

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 10.

1901.

For no. 10, 10000, 10000, 10000.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
6th November 1876.*

No. 53. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 26th September 1876, No. 2,438 :—

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 10th June, No. 1,526, and 4th August, No. 1,976, of 1876.

Read again G.O., No. 880, dated 14th July 1874.

Read also the following letter from R. K. PUCKLE, Esq., Director of Revenue Settlement, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Courtallam, 26th August 1876, No. 3,124-90.

In reply to Board's Proceedings, No. 1,976, dated 4th August 1876, calling for an expression of opinion as to the propriety of the lands under the Chembrambankam and Cholavaram tanks of the Chingleput District being treated in accordance with the principles laid down in G.O., No. 880, dated 14th July 1874, I have the honor to inform you that when treating similar lands under the Red Hill tank, I conceived that I was acting in strict accord with the principles laid down in the Government Order above quoted in refusing to allow the people to compound for second crops, in merely entering the first crop charge or taram assessment, and in leaving the Collector to levy the second crop charge or fasal jastee as hitherto on such lands as grew a second crop. It is true that I did not arbitrarily register such and such lands as "double crop" when they were not at the time so cultivated, as I failed to see the advantage of perpetuating in Chingleput a system of registry which has cost so much labor and money to get rid of at the settlement of other districts; neither is it possible for an officer dealing with a tract of country for three or four months only during the first crop season perhaps, and in a singularly unfavorable year, as happened to be the case when I was settling Sydapet, to determine with any degree of reliability what should or what should not be double crop land.

2. I therefore took a broad view of the case, informed the people that I was assured by the Engineer that it was contemplated at some future time to irrigate the whole country down to the sea, and that it was impossible now to determine single crop and double crop lands; and I left the people to pay for a second crop, when they grew one, at such rates as were customary in the district.

3. This procedure has apparently been viewed as a sacrifice of revenue; it involved no sacrifice, but merely arranged for half of the taram assessment being paid for a second crop instead of half of the old assessment; and the taram assessment being rather higher than the old assessment, I supposed that there would be a slight increase of second crop assessment, as no doubt there has been, if the same area is cultivated annually.

4. Some misconception has arisen as to compulsory compounding for double crop in Tinnevely; only the actual double crop area was thus treated, as it was manifestly unnecessary to ask the people whether they wished to compound for their best lands when they eagerly compounded even for those that never had grown a second crop; and the gradation of the rates of compounding according to tarams, viz., at two-thirds additional to the single crop assessment in the first and second tarams, at one-

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
6th November 1876.*

half in the third, and one-third in the fourth taram was merely a departmental arrangement to check fraud and secure uniformity; the percentage rates charged for a second crop indeed were high, but they were imposed under sanction and were not objected to by a people then paying full rates for a second crop, while the simplicity of the system is such that a Revenue Officer has only to glance at the single crop or taram assessment to know exactly what ought to be charged for the second crop raised on a full.

I would prefer treating the lands under the Chembrambaukam and Cholaveram tanks as those under the Red Hill tank were treated by registering the single crop assessment only, leaving the Collector to charge a second crop rate when a second crop is grown, and I request early orders on the subject, as these lands are now being registered. But if my opinion is asked as to whether it is better to compound or continue to charge *fasal justee* throughout the Chingleput district generally, I pronounce unhesitatingly in favor of compounding as a system likely to greatly extend the area under cultivation with food-grain (for when the people have not water enough for a rice crop they practically grow one of raggi, varagu, cholam, &c.), and one that must simplify the accounts, obviate the necessity for inquisitorial inspections, and be a great saving of labor to the Revenue Officers.

In his letter* printed with the Government Order quoted above, Mr. Banbury,

who was then Director of Revenue Settlements,

* Dated 25th April 1873, No. 798-32.

requested instructions as to whether the compounding for second crop on wet lands should in all cases be optional with the ryots, or whether, in the case of large trustworthy irrigation works, it might not be made compulsory. In connection with this subject, Mr. Banbury made special allusion to the treatment of lands under the Red Hills and Chembrambaukam reservoirs, and, drawing attention to the well-known fact that the imposition of a separate charge when a second crop is raised opens a door to fraud and involves much inquisitorial interference on the part of the officers of Government, strongly recommended that in these and similar cases, where the supply for two crops was well assured, composition should be made compulsory. The Board submitted the proposal to Government with the remark that they considered it must be negatived under the terms of G.O., dated 28th October 1872, No. 1,498, Revenue Department, and Government in their order quoted at the head of these Proceedings decided that, it not seeming feasible to make composition compulsory, land which has in ordinary seasons a certain supply for two crops should be registered as "double crop" land, remission being given in the rare cases where the supply fails, and that composition should be restricted to uncertain irrigation under certain specified conditions. In dealing with the lands under the Red Hills tank, Mr. Puckle when making the settlement of sixty-nine villages in Sydapet Taluk did not follow out these instructions, but registered them as single crop, intimating to the ryots that they would be charged half the taram assessment if they grew a second crop. The Board disapproved, and in their Proceedings, dated 10th Jan. 1876, No. 1,526, decided that the terms of the Government Order should be adhered to. The Board's objection was too late to prevent this tract being registered as single crop, and in their Proceedings, dated 4th August 1876, No. 1,976, Mr. Puckle was invited to express his opinion as

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
6th November 1876.*

to the propriety of the lands affected by the Chembrambaukam and Cholaveram projects being treated in accordance with the principles enunciated by Government.

2. In reply, Mr. Puckle states that, in refusing to allow the people to compound and in entering only the first crop charge, leaving it to the Collector to charge for a second when it was grown, he considered he was acting "in strict accord with the principles laid down by Government," and that at the time he was settling Sydapet "as impossible to determine with any degree of reliability what should or what should not be double crop land. He proposes that the lands affected by the Chembrambaukam and Cholaveram projects should be similarly dealt with. The Board do not however consider that the course proposed is admissible under the terms of the Government Order referred to, as the supply of water to lands under the works in question is almost a certainty, and in order to get rid of the disadvantages attendant on a separate charge for second crop, it has been definitely decided that such lands should be rated as double crop. This course should therefore be followed, unless Mr. Puckle proposes to register the lands as single crop only temporarily, subject to revision hereafter when the capabilities of the tanks have been ascertained, in which case the Board will not object to the proposed registry.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,

Acting Secretary.

No. 54.

ORDER THEREON, 6th November 1876, No. 1,577.

Land Revenue, No. 1.

The principle enunciated in G.O., 14th July 1874, No. 880, viz., that land which has in ordinary seasons a certain

supply for two crops should be registered as double crop, seems easy of application, and it is difficult to see how Mr. Puckle could have acted conformably to that Government Order if he had registered *all* land under the Red Hills Tank as "single crop," when it is admitted on all hands that much of the land can, with certainty, raise two crops in the year. The registry once for all as "double crop" saves the necessity for inquiry every year as to whether a second crop has been raised or not, and cannot be productive of hardship to the ryot, inasmuch as in exceptional seasons the necessary scrutiny is held and relief afforded. Mr. Puckle does not give any specific reasons for advocating a deviation from the above principle. In conducting a settlement which is to stand good for thirty years, and fixing the character of land and the assessment payable on it, the condition of the land during the particular year of settlement can be no guide to the settling officer. The accounts for a series of years should be examined, the ordinary capabilities of tanks and their usual *ayadents* ascertained, and each land registered according to the results thus obtained. If it is in contemplation at the time of the settlement to improve existing sources of irrigation, it is not intended that the character of the lands, as altered by the improved supply, should be ascertained and their assessments fixed accordingly. In such cases the operations of the Settlement Department must necessarily be confined to noting down existing conditions; the assessments being declared subject to revision as soon as such conditions are altered by improved systems of irrigation. In regard to the Chembram-

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
6th November 1876.*

bankam and Cholavaram Tanks, the proper course seems to be to register such lands as "double crop" as can now be ascertained to possess irrigation for two crops with certainty, the rest being left to be dealt with after the projects have reached completion.

(True Extract.)

(Signed)

D. F. CARMICHAEL,

Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue
Director of Revenue Settlement.

For the year 1876-77, the Board of Revenue has decided to settle the rates for the second crop at one-third of the first crop assessment for all permanent double-crop land; and one-fourth and one-fifth of the first crop charge for all lands occasionally irrigated for second crop, with the proviso that the second crop charge should in no case be less than 1 Rupee. A reduction was authorized when the water was raised by picottah or lift.

NOVEMBER
1876

G.O. No. 577, of 5th April 1864, paragraph 13 to 19.

Board of Revenue, Madras.
2nd Nov. 1876.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

REVENUE.

COLL. 11/1876

6.11.08
21.5.38

No. 1,526.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 10th June 1876.

Read the following letter from C. RUNDALL, Esq., Acting Director of Revenue Settlement, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Madras, 15th May 1876, No. 2,057-46 :—

I HAVE the honor to refer, for the consideration of the Board, the principle upon which the charge for second-crop assessment, when consolidated, should be adjusted in the Chingleput District.

2. The districts hitherto treated in this respect comprise Trichinopoly and Salem. For Trichinopoly the Government, after considerable* discussion, sanctioned the composition of the second-

crop charge at one-third of the first-crop assessment for all permanent double-crop land; and one-fourth and one-fifth of the first-crop charge for all lands occasionally irrigated for second crop, with the proviso that the second-crop charge should in no case be less than 1 Rupee. A reduction was authorized when the water was raised by picottah or lift.

3. For Salem, the Director adopted much the same course, and settled the rates for compounding as under :—

For the first group wet	...	...	...	...	...	1
For the second group wet	...	...	...	...	...	1
For the third group wet	...	...	...	...	...	1

Provision being made that the minimum should never be less than 1 Rupee, and that for haling under the fourth group wet an abatement of half a Rupee be allowed.

4. The foregoing describes what may be considered as the established procedure of the department, in respect to consolidating the charge for second-crop assessment.

5. A different course has, however, been followed in Tinnevely in the settlement conducted under Mr. Puckle's special instructions in that district. The charge has been graduated according to the taram or assessment as under :—

Rate of Assessment.	Rate for compounding.
I. and II.	1
III.	1
IV.	1
V.	1

The former circumstances of the Tinnevely District necessitated special rates in respect to the second-crop charge, but the principle of applying the charge differs materially from the ordinary departmental procedure.

6. In their Order, No. 380, of 14th July 1874, Government ruled that composition for the second-crop assessment could not be made compulsory; that the former system of rating land which in ordinary seasons receives a certain supply for two crops, as double crop, should be reverted to, and remission given in the rare cases where the supply may fail; and that composition should be restricted to uncertain irrigation under certain specified conditions.

7. In settling the sixty-nine villages of the Sydapet Taluq of Chingleput, Mr. Puckle adopted the system pursued in Tinnevely, and fixed the rates of compounding for the district at one-third for lands comprised in the first and second tarams of assessment, and one-fourth for the remaining tarams. As only one block of 29.10 acres was thus compounded for, the action taken is of no significance as regards what has been done; but the question arises whether the departmental procedure is to give way to that introduced into the Tinnevely District, and the Acting Deputy Director of Chingleput needs to be instructed as to the course to be pursued.

8. Under the departmental procedure, the rate of compounding depends upon the quality of the irrigation likely to be secured for a second crop, irrespective of the assessment of the land. In Tinnevely, the rate of assessment determines the charge for the composition of the second crop. The system thus introduced in that district may suit the classification by blocks there adopted, as great consideration has been given to the irrigation supplied in rating the land, the best irrigated lands under the extensive river channels being regarded as the best quality or first taram. It is different, however, in other districts; and it would certainly be unsafe to assume that the highest assessed land is the best, as regards position or level for irrigation for the first or second crop either; or that the best irrigated land is the highest assessed, and needs to be so treated for second crop. The quality of the irrigation, irrespective of the quality of the soil, should doubtless continue to be the guiding principle in compounding for second crop, as already given effect to in settled districts; and I am therefore directing Major Stuart that the principle hitherto pursued in the department should be maintained and extended to Chingleput. The same provision in respect to a minimum charge of 1 Rupee (not in force in Tinnevely) will be applied to Chingleput also. I would request that this course may have the approval of the Board.

9. Under G.O., No. 221, of 15th February last, the classification as revised will be by blocks, and in place of the whole of the source of irrigation being adjusted generally at one rate for compounding, I recommend that a variation of rate be permitted according to the quality of the irrigation. Under a tank, for instance, a portion of the area may be favorably located and supplied for second crop with much greater certainty than the more distant lands, or those on a higher level. I would propose to recognize and treat these variations where the officer inspecting and laying out the second-crop irrigation may find the area of sufficient extent to comprise one or more separate blocks.

10. Mr. Banbury's proposals for the settlement of the principal division of Chingleput were submitted prior to the receipt of G.O., No. 880, of 14th July 1874, above referred to; and, under the decision thus passed by Government, I consider that the land irrigable for a double crop under the Red Hills, Cholaveram and Chembrambaukam Reservoirs should have been rated and assessed at double-crop rates. Mr. Puckle, seemingly thought otherwise; and left the second-crop charge for all irrigation under the Red Hills Tank to be made as at present. Probably it is too late to amend the

treatment adopted for the Red Hills irrigation; but effect should at all events, I consider, be given to the order of Government in dealing with irrigation for a double crop under the Cholaveram and Chembrambaukam Tanks, and on this point I beg to solicit the orders of the Board.

In the foregoing letter, the Acting Director of Revenue Settlement submits two questions for consideration and orders.

1st.—The principle upon which the charge for second-crop assessment, when consolidated, should be adjusted in the Chingleput District.

2nd.—The propriety of rating as "double crop" the lands irrigated under the Red Hills, Chembrambaukam and Cholaveram Projects, according to the principle laid down in G.O., dated 14th July 1874, No. 880.

2. In regard to the first point, Mr. Randall explains the established procedure of the Settlement Department in determining the consolidated charge for second-crop assessment to be as follows:—

For all permanent double-crop land...	$\frac{1}{3}$ rd of the first-crop assessment.
For all lands occasionally irrigated for second-crop.	$\frac{1}{4}$ th and $\frac{1}{4}$ th of the first-crop assessment.

A minimum of 1 Rupee is fixed for the second-crop charge, and where water is raised by mechanical means, an abatement of half a Rupee is allowed. This mode of adjustment has been approved by Government and has been followed in the districts settled by the department.

3. It appears, however, that in Tinnevely, the settlement of which was conducted by the Collector, the charges were adjusted according to the qualities of the soil, and this system was adopted by Mr. Puckle in settling sixty-nine villages of the Sydapet Taluq in Chingleput. It appears that only one block of 29.10 acres was thus compounded for, and Mr. Randall now asks for instructions as to whether the procedure which has received the sanction of Government, and which has been followed in the settlement of other districts, is to give way to that imported from Tinnevely. He points out that the former circumstances of the Tinnevely District might have necessitated the application of special rates in regard to the second-crop charge, but demurs to the proposal to substitute the system there followed for that in force in other districts so far as Chingleput is concerned.

4. In paragraph 8 of his letter, Mr. Randall gives his reasons for preferring the established system, and the Board entirely adopt his view that except under special circumstances, which do not exist in Chingleput, the principle to be followed in adjusting the charge for second crop should be the facilities for irrigation which the land possesses rather than the quality of the soil. The instructions issued by the Acting Director to Major Stuart on the subject have the Board's approval, as has also the action he proposes to take (paragraph 9) in the block revision of the classification, which is merely carrying out the same principle.

5. As regards the second question submitted by the Acting Director for orders, the Board are of opinion that the instructions conveyed in G.O., No. 880, dated 14th July 1874, must be adhered to. These appear to have been overlooked

by Mr. Puckle when submitting his report on the settlement of the sixty-nine villages a year later. The Board do not see why the land under the Red Hills Tank should not come under this treatment, as in regard to second crop Mr. Puckle's arrangements were avowedly temporary "pending the extension of the system of irrigation"—vide paragraph 28 of his report.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed)

O. A. GALTON,

Acting Secretary.

To the Director of Revenue Settlement.

Copy to the Collector of Chingleput, with copy of G.O.,

dated 14th July 1874, No. 880.

Ed. W. H. French.

Second crop Assessment.—During the questions raised by Director of Revenue Settlement regarding the principle upon which a charge for — when consolidated, should be assessed in Chingleput District and the proposal of rating as "double crop" the lands under Red Hills, Chembayambakam and certain other Projects according to certain principles laid down by Government.

No. 1,526.

JUNE

Received

1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900

PROCEEDINGS, 10TH JUNE 1876, No. 1,526.

MADRAS.

BOARD OF REVENUE

1876.

No 1577-

Memorandum

6 Manuscript

Board's Proceedings 26:

Sept. 1876 No 2658.

The principle announced in No. 14 July 1874 No 880 viz that land which has been during seasons a certain supply for two crops should be registered as double crop seems easy of application & it is difficult to see how Mr. Puckle could have acted uniformly to that effect if he had registered all the land under the Red Hills Tank as "single crop" when it is admitted on all hands that much of the land can with certainty raise two crops in the year. The "Registry rule for all as double crop" saves the necessity for inquiring every year as to whether a second crop has been

consideration & cannot be
productive partnership to
be kept in as much as the
exceptional seasons the
necessary levelling is held
& relief afforded. - but
Pucall does not give any
specific reasons for advocating
a deviation from the above
principle. In conducting a
settlement which is to
stand for a long time
fixing the character of land
& the assessment payable
on it, the condition of the land
during the particular year
of settlement can be no
guide to the settling officer.
The accounts for a series of
years must be examined, the
rainfall, the condition of the
land, the crops & the
usual average ascertained
& each land reported ac-
cording to the results. The
settling officer should be able

at the time of the settlement
in contemplation to ascertain
existing sources of irrigation,
it is not intended that the
character of the land as
affected by the improved
supply should be ascertained
& the assessments fixed
accordingly. In such cases
the operation of the settlement
must necessarily
be confined to taking
down existing conditions,
the assessments being de-
clared subject to revision
as soon as such conditions
are altered by improved
system of irrigation. I refer
to the Kells Tank & the Chemb-
bambankam & Cholaravaram
tanks, the proper course seems
to be to report such lands
as double crops as can be
ascertained to possess
irrigation for two crops each
year.

over
Draws special attention to the
fact that the lands in the
Kells Tank & Cholaravaram
tanks are not double crops
but are double crops of the
Kells Tank & Cholaravaram
tanks. The proper course seems
to be to report such lands
as double crops as can be
ascertained to possess
irrigation for two crops each
year.

Left to be dealt with Bribble crop lands
after the projects have reached in Chenglepeth & L,
Chumpletum. under Channambakkam
Cholavaram Tanks.