864/8

M.R.O. 1—20,002—12-8-65.

(1) Number of Pages 16

(2) Date of repair 10-11-66

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 864
~~B.P. No.~~ Press / Mis.

Dated 11-7-1874 -196-.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 86. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 17th June 1874, No. 1,477:—

Read the following letter from W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 29th April 1874, No. 113:—

My attention was drawn to the severity of the provision in the new Water-tax Rules sanctioned by Government, in regard to the charge for water on Sugar-cane and other garden produce paying Rupees 8 an acre. The Rules provide that where a field is very large or where a portion is not irrigable, a sub-division may be made, but that in other cases the whole field being irrigable, the whole should be paid on. The cultivation of Sugar-cane is likely to be affected in a great measure if this rule were adopted. There is no question that several of the fields in which Sugar-cane is cultivated, are irrigable, and there is no question generally that the area of those fields is not very large, but for the cultivation of the peculiarly expensive crop of Sugar-cane, so that sub-dividing fields for the Sugar-cane crop is not within the rule. This is one of the special crops whose cultivation we are to encourage, rather than discourage or curtail, and we cannot help allowing it to suffer if the whole field is charged, unless formally sub-divided. The same piece of land is not cultivated every year with this special product, the land becoming poor, and the extent generally cultivated is an acre or two by a well-to-do ryot. Every field, therefore, has to be sub-divided into pieces of 2 or 3 acres, thereby virtually doing away with the usefulness of the original survey, and the number of fields is so large, that it is almost impossible to carry out this measure. I would, therefore, propose that a rule be passed, allowing the Revenue Officers to charge the cultivation of Sugar-cane and similar special crops paying 8 Rupees an acre in lots of 2 acres, counting the fractions below 2 acres as 2 full acres. On this subject, I beg to refer the Board to their Proceedings of the 3rd August 1868, No. 5,626, and the correspondence therewith connected.

2. Mr. Horsfall, the late Sub-Collector, also suggests the course I have now recommended, as can be seen from the accompanying copy of his letter of the 30th March 1874, No. 88.

3. I should have proposed this rule when I had sent my remarks on the Draft Water-tax Rules, but I had then proposed that the actually irrigated land should be charged for water whatever the crop might be: in this case, the difficulty now complained of could not have appeared.

4. I would propose the rule as follows:—If portions of fields are cultivated with Sugar-cane or other crops which pay 8 Rupees per acre for water, water-rate will be charged at the rate of 8 Rupees per acre on the extent cultivated with such crop, and 4 Rupees an acre on the rest of the field.

In calculating the extent cultivated with Sugar-cane etc., every piece of land less than 2 acres will be charged as 2 acres.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. G. HORSFALL, Esq., Sub-Collector, to W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, dated Rajahmundry, 30th March 1874, No. 83.

I BEG to draw your attention to the following subject :—

Section 4, Rule I. of the new Water-tax Rules, contemplates a charge of Rupees 8 an acre for Sugar-cane.

2. Section 6 of the same rule directs that ryots taking water for a portion of a field should be charged on the whole unless the sub-division and irrigation of a particular portion has been previously sanctioned by the Collector.

3. This section either renders the sub-division of several survey fields necessary, or curtails the cultivation of Sugar-cane, if sub-division is refused.

4. You are aware that a ryot of ordinary circumstances cannot afford to cultivate more than 1 or 2 acres with Sugar-cane, and cannot afford to pay water-tax at Rupees 8 an acre on full fields.

5. The same plot which is cultivated with Sugar-cane in one year cannot be cultivated with the same crop for at least two succeeding seasons, consequently ryots vary the place of sugar-cane every year and apply for sub-division.

6. On a reference made by me in 1868, the Board authorized the charge of water-tax for Sugar-cane on a scale of 2 acres (counting fractions of 2 acres as 2 acres), and I believe that this rule, if re-introduced, will render sub-division of fields unnecessary, and will not obstruct Sugar-cane cultivation as the present rule must, as it stands, necessarily do. I would apply the

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. S. FOSTER,
Acting Collector.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. The Board proposed that ryots taking water for a portion of a field should be charged for that portion only,

G. O., dated 16th June 1873, No. 617.

but Government disapproved and the rule now stands thus : "Ryots taking water for a portion of a field will be charged on the whole unless the sub-division and irrigation of a particular portion has been previously sanctioned by the Collector."

3. Mr. Foster points out that this rule is so harsh with regard to Sugar-cane cultivation which pays Rupees 8 an acre and usually covers only a small portion of a field that it must discourage such cultivation.

4. He proposes that there should be a special rule in favor of Sugar-cane cultivation providing that when portions of fields are irrigated for this crop water-rate shall be charged only on the extent cultivated, provided that portions less than 2 acres in extent shall be charged as 2 acres.

5. The Board are strongly of opinion that liberality in this matter is expedient both for the people and the State. They would like to see the rule they proposed adopted now, but if this cannot be done, Mr. Foster's rule should certainly be allowed, the 2 acre minimum being reduced to 1 acre. Under the general Water-rate Rules which have been approved by Government the minimum is half an acre [illegible]

No. 87. ORDER THEREON, 11th July 1874, No. 864.

Miscellaneous.

ON a reconsideration of the question referred to in paragraph 5, G. O., dated 16th June 1873, No. 617, the Governor in Council approves of a modification of Clause 6, Rule I. of the Rules for levying water-rate in the Kistna and Godavery Deltas by the following addition thereto :—

"If portions of fields are cultivated with sugar-cane or other crops which pay Rs. 8 per acre for water, water-rate at Rs. 8 per acre will be charged on the extent cultivated with such crops, half an acre being the minimum extent recognized for the purpose of this Rule."

2. With respect to the rule as originally proposed by the Board and negatived in paragraph 5, G. O., dated 16th June 1873, No. 617, the Governor in Council desires that if the Board are still in favor of a further relaxation they will report in full their reasons after weighing the several disadvantages which such a course would involve.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
„ the Public Works Department.
„ the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Exd. G. A. Turton.

Vide Bd Rec. No. 904 dated 26th July 1877

No. 1,477.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 17th June 1874.

Read the following letter from W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cocanada, 29th April 1874, No. 113:—

My attention was drawn to the severity of the provision in the new Water-tax Rules sanctioned by Government, in regard to the charge for water on Sugar-cane and other garden produce paying Rupees 8 an acre. The Rules provide that where a field is very large or where a portion is not irrigable, a sub-division may be made, but that in other cases the whole field being irrigable, the whole should be paid on. The cultivation of Sugar-cane is likely to be affected in a great measure if this rule were adopted. There is no question that several of the fields in which Sugar-cane is cultivated, are irrigable, and there is no question generally that the area of those fields is not very large, but for the cultivation of the peculiarly expensive crop of Sugar-cane, so that sub-dividing fields for the Sugar-cane crop is not within the rule. This is one of the special crops whose cultivation we are to encourage, rather than discourage or curtail, and we cannot help allowing it to suffer if the whole field is charged, unless formally sub-divided. The same piece of land is not cultivated every year with this special product, the land becoming poor, and the extent generally cultivated is an acre or two by a well-to-do ryot. Every field, therefore, has to be sub-divided into pieces of 2 or 3 acres, thereby virtually doing away with the usefulness of the original survey, and the number of fields is so large, that it is almost impossible to carry out this measure. I would, therefore, propose that a rule be passed, allowing the Revenue Officers to charge the cultivation of Sugar-cane and similar special crops paying 8 Rupees an acre in lots of 2 acres, counting the fractions below 2 acres as 2 full acres. On this subject, I beg to refer the Board to their Proceedings of the 3rd August 1868, No. 5,626, and the correspondence therewith connected.

2. Mr. Horsfall, the late Sub-Collector, also suggests the course I have now recommended, as can be seen from the accompanying copy of his letter of the 30th March 1874, No. 88.

3. I should have proposed this rule when I had sent my remarks on the Draft Water-tax Rules, but I had then proposed that the actually irrigated land should be charged for water whatever the crop might be: in this case, the difficulty now complained of could not have appeared.

4. I would propose the rule as follows:—If portions of fields are cultivated with Sugar-cane or other crops which pay 8 Rupees per acre for water, water-rate will be charged at the rate of 8 Rupees per acre on the extent cultivated with such crop, and 4 Rupees an acre on the rest of the field.

In calculating the extent cultivated with Sugar-cane, etc., every piece of land less than 2 acres will be charged as 2 acres.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. G. HORSFALL, Esq., Sub-Collector, to W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of the Godavery District, dated Rajahmundry, 30th March 1874, No. 88.

I BEG to draw your attention to the following subject :—

Section 4, Rule I of the new Water-tax Rules, contemplates a charge of Rupees 8 an acre for Sugar-cane.

2. Section 6 of the same rule directs that ryots taking water for a portion of a field should be charged on the whole unless the sub-division and irrigation of a particular portion has been previously sanctioned by the Collector.

3. This section either renders the sub-division of several survey fields necessary, or curtails the cultivation of Sugar-cane, if sub-division is refused.

4. You are aware that a ryot of ordinary circumstances cannot afford to cultivate more than one or two acres with Sugar-cane, and cannot afford to pay water-tax at Rupees 8 an acre on full fields.

5. The same plot which is cultivated with Sugar-cane in one year cannot be cultivated with the same crop for at least two succeeding seasons, consequently ryots vary the place of sugar-cane every year and apply for sub-division.

6. On a reference made by me in 1868, the Board authorized the charge of water-tax for Sugar-cane on a scale of 2 acres (counting fractions of 2 acres as 2 acres), and I believe that this rule, if re-introduced, will render sub-division of fields unnecessary, and will not obstruct Sugar-cane cultivation as the present rule must, as it stands, necessarily do. I would apply the rule to all crops upon which a charge of Rupees 8 per acre is made for water.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. S. FOSTER,
Acting Collector.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. The Board proposed that ryots taking water for a portion of a field should be charged for that portion only,

G. O., dated 16th June 1873, No. 617.

but Government disapproved and the rule now stands thus: "Ryots taking water for a portion of a field will be charged on the whole unless the sub-division and irrigation of a particular portion has been previously sanctioned by the Collector."

3. Mr. Foster points out that this rule is so harsh with regard to Sugar-cane cultivation which pays Rupees 8 an acre and usually covers only a small portion of a field that it must discourage such cultivation.

4. He proposes that there should be a special rule in favour of Sugar-cane cultivation providing that when portions of fields are irrigated for this crop water-rate shall be charged only on the extent cultivated, provided that portions less than 2 acres in extent shall be charged as 2 acres.

5. The Board are strongly of opinion that liberality in this matter is expedient both for the people and the State. They would like to see the rule they proposed adopted now, but if this cannot be done, Mr. Foster's rule should certainly be allowed, the 2 acre minimum being reduced to 1 acre. Under the general Water-rate rules which have been approved by Government the minimum is half an acre.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Secretary.

To the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
Copy to the Acting Collector of the Godavery District.
,, to the Director of Revenue Settlement.

Exd. G. A. Turton.

Revenue Department.

No. 864

Revenue Department

No. 2114

From Pres. Bd of Revenue
Dated 17th June 1874.

FORWARDERS.

To Secretary to Govt
Revenue Department

Forwarded for orders.

Board of Revenue

T.
1874.
Copy Bd

Encl. to Bd's Proc. No. 1477.

Read 1874.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 17TH JUNE 1874, No. 1,477.

Encl.

Received 24th June 74.

JUNE.

No. 1,477.

Sugar-cane and other garden produce—paying Rupees 8 an acre on account of Water-rate.—Proposal of Collector of Godavery District that when portions of fields are irrigated for — water rate should be charged only on extent cultivated, provided that portions less than 2 acres in extent shall be charged as 2 acres, submitted for orders of Government with remarks in favour of Collector's proposal.

Revenue Department.

No. 864

6

T.

1874.

Collr Gltur Dt

816.

Forwarded

acres in extent shall be charged as 2 acres, submitted for orders of Government with remarks in favour of Collector's proposal.

I agree with I am inclined that
the Resolution of the Rule proposed
ought not be altered. but
the question
decided against the advice of the
Bd of Revenue & the interests of the Ryo

[illegible]

the B[illegible]

4 No. 1477.

consideration
referred
the 5 G.O.
[illegible] by the
Council
approves of a modifi-
cation of clause 6 Rule
I of the Rules for keep-
ing Water-tank in the
Kistna and Godavery
Deltas

FOR ORDERS.

Remarks in favour of Collector's proposal.

Revenue Department.

No. 864

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 11th July — 1874.

READ the following Proc: of the Bd of Rev:

Subg. with remarks proposal of Coll. of Godavery Dist: that when portions of fields are irrigated for sugar-cane and other garden produce water rate shd be charged only on actual cultivated area

H. E. 17th June 1874 No. 1477.

On a reconsideration of the question referred to in paragraph 5 G.O. 15th June 1873 No. 817 the Governor in Council approves of a modification of clause 6 Rule 1 of the Rules for levying Water-rate in the Kistna and Godavery Deltas

Ct. 1st July/74. Rq. 7th

Deltas by the following addition thereto

"If portions of fields are cultivated with Sugar-cane or other crops which pay 8 Rs per acre for water, water-rate at 8 Rs per acre will be charged on the extent cultivated with such crops ~~for the~~ ~~can are liable~~ half an ~~extent~~ acre ~~which~~ will be the minimum extent recognized for the purpose of this rule."

With respect to the rule as originally proposed by the Board and negatived in paragraph 5 G.O. 16 June 13 I do by the G. in C. desire that if the Board are still in favour of a further relaxation they will report in full their reasons after weighing the several ~~many~~ disadvantages which such a course would involve.

L. Bo. Rev.
A.R. Cobb
Chief Engr for Irrigation } 7/24/17.

Mr. Cobb
Put up proposal of the Bd. regarding G.O.
Matter sent to the present
the Board's remarks to be noted
with a view to ~~some~~ improvement in the
rule. ~~Any~~ ~~suggestions~~ ~~may be~~ ~~called for~~
~~may have to be~~ ~~referred to~~ ~~Govt~~ ~~for~~ ~~consideration~~
~~after~~ obtaining ~~opinions~~ ~~of~~ the views of Govt. on the
matter obtain opinions of the Collectors thereon.

Dig 1827