

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 4570

DATED 21st November 98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Stating that in the circumstances
reports the part of compensation
also 3 ^{sanctions} for certain lands affected by the Bill and
may be given effect to

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 5896.

Read again G.O. No. 1375 of 18-3-98
1648 of 15-4-98.
B.P. No Refee 926 of 19-8-98.
(C.No 5896)

From The Board of Revenue,
Land Revenue
Madras.

Order issue No. 4570 of 21st Nov 1898.

In the circumstances reported
in the last of the papers read
above the grant of compensation
already sanctioned may be

Ref No. 926.

Dated 19th Aug.

Received 22nd

Registered 23rd

Enclosures 4.

Spare copies

given effect to.
The Collector to submit all claims for compensation
in similar cases to the
most careful scrutiny
with the fact of flooding
being established to be
crops of land and to be
fully and established.

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Govt. a report
on the subject of compensa-
tion for damage caused
by the Periyar water in
the Madurai District.

The Board of Revenue (Madras)
The P. W. D.
18-11-98

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Ref. on C.No. 344/Board &
Govt. of 98.

Madura Collector's Office,

26th July 1898.

From

J.G.D. Partridge Esqr.,

Acting Collector of Madura

To

The Secretary to the Commissioners of
Land Revenue, M a d r a s.

Sir,

In reply to the Board's reference dated 20th April 1898 No. 445, I have the honour to state that the only village in which the lands below the Uttamuthu anicut were damaged by the introduction of Periyar water into the Suruliyar is Kaneayagoundanpatti; that Mr. Grimley on personal inspection recorded that the lands in this village were washed away and damaged by the Periyar water. It is also reported that the river bed below the Uttamuthu anicut is not sufficiently wide to carry the large supply of Periyar water and this was the cause of the damage done to the adjacent lands as shown in the rough sketch enclosed. Similar damage was caused to some of the lands in 1884 owing to heavy floods in the Suruly river and in consequence the assessment was remitted in the years 1884 and 1885 but no remission was granted in the subsequent years up to 1895 when the Periyar water was let down for the first time. In these ~~xxx~~ circumstances I consider that it is clear the damage was caused by Periyar water and that the objection of the Chief Engineer to payment of compensation cannot be maintained. The statements are re-submitted.

I have the honour to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

(Sd) J.G.D. Partridge,

Acting Collector.

Madras, 19th August 1898. 189

READ— Letter from J.G.D. Partridge Esquire, Acting Collector of Madura, Ref. on C.No. 344 B. and G. of 98, dated 26th July 1898.

Reference No. 926 dated 19th August 1898.

In its order No. 1375 Mis. Revenue dated 18th March 1898, Government sanctioned the proposals submitted by the Collector of Madura for the payment of compensation for damages caused by the Periyar water. On receipt of an office note from the Chief Engineer for irrigation stating that it was necessary strictly to limit the admission of claims against the project to losses conclusively proved to be due to it and that all claims for loss by floods below the Uttamut anicut were highly disputable, Government in its order No. 1648 Mis. Rev. dated 15th April 1898 called for the Board's remarks on the Chief Engineer's note and directed that in the meantime the proposals already approved should be held in abeyance.

2. The letter read above is the report by the Collector of Madura submitted with reference to the G.O. last referred to. He states that the only village below the Uttamut anicut in which compensation for damage has been claimed is Kamaiyagoundanpatti and that Mr. Grimly, the Ag. Sub Collector, was satisfied, after personal inspection,

Compensation proposed for crops destroyed in fasli 1306. ---Rs. 51-7-"
Do. for lands left waste and for wet lands culti-

tion, that the damage in this village had been caused by Periyar water. Mr. Grimly appears to have reported that the river-bed below the Uttamut anicut is not sufficiently wide to carry the

vated with dry crops---
Rs.53-8-0.

additional supply of Periyar water and
the Collector concurs in his opinion
that the damage was due to Periyar water
on the ground that no similar loss has
been caused since 1884 when there were abnormally heavy floods in
the Suruli river. The Board sees no reason to differ from the Col-
lector and accordingly recommends the grant of the compensation al-
ready sanctioned.

Lonel Davidson
Acting Secretary.

To

The Secretary to Govt.R.D.with a sketch indicating the damage
caused in the Kamaiyagoundan village by Periyar water and 3 compen-
sation stat^s (to be ret^d.)



Exd 1009

Revenue Department

B.P. Refe no 926 of 19-8-88
(C. no 5896)

To ~~the~~ Under Secy.:

A perus of the
correspondence on the subject of
granting compensation for
damage caused by the Periyar
water is given in the B.P. read
above. The question now for
consideration is whether the
proposals approved in G.O. no
1375 of 18-3-98, which was
ordered to be held in abeyance
in G.O. no 1648 of 15-4-98
may now be given effect to.
The local officers are of opinion
that the amount then proposed
cannot equitably be reduced
and the Board concurs in this
view. Submitted that the
P.W.D. Irrigation Branch may
be requested to state whether
it sees any objection

W.P.
31-8-98

Secy

W.P.

19/8

To Secy to Govt. R.D.

C 17/9

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION.

Copy 5th Sept 1898.
Madras,

OFFICE NOTE No.

Circulation Register.

To	From	Despatch Date.	Receipt Date.
The Secy to Govt Revenue Dept.	The Acting Joint Secy to Govt P. W. D. Irriga Branch	6.9.98	

KEEP-WITH.

No.

, dated

189 .

Your office Note of 1.9.98
on B2's Memo No 926 of 19.8.98

Not knowing the locality
it is not easy to give an opinion
but I fully agree with Mr Hughes
that claims of the kind should
not be readily admitted. I
should have supposed and
in fact am strongly inclined
to believe that the land in
question would derive
more benefit (by deposit of
silt) from Periyar floods
than otherwise.

2. From Madras collector's
letter No 4467 of 29 Nov 1897, it
appears that Rs 556-1-0

is

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION.

Copy 5th Sept 1898.
Madras,

OFFICE NOTE No.

Circulation Register.

To	From	Despatch Date.	Receipt Date.
The Secy to Govt Revenue Dept.	The Acting Joint Secy to Govt P. W. D. Irriga Branch	6.9.98	

KEEP-WITH.

No.

, dated

189 .

Your office Note of 1.9.98
on B2's Memo No 926 of 19.8.98

Not knowing the locality
it is not easy to give an opinion
but I fully agree with Mr Hughes
that claims of the kind should
not be readily admitted. I
should have supposed and
in fact am strongly inclined
to believe that the land in
question would derive
more benefit (by deposit of
silt) from Periyar floods
than otherwise.

2. From Madras collector's
letter No 4467 of 29 Nov 1897, it
appears that Rs 556-1-0

is

J. C. (unclear)
 (Lt. Joint Secy & Capt.
 P. W. D. Briggs)
 Branch
 5/9/55

S
 Recd. Recreation Department
 To the Under Secy. of the Dept. of the Interior
 Wash. D. C.

In S.O. No. 13758/18-3-98

the Com. approved the 'Bowed' proposals for the grant of compensation for damages caused by Perizor water as detailed below.

Loss of crops owing to submergence in fash	}	Rs 556-11
130 5. and 130 6.		
lands left waste and wet lands cultivated with	}	520-11 6
dry crops in f 130 6		
Total		1076-7

2. The Chief Engineer for
Immigration pointed out that it
was necessary strictly to limit
the admission of claims against
the project to losses conclusively
proven to be due to it and that
all claims for loss by floods
before the attainment of more
highly disputable. In 1902
164 & 15. 4. 1902 the Board of
Revenue was asked to report
on

718 ~~Fr~~ March 98. ~~926~~
 N.A. 3.10.98 N.C. 3/10/98



169

29.5.58

Secy

Am

24/11/17

Handwritten signature: *Handwritten signature*

4B

3079/8

Very

878

Placed in $\Sigma 0. 1375. 2 \text{ } 18.3.58 \text{ } A$

Iⁿ loc. of crops,

(a) Remit the assessment payable to Govt is whether wet or dry + water rate or dry

(b) ~~that~~ ^{Pay} in all cases
an amount equal to the web

assessment as compensation
for the ryots net profit.
(6) ^{Pay further} ~~Rebate~~ a similar
amount as compensation
for the ryots expenditure
on his crop.

As regards (a) no
remarks seem called for;
this remission is obviously
fair & it will be seen
from an examination
of statement A accompany-
ing the Collector's letter
that it has already
been granted in many
cases at Jamabandi.

As regards (b), the
theory is ~~inadequate~~ that
the net profit is equal
to the assessment. The
Collector follows this in
his recommendation for
compensating the loss of a
wet crop. But he proposes
to grant the same amount,
viz. the amount of the wet
assessment, as compensation
for the loss of dry crops
whether irrigated or not,
grown on the wet land.

This proposal may pass if it is submitted, for it is rarely the case that the ryots net profit is so low as the assessment & (2) dry assessment + water rate sometimes differ but little from the wet assessment.

As regards (c) this amounts practically to taking 33.3% of the gross produce to represent the cultivation expenses. This no doubt is somewhat high; but it may be remembered that in all these cases some outlay in the shape of field repairs will have been necessary ~~therefore~~ to remedy the damage done by the flooding.

II For waste.

Here the compensation amount consists of items a) & (b) of I only & not

item (c). Where no presumption as to crop arises from the history of the field for the past few years, no compensation is given for (b) net profit. For damage caused by floods.

In the assess is in practice much less than the half net, more like 33% over all. *S.H.*

In recent assessments I think it will be found that cultivation expenses are always reckoned at about 1/3rd of the gross cultivation. *M.D.*

* vayal maramat

11 flooded. The amounts proposed must vary with the circumstances of each case & the local estimates must, submit, be accepted.

II £0. 1375. 8 18-3-98 was not circulated to the Hon. Mr. G. 1002. It is a "list" £0.

M.L.
12-11-98
20 the Hon. Mr. G. 1002. *S.H.* 15/11/98

I consider that the compensation must be sanctioned *M.D.*
12-11-98

In under-leaf. Please see Draft 3.0. submitted on the Docket of C. 2. 58.96. *M.L.* 15.11.98. See *M.L.* 18.11.98
M.L. 22/11/98

When given for copying _____
When copied _____ 189 .
When examined _____
When signed _____

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

MENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

LETTER 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.