Archives I - 10,006—16-8 77.

(1) Number of pages 8

(2) Date of repair 11.2.88.

(3) Initials of the Referencer [illegible]

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. / B.P.-No.	565	Press. / Mis.
Dated	20.5.1880	197- .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

565
1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

20th May 1880, No. 565.

No. 131. READ THE FOLLOWING PAPER:—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 1st April 1880, No. 431.

ABSTRACT.—Submitting for orders of Government, with Board's remarks, letter from Collector of Kurnool regarding two additions proposed by the Agent and Manager of Madras Irrigation and Canal Company to No. VI of Irrigation Water-rate Rules.

No. 132. ORDER THEREON, 20th May 1880, No. 565.

Irrigation, No. 5.

As to paragraph 2 of the Board's Proceedings His Grace the Governor in Council is not prepared to sanction any charge for leakage.

2. The matter referred to in paragraph 3 has already been disposed of in G.O., 8th May 1880, No. 524.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.
„ the Public Works Department.

Exd. W. H. French.

60 Copies.

565
2

No. 431.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 1st April 1880.

Read the following letter from C. J. CROSTHWAITE, Esq., Acting Collector of Kurnool, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 10th March 1880, No. 90 :—

IN continuation of this office letter marginally noted, I have the honor to submit, for the orders of Government, two additions to Rule VI of the Irrigation Water-rate Rules proposed by Mr. Latham. The first of these proposals is that "land on which dry* or wet paddy had been grown in any of the five years preceding the opening of the canal shall not be charged water-rate for a similar crop if found overflowed with canal water unless there be proof of the owner's agency, but additional cultivation of dry paddy or wet paddy on land on which no such crop had been grown in any of the five years preceding the opening of the canal and on which canal water has flowed shall be charged water-rate, and it shall not be necessary to prove the owner's agency."

No. 75, dated 25th February 1880.

* Mundla paddy.

2. This is virtually a proposal to cancel Clause II of Rule 6, and charge water rate in all cases of sub-soil leakage. As the Board and Government are already aware, the Company's Agent and Manager has repeatedly endeavored to get Government to recognize the propriety of making ryots pay for benefits indirectly derived by them from the canal, and the present seems to be another effort in the same direction. It is an admitted fact that, in some of the canal villages, the fields are intersected by such a network of distributory channels that water will get into them whether the ryot requires it or not, and the latter is compelled to sow only such a crop (Mundla paddy for example) as would grow on his fields under the circumstances.

3. The second of Mr. Latham's proposals is that "if the Company voluntarily let canal water into a tank after the waste calingulah of the tank had ceased to discharge the natural supply, then the Government shall pay the Company Rupee 1 per acre per month (fractions counting as whole numbers) for such of the said canal water as may be used for irrigation of the first or second crops; but the Government shall not pay the Company if the natural supply only be used."

4. As the above suggestion is already before Government in all its details, it is unnecessary for me to say anything further about it here.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. The Board concur with the Collector in considering that the first alteration is not advisable. The question of the liability of the ryot to payment of water-rate for irrigation by canal leakage water was fully discussed when the rules were last revised (*vide* G.Os., dated 23rd February and 30th August 1877, Nos. 790 and 2,613), and the principle that the cultivation should not be held liable where a supply of water is afforded independently of any action on his part was affirmed. No grounds for setting aside this decision have been brought forward.

3. The second proposal must await final orders on the question of tank supply—Board's Proceedings, dated 15th May 1879, No. 1,278. If the recommendations are approved, the nature of the arrangements must be more fully set forth in the rules.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

[signature] ~~Acting~~ Secretary.

45

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Copy to the Collector of Kurnool, with copy of G.O., dated 30th August 1877, No. 2,613.

Exd. A. Raitt.

V. Original.

Govt. of (1880) Madras

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated May 20th.

Printed 25th.

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 20th May 1880, No. 565.

MAY.

Nos. 131-132.

Irrigation Water-rate Rules. — Stating, in reference to paragraph 2 of Revenue Board's Proceedings regarding —, that His Grace the Governor in Council is not prepared to sanction any charge for leakage, and observing that the matter referred to in paragraph 3 has already been disposed of in G.O., 8th May 1880, No. 524.

Revenue Dept
No 2161

1880.

Board of Revenue,

MADRAS.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Dated April 1st.

Printed th.

Received 19 April 1880

PROCEEDINGS, 1ST APRIL 1880, No. 431.

APRIL.

No. 431.

Irrigation Water-rate Rules.—Submitting for orders of Government, with Board's remarks, letter from Collector of Kurnool regarding two additions proposed by the Agent and Manager of Madras Irrigation and Canal Company to No. VI of —.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 2161

From Revenue Board

Dated 1st April 1880.

FOR ORDERS.

Clause 11 Rule 6 of the rules for regulating the Irrigation Company's water supply provides that subsoil leakage or Canal overflow is not to be charged for, unless it occurred "under circumstances within the control of the Cultivator." Mr. Latham now endeavours to restrict the benefit of this rule to those cases of land on which a wet crop had been grown in any of the five years preceding the opening of the Canals, and charge all other irrigation, irrespective of any action on the part of the ryot—this as the Collector and the

Go. 5th December 1877
No 3357

I do not sanction charge of water rate for leakage but in any case the rules cannot be materially altered in the present position of the Co's affairs.

[illegible]

Board observe is a traverse
of the principle already laid
down – viz that cultivators
should not be held liable to
water tax where a supply of
water is afforded independently
of any action on the part of the
cultivator –

The second instance
adverted to by the Collector has
not been disposed of by G.O.
of 8th May 1880 no. 524 ; the
matter has been under discussion
and consideration for some time
in separate Correspondence
and it is not clear why Mr
Latham has now brought it
forward again in a different
shape –

Read

FOR ORDERS.