

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 565	Press ~~MIS~~
6665	
Dated	6-6-1864

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
4th April 1864.*

No. 61. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 30th September 1863, No. 6,158:—

Read again the following papers.

Letter from the Collector of Nellore, dated 10th June 1863, No. 193, recorded in Board's Proceedings, dated 13th July 1863, No. 4,277.

Letter from the same Officer, dated 20th July 1863, No. 236, recorded in Board's Proceedings, under date 25th August 1863, No. 5,302.

Read also the following letter from the same Officer, dated 1st September 1863, No. 286.

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Board's Proceedings of the 25th ultimo, in respect to the Shrotriem of Gundlapalem and reply *serialim*.

2. The first point I am required to give an opinion upon is, whether the Shrotriem is not entitled to the remission of Rupees 954 under the Orders of Government of the 21st December 1859, No. 1,762, being arrears of Fusly 1265; and in reply I beg to state that in my opinion from the way the Government Order is worded it is an open question, but taken in conjunction with the Order of September 1855, specially referred to by Government, the Shrotriemdar should be required to pay.

3. The Board next require to be informed why Rupees 633 should have been collected for tank repairs, while Rupees 742-12-5 were recommended for remission. On this point there is no definite information on record. But I observe the former sum was recovered under the head of "Fazal;" and this may be presumed to have had something to do with the matter.

4. As regards the Statement, sent with my letter of the 10th June last, giving a "totally different version;" I have simply to observe that the Statement was drawn up to show the total demand in certain years and the way it had been met. The Order of Government was duly quoted in 1859, and a reference to that Order would at once have given information the Statement was not intended to show; and to infer that collections in 1855-56 had been regulated by remissions in 1859, is an anachronism not chargeable to the Statement.

5. In respect to the discrepancy commented on between Mr. Elton's Statement of repairs and that now furnished, I have the honor to state that the sum given by Mr. Elton is correct, but instead of referring to one year, 1855, Mr. Elton should have referred to 1853, 1854 and 1855.

6. The Board doubt whether in paragraph 4 of my letter of the 20th July I referred to the total increase under the Nellore tank or the Shrotriemdar's own cultivation, in reply I beg to state I referred to the Shrotriemdar's, when I said the Petitioner benefited from the improvement, and gave in the margin the extent, which the Board rightly conclude was given to acres.

7. Taking this latter supposition as correct, the Board observe the Petitioner or Shrotriemdar is only a gainer to the extent of 22 acres, and the benefits therefore most limited; whilst if I did not mean the man I was speaking of but meant instead the whole increase under the tank, then the Shrotriemdar's gains were one and something less than decimal 2 of an acre.

8. As I have already explained the one and something less than decimal 2 of an acre is not concerned; and I similarly object to the course pursued by the Board in the former calculation.

Years.	Area irrigated. Acres.	Years.	Area irrigated. Acres.
1850-51	173	1855-56	231
1851-52	228	1856-57	222
1852-53	217	1857-58	260
1853-54	63	1858-59	312
1854-55	107	1859-60	299

* This year claimed to be upwards of 420.

It is not I think a good or a usual way of estimating benefits by comparing extraordinary years. I prefer averages; which is I think also the usual way; and, thus estimated, on the first five years as shown in the margin, the Shrotriemdar or Petitioner's average cultivation was 182 acres, on the second 303.* He has

benefited in fact by the repairs to the extent annually of 66 per cent. on his previous cultivation. The value of an average gain annually for five years of 121 acres of rice cultivation can be readily estimated; and bearing this in mind, after a careful perusal of the previous correspondence, I have no doubt as to the definite proposal it is finally my duty to make under the Proceedings under acknowledgment.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
4th April 1864.*

9. I beg to recommend that the Shrotriendar's claim be rejected, and with reference to the increase of 66 per cent. in the area of his rice cultivation, he be informed that measures will be shortly taken in connection with the general scheme, as regards other similarly situated, for realizing hereafter in due course such share as shall be deemed due on the benefits conferred by repairs made at the sole expense of Government.

10. I have collected the greater portion of the information requisite for laying a general scheme before the Board in respect to the Anikat Shrotriems, which includes Petitioner's, and hope to submit the report in the course of a week or two.

1. In the Board's Proceedings, under date 9th October 1861, No. 5,491, recorded by Government under date 13th December 1861, No. 2,314, Mr. Dykes was directed to report further on the general subject of the Shrotriem villages in his District, and was specially directed to furnish explanation in regard to a claim put forward by the Shrotriendar of Goondlapallem for remission and refund.

2. Mr. Dykes has not up to this date reported on the general question, but the papers above recorded have reference to the special case. In his first letter Mr. Dykes requested that definite orders might be laid down on the subject of charging to Shrotriendars a share in the cost of repairs to irrigation works, but he failed to place before the Board sufficient information as to the merits of the particular case under discussion, to enable them to come to a decision. The Board accordingly directed him to bring forward on a future occasion the general question of the liability of Insimlars to pay for irrigation repairs, and to report how the Petitioner's case was affected by the final orders passed by Government in 1859.

21th December 1859, No. 1,762. on the subject of the Nellore Shrotriem balances, and what was the nature of the repairs for which payment had been taken, and what benefit was derived from them by Petitioner.

3. Mr. Dyke's reply to the Board's Proceedings gave very little more information than his previous letter, and as it seemed to the Board that he had taken a mistaken view of the objects which the Government had in view when issuing the orders referred to, he was requested after re-consulting those orders to make a definite proposal for the treatment of the Petitioner's claim for a refund.

4. The third letter recorded above is the reply to this requisition. Mr. Dykes unhesitatingly proposes that the Petitioner's claim be rejected not apparently, with reference to the orders of Government, to which he had been referred, as he considers the intention of those orders to be doubtful, but in consideration of the large benefits which Petitioner has derived from the outlay, the amount of which he now desires to have refunded. Mr. Dykes estimates the benefits at 66 per cent. on the Shrotriendar's previous cultivation. He arrives at this conclusion by comparing the average cultivation of two periods of five years each, viz, that from 1850-51 to 1854-55, and the other from 1855-56 to 1859-60, the latter period showing an increase of 121 acres on the average over the former. But if an average calculation is to be taken, the fair way of putting the case would be to compare the cultivation before the repairs with the cultivation after them. The repairs were made between 1853 and 1857. Taking then the cultivation of the three first years in the Statement 1850-51, 1851-52, and 1852-53 as the period before repairs the average will be 250 acres. The average cultivation of the seven years since or from 1853-54 to 1859-60 in the Statement, amounts to only 209 acres, i. e., 41 acres less; and not, as Mr. Dykes has it, 66 per cent. increase, to the Shrotriendar. It is, however, unnecessary to discuss further the benefits derived by the Shrotriendar, but as the Board are of opinion that Mr. Dykes has taken an incorrect view of his claim, and as the amount which he claims was credited to Government more than two years back, they resolve to submit the papers recorded at the head of these Proceedings for the consideration and orders of His Excellency in Council with the Board's recommendation that the sum of Rupees 640-13-7, may be refunded to the Petitioner.

5. The village of Goondlapallem, of which Petitioner is Shrotriendar, was for some years under attachment for arrears of the Government quit-rent, and with other similar villages in the

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
4th April 1864.*

Nellore District participated largely in the remissions which were from time to time given by Government on account of these arrears. In their Order dated 27th September 1855, No. 1,090, the Government granted large remissions on account of the arrears for the Fuslies 1261-62, and approved of the Board's orders in regard to those of the particular village. They further directed that all the Shrotriem villages then under attachment should be delivered to their owners on the understanding that thenceforward, the full amount of quit-rent (Jodi) should be regularly paid by the Shrotriendars. This Order did not reach the Collector until late in October of the same year, and the village in question was not handed over to the Shrotriendar until June of the following year, or at the beginning of Fusly 1266.

6. In the Order of Government dated 25th November 1856, No. 1,248, another large remission of arrears for Fuslies 1263 and 1264 was granted, as the Government were of opinion that the Shrotriendars who then consented to receive their Shrotriems should be able to commence their management free of embarrassment, and in that remission the village of Goondlapallem again largely shared. In paragraphs 10 and 26 of his letter, dated 6th November 1858, No. 189, reporting upon the Shrotriem balances for Fuslies 1265 and 1266, the Collector of Nellore alludes to the village of Goondlapallem. Mr. Elton states that that village had been handed over to the Shrotriendar at the commencement of Fusly 1266, and that a balance of Rupees 954 had accrued in Fusly 1265, while the village was under Government management, partly from a deficiency in

the out-turn, and partly from the sum of Rs. 638, a portion of the proceeds of the village having been carried to account in satisfaction of "Maramut" quota, payable by this Shrotriem for repairs to the Nellore Tank in 1855.* He recommended that this balance should be remitted, as well as a further demand, as shown

1851-56.	...	...	...	...	2-7	4	3
1856-57.	...	...	...	...	455	8	2
					742	12	5

in the margin, on account of similar claims against the Shrotriendar for other irrigation repairs. He justified the latter recommendation on the ground that the equity of making such a charge was very doubtful, the more so, as the irrigable lands of the Goondlapallem village were limited in extent as these lands were some times inundated, and as the village had been long held under attachment, owing apparently to the heaviness of the quit-rent.

7. The Collector's recommendations in this letter were supported by the Board, and the Government in their Proceedings acted in the margin, recognized the force of the arguments brought forward by Mr. Elton in favor of

remitting the "Maramut" balances, and accorded their sanction to this part of his proposal. In regard, however, to his remaining recommendations, that the arrears of quit-rent for Fuslies 1265 and 1266 should be remitted, the Government, with reference to their Order of September 1855, laid down general principles, in which these Shrotriems were to be treated. They directed (1) that the villages then under management should at once be given back to their owners with a remission of all arrears; (2) that the arrears due, since 1856, from the villages already restored, should be paid by reasonable instalments; and that in the event of these terms being declined, in either case, the villages should be at once resumed. In accordance with Mr. Dykes's interpretation of these orders the balance of Rupees 954 due from the village of Goondlapallem was realized

8. It will be observed from the foregoing remarks, that, as already noticed in the Board's Proceedings dated 25th August 1863, No. 5,302, it is questionable whether Petitioner is not entitled to a refund of the whole arrear of Rupees 954, for, as shown above, it accrued during 1855-56 while the village was under Government management, and it was evidently the intention of Government that the villages should be given over to their owners free of all arrears. In their final Order they directed that in the cases of those villages which had been already transferred the arrears since 1856 only should be collected. In any case, however, it seems quite clear that Petitioner is fairly entitled to the refund of Rupees 640-13-7, for this sum was, as it seems to

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
4th April 1861.*

the Board, improperly credited by the Government Officers in charge of the Shrotriem to "Maramut quota" instead of to quit-rent in Fusly 1263, and this very Maramut quota was, as shown by the Statement referred to in the marginal note above, a charge for irrigation repairs, of a precisely similar description to those executed in 1856-57, the charge for which, as shown at the commencement of the previous paragraph, was remitted by Government, the Government considering that it was not justly debitable to the Shrotriemdar.

9. The Board are glad to observe from the concluding paragraph of Mr. Dykes's letter that his general report on the Shrotriem is not likely to be much longer delayed.

No. 65. ORDER THEREON, 4th April 1861, No. 563.

1. The Government are of opinion that under the spirit of the Order of 21st December 1859, the entire arrear existing against Gundlapalem, viz., Rupees 954-4-10, should be remitted. The Board are correct in saying it was evidently the intention that the villages then in question should be given over to the owners free of all arrears.

2. It is at the same time very desirable that the question relating to the liability of the Shrotriemdars generally to contribute towards the cost of repairs to irrigation works benefiting their lands should be set at rest. It appears to the Government that the simplest plan would be to scrutinize the assessment of these villages and place it on such a footing that the payment thus made would include any responsibility on account of tank repairs. The difficulty of apportioning and collecting such charges would thus be obviated. In many cases the quit-rent already payable may be found sufficiently heavy to render a further contribution unnecessary. The Board will be good enough to take the subject into consideration. The present position of affairs is unsatisfactory.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER.

Deputy Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
" Accountant General.
" Civil Paymaster.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

No. 4,277.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 13th July 1863.

Read the following letter from J. W. B. DYKES, Esq., Collector of Nellore, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 10th June 1863, No. 183:—

* Nos. 1,558, 1,718, 2,490 and 3,223 of 1860.
No. 1,616 of 1862.

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the endorsed Petitions noted in the margin, and presented by the Shrotriemdar of Gundlapalem in the Taluk of Nellore in this District.

2. There is a grave question involved in these Petitions, and to dispose of the question therein set forth, I beg to be favored with the orders of the Board on this question, viz., the course to be pursued in recovering from Inam villages irrigated from Government works the share they may properly be required to pay of expenditure on those works.

3. My predecessor Mr. Elton recommended that Inamdars should not be required to pay for "costly repairs;" and the Government and the Board endorsed the justice of this recommendation, and in respect to Petitioners to the extent of Rupees 740.

4. But so based the recommendation did not leave the question on very clear grounds, and it is for more precise instructions I now apply.

5. That the Inamdars are liable for repairs there is no doubt, and in connexion with this portion of the question I would urge should be disposed of at the same time the question of improvements that is to say of the whole expenditure, and on what terms Inamdars are to be held entitled to participate in the results of those improvements.

6. In the large schemes, such as the Godavery and the Krishna, this latter question has been disposed of; in isolated works it has not as yet so far as I am aware.

7. And I would beg to recommend,

1st. That, as regards repairs, the Public Works Department should be required to specify what is absolutely requisite for the maintenance of the tank or other work in question, and all Inamdars, Shrotriemdars, &c., holding under the said tank or other work and hitherto liable, be required to contribute thereto in such proportion of such expenditure as shall hitherto have been so established.

2ndly. That as regards improvements, that is to say what is classed by the Public Works Department, as "New Works," and such portion of repairs as the Department shall not be able to certify to as absolutely requisite, that in respect to all such outlay, the Inamdars, Shrotriemdars, and others as aforesaid shall have the option either of contributing in the same proportion as for indispensable repairs, or being assessed on such cultivation as may be yearly measured in the block in excess of the area shown in our accounts as usually irrigated.

8. In carrying out the views laid down in respect to costly repairs, the sum of Rupees 742 was remitted to the Petitioners under the orders noted marginally. But this remission was not made with reference to previous payments under this head, or

Proceedings of Government, R. D., 21st December 1859, No. 1,761, paragraph 18.

such distribution of repairs by the Public Works Department, as I have here recommended. It was made simply with reference to the balance thus outstanding under this head; and in disposing of the claim now brought forward for a remission on the same grounds of Rupees 610-13-7, it will be necessary to decide how much of this money shall be retained for repairs considered

* N. B.—As regards the money in question, which has been collected, I beg to show in the accompanying Memorandum the circumstances under which it was collected.

indispensable, and how much should be returned as due for repairs properly falling under the head of "costly," or what was more than absolutely requisite for the due maintenance of the tank.*

9. I need scarcely add that the charge for repairs is running on and has to be settled for a great many Shrotriems, &c., as well as Gundlapalem, on which the gross liability at the present moment is Rupees 2,793; and in conclusion, in begging I may be favoured with early orders on the subject, I beg further that the Board will kindly have me furnished with a copy of the Statement forwarded with my letter of the 21st June 1863, which is referred to in paragraph 9 of the Board's Proceedings of the 9th October of the same year, and the original of which cannot at present be found here.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

MEMORANDUM of EXPENDITURE on the NELLORE TANK from 1853 to 1857, the share thereof realized from the Shrotriems of Gundlapalem under attachment in 1855-56, and the balance thus left as arrears of quit-rent.

EXPENDITURE.										Collections and disposal.									
Years.		Amount of repairs performed to the Neilore Tanks and Channels.			Share of repairs assigned to the Shrotriemdar.			Amount paid by the Shrotriemdar.			Balance.								
		RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.						
1853		6,157	4	3	342	1	0	230	9	4	111	7	8	Collections ascertained as above					
1854		6,834	12	1	379	11	3	...	...	...	379	11	3	Balance of Rupees 640 in 1855-56, when the Shrotriem was under attachment					
1855-56...		7,664	11	5	436	14	11	...	...	...	436	14	11	017 12 7					
1856-57...		8,199	3	10	455	8	2	...	...	...	455	8	2	Credits of the above amount as follows:					
Total...		29,055	15	7	1,614	3	4	230	9	4	1,383	10	0	Balance of share of repairs assigned to the Shrotriemdar... 640 13 7					
Remitted by paragraph 18, Proceedings of the Madras Government, dated 24th December 1859, No. 1,762.										742	12	5	Credited towards the Jodi of the Shrotriem in that year... 177 0 0						
Balance.....										640	13	7							

Balance left as arrears of quit-rent in 1855-56

The quit-rent in 1855-56 on the Shrotriem

The amount

3. The Board, accordingly, resolve to request Mr. Dykes to report on the following points (1). How Petitioner's case was affected by the Order of Government under date 24th December 1859? (2). What repairs were made and when? (3). What was the customary share of such repairs demandable from Petitioner? (4). To what extent Petitioner benefited by the repairs when made? (5). Whether under any peculiar circumstances the Petitioner might be relieved of any portion of the charge made against him.

4. Mr. Dykes will also be good enough to explain whether an annual charge is made against this Shrotriem for repairs of irrigation works, and what is meant by his statement that its liability on this account already amounts to Rupees 2,793.

5. The Board desire that an immediate reply may be sent to these Proceedings, and wish to know when they may expect the general report called for in their Proceedings dated 9th October 1861, No. 5,491.

(True Copies and Extracts)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Sub-Secretary.

To J. W. B. Dykes, Esq., Collector of Nellore.

Exd. J. Wright.

Requesting a further report on Petition
No. 1,400 of 1862.

No. 4,277.

Dated 13th July 1863.
Despatched
Received
13/7/63

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

No.

Rev: 2405/63.

For the Board of Revenue
and the Board of Revenue
R. D. D. 30th June 1863
1863
Department.

No. 5,302.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 25th August 1863.

Read the following letter from J. W. B. DYKES, Esq., Collector of Nellore, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 20th July 1863, No. 226:—

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Board's Proceedings of the 13th instant, and reply to the questions put therein.

1. The Petitioners' case was affected by the orders of Government of 24th December 1859, inasmuch as they were in arrears and paid up.

Years.	Description of work.	Total expenditure.	Share of repairs assigned to the Shrotriendars.	
			Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
1853	Excavating a field irrigation channel from the new sluice	102 8 2	6 11 1	
1853	Building a new Calingulah to the Sabab channel near the Betel gardens.	270 0 0	15 0 0	
1855	Repairing breaches to do channel.	29 0 6	1 9 10	
Total...		401 8 8	22 4 11	

2. The repairs for which a share of costs was collected, and of which remission is now claimed, are set forth in the accompanying Memorandum, and, with the exception of the items noted marginally, are general repairs of the tank, that at the same time improved the tank, and were executed between 1853 and 1857.

3. The customary share demandable from Petitioner for repairs was one-eighteenth; but there is nothing to show whether this was a limited liability, or for "such repairs" as were executed between 1853 and 1857.

4. The Petitioner benefited from the improvements by an improved supply, and improved storage. I give in the margin the area of irrigation as shown by a ten years' account I have had drawn out for the Anicut.

5. Whether under any peculiar circumstances the Petitioner might be relieved of any portion of the charge made against him, I have the honor to state, that, though I consider it was irregular to provide for the tank repairs before the quit-rent, I am not aware under present rules of any peculiar circumstances that would justify the return of the money.

6. Since then repairs have been carried on on a scale before unknown. The tank has been faced with a cut stone revetment. It has been provided with a head sluice. And the 2,793 Rupees referred to by me is subsequent liability up to 1862, as calculated in a Statement drawn up last year. An annual charge has not been made however.

7. There were many petitions in arrears; and this involving accounts, never very easy to reconcile, was long in being disposed of. A reference to the list of Petitions remaining unanswered now will show the Board the delay complained of is not likely to occur again. And as regards the Shrotriends generally, and the Board's orders of the 9th October 1861, I have the honor to state

they have been disposed of, and my report will be submitted as soon as I get the copy of the Statement applied for in my letter of the 10th June.*

* To Board.

STATEMENT showing the repairs for which		ENCLOSURE No. 1.									
		Share of costs was collected, and of which remission is now claimed by the Shrotriendars of Gundlapalem.									
Year.	Description of the works performed.	Total expenditure.	Share of repairs assigned to the Shrotriendars.	Amount paid by the Shrotriendars.	Balance.	Amount remitted by paragraph 18 of the Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, dated 24th December 1859, No. 1,762.	Balance, which sum having been credited on a rentd Betis in 1855-56, when the Shrotriendars was under attachment, is now claimed to be refunded.				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				
		Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.				
1853.	Repairing the Nellore tank. { Earthwork. New stone. Old stone. Building new sluice in the river channel. Earthwork. New stone. Old stone. Excavating an irrigation field channel from the new sluice.	1,692 5 1 2,197 13 8 727 12 4 868 0 0 719 8 6 62 0 6 89 4 0 102 8 2	94 0 2 122 2 4 40 6 2 31 7 2 39 15 7 3 7 2 4 15 4 5 11 1								
1854.	Clearing the new river channel—Earthwork. Repairing the door shutters of old river channel sluice. Earthwork. Tamping. Repairing breaches and raising the bund, &c. { New stone { Ordinary work. Emergent work. Old stone { Ordinary work. Emergent work. Gravelling. Repairing the Calingulah near Pottipatom. Do. the small Calingulah near do.	Total... 3,015 10 0 2 10 0 143 14 6 75 14 2 2,425 15 6 90 10 3 151 0 9 13 8 0 15 9 0	342 1 0 217 8 6 0 2 4 7 15 11 4 8 8 131 12 9 5 0 2 8 6 3 0 12 0 0 13 10	230 9 4 111 7 8	111 7 8						
From Jan. 1855.	Painting with chunam the retirement of the tank bund. { Earthwork. Repairing breaches—Earthwork. Building a Calingulah to the Sabeba channel near the Betel garden. Filling breaches in the Sabeba channel. Widening the river channel—Earthwork. Filling a breach in the new river channel near the Mulumudi Lodum. Excavating new channel between Gollakurukuru Lodum and river. Temporary embankment to the Lodum channel.	Total. 6,834 12 1 2,515 8 4 56 4 0 851 8 8 270 0 0 29 0 6 1,473 1 0 334 0 8 1,530 10 0 137 2 3	379 11 3 141 6 8 34 3 1 3 2 0 47 4 11 15 0 0 1 9 10 81 15 3 18 8 11 8 2 4 7 9 11		379 11 3						
April 1856.	Repairing a breach in the Lodum Calingulah—Stone work in chunam. Repairing a breach in the new river channel near Mulumudi Calingulah—Stone work in chunam. Repairing a breach in the river channel. Repairing the door shutters of the old channel sluice. Raising the tank bund. { Stone work. Earthwork.	Total. 7,864 11 5 481 0 0 684 7 10 244 5 10 58 11 0 5,836 8 8 914 5 6 8,199 3 10	436 14 11 25 9 9 38 0 5 13 9 3 3 4 2 324 5 10 50 12 9 455 8 2		436 14 11	287 4 3 149 10 8					
1856-57.		Total. 20,035 15 7	1,614 8 4	230 9 4 1,383 10 0	455 8 2	455 8 2	640 13 7				
Nellore, 20th July 1863.											

Nellore, 20th July 1860.

(Signed) J. W. B. DYKES, Collector.

1. The foregoing letter is Mr. Dykes's reply to the Board's Proceedings dated 13th July 1863, No. 4,277, in which he was requested to report particulars regarding the share and interest of the Gundlapalem Shrotriendars in certain repairs to the Nellore tank, and to state how the Shrotriendars' case was affected by the Order of Government of 24th December 1859.

2. On the latter point Mr. Dykes reports that the Shrotriendars were in arrear and that they paid up. This is no reply to the Board's query. The only arrear against the Shrotriendars was a sum of Rupees 954, which accrued while the Shrotriend was under management in Fasli 1265 or 1855-56. The Collector, Mr. Elton, recommended that this balance should be remitted, but in passing orders on the general question the Government directed* that the villages which were then (December 1859) under attachment should be restored to their owners, all arrears being written off, while those villages which had been already restored should be held liable to the payment of full Jodi from 1856.

* Order of Govt. 25th November 1856, No. 1,248.

3. It seems to the Board that as the village of Gundlapalem was included in the latter category, the arrear of Rupees 954 should have been written off under this order, as it had accrued previous to 1856, or at any rate partially so, being the arrear of Jodi payable for Fasli 1265, viz., from June 1855 to June 1856. The Collector is requested in the first instance to report his opinion on this point.

4. If, however, the Order of Government be taken to require payment of the full Jodi or Fasli 1265, and thereafter, the question arises whether this sum of Rupees 954 was really an arrear of Jodi, and whether the Petitioners' claim to a remission of a large portion of it under the circumstances reported in Mr. Dykes's former letter, and to its consequent refund should not be admitted.

5. Mr. Elton, in his letter dated 6th November 1858 (paragraph 10), writes in regard to this village, that all arrears of Fasli previous to 1265 (1855-56) had been written off, but that during that Fasli, while the village was under Government management, this arrear of Rupees 954 had arisen in consequence of Rupees 638 having been carried to account in payment of Maramut quota payable by the Shrotriendars, instead of in payment of Jodi, and that these repairs were made in 1853, he therefore included the balance as irrecoverable, and recommended its remission. In paragraph 26 of the same letter he entered into the injustice of calling upon Inamdars to pay large sums for irrigation repairs, and recommended that the sums noted in the margin, should be remitted.

The Government Order recognised the force of this argument, and remitted these latter amounts.

6. The Board do not understand why the one sum of Rupees 638 should have been collected for tank repairs, while it was recommended that the other two sums noted above, amounting to Rupees 742-12-5, should be remitted. The Collector will be requested to explain this, and also to account for the totally different version of the case which is given in the Statement which accompanied his letter of 10th June 1863, No. 183, from which it would appear that the whole Maramut balances standing against the Shrotriendars for Fasli 1263, 1264, 1265 and 1266, were charged against them; that the remission granted by Government was then taken credit for, and the balance met from the collections of Fasli 1265.

7. If the detailed Statement of irrigation repairs which accompanies the letter recorded at the head of these Proceedings is to be relied on, it would seem that Mr. Elton's statement, that Rupees 638 had been expended in repairs in 1853, was erroneous. An inspection of the Statement will also show that the repairs executed during the Fasli 1266 (1856-57) were of a similar description to those executed in the previous years. If, therefore, the whole sum debited against the Shrotriendard for the repairs in that Fasli was remitted, as being an improper charge, the actual course taken as shown in paragraph 5 above, it stands to reason that similar charges for previous

which

fitted Balance, which sum 18 of having been credited pl the from the collections vern- on a rented Beriz in June 1855-56, when the \$ Shrotriem was under No. attachment, is now claimed to be re- funded.	_____ 8 _____ P.
	RS. A. P.
	111 7 8
	379 11 3

1. The foregoing letter is Mr. Dykes's reply to the Board's Proceedings dated 13th July 1863, No. 4,277, in which he was requested to report particulars regarding the share and interest of the Gundhapollem Shrotriendars in certain repairs to the Nellore tank, and to state how the Shrotriendars' case was affected by the Order of Government of 24th December 1859.

2. On the latter point Mr. Dykes reports that the Shrotriendars were in arrear and that they paid up. This is no reply to the Board's query. The only arrear against the Shrotriendars was a sum of Rupees 954, which accrued while the Shrotriem was under management in Faali 1263 or 1855-56. The Collector, Mr. Elton, recommended that this balance should be remitted, but in passing orders on the general question Government directed* that the villages

• Order of Govt. 25th November 1856, No. 1,234. The villages which were then (December 1859) under attachment should be restored to their owners, all arrears being written off, while those villages which had been already restored should be held liable to the payment of full Jodi from 1856.

4. If, however, the Order of Government be taken to require payment of the full Jodi or Fasil 1205, and thereafter, the question arises whether this sum of Rupees 954 was really an arrear of Jodi, and whether the Petitioners' claim to a remission of a large portion of it under the circumstances reported in Mr. Dykes's former letter, and to its consequent refund should not be admitted.

1975-76... Rupees 257 4 3
455 8 2

The Government Order recognised the force of the arguments, and remitted the said latter amount.

...the one sum of Rupees 638 should have been collected

7. If the detailed Statement of irrigation repairs which accompanies the letter recorded at the head of these Proceedings is to be relied on, it would seem that Mr. Elton's statement, that Rupres 638 had been expended in repairs in 1855, was erroneous. An inspection of the Statement will also show that the repairs executed during the Fasli 1266 (1856-57) were of a similar description to those executed in the previous years. If, therefore, the whole sum debited against the Shrotriemdar for the repairs in that Fasli was remitted, as being an improper charge, the actual course taken as shown in paragraph 5 above, it stands to reason that similar charges for previous

Revenue Department

972/10

years should have been treated in a similar manner. The Collector, however, will be requested after a careful perusal of all the previous correspondence to make a definite proposal for the treatment of the Shrotriendars' claim.

8. The Board will only further observe that from the marginal Statement in paragraph 4 of his letter, it would seem that the benefits derived by the Shrotriendard from the very large charge which was made against him for irrigation repairs between the years 1853 and 1857 (according to Mr. Dykes's letter dated 10th June 1863, amounting to Rupees 1,614-3-4) were most limited, for the area irrigated in 1857-58 is only 22 acres in excess of that irrigated in 1851-52. The paragraph in question is, however, so obscure that the Board are not aware whether this represents the whole increase under the tank, or the increase of the Shrotriendard's own cultivation. If the former, the Shrotriendard's benefit by the outlay will be reduced to an additional wet cultivation of 1 1/2 of an acre. The Board presume that the figures represent acres, though no measure of land is given in the paragraph in question.

9. In conclusion, the Board trust that the Collector will lose no more time in submitting his general report on these Shrotriendard. As far back as 1859, the Government expressed their confidence that he would take care that the lax and dilatory proceedings which had been customary in regard to these Shrotriendards would no longer continue; and the Board cannot but consider that the delay of nearly four years, which has again been permitted to take place, is discreditable. In submitting his general report, Mr. Dykes will bear in mind the apparent intention of Government that the Jodi alone should be exacted, and their expressed intention that the Shrotriendard should be relieved of all charge for a share of costly repairs. He will also report distinctly on all so-called Maramut balances which have accrued against each Shrotriendard, and distinguishing past Fasli, explaining upon what data the share was assigned to each Shrotriendard, and distinguishing the costly repairs above alluded to from others of a more ordinary description.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Sub-Secretary.

To J. W. B. Dykes, Esq., Collector of Nellore.

1. In the statement showing the balances outstanding against the Shrotriendards in the Zillah of Nellore up to 12.61 inclusive, forwarded by the Collector to the Board of Revenue on 13th April 1855, the village of Gundlupalam, Nellore Taluk, was entered as being in arrears for the fasli noted in the margin to the amount of Rs. 1062-5-5 which

Fasli.	A.	A.	P.
1245	2-	10-	7
1249	186	7	7
1258	229	1	7
1259	650	15-	5
	1062-	5-	5

which was the balance
due on the 15th December—
1851.

2. The Collector stated
that after full consideration,
he was of opinion that the
amount was fairly due.
The renter, however, having
allowed the management
of the spotryam to be car-
ried on by Lincar Talup
servants for a portion of
Fasli 1259, it was resolved
to limit the demand for
this fasli to half the actual
outstanding balance. The
net demand against
the renter & his security
was thus left at Rs 689-8-8.
The sum to be remitted being
fixed at - Rs 372-12-9.

From D^o L^o 11th May 1855
L^o 11th May 1855
L^o 11th May 1855

D^o Bro: 13th August 1855
L^o 13th August 1855

3 The Board remarked
upon this case that they had
received complaints from
both the Renter and his
security of the proceedings
taken against them but
were convinced that the
petitioners were in circum-
stances to pay the sum
demanded and that they
had been "treated with
great leniency and for-
bearance considering the
collusive and contumacious
conduct displayed by
them in at first evading
and afterwards refusing
to discharge the just
due of Government."

D^o Bro: 13th August 1855
L^o 13th August 1855

From the statement
which was forwarded by
the

the Board with their
further proceedings it
appeared that the balance
outstanding against the
shetiyam on 15th April 1885
on account of Rs. 1262
amounted to Rs. 560-14-10.
This balance having accrued
while the shetiyam was
under the management of
the officers of Government,
and the village being at
the time of report still
under attachment, the Col-
lector considered that there
was no chance of recovering
any portion of the arrears.
The Board accordingly re-
commended that it should
be written off with other
irrecoverable balances.

The

5. The course proposed
by the Board was sanctioned
by G. O. No. C. 27th September 1885
No. 1090. That is to say the two
sums of Rs. 372-12-9 and
Rs. 560-14-10 were written off,
and the demand from the
proprietors of the balance on
the grounds noticed in para
3 above was declared to be
right and proper.
6. It was further di-
rected that all the shetiyam
villages under
attachment should be sur-
rendered to their respective
proprietors on the understand-
ing that the full jody
must be paid, and that
failure would involve the
forfeiture of the shetiyam.

In

7. In 1856 another statement was submitted by the Collector showing the shobryam balances outstanding to the end of December 1855. The total arrears due from Goondlapallein amounted to Rs. 2008-15-8 of which Rs. 16-1-0 being considered recoverable the irrecoverable balance for the years 1263 & 1264 was entered in the margin.

Insta 1263	Rs.	867	-	13	10
on 1264	-	1123	-	0	10
		<u>1992</u>	-	14	8

This was recommended by the Collector for remission, the village having been under Circar management and there being little hope of their current resources coming up even to the amount of the current demand. Satisfaction was

was accorded for this in C. No. 6. 25th Nov 1856. H. 1918.

76th Nov 1858 H. 187.

8. The shobryam balances were again reported upon by the Collector in 1858. The amount standing against Goondlapallein was Rs. 950-4-10 the whole of which was classed as irrecoverable. This village had been restored to the shobryamdar from F. 1266. The balance due was on account of 1265 and accrued partly from a deficiency in the outturn previous to restoration and partly in consequence of a considerable portion of the proceeds of the village. Rs. 638 having been carried to account in satisfaction of maximum quota

Pa. = 10

"quota payable by this shro-
 "briem on account of repairs
 "performed in 1855 to the tank
 "of Kellore from which its
 "means of irrigation are
 "supplied."

9 With the same
 letter the Collector for-
 forwarded a statement shew-
 ing the amount of un-
 dermined balances due on
 certain Shobryam villages
 on account of the quota
 charged to them for repairs
 performed to tanks and in
 river channels by which
 they are supplied with
 irrigation. The amount
 due from Goundlapallem
 and other particulars are
 entered in the margin. In

Description of work	Year in which the work was performed	Amount of Rupees	
		Rs.	P.
River channel &	1855-56	287	1/3
Kellore Tanks	1856-57	465	8/9
Total		752	12/5

11
 the opinion of the Collector
 the equity of charging a
 proportion of costly re-
 pairs and improvements
 of this kind to the Shobryam
 dars who are already in-
 many instances highly
 affected was very question-
 able, especially as their
 lands might not sensi-
 bly benefit thereby and
 they have no voice in the
 matter. The irrigable lands
 in this village were re-
 presented to be limited in
 extent and as it had been
 long under attachment, ap-
 parently owing to the bea-
 rinefs of the peshkash. Mr.
 Colton asked permission to
 class this sum of 742-12-5

is irrecoverable.

10 In their Proceedings marginally noted, the Board of Revenue (paras 9 & 12) recommended that the Collector's proposals in both cases should be carried into effect, viz that the sums referred to in the two preceding paragraphs should be remitted.

" About the second of these, viz the sum of Rs. 742-12-5, the orders finally passed are clear. In para 18 of their order dated 24th December 1859 No. 1762, the Government, regarding the reasons given by the Collector for his recommendation as sufficient, remitted

the

Proceedings 31st August 1859
No. 3417.

12
the sum outstanding on account of the cost of repairs made in Shobrigum villages to tanks and channels watering Government villages also. No specific orders were, however, passed in regard to the sum of Rs. 954-4-10 referred to in para 8 above. The circumstances under which the balance had accrued were plainly alluded to in para 9 of the G. O. where it was said "the balances recommended for remission in the 11 villages above referred to as having been taken back by their owners, accrued under Government management, being the difference between the actual collections and the jodi

the

"the order of Sept:
"1856 intended an immediate
"adjustment; but instead
"of that, the shobriyans
"were allowed to defer ma-
"king a final decision, and
"the villages were given up
"at different times in the
"three faslis 1266 to 1268. The
"present arrears accrued, in-
"through that delay." Instead,
"however, of saying definite-
"ly whether the Board's re-
"commendation was to be
"complied with, certain
"general principles (para-
"16 of the G.O.) were laid
"down for future guidance.
"It was first determined
"that villages still under
"management should be
"given

13
given back to the owners
with a remission of all
arrears, the quit-rent in
future to be strictly exacted
and it was then ruled that
"the quit rent due since 1856
"in the villages which have
"been taken back by their
"owners, or which have never
"been under attachment will
"be required to be paid by
"reasonable instalments." It
was not distinctly said
that any arrears were to
be remitted but as it was
stated that the quit rent
due since 1856 was to be
paid and as the arrears re-
ported upon included sums
due on account of Faslis
1263-1264-1265 and 1266 i.e.
1853-54-1854-55-1855-56-1856-57
it

it might reasonably be
supposed that some por-
tion, at least, of the arrears,
was in fact to be remitted.

12. It is to be observed
that in the Memorandum
with reference to which this
order was drafted, Mr. Roundell
definitely proposed, (para 12)
that the arrears on the 14 vil-
lages above alluded to (in-
cluding Goundlapalam) -
should be remitted, as to
allow the owners manage-
ment to begin without im-
pairment, and the general
spirit of the G.O. seems to
imply that such arrears as
have arisen during Govern-
ment management should
be written off the future
management

✓ from Govt's 204. letter
dated 21 June 1889

14
management being conducted
in a strict manner.

13. However this may
be the Collector who pro-
ceeded to carry into effect
the instructions contained in
the order in question had
no hesitation in calling
upon the Goundlapalam
shetrigamdar to pay up, and
on their positively refusing
to do so he at once ordered the
resumption of the village
from the close of Fasli 1269.

14. In the habular state-
ment which accompanied
the Collector's letter the
following note was made
of the reasons alleged by the
shetrigamdar, in enquiring for
not-defraying the balance.

The

he must be responsible for
"the arrears."

15. Subsequently to send-
ing in this report it ap-
pears that the Shobriyandars
agreed to pay the bal-
ance by three instalments.
The Board in noticing this
observed that if it was true
as the Shobriyandars alleged
that the sum of Rs 314 odd
charged on account of repairs
to the Tellore Tank was in ex-
cess of the proper share due,
it should properly be remit-
ted or reduced to its proper
amount. Mr. Bykes was re-
quested to furnish explana-
tion on this point.

16. The correspondence
which has since taken place
on this subject is forwarded
with the Board's Proceedings
of

MS. No. 9th Oct. 1861. 225891
Para 9.

"The arrears in Tash 1265
arise, it is stated, from
Rs 610-13-7 having been taken
for the repair of the Tellore
Tank, the same being in ex-
cess of the proper share due,
and paid because the Shobri-
yandars themselves attached
it. It has been paid
it is urged for items remit-
ted by Government. The bal-
ance of Rs 314 is similarly
objected to as attachment-
arrears. As regards the for-
mer objection the Collector
went on to say "the remission
made by Government was
in the amount uncollected;
as regards the latter the at-
tachment was the fault
of the Shobriyandars and
he

of 30th September last No. 6188.
The Collector in reporting on
this claim took occasion to
ask orders on the general
question regarding the course
to be pursued in recovering
from Indian villages irriga-
tion from Government works
their proper share of expen-
diture on such works. He
remarked that the revision
of 1842 already sanctioned to
the Petitioners was not made
with reference to previous
payments but simply be-
cause there was a balance
outstanding - and he there-
fore considered it necessary
to decide how much of
the Rs 640 now under con-
sideration should be re-
turned for repairs considered
indispensable and how much
should

No. 13th July 1863. No. 1177.

16
should be returned as due
for repairs properly falling
under the head of "costly".

17 From the state-
ment appended to his let-
ter it appeared that of
Rs. 29,000 odd, the cost of re-
pairs performed to the Bel-
lore Tank and channels
from 1853 to 1857, the sum of
Rs. 1,614-3-4 was the share
assigned to the Sotriyandans
of Gundlupalam and of
this 230-9-4 had been paid
and 742-12-5 remitted leaving
610-13-7 the balance in dispute.

18. The Board declined
to enter upon the general
question, without further
and fuller information. On
the particular case they
asked for report on certain
points - viz. (1) how the

Sotriyandans

Shobriyandara's case was af-
fected by G.O. 21st December
1859 (2) What repairs were
made and when (3) What was
the customary share demand-
able from this Shobriyam (4)
to what extent had the Sho-
briyandara benefitted by
the repairs when made and
(5) Whether under any pecu-
liar circumstances the Sho-
briyandara might be re-
lieved of any portion of
the charge made against him.

19. The Collector in
reply stated (1) that the
Shobriyam was in arrears
and therefore affected by
the order of December 1859.

(2) that the repairs were ge-
neral repairs and improve-
ments to the tank executed
between

17
between 1853 and 1857 (3) and
that the customary share
payable by Gundlapolam
was one-eighteenth (4) that
the Shobriyandara had bene-
fitted by improved supply
and storage of water, the
area under irrigation having
considerably increased and
(5) that he knew of no pecu-
liar circumstances which
would justify the return
of the money.

20. It occurred to the
Board, however, that under
the circumstances which
have already been remarked
upon in paras 11 & 12 of this me-
mo the arrears of Rs. 954 should
perhaps have been written
off under the order of
December 1859 as having
occurred

Rs. 25th August 1863.
24.5302.

accrued in whole or part
previous to 1856. The Col-
lector's opinion was request-
ed on this point. If however
the order of Government re-
quired the payment of the
full Jodi of Fasli 1265, the
question then seemed, was
the sum aforesaid really
an arrear of Jodi? it was
clear from Mr. Elton's letter
of 1858 that 638 Rs. out of the
951 Rs. had been carried to
account in payment of
Maramet-gasta instead
of in payment of Jodi; and
while subsequent arrears on
account of irrigation repairs
had on the recommendation
of the Collector contained in
the same letter been remit-
ted by Government it was
not clear why similar
arrears

16
arrears for previous years and
for expenditure of exactly the
same description should not
also be foregone, for if one was
an improper charge so must
the other be. In regard to this
point also the Collector was
asked to peruse the previous
correspondence & submit a
definite proposal.

21. The Board at the
same time pointed out that
according to the figures sub-
mitted by Mr. Dykes the
briyandah had not bene-
fitted from the irrigation
repairs so much as the Col-
lector seemed to suppose; the
area irrigated in 1857-58 being
only 22 acres in crops of that
irrigated in 1851-52.

22. In reply to the first
query

young Mr. Dykes thought it an open question whether the sum of Rs. 754 should not be altogether remitted, but on the whole would make the shobryandaz pay. On the second point - viz why repairs on account of tank repairs should be remitted for one year and collected for another, he could give no definite information.

23. Mr. Dykes further demurred to the mode adopted by the Board in estimating the benefits accruing to the shobryandaz from the repairs. Instead of comparing extraordinary years as they had done, he preferred averages, and in this way comparing one set of years with

19
with another it appeared that the shobryandaz had in the latter period gained by the repairs to the extent annually of 66 per cent on his previous cultivation.

24 Under these circumstances the Collector had no hesitation in recommending that the shobryandaz's claim should be rejected.

25 The Board having now sent up the case for the orders of Government they disagree in toto with the Collector and recommend that the sum of Rs. 640-13-7 may be refunded to the shobryandaz. On a review of the whole correspondence they think it very questionable whether the entire amount

* H.D. Lm. 30th Sept. 1963. H.D. 6188.

of Rs 954 should not be
remitted as it accrued during
Government management
in 1855-56, and as it was evi-
dently the intention of Govern-
ment that the villages gene-
rally should be given over
to their owners free of ar-
rears. In any case they
are of opinion that the sum
of Rs 640-13-7 was improp-
erly credited by the Go-
vernment officers in charge
of the shobriyam to "Mara-
mut quota" instead of
to dist. rent - in 1265, the
said Maramut quota be-
ing a charge for irriga-
tion repairs of a precisely
similar description to those
expended in 1856-57 the charge
for which was remitted
because

no
because Government con-
sidered that it was not
justly debitable to the shob-
riyandar.

26. They further ob-
serve in regard to Mr. Dykes's
estimate of the benefits which
the shobriyandar has de-
rived from the outlay in
repairs that if the cultiva-
tion before the repairs is
compared with the cultiva-
tion after them, the result
is a loss acreage of cultiva-
tion instead of an increase
as supposed by the Collector.
27. The Board's recom-
mendation seems fair enough
and should I think be com-
plied with. But with the
Government's ^{express} opinion
on the question whether
the

The whole affair should
not have been remitted &
the question too of the share
which Srotrindars should
pay towards cost of repairs
to irrigation works benefit-
ting their lands has still
to be brought forward. At
present it is in an unsatis-
factory condition. Should
Mr. Board be requested to
take steps to bring the matter
to a decision?

This seems very
desirable J.A.S.

The case stands thus -

The Shrotrindar was under attach-
ment in 1855/6 and rented out for Rs 817-13-7.
At that time there was a claim of Rs 1383-10
against the Shrotrindar for Tank repairs -

The then Colr appropriated Rs 640 of the
rental of 1855/6 to part payment of this Tank
charge & the balance Rs 177 to Dist Rent for 53/6
which was Rs 1131 -

Thus the Shrotrindar remained
a debtor to Govt of Rs 742 for repairs & Rs 954 for Dist
Rent. In their order / 24 Decr 1859 / Govt remitted

the 742 Rs for repairs & there can be
no doubt they would have remitted the
whole charge if it had been outstanding.
The remission was on the general ground
of the impropriety of charging relatives al-
ready over-assessed with a share of
costly repairs & improvements - and
if the Govt look at the statement in Mr.
Dykes letter of 25 Augt last they will
see that the repairs paid out of the Dist
Rent & the repairs remitted were all
of the same character.

The 640 Rs ought, I think, to
be remitted under these circumstances.
(by implication) See the same order ^{partly} Mr. Dykes
arrangements of Dist Rent prior to 1856 to
be remitted in the case of villages de-
structured by the Colr since Sept 1855 &
interferently taken back by the owners.
This Shrotrindar - ~~whether~~ ^{though not} requested after
that date ~~remitted~~ - was then under
attachment and rented out - The
arrears therefore should have been re-
mitted - Its amount after deducting
the 640 Rs above mentioned & the 177 paid
in 1855/6 would be Rs 313.
The Shrotrindar would then
receive back Rs 954-4-10 - or so much
as he had paid of that sum, the balance being

written H.

The above per-
sons are merely
the victims of
an oversight or error.
The claims of J. J.
to Tank repairs
have been settled.
It is possible he is
suffering by these repairs.

L.S.

Some with it shall be

M

W

For Order

25th March/64

U.S.

Some in the property of
the repair or renovation, & then
- also that the repairs are wrong -
It is certainly desirable that the property
of the Station Manager paying a portion of Tank repairs
should be set at rest. - The Tank Station property
should be repaired. It might be called on to do so -
But as the expenditure appears to be too heavy, & as it is a
difficult & unpleasant matter to appoint a collector, for
the purpose of making a survey of the property, & place
it in a position where in my opinion would be to strengthen the property of the
Tank repairs, the preferable course is in my opinion to give up the property of the
it is a property which would suit the circumstances of the property of the Tank repairs.

Revenue Department
No. 565.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 15th March 1864.

Read the following
Proceedings of the Board
of Revenue.

Submitting with remarks
letter from the Collector of
Tellore regarding the Station
of Gundlupet.

The Government
are of opinion that under
the spirit of the order of
24th December 1859, the entire
amount existing against
Gundlupet, viz Rs 98, 4-10
should be remitted. As the
Board are correct in
saying it was evidently
the intention that the v.l.
be then in question.

should

should be given over to
the owners free of all
arrears.

It is at the same
time very desirable that
the question relating to
the liability of the share-
holders generally, to
contribute towards the cost
of repairs to irrigation
works benefitting their
lands should be set at
rest. It appears to the
Government that the
simplest plan would
be to scrutinize the as-
sessment of these vil-
lages and place it on
such a footing that
the

23
the payment thus made
would include any res-
ponsibility on account
of Tank repairs. The dif-
ficulty of apportioning
and collecting such charges
would thus be obviated.
In many cases the quit
rent already payable
may be found suffici-
ently heavy to render a
further contribution unneces-
sary. The Board will be
good enough to take the sub-
ject into consideration. The
present position of affairs
is unsatisfactory.

المجلس
٢٣

16 Copies to the P. & W. Secy. Govt. Secy.
3 — to the Secy. of the
3 — Civil Engineer

12-91

Revenue 1864 Sept 10.
Pro. of Govt for April.

Pro No. 58-59
24-12-59
140-141
13-12-61
12-14
27-9-1855
21-23
25-11-56

No 565.

of the Madras Govt.
14th April 1864.

Pro B of R. dated 11 April 1864
985 of 1864

Letter from the Collr
of Kellore regarding the
Shrotriendar of Coondla
following with orders thereon

No 64 565.