

- (1) Number of pages 4
(2) Date of repair May 86
(3) Initials of the Referencer 10/80 ✓

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P.W.D. Rev DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	3358	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	15 22 - 5	187 197

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

22nd May 1877, No. 33 L.

Irrigation.

Read the following paper:—

No. 64. Endorsement of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Fort St. George, 15th May 1877, No. 23 L.

From J. H. LATHAM, Esq., Chief Engineer and Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Ootacamund, 23rd April 1877, No. 47.

Mundlum Paddy.

G.O. No. 373 of 28th ult.

I have the honor to collect the Mundlum paddy question into a few words in order to show how far it is cleared up.

Mr. Gribble's proposal was an interesting one, as being an approach to a compulsory water-rate. So I understand it. Mundlum paddy wherever found growing on irrigable land was to pay Rspees 1-8-0. If not irrigated it might be and was therefore insured. This proposal is regulated in the Government Order under review.

3. The case of Cann Gudur has rather confused matters. Booming over a flat piece of land, on which a bridge approach tended to obstruct drainage on the upper side, the canal increased the dampness of the land on both sides of it. Before the canal existed Mundlum paddy had occasionally been grown on both sides of the canal, as since made. After the canal was made, this cultivation on both sides increased. This case is dismissed from the discussion in Mr. Daniel's letter printed with the Government Order, and is a loss.

4. Mr. Foster's view is embodied in the amendments of the water-rules submitted with my letter No. 37 of 4th May 1876. It seems to suit the views of all parties. The original Clause 13 exempts from any canal water-rate any land cultivated within the five years previous (to the opening of the canal) under tanks with which the canal interfered. The amended clause 13 extends this complete exemption to Mundlum paddy grown on land on which a smaller crop had been raised in any of the five years previous to the opening of the canal.

5. The "sub-soil leakage" is proposed in the amendments to be no longer exempted; any more than it is in all other irrigation works (so far as I know) in the Presidency. No Collector has ever expressed a diversity of opinion on this. It seems unreasonable to oblige the Canal Engineer to be prepared with two or more trustworthy witnesses above the influence of the ryots, to prove the actual taking of canal water on to every little separate patch of irrigated land in a large area of rice cultivation. Yet the smaller the patch and the more it is surrounded by other fields, the more strength of argument can the ryot show for his assertion that it was irrigated entirely by leakage, and that it was spent for dry crop.

From Lieut. Col. J. MULLINS, R.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to J. H. LATHAM, Esq., Chief Engineer and Manager, Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Madras, 27th April 1877, No. 53 L.C.C.

In acknowledging the receipt of your letter No. 47 of the 23rd instant, I have the honour to say that I am unable to trace Mr. Foster's views which you say are embodied in the amendments of the water rules transmitted with your No. 37, 4th May 1876. I have referred to Clauses 11 and 12 of Rule VI, and, as far as I can see in the amended 11, there is no alteration made, but an endeavour has been made apparently to make the meaning of this clause in the form sanctioned in G.O., Revenue Department, No. 530, 3rd July 1874, clearer. I think the clause as sanctioned is at least as clear as the amended draft, and I do not see that there is any opening for the doubts noted in your explanations as to the meaning. The only water exempted from charge in Clause 11 is subsoil leakage into fields. The surplus of subsoil leakage into a field conveyed to any other field would be chargeable.

From J. H. LATHAM, Esq., Chief Engineer and Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. MULLINS, R.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Ootacamund, 9th May 1877, No. 56.

Your No. 53 of 27th ultimo.

In explanation of my No. 47 of 23rd ultimo as to Mr. Foster's views, I will give them as nearly as I can remember, but it will be better to refer to him if anything comes upon it.

2. His view I believe was Mundlum paddy is wet crop; where it grows without canal water it has a right to grow unmolested; where dry crop only grows before the canal opened and Mundlum afterwards is grown, the canal has a right to the wet crop rate.

3. In order to embody this opinion in the rules the following alteration was drafted for Rule VI, Clause 11. In my amended form of the clause omit from "land irrigated" to "be irrigated" the first line and a half, and substitute—

Mundlum paddy grown in fields in which similar crop had been grown in any of the years 1876 to 1880 will not be charged. A list of the position and extent of such fields shall be made by the Revenue Officers and recorded. Then it goes on irrigation by canal leakage, &c.

4. I see that this is not embodied in my draft of rules accompanying my letter to you, No. 37 of 4th May 1876. I cannot account for this, unless it was sent you as an amendment in some future letter. In my office copy of the proposed amendments (which I supposed agreed with those sent you) the proposed rule is written as amended, and not as in my No. 37 of 4th May 1876. It was not till I commenced this letter that I found out this discrepancy. I will have a search made in hopes to trace it.

5. By Mr. Foster's proposed change (if I interpret him aright) all trouble about leakage—subsoil or other—is avoided. Canal water channels its run on wet crops grown by its means however it get into a field; and in return the exemption from all water rate is extended to include not only wet crop grown under springs, tanks and old channels, but Mundlum paddy grown without any known springs, wherever any such crop had been grown in any of the five years before the canal opened.

6. I hope shortly to submit to you a draft of the rules taking into account all amendments agreed on, and nothing differences of opinion still existing. I regret much that this amendment of Clause 11 has possibly by mere clerical oversight been left unconsidered so far.

Submitted for the consideration of Government with reference to G.O. No. 571, 18th March 1877, and in connection with Proceedings, Madras Government, No. 1,134, dated 4th April 1877, in which the proposed amended rules relating to irrigation under the Company's canal are pointed.

(Signed) JOHN MULLINS, Lieut. Col., R.E.,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

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

No. 65.

ORDER THEREON, 22nd May 1877, No. 33 I.

Communicated to the Revenue Department, with reference to G.O., Revenue Department, No. 1,047, 13th March 1877.

(True Extract.)

W. H. Mullins

Lt. Col., R.E.,
Joint Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.,
Irrigation Branch.

6/6

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation,
Chief Engineer and Manager, Madras Irrigation and Canal Company,
Revenue Department.

Ed. E. C. Shanker.

Spurs Copies.

Revenue Department
No 2786

Col. H. H. H. H.

Public Works

Col. H. H. H. H.

Public Works

Col. H. H. H. H.

Public Works

6 June

Col. H. H. H. H.

Public Works

Col. H. H. H. H.

Public Works

400 + 400 = 800

No 3358
Communicated to
the Board of Revenue
15 June 77

Col. H. H. H. H.

With No 3