dated 4 May 1892,
Mis.
No. 2736 Routine

Subject

Requesting to draw the attention of the D. P. W. officer concerned to the Collr's letter (Vizagapatam) bringing to notice the waste of public money lately caused by the D. P. W. in allowing a high rate of Compensation for quarry stone near the Koppaka.

With an endorsement

Endorsement No. 66

Transferred to the Public Works Department.

Chalton
Secretary to Govt

11th May 1892

Ry 2541 C dated 4th May 1892

Referred to the Superintending Engineer I Circle for report

Col R.R.
Chief Engr & Secy

To be returned

No. 4488/92

FROM,

G. D. Wybrow Esq:
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

FIRST CIRCLE.

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DOWLAISHWERAM, 13th September 1892.

SIR,

In reference to your endorsement No. 2541 C dated 14th May 1892, on Proceedings of the Board of Revenue No. 2736 dated 4th idem (herewith returned) relative to the high rate of Compensation allowed by this Department for the stone required for use on Koppaka Anicut work, in the Vizagapatam District, I have the honor to forward herewith two letters in original, one, received from Executive Engineer Mr. C. J. Elsher who was in charge of the Vizagapatam Division at the time, and the other, from Mr. Moss, Assistant Engineer in charge Ellamanchily Sub-Division, explaining the circumstances which led to the payment of a rate of 8 annas per

1 C. Rs. endorsement No. 2541 C dated 14-5-92
1 Letter from Mr. Moss dated 8/21-9-92
1 Letter No. 4442 dated 8-9-92 from Mr. Elsher

Ry No. 4488 dated 21-8-92 from Mr. Elsher
No. 4442 dated 21-8-92 from Mr. Moss

100 c.ft. for the supply of stone for the work in question

2. It would appear from the explanations that the prevalance of a higher rate namely 11 annas a hundred cubic feet would have had to be paid to the Forest Department, in the same locality and this was the chief cause for the acceptance of the comparatively low rate of 8 annas.

3. It was doubtless a fact that the Mokhasadar took advantage of the then urgency, under which this Deptt was placed for the material, and refused to curtail the rate of 8 annas, which rate he was persuaded to agree to, after some difficulty.

4. As regards the alleged failure to apply to the Revenue Deptt to take up land for quarrying purposes, Mr Elsher explains that:-

(1) the transfer of land invariably involves great delay, and the work was one which in the interests of Govtt did not admit of delay.

(2) he considered that in the then condition of affairs, when nothing was settled regarding the extent of work to be done, it was not advisable to open out a regular quarry involving blasting operations

when plenty of good stone being then available from the surface of the hill, at the cost of conveying it to site, plus the fee of annas 8 per 100 c.ft.

5. The land in question has since been taken up and it is doubtless a pity that it was not acquired in the first instance.

6. The Collector in para 2 of his letter states that "the land is practically valueless and the compensation will be only nominal." The compensation however settled by the Collector amounts to Rs. 1003 for only 20.2 Bighas of land. I have addressed the Collector on the subject with a request to be furnished with the reason why so exorbitant a price, as it appears to me to be, should be paid for land which he has himself stated to be practically valueless.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt servt

Supg: Engineer I Circle

P. W. CURRENT No. 7478

memo No. 2541 C.E. 14.8.92
Fr. Nos. 8682 & 10.11.91
" " 4990 & 19.6.92

FROM,

G. D. Wybrow Esquire

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

FIRST CIRCLE.

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DATED 13th
DESPATCHED 14th } September 1892.
RECEIVED

No. 448 Vz

ENCLOSURES 3.

SUBJECT.

Koppaka Anicut works—
Reporting the causes for
allowing a high rate of com-
-pensation for the stone
required for use on the—

Hm

For orders

Ellamanchilli Sub
Vizagapatam Division Office
No. 442.
Camp Narsipatam 27th August 1892.

From

The Assistant Engineer
Ellamanchily Sub Division

To

The Executive Engineer
Vizagapatam Division.

Reference Division office No. 521 of 27-5-92

Sir,

I have the honor to report that the compensation for rough stone for the Koppaka Anicut was settled on the spot by me in December 1889.

2 The then Shasidar Kshanda Rao pantulu was present on the occasion and I believe, it was only with difficulty that the Mokhasadar was persuaded to accept 8 annas a hundred cubic feet. He demanded the same fees as the Forest Department charge. i.e. one anna a bandy load which would amount to, at least 11 annas a hundred cubic feet.

3 If Government considers the rate of 11 annas a hundred cubic feet a fair one, then 8 annas a hundred cft cannot be thought excessive.

6 As much of the stone was collected before any royalty was demanded and for which nothing was paid, the rate resulting

resulting from the total quantity of stone obtained is much less than 8 as. per 100 c.ft.

When this rate of 8 as was settled, Railway works had not been commenced, and there were no other rates with which to compare except those of the Forest Department and these are much higher. Had it not been for these Forest dues we should probably have obtained the stone for nothing. By going further afield, as the Railway Department has done we might possibly have got the stone for less, but the extra cost of cartage would have more than made up the difference.

What part the Revenue officials took in the settlement of this of 8 as. per 100 c.ft. I do not know, but I do know that when we asked them to settle the rate for gravel taken from the same quarry they fixed it at 4 as. per 100 c.ft, which rate we have been paying.

If, as stated by the collector, the Railway Department was paying only 3 as. per 100 c.ft. for all its stone; it is not apparent why the rate of 4 as per 100 c.ft for gravel (which should be much cheaper) was settled as the rate of compensation to be paid by this Department.

I cannot say why Mr. Ussher did not apply to the Revenue Department to take up the land as a permanent quarry. Very likely former dealings with it had convinced him that there was little to be saved either in money or time by doing so, and that the best plan was to endeavour to come to some arrangement with the mokhasadar himself, especially as the work was very urgent. Such has been my experience in this District.

As this arrangement had been made with the mokhasadar by the Executive Engineer, I did not consider myself justified in interfering with it. But in July 1891 the mokhasadar began to give trouble and to hinder the work by preventing us from taking gravel on the pretext that compensation for gravel had not been settled. We therefore applied to the Collector to take up the land permanently, and to the Thasildar to settle the compensation which should be paid for gravel meanwhile.

Although the land was applied for in August 1891 it was only obtained and paid for on June 20th this year.

I expected that the price of the land would be small, and that we should save something by taking it up permanently.

resulting from the total quantity of stone obtained is much less than 8 as. per 100 c.ft.

When this rate of 8 as was settled, Railway works had not been commenced, and there were no other rates with which to compare except those of the Forest Department and these are much higher. Had it not been for these Forest dues we should probably have obtained the stone for nothing. By going further afield, as the Railway Department has done we might possibly have got the stone for less, but the extra cost of cartage would have more than made up the difference.

What part the Revenue officials took in the settlement of this of 3 as. per 100 c.ft. I do not know, but I do know that when we asked them to settle the rate for gravel taken from the same quarry they fixed it at 4 as. per 100 c.ft, which rate we have been paying.

If, as stated by the collector the Railway Department was paying only "3 as. per 100 c.ft. for all its stone", it is not apparent why the rate of 4 as per 100 c.ft for gravel (which should be much cheaper) was settled as the rate of compensation to be paid by this Department.

I cannot say why Mr. Usshar did not apply to the Revenue Department to take up the land as a permanent quarry. Very likely former dealings with it had convinced him that there was little to be saved either in money or time by doing so, and that the best plan was to endeavour to come to some arrangement with the mokhasadar himself, especially as the work was very urgent. Such has been my experience in this District.

As this arrangement had been made with the mokhasadar by the Executive Engineer, I did not consider myself justified in interfering with it. But in July 1891 the mokhasadar began to give trouble and to hinder the work by preventing us from taking gravel on the pretext that compensation for gravel had not been settled. We therefore applied to the Collector to take up the land permanently, and to the Thasildar to settle the compensation which should be paid for gravel meanwhile.

Although the land was applied for in August 1891 it was only obtained and paid for on June 20th this year.

I expected that the price of the land would be small and that we should save something by taking it up permanently.

H.

It is of no value to anyone but ourselves, and though it will always be useful to us (as we shall need stone from time to time for repairs of neighbouring works) I think Rs 1000 is rather a heavy price to pay for it. The land is "practically valueless" (vide collectors letter) and the compensation ought to be "only nominal".

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servt
H. Mosse
Assistant Engineer

S Stendorf
Executive Engineer
Vizagapatam Division

Narsipatam
28th August 1892.

2709/10

From.

The Assistant Engineer

Ellamanchilly, Tank. Dist.

To.

The Executive Engineer

Visagapatam Division

Vattas.

Dated 21
Recd 22 August 92

No 242.

Kappasa Anicut. High
have
rates said to be unpaid
an account of quarry
fees for stones and
gravel.

Submits explanation.

Encl 1/3408/92

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
REGD. No. 1609
30 AUG. 92
P. W. D.
VIZAGAPATAM DIVISION

1/3007/92

Bezwada
30th / 31 August 1892

From

C. J. Usher Esq.
Executive Engineer

To

The Superintending Engineer
1st Circle

thro' the Superintending Engineer 2nd Circle

Sir

With reference to your letter No. 369 R.P. dated 26-7-92, I have the honor to state that the following are the circumstances, so far as I recollect, which led to the agreement made by me in November or December 1889, with the Mokhasadars of Koppaka village for the supply of stone for the works at Koppaka Anicut

(2) In March 1889 an estimate amounting to Rs. 5210 for reconstructing the Head Sluice at left flank of Koppaka Anicut was sanctioned. Sometime afterwards the collection of stone for the work was commenced from the adjacent hill which was the property of the Mokhasadar, and from which it was usual to take stone required for the Anicut works. No quarry was opened, and stone was merely collected from the surface of the hill. In the month of September 1889, there occurred an extraordinarily high flood which very largely exceeded the calculated M. F. D. and

Enclosures 3

1/3807/92

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
REGD. No. 1609
30 AUG. 92
P. W. D.
VIZAGAPATAM DIVISION

which

2709/13

of Vizagapatam to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Land Revenue so far as I am concerned, I strongly protest against that Officer bringing a charge of waste of public money in connection with this matter. That it was necessary to pay any royalty for the stone was, I am convinced, entirely due to the charges then lately introduced by the Forest Department - the existence of which charges the Collector does not mention in his letter.

8. In conclusion I leave to point out that the Collector states that in August 1891 application was made to him to acquire "an area of a little under 'an acre'" of land "practically valueless and the compensation for which will be only nominal". For this piece of land it appears that after a delay of ten months in acquiring it, compensation has now been paid by the Collector amounting to Rs. 1000

No. 1382K/1 Encls. 3.
" 2-9-92

I have the honor to be
Forwarded to the Sir
Supdg Engineer Your most obt. Servt
for Circle

[illegible]
Supdg Engineer Executive Engineer

1/9/92
Below 30/8/92

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 1319-S.
Rec'd 1- SEP 92
P. W. D.
SECOND CIRCLE

From

C. J. Ussher Esqr.
Executive Engineer

To

The Supg. Engr. 1st Circle
thro' Supg. Engr 2nd Circle

Dated 30th
Despd. 31st August 1892
Recd.

No. —

Enclosures 3 Rs

Collection of Stone for work at Koppak Anicut

Informs the circumstances under which land was not applied for —

Encls 3
P W 5 to 5/5 92

B

With an Endt

1382 Ks
2-9-92

Endt from Under S. & C. Dept. 7

No. 2709 W dt. 29 September 1892

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Prs: of the Bd of Revenue (L.R./H.E. No. 2736 Mis dt 4.5.92)
Endt thereon in the Rev dept (.. 66 dt 11.5.92)
Letter from the S.E. I Circle (.. 4485/2 dt 13.9.92)

2709/14

It is stated in these papers that the Forest Department charged a seigniorage of 11 annas per 100 cubic feet for stone removed from Government land. If this be so, Mr Ussher had some justification for agreeing to pay the Mokhadar at the rate of 8 annas per 100 cubic feet; and with reference to the smallness of the work originally contemplated and its urgency, he may be

2709/15.

exensed for refraining from opening a/ quarry in the first instance. But when the largework, estimated to cost Rs 38,000, was decided on his successor, Mr Traill, should not have continued the arrangement; nor is Mr Moss free from blame in this matter. The fact remains that more has been paid as royalty to the Mokhasadar than the acquisition of the quarry has cost, even at the enormous rate of more than Rs 1000 per acre which has been settled.

2. As to this settlement the Collector's explanation will be called for in the Revenue Dept.

R.A. 22.7 2.8.17

Sir Standing Order 10 Chapter
Dept for favour of Government

S. E. I Circle
S. E. II Circle 7/10
Revenue Dept

C. No. 9478

Govt. of {1892 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated 30/9/92

Rcd. Encl.

G.O. 29th September 1892 No. 2709. W

Koppaka Anicut works

Orders on correspondence regarding the high rate of compensation settled for the stone required for use on the ——— in the Vizagapatam Division.

15

60/4

Jd 29/9

J. C. 29/9