

(1) Number of pages \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Date of repair \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Initials of the Referencer \_\_\_\_\_

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

*Revenue* DEPARTMENT

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

2110

Press  
Mis.

Dated

*b*  
26 ~~7~~ 1877

196

Not to be folded or roughly handled



2110

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.  
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

26th June 1877. No. 2,110.

Read the following papers:—

No. 548      Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 1st September 1876,  
No. 2,246.

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 13th March 1876, No. 723.

Read also the following letter from C. RUNDALL, Esq., Acting Director of Revenue Settlement, to C. A. GALLTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Madras, 13th June 1876, No. 2,379-58:—

I HAVE the honor, with reference to Board's Proceedings (enclosure returned), No. 723, of the 13th March last, to No. 263, of 11th December 1875, and No. 47, of 24th February 1876, offer the following remarks on the questions raised by the Collector of Cuddapah in his letters to the Board as per margin. :

2. In the first communication Mr. Horsley alludes to the ruling of the Board, under date the 22nd August 1874, Proceedings, No. 2,355, that water-rate should be levied in the Cuddapah District for a second wet crop raised on dry land, which proposition he opposed on the grounds given in his letter printed with the foregoing Proceedings. In his second letter the Collector advocates the extension of the exemption he thus formerly recommended, and proposes that so far as well irrigation may be concerned, that "the present limit of distance from the tank bund should be maintained, but all wells beyond that should be allowed to irrigate wet or dry or second crop on wet or dry land without payment of water-rate or second-crop assessment." Mr. Horsley takes exception also to the manner in which the revision of tank ayacuts is being carried out by the Settlement Department in his district, and wishes the operation, as at present conducted, to be stopped.

3. Of the two questions thus raised, it is desirable that I should refer first to the revision of tank ayacuts which is being conducted in conformity with the rules noted in the margin. It is contended that the tank ayacuts are already too large for the tanks, and that the tendency

G.O., No. 181, of 27th January 1871.

of the action of the Settlement Department is to augment the area or ayacut still further. At the same time seemingly the Collector regards it as a general complaint that the tanks are in a neglected state, and that, owing to the gradual silting process, the capacity has been curtailed; whilst the ayacut has been added to since 1861 by lands shown in the A Register as having received water for a certain number of years, being registered as wet. The result of this silting process is stated to be that, unless the tanks fill two or three times a year, the supply received is insufficient for the cultivation of their ayacuts.

4. Save the additions to the tank ayacuts in comparatively recent years, the condition of the tanks in Cuddapah is much the same I expect as in the neighbouring districts. The expenditure on the repair of the tanks is necessarily limited; and as regards the numerous smaller or least important sources, the complaints as to the neglected state they are in may have some foundation; but compared with former days and other districts, the more important and larger tanks are probably as efficient now or more so than formerly.

5. From what I have observed elsewhere, it is an old established custom for the smaller tanks to require to fill two or three times a year to be able to supply their ayacut. The capacity of the tanks is such that it may reasonably be regarded



as a necessity from the first. As a rule, the rain is not limited to one fall, but is distributed over a period of six months. A tank received a partial supply, which is added to by a second fall of rain, and with the first heavy fall the tank probably fills; and, as the supply is expended, it is replaced by further falling rain at intervals, if the season is propitious. That the seasons vary considerably is well known, and it is, no doubt, difficult to determine to what extent the ayacut of a tank may be revised. The object aimed, at by the rules is to revise the area to conform with the ordinary capabilities of the tank in respect to irrigation in fair seasons. Dry lands ordinarily irrigated along with the adjacent wet area are thus transferred to wet. The capabilities of a tank must necessarily, for the purpose of the rules, be gauged in some way. Mr. Horsley is not disposed to accept for his district the course elsewhere; and seemingly he wishes the large enough already, and will not supply an increased area.

6. The circumstances of all ayacuts are not the same. Under some tanks the area may be excessive; under others it may be considerably less than the ordinary capability of the supply may suffice for. Again, in other instances, part of the ayacut may be out of cultivation, and dry land on a lower level, or of better quality, may be now irrigated instead. Whatever is done, it is certain that no hard and fast rule can apply. The case of each ayacut must necessarily be examined and dealt with on its merits, and to do this some principle must be followed, and I contend that the course adopted by the department—that of the ordinary capability of the tank in the past—is the safest and the most readily ascertained method. It may reasonably be argued, that land irrigated under a source in the past in fair seasons may be regarded as so irrigable in the future.

7. Mr. Horsley maintains that the irrigation of the past, as shown by the accounts or A Register, is mostly fictitious, and that the proposals of the department made on the strength of the A Register, are unreliable, and so far as personal inquiries are concerned are not founded on fact. There are some cases evidently, from what is stated, that show the entries by the accounts to be misleading. Still, it cannot be reasonably believed that, as a rule, all entries are fictitious, or that any large portion of the water-rate levied in the district is gratuitously paid by the ryots when water may not have been supplied or obtained, and they know no liability to exist for such payment. If the department proposed the changes to the ayacuts solely on the basis of the A Register, they would, no doubt, be apt to be misled. The transfers are, however, based as well upon actual inspection of the ground; and thus if care be exercised, any chance of being misled is obviated. Should the inspection show the dry assessed area to be more or less surrounded by ordinary wet lands, and to be partitioned and embanked for irrigation and cultivated as wet only, in such years as the supply may suffice, the conclusion that the supply in ordinary years will irrigate such land is well supported. Much depends upon the position of the lands to be changed with reference to the regular wet area; and, if enclosed by wet, the land is probably unsuited for cultivation save under irrigation, the moisture from the surrounding or adjacent wet fields being detrimental to the growth of any dry crop.

8. There are thus many circumstances needing consideration when dealing with the question of revision of tank ayacuts. The tendency of the changes effected, so far as tabulated, is explained in the accompanying letter from Mr. Cox which affords information, as well as to Mr. Horsley's action in respect to the proposals submitted for his consideration by the Deputy Director.

9. The following abstract represents the effect of the changes as given in the statements submitted by Mr. Cox:—

statements submitted by Mr. ...

| Items.                               | Wet Ayacut as registered in the Revenue Accounts. |        | Deduct transferred from Wet to Dry. |        | Balance. | Add transferred from Dry to Wet. |        | Revised Wet Ayacuts. |        |        |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|--------|-------------------------------------|--------|----------|----------------------------------|--------|----------------------|--------|--------|
|                                      | ACRES.                                            | CENTS. | ACRES.                              | CENTS. | ACRES.   | CENTS.                           | ACRES. | CENTS.               | ACRES. | CENTS. |
| <i>Koilkuntla Taluq, Kurnool.</i>    |                                                   |        |                                     |        |          |                                  |        |                      |        |        |
| Deputy Director's Proposals          | 5,394                                             | 85     | 821                                 | 41     | 4,573    | 44                               | 860    | 24                   | 5,433  | 68     |
| As amended by Collector ...          | 5,394                                             | 85     | 820                                 | 53     | 4,574    | 32                               | 842    | 10                   | 5,416  | 42     |
| Difference ...                       | ...                                               | ...    | — 0                                 | 88     | + 0      | 88                               | — 18   | 14                   | — 17   | 26     |
| <i>Proddatur Taluq, Cuddapah.</i>    |                                                   |        |                                     |        |          |                                  |        |                      |        |        |
| Deputy Director's Proposals          | 1,165                                             | 80     | 112                                 | 75     | 1,053    | 5                                | 114    | 22                   | 1,167  | 25     |
| As amended by Collector ...          | 1,165                                             | 80     | 215                                 | 85     | 950      | 45                               | 51     | 53                   | 1,002  | 1      |
| Difference ...                       | ...                                               | ...    | + 103                               | 60     | — 102    | 58                               | — 62   | 66                   | — 165  | 24     |
| <i>Jamalamadagu Taluq, Cuddapah.</i> |                                                   |        |                                     |        |          |                                  |        |                      |        |        |
| Deputy Director's Proposals          | 190                                               | 99     | 12                                  | 24     | 178      | 75                               | 78     | 24                   | 256    | 99     |
| As amended by Collector ...          | 190                                               | 99     | 128                                 | 50     | 62       | 49                               | ...    | ...                  | 62     | 46     |
| Difference ...                       | ...                                               | ...    | + 16                                | 26     | — 113    | 26                               | — 78   | 24                   | — 194  | 50     |

The three taluqs comprised one settlement report, and Koilkuntla, as is well known, formerly belonged to the Cuddapah District. There is very slight variation between the proposals and the Collector's amendments for the latter taluq. If the tank bed area, 432 acres, newly adjusted under wet, be excluded from the comparison, the net result is a decrease of 410 acres as pointed out by Mr. Cox, and not an increase.

10. For the villages tabulated under the Proddatur and Jamalamadagu Taluqs, the Deputy Director's proposals would leave the ayacuts of the former within an acre or two of the original area, whilst the Collector's alterations would reduce the same by 165 acres. In the latter taluq the changes effected are most extensive. The former ayacut of 190.99 acres was proposed by Mr. Cox to be enhanced to 256.99 acres. Mr. Horsley, however, objected to much of the area being retained as wet at all, and cut it down to 62.49 acres. The reductions seemingly appertain to lands under wells. Such want of accord is inevitable, if the Collector treats the proposals submitted to him upon considerations other than the rules sanctioned by Government for the purpose, and upon which the proposals may have been framed.

11. At paragraphs 18 and 19 of Board's Proceedings, No. 915, of 16th June 1872, the course advocated by Mr. Banbury of treating as wet, lands under Dasabandam, Doruvu, and Itifak wells was approved and confirmed by paragraph 4 of G.O., No. 145, of 5th February 1873. In conformity with this ruling, lands irrigated from sources of the foregoing nature, deriving their water-supply from a recognised Government source of irrigation, have been brought to wet under the rules by Mr. Cox. If irrigated for a crop other than paddy, Mr. Horsley has generally declined to retain such lands under wet, or to transfer them to that head when previously dry, but has made exceptions in some instances. In this way in Maddanur and Dommara

\* Villagewar statements and plans accompany the Deputy Director's letter.

Nandyala of the Jamalamadagu Taluq, it will be seen that, in the case of 71.65 acres irrigated by Dasabandam wells in the first village and 11.29 acres irrigated by Doruvu wells in the second village, the Collector transferred the whole of the irrigated area to dry for the reasons marginally given.

(1). Under all the works the lands are poor, and to raise wet crops does not pay. The lands should all be classed dry.  
(II). Wet crops cannot be cultivated. The land should be dry.



is not, however, referred to, nor is the present treatment of lands generally irrigated by wells for a second crop on wet land specified, though the Collector expresses himself so strongly as to the illiberality of the orders now in force in respect to such irrigation. It is not to be inferred from Mr. Horsely's letter that any concession has previously been granted by Government in cases of the nature to which he refers. The question was, nevertheless, raised at a comparatively recent date by Mr. Storr, who suggested that one-third in place of one-half of the ordinary wet assessment should be charged. Mr. Horsley, in forwarding on the proposal, did not regard the reduction as sufficient, and recommended that the

\* Board's Procs., No. 85, of 11th January 1872. charge should be limited to one-fourth. The Board\* supported the latter proposition, and it was approved by G.O., No. 928, of 12th June 1872, as a temporary measure, pending the introduction of the revised settlement. Thus the reduction of the former charge by one-half has had effect during the past four years, and lands irrigated for a second crop partly by wells are at present treated differently from lands directly supplied by a tank or channel for a second crop.

\* Board's Procs., No. 1,663, of 22nd Aug. 1872. Subsequently Mr. Storr, in remarking on the rules for the revision of tank ayacuts,\* questioned the fairness of any charge at all for such irrigation; and, in disposing of the reference (Proceedings, No. 2,087, of 28th October 1872,) the Board remarked at paragraph 6:—"The question whether the rule that 'second crop' is to be charged for when it is grown with water obtained from private wells in wet land is an important one involving a very large amount of revenue in most of the districts. It is an indisputable fact that such wells are generally made, because their position with regard to the tank assures them a good supply of water, and that it is almost impossible to discover, when there is a dispute, whether the water for the second crop has been drawn directly from the tank by channels or indirectly by means of the well. There may be some cases of hardship, but they must be few in number, and the interests of the State require that the rule should not be relaxed."

22. The Collector's proposition at paragraph 7 of his letter, No. 47, of 24th February, has thus been previously before the Board and negatived after due consideration, both in respect to irrigation from wells in wet land for a second crop in wet land, and to either first or second crop in dry land; and I fail to see either on the facts the Collector now records as to the action of wells during the past season, or in the other reasons he adduces, that would justify wells being freed entirely from any charge for irrigation for a second crop. The difficulties referred to by the Board would always be present; and, whilst it is essential that the fact of such irrigation being mainly dependent upon wells in many cases should be recognized and allowed for in adjusting the second-crop charge in such cases, there is no real necessity to forego the charge altogether as recommended, for it is based on good grounds and would lead to endless complications if attempted.

23. The Collector represents that the Government gain a good deal and the ryots very little by the existence of these wells. That the wells do, as stated, play an important part in the irrigation of his district and secure much of the Government revenue in indifferent seasons, must necessarily be admitted, as also that much of the second-crop assessment raised under many of the ordinary tanks is mainly due to irrigation afforded by these wells. With due deference to the Collector's opinion, I must, however, submit that there are substantial advantages on both sides. The circumstances of wells sunk in the wet lands differ materially from wells in dry land. The size and depth being much less, they are nothing like so costly to construct, or so expensive to maintain the work, and as the water springs freely, and the lift is comparatively slight, they are capable of irrigating a very much larger area than wells not similarly located in wet land. As a rule, even a slight store of water in the tank above keeps the level of the supply in the wells within a few feet of the surface and thus renders the lift easy and effective. For a further description of wells in wet lands, paragraphs 14 and

15 of my letter, No. 464-134, of 28th June 1873, printed, with Board's Proceedings, No. 2,169, of 23rd October 1873, can be referred to. Though the remarks then recorded applied to North Arcot, they are in a great measure applicable, I believe, to Cuddapah also. I contend, therefore, that wells in wet lands possess very decided advantages over wells in dry lands; and that these advantages accrue entirely from the wells being sunk in Government irrigation, whereby a much more ample supply and one much more easily worked is secured.

24. The question is one of great importance, for Cuddapah is not singular in respect to this well irrigation. It exists to a large extent in North Arcot and most other districts, and the revenue involved would amount to a large sum. In Cuddapah during the past five years the assessment realized for second-crop irrigation varied according to the season from a little over half a lakh to nearly one lakh of rupees, as exhibited in the subjoined statement, notwithstanding the concession made by G.O., No. 928, of 12th June 1872, which limited the charge for irrigation mainly from wells to one-fourth of the single crop assessment. It must moreover be remembered that this is irrespective of any consolidated second-crop charge:—

| Taluqa.                    | Fasli 1280. | Fasli 1281. | Fasli 1282. | Fasli 1283. | Fasli 1284. |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                            | RS.         | RS.         | RS.         | RS.         | RS.         |
| <i>Principal Division.</i> |             |             |             |             |             |
| Cuddapah ... ..            | 8,592       | 3,180       | 5,400       | 9,599       | 11,421      |
| Proddatur ... ..           | 621         | 2,268       | 3,815       | 3,016       | 1,627       |
| Jamalamadagu ... ..        | 5,958       | 3,170       | 5,497       | 5,040       | 5,445       |
| Budwail ... ..             | 6,723       | 5,012       | 11,960      | 4,806       | 3,415       |
| Sidhout ... ..             | 8,980       | 6,768       | 8,067       | 7,908       | 5,130       |
| Pullampett ... ..          | 13,502      | 12,943      | 18,094      | 15,687      | 18,819      |
| Total ...                  | 44,376      | 33,341      | 52,833      | 46,056      | 45,857      |
| <i>Sub-Division.</i>       |             |             |             |             |             |
| Pulivendla ... ..          | 3,280       | 2,880       | 3,304       | 3,329       | 2,935       |
| Royachoty ... ..           | 6,235       | 3,390       | 4,594       | 3,071       | 8,352       |
| Kadiri ... ..              | 1,720       | 2,544       | 2,969       | 2,518       | 2,822       |
| Voilpand ... ..            | 10,021      | 8,629       | 10,184      | 6,543       | 12,664      |
| Madanapalli ... ..         | 8,890       | 5,989       | 13,228      | 7,324       | 20,489      |
| Total ...                  | 30,146      | 23,432      | 34,279      | 22,785      | 47,262      |
| Grand Total ...            | 74,523      | 56,773      | 87,112      | 68,841      | 93,119      |

25. It is, of course, impossible to indicate or conjecture what proportion of this second-crop assessment may appertain to sources mainly depending on wells for second-crop irrigation, and which Mr. Horsley would wish to see relieved of any charge for second crop; but probably the greater number of tanks in the district—as small tanks are very numerous—would be affected by the proposal, and thus a considerable proportion of the charge now realized would be affected.

26. Putting aside the revenue involved, many difficulties would beset any attempt to free in this manner the tanks mainly depending upon wells for the irrigation under consideration, as pointed out by the Board in Proceedings, No. 2,087, of 28th October 1872, already quoted from. The capabilities of a tank to supply second-crop irrigation depends generally upon its capacity as a reservoir; but in some seasons with an early and considerable fall and a fair distribution of rain during the remainder of the monsoon, even the smaller tanks are able to afford direct irrigation for two crops, if not for the whole at all events for



some portion of the area. Moreover, wells are now and again used to start and irrigate for a time the first crop should the burst of the monsoon be deferred, and paddy follows subsequently as the main crop. Thus the aid which the wells afford is not confined to the second crop only but in part may apply to both. Again, the degree to which tanks depend upon the wells for second crop irrigation varies considerably; and, if the sources mainly depending upon wells for second crop cultivation were to be freed, it would be considered a hardship to exact the liability of wells in the case of wells under tanks capable in most years of supplying irrigation direct to some extent.

27. Much has already been done to alleviate the former assessment on well lands. Under the rules which originated with the orders of the late Court of Directors in 1852, the exceptional assessment upon old well lands in Cuddapah as elsewhere was adjusted to dry rates under the sanction of Government accorded by G.O., No. 1,836, of 29th June 1869, provided the lands were unconnected with Government irrigation. The reduction of assessment which the measure entailed in respect to land in occupation in Cuddapah amounted to no less than Rupees 1,24,291—*Vide* G.O., No. 279, of 14th February 1871.

28. As regards irrigation from wells in wet land extended to dry, the charge according to the rules in force for the bulk of such irrigation falling under the second-class rates is, after deducting one-fourth for lift, Rupees 2-4-0 per acre for a paddy crop and Rupees 1-2-0 for dry crop or second crop. Considering the great value possessed by irrigation in Cuddapah, this charge is very moderate, and should, I think, be maintained. At present the single water-rate of Rupees 2-4-0 under the second or Rupees 3 under the first class covers any charge for second crop also, but this limitation of the rules applies only until the revised assessment may be introduced. Hence the system differs somewhat at present in the settled and unsettled taluqs.

29. Under the new settlement, precarious second crop irrigation of the nature adverted to will, in conformity with the ruling of Government contained in G.O., No. 880, of 14th July 1874, be offered to the cultivators to compound for at their option on favorable terms. Owing to the comparatively little irrigation in the taluqs already settled, little has been done in this respect. The rates

proposed by Mr. Banbury were one-third or one-fourth of the first-crop charges, but in the sub-division one-fifth,

as in Salem, will have to be taken also, and, if requisite, this rate should be applied to the main division of the district as well. Seemingly there is but slight disposition to compound in the settled portion of the district; but, if the rates are thus modified and fixed at one-third, one-fourth, and one fifth, an opportunity would be afforded the ryots if they are inclined to compound at all. The one-third rate might be generally regarded as applicable to tanks from which the direct irrigation may be precarious for a second crop, the one-fourth rate to tanks only partially able to irrigate a second crop as a rule and depending in part on wells, the one-fifth to tanks under which irrigation for a second crop might be mainly by wells. In some instances, it would doubtless be requisite to treat the second crop irrigation of one and the same source where it might vary considerably by block under ten or more of the rates fixed. This course has been already advocated at paragraph 9 of my letter to Board, No. 2,057-46, dated 15th May 1876.

30. The course to be pursued subsequent to settlement has not seemingly been definitely discussed and settled with reference to the views expressed by Government in G.O., No. 928, of 12th June 1872. The principle of a reduced charge for second-crop irrigation mainly from wells having been conceded, it is necessary and reasonable that it should be maintained. I would therefore propose that, if not compounded for in the manner indicated above, the charge be confirmed as formerly at one-half of the first crop assessment for tanks from which direct irrigation may be precarious, and fixed at one-third and one-fourth, respectively,

for tanks only partially able to irrigate a second crop and, as a rule, depending in part on well irrigation, and tanks under which irrigation for a second crop may be mainly by well.

31. Thus in place of a compounded charge of one-third, one-fourth, and one-fifth, the annual charge, when irrigation may be availed of, would be respectively one-half, one-third, and one fourth, or one rate higher. This, I must admit, would limit the variation in the charge to a small amount and offer less inducement to the ryot to compound; but if the reduction of the charge, in cases where the second-crop irrigation may be mainly supplied by wells, to one-fourth is conceded, as it must be under the new Settlement, greater variation could only be secured by fixing the lowest compounding ~~now~~ below one-fifth, which I regard as undesirable.

32. The addition for second crop, if compounded ~~for~~ or separate, would be as under, calculating the rate upon the amended wet rates recommended in my letter, No. 348-21,\* dated the 9th

\* Board's Procs., No. 749, of 16th March 1876.

February 1876, as applicable to the

Budwail, Sidhout, and Pallampett Taluqs:—



| Class and Sort. | FIRST GROUP.                |                             |            |             |            | SECOND GROUP.               |                             |            |             |            | THIRD GROUP.                |                             |            |             |            |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|
|                 | Rate per Acre for 2nd Crop. |                             |            |             |            | Rate per Acre for 2nd Crop. |                             |            |             |            | Rate per Acre for 2nd Crop. |                             |            |             |            |
|                 | Rate per Acre for 1st Crop. | Rate per Acre for 2nd Crop. |            |             |            | Rate per Acre for 1st Crop. | Rate per Acre for 2nd Crop. |            |             |            | Rate per Acre for 1st Crop. | Rate per Acre for 2nd Crop. |            |             |            |
|                 |                             | Half.                       | One-third. | One-fourth. | One-fifth. |                             | Half.                       | One-third. | One-fourth. | One-fifth. |                             | Half.                       | One-third. | One-fourth. | One-fifth. |
| I.              | 2                           | 3                           | 4          | 5           | 6          | 7                           | 8                           | 9          | 10          | 11         | 12                          | 13                          | 14         | 15          | 16         |
| II.             | 12 0 0                      | 6 0 0                       | 4 0 0      | 3 0 0       | 2 0 0      | 10 0 0                      | 5 0 0                       | 3 0 0      | 2 0 0       | 1 0 0      | 9 0 0                       | 4 0 0                       | 3 0 0      | 2 0 0       | 1 0 0      |
| III.            | 10 0 0                      | 5 0 0                       | 3 0 0      | 2 0 0       | 1 0 0      | 8 0 0                       | 4 0 0                       | 2 0 0      | 1 0 0       | 0 0 0      | 7 0 0                       | 3 0 0                       | 2 0 0      | 1 0 0       | 0 0 0      |
| IV.             | 9 0 0                       | 4 0 0                       | 2 0 0      | 1 0 0       | 0 0 0      | 6 0 0                       | 3 0 0                       | 1 0 0      | 0 0 0       | 0 0 0      | 5 0 0                       | 2 0 0                       | 1 0 0      | 0 0 0       | 0 0 0      |
| V.              | 7 0 0                       | 3 0 0                       | 1 0 0      | 0 0 0       | 0 0 0      | 4 0 0                       | 2 0 0                       | 0 0 0      | 0 0 0       | 0 0 0      | 3 0 0                       | 1 0 0                       | 0 0 0      | 0 0 0       | 0 0 0      |
| VI.             | 5 0 0                       | 2 0 0                       | 0 0 0      | 0 0 0       | 0 0 0      | 2 0 0                       | 1 0 0                       | 0 0 0      | 0 0 0       | 0 0 0      | 1 0 0                       | 0 0 0                       | 0 0 0      | 0 0 0       | 0 0 0      |
| VII.            | 4 0 0                       | 1 0 0                       | 0 0 0      | 0 0 0       | 0 0 0      | 1 0 0                       | 0 0 0                       | 0 0 0      | 0 0 0       | 0 0 0      | 0 0 0                       | 0 0 0                       | 0 0 0      | 0 0 0       | 0 0 0      |
| VIII.           | 3 0 0                       | 0 0 0                       | 0 0 0      | 0 0 0       | 0 0 0      | 0 0 0                       | 0 0 0                       | 0 0 0      | 0 0 0       | 0 0 0      | 0 0 0                       | 0 0 0                       | 0 0 0      | 0 0 0       | 0 0 0      |

33. Under G.O., No. 577, of 5th April 1864, the minimum charge for second crop in Trichinopoly was fixed at one rupee, and this rule was extended to Salem. Under wells in the lower group an abatement of half a rupee was allowed. I would recommend that this minimum charge be dispensed with as regards Cuddapah, and any reduction for lift be limited to lands unirrigable directly for the first crop. If the fixed charge is reduced consequent on the irrigation being from wells, the occasion for any allowance for lift disappears. Moreover, where sometimes the irrigation may be by flow and sometimes by lift, it is impossible to record any variation, and the abatement for lift is allowable only in cases where irrigation may be solely by lift. Under the lower rates in Cuddapah there will be any second crop irrigation, as the area under the lower tarans is generally very slight.

34. Should these proposals be approved, the charge in respect to each source of irrigation, if not wholly compounded for, could be adjusted at the time of Settlement by the Settlement Officer with reference to the circumstances of each source, and recorded in the descriptive memoir of the village and any doubt after obviated.

35. According to paragraph 7 of his second letter, Mr. Horsley's proposal is limited to wells not within the prescribed distance of ten yards from the tank bund. I fail to see that this limit is applicable, for it refers to wells in unirrigated and not irrigated land. Moreover, wells at a considerable distance from the tank bund are often equally aided by the tank, provided they are well placed and within the fall away from or under current proceedings from tank.

36. At paragraphs 17 to 19 of his letter Mr. Cox questions the water-supply returned for some of the tanks alluded to by Mr. Horsley. He shows that the rainfall in the neighbourhood registered 21 inches, and that while some of the tanks received a half supply, several are returned as not having stored any water at all. The rainfall of Cuddapah and several adjacent districts is marginally given; and, though for the whole season the fall does not appear very short, it was wonderfully partial in some localities, and not seasonable or sufficiently steady and continuous to throw any large supply into the tanks. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Cox that the recorded supply is open to doubt in some instances, regard being had to the area cultivated and matured under paddy and other irrigated crops, and the number of wells concerned. For instance the four ~~mentioned~~ tanks in Yepperanla (4th village in Mr. Horsley's list) received seven days' supply or one-sixteenth of a full tank. There are no wells in the wet area, but with the aid of four wells in the adjoining dry land, 76.02 acres out of 81.25 acres in occupation were cultivated, 21.64 acres being paddy and 54.33 acres other irrigated crops. The whole was matured and 12.36 acres besides cultivated under second crop. The one-sixteenth of the tank could never have sufficed for the large area, or could the four wells in dry land have matured so many acres of cultivation

| 1875.             | INCHES. |
|-------------------|---------|
| Cuddapah ... ..   | 25.09   |
| North Arcot... .. | 26.16   |
| Bellary... ..     | 19.94   |
| Nellore... ..     | 28.85   |

## ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. H. M. COX, Esq., Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement, Karnool and Cuddapah Districts, to C. RUNDALL, Esq., Acting Director of Revenue Settlement, dated Cuddapah, 19th May 1876, No. 417-164.

I HAVE the honor to forward, herewith, the information called for in your Proceedings of the 19th ult. No. 782-119,\* and to submit a few remarks with reference to the views expressed

by Mr. Horsley on the subject of the augmentation of the wet ayacuts in this district.  
\* Enclosures (2) returned.

2. Enclosed are three\* statements exhibiting the result of the revision of ayacuts in the whole of the taluq of Koilkuntla, Karnool District, and in seven and eighteen villages of Jamalamadugu and Proddatur respectively according to the accounts made up as far as the B

\* I, II, and III.



Statements have been received from the Collector. The black ink figure represent the proposals made by this department, and the corrections in red ink show the changes as recorded by the Collector.

3. In Koilkuntla it will be seen that the Collector's modifications are very insignificant, though in some villages there is a marked addition to the wet ayacut. On the whole, the total figures show a slight increase, but deducting the 432 acres odd relating to the waterspread of tanks which has been now transferred to wet, there is a decided decrease in the wet ayacuts in this taluq, although, as already said, there is a marked increase in some villages.

4. In Jamalamadugu and Proddatur, the Collector of Cuddapah has made great changes on our proposals, the nature of which may be learnt by a reference to the enclosed B Statements for three villages forwarded for your inspection, together with the plans and different Telugu accounts from which these statements have been compiled, as per accompanying Telugu List VII.

5. In one of these villages, objection is raised to the addition proposed to be made to the ayacut of a tank, although these new lands have apparently been growing paddy for some years past, while the cultivation of the old ayacut has continued without intermission, except here and there a field left waste because the ryots did not care to cultivate it that year.

6. The other cases relate to Doruvu and Dasabhandam wells, and these represent the bulk of the changes shown in the statements referred to in paragraph 2. The objections raised to the lands under these sources being classed as wet, is that they do not and cannot grow wet crops, i.e., paddy. This may, as a rule, be said of all wells, and I have explained to Mr. Horsley and Mr. Gribble that we have not registered the lands altogether with reference to the crops grown on them, but in consideration of their receiving water from a fairly trustworthy Government source, and there are cases in which Mr. Horsley's approval of some lands growing similar crops being retained as wet, the only proviso that he has made being that they should be registered as "single crops."

7. Even in the case where a Dasabhandam well has been reported as out of repair, &c., we have retained the ayacut under it as wet for the simple reason that, as long as the Inam grant is allowed for its upkeep, it must be considered a Government source. Such cases are, of course, brought to the notice of the Tahsildar with a view to the Inamdar being served with a notice calling upon him to execute the necessary repairs. Meanwhile, as the ayacut cannot be transferred to dry until the Inam has been resumed, the ryots are informed that they are at liberty to claim remission of wet assessment until such time as the well is repaired, &c.

8. The Collector has also taken exception to the remark entered in the B Statements against well ayacut to the effect that lands newly transferred to wet have been so treated because they "have been invariably cultivated with wet crops." With reference to this I must explain, in the first place, that it is the form adopted from the statement received with the circular of instructions, and next that the garden crops grown with the help of water have been considered by us to all intents and purposes as *not bono fide* dry crops and therefore wet since we have nothing between. I shall feel obliged by the necessary instructions as to whether the form of remark should be altered in future.

9. Doruvu, Dasabhandam, and Itifak wells being recognized as Government sources, the ayacut under them must, I conclude, be registered as wet, otherwise there will be a large area left under Tirwajastee which, I conclude, the present revision was intended to rectify. Where necessary lands under wells are more leniently treated in the Settlement than tank lands, and should the lands be poor they are more lowly classified and rated accordingly by us. The wet rate however is sure to be higher than the dry rate *plus* Rupees 1-2-5\* water-rate leviable on lands growing raggi, &c., according to the water-rate

\* Rupees 1-6-0 less one-fourth deduction for lift.

rules now in force, but I do not think that the assessment fixed in the Settlement will be higher than they can really bear, particularly as no change is made for second crop. While showing all these wells as Government sources, we should not be justified, I think, in entering the ayacuts under a large number of them as dry. This will become a more serious matter in the sub-division taluqs with their numberless Dasabhandam wells.

10. I now come to the subject of Mr. Horsley's letter to the Board of Revenue. There is no doubt immense force in the assertion he makes that since the tanks are yearly becoming more and more silted up, the ayacuts must necessarily be reduced. I do not know upon what rules the extent of the ayacut originally registered as wet was fixed, but I observe in the face of the above assertion the fact that in many cases not only in this but also in other districts a larger extent of land is being irrigated under tanks and is paying Tirwajastee, while, as far as can be ascertained, hardly any complaints have been made by the occupants of the regular wet lands, nor, as a rule, has any remission been granted on those ayacuts except in years when there has been a decided scarcity of water.

11. I do not ignore the fact that wells dug in the wet lands do help to keep up the cultivation, and I have already admitted in my letter of the 7th February, No. 105-47, that I recog-

nize the great assistance these wells do afford, but I do not quite see how the thing is to be remedied in the way Mr. Horsley proposes. He advocates no increase to be made to the ayacut, and that the ryots should be allowed to take water from the wells in the wet lands free of charge. The second proposition might, I think, be allowed, provided the water is not drawn from the wells until that in the tank has been quite used up and none is flowing on to the wet lands from it. Some such rule as this seems necessary, as otherwise any amount of water might be drawn away from the proper wet lands, and even then the crops brought to maturity by means of these wells having already received some water from the tank would still be chargeable with Tirwajastee.

12. According to Mr. Horsley's own admission, the men owing the lands which we are proposing to add to the wet ayacut being influential people will, notwithstanding their fields are registered as dry, still continue to take the water to the detriment of the wet lands, paying or not paying Tirwajastee or water-rate as the case may be. The dry assessment *plus* water-rate being invariably less than the full wet rate will only tend to encourage this state of things, whereas, if the full wet assessment is charged, the man will most likely demand a full flooding, and this will no doubt cause the other ryots to call out or relinquish their lands for want of water. An inquiry might then be made into the matter and the necessary changes carried out.

13. This is, I think, the only way in which the thing can really effectually be righted, unless it is done at once scientifically by instituting a regular survey of all the tanks to determine their capacity and then calculate the area that such a volume of water can irrigate, fixing the ayacut with reference to levels, &c. Any other way of solving the question conclusively is to me impossible, and all that we can do in such a revision as is now being made is to examine the actual state of things on the ground, look into past accounts, to consult the wishes of the ryots, making such changes as seem necessary, and rectifying all glaring irregularities. There must be no errors in judgment, and where this is the case it seems preferable in instances like these the benefit should not be altogether on the side of the ryot who knows his own interest and may, I think, be trusted to bring to notice any injustice he considers he has really suffered when the matter can be better gone into and adjusted on its several merits.

14. I may here mention that I spoke to the District Engineer some days ago and asked him to let me know the result of the survey which it appears has been made in the case of one or two tanks that require repair, but I have not heard from him yet. He told me it would be no easy matter to determine the capacity of all the tanks, and decide on what would be a fair ayacut for each.

15. In consulting the Revenue Accounts, the A Register referred to by the Collector is also examined as it forms the record of all lands which have already under authority been classed as wet, but the present state of things on the ground are likewise taken into account as mentioned above, and alterations made where necessary.

16. The cultivation details given in the Classification Registers do not afford the same help as the Revenue Accounts, as they only represent the state of things existing at the time of demarcation some ten or twelve years back. I must explain, however, that the latter do not in many cases bear out the facts ascertained by our examination in the field.

17. I am inclined also to think that the reports furnished with reference to the quantity of water received by the different tanks is not altogether to be relied upon. For instance, in the statement which accompanied Mr. Horsley's letter, two tanks in Madvaram and four out of the seven in Kuruguntapalli are said to have received no water at all, while the other three tanks in the latter village were about half filled. All nine tanks drain the same range of hills situated between their villages and Vantimitta at which latter place the rain-fall registered in the District Gazette last year was nearly 8 inches in August, 6½ in September, and 4 in October, besides 1 in November and nearly 1½ in December.

18. Similarly, in Ramapuram, a six months' tank is said to have received 3 months' supply, and two 2 months' tanks only half a month's water each, while the other seven in the same village, all 2 months' tanks, got nothing. These all lie in one and the same narrow valley on the confines of the Budwai Taluq, and the large tank would appear to receive its supply from the small hills to the west instead of from the high Vellegonda range bordering Nellore, which may naturally be supposed to catch more of the rain that falls.

19. Another circumstance observable from Mr. Horsley's statement is that a larger extent of land was cultivated with wet crops under tanks two and three in Ramapuram, which are said to have received no water at all, than under the two shown to have had a fifteen days' supply, while in the one case there were only two and eight wells to help the irrigation against ten in the other.

20. With reference to paragraph 4 of the Proceedings under reply, I must explain that it is customary in this district to enter the water-rate charged on any land each year in the Kulwar or Asamiwar chitta of that year, and similar entries are made in the men's puttas if produced at the time of Jamabandi; otherwise the item only appears in the Kulwar chitta and the assessment collected accordingly.



21. In conclusion, pending the disposal of the different subjects now under discussion, I have deemed it advisable to postpone the introduction of the different changes proposed by Mr. Horsley into our accounts, and have left the entries in the registers now being submitted standing just as they are.

P.S.—I think the classification of the several crops as laid down in the table of rates to be charged for water supplied from the Irrigation and Canal Company given at page 251 of Mr. Gribble's Manual of this district shows that the wet crops of which we have been speaking ought rather to be called wet than dry. They come under Clause 3, whereas Clause 4 refers to dry crops.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) C. RUNDALL,  
Acting Director of Revenue Settlement.

Enclosures Nos. 2 to 27.—Statements, Ayacut Sketches, Telugu Accounts, &c.

Enclosure No. 28.—List of Enclosures.

SUBMITTED to Government with reference to G.O., dated 10th January 1876, No. 32.

Under reporting on the agricultural prospects of the district at the end of last year, Mr. Horsley observed, "if Government would treat wet wells more liberally, the effects of a dry season would not be so severely felt by the ryot." Government in their order quoted above desired to have the views of the Collector, the Director of Revenue Settlement, and the Board of Revenue placed before them in greater detail regarding the question raised by the Collector. Mr. Horsley in conforming to the above requisition has also stated his views in regard to the revision of tank ayacuts, he being of opinion that the increase in the number of wells depends on the extension of tank ayacuts, and Mr. Randall has followed him at considerable length in discussing this question. As, however, the matter was finally disposed of in the Proceedings of Government, dated 29th November 1872, No. 1,628, approving the rules framed by the Board for the guidance of officers engaged in the revision of tank ayacuts, and no necessity has been shown for a modification of the instructions then issued, it does not appear necessary for the Board to say more on this occasion than that they approve the proposals of the Acting Director at paragraph 17. The revision of ayacuts must be carried out on the principles enunciated by the Board and Government, and the Collector is not at liberty to ignore the rules by directing transfers at will. Caution should be exercised in proposing extensions of ayacuts, but the proposals must then be examined with reference to the rules, and must not be arbitrarily set aside. The Deputy Director's proposals for Proddatur, Jamalamadugu, and Cuddapah will be allowed to stand subject to any modification that may be deemed necessary on appeal.

3. Turning to the question as to whether, under existing rules, Mr. Horsley has grounds for his assertion that the owners of wet wells, i.e., wells dug in irrigated land, are not treated with a sufficient amount of liberality, the Board observe that up to a quarter of a century ago if a ryot dug a well and irrigated crops therefrom he was liable to an enhanced assessment on the land so improved, but in 1852 under the orders of the Court of Directors this most unfair impost was abrogated, and the ryots received distinct assurances that in future they were to have the full benefit of their own improvements. To guard, however, against abuses, and to protect the rights of the State in existing sources of irrigation, rules\* were framed under the authority of Government restricting the privilege in certain cases. The first of these rules is—

"That if cases should arise when it is manifest that a well dug at a ryot's expense has drawn away water from a previously existing Government work, in such instance such well land shall not be wholly exempted from assessment, but a fair and equitable extra cess water-rate may be imposed."

4. It is this "fair and equitable extra cess water-rate" to which Mr. Horsley takes exception. If the principle involved in the rule is sound, viz., that where a well derives its supply wholly or in part from a source of irrigation which was in existence previous to the construction of the well, then undoubtedly wells dug in wet lands are liable to the extra cess, inasmuch as many of them derive their supply by surface flow from the work which irrigates their site, whilst it may be asserted of all that they are fed from the same source by percolation. Not to impose some charge in the case of irrigation from these wells would be an act of one-sided liberality, inasmuch as they tend greatly to check the surface flow to the lands situated at a distance from the irrigating source, and if, as is often the case, they are excavated on the borders of irrigated lands and the water is used to irrigate dry lands, the supply to which the lower lands within the registered ayacut have a prior claim is unfairly intercepted.

5. Mr. Randall points out that, although no allusion is made by Mr. Horsley to any previous correspondence bearing on the subject, it has been discussed on previous occasions, and that the Board have deliberately declined to recommend any modification of the rules with the view of exempting from charge irrigation from wells in wet lands, it being "an indisputable fact that such wells are generally made because their position with regard to the tank assures them a good supply of water, whilst it is almost impossible to discover whether the water for a second crop has been drawn directly from the tank by channels or indirectly by means of wells"—Vide Board's Proceedings, dated 28th October 1872, No. 2,087. The subject was again discussed at some length in the papers recorded in Board's Proceedings, dated 23rd October 1873, No. 2,169, and the Board affirmed the principles already enunciated in the existing rules. Copies of these papers will now be submitted to Government; the Board adhere to the views expressed therein, and see no reason for the enormous sacrifice of revenue which would result from compliance with Mr. Horsley's recommendation that all wells beyond the limit of distance from the tank bund which is now applicable only to wells sunk in dry land, should be free to "irrigate wet or dry or second crop on wet or dry land without payment of water-rate or second crop assessment."

6. Although there is no necessity for any exemption such as that proposed however, Mr. Randall suggests more liberal treatment of second crop irrigation on wet lands at settlement, and further points out that the existing charge of one-fourth of the wet assessment when a second crop is raised partly by water from private wells was expressly sanctioned only pending the introduction of the new settlement, vide G.O., dated 12th June 1872, No. 928, and that definite orders are now required regarding the charge to be imposed subsequent to settlement. Under the new settlement composition or second crop charge, when the irrigation is precarious, is allowed at one-third and one-fourth of the first-crop charge, Mr. Randall proposes to add a one-fifth rate and to apply the several rates ordinarily as follows: the one-third rate to irrigation from tanks when the supply is precarious, the one-fourth rate to irrigation partly from tanks and partly from wells, the one-fifth rate to cases in which the supply is mainly dependent upon wells. Wherever the supply from any source to different parts of the ayacut varies considerably it will be treated by blocks.

The above rates are to be applied in cases of composition, and Mr. Randall proposes that when the ryots do not consent to compound the second crop charge should be fixed at one-half, one-third, and one-fourth the first-crop assessment in the cases noted above respectively according to the several degrees of certainty of supply.

He further proposes to dispense with the minimum charge of one Rupee per acre prescribed for Trichinopoly and subsequently extended to Salem so as to admit of the above terms being offered to the lower classed lands, the area of which, however, is stated to be limited, G.O., dated 5th April 1864, No. 577.



and to restrict the abatement of one-fourth for lift to cases in which the irrigation is solely by lift, withholding the concession when the supply is obtained partly by flow and partly by lift.

7. These proposals appear to the Board as liberal as the circumstances justify, and they recommend their acceptance. The nature of the supply will be noted and recorded by the Settlement Officer and the charge adjusted accordingly.

8. The attention of the Collector is called to the concluding paragraph of Mr. Rundall's letter in which he shows good ground apparently for questioning the accuracy of the tank supply registers maintained by the Village Officers. The Collector should investigate the cases brought to notice and issue such orders as will ensure greater attention being paid to this important matter.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,  
Acting Secretary.

No. 549. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 4th September 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 July 1876, No. 2,811-79:—

In continuation of my letter, No. 2,879-58, of the 13th ultimo, I have the honor to submit\* a further letter from

the Deputy Director of Cuddapah giving cover to a letter from the Acting Collector of that district, Mr. Gribble, on the subject of the revision of tank ayacuts and the treatment of wet lands irrigated by wells.

2. Mr. Gribble contends that paddy alone should be treated as a wet crop and that raggi when irrigated by a tank or well should still be regarded as a dry crop. I cannot speak for certain as to Cuddapah, but in other districts, when the water-supply is short, raggi is occasionally cultivated on the wet lands in place of paddy, and, therefore, when adjusting the wet ayacut, it is justifiable to deal with the fact whether the land is irrigated or not irrigated, irrespective of the question whether the crop irrigated is always paddy or sometimes raggi instead. Moreover, the irrigation of raggi will be found to generally prevail under the more indifferent sources of irrigation, and a set-off for this is allowed in the grouping, whereby a lower assessment is fixed for such lands than for those under more reliable sources of supply.

3. It is clear from what Mr. Gribble states at paragraph 8 that very considerable revision is urgently needed to the ayacuts of tanks in the sub-division. If the lands are unirrigable as a rule, and therefore waste, it will certainly be requisite to make considerable adjustments to dry, and there is really no foundation for Mr. Gribble's conclusion that the lands will be confirmed as wet and charged "double rate," or double-crop rates I presume. The rules provide equally for the transfer of land from wet to dry as from dry to wet, and such revision is essential.

4. It does not follow that the 17,637 acres referred to as under "Dasabandam Tank Ayacuts only" is relinquished area as stated by Mr. Gribble, for doubtless more or less is immemorial waste. Moreover, the extent does not refer to tanks only, but to channels and wells also. At page 236 of his Manual, to which Mr. Gribble alludes, it is stated that 13,966 acres under Dasabandam tanks were unoccupied in 1278 and 14,713 acres in 1282, and it is therefore inferred there is a tendency to relinquish the wet lands under these tanks. According to Appendix F, however, the area is rendered as 13,946 and 13,713 acres respectively, and consequently the unoccupied area has not increased, but diminished during the period, and the conclusions drawn are seemingly mistaken.

5. The area unoccupied on the average during the past five years is detailed, and from the fluctuations observable Mr. Gribble repeats his impression that "the general tendency is an increase in the number of acres relinquished, and the mere fact of fluctuation shows, I think, that even now the ayacuts are larger than they should be, and that whenever a good season occurs the ryot at once takes up land which he relinquishes in the following year." Under tanks there is but little variation save in one year, 1280. The comparison under the different heads is as follows:—

| Items.          | FASLIS. |        | Difference. |
|-----------------|---------|--------|-------------|
|                 | 1278.   | 1282.  |             |
| Tanks ... ..    | 13,946  | 13,713 | — 233       |
| Channels ... .. | 2,111   | 2,830  | + 719       |
| Wells ... ..    | 1,148   | 1,094  | — 54        |
| Total ... ..    | 17,205  | 17,637 | + 432       |

The increase is thus confined to the occupied area under channels, and it occurred in Fasli 1279. There must have been some special cause for this, as very little of the land then given up has been since occupied.

6. I can but regard Mr. Gribble's further remarks based on the proportion of the total cultivable area that is in occupation as misleading also. According to the statistics given in his Manual the cultivable extent is 3,533,737 acres, and it is stated that only one-third of this, or 1,225,082 acres, is in occupation. To determine the extent actually in occupation the area held under Inam tenure, 665,975 acres, should be added to the foregoing, making 1,891,057 acres. Half, and not one-third of the total cultivable area of the district, as given in the Manual, may therefore be said to be in occupation. Of the remaining half, probably a good part is not really cultivable, and the bulk of the area may be described as consisting of the poorer and indifferent qualities of soil. The tendency of the settlement is invariably to lower the assessment on the indifferent soils, and hence the new rates applicable to waste lands require, as a rule, to be regarded as more favorable to the extension of occupation than the former, or modified paimaish rates which they supersede. In the three taluqs first settled—Jammalamadugu, Proddatur, and Cuddapah—the proportion of the assessed land unoccupied was only 11 per cent., and in the next three taluqs reported on—Budwail, Sidhout, and Pullempet—30 per cent. There is, of course, other land that has never been yet brought under cultivation.

7. As regards the marked tendency to throw up lands, and especially wet land, I append below a statement compiled from the district returns, as to lands relinquished and taken up during the past five years, 1280 to 1284 Fasli:—



|                            | Dry.    | Wet.  | Total.  |
|----------------------------|---------|-------|---------|
| <i>Principal Division.</i> |         |       |         |
| Relinquished... ..         | 16,278  | 2,337 | 18,615  |
| Taken up ... ..            | 17,080  | 3,063 | 20,143  |
| Difference ...             | + 802   | + 726 | + 1,528 |
| <i>Sub-division.</i>       |         |       |         |
| Relinquished... ..         | 20,586  | 1,756 | 22,342  |
| Taken up ... ..            | 16,070  | 1,369 | 17,439  |
| Difference ...             | - 4,516 | - 387 | - 4,903 |
| Total, Relinquished... ..  | 36,864  | 4,093 | 40,957  |
| Do. Taken up ... ..        | 33,150  | 4,432 | 37,582  |
| Difference ...             | - 3,714 | + 339 | - 3,375 |

8. As regards the principal division of Cuddapah, there has been no decrease either of dry or wet occupation. In the sub-division there has been a falling off of 3,714 acres in dry and 387 acres in wet; but, as the cultivated area exceeds five lakhs of acres, the extent is inconsiderable.

9. The falling off in the wet is the main question that Mr. Gribble raises, and the foregoing details, though they do indicate a slight decrease of 387 acres in the subdivision, can hardly be regarded as supporting the Acting Collector's view of the question.

## ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. H. M. COX, Esq., Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement, Kistna, Kurnool, and Cuddapah Districts, to C. RUNDALL, Esq., Director of Revenue Settlement, Madras, dated Cuddapah, 21st June 1876, No. 531-218.

At the Acting Collector's request I have the honor to send you, herewith, a copy of the letter\* which he has written to me with reference to mine to you, dated 19th ultimo, No. 417-165, on the subject of the revision of wet ayacuts, &c., in this district, and, in doing so, beg to make two or three remarks on the same.

\* No. 35, dated 10th June 1876.

2. Paragraph 3.—Mr. Gribble argues that, because in the table of rates adopted by the Irrigation Company, rice is included in the same head as sugar-cane, &c., and charged more than garden raggi, garden korra, &c.; the latter should not be classed as wet. In the Government water-rate table I observe that rice is charged less than sugar-cane, &c., and the same rate (4 Rupees) as that fixed by the Irrigation Company for the garden crops above referred to. I do therefore see the great hardship in this case, particularly when no charge is made for a second crop under wells, which are the sources under which these crops are generally grown.

3. Paragraph 4.—The mere puddles of tanks in the sub-division to which Mr. Gribble refers are those the circumstances of which I have already proposed should be considered to see whether they might not be abandoned and the lands under them transferred to dry, in which case, of course, the wells would also not be chargeable.

4. Paragraph 5.—The assertion that the Tiruvajasti lands were held by rich and influential ryots was not mine, but Mr. Horsley's (*vide* paragraph 5 of his letter of the 24th February, No. 47, to the Board).

5. Paragraph 6.—I explained in paragraph 14 of my letter why I thought that in this case an exception should be made and the benefit lie on the side of Government. If the benefit were given to the ryot I considered that it might lead to evasion of assessment, and that he was quite able to represent any injustice that might be done while the fact of any extent of ayacut being left waste would at once attract the attention of the Revenue authorities and lead them to make an inquiry into the matter.

6. Paragraph 8.—The figures adduced by me himself admits in paragraph 9 the circumstance from those of the main division so that his argument expect that the ayacut in the sub-division taluq I fancy, be found to be much the same as those Arcot District, where the features of the country

able refer to the sub-division taluqs and as that part of country are quite different are cannot, I think, at all apply. I quite require reduction, their circumstances will, tanks in the northern taluqs of the North are similar.

## ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From J. D. B. GRIBBLE, Esq., Acting Collector of Cuddapah, to J. H. M. COX, Esq., Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement, Cuddapah, dated Madanapalli, 10th June 1876, No. 36.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of your letter, No. 417-164, dated June 1876, No. 465-247, to the address of the Director, to thank you for thus affording me an opportunity of making some remarks on points which I venture to disagree with you.

2. I find that the changes alluded to in paragraph 4, which have been made in the proposals for the taluqs of Jammalamadugu and in the actual cultivation of each field. In receipt of a cultivation statement for ten years almost all cases where Mr. Horsley objected extension of ayacuts, it was found that the field entered by the Settlement Department was richly cultivated with wet crops had in reality been cultivated with dry crops, such as korra, horse-gram, and occasionally only paddy. It is, of course, possible that these accounts may be incorrect, but they are supposed to be drawn up from the village accounts, which formed the basis of the annual settlements, and it would be therefore dangerous to impugn their veracity. You will remember one case in which the ten-year account signed by the village officials differed considerably from an account drawn up by the Settlement Department, which also was signed by the village officials. The village officials in this case were called upon to explain why they had signed contradictory accounts, and in reply stated that the account given to the Settlement Department was incorrect. This matter is still under inquiry.

3. The gist of the whole matter is what constitutes a "wet crop," and in paragraph 8 of your letter you say garden crops grown with help of water have been considered by us to all intents and purposes, as not *bona fide* dry crops. I cannot agree that therefore they should be charged wet assessment. It is true that there is nothing between, but I think an intermediate rate should be fixed. On turning to the rules of the Irrigation Canal Company I find there are four kinds of crops with three different rates of assessment—

|                                                         |       |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 1. Crops requiring continuous supply, first crop ... .. | RS. 6 |
| 2. Do. do. second crop ... ..                           | RS. 6 |

Under this head are included only rice, sugar-cane, betel leaves, cocoanuts, plantains, saffron, and fruit trees.

|                                              |       |
|----------------------------------------------|-------|
| 3. Crops requiring frequent floodings ... .. | RS. 4 |
|----------------------------------------------|-------|

Under this head are classed garden raggy, garden korra, garden onions, chillies, sweet-potatoes, tobacco, indigo, and brinjals.

|                                               |       |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------|
| 4. Crops requiring occasional floodings... .. | RS. 2 |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------|

field raggy, field korra, field chillies, field tobacco, cotton, grain, and oil seeds. Korra, raggy, and gram pay therefore a considerably lower assessment than rice, but under the system adopted by the Settlement Department they are made to pay exactly the same assessment, and their cultivation brings a field under the head "irrigable" as a wet crop. This, I submit, is scarcely just, and it was for this reason that I believe Mr. Horsley made so many objections to the extension of ayacuts in the B Statements.

4. In the case of wells, I admit the difficulty under which the whole question labors. In paragraph 6 you say: "The objections raised to the lands under Doravu, Dasabandam, and Itafak wells being classed as wet, is that they do not and cannot grow wet crops, i.e., paddy. This may, as a rule, be said of all wells, and I have explained both to Mr. Horsley and Mr. Gribble that we have not registered the lands altogether with reference to the crops grown on them, but in consideration of their receiving water from a fairly trustworthy Government source." It seems to me that if a well "does not and cannot grow" a wet crop it is unjust to make it pay a full wet assessment, whatever be the source it gets its water from. As a matter of fact, however, these wells depend very little upon the tanks below which they stand. During this year numberless cases came to my notice during the settlement of the Voilpad Taluq, in which a tank had received absolutely no water whatsoever, but yet a large portion of the ayacut raised wet crops from the wells. In other cases, long after the tanks had run dry, the irrigation was continued from the



wells and the crop raised. There are, in the district, to my certain knowledge, 46,904 wells, and there may be many more, of which I have not been informed. I am not quite prepared to endorse the statement that wells do not afford a crop of paddy, but I am confident that in thousands of acres which now grow paddy, and pay a wet assessment to Government, a wet crop would not be raised were it not for the wells. These wells are, for the most part, situated in the valleys where the tanks also lie, and it is often urged that, because they are in the midst of wet cultivation, they must gain a certain supply of water owing to the percolation from the irrigated fields around them, and therefore they should pay a wet assessment, since the water which percolates is from a Government source. This is partly, but not entirely true. The wells are dug in the drainage basins for the same reason that the tanks are built there, because water is available, but they are also dug there so as to prove a help to the Government tanks when their supply runs short. As long as the tank is full and the fields around are irrigated, some water no doubt percolates into the well, but what is to be said when in a year like this the tank is empty and the well is full. This is especially of importance in the sub-division taluqs (to which the settlement has not yet come) where there is an immense number of tanks (4,291), the majority of which are mere puddles, out of which the water speedily evaporates, but which nevertheless succeed in raising a small wet crop, in consequence of the aid given by the well. As far as I understand, what Mr. Horsley maintained (there I fully agree with him) was that if, when it is found that these wells have raised wet crops (which seem to include almost every crop which requires water) in lands beyond their registered ayacut, these lands are classed and charged as wet, it will be unjust. At present such lands pay a dry rate, 1 Rupee plus Tirwajasti rate Rupees 3 or 4 minus one-fourth for lift, when classed as wet they will have to pay double. At present it is not reason can be shown, so that I do not think that Tirwajasti lands are cultivated unless good arrangement, which, though it gives additional labor to the settling officer, is in my opinion more just to the ryot.

5. I am not quite prepared to say that the ayacut lands are usually held by the poor ryots, and the Tirwajasti lands by the rich and influential ones (paragraph 13 of your letter), often the reverse is the case; were it so, when these Tirwajasti lands are classed as wet, the state of things would be no different than it has been hitherto, and there could be no reason for the "other ryots" to call out or relinquish their lands for want of water, for they would be no worse off than they were before. If, however, the effect of increasing the ayacuts should be to cause ryots to relinquish their lands, it is clear that the wet ayacuts will have been increased beyond their capacity of supply. You state, however, (paragraph 13) "an inquiry might then be made into the matter and the necessary changes carried out." This is true, but such an inquiry would in reality be doing the whole work over again, for here we have to deal with 46,904 wells and 4,972 tanks.

6. I see that there are many difficulties in the way of a scientific measurement of the capacity of each tank, but this I feel sure is the only true way of settling the question. I venture to differ from you (paragraph 14) that "there must and will be errors of judgment, and where this is the case, it seems preferable in instances like these that the benefit should not be altogether on the side laid down, I am inclined to exactly the opposite, viz., that in all cases of doubt or error the benefit should be given to the ryot."

7. It is, of course, quite possible, as you say in paragraphs 17 and 18, that the rain accounts are not always quite trustworthy. In the instances you cite they may have been incorrect, but I can confidentially affirm that since I have been in the district, I have seen numberless cases exactly the crops watered solely from the wells.

8. Regarding the general question of decreasing instead of increasing the ayacuts, I would cite one example, which will, I think, bear out Mr. Horsley's opinion that they should not be increased. I allude to the tabular statement quoted on page 236 of my Manual, which shows that have been relinquished and are now lying waste on 17,637 acres, assessed at Rupees 88,231. There are wells which supply water to dry lands, and pay a small rate of from 4 to 5 Rupees. These lands will now probably be classed as wet and be charged double rate, and the ayacuts already partly relinquished will be nominally increased. I would beg you to refer to Appendix F on page 331 of my Manual, which shows the actual number of unoccupied acres under Dasabandam tanks, channels, and wells in the subdivision for each of five faslis ending with Fasli 1282.

The figures stand thus:—

| Fasli.     | Number of Acres. |
|------------|------------------|
| 1278... .. | 17,205           |
| 1279... .. | 17,319           |
| 1280... .. | 15,861           |
| 1281... .. | 17,219           |
| 1282... .. | 17,637           |

These figures show a considerable fluctuation, and wells are very nearly the same for in the number of acres relinquished, and the ayacuts are larger than they show once takes up land, which he relinquishes is one of grave importance. Out of 1,225,082 are cultivated, and only that a settlement, the tendency of the cultivation of these waste acres those of Munro's pymaish, but it in force for sixteen years, and the reduced them by 25 and 33 per cent. total assessment than the old pymaish reduced by Sir Thomas Munro when the price of labor, production, living the ryot profits from the increased whilst he has to pay an increased settlement must be a rise in the lands. At present there is, as monthly statements of sales of arrears of a year's kist are shown.

9. I feel that some apology has arisen in the main division settlement, however, will score I presume, be carried out the ayacuts were founded on a every village and tank. My founded on some local knowledge Mr. Horsley's. These objections scarcely dare hope that they be reconsidered before any in the subdivision.

SUBMITTED to C  
September 1876, No.

2. The Board's Proceedings quoted in manner in which the ryots that the determination depend upon the extent of the crop raised.  
and approved in G

No. 550.

Irrigation, No.

individuals in wet lands in  
2. His Grace the Governor under investigation by the therefore resolves to require recorded above may be brought and that at the same time specifically reported.

unoccupied cultivation in the district only in occupation. I cannot think that the new rates are lower than after these pymaish rates had been in them. Sir Thomas Munro himself ment, however, though showing a less higher settlement than the one introduced by 25 and 33 per cent., and this after enormously increased. It is true that gains a profit only on the grain he sows, and other things. The great test of a just and the bringing under cultivation of waste marked tendency to throw up lands, and the selling price of land is very low, and that the sale of a field.

g subdivisions figure regarding a question which instances of the subdivision are so different. The vision, and the principle once established, it will, Mr. Horsley's objections to the increase of the district and an intimate knowledge of almost backed by such an experience as his, but they are quires, and have been formed independently of some claim to consideration, and, though I I would earnestly ask that the whole matter may may result in an increase of the ayacuts especially

Copy.)

(Signed) J. H. M. COX,  
By. Director of Revenue Settlement.

minutes of Board's Proceedings, dated 1st

modifying the views already expressed in the presence to the remarks of Mr. Gribble on the ayacuts is being conducted, the Board consider the classified as "Wet" and "Dry" must an ordinarily be supplied, not on the nature nunciated by the Board after full discussion November 1872, No. 1,628.

copies and Extract.)

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

26th June 1877, No. 2,110.

In these papers the question of the treatment of lands irrigated by wells constructed and maintained by private pah is fully discussed.

in Council observes that the whole subject is (G.O., 15th January 1877, No. 157-A), and he the points submitted for decision in the papers with the reports now expected from Collectors, it involved in Mr. Horsley's proposals may be



7, No. 2,110.

gs into special promi ce the  
nt subject.

their views upon an aspect of the  
d attention, viz., the legal right  
rom surface flow. It is under-  
ere is no separate property in  
hich it is found.

C. G. MASTER,  
*Secretary to Government.*

Government.  
stood that the  
subterranean water b

To the Board of Revenue.  
,, the Director of Revenue Settlement.  
,, the Public Works Department.  
,, the Financial Department.

Ed. L. F. Zephir and T. O'Connor.



## PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 28th October 1872.

Read the following letter from E. STORR, Esq., Sub Collector, to the Collector of Cuddapah, dated Madanapally, 19th September 1872, No. 299:—

In acknowledging the receipt of Board's Proceedings, No. 1,663 of August 22nd, 1872, with the Draft Rules by the Director of Revenue Settlement for the revision of Tank Ayacut, I have the honour to submit the following remarks, which I request you will forward for their consideration, as I am very anxious that this revision, which will probably be at once commenced in the sub-division, should be as complete as possible.

2. In paragraph 3 of the Circular, it is stated that "it has been ruled by the Board that these enquiries are not to extend to Inam lands which should be left as they are." So far as I can gather from the Board's Proceedings of May 10th, 1872, No. 746, this ruling was only intended to refer to the rough revision to be undertaken by Collectors, and not the more thorough one by the Settlement Department. All that the Board say (*Vide* paragraph 8, Clause 3 of the above Proceedings) is that the revision must not include Inams which have been already finally settled. This surely applies only to Inams which have been settled by the Inam Commissioner, and not to Village Service Inams which have not been touched.

3. In the near prospect of the enfranchisement of these Inams at five-eighths of their assessment, I think it is very advisable not only that they should be re-classified when necessary into wet and dry in the same way as Government lands, but also that the nominal assessment on these lands, which is, in many cases excessive, and in almost all cases very unequal in its incidence, should be revised at the same time.

4. I am led to mention this latter point as I am informed by the Tahsildars that no classification of Service Inams has been undertaken by the Settlement Department, and if this is the case, the present time will be a good opportunity for carrying out this revision. I see that Mr. Pelly in his scheme for the revision of Village Establishments contemplates these Inams being placed on the same basis with respect to assessed value as the Circar lands, before they are enfranchised, and Mr. Rundall in paragraph 24 of his letter, printed with the Board's Proceedings No. 746 of May 10th, recommends that they should be included in the General revision of Tank Ayacuts as well as re-classified before enfranchisement.

5. Many of these lands bear a nominal assessment of Rupees 20, and some even Rupees 30 per acre, and of course it will be no compensation to the Inamdars to enfranchise them at three-eighths of this assessment. They would be better off holding them at the full Circar assessment, the highest rate for which in the richest taluqs of the district will be virtually only Rupees 10 per acre, under the new Settlement.

6. Paragraph 5 of Rule XVI.—As regards the classification of lands in tank beds as wet, I think an exception should be made in those cases, when the tanks are hopelessly ruined, and where the beds are, to all intents and purposes dry lands. The giving of such lands on putta has been forbidden by Board's Proceedings of January 11th, 1872, No. 85, but where the lands have already been given on



virtually dry rates, and where there is no chance of their ever receiving a supply of water, arbitrarily to class them all as wet, and charge a wet assessment would be felt to be a harsh measure.

7. *Paragraph 3 of Rule XVII.*—By this rule it is ordered that dry lands which have been cultivated with wet crops simultaneously with the adjacent registered wet fields *under any source of irrigation* should also be classed as wet. I presume that wells are not intended to be included in the words "any source of irrigation" otherwise a large number of dry fields will be improperly classed as wet.

8. *Rule XVIII.*—Directs that lands upon which a second crop is raised by means of wells dug at the ryots' expense, provided these wells are in the tank bed, or in the Nunjay land under the tank, are to be classed and assessed as double crop lands on the ground that the wells derive their supply from the main source.

9. As regards wells dug in the tank bed, the rule is a fair one, but to apply it strictly to wells half a mile away from the tank bund, and to charge them the full Fysaljasty, or half the ordinary assessment, will place the ryots in a worse position than they are in now. By Government Order, No. 928 of June 12th, 1872, on Board's Proceedings No. 85 of January 11th, 1872, the charge for a second crop raised partly by wells has been reduced to one-fourth of the assessment. This arrangement it is true was a temporary one pending the introduction of the revised settlement, but the principle on which it was granted, viz., that it was not equitable to charge ryots at the same rate for water drawn off from a tank or channel, and for water raised at their own cost, from wells dug at their own expense, remains the same.

10. Wells beyond a certain distance from the waterspread of a tank do not affect its supply in any way, and to class and assess as double crop lands, those which are watered by wells only, and do not receive any supply from a Government source, appears to me hardly fair. I know of some instances in which two crops have been grown for years on so-called wet lands, but which have received water solely from the ryots' own wells, and without the assistance of which no crop whatever could have been raised.

11. *Rule XXVII.*—States that as in the case of the other Inams the Daswundams should remain as heretofore, though Government lands irrigated by the Daswundam tank or channel may be adjusted under the foregoing rules.

If this rule is to be strictly carried out, and the Daswundam Inams left as they are, a large proportion of the wet lands will be left unrevised as about two-thirds of the 5,000 tanks and channels in the sub-division are, what are called, Shamilat Daswundams.

12. These Shamilat Inams have no particular locality, but consist of a deduction of assessment of from one-eighth to three-fourths of the cultivated area under the tank or channel.

I see no reason why the fields containing these Inams should not be re-classified, in the present revision. The Daswundamdars have no priority of claim to water over the other ryots, and I cannot see that their position will be in any way affected by merely altering the classification of the lands to wet or dry as the case may be, when such re-classification is not to affect any right they now possess to water when available.

On the other hand, it will be considerably to the interest of Government to throw open to dry cultivation at reasonable rates, wet lands now left uncultivated from their high assessment.

13. There are no cases in the sub-division similar to those mentioned as existing in North Arcot by Mr. Randall in paragraph 21 of his letter accompanying Board's Proceedings of 10th May 1872, where the liability of the Daswundamdars increases in proportions as the area cultivated falls off. The only cases (and there are few in number) where the liability of the Daswundamdars would be at all affected by the extent of cultivation, are those in which what is called a Hungami Jodi, or temporary quit-rent has been fixed on the Inams. This is payable only when the numbers on which it is payable are cultivated, and as it may reasonably be expected that many of the so-called wet lands now yearly left waste will be cultivated with dry crops when the assessment is reduced, the Inamdars might complain of having to pay a Jodi for dry cultivation, which was originally calculated on the produce of wet lands.

14. Some concession might however be made to them on this score, or if it is thought inadvisable to alter the old Jodi, such Inams might be left as they are, but to exclude all the Shamilat Daswundam fields from the present revision, will cut off a large area of land from the advantages which will certainly in time be gained both by Government and the ryots from the new classification of lands according to their real capability of being irrigated or not.

No. 160.

SUBMITTED for the consideration of the Board of Revenue.

PULLAMPETT,  
25th September 1872.

(Signed) A. J. B. ATKINSON,  
Acting Head-Assistant Collector,  
for Collector.

THE Board's ruling that the revision of tank ayacuts should not include settled Inams was of general application. When an Inam title-deed has once been issued it is not expedient to disturb it because the land or some of it is wrongly classified as dry or wet. Moreover when the Inam Commissioner decided that an Inam now supplied with water was *dry* it was because the supply was created after the Inam was granted.

2. Village Service Inams have not been enfranchised except in Godavery, Kurnool and Trichinopoly, but the Board believe that title-deeds for such Inams in Bellary and Cuddapah have been prepared and are signed and sealed though kept in abeyance. It is necessary in Cuddapah where the inequalities of assessment are great and very desirable in Bellary that the quit-rent should be re-calculated after the Inams have been assessed by the Settlement Department, and in determining the assessment the classification of the land as wet and dry must be revised. The Inam Commissioner will be requested to favour the Board with his opinion on this subject.

3. Mr. Storr is mistaken in supposing that the Settlement Department have not dealt with Service Inam lands so far as to enable them hereafter to determine what would be the assessment on them if they were Government land.

4. Mr. Banbury's instructions as to classifying land in tank beds does not refer to ruined tanks.



Rev 893/6

5. In Section 17 Clause 3 of the instructions he refers to dry lands irrigated from the same source as the adjacent registered wet fields.

6. The question whether the rule that "second crop" is to be charged for when it is grown with water obtained from private wells in wet land is an important one involving a very large amount of revenue in most of the districts. It is an indisputable fact that such wells are generally made because their position with regard to the tank assures them a good supply of water, and that it is almost impossible to discover, when there is a dispute, whether the water for the second crop has been drawn directly from the tank by channels or indirectly by means of the well. There may be some cases of hardship but they must be few in number and the interests of the State require that the rule should not be relaxed.

7. The way in which Shamilat Daswundams should be dealt with at the Settlement is under discussion, and a report on the subject has been called for from the Collector of Cuddapah. If the Inamdar is still to be paid by a share of the out-turn of the wet cultivation under his well it is clear that a revision of the ayacut will affect his interest unless he is allowed his share of the outturn on the dry land irrigated from the well when the whole ayacut is occupied.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) J. GROSE,  
Secretary.

To the Collector of Cuddapah.  
.. the Inam Commissioner.

Copy to the Director of Revenue Settlement.

Exd. G. A. Turton.

Rev 25/76  
3765/76  
86 26.6.77 V. 2110.

1872.  
BOARD OF REVENUE,  
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 28TH OCTOBER 1872. No. 2,087.

Encl.

Received

OCTOBER.  
No. 2,087.

Tank ayacuts—Orders passed on letter from Sub-Collector of Cuddapah regarding revision of.

16

No. 2,169.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, 23rd October 1873.

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 30th April and 1st July 1873, Nos. 687 and 1,146.

Read also the following letter from G. BANBURY, Esq., Director of Revenue Settlement, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Pattraiperumudur, 31st July 1873, No. 1,593-A.-62-A. :—

I HAVE the honour to reply to Board's Proceedings, dated 30th April last, No. 687, regarding the liability of certain dry lands in the North Arcot District to be charged with water-rate.

2. The questions raised by Mr. Wilkinson stand thus :

1st.—If the water of a well in wet land is used for the irrigation of an adjoining dry field should water-rate be levied or not ?

2nd.—If a well in a dry field is within ten yards of a wet field should water-rate be levied in case the dry field is irrigated by such a well ?

3. The present doubts and present correspondence seem to have arisen mainly from Mr. Wilkinson having, in his good-natured endeavour to be generous to the ryots, been hardly just to the Board or myself, as he has misconstrued their orders and misquoted my words. By considering this latter point first we dispose of Question No. 2 at once. The rule agreed upon by Mr. Whiteside and myself runs as follows, and is in reality very different from the meaning now given thereto.

The words as they really stand—

As represented by Mr. Wilkinson—

"Mr. Banbury suggests that water-rate should be charged for all lands irrigated by wells which, though situated in dry land, are within ten yards of wet land."

"Wells on dry land within ten yards of wet lands have not been charged, although, as Mr. Farmer says, the well is merely 'a ruse' to prevent assessment

being charged, as the tank or channel water would run on to the neighbouring dry land direct without any well irrigation. Where the water can flow in this manner and the well is only a pretence, tirvajasti should be charged under Board's Orders No. 123, paragraph 3, Column 1."

It will thus be seen that no charge was made, nor was intended to be made, upon irrigation from these wells, unless they were a mere subterfuge to obtain direct service from the Government source gratis; or unless they were filled, as in some cases explained by Mr. Rundall, by water flowing thereto from the wet fields hard by. This rule seems fair and is in consonance with the Board's Orders, so thus, I think, matters must remain, unless some vital change in the present procedure be contemplated.

4. The remaining question of charging for wells in wet lands hinges upon the construction to be put upon the Board's Circular Orders on this subject.

The practice of charging tirvajasti for these "lopala bhavulu" in Nellore and elsewhere is clearly supported by Clause 3, paragraph 3, of Board's Circular Order, No. 123, which runs thus : "Wells in *unirrigated* land shall not be exempt from extra assessment if within ten yards of a tank bund," &c. The natural inference from which is that wells in *irrigated* land are not to be exempt under any circum-



stances. Messrs. Sewell and Wilkinson seem to be of opinion that when the Board say specially "unirrigated lands" they really mean also "irrigated." But I must confess I do not read the clause in this light, nor is it the usual interpretation thereof. Mr. Wilkinson fortifies his position by urging that by a subsequent clause

\* *Vide* paragraph 3, Clause 6 of Standing Circular No. 123. the exemption extends "to wells\* of all descriptions," thereby including wet.

But the whole question is regarding "wells in unirrigated lands," and the "description" refers evidently to their kind or

- |                 |                   |                                                |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Kalkattu.    | 3. Oray kinar.    | sort, whether in fact they are of stone(1), or |
| 2. Sengalkattu. | 4. Kodalay kinar. | brick(2), of pottery(3), or basket-work(4).    |

Were anything further required to show that the Board said what they really meant, it is to be found in paragraph 8 of Mr. Rundall's letter, herewith forwarded, which shows that, although the above quoted

† *Vide* Board's Standing Order No. VI. of 1866. order was modified† by the following words, "no additional assessment being

leviable on account of wells sunk in wet lands," this modification had soon to be cancelled, and the above sentence struck out; matters being left as they originally stood, and wells in unirrigated alone exempted.

In addition to the above, I have no doubt for the following reason that the Board intended the order to be read as it is written and to apply to only wells in dry land. The rule was framed in 1855, shortly after Mr. Edward Maltby was summoned to the Board from South Arcot, where he and his Head Sheristadar, Runga Charry, had just been much occupied in fully overhauling the question of "Kussur," as "Tirvajasti" is there called, and seeing that all demands under that head were brought to account. It is, therefore, hardly probable that with this question fresh on his mind, Mr. Maltby would have sanctioned a measure calculated to give room for wholesale evasions in this very item of revenue.

5. Having thus disposed of the *quasi* legal aspect of the rule, it becomes necessary to consider its equity and fairness. I need hardly state that the tank is in point of fact the *raison d'être* of the wells situated beneath it. These wells receive the benefit of the storage in the reservoir, although they may be situated far away from the bund itself. Thus to give a homely illustration, I may mention that when examining some of the Chembrumbaukum Villages eighteen months ago, I was told that the tank influenced the supply in the wells as far off as at Kodumbaukum, where the hounds meet. This, no doubt, is the reason why wells are so common under tanks, but so rare in the Nirarumbum tracts under channel irrigation. But Mr. Clogstoun, the Deputy Director in Salem, has put this point so clearly that I cannot do better than give his own words:—"As regards the assessing of dry fields irrigated by a well situated in nunjah land, the invariable practice of the district is to charge a water-rate. Nor does it seem to me that there is any injustice whatever in such a course. The question of justice or injustice naturally turns upon the point whether the presence of the water in the well is, or is not wholly or in part due to the presence of the Government irrigation work and to the channel which feeds it, and to which the Government has an exclusive right. I myself would

answer the question in the affirmative, and I venture to think that very few of the ryots most interested would differ from me. As a matter of fact a very large number of the so-called wells, are not wells at all. They are simply large pits into which the water of the tank flows. If this statement needs any proof, it will be found in the fact that when the tank under which the wells are situated is breached, there is no water in the wells, or if any, it is very low. The indebtedness of these wells to the tank is again seen in the speedy manner in which a tank is drained in a few days to fill them up. The capacity of some of the wells in question is enormous, and when a large number of these wells exist under a tank, the quantity of water required to fill them is very considerable, and this water is abstracted from the general share to the detriment of those ryots who have no wells.

It is the latter consideration which, supposing the views I have above stated to be correct, may be allowed chiefly to guide us in determining whether a point may not be stretched in favour of the ryot, and the permission accorded to him of using the water of his nunjah well free of charge for the irrigation of his dry land. Such a concession, would, I am convinced, be contrary to the general interests of the cultivators of wet land, for while the general stock of water would be appreciably lessened, only those individuals would profit who held wet lands bordering on dry. The amount of water that might be taken to dry lands from one single well which has nearly the whole water of a tank to fall back upon is manifestly enormous. The concession in short would be detrimental to the interests of the majority of cultivators under any irrigation work of any size, and would invariably be detrimental to the interests of Government. It is a concession quite uncalled for, and one which I think it most inadvisable to grant."

6. What Mr. Clogstoun says about the breached tanks is doubtless correct, as I remember giving over a ruined tank in the Perambaloor Taluq of Trichinopoly to the ryots, which they repaired without constructing anything like a sluice, as the storage was to benefit the wells not to flow directly to the fields. Again, cases must be rare in which crops, or at all events "wet" crops, are really brought to maturity on dry lands by the "lopala bhavi" water alone; for it is to be remembered that for a good portion of the year these wells in wet land cannot be worked, as they are filled flush with the surrounding irrigation. In fact when I saw these "lopala bhavulu" in Chendragherry, which gave rise to the present discussion, there was neither pretence nor capability of their irrigating the dry lands, the wet crops on which were being matured by percolation and flow from the adjoining wet fields. These crops, when Mr. Randall and I saw them at the beginning of December, were of about three months growth, whilst the "lopala bhavulu" which it is now advocated to exempt could not, as above explained, have been worked for the preceding two months, nor could they be used for the ensuing six weeks even supposing no rain fell in the interim. Whence then comes the water required during this period of at least three and a half months, except by percolation and direct flow?

7. I can hardly agree with Mr. Sewell that "the ryots will feel discouraged to improve their lands by construction of wells at their own cost if they are not allowed to reap the benefits of their own improvements in the cases brought to light



in this letter." If the ryot really wishes to dig a well in his dry land fair and above board, he can do so freely enough and be charged nothing, but if he comes slyly filching Government water, it is certainly proper that he should be made to understand that it cannot be done. It is in a word trickery, not industry, that the rule comes down upon.

8. As regards the practice prevailing in districts in which the settlement has been in progress, the procedure is given below. It must, however, be borne in mind that not only are the cases of "dry" lands watered by wells in "wet" comparatively rare, the water being generally supplied to the neighbouring wet fields, but that it is likely the Board's Orders thereon have, in some instances, been lost sight of. Thus one Tahsildar, when asked what was the course followed, told me candidly enough "It is a point to which I have not paid much attention."

NELLORE AND SALEM.—In these districts the charge is made, the Board's Orders being read as they stand.

KISTNA.—Mr. Cox says "wells situated in the middle of the wet ayacuts are only used to supplement the water-supply from the tanks. In a few cases in Vinukondah where such wells water dry lands, the latter are charged with wet rates; but, in other instances, where the wells only border wet cultivation, only the dry rate is charged."

TRICHINOPOLY.—Mr. Pennington writes that although it is stated that there are no cases of this kind, still he thinks some "must exist," and that he should charge them as in Nellore.

SOUTH ARCOT.—As I already stated there are hardly such things as "lopala bhavulu" in the channel irrigated tracts settled by us.

GODAVERY.—Mr. Foster replies that "no water-rate is charged in any case on lands irrigated from wells, if they are not sunk within the prohibited distance (ten yards) of a Government tank or channel. It is presumed by this that in the Godavery, to be a "lopala bhavi" in the Nellore sense of the word, the well must be within ten yards of the bund; but this is manifestly wrong, as even supposing the reservoir be small, the wells will be indebted thereto for their supply at one hundred times this standard distance from the embankment.

CUDDAPAH.—Major Stuart reports that no charge is made, but that "instances in which the water is used for the irrigation of an adjoining dry field are very rare," and such is the case no doubt, as in Cuddapah these wells are really "Kumak" or auxiliary to the tank-supply to wet lands alone.

9. Mr. Wilkinson, in paragraph 8 of his letter, brings forward very appropriately the case of second crop being charged by Board's Orders on wet lands when irrigated by "lopala bhavulu," and says "it may therefore be urged that much more should water-cess be charged when the water of such well is taken for dry land," but that the Board passed these orders "to avoid dispute, not because the well was situated in the wet area." But this is hardly I think the exact state of the case, as the Board had just about that time been considering the case of the Chembrumbankum Tank, where the ryots by the outlay of 8 or 9 Rupees on a "warai" kinar had managed to

escape payment for second crop, although the Government had just laid out large sums in repairing the reservoir and thus

securing water for maturing this second harvest. No doubt in some cases this rule may be hard, but I remember that Mr. Puckle, who is certainly never exacting, was, in order to prevent wholesale evasions, obliged to support it in the Kadarumbum Taluqs of Trichinopoly, though his inclinations tended otherwise. In fact, in passing these recent orders, the Board merely reiterated what they had recorded\* regarding

certain changes in the North Arcot  
\* Board's Proceedings, dated 8th March 1855, Hookumnamah, and which alteration on this point runs thus:—

"It is the rule when a second crop is raised on one crop, nunjah land watered by tanks, &c., jointly with private wells, to remit one-third of the second crop, nunjah teerwah, as a compensation for the labour of raising the water; this rule is abolished, and in future the full second crop nunjah teerwah will be levied in such nunjah land under a tank or channel, *however it may be irrigated.*"

10. As far as I am able to form any opinion, it certainly seems to me necessary that the rules regarding water-rate should be strict, for not only is the water itself highly prized, but it is from this charge for water that the State must, to a considerable extent, look for a return in the shape of interest on the sums annually expended in the up-keep and construction of irrigation works. With rising rates of materials and labour, it will not do to be over-liberal as to the charge for water, or there would soon be no possibility of constructing or repairing a work that would yield interest on the capital expended thereon.

To take a lower view.—As regards "second crop" and "water-rate," the evasions are, it must be admitted, more or less extensive in every district, and it certainly is not good policy to foster and enhance them by making the rules more indulgent. In reality, I hardly think that the Board have any cause to apprehend that the rules as they now stand would in reality press hardly, were they carried into effect over the whole Presidency, as they have been in Nellore. For practically, however strict the head of the district may be, when it becomes a case of "pull Collector pull cultivator," the latter now-a-days gets so far the best of the tussle that the hands of the former require strengthening rather than weakening.

11. Again, a considerable change is perceptible in the views and proceedings of Revenue Officers of the present day, as contrasted with those of years gone by. The Head Sheristadar, the great local authority in those days, was wonderfully keen and careful in all that appertained to the beriz of his district in which both he and the Collector took a personal pride. The English Revenue Officers had also a kind of mild D. P. W. training; we repaired tanks, built sluices, and constructed tunnels (how mine ever stood has been a marvel to me to this day), so that we were apt to take a very practical, and by no means a theoretical view of the manner in which water-rate should be levied. Now the whole state of affairs is changed. The English Officers have less tent and more office work, the Head Sheristadar's position and authority no longer exist, the district is cut up into small portions and each officer can do pretty much as seems good in his own eyes, so here again is a reason why the rules which regulate our Land Revenue procedure should be strict and explicit.



12. To support this view of the case, I may mention that when examining some of the villages in Chendragherry with Mr. Rundall, where our work was in progress, I found that the Board's Orders as to exempting "own wells" and other concessions had been taken great advantage of, the facts having no doubt been misrepresented to the local officers. Thus rich double crop wet lands irrigated by spring channels from the Soornamooky, which had been highly assessed nunjah ever since we held the district, were in some instances summarily brought to dry at Rupees 1-8-0 per acre. In five or six cases spring channels which had ever been Government sources were given away to the ryots, and the hitherto highly rated wet lands altered to "dry," because the usual "Kudimaramut" was construed into "own improvements" which the ryots were to have the benefit of. Under this view of the case all the "Kasham kalways," "Munday kolams," and "Talla varichis" in the country might be given away as private sources and the revenue diminished by hundreds of lakhs.

13. With reference to the subsequent Proceedings of the Board, dated 1st instant, requesting my views on four special cases in which Mr. Wilkinson and Mr. Rundall differ as to the charge for water-rate, I give a brief abstract of the

\* Mr. Rundall's letters go so fully into the questions at issue that I forward them in original, and request their return.

merits of each case as gathered from the letters\* and "Sawalputti" enclosed. It will be seen that the evidence is sometimes rather conflicting.

*Survey No. — as shown in Sketch No. 36.*†—Both officers agree that the well

† Enclosure No. 4.

should not be classed as "lopala bhavi;" so this case needs no further discussion.

*Survey No. 37.*—Mr. Rundall's examination shows that the channel water flows into the well, that tirvajasti was charged for Faslies 1279, 1280, and 1281 on second crop, and on first and second crops for 1282, the well being situated in the land on which tirvajasti was charged, and that the pond situated in "peramboke" is also used as a source of supply.

Mr. Wilkinson records that the pool is situated in puttah land, and thus exempts apparently everything. Says also nothing as to previous charge for tirvajasti.

As the facts stated are so opposed to each other, and as tirvajasti seems to have been charged by Collector formerly, it will be best to let Mr. Whiteside settle this, and his decision can guide our entries. I learn, moreover, from subsequent inquiry that this pool which has been recently constructed to catch the water of a hill stream is not "situated in puttah-land," only the bank being thus circumstanced, as the waterspread is in Government waste.

*Survey No. 40.*—Mr. Rundall says the two wells in Minor Fields A and B are in land which must, under Board's Orders, be permanently classed as wet, that tirvajasti has been charged for four faslies and that the tank and channel afford trustworthy supply, the high level lands being supplied for both crops during Fasly 1282.

Mr. Wilkinson states that the channel is insignificant and out of repair, and that the supply is merely drainage.

In this case all depends as to whether Field No. 40 will be classed as wet under the rules after consultation with the Collector; but, as the minor channel supplying

these lands is taken off from a feeder to the Mungasamudram Tank, and as the supply is trustworthy, it would seem fair to class them as wet. Moreover, as tirvajasti has hitherto been charged, Mr. Whiteside should, I think, decide as to this year's procedure, as Mr. Wilkinson seems to have remitted the demand altogether. One point here deserves notice. Mr. Wilkinson's remission on the ground "that it is merely drainage" is a very dangerous doctrine. Under this ruling the rich Lalgudi Division in Trichinopoly, the flourishing villages under the Ponnery and Cawn Sahib Channels in Chellumbrum, together with countless tracts similarly irrigated would all be brought to "dry," thereby sacrificing, at a rough guess, perhaps one-fourth of the wet land revenue of the Presidency.

*Survey No. 32.*—Mr. Rundall explains how the Monigar has diverted to his own field the water of the supplying channel to the tank; that he erects a dam therein when stream falls low and that it runs for three months.

Mr. Wilkinson says, that only a small quantity of water is diverted when there is plenty of water in the channel and that it is a jungle stream.

Here the charge is doubtless correct, the water flowing to a Government source is diverted to dry land, and according to rules universally prevailing should be charged. It is true that this case is but a trifling one, but the principle should be upheld, or others will follow the Monigar's example and matters may get as bad as they once did in the Bownagherry Taluq of South Arcot where, by means of a series of dams in the supplying channels, the dry lands above the tank were cultivated with wet crops free of charge, whilst the wet ayacut below was left waste and neglected.

14. The jungle stream question is no doubt a very important one and should be definitely settled by the Board, as different districts seem to have different views on the matter. Thus as I lately represented to the Board, the Gundla Cumma is deemed a "jungle stream" in the Kistna, but directly it enters Nellore it becomes a source of supply for which tirvajasti is charged. Again, I have been told that in Mr. Dyke's days in Nellore such a wide significance was given to the term "jungle stream" that at last only water from the Pennair was charged; and then matters had to be rectified.

The term was, I presume, intended to signify those mountain brooks and streams which come down when filled by the rains and last for only a few days at a time. Where the supply furnished by these streams is certain and continuous for four or five months they must be regarded somewhat in the light of hill springs, and under this view, lands dependant thereon would be liable to be charged, with either wet assessment or water-rate as in the case of the "sonaloo" in Kistna, the "jouk pachal" in Salem, and the "shodamboos" in Sutwaide. Moreover the old rule in the South Arcot Hookumnamah that these jungle streams should not be exempt when they eventually benefited any Government work was a safe one, and has not

*Vide C. O. 126, para. 1.*

only been acted on in most districts, but has been approved of by the Board. To avoid any further trouble regarding these doubtful cases, I have generally in the settlement, with the consent of the ryots, brought the lands under this category to a moderate wet rate. This satisfies both parties and prevents the Curnam



sometimes charging and sometimes not, as inducement offers. It also enables the ryot to obtain remissions should his supply really fail.

15. One more point remains regarding the Peramboke ponds, or "Kuttays."

\* *Vide* also Mr. Wilkinson's Circular, copy of which was forwarded to me by Board.

Mr. Rundall touches upon this in his letter now forwarded,\* and I must say that the plan of charging nothing on the lands irrigated therefrom, or giving over these little pools altogether to the ryots seems to me objectionable. These pools are useful for the whole village and particularly for watering cattle, so that to encourage the diminution of supply by letting it go free to cultivation is to unfairly benefit one person to the detriment of the rest.

Again, it has often happened that these small tanks, even with wet ayacut under them, have been given away on the ground that they are not repaired by the Circar, but by private enterprise, and are consequently the ryots own. But then it may naturally be asked, if we thus give over these little reservoirs which can be repaired at the outlay of 6 or 7 Rupees annually, how about the river channels which the ryots maintain at a very heavy expense by clearing out, and constructing "Coramboos" from year to year, and which must remain as Government property?

In such instances we make over to one individual what has been common property for years, merely because the said individual has been sharp enough to do a little earthwork thereto. In fact, I have observed that most of the Revenue Officers who were at one time anxious thus to turn these "Kuttays" and "Tangals" into private property held subsequently a totally different opinion. I regret that this letter has extended to so great a length, but although the actual cases at issue are but trivial, the principles involved are important as they affect the revenues of the Presidency at large.

#### ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From C. RUNDALL, Esq., Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement, Nellore and North Arcot, to G. BANBURY, Esq., Director of Revenue Settlement, Madras, dated Nellore, 28th June 1873, No. 464-134.

I have the honour to report as desired under date the 6th ultimo, No. 895-142, on the points mooted by Mr. Wilkinson and referred to the Board of Revenue for orders by the Acting Collector of North Arcot—*Vide* Board's Proceedings of 30th April, No. 627.

2. The second of the two questions, I must remark at the outset, is not quite correctly stated. The memorandum referred to by Mr. Wilkinson at paragraph 9 of his letter, printed with the latter Proceedings, is that which you drew up and submitted to the Collector, Mr. Whiteside, on several points connected with Mr. Farmer's disposal of cases of evasion of land assessment and water-rate; and regarding which it appeared desirable that an uniform procedure should be adopted, and certain modifications effected when the Collector might review the orders passed by Mr. Farmer at the Jammabandi of the Chendragherry Taluq for 1871-72, and arranged for the numerous pending cases, reported for settlement subsequent to Mr. Farmer's completion of that Jammabandi.

3. According to Mr. Wilkinson's quotation from your memorandum, you suggested that water-rate should be charged for all lands irrigated by wells, "which though situated in dry

land are within ten yards of wet land." The ten yard limit does not affect the question, and what you did remark on this subject, I record *in extenso* below:—

#### *Evasions of Water-rate on Government Dry Lands.*

These lands when irrigated by wells within the prescribed distance of tank or channel

*Tirvajasti* was charged not only for Fasli 1281, but also for one or two or three previous faslis as well.

must be charged with *tirvajasti*. But here a question arises. Mr. Farmer has only charged those wells which are situated within ten yards

of a large channel, say 12 feet broad; but there are many which should not be thus exempted, as

*Lands irrigated by wells situated in wet lands do not appear to have been charged in many instances, and wells situated within ten yards of small channels (tank or river) have been excluded from any liability.*

the river channels are often narrow, but very plentifully supplied. I think wherever the well is really benefited by the channel as supposed by the Board, the charge should be made. We

can give the returns for such cases, and in fact for all that should be charged. Wells on dry land within ten yards of wet lands have not been charged, although, as Mr. Farmer says, the well is merely a ruse to prevent assessment being charged, as the tank or channel water would run on to the neighbouring dry land direct without any well irrigation. When the water can flow in this manner and the well is only a pretence, *tirvajasti* should be charged under Board's Orders, No. 123, paragraph 3, Column 1.

4. The prescribed distance of ten yards was not alluded to, or intended as any criterion of liability; and the second question to raise, if any doubt can be attached to the suggestion, is, not that given by Mr. Sewell, but, whether *lands irrigated by wells, which, though situated in dry land, fall within the scope of Clause 1, paragraph 3 of Standing Order No. 123, should be charged with tirvajasti*. The clause had apparently been ignored by Mr. Farmer, and the Collector's attention was drawn to the omission to make any charge in cases when a liability accrued from the situation of the well being such that it manifestly drew away water from a Government source, and benefited from its favourable position with reference to Government irrigation.

5. With regard to the first question cited by the Acting Collector of North Arcot, I have heretofore deemed the several rules promulgated at paragraph 3 of Standing Order No. 123 to apply solely to wells in unirrigated land: and that the rules laid down the cases in which wells in unirrigated land would be held to be liable to a fair and equitable water-rate on account of connection with or close proximity to a Government source of irrigation, the term unirrigated land being intended to denote land to which irrigation from a Government source might not appertain. The use of the term unirrigated land in the order is significant; and I have always regarded its application as thereby limiting the scope of the order solely to land that might be unirrigated; and have looked on all wells in land under regular wet cultivation from a Government source, as not exempted under the foregoing rules from liability to *tirvajasti* for irrigation. A well in wet land, regularly so cultivated, must draw its supply in a great measure from the Government source or surrounding irrigation; and, if the supply thus obtained by the well is diverted to adjacent dry land, a fair and equitable water-rate should certainly be levied in such cases.

6. Looking at the question in another light, it may, I think, be justly contended that the rules were originally promulgated with the view of defining and making widely known the only liability that for the future would exist in respect to wells in unirrigated land, that might either then exist or be constructed hereafter; and so give an impetus to the construction of wells in unirrigated land, by publishing the exemptions which Government had been pleased to make in the ryot's favour. Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Order, can, I think, but mean wells that may have been or may hereafter be constructed in unirrigated land; and are not, I infer, intended to apply to wells in land under irrigation from a Government source of supply.

7. The rules were published apparently in 1855, when land was always registered under three heads—dry, wet, and garden; and as Rule III. which details the cases in which wells should



be exempt specifies wells in unirrigated land, it is a fair conclusion to draw that the word was specially used to denote the meaning of the order, and that it was applicable to land that might not be irrigated, irrespective of its registration as dry, wet, or garden in the Revenue Accounts. The reference in Rule VI. "to wells of all descriptions" should, I opine, be read in connection with the specification previously given in Rule III.

8. Standing Order No. 123, after being first issued, was modified by Circular Order No. VI. of 1866, as follows:—

"Under instructions from Government Collectors are informed that the distance from a river or channel bund within which a well may be sunk in dry land without subjecting it to increased assessment, is reduced from fifty to ten yards from the foot of the embankment, *no additional assessment being leviable on account of wells sunk in wet land.*" Subsequently, by Circular Order No. XV. of the same year, the instructions were further amended. "With reference to Standing Order No. VI. of 1861, Collectors are informed that the sinking of wells, whether in wet or dry lands, within 10 yards of a tank or channel is equally prohibited by the Government Orders, and that the words (no additional assessment, etc.) should be struck out."

9. From the foregoing, it appears to me conclusive, that Standing Order No. 123 as originally framed, was not intended to apply generally to wells located in both wet and dry land as contended by Mr. Wilkinson, but to wells in lands unirrigated, that is, under dry cultivation. In the Standing Order No. 123-1, it will be observed the word dry is printed in italics; and, when it was ruled, that no additional assessment would be levied on account of wells sunk in wet land, the exemption on further consideration was withdrawn. Why was there any need for this ruling and its revocation, if the rules were originally intended to apply to all wells indiscriminately, no matter whether situated in unirrigated or irrigated land?

10. It is necessary to enter thus fully into the question as these Circular Orders came out just after we had commenced classification operations in Nellore, and were registering all wells as within or without the limits of liability according to the rules. In 1865, on a reference made

\* No. 2,023 of 22nd April.

by Mr. Dykes, the Board ruled\* that the exemption from liability to an extra charge is "withdrawn if the well is in such a position, or so

near a river or channel that it cannot fail to obtain its supply in part from it. In fact, a charge for water is to be made only when water is obtained from a Government source of irrigation." A well situated in wet land in the midst of Government irrigation cannot fail to draw its supply in part therefrom. And, though in paragraph 8 of his letter Mr. Wilkinson contends that the practice which received confirmation in the Board's Proceedings of 28th October 1872, No. 2,087, "was sanctioned on the ground that it would avoid dispute, not because the well was situated in the wet area," yet, it must, I think, be allowed that the position of the well is really the basis or cause, and likewise the essential point of the discussion in the case of each and every dispute of this nature. The Board remarked, "It is an indisputable fact that such wells are generally made because their position with regard to the tank assures them a good supply of water, and that it is almost impossible to discover, when there is a dispute, whether the water for the second crop has been drawn directly from the tank by channel or indirectly by means of the well. There may be some cases of hardship, but they must be few in number, and the interests of the State require that the rule should not be relaxed." From the foregoing it is evident there were other and more important grounds than the avoidance of disputes on which the ruling was based.

11. Had any doubt occurred to me whilst working in Nellore as to Question (1) now addressed to the Board, I should have included the same in the memorandum I drew up and submitted for orders, under date 30th May 1868, No. 142-37. The paper was disposed of by the Board, under date 20th May, 1869, No. 3,556.

12. With reference to the practice in Nellore, which I am asked to state, I have found the taluq authorities generally to regard Standing Order No. 123, as exempting all wells in dry or

unirrigated land from any liability, if without ten yards from a channel, etc., no matter what its position or connection with Government irrigation might otherwise be; and wholly ignoring any liability under Clause I. of paragraph 3 of the Standing Order. As above stated, all wells were registered during classification operations as either within or without the liability of Clause III. (as modified), and lists of all wells within ten yards of rivers, etc., thus liable were prepared and submitted to the Collector; and, at the same time, a separate list was furnished of all wells with an apparent liability under Clause I., in order that each case might be regularly inquired into and the liability, or otherwise, finally disposed of by the Revenue Department. The Collectors have held the Standing Order No. 123 not to apply to wet or irrigated land, and I find Mr. VansAgnew has remarked in a case coming under Query (1) that "A well in wet land must be presumed to draw its supply from a Government source, and if that supply is used to irrigate adjacent dry land, I don't see why that land should not pay a fair and equitable extra cess water-rate."

13. Mr. Whiteside in his treatment of cases of a like nature in the recent Jammabandi of Chendragherry Taluq seemingly regarded a liability to accrue in like manner, as he did not question the construction we hold in respect to the rules; and, therefore, looking at the conflicting views held by different officers as to the Standing Order in question (No. 123), it must be regarded as more or less ambiguous, and to need to be more decisively worded that all doubt as to the application of the order may be removed.

14. In North Arcot, wells are very numerous and exist largely in the wet ayacut of the moderate and ordinary sources of irrigation, or tanks, which may be of comparatively slight capacity. The wells enable the ryots to eke out the tank-supply to the greatest advantage, and to be assured of a second crop being matured each year for a good proportion of the wet area. The country undulates so much in parts, that often the tract under wet cultivation resembles a valley more or less; and, as a rule, the tanks or reservoirs lie well above and not far distant from the tract of wet cultivation. In the rains, when the surrounding fields are under irrigation, the wells are quite full—likewise the incline on which the pacotta bullocks work at other times. It is only after the rains may have ceased, and the tank-supply in a great measure been expended, that the wells come into play at all. If there is rain late in the season, the second crop is often matured from the tank-supply alone. In some instances, owing to the peculiarly porous character of the soil in parts of North Arcot, the sub-soil leakage is very considerable; and the wells catch and retain in a great measure a portion of the supply that would irretrievably be lost. In most of these cases, the actual distance from the tank bund that each well may be located is often quite immaterial, as the wells situated at some distance therefrom are in the course of the under-current or leakage from the supply, and benefit equally with those located nearest to the tank bund. As regards the actual benefits there may be from proximity to irrigation, wells thus circumstanced are certainly more favoured than wells within ten yards of a channel often are. There can be no doubt as to the advantage of position in the first instance, though the latter may be questionable. The percolation to wells in wet land is occasionally so great that the well fills and the surplus flows off to lands on a lower level."

15. In other instances wells are situated in registered dry land, but on the margin of the wet area, and are just as well off as if in the midst thereof. An instance of this kind was submitted for orders in my letter of 18th November last, No. 669-245. There was admitted to be a direct flow from the well for two months or so, to part of the dry holding cultivated each year with paddy under the well; and such cases clearly come within the liability of Clause I. of the Rules laid down in Standing Order, No. 123.

16. There is yet another point, in the application of the rules, on which great diversity of practice occurs, viz., with regard to the size of channels that should be regarded as occasioning a liability to wells within the prescribed distance or ten yards thereof. Mr. Farmer arbitrarily fixed on twelve feet as a limit within which channels need not be taken cognizance of in dealing



with this question; but the omission in this respect was remedied subsequently by Mr. Whiteside. The size of the channel is often no real criterion at all as to the benefits that may accrue to wells within the prescribed distance. The larger channels often run deep and carry the water-supply much below the surface level of the ground, whilst the smaller channels are flush with or above the surface level. In each case the points it is desirable and necessary to establish are, first, whether the channel previously existed and is ordinarily or occasionally used—that is a principal or minor channel of the source to which it may appertain—and, secondly, if, from its position, it manifestly benefits and draws away water from the said Government channel or irrigation therewith connected. If the channel is really of long standing and ordinarily used, and the well manifestly does benefit and has not existed longer than the channel or irrigation with which connected, the liability should be enforced in my opinion.

17. As regards districts under settlement, or at all events North Arcot, I beg to suggest that the liability as to all wells should be determined by the Settlement Officers when undertaking the changes or revision of the wet area in conformity with the general orders promulgated last year. I have requested my Assistant to invariably, if practicable, examine wells in respect to which a liability may be reported, and to record his opinion and reasons for or against the same; and, when the Board of Revenue may have authoritatively declared the right application of the several points of the above Standing Order already touched on, the foregoing course will, I consider, be the best to adopt. We shall then be able to furnish to the revenue authorities the grounds, reliably recorded, on which a liability in respect to each well may be established.

18. In modifying Standing Order, No. 123, it would be advisable to allow the converse of rule or Clause I., and to declare that the liability within ten yards need only be enforced where it is manifest that the well benefits from its proximity to the irrigation channel, etc.

19. Finally with regard to the rules referred to in Mr. Wilkinson's letter under reference,

Dry lands irrigated by means of pools or wells constructed on peramboke lands without orders should not be charged with tirvajasti, unless the pool or well is so situated as to draw away water from a Government source of irrigation.

I think the propriety of No. II. may be questioned. The rule is marginally inserted. So far as applicable to wells, it appears quite correct, as they invariably are located in occupied land; but where ponds or guntas now

registered as peramboke may be considered, such pools, ponds, guntas, or reservoirs, by whichever named, should be regarded as public property; and any irrigation taken therefrom should certainly be charged for. As a rule, these reservoirs have been constructed on public grounds, and very often supply both man and beast with water, being extensively used for watering cattle. Irrigation therefrom should generally be prohibited altogether, and not encouraged by granting it free.

20. It would be well perhaps, to obviate delay, to furnish a copy of this letter to the Collector of North Arcot, in order that any remarks that that officer, or Mr. Wilkinson might have to record thereon, might reach the Board at an early date.

#### ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From C. RUNDALL, Esq., Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement, Nellore and North Arcot, to G. BANBURY, Esq., Director of Revenue Settlement, Madras, dated Nellore, 11th July 1873, No. 497-145.

In continuation of my letter, No. 464-138, of 28th ultimo, I have the honour to report as requested on the subject of Mr. Wilkinson's letter of 16th May, No. 421, printed with the Board's Proceedings, No. 1,146, of 1st instant.

2. The land inspected on the occasion Mr. Wilkinson refers to was supplied from a tank situated higher up the valley, but certainly within one mile of the fields we inspected. The Mangasamudram Tank—a source of considerable capacity as tanks run in that locality—was lower down the valley, probably a quarter of a mile distant.

3. On either side of the valley there is a high level channel, and at the spot we examined this skirted the foot and commanded the area of the second terrace. The first, or lower terrace, I may remark, forms the hollow of the valley and comprises double crop wet (nunjah) land; the second that commanded by this high level channel; and the third and fourth lie above the level for direct irrigation. The tract forming the second terrace is principally registered dry, but comprises as well a slight extent of both single and double crop wet (nunjah), the whole of the

\* Paragraph 4 of Mr. Wilkinson's letter.

cultivation being the same. The two wells\* close to the channel passing along the foot of the second terrace are in land classed as dry, but ordinarily cultivated as wet, and requiring to be so regarded. The extent is liable to permanent transfer to wet under the rules promulgated with the Board's Proceedings of 22nd August 1872, No. 1,663. Moreover, these two wells are situated in one and the same Survey No. and the land being ordinarily under irrigation has been demarcated as if regular wet land. There are three sub-divisions; A. wholly dry assessed land; B. partly the same and partly double crop wet (nunjah); and C. wholly single crop wet (nunjah). The two wells are situated close to the channel in the dry assessed portions of A. and B., respectively. The area of No. 40-A. is ninety-two cents, and it was irrigated during Faslies 1279, 1280, and 1281, for the first crop from the well, without any charge for tirvajasti; and for the second crop from the channel, water-rate being levied. In 1282 both the first and second crops were raised from the channel supply, and at the time of our inspection the second crop had not long been harvested. 40-B. is 1.44 acres in extent, of which 70 cents are recorded to have been cultivated exactly the same as for 40-A. The remaining 74 cents lie on a higher level on the third terrace, and were irrigated by baling from the channel or from the well in the second terrace. This Mr. Wilkinson doubted, though the place of lifting was still clearly apparent. 40-C., the registered wet land, was being so cultivated. Lower down there were other numbers similarly commanded and circumstanced, only registered dry at present.

4. The channel was of small size, the breadth of the water-way being only about one foot but it never struck me that it was in great disrepair, and the facts above recorded as to the past irrigation of recent years show conclusively that it is in serviceable order. As a rule, about Chittoor, the tanks are of very small capacity, but very numerous, and the channels are very minute in size, the rapid fall allowing a fair supply being conveyed. Again, the channel in question is asserted to carry merely the drainage from the wet or nunjah fields above, and not to come from the tank. Had I been aware of this statement at the time, I should certainly have satisfied myself on this point. The drainage from the wet or nunjah fields above would naturally fall into the low level channel, forming the edge or margin of the lowest or first terrace. Probably the channel does in some measure convey the surplus supply passed through the fields higher up the valley and nearer to the tank. That it is wholly so supplied, and is not a continuation of some channel direct from the tank, I very much doubt. Unfortunately I am not in Chittoor, and at hand to solve this point before writing.

5. Moreover, a three months tank is not so indifferent a source as might be inferred from the appellation. When full it flows for three months provided it only receives one supply and is then filled. Usually, these tanks receive a partial or full supply three or more times during the season, and are able to go on irrigating land for six to eight months. The fact that part of the ayacut is double crop wet (nunjah), and is so cultivated; and that the high land under the source was commanded and supplied for both crops during 1282, and has been invariably supplied for one crop during recent years, indicates the tank to be a fairly reliable source of supply.

6. The channel in question may be somewhat insignificant in size, but, inasmuch as it is ordinarily used, and regularly supplies the fields it commands, the mode by which it derives its supply, whether direct from the tank, or by the surplus water of fields lying above, is, in my opinion, altogether immaterial. The original source of the supply being the tank, the irrigation must be regarded as appertaining to a Government source, and a liability to a charge for water-rate is certainly established when use may be made of such irrigation. Heretofore, tirvajasti has been



charged for one crop during Faslies 1279, 1280, and 1281, and for two crops for 1282. The wells in No. 40 require to be regarded as in wet land as the tract they are situated in is ordinarily

\* They are both quite close within ten yards.

under irrigation, leaving out of the question the distance they may be located from the channel.\*

I insisted that they ought to be classed as wells within the prohibited limits, consequent on their being thus located and surrounded and completely filled with the channel water for several months. In the middle of the hot weather, May, we found the water-supply only two or three feet from the surface.

7. Adverting to the third well, mentioned in paragraph 6, I stated that being within ten yards of the channel, a liability might under the rules be held to apply, but I certainly admitted that the well could not fairly be classed as lopala, or within, as the difference in the level of the land prevented any advantage accruing to the well. I did not endeavour to establish any liability in that instance, but merely explained that the demarcator had grounds for reporting an apparent liability for determination by others.

8. With reference to the hill stream, paragraph 10, the question as I take it, is not whether any diminution worthy of notice has been occasioned to the Government tank below. Is it, or is it not, a hill or jungle stream in a remote locality coming within the exemption promulgated

† Rule 4 of Standing Order No. 123.

Standing Order No. 126 quoted by Mr. Wilkinson, refers to works constructed with the approval of the Collector.

by Government.† In the case referred to, the field is situated about a quarter of a mile distant from the waterspread of the tank when full,

and the stream is one of the principal feeders of the tank. The Monigar of the village, as Mr. Wilkinson states, has constructed a narrow channel along the course of this stream, and a short distance up leads off the water by this channel and diverts a small supply to his field. As the supply in the stream diminishes, I was informed that the water was dammed back. For the protection of the interests of Government this must, I think, be looked on as an encroachment on the supply of the tank below, though the quantity of water diverted may in reality be inappreciable. If the Monigar is justified in thus tampering with vested rights, the ryots all along the course of the stream would be equally at liberty to construct small channels and help themselves to what they can get. Believing that the rule in force, No. IV. of Standing Order No. 123, did not intend to countenance any interference with streams in close proximity to Government tanks and irrigation, I insisted that for irrigation thus diverted tirvajasti should be charged. I did not regard the well as liable, or that it should be held to be a lopala well as reported by the demarcator consequent on its being five yards from the hill stream and within the area irrigated thereby. Mr. Wilkinson is in error in mentioning that we appear to hold a liability to apply to any "water course, hill or jungle stream," as we do not consider any liability to apply to them in the same way as river or Government channels. Classifiers report all apparent liability in order that the same may be investigated and disposed of by higher authority.

9. Although we explained to the Revenue authorities that the liability which classifiers might thus report, required to be regarded merely as an apparent liability, needing to be established by examination and finally disposed of, the result in Chittoor has been that, owing to the multitude of instances immediate inspection and inquiry was impracticable; and, consequently, the reports as to any apparent liability have been, I am given to understand, in a great measure rejected. This partly no doubt arose from difference of opinion as to what constituted a valid liability.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Sawalpatti.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.—Sketch.

21  
THESE papers relate to certain cases of alleged evasion of wet assessment for crops grown in dry land which were brought to notice in the District of North Arcot.

2. It is difficult to frame rules which shall be applicable to every such case, but District Officers should be able without hesitation to settle each case, on the broad principle which has been laid down in Standing Order No. 123. This is that where the supply of the well is drawn from a Government source, a charge should be made.

3. Hence a charge is correctly made for all irrigation from a well sunk in wet land. Such wells often derive their supply by surface flow, and it may be asserted of every one of them that they derive water from the source at least by percolation. Wells sunk in dry land, but closely adjoining wet land, and in such a situation as clearly to derive their water from the existence of the tank, would, under this principle, be properly charged; but cases of this kind should be dealt with liberally, and charges should be imposed only when it is clear that the well depends on the tank or when any fraudulent intent is apparent. The character of the well, and whether the land could or not be irrigated by direct flow, will be points of importance to guide the District Officers to whose discretion the decision must be left. There seems no necessity to modify or add to the Standing Orders on the subject. Clause I. of Standing Order No. 123, as pointed out by Mr. Banbury, meets such cases exactly. These remarks dispose of the questions raised in the letter recorded in the first Proceedings read above.

4. There appears to be considerable divergence between the reports of Messrs. Wilkinson and Rundall as to the facts of the cases in which tirvajasti has been charged for dry land containing wells, and which are the subject of the second Proceedings read above. It appears that as regards two of the wells the land is capable of irrigation, and is in fact irrigated from the channel, the water of which fills the wells for several months—and that as to the third well its proximity to the channel was merely brought to notice, but it was not insisted that the charge should be imposed, the land lying on a higher level. The Board consider that these cases should be left to the decision of the Collector. It is inadvisable to attempt to define the word "channel" as regards size, for its importance and its relation to the well and the land irrigated frequently depend on other circumstances.

5. In the further case brought to notice when the Monigar diverted to his dry field, in which he had also sunk a well, the water of a channel or stream flowing directly into a Government tank, the charge should clearly be made. The proviso in the first of the rules contained in Standing Order No. 126 is sufficiently distinct and covers the case in question.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed)

H. E. STOKES,

Acting Sub-Secretary.

To the Collector of North Arcot.

„ Director of Revenue Settlement,

with two original enclosures returned.

Exd. W. H. French.



## PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 13th March 1876.

From W. D. HORSLEY, Esq., Collector of Cuddapah, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 24th February 1876, No. 47 :—

I HAVE the honor to report on the subject of G.O., No. 32, dated 10th January 1876, as directed in the footnote of the Board, dated 17th January 1876.

2. The irrigation works in this district are chiefly tanks fed by small streams, which collect the drainage of the country. The rain-fall is by no means excessive, and is very partial. The south-west monsoon rains are not heavy, but ordinarily the tanks receive sufficient water to enable ryots to commence ploughing and sowing their wet lands. The rains of the north-east monsoon in October and November fill the tanks, and the water brings the crops to maturity.

3. The tanks are said to be capable of holding water sufficient to irrigate the lands under them for a certain length of time, and thus a tank is termed a one, two, or three months' tank. The supposition is that the calingulah of a tank does not flow till the tank has received a supply sufficient to bring all the wet crops in its ayakat to maturity. When a tank is said to have filled, wet land left waste receives no remission, as the supply of water is supposed to have been sufficient.

4. The tanks were no doubt originally of the capacity shown in the accounts. A four months' tank at one time did hold water sufficient for the cultivation of its ayakat for four months, but I may almost say that no tank holds now the water with which it is credited. Tanks naturally silt up, and this process is very often accelerated by tank bed cultivation, which it is so difficult to check, though efforts are always made at every Jamabandi to render the practice as expensive as possible to the offending ryot. The result of this silting process is that tanks unless they fill two or three times in the year, the water they receive is insufficient for the cultivation of their ayakats. The ayakats have thus become too large for the tanks.

5. If, owing to a good year of rain, a tank receives more water than the ayakat requires, wet crops may be raised by means of the surplus tank water on dry land beyond the wet ayakat on payment of a water-rate. This privilege is supposed to be exercised only after the wet lands have received all the water they require. This is very good in theory, but in practice Reddies, Curnams, and influential ryots have for years watered their dry lands to the detriment of the wet lands. Even when these outsiders fail to get water, they will not allow the water-rate entered in their puttats for water taken in past years to be struck out, as they hope in course of time to establish their right to tank water. Two remarkable instances of this came to my notice when settling the Sidhout Taluq this year. I granted wet remission owing to tanks having received no water. A list of charges for water irrigating dry land was then placed before me, and I perceived that dry land had been irrigated by a tank, the revenue under which I had remitted, because the tank had received no water. My inquiry showed that the tank had undoubtedly received no water, but the dry land ryots had asked the Curnams to allow the water-rate charged in past years to be continued, that their right to water might appear in the accounts to be uninterrupted for a number of years. I will refer to this again and show how the settlement have encouraged this idea. This practice of watering dry land continued for many years till, in 1861, the A register was introduced. This register showed what dry lands had received water for a certain number of years, and these lands were added to the ayakats of tanks. The Curnams, I believe, were well paid by the dry land puttadars for the entries made in this register. Thus ayakats already too large for tanks were made still larger.

6. Lands composing wet ayakats pay a heavy assessment, as tanks kept up by Government are supposed to give them all the water they require, and some of the lands are assessed at a double crop rate as they are supposed to raise two wet crops. Tanks are incapable of supplying all the required water, and the ryots to keep their crops going sink wells in their wet fields at their own cost. The cost of sinking a well may be estimated at Rupees 500, and, in addition to this expenditure, the ryot has to keep men and bullocks to work the well. But for the assistance of these wells, many acres of crops would be annually lost to the ryot, and because the crop withered owing

1873.

Board of Revenue,  
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 23RD OCTOBER 1873, No. 2,169.

Encl.

Received

OCTOBER.

No. 2,169.

Wet-Assessment—for crops grown in dry land in North Arcot District.—Orders passed on papers relating to certain cases of alleged evasion of —

Rev 25 / 1765 / 76

Gr 26.6.77 v. 2110



to want of water, the assessment would be partially or wholly remitted. The wells protect the ryot and the Government from loss. The ryots do not gain much by their wells. They save their crops, but from the value of their crop must be deducted the money spent in digging and working the well. In order that they may receive something in return for their outlay, the ryots irrigate by means of their wells wet crops on dry land. Because the wells are in wet lands, and thereby, to use the words of the Board, "derive their supply in part at least from Government sources" the ryots have to pay a water-rate as if the water had been taken from a tank. In a year like the present, the supply of water afforded by wells has been very valuable. To what extent wells can be utilized will be seen from the enclosed statement compiled from facts which came to my notice when settling the Sidhout Taluq. The Board will observe how little tanks had to say to the revenue from lands under the tanks, and but for wells whole ayakats would have been utterly unproductive. The very first case in the list shows that a four months' tank with a wet ayakat yielding a revenue of Rupees 540, received this year no water. Notwithstanding, nearly the whole ayakat was rendered productive. By means of wells, dry crops have been raised. The wet assessment is lost to Government, but a part of it is recovered by the collection of an assessment at the highest dry rate. The third tank in Jonnavaram received one-third of its full supply. Nearly the whole of its ayakat was cultivated with wet crops by the assistance of wells, and a few acres were by the same means cultivated with dry crops. But here again wells which have done so much are taxed. They are in wet land under a tank with very little or no water, and I scarcely think that the Board could say "in part at least" they derive their supply from a Government source. Yet under the new rules, these well owners paid a water-rate for every acre which raised a dry or a wet crop.

7. I have shown that wells have been dug and worked at a great outlay on the part of their owners, and that the necessity for the wells has arisen owing to tanks being unable to give the water they are supposed to give. I have shown that the Government gain a great deal and the ryot very little by this arrangement. I have shown that the ryot when he tries to make something out of his well, he is at once stopped by a tax. I think, therefore, I am justified in saying that wells are treated illeberally. Admitting that "in part at least" the well springs are assisted by the tank, I think Government might, without being extravagant, refuse to take notice of this, and thereby help the ryot who has done so much to help himself. The present limit of distance from the tank bund should be maintained, but all wells beyond that should be allowed to irrigate wet or dry or second crops on wet or dry land without payment of water-rate or second crop assessment.

8. I have already alluded to the anxiety displayed by ryots to have their dry lands classed as wet. The first mischievous result of this was the A Register, which made ayakats larger still. The mischief however is not at an end, as the Settlement Department is making the ayakats larger. That department examines the old accounts, and imagines that accounts show facts. The accounts will show that dry land in excess of the ayakat has paid water-rate, but that does not prove that the lands were legitimately watered, or that they were even watered at all. Because the dry lands have paid for water, the department assumes that the tank was capable of watering the lands. The A register was made on fees to Curnams, and not on facts, yet I know the Settlement Department looks upon that account as a valuable document, and bases its revision of ayakats on the entries in that account. This, of course, is known, and consequently as I found to be actually the case in the Sidhout Taluq, where the revision of ayakats has not yet been commenced, the ryots consent to be charged for water which they have not received, in order to induce the Settlement Department to class their land as wet, and to include them in a wet ayakat. The "much personal inquiry and inspection" alluded to by Mr. Puckle in his letter to the Board, dated 13th February 1875, has no doubt been made by the officers in the Settlement Department, but the inquiry does not show facts. Ayakats may not be, as I and every officer who knows anything about the district says, too large. They may be large enough, but how it is possible that they can be too small, as the Settlement Department says they are, I do not understand, unless it can be shown that anything has been done to the tanks to make their capacity greater. Unfortunately the complaint in this district is that tanks have been neglected, and, therefore, it might be supposed that their ayakats were large enough, or too large, but certainly not too small.

9. I have alluded to the revision of ayakats, because if the ayakats are increased, the number of wells will increase also. I trust, however, that the Board will consider it necessary to stop the revision of ayakats as at present conducted.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Statement.

The Collector was requested to submit his report through the Director of Revenue Settlement. A copy of the communication will now be furnished to that officer with the request that he will state his views on the question.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,  
Acting Secretary.

To the Director of Revenue Settlement,  
with original Statement, to be returned.

Copy to the Collector of Cuddapah.

Exd. W. J. Lewis.



No. 2,246.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 1st September 1876.

Read again Board's Proceedings, dated 13th March 1876, No. 723.

Read also 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, 13th June 1876, No. 2,379-58:—

I HAVE the honor, with reference to Board's Proceedings (enclosure returned), No. 263, of 11th December 1875, and No. 47, of No. 723, of 13th March last, to offer the following remarks on the questions raised by the Collector of Cuddapah in his letters to the Board as per margin.

2. In the first communication Mr. Horsley alludes to the ruling of the Board, under date the 22nd August 1874, Proceedings, No. 2,355, that water-rate should be levied in the Cuddapah District for a second wet crop raised on dry land, which proposition he opposed on the grounds given in his letter printed with the foregoing Proceedings. In his second letter the Collector advocates the extension of the exemption he thus formerly recommended, and proposes that so far as well irrigation may be concerned, that "the present limit of distance from the tank bund should be maintained, but all wells beyond that should be allowed to irrigate wet or dry or second crop on wet or dry land without payment of water-rate or second-crop assessment." Mr. Horsley takes exception also to the manner in which the revision of tank ayacuts is being carried out by the Settlement Department in his district, and wishes the operation, as at present conducted, to be stopped.

3. Of the two questions thus raised, it is desirable that I should refer first to the revision of tank ayacuts which is being conducted in conformity with the rules G. O., No. 181, of 27th January 1871. It is contended that the tank ayacuts are already too large for the tanks, and that the tendency of the action of the Settlement Department is to augment the area or ayacut still further. At the same time seemingly the Collector regards it as a general complaint that the tanks are in a neglected state, and that, owing to the gradual silting process, the capacity has been curtailed; whilst the ayacut has been added to since 1861 by lands shown in the A Register as having received water for a certain number of years, being registered as wet. The result of this silting process is stated to be that, unless the tanks fill two or three times a year, the supply received is insufficient for the cultivation of their ayacuts.

4. Save the additions to the tank ayacuts in comparatively recent years, the condition of the tanks in Cuddapah is much the same I expect as in the neighbouring districts. The expenditure on the repair of tanks is necessarily limited; and as regards the numerous smaller or least important sources, the complaints as to the neglected state they are in may have some foundation; but compared with former days and other districts, the more important and larger tanks are probably as efficient now or more so than formerly.

*Rev 293/76*

1876.  
BOARD of Revenue,  
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 13TH MARCH 1876, No. 723.

Received

MARCH.  
No. 723.

Wells—situated in wet lands in Cuddapah District.—Forwarding to Director of Revenue Settlement for remarks, copy of Collector's letter regarding cultivation raised by means of—

*Rev. Secy. 26 June 1876*

*Rev. 20 2765/76*

*P 26.6.77 v. 2110.*



5. From what I have observed elsewhere, it is an old established custom for the smaller tanks to require to fill two or three times a year to be able to supply their ayacut. The capacity of the tanks is such that it may reasonably be regarded as a necessity from the first. As a rule, the rain is not limited to one fall, but is distributed over a period of six months. A tank received a partial supply, which is added to by a second fall of rain, and with the first heavy fall the tank probably fills; and, as the supply is expended, it is re-placed by further falling rain at intervals, if the season is propitious. That the seasons vary considerably is well known, and it is, no doubt, difficult to determine to what extent the ayacut of a tank may be revised. The

\* Board's Proceedings No. 746, of 10th May 1872, paragraph 8, clause 1: "The principle always kept in view must be that the area which Government can ordinarily supply with water should be registered as 'wet,' and all the rest as 'dry.' This is a question of fact, and on re-consideration the Board are of opinion that the 'consent' of the landholders is immaterial. If land can be supplied with water it is 'wet land'; if not, it is 'dry land.'"

object aimed at by the rules is to revise the area to conform with the ordinary capabilities of the tank in respect to irrigation in fair seasons. Dry lands ordinarily irrigated along with the adjacent wet area are thus transferred to wet. The capabilities of a tank must necessarily, for the purpose of the rules, be gauged in some way. Mr. Horsley is not disposed to accept for his district the course prescribed by the rules and followed elsewhere; and seemingly he wishes the ayacuts left as at present, and not added to, on the ground that the ayacuts are large enough already, and will not supply an increased area.

6. The circumstances of all ayacuts are not the same. Under some tanks the area may be excessive; under others it may be considerably less than the ordinary capability of the supply may suffice for. Again, in other instances, part of the ayacut may be out of cultivation, and dry land on a lower level, or of better quality, may be now irrigated instead. Whatever is done, it is certain that no hard and fast rule can apply. The case of each ayacut must necessarily be examined and dealt with on its merits, and to do this some principle must be followed, and I contend that the course adopted by the department—that of the ordinary capability of the tank in the past—is the safest and the most readily ascertained method. It may reasonably be argued, that land irrigated under a source in the past in fair seasons may be regarded as so irrigable in the future.

7. Mr. Horsley maintains that the irrigation of the past, as shown by the accounts or A Register, is mostly fictitious, and that the proposals of the department made on the strength of the A Register, are unreliable, and so far as personal inquiries are concerned are not founded on fact. There are some cases evidently, from what is stated, that show the entries by the accounts to be misleading. Still, it cannot be reasonably believed that, as a rule, all entries are fictitious, or that any large portion of the water-rate levied in the district is gratuitously paid by the ryots when water may not have been supplied or obtained, and they know no liability to exist for such payment. If the department proposed the changes to the ayacuts solely on the basis of the A Register, they would, no doubt, be apt to be misled. The transfers are, however, based as well upon actual inspection of the ground; and thus if care be exercised any chance of being misled is obviated. Should the inspection show the dry assessed area to be more or less surrounded by ordinary wet lands, and to be

partitioned and embanked for irrigation and cultivated as wet only, in such years as the supply may suffice, the conclusion that the supply in ordinary years will irrigate such land is well supported. Much depends upon the position of the lands to be changed with reference to the regular wet area; and, if enclosed by wet, the land is probably unsuited for cultivation save under irrigation, the moisture from the surrounding or adjacent wet fields being detrimental to the growth of any dry crop.

8. There are thus many circumstances needing consideration when dealing with the question of revision of tank ayacuts. The tendency of the changes effected, so far as tabulated, is explained in the accompanying letter from Mr. Cox which affords information, as well as to Mr. Horsley's action in respect to the proposals submitted for his consideration by the Deputy Director.

9. The following abstract represents the effect of the changes as given in the statements submitted by Mr. Cox:—

| Items.                               | Wet Ayacut as registered in the Revenue Accounts. |        | Deduct transferred from Wet to Dry. |        | Balance. |        | Add transferred from Dry to Wet. |        | Revised Wet Ayacut. |        |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|--------|-------------------------------------|--------|----------|--------|----------------------------------|--------|---------------------|--------|
| <i>Koilkuntla Taluq, Kurnool.</i>    | ACRES.                                            | CENTS. | ACRES.                              | CENTS. | ACRES.   | CENTS. | ACRES.                           | CENTS. | ACRES.              | CENTS. |
| Deputy Director's Proposals.         | 5,394                                             | 85     | 831                                 | 41     | 4,573    | 44     | 860                              | 24     | 5,433               | 68     |
| As amended by Collector ...          | 5,394                                             | 85     | 820                                 | 53     | 4,574    | 32     | 842                              | 10     | 5,416               | 42     |
| Difference ...                       | ...                                               | ...    | — 9                                 | 88     | + 0      | 88     | — 18                             | 14     | — 17                | 26     |
| <i>Proddatur Taluq, Cuddapah.</i>    |                                                   |        |                                     |        |          |        |                                  |        |                     |        |
| Deputy Director's Proposals.         | 1,165                                             | 80     | 112                                 | 75     | 1,053    | 5      | 114                              | 22     | 1,167               | 25     |
| As amended by Collector ...          | 1,165                                             | 80     | 215                                 | 35     | 950      | 45     | 51                               | 56     | 1,002               | 1      |
| Difference ...                       | ...                                               | ...    | + 103                               | 45     | — 102    | 56     | — 62                             | 66     | — 165               | 24     |
| <i>Jamalamadagu Taluq, Cuddapah.</i> |                                                   |        |                                     |        |          |        |                                  |        |                     |        |
| Deputy Director's Proposals.         | 190                                               | 99     | 13                                  | 24     | 178      | 75     | 78                               | 24     | 256                 | 99     |
| As amended by Collector ...          | 190                                               | 99     | 128                                 | 50     | 62       | 49     | ...                              | ...    | 62                  | 49     |
| Difference ...                       | ...                                               | ...    | + 116                               | 49     | — 116    | 26     | — 78                             | 24     | — 194               | 50     |

The three taluqs comprised one settlement report, and Koilkuntla, as is well known, formerly belonged to the Cuddapah District. There is very slight variation between the proposals and the Collector's amendments for the latter taluq. If the tank bed area, 432 acres, newly adjusted under wet, be excluded from the comparison, the net result is a decrease of 410 acres as pointed out by Mr. Cox, and not an increase.

10. For the villages tabulated under the Proddatur and Jamalamadagu Taluqs, the Deputy Director's proposals would leave the ayacuts of the former within an acre or two of the original area, whilst the Collector's alterations would reduce the same by 165 acres. In the latter taluq the changes effected are most extensive. The former ayacut of 190.99 acres was proposed by Mr. Cox to be enhanced to 256.99 acres. Mr. Horsley, however, objected to much of the area being retained as wet at all, and cut it down to 62.49 acres. The reductions seemingly appertain to lands under wells. Such want of accord is inevitable, if the Collector treats the proposals submitted to him upon considerations other than the rules sanctioned by Government for the purpose, and upon which the proposals may have been framed.

11. At paragraphs 18 and 19 of Board's Proceedings, No. 915, of 16th June 1872, the course advocated by Mr. Banbury of treating as wet, lands under Dasabandam, Do-



ruvu, and Itifak wells was approved and confirmed by paragraph 4 of G. O., No. 145, of 5th February 1873. In conformity with this ruling, lands irrigated from sources of the foregoing nature, deriving their water-supply from a recognized Government source of irrigation, have been brought to wet under the rules by Mr. Cox. If irrigated for a crop other than paddy, Mr. Horsley has generally declined to retain such lands under wet, or to transfer them to that head when previously dry, but has

\* Villagewar statements and plans accompany the Deputy Director's letter.

it will be seen that, in the case of 71.65

(I.) Under all the works the lands are poor, and to raise wet crops does not pay. The lands should all be classed dry.

(II.) Wet crops cannot be cultivated. The land should be dry.

made exceptions in some instances. In this way in Maddanur\* and Dommara Nandyala of the Jamalamadagu Taluq, 71.65 acres irrigated by Dasabandam wells in the first village, and 11.29 acres irrigated by Doruvu wells in the second village, the Collector transferred the whole of the irrigated area to dry for the reasons marginally given.

12. The decision of the question rests upon the fact whether there is any liability for a charge for irrigation, not upon the crop grown. The cultivation of garden crops may be more suited to the soil than the growth of paddy, but provided the irrigation is regular and sure, the area irrigated should be treated as wet. All lands thus treated are non-liaible, it must be remembered, for any second crop charge, which is an advantage, as a considerable extent is seemingly so cultivated.

13. The effect of the Collector's views is exemplified in the case of tanks by the plans and statement submitted by Mr. Cox for the village of Madur, Proddatur Taluq. The results of the Collector's modifications are exhibited below:—

|                                    | Deputy Director's Proposals. |    | Collector's Amendments. |     | Difference. |     |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|----|-------------------------|-----|-------------|-----|
|                                    | A.                           | C. | A.                      | C.  | A.          | C.  |
| Register, wet ayacut ... ..        | 489                          | 37 | 489                     | 37  | ...         | ... |
| Deduct transfer, wet to dry ... .. | 30                           | 13 | 30                      | 13  | ...         | ... |
| Balance ... ..                     | 459                          | 24 | 459                     | 24  | ...         | ... |
| Add transfer, dry to wet ... ..    | 55                           | 61 | ...                     | ... | —55         | 61  |
| Revised ayacut ... ..              | 514                          | 85 | 459                     | 24  | —55         | 61  |

14. The net increase proposed to the ayacut is thus 25.48 acres. The Collector endorses the adjustment of 30.13 acres to dry, and, if the plan is referred to, it will be seen that these lands are on the outer edge of the ayacut, or else regularly detached and in the midst of dry. The lands not being irrigated, are properly excluded altogether from the ayacut under Rule 16-2. As regards the 55.61 acres, the Deputy Director proposes to adjust from dry to wet, the Collector seemingly deals with the question on general considerations, and rules that the "ayacut should not be increased." It is evident that the changes were not examined with reference to the rules, and so disposed of, as they should have been. Nor does the map appear to have

been consulted. By referring thereto, it will be seen that the fields proposed for transfer to wet are so surrounded by irrigated lands as to render their continuance as dry undesirable, provided they are ordinarily irrigated as appears to be the case. The crop is noted as paddy in all instances when cultivated. A few fields are now and again waste, as will generally be the case in wet lands. Had the Collector shown the lands not to be ordinarily irrigated, and therefore not liable to transfer under the rules, the modifications made would, of course, have been acquiesced in.

15. The bulk of the land being ordinarily irrigated for paddy, and solely under irrigated crops when cultivated, the lands were seemingly correctly proposed for transfer to wet, and, in my opinion, the proposal should be maintained. It will be noticed that there are several dry fields so left, still interspersed amongst the ayacut, and it cannot be fairly regarded in this case that the ayacut has been unnecessarily enhanced by this department, and that past experience warrants no change being made. The source has sufficed hitherto in fair years for 459.24 acres of the original ayacut, and the bulk of the 55.61 acres has been irrigated also. The source is capable of irrigating the 514.85 acres now credited to it, and that area should therefore be confirmed, subject to any slight modification that may be needful.

16. At paragraph 5 of his letter, No. 47, Mr. Horsley alludes to dry lands on which wet crops are raised by means of the surplus irrigation as being beyond the wet ayacut. I would remark that the ayacuts are not compact, and very often the dry lands receiving the surplus irrigation are not entirely beyond, but a good deal intermixed amongst the regular wet lands; and thus it is so essential they should be duly considered and adjusted if in reality under wet cultivation.

17. I will, if the Board approve, enjoin greater care upon the Deputy Director to restrict the revision of tank ayacuts in Cuddapah to the area that may be irrigated in ordinary years, and to eliminate all doubtful cases where the land may not, when cultivated, invariably be under irrigation. If this is done, and discretion is exercised in applying the rules, I do not apprehend that the ayacuts will be unnecessarily extended or beyond the capabilities of the sources. At the same time, I would request that the Collector, in dealing with the revision of tank ayacuts, may be directed to conform to the rules and dispose of the contemplated revision on that basis. As regards the changes taken exception to by Mr. Horsley, I would suggest for the settled taluqs—Proddatur, Jamalamadagu, and Cuddapah—that the Deputy Director's proposals be allowed to stand, and modified, if need be, on appeal. It is very desirable that these three taluqs should be closed. The non-settlement of the question prevents the settlement registers of several villages being furnished for printing. It will, I think, be evident to the Board that the proposals have been carefully scrutinized and framed by the Deputy Director.

18. That surplus water is generally available, and that the tanks in the taluqs of Cuddapah recently settled, and now under settlement, are capable of generally irrigating dry land to some extent, may, I consider, be satisfactorily demonstrated by the



water-rate and additional assessment levied on this account during recent years. The subjoined statement furnishes particulars for the past five years:—

| Talugs.               | ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT AND WATER-TAX ON GOVERNMENT LAND. |             |             |             |             |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                       | Fasli 1230.                                             | Fasli 1281. | Fasli 1282. | Fasli 1283. | Fasli 1284. |
|                       | RS.                                                     | RS.         | RS.         | RS.         | RS.         |
| 1. Cuddapah ... ..    | 12,599                                                  | 9,136       | 11,455      | 12,617      | 2,775       |
| 2. Proddatur ... ..   | 2,934                                                   | 2,959       | 3,486       | 3,371       | 983         |
| 3. Jamalanadagu... .. | 5,582                                                   | 4,592       | 4,863       | 5,239       | 2,013       |
| 4. Budwail ... ..     | 7,329                                                   | 6,995       | 7,336       | 6,793       | 4,394       |
| 5. Sidhout ... ..     | 4,643                                                   | 4,640       | 5,149       | 4,892       | 2,610       |
| 6. Pullampett ... ..  | 5,489                                                   | 6,282       | 7,193       | 6,945       | 6,039       |
| Total ...             | 38,576                                                  | 34,604      | 39,482      | 39,857      | 18,814      |

19. In Fasli 1283 the charge amounted to Rupees 39,857, much the same as during the preceding three years; but in 1284, in consequence of the floods, I conclude the sum fell to Rupees 18,813. It is sufficient to show that in most years a good extent of dry land is ordinarily irrigated; and the sum is too large to suppose that any considerable portion of it can be paid voluntarily for no consideration of irrigation received, as implied by the Collector.

20. I have still to refer to the second question: the Collector's proposal that wells in wet lands, not within the prescribed limit of distance of the tank bund, ten yards, should be free to irrigate dry or wet, or second crop on dry or wet without any liability for water-rate or second-crop assessment.

21. The occasion for considering this question arose with the remark made by Mr. Horsley at paragraph 6 of his letter to Board, No. 263, of 11th December last, when reporting on the state of the season in his district that "if Government would treat wells more liberally, the effects of a dry season would not be so severely felt by the ryots. I have written before on this subject, but I regret to say that my views did not meet with the approval of the Board." Mr. Horsley was supposed to refer to

G.O., No. 32, of 10th January 1876. Board's Proceedings, No. 2,355, of 22nd August 1874; and upon being requested to record his views in greater detail, he complied thereto by letter, No. 47, of 24th February last. The former correspondence that has passed is not, however, referred to, nor is the present treatment of lands generally irrigated by wells for a second crop on wet land specified, though the Collector expresses himself so strongly as to the illiberality of the orders now in force in respect to such irrigation. It is not to be inferred from Mr. Horsley's letter that any concession has previously been granted by Government in cases of the nature to which he refers. The question was, nevertheless, raised at a comparatively recent date by Mr. Storr, who suggested that one-third in place of one-half of the ordinary wet assessment should be charged. Mr. Horsley, in forwarding on the proposal, did not regard the reduction as sufficient, and recommended

\* Board's Procs., No. 85, of 11th January 1872. that the charge should be limited to one-fourth. The Board\* supported the latter

proposition, and it was approved by G.O., No. 928, of 12th June 1872, as a temporary measure, pending the introduction of the revised settlement. Thus the reduction of the former charge by one-half has had effect during the past four years, and lands irrigated for a second crop partly by wells are at present treated differently from lands directly supplied by a tank or channel for a second crop. Subsequently Mr. Storr, in remarking on the rules for the revision of tank ayacuts\*, questioned the fairness

\* Board's Procs., No. 1,663, of 22nd Aug. 1872. of any charge at all for such irrigation; and, in disposing of the reference (Proceedings, No. 2,087, of 28th October 1872,) the Board remarked at paragraph 6:—"The question whether the rule that 'second crop' is to be charged for when it is grown with water obtained from private wells in wet land is an important one involving a very large amount of revenue in most of the districts. It is an indisputable fact that such wells are generally made, because their position with regard to the tank assures them a good supply of water, and that it is almost impossible to discover, when there is a dispute, whether the water for the second crop has been drawn directly from the tank by channels or indirectly by means of the well. There may be some cases of hardship, but they must be few in number, and the interests of the State require that the rule should not be relaxed."

22. The Collector's proposition, at paragraph 7 of his letter, No. 47, of 24th February, has thus been previously before the Board and negatived after due consideration, both in respect to irrigation from wells in wet land for a second crop in wet land, and to either first or second crop in dry land; and I fail to see either on the facts the Collector now records as to the action of wells during the past season, or in the other reasons he adduces, that would justify wells being freed entirely from any charge for irrigation for a second crop. The difficulties referred to by the Board would always be present; and, whilst it is essential that the fact of such irrigation being mainly dependent upon wells in many cases should be recognized and allowed for in adjusting the second crop charge in such cases, there is no real necessity to forego the charge altogether as recommended, for it is based on good grounds and would lead to endless complications if attempted.

23. The Collector represents that the Government gain a good deal and the ryots very little by the existence of these wells. That the wells do, as stated, play an important part in the irrigation of his district, and secure much of the Government revenue in indifferent seasons, must necessarily be admitted, as also that much of the second crop assessment raised under many of the ordinary tanks is mainly due to irrigation afforded by these wells. With due deference to the Collector's opinion, I must however submit that there are substantial advantages on both sides. The circumstances of wells sunk in the wet lands differ materially from wells in dry land. The size and depth being much less, they are nothing like so costly to construct, or so expensive to maintain and work, and as the water springs freely, and the lift is comparatively slight, they are capable of irrigating a very much larger area than wells not similarly located in wet land. As a rule, even a slight store of water in the tank above keeps the level of the supply in the wells within a few feet of the surface and thus renders the lift easy and effective. For a further description of wells in wet lands, paragraphs 14 and 15 of my letter, No. 464-134, of 28th June 1873, printed



with Board's Proceedings, No. 2,169, of 23rd October 1873, can be referred to. Though the remarks then recorded applied to North Arcot, they are in a great measure applicable, I believe, to Cuddapah also. I contend, therefore, that wells in wet lands possess very decided advantages over wells in dry lands, and that these advantages accrue entirely from the wells being sunk in Government irrigation, whereby a much more ample supply and one much more easily worked is secured.

24. The question is one of great importance, for Cuddapah is not singular in respect to this well irrigation. It exists to a large extent in North Arcot and most other districts, and the revenue involved would amount to a large sum. In Cuddapah during the past five years the assessment realized for second crop irrigation varied according to the season from a little over half a lakh to nearly one lakh of rupees, as exhibited in the subjoined statement, notwithstanding the concession made by G.O., No. 928, of 12th June 1872, which limited the charge for irrigation mainly from wells to one-fourth of the single crop assessment. It must moreover be remembered that this is irrespective of any consolidated second crop charge:—

| Taluqs.                    | Fasli 1280. | Fasli 1281. | Fasli 1282. | Fasli 1283. | Fasli 1284. |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <i>Principal Division.</i> | RS.         | RS.         | RS.         | RS.         | RS.         |
| Cuddapah ... ..            | 8,592       | 3,180       | 5,400       | 9,599       | 11,421      |
| Proddatur ... ..           | 621         | 2,268       | 3,815       | 3,016       | 1,027       |
| Jammalamugulu ... ..       | 5,958       | 3,170       | 5,497       | 5,040       | 5,445       |
| Budwail ... ..             | 6,723       | 5,012       | 11,960      | 4,806       | 3,415       |
| Sidhout ... ..             | 8,980       | 6,768       | 8,067       | 7,908       | 5,130       |
| Pullampett ... ..          | 13,502      | 12,943      | 18,094      | 15,687      | 18,819      |
| Total...                   | 44,376      | 33,341      | 52,833      | 46,056      | 45,857      |
| <i>Sub-Division.</i>       |             |             |             |             |             |
| Pulivendla ... ..          | 3,280       | 2,880       | 3,304       | 3,329       | 2,935       |
| Royachoty ... ..           | 6,235       | 3,390       | 4,594       | 3,071       | 8,352       |
| Kaderi ... ..              | 1,720       | 2,544       | 2,969       | 2,518       | 2,822       |
| Voilpau ... ..             | 10,021      | 8,629       | 10,184      | 6,543       | 12,664      |
| Madanapally ... ..         | 8,890       | 5,989       | 13,228      | 7,324       | 20,489      |
| Total...                   | 30,146      | 23,432      | 34,279      | 22,785      | 47,262      |
| Grand Total...             | 74,522      | 56,773      | 87,112      | 68,841      | 93,119      |

25. It is, of course, impossible to indicate or conjecture what proportion of this second crop assessment may appertain to sources mainly depending on wells for second crop irrigation, and which Mr. Horsely would wish to see relieved of any charge for second crop; but probably the greater number of tanks in the district—as small tanks are very numerous—would be affected by the proposal, and thus a considerable proportion of the charge now realized would be affected.

26. Putting aside the revenue involved, many difficulties would beset any attempt to free in this manner the tanks mainly depending upon wells for the irrigation under consideration, as pointed out by the Board in Proceedings, No. 2,087, of 28th October 1872, already quoted from. The capabilities of a tank to supply second crop irrigation

depends generally upon its capacity as a reservoir; but in some seasons with an early and considerable fall and a fair distribution of rain during the remainder of the monsoon, even the smaller tanks are able to afford direct irrigation for two crops, if not for the whole at all events for some portion of the area. Moreover, wells are now and again used to start and irrigate for a time the first crop should the burst of the monsoon be deferred, and paddy follows subsequently as the main crop. Thus the aid which the wells afford is not confined to the second crop only but in part may apply to both. Again, the degree to which tanks depend upon the wells for second crop irrigation varies considerably; and, if the sources mainly depending upon wells for second crop cultivation were to be freed, it would be considered a hardship to exact the liability of wells in the case of wells under tanks capable in most years of supplying irrigation direct to some extent.

27. Much has already been done to alleviate the former assessment on well lands. Under the rules which originated with the orders of the late Court of Directors in 1852, the exceptional assessment upon old well lands in Cuddapah as elsewhere was adjusted to dry rates under the sanction of Government accorded by G.O. No. 1,836, of 29th June 1869, provided the lands were unconnected with Government irrigation. The reduction of assessment which the measure entailed in respect to land in occupation in Cuddapah amounted to no less than Rupees 1,24,291—*Vide* G.O., No. 279, of 14th February 1871.

28. As regards irrigation from wells in wet land extended to dry, the charge according to the rules in force for the bulk of such irrigation falling under the second class rates is, after deducting one-fourth for lift, Rupees 2-4-0 per acre for a paddy crop and Rupees 1-2-0 for dry crop or second crop. Considering the great value possessed by irrigation in Cuddapah, this charge is very moderate, and should, I think, be maintained. At present the single water-rate of Rupees 2-4-0 under the second or Rupees 3 under the first class covers any charge for second crop also, but this limitation of the rules applies only until the revised assessment may be introduced. Hence the system differs somewhat at present in the settled and unsettled taluqs.

29. Under the new settlement, precarious second crop irrigation of the nature adverted to will, in conformity with the ruling of Government contained in G.O., No. 880, of 14th July 1874, be offered to the cultivators to compound for at their option on favorable terms. Owing to the comparatively little irrigation in the taluqs already settled, little has been done in this respect. The rates proposed by Mr. Banbury were one-third or one-fourth of the first crop charges but in the sub-division one-fifth, as in Salem, will have to be taken also, and if requisite this rate should be applied to the main division of the district as well. Seemingly there is but slight disposition to compound in the settled portion of the district; but, if the rates are thus modified and fixed at one-third, one-fourth, and one-fifth, an opportunity would be afforded the ryots if they are inclined to compound at all. The one-third rate might be generally regarded as applicable to tanks from which the direct irrigation may be precarious for a second crop, the one-fourth rate

Director to Board, No. 1,944-55, dated 30th September 1871, paragraph 63.



to tanks only partially able to irrigate a second crop as a rule and depending in part on wells, the one-fifth to tanks under which irrigation for a second crop might be mainly by wells. In some instances, it would doubtless be requisite to treat the second crop irrigation of one and the same source where it might vary considerably by block under ten or more of the rates fixed. This course has been already advocated at paragraph 9 of my letter to Board, No. 2,057-46, dated 15th May 1876.

30. The course to be pursued subsequent to settlement has not seemingly been definitely discussed and settled with reference to the views expressed by Government in G.O., No. 928, of 12th June 1872. The principle of a reduced charge for second crop irrigation mainly from wells having been conceded, it is necessary and reasonable that it should be maintained. I would therefore propose that, if not compounded for in the manner indicated above, the charge be confirmed as formerly at one-half of the first crop assessment for tanks from which direct irrigation may be precarious, and fixed at one-third and one-fourth respectively for tanks only partially able to irrigate a second crop and, as a rule, depending in part on well irrigation, and tanks under which irrigation for a second crop may be mainly by wells.

31. Thus in place of a compounded charge of one-third, one-fourth, and one-fifth, the annual charge, when irrigation may be availed of, would be respectively one-half, one-third, and one fourth, or one rate higher. This, I must admit, would limit the variation in the charge to a small amount and offer less inducement to the ryot to compound; but if the reduction of the charge, in cases where the second crop irrigation may be mainly supplied by wells, to one-fourth is conceded, as it must be under the new Settlement, greater variation could only be secured by fixing the lowest compounding rate below one-fifth, which I regard as undesirable.

32. The addition for second crop, if compounded for or separate, would be as under, calculating the rate upon the amended wet rates recommended in my letter, No.

\* Board's Procs., No. 749, of 16th March 1876.

348-21,\* dated the 9th February 1876, as applicable to the Budwail, Sidhout, and Pullampett Taluqs:—

| Class and Sort. | FIRST GROUP.                |                          |                           |                             |                            | SECOND GROUP.               |                          |                            |                             |                            | THIRD GROUP.                |                          |                            |                             |                           |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
|                 | Rate per Acre for 1st Crop. |                          |                           | Rate per Acre for 2nd Crop. |                            | Rate per Acre for 1st Crop. |                          |                            | Rate per Acre for 2nd Crop. |                            | Rate per Acre for 1st Crop. |                          |                            | Rate per Acre for 2nd Crop. |                           |
|                 | Rate per Acre for 1st Crop. | Half.                    | One-third.                | One-fourth.                 | One-fifth.                 | Rate per Acre for 1st Crop. | Half.                    | One-third.                 | One-fourth.                 | One-fifth.                 | Rate per Acre for 1st Crop. | Half.                    | One-third.                 | One-fourth.                 | One-fifth.                |
|                 |                             |                          |                           |                             |                            |                             |                          |                            |                             |                            |                             |                          |                            |                             |                           |
| I               | 2                           | 3                        | 4                         | 5                           | 6                          | 7                           | 8                        | 9                          | 10                          | 11                         | 12                          | 13                       | 14                         | 15                          | 16                        |
| II.             | 12 0<br>10 0                | 6 0<br>5 0               | 4 0<br>3 5                | 3 0<br>2 8                  | 2 6<br>2 0                 | 10 0<br>9 0                 | 5 0<br>4 8               | 3 5<br>3 0                 | 2 8<br>2 4                  | 2 0<br>1 13                | 9 0<br>8 0                  | 4 8<br>4 0               | 3 0<br>2 11                | 2 4<br>2 0                  | 1 13<br>1 10              |
| III.            | 9 0<br>7 0<br>5 0<br>3 0    | 4 8<br>3 8<br>2 8<br>1 8 | 3 0<br>2 5<br>1 11<br>1 0 | 2 4<br>1 12<br>1 4<br>0 12  | 1 13<br>1 6<br>1 0<br>0 10 | 8 0<br>6 0<br>4 8<br>2 8    | 4 0<br>3 0<br>2 4<br>1 4 | 2 11<br>2 0<br>1 8<br>0 13 | 2 0<br>1 8<br>1 2<br>0 10   | 1 10<br>1 3<br>0 14<br>0 8 | 7 0<br>5 0<br>4 0<br>2 0    | 3 8<br>2 8<br>2 0<br>1 0 | 2 5<br>1 11<br>1 5<br>0 11 | 1 12<br>1 4<br>1 0<br>0 8   | 1 6<br>1 0<br>0 13<br>0 6 |
| IV.             | 10 0<br>8 0<br>5 8          | 5 0<br>4 0<br>2 12       | 3 5<br>2 11<br>1 13       | 2 8<br>2 0<br>1 6           | 2 0<br>1 10<br>1 2         | 9 0<br>7 0<br>5 0           | 4 8<br>3 8<br>2 8        | 3 0<br>2 5<br>1 11         | 2 4<br>1 12<br>1 4          | 1 13<br>1 6<br>1 0         | 8 0<br>6 0<br>4 8           | 4 0<br>3 0<br>2 4        | 2 11<br>2 0<br>1 8         | 2 0<br>1 8<br>1 2           | 1 10<br>1 3<br>0 14       |
| V.              | 7 0<br>5 0<br>3 0           | 3 8<br>2 8<br>1 8        | 2 5<br>1 11<br>1 0        | 1 12<br>1 4<br>0 12         | 1 6<br>1 0<br>0 10         | 6 0<br>4 8<br>2 8           | 3 0<br>2 4<br>1 4        | 2 0<br>1 8<br>0 13         | 1 8<br>1 2<br>0 10          | 1 3<br>0 14<br>0 8         | 5 0<br>4 0<br>2 0           | 2 8<br>2 0<br>1 0        | 1 11<br>1 5<br>0 13        | 1 4<br>1 0<br>0 8           | 1 0<br>0 13<br>0 6        |
| VI.             | 8 0<br>5 8<br>4 8           | 4 0<br>2 12<br>2 4       | 2 11<br>1 13<br>1 8       | 2 0<br>1 6<br>1 2           | 1 10<br>1 2<br>0 14        | 7 0<br>5 0<br>4 0           | 3 8<br>2 8<br>2 0        | 2 5<br>1 11<br>1 5         | 1 12<br>1 4<br>1 0          | 1 6<br>1 0<br>0 18         | 6 0<br>4 8<br>3 8           | 3 0<br>2 4<br>1 12       | 2 0<br>1 8<br>1 3          | 1 8<br>1 2<br>0 14          | 1 3<br>0 14<br>0 11       |
| VII.            | 7 0<br>5 0<br>4 0           | 3 8<br>2 8<br>2 0        | 2 5<br>1 11<br>1 5        | 1 12<br>1 4<br>1 0          | 1 6<br>1 0<br>0 13         | 6 0<br>4 8<br>3 8           | 3 0<br>2 4<br>1 12       | 2 0<br>1 8<br>1 3          | 1 8<br>1 2<br>0 14          | 1 3<br>0 14<br>0 11        | 5 0<br>4 0<br>3 0           | 2 8<br>2 0<br>1 8        | 1 11<br>1 5<br>1 0         | 1 4<br>1 0<br>0 12          | 1 0<br>0 13<br>0 10       |
| VIII.           | 5 0<br>4 0<br>3 0           | 2 8<br>2 0<br>1 8        | 1 11<br>1 5<br>1 0        | 1 4<br>1 0<br>0 12          | 1 0<br>0 13<br>0 10        | 4 8<br>3 8<br>2 8           | 2 4<br>1 12<br>1 4       | 1 8<br>1 3<br>0 13         | 1 2<br>0 14<br>0 10         | 0 14<br>0 11<br>0 8        | 4 0<br>3 0<br>2 0           | 2 0<br>1 8<br>1 0        | 1 5<br>1 0<br>0 11         | 1 0<br>0 12<br>0 8          | 0 13<br>0 10<br>0 6       |



33. Under G.O., No. 577, of 5th April 1864, the minimum charge for second crop in Trichinopoly was fixed at one rupee, and this rule was extended to Salem. Under wells in the lower group an abatement of half a rupee was allowed. I would recommend that this minimum charge be dispensed with as regards Cuddapah, and any reduction for lift be limited to lands unirrigable directly for the first crop. If the fixed charge is reduced consequent on the irrigation being from wells, the occasion for any allowance for lift disappears. Moreover, where sometimes the irrigation may be by flow and sometimes by lift, it is impossible to recognize any variation, and the abatement for lift is allowable only in cases where the irrigation may be solely by lift. Under the lower rates in Cuddapah there will rarely be any second crop irrigation, as the area under the lower tarams is generally very slight.

34. Should these proposals be approved, the charge in respect to each source of irrigation, if not wholly compounded for, could be adjusted at the time of Settlement by the Settlement Officer with reference to the circumstances of each source, and recorded in the descriptive memoir of the village and any doubt hereafter obviated.

35. According to paragraph 7 of his second letter, Mr. Horsley's proposal is limited to wells not within the prescribed distance of ten yards from the tank bund. I fail to see that this limit is applicable, for it refers to wells in unirrigated and not irrigated land. Moreover, wells at a considerable distance from the tank bund are often equally aided by the tank, provided they are well placed and within the fall away from or under current proceeding from tank.

36. At paragraphs 17 to 19 of his letter, Mr. Cox questions the water-supply returned for some of the tanks alluded to by Mr. Horsley. He shows that the rainfall in the neighbourhood registered 21 inches, and that while some of the tanks received a half supply, several are returned as not having stored any water at all. The rainfall

| 1875.              | INCHES. |
|--------------------|---------|
| Cuddapah ... ..    | 25.09   |
| North Arcot ... .. | 26.16   |
| Bellary ... ..     | 19.94   |
| Nellore ... ..     | 28.85   |

of Cuddapah and several adjacent districts is marginally given; and, though for the whole season the fall does not appear very short, it was wonderfully partial in some localities, and not seasonable or sufficiently steady and continuous to throw any large supply into the tanks. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Cox that the recorded supply is open to doubt in some instances, regard being had to the area cultivated and matured under paddy and other irrigated crops, and the number of wells concerned. For instance the four months' tank in Yepperanla (4th village in Mr. Horsley's list) received seven days' supply or one-sixteenth of a full tank. There are no wells in the wet area, but with the aid of four wells in the adjoining dry land, 76.02 acres out of 81.25 acres in occupation were cultivated, 21.64 acres being paddy and 54.38 acres other irrigated crops. The whole was matured and 12.96 acres besides cultivated under second crop. The one-sixteenth of the tank could never have sufficed for the large area, or could the four wells in dry land have matured so many acres of cultivation.

#### ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. H. M. COX, Esq., Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement, Kurnool and Cuddapah Districts, to C. RUNDALL, Esq., Acting Director of Revenue Settlement, dated Cuddapah, 19th May 1876, No. 417-164.

• Enclosures (2) returned. I HAVE the honor to forward, herewith, the information called for in your Proceedings of the 19th ultimo, No. 782-119,\* and to submit a few

remarks with reference to the views expressed by Mr. Horsley on the subject of the augmentation of the wet ayacuts in this district.

2. Enclosed are three\* statements exhibiting the result of the revision of ayacuts in the whole of the taluq of Koilkuntla, Kurnool District, and in seven and eighteen villages of Jamalamadugu and Proddatur respectively according to the accounts made up as far as the B Statements have been received from the Collector. The black ink figures represent the proposals made by this department, and the corrections in red ink show the changes as recorded by the Collector.

3. In Koilkuntla it will be seen that the Collector's modifications are very insignificant, though in some villages there is a marked addition to the wet ayacut. On the whole, the total figures show a slight increase, but deducting the 432 acres odd relating to the waterspread of tanks which has been now transferred to wet, there is a decided decrease in the wet ayacuts in this taluq, although, as already said, there is a marked increase in some villages.

4. In Jamalamadugu and Proddatur, the Collector of Cuddapah has made great changes on our proposals, the nature of which may be learnt by a reference to the enclosed B Statements for three† villages forwarded for your inspection, together with the plans and different Telugu accounts from which these statements have been compiled, as per accompanying Telugu List VII.

5. In one of these villages, objection is raised to the addition proposed to be made to the ayacut of a tank, although these new lands have apparently been growing paddy for some years past, while the cultivation of the old ayacut has continued without intermission, except here and there a field left waste because the ryots did not care to cultivate it that year.

6. The other cases relate to Doruvu and Dasabhandam wells, and these represent the bulk of the changes shown in the statements referred to in paragraph 2. The objections raised to the lands under these sources being classed as wet, is that they do not and cannot grow wet crops, i.e., paddy. This may, as a rule, be said of all wells, and I have explained both to Mr. Horsley and Mr. Gribble that we have not registered the lands altogether with reference to the crops grown on them, but in consideration of their receiving water from a fairly trustworthy Government source, and there are cases in which Mr. Horsley has approved of some lands growing similar crops being retained as wet, the only proviso that he has made being that they should be registered as "single crops."

7. Even in the case where a Dasabhandam well has been reported as out of repair, &c., we have retained the ayacut under it as wet for the simple reason that, as long as the Inam grant is allowed for its upkeep, it must be considered a Government source. Such cases are, of course, brought to the notice of the Tahsildar with a view to the Inamdar being served with a notice calling upon him to execute the necessary repairs. Meanwhile, as the ayacut cannot be transferred to dry until the Inam has been resumed, the ryots are informed that they are at liberty to claim remission of wet assessment until such time as the well is repaired, &c.

8. The Collector has also taken exception to the remark entered in the B Statements against well ayacut to the effect that lands newly transferred to wet have been so treated because they "have been invariably cultivated with wet crops." With reference to this I must explain, in the first place, that it is the form adopted from the statement received with the circular of instructions, and next that the garden crops grown with the help of water have been considered by us to all intents and purposes as not *bona fide* dry crops and therefore wet since we have nothing between. I shall feel obliged by the necessary instructions as to whether the form of remark should be altered in future.

9. Doruvu, Dasabhandam, and Itifak wells being recognized as Government sources, the ayacut under them must, I conclude, be registered as wet, otherwise there will be a large area left under Tirwa jastee which, I conclude, the present revision was intended to rectify. Where necessary



lands under wells are more leniently treated in the Settlement than tank lands, and should the lands be poor they are more lowly classified and rated accordingly by us. The wet rate however is sure to be higher than the dry rate *plus* Rupees 1-2-0\*  
\* Rupees 1-8-0 less one-fourth deduction for lift

water-rate leviable on lands growing raggi, &c., according to the water-rate rules now in force, but I do not think that the assessment fixed in the Settlement will be higher than they can really bear, particularly as no change is made for second crop. While showing all these wells as Government sources, we should not be justified, I think, in entering the ayacuts under a large number of them as dry. This will become a more serious matter in the sub-division taluqs with their numberless Dasabhandam wells.

10. I now come to the subject of Mr. Horsley's letter to the Board of Revenue. There is no doubt immense force in the assertion he makes that since the tanks are yearly becoming more and more silted up, the ayacuts must necessarily be reduced. I do not know upon what rules the extent of the ayacut originally registered as wet was fixed, but I observe in the face of the above assertion the fact that in many cases not only in this but also in other districts a larger extent of land is being irrigated under tanks and is paying Tirwa jastee, while, as far as can be ascertained, hardly any complaints have been made by the occupants of the regular wet lands, nor, as a rule, has any remission been granted on those ayacuts except in years when there has been a decided scarcity of water.

11. I do not ignore the fact that wells dug in the wet lands do help to keep up the cultivation, and I have already admitted in my letter of the 7th February, No. 105-47, that I recognize the great assistance these wells do afford, but I do not quite see how the thing is to be remedied in the way Mr. Horsley proposes. He advocates no increase to be made to the ayacut, and that the ryots should be allowed to take water from the wells in the wet lands free of charge. The second proposition might, I think, be allowed, provided the water is not drawn from the wells until that in the tank has been quite used up and none is flowing on to the wet lands from it. Some such rule as this seems necessary, as otherwise any amount of water might be drawn away from the proper wet lands, and even then the crops brought to maturity by means of these wells having already received some water from the tank would still be chargeable with Tirwa jastee.

12. According to Mr. Horsley's own admission, the men owning the lands which we are proposing to add to the wet ayacut being influential people will, notwithstanding their fields being registered as dry, still continue to take the water to the detriment of the wet lands, paying or not paying Tirwa jastee or water-rate as the case may be. The dry assessment *plus* water-rate being invariably less than the full wet rate will only tend to encourage this state of things, whereas, if the full wet assessment is charged, the man will most likely demand a full flooding, and this will no doubt cause the other ryots to call out or relinquish their lands for want of water. An inquiry might then be made into the matter and the necessary changes carried out.

13. This is, I think, the only way in which the thing can really effectually be righted, unless it is done at once scientifically by instituting a regular survey of all the tanks to determine their capacity and then calculate the area that such a volume of water can irrigate, fixing the ayacut with reference to levels, &c. Any other way of solving the question conclusively is to my mind impossible, and all that we can do in such a revision as is now being made is to examine the actual state of things on the ground, look into past accounts, to consult the wishes of the ryots, making such changes as seem necessary, and rectifying all glaring irregularities. There must and will be errors in judgment, and where this is the case it seems preferable in instances like these that the benefit should not be altogether on the side of the ryot who knows his own interest and may, I think, be trusted to bring to notice any injustice he considers he has really suffered when the matter can be better gone into and adjusted on its several merits.

14. I may here mention that I spoke to the District Engineer some days ago and asked him to let me know the result of the survey which it appears has been made in the case of one or two tanks that require repair, but I have not heard from him yet. He told me it would be no easy matter to determine the capacity of all the tanks and decide on what would be a fair ayacut for each.

15. In consulting the Revenue Accounts, the A Register referred to by the Collector is also examined as it forms the record of all lands which have already under authority been classed as wet, but the present state of things on the ground are likewise taken into account as mentioned above, and alterations made where necessary.

16. The cultivation details given in the Classification Registers do not afford the same help as the Revenue Accounts, as they only represent the state of things existing at the time of demarcation some ten or twelve years back. I must explain, however, that the latter do not in many cases bear out the facts ascertained by our examination in the field.

17. I am inclined also to think that the reports furnished with reference to the quantity of water received by the different tanks is not altogether to be relied upon. For instance, in the statement which accompanied Mr. Horsley's letter, two tanks in Madvaram and four out of the seven in Kuruguntapalli are said to have received no water at all, while the other three tanks in the latter village were about half filled. All nine tanks drain the same range of hills situated between their villages and Vantimitta at which latter place the rainfall registered in the District Gazette last year was nearly 8 inches in August, 6½ in September, and 4 in October, besides 1 in November and nearly 1½ in December.

18. Similarly, in Rainapuram, a six months' tank is said to have received 3 months' supply, and two 2 months' tanks only half a month's water each, while the other seven in the same village, all 2 months' tanks, got nothing. These all lie in one and the same narrow valley on the confines of the Budwail Taluq, and the large tank would appear to receive its supply from the small hills to the west instead of from the high Vellegonda range bordering Nellore, which may naturally be supposed to catch more of the rain that falls.

19. Another circumstance observable from Mr. Horsley's statement is that a larger extent of land was cultivated with wet crops under tanks two and three in Ramapuram, which are said to have received no water at all, than under the two shown to have had a fifteen days' supply, while in the one case there were only two and eight wells to help the irrigation against ten in the other.

20. With reference to paragraph 4 of the Proceedings under reply, I must explain that it is customary in this district to enter the water-rate charged on any land each year in the Kulwar or Asamiwar chitta of that year, and similar entries are made in the men's puttās if produced at the time of Jamabandi; otherwise the item only appears in the Kulwar chitta and the assessment collected accordingly.

21. In conclusion, pending the disposal of the different subjects now under discussion, I have deemed it advisable to postpone the introduction of the different changes proposed by Mr. Horsley into our accounts, and have left the entries in the registers now being submitted standing just as they are.

P.S.—I think the classification of the several crops as laid down in the table of rates to be charged for water supplied from the Irrigation and Canal Company given at page 251 of Mr. Gribble's Manual of this district shows that the garden crops of which we have been speaking ought rather to be called wet than dry. They come under Clause 3, whereas Clause 4 refers to dry crops.

(True Copy.)  
(Signed) C. RUNDALL,  
Ag. Director of Revenue Sett.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 2 to 27.—Statements, Ayacut Sketches, Telugu Accounts, &c.

ENCLOSURE No. 28.—List of Enclosures.

SUBMITTED to Government with reference to G.O., dated 10th January 1876,  
No. 32.



2. In reporting on the agricultural prospects of the district at the end of last year, Mr. Horsley observed, "if Government would treat wet wells more liberally, the effects of a dry season would not be so severely felt by the ryot." Government in their order quoted above desired to have the views of the Collector, the Director of Revenue Settlement, and the Board of Revenue placed before them in greater detail regarding the question raised by the Collector. Mr. Horsley in conforming to the above requisition has also stated his views in regard to the revision of tank ayacuts, he being of opinion that the increase in the number of wells depends on the extension of tank ayacuts, and Mr. Randall has followed him at considerable length in discussing this question. As, however, the matter was finally disposed of in the Proceedings of Government, dated 29th November 1872, No. 1,628, approving the rules framed by the Board for the guidance of officers engaged in the revision of tank ayacuts, and no necessity has been shown for a modification of the instructions then issued, it does not appear necessary for the Board to say more on this occasion than that they approve the proposals of the Acting Director at paragraph 17. The revision of ayacuts must be carried out on the principles enunciated by the Board and Government, and the Collector is not at liberty to ignore the rules by directing transfers at will. Caution should be exercised in proposing extensions of ayacuts, but the proposals must then be examined with reference to the rules, and must not be arbitrarily set aside. The Deputy Director's proposals for Proddatur, Jamalanadugu, and Cuddapah will be allowed to stand subject to any modification that may be deemed necessary on appeal.

3. Turning to the question as to whether, under existing rules, Mr. Horsley has grounds for his assertion that the owners of wet wells, i. e., wells dug in irrigated land, are not treated with a sufficient amount of liberality, the Board observe that up to a quarter of a century ago if a ryot dug a well and irrigated crops therefrom he was liable to an enhanced assessment on the land so improved, but in 1852 under the orders of the Court of Directors this most unfair impost was abrogated, and the ryots received distinct assurances that in future they were to have the full benefit of their own improvements. To guard, however, against abuses, and to protect the

rights of the State in existing sources of irrigation, rules\* were framed under the authority of Government restricting the privilege in certain cases. The first of these rules is—

"That if cases should arise when it is manifest that a well dug at a ryot's expense has drawn away water from a previously existing Government work, in such instance such well land shall not be wholly exempted from assessment, but a fair and equitable extra cess water-rate may be imposed."

4. It is this "fair and equitable extra cess water-rate" to which Mr. Horsley takes exception. If the principle involved in the rule is sound, viz., that where a well derives its supply wholly or in part from a source of irrigation which was in existence previous to the construction of the well, then undoubtedly wells dug in wet lands are liable to the extra cess, inasmuch as many of them derive their supply by surface flow from the work which irrigates their site, whilst it may be asserted of all that they are fed from the same source by percolation. Not to impose some charge in the case of irrigation from these wells would be an act of one-sided liberality, inasmuch as they tend greatly to check the surface flow to the lands situated at a distance from the

irrigating source, and if, as is often the case, they are excavated on the borders of irrigated lands and the water is used to irrigate dry lands the supply to which the lower lands within the registered ayacut have a prior claim is unfairly intercepted.

5. Mr. Randall points out that, although no allusion is made by Mr. Horsley to any previous correspondence bearing on the subject, it has been discussed on previous occasions, and that the Board have deliberately declined to recommend any modification of the rules with the view of exempting from charge irrigation from wells in wet lands, it being "an indisputable fact that such wells are generally made because their position with regard to the tank assures them a good supply of water, whilst it is almost impossible to discover whether the water for a second crop has been drawn directly from the tank by channels or indirectly by means of wells"—*Vide* Board's Proceedings, dated 28th October 1872, No. 2,037. The subject was again discussed at some length in the papers recorded in Board's Proceedings, dated 23rd October 1873, No. 2,169, and the Board affirmed the principles already enunciated in the existing rules. Copies of these papers will now be submitted to Government; the Board adhere to the views expressed therein, and see no reason for the enormous sacrifice of revenue which would result from compliance with Mr. Horsley's recommendation that all wells beyond the limit of distance from the tank bund which is now applicable only to wells sunk in dry land, should be free to "irrigate wet or dry or second crop on wet or dry land without payment of water-rate or second crop assessment."

6. Although there is no necessity for any exemption such as that proposed however, Mr. Randall suggests more liberal treatment of second crop irrigation on wet lands at settlement, and further points out that the existing charge of one-fourth of the wet assessment when a second crop is raised partly by water from private wells was expressly sanctioned only pending the introduction of the new settlement, *vide* G.O., dated 12th June 1872, No. 928, and that definite orders are now required regarding the charge to be imposed subsequent to Settlement. Under the new Settlement composition for second crop charge, when the irrigation is precarious, is allowed at one-third and one-fourth of the first crop charge. Mr. Randall proposes to add a one-fifth rate and to apply the several rates ordinarily as follows: the one-third rate to irrigation from tanks when the supply is precarious, the one-fourth rate to irrigation partly from tanks and partly from wells, the one-fifth rate to cases in which the supply is mainly dependent upon wells. Wherever the supply from any source to different parts of the ayacut varies considerably it will be treated by blocks.

The above rates are to be applied in cases of composition, and Mr. Randall proposes that when the ryots do not consent to compound the second crop charge should be fixed at one-half, one-third, and one-fourth the first crop assessment in the cases noted above respectively according to the several degrees of certainty of supply.

He further proposes to dispense with the minimum charge of one Rupee per acre prescribed for Trichinopoly and subsequently extended to Salem so as to admit

of the above terms being offered to the lower classed lands, the area of which, however, is stated to be limited, and to restrict the abatement of one-fourth for lift to cases in which the irrigation is solely by lift, withholding the concession when the supply is obtained partly by flow and partly by lift.

G.O., dated 5th April 1864, No. 577.



7. These proposals appear to the Board as liberal as the circumstances justify, and they recommend their acceptance. The nature of the supply will be noted and recorded by the Settlement Officer and the charge adjusted accordingly.

8. The attention of the Collector is called to the concluding paragraph of Mr. Rundall's letter in which he shows good ground apparently for questioning the accuracy of the tank supply registers maintained by the Village Officers. The Collector should investigate the cases brought to notice and issue such orders as will ensure greater attention being paid to this important matter.

(True Copies and Extract.)

*C. A. Galton*  
Acting Secretary

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,

with twenty-seven original enclosures to be returned, and copies of

Board's Proceedings, dated 28th October 1872, No. 2,087; 23rd

October 1873, No. 2,169; and 13th March 1876, No. 723.

„ the Collector of Cuddapah.

„ the Acting Director of Revenue Settlement.

Ed. A. Grubert.  
Ed. W. J. Lewis.

Wells—in wet lands in Cuddapah District.—  
Submitting to Government views of Board and  
Director of Revenue Settlement regarding culti-  
vation raised by means of —, and recommending  
acceptance of Mr. Rundall's proposals in regard  
to compensation for second crop charges.

No. 2,246.

SEPTEMBER.

PROCEEDINGS, 1st SEPT. 1876, No. 2,246.

BOARD OF REVENUE,  
MADRAS.

1876.

No. 2,269.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 4th September 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 July 1876, No. 2,811-79:—

In continuation of my letter, No. 2,379-58, of the 13th ultimo, I have the honor

\* In original, to be returned. to submit\* a further letter from the Deputy Director of Cuddapah giving cover to a

letter from the Acting Collector of that district, Mr. Gribble, on the subject of the revision of tank ayacuts and the treatment of wet lands irrigated by wells.

2. Mr. Gribble contends that paddy alone should be treated as a wet crop and that raggy when irrigated by a tank or well should still be regarded as a dry crop. I cannot speak for certain as to Cuddapah, but in other districts, when the water-supply is short, raggy is occasionally cultivated on the wet lands in place of paddy, and, therefore, when adjusting the wet ayacut, it is justifiable to deal with the fact whether the land is irrigated or not irrigated, irrespective of the question whether the crop irrigated is always paddy or sometimes raggy instead. Moreover, the irrigation of raggy will be found to generally prevail under the more indifferent sources of irrigation, and a set-off for this is allowed in the grouping, whereby a lower assessment is fixed for such lands than for those under more reliable sources of supply.

3. It is clear from what Mr. Gribble states at paragraph 8 that very considerable revision is urgently needed to the ayacuts of tanks in the subdivision. If the lands are unirrigable as a rule, and therefore waste, it will certainly be requisite to make considerable adjustments to dry, and there is really no foundation for Mr. Gribble's conclusion that the lands will be confirmed as wet and charged "double rate," or double-crop rates I presume. The rules provide equally for the transfer of land from wet to dry as from dry to wet, and such revision is essential.

4. It does not follow that the 17,637 acres referred to as under "Dasabandam Tank Ayacuts only" is relinquished area as stated by Mr. Gribble, for doubtless more or less is immemorial waste. Moreover, the extent does not refer to tanks only, but to channels and wells also. At page 236 of his Manual, to which Mr. Gribble alludes, it is stated that 13,966 acres under Dasabandam tanks were unoccupied in 1278 and 14,713 acres in 1282, and it is therefore inferred there is a tendency to relinquish the wet lands under these tanks. According to Appendix F, however, the area is rendered as 13,946 and 13,713 acres, respectively, and consequently the unoccupied area has not increased, but diminished during the period, and the conclusions drawn are seemingly mistaken.

5. The area unoccupied on the average during the past five years is detailed, and from the fluctuations observable Mr. Gribble repeats his impression that "the general tendency is an increase in the number of acres relinquished, and the mere fact of fluctuation shows, I think, that even now the ayacuts are larger than they should be, and that whenever a good season occurs the ryot at once takes up land which he



relinquishes in the following year." Under tanks there is but little variation save in one year, 1280. The comparison under the different heads is as follows:—

| Items.         | FASLIS. |        | Difference. |
|----------------|---------|--------|-------------|
|                | 1278.   | 1282.  |             |
| Tanks ... ..   | 13,946  | 13,713 | — 233       |
| Channel ... .. | 2,111   | 2,830  | + 719       |
| Wells ... ..   | 1,148   | 1,094  | — 54        |
| Total ...      | 17,205  | 17,637 | + 432       |

The increase is thus confined to the unoccupied area under channels, and it occurred in Fasli 1279. There must have been some special cause for this, as very little of the land then given up has been since occupied.

6. I can but regard Mr. Gribble's further remarks based on the proportion of the total cultivable area that is in occupation as misleading also. According to the statistics given in his Manual the cultivable extent is 3,533,737 acres, and it is

Appendix E, No. 5.

stated that only one-third of this, or 1,225,082 acres, is in occupation. To determine the extent actually in occupation the area held under Inam tenure, 665,975 acres, should be added to the foregoing, making 1,891,057 acres. Half, and not one-third of the total cultivable area of the district, as given in the Manual, may therefore be said to be in occupation. Of the remaining half, probably a good part is not really cultivable, and the bulk of the area may be described as consisting of the poorer and indifferent qualities of soil. The tendency of the settlement is invariably to lower the assessment on the indifferent soils, and hence the new rates applicable to waste lands require, as a rule, to be regarded as more favorable to the extension of occupation than the former, or modified paimash rates which they supersede. In the three taluqs first settled—Jammalamadugu, Proddatur, and Cuddapah—the proportion of the assessed land unoccupied was only 11 per cent., and in the next three taluqs reported on—Budwail, Sidhout, and Pullempet—30 per cent. There is, of course, other land that has never been yet brought under cultivation.

7. As regards the marked tendency to throw uplands, and especially wet land, I append below a statement compiled from the district returns, as to lands relinquished and taken up during the past five years, 1280 to 1284 Fasli:—

|                            | Dry.    | Wet.  | Total.  |
|----------------------------|---------|-------|---------|
| <i>Principal Division.</i> |         |       |         |
| Relinquished ... ..        | 16,278  | 2,337 | 18,615  |
| Taken up ... ..            | 17,080  | 3,063 | 20,143  |
| Difference ...             | + 802   | + 726 | + 1,528 |
| <i>Subdivision.</i>        |         |       |         |
| Relinquished ... ..        | 20,536  | 1,756 | 22,342  |
| Taken up ... ..            | 16,079  | 1,369 | 17,439  |
| Difference ...             | — 4,516 | — 387 | — 4,903 |
| Total, Relinquished ... .. | 36,864  | 4,093 | 40,957  |
| Do. Taken up ... ..        | 33,150  | 4,432 | 37,582  |
| Difference ...             | — 3,714 | + 339 | — 3,375 |

8. As regards the Principal Division of Cuddapah, there has been no decrease either of dry or wet occupation. In the subdivision there has been a falling off of 3,714 acres in dry and 387 acres in wet; but, as the cultivated area exceeds five lakhs of acres, the extent is inconsiderable.

9. The falling off in the wet is the main question that Mr. Gribble raises, and the foregoing details, though they do indicate a slight decrease of 387 acres in the subdivision, can hardly be regarded as supporting the Acting Collector's view of the question.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. H. M. COX, Esq., Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement, Kistna, Karnool, and Cuddapah Districts, to C. RUNDALL, Esq., Director of Revenue Settlement, Madras, dated Cuddapah, 21st June 1876, No. 531-218.

At the Acting Collector's request I have the honor to send you, herewith, a copy of the letter\* which he has written to me with reference to mine to you, dated 19th ultimo,

\* No. 36, dated 10th June 1876.

No. 417-165, on the subject of the revision of ayacuts, &c., in this district, and in doing so beg to make two or three remarks on the same.

2. Paragraph 3.—Mr. Gribble argues that, because in the table of rates adopted by the Irrigation Company, rice is included in the same head as sugar-cane, &c., and charged more than garden raggy, garden korra, &c.; the latter should not be classed as wet. In the Government water-rate table I observe that rice is charged less than sugar-cane, &c., and the same rate (4 Rupees) as that fixed by the Irrigation Company for the garden crops above referred to. I do therefore see the great hardship in this case, particularly when no charge is made for a second crop under wells, which are the sources under which these crops are generally grown.

3. Paragraph 4.—The mere puddles of tanks in the subdivision to which Mr. Gribble refers are those the circumstances of which I have already proposed should be considered to see whether they might not be abandoned and the lands under them transferred to dry, in which case, of course, the wells would also not be chargeable.

4. Paragraph 5.—The assertion that the Tirwajasti lands were held by rich and influential ryots was not mine, but Mr. Horsley's (*vide* paragraph 5 of his letter of the 24th February, No. 47, to the Board).

5. Paragraph 6.—I explained in paragraph 14 of my letter why I thought that in this case an exception should be made and the benefit lie on the side of Government. If the benefit were given to the ryot I considered that it might lead to evasion of assessment, and that he was quite able to represent any injustice that might be done while the fact of any extent of ayacut being left waste would at once attract the attention of the Revenue authorities and lead them to make an inquiry into the matter.

6. Paragraph 8.—The figures adduced by Mr. Gribble refer to the subdivision taluqs and as he himself admits in paragraph 9 the circumstances of that part of country are quite different from those of the main division so that his arguments here cannot I think at all apply. I quite expect that the ayacut in the subdivision taluqs will require reduction, their circumstances will, I fancy, be found to be much the same as those of the tanks in the northern taluqs of the North Arcot District, where the features of the country are very similar.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From J. D. B. GRIBBLE, Esq., Acting Collector of Cuddapah, to J. H. M. COX, Esq., Deputy Director of Revenue Settlement, Cuddapah, dated Madanapalli, 10th June 1876, No. 36.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of your letter, No. 417-164, dated 19th ultimo, to the address of the Director, and to thank you for thus affording me an opportunity of making some remarks on points on which I venture to disagree with you.



2. I find that the changes alluded to by you in paragraph 4, which have been made in the proposals for the taluqs of Jammalamadugu and Proddatur, have been made by Mr. Horsley after receipt of a cultivation statement for ten years, showing the actual cultivation of each field. In almost all cases where Mr. Horsley objected to the extension of ayacuts it was found that the fields entered by the Settlement Department as "invariably cultivated with wet crops" had in reality been cultivated with dry crops, such as raggy, korra, horse-gram, and occasionally only paddy. It is, of course, possible that these accounts may be incorrect, but they are supposed to be drawn up from the village accounts, which formed the basis of the annual settlements, and it would be therefore dangerous to impugn their veracity. You will remember one case in which the ten year account signed by the village officials differed considerably from an account drawn up by the Settlement Department, which also was signed by the village officials. The village officials in this case were called upon to explain why they had signed contradictory accounts, and in reply stated that the account given to the Settlement Department was incorrect. This matter is still under inquiry.

3. The gist of the whole matter is what constitutes a "wet crop," and in paragraph 8 of your letter you say garden crops grown with the help of water have been considered by us to all intents and purposes as not *bona fide* dry crops, but I do not agree that therefore they should be charged wet assessment. It is true that there is nothing between, but I think an intermediate rate should be fixed. On turning to the rules for the Irrigation Canal Company I find there are four kinds of crops with three different rates of assessment—

|                                                  |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Crops requiring continuous supply, first crop | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | RS. |
| 2. Do. do. second crop                           | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 6   |

Under this head are included only rice, sugar-cane, betel leaves, cocoanuts, plantains, saffron, and fruit trees.

|                                       |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|---------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 3. Crops requiring frequent floodings | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | RS. |
|                                       | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 4   |

Under this head are classed garden raggy, garden korra, garden onions, chillies, sweet potatoes, tobacco, indigo, and brinjals.

|                                        |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|----------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 4. Crop requiring occasional floodings | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | RS. |
|                                        | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 2   |

field raggy, field korra, field chillies, field tobacco, cotton, grain, and oil seeds. Korra, raggy, and gram pay therefore a considerably lower assessment than rice, but under the system adopted by the Settlement Department they are made to pay exactly the same assessment, and their cultivation brings a field under the head "invariably raises a wet crop." This, I submit, is scarcely just, and it was for this reason that I believe Mr. Horsley made so many objections to the extension of ayacuts in the B Statements.

4. In the case of wells, I admit the difficulty under which the whole question labors. In paragraph 6, you say: "The objections raised to the lands under Doravu, Dasabandam, and Itafak as a rule, be said of all wells, and I have explained both to Mr. Horsley and Mr. Gribble that we have not registered the lands altogether with reference to the crops grown on them, but in consideration of their receiving water from a fairly trustworthy Government source." It seems assessment, whatever be the source it gets its water from. As a matter of fact, however, these wells depend very little upon the tanks below which they stand. During this year numberless cases came to my notice during the settlement of the Voilpad Taluq, in which a tank had received absolutely no water whatsoever, but yet a large portion of the ayacut raised wet crops from the wells. In other cases, long after the tanks had run dry, the irrigation was continued from the wells and the crop raised. There are, in the district, to my certain knowledge, 46,904 wells, and there may be many more, of which I have not been informed. I am not quite prepared to endorse the statement that wells do not and cannot grow a crop of paddy, but I am confident that in thousands of acres which now grow paddy, and pay a wet assessment to Government, a wet

crop would not be raised were it not for the wells. These wells are, for the most part, situated in the valleys where the tanks also lie, and it is often urged that, because they are in the midst of wet cultivation, they must gain a certain supply of water owing to the percolation from the irrigated fields around them, and therefore they should pay a wet assessment, since the water which percolates is from a Government source. This is partly, but not entirely true. The wells are dug in the drainage basins for the same reason that the tanks are built there, because water is available, but they are also dug there so as to prove a help to the Government tanks when their supply runs short. As long as the tank is full and the fields around are irrigated, some water no doubt percolates into the well, but what is to be said when in a year like this the tank is empty and the well is full. This is especially of importance in the subdivision taluqs (to which the settlement has not yet come) where there is an immense number of tanks (4,291), the majority of which are mere puddles, out of which the water speedily evaporates, but which nevertheless succeed in raising a small wet crop, in consequence of the aid given by the well. As far as I understand, what Mr. Horsley maintained (there I fully agree with him) was that if, when it is found that these wells have raised wet crops (which seem to include almost every crop which requires water) in lands beyond their registered ayacut, these lands are classed and charged as wet, it will be unjust. At present such lands pay a dry rate, say, 1 Rupee plus Tirwajasti rate Rupees 3 or 4 minus one-fourth for lift, when classed as wet they will have to pay double. At present it is not usual to allow remission for ayacut lands left waste, if Tirwajasti lands are cultivated unless good reason can be shown, so that I do not think that the Government lose much by the present arrangement, which, though it gives additional labor to the settling officer, is in my opinion more just to the ryot.

5. I am not quite prepared to say that the ayacut lands are usually held by the poor ryots, and the Tirwajasti lands by the rich and influential ones (paragraph 13 of your letter), often the reverse is the case; were it so, when these Tirwajasti lands are classed as wet, the state of things would be no different than it has been hitherto, and there could be no reason for the "other ryots to call out or relinquish their lands for want of water," for they would be no worse off than they were before. If, however, the effect of increasing the ayacuts should be to cause ryots to relinquish their lands, it is clear that the wet ayacuts will have been increased beyond their capacity of supply. You state, however, (paragraph 13) "an inquiry might then be made into the matter and the necessary changes carried out." This is true, but such an inquiry would in reality be doing the whole work over again, for here we have to deal with 46,904 wells and 4,972 tanks.

6. I see that there are many difficulties in the way of a scientific measurement of the capacity of each tank, but this I feel sure is the only true way of settling the question. I venture to differ from you (paragraph 14) that "there must and will be errors of judgment, and where this is the case, it seems preferable in instances like these that the benefit should not be altogether on the side of the ryot." It is, of course, a dangerous thing to lay down a sweeping rule, but, if one is to be laid down, I am inclined to exactly the opposite, viz., that in all cases of doubt or error the benefit should be given to the ryot.

7. It is, of course, quite possible, as you say in paragraphs 17 and 18, that the rain accounts are not always quite trustworthy. In the instances you cite they may have been incorrect, but I can confidentially affirm that since I have been in the district, I have seen numberless cases exactly similar to those cited by Mr. Horsley, where I have, with my own eyes, seen the tank empty and the crops watered solely from the wells.

8. Regarding the general question of decreasing instead of increasing the ayacuts, I would cite one example, which will, I think, bear out Mr. Horsley's opinion that they should not be increased. I allude to the tabular statement quoted on page 236 of my Manual, which shows that out of Dasabandam tank ayacuts only in the subdivision 17,637 acres, assessed at Rupees 88,231, have been relinquished and are now lying waste for want of water. Under many of these tanks there are wells which supply water to dry lands, and pay a small rate of from 4 to 5 Rupees. These lands will now probably be classed as wet and be charged double rate, and the ayacuts already partly relinquished will be nominally increased. Again, I would beg you to refer to Appendix F



on page 331 of my Manual, which shows the actual number of unoccupied acres under Dasabandam tanks, channels, and wells in the subdivision for each of five faslis ending with Fasli 1282.

The figures stand thus:—

| Fasli.     | Number of Acres. |
|------------|------------------|
| 1278... .. | 17,205           |
| 1279... .. | 17,319           |
| 1280... .. | 15,861           |
| 1281... .. | 17,219           |
| 1282... .. | 17,637           |

These figures show a considerable fluctuation specially under tanks, for the figures under channels and wells are very nearly the same for each year. The general tendency, however, is an increase in the number of acres relinquished, and the mere fact of fluctuation shows, I think, that even now the ayacuts are larger than they should be, and that whenever a good season occurs, the ryot at once takes up land, which he relinquishes in the following year. This question of unoccupied land is one of grave importance. Out of 3,533,737 acres of land fit for cultivation in the district only 1,225,082 are cultivated, and only one-third of the total area is in occupation. I cannot think that a settlement, the tendency of which is to increase the assessment, is one calculated to render the cultivation of these waste acres more practicable. It is true that the new rates are lower than those of Munro's pynaish, but it must be remembered that after these pynaish rates had been in force for sixteen years, and the country was almost ruined by them. Sir Thomas Munro himself reduced them by 25 and 33 per cent. The present settlement, however, though showing a less total assessment than the old pynaish, shows a considerably higher settlement than the one introduced by Sir Thomas Munro when he reduced his own rates by 25 and 33 per cent., and this after the price of labor, production, living, and everything else has enormously increased. It is true that the ryot profits from the increased price of grain, but he gains a profit only on the grain he sows, whilst he has to pay an increased rate for twenty different other things. The great test of a just settlement must be a rise in the selling price of land and the bringing under cultivation of waste lands. At present there is, as I have shown, a marked tendency to throw up lands, and the monthly statements of sales of land show that the selling price of land is very low, and that the arrears of a year's kist are seldom realized by the sale of a field.

9. I feel that some apology is due for citing subdivisions figure regarding a question which has arisen in the main division, since the circumstances of the subdivision are so different. The settlement, however, will soon come to the subdivision, and the principle once established, it will, I presume, be carried out throughout the district. Mr. Horsley's objections to the increase of ayacuts were founded on a long experience in the district and an intimate knowledge of almost every village and tank. My objections are not backed by such an experience as his, but they are founded on some local knowledge and many inquiries, and have been formed independently of Mr. Horsley's. These objections have, therefore, some claim to consideration, and, though I scarcely dare hope that they will carry the day, I would earnestly ask that the whole matter may be reconsidered before any step is taken, which may result in an increase of the ayacuts especially in the subdivision.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. H. M. COX,  
Dy. Director of Revenue Settlement.

SUBMITTED to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings, dated 1st September 1876, No. 2,246.

2. The Board see no necessity for modifying the views already expressed in the Proceedings quoted above. With reference to the remarks of Mr. Gribble on the manner in which the revision of tank ayacuts is being conducted, the Board consider that the determination of the area to be classified as "Wet" and "Dry" must

depend upon the extent to which water can ordinarily be supplied, not on the nature of the crop raised. This principle was enunciated by the Board after full discussion and approved in G.O., dated 29th November 1872, No. 1,628.

(True Copies and Extract.)

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

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

„ the Director of Revenue Settlement, with two enclosures returned.

Copy to the Collector of Cuddapah.

Ed. A. Gruberl.



Revenue Department.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue  
Dated 4<sup>th</sup> September 1876.

Read the following

2811  
79

From

C. Randall Esquire

By Director of Revenue Settlements

To

C. S. Walton Esquire

Agent to the Board of Revenue

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No. 2377-

In original to  
has returned

of the 13<sup>th</sup> ultimo, I have the honor to sub-

mit a further letter from the Deputy Director

of Madras, giving over to a letter from

the Acting Collector of that District

Mr. Gribble, on the subject of the revision

of tank ayakuts and the treatment of well

lands irrigated by wells.

2. Mr. Gribble contends that Paddy should

be treated as a wet crop, and that

Ragi when irrigated by a tank or well

1876.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 4TH SEPTEMBER 1876, No. 2,269.

Encl.

Received

SEPTEMBER.

No. 2,269.

Revision of tank ayakuts and treatment of well  
lands irrigated by wells—in Cuddalore District.—  
Submitting to Government, with Board's views,  
further report from Director of Revenue Settle-  
ment on subject of —.



should still be regarded as a dry crop. I cannot  
speak for certain as to Suodapak, but in  
other Districts, when the water supply is short,  
Ragi is occasionally cultivated in the wet  
lands in place of Paddy, and therefore  
when adjusting the wet Ayakat it is just-  
ified to deal with the fact whether the  
land is irrigated or not irrigated, irrespective  
of the question whether the crop irrigated  
is always Paddy or sometimes Ragi instead.  
Moreover, the irrigation of Ragi will  
be found to generally prevail under the  
more indifferent sources of irrigation,  
and a set off for this is allowed in  
the grouping, whereby a lower assessment  
is fixed for such land, than for those  
under more reliable sources of supply.

It is clear from what Mr Gribble

88  
states at para 8, that very considerable  
revision is urgently needed to the Ayakat  
of Panks in the sub-division. If the lands  
are unirrigable as a rule, and therefore  
waste, it will certainly be requisite  
to make considerable adjustments to  
Dry, and there is really no foundation for  
Mr. Gribble's conclusion that the lands  
will be confirmed as wet and charged  
"double rate" or double crop rates, I pre-  
sume. The rules provide, equally for the  
transfer of land from Wet to Dry, as from  
Dry to Wet, and such revision is essential.

4. It does not follow that the 17637  
Acres referred to as under "Dasabandam  
Lack Ayakat only" is relinquished area  
as stated by Mr Gribble, for doubtless

more



more or less is immemorial waste. Moreover,  
the extent does not refer to banks only, but  
to channels and wells also. At page 236  
of his Manual, to which Mr. Gribble  
alludes, it is stated that 13966 acres  
under Darabandam banks were unoccupied  
in 1278, and 14713 acres in 1282; and it is there-  
fore inferred there is a tendency to retri-  
bute the wet lands under these banks.  
According to appendix F, however the area  
is rendered as 13946 and 13713 acres respectively;  
and consequently the unoccupied area has not  
increased but diminished during the period,  
and the conclusions drawn are seemingly  
mistaken.

5. The area unoccupied on the average  
during the past five years is detailed,  
and

x Copy of the  
Manual  
at Coty.

39  
and from the fluctuations observable. Mr.  
Gribble repeats his impression that "the  
general tendency is an increase in the  
number of acres relinquished, and the mere  
fact of fluctuation shows, I think, -  
that even now the Akayats are larger  
than they should be, and that whenever  
a good season occurs, the ryot at once  
takes up land which he relinquishes in the  
following year." Under banks there is but  
little variation save in one year 1280.  
comparison under the different heads is  
as follows

| Items   | Acre  |       | Differ.<br>= Acres |
|---------|-------|-------|--------------------|
|         | 1278  | 1282  |                    |
| Banks   | 13946 | 13713 | - 233              |
| Channel | 2111  | 2830  | + 719              |
| Wells   | 1148  | 1094  | - 54               |
|         | 17205 | 17637 | + 432              |

The



The increase is thus confined to the unoccupied areas under channels and it occurred in fash 1279. There must have been some special cause for this, as very little of the land then given up has been since occupied.

16. I can but regard Mr. Spiller's further remarks based on the proportion of the total cultivable area that is in occupation as misleading also. According to the statistics given in his Manual Appendix E. No. 5 the cultivable extent is 2533737 acres, and it is stated that only one third of this, or 1225082 acres is in occupation. To determine the extent actually in occupation the area held under Guam Revenue 665975 acres, should be added to the foregoing making 1891057 acres. Half

40  
and not one third of the total cultivable area of the District, as given in the Manual, may therefore be said to be in occupation. Of the remaining half, probably a good part is not really cultivable, and the bulk of the area may be described as consisting of the poorer and indifferent qualities of soil. The tendency of the settlement is invariably to lower the assessment on the indifferent soils, and hence the new rates applicable to waste lands, require, as a rule, to be regarded as more favorable to the extension of occupation than the former, or modified fairmarket rates which they supersede. In the three Taluqs first settled. Jammalamadugu, Poodakur, and



and Cuddapah - the proportion of the  
 a-peared land unoccupied was only 11 per  
 cent; and in the next three Taluqs reported  
 on. Budwail, Sidhouth and Pallampett -  
 30 per cent. There is of course other land  
 that has never been yet brought under  
 cultivation.

As regards the marked tendency to  
 throw up land, and especially wet land, I  
 append below a statement compiled from  
 the District returns, as to lands relinquished  
 and taken up during the past five years  
 1280 to 1284 fuch.

|                           | Dry   | Wet  | Total |
|---------------------------|-------|------|-------|
| <u>Principal Division</u> |       |      |       |
| Relinquished              | 16278 | 2337 | 18615 |
| Taken up                  | 17080 | 3063 | 20143 |
| Difference                | +802  | +726 | +1528 |
| <u>Sub-Division</u>       |       |      |       |
| Relinquished              | 20586 | 1756 | 22342 |
| Taken up                  | 16070 | 1369 | 17439 |
| Difference                | -4516 | -387 | -4903 |
| <u>Total</u>              |       |      |       |
| Relinquished              | 36864 | 4093 | 40957 |
| Taken up                  | 33150 | 4432 | 37582 |
| Difference                | -3714 | +339 | -3375 |

8. As regards the Principal Division of  
 Cuddapah there has been no decrease  
 either of Dry or wet occupation. In the  
 sub-division there has been a falling  
 off of 3714 acres in dry and 387 acres in  
 wet; but as the cultivated area exceeds  
 5 laes of acres, the extent is inconsider-  
 -able

9. The falling off in the wet is the  
 main question that Mr. Spibille raises  
 and the foregoing details, though they  
 do indicate a slight decrease of 387  
 Acres in the subdivision, can hardly  
 be regarded as supporting the Acting  
 Collector's view of the question.

Revenue Settlement Office - Madras. } I have &c  
 15 July 1876 } Signed/ C. Randall  
 By Director of  
 Revenue Settlement  
 Enclosure



Enclosures

From

N<sup>o</sup> 36

J. D. B. Gribble Esquire

Ag Collector of Cuddapah

To

J. W. M. Cox Esquire

Secy Director of Revenue Settlement  
Cuddapah

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of your letter N<sup>o</sup> 417, dated 2<sup>nd</sup> June 1876, <sup>Received with the Dy. Dir's letter N<sup>o</sup> 465 247</sup>

ultimus to the address of the Director and to thank you for thus affording me an opportunity of making some remarks on points on which I venture to disagree with you.

2. I find that the changes alluded to by you in para 4, which have been made in the proposals for the Taluqs of Jammalamadign & Proddatur, have been made by Mr. Horsley after receipt of a cultivation statement for 10 years

showing the actual cultivation of each field. In almost all cases where Mr. Horsley objected to the extension of Aya kuts, it was found that the fields entered by the Settlement Department as "invariably cultivated with wet crops" had, in reality, been cultivated with dry crops such as raggy, corra, horsegram, and occasionally only paddy. It is of course possible that these accounts may be incorrect, but they are supposed to be drawn up from the village accounts, which formed the basis of the annual settlements, & it would be therefore, dangerous to impugn their veracity. You will remember one case in which the 10 years Accounts signed by the village



village officials differed considerably from an account drawn up by the Settlement Department, which also was signed by the village officials. The village officials in this case were called upon to explain why they had signed contradictory accounts, and in reply stated that the account given to the Settlement Department was incorrect.

This matter is still under enquiry.

3. The gist of the whole matter is what constitutes a "wet crop" and in para 8 of

2 Your letter you say garden crops grown with the help of water have been inconsiderately, as to all interests and purposes as not bona fide dry crops, but I cannot agree that therefore they should be charged wet assessment. It

is true that there is nothing between, but I think an intermediate rate should be fixed. On turning to the rules for the Irrigation Canal Company, I find there are four kinds of crops with three different kinds of crops and three different rates of assessment.

1 Crops requiring continuous supply <sup>R. and</sup> 1st class 6-0-0  
2. " " " " 2nd class 4-0-0

under this head are included only Rice, Sugar cane, Betel leaves, Cocoanuts, plantains, Saffron, and fruit trees.

3. Crops requiring frequent floodings — 4 Rupas. Under this head are classed garden raggy, garden, korra, garden onions, chillies, sweet potatoes, Tobacco, Indigo, and Brinjals.

4. Crop requiring occasional floodings — 2-0-0. Field raggy, field korra, field chillies, field Tobacco, Cotton, grain, and oil seeds. Korra Raggy and gram pay therefore a considerably lower assessment than rice, but under the system



system adopted by the Settlement Department,  
they are made to pay exactly the same as  
a peasant and their cultivation brings a  
field under the head invariably raises a  
"wet crop". This I submit is scarcely just,  
and it was for this reason that I believe  
Mr. Horsley made so many objections  
to the extension of Agents in the B. Statements.  
In the case of wells, I admit the diffi-  
culty under which the whole question  
labours. In para 16, you say "The objections  
raised to the lands under Doruvu, Dasa-  
bandam, and Itifak wells being classed  
as W.A., is that they do not and cannot  
grow wet crops, i.e. Paddy. This may, as  
a rule, be said of all wells, and I have  
explained both to Mr. Horsley and Mr  
Gibbels that we have not registered

the

64  
the lands altogether with reference to the  
crops grown on them, but in consideration  
of their receiving water from a fairly  
trustworthy Government source". It seems  
to me that if a well "does not and  
cannot grow" a wet crop it is unjust  
to make it pay a full wet assessment  
whatever be the source it gets its  
water from. As a matter of fact however,  
these wells depend very little upon the  
banks below which they stand. During  
this year numberless cases came to my  
notice during the settlement of the Vailpand  
Taluk, in which a bank received absolutely  
no water whatsoever, but yet a large  
portion of the Agent raised wet crops  
from the wells. In other cases long after  
the banks had run dry, the irrigation  
was



was continued from the Wells and the crop  
raised. There are, in the District, to my certain  
knowledge 46904 wells and there may be  
many more, of which I have not been  
informed. I am not quite prepared to  
endorse the statement that wells do not  
and cannot grow a crop of paddy but I  
am confident that in thousands of  
Acres, which now grow paddy, & pay a wet  
assessment to Government, a wet crop  
would not be raised, were it not for the  
wells. These wells are, for the most part,  
situated in the valleys where the Tanks  
also lie, and it is often urged that  
because they are in the midst of wet  
cultivation, they must gain a certain  
supply of water owing to the percolation  
from the irrigated fields around them,  
and therefore they should pay a wet assessment  
since

45  
since the water which percolates is from  
a Government source. This is partly, but  
not entirely true. The wells are dug in the  
drainage basins for the same reason that  
the Tanks are built there, because water  
is available, but they are also dug there so  
as to prove a help to the Government Tanks  
when their supply runs short. As long  
as the Tank is full and the fields around  
are irrigated, some water no doubt percolates  
into the well, but what is to be said,  
when in a year like this the Tank is  
empty, and the well is full. This is  
especially of importance in the sub-  
-division Bahags (to which the settlement  
has not yet come) where there is an  
immense number of tanks (4291) the  
majority of which are mere puddles,  
out of which the water speedily  
evaporates.



evaporates, but which nevertheless succeed  
in raising a small wet crop, in consequence  
of the aid given by the well. As far as  
I understand, what Mr. Horsley main-  
tained (there I fully agree with him)  
was that if, where it is found, that  
these wells have raised wet crops,  
(which seem to include almost every  
crop which requires water) in lands  
beyond them registered Ayaunt, these  
lands are classed and charged as wet,  
it will be unjust. At present such  
lands pay a dry rate, say 1 Rupee,  
plus Dirwajasti rate Rs 3 or 4 minus  $\frac{1}{4}$   
for lift; when classed as wet they will  
have to pay double. At present it is  
not usual to allow remission for Ayaunt  
lands left waste, if Dirwajasti lands

are cultivated unless good reason can be  
shown, so that I do not think that the  
Government lose much by the present  
arrangement, which though it gives  
additional labor to the settling officer  
is in my opinion more just to the ryot-  
5. I am not quite prepared to say  
that the Ayaunt lands are usually  
held by the poor ryots, and the Dirwa-  
jasti lands by the rich and influential  
ones (para 13 of your letter) often the  
reverse is the case; were it so, when  
these Dirwajasti lands are classed  
as wet, the state of things would be  
no different than it has been hitherto,  
and there could be no reason for the  
other ryots to call out or relinquish their  
lands for want of water for they would

be



be no worse off than they were before.  
If however the effect of increasing the  
Agents should be to cause ryots to relin-  
quish their lands, it is clear that the  
West Agents will have been increased  
beyond their capacity of supply. You state  
however (para 13) "an inquiry might then  
be made into the matter and the necessary  
changes carried out". This is true but such  
an inquiry would in reality be doing  
the whole work over again, for, here  
we have to deal with 46904 wells  
and 4942 tanks.

b. I see that there are many diffi-  
culties in the way of a scientific  
measurement of the Capacity of each  
Tank, but this I feel sure is the only  
true

47  
true way of settling the question. I am  
sure to differ from you (para 14) that  
"there must and will be errors of judg-  
ment, and where this is the case, it  
seems preferable in instances like these  
that the benefit should not be altogether  
on the side of the ryot". It is of course  
a dangerous thing to lay down a sweeping  
rule but if one is to be laid down I am  
inclined to exactly the opposite; viz that  
in all cases of doubt or error, the benefit  
should be given to the ryot.

7. It is of course quite possible, as you  
say in paras 17 & 18, that the rain accounts  
are not always quite trustworthy. In  
the instances you cite they may have  
been incorrect, but I am confidently  
affirm that since I have been in the  
District, I have seen numberless cases  
exactly



exactly similar to those cited by Mr. Horsley, where I have, with my own eyes, seen the Tank empty, and the crops watered solely from the Wells.

8. Regarding the general question of decreasing instead of increasing the Agents, I would cite one example, which will I think bear out Mr. Horsley's opinion that they should not be increased. I allude to the tabular statement quoted on page 236 of my Manual, which shows that out of Dasabandham Tank Agents only in the Sub-Division 17637 acres assessed at Rs 88231 have been relinquished and are now lying waste for want of water. Under many of these Tanks there are wells which supply water to dry lands, and pay a small rate of

48  
of from 4 to 5 Rupees. These lands will now probably be classed as Wet & be charged double rate and the Agents already partly relinquished will be nominally increased. Again I would beg you to refer to Appendix B on page 331 of my Manual, which shows the actual number of unoccupied acres under Dasabandham Tanks, channels, and wells in the subdivision for each of five years ending with Hary 1282.

| The figures stand thus | Hary | No of Acres |
|------------------------|------|-------------|
| 1278                   | —    | 87,205      |
| 1279                   | —    | 117,319     |
| 1280                   | —    | 15,861      |
| 1281                   | —    | 17,219      |
| 1282                   | —    | 17,637      |

These figures show a considerable fluctuation specially under Tanks, for the figures under Channels & Wells are very nearly the same for each year. The general tendency however is an increase in the number of acres relinquished



and the mere fact of fluctuation shows, I think, that even now the Ryots are larger than they should be, and that whenever a good season occurs, the ryot at once takes up land which he relinquishes in the following year. This question of unoccupied land is one of grave importance. Out of 3533737 Acres of land fit for cultivation in the District only 1225082 are cultivated, and only one third of the total area is in occupation. I cannot think that a settlement, the tendency of which is to increase the apportionment is one calculated to render the cultivation of these Waste Acres more practicable. It is true that the new rates are lower than those of Munro's Rywaih, but it must be remembered that after these Rywaih rates had been in force for 16 years, & the country

was almost ruined by them - Sir Thomas Munro himself reduced them by 25 and 33 per cent. The present settlement, however, though showing a less total apportionment than the old Rywaih, shows a considerably higher settlement than the one introduced by Sir Thomas Munro when he reduced his own rates by 25 and 33 per cent, and this after the price of labour, production living and everything else has enormously increased. It is true that the ryot profits from the increased price of grain, but he gains or profits only on the grain he sows, whilst he has to pay an increased rate for twenty different other things. The great test of a just settlement must be a rise in the selling price of land & the bringing under cultivation of waste lands. At present there is, as I have shown, a marked tendency



to throw up land, and the monthly statements of sales of land show that the selling price of land is very low, and that the arrears of a year's rent are seldom realized by the sale of a field.

9. I feel that some apology is due for giving subdivisions figures regarding a question which has arisen in the main Division, since the circumstances of the subdivision are so different. The settlement, however, will soon come to the Sub-Division, and the principle once established, it will I presume be carried out throughout the District.

Mr. Horsley's objections to the increase of Agents were founded on a long experience in the District, and an intimate knowledge of almost every village & tank.

My

50  
My objections are not backed by such an experience as his, but they are founded on some local knowledge, and many inquiries, and have been formed independently of Mr. Horsley's. These objections have therefore some claim to consideration, and though I scarcely

dare hope that they will carry the day, I would earnestly ask that the whole matter may be reconsidered before any step is taken, which may result in an increase of the Agents especially in the

sub-division. I have the  
Cuddapah Collector's Office } 14/3 Mr. Ramaswamy  
at Madanapalle 10 June 1870 } Dy. Collr. for Collector.

Rev. Sett. Office } True Copy  
Cuddapah } 14/3 J. H. M. Cox  
June 1870 } Dy. Dir. Rev. Sett

From J. H. M. Cox Esqre } No 531  
Dy Director of Rev. Settlement - } 218  
Do C. Randall Esquire }  
Director of Revenue Settlement Madras }  
Hishna, Huruol  
Cuddapah Dist.



Sir,  
At the Acting Collector's request I  
have the honor to send you herewith a copy  
of the letter which he has written to me with  
reference to mine to you dated 19<sup>th</sup> ultimo, No 36 of 10<sup>th</sup> June 1876  
on the subject of the Revision of Mr. Bryant's  
in this District and in doing so beg to make  
two or three remarks on the same.

2. Mr. Gribble argues that because in the  
table of rates adopted by the Irrigation Company,  
Rice is included in the same head as Sugar cane &  
and charged more than garden Ruggi, garden  
Korma & the latter should not be classed  
as Mat. In the Government water rate  
table I observe that Rice is charged  
less than sugar cane & the same rate  
(4 Rs) as that fixed by the Irrigation Com-  
pany for the garden crops above referred to,  
I do not therefore see the great hardship  
in

Para 4.

in this case particularly when no charge is  
made for a second crop under wells which are  
the sources under which these crops are generally  
grown.

3. The mere puddles of banks in the sub-  
division to which Mr. Gribble refers are those  
the circumstances of which I have already  
proposed should be considered to see whether  
they might not be abandoned and the land  
under them transferred to Dry in which case  
of course the Wells would also not be charge-  
able.

Para 5.

4. The assertion that the Tirwajasti lands  
were held by rich and influential ryots was  
not mine but Mr. Horsley's vide para  
5, of his letter of the 24<sup>th</sup> February No 47 to  
the Board.

Para 6.

5. I explained in para 14 of my letter why  
I



I thought that in this case an exception should be made and the benefit lie on the side of Government. If the benefit were given to the ryots I considered that it might lead to evasion of a payment & that he was quite able to represent any injustice that might be done while the fact of any extent of Agency being left waste would at once attract the attention of the Revenue Authorities and lead them to make an inquiry into the matter.

6. The figures adduced by Mr. Gribble refer to the sub-division Taluqs and as he himself admits in para 9 the circumstances of that part of country are quite different from those of the main Division so that his arguments here cannot I think at all apply

apply. I quite expect that the Agency in the sub-division Taluqs will require reduction, their circumstances will I fancy be found to be much the same as those of the Taluqs in the northern Taluqs of the North Arcot District where the features of the country are very similar.

I have to  
Revenue Settlement Mr J. M. M. Cox.  
Officer - Cuddapah } By Dir. of Rev. Settlement  
2<sup>nd</sup> June 1876.

Submitted to Government in conformity  
of Board's Proceedings dated 1<sup>st</sup> September  
1876, No. 2246.

2. The Board see no necessity for modifying the views already expressed in the proceedings quoted above. With reference to the remarks of Mr. Gribble on the manner in which the revision of Tank Agency is being conducted; the Board consider that the determination



53  
determination of the area to be classified  
as "wet" and "dry" must depend upon the extent  
to which water can ordinarily be supplied, not  
on the nature of the crop raised. This principle  
was enunciated by the Board after full  
discussion and approved in G. O. dated 29th Novem-  
ber 1872, No. 1628.

True Copies & Extracts

Wm. L. Galt  
Acting Secretary

To  
The Secretary to Government  
Revenue Department



Board's Proceedings 1876  
1876 Vol 2246 + 3766

Early this year Mr. Horsley  
collecting fund for the  
in a report he submitted  
on the state of the season in  
his district observed that  
if Government would liberally  
with wells & give liberally  
the effects of a dry season  
would not be so severely  
felt by the ryot as it was  
then, the Government desired  
to have the views of the  
Collector, the Director of  
Revenue Settlements &  
the Board of Revenue placed  
before them in greater detail  
regarding  
the question raised by the  
Collector. Mr. Horsley has  
accordingly stated his views  
fully in his letter recorded  
in Board's Proceedings  
13 March 1876 & 1872 state following  
effect.  
The tanks were originally

20 10 January 1876 No 32

40 29 07

17 12 1876

21 3 1876

Proceedings of the

Board of Revenue

Dated 4<sup>th</sup>

Sept 4<sup>th</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> December 1876

Dec 14<sup>th</sup>

1876-6-77

Submitting report with

from Director of Revenue

Settlements submitting

Further report on the

subject of the revision of

the Land Revenue & the

treatment of wet lands

irrigated by wells

1876-77

No 329

1876-77

1876-77

1876-77



the capacity shown in the accounts. A fair man that took at one time did hold water sufficient for the cultivation of his ayakut, for 4 months, but no tank holds how the water with which it is credited. Tanks naturally fill up & the process is very often accelerated by tank bed cultivation which is very difficult to check.

The result is that ~~the tanks~~ <sup>tanks</sup> unless they fill two or three times in the year, the water they receive is insufficient for the cultivation of their ayakuts.

The ayakuts have thus become too large for the tanks: but this is made still larger by the practice which prevails in the district of drawing water from the tanks for dry lands to the detriment of their cultivation under the original ayakut, even when water

is not thus obtained, water rate raised in Pussahs for

This is more than doubtful. Ploughy earth already in the tanks can scarce afford to the tank & crops don't grow till - But growth of crops prevents any currents & fresh water

+ the area registered as capable of irrigation by the tanks.

The diminishing of the tanks is in relation to the tanks, fact that the tanks are diminishing in number & the distance from the tanks to the ayakut is increasing.

deepens shallows & shallows deep. The consequence is that the tanks are becoming more and more inadequate.

But does not show that there is no current & current for

The tanks are the natural result of accumulation of small amounts of capital & labour & are not intended to be a permanent source of water. They are a necessary supplement of irrigation & will not be a means of extending cultivation.

88  
water taken in last year is not allowed to be struck <sup>increased as a punishment</sup> up, as the ryots hope in consequence to establish their right to tank water. Thus the accounts shown in the accounts have become unduly large & the settlement department adopt these accounts as a basis & revise the ayakut accordingly, implying thereby that the original ayakut were too small. With the growing abuse of this privilege of water <sup>from the tanks</sup> the decrease in the irrigation capabilities of the tanks from natural & other causes at about 10% planned, there has sprung up a large number of wells which the ryots find it necessary to have, to supplement the supply of water from the tanks which has become gradually more & more inadequate.



These wells have become so  
 important for irrigation  
 purposes that during the  
 last season when many  
 of the tanks were quite  
 empty, the wells were first  
 & supplied enough of water  
 for the entire against culti-  
 vation in many places but  
 finally has outwitted an  
 account showing the quantity  
 of water in the tanks, the  
 extent of the against & that  
 cultivated. The correctness  
 of this account, altho' called in  
 question by the Settlement  
 Department in some respects,  
 must generally be admitted;  
 as his rival in his letter  
 appended in the later H.D.  
 Proceedings states that he knows  
 by his own personal observation  
 that many of the tanks were  
 dry & that his rival helped  
 materially to keep the cul-  
 tivation going as usual. The  
 wells have thus been the means  
 of saving the Government

and saved Government from the  
 whole of the food of  
 the people

I.E. where the well is so  
 near the tank, that its supply  
 depends on that work of the State.

It is a fact that the accounts  
 are correct - at all - as to the  
 fact that the wells are a fact or  
 that the Government is in a  
 position to support the Government.

I am sure that the  
 Government is in a position to  
 support the Government.

from loss; but the Govt. is however  
 placed under great disadvantage  
 as much as he has to  
 spend money in digging &  
 working the well & is further  
 called upon to pay water  
 tax for the wet cultivation  
 or for the wet  
 he may raise on dry land  
 by means of his well & his  
 second crop on one crop land  
 from the same source. But  
 hardly for these reasons re-  
 commend.

1. That the present limit of dis-  
 charge from the tank land may  
 be maintained; all wells  
 beyond that limit should  
 be allowed to irrigate wet  
 or dry or second crop on wet  
 or dry land without payment  
 of water rate or second crop  
 assessment.

2. That the revision of against  
 the Government is approved as present and all of  
 the Government is approved as present and all of  
 the Government is approved as present and all of



collector's letter was sent  
 has submitted a detailed  
 explanation on the points raised.  
 He submits that the execution  
 of the agents is conducted  
 in conformity with the rules  
 sanctioned in 1877 Jan 7 1891  
 that compared with  
 other days & other districts  
 the most important & larger  
 lands are probably as efficient  
 now or more so than formerly.  
 That the safest & most readily as-  
 sessed method of fixing the  
 area of the agent is to fix it  
 out by actual examination  
 of the works & <sup>reference to</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~  
 accounts the ordinary capa-  
 bility of the tanks in the past;  
 that the accounts kept by the  
 be incorrect in some cases cannot  
 as a rule be so; that they are  
 not altogether relied on, as actual  
 inspection of the ponds presents  
 any decision as to the agent  
 extent; the situation of the lands  
 & the nature of the cultivation  
 are generally determining  
 have each tract to be treated as

Board's Proceedings  
 19 Sept. 1898 No 2266

Note  
 This is done in accordance  
 with the rules. It is a  
 common practice to  
 experience that the  
 are found as a rule  
 far beyond the calculation  
 of the works concerned

Mr. Randall

Board's ruling is quoted below.  
 "The Board are of opinion that  
 the Barabundam lands  
 referred to in para 17  
 have rightly been classed  
 as wet, & allowed a deduc-  
 tion of one-fourth of the ad-  
 assessment as compensation  
 for the loss of raising the  
 water."  
 "Mr. Banting is in favor of  
 classing all land under  
 'Doravoo' wells as well  
 as under Itupath wells  
 as wet & allowing a deduc-  
 tion of one fourth assessment  
 for the cost of bailing. As regards  
 the latter, wells, which are  
 situated within the pre-  
 scribed distance of a foot  
 work of irrigation there is no  
 objection to this course. Neither  
 Mr. Banting nor his Deputy explain  
 the terms 'Doravoo' wells, but if, as the  
 Board understand, these also are wells  
 immediately deriving their water supply  
 from a Govt. source of irrigation, the lands  
 under them have been correctly classed as  
 'wet', but if, on the other hand, they are not  
 so situated, then, unless it is quite clear  
 that they were constructed at the cost of the  
 State, the lands cannot be classed as wet, nor  
 is it just to charge any water rate on such  
 lands, and it will be necessary to revise the  
 statement in regard to them."

limits are that Mr. Banting  
 does not conform to the rules  
 prescribed by the Board & approved  
 by Govt. in their order of 5th Feb  
 1893 No 45, <sup>table</sup> objects to the  
 against as the settlement  
 department would fix it;  
 & advocates a curtailment of  
 reduction (see figures state-  
 ment in para 9 of the Director's  
 letter printed in D. P. No. 1898  
 1896 No 2266) - that the principle  
 followed by the Settlement Dept. is  
 to class lands irrigated  
 from a Govt. source deriving their  
 water supply from a recognized  
 Government source of irrigation  
 as wet, while Mr. Banting  
 as a general rule objects to  
 lands irrigated from a Govt.  
 source being classed as wet, altho' they may have  
 been classed dry previously to  
 deriving any irrigation  
 Mr. Randall requests that the  
 Board should be kept up to the  
 confirmed & Mr. Banting's  
 for conform to the rules



water - rate & additional as  
 assessment, he says, have been  
 levied on irrigated drylands  
 during recent years averaging  
 upwards of 3000 Rs a year  
 & his sum is too large to suppose  
 that any considerable portion of  
 it can be paid voluntarily  
 for no consideration of irrigation  
 received -

On the subject of assessment  
 on lands mainly irrigated  
 by wells in wet lands, Mr  
 Randall observes that  
 by G.O. 12 June 1872 No 928  
 a decision has already been  
 made to which no reference  
 has been made by Mr Justice,  
 & that subsequently when  
 it was attempted to show  
 that it was not fair to make  
 any charge at all for such  
 irrigation the Hon. Mr. Justice  
 observed as follows "The question whether  
 the rule that second crops to  
 be charged for when it is from water  
 obtained from private wells in wet lands is  
 an important one involving a very large  
 amount of revenue in most of the districts.  
 It is an indisputable fact that such wells  
 are generally made, because their position

\* one fourth of the highest rate  
 of assessment for wet lands  
 to be charged when second  
 crop is raised partly by irrigation  
 from private wells, as a  
 temporary arrangement  
 pending the introduction  
 of the revised settlement.

It is evident that the law  
 does not require that the land  
 should be irrigated by a well  
 but that it should be irrigated  
 by a well or by a tank.

(Continuation of opinion in 58)  
 Hon. Mr. Justice, proposals are in  
 accordance with the spirit  
 of the G.O. The settlement  
 Mr. Justice has apparently adopted  
 as a different principle in  
 the result of his principle in  
 cultivated by the Board  
 that all land supplied with  
 water should be treated  
 as wet & charged for accordingly

But what of the right to irrigate the State  
 & interests of the many who live on  
 the capital

58  
 with regard to the tank assess-  
 ment a good supply of water, and that  
 it is almost impossible to decide  
 when there is a dispute, whether  
 the water for the second crop has  
 been drawn directly from the tank  
 by channels or indirectly by  
 means of the well. There may  
 be some cases of hardship, but  
 they must be few in number,  
 and the interests of the State  
 require that the rule should not  
 be relaxed.

The Board of Revenue disposes  
 of the Collector's proposals sum-  
 marily by saying that they  
 are opposed to the rules ap-  
 proved in G.O. 29 November 72  
 No 1628, & direct that the Collector  
 observe his revision of accounts  
 shall stand subject to any  
 modifications that may be  
 considered necessary or appear  
 that it will be well to  
 consider the provisions of the  
 rules above referred to. The



broad principle land dam  
wherein is that the area  
which governs in an ordinary  
supply with water shall  
be registered as 'wet' & all  
the rest as 'dry'. This rule  
does not seem to meet the  
difficulty that Mr Horsley  
refers to. He says that usually  
a dry land is irrigated by  
taking water from the water-  
course of the adjacent wet  
cultivation & the creation  
of private wells has helped  
to his indefinite extension  
of his adjacent. The enforce-  
ment of the principle above  
enunciated cannot under  
his circumstances easily  
lead to a just determination  
of his correct adjacent; & it  
will in practice be found  
difficult to enforce it  
in as much as it cannot  
always be clearly demon-  
strated that the irriga-  
tion is from the <sup>private</sup> well or the tank  
further to the advantage of the

When has the land been held for  
mutual advantage of the  
of Capital?

What position is taken  
on water?

It is a dry land but it is  
dry only in some occasional  
watered by the small channels  
in general, and in some cases, that  
I think this is a reference  
for general purposes the  
broad principle is that  
of a dry land is not  
What is it?

5  
rule is also open to question  
Is a land to be classed  
as wet merely because it  
derives irrigation from a  
government source? It is  
quite possible that the  
soil may be so poor that  
natural standing water  
being, no wet crop  
can be raised thereon.  
It is manifestly hard  
that such land should be  
made to pay wet assess-  
ment. This is exactly the  
Horsley's contention (see  
margin of para 11 of Mr Horsley's  
letter in R. P. No. 40246.) &  
is brought out more fully  
in Mr. Little's letter, re-  
cited in R. P. No. 41461/76.  
The arguments advanced  
seem entitled to much  
consideration. The accepted  
principle of land settlement  
which is the half wet is  
based on the estimated



out turn of produce, which  
 depends as much upon na-  
 tural conditions of soil &c.  
 as upon ar-  
 tificial irrigation as.  
 advantages possessed. Indeed.  
 the principle is so far carried  
 out where natural condi-  
 tions alone suffice to mature  
 wet crops, <sup>with any degree of certainty</sup> as on the west coast.  
 is invariably changed, &  
 where irrigation is indis-  
 pensable, the crop supplies  
 it from his own means  
 & his own industry, the  
 government have always  
 claimed only <sup>the</sup> dry season  
 as wet crops so raised.  
 This principle has been recently  
 advocated by Mr. A. in a letter  
 to the Gov. of India, & it is desir-  
 able that if it is to be  
 acted on, it should be stated  
 distinctly for the guidance  
 of the Board & the Settlement  
 Dept.  
 As regards the inland  
 rivers claimed by Mr. Huxley  
 in regard to the irrigated

note  
 It should be noted that the  
 tendency of the revenue  
 of agents by the Settlement  
 Dept. is to increase them. In  
 comparison the maximum  
 the original agent & the  
 which shown in the present  
 revenue accounts. In  
 1867 Jan 7 1871 it was  
 clearly admitted that the  
 agents were becoming  
 too large & the Govt. should  
 have the right reserved and

and possibly even to the extent of the  
 able extent

60  
 by private wells on wet  
 land, the Board in an  
 that the justice & fairness  
 of the Standing order on  
 the subject are beyond  
 question. The Standing order  
 quoted (under para 3 of the  
 Board's Res. 1<sup>st</sup> Sept.) does  
 not however apply to the  
 cases cited by Mr. Huxley.  
 The wells referred to by  
 the officer could scarcely  
 have had the benefit of  
 any surface drainage  
 or percolation during the  
 last season, <sup>even to the extent of the</sup> when the  
 tanks under which they  
 are said to be situated  
 were perfectly dry.  
 They were full & supplied  
 as much irrigation to the  
 agent lands as the tanks  
 if full would have done.  
 Showing thus beyond doubt  
 that the wells are quite  
 independent of any Govt. supply  
 of water, they play an important



a apart in the irrigation  
 d system of the country, it  
 c seems only fair that they  
 e should be  
 f more entitled to his  
 g consideration claimed  
 h for them by the Board  
 i of the Irrigation  
 k of the Board have  
 l no application to their  
 m case. A great deal must  
 n be left to his discretion  
 o of his Police and officers.  
 p & that hard & fast rule can  
 q be laid down. The policy  
 r of leasing well lands at such  
 s was condemned by the  
 t of the Board as early as 1856  
 u & that adjustment having  
 v been made was ordered in 1860  
 w to 1856 of 29 June 1869.  
 x The same of the large amount  
 y as the 1,200,291 involved in  
 z his measure did not prove  
 a a delivery to his surface.  
 b much of the principle - the effect  
 c of this policy, however, was  
 d finally been neutralized by  
 e the Board's policy of the water

more especially in the  
 favorable seasons  
 the subsoil springs  
 no surface drainage was necessary

long question of stimulation industry  
 doubtless of capital

being directly or indirectly  
 benefited by previous  
 existing government  
 work; & his <sup>so-called</sup> policies of imposing  
 a fair & equitable assessment  
 rate on the lands irrigated  
 by them.

Mr Randall's proposal  
 for the future treatment  
 of the lands is to charge  
 $\frac{1}{4}$  assessment when crop  
 is raised exclusively by  
 the aid of a well in place  
 of  $\frac{1}{2}$  assessment when it  
 is exclusively by foot water.  
 or the relief is to assess in  
 the Dupree. This is not only  
 when the rate is not com-  
 pounded - but which is  
 compounded, he proposes  
 $\frac{1}{2}$  rate for lands in which the  
 supply is mainly dependent on  
 wells -  $\frac{1}{4}$  rate for lands in which  
 the supply is mainly dependent on  
 foot water. The question is whether this  
 is sufficient consideration  
 for the labor & the cost involved  
 in the Dupree, considering that

12 1/2 per cent

for Dupree



the unduly high. As left  
absolutely unaltered  
while the Director  
consider that no undue  
source whatever is war-  
ranted by <sup>the</sup> circumstances  
of his case & the rates  
proposed are far too liberal  
& must satisfy his eye.

It is submitted that in  
consideration of the gross  
abuse which may follow  
in absolute exemption from

tax of the cultivation and  
under discussion of the

loss of Rev. which such

a measure may entail

decision may be given

to the Rev. of persons at the

annual settlement to

assist in the ~~case~~ Theerwa-

field & if used fairly and

in such cases as may clearly

be ascertained to be sections

from ~~any~~ private work

of irrigation; & to charge  $\frac{1}{2}$

&  $\frac{1}{4}$  according as the tax

is compounded or not, in all

cases of partial irrigation

of the difficulty which may attend its  
practical working

Farmer - Mr. Saper will be  
by the bank in England. It is  
free unless it appears that  
supplies into the tank will  
over the land water. It is  
the proper one of the  
cut off - makes of the  
drainage of the tank as  
one standing - with a view  
the proper one of the  
drainage of the tank -

Farmer - Mr. Saper will be  
by the bank in England. It is  
free unless it appears that  
supplies into the tank will  
over the land water. It is  
the proper one of the  
cut off - makes of the  
drainage of the tank as  
one standing - with a view  
the proper one of the  
drainage of the tank -

Farmer - Mr. Saper will be  
by the bank in England. It is  
free unless it appears that  
supplies into the tank will  
over the land water. It is  
the proper one of the  
cut off - makes of the  
drainage of the tank as  
one standing - with a view  
the proper one of the  
drainage of the tank -

Farmer - Mr. Saper will be  
by the bank in England. It is  
free unless it appears that  
supplies into the tank will  
over the land water. It is  
the proper one of the  
cut off - makes of the  
drainage of the tank as  
one standing - with a view  
the proper one of the  
drainage of the tank -

I think this matter may with  
advantage be discussed in  
Council on our return to  
Madras. So far as I can

judge from these papers  
I think that as regards the  
Agents of Tanks, Mr. Russell

shows that the observance of  
the rules prescribed seems

to be very successful. In  
the circumstances which  
may in many cases  
each year, & no fixed  
settlement is made.

Under the arrangement  
the 3rd rule proposed  
will be applied either  
to the 1st or 2nd  
department will have to  
confer itself something down  
in each case whether irri-  
gation is derived from private  
wells or not, & charging  $\frac{1}{4}$  or  $\frac{1}{2}$   
assessment. uniform on the  
former, ~~without any~~ <sup>without any</sup> ~~without any~~ <sup>without any</sup>  
full exemption from ~~assessment~~ <sup>assessment</sup>  
being ~~death~~ <sup>death</sup> with ~~light~~ <sup>light</sup> ~~light~~ <sup>light</sup>  
officers in the annual set-  
tlements - Special tanks  
irrigated beyond doubt ex-  
clusively from a private  
work, & the extent of ~~open~~ <sup>open</sup>  
under which is specially  
treated as ~~well~~ <sup>well</sup> ~~well~~ <sup>well</sup>  
be so treated by the settlement  
officers. 5/10/86

from private sources. In  
the circumstances which  
may in many cases  
each year, & no fixed  
settlement is made.  
Under the arrangement  
the 3rd rule proposed  
will be applied either  
to the 1st or 2nd  
department will have to  
confer itself something down  
in each case whether irri-  
gation is derived from private  
wells or not, & charging  $\frac{1}{4}$  or  $\frac{1}{2}$   
assessment. uniform on the  
former, ~~without any~~ <sup>without any</sup> ~~without any~~ <sup>without any</sup>  
full exemption from ~~assessment~~ <sup>assessment</sup>  
being ~~death~~ <sup>death</sup> with ~~light~~ <sup>light</sup> ~~light~~ <sup>light</sup>  
officers in the annual set-  
tlements - Special tanks  
irrigated beyond doubt ex-  
clusively from a private  
work, & the extent of ~~open~~ <sup>open</sup>  
under which is specially  
treated as ~~well~~ <sup>well</sup> ~~well~~ <sup>well</sup>  
be so treated by the settlement  
officers. 5/10/86



Sufficiently correct results -

The system pursued consists in an examination of the accounts of actual cultivation during a series of years and of personal inspection of the land by the visiting Officer

~~I think~~ that in the case of Cuddapah the Board have done all that is necessary in approving the suggestion of Mr. Rendall, that the Board instruct the Deputy Director to "restrict the revision of tank accounts to the area that may be irrigated in ordinary years and to eliminate all doubtful cases, where the land may not when cultivated, invariably be under irrigation"

The case of 'wells' is somewhat more difficult. It is very undesirable to do anything which will check private enterprise so useful as

That if cases should arise when it is manifest that a well dug at a ryot's expense has drawn away water from a previously existing Govt work, in such instance it such well land shall not be wholly excused from apportionment, but a fair & equitable extra cess water rate may be imposed.

Those desiring supply from surface flow - are simply taking a certain amount of irrigating water for the benefit of particular plot. To the prejudice of other land further on they in no sense using additional water to aid their crops - & so the unshared surplus

63  
the wells which it would seem large by supplement the insufficient supply of the Tanks in Cuddapah. but I hesitate to reverse a principle which has long been accepted by Govt. & with which the people are familiar. ~~and~~ it is embodied in the Board's rule -

If this principle is admitted it can hardly be denied that wells dug in wet lands are liable to some extent - for as the Board remark many of them derive their supply from surface flow from the work which irrigates their site, whilst it may be ascertained of all that they are fed from the same source by percolation.

The case of these wells stands on a different footing from



wells on Dry Land, inasmuch as they are not expensive in construction and water is found with ease.

There is also the difficulty that it is almost impossible to decide whether the water for a second crop has been drawn from the tank by channels or indirectly by means of wells.

The information of the cost involved in Mr. Horsley's proposals may with advantage be obtained. The Board say the loss involved will be enormous.

It must also be borne in mind that it may be difficult to withhold the same indulgence from other districts in which the practice of "wet wells" as they are called prevails.

C No 37648766 of 176  
SO 26-6-77 No 2110.  
wet wells in Cuddapah.

Wells fed by percolation. i.e. wells which make water in the soil or lower strata to the surface to aid the crop & supplement - got water appear to me to be equally suitable for exemption from wet - assessment ~~and whether the water percolates from a tank by sub-filtration or be raised from other sources~~

The principle in all countries I believe is that there is no property in subterranean water - but that it belongs to the soil in which it is found -

The information required would be supplied

By 12/11

Board Proceedings 4/12  
21 Sept. 1896 No. 22464.

In these papers, the question of the treatment of lands irrigated by wells constructed & maintained by private individuals on wet lands in Cuddapah is fully discussed -

Historical aspect of the proposal to permit this matter to be decided in order to have the subject brought before the Board as a comprehensive proposal under one description.

But I would make the order very strict. By the first class Paras I add that the season of drought thro' which we are passing is likely to lead to consideration & suggestion of a new & more

The Govt. observe that in pursuance of the policy laid down by a late Govt. of Madras that private individuals should be given the full benefit of the improvements effected by themselves, a revenue of Rs. 124291 was relinquished in 1869 in favour of the owners of old private wells, & the

under No 2036 of 29 June 1869 124291 was relinquished without character by Govt. in 1869 in favour of the owners of old private wells, & the

22/10/96 15: New R 2410 No 10  
C. S. 5. Oct 10/96  
C. S. 5. Oct 10/96



principle has been since  
followed of not charging  
for <sup>produce raised by</sup> ~~canals~~ irrigation exp.

fluid by wells sunk in. Not to lose sight of  
dry land & promised by His Grace's suggestion  
as to the legal right  
are situated at a greater  
to subsoil water.  
distance than 10 yards  
Personally do as Mr.  
from the Cuddapah tank  
Collect - the matter looks  
river or channel. In  
having been argued for  
this point of view

Cuddapah an exceptional  
indulgence was <sup>also</sup> granted  
of charging only one-fifth  
instead of half of the highest water  
rate when second crop is  
raised partly by irrigation

from private wells, as a  
compromise arrangement.  
Pending the introduction  
of the revised settlement  
Mr. Berkeley the late collector  
of Cuddapah was of opinion  
that the water was <sup>in wet lands</sup>  
treated very liberally.

10/5  
90 12 June 1872  
928.

But it should be  
very speedily brought  
to a decision  
10/5

and used with all water  
beyond the reserved li-  
mit of 100 yards from the  
bank and the water at  
Cuddapah is not to be  
used for irrigation  
or wet lands without  
payment of water rate  
or second crop assessment.

The Director of the Govt. Sec.  
of Revenue is opposed to  
the fear of a large  
a consequence the  
of Govt. object look on  
the <sup>also</sup> <sup>mainly</sup> <sup>of the heavy</sup> <sup>Castor revenue</sup> which  
such a measure with  
involved. His Grace  
the Governor in Council  
while fully admitting  
the force of the objection  
raised, cannot but



consider with the import-  
ant part which private  
wells play in seasons of  
drought & the help they  
afford both to the poor  
& the poor in saving to  
the farmer his crop & the  
latter their revenue,  
entitled them to more  
favourable treatment  
than has yet been ac-  
corded. He observes  
however that the  
whole subject is under  
investigation by the  
Board - vide his  
Proceedings of 4 Jan'y  
1877 no 24. of 15 Jan'y  
1877 no 157 & and  
accordingly request that  
his points ~~be~~ submitted  
for decision on the above

66  
he persons as he again  
~~there~~ brought up with  
the report is now away  
from Colchester, & that  
at the same time the  
cost involved in the  
Horsley proposals  
may be specifically  
reported.

Mr. Horsley's remarks  
regarding the cost of  
tensions of dykes  
will doubtless re-  
ceive attention in  
arranging future  
operations connected  
with the rearing of  
dykes of tanks, as  
now conducted under  
the order of the D. of the

7/15/77



7.5.7.7

N<sup>o</sup> 2110

Proceedings of the Madras Government  
Under date the 26 June 1877.

Read the following  
Proceedings of the Board  
of Revenue.

Submitting views of Board  
and Director of Revenue Settlement  
regarding cultivation raised by  
means of Wells in wet lands in  
Cuddapah District, and recommend-  
ing acceptance of Mr. Rundall's  
proposals in regard to compensation  
for second crop charges.

(Fb. C. 1<sup>st</sup> Sept/76, N<sup>o</sup> 2246)

Sub? with Board's views,  
further reports from Director of  
Revenue Settlement on subject of  
Revision of tank payments and  
treatment of irish lands irrigated  
by wells in Cuddapah District

( $n = 4^2$  — " — "  $N^{\circ} 2269$ .)

In these papers  
the questions of the treatment  
of lands irrigated by wells  
constructed, and maintained  
by



by private individuals in  
secret lands in Budapest is  
fully discussed.

2. His Grace the Governor  
in Council observes that the  
whole subject is under in-  
vestigation by the Board

(G.O. 15<sup>th</sup> January 1877 N<sup>o</sup>. 157A)

and he therefore resolves

to request that the points  
submitted for decision in

the papers recorded above

may be brought up with

the reports now expected

from collectors, and that at

the same time the cost

involved in Mr. Horsley's

proposals may be specifi-

cally reported.

The

69 15  
3. The character of the  
present season brings into  
special prominence the  
necessity of a careful  
consideration of this  
important subject.

4. The Board will  
at the same time state  
their views upon any  
aspect of the question -  
which does not seem  
ever to have attracted  
attention viz. The legal  
right of Government to  
sub-soil water as distin-  
guished from surface -  
flow. It is understood  
that the principle in most  
countries



countries is that there  
is no separate property  
in subterranean water  
but that it belongs to the  
soil in which it is found  
whether it percolates from  
a Government source by  
subfiltration or is brought  
to the surface from the  
lower strata.

CU

- 14 To W. of Bureau (10-7-77) with 27 Dec.
- 15 To W. of Bureau (10-7-77)
- 21 To C. W. Dept.
- 5 To Financial Dept.

2/1/78



Lands irrigated  
by wells constructed or  
sustained by private  
individuals in wet lands  
in Ladopah L.

see