Revenue (189 7) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 4992

DATED 23 Sept^r

[Despatch Abstract.]

Approving the proposals of the Coll^r of Coimbatore to augment the establishments sanctioned in G.O. no 2230 dated 8th June 1896, for distribution of water under the Thadagalli and Arakankottai Channels at an additional cost of Rs 262 and 78 respectively & to levy irrigation cess on the acreage under the channels at one anna & one anna three pies, with effect from Fasli 1307.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Local & Munl. (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 6953

REC'D GOVT. MADRAS 12 AUG 97

From

The Offg. Accountant-General
Fort Saint George.

Order

No. LFD / 328

Dated *11th August 1897.*

Received 12.8.97

Registered 14.8.97

Enclosures *Three.*

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Forwarding for Sanction of Government Board of Revenue's Support on proposals of the Collector of Trichinopoly regarding the rates of cess to be levied under certain channels under the Irrigation Cess Fund &c

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	2230		8-6-96
	2625		11-7-96
	253		10-5-96
	532		6-2-96
	55		30-1-96

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Form B

Statement proposing expenditure for which provision has not been made in the budget for 1897-98 and which cannot be met from anticipated savings under the grant head

Amount of Allotment required	Major head under which the expenditure will fall	Explanation as to why no reappropriation within the budget grant is considered possible	Major head from which transfer to meet the charge is ordered. (Entry to be made in this office by Government alone)
Rs 438	Irrigation Cess Fund 45 Civil works	The budget grant is expected to be fully utilized and cannot be reappropriated. The only source from which this additional charge can be met is the balances under the Fund.	

Coimbatore Collectorate
Office 12 June 1897

Deputy Collector

Collector

S.S.S.

Form B

Statement proposing expenditure for which provision has not been made in the budget for 1897-98 and which cannot be met from anticipated savings under the grant head

Amount of allotment required	Major head under which the expenditure will fall	Explanation as to why no reappropriation within the budget grant is considered possible	Major head from which a transfer to meet the charge is ordered. ~~to be~~ (Entry to be made by Govt alone)
Rs 438	Irrigation Cess Fund 45 Civil works	The budget grant is expected to be fully utilized and cannot be reappropriated. The only source from which this additional charge can be met is the balance under the Fund.	

Coimbatore Collector's Office 12th June 1897

S.S.S.

Deputy Collector

[signature]

Collector

[initials] 11/6/97.

Rev

…vision of Establishment.

Pay.		Proposition.						Grounds of proposition.	Recommendations of the District Board and orders of Government.
		Permanent.		Temporary.					
		Increase per month	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.		Decrease per month.			
…o.	Maximum.	Amount.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.	Period.	Amount.		
	RS.	RS.	RS.		RS.		RS.		
	136	"							
	4	4		To be entertained for 4 months from May to August during the year					
	4	4		do for 8 months from August to March during the year					
	6	6		do for 6 months from May to October during the year					
	6	6		do for 5 months from April to August during the year					
	12	12		do for 9 months from July to March during the year					
	168	32							
	48	"							
	6	6		To be entertained for 6 months from May to October during the year					
	54	6							
	15	15		To be retained throughout the year					

…rs of this office and are correct with the exception of the items altered in red ink."

Dy Collector

[illegible signature]
Collector

Statement of Proposition for R…

Order sanctioning present establishment		Office to which the proposition refers.	Nature of Charge.						
			Present scale.				Proposed scale.		
			No.	Designation.	Pay.		No.	Designation.	Mini…
No.	Date				Minimum. + increment	Maximum.			+ incre…
					RS.	RS.			RS.
G.O. No 2688 W	28/10/1895	Edapalli Main and Branch Channel Establishment in the Satyamangalam Taluk under the Superintendence of the Revenue Dept.	34	Niranis at Rs 4 each	- -	136	34	Niranis at Rs 4 each	-
							1	Nirani on Rs 4	-
							1	do	-
							1	Nirmaniyar on Rs 6	-
							1	do	-
							2	do at Rs 6 each	-
						136			
embodied in B.P. No 4646 Mis R.S. L.R. & Agri dated 18/11/95 6618 Mis 4-12-95		Arakankottai Main and Branch Channel Establishment in the Satyamangalam Taluk under the Superintendence of the Revenue Dept.	12	Niranis at Rs 4 each	- -	48	12	Niranis at Rs 4 each	-
							1	Nirmaniyar on Rs 6	
							1	Head Maniyar for the supervision of both the channels	-

"Certified that the entries in the column of 'Present scale' have been compared with regis…

Coimbatore Collector's Office 12 June 1897

S.S.S.

Statement of Proposition for Revision of Establishment.

Order sanctioning present establishment No.	Order sanctioning present establishment Date	Office to which the proposition refers.	Nature of Charge — Present scale: No.	Present scale: Designation.	Present scale: Pay. Minimum.	Present scale: Pay. Maximum.	Proposed scale: No.	Proposed scale: Designation.	Proposed scale: Pay. M
		Oodapatti main and branch Channel Establishment in the Satyamangalam Taluk under the Superintendence of the Revenue Dept	34	Sircars at Rs 4 each	"	136	34	Sircars at Rs 4 each	
							1	Sircar on Rs 4	
							1	—— do ——	
							1	Sirmoniagar on Rs 6	
							1	—— do ——	
							2	— do — at Rs 6 each	
G.O. No 2688/97	28/10/1895					136			
		Arakankottai main and Branch Channels Establishment in the Satyamangalam Taluk under the Superintendence of the Revenue Dept	12	Sircars at Rs 4 each		48	12	Sircars at Rs 4 each	
							1	Sirmoniagar on Rs 6	
							1	Head Monigar for the Supervision of both the Channels	

Proposition. Permanent. Pay. Minimum.	Permanent. Pay. Maximum.	Permanent. Increase per month. Amount.	Permanent. Decrease per month. Amount.	Temporary. Increase per month. Period.	Temporary. Increase per month. Amount.	Temporary. Decrease per month. Period.	Temporary. Decrease per month. Amount.	Grounds of proposition.	Recommendations of the District Board and orders of Government.
Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs.		Rs.		
"	136	"							
-	4	4						To be entertained for four months from May to August during the year	
-	4	4						- do - for 8 months from August to March during the year.	
-	6	6						do for 6 months from May to October during the year	
-	6	6						do for 5 months from April to August during the year	
	12	12						do for 9 months from July to March during the year	
	168	32							
-	48	"							
-	6	6						To be entertained for 6 months from May to October during the year	
	54	6							
	15	15						To be retained throughout the year -	

"Certified that the entries in the column of 'Present scale' have been compared with reg ers of this office and are correct with the exception of the items altered in red ink."

Coimbatore Collectors Office 12th June 1897

By Collector

Collector

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

1897.

Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture),

MADRAS.

Recd.	1897.	*Enclosures*
Regd.		*Spare copies*

Printed August th.

Proceedings, 14th July 1897, No. 504.

JULY.

Irrigation Cess Fund.—Submitting for the sanction of Government, with the Board's support, proposals from the Collector of Coimbatore regarding the rates of cess to be levied under the Thadapalli and Arakankottai channels under the — and the establishment required for supervising the distribution of water in the branch channels.

ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE
4 AUG 97
MADRAS

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture).

Read—again the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), dated 5th October 1896, Mis. No. 4819 :—

Read—the following letter from H. BRADLEY, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of R.S., L.R. and Agri., dated 2nd August 1896, Ref on Cur. No. 2697 B.-Rev. :—

With reference to the correspondence ending with B.P., dated 8th April 1896, Mis. No. 1740 (Settlement), I have the honour to enclose a copy of a letter No. 293-M., dated 28th July 1896, from the Superintending Engineer with its enclosure, and to request the orders of the Board.

2. When the proposal that the Public Works Department should take over the management of the water distribution in the Arakankottai, Thadapalli and Kalingaroyan channels was first made, I sent in proposals based upon the assumption that the Public Works Department would only relieve us of a very few of the sluices, but was officially informed by the Superintending Engineer that the Public Works Department intended to undertake the whole management of the sluices. This was especially laid down in a letter, dated 23rd April 1895, No. 1541, from the Executive Engineer to the Superintending Engineer, a copy of which was sent to me, in which the following passage occurs, "The intention of Government apparently is that the complete control of the distribution of water in these channels should vest in this department, the Revenue Department being concerned only with distribution to fields."

3. Nothing can be clearer than this, and accordingly in my letter to the Superintending Engineer, Ref. on C. No. 894-Rev., dated 24th May 1895, I wrote, "I now understand that you propose to undertake the whole management of the sluices in all the three channels, and I assume that you will also undertake the management of all sluices in the branch channels, and my proposals in this letter will be based upon these assumptions."

4. It was in connection with my first proposals, that B.P., dated 31st May 1895, Mis. No 2772, was passed, and I beg to draw attention to my letter, No. 1406-Rev., dated 8th June 1895, replying to this Board's Proceedings. Accordingly, my revised proposals were accepted by the Public Works Department, the old establishment was dispensed with, the new establishment taken on, and the irrigation cess fixed in the Government Order communicated to me in the Board's Proceedings quoted in paragraph 1 above.

5. I am now suddenly informed that the Public Works Department is only going to undertake the management of the sluices in the main channels, and I am called upon to manage all the other sluices. This cannot be done with the existing establishment, but before making proposals for increasing it, I request the orders of the Board on the main question, whether the Revenue Department is to have the management of any of the sluices or not, and, if so, whether the cost is to be defrayed by an irrigation cess, or by a grant from public funds.

6. If the Public Works Department only undertakes the sluices in the main channels, it is absurd for the Chief Engineer to pretend that it is with the object of preventing waste of water that he wishes the Public Works Department to undertake the distribution work—*vide* paragraph 2 of his note No. 62-E.W., dated 1st October 1895, printed in G.O., No. 2688, Public Works, dated 28th October 1895. For, there is no difficulty in the distribution of water in the main channels, and it is in the branches that the difficulty really exists. In the Thadapalli channel there are over 40 miles of branch channels irrigating an ayacut of over 7,000 acres and containing 850 sluices. This represents something more than half the ayacut and nearly two-thirds of the sluices. It will thus be seen that the Chief Engineer now proposes to undertake less than half the work on this channel. I have no details for the other two channels.

7. I do not think that it is fair to ask the Revenue Department to undertake the control of the sluices in the branch channels, while that of those in the main channels is under the Public Works Department. For, it is customary in seasons of short supply, to fill the branch channels by closing the sluices in the main channels, and, unless the control of all is in the hands of one department, it is impossible to expect the work to be satisfactorily done. There is one other way of meeting the case in the smaller channels, by laying down fixed turns for distribution and leaving it to the villagers themselves, to see that those arrangements are not deviated from.

8. I request that early orders may be passed on this reference, as it may be expected that there will be trouble in distribution in September and the early part of October, and if it is decided that the Revenue Department is to do the distribution, additional establishment will be required.

Reference on the above, dated 18th August 1896.

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for favour of very early remarks.

(Signed) R. V. SRINIVASIAR,
Secretary.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, with two enclosures in original to be returned.

Read—the following letter from Colonel R. R. E. DRAKE BROCKMAN, R.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), dated Madras, 8th September 1896, No. 393-M. :—

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your reference, dated 18th August 1896, on G. R. No. 4475 of 1896, and to state that it is impossible for this department to enter upon the task of minor distribution after the water has left the sluices in the main channel. This can be done as in every district, and even in the Kistna and Gódávari deltas, by the Revenue Department and heads of villages. The duty of Public Works officers will be limited to seeing that no more water is allowed to pass through a sluice in the main channel bank than is commensurate with the total acreage under it. As to the division of this water after it has left the main channel, the Revenue Officials are the best judges. The waste of water from the main channel is prevented by the action taken in regulating the discharge through the head sluices of each particular area, and the Revenue Department and village officers must afterwards arrange to see that no waste occurs in the distributaries. A "mamool nama" can be drawn up for each sluice, otherwise a table of discharges, and this will be followed by the Public Works official in charge. If the supply in the main channel is deficient for all the acreage at one and the same time, turns can be arranged for the several reaches of the main canal in communication with the Revenue Officials and on their requisition.

2. The Collector will see from this, that the "absurdity" of the previous statement made by me cannot be established, and I must take exception (and in this, I trust, the Board will support me) to his method of thus expressing himself in connection with anything I may have written on technical matters connected with distribution of water.

3. As requested, I return the enclosures received with your reference.

Enclosure No. 1.

From J. HANNAN, Esq., Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated 28th July 1896, No. 293-M :—

With reference to your letter, dated 23rd May last, No. 894/1895, I have the honour to point out that in paragraph 2 of Chief Engineer's note printed with G.O., No. 2688-W., dated 28th October 1895, it is laid down that only the main channels were to be regulated by this department. In the proposition statement of establishment submitted by me and printed in the same Proceedings I allowed for an establishment for regulating not only the main but also the

distribution channels, namely 28 miles of distributaries under the Thadapalli and four under the Arakankottai and this establishment was duly sanctioned. On receipt of your letter above quoted, reference was made to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation. I enclose you a copy of his reply in which he again states that only the main channels are to be regulated by this department. Under these circumstances, I request that you will be good enough to attend to the regulation of the distributaries. It will, as you point out, be necessary for you to increase your Nírání establishment. I will be able to make a reduction, but only in that portion of the sanctioned establishment which is to be charged to "works," namely, in the number of lascars or "Nirânies." You will have to entertain Monegars to supervise and niranies to work the regulation in the distributaries. The result will be a considerable excess in establishment over and above what it was when the entire regulation was entrusted to your department.

Enclosure No. 2.

Memorandum No. IV—16 C. F.

With reference to his endorsement, No. 101-I., dated 5th June 1896, the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, is informed that it is intended that the Public Works Department control should be restricted to the Kalingaroyan, Thadapalli and Arakankottai channels.

2. The distribution by the establishment maintained under the orders of the Public Works Department should be confined to the main channel and the sluices in its bank. The minor distribution will be looked after by the establishment maintained under the Revenue Department.

(True Copy.)

Ootacamund,
15th June 1896.

(Signed) F. J. WILSON,
Asst. Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

(True Copy).

(Signed) J. HANNAN,
Superintending Engineer, IV Circle.

Read—the following letter from H. BRADLEY, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of R.S., L.R. and Agri., dated 21st September 1896, Ref. on Cur. No. 2697 H-Rev. :—

In continuation of my letter Ref. on Cur. No. 2697 B.-Rev., dated 2nd August 1896, I have the honour to report, for the information of the Board, that the Executive Engineer and myself have arranged between us to work the channels in question for this season, *i.e.*, till the end of March 1897.

Resolution—dated 5th October 1896, Mis. No. 4819.

In the circumstances reported by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation in his letter read above, the Board agrees with him that the distribution of water after it leaves the main channels should be undertaken by the Revenue Department.

2. The Collector is accordingly requested to submit, in due course, proposals for the entertainment of the required additional establishments. If, as the Board apprehends, the cost of the additional establishment cannot be met without a re-imposition in the case of the Kalingaroyan channel and the imposition at higher rates in the case of the Thadapalli and Arakankottai channels, of the cess ordered to be abolished in the former case and levied after the expiry of a certain period in the latter, in G.O., No. 2230, dated 8th June 1896, communicated in B.P., dated 20th June 1896, No. 3073, the Collector should also submit definite proposals as to the period from, and the rate at which, the cess should be levied under the several channels. The total cost of the establishment required under each channel should be debited to the Village Service Fund and the Irrigation Cess Fund in the manner laid down in G.O., No. 845, Revenue, dated 25th September 1893, communicated with B.P., dated 27th October 1893, No. 435.

3. It is observed from the Collector's letter last read above that he has arranged with the Executive Engineer to work the channels in question for this season.

4. With reference to paragraph 2 of the notes of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, the Board agrees with that officer that the expression objected to should not have been used by the Collector.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) R. V. SRINIVASIAR,
Secretary.

To the Collector of Coimbatore.
„ Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Read—again the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), dated 8th March 1897, Mis. No. 1712 :—

Read—the following letter from H. BRADLEY, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of R. S., L. R. and Agri., dated 15th October 1896, Ref. on C. No. 2697 (K)-Rev. :—

I have the honour to submit the report called for in B.P., dated 5th current, Mis. No. 4819 (Sett.).

2. In the case of the Kalingaroyan channel there appears to be no necessity for reviving the Irrigation Cess, as the contribution from Village Service Fund is sufficient to meet the cost of the field distribution establishment as reported in my letter, dated 19th March 1896, No. 4781-C., Revenue. There has been no increase of work to this establishment in consequence of the proposals of the Chief Engineer approved by the Board as all the sluices take off the main channel.

3. With regard to the Thadappalli and Arakankottai channels, a statement showing the additional establishments required for doing the additional work now thrown on the Revenue Department and their cost is attached. In preparing this statement, the Kugalur branch channel, which is ten miles long, is treated as a main channel and the Executive Engineer has not objected to this being done. I request the Board's approval thereto and for sanction to entertain the establishment required as noted in the list. The present proposals are only tentative and have been made on the lowest possible scale. It may be found necessary to increase them after some experience.

4. In my letter quoted in paragraph 2 above, it was stated that Rs. 408 and Rs. 216 were required from Irrigation Cess Fund to meet the cost of field distribution establishment for the Thadapalli and Arakankottai channels, respectively, in addition to the contribution from Village Service Fund. The cost of the establishment that will, therefore, be required now is Rs. 408+198=Rs. 606 in the case of the Thadapalli channel and Rs. 216+30=Rs. 246 in the case of the Arakankottai channel. The rate of cess to be levied on Thadapalli channel lands ought to be fixed at 9 pies an acre, and in the Arakankottai channel at 1 anna an acre. The cess should be collected in the case of these two channels after the termination of the period of suspension of the cess ordered in G.O., No. 55, dated 30th January 1895, *i.e.*, from fasli 1307 in the case of the Thadapalli channel lands, and from fasli 1306 in the case of those of Arakankottai.

5. I regret that I should have annoyed the Chief Engineer by the use of the expression "absurd" in connection with any proposals of his. I wrote somewhat warmly as the changes that have been caused by the Public Works Department in connection with this matter are subversive of discipline. Nothing can be more unsatisfactory than the abolition of a menial establishment which has to be entertained again almost immediately and I cannot see why the Collector of a District should be expected to quietly accept and rectify, without protest, the mistakes committed by the Public Works Department. For I do not suppose it will be contended that I was not misled in this matter.

6. Lastly, I submit that it would be equally possible for the Public Works Department to prevent waste by attending to the quantity of water sent down the channels at the anicut, and keeping the whole of the distribution work under one department or the other, I do not care which. The division of responsibility between the two departments, which is sure to lead to friction between the Tahsildar and the Public Works Department subordinates, and which is never likely to work smoothly, is what I object to.

ENCLOSURE.

List of establishment required for supervising the branch channels under the Thadapalli and Arakankottai Main channels.

Name of the branches.	Length of the branches in miles.	Number of villages irrigated.	Number of sluices.	Ayacut.	Details of establishment now existing.				Details of additional establishment proposed to be entertained.				Remarks.
					Name of post.	Number.	Monthly pay.	Total cost in a year.	Name of post.	Number.	Monthly pay.	Period to be retained during the year.	Total cost in a year.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Thadapalli Main channel.				Acs.			Rs.	Rs.			Rs.		Rs.	
Singaiyen branch	5	4	70	450	Niranies ..	3	4	144	Nirmonegar ..	1	6	Five months.	30	From June to October.
Sholamadevi and Bodichimanpalayam, Sinnavaikal	Miles. 5	3	188	1,105	Do. ..	4	4	192	Nirmonegar ..	1	6	Eight months.	48	From August to March.
Puliampatti surplus	1½								Niranj ..	1	4	Do.	32	
Puliampatti channel	2												80	
Sengalorai Sinnavaikal	3	1	35	600	Do. ..	2	4	96	No additional establishment is necessary. Village is uninhabited.					
Agraharakarai surplus and the side channel	8	3	142	1,992	Do. ..	4	4	192	Nirmonegar ..	1	6	Eight months.	48	From August to March.
Perundalayur surplus ..	Miles. 7	3	148	760	Do. ..	3	4	144	Nirmonegar ..	1	6	Four months.	24	From May to August.
Ammapalayam branch ..	1½								Niranj ..	1	4	Do.	16	
													40	
Arakankottai Main channel.														
Vaniputhur branch	4	2	77	150	Do. ..	2	4	96	Nirmonegar ..	1	6	Five months.	30	From June to October.
Grand Total ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	228	

Reference on the above, dated 2nd November 1896.

The Chief Engineer for Irrigation is requested to favour the Board with his remarks on the Collector's proposal in paragraph 2 to treat the Kugalur branch channel as a main channel, and on the suggestion in paragraph 6 that the whole of the distribution work might be kept under one Department.

(Signed) R. V. SRINIVASIAR,
Secretary.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, with statement
(to be returned).

Read—the following letter from W. HUGHES, Esq., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of R.S., L. R. and Agri, dated Madras, 5th February 1897, No. 56-M. :—

In reply to reference from the Board of Revenue, No. 6209, dated 2nd November 1896, regarding regulation of distribution from certain channels in Coimbatore District, I have the honour to forward herewith for information a copy of the Executive Engineer's letter No. 165, dated 13th January 1897. From this it will be seen that the sluices in the Kugalur channel are now regulated by the Public Works Department and if the Revenue Department desires it or has no objection, the Public Works Department can also take charge of the regulation of the Thadapalli side channel.

2. As to the general question raised by the Collector I do not consider it practicable for the Public Works Department to manage the distribution from the small channels and if the separate control now exercised by the two departments should prove unworkable (I see no reason at present for expecting this) Government might be moved to alter the arrangement sanctioned in G.O., No. 2688-W., dated 28th October 1895. I do not think there are at present any grounds for bringing the matter again before Government.

ENCLOSURE.

From A. A. G. MALET, Esq., Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division, to the Superintending Engineer, IV Circle, dated 13th January 1897, No. 165.

With reference to your No. 710-C.I., dated 5th December 1896, I have the honour to point out that the information called for in Chief Engineer's Memorandum No. 20-C.I., dated 10th August 1896, was given in my No. 4155, dated 5th December 1896.

2. Apparently the other points on which a report is required are—

(1) What arrangements have been made (with the Revenue Department) for the regulation of the distribution.
(2) How these arrangements are working.
(3) Whether it has been found possible to properly apportion the discharge through the sluices of the main channel.
(4) Whether there is any objection to treating the Kugalur branch channel as a main channel for purposes of regulation.

3. As regards (1) the Public Works Department now regulate the sluices in the three main channels and also the only branch of the Kalingaroyan channel, which is four miles long, and the Kugalur branch of the Thadapalli channel, which is ten miles long.

The other branches of the Thadapalli channel, the Vaniputhur, which is the only branch of the Arakankottai channel, and the subsidiary distribution of all the three main channels is now being regulated by the Revenue Department.

4. As regards (2) the arrangement has worked satisfactorily; but this, in my opinion, is chiefly due to the season having been a favourable one.

5. As regards (3) I would point out that only a portion of the Thadapalli channel has been re-sluiced and that many of the sluices in the first 11½ miles of the Thadapalli channel which were put in some 3 or 4 years ago are more or less damaged.

Nothing has as yet been done towards re-sluicing the Arakankottai and Kalingaroyan channels. It is not therefore possible to properly apportion the discharge through the sluices of the main channels.

6. As regards (4) I see no objection to treating the Kugalur branch as a main channel for purposes of regulation.

7. Until the re-sluicing of each main channel has been completed, I do not think it would be advisable for the Public Works Department to take over the distribution under the rest of the branch channels except the Thadapalli side channel. This side channel has been sluiced but the sluicing is not very satisfactory, and I consider it would be advisable for the Public Works Department to take up its regulation for purposes of observation and experiment.

Resolution—dated 8th March 1897, Mis. No. 1712.

The Chief Engineer's letter read above will be communicated to the Collector with reference to paragraphs 2 and 6 of his letter first read above, and he will be requested to report whether he has any objection to the proposal of the Public Works Department to take charge of the regulation of the Thadapalli side channel also. If he sees no objection, he will be requested to report what modification will be necessary in the establishment proposed for supervising the branch channels under the Thadapalli channel and in the rate of cess to be levied.

2. With reference to paragraph 2 of the Chief Engineer's letter read above, the Collector will be requested to submit a report, after the lapse of one year, as to how the arrangement sanctioned in the Government Order communicated with B.P., dated 4th December 1895, No. 6618, has worked.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. V. SRINIVASIAR,
Secretary.

To the Collector of Coimbatore.
Copy to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Read—also the following letter from H. BRADLEY, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement and Director of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture, dated 10th May 1897, Ref. on Cur. No. 2697 (P.)-Rev. of 1896 :—

With reference to paragraph 1 of B.P., dated 8th March 1897, Mis. No. 1712 (Sett.,) I have the honour to submit the following report.

2. There is no objection to the Public Works Department taking charge of the Thadapalli side channel as proposed by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation. If this be done no reduction can be effected in the strength of the channel establishment working under the Revenue Officers as it is reported that the side channel gave very little work to the Nir-monegar whose time was chiefly occupied with the Agraharakarai surplus channel. He can be made to also supervise the Sengalarai Sinna Vaikal, three miles long, for which no provision was made before. The Tahsildar reports that at the time he submitted his proposals for the management of the work of field distribution last year, he overlooked the necessity for the appointment of a Head Monegar to supervise the work of the different Nir-monegars and to be available on the spot at the inspection of the channels by the Public Works Department officers in connection with complaints. He can furnish reports as to the condition of crops, &c., and help the Public Works Department officers in the regulation of the supply of water in all the reaches on those occasions.

3. He also considers that his proposals ought to have provided for the inspection of the channels for purposes of repairs before they are opened for cultivation and that

the Nir-monegars, five in number, should be entertained a month earlier, *i.e.*, before water is let into the channels. I agree with these proposals. Those made last year were merely tentative.

4. The additional establishment he asks for will cost Rs. 210 a year, as shown in the margin. I submit them for the Board's favourable consideration.

	Rs.
One Head Monegar on Rs. 15 per mensem	180
Five Monegars on Rs. 6 each for one month	30
Total ...	210

5. The cost of the establishment that will be required to look after the field distribution of water in the Thadapalli and Arakankottai channels to be paid from the Irrigation Cess Fund will then be Rs. 408 + Rs. 402 or Rs. 810 in the case of the former, and Rs. 216 + Rs. 36 or Rs. 252 in the case of the latter channel, as shown in the enclosed statement. The cess may be fixed at 1 anna an acre in the case of the Thadapalli channel, whose acreage is 13,231 and at 1 anna 1 pie in case of the Arakankottai channel, whose acreage is 3,819. It should be collected from fasli 1307.

6. With reference to paragraph 2 of the B.P., I have the honour to state, that as observed by the Executive Engineer in paragraph 4 of his letter, No. 165, dated 13th January 1897, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, this year was a specially favourable one; the channels had a good supply of water during the year and there was no occasion for complaint of insufficiency of water in these channels. It is impossible to form a satisfactory opinion on this year only. If it be considered necessary that a report should be submitted after another year's experience, the fact will be borne in mind.

ENCLOSURE.

LIST of establishment required for supervising the branch channels under the Thadapalli and Arakankottai main channels in the Satyamangalam taluk.

Name of the branches.	Length of the channels.	Number of villages irrigated.	Number of the sluices.	Ayacut.	Details of establishment formerly existed.		Details of establishment now existing.		Details of additional establishment proposed to be entertained.					Remarks.
					Name of post.	Number.	Name of post.	Number.	Name of post.	Number.	Monthly payment.	Period to be retained during each year.	Total cost in a year.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
	MLS.			ACS.									RS.	
Lingien branch	5	4	70	450	Nir-monegar .	1	Niranies ..	3	Nir-monegar .	1	6	6 months.	36	From May to October.
					Nir-kattis ..	4								
Perundalayur surplus and Ammapoliem branch.	8½	3	148	750	Nir-monegar .	1	Niranies ..	3	Nir-monegar.	1	6	5 ,,	30	From April to August.
					Nir-peon ..	1			Nirany ..	1	4	4 ,,	16	From May to August.
					Nir-katti ..	2								
Agraharakarai surplus and Sengalarai Sinna Vaikal.	7	3	153	1,032	Nir-monegar .	1	Niranies ..	4	Nir-monegar.	1	6	9 ,,	54	From July to March.
					Nir-peon ..	1								
					Nir-kattis ..	6								
Solamadevi and Bodi Sinnampoliem Sinna Vaikal, Puliyampatti surplus, Puliampatti channel.	8½	3	188	1,105	Nir-monegar .	1	Niranies ..	4	Nir-monegar .	1	6	9 ,,	54	From July to March.
					Nir-peon ..	1			Niranies ..	1	4	8 ,,	32	From August to March.
					Nir-katti ..	4								
Vaniputhur branch	4	2	77	150	Nir-monegar .	1	Niranies ..	2	Nir-monegar .	1	6	6 ,,	36	From May to October.
					Nir-peon ..	1								
					Nir-kattis ..	2								
													258	
									Head-monegar.	1	15	12 ,,	180	
Total ..	..	..	..	..		..		..		..	..		438	

BOARD OF REVENUE (REV. SETT., L. RDS. AND AGRI.), 14TH JULY 1897, No. 504. 11

Reference on the above, dated 31st May 1897.

The Collector is requested to submit a proposition statement in duplicate in form A appended to the G.O., communicated with B.P., dated 23rd October 1896, No. 398 (L.R.), for the establishment proposed for supervising the branch channels in the Thadapalli and Arakankottai channels.

2. The acreages under the channels referred to in paragraph 1 above, reported in the Collector's letter read above, differ from those reported in paragraph 4 of his letter disposed of in B.P., dated 8th April 1896, No. 1740. The Collector is requested to explain the discrepancies.

(Signed) R. V. SRINIVASIAR,
Secretary.

To the Collector of Coimbatore.

READ—also the following letter from H. BRADLEY, Esq., Collector of Coimbatore, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture, dated 24th June 1897, Ref. on C. No. 2697 (S)-Rev. of 1896:—

With reference to B.P., Ref. on Genl. Regr. No. 3526 of 1897, dated 31st ultimo, I have the honour to submit herewith a proposition statement in duplicate in forms A and B for the establishment proposed for supervising the branch channels in the Thadapalli and Arakankottai channels.

2. The figures given for the acreage under the two channels reported in this office Ref. on C. No. 4781-(C)-Rev. of 1895, dated 19th March 1896, were those of the Superintending Engineer, whereas those reported in this office Ref. on C. No. 2697 (P)-Rev. of 1896, dated 10th May 1897, are Tahsildar's. The figures given by the latter do not include the inam and dry area irrigated from the channels. The inam area under the Arakankottai and Thadapalli channels is 120 and 456 acres respectively. It is reported that the figures given by the Superintending Engineer are not accurate.

STATEMENT of Proposition for Revision of Establishment.

Order sanctioning present establishment.		Nature of charge.	Proposition.									
			Present scale.			Proposed scale.			Permanent.		Temporary.			
Number.	Date.	Office to which the proposition refers.	Number.	Designation.	Pay.	Number.	Designation.	Pay.	Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Grounds of proposition.	Recommendation of the Board of Revenue.	Order of the Local Government.
					Minimum and increment. Maximum.			Minimum and increment. Maximum.	Amount.	Amount.	Period. Amount.	Period. Amount.			
	25th October 1895.	Thadapalli main and branch channel establishment in the Satyamangalam taluk under superintendence of the Revenue Department.	34	Niranis at Rs. 4 each ..	Rs. Rs. .. 136	34	Niranis at Rs. 4 each ..	Rs. Rs. .. 136	Rs. ..	Rs. ..	.. ..	.. ..			
						1	Niranir on Rs. 4 ..	.. 4	.. 4	..	..	..			
						1	Do.	.. 4	4	..	To be entertained for four months from May to August during the year.	..			
						1	Nirmonigar on Rs. 6 ..	.. 6	6	..	To be entertained for eight months from August to March during the year.	..			
						1	Do.	.. 6	6	..	To be entertained for six months from May to October during the year.	..			
						2	Nirmonigars at Rs. 6 each.	.. 12	12	..	To be entertained for five months from April to August during the year.	..			
							Total ..	.. 168	32	..	To be entertained for nine months from July to March during the year.	..			
	25th October 1895.	Arakankottai main and branch channel establishment in the Satyamangalam taluk under the superintendence of the Revenue Department.	12	Niranis at Rs. 4 each ..	.. 48	12	Niranis at Rs. 4 each ..	.. 48	..	..	..	..			
						1	Nirmonigar on Rs. 6 ..	.. 6	6	..	To be entertained for six months from May to October during the year.	..			
							Total ..	.. 54	6	..	..	..			
						1	Head monigar for supervision of both the channels.	.. 15	15	..	To be retained throughout the year.	..			

G.O., No. 2685-W., embodied in B.P., Mis. No. 6618 (R.S., L.R. and Agri.) dated 4th December 1895.

"Certified that the entries in the column of 'Present scale' have been compared with registers of this office and are correct with the exception of the items altered in red ink."

(Signed) HERBERT BRADLEY,
Collector.

RESOLUTION—dated 14th July 1897, No. 504.

Submitted for the orders of Government with reference to the correspondence ending with G.O., No. 2230, dated 8th June 1896.

2. In its order quoted above, Government sanctioned the abolition of the cess under the Kalingaroyan channel, and the re-imposition of the cess under the Thadapalli and Arakankottai channels, at the rate of 6 pies and 1 anna per acre, after the expiry of the period of suspension sanctioned in G.O., No. 55, dated 30th January 1895. It was thought at the time that after the transfer to the Public Works Department of the control over the distribution of water in the main channels, the work which remained for the Revenue Department could be managed by establishments costing, respectively, Rs. 120, Rs. 136 and Rs. 48 per mensem for the three channels mentioned above; and that as the contributions from the Village Service Fund had been fixed at Rupees 2,258, Rs. 1,224 and Rs. 360 there would be no need to levy any cess under the Kalingaroyan channel, and in the case of the other two channels for which the contribution from the Village Service Fund required to be supplemented, the additional amounts required, viz., Rs. 408 and Rs. 216 per annum, could be raised by the imposition of a cess of 6 pies per acre in the case of the Thadapalli channel, and of 1 anna per acre in the case of the Arakankottai channel. A difference of opinion having, however, subsequently arisen between the Revenue Department and the Public Works Department as to the agency by which the management of sluices should be undertaken, the Collector, in his letter read in B.P., dated 5th October 1896, No. 4819, reported that he was suddenly informed that the Public Works Department would undertake the management of the sluices in the main channels only, and submitted for the orders of the Board the question whether the Revenue Department was to have the management of all other sluices and, if so, whether the cost of the additional establishments which will have to be maintained in the Revenue Department was to be defrayed from the Cess Fund or by a grant from public funds. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to whom the Collector's letter was referred for favour of remarks, reported that it was impossible for the Public Works Department to enter upon the task of minor distribution after the water had left the sluices in the main channel. This work, he thought, should be done by the Revenue Department, the duty of the Public Works Department being limited to seeing that no more water was allowed to pass through a sluice in the main channel than was commensurate with the total acreage under it. The Board, in its Procs., dated 5th October 1896, No. 4819, read again above, agreed with the Chief Engineer that the distribution of water after it leaves the main channels should be undertaken by the Revenue Department and called on the Collector to submit in due course proposals for the entertainment of the required additional establishments and as to the period from, and the rate at which, the cess should be levied under the several channels. In submitting his proposal in his letter, No. 2697K-Rev., dated 15th October 1896, disposed of in B.P., dated 8th March 1897, No. 1712, read again above, the Collector reported that there was no necessity for reviving the irrigation cess in the case of Kalingaroyan channel, that in regard to the other two channels, viz., Thadapalli and Arakankottai, Rs. 606 and Rs. 246 would be required to meet the cost of the establishment to be debited to the Irrigation Cess Fund and that the rate of cess ought to be fixed at 9 pies and 1 anna an acre, respectively. In submitting these proposals, the Collector had also asked for the approval of the Board as to treating Kugalur branch channel as a main channel. The Collector's letter was referred to the Chief Engineer, and as he stated that the sluices in the Kugalur channel were being regulated by the Public Works Department and that if the Revenue Department desired it or had no objection, the Public Works Department could also take charge of the regulation of the Thadapalli side channel, the Board in its Procs., dated 8th March 1897, No. 1712, asked the Collector to report whether he had any objection to this proposal; and, if not, to state what modification would be necessary in the establishment proposed for supervising the branch channels under the Thadapalli channel and in the rate of cess to be levied. In his letter, No. 2697P-Rev., dated 10th May 1897, read above, the Collector reports that there is no objection to the Public Works Department taking charge of the channel, but that no reduction in consequence can be proposed in the strength of the establishment

under the Revenue Department, as the side channel gave very little work to the Nir-monegar. He also supports the Tahsildar's proposal to appoint a Head Monegar "to supervise the work of the different Nir-monegars and to be available on the spot at the inspection of the channels by the Public Works Department officers in connection with complaints," and to entertain the five Nir-monegars proposed in his previous letter a month earlier, to enable them to inspect the channels for purposes of repairs before they are opened for cultivation. He estimates the total cost of the establishment to be paid from the Irrigation Cess Fund at Rs. 810 in the case of the Thadapalli and Rs. 252 in the case of the Arakankottai channel and proposes that the cess may be fixed at 1 anna an acre in the case of the former and at 1 anna 1 pie in the case of the latter, and that it should be collected from fasli 1307. The Board supports the proposals of the Collector which are well considered, and submits them for the sanction of Government. The necessary proposition statement is also submitted.

Please see C.P. 7400/97 Letter received

3. From the proposition statement submitted by the Collector, it is observed that the Head Monegar proposed to be entertained is to supervise both the channels; while from his letter, No. 2697P-Rev., dated 10th May 1897, it would appear that the cost would be debited wholly to the Thadapalli channel. The Board sees no reason why the cost should not be debited to the two channels in proportion to the acreage under them. The Collector will be requested to report further on the matter.

Reported (C.P. 7400/97)

C.M. 7400/97

(True Copies and Extract.)

R. V. Srinivasan

Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
through the Accountant-General with a
proposition statement in duplicate.

" Collector of Coimbatore.

Endorsement

No. 270/328

Forwarded to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department

Fort St George, Acct Genl's Office, 11th August/97

Fair

J.H. Manison

Offg. Accountant-General

Regr's clerk
To be disposed of along with
cur. 69 of 1897
27-8-97

8093

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 7400

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS * REVENUE DEPARTMENT * 26 AUG 97

Order

From

The Board of Revenue
Revenue Settlement,
Land Records & Agriculture
Madras.

No. 6807 Mis:

Dated 25th August 1897

Received 26-8-97

Registered 27-8-97

Enclosures

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Irrigation Cess

Submitting to Government with remarks letter from the Collector of Coimbatore reporting that the pay of the Head Monigar should be debited to both the Channels and that the rate of cess under the Arrakankottai Channel should be levied at 1 anna 3 pies.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
B(P)	504	—	14-7-97)

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

(Sett. 24 2,000—

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE. MADRAS.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture.)

Dated 25th August 1897.

No. 6807 mb.

READ the following letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, def: on cur: No. 26975/Rev, dated 14th August 1897:—

With reference to the closing sentence of para 3 of B. P. (Sett:) No. 504, dated 14th July 1897, I have the honor to state that the pay of the Head Monigar should be debited proportionately to the two channels. In that case, Rs 140 should be debited to the Thadappalli channel, and Rs 40 to the Arrankankottai channel, according to the acreage under them. So, the amounts that will have to be collected as Irrigation so to meet the cost of the Establishment under the Revenue Department are Rs 408+222+140 or 770. in case of the Thadappalli, and Rs 216+36+40 or 292 in case of the Arrankankottai Channels. The cess may therefore be fixed at the amo

an acre, on lands under the former channel and at one anna three pies, an acre under the latter.

Resolution

Submitted to Government in continuation of the Board's Proceedings quoted by the Collector.

2. In the circumstances reported by the Collector in his letter read above, the Board recommends that sanction may be accorded for the levy of the irrigation cess in the case of the Arakkankottai channel, at 1 anna and 3 pies instead of at 1 anna and 1 pie as proposed in para 2 of Board's Proceedings No. 604, dated 14th July 1897.

(True copy and extract)

R. V. Srinivasaiah
Secretary

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue department

Copy to the Collector of Coimbatore.

VDC 8-9

Date.

The Hon'ble Mr. J. Grose C.S.I.E

Flag A

JG
22/9/97

C. Nos.6953 and 7400 of 1897.

- : -

G.O. No. Rev 4992 d/28 Sept 97

The Collector's proposals to augment the establishments sanctioned in G.O. No.2230, dated 8th June 1896 for distribution of water under the Thadapalli and Arakankottai channels, at an additional cost of Rs.362 and 76 respectively and to levy irrigation cess on the acreage under the channels at one anna and one anna three pies, with effect from fasli 1307, are approved, as recommended by the Board of Rev.

To the Board of Revenue (Rev.Sett &c
" P.W.Dept. (Irrigation)
" Accountant-General.

dno.28-9-97

Note.

Please see G.O. No.2230 Mis. dated 8th June 1896 and the note thereunder.

2. In his letter under that order, the Collector of Coimbatore reported that the establishments to be entertained in the Revenue Department for purposes of field distribution of water under the Thadapalli and Arakankottai channels

Flag A

14/9/97

channels, would cost Rs.1632 and 576 - respectively but as the contributions - from the village service fund in the -- case of the two channels amounted to only Rs.1224 and 360 respectively, he suggested that the balance of the amount -- viz: Rs.408 and 216 be raised by the levy of irrigation cess at the rates of 6 -- pies and one anna on the acreage under the two channels respectively. These proposals were approved by Government in - its order quoted above. It would appear that when he made the above proposals, the Collector was under the impression that the Public Works Department would undertake the management of all the --- sluices in the channels and that the Revenue Department was concerned only with the distribution of water to fields. The Collector now reports that he has since learnt from the Public Works Department that that Department is to undertake the management of the sluices in the main -- channels only and that the Revenue Department has to manage all other sluices including field distribution; that the establishment already sanctioned is -- therefore insufficient and that it ---- should be augmented at an additional -- cost of Rs.362 and 76 respectively. If this

this is allowed, the expenditure to be met by levy of irrigation cess would be Rs.770 and 292 instead of Rs.408 and 216 as originally supposed. To meet this additional expenditure the Collector suggests that the cess be levied from fasli 1307 on the acreage under the two channels at one anna and one anna & three - pies respectively instead of at 6 pies and one anna as ~~previously proposed~~ sanctioned.

3. The Collector's present proposals are ~~supported~~ by the Board and may, it is presumed, be sanctioned.

4. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation, in para 2 of his note No.62 E.W. d/1.10.95, printed at page 3 of G.O. No.2688 W. - dated 28th October 1895 which was communicated to the Collector through the Board, clearly stated that the Public Works Department would undertake the ~~xxx~~ control over the distribution of water until it leaves the main channels and that subsequent distribution should as hitherto be managed by the Revenue Department. But the local P.W.D. officers seem to have misunderstood the matter and misled the Collector.

5. A summary of the correspondence on the subject which took place between the Collector, the Board of Revenue -

and

and the Chief Engineer for Irrigation - since the issue of G.O. No.2230 dated 8th June 1896, is given in para 2 of the --- Board's Resolution under C.No.6953/97.

C.R.
9 Sep 97

[illegible] 8/9/97

Flag A

When given for copying ___
When copied ___
When examined ___
When signed ___
} 189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No DATED 189 ,

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .. A A A A A A A

[...]ER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

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

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only