M.R.O. 1—29,000—16-10-29.

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

---

## Government of Madras.

## Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2350 Press ~~Mis.~~

117-118 Dated 16-9- No. 1868.

***Not to be folded or roughly handled***

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,*
*10th September* 1868.

No. 117. Read the following letter from the Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 31st July 1868, No. 49 :—

1. I have the honor, with reference to the Order of Government, Revenue Department, of the 20th ultimo, No. 1,740, to submit the correspondence as per margin which has taken place with reference thereto.

To Agent, No. 75, 24th June.
From do. ,, 138, 9th instant.

2. It will be seen that the Agent, Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, does not consider that the arrangement which the Board of Revenue propose to substitute for his system of water tickets, would answer his purpose, and it appears to me that the Board's plan would entail quite as much labor as that which Mr. Henslowe desires to have adopted, only in the former case this labor would be distributed.

3. The Agent proposes to give the Curnums some trouble, and he is ready to pay for so doing, and, therefore, thus far I beg to recommend the sanction of the use of the water tickets. Mr. Henslowe does not refer specially to paragraph 8 of the Order under reply, and so the remuneration of the Curnums has yet to be decided upon. As, however, it is by no means certain that ryots will like to go to the Curnum in the first place, and to the Divisional Engineer's Office afterwards, and as the stamping of the duplicate of the water ticket, which is the ryot's voucher, in the Engineer's Office, is not, in my opinion, of much moment, I would suggest that the triplicate and quadruplicate of the ticket be collected by the Company's Peons from the Curnums, and not, as the Chief Engineer appears to suppose, from the ryots. It will then rest with the Company's officers to collect the tickets just as frequently as may be deemed desirable, and all the Curnum would have to do, when issuing the duplicate to the ryot, would be to put the triplicate and quadruplicate in a printed cover, furnished to him for that purpose, in readiness for the peon at his next call. All the tickets should be numbered in print before the issue of the ticket books to the Curnums, and thus the Engineers will be enabled at once to make enquiries should any ticket be missing.

4. The ryots should not be obliged to carry about their water tickets to the fields, for it would be unreasonable to expect a man to take care of a bit of paper for five or six months, and always have it in his pocket: but they should be required to produce it at the village on the demand of the Divisional Engineer, or on that of a Revenue Inspector, whose appointment shall have been duly notified to the village officials. No other employés of the Company, unless hereafter specially authorized with the approval of Government, should be permitted to interfere with the ryots.

5. As the time and labor involved in preparing tickets will depend upon the number of fields to be separately entered, rather than upon the area of the fields and the value of the water rates, for, on a ryot applying to have a field of such and such a number irrigated, the Curnum must satisfy himself by an inspection, either of a Revenue Register or of the Ryot's Puttah, whether such field belongs to him; it appears to me that the remuneration of the Curnum should be dependent upon the number of tickets issued, and I would suggest that he be paid 2 Annas for each

may partly be avoided. It need not be

ticket in quadruplicate, and 1 Anna additional for every extra field involving another line, with particulars of area, &c. This remuneration to be paid monthly, and the amount to be sent to the Curnum from the Divisional Office, with a receipt for his signature.

6. I do not see any objection to the ryot's name being entered at the top of the permit, as proposed in paragraph 4 of the Revenue Board's Proceedings, instead of in a column, as in the Agent's form; on the other hand, as the writing of the name four times will in either case be necessary, the gain will be confined to a slight diminution of the area of the ticket.

---

From the Acting Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Agent and Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Madras, 24th June 1868, No. 75.

In forwarding herewith copies* of the Proceedings of Government, Revenue Department, No. 1,740, of the 20th instant, I have the honor to request that you will be good enough to furnish me, with reference to paragraph 1 of the Order, with such remarks as you may have to offer on the Revenue Board's proposals regarding Irrigation Permits to ryots.

* In triplicate.

---

From the Agent and Manager of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Consulting Engineer for Irrigation and Canal Company, dated Madras, 9th July 1868, No. 138.

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter, No. 75 of the 24th ultimo, in reference to the Revenue Board's proposals on the subject of Irrigation Permits to ryots.

1. I may first be permitted to allude to Captain Mullins' opinion, that the arrangement proposed by me will not prevent the fraudulent or irregular use of water. My intention certainly embraced that object among others, and I still think that this system (or a similar one) carried out carefully ought to ensure it. If a ryot is found irrigating two acres, and can only shew a permit for one, he would be called upon to pay double for the second.

2. I should have been disposed to think the Collector's objection to making the ryot deliver the duplicate and triplicate (which had indeed already struck me) a reasonable one, but I find that the Chief Engineer, who has better opportunities than I have for judging of local circumstances, strongly objects to the Company's Peons collecting the permits.

3. Paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Board's Minute must be considered together. The objects of the permit are :—

First, to afford a check against the ryots using water without paying for it, the operation of the permit would be something similar to that of a Railway ticket. Passengers are made to shew their tickets, and if they cannot do so they are made to pay. Secondly, to afford me an opportunity of preparing and keeping the Revenue accounts.

As my *disbursement* accounts are based upon *vouchers*, so a system of permits would enable my staff to prepare the *Revenue* accounts on a similar system, and with ease.

4. My object in adopting this voucher system was to relieve the Engineers of account keeping, and to ensure greater accuracy; and I am unwilling to throw upon the Engineers the burden of Revenue account keeping, which would infallibly be the result of leaving the Curnum to supply abstracts to the Company's Officers at Kurnool.

5. I have not been long enough in India to venture to express an opinion upon the general question of the integrity, intelligence, and abilities of native officials; but as yet I have not learned to understand their ways and mode of transacting business, and therefore I prefer *not* to trust to



them; and as my experience shews that native officials *have*, in contravention of the orders of Government on the subject, delayed for *several months* the forwarding to the proper quarter of *applications* for water, I have no reason to hope that if the keeping of registers for revenue purposes were left in their hands, greater punctuality and accuracy would be observed. On the 10th September 1866, in reply to a letter I addressed to the Chief Engineer, he stated, "about 400 acres more than applied for are said to be irrigated, but applications at present take about *two months* to reach us through the Curnum, Deputy Collector, and Collector."

In a letter to Mr. Pochin, dated 24th October 1866, Mr. Latham thus expressed himself: "The following are the dates on which I received applications :—

*May 9th*, 10*th*, 14*th*, 22*nd*, 26*th*.
*June* 11*th*,
*July* 24*th*,
*August* 10*th*.

On the 27th September, after my list was complete, I received from you applications which were marked in the Curnum's book as having been sent into the Deputy Collector on the 24th July. The Curnum had then sent in no list since the 1st June, so that an application made on the 1st June would not reach me till the 27th September, and then had to be copied by the Resident Engineer. So much for time, now for accuracy. *I find many applications in the Curnum's books which have never reached me* * * If I look through the list of applications I have received for Zingaran, the list of applications made by the Curnum, as those he has forwarded to you, *and the list of the land actually irrigated*, the difference is so great between them all, that it is evidently impossible to do justice to the Company, the Government, and the cultivators."

6. The mode proposed by the Revenue Board (paragraph 6) appears to me to be very similar to my system, with this difference, that instead of my supplying printed forms, which only require filling up, the Curnum would have the labor of making an extract from his Register for each ryot, which extract would be sent to the Company's Officers to be stamped. It also contemplates throwing upon the Company's Officers at Kurnool the labor of keeping an account to be made up from these extracts; this I particularly wish to avoid. The Agent is expected to keep Revenue accounts, and in order to enable him to do so he must have independent elements wherewith to frame them. If some officer of the Government, at the end of every quarter or at the end of every month, sends me a report simply stating that a certain sum of money has been paid into the treasury to the credit of the Company, as proceeds of irrigation, what more can I do than say: "I believe you?" It is obviously impossible for me, upon such data, to frame an independent account, and render it as my account or the Company's account, for which I am to be held responsible.

7. The Government in their Order,* paragraph 4, observe that they think the proposed system is needlessly elaborate, and, calculated from the trouble it must entail on the ryot, to lead to evasions, *if not to discourage the use of the water*. This is a very serious objection, but I cannot believe that the mere precaution of requiring the ryot to provide himself with *authority* for taking water before he uses it could be productive of so fatal a result. If a man wants bread, he must go and buy it.

* No. 1,740 of 20th June 1868, Revenue Department.

Again, in paragraph 5, "the Company are not dealing with the ryots individually, but with Government." This is quite true, but such "*dealing*" has reference to fair, legitimate, and recognized dealings. Some extra and subsidiary measures must be adopted to prevent the Company and the Government from being robbed of their water. Some system in fact of water police must be organized, and I submit that the system of water tickets or permits would form a very efficient element of police.

No. 310 of 30th June 1868.

I have the honor to enclose copy of Mr. Latham's letter, wherein he details his objections to the modification proposed by the Government.

may partly be avoided. It need not be

From the Chief Engineer of the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to the Agent and Manager, dated Kurnool, 30th June 1868, No. 310.

*Irrigation Notices.*

In reference to G. O., No. 1,740, of 20th June, in which they decline to approve the mode of demanding and supplying water recommended by the Consulting Engineer, the Collector and myself, indeed by every officer practically acquainted with the mode in which our system has hitherto worked, unless it be modified as described in their paragraph 7, I have the honor to point out that that modification, in my opinion, destroys the value of the arrangement to the Company, though it might be made, doubtless, to assist the Government Revenue Officers; and I cannot recommend that the Company bear the expense of it.

As you proposed the plan, I look upon it as follows:—

1. That the cheque kept by the Curnum is a convenience to him, and repays him the trouble of filling it up.

2. That the permit, stamped by the Company's Officer and retained by the ryot, protects the ryot, who would wisely pay a booking fee for it sooner than not have it. It is evidence to the Collector where the accounts of the Company and Curnum differ.

3. That the cheque kept by the Engineer will enable him to avoid claiming double water rate, except where water has really been surreptitiously used, and so prevent much dispute.

The use of the cheques would practically prevent the Curnum declining to enter a ryot on his application for irrigation, because the Engineer will see that he does it, and has a copy, and absolutely prevent the Curnum saying that he has entered the ryot's application when he has not. It also prevents his antedating applications in order to save the applicant from fines.

In the plan proposed by Government, none of the points mentioned in my last paragraph are secured. The Curnum can put off the ryot by saying that he is not sending the Company notice of applications for some weeks and cannot be bothered. He can say that he has applied to the Collector, and that it is no use bothering for a permit, and I really do not see what good it would be to the ryot or any one else; the Company's Superintendent has no interest in seeing that the ryot gets a paper of which he has no authorized copy, and, lastly, I suppose the Curnum would send abstracts of applications to the Engineers, who have no control over him, rather less regularly than he sends them to the Collector at present.

Lastly, it would not be safe for an Engineer to make a channel at some expense upon being merely shewn a permit of the Curnum to the ryot to irrigate under it.

Such is my opinion. It is not a question for argument within the limits of correspondence, and without any facts agreed on for a basis. But it may be remembered, with advantage, that even a Head Reddi in a village here can rarely read, and that the Curnum would only need to say to any ryot, "Ore, give me that permit to alter," and the ryot would give it him to alter at any time.

The objections to your proposed plan may partly be avoided. It need not be made compulsory to the ryot to get a stamped permit, or to take any trouble at all. If he apply to the Curnum, and the Curnum register the application, and in the course of time send it, as at present, to the Collector, and he to the Company's Officers, the ryot may *then* take water. If he take water while the application is in the hands of the Government Officers, the Company seem fairly entitled to double rate from the Government and the Government to single rate only from the ryot.

My opinion is that the Company's Officer will never be living so far from the villages as to require the ryot to walk with his papers such a distance as he would in the least object to. There is a difficulty in collecting such papers from men who are almost all day in the fields, especially as no peon could be trusted to stamp the cheque retained by the ryot.

---

Referred to the Revenue Department.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
4*th August* 1868.

(Signed) CHARLES A. ORR, Colonel, R. E.,
*Secretary to Government, P. W. D.*

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,*
10*th September* 1868.

No. 118. ORDER THEREON, 10th September 1868, No. 2,350.

Irrigation, No. 6.

Forwarded to the Board of Revenue, with the request that they will submit any remarks which they may desire to make upon the Consulting Engineer's proposals with as little delay as possible.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
*Acting Secretary to Government.*

To the Board of Revenue.
,, the Public Works Department.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

may partly be avoided. It need not be

be bothered. He can say that he has applied to the Collector, and that it is no use bothering for a permit and that he do not see what good it would be to the ryot or any one else; the Company's Superintendent has no interest in seeing that the ryot gets a paper of which he has no authorized copy; and lastly I suppose the Caramum would send abstracts of applications to the Engineers, who have no control over him rather to prejudicially than he sends them to the Collector at present.

Lastly it would not be safe for an Engineer to make a channel at once upon being merely shown a permit of the Caramum to the ryot to irrigate under it.

Such is my opinion. It is not a question for experiment within the limits of correspondence, and without any facts agreed on for a basis. But it may be remembered with advantage that even a Head Reddi in a village here can rarely read and that the Caramum would only need to say to any ryot "One," give me that permit to alter; and the ryot would give it him to alter at any time.

The objections to your proposal can I think mostly be avoided. It need not be

made Compulsory to the pyot to get a Stamped permit, or to take any trouble at all. If he apply to the Canonnier, and the Canonnier register the application, and in the course of time send it as at present to the Collector, and he to the Company's Officers the pyot may then take water. If he take water while the application is in the hands of the Government Officers the Company seem fairly entitled to some little rate from the Government, to Engage rateably from the pyot.

My opinion is that the Company's Officer will never be living so far from the villages as to require the pyot to walk with his papers such a distance as he would in the least object to. There is a difficulty in collecting such papers from men who are almost all day in the fields especially as no person could be trusted to stamp the check retained by the pyot.

Shewer &c
10/7 J. F. Schwartz
for Chief Engineer

Object in Canonnier

/True Copy/
H. Hartnett Lieut
Asst Engineer

Pro. No. 493-96 20-6-68 — 2 — Ft. 2350. — 5th Report to Engg No. 5 L.R. 10-5-69

To Forwarded to the Board of Revenue with the request that they will submit any remarks which they may desire to make upon the Consulting Engineer's proposals with as little delay as possible.—

Lt

11th Chief Engr's Office Fort St George 19th Sept 1868

Board of Rev 102 Despr 1868