M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1321	Press ~~Mis.~~
228-229	
Dated 16 — 6 — 1862.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 16th June 1862.

No. 228. Read the following Proceedings of the Madras Government in the Public Works Department, dated 12th June 1862, No. 1,335:—

Passing orders on letter from Deputy Chief Engineer, Northern Circle, submitting correspondence between the Collector and District Engineer of Nellore as to the proper mode of exhibiting the results of the Nellore Anicut and Channels.

(Vide Public Works Proceedings, 12th June 1862, Nos. 240, 241.)

No. 229. ORDER THEREON, 16th June 1862, No. 1,321.

Ordered to be communicated to the Board of Revenue and to the Collector of Nellore.

(Signed) P. P. HUTCHINS,
Acting Deputy Secretary to Government.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel S. O. E. LUDLOW, Deputy Chief Engineer, Northern Circle, to Lieutenant-Colonel W. H. HORSLEY, Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Chepauk, 15th May 1862, No. 306/N 61:—

SIR,

1. Letter from the District Engineer, Nellore, No. 960, dated 5th May 1862.
1. Copies of correspondence.
1. Statement.

1. I have the honor to forward for the information of Government a letter from the District Engineer Nellore and correspondence between that Officer and the Collector on the subject of the statement called for by Government of the effects of the Pennár Anicut works, and to request that I may be favored with orders as to the form in which the said Statement is to be drawn up, on which point there is a difference of opinion between the Collector and Engineer.

2. It appears from this correspondence that these Officers are materially at issue, 1st, as to the facts of the case; 2nd, as to the proper mode of exhibiting the effects produced by the works.

3. That there has been an increase of revenue under the channels supplied by the Anicut, since the Anicut was first begun, is an admitted fact, but while the Engineer gives the credit of much of this increase to the Anicut, though damaged and imperfect, the Collector considers that none of the increase is due to the work, but attributes it mainly to the construction of Corumboos by customary labor. On this point the Engineer remarks, and as I think justly, that unless the amount of customary labor was increased, which is not alleged, after the construction of the Anicut, the increase of cultivation must be attributed to the effects of that work.

4. In paragraph 3 of his letter, No. 651, Captain Mullins exhibits a statement of the useful effects produced by the Anicut from the time of its construction in 1855 until that of its completion in 1861, which it is impossible to reconcile with the very different account given by the Collector in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, of his reply, No. 113. These discrepancies will have to be cleared up by further information and enquiry before a satisfactory report can be drawn up, but at present the question that presses for immediate settlement is the form of Return which will have to be furnished.

5. Captain Mullins proposes a form of Statement showing the average Revenue of *all* lands (and I of course understand him to mean all lands *now*) irrigated by the Anicut Channels for the ten years prior to 1855, and the revenue of such lands for each year subsequent to that date. These Returns, if no extraneous causes of disturbance existed, ought to exhibt the results of the work, but as such causes do exist, he requests information as to the effect which the orders relating to the liberty of giving up land, the diminution of the assessment and other causes may have had in influencing the extent of cultivation and amount of revenue.

6. The Collector objects to a comparison of the results prior to 1855 with those subsequent to that date, and thinks that it would be safe to commence to calculate the returns on the Pennár Irrigation from the current year. He however altogether omits to state what year or years, the current year is to be compared with, though in order to judge of the results, some comparison is indispensable. If the comparison is to be made between the current year and the average of ten years prior to 1855, the result would be too favorable to the Anicut, if with the average subsequent to 1855 too unfavorable.

7. In paragraph 10 of his letter the Collector raises sundry objections to Captain Mullins' proposals. His objection to the Statement called for, is I think fully and satisfactorily answered by Captain Mullins in paragraph 6 of his No. 906, and in paragraph 7 he explains in an equally satisfactory manner his reasons for asking for the other information he desired to have.

8. After weighing carefully the arguments adduced on both sides, I am of opinion that the actual results of the Anicut would be well elucidated if exhibited in the form of Statement proposed by Captain Mullins, and therefore recommend it for adoption.

ORDER THEREON, 12th June 1862, No. 1,335.

No. 309.

1. In paragraph 3 of the Despatch from the Secretary of State, dated 8th February 1862, information was called for of the effects on the cultivation and on the land revenue resulting from the Nellore Anicut and Channels.

2. In the above letter the Deputy Chief Engineer submits correspondence between the Collector and District Engineer, showing that those Officers are materially at issue, 1st, as to the facts of the case, and 2nd, as to the proper mode of exhibiting the results of the works, and recommends that the form proposed by the District Engineer be adopted.

3. The Government however are of opinion that the simplest proceeding will be to prepare a Return showing the area, and revenue derived from the Channels in question for 10 years prior to 1855, and for each year subsequently. The Government will then be able to form their own judgment from the actual cultivation and return. A separate Statement showing the effect produced by the reduction of assessment in increasing the area of land taken up might also be prepared. Entries in the column of Remarks of the state of the Anicut during each year will probably help to show how far the fluctuations of revenue were influenced by the accidents to that work.

(True Extract.)

[signature] Lieut.-Colonel
Secretary to Government.

To the Deputy Chief Engineer, Northern Circle.
" Revenue Department.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Revenue 1862 No 1321
Proc: of Govt for June
No: 1709.

Proceedings of the
Madras Govt in the
Public Works Dept

Dated 12th June 1862
Received 18th "

No: 1335.

No 1321.

Ordered to be communicated to the Board of Revenue and to the Collector of S. Arcot.

J. R. P.

From the Secy
16th June 1862.

To Chief Engr & Secy
with Dr. Ltr No: 1335.

1 — Letter of Collector
with No 1

Transmg Orders upon
letter from Dy Chief Engr
N.C. submitting Correspondence
relative to the Collr of Chingleput
Estimate of Collr of Nellore for
further Supply of Irrigation
the results of the Nellore
Anicut and Channels

No 2284-229.

Rupees 16 - 2 - 1
Bill on order £

Granted Collector in charge of Nellore Rs 122 - 2 - 11 July 62 Cr Rs 2119 - 11