Archives I—10,000—6-10-76.

(1) Number of pages 2c

(2) Date of repair 5-10-84

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. / ~~U.P. No.~~	1965	Press. / ~~Misc.~~
Dated	6.R-1878	~~197~~ .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1965
10

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

6th December 1878, No. 1,965.

Read the following paper:—

No. 70. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 19th October 1878, No. 2,837.

Read the following letter from A. J. B. ATKINSON, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector in charge of Cuddapah, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 29th August 1878, No. 573:—

I HAVE the honor to report the following facts for the orders of the Board of Revenue.

2. A late Collector, Mr. Daniel, issued a takid* on November 2nd, 1876, which stated that as the canal supply of water was running short, he had asked for the filling of the tanks as soon as possible; and directed the Tahsildars of Cuddapah and Proddutur to inform the ryots that only the land assessment would be levied and no canal water-rate.

* Enclosure A, with translation.

3. Mr. Daniel in paragraph 3 of his letter, No. 310, dated 22nd November 1876, reported that at the time he requested the tanks to be filled, he ought to have asked sanction for his takid, and quoted a Proceedings of the Board, Miscellaneous No. 9,276, dated 10th November 1876. These Proceedings however and the Government Order on which they were laid say nothing about water-rate; they simply authorize the filling of the tanks. The Board in their Proceedings, No. 2,958, of 24th November 1876, passed on Mr. Daniel's letter above quoted, state that orders have been passed on the subject of the water-rate and quoted their Proceedings, No. 2,918, of 21st November 1876. A reference to these Proceedings, however, shows that the subject there dealt with is the remission of tirwajasti on dry lands irrigated from doruvu wells and from Government sources of irrigation. There is nothing in them regarding canal water at all.

4. The Proceedings of the Board, No. 2,899, dated 20th November 1876, passed on G.O., Public Works Department, of 17th October 1876, No. 2,779, and on G.O., Revenue Department, 13th November 1876, No. 1,639, lay down the rules to govern the charge of canal water. They say that two-thirds of the Company's charge and the highest dry rate of the village are to be recovered from the ryots, the difference between the consolidated wet assessment (which includes the water-rate) and the highest dry rate of the village being remitted.

5. The Canal Deputy Collector pointed out on 10th August 1877 that the Board's order quoted above was quite opposed to Mr. Daniel's takid, and proposed (1) that two-thirds of the price of canal water should be charged on Sirkar wet lands cultivated with single crop under tanks filled by the Irrigation and Canal Company; (2) that the full price of canal water should be charged for the second crop raised on one crop lands and for dry lands cultivated by means of canal water let into the tanks by the Company; and (3) that full price should be charged in the case of Inam lands cultivated.

6. In his letter, No. 1,634, of 24th August 1877, Mr. Price stated that the principles above enunciated had his approval. The consequence was that Mr. Daniel's takid and promise of November 2nd, 1876, were set aside, and the Deputy Collector's

proposals, which are in fact only the Board's Order of 20th November 1876, No. 2,899, were carried into effect.

7. Mr. Lister in reporting (Enclosure B) on the Board's Proceedings, No. 551, dated 28th February 1878, directing an explanation of the high rate of charge in the village of Cheyapad brings all these facts to notice. He is of opinion that Mr. Daniel's takid of 2nd November 1876 was based on G.O., Public Works Department, of 17th October 1876, No. 279. This, however, cannot be the case as that order together with G.O., Revenue Department, 13th November 1876, No. 1,639, were only communicated with a manuscript copy of the Board's Proceedings, No. 2,899, dated 20th November 1876. There is no explanation forthcoming as to how Mr. Daniel's order promising that there would be no charge for the canal water came to be issued.

8. Mr. Lister's proposals are as follows:—

(1.) That the Puttadars should pay the usual revenue charges only in accordance with the Collector's assurance under which they took the water. This is supported as being not only good faith but as affirmed in principle by the Board in their Proceedings, No. 48, of 8th January 1878, as regards Kurnool.

(2.) That in Mulur village the revenue charges of tirwajasti, which have been imposed, should be allowed to stand for both Puttadars and Inamdars.

(3.) That in Pilurupalli village, Inamdars should pay a crop rate of Rupees 4.

(4.) That in other villages Inamdars should pay at the rate of Rupees 6 an acre for paddy and of Rupees 4 for other crops.

(5.) That refunds of canal water-rate should be made by him.

9. The financial effect is shown to be that out of Rupees 5,520-10-3 to be paid to the Company as the cost of stored water, the Inamdars will only contribute Rupees 1,022-3-1 at crop rates, and that the balance, Rupees 4,498-9-2, is to be paid by Government against an offset of revenue of Rupees 1,629-11-0.

10. It would be unbecoming in me to offer any remarks on the facts reported and on Mr. Lister's proposals, except to state that Mr. Lister gives no reason for his last proposal, viz., to pay the refunds of canal water-rate in person. If by this means he can show the ryots of the villages under the canal his close connection with the canal and with their prospects it can only do good.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From A. L. LISTER, Esq., on Special Duty, Kurnool and Cuddapah, to the Collector of Cuddapah, dated Ayuloor, 27th June 1878, No. 160.

WITH reference to the complaint made by some ryots to Mr. Price about the high charges made for canal water supplied to Cheyapad tank, Proddutur Taluk, on the requisition of Mr. Daniel, about which the Board of Revenue desired an explanation in their Proceedings, No. 551, of the 28th February last, I have the honor to state that similar over-charges were made in Cuddapah Taluk also, and I therefore submit a report upon the subject.

2. The existing rules about supplementing the supply of a tank with canal water do not work at all, partly on account of the difficulty, which approaches impossibility, of securing agreement among the ayacut holders to make an application for canal water, and partly on account of the charge by volume being entirely unintelligible to ryots who do not care to incur a liability which they have no means of estimating.

3. So towards the fall of 1876, although the monsoon had failed and want of food-grains was clearly impending, tanks were lying empty and lands under them were left uncultivated while plenty of water was flowing down the canal which nobody would use.

4. With a view to utilizing this water, Mr. Latham submitted to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation in his letter No. 98, of the 29th September 1876, certain proposals which swept away the two great obstacles of a general application from ayacut holders and of an indefinite charge.

5. Mr. Latham's proposal really amounted to this; that lands under tank should be treated as other lands, paying the Company for the supplemental supply at the rate of Rs. 1-8-0 or Rupee 1 a-month according to the crop, "*but the total rate never to exceed a maximum of*

Rupees 6 and Rupees 4 respectively," and the Government water-rate or wet assessment should be remitted in full on all lands for which no tank water was supplied.

6. In submitting this proposal for the consideration of Government, Colonel Mullins made an equally fair but entirely different suggestion, viz., that the supplemental water should be supplied to tanks by volume at the cost of Government, the ryots paying the usual revenue charges only.

7. The question was considered by Government in the Public Works Department on the 17th October, and the danger of more water being thrown into tanks than was necessary was foreseen, and Mr. Latham was requested to let the Collectors know the capacity of the tanks he was prepared to supply to enable them to make a requisition for the amount wanted for each taluk; these instructions clearly had reference to Colonel Mullins' suggestion, and not to Mr. Latham's proposal, under which the charge would have determined by the area irrigated by canal water and not by the quantity of water stored in the tank.

8. On the 13th November Government in the Revenue Department approved of the proposal and directed the Board of Revenue to issue the necessary instructions to the Collectors without delay.

9. On the 20th November the Board of Revenue issued orders that in Cuddapah District the difference between the consolidated wet assessment and the highest dry rate in the village would be remitted, and the usual two-thirds of the Company's charge against Government should be received.

10. Had these instructions reached the district sooner, the water would not have been used, for it is certain that nothing would have induced the ryots to take water on such terms; in one case indeed the relaxation granted by the Board of Revenue was absolutely nothing, as the wet assessment on the land under the tank and the highest dry rate of the village were the same.

11. But previous to the receipt of these instructions the Collector, Mr. Daniel, had issued, on the 2nd November, takid No. 85, reciting that the Tahsildar had reported that the ryots were unwilling to pay both the Government kist and the canal rate and were not using the canal water in consequence, and directing the Tahsildar to make it known to the ryots that even though they took the canal water they would have to pay the taram kist only; this takid was communicated to the villagers; indeed, it was among the records of Cheyapad village that I first saw it, and on the strength of the Collector's promise, the ryots used the canal water poured into their tanks.

12. I would ask especial attention to the date of the Collector's takid; it was issued on the *2nd of November*, doubtless as soon as Mr. Daniel had seen the Government Proceedings, Public Works Department of 17th October, with which it appears to be in conformity.

13. Mr. Daniel's promise has unfortunately not been acted up to, and not only have the ryots been charged with two-thirds of the cost of the water, but every other possible additional charge has been imposed upon them, full wet assessment, second crop assessment, and tirwajasti; and the heavy water-rates have in some cases been collected with interest and process fees after distraining standing crops for money which the ryots did not fairly owe; these revenue charges which were improperly imposed were ordered to be refunded by the Collector in January, but the ryots have suffered much and they are undoubtedly discontented about the charges imposed on them; the refunds, too, have not yet been made; now they had better lie over until this report is disposed of, and I have so instructed the Tahsildar.

14. I will now explain how Mr. Daniel's promise came to be set aside. On the 12th July last the Deputy Collector, Kristna Row, wrote to the Collector to ask whether the ryots were or were not to be charged with two-thirds of the price of water in addition to the full *wet* assessment of the land, from which question I infer that the Deputy Collector had not even seen the correspondence and orders on the subject, for he goes on to say that the spirit of Mr. Daniel's circular was quite against the principle enunciated in G.O., dated 17th June 1875, No. 921.

15. In reply he received docket, No. 1,164 of 1877, signed by Mr. Deputy Collector Johnston for the Acting Collector, referring him to the Board's Proceedings of 20th November, "a copy of which is now enclosed."

16. On the 10th August the Deputy Collector wrote that Mr. Daniel's circular appeared "to be quite at variance with the instructions issued by the Board of Revenue on the said Government Order; he pointed out Mr. Daniel's *promise* to levy only the wet assessment and to remit the two-thirds of the price of the canal water let into the tanks; he showed that the charge would be "*very high*," Rupees 20-10-6 and Rupees 15-8-0, respectively, for *a single crop*; the ryots were clamorous and dissatisfied with the arrangement; the quantity of water let into Maidkur tank was quite disproportionate to the wet area cultivated under it; he enclosed two clear statements showing the financial effect of breaking Mr. Daniel's promise or of keeping it, and he concluded in paragraph 6 by particularizing the charges made against the ryots with reference to G.O. of 17th June 1875, and Board's Proceedings of 20th November 1876.

17. On the 26th August I received a reply from the Acting Collector signed by Mr. Deputy Collector Johnston stating "the principles enunciated in paragraph 6 of your letter have my approval;" whereupon the charges were imposed on the principle of distributing over the irrigated area the total cost of the water poured into the tank at the rate of Rupee one for every 1,440 cubic yards.

18. I beg to recommend that Mr. Daniel's promise should be kept and that the usual revenue charges only should be levied from the ryots; these have already been imposed and mostly collected; I wish personally to make the refunds of canal water-rate.

19. It is doubtless unnecessary to say anything further in support of the view that the assurances under which the ryots took water should be acted up to; but I would add that the Board of Revenue affirmed this principle in their Proceedings of the 6th January 1876, No. 48, where they laid down that "as the ryots acted on Mr. Foster's promise of remission no charge can now be made;" the ryots *too* did not ask for their tanks to be *filled*; it was the Collector who made the application, distinctly stating that *Government* were to be charged with the cost at Rupee one for every 1,440 cubic yards.

20. The Deputy Collector referring to the tanks in Cuddapah Taluk only said that the Company's bill for water was Rupees 2,080-12-5 while the income from the lands cultivated under these tanks was Rupees 1,701-5-11, showing the loss to Government of Rupees 379-12-6 if Mr. Daniel's promise was kept.

21. But this income was calculated on Inamdars paying the excessive charges of 15 and 20 Rupees an acre. I beg to submit that this is neither fair nor equitable. Had Mr. Latham's proposal been accepted, Inam lands could not have been charged more than 6 Rupees an acre for a rice crop. Inamdars can only be called upon in fairness to pay for the value of the water they used, and not for the loss of a quantity of water which was not wanted. I think that Inamdars should be charged in accordance with Mr. Latham's proposal at the rate of 6 Rupees an acre for paddy, and at the rate of 4 Rupees an acre for other crops.

22. *Duggunapalle Tank* illustrates well the extreme hardship individual ryots have suffered through these orders. The ayacut consists of only 13 acres, of which A. 11 D. 42 used stored water for two crop; A. 1 D. 71 dry land paid water for a second crop; the total cost of the stored water was Rupees 280-7-7 from the charge was reduced to Rupees 15-8-0 an acre for each crop; and an additional rupee an acre was charged for canal water taken in November before tank-supply commenced.

The incidence of the rate was as under:—

A.	D.		Rs.	A.	P.
8	52	Paid for November	1	0	0
		Charge for first crop	10	5	4
		Do. for second crop	15	8	0
			26	13	4
2	90	Paid for first crop	10	5	4
		Do. for second crop	15	8	0
			25	13	4

in addition to the usual wet assessment—

A.	D.		Rs.	A.	P.
1	71	Of dry land paid assessment	3	1	0
		Second crop water-rate	15	8	0
			18	9	0

23. But the heavy charges in this village fell on a few shoulders only, and were therefore the more felt, e.g., Aswardham Reddi, at these rates became liable to Rupees 113-13-8, of which in January last he had paid Rupees 13-9-8; a demand notice for Rupees 100-3-7 was served upon him; his standing crops were distrained, and the amount with Rupees 4-8-0 interest, Annas 3 demand Sutter and Annas 8 diswalla batta; in all Rupees 105-6-7 was levied from him. Gazelpalli Pillai Kondaiah similarly paid Rupees 103-13-9, and Chinna Ellanna paid Rupees 87-8-5.

24. These ryots produce the receipt for a registered letter to the Tahsildar of Cuddapah, dated 21st August 1877; another registered receipt of a letter to the Collector of Cuddapah, dated 12th January 1878, a couple of days after the distraint, to neither of which they received, they say, any reply; no enquiry seems to have been held; a third registered receipt of a letter addressed to Mr. Dumphy from whom they received an endorsement promising that he would

secure them an enquiry if possible. I mention these documents lest any one should ask why the ryots did not complain.

25. *Midtur Tank* has an ayacut of 83 acres, of which 45 are unoccupied waste, having been thrown out of cultivation at the settlement, when rates of Rupees 7-8-0 and 4-8-0 were imposed; last fasli 32 acres more were left waste, and only 6 acres of the ayacut were cultivated.

26. Yet this tank was *filled* under the Collector's orders, and the cost of the stored water was Rupees 1,012-0-8; only A. 4 D. ·08 of the ayacut was irrigated with this water, and the Government contribution of one-third of the cost of stored water was withheld, because it was a second crop, the first crop having been raised by canal water supplied direct by distribution channels; the holders of these 4 acres were fortunately saved from a charge of Rupees 250 an acre by the enterprise of some dry landholders who irrigated A. 44 D. ·87; the cost of the charge by volume Rupees 1,012-0-8 distributed over A. 48 D. ·95 was reckoned to be Rupees 20-10-5 an acre, and this sum was imposed.

27. The A. 4 D. ·8 of the ayacut was charged with Rupees 11-11-6 fasaljasti; the A. 12 D. ·47, putta dry land, was charged with Rupees 18-11-3 teervajasti, although there was no Government water, and although they were charged the full cost of the canal water; the A. 32 D. ·40 inam land was charged with Rupees 48-9-7 teervajasti.

28. So a fresh question arises—What are the dry landholders to pay the Revenue teervajasti, or (if my suggestion about inamdars is approved) the canal crop rate? The teervajasti on A. 48 D. ·95 dry land amounted to Rupees 67; at crop rate for no paddy at all was grown under this tank, the charge would be nearly Rupees 176. I think the crop rate might fairly have been imposed, and the teervajasti remitted; but as the amount involved is small, and as varying forms of refund offer opportunities for misapprehension and peculation, and as my substantial recommendation is that the revenue charges should stand and the canal rates be remitted and refunded, I would prefer no charge being made on ryots or inamdars for the water stored in Midtur tank; the financial result is no doubt disastrous, as Government have to pay Rupees 1,012 for the water, and only recover Rupees 79 in teervajasti and fasaljasti; but this is the result of a tank being filled when ryots did not choose to use the water; and the additional Rupees 109 which would be gained by levying crop rates on inam dry lands would not convert the transaction into a financial success.

29. *Pullampully Tank* is the only one in which there was a gain by the stored water; the cost was Rupees 942-9-0; there is only one wet rate under this tank, viz., Rupees 10; Rupees 767-2-0 income was received by wet assessment, teervajasti and fasaljasti; and A. 160 D. ·69 of inam lands were irrigated. I have not yet received the list of crops grown on these inam lands, but I do not think it would be fair to charge the inamdars more than Rupees 4 a crop, in which case they would contribute Rupees 642, leaving only Rupees 300 to be paid by Government in return for Rupees 767 of secured revenue.

30. *Rachinayapally Tank* yields Rupees 26-12-6 fasaljasti, and at crop rates Rupees 34-14-9 from inam lands; in all Rupees 61-11-3 against Rupees 187-3-7, the cost of the stored water.

31. *Chinnamasapally Tank* yields Rupees 457-0-2 assessment and Rupees 219-10-7 from inam lands at crop rates; in all Rupees 676-10-9 against Rupees 1,122-7-9, the cost of the stored water.

32. *Cheyapad Tank* in Proddutur Taluk has an ayacut of A. 110 D. ·30, of which A. 12 D. ·22 were immemorial waste until the present year; last year a further extent of A. 24 D. ·86 was left waste; the remainder A. 73 D. ·22 was cultivated.

33. But A. 38 D. ·40, of this A. 73 D. ·22 was irrigated for the first crop by the Company's distribution channels without the water passing through the tank; this land therefore has not contributed on account of first crop towards the payment of the water stored in the tank.

34. The whole of the cost of this water has been thrown upon the remainder of the ayacut A. 34 D. ·82 and 4 acres of dry land for the first crop, and A. 41 D. ·11 for the second crop; in all A. 79 D. ·93, of which A. 28 D. ·30 are inam and A. 51 D. ·63 Sirkar land.

35. Dividing the total cost of Rupees 1,875-13-10 over A. 79 D. ·93 acres, the water-rate was reckoned to be Rupees 23-7-10 an acre; of this a reduction of one-third was made on A. 24 D. ·51 Sirkar land for first crop; this reduction amounted to Rupees 191-8-0, leaving Rupees 1,684-5-10 to be paid by the ryots.

36. Before the order to fill the tank was issued, some of the lands were irrigated direct by distribution channels at the monthly rate, and the crop was subsequently matured with the stored water; these ryots were charged Rupee 1 for November in addition to the Rupees 23-7-10.

37. The incidence of this heavy water-rate has varied according as the lands were Sirkar or Inam, whether they used the stored water for one crop or for two, and whether they took water in November at the monthly rate or not.

I will distribute the different rates over A. 79 D. 93 acres; the whole area charged:—

	A.	D.		RS.	A.	P.			
Inam	2	27	Monthly rate for November...	1	0	0			
			First crop	23	7	10			
			Second crop	23	7	10			
							47	15	8
Sirkar ...	10	30	Monthly rate for November..	1	0	0			
			First crop Rupees 23-7-10 less one-third *plus* Rupees 3 highest dry rate for land assessment...	18	10	0			
			Second crop	23	7	10			
							43	1	10
	12	57	First crop.						
	12	57	Second crop.						
Total area so far ...	25	14							
Inam	8	04	For November	1	0	0			
			First crop	23	7	10			
							24	7	10
Do.	4	0	Do.				23	7	10
Sirkar ...	9	16	Rupees 23-7-10 less one-third *plus* Rupees 3 assessment and Rupee 1 for November ...				19	10	0
Do. ...	5	05	Rupees 23-7-10 less one-third *plus* Rupees 3 assessment ...				18	10	0
Do. ...	16	82	For second crop				23	7	10
Inam ...	11	72							
Total ...	79	93							

38. Paddy was grown on none of these lands; mostly raggy for the first crop and indigo and jonna for the second; no water was stored before December, and the 12 acres which have been rated with upwards of 40 Rupees are called upon to pay that sum for half a year's supply for a couple of garden crops; the tank too I am told leaked much near the western calingulah; for what was lost by leakage too the ryots have been charged.

39. The recommendations then which I respectfully submit are as follows:—

(1.) That puttadars should pay the usual revenue charges only in accordance with the Collector's assurance under which they took the water.

(2.) That in Midtur village the revenue charges of teervajasti which have been imposed should be allowed to stand for both puttadars and inamdars.

(3.) That in Palampally village inamdars should pay a crop rate of Rupees 4.

(4.) That in other villages inamdars should pay at the rate of Rupees 6 an acre for paddy and of Rupees 4 for other crops.

(5.) That refunds of canal water-rate should be made by me.

40. The financial result of the whole transaction will be as follows:—

	RS.	A.	P.
Cost of stored water to be paid to the Company	5,520	10	3
Amount of this sum to be collected from inamdars at crop rates	1,022	3	1
Leaving	4,498	7	2

Balance to be paid by Government, and considering the circumstances under which Mr. Daniel ordered the tank to be filled, it would appear to be a famine charge; by this expenditure Rupees 1,629-11-0 of revenue was secured.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) A. J. B. ATKINSON,
Acting Sub-Collector in Charge.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.—Copy of Takid.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Translation of Takid.

MR. DANIEL exceeded his authority in promising that no charge for canal water would be levied, but faith must be kept with the ryots, and a somewhat similar concession has already been made in Kurnool under Board's Proceedings, dated 8th January 1878, No. 48. The Board in passing their Proceedings, dated 20th November 1876, No. 2,899, never contemplated the imposition of such heavy charges, and the effect of their ruling should have been brought to notice at once, instead of resorting to extreme measures for enforcement of the demand as represented by Mr. Lister; it should be explained why no notice was taken of the ryots' complaints (*vide* paragraph 24), and the refunds authorized by the Collector (paragraph 13) should be paid at once. Mr. Lister's proposals enumerated in paragraph 8 of Mr. Atkinson's letter appear fair and reasonable and are accepted. Mr. Lister's object in suggesting that the refunds should be made by him is probably to ensure the money reaching those who are entitled to it.

(True Copies and Extract.)

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

No. 71. ORDER THEREON, 6th December 1878, No. 1,965.

Irrigation, No. 3. RECORDED.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. A. F. Goodall.

Govt. of [illegible] (1878) Revenue

To

The Board of Revenue.

Dated December 1878.

Printed 6th

Read

G.O., 6th December 1878, No. 1965.

DECEMBER

Nos. 7071.

Copies [illegible]

Collector [illegible]

Proceedings of the Board

of Revenue relating to charges [illegible]

1965/5

No. 48.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 8th January 1878.

Read the following letter from R. DAVIDSON, Esq., Acting Collector of Kurnool, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 8th December 1877, No. 1,061 :—

I have the honor to submit copies of correspondence that has passed between me and the General Deputy Collector, Ramachendra Row, with regard to the remissions of the Government water-rate on lands under four tanks in the Nandial Taluq, and to request instructions on the point raised.

2. In his letter, No. 126, dated 5th October 1876 (copy enclosed), the Collector, Mr. Foster, directed the Deputy Collector to inform the ryots that when the supply of the tank failed they might take water direct from the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, and he promised in such cases to remit the Government water-rate of 4 Rs. an acre. Accordingly several ryots holding lands under four tanks, viz., those of Nandial, Kanala, Iyavarikodur, and Biyapakodur, did take water from the Company in the manner directed, and the Deputy Collector has recently issued instructions to remit the Government water-rate on the first crop in such cases, leaving the ryots to pay to the Company the usual charge of 6 Rupees an acre.

3. The order of Mr. Foster seems to me to be opposed both to the Canal Rules [illegible] G.O., No. 1,273, dated 9th October 1874. The proper course would have been for the Collector to have requested the Canal Officers to have filled the tank, and when that had been done the charges for crops raised under it would have been regulated by paragraph 4 of the Government Order above mentioned.

4. The Deputy Collector urges that because the water was taken direct from the Company and not *stored* in the tanks, the Government Order in question does not apply. I do not agree with him; paragraph 5 says clearly "that when the ordinary supply of the tank is supplemented from the canal the assessment will be raised in the proportion above noted."

5. At the same time it will be very hard upon the ryots, and will amount to breaking faith with them if, after the Collector's distinct assurance that the 4 Rupees water-rate will be remitted, we now demand it. I recommend that the remissions be granted. The Deputy Collector does not mention the amount of revenue involved, though he says it is not large; however this does not affect the question.

Enclosure No. 1.

From W. S. FOSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of Kurnool, to A. RAMACHENDRA, ROW, Special Deputy Collector of Nandial, dated 5th October 1876, No. 126.

The south-west monsoon having failed, the supply of water to many of the Government tanks and channels has also failed. As the ryots who occupy wet lands under these works of irrigation might be anxious to obtain canal water for the irrigation of their lands direct from the Company, I have thought it advisable to remit to such ryots the Government water-rate, viz., Rupees 4 per acre, on their wet lands. These ryots will have to pay the Company their water-rate according to rules. I have the honor, therefore, to request you will be good enough to make this known to the ryots generally, and also encourage them to utilize the canal water where Government irrigation works have failed.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) C. J. KNOX,
Special Asst. Collector,
For Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From A. RAMACHENDRA ROW, Deputy Collector of Nandial, to the Acting Collector of Kurnool, dated Chagalmarry, 26th October 1877, No. 258.

YOUR office letter, No. 126, dated 5th October 1876.

I have the honor to state that I have issued instructions to the Tahsildars of Nandial and Sirwell to remit Rupees 4 on the first crop on wet lands under Government tanks, which, owing to the failure of water in the said tanks, were irrigated *direct* by canal water either through the tank sluices or otherwise.

Nandial Taluq.
1. Nandial.
2. Kanala.
3. Iyavarikodur.
4. Biyapakodur.

Sirwell Taluq.
1. Chintakunta.

* No. 1,294, dated 9th October 1874.

2. This order has reference only to the lands under the tanks noted in the margin.

3. Of course, the usual water-rate is collected by Government on the second crops which had been supplied by tanks *filled** by canal water, for which Government pays the Company at 1,440 cubic yards per rupee.

4. I request that, should you see any objection to my orders on the subject of the remissions in question, which have been based on your office letter above quoted, you will be pleased to instruct me accordingly.

5. Copies of my takeods to both the Tahsildars above alluded to are herewith submitted.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) C. J. KNOX,
Special Asst. Collector,
For Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

From C. J. KNOX, Esq., Special Assistant Collector in charge, Kurnool, to the Deputy Collector of Nandial, dated 21st November 1877, No. 2,501.

YOUR docket of 26th October 1877, No. 258.

I have the honor to observe that your orders based on Mr. Foster's letter are opposed to G.O., No. 1,294, dated 9th October 1874.

2. I request that you will cancel the orders, and if you think there are sufficient reasons for a departure from the Government Order in this case, you can make a special reference stating the reasons, and the matter will then be submitted to the Board.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) C. J. KNOX,
Special Asst. Collector,
For Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.

From A. RAMACHENDRA ROW, Deputy Collector of Nandial, to R. DAVIDSON, Esq., Acting Collector of Kurnool, dated 29th November 1877, No. 123.

WITH reference to your letter, No. 2,501, dated the 21st instant, I have the honor to request you will be pleased to reconsider the subject of the cancellation of the orders therein alluded to under the following circumstances.

2. The first-crop lands on which the water-rate of 4 Rupees was ordered to be remitted under Mr. Foster's orders are situated under the tanks noted in the margin.

1. Nandial.
2. Kanala.
3. Iyavarikodur.
4. Biyapakodur.
5. Chintakunta.

3. The tanks were not *filled* by the Company to supply water to the lands, but the ryots were allowed the option of obtaining a *direct* supply of *running* water from the canal under the rules, just as the tanks had no existence, and they did apply accordingly to the Company *direct* and got the water to their lands through the tank sluices in the majority of cases, while in Chintakunta the owners of certain plots were supplied direct from the Company's channels. The ryots agreed to pay the 6 Rupees rates to the Company, like other lands irrigated by the

1965
b

canal, as there was not a drop of water in any of the tanks; and under these circumstances the Government Order,† which entirely has reference to *tank filling*, does not seem to be applicable.

† No. 1,294, dated 9th October 1874.

4. If the ryots had not been allowed this opportunity of utilizing the canal water when the natural supply in the tanks failed, the result would have been, in a season of severe distress, the entire abandonment of cultivation on those lands by the ryots, and the consequent sacrifice of even the land assessment to Government.

5. It appears, therefore, advisable to obtain the sanction, if necessary, of the Board of Revenue for the remissions promised by Mr. Foster, which are not large.

6. I beg to add that in my letter,* to which your communication under reference is a reply, I have treated separately tank lands of both classes, viz., the first-crop lands which received a direct supply of running water from the canal, and, secondly, the second-crop lands which were irrigated *after tank filling*, and which were charged with rates under the Government Order quoted.

* No. 258, dated 26th October 1877.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) C. J. KNOX,
Special Asst. Collector,
For Acting Collector.

THE Collector has correctly indicated the course which should have been adopted, but as the ryots acted on Mr. Foster's promise of remission, no charge can now be made.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Sub-Secretary.

To the Collector of Kurnool.

Exd. A. F. Goodall.

1878.
Board of Revenue
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 9TH JANUARY 1878, No. 48.

Received — Read

JANUARY.
No. 48.

Remissions of Government Water-rate—on land under four tanks in Nandial Taluq, Kurnool District.—Passing orders on letter from Collector forwarding correspondence between himself an General Deputy Collector regarding —.

1965/7

No. 2,837.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 19th October 1878.

Read the following letter from A. J. B. ATKINSON, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector in charge of Cuddapah, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 20th August 1878, No. 573 :—

I HAVE the honor to report the following facts for the orders of the Board of Revenue.

2. A late Collector, Mr. Daniel, issued a takid* on November 2nd, 1876, which stated that as the canal supply of water was running short, he had asked for the filling of the tanks as soon as possible; and directed the Tahsildars of Cuddapah and Proddutur to inform the ryots that only the land assessment would be levied and no canal water-rate.

* Enclosure A., with translation.

3. Mr. Daniel in paragraph 3 of his letter, No. 310, dated 22nd November 1876, reported that at the time he requested the tanks to be filled, he ought to have asked sanction for his takid, and quoted a Proceedings of the Board, Miscellaneous No. 9,276, dated 10th November 1876. These Proceedings however and the Government Order on which they were laid say nothing about water-rate; they simply authorize the filling of the tanks. The Board in their Proceedings, No. 2,958, of 24th November 1876, passed on Mr. Daniel's letter above quoted, state that orders have been passed on the subject of the water-rate and quoted their Proceedings, No. 2,918, of 21st November 1876. A reference to these Proceedings, however, shows that the subject there dealt with is the remission of tirwajasti on dry lands irrigated from doruvu wells and from Government sources of irrigation. There is nothing in them regarding canal water at all.

4. The Proceedings of the Board, No. 2,899, dated 20th November 1876, passed on G.O., Public Works Department, of 17th October 1876, No. 2,779, and on G.O., Revenue Department, 13th November 1876, No. 1,639, lay down the rules to govern the charge of canal water. They say that two-thirds of the Company's charge and the highest dry rate of the village are to be recovered from the ryots, the difference between the consolidated wet assessment (which includes the water-rate) and the highest dry rate of the village being remitted.

5. The Canal Deputy Collector pointed out on 10th August 1877 that the Board's order quoted above was quite opposed to Mr. Daniel's takid, and proposed (1) that two-thirds of the price of canal water should be charged on Sirkar wet lands cultivated with single crop under tanks filled by the Irrigation and Canal Company; (2) that the full price of canal water should be charged for the second crop raised on one crop lands and for dry lands cultivated by means of canal water let into the tanks by the Company; and (3) that full price should be charged in the case of Inam lands cultivated.

6. In his letter, No. 1,631, of 24th August 1877, Mr. Price stated that the principles above enunciated had his approval. The consequence was that Mr. Daniel's takid and promise of November 2nd, 1876, were set aside, and the Deputy Collector's proposals, which are in fact only the Board's Order of 20th November 1876, No. 2,899, were carried into effect.

7. Mr. Lister in reporting (Enclosure B) on the Board's Proceedings, No. 551, dated 28th February 1878, directing an explanation of the high rate of charge in the village of Cheyapad brings all these facts to notice. He is of opinion that Mr. Daniel's takid of 2nd November 1876 was based on G.O., Public Works Department, of 17th October 1876, No. 2,779. This, however, cannot be the case as that order together with G.O., Revenue Department, 13th November 1876, No. 1,639, were only communicated with a manuscript copy of the Board's Proceedings, No. 2,899, dated 20th November 1876. There is no explanation forthcoming as to how Mr. Daniel's order promising that there would be no charge for the canal water came to be issued.

8. Mr. Lister's proposals are as follows :—

(1.) That the Puttadars should pay the usual revenue charges only in accordance with the Collector's assurance under which they took the water. This is supported as being not only good faith but as affirmed in principle by the Board in their Proceedings, No. 48, of 8th January 1878, as regards Kurnool.

(2.) That in Midtur village the revenue charges of tirwajasti, which have been imposed, should be allowed to stand for both Puttadars and Inamdars.

(3.) That in Palumpalli village, Inamdars should pay a crop rate of Rupees 4.

(4.) That in other villages Inamdars should pay at the rate of Rupees 6 an acre for paddy and of Rupees 4 for other crops.

(5.) That refunds of canal water-rate should be made by him.

9. The financial effect is shown to be that out of Rupees 5,520-10-3 to be paid to the Company as the cost of stored water, the Inamdars will only contribute Rupees 1,022-3-1 at crop rates, and that the balance, Rupees 4,498-9-2, is to be paid by Government against an offset of revenue of Rupees 1,629-11-0.

10. It would be unbecoming in me to offer any remarks on the facts reported and on Mr. Lister's proposals, except to state that Mr. Lister gives no reason for his last proposal, viz., to pay the refunds of canal water-rate in person. If by this means he can show the ryots of the villages under the canal his close connection with the canal and with their prospects it can only do good.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From A. L. LISTER, Esq., on Special Duty, Kurnool and Cuddapah, to the Collector of Cuddapah, dated Ayalcor, 27th June 1878, No. 160.

WITH reference to the complaint made by some ryots to Mr. Price about the high charges made for canal water supplied to Cheyapad tank, Proddutur Taluk, on the requisition of Mr. Daniel, about which the Board of Revenue desired an explanation in their Proceedings, No. 551, of the 28th February last, I have the honor to state that similar over-charges were made in Cuddapah Taluk also, and I therefore submit a report upon the subject.

2. The existing rules about supplementing the supply of a tank with canal water do not work at all, partly on account of the difficulty, which approaches impossibility, of securing agreement among the ayacut holders to make an application for canal water, and partly on account of the charge by volume being entirely unintelligible to ryots who do not care to incur a liability which they have no means of estimating.

3. So towards the fall of 1876, although the monsoon had failed and want of food-grains was clearly impending, tanks were lying empty and lands under them were left uncultivated while plenty of water was flowing down the canal which nobody would use.

4. With a view to utilizing this water, Mr. Latham submitted to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation in his letter, No. 98, of the 29th September 1876, certain proposals which swept away the two great obstacles of a general application from ayacut holders and of an indefinite charge.

5. Mr. Latham's proposal really amounted to this; that lands under tank should be treated as other lands, paying the Company for the supplemental supply at the rate of Rs. 1-8-0 or Rupee 1 a-month according to the crop, "*but the total rate never to exceed a maximum of Rupees 6 and Rupees 4 respectively*," and the Government water-rate or wet assessment should be remitted in full on all lands for which no tank water was supplied.

1965

6. In submitting this proposal for the consideration of Government, Colonel Mullins made an equally fair but entirely different suggestion, viz., that the supplemental water should be supplied to tanks by volume at the cost of Government, the ryots paying the usual revenue charges only.

7. The question was considered by Government in the Public Works Department on the 17th October, and the danger of more water being thrown into tanks than was necessary was foreseen, and Mr. Latham was requested to let the Collectors know the capacity of the tanks he was prepared to supply to enable them to make a requisition for the amount wanted for each taluk; these instructions clearly had reference to Colonel Mullins' suggestion, and not to Mr. Latham's proposal, under which the charge would have determined by the area irrigated by canal water and not by the quantity of water stored in the tank.

8. On the 13th November Government in the Revenue Department approved of the proposal and directed the Board of Revenue to issue the necessary instructions to the Collectors without delay.

9. On the 20th November the Board of Revenue issued orders, that in Cuddapah District the difference between the consolidated wet assessment and the highest dry rate in the village would be remitted, and the usual two-thirds of the Company's charge against Government should be received.

10. Had these instructions reached the district sooner, the water would not have been used, for it is certain that nothing would have induced the ryots to take water on such terms; in one case indeed the relaxation granted by the Board of Revenue was absolutely nothing, as the wet assessment on the land under the tank and the highest dry rate of the village were the same.

11. But previous to the receipt of these instructions the Collector, Mr. Daniel, had issued, on the 2nd November, takid No. 95, reciting that the Tahsildar had reported that the ryots were unwilling to pay both the Government kist and the canal rate and were not using the canal water in consequence, and directing the Tahsildar to make it known to the ryots that even though they took the canal water they would have to pay the taram kist only; this takid was communicated to the villagers; indeed, it was among the records of Cheyapad village that I first saw it, and on the strength of the Collector's promise, the ryots used the canal water poured into their tanks.

12. I would ask especial attention to the date of the Collector's takid; it was issued on the *2nd of November*, doubtless as soon as Mr. Daniel had seen the Government Proceedings, Public Works Department of 17th October, with which it appears to be in conformity.

13. Mr. Daniel's promise has unfortunately not been acted up to, and not only have the ryots been charged with two-thirds of the cost of the water, but every other possible additional charge has been imposed upon them, full wet assessment, second crop assessment, and tirwajasti; and the heavy water-rates have in some cases been collected with interest and process fees after distraining standing crops for money which the ryots did not fairly owe; these revenue charges which were improperly imposed were ordered to be refunded by the Collector in January, but the ryots have suffered much and they are undoubtedly discontented about the charges imposed on them; the refunds, too, have not yet been made; now they had better lie over until this report is disposed of, and I have so instructed the Tahsildar.

14. I will now explain how Mr. Daniel's promise came to be set aside. On the 12th July last the Deputy Collector, Kristna Row, wrote to the Collector to ask whether the ryots were or were not to be charged with two-thirds of the price of water in addition to the full *wet* assessment of the land, from which question I infer that the Deputy Collector had not even seen the correspondence and orders on the subject, for he goes on to say that the spirit of Mr. Daniel's circular was quite against the principle enunciated in G.O., dated 17th June 1875, No. 921.

15. In reply he received docket, No. 1,164 of 1877, signed by Mr. Deputy Collector Johnston for the Acting Collector, referring him to the Board's Proceedings of 20th November, "a copy of which is now enclosed."

16. On the 10th August the Deputy Collector wrote that Mr. Daniel's circular appeared "to be quite at variance with the instructions issued by the Board of Revenue on the said Government Order; he pointed out Mr. Daniel's *promise* to levy only the wet assessment and to remit the two-thirds of the price of the canal water let into the tanks; he showed that the charge would be "*very high*," Rupees 20-10-6 and Rupees 15-8-0, respectively, for *a single crop*; the ryots were clamorous and dissatisfied with the arrangement; the quantity of water let into Maidkur tank was quite disproportionate to the wet area cultivated under it; he enclosed two clear statements showing the financial effect of breaking Mr. Daniel's promise or of keeping it, and he concluded in paragraph 6 by particularizing the charges made against the ryots with reference to G.O. of 17th June 1875, and Board's Proceedings of 20th November 1876.

17. On the 26th August he received a reply from the Acting Collector signed by Mr. Deputy Collector Johnstou stating "the principles enunciated in paragraph 6 of your letter have my approval;" whereupon the charges were imposed on the principle of distributing over the irrigated area the total cost of the water poured into the tank at the rate of Rupee one for every 1,440 cubic yards.

18. I beg to recommend that Mr. Daniel's promise should be kept and that the usual revenue charges only should be levied from the ryots; these have already been imposed and mostly collected; I wish personally to make the refunds of canal water-rate.

19. It is doubtless unnecessary to say anything further in support of the view that the assurances under which the ryots took water should be acted up to; but I would add that the Board of Revenue affirmed this principle in their Proceedings of the 8th January 1878, No. 48, where they laid down that "as the ryots acted on Mr. Foster's promise of remission no charge can now be made;" the ryots too did not ask for their tanks to be *filled*; it was the Collector who made the application, distinctly stating that *Government* were to be charged with the cost at Rupee one for every 1,440 cubic yards.

20. The Deputy Collector referring to the tanks in Cuddapah Taluk only said that the Company's bill for water was Rupees 3,644-12-5 while the income from the lands cultivated under these tanks was Rupees 3,164-5-11, showing the loss to Government of Rupees 479-12-6 if Mr. Daniel's promise was kept.

21. But this income was calculated on Inamdars paying the excessive charges of 15 and 20 Rupees an acre. I beg to submit that this is neither fair nor equitable. Had Mr. Lathsin's proposal been accepted, Inam lands could not have been charged more than 6 Rupees an acre for a rice crop. Inamdars can only be called upon in fairness to pay for the value of the water they used, and not for the cost of a quantity of water which was not wanted. I think that Inamdars should be charged in accordance with Mr. Lathain's proposal at the rate of 6 Rupees an acre for paddy, and at the rate of 4 Rupees an acre for other crops.

22. *Duggunapalle Tank* illustrates well the extreme hardship individual ryots have suffered through these orders, the ayacut consists of only 13 acres, of which A. 11 D. 42 used stored water for two crop; A. 1 D. 71 dry land took water for a second crop; the total cost of the stored water was Rupees 380-7-5; so the charge was reckoned to be Rupees 15-8-0 an acre for each crop; and an additional rupee an acre was charged for canal water taken in November before tank-supply commenced.

The incidence of the rate was as under:—

A.	D.		Rs.	A.	P.
8	52	Paid for November	1	0	0
		Charge for first crop	10	5	4
		Do. for second crop	15	8	0
			26	13	4
2	90	Paid for first crop	10	5	4
		Do. for second crop	15	8	0
			25	13	4

in addition to the usual wet assessment—

A.	D.				
1	71	Of dry land paid assessment	3	1	0
		Second crop water-rate	15	8	0
			18	9	0

23. But the heavy charges in this village fell on a few shoulders only, and were therefore the more felt, *e.g.*, Aswardham Reddi at these rates became liable to Rupees 113-13-3, of which in January last he had paid Rupees 13-9-8; a demand notice for Rupees 100-3-7 was served upon him; his standing crops were distrained, and the amount with Rupees 4-8-0 interest, Annas 3 demand batta, and Annas 8 distraint batta; in all Rupees 105-6-7 was levied from him. Gazelpalli Pillai Kondaiah similarly paid Rupees 103-13-9, and Chinna Ellanna paid Rupees 87-8-5.

24. These ryots produce the receipt for a registered letter to the Tahsildar of Cuddapah, dated 21st August 1877; another registered receipt of a letter to the Collector of Cuddapah, dated 12th January 1878, a couple of days after the distraint, to neither of which they received, they say, any reply; no enquiry seems to have been held; a third registered receipt of a letter addressed to Mr. Dumphy from whom they received an endorsement promising that he would

1965/69

secure them an enquiry if possible. I mention these documents lest any one should ask why the ryots did not complain.

25. *Midtur Tank* has an ayacut of 83 acres, of which 45 are unoccupied waste, having been thrown out of cultivation at the settlement, when rates of Rupees 7-6-0 and 4-8-0 were imposed; last fasli 32 acres more were left waste, and only 6 acres of the ayacut were cultivated.

26. Yet this tank was *filled* under the Collector's orders, and the cost of the stored water was Rupees 1,012-0-8; only A. 4 D. ·08 of the ayacut was irrigated with this water, and the Government contribution of one-third of the cost of stored water was withheld, because it was a second crop, the first crop having been raised by canal water supplied direct by distribution channels; the holders of these 4 acres were fortunately saved from a charge of Rupees 250 an acre by the enterprise of some dry landholders who irrigated A. 44 D. ·87; the cost of the charge by volume Rupees 1,012-0-8 distributed over A. 45 D. ·95 was reckoned to be Rupees 20-10-5 an acre, and this sum was imposed.

27. The A. 4 D. ·8 of the ayacut was charged with Rupees 11-11-6 fasaljasti; the A. 12 D. ·47, putta dry land, was charged with Rupees 18-11-3 teervajasti, although there was no Government water, and although they were charged the full cost of the canal water; the A. 32 D. ·40 inam land was charged with Rupees 48-0-7 teervajasti.

28. So a fresh question arises—What are the dry landholders to pay the Revenue teervajasti, or (if my suggestion about inamdars is approved) the canal crop rate? The teervajasti on A. 48 D. ·95 dry land amounted to Rupees 67; at crop rate for no paddy at all was grown under this tank, the charge would be nearly Rupees 176. I think the crop rate might fairly have been imposed, and the teervajasti remitted; but as the amount involved is small, and as varying forms of refund offer opportunities for misapprehension and peculation, and as my substantial recommendation is that the revenue charges should stand and the canal rates be remitted and refunded, I would prefer no charge being made on ryots or inamdars for the water stored in Midtur tank; the financial result is no doubt disastrous, as Government have to pay Rupees 1,012 for the water, and only recover Rupees 79 in teervajasti and fasaljasti; but this is the result of a tank being filled when ryots did not choose to use the water; and the additional Rupees 109 which would be gained by levying crop rates on inam dry lands would not convert the transaction into a financial success.

29. *Pullampilly Tank* is the only one in which there was a gain by the stored water; the cost was Rupees 942-9-0; there is only one wet rate under this tank, viz., Rupees 10; Rupees 767-2-0 income was received by wet assessment, teervajasti and fasaljasti; and A. 160 D. ·69 of inam lands were irrigated. I have not yet received the list of crops grown on these inam lands, but I do not think it would be fair to charge the inamdars more than Rupees 4 a crop, in which case they would contribute Rupees 642, leaving only Rupees 300 to be paid by Government in return for Rupees 767 of secured revenue.

30. *Rachinayapally Tank* yields Rupees 26-12-6 fasaljasti, and at crop rates Rupees 34-14-9 from inam lands; in all Rupees 61-11-3 against Rupees 187-3-7, the cost of the stored water.

31. *Chinnamasapally Tank* yields Rupees 457-0-2 assessment and Rupees 219-10-7 from inam lands at crop rates; in all Rupees 676-10-9 against Rupees 1,122-7-9, the cost of the stored water.

32. *Cheyapad Tank* in Proddutur Taluk has an ayacut of A. 110 D. ·30, of which A. 12 D. ·22 were immemorial waste until the present year, last year a further extent of A. 24 D. ·86 was left waste; the remainder A. 73 D. ·22 was cultivated.

33. But A. 38 D. ·40, of this A. 73 D. ·22 was irrigated for the first crop by the Company's distribution channels without the water passing through the tank; this land therefore has not contributed on account of first crop towards the payment of the water stored in the tank.

34. The whole of the cost of this water has been thrown upon the remainder of the ayacut A. 34 D. ·82 and 4 acres of dry land for the first crop, and A. 41 D. ·11 for the second crop; in all A. 79 D. ·93, of which A. 28 D. ·50 are inam and A. 51 D. ·63 Sirkar land.

35. Dividing the total cost of Rupees 1,875-13-10 over A. 79 D. ·93 acres, the water-rate was reckoned to be Rupees 23-7-10 an acre; of this a reduction of one-third was made on A. 24 D. ·51 Sirkar land for first crop; this reduction amounted to Rupees 191-8-0, leaving Rupees 1,684-5-10 to be paid by the ryots.

36. Before the order to fill the tank was issued, some of the lands were irrigated direct by distribution channels at the monthly rate, and the crop was subsequently matured with the stored water; these ryots were charged Rupee 1 for November in addition to the Rupees 23-7-10.

37. The incidence of this heavy water-rate has varied according as the lands were Sirkar or Inam, whether they used the stored water for one crop or for two, and whether they took water in November at the monthly rate or not.

I will distribute the different rates over A. 79 D. 93 acres; the whole area charged :—

	A.	D.		Rs.	A.	P.			
Inam	2	87	Monthly rate for November ...	1	0	0			
			First crop	23	7	10			
			Second crop	23	7	10			
							47	15	8
Sirkar ...	10	30	Monthly rate for November..	1	0	0			
			First crop Rupees 23-7-10 less one-third *plus* Rupees 3 highest dry rate for land assessment	18	10	0			
			Second crop	23	7	10			
							43	1	10
	12	57	First crop.						
	12	57	Second crop.						
Total area so far ...	25	14							
Inam	8	04	For November	1	0	0			
			First crop	23	7	10			
							24	7	10
Do.	4	0	Do.	...			23	7	10
Sirkar ...	9	16	Rupees 23-7-10 less one-third *plus* Rupees 3 assessment and Rupee 1 for November.	...			19	10	0
Do. ...	5	05	Rupees 23-7-10 less one-third *plus* Rupees 3 assessment ...	...			18	10	0
Do. ...	16	82	For second crop	...			28	7	10
Inam ...	11	72							
Total ...	79	93							

38. Paddy was grown on none of these lands; mostly raggy for the first crop and indigo and jonna for the second; no water was stored before December, and the 12 acres which have been rated with upwards of 40 Rupees are called upon to pay that sum for half a year's supply for a couple of garden crops; the tank too I am told leaked much near the western calingulah; for what was lost by leakage too the ryots have been charged.

39. The recommendations then which I respectfully submit are as follows :—

(1.) That puttadars should pay the usual revenue charges only in accordance with the Collector's assurance under which they took the water.
(2.) That in Midtur village the revenue charges of teervajasti which have been imposed should be allowed to stand for both puttadars and inamdars.
(3.) That in Palampally village inamdars should pay a crop rate of Rupees 4.
(4.) That in other villages inamdars should pay at the rate of Rupees 6 an acre for paddi and of Rupees 4 for other crops.
(5.) That refunds of canal water-rate should be made by me.

40. The financial result of the whole transaction will be as follows :—

	Rs.	A.	P.
Cost of stored water to be paid to the Company	5,520	10	3
Amount of this sum to be collected from inamdars at crop rates	1,022	3	1
Leaving	4,498	7	2

Balance to be paid by Government, and considering the circumstances under which Mr. Daniel ordered the tank to be filled, it would appear to be a famine charge; by this expenditure Rupees 1,629-11-0 of revenue was secured.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) A. J. B. ATKINSON,
Acting Sub-Collector in Charge.

1965
BC

Enclosure No. 2.—Copy of Takid.

Enclosure No. 3.—Translation of Takid.

Mr. Daniel exceeded his authority in promising that no charge for canal water would be levied, but faith must be kept with the ryots, and a somewhat similar concession has already been made in Kurnool under Board's Proceedings, dated 8th January 1878, No. 48. The Board in passing their Proceedings, dated 20th November 1876, No. 2,899, never contemplated the imposition of such heavy charges, and the effect of their ruling should have been brought to notice at once, instead of resorting to extreme measures for enforcement of the demand as represented by Mr. Lister; it should be explained why no notice was taken of the ryots' complaints (*vide* paragraph 24), and the refunds authorized by the Collector (paragraph 13) should be paid at once. Mr. Lister's proposals enumerated in paragraph 8 of Mr. Atkinson's letter appear fair and reasonable and are accepted. Mr. Lister's object in suggesting that the refunds should be made by him is probably to ensure the money reaching those who are entitled to it.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Acting Secretary.

To the Collector of Cuddapah.

Copy to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with copy of Board's Proceedings, 8th January 1878, No. 48.

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

Revenue Department

No 5026.

1878.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

To

THE COLLECTOR OF CUDDAPAH.

Dated October 19*th*.

Printed November 11*th*.

Received 15 November

PROCEEDINGS, 19TH OCTOBER 1878, No. 2,837.

Dups 14/11/78 ent

OCTOBER.

No. 2,837.

Canal water—supplied to certain tanks in Cuddapah District in 1876.—Passing orders on letter from Collector submitting one from Mr. A. L. Foster, on Special Duty, regarding charges made for [illegible] No. 1965—

Recorded

Superintendent Land

6 Dec 1878

14 Feb (Board of Revenue — 8 to 10 days)

7 71

Cancelled R 5 Dec 78