M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1627 Press ~~Mis.~~

95-96

Dated 30 —11— 1859.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 95. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue; dated 9th November 1859, No. 4588.

Read the following letter from A. PURVIS, Esq., Collector of Rajahmundry; to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Fort St. George, dated 24th October 1859, No. 153.

On perusing the observations contained in paragraphs 48 and 64 of the report submitted by Mr. Dykes, under date the 10th June last, and the statement given as an appendix to the same report, headed "Statement of Circar and Inam lands in seven of the villages included in the list submitted with Deputy Superintendent's letter, No. 120, of 1st February 1859," I was induced, with reference to the observation in the column of remarks in the statement referred to, to beg the Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement to inform me whether all the land entered as irrigated, both Inam and Government, was actually under irrigation when the land register, furnished by his department to that of the survey, was prepared, or whether, as I suspected, all land which *might have been irrigated* was also included.

2. I have now the honor to submit copy of the Deputy Director's reply, and of the statement which accompanied it. It will be seen that the land entered as irrigated, according to the survey accounts in the statement furnished to Mr. Dykes by the Deputy Superintendent Revenue Survey, was by no means all actually under irrigation, but that both land irrigated and irrigable was included. Other mistakes are also pointed out.

3. The result is that the "concealed cultivation," if such it can be called, in the villages in question, which are in the sub-division, instead of being, as Mr. Dykes supposed, 128, was 28 per cent. The facts thus being, through Mr. Dykes' having assumed the correctness of the statement furnished him, mis-stated by exactly one hundred per cent.

4. I have thought it right to send Mr. Dykes a copy of Mr. Master's letter and its enclosure.

From R. E. MASTER, Esq., Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement; to A. PURVIS, Esq., Collector of Rajahmundry, dated Nursapore, 19th October 1859, No. 350.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 29th ultimo, and its enclosure, and in reply to state that the land entered *as irrigated* according to the survey accounts in the statement furnished to Mr. Dykes by Captain Crewe *was not all* actually under irrigation, when the land register was prepared by my department. Under instructions from the Director of Revenue Settlement, I have classed as wet all land provided with irrigation, *i. e.*, both land irrigated and land irrigable from present resources, whether cultivated or waste. This fact alone vitiates all the conclusions arrived at by Mr. Dykes, for it is obvious that waste land cannot be considered as "concealed irrigation," merely because it is capable of being irrigated.

2. In addition, however, two serious mistakes crept into the above statement, which render the conclusion still more fallacious; the first was that a considerable extent of land in Kalagam-

pudi Polaveram, not provided with irrigation, had been erroneously classed by my department as wet, and the second that the Gumastha from the Survey office, who was deputed to the Taluk cutcherry, to obtain the proportions of the land shown in the statement, under the head of revenue accounts inadvertently placed the figures in the unirrigated instead of the irrigated column for the Inams of Emaraze Polaveram.

3. I have now the pleasure to forward a revised statement shewing the real comparison, for the seven villages, according to the survey and according to the revenue accounts. Excluding the irrigable waste from consideration, you will observe that the per centage of excess found by the survey over the revenue accounts, so far from being 128, as made out by Mr. Dykes, is only 53 in the Inam and 22 in the Zeroyty land, or taking the whole together 28 per cent.; an excess which cannot be considered extraordinary, seeing that the result of one main circuit of the taluk was an excess of 39 per cent. and of another one of 61 per cent.

4. The discrepancy between the irrigated and unirrigated land in Kalagampudi Polaveram in the two accounts arises from the different mode of classification. According to our rules, lands dependent on the rains are entered as dry, notwithstanding that they may be producing wet crops. It having been discovered by the Sub Collector that during the last Fusly nearly the whole village had produced wet crops, though only a small portion had received the benefit of annicut water, teerwa jasthi was clapped on the whole.

5. Irrigation from the annicut channels is distinguished in our accounts from that from other sources. In the above seven villages, however, the land entered as irrigated according to survey accounts, was irrigated exclusively from the annicut channels.

6. I regret there should have been so much delay in answering your letter. I wished to furnish you with a correct account and had to wait for certain statements of area from the Survey office. My recent absence at Masulipatam has also increased the delay.

Statement of Circar and Inam lands of seven villages of the Mogultur Taluk.

Names of villages.	By Survey Accounts.																By Revenue Accounts.															
	Inam.								Circar.								Inam.								Circar.							
	Irrigated.				Unirrigated.				Irrigated.				Unirrigated.				Irrigated.				Unirrigated.				Irrigated.				Unirrigated.			
	Cultivated.		Waste.		Cultivated.		Waste.		Cultivated.		Waste.		Cultivated.		Waste.		All other lands.		Total area of village.		Cultivated.		Waste.		Cultivated.		Waste.		All other lands.		Total area of village.	
	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.
Bagesweram ...	22	57	.....	...	...	...	...	...	146	92	2	60	.....	18	...	...	71	27	243	54	18	80	...	...	...	...	...	...	77	42	...	...	...	...	8	80	28	98	134	...
Kalagampudi Polaveram ...	4	94	.....	...	35	37	...	...	49	4	.....	...	204	14	32	46	77	62	403	57	14	62	...	...	...	...	...	...	4	81	112	...	...	...	...	...	27	47	30	10	189	...
Gagiparru	12	61	32	67	...	...	...	...	110	43	51	97	.....	...	...	...	33	79	241	47	8	60	...	...	...	...	...	...	23	80	133	25	...	...	...	...	9	95	31	20	206	80
Narsapuram. ...	18	70	11	91	...	...	...	...	119	38	58	36	.....	...	...	...	459	46	667	81	12	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	33	95	65	...	...	...	...	75	13	584	42	768	53
Madavayapallem	60	5	53	35	13	5	...	...	133	76	402	6	.....	...	...	...	208	11	870	38	8	40	...	...	...	...	...	...	74	93	83	85	...	...	...	...	139	55	178	93	485	66
Pemaraze Polaveram..... ...	124	54	47	96	...	...	...	...	416	4	96	79	.....	...	...	...	94	61	779	94	109	40	...	...	...	...	...	...	16	3	380	45	...	...	...	...	27	93	49	3	582	84
Gorintada	79	81	9	69	...	...	...	26	218	10	170	45	22	60	17	42	113	24	631	57	39	60	...	...	...	...	...	...	24	20	94	53	...	...	...	...	146	72	96	95	402	...
Total...	323	22	155	58	48	42	...	26	1,193	67	782	23	226	92	49	88	1,058	10	3,838	28	211	42	...	...	...	...	...	...	145	10	977	15	...	...	...	...	435	55	999	61	2,768	83

RAJAHMUNDRY DISTRICT,
NURSAPUR, 19*th October* 1859.

(Signed) R. E. MASTER,
Deputy Director Revenue Settlement.

(A true Copy.)

(Signed) A. PURVIS, *Collector.*

Ordered to be communicated to Government, with reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 30th August 1859.

2. It appears that from waste land, capable of being irrigated, having been blended with land actually irrigated in the statement furnished to Mr. Dykes by the Survey Department, Mr. Dykes was led to infer that the quantity of land exhibited in the revenue returns as irrigated was understated to the extent of 128 per cent., this difference being viewed by him as "concealed irrigation," whereas the difference between the two sets of accounts, according to a revised return furnished by Mr. Master, Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement, is only 28 per cent. The difference assumed by Mr. Dykes was further affected by other errors as pointed out by Mr. Master.

3. The correspondence having been placed on the Editor's table, the Board beg to suggest that the detection of the error now brought to notice, may be in like manner communicated.

4. Mr. Purvis will be requested to inform the Board what rates of assessment have been fixed for the lands dependent on the rains alone, noticed by Mr. Master in paragraph 4 of his letter.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON, *Acting Secretary.*

No. 96. ORDER THEREON, 30th November 1859, No. 1627.

Mr. Dykes appears to have been misled by want of accuracy in the statement furnished to him by the Survey Department, into the belief that the Karnam's accounts of the extent of land irrigated in the seven villages concerned, was much more incorrect than they really were.

2. The papers will be laid on the Editor's table as suggested by the Board.

(Signed) J. D. BOURDILLON,

Secretary to Government.

No. 4588.

PROCEEDINGS of the BOARD of REVENUE, dated 9th November 1859.

Read the following letter from A. PURVIS, Esq., Collector of Rajahmundry, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, Fort St. George, dated 24th October 1859, No. 153.

On perusing the observations contained in paragraphs 48 and 64 of the report submitted by Mr. Dykes, under date the 10th June last, and the statement given as an appendix to the same report, headed "Statement of Circar and Inam lands in seven of the villages included in the list submitted with Deputy Superintendent's letter, No. 120, of 1st February 1859," I was induced, with reference to the observation in the column of remarks in the statement referred to, to beg the Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement to inform me whether all the land entered as irrigated, both Inam and Government, was actually under irrigation when the land register, furnished by his department to that of the survey, was prepared, or whether, as I suspected, all land which *might have been irrigated* was also included.

2. I have now the honor to submit copy of the Deputy Director's reply, and of the statement which accompanied it. It will be seen that the land entered as irrigated, according to the survey accounts in the statement furnished to Mr. Dykes by the Deputy Superintendent Revenue Survey, was by no means all actually under irrigation, but that both land irrigated and irrigable was included. Other mistakes are also pointed out.

3. The result is that the "concealed cultivation," if such it can be called, in the villages in question, which are in the sub-division, instead of being, as Mr. Dykes supposed, 128, was 28 per cent. The facts thus being, through Mr. Dykes' having assumed the correctness of the statement furnished him, mis-stated by exactly one hundred per cent.

4. I have thought it right to send Mr. Dykes a copy of Mr. Master's letter and its enclosure.

From R. E. MASTER, Esq., Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement, to A. PURVIS, Esq., Collector of Rajahmundry, dated Nursapore, 19th October 1859, No. 350.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 29th ultimo, and its enclosure, and in reply to state that the land entered *as irrigated* according to the survey accounts in the statement furnished to Mr. Dykes by Captain Crewe *was not all* actually under irrigation, when the land register was prepared by my department. Under instructions from the Director of Revenue Settlement, I have classed as wet all land provided with irrigation, i. e. both land irrigated and land irrigable from present resources, whether cultivated or waste. This fact alone vitiates all the conclusions arrived at by Mr. Dykes, for it is obvious that waste land cannot be considered as "concealed irrigation," merely because it is capable of being irrigated.

2. In addition, however, two serious mistakes crept into the above statement, which render the conclusion still more fallacious; the first was that a considerable extent of land in Kalagampudi Polaveram, not provided with irrigation, had been erroneously classed by my department as wet, and the second that the Gumastha from the Survey office, who was deputed to the Taluk cutcherry to obtain the proportions of the land shown in the statement, under the head of revenue accounts inadvertently placed the figures in the unirrigated instead of the irrigated column for the Inams of Pemaraze Polaveram.

3. I have now the pleasure to forward a revised statement shewing the real comparison for the seven villages, according to the survey and according to the revenue accounts. Excluding the irrigable waste from consideration, you will observe that the percentage of excess found by the survey over the revenue accounts, so far from being 128, as made out by Mr. Dykes, is only 53 in the Inam and 22 in

the Zeroyty land, or taking the whole together 28 per cent.; an excess which cannot be considered extraordinary, seeing that the result of one main circuit of the taluk was an excess of 39 per cent. and of another one of 61 per cent.

4. The discrepancy between the irrigated and unirrigated land in Kalagampudi Polaveram in the two accounts arises from the different mode of classification. According to our rules, lands dependent on the rains are entered as dry, notwithstanding that they may be producing wet crops. It having been discovered by the Sub Collector that during the last Fusly nearly the whole village had produced wet crops, though only a small portion had received the benefit of annicut water, teerwa jasthi was clapped on the whole.

5. Irrigation from the annicut channels is distinguished in our accounts from that from other sources. In the above seven villages, however, the land entered as irrigated according to survey accounts, was irrigated exclusively from the annicut channels.

6. I regret there should have been so much delay in answering your letter. I wished to furnish you with a correct account and had to wait for certain statements of area from the Survey office. My recent absence at Masulipatam has also increased the delay.

STATEMENT of Circar and Inam lands of seven villages of the Mogultur Taluk.

Names of villages.	BY SURVEY ACCOUNTS.																		BY REVENUE ACCOUNTS.															
	Inam.								Circar.								All other lands.	Total area of village.	Inam.								Circar.						All other lands.	Total area of village.
	Irrigated.				Unirrigated				Irrigated.				Unirrigated.						Irrigated.				Unirrigated.				Irrigated.				Unirrigated.			
	Cultivated.		Waste.		Cultivated.		Waste.		Cultivated.		Waste.		Cultivated.		Waste.				Cultivated.		Waste.		Cultivated.		Waste.		Cultivated.		Waste.		Cultivated.			
	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.	A.	C.
Bagesweram ...	22	57	.....	...	...	...	...	...	146	92	2	60	.....	18	...	...	71	27	243	54	18	80	...	...	...	...	...	...	77	42	...	...	...	...	8	80	28	98	134	...
Kalagampudi Polaveram.....	4	94	.....	...	35	37	...	...	49	4	.....	...	204	14	32	46	77	62	403	57	14	62	...	...	...	...	4	81	112	0	...	...	...	...	27	47	30	10	189	..
Gagiparru.....	12	61	32	67	...	...	...	...	110	43	51	97	.....	...	...	...	33	79	241	47	8	60	...	...	...	...	23	80	133	25	...	...	...	...	9	95	31	20	206	80
Narsapuram... ...	18	70	11	91	...	...	...	...	119	38	58	36	.....	...	...	...	45	46	667	81	12	0	...	...	...	...	1	33	95	65	...	...	...	...	75	13	584	42	768	53
Madavayapallem..	60	5	53	35	13	5	...	...	133	76	402	6	.....	...	...	...	208	11	870	38	8	40	...	...	...	...	74	93	83	85	...	...	...	...	139	55	178	93	485	66
Pemaraze Polaveram.....	124	54	47	96	...	...	...	...	416	4	96	79	.....	...	...	..	94	61	779	94	109	40	...	...	...	..	16	3	380	45	...	...	...	...	27	93	49	3	582	84
Gorintada... ...	79	81	9	69	...	...	...	26	218	10	170	45	22	60	17	42	113	24	631	57	39	60	...	...	...	...	24	20	94	53	...	...	...	...	146	72	96	95	402	...
Total...	323	22	155	58	48	42	...	26	1,193	67	782	23	226	92	49	88	1,058	10	3,838	28	211	42	...	...	...	...	145	10	977	15	...	...	...	...	435	55	999	61	2,768	83

RAJAHMUNDRY DISTRICT,
Nursapur, 19th October 1859.

(Signed) R. E. MASTER,
Deputy Director Revenue Settlement.

(A true Copy.)

(Signed) A. PURVIS,
Collector.

Ordered to be communicated to Government, with reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 30th August 1859.

2. It appears that from waste land, capable of being irrigated, having been blended with land actually irrigated in the statement furnished to Mr. Dykes by the Survey Department, Mr. Dykes was led to infer that the quantity of land exhibited in the revenue returns as irrigated was understated to the extent of 128 per cent., this difference being viewed by him as "concealed irrigation," whereas the difference between the two sets of accounts, according to a revised return furnished by Mr. Master, Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement, is only 28 per cent. The difference assumed by Mr. Dykes was further affected by other errors as pointed out by Mr. Master.

3. The correspondence having been placed on the Editor's table, the Board beg to suggest that the detection of the error now brought to notice, may be in like manner communicated.

4. Mr. Purvis will be requested to inform the Board what rates of assessment have been fixed for the lands dependent on the rains alone, noticed by Mr. Master in paragraph 4 of his letter.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Acting Secretary.

To

J. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Secretary to Government, R. D.

Copy to Collector of Rajahmundry.

Exd. J. Wright.

R. 21st October 59 Nos 132 & 135

Pro. of the Bord of Rev.
Dated 12th March 1860 No.
891 in Rev. 31st Sep.

No 95 + 96.

23rd Nov. 1859

Revenue 1859 Depart.
Fr. of Govt. 30th Nov.
No. 2117.

Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue
Dated 9th
November 1859
Rec. 18 3

No. 4588.

No. 1627 - 30th November

Submitting with the Boards observations a communication from the Collector of Rajahmundry forwarding a letter from the Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement pointing out certain mistakes crept into the Statement appended with Mr. Dykes report dated 10th June last on the subject of the Godavery and Kistna Deltas.

With an Order

No 1627

Mr Dykes appears to have been misled by want of accuracy in the Statement furnished to him by the Survey Department into the belief that the Karnam accounts of the extent of land irrigated are more incorrect than they really were.

2 The papers will be laid on the Editors table as suggested by the Board.

Fort St. Geo.
30 Nov. 1859.

Reply to Board of Revenue Dept. No. 1 &
to — J. A. B. Dykes Esqr.