1.7.86BR.

(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 48 20

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் July 90

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் May. 1990

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P.W. துறை

அரசாணை எண். —
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 242

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் : 2.2.[illegible] 198[illegible].

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

இவண. தா-1—18,006—15-6-87.

242
7

2ND FEBRUARY 1893, No. 242 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

READ—the following paper :—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), dated 23rd December 1892, Mis. No. 4877.

Read—G.O., dated 12th December 1892, Mis. No. 5409, Revenue.

Resolution—dated 23rd December 1892, Mis. No. 4877.

In the schedule of requirements under Imperial Civil Works for 1893–94, it is observed that no provision has been made on account of the tidal canal between Masulipatam and the Manginapudi factory, for which work the preparation of the necessary plans and estimates was ordered in para. 2 of G.O., Mis. No. 225, dated 12th January 1892, Revenue. It is not known whether the Public Works Department has made provision for the work in its budget. The Board therefore requests that, pending the receipt of the plans and estimates already called for by Government, a sum of Rs. 56,600 may be provided for the work, as its early execution will be of advantage.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) EDMUND MILLETT,
Assistant Secretary.

No. 97, Revenue.

Transferred to the Public Works Department.

(Signed) R. C. C. CARR,
Under-Secy. to Government.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
14th January 1893.

ORDER—dated 2nd February 1893, No. 242 W., Public Works.

The "tidal canal between Masulipatam and the Manginapudi factory" was not included by the Board of Revenue in its schedule of requirements for 1893–94 as required by the orders quoted in the margin. No budget provision for next year has therefore been made for the work.

G.O., No. 3769 W., dated 25th Sept. 1878.
" " 4403 W. " 19th Nov. "

2. If it be desired that an application should be made to the Government of India for a special allotment of funds, the grounds of urgency should be fully stated.

(True Extract.)

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

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

Exd. C. A. Munisawmy.
Spare Copies

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of {1893} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated February, 2nd.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 2nd Feb. 1893, No. 242 W.

FEBRUARY.

Tidal canal between Masulipatam and the Manginapudi factory

Stating that no budget provision for next year has been made for the —, and that an application should be made to the Government of India for a special allotment of funds if desired.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following G.O., dated 22nd March 1892, Mis. No. 1569, Revenue :—

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), dated 6th February 1892, No. 68 :—

C. S. CROLE, Esq., C.S.

Read—again the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), dated 28th November 1891, Mis. No. 3846 :—

C. S. CROLE, Esq., C.S.

Read—the following G.O., dated 17th November 1891, Mis. No. 5905, Revenue :—

Read—the following G.O., dated 24th October 1891, No. 821 I., Public Works :—

Read—the following papers :—

Proceedings of the Madras Government, dated 9th February 1891, No. 918.
" " " 3rd March " " 1145-C.

From the Executive Engineer, Kistna Eastern Division, to the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, dated 14th July 1891, No. 1790.

Little else occurs to me to say beside what has already been brought out in these papers—

(1) A fresh-water canal would have no particular advantages over a tidal canal and would have the disadvantage of being more costly, involving masonry works and of being closed for three months in the year.

(2) A tidal canal would be cheap and available for navigation all the year.

(3) A tramway would be far more expensive to construct and maintain, and would have the disadvantage of higher freight charges as compared with the canals and would involve a break in bulk at Bandar, whether the salt were forwarded from that place by canal or by rail (there being a break of gauge in that rail).

2. As to the relative costs. As it is not indicated what kind of tramway is contemplated, I can give no approximation as to its cost. The tidal canal is already estimated at Rs. 56,600. The fresh-water canal was estimated in 1874 at Rs. 68,580, but rates have risen considerably since then, and 25 per cent. might be safely added to it, making it Rs. 78,860 approximately.

3. I do not think any of the projects, if carried out, would form an efficient protection against a storm-wave.

No. 920 K.S.

Communicated to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation with reference to his endorsement, No. 1145-C. of the 3rd March 1891, on Revenue Department G.O., No. 918 of the 9th February 1891, which is herewith returned, together with its

five enclosures, and with the remark that the undersigned concurs with the Executive Engineer's remarks.

22nd July 1891. (Signed) J. HANNAN,
Superintending Engineer, II Circle.

Memo. to the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, dated 31st July 1891, No. II/95 K.S.

From J. HANNAN, Esq., Superintending Engineer, II Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Bezvada, 7th October 1891, No. 1594 K.S.

With reference to your memo., No. II/95 K.S., dated 31st July 1891, I have the honour to inform you that the cost of a salt-water canal from tidal lock at Masulipatam to the Manginapudi salt-pans was estimated by me in May 1890 at the request of the Collector at Rs. 56,000. The estimate was framed from a longitudinal section taken along the proposed line, lump sum provisions being made for one bridge and four cattle-crossings. It will, therefore, be a very fair approximation of the actual cost.

2. The addition of 25 per cent. refers only to the estimate for the fresh-water canal of Rs. 68,580 which was made out in 1874. The estimate itself is not now forthcoming.

3. The cost of keeping open the tidal canal would probably be Rs. 300 a mile, and about the same for a fresh-water one, the length of the canal being 7 miles.

No. 175 I.

Note by Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

The cost of a fresh-water canal from the Masulipatam canal to the Manginapudi salt-pans is estimated *approximately* at Rs. 78,860; that of a salt-water (tidal) canal from the creek below the Masulipatam lock at Rs. 56,600. The probable cost of a tramway can best be furnished by the office of the Consulting Engineer for Railways.

2. As regards the relative merits of the two kinds of canal, there is no doubt that, for the purpose for which it is specially required, the tidal canal will be better of the two, as it need never be closed, whilst the fresh-water canal would have to be so far at least three months in every year.

3. The upkeep of the tidal canal would, it is believed, be less than that of a tramway, and carriage along it would be cheaper.

4. Neither of the works would in themselves afford protection against a storm-wave, but an embankment specially for the purpose could, if wished, be run along the south side of any one of them; it could probably be more easily and cheaply combined with the tidal canal than with either the fresh-water canal or the tramway.

OOTACAMUND, (Signed) G. T. WALCH,
15th October 1891. Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

To the Joint Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch.

Order—dated 24th October 1891, No. 821 I., Public Works.

Transferred to the Revenue Department with reference to G.O., No. 918, dated 9th February 1891.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. T. WALCH,
Joint Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.,
Irrigation Branch.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Superintending Engineer, II Circle.
" Revenue Department, with five enclosures.

Read—also Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), dated 11th November 1891, Mis. No. 3616.

ABSTRACT.—Requesting that Government may be pleased to pass early orders on Board's Proceedings, dated 11th October 1890, No. 474, regarding the excavation of a navigable canal between the Manginapudi factory and Bandar.

Order—dated 17th November 1891, Mis. No. 5905, Revenue.

Referred to the Consulting Engineer for Railways with the request that information may be furnished as to the cost of the construction of a tramway from Masulipatam to Manginapudi salt-pans. His opinion is also requested on the points referred to in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation printed with the first paper read above.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Consulting Engineer for Railways, with enclosures to be returned.

Copy to the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Resolution—dated 28th November 1891, Mis. No. 3846.

Recorded pending receipt of final orders on the subject.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) HERBERT BRADLEY,
Secretary.

Read—the following G.O., dated 12th January 1892, Mis. No. 225, Revenue:—

Read—again G.O., dated 11th December 1890, No. 7640, referring to the Public Works Department, for favour of remarks, Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), dated 11th October 1890, No. 474, and 24th October 1890, No. 485.

Read—again the following G.O., dated 9th February 1891, No. 918, on Proceedings of the Public Works Department, dated 15th January 1891, No. 43 I., transferring a note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation giving his opinion that a tidal canal is preferable for carriage of salt from Manginapudi to Masulipatam:—

Order—

Retransferred to the Public Works Department with the request that information may be furnished as to the relative merits of a tramway, a tidal canal and a fresh-water canal on the assumption that a railway between Masulipatam and Bezvada will eventually be constructed, as also as to their relative cost.

2. The question whether the work would be so carried out as to afford any protection against a storm-wave should also be considered.

Read—again G.O., dated 17th November 1891, Mis. No. 5905, Revenue.

Read—also the following note by the Consulting Engineer for Railways, Madras, dated 21st November 1891:—

I presume the description of tramway proposed is similar to that used by the Forest Department on which the wagons are worked by coolies or bullocks. I have ascertained that the permanent-way material with rails weighing 14 lb. per yard

2-feet gauge cost including wagons Rs. 5,400 per mile. To this must be added cost of formation and bridges which would probably be light between Masulipatam and Manginapudi.

2. The relative merits of a tramway and canal can best be decided by the local authorities. In a land of canals I should be disposed to give the preference to that mode of communication. A canal would avoid the necessity for transhipment, and could be worked and probably maintained more cheaply than a tramway.

3. A steam tramway would certainly not be economical.

4. Full particulars of the forest tramways will be found at pages 31 to 35 of the administration report of that department for 1889-90 and in Proceedings of Board of Revenue, dated 11th July 1886, Forest No. 888.

Order—dated 12th January 1892, Mis. No. 225, Revenue.

Professional opinion being in favour of a tidal canal, the Government sanctions its construction.

2. The papers will be transferred to the Public Works Department for preparation of the necessary plans and estimates.

3. The question of the best mode of raising funds to cover the cost of maintenance of the canal and the interest on the capital cost of its construction will be referred to the Board of Revenue.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Public Works Department.
" Commissioner of Salt, Abkári and Separate Revenue.

Resolution—dated 6th February 1892, No. 68.

The papers read above will be communicated to the Collector of Kistna, the Deputy Commissioner, Central Division, and the Assistant Commissioner, Masulipatam Sub-Division, for information.

2. With reference to paragraph 3 of the Government Order last read above, the Board begs to invite the attention of Government to paragraph 14 of its Proceedings, No. 474, dated 11th October 1890, and to paragraph 1 of Mr. Arundel's letter printed with Board's Proceedings, No. 485, dated 24th October 1890. The Board still adheres to the opinion that the best mode of raising funds to cover the cost of maintenance of the canal and the interest on the capital cost of its construction is by the levy of tolls on the canal traffic. The Collector should elaborate this suggestion.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) W. O. HORNE,
Acting Secretary.

To the Collector of the Kistna District.
" Deputy Commissioner of Salt and Abkári Revenue,
Central Division.
" Assistant Commissioner of Salt and Abkári Revenue,
Masulipatam Sub-Division.
" Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Order—dated 22nd March 1892, Mis. No. 1569, Revenue.

It is observed that the Board's proposal differed from Mr. Arundel's, the former having, in paragraph 14 of its Proceedings, dated 11th October 1890, No. 474, recommended a system of levying fees on boats as is done in the case of the canal at Vedárniem, whilst the latter suggested a toll on the canal traffic at so much per bag carried.

242/4

The Board should report on the relative merits of the two systems as applied to the proposed canal and also state whether the Salt Department will undertake the management of the canal.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Commissioners of Salt, Abkári and Separate Revenue.

READ—again the following G.O., dated 11th May 1892, Mis. No. 2351, Revenue:—

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), dated 8th April 1892, No. 204:—

C. S. CROLE, Esq., C.S.

Read—G.O., dated 22nd March 1892, Mis. No. 1569, Revenue:—

Resolution—dated 8th April 1892, No. 204.

Communicated to the Collector of Kistna, who is requested to expedite the report called for in the last sentence of paragraph 2 of Board's Proceedings, dated 6th February 1892, No. 68. The Board's intention was that funds should be raised by the levy of *fees* on boats as is done in the case of the Vedárniem canal and the word "*tolls*" was used in the Board's Proceedings above referred to by a clerical error. While submitting detailed proposals for the levy of fees, the Collector will, however, be requested to report on the relative merits of the two systems.

2. With reference to the concluding portion of the Government Order, Government will be informed that the Salt Department is prepared to take over the management of the canal when constructed.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. S. MEYER,
Acting Secretary.

To the Collector of Kistna.
" Deputy Commissioner of Salt and Abkári Revenue, Central Division.
" Assistant Commissioner of Salt and Abkári Revenue, Masulipatam.
" Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Order—dated 11th May 1892, Mis. No. 2351, Revenue.

Recorded pending further report.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), dated 12th August 1892, No. 432 :—

C. S. Crole, Esq., C.S.

Read—the following letter from A. T. ARUNDEL, Esq., Collector, Kistna District, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Salt, Abkári and Separate Revenue, dated Masulipatam, 20th July 1892, No. 6439 :—

I have the honour to reply to Board's Proceedings, No. 68, dated 6th February 1892, and No. 204, dated 8th April 1892.

2. The estimated cost of the tidal canal is Rs. 56,600 and the interest on this sum, at 4 per cent., is Rs. 2,264. The Superintending Engineer's estimate of the cost of upkeep is Rs. 300 per mile for the seven miles, or Rs. 2,100 in all. A total annual sum of Rs. 4,364 must therefore be provided, and this allows no margin for unforeseen expenditure.

3. The average export of salt from Manginapudi may be taken at 150,000 maunds or 75,000 bags or 5,500 tons. The present cost of transit of salt from Manginapudi to Masulipatam is Rs. 1–5–0 per bandy-load of 8 bags of 2 maunds each. The cost of transit per maund is therefore As. 1–3¾, and per bag is As. 2–7½.

4. To realize the required sum of Rs. 4,364, allowing for possible fluctuations, &c., a charge of 1 anna per bag should be levied for the use of the canal. This will be less than half the present transit charge and will realize roughly Rs. 4,700.

5. I do not see how it is possible to collect this sum, except in the form of tolls. No boat-owners could pay in advance the license fees necessary to make up so large a sum, whereas a toll, paid from time to time "on the job," can readily be disbursed by the boat-owner or consigner. For instance, a boat will carry, say 15 tons. It could easily make one trip to and from Masulipatam per week or 4 per month or 50 in the year. 50 trips at 200 bags per trip will amount to 10,000 bags, and the license fee for such a boat should be Rs. 625, an impossible sum. Suppose, however, that a boat of 15 tons made only one trip per month or 12 per annum, it would carry 2,400 bags in all and should pay a fee of Rs. 150 which, again, even if payable in two instalments, would be a fatal deterrent. Even so, it would be necessary to ensure the licensing of 29 boats at Rs. 150 each, to make up the required sum, and no such opulent flotilla would be forthcoming. I learn from the Collector of Tanjore that license fees for boats on the Vedárniem canal are charged at the rate of Re. 1 per ton. This would be entirely inadequate to raise the necessary sum on the Manginapudi canal.

6. The conclusion from every point of view is that the required fund can be raised by a toll and by no other means. It could be collected without difficulty by the preventive establishment at Manginapudi, with a special staff of clerk and peon during the manufacturing season, and after a while could, if desired, be leased out on contract.

Resolution—dated 12th August 1892, No. 432.

Submitted to Government with reference to the correspondence ending with G.O., dated 11th May 1892, Mis. No. 2351, Revenue.

2. The interest on the capital to be sunk on the canal is estimated at Rs. 2,264, and the cost of upkeep Rs. 2,100, making a total of Rs. 4,364. Under the circumstances explained by the Collector the best method of raising this amount seems to be by levying a toll on each bag of salt transported by the canal and not by a license fee on boats. The Collector proposes a toll of one anna per bag of 2 maunds of salt, and considers this not excessive as it is less than half the transit charge by cart, which he works out to be 2 annas 7½ pies per bag. But, in making this comparison, he has omitted to take into account the boat charges as well as the toll. This, however, as

242/5

will be seen from paragraph 2 of Lieutenant-Colonel J. C. Anderson's letter to the Collector of Kistna, printed in G.O., dated 14th February 1865, No. 311, Revenue, and from paragraph 2 of the Collector's letter, printed in Board's Proceedings, dated 11th October 1890, No. 474, should not be more than 4 pies per bag. Inclusive of tolls, the cost of transit by canal will amount to less than 1½ annas per bag, against 2 annas 7½ pies by cart. The toll proposed is not so high as it might seem, and is capable of reduction as canal traffic increases.

3. As regards the establishment required for collecting tolls, the Board considers that the collection may be made by a petty officer and a peon under the general orders of the Inspector, Manginapudi Circle. The Deputy Commissioner will be requested to report if the establishment can be conveniently spared from the factory staff.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. O. HORNE,
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
,, Collector of Kistna.
,, Deputy Commissioner of Salt and Abkári Revenue, Central Division.
,, Assistant Commissioner of Salt and Abkári Revenue, Masulipatam Sub-Division.

Order—dated 10th October 1892, No. 1036, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

The Government agrees with the Collector and the Board in considering that the funds required for defraying the cost of maintenance of the proposed Manginapudi canal and for repaying the interest on the capital cost of its construction should be raised by a system of tolls.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
,, the Public Works Department.

Exd. C. M. Brisson.

70 Copies.

Govt. of {1892} Madras.

REVENUE.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 10th October 1892, No. 1036

OCTOBER.

Manginapudi canal.

Agreeing with the Collector of Kistna and the Board in considering that the funds required for defraying the cost of the maintenance of the proposed — and for repaying the interest on the capital cost of its construction should be raised by a system of tolls.

JUDICIAL. (1892.) DEPARTMENT.

"REGISTRATION."

Gc 2590 : 23-12-91 Mis

From

Ag.

THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF

REGISTRATION,

Madras,

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY

TO GOVERNMENT,

Encls 5 (Chbars). Fort St. George.

Recd 20-1-93

Dated 25
Despd 26 } December 1892.
Received

No. 2634.

ENCLOSURE: Nil

No.

Submitting for approval and sanction a plan and an estimate amounting to Rs 3840 for constructing a Sub. Registrar's Office at Kurnipadi, South Arcot District.

RMS
Encl

MV

√

Read 19 January 1893 No 90

H. M. Mis 18/Jan

Approved & transferred to the Public Works Department.

(By order)

A Chatterton

Ag. Under Secretary

Abj
B/JR

To the Public Works Dept.
with orders

No. 1320 w dy 13-5-91 ✓
" 734 w - 24-3-85 ✓
" 941 w - 22-3-90 ✓
" 3018 w - 2-11-92 ✓
" 86 w - 8-1-92 ✓
" 5135 c - 5-12-92 ✓

C. 17/1
R. 9/1

H.M.
21-1-93

242/6

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE MADRAS

Read Despatch from

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Separate Revenue).

Dated 23d December 1892.

No. 4877 Mis.

Read P. O. dated 12th December 1892

Mis No 5409 Revenue.

Resolution—dated 23d Dec 1892, Mis No 4877

In the schedule of requirements under Imperial Civil Works for 1893–94, it is observed that no provision has been made on account of the tidal canal between Masulipatam and the Magnimole factory for which work the preparation of the necessary plans and Estimates was ordered in para 2 of P. O. dated 7th January 1892, Mis No 225 Revenue. It is not known whether the Public Works Department has made provision for the work in its Budget. The Board therefore request that pending the receipt of the plans and Estimate already called for by Government

Government, a sum of Rs. 56,600 may be provided for the work as the early execution will be of advantage.

/True Extract/

I am &c.

Assistant Secretary.

To

The Secretary to Government,

P.

Revenue Department.

P. W. CURRENT No. 415
(1892)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Current Number 10996

From The Board of Revenue
Separate Revenue

Dated 23rd
Received 26th } December 1892

Enclosures

No. 4877

ABSTRACT.

Endorsement No 97

Transferred to the
Public Works Department.

Recd
Under Secretary to Govt

Fort St George
14th January 1893

Recd: 18-1-93

No 4403 W 4/17-11-78
" 3767 W - 25-9-78
" 283 - 16-4-80
" 439 - 15-1-91
" 3134C - 1-7-91
" 8219 - 24-10-91 orig
" 719 - 26-1-92
" 799 - 1-2-92
" 3230-10 - 24-11-92

SUBJECT.

Requesting Government to make provision in the P.W.D budget for certain work in the Public Works Department; in connection with the tidal Canal between Masulipatam and Manginapudi factory.

Endorsement.

To
The Public Works Dept
Board of Revenue
Separate Revenue

242/8

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Ws. 242. wd. 2nd February 93.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Proc. of the Bd of Rev. (Sep. Rev.) No 4877 mis d/23-12-92
Endorst. thereon in the Rev. Dept. No 97 d/14-1-93

The tidal Canal between Masulipatam and the Manginapudi factory was not included by the Board of Revenue in its Schedule of requirements for 1893-94, as required by the orders quoted in the margin. No budget provision for next year has therefore been made for the work.

2. If it be desired that an application should be made to the Govt. of India for a special allotment of funds, the ground of urgency should be fully stated.

- G.O. No 3769 wd/25 Sept. 1878
- " 4403 W - 19 Nov. 1878

to
17 Feb

The Rev. Dept.
" S. E. II Circle J. 9/1/2

27.1.93

C. No. 415

Govt. of 1893 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated

Read

G.O. 2nd Febuary 93 No. 242-E

Tidal canal between Masulipatam and the Manginapudi factory

Stating that no budget provision for next year has been made for the ——, and that an application should be made to the Govt of India for a special allotment of funds if desired.

1-4

1-4