Revenue (~~190~~ 1899) Department.

PRESS SERIES.

G.O., No. 601

DATED 7" Septr. 1899.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Spinning Mill at Papanasam.

Passing orders on a memorandum drawn up by Messrs. A. & F. Harvey, Managers on behalf of the Tinnevelly Mills Company, in respect of the supply of water from the Tambraparni river to the —— worked by the Co.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

O/18 4,0 — 18-10-98.

Revenue (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 4272

From

The Secretary of State
for India
London.

No. 2 Public Works

Order

Dated 8th June 1899

Received 3rd July 1899

Registered 4th —do—

Enclosures 2

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Forwarding for consideration a representation submitted to him by Sir J. Rankin, Bart, M.P. on behalf of the Tinnevelly Mills Company as to the restrictions imposed by the Govt. of Madras in respect to the supply of water from the Tambraparni river to the Spinning Mill at Papanasam.

4A

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
G.O.	283	Rev	1-5-99
	174A	Rev	10-3-99

[illegible] receipt of original of G.O. 174 A d 10.3.99 sent to Madras for the notes being printed. orgl called for. orgl recd. 14/7/99. [illegible] copies of notes [illegible]

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

INDIA OFFICE,

675. J.E.H 26699

LONDON, 8th JUNE 1899.

PUBLIC WORKS,

No. 2.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE HONOURABLE THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL FORT ST. GEORGE.

SECY. REV. DEPT. JUN 99

Sir,

Letter dated 22nd May and inclosure.

I transmit herewith for the consideration of Your Excellency's Government copy of a representation submitted to me by Sir J. Rankin Bart. M.P. on behalf of the Tinnevelly Mills Company as to the restrictions imposed by the General Order of Your Government in the Revenue Department No.174 A., of the 10th March 1899 in respect to the supply of water from the Tambraparni river to the Spinning Mill worked at Papanasam by the Company.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient humble Servant,

George Hamilton

BRYNGWYN,

TRAM INN, R. S. O.,

HEREFORDSHIRE.

22nd May, 1899.

Dear Sir,

At our interview last Wednesday 17th Inst. relative to the recent order of the Madras Government affecting the water supply to the Mills at Tinnevelly belonging to Messrs. Harvey you were good enough to say that if they would draw up a Memorandum of their Observations upon this order you thought that the Secretary of State for India would forward the Memorandum to the Governor of Madras. I now beg to enclose the Messrs. Harvey's observations & I trust that the Secretary of State will find it possible for him to send them on to Madras asking the Madras Government not to impose such conditions as would inevitably put an end to the industry now carried on at these Mills, thereby throwing some 2000 native workers & their families out of employment, & seriously discouraging the employment of British Capital in India. Thanking you for your courtesy

I am, &c.,

(Sd.) James Rankin.

The Secretary,
Public Works Department,
India Office.

1899
REVENUE DEPT.
[illegible] No. 1
[illegible] No. 4272

WATER-SUPPLY TO THE TINNEVELLY MILLS CO., LIMITED.

THE TINNEVELLY MILLS CO. LTD. HAVING RECEIVED FROM THE COLLECTOR OF TINNEVELLY A LETTER DATED 21st MARCH 1899, ENCLOSING COPY EXTRACT FROM GOVERNMENT ORDER No.174 A REVENUE DATED 10th MARCH 1899, RELATIVE TO THE WATER SUPPLY, AND REQUESTING THAT ANY OBSERVATIONS THEREON WHICH THE CO. MIGHT WISH TO MAKE SHOULD BE MADE WITHOUT DELAY, THE COMPANY BEGS TO SUBMIT THE FOLLOWING OBSERVATIONS.

H

QUANTITY TO GO OVER FALLS.

(1) para 10 of G.O. 174A 10-3-99
H

If a minimum supply of (1) 15 cub. ft. per second is at all times to pass over the Falls, it will prove fatal to the industry, as it frequently happens during the dry season that after sufficient water to drive the Mill is taken, there is not enough left in the river to fulfil this condition. Colonel Pennycuick the then Superintending Engineer in his report (2) to Government dated 29th July 1887, writes as follows- "The Collector agrees with me in considering that for this purpose a minimum of five cubic feet per second is ample, this is equal to 2,700,000 gallons per day, or the water supply at 15 gallons per head for a city of 180,000 inhabitants.

(2) [illegible] at pp. 19-20 of G.O. 490 d 14-6-89
K,

7

"It is therefore suggested that this quantity be taken as the minimum to be allowed to pass over the Falls.

"After this has been provided for, there is no objection to the Tinnevelly Mills Co. taking the full 20 cubic feet which they require so long as it is available in the river".

(1) para 7 of this report at p. 2 of G.O. 762 I, d 26-8-84 P

Further, Colonel Hasted, the then Chief Engineer for Irrigation, in his report (1) to Government dated 13th August 1884 writes- "I recommend that Government should extend the concession already given by allowing Messrs. Harvey and Company the right to take 20 cubic feet a second from the river for eight months in the year viz. from 1st June to 1st February, & that careful measurements of the discharge of the river should be made after the end of next North-east Monsoon and during the dry season & compared with the rain-fall of previous years in order that it may be seen whether this concession can be given for the whole year in future". The fact that for 13 years the Company has taken from the River enough water to drive the Mill and that an ample quantity has at all times been left in the river to flush the sacred pool surely proves that "this concession (to take 20 cubic feet a second all the year

Please see in this connection paras 13-15 of the office note under G.O. 174 A, d 10-3-99 - pp 10-13 of printed note round) can be given for the whole year".

x – in para 4 of G.O. 174A/10.3.91 (H) – also para [illegible] of G.O. 490/14.6.89

INTERPRETATION OF G.O. 762 I 26th August 1884.

Referring to the interpretation which Government P puts upon G. O. 762 I 26th August 1884, Colonel Hasted writes⊗ on 31st Jany. 1890 ". . . there can be no doubt from what is said in my notes printed with G.O. No. 762 I dated 26th August 1884 that I contemplated allowing you to take 20 cubic feet per second from the river all the year round, free of charge for ten years if it appeared after careful measurement of the hot weather discharge that there was a sufficient supply in the river to enable 20 cub.feet per sec. to be taken off without injury to existing rights". Therefore it is respectfully submitted that the true interpretation of this order is that the Company was to be allowed to take a supply of not more than 10 cubic feet per second during the dry season except with the permission of the superintending Engineer, and not more than 20 cubic feet per second during the remainder of the year. The question of taking more than 20 cubic feet per second during the remainder of the year was never discussed. Government would hardly go out of its way to grant what was never asked for.

⊗ apparently [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to have occurred here.

– Para 10 of G.O. 174A/10.3.91 (H)

RESTRICTION OF SUPPLY TO 12 CONSECUTIVE HOURS PER DAY.

To restrict the supply to 12 consecutive hours per day would be most harassing, and is in the Company's K opinion contrary to G.O. 490 of 14th June 1889, which

para 4(b) of the G.O.

distinctly states "by day or by night".

GOVT. RIGHT TO STOP SUPPLY.

para 11 of G.O. 174A/10.3.99 - H

The Government "reserves to itself absolutely the right at any time to cut off without payment of compensation the whole or any portion of the supply to the Company". The Company could not be expected to carry on Business and expend Capital under such uncertain conditions.

CHARGE PROPOSED TO BE MADE FOR WATER.

para 11 of G.O. 174A/10.3.99 - H

The charge which the Government proposes to make for the water amounts to more than three per cent. on the Capital of the Company; in other words, the Government proposes to take a cumulative preference dividend of over three per cent. per annum before, and whether or not, the Shareholders get anything, and this from an industry, which the Government has not spent a Rupee to foster. Whatever charge is agreed upon should, in the Company's opinion, be dependent on the profits earned, like the Income Tax.

REVISION OF ARRANGEMENT IN 7 YEARS.

last but para of para 11 of G.O. 174A/10.3.99 (H).

The Company would much prefer to have a final arrangement entered into in place of making it in force for seven years. To carry on business satisfactorily, reasonable security and finality are essential.

PENAL CLAUSE.

para 12 of G.O. 174A/10.3.99 (H)

The Penal Clause is very humiliating, and the Company can scarcely be expected to place itself so

10

absolutely at the mercy of the Superintending Engineer who may for the moment be in charge. Further, what is there in the past history and relations of the Company with the Government or any one which calls for the imposition of such a condition?

MEASURING OF WATER.

(para 12 ff
G.O. 174A/10.3.99 H

The proposed measuring of the Water is a condition almost certain to lead to disputes, in fact the measuring of the quantity of water in a river is under the best conditions to a great extent approximate. The Company cannot use more water than the exact quantity required to drive the Mill, and this quantity varies very little throughout the Year.

TO SUM UP; the Company requires sufficient water to drive the Mill. This it has always had for the last × 13 years and for this supply the Company would be willing to pay a sum equal to double the Income Tax. Thus the higher the Company's earnings the greater would be the Revenue to Government. To restrict the quantity to ten cubic feet per second for four months will benefit no one , and cause the Company more loss than it could recoup in the eight months' full working, not to speak of depriving half the workers

× From para 13 of the office note under G.O. 174A/10.3.99 (pp. 10-21 office note), it will be seen that the Coy. has drawn off a larger quantity of water than it was entitled to

11

of their means of livelihood.

If Government insists in carrying out its proposals, the Company will be compelled to abandon the industry, and apart from the heavy loss to the Shareholders it means loss of employment to 1500 to 2000 persons, who are directly or indirectly dependent on it for their daily bread.

Surely the Government overlooks the terms of the original concession, on the good faith of which the Shareholders were induced to risk their Capital, and which reads that "any charge to be made would not be of a kind calculated to be repressive of the development of the contemplated industry". The present proposals will not only entirely prevent development but will stifle what has already been accomplished, and will not encourage home Capitalists to risk further investments in India.

vide para 3
Pgo 174 A (H)
10.8.99

Pgo 403 I (2)
30.5.83

It may be pointed out that the Company has incurred an outlay of over Rs. 60,000 in erecting over the River an Iron Girder Bridge and keeps it up entirely at its own expense. This Bridge is open to all and has proved an inestimable advantage to the neighbourhood.

For Tinnevelly Mills Co., Ltd.,

(Sd.) A. & F. Harvey, Managers.

No. 1

CHIEF SECRETARY'S
27 JUN 1900
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

558
REVENUE DEPT.
No. 2
4272

Notes connected with G.O. 601 d 7-9-99

Re: the concession granted to the Tinnevelly Mills Co. to utilize the water of the Tambraparni for the Spinning Mi[ll] at Papanasam.

D/4 1,920—14-3-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Subject ——

~~Current~~ No. 4272 of 1899.

G.O. No. 601
7-9-99

From the Rt. Hon'ble the Secy. of State

No. 2 Public Works Dated 8" June 1899.

FOR ORDERS.

Hon Mr. Arundel
Hon Mr. Winterbotham
~~H.M.~~
H. E. the Govr.

Office note with intermediate remarks
note by P.W. Secy.
final office note

8.99
4

Insert this in place marked Δ on page 17 below

To Under Secretary.

In G.O. No: 174 A. dated 10-3-99 Rev. the Govt. defined the terms subject to which the concession granted to the Tinnevelly Mill Company for utilizing the water of the Tambraparni river for the Company's spinning mill at Papanasam was to be continued. In paragraph 15 of the same order, it was directed that any observations which the Company wished to make with reference to the terms laid down by Govt. should be submitted without delay. In their letter

dated

ated the 25th March 1899 (printed
t page 2 of G.O. No.: 283 d 1-5-99) J
he Managers of the Tinnevelly
ills Co. promised to submit
their observations on receipt
of instructions from the body
f shareholders in England.
he Secretary of State
now forwards for the considera-
tion of Govt. a memorandum
of observations submitted to
His Lordship by the managers
of the Tinnevelly Mills Co.
through Sir J. Rankin, M.P.,
Bart. The observations submitted by the managers on behalf of the Company will be set out below:-

(i) minimum quantity of water to be allowed to go over the Papanasam Falls

In paragraph 10 of G.O. No: 174 A d. 10-3-99 the Govt. maintained the decision in G.O. No: 490 d. 14-6-89 that a minimum supply of "15 cubic feet per second "shall at all times be

allowed

FOR ORDERS.

× Messrs. A. and F. Harvey

× pp. 3-9 of current

H

K ~~×(para 4 of this G.O.)~~

p 3 of current.

Foolish to do so, for this view was not accepted in the G.O. of /89, unsuccessfully appealed against, nor in the report to S. of S. on the appeal. K,

×Flag O,

H

It is very necessary to maintain ~~this~~ position ~~& it~~ in the G.O. now to be passed attention should be drawn to the fact that the Govt. has insisted on this condition & that the Secy. of S. ~~has~~ declined to interfere on appeal preferred by the Co. H.A.

K

H

A.E.H.

"allowed to pass over the "falls both by day and "by night". Messrs. A & F. Harvey urge that "if a minimum "supply of 15 cubic feet "per second is at all times "to pass over the Falls, it "will prove fatal to the "industry, as it frequently "happens during the dry "season that after suf-"ficient water to ~~dri~~ "drive the Mill is taken, "there is not enough left "in the river to fulfil "this condition". Messrs. A. and F. Harvey quote in their favour the view taken by Colonel Pennycuick (then Supdg: Engineer) in his report d. 29-7-87 printed at pages 19-20 of G.O. 490 Rev. d 14-6-89 that a minimum supply of 5 cubic feet per second to go over the falls was ample. The decision in G.O. 490 dat ~~14~~-6-89 reaffirmed in G.O. No: 174 A d. 10-3-99 that a" minimum supply of 15 cubic feet per second should go over the falls, was based on the notes recorded by the Hon'ble Mr. Garstin and the Hon'ble Sir H. Stokes which will be found extracted in paragraph 10 of the L office-note under G.O. No: 174 A. d 10-3-99 – please see ~~al~~ also paragraphs 4-6 M and 9-10 of the Hon'ble N Mr. Arundel's note d. 28-10-98 under this G.O. It will be seen that on appeal by the Tinnevelly Mills Co. from the orders in G.O. 490 d 14-6-89, K the Rt. Hon'ble the Secy. of State saw no reason for interfering with the discretion of the Local Govt. as regards the quantity of water to be supplied to the Company – vide G.O. 206 d 25.3.91. O It will also be seen that the Superintending Engineer is by para 10 of G.O. 174A d H 10-3-99 given the discretion to

---

reduce during the dry season, i.e. from 1st February to 31st May, the minimum of 15 cubic feet per second which should go over the falls to 10 cubic feet per second. It is presumed that there will be no disposition to reconsider the ~~of~~ orders already passed as regards the minimum supply, which is to be the first charge on the river.

Messrs. Harvey ~~also~~ take objection to the interpretation P put upon G.O. 762 I d 26-8-84 in para 4 of G.O. 174A. Rev. d. H 10.3.99. Attention is in this connection invited to para 2 K of G.O. No: 490 Rev. d 14-6-89.

(ii) Restriction of the supply of water to 12 consecutive hours per day – please see H para 10 of G.O. 174A. Rev. d 10.3.99.

Messrs. Harvey observe as follows:– "To restrict the "supply to 12 consecutive "hours per day would be most

taken from the time

#: ~~Please see para 4 of G.O. 490 d 14-6-89 (K)~~
~~& para 10 of G.O. 174 A d 10.3.99 (H).~~

No. But the Supg. Engineer will be allowed the same # discretion to reduce the quantity of water passing over the falls in the dry season that he has hitherto exercised. A.A.

A.S.H.

~~p. 5-6 of current~~

Putting Col. Hasted's letter aside, there is some force in the Company's argument. However it is not material, only showing that the Supg Engr. might allow more than 10 c.f. during dry season. H.

pp 5-6 of current

most harassing, and is in the "Company's opinion contrary to G.O. 490 of 14th June 1889, which distinctly states 'by day or by night'".

Attention is in this connection solicited to para 13 of the Hon: Mr. Arundel's note d. 28-10-98 under G.O. 174 A. d 10.3.99. Under paragraph 10 of this G.O., the Company is ordinarily allowed to take, if available for twelve consecutive hours in each day, 10 cubic feet per second for four months from the 1st February to 31st May and 20 cubic feet per second during the rest of the year. By the same paragraph the Superintending Engineer is empowered to permit the Company on their written application to take in addition to the above supply ordinarily allowed, one or more cubic feet per second for twelve consecutive hours in each day

6

K

Q I don't know why it is restricted to 12 hours. Perhaps this restriction might be reconsidered.

H

I cannot find it in the order of June/89 (K), the Concessions of which the Order of March/99 (H) pro-fessed to confirm. H.

Please see Mr Hughes' note below.

H.T.
3.8.99

This concession may be allowed. ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ A.H.

A.S.H.

day for a period of not less than four months during the year. It does not appear from the G.O. whether the Company may apply for water for more than 12 consecutive hours in each day, but from the Under Secretary's and Secretary's notes at pages

R 38-39 of the notes under the G.O., it is thought that the Company may take water for more than 12 hours a day, provided that the extra supply is paid for at the rate fixed in para 11 of the G.O. for additional supply of water taken by the Company over and above the supply ordinarily allowed in consideration of the fixed annual payment of Rs. 10,000.

I think this was intended
H.
18/7

Query See above
A.

H

As regards the period of 12 hours being a period of ~~12 cons~~ 12 consecutive hours, attention is solicited to the note in the Public Works Department

S

4

taken from the rules would have

Department d. 13.2.99 at pp. 40-41 of the notes under G.O. 174 A d. 10-3-99 and the note in this Deptt. and the Hon: Mr. Arundel's note at the latter page.

(iii) Right of Govt. to restrict or cut off supply of water.

With reference to the right reserved to Govt. by para 10 of G.O. 174 A. d 10.3.99 "to cut off without "payment of compensation "the whole or any portion of "the supply to the company, "if at any time it should "in the opinion of Govt. be "necessary to satisfy public "requirements", the Managers of the company represent that it "could not be expected to carry on business "and expend capital under "such uncertain conditions".

In connection with this representation, attention is solicited to the Secretary's and the Hon: Mr. Winterbotham's notes

~~p 6 of current~~

I am clearly of opinion that this right should be maintained as it is was before. It is nothing new. The Co. was formed & has flourished exceedingly hitherto so that the power reserved to Govt. has not affected the Co. adversely. We don't know what may happen in the future, and owing to some cause we cannot now foresee, Govt. had — even temporarily — to stop the supply, the compensation claimed by the Co. would be enormous.

A.A.

Secy

Should any modification be now made?

[illegible]
18/7

H.M. for orders.
I don't suppose the Co. will really object.

H.

p 6 of current

*/ The capital of the Co. appears to be 4 lakhs - please see para 12 of Secy's note d. 28.7.98.

notes at pages 41 and 44 respectively of the notes under G.O. 174 A d. 10-3-99. Attention is also solicited to the Secretary's and the Hon: Mr. Arundel's notes at page 3 of the galley-proof of that G.O., where it was decided that any modification of the right reserved by Govt. to cut off supply might be discussed in the event of the Company's ~~takin~~ taking objection to it.

(iv) Charge to be made for the water supplied to the Company - para 11 of G.O. 174 A d 10.3.99.

On this head, the managers of the Company observe as follows:—

"The charge which the "Govt. proposes to make "for the water amounts "to more than three per "cent. on the capital* of "the Company; in other "words, the Govt. propose "to take a cumulative preference dividend of over three per cent per annum before, and whether or not, the Shareholders get anything, and this from an industry, which the Govt. has not spent a Rupee to foster. Whatever charge is agreed upon should, in the Company's opinion, be dependent on the profits earned, like the Income tax." Messrs. Harvey accuse Govt. of overlooking the terms of the original concession under which "any charge to be made would not be of a kind calculated to be repressive of the development of the contemplated industry", and on the good faith of which the Shareholders were induced to risk their capital. It is added that if the Company is allowed all the water it requires (apparently 20 cubic feet per second all the year round), the Company is prepared to pay for such supply a sum equal to twice the income-tax assessed on its earnings.

The decision in G.O. No: 174 A d. 10-3-99 (para 11) regarding the charge to be made for the water supplied to the Company was based on the notes recorded by the Hon: Mr. Arundel and concurred in by H.E. the Governor at pages 29-30 and 35-37 of the notes under the G.O.

(V) Measurement of the water supplied to the Company — paragraph 12 of G.O. 174 A d 10-3-99. As regards the measuring of the water, the managers of the Company represent that this is a condition almost certain to lead to disputes, as "in fact "the measuring of the quantity "of water in a river is unde

the

The Govt gave the power for nothing for many years!

~~p. 8 of current~~

Please see para 3 of G.O. 174 A d 10-3-99

H

~~p. 7 of current~~

~~Please see last sentence at pp. 6 and 7 of current~~

H

Please see Mr. Hughes note below
H.

Prob. no modification will be accepted here?
W.T.

The proposed charge should certainly be maintained. The amount will ~~ordinarily~~ normally be Rs 10500 per annum — see para 11 of the G.O. The Secy. Mr. Forbes proposed an annual charge of Rs 29000 & showed ~~&~~ that after this had been levied the Co. wd still ~~[illegible]~~ have some 10 percent dividends to distribute. (p. 50 of notes). The Co. of course object to the charge fixed by Govt. There is not the smallest fear of their abandoning the industry. The end will be that the Co. "saying I will ne'er consent, consented!"

p. 7 of current

W

H

AA

I concur.
A.S.H.

6

taken from the [illegible]

12

"the best conditions to a great extent approximate". The Managers also take exception to the penal provisions in the ~~sa~~ G.O. for any tampering with the regulating apparatus and for [failure to pay the ~~char~~ Govt. dues as being very humiliating.

(vi) Revision of the charges at the end of seven years — para 11 ~~1st of G.O.~~ of G.O. 174 A d. 10-5-99 - ~~last~~ sub-para. The Govt. has reserved to itself the right to revise the scale of rates prescribed in para 11 of the G.O. at the end of seven years commencing from the date of notice given to the company of the charges to be levied on it. Messrs. Harvey now ~~urge~~ state that the company "would much prefer to have a final arrangement entered into in place of making it in force for seven years. To carry on business satisfactorily, reasonable security

I would make no change at all here. See my note on page 16 below.
AA.

p.6 of current

A.S.H.

x para 12.

This sounds, I submit "humbug" HT
yes - but very natural. The Co. of course protests all through.
AA

No modification required AA
H.T.

But please see Mr. Hughes' note
H.T.

p.6 of current

No modification required
H.T.

Certainly not
AA
A.S.H.

13

p.8 of current

This statement need not be taken seriously - it is a useful phrase intended to emphasise the objections.
AA 8.8.99.
Yes. A.S.H. 12.8.99

"security and finality are essential".

Messrs. Harvey state in conclusion that "if Govt. insists in carrying out its proposal the Company will be compelled to abandon the industry".

Orders are requested.

P.E. Tirojuler
17.7.99.

Secy

On the present assertions, there seems no ground to reconsider the orders passed. If practical difficulty in measuring the water is experienced an adde lump charge may be fixed in lieu of the charge per cusec.

18/7/99

To P.W. for favour of remarks - esp. as to the marginal note on p.6

H.T.
19.7.99

~~G.O. No. 3686/19.7.99.~~

7

taken from the

Public Works Dept.

I beg to offer the following remarks on the principal points raised by ~~Mr. [illegible]~~ the Mills Co.

Minimum over falls. – Hitherto the Mills Co. has had enough water nearly always to work the machinery at full power, but this is only because the rule as to minm discharge over falls has been in great measure disregarded and now that the rules are to be really enforced it may be expected that the supply to the mills will frequently be less than required – 5 cusecs over the falls is I believe sufficient to keep the pools fresh but there have been other considerations and Govt. has practically fixed the minimum for the 4 hot weather months at 10 cusecs by allowing the S.E. discretion to reduce it to that quantity – The G.O. reserves to Govt. the power to ~~reduce~~ alter the minm over falls ~~and~~ I ~~think [illegible]~~ Co. should be ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~. Any raising of it would be fatal to the Co's business. Whether a high measure of prosperity is compatible with a strict enforcement of the present minimum discharge over falls is uncertain –

Much difference of opinions

See my note above. Govt. must maintain the status quo ante: that is all. A.A.

Restriction to 12 hrs. Supply. I think the wording of paras 10 (2) and 11 does not quite represent the intentions of Govt. There is nothing in the file indicating any intention of forbidding supply for a longer period than 12 hrs a day and this period seems to be fixed in order to define more precisely what is to be given for the stipulated charge. The ordinary working hours at the Mills are not stated and there is therefore no information whether a 12-hours supply would usually be sufficient. The sluice will have to be kept open about an hour longer than the working hours. It may also be desired to work over-time and especially when the supply is short and this can scarcely be forbidden. I beg to suggest that all reference to the hours of supply be struck out from the G.O. If water were taken for over time, it would be almost impossible to say what the charge should be without keeping a time-keeper at the Mills.

This may be done: see note above.
A.A.
A.S.H.

Charge for water. – The concession for the 4 months Feb. to May is for 10 cub ft per second during 12 hours a day but the Co. is permitted to ask for more and will certainly ask for what is required to work the Mills at full power. The S.E. can only reply that he does not know the quantity of water which can be calculated on; that so long as 10 cft per second is allowed to pass over the falls the Co. may take what it can get up to the quantity asked for and that if the full quantity is not obtained such reduction will be made in the bills as the Govt. thinks fit. The Co's manager, on his part, can only in periods of scarcity adjust his work from time to time to the supply which he expects to be available. All this means that the whole of the water taken from the river would have to

Public Works Dept

I beg to offer the following remarks on the principal points raised by ~~Mr. [illegible]~~ the Mills Co.

Minimum over falls.. Hitherto the Mills Co. has had enough water nearly always to work the machinery at full power, but this is only because the rule as to minm discharge over falls has been in great measure disregarded and now that the rules are to be really enforced it may be expected that the supply to the mills will frequently be less than required – 5 Cusecs over the falls is I believe sufficient to keep the pools fresh but there have been other considerations and Govt. has practically fixed the minimum for the 4 hot weather months at 10 Cusecs by allowing the S.E. discretion to reduce it to that quantity – The G.O. reserves to Govt. the power to ~~reduce~~ alter the minm. over falls ~~and~~ I ~~[illegible]~~ Co. ~~should~~ be ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~

Any raising of it would be fatal to the Co's business. Whether a high measure of prosperity is compatible with a strict enforcement of the present minimum discharge over falls is uncertain –

Much difference of opinions

See my note above. Govt. must maintain the status quo ante: that is all. AA

Restriction to 12 hrs. Supply. I think the wording of paras 10 (2) and 11 does not quite represent the intentions of Govt. There is nothing on the file indicating any intention of forbidding supply for a longer period than 12 hrs a day and this period seems to be fixed in order to define more precisely what is to be given for the stipulated charge. The ordinary working hours at the Mills are not stated and there is therefore no information whether a 12-hours supply would usually be sufficient. The sluice will have to be kept open about an hour longer than the working hours. It may also be desired to work over-time especially when the supply is short and this can scarcely be forbidden. I beg to suggest that all reference to the hours of supply be struck out from the G.O. If water were taken for over time, it would be almost impossible to say what the charge should be without keeping a time-keeper at the Mills.

This may be done: see note above. AA

Charge for water.– The concession for the 4 months Feb. to May is for 10 Cub ft per second during 12 hrs a day but the Co. is permitted to ask for more and will certainly ask for what is required to work the Mills at full power. The S.E. can only reply that he does not know the quantity of water which can be calculated on; that so long as 10 cft per second is allowed to pass over the falls the Co. may take what it can get up to the quantity asked for and that if the full quantity is not obtained such reduction will be made in the bills as the Govt. thinks fit. The Co's manager, on his part, can only in periods of scarcity adjust his work from time to time to the supply which he expects to be available. All this means that the whole of the water taken from the river would have to be measured. There is trouble but no difficulty in this. The difficulty would lie in determining how much of the water is in excess of the concession and there might be frequent disputes about this. I strongly recommend that a charge be fixed independent of measurements.

I would not make any changes in this respect. The measurement will rest with the Supg. Engr. and if any question should arise Govt. can be appealed to & its order must be final, for it wd. always be in its power to direct the Supg. Engr. not to exercise his discretion in favour of the Co. but to send the 15 C.f. per sec. over the falls. AA

A.S.H.

The Co. offers to pay a sum equal to double the income tax or about 6 per cent on profits. This is the principle which I suggested in Nov. 1896 as an alternative to the Collector's proposal to charge a lump sum of Rs 5000 and I still think it fairer to the Co. whose profits are very fluctuating.

I still think the charge stated in the G.O. to be too* high and likely to prevent other similar enterprises being undertaken without a strict agreement. People cannot be expected to take the risk of establishing industries in out-of-the-way, unhealthy places unless they are allowed when successful to make much larger profits than they could expect in more favoured places.

This description is not I think applicable here. H.T.

See note above. It is little more than one-third of what was proposed by the Secy. (Rs 10500 as compared with Rs 29000) wh. wd. still have left a dividend of about 10 p.c. Govt. must consider the claims of the general taxpayer as compared with the high dividends of a flourishing company. AA

A.S.H.

If Govt. insists on the charge stated for the regular supply the amount might well be allowed to cover any extra supply given in Feb to May.

I think not. AA

The proviso that the supply can be stopped without compensation should I think be reconsidered.

3.8.99 W.H.

See my note above on this point AA

17

Rev. Dept

H.E. the Govr.

The observations of the Co., which might with more propriety have been sent direct to this Govt., are directed against the terms of a G.O ($\frac{174.I}{10.3.99}$) which ~~was~~ had been most carefully considered. I think therefore that Mr. Hughes' note goes too far & would reopen too much.

But the restriction to 12 hrs. might be omitted with ref. to the marginal note on p. 6 of office note & to Mr. Hughes' remarks on the point.

The objections & suggested orders are repeated here in a convenient form;

i. Minm. supply over falls. Cannot be reconsidered AA A.S.H.
ii. Restriction to 12 hrs. May be omitted AA A.S.H.
iii. Right of Govt. to cut off water. Need not be reconsidered AA A.S.H.
iv. Charge for water. Terms will be reasonable if the "12 hrs. condition" be excised. No change. AA
v. Measurement difficult, & Penal provns. objected to.
vi. Revision at end of 7 yrs. objected to.

Not to be reconsid. AA 8.8.99

A.S.H. 12.8.99

H.T.
3.8.99

P.T.O.

be measured. There is trouble to

28

I still think there is much force in the Co's objections to iii & iv —

I think their proposal to make the charge some multiple of the Co's income tax is a good one — but I am prepared to concur that the orders already passed as to this should be upheld —

HR

If the absolute right to cut off the supply at any time must be retained; I think we might re-assure the Co. & the public by remarking that, so far as Govt can foresee, the likelihood of circumstances arising such as would necessitate the right being exercised may be regarded as extremely remote —

We might say "It is necessary in the public interests to reaffirm this condition, but so far as Govt. can foresee, &c."

AA

26.8.99

In other respects I agree

HR —

9-8-99.

To Under Secretary.

Please see the draft order submitted below.

15.8.99.

Secy

16/8/99

Will Irrign. kindly advise effect on scale laid down in para 11 in G.O. of March 99 will be of omitting restriction regarding 12 consec. hours.

19.8.99.

Press

Insert here the draft (passed by Secy.) (pp. 18a – 18f) with alterations and remarks by HM to be entered in margin

10

~~A H [illegible]~~

18a

Revenue Department.

A

~~Read again G.O.No.174 A, d/ 10-3-99.~~

A

~~" 283, d/ 1-5-99.~~

A

~~" also despatch from the Rt. Hon. the Secretary of State No.2 Public Works d/ 8-6-99. (C.No.4273/99).~~

-::-

~~HM~~

Draft

Order Press.

In the memorandum forwarded by the Rt. Hon. the Secretary of State for India with the despatch read above, ---- Messrs. A. and F. Harvey, Managers on behalf of the Tinnevelly Mills Co., submit ---- certain observations, with reference to paragraph 15 of G.O.No.174 A Revenue, --- dated the 10th March 1899, which laid -- down the terms on which the concession -- of utilising the water of the Tambraparni river for the spinning mill at Papanasam would be continued to the Co.

H

2. Minimum supply of water to be allowed to pass over the Papanasam Falls

So early as 1889, the Govt. after a --- careful be measured. There is trouble

careful consideration decided in order No. 490 Revenue, dated 14th June 1889 that a minimum supply of 15 cubic feet per second should at all times be --- allowed to pass over the falls both -- by day and by night. The Tinnevelly -- Mills Co. appealed to the Rt. Hon. the Secretary of State for India against - the decision of the Govt. but without effect. (G.O.Misc.No.2067 Rev: d/ -- 25" March 1891). In defining, in -- March last, the terms of the conces-- sion, H.E. the Governor in Council --- considered it essential in the public interests to maintain the decision --- arrived at in 1889 that a minimum --- supply of 15 cubic feet per second to pass over the falls should be the first charge on the river, subject, however, to the modification that the Super---- intending Engineer of the circle might at his discretion reduce the minimum ---- supply to 10 cubic feet per second -- during the dry season, namely, from 1st February to 31st May. His Excellency in

K

O

---

in Council has given careful consideration to the objections now urged by Messrs -- A and F. Harvey, but does not see any -- sufficient reason for modifying ~~the~~ this decision ~~already arrived at as to the minimum amount of water which should pass over the Papanasam falls.~~

(Seems an unnecessary repetition HS)

3. Charges payable for the water ---- supplied to the company and the restriction of the supply to 12 consecutive --- hours per day (vide paras 10 and 11 of G.O.No.174 A d/ 10-3-99). On reconsideration, His Excellency the Governor in Council is [pleased to remove] the condi-- tion restricting the supply of water to 12 consecutive hours per day. Subject to this modification the scale of charges [stated] in para 11 of G.O.No.174 A dated 10th March 1899 will be maintained. It cannot be reasonably contended that the scale of -- charges as modified is anything but ---- moderate, and the Government is not prepared to substitute a charge calculated on the basis of incometax.

H

willing to dispense with HS.

laid down

(It is contended HS)

As

be measured. There is trouble to 1

186

careful consideration decided in order No. 490 Revenue, dated 14th June 1889 K that a minimum supply of 15 cubic feet per second should at all times be --- allowed to pass over the falls both -- by day and by night. The Tinnevelly -- Mills Co. appealed to the Rt. Hon. the Secretary of State for India against - the decision of the Govt. but without effect. (G.O.Misc.No.2067 Rev: d/ -- 23" March 1891). O In defining, in -- March last, the terms of the concession, H.E. the Governor in Council --- considered it essential in the public interests to maintain the decision --- arrived at in 1889 that a minimum --- supply of 15 cubic feet per second to pass over the falls should be the first charge on the river, subject, however, to the modification that the Super---- intending Engineer of the circle might at his discretion reduce the minimum ---- supply to 10 cubic feet per second -- during the dry season, namely, from 1st February to 31st May. His Excellency in

18C

(Seems an unnecessary repetition H.S.)

in Council has given careful consideration to the objections now urged by Messrs -- A and F. Harvey, but does not see any -- sufficient reason for modifying ~~the~~ this decision ~~already arrived at as to the minimum amount of water which should pass over the Papanasam falls.~~

3. Charges payable for the water ---- supplied to the company and the restriction of the supply to 12 consecutive --- hours per day (vide paras 10 and 11 of G.O.No.174 A d/ 10-3-99). H On reconsideration, His Excellency the Governor in Council is [pleased to remove] willing to dispense with H.S. the condition restricting the supply of water to 12 consecutive hours per day. Subject to this modification the scale of charges laid down [stated] in para 11 of G.O.No.174 A dated 10th March 1899 will be maintained. It cannot be reasonably contended that the scale of -- charges as modified is anything but ---- moderate, and the Government is not prepared to substitute a charge calculated on the basis of incometax.

(It is contended H.S.)

As

be measured. There is trouble

186

18d (3)

As already ordered in para 14 of G.O.No. 174 A Revenue, dated 10-3-99 — H — and in G.O. 283 Rev: d/ 1-5-99 a lump charge of Rs. 12,000 per annum (to be collected by monthly instalments of Rs.1,000) should be made for ~~all~~ the use of the water ~~taken~~ by the company, pending the execution of the agreement to be entered into with it and the cons~~ti~~truc~~tu~~tion of the necessary regulating works.

only to determine the amount of water passing over the Falls. [illegible] orders [illegible] P.W.D. for the [illegible] — J

4. Right of the Govt. to restrict or cut off supply of water.

In paragraph 10 of G.O.No.174 A — H — Revenue, d/ 10-3-99 the Govt. reserved to itself the right to cut off without payment of compensation the whole or any portion of the supply of water to the company, if at any time it should in the opinion of the Govt. be necessary to satisfy public requirements. With reference to the objections urged by the company against the right in question, the company's attention will be drawn

(4)

(5)

(It can do no harm to say so much, and it will indicate the fact that Govt. does not contemplate cutting off the supply capriciously H.D.)

For orders whether it is wise to put this in. O.W.D. 1/17.

(6)

12

18e

drawn to the fact that this is no new condition, it having been laid down in G.O.No.361 I dated 1st May 1883 in — Y — which Messrs A and F. Harvey were originally allowed to utilize the water of the Tambraparni river for the spinning mill at Papanasam. Substantially the same condition was repeated in G.O.No. ~~489~~ 490 — K — Revenue, dated 14th June 1889. His Excellency the Governor in Council ~~is~~ strongly convinced that the right in question should as a matter of principle continue to be reserved, however remote ~~The Govt. at the same time desires to assure the company, that so far as it can foresee,~~ the likelihood of circumstances arising such as would necessitate the exercise of the right ~~reserved by the Govt., may be regarded~~ may be as extremely remote.

5. As regards the objections urged by the company to a measuring of the water, to the penal provisions for tampering with the regulating apparatus or for failure to pay the Govt. dues, and to

at... water.

be measured. There is [illegible]

16 f

~~to the~~ future revision of the charges payable by the company, the Govt. does not consider that the company has adduced any sufficient grounds for modification of the previous order.

6. The Collector of Tinnevelly is requested to ascertain and report at an early date whether the company assents to the terms defined in G.O.No. 174 A Revenue, dated 10-3-99, as modified by the present order, so that action may be taken without further delay for the preparation of a draft of the agreement to be entered into with the company, and for the construction of the necessary regulating works.

4

W. I.
18 8 99

To the Board of Rev: Rev: Sett.
" " L. R.
" P.W.D. (Irrigation).
" Collector of Tinnevelly.
Copy to the Managers, Tinnevelly Mills Co. through the Collector of Tinnevelly.

19

Public Works

I do not think the Rev. Secretary enquiry as to the effect on the Scale laid down in para 11 of the G.O. of March 1899 of omitting the restriction regarding the hours of water supply, can be answered definitely. There is no information as to the ordinary working hours or the amount of over-time work. My opinion is that the removal of the restriction will make very little difference in the Scale, and that it cannot make much difference unless the Co. duplicates the Mills and works at night. I do not think this a contingency which need be taken into account. The unhealthiness of the place in the hot weather, the high wages which would have to be paid for night work the difficulty of getting Europeans of the kind who would be entrusted with the management of the work to undertake it are all against the establishment of mills for all-night work –

I beg to submit that it is advisable for many reasons to ~~Substitute~~ Substitute the temporary charge laid down in para 14 of the G.O. for the Scale laid down in para 11. It would make no appreciable difference in the charge and do away with the necessity

20

measuring the water. The measuring apparatus will cost a good deal, a man on good pay will have to be kept in charge of it, and the clockwork must be expected to get out of order sometimes and a man will have to be brought from Tinnevelly to see to it.

If this proposal is not accepted para 11(b) should be modified and a daily instead of monthly charge fixed. It should also be added that the maximum discharge when the channel is in steady flow will be taken as the rate of discharge for each day.

W.H.
22.8.99

Rev. Dept

H.M.

H.T.
22 8 99

1. This must go back to the Hon. Mr. Arundel, on whose note para 11(b) of G.O. $\frac{174A}{10-3-99}$ is based —
The question is whether (b) is intelligible —
Leaving out the words "per period of twelve consecutive hours" the charge for extra water is to be "For every additional cu. foot per second a further monthly sum of Rs 50" —
If the extra water is only taken for a day, or part of a day, how is it to be charged for?
Perhaps the following will do?
"For every additional cu. foot per second a charge of Rs 1-8-0 per day will be made, whether the extra water be taken throughout the 24 hours or for only part thereof."

2 — The Chief Engineer anticipates difficulty in measuring the water, & I fear it will lead to frequent disputes —

He proposes that a lump sum of Rs 12000 per an. shd be charge —
This wd. be equivalent to Rs 125 a month for extra water —
If the Co. always takes 5 c. ft. extra water (I believe an excessive estimate?) this wd. be Rs 7-8-0 per day = Rs 225 per month, but the cost of machinery & establishment for measuring wd. have to be deducted —
I think it wd. greatly simplify matters, without diminishing the income, if the lump sum of Rs 12000 were stipulated for for the next 7 years —

H.W.
22-8-99.

Will H.M. please see if he approves para 4 of the draft G.O. below, as modified by me

H.W.

Hon. Mr. Arundel.

H.T.
24.8.99.

In view of the Irrign. Secretary's renewed argument I am ready to agree to a lump annual payment with no extra charge. To fix it at Rs 12000 would probably involve further correspondence & discussion, and if H.E. & H.M. have no objection I wd. ~~make~~ a further concession by fixing the lump annual payment at Rs 10500. With this & the concession as to the hours of work, & the reassurance on p. 18, we shall have gone quite as far as is necessary. A.A. 26.8.99

A.E.H.
5.9.99

Press
This must be printed in continuation of the notes with marginal references to original

Hon. Mr. Arundel.

Will H.M. kindly see whether the marginal alterations correctly represent his views.

H.T.
1.9.99.

Yes
A.A.
2.9.99.

Hon. Mr. Winterbotham }
H.E. The Govr. }

Issue as revised by Hon. Mr. Winterbotham —

H.T.
7.9.99.

Press
Print this at end of the

20

measuring the water. The measuring apparatus will cost a good deal, a man on good pay will have to be kept in charge of it, and the clockwork must be expected to get out of order sometimes and a man will have to be brought from Tinnevelly to see to it.

If this proposal is not accepted para 11(b) should be modified and a daily instead of monthly charge fixed. It should also be added that the maximum discharge when the channel is in steady flow will be taken as the rate of discharge for each day.

W.H.
22.8.99

Rev. Dept.

H.M.

H.T
22 8 99

1. This must go back to the Hon. Mr. Arundel, on whose note para 11(b) of G.O. $\frac{174A}{10-3-99}$ is based —
The question is whether (b) is intelligible —
Leaving out the words "per period of twelve consecutive hours" the charge for extra water is to be
"For every additional cu. foot per second a further monthly sum of Rs 50" —
If the extra water is only taken for a day, or part of a day, how is it to be charged for?
Perhaps the following will do?
"For every additional cu. foot per second a charge of Rs 1-8-0 per day will be made, whether the extra water be taken throughout the 24 hours or for only part thereof."

2 — The Chief Engineer anticipates difficulty in measuring the water, & I fear it will lead to frequent dispute —

He proposes that a lump sum of Rs 12000 per an. shd be charge —
This wd. be equivalent to Rs 125 a month for *extra* water —
If the Co. always takes 5 c.ft. extra water (I believe an excessive estimate?) this wd. be Rs 7-8-0 per day = Rs 225 per month, but the cost of machinery & establishment for measuring wd. have to be deducted —
I think it wd. greatly simplify matters, without diminishing the income, if the lump sum of Rs 12000 were stipulated for for the next 7 years —

H.W.
22-8-99 —

Will H.M. please see if he approves para 4 of the draft G.O. below, as modified by me

H.W.

Hon. Mr. Arundel.

H.T.
24-8-99.

In view of the Irrign. Secretary's renewed argument I am ready to agree to a lump annual payment with no extra charge. To fix it at Rs 12000 would probably involve further correspondence & discussion, and if H.E. & H.M. have no objection I wd. ~~make~~ a further concession by fixing the lump annual payment at Rs 10500. With this & the concession as to the hours of work, & the reassurance on p. 18, we shall have gone quite as far as is necessary. A.A. 26.8.99

H.E.H.
6.9.99

---

a

Press
This must be printed in continuation of the notes with marginal as [illegible] [illegible]

Hon. Mr. Arundel.

Will Hon. kindly see whether the marginal alterations correctly represent his views.

H.T
1.9.99.

Yes
A.A.
2.9.99.

Hon. Mr. Winterbotham
H.E. The Govr.

Issue as revised by Hon. Mr. Winterbotham.

H.T
7.9.99.

Press
Print this at the end of the

15

ue,dated 14th June
pply of 15 cubic
d at all times be
the falls both by
e Tinnevelly Mills
ight Hon'ble the
r India against
overnment but with-
sc.No.2067,Revenue
). In defining,
rms of the conces-
nor in Council con-
in the public in-
the decision arrived
nimum supply of 15
to pass over the
first charge on the
ver, to the modifi-
intending Engineer
at his discretion
pply to 10 cubic
the dry season,
ruary to 31st/May.

His

---

in Order No.490 Reve
1889 that a minimum
feet per second shou
allowed to pass over
day and by night. T
Co. appealed to the
Secretary of State
the decision of the
out effect. (G.O.
dated 25th March 189
in March last, the t
sion, H.E. the Gover
sidered it essential
terests to maintain
at in 1889 that a mi
cubic feet per secon
falls should be the
river, subject, howe
cation that the Supe
of the Circle might
reduce the minimum
feet per second dur
mely, from 1st Fe

l has given

the objections

d F Harvey, but

tent reason for

for the water

and the restric-

3 consecutive

as 10 and 11 of

-99). On recon-

ency the Governor

to dispense with

ing the supply of

e hours per day.

cation the scale

n para 11 of G.O

rch 1899 will be

be reasonably con-

of charges as

but moderate, and

prepared to sub-

lated on the ba-

3 para 14 of G.O

It would be more correct to say to ensure that the prescribed minimum of water shall pass over the Falls

H.D.
5-9-99.

AA

2 To be inserted as a new para:—

Regulating works will now be necessary only to ~~to determine the account of water passing~~ over the Falls. Very early orders will issue in the Public Works Department for the construction of such works.

3. The following to be substituted for the words marked 33:—

In modification of

th

fr

15

dated 10-5-99,

es

at the end of that period to re se ... cha

water.

AA H.D.

23

D

Marked with asterisks

I don't like the wording of the
[por]tion within blue brackets at all—
I would suggest
"Go[vernmen]t is prepared to concede that the total charge
to be made for the water ~~should~~ shall be limited
to a lump annual payment of Rs 10,500
payable on the 1st April"—
Otherwise I agree H.S.—

A.S.H.

Alt

The following to be substituted for the portion enclosed in brackets:—

u modification of paragraph 10 of G.O No 174 A Revenue
lated 10-3-99, ~~the~~ Superintending Engineer will ~~[illegible]~~-
~~[illegible]~~ subject to the conditions as to the quantity
water passing over the Falls, is empowered to permit ~~to permit~~ the Com-
ny on its written application to take in addition
the supply ordinarily allowed, any additional
antity of water it may require. Further in modification of
ragraph 11 of G.O No 174 A Rev: dated 10-3-99 H.E. the Go-
nor in Council ~~considers~~ that a lump charge of Rs 10,500
annum, payable on the 1st April, will suffice for all water
plied under the conditions laid down in para 10 of ~~that order~~
from any cause the supply is reduced below 10 cubic feet
second from 1st Feb to 31st May or below 20 cubic feet per second
ing the remainder of the year, such reduction of the above annual
ment may be made as the Government thinks fit. This decision
be in force for the next seven years from the date on which
ice was given to the company under para 15 of G.O No 174 A Rev:
ted 10-3-99; and the Government reserves to itself the right
the end of that period to revise the charge made for the
ater.

His Excellency in Coun
careful consideration
now urged by Messrs A
does not see any suffi
modifying this decisio

3. Charges payable
supplied to the compa
tion of the supply to
hours per day (vide p
G.O.No.174 A dated 10
sideration, His Excel
in Council is willing
the condition restric
water to 12 consecuti
[Subject to this modi
of charges laid down
No.174 A dated 10th
maintained. It canno
tended that the scal
modified is anything
the Government is no
stitute a charge ca
sis of incometax.]

3 ~~As already ordere~~

Att

substituted for the portion enclosed in brackets:-

which the Company signifies to the
ance of the conditions now laid

.O. No.174 A Revenue
G.O. 283 Rev. date
charge of Rs. 12,000
collected by monthly
Rs. 1,000) should be
the water by the comp-
~~execution of the agr~~
~~into with it and the~~
~~necessary regulating~~

4. Right of the
trict or cut off sup

In paragraph
Revenue, dated 10-3-9
served to itself the
without payment of c
or any portion of th
the company, if at
in the opinion of th
cessary to satisfy
With reference to t
by the Company aga
question, the comp
be drawn to the fa
condition, it havi

G.O. No.361 I dated

which Messrs A and F

ally allowed to utili

Tambraparni river for

at Papanasam. Subst

condition was repeat

Revenue, dated 14th

~~cellency the Governm~~

~~strongly convinced th~~

~~question should be con~~

~~continue to be reser~~

~~may be~~ the likelihoo

arising such as wou

ercise of the right

5. ~~As regards~~

by the Company to a

water, to the pe

tampering with the

~~or~~ for failure to

dues, and ~~to~~ future

payable by the com

does not consider

adduced any suffic

fication of the p

Tinnevelly is
nd report at an
ompany assents
G.O.No.174A,
as modified by
hat action may be
elay for the pre-
the agreement to
he company.[13 ~~and~~
~~the necessary re-~~

13. The portion in bra

W.D
5-9-99

A.S.H
6.9.99

ue, Revenue Settlement
, Land Revenue.
ation)
Tinnevelly. 8.9.99
Tinnevelly Mills Co.
ctor of Tinnevelly.

25.9.99

10
7

Collector o

26

6. The Co
requested to ascert
early date whether
to the terms define
Revenue, dated 10-3
the present order,
taken without furth
paration of a draft
be entered into wit
~~for the constructio~~
~~gulating works.~~]13

To the Board of Rev
,, ,, ,,
,, ,, P. W. D. (I
,, ,, Collector o
Copy to the Manager
thro' the Col

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., NO. 601, DATED 7TH SEPTEMBER 1899.

[SUBJECT.—*Concession granted to the Tinnevelly Mills Company to utilize the water of the Tambraparni for the Spinning Mill at Pápanásam.*]

From the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, No. 2, Public Works, dated 8th June 1899.

To Under Secretary—

In G.O., No. 174A, Revenue, dated 10th March 1899, the Government defined the terms subject to which the concession granted to the Tinnevelly Mills Company for utilizing the water of the Tambraparni river for the Company's Spinning Mill at Pápanásam was to be continued. In paragraph 15 of the same order, it was directed that any observations which the Company wished to make, with reference to the terms laid down by Government, should be submitted without delay. In their letter, dated the 25th March 1899 (printed at page 2 of G.O., No. 283, dated 1st May 1899), the managers * of the Tinnevelly Mills Company promised to submit their observations on receipt of instructions from the body of shareholders in England. The Secretary of State now forwards, for the consideration of Government, a memorandum of observations submitted to His Lordship by the managers of the Tinnevelly Mills Company through Sir J. Rankin, M.P., *Bart.* The observations submitted by the managers on behalf of the Company will be set out below:—

2. (i) *Minimum quantity of water to be allowed to go over the Pápanásam Falls.*—In paragraph 10 of G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899, the Government maintained the decision in G.O., No. 490, dated 14th June 1889, that "a minimum supply of 15 cubic feet per second shall at all times be allowed to pass over the falls both by day and by night." Messrs. A. and F. Harvey urge that "if a minimum supply of 15 cubic feet per second is at all times to pass over the falls, it will prove fatal to the industry, as it frequently happens during the dry season that after sufficient water to drive the mill is taken, there is not enough left in the river to fulfil this condition." Messrs. A. and F. Harvey quote in their favour the view taken by Colonel Pennycuick (then Superintending Engineer) in his report, dated 29th July 1887, printed at pages 19–20 of G.O., No. 490, Revenue, dated 14th June 1889, that a minimum supply of 5 cubic feet per second to go over the falls was ample. The decision * in G.O., No. 490, dated 14th June 1889, reaffirmed in G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899, that a minimum supply of 15 cubic feet per second should go over the falls, was based on the notes recorded by the Hon'ble Mr. Garstin and the Hon'ble Sir H. Stokes which will be found extracted in paragraph 10 of the office-note under G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899—please see also paragraphs 4-6 and 9–10 of the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel's note, dated 28th October 1898, under this Government Order.

Foolish to do so, for this view was not accepted in the Government Order of 1889, unsuccessfully appealed against, nor in the report to Secretary of State on the appeal.

H.T.

* It is very necessary to maintain this position and in the Government Order now to be passed attention should be drawn to the fact that the Government has insisted on this condition and that the Secretary of State declined to interfere on appeal preferred by the Company.

A. T. A[RUNDEL].

A. E. H[AVELOCK].

---

* Messrs. A. and F. Harvey.

It will be seen that on appeal by the Tinnevelly Mills Company from the orders in G.O., No. 490, dated 14th June 1889, the Right Honourable the Secretary of State saw no reason for interfering with the discretion of the Local Government as regards the quantity of water to be supplied to the Company—*vide* G.O., No. 2067, dated 25th March 1891. It will also be seen that the Superintending Engineer is, by paragraph 10 of G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899, given the discretion to reduce during the dry season, *i.e.*, from 1st February to 31st May, the minimum of 15 cubic feet per second which should go over the falls to 10 cubic feet per second. It is presumed that there will be no disposition to reconsider the orders already passed as regards the minimum supply, which is to be the first charge on the river.

No. But the Superintending Engineer will be allowed the same discretion to reduce the quantity of water passing over the falls in the dry season that he has hitherto exercised.

H.T.

A.T.A.
A.E.H.

Messrs. Harvey take objection to the interpretation put upon G.O., No. 762 I., dated 26th August 1884, in paragraph 4 of G.O., No. 174A, Revenue, dated 10th March 1899. Attention is in this connection invited to paragraph 2 of G.O., No. 490, Revenue, dated 14th June 1889.

Putting Colonel Hasted's letter aside, there is some force in the Company's argument. However it is not material, only showing that the Superintending Engineer might allow more than 10 cubic feet during dry season.

H.T.

3. (ii) *Restriction of the supply of water to twelve consecutive hours per day*—please see paragraph 10 of G.O., No. 174A, Revenue, dated 10th March 1899.

Messrs. Harvey observe as follows:—"To restrict the supply to twelve consecutive hours per day would be most harassing, and is in the Company's opinion contrary to G.O., No. 490 of 14th June 1889, which distinctly states 'by day or by night'."

Attention is in this connection solicited to para. 13 of the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel's note, dated 28th October 1898, under G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899. Under paragraph 10 of this Government Order, the Company is ordinarily allowed to take, if available, for twelve consecutive hours in each day, 10 cubic feet per second for four months from the 1st February to 31st May and 20 cubic feet per second during the rest of the year. By the same paragraph the Superintending Engineer is empowered to permit the Company on their written application to take, in addition to the above supply ordinarily allowed, one or more cubic feet per second for twelve consecutive hours in each day for a period of not less than four months during the year. It does not appear from the Government Order whether the Company may apply for water for more than twelve consecutive hours in each day; but from the Under Secretary's and Secretary's notes at page 34 of the notes under the Government Order, it is thought that the Company may take water for more than 12 hours a day, provided that the extra supply is paid for at the rate fixed in paragraph 11 of the Government Order for additional supply of water taken by the Company over and above the supply ordinarily allowed in consideration of the fixed annual payment of Rs. 10,500.

I don't know why Hon'ble Member restricted to 12 hours. Perhaps this restriction might be reconsidered. I cannot find it in the order of June 1889 the concessions of which the order of March 1899 professed to confirm.

H.T.

This concession may be allowed.

A.T.A.
A.E.H.

I think this was intended.

N.E.M.
18-7-00.

Query: see above.

H.T.

As regards the period of 12 hours being a period of twelve *consecutive* hours, attention is solicited to the note in the Public Works Department, dated 13th February 1899, at pages 34–35 of the notes under G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899, and the note in this department and the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel's note at the latter page.

4. (iii) *Right of Government to restrict or cut off supply of water.*—With reference to the right reserved to Government by paragraph 10 of G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899, "to cut off without payment of compensation the whole or any portion of the supply to the Company, if at any time it should in the opinion of Government be necessary to satisfy public requirements," the managers of the Company represent that it "could not be expected to carry on business and expend capital under such uncertain conditions." In connection with this representation, attention is solicited to the Secretary's and the Hon'ble Mr. Winterbotham's notes at pages 35 and 36-37 respectively, of the notes under G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899. Attention is also solicited to the Secretary's and the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel's notes on the revised draft of that Government Order, where it was decided that any modification of the right reserved by Government to cut off supply might be discussed in the event of the Company's taking objection to it.

Secretary—
Should any modification be now made.

N.E.M.
18-7-00.

Honourable Member for orders—
I don't suppose the Company will really object.

H.T.

I am clearly of opinion that this right should be maintained as it was before. It is nothing new. The Company was formed and has flourished exceedingly hitherto so that the power reserved to Government has not affected the Company adversely. We don't know what may happen in the future, and if, owing to some cause we cannot now foresee, Government had—even temporarily—to stop the supply, the compensation claimed by the Company would be enormous.

A.T.A.

I agree.

A.E.H.

5. (iv) *Charge to be made for the water supplied to the Company*—paragraph 11 of G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899. On this head, the managers of the Company observe as follows:—

"The charge which the Government proposes to make for the water amounts to more than 3 per cent. on the capital * of the Company; in other words, the Government proposes to take a cumulative preference dividend of over 3 per cent. per annum before, and whether or not, the shareholders get anything, and this from an industry, which the Government has not spent a rupee to foster. Whatever charge is agreed upon should, in the Company's opinion, be dependent on the profits earned, like the income-tax." Messrs. Harvey accuse Government of overlooking the terms of the original concession under which "any charge to be made would not be of a kind calculated to be repressive of the development of the contemplated industry," and on the good faith of which the shareholders were induced to risk their capital. It is added that if the Company is allowed all the water it requires (apparently 20 cubic feet per second all the year round), the Company is prepared to pay for such supply a sum equal to twice the income tax assessed on its earnings.

* The capital of the Company appears to be 4 lakhs—please see paragraph 12 of Secretary's note, dated 28th July 1898, with G.O., No. 174-A, dated 10th March 1899.

The Government gave the power for nothing for many years!

N.E.M.

Please see paragraph 3 of G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899.

The decision in G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899 (paragraph 11) regarding the charge to be made for the water supplied to the Company was based on the notes recorded by the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel and concurred in by His Excellency the Governor at pages 29–30 and 32–33 of the notes under the Government Order.

Probably no modification will be accepted here.

H.T.

The proposed charge should certainly be maintained. The amount will normally be Rs. 10,500 per annum—see paragraph 11 of the Government Order. The Secretary, Mr. Forbes, proposed an annual charge of Rs. 29,000 and showed that, after this had been levied, the Company would still have some 10 per cent. dividends to distribute (p. 20 of notes). The Company of course object to the charge fixed by Government. There is not the smallest fear of their abandoning the industry. The end will be that

6 (v) *Measurement of the water supplied to the Company*—paragraph 12 of G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899.

It will be seen that on appeal by the Tinnevelly Mills Company from the orders in G.O., No. 490, dated 14th June 1889, the Right Honourable the Secretary of State saw no reason for interfering with the discretion of the Local Government as regards the quantity of water to be supplied to the Company—*vide* G.O., No. 2067, dated 25th March 1891. It will also be seen that the Superintending Engineer is, by paragraph 10 of G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899, given the discretion to reduce during the dry season, *i.e.*, from 1st February to 31st May, the minimum of 15 cubic feet per second which should go over the falls to 10 cubic feet per second. It is presumed that there will be no disposition to reconsider the orders already passed as regards the minimum supply, which is to be the first charge on the river.

No. But the Superintending Engineer will be allowed the same discretion to reduce the quantity of water passing over the falls in the dry season that he has hitherto exercised.

A.T.A.
A.E.H.

H.T.

Messrs. Harvey take objection to the interpretation put upon G.O., No. 762 I., dated 26th August 1884, in paragraph 4 of G.O., No. 174A, Revenue, dated 10th March 1899. Attention is in this connection invited to paragraph 2 of G.O., No. 490, Revenue, dated 14th June 1889.

Putting Colonel Hasted's letter aside, there is some force in the Company's argument. However it is not material, only showing that the Superintending Engineer might allow more than 10 cubic feet during dry season.

H.T.

3. (ii) *Restriction of the supply of water to twelve consecutive hours per day*—please see paragraph 10 of G.O., No. 174A, Revenue, dated 10th March 1899.

Messrs. Harvey observe as follows:—" To restrict the supply to twelve consecutive hours per day would be most harassing, and is in the Company's opinion contrary to G.O., No. 490 of 14th June 1889, which distinctly states 'by day or by night'."

Attention is in this connection solicited to para. 13 of the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel's note, dated 28th October 1898, under G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899. Under paragraph 10 of this Government Order, the Company is ordinarily allowed to take, if available, for twelve consecutive hours in each day, 10 cubic feet per second for four months from the 1st February to 31st May and 20 cubic feet per second during the rest of the year. By the same paragraph the Superintending Engineer is empowered to permit the Company on their written application to take, in addition to the above supply ordinarily allowed, one or more cubic feet per second for twelve consecutive hours in each day for a period of not less than four months during the year. It does not appear from the Government Order whether the Company may apply for water for more than twelve consecutive hours in each day; but from the Under Secretary's and Secretary's notes at page 34 of the notes under the Government Order, it is thought that the Company may take water for more than 12 hours a day, provided that the extra supply is paid for at the rate fixed in paragraph 11 of the Government Order for additional supply of water taken by the Company over and above the supply ordinarily allowed in consideration of the fixed annual payment of Rs. 10,500.

I don't know why Hon'ble Member restricted to 12 hours. Perhaps this restriction might be reconsidered. I cannot find it in the order of June 1889 the concessions of which the order of March 1899 professed to confirm.

H.T.

This concession may be allowed.

A.T.A.
A.E.H.

I think this was intended.

N.E.M.
18-7-00.

Query: see above.

H.T.

As regards the period of 12 hours being a period of twelve *consecutive* hours, attention is solicited to the note in the Public Works Department, dated 13th February 1899, at pages 34–35 of the notes under G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899, and the note in this department and the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel's note at the latter page.

4. (iii) *Right of Government to restrict or cut off supply of water.*—With reference to the right reserved to Government by paragraph 10 of G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899, "to cut off without payment of compensation the whole or any portion of the supply to the Company, if at any time it should in the opinion of Government be necessary to satisfy public requirements," the managers of the Company represent that it "could not be expected to carry on business and expend capital under such uncertain conditions." In connection with this representation, attention is solicited to the Secretary's and the Hon'ble Mr. Winterbotham's notes at pages 35 and 36-37 respectively, of the notes under G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899. Attention is also solicited to the Secretary's and the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel's notes on the revised draft of that Government Order, where it was decided that any modification of the right reserved by Government to cut off supply might be discussed in the event of the Company's taking objection to it.

Secretary—
Should any modification be now made.

N.E.M.
18-7-00.

Honourable Member for orders—
I don't suppose the Company will really object.

H.T.

I am clearly of opinion that this right should be maintained as it was before. It is nothing new. The Company was formed and has flourished exceedingly hitherto so that the power reserved to Government has not affected the Company adversely. We don't know what may happen in the future, and if, owing to some cause we cannot now foresee, Government had—even temporarily—to stop the supply, the compensation claimed by the Company would be enormous.

A.T.A.

I agree.

A.E.H.

5. (iv) *Charge to be made for the water supplied to the Company*—paragraph 11 of G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899. On this head, the managers of the Company observe as follows:—

"The charge which the Government proposes to make for the water amounts to more than 3 per cent. on the capital * of the Company; in other words, the Government proposes to take a cumulative preference dividend of over 3 per cent. per annum before, and whether or not, the shareholders get anything, and this from an industry, which the Government has not spent a rupee to foster. Whatever charge is agreed upon should, in the Company's opinion, be dependent on the profits earned, like the income-tax." Messrs. Harvey accuse Government of overlooking the terms of the original concession under which "any charge to be made would not be of a kind calculated to be repressive of the development of the contemplated industry," and on the good faith of which the shareholders were induced to risk their capital. It is added that if the Company is allowed all the water it requires (apparently 20 cubic feet per second all the year round), the Company is prepared to pay for such supply a sum equal to twice the income tax assessed on its earnings.

* The capital of the Company appears to be 4 lakhs—please see paragraph 12 of Secretary's note, dated 28th July 1898, with G.O., No. 174-A, dated 10th March 1899.

The Government gave the power for nothing for many years!

N.E.M.

Please see paragraph 3 of G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899.

The decision in G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899 (paragraph 11) regarding the charge to be made for the water supplied to the Company was based on the notes recorded by the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel and concurred in by His Excellency the Governor at pages 29–30 and 32–33 of the notes under the Government Order.

Probably no modification will be accepted here.

H.T.

The proposed charge should certainly be maintained. The amount will normally be Rs. 10,500 per annum—see paragraph 11 of the Government Order. The Secretary, Mr. Forbes, proposed an annual charge of Rs. 29,000 and showed that, after this had been levied, the Company would still have some 10 per cent. dividends to distribute (p. 20 of notes). The Company of course object to the charge fixed by Government. There is not the smallest fear of their abandoning the industry. The end will be that

6. (v) *Measurement of the water supplied to the Company*—paragraph 12 of G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899.

the Company "saying I will ne'er consent, consented!"

A.T.A.

I concur.

A.E.H.

As regards the measuring of the water, the managers of the Company represent that this is a * condition almost certain to lead to disputes, as "in fact the measuring of the quantity of water in a river is under the best conditions to a great extent approximate." The managers also take exception to the penal provisions in the Government Order for any tampering with the regulating apparatus and for failure to pay the Government dues as being very humiliating.

* I would make no change at all here. See my note on page 5 below.

A.T.A.
A.E.H.

This sounds, I submit "humbug." *

N.E.M.

No modification required.

H.T.
A.T.A.

7. (vi) *Revision of the charges at the end of seven years*—paragraph 11 of G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899 (sub-paragraph). The Government has reserved † to itself the right to revise the scale of rates prescribed in paragraph 11 of the Government Order at the end of seven years commencing from the date of notice given to the Company of the charges to be levied on it. Messrs. Harvey now state that the Company "would much prefer to have a final arrangement entered into in place of making it in force for seven years. To carry on business satisfactorily, reasonable security and finality are essential."

* Yes—but very natural. The Company of course protests all through.

A.T.A.

† No modification required.

H.T.

Certainly not.

A.T.A.
A.E.H.

8. Messrs. Harvey state in conclusion that "if Government insists in carrying out its proposals, the Company will be compelled to abandon the industry."

Orders are requested.

P.E.
17-7-99.

This statement need not be taken seriously—it is a useful phrase intended to emphasize the objections.

A.T.A.
8-8-99.

Yes.

A.E.H.
12-8-99.

To Secretary—

On the present assertions, there seems no ground to reconsider the orders passed. If practical difficulty in measuring the water is experienced, an additional lump charge may be fixed in lieu of the charge per cusec.

N. E. MARJORIBANKS.
18-7-99.

To Public Works for favour of remarks—especially as to the first marginal note to paragraph 3 of office-note.

H. TREMENHEERE.
19-7-99.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

I beg to offer the following remarks on the principal points raised by the Mills Company :—

Minimum over falls.—Hitherto the Mills Company has had enough water nearly always to work the machinery at full power, but this is only because the rule as to minimum discharge over falls has been in great measure disregarded and now that the rules are to be really enforced it may be expected that the supply to the mills will frequently be less than required. Five cusecs over the falls is, I believe, sufficient to keep the pools fresh, but there have been other considerations and Government has practically fixed the minimum for the four hot-weather months at 10 cusecs by

Much difference of opinions.

H.T.

allowing the Superintending Engineer discretion to reduce it to that quantity. The Government Order reserves to Government the power to alter the minimum over falls. Any raising of it would be fatal to the Company's business. Whether a high measure of prosperity is compatible with a strict enforcement of the present minimum discharge over falls is uncertain.

See my note above. Government must maintain the *status quo ante*; that is all.

A.T.A.

Restriction to 12 hours' supply.—I think the wording of paragraphs 10 (2) and 11 does not quite represent the intention of Government. There is nothing in the file indicating any intention of forbidding supply for a longer period than 12 hours a day, and this period seems to be fixed in order to define more precisely what is to be given for the stipulated charge. The ordinary working hours at the mills are not stated and there is therefore no information whether a 12-hours supply would usually be sufficient. The sluice will have to be kept open about an hour longer than the working hours. It may also be desired to work overtime especially when the supply is short and this can scarcely be forbidden. I beg to suggest that all reference to the hours of supply be struck out from the Government Order. If water were taken for overtime work, it would be almost impossible to say what the charge should be without keeping a time-keeper at the mills.

This may be done : see note above.

A.T.A.
A.E.H.

Charge for water.—The concession for the four months, February to May, is for 10 cubic feet per second during 12 hours a day, but the Company is permitted to ask for more and will certainly ask for what is required to work the mills at full power. The Superintending Engineer can only reply that he does not know the quantity of water which can be calculated on ; that so long as 10 cubic feet per second is allowed to pass over the falls, the Company may take what it can get up to the quantity asked for and that if the full quantity is not obtained such reduction will be made in the bills as the Government thinks fit. The Company's manager, on his part, can only in periods of scarcity adjust his work from time to time to the supply which he expects to be available. All this means that the whole of the water taken from the river would have to be measured. There is trouble, but no difficulty in this. The difficulty would lie in determining how much of the water is in excess of the concession and there might be frequent disputes about this. I strongly recommend that a charge be fixed independent of measurements.

I would not make any change in this respect. The measurement will rest with the Superintending Engineer and if any question should arise Government can be appealed to and its order must be final, for it would always be in its power to direct the Superintending Engineer *not* to exercise his discretion in favour of the Company but to send the 15 cubic feet per second over the falls.

A.T.A.
A.E.H.

The Company offers to pay a sum equal to double the income-tax or about 5 per cent on profits. This is the principle which I suggested in November 1896 as an alternative to the Collector's proposal to charge a lump sum of Rs. 5,000 and I still think it fairer to the Company whose profits are very fluctuating. I still think the charge stated in the Government Order to be too high * and likely to prevent other similar enterprises being undertaken without a strict agreement. People cannot be expected to take the risk of establishing industries in out-of-the-way, unhealthy places unless they are allowed when successful to make much larger profits than they could expect in more favoured places. If Government insists on the charge stated for the regular supply, the amount might well be allowed to cover any extra supply given in February to May.

* See note above. It is little more than one-third of what was proposed by the Secretary (Rs. 10,500 as compared with Rs. 29,000) which would still have left a dividend of about 10 per cent. Government must consider the claims of the general tax-payer as compared with the high dividends of a flourishing Company.

A.T.A.
A.E.H.

This description is not, I think, applicable here.

H.T.

I think not.

A.T.A.

See my note above on this point.
A.T.A.

The proviso that the supply can be stopped without compensation should, I think, be reconsidered.

W. HUGHES.
3-8-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

The observations of the Company, which might with more propriety have been sent directly to this Government, are directed against the terms of a G.O. (No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899) which had been most carefully considered. I think therefore that Mr. Hughes' note goes too far and would reopen too much.

But the restriction to 12 hours might be omitted with reference to the marginal note to paragraph 3 of office-note and to Mr. Hughes' remarks on the point.

The objections and suggested orders are repeated here in a convenient form—

(i)	Minimum supply over Falls ...	Cannot be reconsidered.	A.T.A. A.E.H.
(ii)	Restriction to 12 hours	May be omitted.	
(iii)	Right of Government to cut off water.	Need not be reconsidered.	
(iv)	Charge for water	Terms will be reasonable if "12 hours' condition" be excised.	No change. A.T.A.
(v)	Measurement difficult and penal provisions objected to.	Not to be reconsidered.	A.T.A. 8-8-99. A.E.H. 12-8-99.
(vi)	Revision at end of seven years objected to.		

H.T.
3-8-99.

To Hon'ble Mr. Arundel—
,, Hon'ble Mr. Winterbotham—
,, His Excellency the Governor—

Office-note with intermediate remarks.
Note by Public Works (Irrigation).
Final office-note.

H.T.
4-8-99.

I still think there is much force in the Company's objections to (iii) and (iv).

I think their proposal to make the charge some multiple of the Company's income-tax is a good one, but I am prepared to concur that the orders already passed as to this should be upheld. If the absolute right to cut off the supply at any time must be retained, I think we might reassure the Company and the public by remarking that, so far as Government can foresee, the likelihood of circumstances arising such as would necessitate the right being exercised may be regarded as extremely remote.

We might say: "It is necessary in the public interests to reaffirm this condition, but so far as Government can foresee, &c."
A.T.A.
26-8-99.

In other respects I agree.

H. M. W[INTERBOTHAM].
9-8-99.

To Under Secretary—

Please see the draft order submitted below.

P.E.
15-8-99.

To Secretary—

N.E.M.
16-8-99.

Will Irrigation kindly advise effect on scale laid down in paragraph 11 in G.O. of March 1899 will be of omitting restriction regarding 12 consecutive hours?

H.T.
19-8-99.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

I do not think the Revenue Secretary's enquiry as to the effect on the scale laid down in paragraph 11 of the Government Order of March 1899 of omitting the restriction regarding the hours of water-supply can be answered definitely. There is no information as to the ordinary working hours or the amount of over-time work. My opinion is that the removal of the restriction will make very little difference in the scale, and that it cannot make much difference unless the Company duplicates the mills and works at night. I do not think this a contingency which need be taken into account. The unhealthiness of the place in the hot weather, the high wages which would have to be paid for night work, the difficulty of getting Europeans of the kind who could be entrusted with the management of the work to undertake it, are all against the establishment of mills for all-night work.

I beg to submit that it is advisable for many reasons to substitute the temporary charge laid down in paragraph 14 of the Government Order for the scale laid down in paragraph 11. It would make no appreciable difference in the charge and do away with the necessity of measuring the water. The measuring apparatus will cost a good deal, a man on good pay will have to be kept in charge of it, and the clockwork must be expected to get out of order sometimes and a man will have to be brought from Tinnevelly to see to it.

If this proposal is not accepted paragraph 11 (*b*) should be modified and a daily instead of monthly charge fixed. It should also be added that the maximum discharge when the channel is in steady flow will be taken as the rate of discharge for each day.

W.H.
22-8-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

To Honourable Member—

H.T.
22-8-99.

1. This must go back to the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel, on whose note paragraph 11 (*b*) of G.O, No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899, is based.

The question is whether (*b*) is intelligible.

Leaving out the words "per period of twelve consecutive hours" the charge for extra water is to be "for every additional cubic foot per second a further monthly sum of Rs. 50."

If the extra water is only taken for a day, or part of a day, how is it to be charged for?

Perhaps the following will do?—

"For every additional cubic foot per second a charge of Rs. 1-8-0 per day will be made, whether the extra water be taken throughout the 24 hours or for only part thereof."

2. The Chief Engineer anticipates difficulty in measuring the water and I fear it will lead to frequent dispute.

He proposes that a lump sum of Rs. 12,000 per annum should be charged.

This would be equivalent to Rs. 125 a month for *extra* water.

If the Company always takes 5 cubic feet extra water (I believe an excessive estimate?) this would be Rs. 7-8-0 per day = Rs. 225 per month, but the cost of machinery and establishment for measuring would have to be deducted.

I think it would greatly simplify matters, without diminishing the income, if the lump sum of Rs. 12,000 were stipulated for for the next seven years.

Will Honourable Member please see if he approves paragraph 4 of the draft Government Order, as modified by me.

H.M.W.
22-8-99.

To Hon'ble Mr. Arundel—

H.T.
24-8-99.

In view of the Irrigation Secretary's renewed argument, I am ready to agree to a lump annual payment with no extra charge. To fix it at Rs. 12,000 would probably involve further correspondence and discussion, and if His Excellency and Honourable Member have no objection I would make a further concession by fixing the lump annual payment at Rs. 10,500. With this and the concession as to the hours of work, and the reassurance on page 6, we shall have gone quite as far as is necessary.

A.T.A.
26-8-99.

To Hon'ble Mr. Arundel—

Will Honourable Member kindly see whether the marginal alterations correctly represent his views?

H.T.
1-9-99.

Yes.

A.T.A.
2-9-99.

Hon'ble Mr. Winterbotham and His Excellency the Governor with reference to Hon'ble Mr. Arundel's note, dated 26th August 1899.

H.T.
H.M.W.
5-9-99.

A.E.H.
6-9-99.

Issue as revised by the Hon'ble Mr. Winterbotham.

H.T.
7-9-99.

Government {1899} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. }1899. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 601, 7th September 1899.

SEPTEMBER.

Spinning Mill at Papanasam.

Passing orders on a memorandum drawn up by Messrs. A. and F. Harvey, Managers on behalf of the Tinnevelly Mills Company, in respect of the supply of water from the Tambraparni river to the — worked by the company.

To Hon'ble Mr. Arundel—

H.T.
24-8-99.

In view of the Irrigation Secretary's renewed argument, I am ready to agree to a lump annual payment with no extra charge. To fix it at Rs. 12,000 would probably involve further correspondence and discussion, and if His Excellency and Honourable Member have no objection I would make a further concession by fixing the lump annual payment at Rs. 10,500. With this and the concession as to the hours of work, and the reassurance on page 6, we shall have gone quite as far as is necessary.

A.T.A.
26-8-99.

To Hon'ble Mr. Arundel—

Will Honourable Member kindly see whether the marginal alterations correctly represent his views?

H.T.
1-9-99.

Yes.

A.T.A.
2-9-99.

Hon'ble Mr. Winterbotham and His Excellency the Governor with reference to Hon'ble Mr. Arundel's note, dated 26th August 1899.

H.T.
H.M.W.
5-9-99.

A E.H.
6-9-99.

Issue as revised by the Hon'ble Mr. Winterbotham.

H.T.
7-9-99.

Government (1899) of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. } 1899. *Enclosures*
Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 601, 7th September 1899.

a

SEPTEMBER.

Spinning Mill at Papanasam.

Passing orders on a memorandum drawn up by Messrs. A. and F. Harvey, Managers on behalf of the Tinnevelly Mills Company, in respect of the supply of water from the Tambraparni river to the — worked by the company.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—again the following G.O., No. 174A, Revenue, dated 10th March 1899:—

Read—Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture), Mis. No. 2373, dated 4th April 1898.

Abstract.—Requesting that the Government may be pleased to address the Bombay Government for information regarding the principles on which the royalty was fixed in the case of the Gokah Mill in the Bombay Presidency, as it will be useful in fixing the charge for water supplied to the spinning mill at Pápanásam worked by the Tinnevelly Mills Company.

Read—Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture), No. 600, Routine, dated 12th May 1898.

Abstract.—Submitting certain papers called for by Government.

Read—Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture), Mis. No. 1260, dated 4th March 1899.

Abstract.—Submitting to Government, with remarks, letter from the Collector of Tinnevelly requesting orders as to the rate of charge to be fixed on the Tinnevelly Mills Company for the use of Government water from 1895.

Order—No. 174A, Revenue, dated 10th March 1899.

Miscellaneous.

The papers read above relate to the question of the charge to be made for the water supplied to the spinning mill worked at Pápanásam by the Tinnevelly Mills Company, the period of ten years for which a free grant was made having expired by the 31st August 1895. The history of the concession originally granted to Messrs. A. and F. Harvey and subsequently extended to the company for utilizing the water-power of the Tambraparni river, will first be briefly recapitulated.

2. In 1883 Messrs. A. and F. Harvey applied for permission to utilize the water of the Tambraparni river above the Pápanásam falls for working a spinning mill with turbines, promising not to pollute and not to diminish the supply. By G.O., No. 361 I., Public Works, dated 1st May 1883, they were allowed to take a supply of water without charge subject to the following conditions:—

(i) that the designs for the works to be constructed were to receive the approval of the Collector and the Superintending Engineer and to be based on the instructions of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation;

(ii) that the quantity of water to be taken off was not to exceed 10 cubic feet per second;

(iii) that the water after being used was to be returned to the river above the Kodamelalagien anicut, or, should this be impossible, was to be passed into the south channel taken off from the anicut; in the latter case not more than half the supply in the river being taken off except with the permission of the Superintending Engineer;

(iv) that Messrs. A. and F. Harvey were to agree to "bund" the south channel below the sluice which discharges into the river whenever required by the Engineer officers to do so, and were to keep the channel above the bund clear of silt;

(v) that they were to have no claim for compensation if from any cause the supply of water proved deficient; and

(vi) that they were to have a claim on the water only after public requirements had been attended to.

G.O., No. 564 I., dated 16th July 1883.
,, ,, 703 I., ,, 30th August ,,

3. Subsequently Messrs. A. and F. Harvey were informed, in reply to an inquiry made by them, that permission to use the water free of charge had been granted to the firm as the pioneers of a new industry; that in ordinary circumstances a charge would have been made for the water; that the concession granted should, however, run for a period of ten years from the opening of the mill; and that on the expiry of this period a charge would be made, but that it would not be of an amount calculated to be repressive of the development of the contemplated industry.

4. On a representation from Messrs. A. and F. Harvey, the terms of the concession were modified by G.O., No. 762 I., dated 26th August 1884. By this order the firm was allowed to take a supply of not more than 10 cubic feet per second during the dry season, *i.e.*, from the 1st February to the 31st May, and except with the permission of the Superintending Engineer not more than 20 cubic feet per second during the remainder of the year.

5. In December 1885 Messrs. Harvey reported that a company had been incorporated under the Companies Act named the "Tinnevelly Mills Company" and requested that the privileges already granted to them might be transferred to the Tinnevelly Mills Company. This request was sanctioned in G.O., No. 67 I., dated 23rd January 1886.

6. Shortly afterwards the company applied for permission to use a supply of water for working another mill at Pápanásam and to be allowed therefor an additional 15 cubic feet in the dry season and 30 cubic feet during the rest of the year. About the same time representations were received from many persons in the Tinnevelly district protesting against the utilization of the water by the company as it diminished the splendour of the Pápanásam Falls and the sanctity of the bathing pools below the falls. The Government after careful consideration of the whole matter decided that it would be inadvisable to grant any further concessions than those already granted.

7. In consequence of the representations above referred to, the question of the amount of water to be passed over the falls and the amount to be spared for the mills was again fully considered by Government in G.O., No. 490, dated 14th June 1889. In this order the Government adhered to its decision declining to concede any fresh privileges to the company. It was pointed out that the concession was granted to them on the distinct understanding that they would not be entitled to compensation in consequence of the deficiency from any cause of the supply of water and that they would only have a claim on the water after public requirements had been attended to. The concession granted to the Tinnevelly Mills Company was then more precisely defined in the following terms:—

"(*a*) A minimum supply of 15 cubic feet per second shall at all times be allowed to pass over the falls both by day and by night;

"(*b*) Subject to the above first charge on the river, the supply of water to the mills shall not ordinarily exceed by day or by night 10 cubic feet per second from 1st February to 31st May and 20 cubic feet per second during the remainder of the year, provided, however, that the Superintending Engineer may from time to time, at his discretion, increase the above supply whenever he considers that water is available, due care being taken that the prescribed minimum discharge over the falls is not diminished, and it being distinctly understood that no continuity of such additional supply is in any way guaranteed, the power to cut off the whole or any part of the additional supply at any time being vested in the Superintending Engineer;

"(*c*) No charge will be made for the supply originally granted for a period of ten years from the opening of the mill, but it must be distinctly understood that the Government reserves to itself the right to charge for that water at the end of that period and for all additional water supplied at any time after notice of intention to do so has been given."

The Government at the same time directed that steps should be taken for the construction of the necessary regulating works, but this order has been in abeyance.

8. The Tinnevelly Mills Company appealed against this decision to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India who saw no reason to interfere with the discretion of this Government in regard to the quantity of water to be supplied to the company.

Despatch from the Secretary of State for India, No. 2, dated 26th February 1891.

9. The mill constructed by Messrs. A. and F. Harvey to use the concession granted in 1883 having been practically completed for work on the 1st September 1885, the period of ten years for which a free grant was made expired on the 31st August 1895.

10. The questions now for decision are (1) whether the terms of the concession as regards the supply of water available to the Tinnevelly Mills Company should be revised; and (2) what charge should be made for the water taken by the company.

As regards the first question, the Government considers that the decision in G.O., No. 490, dated 14th June 1889, should be maintained, namely,—

(1) that a minimum supply of 15 cubic feet per second shall at all times be allowed to pass over the falls both by day and by night, but subject to this modification that Government reserves to itself full power to make in practice any alteration of the minimum which it may think fit;

(2) that, subject to the above first charge on the river, the company shall be ordinarily allowed to take, if available, for twelve consecutive hours in each day 10 cubic feet per second from 1st February to 31st May, and 20 cubic feet per second during the remainder of the year.

In confirming this concession His Excellency the Governor in Council desires that the company should distinctly understand that the Government does not guarantee the continuous supply of water, and that it reserves to itself absolutely the right at any time to cut off without payment of compensation the whole or any portion of the supply to the company, if at any time it should in the opinion of Government be necessary to satisfy public requirements. The Superintending Engineer of the Circle will be given discretion to reduce during the dry season, *i.e.*, from 1st February to 31st May, the minimum of 15 cubic feet per second which should go over the falls to 10 cubic feet per second. Subject to the conditions as to the quantity of water passing over the falls, the Superintending Engineer will also be empowered to permit the company on their written application to take, in addition to the supply ordinarily allowed, one or more cubic feet per second for twelve consecutive hours in each day for a period of not less than four months during the year.

11. Next, as regards the charge to be made for the water taken by the company, the Government considers that the Tinnevelly Mills Company should pay for water supplied under the conditions laid down in the preceding paragraph the following charges, viz., (*a*) for the supply of 10 cubic feet per second from 1st February to 31st May per day of twelve consecutive hours and of 20 cubic feet per second per day of twelve consecutive hours during the remainder of the year, an annual sum of Rs. 10,500 payable on the 1st April of each year; but if from any cause the supply has been reduced below those quantities, such reduction of the annual payment will be made as the Government thinks fit; (*b*) for every additional cubic foot (fractions being neglected) per second per period of twelve consecutive hours, a further monthly sum of Rs. 50 payable on the first day of the month succeeding that on which the water was taken.

The above scale will be in force for the next seven years from the date on which notice is given to the company under paragraph 15 *infra*; and the Government reserves to itself the right to revise the rates at the end of that period.

12. The construction of regulating works to show the quantity of water drawn off for the mills and also the amount passing over the falls up to 15 cubic feet per second becomes now most necessary. These works will be constructed at the cost of Government and will be controlled by the Public Works Department. To provide against any tampering with the regulating apparatus by the employés of the company, the Superintending Engineer, unless he is satisfied that they are in no way responsible, will be authorized to impose upon the company an additional or penal rate of Rs. 100 per diem in the event of the apparatus being tampered with and until it is restored, and also to cut off the entire supply until the amount is paid. He will also be empowered to cut off the supply on the company's failure after due notice to pay the annual and monthly charges.

13. On the execution of the agreement, orders will issue in the Public Works Department for the construction of the regulating works at a very early date.

14. Some time must elapse before the agreement is executed and the construction of the regulating works will take some further time. Until the works have been completed it will be impracticable to enforce the scale of charges laid down in paragraph 11 above. The Government accordingly considers that until the works are ready a lump charge at the rate of Rs. 12,000 per annum should be made for all water taken by the company under the conditions stated in paragraph 10 *supra* from and after the date of the notice referred to in the next succeeding paragraph below.

15. The Board of Revenue is requested to instruct the Collector of Tinnevelly to give notice *at once* to the Tinnevelly Mills Company that from the date of the notice under the terms of G.Os., No. 564 I., dated 16th July 1883; No. 703 I., dated 30th August 1883; No. 762 I., dated 26th August 1884; and No. 490, Revenue, dated 14th June 1889, and subject to the conditions and restrictions stated above, a charge for water will be levied and that the charge will be in accordance with the rates which are specified above. Any observations which the company may wish to make should be submitted without delay.

16. A draft of the agreement to be entered into with the Tinnevelly Mills Company will be drawn up in consultation with the Government Solicitor.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement,
Land Records and Agriculture).
,, the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
,, the Public Works Department.
Copy to the Collector of Tinnevelly.

READ—again the following G.O., No. 283, Revenue, dated 1st May 1899:—

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture), Mis. No. 1835, dated 7th April 1899:—

Read—again Board's Proceedings, No. 83, Press, dated 17th March 1899.

Read—also the following letter from E. SCOTT, Esq., Acting Collector of Tinnevelly, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement and Director of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture, dated 29th March 1899, Ref. on Cur. No. 348-G.B. Gen.:—

Adverting to Board's Proceedings, No. 83, Press, dated 17th March 1899, I have the honour to state that, under paragraph 15 of G.O., No. 174A, Revenue, dated 10th March 1899, a notice was sent to Messrs. A. and F. Harvey, Managers of the Tinnevelly Mills Company (Limited), Ambásamudram, on 21st March 1899.

2. I submit a copy of the reply received from the Managers.

Enclosure.

From the Managers, Tinnevelly Mills Company (Limited), Tuticorin, to the Collector of Tinnevelly, dated 25th March 1899.

We have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your No. 348-G.B.P. of 1899, dated 21st March 1899.

Referring to the proposals contained therein, the terms and conditions are so onerous, and the yearly rent so heavy that our only course is to place the question before the shareholders in England who control the company and await their instructions, and the better to attain this end, Mr. A. Harvey has resolved to proceed to England by next available steamer.

Referring to paragraph 2 of your letter calling for "any observations which the company may wish to make," we will comply with this request immediately we receive our instructions from England, but in the meantime we beg to be permitted to point out that the original Government Orders granting the concession, and on the good faith of which the industry was established, make no mention of limiting the supply to 12 consecutive hours per day, nor do they in any way limit the time for which the concession was granted, and further they guarantee that the charge to be made for the use of the water "will not be of an amount in any way calculated to be repressive of the development of the contemplated industry."

If the terms and conditions stated in the G.O., No. 174A, Revenue, dated 10th March 1899, of which you have just sent us an extract, are insisted on, we may at once say that not only will all further "development" be absolutely prevented, but an industry which has taken many years of painstaking labour to establish will be effectually stifled, and the members of about 800 families deprived of their daily bread.

Resolution—Mis. No. 1835, dated 7th April 1899.

Submitted to Government, with reference to the concluding sentence of paragraph 15 of G.O., No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. V. SRINIVASIAR,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with enclosure to Collector's letter in original.

Order—No. 283, Revenue, dated 1st May 1899.

Miscellaneous.

Recorded with the remark that under paragraph 14 of G.O., No. 174A, Revenue, dated 10th March 1899, a lump charge of Rs. 12,000 per annum should be made for all water taken by the company, pending the execution of the agreement to be entered into with it and the construction of the necessary regulating works. The Government considers that the above lump charge should be collected by monthly instalments of Rs. 1,000.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Collector of Tinnevelly.
" the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement,
Land Records and Agriculture).
" the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
" the Public Works Department.

Read—also the following despatch from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India, to His Excellency the Governor in Council of Fort St. George, dated India Office, London, 8th June 1899, No. 2, Public Works :—

Letter, dated 22nd May, and enclosure.

I transmit herewith, for the consideration of Your Excellency's Government, copy of a representation submitted to me by Sir J. Rankin, *Bart.*, M.P., on behalf of the Tinnevelly Mills Company as to the restrictions imposed by the general order of your Government, in the Revenue Department, No. 174A, of the 10th March 1899, in respect to the supply of water from the Tambraparni river to the spinning mill worked at Pápanásam by the Company.

Enclosures.

From Sir JAMES RANKIN, *Bart.*, M.P., to the Secretary, Public Works Department, India Office, dated Bryngwyn, Tram Inn, R.S.O., Herefordshire, 22nd May 1899.

At our interview last Wednesday, 17th instant, relative to the recent order of the Madras Government affecting the water-supply to the mills at Tinnevelly, belonging to Messrs. Harvey, you were good enough to say that, if they would draw up a memorandum of their observations upon this order, you thought that the Secretary of State for India would forward the memorandum to the Governor of Madras. I now beg to enclose the Messrs. Harvey's observations, and I trust that the Secretary of State will find it possible for him to send them on to Madras, asking the Madras Government not to impose such conditions as would inevitably put an end to the industry now carried on at these mills, thereby throwing some 2,000 native workers and their families out of employment and seriously discouraging the employment of British capital in India. Thanking you for your courtesy, I am, &c.

Water-supply to the Tinnevelly Mills Company (Limited).

The Tinnevelly Mills Company, Limited, having received from the Collector of Tinnevelly a letter, dated 21st March 1899, enclosing copy extract from G.O., No. 174A, Revenue, dated [illegible]th March 1899, relative to the water-supply, and requesting that any observations thereon [illegible]ch the Company might wish to make should be made without delay, the Company begs to submit the following observations :—

Quantity to go over falls.—If a minimum supply of 15 cubic feet per second is at all times to pass over the falls, it will prove fatal to the industry, as it frequently happens during the dry season that after sufficient water to drive the mill is taken there is not enough left in the river to fulfil this condition. Colonel Pennycuick, the then Superintending Engineer, in his report to Government, dated 29th July 1887, writes as follows : "The Collector agrees with me in considering that for this purpose a minimum of 5 cubic feet per second is ample, this is equal to 2,700,000 gallons per day, or the water-supply at 15 gallons per head for a city of 180,000 inhabitants.

"It is therefore suggested that this quantity be taken as the minimum to be allowed to pass over the falls.

"After this has been provided for there is no objection to the Tinnevelly Mills Company taking the full 20 cubic feet which they require so long as it is available in the river."

Further, Colonel Hasted, the then Chief Engineer for Irrigation, in his report to Government, dated 13th August 1884, writes : "I recommend that Government should extend the concession already given by allowing Messrs. Harvey & Co. the right to take 20 cubic fee[illegible] second from the river for eight months in the year, viz., from 1st June to 1st February, and that careful measurements of the discharge of the river should be made after the end of next north-east monsoon and during the dry season and compared with the rainfall of previous years in order that it may be seen whether this concession can be given for the whole year in future." The fact that for 13 years the Company has taken from the river enough water to drive the mill and that an ample quantity has at all times been left in the river to flush the sacred pool surely proves that "this concession (to take 20 cubic feet a second all the year round) can be given for the whole year."

Interpretation of G.O., No. 762 I., dated 26th August 1884.—Referring to the interpretation which Government puts upon G.O., No. 762 I., dated 26th August 1884, Colonel Hasted writes on 31st January 1890 : " . . . there can be no doubt from what is said in my notes printed with G.O., No. 762 I., dated 26th August 1884, that I contemplated allowing you to take 20 cubic feet per second from the river all the year round, free of charge for ten years, if it appeared after careful measurement of the hot weather discharge that there was a sufficient supply in the river to enable 20 cubic feet per second to be taken off without injury to existing rights." Therefore it is respectfully submitted that the true interpretation of this order is that the Company was to be allowed to take a supply of not more than 10 cubic feet per second during the dry season except with the permission of the Superintending Engineer, and not more than 20 cubic feet per second during the remainder of the year. The question of taking more than 20 cubic feet per second during the remainder of the year was never discussed. Government would hardly go out of its way to grant what was never asked for.

Restriction of supply to twelve consecutive hours per day.—To restrict the supply to twelve consecutive hours per day would be most harassing, and is in the Company's opinion contrary to G.O., No. 490 of 14th June 1889, which distinctly states " by day or by night."

Government right to stop supply.—The Government " reserves to itself absolutely the right at any time to cut off without payment of compensation the whole or any portion of the supply to the Company." The Company could not be expected to carry on business and expend capital under such uncertain conditions.

Charge proposed to be made for water.—The charge which the Government proposes to make for the water amounts to more than three per cent. on the capital of the Company; in other words, the Government proposes to take a cumulative preference dividend of over three per cent. per annum before, and whether or not, the shareholders get anything, and this from an industry which the Government has not spent a rupee to foster. Whatever charge is agreed upon should, in the Company's opinion, be dependent on the profits earned, like the income-tax.

Revision of arrangement in seven years.—The Company would much prefer to have a final arrangement entered into in place of making it in force for seven years. To carry on business satisfactorily, reasonable security and finality are essential.

Penal clause.—The penal clause is very humiliating, and the Company can scarcely be expected to place itself so absolutely at the mercy of the Superintending Engineer who may for the moment be in charge. Further, what is there in the past history and relations of the Company with the Government or any one which calls for the imposition of such a condition?

Measuring of water.—The proposed measuring of the water is a condition almost certain to lead to disputes; in fact the measuring of the quantity of water in a river is under the best conditions to a great extent approximate. The Company cannot use more water than the exact quantity required to drive the mill, and this quantity varies very little throughout the year.

To sum up: the Company requires sufficient water to drive the mill. This it has always had for the last 13 years, and for this supply the Company would be willing to pay a sum equal to double the income-tax. Thus the higher the Company's earnings the greater would be the revenue to Government. To restrict the quantity to ten cubic feet per second for four months will benefit no one, and cause the Company more loss than it could recoup in the eight months' full working, not to speak of depriving half the workers of their means of livelihood.

If Government insists in carrying out its proposals, the Company will be compelled to abandon the industry, and apart from the heavy loss to the shareholders, it means loss of employment to 1,500 to 2,000 persons, who are directly or indirectly dependent on it for their daily bread.

Surely the Government overlooks the terms of the original concession, on the good faith of which the shareholders were induced to risk their capital, and which reads that " any charge to be made would not be of a kind calculated to be repressive of the development of the contemplated industry." The present proposals will not only entirely prevent development but will stifle what has already been accomplished, and will not encourage home capitalists to risk further investments in India.

It may be pointed out that the Company has incurred an outlay of over Rs. 60,000 in erecting over the river an iron girder bridge and keeps it up entirely at its own expense. This bridge is open to all and has proved an inestimable advantage to the neighbourhood.

For Tinnevelly Mills Company (Limited),

(Signed) A. and F. HARVEY,
Managers.

ORDER—No. 601, Revenue, dated 7th September 1899.

Miscellaneous.

In the memorandum forwarded by the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India with the despatch read above, Messrs. A and F. Harvey, Managers on behalf of the Tinnevelly Mills Company, submit certain observations with reference to paragraph 15 of Government Order, No. 174A, Revenue, dated the 10th March 1899, which laid down the terms on which the concession of utilizing the water of the Tambraparni river for the spinning mill at Pápanásam would be continued to the Company.

2. *Minimum supply of water to be allowed to pass over the Pápanásam Falls.*—So early as 1889, the Government, after a careful consideration, decided in Order, No. 490, Revenue, dated 14th June 1889, that a minimum supply of 15 cubic feet per second should at all times be allowed to pass over the falls both by day and by night. The Tinnevelly Mills Company appealed to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India against the decision of the Government, but without effect (Government Order, Mis. No. 2067, Revenue, dated 25th March 1891). In defining, in March last, the terms of the concession, His Excellency the Governor in Council considered it essential in the public interests to maintain the decision arrived at in 1889 that a minimum supply of 15 cubic feet per second to pass over the falls should be the first charge on the river, subject, however, to the modification that the Superintending Engineer of the Circle might at his discretion reduce the minimum supply to 10 cubic feet per second during the dry season, namely, from 1st February to 31st May. His Excellency in Council has given careful consideration to the objections now urged by Messrs. A. and F. Harvey, but does not see any sufficient reason for modifying this decision.

3. *Charges payable for the water supplied to the Company and the restriction of the supply to twelve consecutive hours per day* (*vide* paragraphs 10 and 11 of Government Order, No. 174A, dated 10th March 1899).—On reconsideration, His Excellency the Governor in Council is willing to dispense with the condition restricting the supply of water to 12 consecutive hours per day. In modification of paragraph 10 of Government Order, No. 174A, Revenue, dated 10th March 1899, the Superintending Engineer will, subject to the conditions as to the quantity of water passing over the falls, be empowered to permit the Company on its written application to take, in addition to the supply ordinarily allowed, any additional quantity of water it may require. Further, n modification of paragraph 11 of Government Order, No. 174A, Revenue, dated 10th March 1899, His Excellency the Governor in Council is prepared to concede that the otal charge to be made for the water shall be limited to a lump annual payment of Rs. 10,500, payable on the 1st April. If from any cause the supply is reduced below 10 cubic feet per second from 1st February to 31st May or below 20 cubic feet per econd during the remainder of the year, such reduction of the above annual payment may be made as the Government thinks fit. This decision will be in force for the ext seven years from the date on which notice was given to the Company under aragraph 15 of Government Order, No. 174A, Revenue, dated 10th March 1899; and he Government reserves to itself the right at the end of that period to revise the charge made for the water.

Regulating works will now be necessary only to ensure that the prescribed inimum of water shall pass over the falls. Very early orders will issue in the ublic Works Department for the construction of such works.

In modification of paragraph 14 of Government Order, No. 174A., Revenue, dated 0th March 1899, and Government Order, No. 283, Revenue, dated 1st May 1899, a mp charge of Rs. 12,000 per annum (to be collected by monthly instalments of s. 1,000) should be made for the use of the water by the Company, up to the date on hich the Company signifies to the Collector its acceptance of the conditions now laid own.

4. *Right of the Government to restrict or cut off supply of water.*—In paragraph 10 of Government Order, No. 174A, Revenue, dated 10th March 1899, the Government reserved to itself the right to cut off without payment of compensation the whole or any portion of the supply of water to the Company, if at any time it should, in the opinion of the Government, be necessary to satisfy public requirements. With reference to the objections urged by the Company against the right in question, the Company's attention will be drawn to the fact that this is no new condition, it having been laid down in Government Order, No. 361 I., dated 1st May 1883, in which Messrs. A and F. Harvey were originally allowed to utilize the water of the Tambraparni river for the spinning mill at Pápanásam. Substantially the same condition was repeated in

Government Order, No. 490, Revenue, dated 14th June 1889. It is necessary to reaffirm this condition, but so far as the Government can foresee, the likelihood of circumstances arising such as would necessitate the exercise of the right reserved by the Government may be regarded as extremely remote.

5. The objections urged by the Company to a measuring of the water and to the penal provisions for tampering with the regulating apparatus will be largely removed by the present orders. As regards the objections urged against the penal provisions for failure to pay the Government dues, and against future revision of the charges payable by the Company, the Government does not consider that the Company has adduced any sufficient grounds for modification of the previous orders.

6. The Collector of Tinnevelly is requested to ascertain and report at an early date whether the Company assents to the terms defined in G.O., No. 174A., Revenue, dated 10th March 1899, as modified by the present order, so that action may be taken without further delay for the preparation of a draft of the agreement to be entered into with the Company.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) H. TREMENHEERE,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement).
" the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
" the Public Works Department (Irrigation).
" the Collector of Tinnevelly.
Copy to the Managers, Tinnevelly Mills Company,
through the Collector of Tinnevelly.

Exd. A. Rungasawmy Aiyangar

50 Copies.

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED.
- Order complete,
- Letter only.
- Order complete with Letter

READ AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
190 .

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

[illegible]EMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.