M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 517	Press / Mis.
Dated 12. 4. 1859.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

517

No. 81. Read the following Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 29th March 1859, No. 1078.

Read letter from J. W. Dykes, Esq., on special duty, under date the 1st Ultimo, No. —, submitting explanation of certain passages in his Report of the 11th September 1858 which were noticed as obscure in the Board's Proceedings of the 10th December 1858.

In Con. 8*th Dec.* 1858.

(In Consultation 12th February 1859, No. 545.)

Ordered that the foregoing letter be submitted to Government with reference to Extract Minutes Consultation of the 12th January 1859, para. 2, No. 51, R. D.

In Con. 13*th Jan.* 1859.

2. The land measure of the District of Rajahmundry is a Pooty, the extent of which varies in different localities. It is generally taken to comprize 8 Acres, but Colonel A. Cotton and Captain Rundall estimate it at 10, and Mr. Bayley, who has made great researches into the weights and measures of India, states that in some situations it contains as much as 11-52, and 12-8 Acres. Presuming that Mr. Dykes had converted it uniformly at the usual rate 8 Acres per Pooty, the Board observed that the excess found by his actual measurements over the extent entered in the accounts of the Tahsildars according to his calculation of it, could not always be justly called concealed cultivation the term always applied to it by Mr. Dykes.

3. For an explanation he now refers the Board to para. 145 of his Kistna Report. Hereafter mentioning the variation in the extent of the Pooty, he observes as follows—"but "as regards the existing state of things and the limits of this "enquiry, the official Pooty of 8 Acres was the only Pooty I ever alluded to in any of the "Rajahmundry villages which were measured. Even in discussing the lunka rates of assessment, "the Tahsildar and village authorities took the Pooty at its official value; and the official rate "of commutation was therefore adopted by me for the Rajahmundry District without hesita-"tion. Eight Acres is the value at which it was meant I should, and it was the value at which "it was known by the local authorities that I did, take the Pooty in Rajahmundry. And "having found this result thus manifestly false, and in favor of these local authorities and the "ryots, I entered the error as wilful on their part. I entered the area, irrigated in excess of the "irrigation Returns, as so much concealed irrigation."

From Mr. Dykes 5th Nov. 1858, *in Con. 26th Feb.* 1859.

4. In the absence of any mention of the extent of the Pooty in the villages actually measured by Mr. Dykes, the remarks given above do not remove from the mind of the Board an uncertainty as to whether the excess found by actual measurement, above the irrigation returns calculated by conversion of the Pooty into Acres at the rate of 8 Acres per Pooty was *wilfully* omitted. For, take an example—Certain land irrigated is exhibited in the village accounts as comprising 10 Pooties. This extent converted into Acres at 8 Acres per Pooty, as would be done by the Tahsildar and Mr. Dykes, would be equal to 80 Acres. But the Pooty of the Village happens to be a large one containing 10 Acres, converted at which rate the extent is equal to 100 Acres. Mr. Dykes actually measures the tract, and finds it to comprise 98 Acres. Such being the case, the village account expressed in Pooties exhibits more than the real extent; but the erroneous estimate of the extent of the Pooty as far as regards this village, makes it appear that there was a concealment of 18 Acres. The Board did not blame Mr. Dykes for converting the Pooty at 8 Acres; nor did they question the fact of the extent charged to the *Water Cess* being in many cases less than the real extent irrigated. They only doubted the *universal* applicability of the term "concealed cultivation" as implying wilful concealment to the extent exhibited by him as an excess—and the facts he now states, confirm their doubts on this point.

5. In para. 18of their Proceedings of the 10th December last, the Board observed that they could not understand the process by which Mr. Dykes had attempted to distinguish the portion of the increase in the joint rent to be ascribed to irrigation alone. Mr. Dykes now, in his Appendix, gives a figured Statement in explanation. On examining it the Board see, that the sum which Mr. Dykes would assume as a separate irrigation assessment is said to bear the same proportion to the consolidated assessment made up by the Joint Rent and Water Cess, as the diffrence between the demand in former years and at present does to the present total demand, which is com-

posed of the consolidated Joint Rent and "Grama Khurch." In regard to this sum of proportion the Board observe in the first place that in the example given the unknown quantity appears to be incorrect; and in the second place that referring to para. 27 of Mr. Dykes' Report of the 11th September 1858, the consolidated Joint Rent is entered as Rupees 2,253-4-0 which does not correspond with the entry in para. 22 or in the example.

In Con. 8th December 1858.

6. The construction which the Board put upon the example is, that first deducting the Grama Khurch, which, they have already stated their opinion, should not have been included in the term total Demand, the excess borne by the remainder over the Joint Rent before the Anicut was built is considered by Mr. Dykes to be attributable to that work and its subsidiary channels. The Board are of opinion that these Hydraulic works are the *chief* cause of the increase, but that, as remarked in Para. 18 of their Proceedings of the 10th December last, high prices and extention of cultivation in land not irrigated may have contributed to the improvement.

7. In para. 8 Mr. Dykes, adverting to para. 21 of the Board's Proceedings of the 10th December last, confirms the correctness of the interpretation put by the Board on some expressions in para. 22 of his report of the 11th September 1858, and maintains the propriety of his language. The Board do not concur with him. Although some land was irrigated twice over, it would have been quite correct, in their opinion, to have said, that owing to irrigation the average assessment was raised to 6 Rupees per Acre, and the statement that it was nearly 4 Rupees on the total extent of irrigation, meaning, but not expressing, that some land was cultivated twice over, was liable to be misunderstood.

In Con. 8th December 1858.

8. With reference to para. 9 the Board observe that they can readily understand, that under a Joint Rent the assessment of the lands of an individual, which happen to be of superior quality may be far higher than the average of the village, yet where, as in the present instance, it exceeds it by more than threefold, and the ultimate object of the discussion is to determine the additional assessment which lands can bear owing to improved irrigation, the circumstance was well worthy in their opinion of some remark. As shewn in para. 25 of the Board's Proceedings alluded to above, it strongly affects the question of the expediency of imposing a uniform Teerwa jastee or additional Water Cess.

Bd's. Pro. 10*th Dec.* 1858, *p.* 31.

9. Para. 11 relates to an objection made by the Board on the inexpediency of adopting Mr. Dykes' proposition of a temporary reduction of the irrigation rate as regards lands sown broad-cast. Mr. Dykes explains that the necessity for this would of course cease with the Joint Rents, but states the ground on which he thought that it might be useful in the interim. The Board do not quite comprehend his argument; but further remark is unnecessary as further experience, he states, has materially altered his opinion.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM, *Secretary.*

No. 82. ORDER THEREON, No. 517; dated 12th April 1859.

Ordered that the foregoing Extract be recorded.

(Signed) J. D. BOURDILLON,
Secretary to Government.

In Con. 12th February 1859, No. 545.

From J. W. B. DYKES, Esq., On special Duty,

dated Rajahmundry, 1st February 1859.

With reference to Minutes of Consultation in the Revenue Department under date the 12th Ultimo,* I now do myself the honor of submitting for consideration further explanations on the several points, in which I failed to express myself with sufficient clearness when reporting† the results of the special servey in the Godavery Delta.

* No. 51.

† 11th September 1858.

2. As supposed by the Board,‡ I beg to state that the Rajahmundry, accounts were furnished to me in the local measure of a Pooty, and were converted by me into Acres at the rate of 8 Acres to the Pooty. The grounds on which I considered myself justified in taking this step have been given at length in my report on the Kistna in continuation of the report under reference.

‡ Para. 9.

3. Viewed with reference to the estimates given by Mr. Bayley, Colonel A. Cotton, and Captain Rundall, I, undoubtedly, should have been far from justified in entering the whole excess found by survey as "concealed irrigation." And I regret that I did not explain in the first instant the grounds on which I had acted, instead of waiting till the question of local measurements was disposed of at once. Nevertheless I trust that the Board will kindly excuse the delay; and that the explanations now given* will prove satisfactory. When the Pooty was always taken at 8 Acres by the local authorities; when the village Curnums offered to convert their returns for me at that rate; and when it was well known by all the local authorities that I took the Pooty at that rate; I could not regard the excess shown by the Survey as otherwise than wilful.

* Kistna Report para. 143.

4. Very probably the old differences in the value of the local measure will go far towards explaining why this excess was so much greater in some localities than others. The natives found the error always in their favor, and as might be expected, they did not take particular pains to explain it. For this reason it would not be fair to treat those in fault, in the same way, as if there had not been this temptation in their path. But this, I would respectfully submit, does not affect the main point at issue. The error and the resulting excess was so much concealed irrigation as regards the data, on which the Joint Rent was to be fixed. And, with regard to, the Inams,* the Revenue Returns show that the water cess, if laid on the Pooty, was also invariably calculated by the *Pooty of* 8 *Acres*.

* Para. 9.

5. With regard to the Board's remarks in paras. 18 and 20, I beg to give now in an appendix, the figured statements referred to, and to express my regret that I should not in the first instance have explain- the process pursued, more clearly.

6. In para. 19 the Board express their wish that a comparative statement had been given, showing the gross revenue for some year before the Anicut was built, and in some recent year. This I attempted to do, when I took the revenue of 1845-46; and compared it with that of 1857-58; but, as the Board are aware, I have since been permitted* to draw up a comparative statement of this nature in a more satisfactory manner and for the whole Delta.

* Minutes of Consultation Revenue Department No. 51.

7. In para 21 the Board review another portion of my Report which was obscure, and remark that "the *extent* of land irrigated is not increased by the same land being irrigated *twice over*," which it was inferred that I intended to assert from using the terms of "*area actually irrigated*" and "*total extent of irrigtaion*" in contradistinction.

8. On this point I beg to state that the inference as to my intention is quite correct. And I trust to be able to show that the extent of land irrigated, is increased by being irrigated twice over. I of course do not mean to assert that the land itself is actually increased, but, viewed with reference to assessment, I would respectfully submit that the extent of irrigated land is virtually increased by being irrigated twice over. I do not mean to assert that measuring the land twice over would make one acre into two. But, if the same land is irrigated twice, the quantity of water consumed may be inferred to be double, and the irrigation assessment should be modified accordingly. The apparent inconsistency arises from the irrigation assessment being fixed on the land. It is therefore necessary to calculate the irrigation assessment in all cases by the acre. And I therefore used the terms "area actually irrigated," and "total extent of irrigation." in contradistinction to each other.

* Board's Para. 25.

9. With reference to the great differences* observable between the average consolidated assessment and the special assessment on certain fields as shewn in the produce tables in my Report, I beg to state that it was not made the subject of special remark, as I thought any observations of mine would be superfluous. In para. 9, the Board observe that " under a Joint Rent the demand is formed on general data, and not on accounts showing the extent of the occupation of each individual and its assessment." This important fact is the explanation of the observed difference; and was not given as I felt then sure that the fact was well known to the Board. The occupation of each individual and its assessment may be given correctly in the village accounts, and perhaps was in the cases in question.—But under a Joint Rent tenure, there is no certainly in the matter, and the assessment shown, must in most villages be so modified by the extent of concealed irrigation that I thought no reliance could be placed on such data; and any remarks of mine on such data would only swell a report, the perusal of which, as it was, would trespass too much on valuable time. The extent of Inam lands in these villages is also another source of error; which has been fully explained in the published Selections from the Government Records on the assessment of Kurnool;* and this point, it similarly seemed to me, unnecessary to refer to.

* Paras. 182, 183, 190. &c.

10. There is now one point, to which I would beg permission to refer briefly on my own account. I much regret that I did not express myself more clearly as regards the present results of water carriage in the Godavery Delta. But, when *distance* has been ignored in India, so great a step has been gained, that I forbore for the moment to look further. I felt that I ought to be content. We must wait to see the natives recognize *time*.

11. And finally, with regard to the recommendation of a distinctive rate, which I ventured to make in the case of villages such as Ogidy &c., and which the Board condemn as ill judged, I gladly take this opportunity of explaining, that I did not mean to suggest a distinctive rate based directly on the nature of the crop. Such a cure would indeed be worse than the disease. It was looking to a general rise in the rates throughout the Delta, that I made the recommendation, and my intention was simply to recommend that, in the event of this general rise, the general nature of the cultivation should, every where, be taken into consideration. Of course, as soon as the Joint Rent system is abandoned, there would be no necessity for such matters being considered. But, till the Joint Rent system is abolished, I wish to see anicut irrigation treated like every thing else, and due regard shown in raising the rates, to the general resources of each village, as manifested by the extent of land, there, that the ryots were only able to cultivate broad cast. Subsequently gained experience has, however modified my opinion in this matter materially.

APPENDIX.

Calculations made with a view to obtaining approximately the true extent to which a bonâ fide irrigation assessment has been levied on the Jont Rent lands;* or, in other words how far the rise in the Joint Rent is due to anicut irrigation alone.

* Godavery Report Para. 25.

Extract from Report.

" On the other hand the consolidated Joint Rent does not in any way show to what extent the Joint Rent has been raised for irrigation and in comparing the area actually irrigated on the Joint Rent lands, with the irrigation Returns sent in by the Tahsildar, the true extent to which a bonâ fide irrigation assessment has been levied, may be approximated by comparing the present total demand in former years, before the village had the advantage of a steady supply of water; and taking the same proportions of the consolidated irrigation assessment; as showing respectively what was the original Joint Rent, and what is the actual irrigation assessment."

Gundraidoo.

Statement appended to Para. 27.

	Rs.	A.	P.
Present total demand against the Joint Rent Lands.	2,327	9	6
Demand in former years &c...	1,184	13	6
Comparison or actual difference...	1,142	12	0

* Godavery Report.

Consolidated demand (para 22*) Rupees 2,136.

Then as Rs. 2,327 : Rs. 1,142 :: Rs. 2,136 : Rs. 1,048, "the probable amount to be deducted from the consolidated demand as a separate irrigation assessment."

The calculations for Meddapad were made in the same way.

N. B. It will be observed, perhaps, that I have given the "actual difference" for Gundraidoo as Rs. 1,142; whilst from the statement appended to para. 27 it would appear that the difference is really Rupees 1,145 which would change the proportion and make the results Rupees 1,051 instead of 1,048. This, I beg to state, is owing to Rupees 2-8 Quit rents having been inadvertently included in the total Joint Rents in the first instance. And as I only discovered the mistake and rectified this statement as I was sending off the report, I trust I shall be excused for having overlooked this necessary consequence.

SIDDUNTUM.

Godavery Report para. 43.

In this village the village expenses have risen Rupees 140 in the last 13 years; and the whole of this sum I have stated may be fairly carried to the credit of irrigation. But on revising the accounts I felt afterwards that I was scarce justified in pursuing this course. Taking the total Joint Rent on the mainland as shown in column 6 of the statement appended to para. 42, after deducting 100 Rupees for "ordinary" i. e., original village expenses to be borne by the Lunka and comparing this sum of Rupees 3,780 with the sum of Rs. 2,779 shown by the Collector as the consolidated irrigation assessment on the Joint Rent lands, gives Rs. 105 as the proportion of the increased village expenses strictly chargeable on the Joint Rent land under irrigation; and this sum has therefore been added to the consolidated irrigation assessment above referred to, and to the separate irrigation assessment, instead of the gross increase of Rs. 140, as my remarks would leave to be inferred. But this also was incorrect. Instead of the total assessment shown in column 6, only the Joint Rent and the irrigation cess on the Joint Rent lands should have been taken to obtain the proportion, and this would have given a some what larger result. The result would have been 112 instead of 105 Rupees.

Copy in a Letter to Engr
Dr 6th Septr/60 No 96.

D 548/59

12th April/59
No 517

D 81/82

Cons: 18th January 1859 No 2

Rec: 1859.

Cons 12th April

No 548

Copy in Letter to Engr

Dy 6th Dy 10th 1860 No 90.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

Dated 29th March 1859.

Recd 31

1 Encl. No 1078.

From Do 8th May 1859 & No 865 Cons:

Reviewing the explanation furnished by Mr Dykes in reference to certain passages noticed by the Board as obscure in his Report of 11th September 1858 relative to the irrigated area under the Godavery and Kistnah Anicuts.

No 517

Recorded

12th April 1859

Nos 881 & 882

5th April 59th

Recorded