Perenne Disposal
No. 278.

Govt. of {1869}-Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated August, 11th.

Recd. 16th—16th *Encl.*

G. O., 11th August 1869, No. 2,612.

AUGUST.

Nos. 240-241

No

Anicut.—Passing orders on the letter from the Superintending Engineer of the 5th Division, applying for orders regarding the completion of the construction of a new anicut across the Swathanuddy at Kistnapuram, and the restoration of the Mudinayakan ruined anicut across the same river in the Salem District.

No. 94. 19 Augt 69

With order

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department, 11th August 1869.

No. 240. Read the following letter from the Superintending Engineer, 5th Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Bangalore, 15th July 1869, No. 69:—

1 Letter.
1 Extract from Collector of Salem.
1 Letter.
2 Extracts from Superintending Engineer.

I HAVE the honour to request the orders of Government regarding the undermentioned works in the Salem District:—

I. Anicut across the Swathanuddy river and [illegible] anel at Kistnapuram.

II. Restoring Goodoomullay Mudinayaken ruined anicut, and cutting a new channel—entered in the List of Incomplete Works of the current year.

2. The history of these works is as follows:—They were sanctioned on the 5th of December 1863, in G. O., 3,587, and funds were provided for them in the Budget of 1867-68. Soon after the works were commenced, the ryots of Gungavelly, who have an anicut lower down the same river, complained against the construction of the anicuts, and, at the request of the Collector, I stopped the works. I then inspected the sites, and reported on the probable effects of the new anicuts on those lower down the river, and suggested some modifications in their design, which I thought would remove the objections of the ryots of Gungavelly. They, however, were not satisfied, and filed a suit in the Principal Sudder Ameen's Court at Salem against the Executive Agent of the Range. All this was reported by me in my letter of the 6th of March 1868, recorded in the Proceedings of Government of the 11th of March 1868.

3. The suit was eventually withdrawn by the ryots of Gungavelly, but with leave to bring it forward again should their supply of water be diminished. On hearing of the withdrawal of the suit, the Executive Agent recommenced the works, but, after a short time, I again ordered them to be stopped, in consequence of the Collector writing to me and expressing his fears for the safety of the revenue at present derived from the village of Gungavelly.

4. The difficulty now started by the Collector is, how is the cultivation under the two new anicuts to be carried on if water is allowed in the channels only on those days on which there happens to be a fresh. Now, I had never suggested that the supply should be restricted to those days, and it must have been well known at the time the anicuts were designed [illegible] at the village [illegible] no tanks in which water could be stored, and that, therefore, the supply from the river must be continuous. What I did suggest was that the wet cultivation in the villages of Goodoomullay and Kistnapuram should, at all events in the first instance, be restricted to a single crop, and that water should be taken in those months in which it could most easily be spared. The Collector, in his letter of the 23rd of November 1867, appeared to have adopted this suggestion. I was, therefore, surprised that he should have raised the question above mentioned.

5. The ryots of Kistnapuram and Goodoomullay, being most anxious to get a supply of water from the river, exerted themselves greatly during the short time the works were in progress, and the expenditure on the two works has been Rupees 1,258 and Rupees 1,705 respectively, for cutting channels and collecting materials

for the anicuts. If the works are abandoned all this money will be lost. If so large an expenditure had not been incurred, the opposition of the ryots and the lukowarm support of the Collector might be reasons for abandoning the works, but as it is, they should, in my opinion, be proceeded with. I recommend, however, that the anicut furthest from Gungavelly be fully completed, and its effect practically ascertained before the other is built. It is also probable that the cost of the anicut may exceed the estimate, as it has been designed after the pattern so common in Salem, that is to say, almost entirely of loose stone. Stone-in-chunnam should be substituted in some parts of the work.

6. I forward copies of the correspondence between the Collector and myself regarding these anicuts, and have only to add that, since the letters were written, the ground near the villages has again been examined with a view to the formation of small tanks, but without success. Unless, therefore, the water is taken continuously for about four months in the year, the anicuts will not be of any use.

From the Superintending Engineer, 5th Division, to the Collector of Salem, dated Cuddalore, 5th January 1868, No. 152.

In your No. 187, of the 22nd of December 1868, you state that you have nowhere given your opinion (on the probable effect of the proposed anicuts on the cultivation of Gungavelly), but have asked me for mine. My opinion has been given so often, that I am tired of the subject. It is given in my letters to you of the 7th of November 1867, No. 152, and 20th of November 1867, No. 158, also in my letter recorded in the Proceedings of Government of the 11th of March 1868, copy of which I sent you, also in my replies to your two demi-officials.

2. You now again ask how I propose giving the villages of Kistnapuram and Goodoomullay water for their cultivation when the freshes subside. If you had ever visited the locality, I do not think you would have asked the question. My answer is that the villages of Kistnapuram and Goodoomullay will get water from the river precisely in the same way as the villages lower down the river, and scores of other villages in similar situations in the Salem District. The anicuts below Gungavelly are only a mile, and in some cases only a quarter of a mile apart. The proposed anicuts are to be, one two-and-a-half, and the other four-and-a-half miles above the Gungavelly anicut. The ryots of Gungavelly have opposed the construction of the anicuts, but that was only to be expected. They would have offered some opposition if the anicuts were to have been respectively twenty and thirty miles higher up the river.

3. You also state that "it is quite clear that, without storing water, the freshes that may be carried from the river by the channels to Goodoomullay and Kistnapuram will not be sufficient for the production of a single crop." I never supposed that it would be sufficient to give these villages water only on those days on which there were freshes or floods in the river. The designer of the anicuts and the Collector who signed the estimates knew very well the villages had no tanks in which the water could be stored. If you refer to my demi-official (written from Bangalore in answer to one from you) you will find that I stated that, during the months in which freshes usually come down the river, there would be more water in the river in the intervals between the freshes, than during the other months. Water might be taken to Kistnapuram and Goodoomullay during the months in which there are commonly freshes, without any loss to Gungavelly, and it might be taken, probably, during the whole year.

4. Not long ago an anicut was built near Cusbah Kalikurchi, in the South Arcot District, about midway between two old anicuts, four or five miles apart. The new anicut gives a supply all the year round, notwithstanding there is another above it, and it does not appear to have had a prejudicial effect on the one lower down. An anicut was built five years ago near Cuddalore,

midway between two anicuts, nine miles apart, the revenue dependent on each of which is upwards of 20,000 Rupees. There are no tanks connected with these anicuts. As I have already stated, there are scores of anicuts in the Salem District, in similar situations to those now proposed, about which there has been as much correspondence as if they were the first of their kind. I cannot but contrast the progress of these two paltry works with that of the Keenanore and Mehmatoor anicuts, near Virdachellum, in South Arcot. The Keenanore anicut, built of brick-in-chunam on wells, was completed at a cost of 45,000 Rupees, and in operation within sixteen months of its commencement. At the Mehmatoor anicut, lately sanctioned, I fully expect to have 15,000 Rupees worth of work done in three months.

5. My last letter to you, from Ahtoor, was written after again v... ng Gungavelly and Kadambur. I did not see any site for a tank for Goodoomullay, and the Executive Agent of the Range informed me there was not any on the other side of the river, in the limits of Kistnapuram.

6. The result of the suit brought by the ryots of Gungavelly (originally against the Supervisor of the Range) is most unsatisfactory, as nothing has been decided. At any future time, should there be a failure of rain, the Gungavelly ryots have it in their power to bring this suit forward again, as they will attribute any diminution in their ordinary supply of water not to the drought, but to the new anicuts.

7. I must also request a more decided answer to my letter, No. 147, of the 15th of December, as, in the latter part of your No. 187, you merely state that if the ryots of Goodoomullay and Kistnapuram cannot have water for the whole time required to mature a single crop, the projects must be abandoned. Whereas the anicuts were designed and sanctioned for the express purpose of giving these two villages water during as long a period as was necessary.

Extract from a letter from the Superintending Engineer, 5th Division, to the Collector of Salem, dated Talavassel, 7th November 1867, *No.* 152.

* * * *

3. The Kistnapuram anicut is intended to be built three miles above that of Gungavelly, and the Goodoomullay anicut two miles above the Kistnapuram. I forward a rough sketch of the river, with the names of the anicuts already built below Gungavelly, and the distances they are from each other. Now, if cultivation has been for many years successfully carried on by means of these anicuts, and they have not been found to interfere injuriously with each other, there is every prospect of anicuts being built for the bene[illegible] of the villag[illegible]tnapuram and Goodoomullay, without the supply from [illegible]Gungavelly ani[illegible] being sensibly [illegible]minished. The distance between the two new anicuts, and the distance between the lower of the two and the Gungavelly anicut are both greater than the distance between any two of the old anicuts. Moreover, a considerable stream falls into the river below the proposed site of the Kistnapuram anicut.

4. I do not see any reason for giving up the construction of the anicuts, but I purpose so far modifying the designs as to make a cut or sluice in the body of each, the floor of which is to be on a level with the floor of the channels. Should it be found that the supply from the Gungavelly anicut is diminished by the new anicuts, then these cuts can be left open during the dry months, and closed during the rest of the year, when it is admitted there is usually water enough and to spare.

5. Considerable progress has been made with the channels from the proposed anicuts, and large quantities of materials have been collected. The expenditure on these accounts will all be lost if the anicuts are not proceeded with.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department, 11th August 1869.

From the Collector of Salem, to the Superintending Engineer, 5th Division, dated Camp at Ahtoor, 26th January 1869, No. 7.

I DEFERRED replying to your letter, No. 152, of the 5th instant, till I had seen the ryots of all three villages (1, 2, 3). I have now done so, and hasten to write to you. You ask me in the above letter whether the works to the two anicuts (concerning the construction of which your department was sued in Court) are to be proceeded with. All I can gather from your letter is, that for the purposes of raising a single crop *you* are of opinion that the *water of the freshes* will be *alone* sufficient. I am sorry I cannot agree with you, and the ryots, who will be expected to cultivate the new nunjah land, have decidedly stated that to realize a wet crop by the freshes alone would be impossible. I send you a copy of a statement made by those most interested in the construction of the anicut (Goodoomullay). Having now informed you that it is my humble opinion, backed by the ryots, who are not only interested in the building of the works, but are also by no means ignorant of the amount of water required for a single crop, viz., that the water of the freshes alone will not produce a wet crop, I must entirely leave the subject to you, and if your professional opinion is still the same, or in other words, contrary to what I have above stated, you are at liberty to proceed and carry on the projects. The only object I have had throughout has been to see that Government money should not be thrown away, which it certainly would be if after the anicuts were built it was found that what I have said proves true.

1. Goodoomullay.
2. Kistnapuram.
3. Gungavelly.

I never state[illegible] le kind.
(Initialed) E. A. F.

2. I would beg in conclusion to state, that I am sorry that the correspondence regarding these two works both officially and demi-officially has tired you, but I still maintain that my original question has not *yet* been answered.

Extract from a letter from the Superintending Engineer, 5th Division, to the Collector of Salem, dated Cuddalore, 20th November 1867, *No.* 158.

* * *

2. I do not think the Goodoomullay and Kistnapuram anicuts will be of much use if the ryots are only to have water from them during floods in the river, as the water cannot be stored in tanks. It is yet to be seen whether the supply of Gungavelly will be sensibly diminished by the new anicuts. If it is, the sluices in the anicuts should be left open during the dry season, and the wet cultivation of Goodoomullay and Kistnapuram's restricted to one crop a year.

Extract from a letter from the Collector of Salem, to the Superintending Engineer, 5th Division, dated 23rd November 1867, *No.* 184.

* * *

3. With reference to the 2nd paragraph of your letter, I must state that it is better to decide at once what the Goodoomullay and Kistnapuram ryots are to have. I am not willing to risk the large revenue which th[illegible]velly anicut now produces. It is therefore, I think, advisable to let the Goodoomullay and K[illegible] puram ryots [illegible]ater sufficient f[illegible] one crop, which is all you would give them according to your letter in case the new anicuts affect the supply to Gungavelly anicut.

No. 241. ORDER THEREON, 11th August 1869, No. 2,642.

IRRIGATION, No. 14.

IN this letter the Superintending Engineer of the 5th Division applies for orders regarding the completion of the construction of a new anicut across the Swathanuddy at Kistnapuram, and the restoration of the Mudinayakan ruined anicut across the same river, in the Attur Talcok of the Salem District. These works were sanctioned by Government, in 1863, on the strong recommendation of the then Collector of the District and of

the Board of Revenue, and they appear to have been commenced in 1867; but in October of that year, owing to the representation of the Collector that the ryots cultivating under the Gungavelly anicut, situated lower down the Swathanuddy, were greatly opposed to the carrying out of these projects, they were stopped pending further enquiries, which were made by the Superintending Engineer on the spot, and that Officer came to the conclusion that the cultivation of the Gungavelly ryots would not be perceptibly affected by the upper anicuts. Those interested in the Gungavelly anicut however were not satisfied with this decision, and a suit was instituted by them to prevent the construction of the anicuts. This suit was eventually withdrawn, leave however being granted to bring it forward again should the supply of water for the Gungavelly anicut cultivation be diminished by the new works.

Proceedings Madras Government, 11th March 1868, No. 821.

2. The Right Honorable the Governor in Council considers that, under the circumstances, it is necessary, in order clearly to assert the right of the Government to carry out such irrigation works, as may be deemed necessary for the benefit of the country, to direct the anicuts across the Swathanuddy to be proceeded with, but as on the other hand it is clearly the duty of the Government to protect the just rights and interests, not only of the cultivators under the Gungavelly anicut but also of those under the anicuts lower down the same river, which have been referred to, it appears to be essential that provision should be made, by means of sluices, for passing all the water in the river whenever the quantity is not in excess of the requirements of the cultivation under the lower anicuts. Colonel Foord should therefore ascertain and report what the average area of cultivation, for the last fifteen years, under each of the lower anicuts, has been, and he should then modify the designs for the new weirs, so that the supply for the total area, calculated at the rate of 2½ cubic yards per acre per hour, may be passed by the under-sluices, when the water in the river is just flush with the crowns of the crests of these dams; and the channels under the latter must be regulated by head-sluices, so that no water may be drawn off when the water in the river is below their crests. With these arrangements the cultivators of Gungavelly will have no legitimate cause of complaint, nor will any grounds remain on which a fresh suit could be brought against the Government with any prospect of success.

3. The Collector of Salem is requested to explain to the Gungavelly ryots the orders which have now been passed by the Government, and inform them that, while their claim to all the water in the [illegible] cut cannot be admitted [illegible] measures for securing to them an adequate supply before any water is taken to the lands under the Kistnapuram and Mudinayaken anicuts, will be made.

(True Extract.)

Major, R.E.,
Acting Joint-Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 5th Division.
,, Collector of Salem.
,, Revenue Department.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Copy to the Revenue Board