M.R.O. 1—20,002—12-8-65.

(1) Number of Pages 38

(2) Date of repair 12-5-69

(3) Initials of the Referencer 22.5.68

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. ~~B.P. No.~~	1158	Press ~~Mis.~~
Dated 24.8.1876 ~~196~~ .		

Not to be folded or roughly handled

DA

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
24th August 1876.

No. 252. Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel R. H. BEDDOME, Conservator of Forests, to the Hon. O. F. CARMICHAEL, Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated Ellamanore, 10th August 1876, No. 1,040:—

1. Progress Report of the North Arcot Forest Division for June 1876.
2. Letter from the Deputy Conservator of North Arcot, to the Conservator of Forests, dated 26th July 1876, No. 295.
3. Letter from the Deputy Conservator of North Arcot, to the Conservator of Forests, dated 8th August 1876, No. 308, with one enclosure.

I HAVE the honor to submit the correspondence as per margin, by which Government will perceive that a most alarming loss has occurred in our North Arcot Casuarina Plantations; these plantations suffered fearfully from the heavy floods in 1872 and 1874, but notwithstanding this they promised to be eventually a great success and they were the pride of our department; the terrible drought, however, that this district has been experiencing during the last year has killed thousands of the trees, and it has been evident that, if the district is only occasionally liable to similar seasons, casuarina planting cannot pay.

2. It will be seen by the return forwarded with the third enclosure that the receipts from Trivellam (our oldest plantation) have amounted to Rs. 8,626, and that the sale of the trees now dead is expected to realize another Rs. 4,000, and as there are still 100,000 trees standing, and the total expenditure up to date has been Rs. 14,055, this plantation shows a profit up to date notwithstanding the vicissitudes of flood and drought; and it will be seen by the second enclosure that the Deputy Conservator is sanguine that the other plantations will eventually pay though, if now given up, they would show a great loss. A similar drought has not been experienced for eighteen years in this district, and the Collector, in his marginal note on the Deputy Conservator's report, states his opinion that it would be a great mistake not to replant at once, and as the planting season has just commenced, and there is not a day to be lost, I have authorized the Deputy Conservator to commence at once; he has large nurseries ready containing about four lakhs of plants, which would be useless next year, and many pits have been prepared which would be all labor lost and require additional expenditure if the planting were delayed; there are Rs. 6,500 available for the work in the budget of the division for the current year, which I think should all be laid out, notwithstanding the financial crisis and the orders to retrench, as much loss must accrue if the work be delayed till next year, and I may be able, if necessary, to arrange for the other Rs. 3,500 necessary to complete the replant if I think it advisable later on.

3. The loss has been very great, and the question of ordering a replant in the face of a liability to such serious floods and scorching droughts so responsible that I have thought it necessary to lay the whole before Government, but I myself quite agree with the Collector that it would be a great mistake not to replant.

No. 253.

MINUTE BY THE HON. SIR W. ROBINSON, K.C.S.I.

I SUBMIT that the Government should firmly refuse to permit—especially under existing nancial difficulties—any further capital expenditure on these failures or wrecks, until they have the fullest information before them; and that the animadversion of Government should be communicated to Colonel Beddome for the slovenly character of his report and his neglect to analyse or verify the results of Mr. Sheffield's too meagre communication, before placing so disastrous an account of an enterprise which has probably cost half a lakh of rupees before Government, with an intimation that he has, in anticipation of sanction, authorized further large expenditure.

The circumstances lead to the inference that the localities may be generally badly chosen, and I confess that I doubt whether casuarina is at all suited to dry inland districts. On these points the Government should require thorough investigation. And I think that the aid of experienced advice outside the departments concerned—the Collector and Conservator—should be sought. Both are committed to the enterprises reported on. Colonel Beddome's letter shows that he scarcely realises the conditions which must guide the careful decision of Government; when we have recently had before us a disastrous account of Collector-forestry in the Godavery District, where a casuarina plantation has had to be abandoned after a waste of Rs. 11,000 (without bringing to account the interest of money laid out over a series of years, cost of supervision, assessment of land, &c., which may doubtless largely enhance the capital charges) and the concern sold for Rs. 1,000, or probably little more than the value, of the land to save further disaster, and other costly but doubtful experiments in planting.

I am uninfluenced by the assurance that recent seasons have been disastrous. These climatic tests of departmental judgment and operations are very valuable, and are recurring and certain contingencies; and the ability or otherwise of our permanent works to stand these vicissitudes, is the true standard of judgment as to the propriety of continuing them. And the fact that nine enterprises nurtured under varied conditions and of various ages, have shared the same fate within a period of a few years of initiation seems to me to command careful consideration before proceeding with further outlay—nurseries notwithstanding.

The Inspector reports that, "the whole of the plantation are in a very bad state; in fact, nearly all the trees, large and small, are dead and the whole will require replanting if planting is to be continued." He does not appear to be sanguine; and I fear that the outlay up to date of nearly half a lakh of rupees may be considered gone, save what may be realised for the dead trees. The question is: are we, with such warning, to permit the thing to be undertaken almost *de novo*?

The statement of North Arcot casuarina plantation prepared in the office shows that the two oldest plantations (Nos. 9 and 1 of 1867 and 1868) had respectively cost Rs. 112 and Rs. 27 per acre (without including interest, supervision, assessment of land, &c.,) up to the 31st March 1875, since which date considerable expenditure has doubtless been incurred. The one is reported "looking bad" and nursery gone; and the other is stated to have nearly died out and no market apparently for the dead trees. There is a nursery attached to the plantation, on the strength of which apparently Colonel Beddome proposes to begin again in the same locality. An outlay of Rs. 12, 000on the plantation over a series of nine years has realized Rs. 3,500 and something may be got for the dead wood of the wreck; but this scarcely justifies precipitation. The other seven plantations planted between 1870 and 1873 have already cost Rs. 20 per acre (without counting interest, &c.), and are apparently gone; for the dead plants can realise little to credit.

I submit therefore that, as suggested in the note, that Colonel Beddome be directed to inspect and report most carefully on the present condition and future prospect of each plantation before incurring any further capital expenditure.

18th August 1876.

(Signed) W. ROBINSON.

1153

2

No. 254.

ORDER THEREON, 24th August 1876, No. 1,158.

Forests, No. 12.

THE Government observe that Colonel Beddome's letter is not sufficiently explicit in regard to these plantations.

2. There are nine plantations in all, and these are reported on by Mr. Sheffield in his Inspection Notes for June, but in the statement sent with his letter of 8th August four only are referred to.

3. A reference to the Annual Report, 1874-75, shows that there were in all 643,745 trees (166,498 being in the Trivellam Plantation) on the nine plantations. The total cost had been Rs. 33,153, the total receipts Rs. 3,455, all of which, except Rs. 16, came from Trivellam. The regular estimate for 1875-76 was Rs. 8,952; consequently the total expenditure to end of last year may be estimated approximately Rs. 42,000 against receipts of about Rs. 9,000.

4. The Government observe that the difference between the account given of these plantations in Mr. Sheffield's notes for June, dated 11th July, and that shown in the statement which accompanied his letter of the 8th August is so great as to call for remark. For instance, of Trivellam Mr. Sheffield says: "nearly the whole of the trees are dead," but in the statement he shows 100,000 trees as still alive, explaining that only 25,000 of the 136,000 originally planted were alive, 75,000 having been replanted in 1874-75. Moreover in the statement he shows only 10,000 as dead.

Again, of Viringepuram he says: "Same state as Trivellam," but the statement shows 70,000 as living out of 200,000 originally planted.

Again, of Kulminiel: "Hardly one plant alive out of the 1½ lakhs planted out." The statement shows 50,000 trees.

5. Mr. Sheffield's remarks regarding Tengal, Cheyunur, Gazerlamandam, Vanavadu, Ammundy, and Ammerdy are much to the same effect, but of none of these Colonel Beddome speaks or furnishes information excepting Ammundy.

6. There is another point regarding the Trivellam Plantation to which the Conservator's attention is drawn. Mr. Sheffield values the 25,000 trees which have survived of the 1868 planting at Rs. 6,000, or three annas ten pies a tree, but on the other hand he values the 10,000 dead trees at Rs. 4,000 or six annas four pies a tree. This estimate requires explanation, as it might be presumed that the weaker plants had died, the stronger survived. Moreover, on the Deputy Conservator's own showing, the dead trees must have been of a later planting than the 25,000, as these were the only surviving trees at the beginning of 1874-75.

7. Under these circumstances the Government are unable to sanction any outlay in replanting until they are possessed of accurate data in regard to the present state of the plantations, or to decide the question of whether any or all of them should be either retained or abandoned. The Government have already incurred an expenditure of probably half a lakh on this enterprise; but, judging from the experience of eight years, it seems questionable whether any further expenditure should be incurred. unless some effective means can be provided, at a reasonable cost, for averting the disasters which are likely to occur from drought and flood.

The Conservator will accordingly visit each of the plantations with the least practicable delay and submit to Government a detailed report thereon. He will submit his notes of inspection immediately to enable Government to decide whether the planting operations which have been begun under Colonel Beddome's orders should be continued. His more detailed [illegible] and financial estimate may follow later.

The Conservator will explain [illegible] the condition of these plantations was not brought to the notice of Government earlier.

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Secretary to Government.

Exd. J. W. Fischer.

Proof

1158/4

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

MINUTE BY THE HON. SIR W. ROBINSON, K.C.S.I.

I SUBMIT that the Government should firmly refuse to permit—especially under existing financial difficulties—any further capital expenditure on these failures or wrecks, until they have the fullest information before them; and that the animadversion of Government should be communicated to Colonel Beddome for the slovenly character of his report and his neglect to analyse or verify the results of Mr. Sheffield's too meagre communication, before placing so disastrous an account of an enterprise which has probably cost half a lakh of rupees before Government, with an intimation that he has, in anticipation of sanction, authorized further large expenditure.

The circumstances lead to the inference that the localities may be generally badly chosen, and I confess that I doubt whether casuarina is at all suited to dry inland districts. On these points the Government should require thorough investigation. And I think that the aid of experienced advice outside the departments concerned—the Collector and Conservator—should be sought. Both are committed to the enterprises reported on. Colonel Beddome's letter shows that he scarcely realises the conditions which must guide the decision of Government ~~While~~; when we have recently had before us a disastrous account of Collector-forestry in the Godavery District, where a ~~Government~~ casuarina plantation has had to be abandoned after a waste of Rs. 11,000 (without bringing to account the interest of money laid out over a series of years, cost of supervision, assessment of land, &c., which may doubtless largely enhance the capital charges) and the concern sold for Rs. 1,000, or probably little more than the value, of the land to save further disaster, and other costly but doubtful experiments in planting.

I am uninfluenced by the assurance that recent seasons have been disastrous. These climatic tests of departmental judgment and operations are very valuable, and are recurring and certain contingencies; and the ability or otherwise of our permanent works to stand these vicissitudes, is the true standard of judgment as to the propriety of continuing them. And the fact that nine enterprises nurtured under varied conditions and of various ages have shared the same fate within a period of a few years of initiation seems to me to command careful consideration before proceeding with further outlay—nurseries notwithstanding.

The Inspector's reports that "the whole of the plantation are in a very bad state; in fact, nearly all the trees, large and small, are dead and the whole will require replanting if planting is to be continued." He does not appear to be sanguine; and I fear that the outlay up to date of nearly half a lakh of rupees may be considered gone, save what may be realised for the dead trees. The question is: are we, with such warning, to permit the thing to be undertaken almost *de novo*?

The statement of North Arcot casuarina plantation prepared in the office shows that the two oldest plantations (Nos. 9 and 1 of 1867 and 1868) had respectively cost Rs. 112 and Rs. 27 per acre (without including interest, supervision, assessment of land, &c.) up to the 31st March 1875, since which date considerable expenditure has doubtless been incurred. The one is reported "looking bad" and nursery gone; and the other is stated to have nearly died out and no market apparently for the dead trees. There is a nursery attached to the plantation, on the strength of which apparently Colonel Beddome proposes to begin again in the same locality. An outlay of Rs. 12,000 on the plantation over a series of nine years has realized Rs. 3,500 and something may be got for the dead wood of the wreck; but this scarcely justifies precipitation. The other seven plantations planted between 1870 and 1873 have already cost Rs. 20 per acre (without counting interest, &c.) and are apparently gone; for the dead plants can realise little to credit.

I submit therefore that, as suggested in the note, that Colonel Beddome be directed to inspect and report most carefully on the present condition and future prospect of each plantation before incurring any further capital expenditure.

18th *August* 1876. (Signed) W. ROBINSON.

5

Govt. of 1876 Madras.

REVENUE.

To

THE CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated August, 24th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 24th August 1876, *No.* 1,158.

AUGUST.

Nos. 252—254.

Casuarina Plantations in the North Arcot District.—Directing the Conservator of Forests to visit each of the —, to submit his notes of inspection immediately, his more detailed report and financial estimate later, and to explain why the condition of these plantations was not brought to the notice of Government earlier.

concerned – the Collector
and Conservator – should
be sought. Both are
committed to the Enterprise

GO - 24 Aug/76 No 1158

Minute –

I Submit that the Govt: should firmly refuse to permit – Especially under Existing financial diffi=culties – any further Capital Expenditure on these failures or wrecks – until they have the fullest information before them, and that the animadversion of Govt: should be com=municated to Colonel Beddome for the Slovenly character of his report and neglect to analyse or verify the result of Mr Sheffield's too meagre

Communication before placing so disastrous an account of an enterprise which has probably cost half a lakh of Rupees before Govt:— with an intimation that he has, in anticipation of sanction, authorized further large expenditure.

The circumstances lead to the inference that the localities may be generally badly chosen and I confess that I doubt whether Casuarina is at all suited to dry inland Districts. On these points the Govt: should require thorough investigation. And I think that the aid of experienced advice outside the Departments concerned

concerned — the Collector and Conservator — should be sought. Both are committed to the Enterprise reported on. Col: Beddome's letter shows that he scarcely realizes the conditions which must guide the decision of Govt:— While we have recently had before us a disastrous account of Collector-forestry in the Godavery District, where a Government Casuarina plantation has had to be abandoned after a waste of Rs: 11,000 (without bringing to account the interest of money laid out over a series of years, cost of supervision & assessment of land &c, which may doubtless largely Enhance the Capital charges) and the Concern Sold for Rs: 1000 or probably little more than the value of the land, to save further disaster –

I am uninfluenced by the assurance that recent Seasons have been disastrous. These climatic tests of departmental judgment & operations are recurring and certain Contingencies, and the ability or otherwise of our permanent works to stand these vicissitudes is the true standard of judgment as to the propriety of Continuing them, and the

fact

fact that nine Enterprizes nurtured under varied Conditions and of various ages have shared the same fate within a period of a few years of initiation seems to me to Command Careful Consideration before proceeding with further ~~dat~~ outlays – nurseries notwithstanding.

The Inspector's report that "the whole of the plantation are in a very bad state, in fact nearly all the trees, large & small, are dead & the whole will require replanting, if planting is to be Continued". He does not appear to be sanguine and I fear that the outlay up to date of nearly half a lakh of rupees may be considered gone; save what may be realized for the dead trees. The question is: Are we with such warning to permit the thing to be undertaken almost *de novo*?

The statements of North Arcot Casuarina plantation prepared in the office shows that the two oldest plantations (Nos 9 & 11 of 1867 & 1868) had respectively cost Rs 112 & 27 per acre without including interest, supervision, assessment of land &c up to the 31st March 1875. Since which date considerable expenditure has doubtless been incurred. The one is reported "looking bad" and nursery gone, and the other is stated to have nearly died out and no market apparently for the dead trees. There is a nursery attached to the plantation on the strength of which apparently Col: Beddome proposes to begin again on the same locality. An outlay of Rs: 12000 on the plantation over a series of 9 years has realized Rs: 3,500 and some may be got for the dead wood of the wreck, but this scarcely justifies precipitation. The other plantations planted between 1870 & 1873 have already cost Rs: 20 per acre (without counting interest &c) and are apparently gone, for the dead plants can realize little to credit.

I submit therefore that as suggested in the note, Colonel Beddome be directed to inspect & report most carefully on the present condition & future prospect of each Plantation before incurring any further Capital Expenditure

1878 J Robinson

GO 24 August /76 No 1158
Passed

14/8

Nº 253 -

[illegible] advice outside the Departments concerned

1158/9

No. 1040

Office of Conservator of Forests
Camp, Ellavanore,
10th August 1876.

From,
Lieut. Col. R. H. Beddome,
Conservator of Forests

To,
The Hon. D. F. Carmichael,
Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
Ootacamund

Sir,

I have the honor to submit the correspondence as per margin, by which Government will perceive that a most alarming loss has occurred in our North Arcot Casuarina plantations, these plantations suffered fearfully from the heavy floods in 1872 and 1874 but notwithstanding this they promised to be financially a great success and they were the pride of our Department, the terrible drought however that this District has been experiencing during the last year

1. Progress Report of the N. Arcot Forest Division for June '76.
2. Letter from the Depy: Conservator of N. Arcot to the Conservator of Forests dated 26th July 1876 No. 295.
3. Letter from - do - to - do - dated 8th August '76 No. 308 with one enclosure.

year has killed thousands of the trees and it has been evident that if the District is only occasionally liable to similar seasons that Casuarina planting cannot pay -

2. It will be seen by the Return forwarded with the 3rd enclosure that the receipts from Trivellum (our oldest plantation) have amounted to Rs: 8626 and that the sale of the trees now dead is expected to realize another 4000 Rs:, and as there are still 100,000 trees standing and the total expenditure up to date has been Rs: 14,055, this plantation shews a profit up to date notwithstanding the vicissitudes of flood and drought, and it will be seen by the second enclosure that the Deputy Conservator is sanguine that the other plantations will eventually pay though if now given up they would shew a great loss. A similar drought has not been experienced for 18 years in this District and the Collector in his marginal note on the Deputy Conservator's report states his opinion that it would be a great mistake not to replant at once and as the planting season has just commenced and there is not a day to be lost I have authorized the Depy: Conservator to commence at once, he has large nurseries ready containing about 4 lakhs of plants which would be useless next year, and many pits have been prepared which would be all labour lost and require additional expenditure if the planting were delayed - there are 6500 Rs: available for the work in the Budget of the Division for the current year which I think should all be laid out notwithstanding the financial crisis and the orders to retrench, as much loss must accrue if the work be delayed till next year; and I may be able if necessary to arrange for the other 3500 Rs: necessary to complete the replant, if I think it advisable later on

This [illegible] been [illegible]

on.

3. The loss has been very great, and the question of ordering a replant in the face of a liability to such serious floods and scorching droughts so responsible that I have thought it necessary to lay the whole before Government but I myself quite agree with the Collector that it would be a great mistake not to replant.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most obedt. Servt.
RH Beddome Lt. Col.
Conservator of Forests.

No 252

No 3306
Revenue - Forests
Revenue 1876 Depart.
From
The Conservator of Forests
To
The Secretary to Govt
Rev. Dept.
Ootacamund
Dated 10th } August 1875
Recd 12th }
No. 1040
(Enclosures three
ORS)
Subject
Sched. 1157-24 Augt 1876
Regarding the North
[illegible] plantations

See minute
1876 [illegible]

1158/12

Revenue Departt

Memo for Orders

No 3306. The Govt. [illegible]

(1) Colonel Beddome's letter is (any thing but) not satisfactory explicit in regard to these Plantations. He has failed to put before Govt. a complete Statement of the case - concentrating their attention almost entirely upon one single Plantation Viz Trivellum, the only Plantation that has so far yielded any appreciable revenue to Govt.

(2) There are nine (9) Plantations in all - and these are reported on by Mr Sheffield in his inspection Notes for June; but in the Statement sent with his letter of 8th August only 4 four are referred to -

(3) The following extract from the Annual Report 1874/75 exhibits the state of the Plantations on 31st March 1875. The figures do not

altogether consistent with Col. Beddomes statement.

Name of Plantation	Year in which formed	Area in acres	Description of the Trees	Number of Trees	Cost		Receipts	
					During the year	Up to the end of the year	During the Year	Up to the end of the year
Trivellum 1	1868.	435	Casuarina equestifolia	1,66,498.	1631. 5. 6.	11921. 13-4.	3084-7. 3.	3437-9-3
Vurinjeepuram 2	1870	260	do	1,91,247.	1835-7-4	8,014-7-4.	"	"
Tengal 3	1872.	110	do	3,000	477. 6. 8	598. 8-8.	"	"
Keelminiell 4	1873.	150.	do	1,20,000.	1925-9. 4	1,879. 3. 5	"	"
Chaynoor 5	1871	130	Albizzia Lebbek, Cassia florida, Acacia Arabica, Casuarina &	81,000	775-5-4	4,649. 12-10	"	"
Guzerlamunthum 6	1871	45.	Casuarina equestifolia	44,000.	447-1-9.	2,068. 3-7	"	"
Vanavadoo 7	1873	30	do	30,000	314-9. 2	466. 8-10	"	16...
Ammoondy 8	1873	160.	do	"	501-9-4.	739-3-6	"	"
Amzerdy 9	1857	25	Experimental plantation containing different species of timber & firewood trees	8,000	198. 0-0	2815-11-9	"	"
		1,345.		6,43,745.	7206. 6-4	33,153. 8. 3	3,084-7. 3.	3453-9-3

(3) A reference to the annual report 1874/75 shows

(4) It is observed that at the end of that year, it was reported that there were in all 6,43,745 trees in the 9 Plantations (1,66,498 by the Trivellum plantation). The total cost had been 33,153 Rs. the total Receipts Rs 3,453, all of which except Rs 16 came from Trivellum. The regular estimate for 1875/76 was 8952. Consequently the total expenditure to end of last year was probably (may be estimated approximately at) Rs 42,000. against receipts of approximately less than 9000 Rs.

What

1158/13

(5) What was the state of these Plantations at the end of the last month according to Mr Sheffield's notes for that month dated 11 July.

(4) The Govt. observe that the difference between the account given of these plantations in Mr Sheffield's notes dated 11th of June, and that given in the statement which accompanied his letter of 8th August, is so great as to call for remark; for explanation

Mem

(1) Of Trivellum he says "nearly the whole of the trees are dead". but in the statement (dated 8th of the month following) he shows 100,000 trees as still alive, explaining only 25,000 of the 135,000 originally planted were alive, 75,000 having been replanted in 1874/75. He shows* only 10000 as dead. It is hard to reconcile these statements. There is also another matter requiring explanation. He states, of the trees originally planted in 1868, only 25,000 remain. These he values at 6,000 Rs or 3 a. 10 p. a tree, but he values the 10,000 dead

Moreover* in the statement

trees at 4,000 Rs or 5a 4p a tree. It might have been supposed that the best trees would have survived, the weaklings died but the fact seems otherwise —

(2) Veeringepooram.

"Same state as Trivellum" but the statement shows 70,000 as living out of 200,000 originally planted.

(3) Tengal.

"Hardly a tree alive". Col Beddome does not mention this plantation. The expenditure has probably been 1000 Rs.

(4) Kelminiel,

"Hardly one plant alive out of the 1½ lacs planted out". The statement shows 50000 trees.

The expenditure has been Rupees 3196 —

(5) Chaynoor.

"Like the above". that is

(5) Mr Sheffield's remarks regarding Tengal, Chaynoor, Gazerlamundum, Vanawadee, Ammerdy & Ammerdy are much to the same effect, but as none of these Col Beddome speaks or [illegible] information excepting Ammerdy —

(6) There is another point regarding the Trivellum Plantation to which the Conservator's attention is drawn — Mr Sheffield values the 25000 trees which were survivors of the 1868 planting at 6000 Rs or 3a 10p a tree — but the [illegible] values the 1000 dead trees at 6000 Rs or 5 Rs 4 p per tree — The Conservator's report in explanation as the [illegible] — [illegible] be presumed that the weaker plants had died, the stronger survived — however the [illegible] of Conservator [illegible] showing the dead trees must have been of a later planting than the 25000 — as there were the only living trees at the beginning of 1874/75 —

Which is in charge?

W Sheffield

is "nearly the whole of the trees are dead". Colonel Beddome does not refer to this Plantation but the expenditure to March 1875 was Rs. 4649 — probably 5500 to end of 1876.

(6) Gazerlamundum.

"Gone like the other plantations".

Not mentioned by Col Beddome. Expenditure probably 2500 Rs.

(7) Vanawadee.

"In bad order".

Not referred to by Colonel Beddome. Expenditure to 1876 about 700 or 800 Rs.

(8) Ammerdy.

"Ground pitted".

statement shows no trees at all. Cost to 30 July 76 1729 Rs.

(9) Ammerdy.

"Looking bad".

not referred to by Col. Beddome - Expenditure probably 3000 Rupees.

From the above notes it is submitted that the statements before Govt are too open to question (2) to enable Govt to decide on the question of retention or abandonment of some or all the Plantations. It is suggested (3) that the above discrepancies may be pointed out to Col Beddome in general terms and that he be required to inspect the Plantations immediately (4) in person + and render a careful account of the number of the trees, the cost of each plantation to date - and an Estimate of the probable cost before (5) they become productive

Nothing

(7.)

Until trees are [illegible] the Govt are unable to sanction any [illegible] until they are possessed of accurate data in respect to the [illegible] state of the plantations [illegible] the question of whether they or all of them should be either retained or abandoned. The Govt have already incurred an expenditure of probably half a lakh on this enterprise [illegible] of 8 years it seems questionable whether [illegible] whole of the [illegible] any further expenditure should be incurred, unless some ~~[illegible]~~ & operative means can be provided at a reasonable cost for ~~[illegible]~~ averting the disasters which are likely to ~~[illegible]~~ drought & floods —

+ in company with the Collector

— The Conservator will accordingly inspect [illegible] at the least practicable delay and submit a full [illegible] each of all the plantations [illegible] a detailed report thereon — [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ immediately, [illegible] to decide whether the planting operations which have been begun [illegible] should be continued [illegible] Col Beddome's [illegible] report & [illegible] ~~[illegible]~~ [illegible]

The Collector [illegible] the condition of these plantations [illegible]

HL

Nothing is said as to any effort being made to water the plants during the drought, or to protect the lands from floods. On the possibility of meeting these two evils the undertaking seems to hinge.

HL

15/7/76

N. Arcot Casuarina
Plantations.

Forests
No. 13

Revenue Dept.

1158/16

No. 1158

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 24th Augt. 1876

Read letter from Conservator of Forests 10: Augt. 1876 N. 1040, regarding N. Arcot Casuarina Plantations.

—

The Govt. observe that Col: Beddome's letter is not sufficiently explicit in regard to these Plantations.

2. There are nine Plantations in all, and these are reported on by Mr Sheffield in his Inspection Notes for June, but in the Statements sent with his letter of 8th August, four only are referred to —

A

3. A reference to Annual Report, 1874-75, shows that there were in all 6,43,745 trees, (1,66,458 being in the Trivellum Plantation) on the 9 Plantations. The total cost had been 33,153 Rs, the total receipts Rs 3,453, all of which, except Rs 16, came from Trivellum. The Upkeep Estimate for 1875-76 was Rs 8952, consequently the total expenditure to end of last year may be estimated approximately at Rs 42,000, against receipts of about 9,000 Rs.

4. The Govt. observe that the difference between the account given of these Plantations in Mr Sheffield's Notes for June dated 11th July, and that shown in the

1158/17°

Statement which accompanies this letter of the 8th August, is so great as to call for remark. For instance, of Trivellum Mr Sheffield says "nearly the whole of the trees are dead", but in the Statement he shows 10,000 trees as still alive, explaining that only 25,000 of the 136,000 originally planted were alive, 75000 having been replanted in 1874-75. Moreover, in the statement he shows only 10000 as dead.

Again, of ~~Veerinjeeporam~~ Virinjepuram he says, "same state as Trivellum", but the Statement shows 70,000 as living out of 200000 originally planted.

Again, of Kulamainil:- "Hardly one plant alive out of the 1 1/2 Lacs planted out!" The Statement shows 50,000 trees.

Mr Sheffield

5 Mr [illegible]'s
remarks regarding [illegible],
Chagundi, Gazielty [illegible],
Vanavaddi, Aminitondy,
and Anumondy, are much to
the same effect, but of
none of these Col. Beddome
speaks, or furnishes information,
excepting Anumondy.

6. There is another
point regarding the Dirthum
Plantation to which the
Conservator's attention is
drawn. Mr Sheffield values
the 25,000 trees which had
survived of the 1868 planting
at 6000 Rs, or 3 annas 10 pies
a tree, but then he values the
10,000 dead trees at 4,000 Rs
or 6 annas 5 pies a tree.
This estimate requires
explanation, as it might be
presumed that the weaker
plants had died, the

1158/18

the stronger survived.
Moreover, on the Deputy
Conservator's own showing,
the dead trees must have
been of a later planting
than the 25,000, as these
were the only surviving
trees at the beginning of 1874·75.

7. Under these
circumstances, the Govt.
are unable to sanction any
outlay in replanting until
they are possessed of
accurate data in regard to
the present state of the
Plantations, or to decide
the question of whether any
or all of them should be
either retained or abandoned.
The Govt. have already
incurred an expenditure
of probably half a lakh
on

on this enterprise, but, judging from the experience of 8 years it seems questionable whether any further expenditure should be incurred unless some effective means can be provided, at a reasonable cost, for averting the disasters which are likely to occur from drought and flood.

The Conservator will accordingly visit each of the Plantations with the least practicable delay and submit to Govt. a detailed report thereon. He will submit his notes of inspection immediately, to enable Govt. to decide whether the planting operations, which have been begun under Col. Beddome's orders, should be continued. His more detailed report and financial estimate may follow later. 1158/19

The Conservator will explain why the condition of these Plantations was not brought to the notice of Govt. earlier.

Issd copy to the Conservator of Forests on 24 Aug
21 Printed copies on 6 Sept
14 to the Board of Rev on 6 Sept

[illegible]

A [illegible] Caucasian

Plantations

Invitations

[illegible] first

[illegible]