Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 2711

DATED 27th June

[Despatch Abstract.]

Canning to the Bd of Rev. Proc. of the Financial Dept. considering that the charge on account of compensation for lands in certain villages in the Cumbum valley injured through submersion by the Periyar water should be treated as part of the expenditure of the Periyar project & should not be debited to Land Rev.

Revenue 1898 Department

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Government (1898) of Madras.

FINANCIAL.

5/27/11/98

Recd. 17 June } 1898. Enclosures
Regd. — Spare copies

G.O., No. 498, 2nd June 1898.

G.O Irrn No. 2711 d/27th Nov 98
Communicated to the
Board of Revenue

JUNE.

14th
2 61

Ref

To the B? of Revenue (A. R) = 2510-
5 6 98

14th 23/11/98

Compensation for Lands.

Considering that the charges on account of — in certain villages in the Cumbum valley injured through submersion by the Periyár water should be treated as part of the expenditure of the Periyár project and should not be debited to 3. Land Revenue.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers :—

G.O., Mis. No. 1375, Revenue, dated 18th March 1898.

Read—the following reference on Genl. No. 5822 of 1897, dated 14th January 1898, from the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue) on the following letter from the Collector of Madura, Dis. No. 4167, dated 24th November 1897 :—

I have the honour to submit the following proposals for payment of compensation for lands in certain villages in the Cumbum valley on which the crops were destroyed or which were left waste owing to their submersion by the Periyár water.

2. The Board is aware that the Periyár project was opened in October 1895 and that the whole of the Periyár water was sent down through the Vyravanar and Surulyar streams into the Vaigai. The beds of these streams being too small to contain the Periyár water, the water overflowed its banks and inundated the cultivated lands on either side until it cut a channel for itself. The destruction of crop occurred in 1895 over an area of 17·08 acres in Keelagudalur, Cumbum and Kamaiya Koundanpatty villages partly in October 1895 when the Periyár water was let down for the first time into Surulyar and partly before 15th December 1895 when the river, full already of Periyár water, was swelled by heavy rains. The head sluice in the Periyár lake was closed for annual repairs on the 15th December 1895 and was not opened till towards the 22nd of June 1896. When it was re-opened there was a further destruction of seedlings or sproutings over a considerable area which were sown in July 1896 and which were destroyed very soon after they were sown. The extent over which the crops were destroyed in June, July and August 1896 was 48·40 acres in Keelagudalur and Naranathenanpatty villages. In December 1896 the second crop over a further extent of 2·20 acres was destroyed in the Cumbum village. The total extent over which crops were destroyed in both the faslis was 67·68 acres.

3. In addition to this destruction of crop, some of the lands were rendered either permanently or temporarily unfit for cultivation owing to the deposit of silt or owing to their having been washed away to form the river-bed in which the water is now flowing. The list of lands to be permanently acquired for the bed of the river can be made out only after the Public Works Department has determined on the extent necessary. This could not be determined in 1895 as the course of the river was then uncertain. In the season of 1896, the river had cut a channel for itself which will be more or less its permanent course, so that it is now possible to determine the extent of land to be acquired permanently. The Executive Engineer has promised to submit definite proposals for the acquisition of lands permanently rendered unfit for cultivation by the action of the Periyár works after an accurate survey is made. But there is no reason why compensation for the destruction of crops and for waste due to the submersion of the land should not be given at once. Following the precedent laid down by the Settlement Commissioner in a somewhat similar case in Mangulam village in the Madura taluk, I suggested to the Sub-Collector that compensation should be given for actual loss of crop at the rate of three times the assessment and for waste at twice the assessment, while the compensation for lands rendered unfit for cultivation by silt has been fixed at a sum equal to the cost of removing the silt. A few modifications of this general principle are required in the case of wet lands cultivated with dry crops. In determining the amount of compensation for loss of crops the following rates have been adopted :—

(1) *In single crop wet lands*—
  (*a*) For first or second crop wet, three times the wet assessment.
  (*b*) For irrigated dry crops, twice the wet assessment + dry assessment and dry water-rate.
  (*c*) For unirrigated dry crops, twice the wet assessment and dry assessment.

(2) *In compounded wet lands*—
  (*a*) For first or second crop wet, three times single wet assessment.
  (*b*) For irrigated dry crops, twice single wet assessment + dry assessment and dry water-rate.

(3) *In double crop wet lands*—
  (*a*) For first or second crop wet, three times single wet assessment.
  (*b*) For irrigated dry crops, twice single wet assessment + dry assessment and dry water-rate.

As for waste the following rates have been adopted :—

(1) In single crop wet lands, twice the single wet assessment.
(2) In compounded wet lands—
  (*a*) where second crop was raised in any of the previous five years, twice the compounded charge.
  (*b*) where no second crop was raised in any of the previous five years, twice the single wet assessment.
  (*c*) where no crop was raised during the previous five years, no compensation.
(3) In double crop lands, twice the double crop charge for waste in both seasons, and twice the single wet assessment for waste in one season.
(4) In dry lands—
  (*a*) If crop was raised in any of the previous five years, twice the dry assessment.
  (*b*) If no crop was raised during the previous five years, no compensation.

5. Where dry crops were raised on single crop wet lands and dry assessment only was charged at jamabandy, twice the difference between dry and wet has been recommended as compensation.

Adopting these rates, the Sub-Collector has submitted the enclosed three statements (*a*) for lands on which crops were destroyed, (*b*) for lands left waste, and (*c*) for lands requiring clearance of silt before they are again rendered fit for wet cultivation. From these statements it will be seen that the net amount of compensation to be given excluding the remissions already granted for 131·81 acres of land left waste comes to Rs. 520–6–0 in fasli 1306, and Rs. 556–1–0 for the 67·68 acres of land on which crops were destroyed in faslis 1305 and 1306. The cost of clearance of silt on 2·51 acres of land rendered temporarily unfit for cultivation is estimated at Rs. 336.

6. I request that the rates proposed may be approved and that the Public Works Department may be directed to place the amount of compensation of Rs. 1,076–7–0 at my disposal, as I presume the amount should be debited to the project.

Reference, dated 14th January 1898.

Submitted for the orders of Government.

2. The Board recommends that the Collector's proposals may be approved and that a sum of Rs. 1,076–7–0 may be ordered to be placed at his disposal for payment of compensation for damage caused by the Periyár water as detailed in the margin.

	Amount still due. Rs.	A.	P.
Loss of crops owing to submergence in faslis 1305 and 1306.	556	1	10
Lands left waste and wet lands cultivated with dry crops in fasli 1306	520	6	0
Total ..	1,076	7	0

3. The Collector presumes that the amount should be debited to the project. But the Board considers that the charge should be debited to land revenue to which head the sale-proceeds of waste lands benefitted by the Periyár channel are being credited (*vide* paragraph 3 of G.O., No. 1026, Revenue, dated 7th October 1892).

Order—Mis. No. 1375, Revenue, dated 18th March 1898.

The Collector's proposals which are supported by the Board of Revenue are approved.

2. The question of the incidence of the charge will be considered in the Financial Department.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) N. E. MARJORIBANKS,
for *Ag. Secretary to Government.*

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), with enclosures.
" Financial Department.
" Public Works Department.

Endt. No. 816.

Referred to the Accountant-General for remarks, to be forwarded through the Public Works Department. It is not clear why the charges should be debited to 3. Land Revenue (Provincial), instead of to the working expenses of the Periyár project itself (Imperial). The special circumstances under which the sale-proceeds of waste lands were credited to 1. Land Revenue in 1892 do not appear to apply to the present case.

(Signed) A. T. ARUNDEL,
Chief Secretary.

1*st April* 1898.

G.O., Mis. No. 1648, Revenue, dated 15th April 1898.

Read—the following office-note from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, No. 123, dated 5th April 1898.

With reference to G.O., Mis. No. 1375, dated 18th March 1898, approving of the payment of Rs. 1,076-7-0 for loss of crop and silting of lands by water from the Periyár lake, I beg to point out the necessity of strictly limiting the admission of any claims of this sort to what can be conclusively proved to be due to the cause asserted. I do not mean to express any doubt of the equity of paying the amount sanctioned in this case and in fact have only an imperfect idea of the locality where the crops are alleged to have been destroyed, but I happen to have heard sometime ago that large, and, in my opinion, unfounded, claims are to be made.

On the banks of the Vyravanar down to its junction with the Surulyar about one and a half miles above the Uttamut anicut I expect there will be many places where land or crops have been injured, but I should say ryots holding lands below this junction would have very great difficulty in proving that loss is due to Periyár water. While the Periyár works were in progress, the Uttamut anicut was rebuilt to its former length and also an additional anicut was built. Not only this, vents were made in the anicut capable of discharging all the Periyár water without the water level rising to crest level and these were intended to be kept open—and presumably have been—throughout the Periyár irrigation season. The maximum flood discharge is calculated to be 11,000 c. ft. per second, the ordinary flood discharge would perhaps be a fourth of this. The Periyár discharge is 1,100 c. ft. per second. It follows that the addition of the Periyár water would not raise the level of ordinary floods at all at the anicut and but to a small extent between the anicut and the Surulyar-Vyravanar junction.

I think all claims for loss by flooding below the Uttamut anicut are highly disputable and if any such claims are to be sent up for Government orders, I beg you will allow me to express an opinion on them.

Order—Mis. No. 1648, Revenue, dated 15th April 1898.

The office-note from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation read above will be referred to the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue) for very early remarks. The proposals approved in paragraph 1 of G.O., No. 1375, dated 18th March 1898, should, in the mean time, be held in abeyance.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) N. E. MARJORIBANKS,
for *Ag. Secretary to Government.*

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).
" Public Works Department.
" Financial Department.

From the Accountant-General, Madras, dated 11th May 1898, No. 1842.

From T. H. BIGGS, Esq., Accountant-General, to the Chief Secretary to Government (through the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department), dated Fort St. George, 29th April 1898, No. 1677.

With reference to the memorandum from Government, No. 846, Financial, dated the 1st April 1898, forwarding Government Order, No. 1375, Revenue, dated the 18th March 1898, for report as to which department should bear the charge on account of compensation for lands in certain villages in the Cumbum valley injured through submersion by the Periyár water, I have the honour to report that as the charge is incidental to the execution of the Periyár project, it should, in my opinion, be treated as a part of the expenses of the project and debited to the Public Works Department. The enclosure to the memorandum under reference is herewith returned.

Forwarded to the Chief Secretary to Government, Financial Department. It seems right that charges for injury to crops when this is due to Periyár water should be debited to the project, but in the case of lands destroyed or rendered permanently unfit for cultivation, it would seem right to debit compensation to the head to which the sale of waste lands benefitted by the project is credited. I believe the project is credited with 4 per cent. annually on the amount realized by the sale of waste lands.

(Signed) W. HUGHES,
Chief Engineer, Irrigation Branch.

OOTACAMUND,
14*th May* 1898.

ORDER—No. 498, Financial, dated 2nd June 1898.

The Government considers that the charges on account of compensation should be treated as part of the expenditure of the Periyár project and should not be debited to 3. LAND REVENUE.

(True Extract.)

A. T. Arundel.
for *Chief Secretary.*

To the Revenue Department.
" Public Works Department.

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

: highly
:rs, I beg

ıen given for copying ——
ıen copied ——
ıen examined ——
ıen signed ——
} 183

AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
183 ,

RENT No.

OURSE TO C. No.

R OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
ER OF GOVERNMENT.							
MENT WITH DITTO.							
BE NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.							

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
? = Copy abstract only.
= Copy heading only.