

42
20.8.37
3

M.B.O. 1-32,000-16-10-29.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Pulakrishnan DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1237	Press Mis.
Dated	11 th June	1957.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

11
11/8/57

Bowlandrain
11th June 1857.

Memorandum

in
Mr Golding's Report on Radium
9th July 1857.

Among various papers connected with this subject, I find this one, not only as ~~being~~ ^{being} the one of highest authority, but ~~also~~ ^{also} as it seems to me to offer the best ground for giving my opinion on the leading points in this question.

I must premise that I shall upon this as nothing less than the point question whether an extensive system of irrigation and navigation is really calculated to produce the results which its advocates have expected from them, and therefore whether it is advisable to extend them throughout India. That great effort should be made to get ^{and} ~~and~~ of the results they may have produced is of course to be expected, for all who have held opposing opinions or who have ~~dislike~~ ^{dislike} to any thing that has the nature of an innovation must be under a strong bias to underrate results, which ~~to~~ ^{to} show they were mislabeled. And even many who have not opposed, may be led to take a false view either from the influence of others, or

These causes. — In this way however the point
and is gained. of accurate description being brought
to bear upon this subject; and thus the truth is
put in a strong light; for ~~no body~~ ^{no body} is fully satis-
fied of any thing, or ought to be, till he has heard
what an opponent has to say. ~~It~~

3. Mr. Goldingham wrote his report
under instructions to ascertain accurately what the
effects of the great work are. — In Para 6 and 7
we give the extent of land occupied and un-
occupied in the Rajahmundry Delta, the ^{former} 27,500
acres, the latter 5,300. — This is one of the ~~most~~
instances, in this report of returns, ~~statements~~ which
really have nothing to do with the ~~matter~~ ^{point} that is
this area? ^{Article} it is not the area of the ^{point}
^{of the Delta in 1854} ¹⁵⁰⁰
Delta, which contains 60,000 square miles, and there-
fore not small under ^{700,000} ^{100,000} ^{150,000} ^{200,000} ^{250,000} ^{300,000} ^{350,000} ^{400,000} ^{450,000} ^{500,000} ^{550,000} ^{600,000} ^{650,000} ^{700,000} ^{750,000} ^{800,000} ^{850,000} ^{900,000} ^{950,000} ^{1,000,000} ^{1,050,000} ^{1,100,000} ^{1,150,000} ^{1,200,000} ^{1,250,000} ^{1,300,000} ^{1,350,000} ^{1,400,000} ^{1,450,000} ^{1,500,000} ^{1,550,000} ^{1,600,000} ^{1,650,000} ^{1,700,000} ^{1,750,000} ^{1,800,000} ^{1,850,000} ^{1,900,000} ^{1,950,000} ^{2,000,000} ^{2,050,000} ^{2,100,000} ^{2,150,000} ^{2,200,000} ^{2,250,000} ^{2,300,000} ^{2,350,000} ^{2,400,000} ^{2,450,000} ^{2,500,000} ^{2,550,000} ^{2,600,000} ^{2,650,000} ^{2,700,000} ^{2,750,000} ^{2,800,000} ^{2,850,000} ^{2,900,000} ^{2,950,000} ^{3,000,000} ^{3,050,000} ^{3,100,000} ^{3,150,000} ^{3,200,000} ^{3,250,000} ^{3,300,000} ^{3,350,000} ^{3,400,000} ^{3,450,000} ^{3,500,000} ^{3,550,000} ^{3,600,000} ^{3,650,000} ^{3,700,000} ^{3,750,000} ^{3,800,000} ^{3,850,000} ^{3,900,000} ^{3,950,000} ^{4,000,000} ^{4,050,000} ^{4,100,000} ^{4,150,000} ^{4,200,000} ^{4,250,000} ^{4,300,000} ^{4,350,000} ^{4,400,000} ^{4,450,000} ^{4,500,000} ^{4,550,000} ^{4,600,000} ^{4,650,000} ^{4,700,000} ^{4,750,000} ^{4,800,000} ^{4,850,000} ^{4,900,000} ^{4,950,000} ^{5,000,000} ^{5,050,000} ^{5,100,000} ^{5,150,000} ^{5,200,000} ^{5,250,000} ^{5,300,000} ^{5,350,000} ^{5,400,000} ^{5,450,000} ^{5,500,000} ^{5,550,000} ^{5,600,000} ^{5,650,000} ^{5,700,000} ^{5,750,000} ^{5,800,000} ^{5,850,000} ^{5,900,000} ^{5,950,000} ^{6,000,000} ^{6,050,000} ^{6,100,000} ^{6,150,000} ^{6,200,000} ^{6,250,000} ^{6,300,000} ^{6,350,000} ^{6,400,000} ^{6,450,000} ^{6,500,000} ^{6,550,000} ^{6,600,000} ^{6,650,000} ^{6,700,000} ^{6,750,000} ^{6,800,000} ^{6,850,000} ^{6,900,000} ^{6,950,000} ^{7,000,000} ^{7,050,000} ^{7,100,000} ^{7,150,000} ^{7,200,000} ^{7,250,000} ^{7,300,000} ^{7,350,000} ^{7,400,000} ^{7,450,000} ^{7,500,000} ^{7,550,000} ^{7,600,000} ^{7,650,000} ^{7,700,000} ^{7,750,000} ^{7,800,000} ^{7,850,000} ^{7,900,000} ^{7,950,000} ^{8,000,000} ^{8,050,000} ^{8,100,000} ^{8,150,000} ^{8,200,000} ^{8,250,000} ^{8,300,000} ^{8,350,000} ^{8,400,000} ^{8,450,000} ^{8,500,000} ^{8,550,000} ^{8,600,000} ^{8,650,000} ^{8,700,000} ^{8,750,000} ^{8,800,000} ^{8,850,000} ^{8,900,000} ^{8,950,000} ^{9,000,000} ^{9,050,000} ^{9,100,000} ^{9,150,000} ^{9,200,000} ^{9,250,000} ^{9,300,000} ^{9,350,000} ^{9,400,000} ^{9,450,000} ^{9,500,000} ^{9,550,000} ^{9,600,000} ^{9,650,000} ^{9,700,000} ^{9,750,000} ^{9,800,000} ^{9,850,000} ^{9,900,000} ^{9,950,000} ^{10,000,000} ^{10,050,000} ^{10,100,000} ^{10,150,000} ^{10,200,000} ^{10,250,000} ^{10,300,000} ^{10,350,000} ^{10,400,000} ^{10,450,000} ^{10,500,000} ^{10,550,000} ^{10,600,000} ^{10,650,000} ^{10,700,000} ^{10,750,000} ^{10,800,000} ^{10,850,000} ^{10,900,000} ^{10,950,000} ^{11,000,000} ^{11,050,000} ^{11,100,000} ^{11,150,000} ^{11,200,000} ^{11,250,000} ^{11,300,000} ^{11,350,000} ^{11,400,000} ^{11,450,000} ^{11,500,000} ^{11,550,000} ^{11,600,000} ^{11,650,000} ^{11,700,000} ^{11,750,000} ^{11,800,000} ^{11,850,000} ^{11,900,000} ^{11,950,000} ^{12,000,000} ^{12,050,000} ^{12,100,000} ^{12,150,000} ^{12,200,000} ^{12,250,000} ^{12,300,000} ^{12,350,000} ^{12,400,000} ^{12,450,000} ^{12,500,000} ^{12,550,000} ^{12,600,000} ^{12,650,000} ^{12,700,000} ^{12,750,000} ^{12,800,000} ^{12,850,000} ^{12,900,000} ^{12,950,000} ^{13,000,000} ^{13,050,000} ^{13,100,000} ^{13,150,000} ^{13,200,000} ^{13,250,000} ^{13,300,000} ^{13,350,000} ^{13,400,000} ^{13,450,000} ^{13,500,000} ^{13,550,000} ^{13,600,000} ^{13,650,000} ^{13,700,000} ^{13,750,000} ^{13,800,000} ^{13,850,000} ^{13,900,000} ^{13,950,000} ^{14,000,000} ^{14,050,000} ^{14,100,000} ^{14,150,000} ^{14,200,000} ^{14,250,000} ^{14,300,000} ^{14,350,000} ^{14,400,000} ^{14,450,000} ^{14,500,000} ^{14,550,000} ^{14,600,000} ^{14,650,000} ^{14,700,000} ^{14,750,000} ^{14,800,000} ^{14,850,000} ^{14,900,000} ^{14,950,000} ^{15,000,000} ^{15,050,000} ^{15,100,000} ^{15,150,000} ^{15,200,000} ^{15,250,000} ^{15,300,000} ^{15,350,000} ^{15,400,000} ^{15,450,000} ^{15,500,000} ^{15,550,000} ^{15,600,000} ^{15,650,000} ^{15,700,000} ^{15,750,000} ^{15,800,000} ^{15,850,000} ^{15,900,000} ^{15,950,000} ^{16,000,000} ^{16,050,000} ^{16,100,000} ^{16,150,000} ^{16,200,000} ^{16,250,000} ^{16,300,000} ^{16,350,000} ^{16,400,000} ^{16,450,000} ^{16,500,000} ^{16,550,000} ^{16,600,000} ^{16,650,000} ^{16,700,000} ^{16,750,000} ^{16,800,000} ^{16,850,000} ^{16,900,000} ^{16,950,000} ^{17,000,000} ^{17,050,000} ^{17,100,000} ^{17,150,000} ^{17,200,000} ^{17,250,000} ^{17,300,000} ^{17,350,000} ^{17,400,000} ^{17,450,000} ^{17,500,000} ^{17,550,000} ^{17,600,000} ^{17,650,000} ^{17,700,000} ^{17,750,000} ^{17,800,000} ^{17,850,000} ^{17,900,000} ^{17,950,000} ^{18,000,000} ^{18,050,000} ^{18,100,000} ^{18,150,000} ^{18,200,000} ^{18,250,000} ^{18,300,000} ^{18,350,000} ^{18,400,000} ^{18,450,000} ^{18,500,000} ^{18,550,000} ^{18,600,000} ^{18,650,000} ^{18,700,000} ^{18,750,000} ^{18,800,000} ^{18,850,000} ^{18,900,000} ^{18,950,000} ^{19,000,000} ^{19,050,000} ^{19,100,000} ^{19,150,000} ^{19,200,000} ^{19,250,000} ^{19,300,000} ^{19,350,000} ^{19,400,000} ^{19,450,000} ^{19,500,000} ^{19,550,000} ^{19,600,000} ^{19,650,000} ^{19,700,000} ^{19,750,000} ^{19,800,000} ^{19,850,000} ^{19,900,000} ^{19,950,000} ^{20,000,000} ^{20,050,000} ^{20,100,000} ^{20,150,000} ^{20,200,000} ^{20,250,000} ^{20,300,000} ^{20,350,000} ^{20,400,000} ^{20,450,000} ^{20,500,000} ^{20,550,000} ^{20,600,000} ^{20,650,000} ^{20,700,000} ^{20,750,000} ^{20,800,000} ^{20,850,000} ^{20,900,000} ^{20,950,000} ^{21,000,000} ^{21,050,000} ^{21,100,000} ^{21,150,000} ^{21,200,000} ^{21,250,000} ^{21,300,000} ^{21,350,000} ^{21,400,000} ^{21,450,000} ^{21,500,000} ^{21,550,000} ^{21,600,000} ^{21,650,000} ^{21,700,000} ^{21,750,000} ^{21,800,000} ^{21,850,000} ^{21,900,000} ^{21,950,000} ^{22,000,000} ^{22,050,000} ^{22,100,000} ^{22,150,000} ^{22,200,000} ^{22,250,000} ^{22,300,000} ^{22,350,000} ^{22,400,000} ^{22,450,000} ^{22,500,000} ^{22,550,000} ^{22,600,000} ^{22,650,000} ^{22,700,000} ^{22,750,000} ^{22,800,000} ^{22,850,000} ^{22,900,000} ^{22,950,000} ^{23,000,000} ^{23,050,000} ^{23,100,000} ^{23,150,000} ^{23,200,000} ^{23,250,000} ^{23,300,000} ^{23,350,000} ^{23,400,000} ^{23,450,000} ^{23,500,000} ^{23,550,000} ^{23,600,000} ^{23,650,000} ^{23,700,000} ^{23,750,000} ^{23,800,000} ^{23,850,000} ^{23,900,000} ^{23,950,000} ^{24,000,000} ^{24,050,000} ^{24,100,000} ^{24,150,000} ^{24,200,000} ^{24,250,000} ^{24,300,000} ^{24,350,000} ^{24,400,000} ^{24,450,000} ^{24,500,000} ^{24,550,000} ^{24,600,000} ^{24,650,000} ^{24,700,000} ^{24,750,000} ^{24,800,000} ^{24,850,000} ^{24,900,000} ^{24,950,000} ^{25,000,000} ^{25,050,000} ^{25,100,000} ^{25,150,000} ^{25,200,000} ^{25,250,000} ^{25,300,000} ^{25,350,000} ^{25,400,000} ^{25,450,000} ^{25,500,000} ^{25,550,000} ^{25,600,000} ^{25,650,000} ^{25,700,000} ^{25,750,000} ^{25,800,000} ^{25,850,000} ^{25,900,000} ^{25,950,000} ^{26,000,000} ^{26,050,000} ^{26,100,000} ^{26,150,000} ^{26,200,000} ^{26,250,000} ^{26,300,000} ^{26,350,000} ^{26,400,000} ^{26,450,000} ^{26,500,000} ^{26,550,000} ^{26,600,000} ^{26,650,000} ^{26,700,000} ^{26,750,000} ^{26,800,000} ^{26,850,000} ^{26,900,000} ^{26,950,000} ^{27,000,000} ^{27,050,000} ^{27,100,000} ^{27,150,000} ^{27,200,000} ^{27,250,000} ^{27,300,000} ^{27,350,000} ^{27,400,000} ^{27,450,000} ^{27,500,000} ^{27,550,000} ^{27,600,000} ^{27,650,000} ^{27,700,000} ^{27,750,000} ^{27,800,000} ^{27,850,000} ^{27,900,000} ^{27,950,000} ^{28,000,000} ^{28,050,000} ^{28,100,000} ^{28,150,000} ^{28,200,000} ^{28,250,000} ^{28,300,000} ^{28,350,000} ^{28,400,000} ^{28,450,000} ^{28,500,000} ^{28,550,000} ^{28,600,000} ^{28,650,000} ^{28,700,000} ^{28,750,000} ^{28,800,000} ^{28,850,000} ^{28,900,000} ^{28,950,000} ^{29,000,000} ^{29,050,000} ^{29,100,000} ^{29,150,000} ^{29,200,000} ^{29,250,000} ^{29,300,000} ^{29,350,000} ^{29,400,000} ^{29,450,000} ^{29,500,000} ^{29,550,000} ^{29,600,000} ^{29,650,000} ^{29,700,000} ^{29,750,000} ^{29,800,000} ^{29,850,000} ^{29,900,000} ^{29,950,000} ^{30,000,000} ^{30,050,000} ^{30,100,000} ^{30,150,000} ^{30,200,000} ^{30,250,000} ^{30,300,000} ^{30,350,000} ^{30,400,000} ^{30,450,000} ^{30,500,000} ^{30,550,000} ^{30,600,000} ^{30,650,000} ^{30,700,000} ^{30,750,000} ^{30,800,000} ^{30,850,000} ^{30,900,000} ^{30,950,000} ^{31,000,000} ^{31,050,000} ^{31,100,000} ^{31,150,000} ^{31,200,000} ^{31,250,000} ^{31,300,000} ^{31,350,000} ^{31,400,000} ^{31,450,000} ^{31,500,000} ^{31,550,000} ^{31,600,000} ^{31,650,000} ^{31,700,000} ^{31,750,000} ^{31,800,000} ^{31,850,000} ^{31,900,000} ^{31,950,000} ^{32,000,000} ^{32,050,000} ^{32,100,000} ^{32,150,000} ^{32,200,000} ^{32,250,000} ^{32,300,000} ^{32,350,000} ^{32,400,000} ^{32,450,000} ^{32,500,000} ^{32,550,000} ^{32,600,000} ^{32,650,000} ^{32,700,000} ^{32,750,000} ^{32,800,000} ^{32,850,000} ^{32,900,000} ^{32,950,000} ^{33,000,000} ^{33,050,000} ^{33,100,000} ^{33,150,000} ^{33,200,000} ^{33,250,000} ^{33,300,000} ^{33,350,000} ^{33,400,000} ^{33,450,000} ^{33,500,000} ^{33,550,000} ^{33,600,000} ^{33,650,000} ^{33,700,000} ^{33,750,000} ^{33,800,000} ^{33,850,000} ^{33,900,000} ^{33,950,000} ^{34,000,000} ^{34,050,000} ^{34,100,000} ^{34,150,000} ^{34,200,000} ^{34,250,000} ^{34,300,000} ^{34,350,000} ^{34,400,000} ^{34,450,000} ^{34,500,000} ^{34,550,000} ^{34,600,000} ^{34,650,000} ^{34,700,000} ^{34,750,000} ^{34,800,000} ^{34,850,000} ^{34,900,000} ^{34,950,000} ^{35,000,000} ^{35,050,000} ^{35,100,000} ^{35,150,000} ^{35,200,000} ^{35,250,000} ^{35,300,000} ^{35,350,000} ^{35,400,000} ^{35,450,000} ^{35,500,000} ^{35,550,000} ^{35,600,000} ^{35,650,000} ^{35,700,000} ^{35,750,000} ^{35,800,000} ^{35,850,000} ^{35,900,000} ^{35,950,000} ^{36,000,000} ^{36,050,000} ^{36,100,000} ^{36,150,000} ^{36,200,000} ^{36,250,000} ^{36,300,000} ^{36,350,000} ^{36,400,000} ^{36,450,000} ^{36,500,000} ^{36,550,000} ^{36,600,000} ^{36,650,000} ^{36,700,000} ^{36,750,000} ^{36,800,000} ^{36,850,000} ^{36,900,000} ^{36,950,000} ^{37,000,000} ^{37,050,000} ^{37,100,000} ^{37,150,000} ^{37,200,000} ^{37,250,000} ^{37,300,000} ^{37,350,000} ^{37,400,000} ^{37,450,000} ^{37,500,000} ^{37,550,000} ^{37,600,000} ^{37,650,000} ^{37,700,000} ^{37,750,000} ^{37,800,000} ^{37,850,000} ^{37,900,000} ^{37,950,000} ^{38,000,000} ^{38,050,000} ^{38,100,000} ^{38,150,000} ^{38,200,000} ^{38,250,000} ^{38,3}

returned as receiving no water. One day I met
a Revenue Officer at his tent just as he had
finished his luncheon, and he told me
that there was no land whatever under crown
crop in the Talook; I was not 3 miles from his
tent when I passed through a large extent, some
2 or 300 acres at that moment under crop, belonging
to that Talook.

24 E. If it were only on this one point, I am
 sure the report is worthless, for it gives a totally
 false view of the case. - Had the Engineer been
 called upon to send in a map showing the
 lands that the American water had reached
 and to list a few of the villages for comparison
 with these returns, and had the Commission, or
 his Assist. gone with the Engineer, and the Indian
 and Village authorities to see for himself the
 state of the case, he would have soon found out
 that these returns were totally false.

62 In Para 20. the expression "Morrell Standard" is used and the Revenue obtained in the highest known year is taken for it. There can be no such a thing as a "Morrell Standard" in the District. When the District was in anarchy there was one state of things, when it had peace and was a manufacturing district there was another, when it lost its manufactures, there was another.

another, after 1840; when the irrigation began.
to be attended to there was another, ^{often as} new river,
another. A. ^{normal} ~~normal~~ State of Revenue is an image
= nation.

In the 2^dnd Part there is Revenue after
the Amnicut, "is compared with the average
of 5 years before it. There are three
comparisons. First, the improvements did not com-
pare with the annual. The cutting and clearing
of Channels, the embanking of the rivers &c were
carried on in 1845, 46, and 47. Thus the improve-
ment in the Revenue which was the fruit of two
years is misapplied brought to the against them.
But more than this, the Revenue of one Talook
Boudler, had been greatly improved by attention
to irrigation commencing in 1846. This was not
fruit of these particular works, but it was the
fruit of improved irrigation. Secondly - the
average increase from the time the works are
commenced shows nothing. The question is, what
the last year's Revenue is, to the average of
the last two years, because part of the outlay
had not taken place in the first years that
was brought into the average. Thirdly - this
return is totally fallacious, because 2/3 of the
Lands no Revenue had been levied for
the Amnicut water. It

Lee

8th In the Paras that follow the effects of the new works are stated, in which he comes to the conclusion that the Annual increase of Revenue is ^{1,30,000} 430,000 Rupees Per Annum.

9th In the first place who could imagine that there was any crop in this case, not in the remotest way, ^{the first estimate added 1.50 Rs.} which is no less than that that the Revenue authorities had not lived the case for the water on the lands irrigated, except for an insignificant extent.

10th What can be the use of these returns? At first a few villages were made to pay additional ^{assessment}, but as soon as it was found that there were added no proofs of the good effects of the works, the levying of the water rates, except what were merely nominal and only on a very small portion of the lands, were stopped, and it is only now under the positive orders of Government that a water rate is being levied, and ^{a small portion of} little only on the nominal extent of lands, that has had water three years. Taking the actual quantity of land watered, at only 25,000 acres at that time, the Revenue at the present water rate of 2 Rs per acre would have been 50,000 Rs, for only one crop.

11th The positive neglect of the Revenue authorities to levy the additional tax is the most important fact in the whole case, as respects the -

the Revenue, and these returns are so given as to lead everyone to suppose that the land had been taxed just as it was benefited - 12th

But it was not only the land that was watered that was benefited, all the low lands of the Delta had been also improved. The evil they suffered under was ^{if winter} and the river embankments which were begun in 1845 besides other works, had almost put an end to destructive floods. Nothing had been revised since such a time. Again a very large proportion of the Delta had been kept from the water carriage, whether the lands were watered or not and all had the benefit of the expenditure - 13th

The works cannot produce Revenue, if the Revenue authorities will not collect it. Some of the lands now in the 11th year of irrigation, are paying this year the first water tax.

14th In fact the state of things here throws a light upon the strange anomaly in the act of a body of Engineers being employed to collect the Revenue on the lands they had themselves irrigated. From what has taken place ^{in the case}, I have no doubt that this arose from their finding that the Revenue Officers would not do it, and the Engineers consequently as the only alternative, urged the Government to let them to collect ^{the Revenue} or themselves.

15th Of other mistakes, fallacies &c. in these Paras I must reserve the following. In

Para 25, it is stated that the Toolea Buzah had been more or less available for irrigation since 1847-48, the fact being that there had always been irrigation under it, ^{but} that it was in a most neglected state, and that its improvement was commenced in 1845, and materially affected the Cultivation that year. 1845. In Para 26, reference is made to an Appendix supposed to show the increase under the Toolea Buzah (I suppose including the branch called the Lamulcottah Channel) from the time when water was first received. This return also is totally false. The average of 5 years is given as before the irrigation commenced, and this ends with 1846-7 ¹⁸⁴⁶⁻⁷ whereas the irrigation commenced in 1845-46. and thus two years which had the water from the new Lamulcottah Channel and the improvement of the Toolea Buzah main Channel, are given as years before the works, and thus made to tell against them. The fallacy consists as before in the use of the word annicut, whereas these Channels were cut and improved two years before the annicut was begun. Thus in one of the statements of 1845, the Revenue of the village of Meikavale is given as 5829 in July 1257, and this is made part of the increase before the works. The actual increase of Revenue in 10 years before the works was 2900, and, nearly 3000. It had been added in consequence

III

of the supply of water from the Lagoon which it
had never had before.

17th By the return given the results in
Bicarbonate were as follows

Collection in 1253. 1843-44..... 30'22

<i>46.....</i>	<i>38'27.</i>
<i>40.....</i>	<i>29'22</i>
<i>47.....</i>	<i>42'45-</i>
<i>48.....</i>	<i>53'24.</i>

Surge before the works. N. 4102

1848.49. . . 7367.

50. . . . 85.4

51. . . . 9148'

52. . . . 245

۵۴۰۰۰۰

Average since the works..... 8750.

Expenses.. 4683.

The true statement would be, (taking the average of 1843-44, 1844-45, 1845-46, 1846-47, 1847-48, 1848-49, 1849-50, 1850-51, 1851-52, 1852-53, 1853-54, 1854-55, 1855-56, 1856-57, 1857-58, 1858-59, 1859-60, 1860-61, 1861-62, 1862-63, 1863-64, 1864-65, 1865-66, 1866-67, 1867-68, 1868-69, 1869-70, 1870-71, 1871-72, 1872-73, 1873-74, 1874-75, 1875-76, 1876-77, 1877-78, 1878-79, 1879-80, 1880-81, 1881-82, 1882-83, 1883-84, 1884-85, 1885-86, 1886-87, 1887-88, 1888-89, 1889-90, 1890-91, 1891-92, 1892-93, 1893-94, 1894-95, 1895-96, 1896-97, 1897-98, 1898-99, 1899-00, 1900-01, 1901-02, 1902-03, 1903-04, 1904-05, 1905-06, 1906-07, 1907-08, 1908-09, 1909-10, 1910-11, 1911-12, 1912-13, 1913-14, 1914-15, 1915-16, 1916-17, 1917-18, 1918-19, 1919-20, 1920-21, 1921-22, 1922-23, 1923-24, 1924-25, 1925-26, 1926-27, 1927-28, 1928-29, 1929-30, 1930-31, 1931-32, 1932-33, 1933-34, 1934-35, 1935-36, 1936-37, 1937-38, 1938-39, 1939-40, 1940-41, 1941-42, 1942-43, 1943-44, 1944-45, 1945-46, 1946-47, 1947-48, 1948-49, 1949-50, 1950-51, 1951-52, 1952-53, 1953-54, 1954-55, 1955-56, 1956-57, 1957-58, 1958-59, 1959-60, 1960-61, 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64, 1964-65, 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68, 1968-69, 1969-70, 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73, 1973-74, 1974-75, 1975-76, 1976-77, 1977-78, 1978-79, 1979-80, 1980-81, 1981-82, 1982-83, 1983-84, 1984-85, 1985-86, 1986-87, 1987-88, 1988-89, 1989-90, 1990-91, 1991-92, 1992-93, 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96, 1996-97, 1997-98, 1998-99, 1999-00, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24, 2024-25, 2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28, 2028-29, 2029-30, 2030-31, 2031-32, 2032-33, 2033-34, 2034-35, 2035-36, 2036-37, 2037-38, 2038-39, 2039-40, 2040-41, 2041-42, 2042-43, 2043-44, 2044-45, 2045-46, 2046-47, 2047-48, 2048-49, 2049-50, 2050-51, 2051-52, 2052-53, 2053-54, 2054-55, 2055-56, 2056-57, 2057-58, 2058-59, 2059-60, 2060-61, 2061-62, 2062-63, 2063-64, 2064-65, 2065-66, 2066-67, 2067-68, 2068-69, 2069-70, 2070-71, 2071-72, 2072-73, 2073-74, 2074-75, 2075-76, 2076-77, 2077-78, 2078-79, 2079-80, 2080-81, 2081-82, 2082-83, 2083-84, 2084-85, 2085-86, 2086-87, 2087-88, 2088-89, 2089-90, 2090-91, 2091-92, 2092-93, 2093-94, 2094-95, 2095-96, 2096-97, 2097-98, 2098-99, 2099-00, 2100-01, 2101-02, 2102-03, 2103-04, 2104-05, 2105-06, 2106-07, 2107-08, 2108-09, 2109-10, 2110-11, 2111-12, 2112-13, 2113-14, 2114-15, 2115-16, 2116-17, 2117-18, 2118-19, 2119-20, 2120-21, 2121-22, 2122-23, 2123-24, 2124-25, 2125-26, 2126-27, 2127-28, 2128-29, 2129-30, 2130-31, 2131-32, 2132-33, 2133-34, 2134-35, 2135-36, 2136-37, 2137-38, 2138-39, 2139-40, 2140-41, 2141-42, 2142-43, 2143-44, 2144-45, 2145-46, 2146-47, 2147-48, 2148-49, 2149-50, 2150-51, 2151-52, 2152-53, 2153-54, 2154-55, 2155-56, 2156-57, 2157-58, 2158-59, 2159-60, 2160-61, 2161-62, 2162-63, 2163-64, 2164-65, 2165-66, 2166-67, 2167-68, 2168-69, 2169-70, 2170-71, 2171-72, 2172-73, 2173-74, 2174-75, 2175-76, 2176-77, 2177-78, 2178-79, 2179-80, 2180-81, 2181-82, 2182-83, 2183-84, 2184-85, 2185-86, 2186-87, 2187-88, 2188-89, 2189-90, 2190-91, 2191-92, 2192-93, 2193-94, 2194-95, 2195-96, 2196-97, 2197-98, 2198-99, 2199-00, 2200-01, 2201-02, 2202-03, 2203-04, 2204-05, 2205-06, 2206-07, 2207-08, 2208-09, 2209-10, 2210-11, 2211-12, 2212-13, 2213-14, 2214-15, 2215-16, 2216-17, 2217-18, 2218-19, 2219-20, 2220-21, 2221-22, 2222-23, 2223-24, 2224-25, 2225-26, 2226-27, 2227-28, 2228-29, 2229-30, 2230-31, 2231-32, 2232-33, 2233-34, 2234-35, 2235-36, 2236-37, 2237-38, 2238-39, 2239-40, 2240-41, 2241-42, 2242-43, 2243-44, 2244-45, 2245-46, 2246-47, 2247-48, 2248-49, 2249-50, 2250-51, 2251-52, 2252-53, 2253-54, 2254-55, 2255-56, 2256-57, 2257-58, 2258-59, 2259-60, 2260-61, 2261-62, 2262-63, 2263-64, 2264-65, 2265-66, 2266-67, 2267-68, 2268-69, 2269-70, 2270-71, 2271-72, 2272-73, 2273-74, 2274-75, 2275-76, 2276-77, 2277-78, 2278-79, 2279-80, 2280-81, 2281-82, 2282-83, 2283-84, 2284-85, 2285-86, 2286-87, 2287-88, 2288-89, 2289-90, 2290-91, 2291-92, 2292-93, 2293-94, 2294-95, 2295-96, 2296-9

1843-44... 3622

45- . . . 3894.

46. . . . 2922

3: 10407

Increase of
each year over
former average

average before the
wires } 3487. Collier

1846-47. 4248. 761.

47-48-5824-2307.

48/49-7367-5850.

49-150. 850 + - 801/7.

57,151. 9148-5001.

57. 52. 9248. 5701
6157.

53. 2652 - 67/67
69/69

54 - 2093. 6200.
1000 - 6322

55-4817-6596.

53-1070-201
1070-2423

57-10,900-1,400

186 Thus the Actual increase, 1853, was 6170,
not 4602, and it is now that the water rate has been
raised

laid upon the Enam lands, 7423 Rupees, so that the village, pays three times the average of the three years, preceding the works. — It is quite fallacious to give the average since the works were begun, because in the first year the whole expenditure had not been made. As this fallacy is not pointed out to the report under consideration, and it is a very important one, I give now the calculated results of a work by the two modes of showing them. Let us suppose 10,000 Rs. laid out every year, and that the Revenue improves in consequence at the rate of 5000 Rupees a year, the calculation from the average would be as follows:

	Expenditure	Increase of Revenue
1 st year	10,000	5,000
2 nd year	10,000	10,000
3 rd year	10,000	15,000
4 th year	10,000	20,000
5 th year	10,000	25,000
Total expenditure	50,000	75,000
		15,000

19th The average increase would then be stated at 15,000 Rupees per annum, on an expenditure of 50,000 Rupees, or 30 per cent, whereas it is evident that the increase in the 50,000 has been 25,000 or 50 per cent. The fallacy consists in taking the average of profits, profits that occurred before a great part of the expenditure was made, since the 50,000 of the expenditure is of course much under the mark, because no expenditure produces its full results under even normal years.

Under Para 26. he goes on to show that

that the increase in 15 villages that had the water from 1 to 6 years the increase in Revenue in 1265, was 62 per cent above the average of five years, before the works. — How remarkable it is that he should not have observed the enormous discrepancy between the increase in Biccavali and in these villages and ascertain what the cause of it was.

21st The cause was, what I have stated, viz. that in most of these villages the additional Revenue had not been levied, either nothing at all had been taken or a merely nominal sum.

22nd Biccavali was before the rest — the only one watered village in these Taluqs, the only one that had two large tanks and the increase which it has borne very well shows what might have been obtained. I don't mean to say that I think it is now an additional expenditure ought to have been levied, but it shows indisputably what the improved irrigation will have increased Revenue. And it shows what enormous sums have been lost to Government by the neglect of the Revenue authorities to enforce some additional payment as soon as ever the water reached the upper lands, and as soon as the flooding of the lower lands was diminished.

23rd In Para 25, it is stated that the irrigation was compared to the Foola Bagah in 1853-54. This also is not the fact. The

Annex

Ummat was carried across the river in ¹⁸⁴⁹ ~~1848~~, and that year water was thrown into the *Regueros* in the Western Delta. The decay of Revenue was not caused by want of water, but because the rights of Government were neglected.

24th. In Para 31. he gives a statement of the total returns from the Ummat works. It will be seen from my previous Paras. that I consider this return of no value whatever, independent of the essential fact, that the additional Revenue had not been avoided, excepting in a very small portion of the lands. To give this statement as a correct return of results, without hinting at this astonishing fact, must totally falsify the whole case.

25th. The real extent of land watered, having been at least $\frac{2}{3}$ less of acres, even if the low rate of 2 Rs. per one Crop. which is now being given from some of the lands, had been taken, the direct increase from old lands would have been $\frac{1}{2}$ less a year, besides extension of Cultivation, extra Revenue &c.

26th. In the 34th Para. the improvement in the condition of the people is spoken of as "an important benefit"

27th. I must beg to call this the grand object of the Works. Of course the finances must be looked to, and it must be ascertained that works will pay in Revenue ^{the}

13
the interest of their art, but the benefit of the mass of the population is the real object. And on this point, nothing can be more satisfactory than the results of all the enquiries that I have made. The receipts of the labouring classes are probably about 50 per cent higher than they were and there is employment for all, and the ^{whole body of the} land owners are undoubtedly relieved from the wretched state of poverty and debt they were in.

28th. In Para 36. and 37. Mr. Goldingham endeavours to show that Mr. Taylor's ^{inferences} ~~inferences~~ as to increased Revenue are fallacious. First he compares the Revenue of the previous years, with a certain sum which he is pleased to call the "Normal Standard," and which he himself elsewhere states to be the highest known. First, there is no such a thing as a "normal state of things" as I have before stated, and in the next place, that the Revenue and the ^{of years} ~~of years~~ in such a miserable state for a series of years ^{previous to 1845} ~~previous to 1845~~ ^{years} ~~years~~ was one great reason why the war was more required and necessitated, but certainly nothing could be more fair than to compare the Revenue since with the Revenue before. The fact is that in a very short time and in spite of the way in which the claims of Government were trifled with, in letting most of the lands have all the benefits of the works, without paying any thing, the Revenue of the district was.

was brought up to what it had been 20 or 30
years before, when it was comparatively wealthy
in consequence of its great manufactures.

29th. Again the Revenue of the Sub-collectorate had already been considerably affected by the improved irrigation of the Condy Taluk, which commenced in 1840.

30th Again in Para 41. he gives a State-
ment, which in my copy is unintelligible, by way
of Comparison of the increase of Revenue in the
Upper Talooks, with that of those in the Delta. I
don't know what the statement should be, but
whatever it is, it would be as fallacious as all
the other Comparisons, from the same cause, vizt
that the water tax had not been lowered, except
to a small extent.

31th. In Para 44, he states that the average of the ~~collections~~ in the upper talooks for two series of 6 years, is 18,000 and 22,700 showing an increase of 40000. Puses, or 26 per cent, where as we find in the Village of Bicarav the ~~average~~ ^{amount} had been 200 per cent, and some thing like this ought to have been the case with all the Villages to which the water was conveyed.

320. In Para 45. the estimated returns from the irrigated land compared with those from land in the former state are adverted to. This estimate also ^{have got assistance of proof from actual measure} ~~is prepared~~ is sent to the sund of pro-
duced depended on -

* Being the average of 3 years I
have given in the following table of the

33 I cannot here help remarking on the extraordinary circumstances that there is nothing in this report, that implies that an attempt was made to ascertain this specific point. Surely, when 'the work of the Government was that the effects of its great work should be accurately ascertained' the most important enquiry of all was, 'What is the value of produce on the Irrigated lands, compared with what it was before?' - How could any conclusion with any thing, be arrived at, unless this fundamental point was actually ascertained? All that is said on this point, is that an estimate given by Mr. Taylor, is referred to.

345. It appears that not the slightest enquiry was made on this head, much less was any personal examination made to assure the Comptroller that he was proceeding on correct information. This seems to me an extraordinary circumstance. Afterwards in Para 37, the rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per acre is proposed as the highest which it would be safe to impose for the new works, but not one word is said as to the grounds in which this sum is fixed upon. If there were any grounds for it, surely they ought to have been stated, especially when nobody ever heard of such a rate in any other district.

35. But let us compare this estimate -
with fact; in the Estimate the value of
produced in the first year is given at 72. actually

shorter. But
 was covered. Taking the average of the previous two years, 2900 ft. Above
 sea level.

on 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ Rs an acre, the actual value of produce ^{on crop} of two pieces of land, cultivated for trial were respectively 14 Rs. and 30 $\frac{1}{2}$ Rs in the first year. The produce of another piece of land by another person was 28 Rs. in the 2^d or 3^d year. In the Estimate 18 Rs. is given as the highest produce on 1st class land after 3 years of cultivation for Paddy.

36th Again Mr. Newill took the produce in the Patnab Belta by actual measurement of many fields, and found it in an average, where there was good irrigation, 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ Gunton (andies) of 1920 lbs, which at the average price of the last 5 years 28 Rs, gives 42 Rs. besides straw, for which add $\frac{1}{8}$ making 47 Rs. an acre.

37th The fact is that this estimate was made out by interested persons, and of course is useless.

38th In the Estimate, it is thus made out that there is a profit the first year on the irrigated land of the 1st Class of 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ Rs per acre, but in the two pieces of cultivation, just mentioned the actual profit was, of 6 Rs an acre on poor lands and 18 $\frac{1}{2}$ Rs ^{1st better} on the ~~best~~ ^{best} land.

39th Another farmer yielded 32, Bisperes per acre.

40th These are all actual & ascertained returns and if Mr. Goldingham had himself seen some grain cut and weighed, he would have ascertained at once the value of this Estimate -

The

I

41st The fact is that the estimate here should have been taken to ascertain the real state of the land, for no conclusion or any kind worth anything could be reached without it. He gives the value of produce on unirrigated land at about 7 Rs. an acre, and I believe this is not far wrong. If we take the value under irrigation at only 28, the difference 16 Rs. on 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres of area, a low estimate of the area probably watered at that time, the increase of produce will be 40 does out of which the additional Revenue Co. deduction was according to this report 1,30,000 Bisperes and this does not allow for new cultivation, for the reduction of lands and for the water carriage.

42nd In Para 48, it is stated that the cost of transit has been diminished $\frac{2}{3}$ -

This also conveys a very incorrect view of the benefits of the water carriage.

1st For a part of the year and over most of the Belta things could not be carried at all, except at a ruinous price, so that rice might be in great demand at Baccanada and a man could not sell what he had from the impossibility of conveying it.

2^d The actual reduction is not $\frac{2}{3}$ but $\frac{8}{10}$ or $\frac{4}{5}$ - The usual price paid for straw is 3 pie a ton a mile, about $\frac{1}{10}$ of the former price -

3^d This is the charge, but it is a charge that allows an enormous profit to the boat owner, because the supply of boats does not equal the demand, and in judging of the results of the works our question is, what is the total saving in carriage, whatever proportion of it goes to the employer, and what to the Boat owner, the actual saving. I believe is at least $\frac{19}{20}$ -

43rd In the 51 Para he states that the Belta land will not all be watered from the Channels, but that the water must be raised by Picottahs. He says

"there

of a few acres planted by the latter
was this year abundantly profitable. i.e.
they can be finer than the same planted
this year by Europeans, and the statements
they give me of the cost and returns obtained
and expected, are extraordinarily encour-
aging. There is thus every reason to believe

that the attention of European Capitalists will
be drawn to the district for this cultivation.
It must however be observed
that the present population is not equal to the
full cultivation of the Delta, even for Paddy.

49th. In Para 59. It is stated that in the
Coudy Talook and under the same collector's Channel
the present must not be viewed as furnishing
a standard for the Delta generally. "This is quite
true, for Coudy had already extensive irrigation and
was far better watered than any other part of the
Delta, and one of the villages under the same collector's
Channel was better supplied with water than al-
most any one in the Delta. The benefit of the irriga-
tion in the Puller Talook for instance was
which had not an acre watered before,
must be capable of yielding a far
greater increase of Revenue, than Coudy and also the

VI

in a less degree with all the other Talooks. He
also gives from Mr. Taylor, a return of waste
land of 27000 acres in the Subcollectorate.
What this means I don't know, but it certainly
bears no proportion to the extent of land that
does not pay Revenue.

50th. With respect to the future price of
grain it must be remembered that the moment
cheap rice is given to a Port, the price except
in scarcity does not depend upon the extent
of the crop but on the state of the market of the
world. While Rice is at a certain price in London,
it cannot possibly fall below a corresponding
price in Rajahmundry. In seasons of scarcity
in the neighbouring districts it may rise, but it
cannot possibly fall except in years.

51st. In the 60th and following Para
about the mode of assessing the land, I have
observed nothing to say, except that I do hope there
will be no more ^{either of things or produce} guessing, and nothing will be
done upon such false returns and statements
as this report contains, but that the actual extent
of land and actual produce will be really ascer-
tained and the water ^{levied} upon real grounds.

52nd. In the statement these gives of the
average assessment upon land in the Delta, it is
shown to be at present $3\frac{3}{4}$ Rs per acre in the
nominal area, but it must be recalled that
the real area is far greater, so that the actual
assessment

apeximum is not more than 2 or 3 Rs an acre. If we add $1\frac{1}{4}$ Rs as Mr Goldingham proposes per nominal acre it will make 5.00 or perhaps $5\frac{1}{2}$ Rs per real acre for the richest land in the Presidency improved in a way that no other land is. - We compare this with the tax on irrigated land in North Arcot cut off from a Post by a long land - carriage, we shall see at once that it is a real comparison to the usual land tax and is really based upon nothing.

53^d In Para 7th he speaks of the Post as averaging 8 acres. This is a mistake. By the surveys made by the Engineers, the actual area of the Post is on an average about 13 acres. How extraordinary it seems that in all these points Mr Goldingham should have neglected to seek information from the Department, which alone could supply him with it correctly. In the same Para he says the present tax on the Villages under the Soera Bagah, it is supposed, "that it is equal to one half of the gross produce or perhaps above it." I must beg earnestly to press upon the notice of the Government this extraordinary passage. - He says again, "it is supposed." Now I cannot but ask, are we to proceed upon suppositions and those such that it is not considered right to make any individual responsible for them - who could suppose such a thing? The thing is so notoriously contrary to fact that I may venture to say no man could possibly

possibly suppose it, we have two proofs that in Goldingham himself did not suppose it, first because he would be saying that he supposed it, and secondly because he in this report gives Mr Taylors estimate of produce without making any objection to it. In that estimate the produce of 1st class land is given at 180 lbs in Post, and in the statement, ^{if we take 200 lbs} the actual average of produce on three Soera Bagah Villages is given at $45\frac{1}{2}$ lbs, or about $\frac{1}{4}$ of his estimated produce on 1st class land, we must make allowance for average land, but if we allow the average produce to be 150 lbs, the proportion of land would be less than $\frac{1}{4}$ instead of $\frac{1}{2}$ as Mr Goldingham would be saying. But I have before shown by stating 54th actual results that this estimate is all nonsense. 55th The fact is this, almost the whole of the Soera Bagah land is now regularly cultivated for two crops, and the actual value of produce must be, by the various trials that have been made, about 36 Roppees per acre, not less, making the average of $45\frac{1}{2}$ lbs a poor crop, or $4\frac{1}{2}$ Rs an acre, $\frac{1}{4}$ of the produce and this I think is about the real state of the case, at least the proportion is not greater than this. It must be observed that Mr Newalls average of many actual trials in Guntoor, was $2\frac{1}{2}$ Roppees or 100 lbs of grain which at 12 Roppees, gives 32 Rs. and.

and adding $\frac{1}{8}$ for value of straw 30 Rs. per acre,
per one acre.

56th Upon this anonymous supposition which
is shown to be baseless even by the Commissioner's own
paper, and which in reality is only an ^{instead of "half an acre"} ~~in~~ ^{of} ~~the~~ ^{proposed}
one fourth of the true proportion of, produce,
actually forms the basis of the Commissioner's es-
timate for the expenditure of the whole district.

57th But in the following page he supposes
again that the produce may be 120 Rs. a party,
which differs from the estimate on Mr. Taylor
which in another place he adopts, by $\frac{1}{3}$ or 40 Rs. a
party. He then applies this to the area of land
which he states to have been irrigated by 40,000 acres,
and shows that the actual collections were 25,000
Rs. or 4,000 Rs. under what they should have been.

58th Now when we compare the results arrived
at by this accumulation of false returns and
suppositions with the realities of the case, we find
that the amount of 4,000 Rs. is about the sixteenth
part of what ought to have been added to the Revenue.

59th The actual extent of land watered
was certainly not less than 25,000, and the expenditure
at 1 Rs. per acre, ~~it~~ would have been 25,000 Rs.
The present average expenditure on this extent of
land at the rate Mr. Goldingham gives 30 Rs. a party
or 3 Rs. per acre, (really) would be $7\frac{1}{2}$ Lacs, showing
a difference of $7\frac{1}{2}$ Lacs.

VII

Suppose I be on these grounds. The present average ex-
penditure is given at 30 Rs. a party / $3\frac{1}{2}$ Rs. per acre. Calling the Party
8 acres, or 3 Rs. per acre. The water lay now being laid is
2 Rs. per one crop land and 4 for 2. I therefore add an average of 3 for
water rate, which supposes only half the land to be double cropped.
At this rate the expenditure would be about $\frac{1}{5}$ of the gross pro-
duce and it allows nothing for land cultivated with sugar,
Chillies &c. Surely it would have been but what was in-
ferred upon an Officer of Government, to have ascertained by actual

measurement both of Revenue and land what the expenditure ought
to be, before laying the matter before Government.

60th I give in this Appendix to this, Copies of letters
between the Commissioner and the District Engineer on the subject
of Acres and Produce. It will be there seen that the watered
area in the Taluk of Nagaravur given by Mr. Goldingham
at 650,000, or according to his mode of Calculation, 5200 acres
was actually near 30,000 acres or 6 times as great. In two
villages which he tested, the Commissioner's returns gave 27 Rs. in
316 acres, watered, while the actual extent was 115 Potties
at 10 acres or 1150 acres.

61th As the Commissioner in one part of this report
refers to the increase of Revenue in Guntur before the
works, were begun there, as a proof that the increase of
Revenue in Nag. T. would have been great without the
works. I must just remark, first, that the increase
of Revenue, in one district, that was not improved
by Public Works, does not prove that the increase
in another was not caused by its Public Works.
The increase in Guntur was clearly caused by two
things, one was the district was gradually recovering
from a dreadful state of depopulation and
there was nothing to prevent its rising to the state
it was in before its loss of population, the other is
that it is I believe now allowed by all who have
had to do with the district, that Mr. Stokes Revenue
was really more than the district could bear.

It

64th It is never sufficient merely to look at the Collection of a district at the time. If an increase is supported by an increase of Exports, of Revenue from Extra sources, of internal traffic we may know that it is a sound increase but if not we may be sure that it is only the fruit of a more severe taxation and will probably be followed within a few years by a falling off.

65th I must again refer to the immense importance of this subject and it must be my apology if this paper seems to be sincere upon the Report under consideration. On, proportion to the authority of the paper, due to the experience and thoroughly approved uprightness of the writer is the necessity of proving the essential fallacies it contains and the total falsity of the conclusions.

66th I do trust that this style of paper will now entirely disappear from the records of Government. The times of make-believe and anonymous suppositions surely have lasted long enough. Let us now deal with realities. What possible use there can be in taking a return while we have abundance of means of knowing to be totally false, and dealing with it gravely as if we know it to be true. I cannot imagine, and I am equally at a loss to know what can be the use

of supposing or allowing something without a name to suppose to us, when we can walk out of our tent a few hundred yards and see the case with our own eyes or when we can send to a gentleman a few miles off, who has actually ascertained the state of the case.

67th I cannot say less than that the whole of this paper is based upon returns so false that they represent from $\frac{1}{5}$ to $\frac{1}{10}$ of the truth and upon suppositions that are totally false, and as to the effects of the works upon the Revenue that no less a mistake is made than the not mentioning the fundamental fact viz. that the extra Revenue due to the works had not been collected, excepting on an insignificant proportion of the lands. Even in the village of Secinville, one of the few villages upon which at first a real increase of tax was laid, it is only this year the season in which it has had the works, that 1000 Rs. has been levied on the irrigated lands for the first time, so that on the irrigated lands alone in a single village 10,000 Rs. has been lost to Government. Taking the present area watered at 6 laes of acres (and allowing nothing for the relief of flooded lands nor for the water transit of which all the remaining lands have the benefit) and allowing a water rate of 3 Rs. per acre the increased Revenue ought to be 18 laes, (independent of extension of cultivation) and the actual increase has been about 6½ laes, comparing the present year (22½ laes) with the average of 10 years before the works 15,70,000. The difference is nearly 12 laes and if we take the

the average from the first at about $\frac{1}{3}$ of this or 4 lacs a year, it will give for the 11 years, 44 lacs as the sum that has been lost to Government thro' the neglect of the Revenue Officers and even if we supposed that the people were allowed two years use of the water free there would still remain 36 lacs, as the amount of Government property that has been lost to the State.

68th I consider the remedy applied to this in the North West, of employing a body of Engineers to collect the Revenue from their own works, worse than the disease; for, to employ men in the comparatively simple work of collecting Revenue who are capable of planning and executing the works which will create it, is evidently grievous waste. But I cannot say less than this that I think this case unmistakably calls for some most decided measures to make the Revenue Officers understand that the rights of Government are not to be thus trampled with impunity; and I am convinced that the greatest obstacle to the real and effective improvement of the Country committed to our care generally will not be removed till a Revenue Officer is made clear by his understanding that if he will not do his duty another will be found who can and will do it. The public removal

removal of an officer from a district, who has proved himself incapable or unwilling to enforce the just claims of Government in this way, would do more to forward the improvement of India than a hundred long reports by a Commissioner. I really must beg to be allowed to speak plainly on this point, for the welfare of India hinges upon it; there is a thorough ^{experiment} ~~research~~ as to what can be done on a large scale. Irrigation and navigation, and if after the English have any good designs carried out the works effecting, the Revenue Officers are permitted first to neglect their duty to collect the new Revenue and then to adduce the comparatively small increase of Revenue as a proof how moderate the effect of the works has been, the result must be a total failure view of the value of such works, and a consequent backwardness to extend them throughout India.

The results of the works have indeed been abundant as it is, but they certainly ought to have been about 3 times as great. The village of Meeravale, which is a fair example, because it was before one of the best watered villages in the district, has increased from 2900 Rupees the average of 10 years before the works to 10,900, or nearly four fold, and this agrees well with the capability of the irrigated land to pay Revenue.

The

The old Revenue was 3 Rupees per acre, and four times this, or 12 Rs. would be at a moderate computation 33 per cent on the gross Produce. It is quite certain that this would be a very light assessment compared with watered lands in other districts, when it is considered that transit at 3 p. or 4 p. a ton a mile is provided almost to every man's door. The Engineer reckons that at a low calculation (and I am sure it is so) the amount of water traffic is now 12 mil. ton tons carried one mile per annum, upon which the total saving would be at 2 or a ton 15 aces, this alone being 7 of what I have above supposed ought to have been added to the Revenue and more than double the actual increase of Rent.

7/12 If it should be a question how it has happened that Maccaville and a few other villages were ^{made} ~~made~~ to pay so heavily from the first for the water while by far the greater part of the lands have paid nothing, I answer the reason is plain enough to any person acquainted with the real state of things in the districts. When the real increase of capability of these villages to pay Revenue was perceived, it was at first fully acted upon. I think indeed that the increase of tax was rather severely enforced, but as soon as it was found that the Engineers adduced this as a proof of the effect of the works a change of proceeding on the part of the native Revenue authorities was of course adopted. The native Anteherry being all either landowners or connected with landowners their bias is of course against the interests of the Government.

31
but this is counterbalanced by their wish to approve themselves as able managers of the Revenue ~~of the District~~ ^{of the District}, and the credit arising from an increase of Revenue is earnestly desired as a proof of their capacity and industry, but when this counteracting influence is written down, and the credit of the increase is found to go to another department, and one too against which the native Revenue Department have a very strong feeling, as rivals and innovators, there is nothing to prevent their acting under the natural bias, and the consequence is that ^{every} ~~many~~ effort is made against an increase of Revenue. This seems the only possible way of accounting for the monstrous returns both of area and Revenue with which the Annual Survey was furnished. Every Revenue authority in the villages and in the Talook knew that the Returns for the villages of Payale and Sompilly mentioned in Captain Dundall's letter were quite false. They knew well enough that the whole of the village lands were watered, but they knew also that the European authorities would accept any thing they chose to put before them, and would neither see in themselves, nor call upon the Civil Engineer to ascertain for them the actual state of the case. After all this trifling with the claims of Government the following statement will show the progress of the district now in respect of Revenue under the new state of things.

Statement.

Statement

		Ditto Collections of Land Revenue		Average of After Collection	Total Collected
		Within the Fiscal	Afterwards		
1836-7	124.6	14,59,000	2,00,000	247,000	17,35,000
8	7	14,79,000	2,19,000		16,99,000
9	8	9,49,000	3,34,000		12,83,000
10	9	11,68,000	2,92,000		14,09,000
1	1250	11,63,000	2,08,000		14,31,000
2	1	13,54,000	1,89,000		15,34,000
3	2	13,39,000	1,17,000		15,15,000
4	3	11,55,000	4,24,000		15,54,000
5	4	15,40,000	1,08,000		17,31,000
6	5	15,19,000	2,40,000		17,49,000
7	6	17,81,000	32,000	18,59,000	18,12,000
8	7	18,41,000	32,000		18,73,000
9	8	18,69,000			19,29,000
0	9	14,62,000	129,000		18,91,000
1	1260	19,06,000	67,000		19,73,000
2	1	19,69,000	36,000		20,25,000
3	2	19,75,000	90,000		21,65,000
4	3	19,73,000	48,000		21,24,000
5	4	20,00,000	45,000		20,45,000
6	5	20,60,000	26,000		20,86,000
1846-7	126.6	21,73,000	32,000	29,000	22,10,000

* The Traffic has increased much more than the number of boats as the average tonnage of each boat has probably more than doubled.

Land Revenue in Rajahmundry.

Average Col ^l before the Works	Average Col ^l since the Works	Excess since the Works	P. Works Expended including Repairs	Exports & Imports	T. Bagat Traffic Net of Costs	Population of Rajahmundry
15,69,000	10,95,000	3,26,000	22,000	12,98,500		
			197,000	17,64,000		
			285,000	17,38,000		
			193,000	15,22,000		
			282,000	13,15,000		
			187,000	17,52,000		711,400
			425,000	17,54,000	62.6	
			501,000	19,70,000	1,608	
			705,000	20,97,000	6,571	
			707,000*	20,72,000	9,004	
22,10,000	6,41,000	Total 34,84,000		24,81,000	9,340	751,400
				24,93,000	13,460	

* It must be observed that this is the whole expenditure on the works but the returns of Revenue are only for that part of it in Rajahmundry. There is some increase in the Masulipatnam part of the District, which should be added, but I have no distinct statement of it: it is considerable but nothing to what ought to have been collected.

73rd It will be seen from this that while the land Revenue has increased nearly 6 1/2 lacs, the arrears of collections at the end of the Fy. have diminished from an average of 2 1/2 lacs to 3,000. We have thus positive proof that the district is now paying without the least difficulty a land Revenue higher by nearly 6 1/2 lacs or 40 per cent, than it paid with great difficulty before.

74th Taking the total expenditure at 25 lacs, we have a return of 25 per cent at present in Revenue, notwithstanding the neglect of the Revenue authorities. Were the whole of the watered lands opened, the increased on old lands alone would be 18 lacs at a very low estimate, or 72 per cent upon the outlay.

75th Even as matters are, whether we look at the increase of Revenue, the proofs of the ease with which it is paid, the astonishing increase of internal traffic or the increase of Exports and Imports, it is impossible that we can be mistaken in concluding that the district has undergone a change such as no other district in India has undergone excepting Bangalore from the same cause, and that the change was wrought by Bangalore with this end what reason can be imagined why the state of every district in India should not be thus radically changed, if the same means were applied.

76th It does not seem necessary to go further into the subject in connection with the

25
this Report as I have already to lay before the Government a more general report upon these important works.

M. Cotton Col.
Comd^g of Eng^{rs}

Dustin
June 11th
1857.

Genl. G. G. G. G.
 Commandant of Engineers

Mr. G. G. G. G.
 Secretary to Government

Sub. Secy. G. G. G.

I have been collecting information on the very important subject of the state of this Delta and the effects of the river on the Delta, hoping to be able to lay before the Government my view of the case, but I have found it advisable to examine so many points, that my report has been greatly delayed and is therefore sent to me associated in the mean time to send in some remarks on Mr. Goldingham's report, as they refer to that great and essential point of the question, which I think ought to be taken up most seriously without further delay, viz. the failure of the Revenue authorities to collect the extra Revenue on account of the improvement effected by the works.

The enormous loss of Revenue which has been sustained, probably not at all short of $\frac{1}{2}$ a million Sterling, from this cause, is alone no small matter.

"Public"

consider

the whole of the

circumstances

in 1857

the 11th June 1857

the 11th June 1857

the 11th June 1857

the 11th June 1857

the 11th June 1857

the 11th June 1857

the 11th June 1857

the 11th June 1857

the 11th June 1857

the 11th June 1857

in the present state of the finances, and
when the consequence of this neglect, in
the comparatively moderate return of the
banks, is telling against the progress of more
activity in India, it becomes a matter of
far greater importance. Had the Report
shown an increase of 18 Lacs as it ought
to have done, it would perhaps have thorough-
ly roused attention to the subject of internal
improvements.

3^d The actual meridian of Remond.

That indeed been what in any other case would be accounted astonishing success, but it is as not known, that by far the greater part of the Delta is still paying either nothing or a merely nominal tax for a state of improvement, far beyond any thing in any other district of India, a totally false estimate will be formed of the value of Irrigation works upon a large scale.

4th If public money is expended in excess by an Officer, tho' the Government have ~~some~~ work executed, for the money, a rigid inquiry is properly made, how much more is it necessary when such enormous sums are actually lost to Government through neglect in collecting -



Goodman
11th June 1857.

41
I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
A. Cotton Coll
Commandant of Engineers

