M.R.O. 1—20,002—12-8-65.

(1) Number of Pages 24

(2) Date of repair 8 - 3 - 1968

(3) Initials of the Referencer 26.4.68

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 1668
B.P. No.

Press,
Mis.

Dated 22 - 11 - 1875 196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following papers :—

No. 242. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 30th September 1875, No. 2,735.

Read the following Proceedings of the Madras Government, dated 28th August 1875, No. 1,818, Revenue Department :—

ABSTRACT.—Communicating to the Board of Revenue G.O., Public Works Department, on the statement of remissions of land assessment and water-tax granted during Faslis 1281 and 1282, Godavery District.

BEFORE issuing instructions to Collectors on the subject of furnishing information to District Engineers regarding remissions granted on irrigated lands, the Board beg to inquire whether it would not be sufficient if the District Engineers are furnished with a statement showing the remissions granted in consequence of defective or neglected state of irrigation works and for causes susceptible of removal, or whether it is necessary that the statement should embrace all remissions granted for excess or deficiency of the water-supply, whether it be in consequence of bad seasons or defective state of irrigation works. In their Order, dated 6th December 1873, No. 1,362, Revenue Department, the Government observed that the attention of District Engineers should be drawn to all cases of remissions apparently attributable to causes susceptible of removal or caused by failures on the part of the department, and further added that the Collector, and not the District Engineer, is the officer to whom they look for a review of remissions made under all heads ; but, from the Government Order read above, a separate report from District Engineers on all remissions granted on irrigated lands appears to be required.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Acting Secretary.

No. 243. Endorsement of the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 5th November 1875, No. 256.

Memorandum from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to Major-General G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Venkatagherry, 29th October 1875, No. 1,269.

IN some districts for many years past remissions of revenue on irrigated lands have received more or less attention from Public Works Officers in charge of the works, in consequence of information furnished to them by Collectors. In Nellore claims for remissions were sometimes inquired into at the Jummabundy by the Collector, the District Engineer or Range Officer being present to afford information regarding the water-supply. In the delta villages, the circumstances of which were well known to the Public Works Officers, remissions were generally granted or refused on the information thus given.

2. When the revenue statement for Fasli 1281 for the whole Presidency was received, the remission column did not distinguish between remissions due to excess or failure of water and other causes, and a reference made by this office to the Board of Revenue resulted in its being explained that out of Rupees 12,73,994, Rupees 4,69,115 were due to causes unconnected with the water-supply. There were also Rupees 6,11,061 remitted on entire fields of wet lands left waste for excess or failure of water. In G. O., No. 2,344, of the 22nd September 1873, District Engineers were directed to obtain from Collectors the details of remissions of revenue connected with the water-supply, and these instructions have been to some extent attended to.

Proceedings, Madras Government, No. 2,089, 21st August 1873.

3. The general revenue statements for Faslis 1282* and 1283† show the remissions due to water and other causes respectively.

* Proceedings, Madras Government, No. 1,380, dated 22nd May 1874.
† Proceedings, Madras Government, No. 2,197, dated 28th July 1875.

4. The Board of Revenue in their Proceedings, No. 2,735, of the 30th September 1875, inquire whether it will not suffice if "District Engineers are furnished with a statement showing the remissions granted in consequence of defective or neglected state of irrigation works and for causes susceptible of removal, or whether it is necessary that the statement should embrace all remissions granted for excess or deficiency of the water-supply, whether it be in consequence of bad seasons or defective state of irrigation works." What appears to be necessary is that District Engineers should receive detailed information for all entries made in Column 8 and perhaps Columns 17 and 18 of the irrigation statements. The heading of the former Column is "Remissions on account of excess or failure of water," and it is understood that cultivated lands are referred to. Again Columns 17 and 18 refer to remissions on lands left uncultivated for want or excess of water. If the Revenue Board consider that there are data on which remissions due to bad seasons can be clearly distinguished from those due to defective works, there can, it is thought, be not only no objection to the omission of the former from detailed statements furnished to District Engineers, but it will be better in every way that their attention should be confined to matters with which it is their duty to deal. The undersigned does not know the process by which Revenue Officers obtain the detailed information on which remissions are based, but he entertains some doubt as to whether the distinction between bad seasons and inefficient works is always easy of determination. To take an example from the Western Delta, Kistna, a season of heavy rainfall involves considerable remissions for swamped cultivation. As regards these lands, the season is bad, and defective irrigation works have nothing to do with the results. The Irrigation Officers also may be to a very slight extent, if at all, responsible, but, nevertheless, it would seem to be desirable that the fact of the necessity for the remissions and the cause of them should be prominently brought to their notice, because a remedy is possible. As a general rule, the evil effects of bad seasons, which are unfavorable owing to excess of rainfall and water, are removable; those from failure of rain are less under control, though possibly something may be done by way of mitigation.

Vide Proceedings, Madras Government, No. 2,197, 28th July 1875.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
22nd November 1875.

5. The undersigned has had occasion recently in reviewing estimates for the repair and improvement of irrigation works (tanks) to point out that in some cases it is manifestly impracticable for the ayacut area under them to be regularly cultivated, owing to the inadequacy of the water-supply. If the difference in such cases between ayacut assessment and revenue be exhibited as a remission, it would, of course, be a waste of time to inquire into the matter annually, and such remissions might conveniently be either got rid of by an adjustment of the ayacut, or be placed apart from those due to water-supply.

6. In paragraph 3 of G. O., Revenue Department, No. 1,362, of the 6th December 1873, exception appears to be taken to the remarks in paragraph 4 of this Office Note printed in Proceedings, Madras Government, No. 2,344, of the 22nd September 1873. Possibly the scope of those remarks was misunderstood. The Government of India have repeatedly called for an annual revenue report of the operations of the Irrigation Department, and have transmitted the similar reports of other Provinces as a guide. Hitherto the materials available have been the general annual revenue statements for Faslis 1281, 1282, and 1283, which have never been reviewed either for districts by Collectors, or generally by the Board of Revenue, and have been submitted to Government with a brief Note by the undersigned on the general results exhibited, together with information as to Public Works charges; 2ndly, the more detailed statements for the Godavery and Kistna Delta irrigation which have been reviewed in this office as far as circumstances would permit. Any thing approaching to a complete Irrigation Revenue report for the Presidency has not for any year yet been compiled, because the materials for such a report are still wanting. The Collectors' reviews and those of the Board of Revenue will, when made available, form the principal part of these reports, but there is, nevertheless, much to be added by the Public Works Officers, who have to show what expenditure may have been incurred, with what objects, and with what results. These reports will necessarily deal in considerable detail with important works on which large outlay has been, or is being incurred, and more generally with the rest of the irrigation works of each district. Ultimately the latter section will treat of the works under the several classes,* but at present no such subdivision is practicable. It would appear, however, to be desirable that the general statements for the Presidency should, as soon as, and to the extent for the time, practicable, exhibit separately the particulars for Class I., or important individual works; thus in the Godavery entry three might with advantage be divided into :—

* Class 2.—From rivers with tanks supplied.
Do. 3.—From minor streams, &c.
Do. 4.—Rain-fed tanks.
Do. 5.—Spring channels.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Godavery Delta																	
Do. Kistna Ellore Canal																	
Do. Extra delta or general ...																	
Total ...																	

It appears from the statements given in Proceedings, Madras Government, Nos. 2,178 and 2,197, of the 27th and 28th July 1875, respectively, that the—

Fasli 1283.	Acres.	Revenue. Rs.
Godavery Delta irrigation was	514,650	22,68,280
Do. under Kistna Ellore Canal ...	13,631	49,824
	528,281	23,18,104
and the total for the district being ...	567,282	23,42,724
The extra delta irrigation was ...	39,001	24,620

As the special and more detailed reviews will dispose of the delta irrigation, so the more general review will deal with the rest, which in the case of this district is unimportant. The revenue of the extra delta irrigation appears to be low, and it may be noticed that, as yet, the deltaic area has not been fully shown, the acreage in the Nidathavole and Baharzalli Estates not having been entered. Remissions would form one sub-head of the reviews by the Revenue Officers, and would require more or less notice by the Public Works Officers of the subsequent action taken or proposed to be taken. The sub-division in the general statement for the Kistna would be similar; that in Chingleput again would show the particulars for the Madras Water Works and for the Chembrambakum tank by two lines, and the rest of the irrigation in a third line, while hereafter there may be other individual works deemed to be deserving of separate exhibition.

7. When the general statements of irrigation show the particulars for each district—

for 1, each system or individual work of Class I.
„ 2, each of the other classes in one line,
and 3 the total,

when also the more detailed statements for each work of Class I. become available; when the Collector's and the Revenue Board's reviews affording full information on the revenue side are received; and when to all these are added the Public Works notices of operations, expenditure and results, the Government will be somewhat better able to judge not only of the value of particular investments, but of the importance of irrigation generally and as to whether the management and administration of irrigation works are what they should be. What is still to be done in Madras as regards obtaining a knowledge of what irrigation works cost, what revenue and what results they produce, has been done elsewhere. The task may be more difficult here, but its accomplishment will in its effects be none the less valuable.

(Signed) JOHN MULLINS, Lieut.-Colonel, R.E.,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Transferred to the Revenue Department.

(Signed) G. W. WALKER, Major-General, R.E.,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
22nd November 1875.

No. 244. Order thereon, 22nd November 1875, No. 1,668.

Irrigation, No. 6.

Ordered that the foregoing Memorandum by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation be communicated to the Board of Revenue, and that Colonel Mullins be requested to place himself in personal communication with the Board in view to determining the form of return which will most satisfactorily meet the requirements of the case and provide material for a thorough review of the result of the expenditure on works of irrigation.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) L. A. CAMPBELL,
Under-Secretary to Government.

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

Exd. A. Grubert.

No. 2,735.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 30th September 1875.

Read the following Proceedings of the Madras Government, dated 28th August 1875, No. 1,818, Revenue Department:—

Abstract.—Communicating to the Board of Revenue G.O., Public Works Department, on the statement of remissions of land assessment and water-tax granted during Faslis 1281 and 1282, Godavery District.

Before issuing instructions to Collectors on the subject of furnishing information to District Engineers regarding remissions granted on irrigated lands, the Board beg to inquire whether it would not be sufficient if the District Engineers are furnished with a statement showing the remissions granted in consequence of defective or neglected state of irrigation works and for causes susceptible of removal, or whether it is necessary that the statement should embrace all remissions granted for excess or deficiency of the supply water whether it be in consequence of bad seasons or defective state of irrigation works. In their Order, dated 6th December 1873, No. 1,362, Revenue Department, the Government observed that the attention of District Engineers should be drawn to all cases of remissions apparently attributable to causes susceptible of removal or caused by failures on the part of the department, and further added that the Collector, and not the District Engineer, is the officer to whom they look for a review of remissions made under all heads; but, from the Government Order read above, a separate report from District Engineers on all remissions granted on irrigated lands appears to be required.

(A true Extract.)

Acting Secretary.

To the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Exd. J. W. Fischer.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 3906

From The Board of Revenue

Dated 30th September 1875.

FOR ORDERS.

We submit the
Last Collectors
Annual Statements
District Superintendents
Returns of Irrigation
Sanctioned by Government
as to Remissions
or Advances. We
are also in correspondence
with the Collectors
of Tanjore & Madura
regarding the Boundaries
of Irrigation Divisions
in those Districts.

6 December 73 No 77-78
28 August 75 — 1818 Mem

Original

Public Works Department Proceedings of the Government of Madras, dated 22nd November 1875, No. 1668.

Read the Letter from the Board of Revenue, dated 30th September 1875, No. 2,735, forwarding Returns of Irrigation sanctioned by Collectors during the year 1874-75, and requesting that the Executive Engineers may be furnished with copies of the Returns relating to their Divisions.

Ordered that Copies of the Returns be communicated to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, the Executive Engineers, and the Superintending Engineer, Southern Circle.

(True Extract)

(Signed) C. Pandia Asary
Assistant Secretary to Government.

No 1668 22 Nov 1875

Ans. 873 = 24 Nov
No 3906
No 1405

1875.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 30TH SEPTEMBER 1875, No. 2,735.

Dup 24 Oct 75

Encl.

Rem 4339/75

Received 9 Oct 75

SEPTEMBER.

No. 2,735.

Remissions—granted on irrigated lands.—Instructions requested on certain points relative to information to be furnished by Collectors to District Engineers regarding —.

Circular Order.

No 1668 - 22 November 1875

To the Board of Revenue Dr 23 Oct 75
The Chief Engineer for Irrigation
Executive Engineers
&c &c &c

Ans. 873 = 24 Nov
No 3906
No 1405

1875.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 30TH SEPTEMBER 1875, No. 2,735.

Dup 24 Oct 75

Encl.

Rem 4339/75

Received 9 Oct 75

SEPTEMBER.

No. 2,735.

Remissions—granted on irrigated lands.—Instructions requested on certain points relative to information to be furnished by Collectors to District Engineers regarding —.

Circular Order.

No 1668 - 22 November 1875

To the Board of Revenue Dr 23 Oct 75
The Chief Engineer for Irrigation
Executive Engineers
&c &c &c

If their Statements
regarding the
failure of Broker
from whatever
cause come under
Notice by the
Inspecting Officers
who alone are
in a position to
test their correctness
and file the
Collector's letter
any Given Bank
had or had not
a full supply

Lal

Original to
Supply Branch
Returns of Remittances

13.10.75

Sanction

Noted

Noted

BM

1.2.

Having read the Note
of the Ch: Dep: Insp:
Genl: & then Dep:
Insp: Genl: comm:
then & the Ho: &
requesting him to place
himself in personal
Communication with them
in their Returning
& some portion of
the Treasure Chests
sent to the Esquimalt
Station & perceiving
material from
these Notes of the
result of the
Expedition on Genl:
Orders. JM

b

FOR ORDERS.

Remissions granted on irrigated lands

Elucidated in Govt Proc: of 21st August 1873 for information of Collectors

Rec'd Sept. 13th 75
Oct 75 No. 26 Oct 75

No: 1269

Memorandum.

In some Districts for many years past remissions of revenue on irrigated lands have received more or less attention from Public Works Officers in charge of the works, in consequence of information furnished to them by Collectors. In Vellore claims for remissions were sometimes enquired into at the Jummabundy by the Collector, the District Engineer or Range Officer being present to afford information regarding the water supply. In the Delta villages, the circumstances of which were well known to the Public Works Officers, remissions were generally granted or refused on the information thus given.

2 When the Revenue Statement for Fusly 1281 for the whole Presidency was received, the remission column did not

Proc: Madras Govt No. 2089 21st Augt 1873

not distinguish between remissions due and other causes to excess or failure of water, and a reference made by this office to the Board of Revenue resulted in its being explained that out of Rupees 12,73,994, Rupees 4,69,115 were due to causes unconnected with the water supply. There were also Rupees 6,11,061 remitted on entire fields of wet lands left waste for excess or failure of water. In G. O. No. 2344 of the 22nd September 1873 District Engineers were directed to obtain from Collectors the details of remissions of revenue connected with the water supply, and these instructions have been to some extent attended to.

3 The general revenue statements for Fuslis 1282* and 1283@ show the remissions due to water and other causes respectively.

4 The Board of Revenue in their Proceedings No. 2735 of the 30th September 1875

* Pros: Madras Govt. No. 1380 dated 22nd May 1874.

@ Pros: do — do. No. 2197 dated 28 July 1875.

1875 inquire whether it will not suffice if "District Engineers are furnished with "a statement showing the remissions — "granted in consequence of defective or "neglected state of irrigation works, and "for causes susceptible of removal, or "whether it is necessary that the State- "-ment should embrace all remissions "granted for excess or deficiency of the "water supply, whether it be in conse- "-quence of bad seasons or defective state "of irrigation works". What appears to be necessary is that District Engineers should receive detailed information for all entries made in Column 8 and perhaps Columns 17 and 18 of the Irrigation Statements. The heading of the former Column is "Remissions on account of excess or failure of water", and it is understood that cultivated lands are referred to. Again Columns 17 and 18 refer to remissions on lands left uncultivated for

vide Pros: Madras Govt. No. 2197-28 July 1875.

for want or excess of water. If the Revenue Board consider that there are data on which remissions due to bad seasons can be clearly distinguished from those due to defective works, there can, it is thought, be not only no objection to the omission of the former from detailed statements furnished to District Engineers, but it will be better in every way that their attention should be confined to matters with which it is their duty to deal.

The undersigned does not know the process by which Revenue Officers obtain the detailed information on which remissions are based, but he entertains some doubt as to whether the distinction between bad seasons and inefficient works is always easy of determination. To take an example from the Western Delta, Kistna; a season of heavy rainfall involves considerable remissions for swamped cultivation. As regards these lands the season is bad, (and

and defective irrigation works have nothing to do with the results. The irrigation Officers also may be to a very slight extent, if at all, responsible, but nevertheless it would seem to be desirable that the fact of the necessity for the remissions and the cause of them should be prominently brought to their notice, because a remedy is possible. As a general rule the evil effects of bad seasons, which are unfavourable owing to excess of rainfall and water, are removable; those from failure of rain are less under control, though possibly something may be done by way of mitigation.—

5 The undersigned has had occasion recently in reviewing estimates for the repair and improvement of irrigation works (tanks) to point out that in some cases it is manifestly impracticable for the ayacut area under

under them to be regularly cultivated owing to the inadequacy of the water supply. If the difference in such cases between Ayacut assessment, and revenue be exhibited as a remission it would of course be a waste of time to enquire into the matter annually, and such remissions might conveniently be either got rid of by an adjustment of the Ayacut, or be placed apart from those due to water supply.

6 In para 3 of G. O. Revenue Departmt. No. 1362 of the 6th December 1873 exception appears to be taken to the remarks in para 4 of this office note printed in Pros. Madras Govt. No. 2344 of the 22d. September 1873. Possibly the scope of those remarks was misunderstood. The Government of India have repeatedly called for an Annual Revenue report of the operations of the Irrigation Department, and have transmitted the similar

reports

reports of other Provinces as a guide. Hitherto the materials available have been the general annual revenue statements for Fuslis 1281, 1282 and 1283, which have never been reviewed either for Districts by Collectors, or generally by the Board of Revenue, and have been submitted to Government with a brief note by the undersigned on the general results exhibited, together with information as to Public Works charges; 2dly the more detailed statements for the Godavery and Kistna Delta irrigation which have been reviewed in this office as far as circumstances would permit. Anything approaching to a complete Irrigation Revenue report for the Presidency has not for any year yet been compiled, because the materials for such a report are still wanting. The Collectors' reviews and those of the Board of Revenue will, when made available, form the

principal

principal part of these reports, but there is nevertheless much to be added by the Public Works Officers, who have to show what expenditure may have been incurred, with what objects, and with what results. These reports will necessarily deal in considerable detail with important works on which large outlay has been or is being incurred, and more generally with the rest of the irrigation works of each District. Ultimately the latter section will treat of the works under the several classes, but at present no such sub division is practicable. It would appear however to be desirable that the general statements for the Presidency should as soon as, and to the extent for the time, practicable exhibit separately the particulars for class I or important individual works, thus in the Godavery entry 3 might with advantage be divided into -

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

Godavery — Delta
— do: — Kistna Ellore Canal —
— do: — Sytra Delta or General —

× Class 2 - From rivers with tanks supplied
do: 3 - From minor streams ×
do: 4 Rainfed tanks
do: 5 Spring channels.

Fusli 1283

It appears from the Statements given in Pros: Madras Govt: Nos 2178 and 2197 of the 27th and 28th July 1875, respectively, that the

	Acres	Revenue Rupees.
Godavery Delta irrigation was	514,650	– 22,68,280
— do: — under Kistna Ellore Canal —	13,631	– 49,824
	528,281	– 23,18,104
and the total for the District being —	567,282	– 23,42,724.
The extra Delta irrigation was	39,001	– 24,620

As the special and more detailed reviews will dispose of the Delta irrigation, so the more general review will deal with the rest, which in the case of this District is unimportant. The revenue of the extra Delta irrigation appears to be low, and it may be noticed that as yet the Deltaic area has not been fully shown, the acreage in the Nidathavole and Bahazalli estates not having been entered. Remissions would form one subhead of the reviews by the Revenue Officers, and would require more or less notice by the Public Works Officers of the subsequent

action

action taken or proposed to be taken. The subdivision in the general statement for the Kistna would be similar: that in Chingleput again would show the particulars for the Madras Water Works and for the Chembrambaukum tank by two lines, and the rest of the irrigation in a third line, while hereafter there may be other individual works deemed to be deserving of separate exhibition.

7 "When the general statements of irrigation show the particulars for each District,

for 1 each system or individual work of class I

2 each of the other classes in one line

and 3 the total,

when also the more detailed statements for each work of class I become available, when the Collectors' and the Revenue Boards' reviews, affording full information on the revenue side are received, and when to all these are added the Public Works notices

of

of operations, expenditure and results, the Government will be somewhat better able to judge not only of the value of particular investments, but of the importance of irrigation generally, and as to whether the management and administration of irrigation works are what they should be. What is still to be done in Madras as regards obtaining a knowledge of what irrigation works cost, what revenue and what results they produce, has been done elsewhere. The task may be more difficult here, but its accomplishment will in its effects be none the less valuable.

Camp at
Venkatagherry
29th October 1875

Lieut. Col. R.E.
Chief Engineer for Irrigation

To,

The Secretary to Government
P.W.D.

Received 1875 Despatch
No 4339
[illegible]

Farm

The Chief Engr.
for Irrigation

Ord. No. 1668. 22 November 1875

Dated 25 Octr.
Rec'd. 5 Novr. 1875.
Rec'd 6 Novr
Ord: 1269.

Regarding remission
of Assessment for
Taxes 1282 & 1283.

Transferred to the Permanent Department

Commissioner Land Office
Secretary Department of the Interior

No 258

Transferred

h: 243.