

(1) Number of pages 22
(2) Date of repair 21. 3. 1972
(3) Initials of the Referencer 1

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

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

754

Press
Mis.

Dated

21. 2. 1977

1977

Not to be folded or roughly handled

21

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 13th November 1876.

Read the following letter from R. K. PUCKLE, Esq., Director of Revenue Settlement, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Radapuram, 27th September 1876, No. 3,432-100:—

I HAVE the honor to inform you that the settlement of the Tinnevely District was made on the assumption that the crop grown during the north-east monsoon, locally styled Peshanam, was the first crop in irrigated lands, *vide* paragraph 7 of my letter No. 416 embodied in Board's Proceedings, No. 2,960, dated 12th October 1874; and during the settlement the ryots were encouraged to compound for the crop grown during the south-west monsoon, locally styled Kar, as a second crop; the ryots were specially warned at the time that by compounding they undertook all risks of season in the matter of second crop, and that they would have to pay the compounded rate whether they got water or not, or whether they grow rice, or dry grain, or vegetables as a second crop. This was perfectly understood at the time, and the mode of treatment of a first crop was disposed of by the Board in Proceedings, No. 234, dated 6th February 1874, to the effect that when this crop failed the ryots were entitled to remission to the extent of the full assessment for that crop. Board's Proceedings, No. 768, dated 17th March 1876, seem to me to require some slight modification to explain these principles clearly, and I beg to suggest that in the last line for "no remission can be granted where one average crop has been secured", the words "no remission can be granted where a first crop has been secured" may be substituted.

2. I take the liberty of addressing the Board on this subject, though I have received no official copy of the Proceedings in question, as I find that much misapprehension exists here, and that those ryots who have spoken to me on the subject will be quite satisfied with this interpretation of the order.

THE amendment suggested by the Director of Revenue Settlement seems to the Board on reconsideration to be correct, and the Collector of Tinnevely will send accordingly the Proceedings referred to by Mr. Puckle.

2. The Proceedings, 9th March 1876, No. 662, also require revision. In paragraph 3 for the words "when one crop whether Kar or Peshanam is got off the land", should be read "when the first crop (Peshanam) is got off the land". The Collector of Tinnevely will make and act upon this correction.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

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

To the Acting Collector of Tinnevely.
" the Director of Revenue Settlement,
with copy of Board's Proceedings, 9th March 1876, No. 662.

Exd. W. J. Lewis.

N. 768.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 17th March 1876.

Read the following letter from A. J. STUART, Esq., Acting Collector of Tinnevely, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Tinnevely, 2nd March 1876, No. 143:—

I HAVE the honor to request early orders on my letter, No. 648, dated 27th November 1875, on the subject of remissions for crops lost on lands left waste under the usual remission rules when a double crop has been compounded for. The Jamabandi is about to be begun, and it is necessary to know on what principle these cases which, owing to the dryness of the latter part of the season will probably be numerous, are to be dealt with.

2. I have recommended that remissions be granted where the ryot is willing to forego in future the benefit of the compounded rate. If the Board think that remissions should cease upon compounded land, I think that permission should be given to reclass as single crop land any lands which up to settlement were single crop land, if at the present Jamabandi the ryots, having found that they are not likely to be permanent double crop lands owing to insufficient supply, may wish to make this change. Such lands would in future pay a full second charge for second crop whenever they might be able to cultivate a second crop. The option might be limited to this year or one more year if grace might be given, as the notice this year will be very short.

3. If this course does not recommend itself to the Board, I beg for permission to grant remission this year in special cases, where, owing to the unfavorable season, the losses have been more heavy than in an average year, as will certainly be the case in the Tenkarai Taluq at the end of the Tambrapurni irrigation and in some parts of Tenkasi and Tinnevely taluqs watered from the Chittar river. This will be a special measure to meet a specially unfavorable season.

As regards the proposal to allow the ryots to recede from their agreement to compound for a second crop, the Collector is referred to the Board's Proceedings, dated 9th March 1876, No. 662, to which they adhere. The Board will consider any proposals which the Collector may bring forward for the grant of special remission for failure of both crops owing to the unfavorable nature of the season, but no remission can be granted where one average crop has been secured.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

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

To the Collector of Tinnevely.

Exd. W. J. Lewis.

1876.

Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 18TH NOVEMBER 1876, No. 2,812.

Encl.

Recd. 12/11/76

Received 16.21-2.97-1876

NOVEMBER
No. 2,812.

Settlement of Tinnevely District.—Requesting that certain corrections may be made in Board's Proceedings, dated 9th and 17th March 1876, Nos. 662 and 768, respectively, regarding grant of remissions in cases where assessment for second crop has been compounded for.

Remissions.—Referring Collector of Tinnevely to Board's Proceedings of 9th March 1876, No. 662, with reference to his proposal to allow ryots to recede from their agreement to compound for a second crop, and passing orders regarding grant of special remissions for failure of crops owing to unfavorable nature of the season.

MARCH.
No. 768.

Received

Feb 21-2-99 47574

No: 2
1227/14

Encl.

PROCEEDINGS, 17th MARCH 1876, No. 768.

1876.
Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

No. 662.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 9th March 1876.

Read the following letter from A. J. STUART, Esq., Acting Collector of Tinnevely, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 27th November 1876, No. 648:—

I HAVE the honor to request the orders of the Board as to whether remissions under the rules may be given or not to ryots who have compounded at settlement, and whose lands are waste or crops lost for *one crop* for want of water and without fault.

2. I enclose an extract from a notice published by Mr. Puck in the Gazette and of which copies were distributed in the villages. To my mind, it is not sufficiently clear to the ordinary ryot's capacity that compounding involved loss of the right to remission. As a fact, the ryots expect remission for Car waste or withered as before.

3. In many villages of the Tenkarai Taluq in the present season, the lands have been left waste for want of water in Car; in many others, the crops have been altogether or partially lost entirely owing to the deficiency of the season, not to any neglect of the ryot. Everywhere, it will be a very unpopular measure to refuse the hitherto usual remissions, but under the Streevaigundam Anicut where the assessment has been largely increased in the settlement, I shall probably have to ask the Board to make remissions as a special case, if the system of granting remission on compounded land is not recognized.

4. In carrying out the settlement, the owners of wet lands in the Tambra-purni Valley were offered the liberty of compounding for a double crop, that is to say, they were charged two-thirds, half or one-third, or some other proportion of the first crop charge for the second crop if they compounded, while three-fourths was to be the charge if they declined to compound. The yield of the second crop is not the same as for the first, and the Car-crop, though in point of time the first, was taken as the second crop, while the yield of Car where it can be grown is higher than that of Peshanum. It is not surprising therefore, that all who can grow a two-crops with moderate certainty, agreed to compound.

5. But it appears that many lands for which there is often not sufficient water in the Car season compounded also, no doubt attracted by the reduction in the rate to which it is doubtful if they properly understood that loss of remission, unless both crops fail, was a condition; so long as all the lands are cultivated, there is no loss to any one by this arrangement, but as, in fact, there are few years in which there is not a considerable area of waste for want of water in Car, the question arises, are such lands, if their owners have compounded, to get remissions or not. If they do, the result of the settlement will be less than expected, founded, as it was, upon the compounding system, by which the double crop was, it is feared, extended to more lands than the water-supply will warrant being permanently classed as double crop, certainly to a large area in excess of what had hitherto been so classed.

6. If remissions are not allowed, the Board must depart from the principle they have hitherto always followed, *viz.*, that with wet lands remission is to be granted where lands are waste or a crop lost for want of water, not the fault of the ryot. I am informed that it was thought in the Settlement Department that

compounding ryots would or might grow a dry crop when there was not sufficient water, but in practice, they very seldom attempt this, and anyhow the supposition cannot be applied to lands cultivated wet, but withered for want of water.

7. I am not aware that when the ryots were offered the option of compounding, they were clearly informed that no remission would in future be allowed, unless both crops failed; indeed the fact that I have now to refer this question as to whether remission may or may not be given for one failure, shows that the point cannot have been made clear to the ryots, since it is not clear to the officers of the district. I am informed that Mr. Comyn was as much in doubt about it as myself.

8. I think that the right to remission for either crop ought to be recognized, but as this will entail a loss of revenue unlooked for at the time the settlement was made, I would propose that whenever a ryot claims remission for either crop on compounded land, remission should only be allowed on condition of his agreeing to give up his right to compound for the future, and that the land be reclassified as one-crop land and charged in future a three-fourth full wet rate whenever it carries a second crop, that is, as single-crop lands are now charged.

9. It will be clear that if a large area of previously single-crop land was compounded for at settlement and so classed as double crop, the charge for second crop is a charge that for so much of this land as is often waste for want of water, must either be remitted by Government, in which case the settlement calculations ought not to have taken credit for it as double crop, or else it must often be paid for by the compounding ryot, without any return, to do which it is by no means clear that he agreed when he compounded, since there is nothing to show that he understood that one of the conditions of compounding was the loss of the privilege of remission, unless both crops are lost.

10. I doubt if the Board meant the remission system to be altered, the more so as this would, in seasons of scanty water-supply, make the ryots pay from one-fourth to two-thirds more assessment for one crop than it has been thought fair to put upon it. I think it sufficient to understand by "compounding for two crops" that two crops must be grown or paid for whenever there is sufficient water. I therefore refer the question, with a request that I may receive definite instructions in view to the coming Jamabandi, whether remissions are to be given under the rules for compounded lands as for all others, or whether compounded lands are in future to be refused remission altogether, unless the land is waste for both crops or both crops are lost, or whether a middle course as suggested in paragraph 8 would meet the approval of the Board.

11. I may add that I think there can be no doubt that more land has been compounded for than can be reasonably expected will be supplied in an ordinary Car season, in other words that nearly all land that can ever expect or has ever grown a second crop has been classed as double crop—a departure made at the settlement from the previous rule that only such lands should be classed as permanent double crop as were tolerably sure, unless in exceptionally bad seasons to be able to grow a second crop. Only such lands were formerly taken credit for in the Revenue accounts as double crop, whereas now all compounded lands are so counted. It follows that the settlement demand based upon an increased area of double crop land, larger than can be fairly supplied in an ordinary year for both

151/4
crops, will seldom be realized if remissions are given for such parts of the double-crop land as are waste or withered. The settlement so based made the demand about the same as the old demand founded on a basis in which remissions were not so much required, because less land was entered as double crop and its assessment in the demand, while for considerable areas of single-crop lands extra assessment was paid for growing a second crop, a resource which, in the new settlement, will be much reduced.

12. The effect of the change will be, if remissions are allowed, that there will be a considerable sacrifice of revenue through the settlement, in annual remissions on double-crop compounded land, while if they are refused, the revenue will remain much as before, but the onus of a not inconsiderable part of it will have been shifted from the best lands most certain of irrigation, to the lands further from the sources of supply which will be made to pay in all seasons when they can hope to reap only in some, and thus will pay more in proportion to their yield than they did before, while the best lands pay less.

13. I see no way out of the difficulty, but the one I propose in paragraph 8, the effect of which will be gradually to reclass as single crop the excess of compounded lands over the fairly supplied double-crop lands, charging them a three-fourth rate when a second crop is grown. This will probably result in a considerable reduction of the demand more than can be made up for by extra charge on single-crop lands occasionally growing a second crop—the loss can only be avoided by refusing remission on compounded lands and insisting upon maintaining the double-crop compounded assessment, whether there is water for two crops or not, both of which appeared to me harsh and doubtful steps.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Extract from Settlement Notice published by late Collector.

MR. STUART has afforded no information as to the probable financial effect of his proposal to allow ryots dissatisfied with the agreement entered into by them as regards compounding for the second-crop charge to recede from it on the understanding that they should in future pay at the old rate of three-fourths of the first-crop assessment whenever a second crop is cultivated, and the Board are unable to form an estimate from the settlement reports on record in their office as details of the irrigated lands compounded for at the several rates are not given, except in the report for the northern portion of the Ambasamudram Taluq recorded in G.O., dated 6th December 1875, No. 1,760.

2. That report shows that in the river-irrigated tract the proportions of area and the assessment thereon compounded at the several rates are as follows:—

	Area.	Per cent.	Second-crop charge.
	ACRES.		RS.
Two-thirds ...	1,518	11.6	10,683
Half ...	3,112	24.0	13,976
One-third ...	3,229	24.8	8,063
One-fourth ...	5,142	39.6	6,726
Total...	13,001	100.0	39,448

754/5

The whole of the river-irrigated area except 90 acres was compounded for. At the old rates 8,094 acres of land were cultivated with second crop; thus the increase in area under the new settlement is almost exactly the extent compounded for at the lowest rate. It may be assumed, therefore, that it is to this tract that Mr. Stuart's measure of relief would apply, as it is no doubt in this portion that the irrigation for a second crop is precarious. If this surmise be correct the matter is not of much importance, for the second-crop charge is in no case more than Rupees 1-8-0, and the whole assessment for the two crops in no case more than Rupees 7-8-0 per acre, the average being only Rupees 6-8-0. The sum involved is Rupees 6,726 out of a revenue amounting to Rupees 1,35,000, and a portion of the former amount would doubtless be recovered at the three-fourths' rate which without composition would probably be secured on some of the land. The figures for the other settled tracts would probably give similar results, and, if the Board's suppositions be correct, it is certainly not worthwhile disturbing the settlement to give so small a modicum of relief.

3. In the letter recorded in Board's Proceedings, dated 24th March 1873, No. 444, Mr. Puckle explained the principle on which the terms of composition were arranged, and it is evident from his remarks that the proportion of land compounded for at the higher ratios must be everywhere as in Ambasamudram very small. The letter recorded in Board's Proceedings, dated 19th March 1874, No. 628, shows that Mr. Puckle fully explained the matter to the ryots, and that they were aware of the nature of the agreement when they accepted the composition. It is quite clear from Mr. Puckle's reports on settlement operations in Tinnevely that the charge for second crop was compounded at the low rates specified on the distinct understanding that no remission would be granted for failure of a second crop, and the Board, in accepting the explanation furnished in the letter just quoted, affirmed the principle that when one crop, whether Car or Peshanam is got off the land, the double-crop compounded rate must be paid, but that remission of the whole will be allowed under the ordinary rules when no crop at all is secured within the year. The adoption of Mr. Stuart's proposals would be tantamount to reversing Mr. Puckle's policy and upsetting his settlement altogether; the Board must therefore decline to modify his arrangements.

4. As regards Mr. Stuart's statement that the burden has been shifted Mr. Puckle's letter recorded in Board's Proceedings, dated 24th March 1873, No. 444, to the inferior lands by the mode of settlement adopted, the Board observe that compounding is compulsory only in the case of the best lands, and that from the figures given in the several settlement reports it appears that the average second-crop charge in no case exceeds half the assessment for the first crop, whilst in the cases where the ratio is as high as that, a very large proportion of the area is superior land assessed at high rates.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

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

To the Acting Collector of Tinnevely.

Exd. W. H. French.

13 March 1876

Lands of Ryots who have compounded Settlement, and whose lands are waste, or crop lost for one crop for want of water, in Tinnevely District.—Passing orders on Collector's letter inquiring whether remission of assessment under the rules may be granted on —

MARCH.
No. 662.

Received

1876-2-27-10752

Also: 12/1/77

Encl.

PROCEEDINGS, 9TH MARCH 1876, No. 662.

1876.
Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

No. 389.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 1st February, 1877.
and the following letter from A. J. STUART, Esq., Acting Collector of Tinnevely, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 3rd November 1876, No. 351:—

In reply to Board's Proceedings No. 733, dated 14th March 1876, I have the honor to submit comparative statements for the north and south Srivykuntham taluqs, showing the areas likely to be irrigated as estimated by Mr. Puckle in 1872, and those now thought probable by the Tahsildar, a very competent officer and thoroughly acquainted with his taluq. The Board will find the population of each village in the first column, and the condition of the ryots as well as explanations of variations in estimate in the last column.

2. The revision of assessment on the north side has resulted in an increase of revenue of Rupees 7,743, but this is included in the figures already given by me for Fasli 1284.

3. The remissions for Fasli 1284, amounting to Rupees 31,035, were in part the result of a deficient supply of water in the kar season, and also to a large extent were caused by the ryots having taken into holding more land than there was any prospect of cultivating for kar for a long time to come if ever. This remission to a great extent disappears in the current fasli, owing to the rule that no remission is to be granted on lands compounded for two crops when only one crop fails, the result being that the large extent of 7,246 Acres assessed at Rupees 23,015, waste and withered in kar, has been paid for by the ryots.

4. I am of opinion that this state of things is likely to be permanent, and ought to be met by granting option to the ryots of having their lands reclassified as single crop with a change of half or two-thirds single-crop assessment on a second crop if cultivated successfully. The opportunity would not be taken advantage of except when there is no probability of a second crop being permanent, and then, I think, it is only just to allow the opportunity. The ryots, there can be no doubt, had exaggerated ideas of the quantity and certainly of the supply for kar, and ought to be allowed the opportunity for at least five years to come of retracting their consent to the compounded charge.

5. I beg to enclose also a Statement No. 4, in the form of No. 3 of my letter contained in Board's Proceedings under reply, giving the information already tabulated for a number of years for the past Fasli 1285 also. It will be seen by comparison of the figures of 1285 with those of 1284, that the area of holdings on putta at wet rates has remained nearly the same, that the area cultivated for Peshanam has increased by nearly 1,000 Acres, while that cultivated for kar has diminished by more than 3,000 Acres. The kar season was unusually unfavorable but still I cannot but regard this as confirming my low estimate of the increase to be expected in the kar season. It shows how near the ultimate limit we have come when a difference in season will reduce the area cultivated in kar, already 7,000 Acres less than that held and paid for, by as much as 3,000 Acres more.

6. As regards the statement now submitted, I beg to state that it expresses the views of the Tahsildar who is certainly very well qualified to form an opinion both by thorough knowledge of the taluq acquired in a four years' residence there, and by the

fact that he is himself a very intelligent officer. According to his estimate, 1,000 Acres under the south channel and 463 Acres under the north channel, total 1,463 Acres, may be expected to come into cultivation eventually besides the area now held on putta, and he expects the whole of this will be cultivated for both crops. This is for the Tenkarai taluq only. The total would thus be 18,801 Acres assessed at Rupees 1,97,986 for both crops together.

To this must be added for Chapidaram taluq 241 Acres of first crop and 24 Acres of second crop cultivated this year, and about 2,000 Acres more for first crop, which in course of time will probably come into cultivation at the end of the north channel, and perhaps 100 for second crop:—

or 2,241 Acres first crop assessed at	...	...	RS.
224 " second crop assessed at	...	...	11,205
			1,120
Total	...	...	12,325

The grand total would thus give—

21,042 Acres for Peshanam first crop ...	...	...	RS.
19,025 " for kar second crop ...	...	...	2,10,311

7. I regret that I cannot agree with the Tahsildar in the estimate of the areas likely to be ultimately irrigated, as I think the figures already given by me are much more probable. The Board have taken my safe estimate for the comparisons and observations made by them. If my probable estimates were taken they would have a fair idea of what I think may be expected; the safe estimate is what I am sure of, the other what I believe will be the case. I give 31,255 Acres assessed at Rupees 1,79,631 as my estimate of what is probable, against 40,067 Acres assessed at Rupees 2,10,311 as the Tahsildar's estimate, and 55,724 Acres assessed at Rupees 2,92,793 as Mr. Puckle's estimate of 1872. I consider it most probable that some of the land now in holding on the south side will go out of wet holding for want of water supply, and that on the north side besides present holdings, there will eventually be about 2,000 Acres of land cultivated near Tuticorin for one crop only. This will probably be a good many years in coming to pass, as that part of the country is thinly populated and a good deal must be done in the way of draining and improving the lands to be cultivated.

The widest difference between my estimate and the Tahsildar's is in the extent likely to be cultivated in kar; I do not think this will rise beyond 10,000 Acres; he thinks 18,800 will eventually be successfully sown. The remaining difference is in Peshanam, where I think present holdings will not be fully reached on the south side, and he thinks that 1,400 Acres more than this will come into cultivation.

8. I think, as regards the Tenkarai taluq, that the ryots have from the first taken too sanguine a view of the possible irrigation. As remarked in my previous letter, any extension can only be by means of tanks already existing, and which cannot be very greatly enlarged without encroaching on the lands taken up for cultivation. Moreover, though the supply in the river is abundant, I doubt the carrying power of the main canals under present conditions to supply a larger area than that estimated. For the villages at the end of the south main channel, I can say certainly that it is

nothing but the absence of a sufficient water supply which has prevented their working up to the area held by them or near it, and I do not see, under existing conditions of channels and tanks, that this state of things can be very materially improved.

9. The reasons why there is so great a difference between my estimate and the Tahsildar's or Mr. Puckle's probably is that Mr. Puckle estimated in 1872, and took into account nearly all the land which was then reported to be within command of the channels, while subsequent experience of four years shows that only such area as can be commanded by tanks can be expected to come into cultivation. Credit was given to the channels for being able to carry all the water that was wanted, and it was thought that the only difficulty was to find land lying low enough for command. Experience shows that the channels fed by freshes of varying amount are not in their present state capable of carrying more water than suffices for a limited area, far below, in my opinion, the total of what the level of the channel commands.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 to 3.—Statements.

In 1872, Mr. Puckle estimated the total area likely to be brought under irrigation under the Srivykuntham anicut at 55,724*

* G.O., dated 2nd August 1872, No. 1,153.

	1st Crop.	2nd Crop.	Total.
	ACRES.	ACRES.	ACRES.
South Canal ...	13,510	13,382	26,892
North Canal ...	14,416	14,416	28,832
	27,926	27,798	55,724

	RS.
† South Canal ...	1,72,829
North Canal ...	1,54,294
	3,27,123

G.O., dated 19th July 1875, No. 1,085.

	RS.
† North Channel ...	1,54,294
South Channel, Fasli 1284 ...	91,602
Increase under South Channel ...	49,495
	2,95,391

	ACRES.
§ 1st Crop ...	17,922
2nd Crop ...	11,333
	29,255

Acres, assessed at Rs. 3,27,123†. Again, in reporting on the effects of the Revenue Settlement of the lands under the Southern channel, he stated that besides the revenue brought to account up to Fasli 1284, which, exclusive of remissions, amounted to Rs. 91,602, an increase of Rupees 49,495 was expected from the lands under that channel. This together with the previously estimated revenue under the northern channel amounted to Rs. 2,95,391‡ (not Rupees 2,92,793 as entered in paragraph 8 of the Board's Proceedings, dated 14th March 1876, No. 733). Mr. Stuart, however, having reported in January 1876 that not more than 29,255§ Acres can be safely estimated as capable of being brought under irrigation, he was called upon to report more fully on the subject, and the letter above recorded is the reply.

2. Mr. Stuart still adheres to his former opinion, and states that while he is sure that 29,255 Acres will be brought under irrigation, it is probable that under 1st and 2nd crops 31,255 Acres assessed at Rupees 1,79,631 may be irrigated, but not more. He states that this large difference between his estimate and that of Mr. Puckle's is due to Mr. Puckle having taken into account nearly all the land which was then reported to be within the command of the channels, but that subsequent experience of

four years has shown that channels are not capable of supplying as much water as is required for so large an extent. The Tahsildar of the Tenkari taluq, in which the lands are mostly situated, estimates the probable area to be irrigated at 37,602 Acres, assessed at Rupees 1,986, and adding to this the area likely to be irrigated in the Ottapidaram taluq, the total area estimated by the Tahsildar comes to 40,067 Acres, assessed at Rupees 2,10,311. Mr. Stuart, however, does not consider that the Tahsildar's estimate can be realized. He thinks that some of the lands now occupied on the south side will not be cultivated as yet for want of water supply.

3. The extent now actually irrigated or charged as irrigated under the 1st and 2nd crops is 30,025+ Acres, assessed at Rupees 1,58,657, and according to Mr. Stuart, not more than 1,230 Acres are likely to be brought under irrigation hereafter.

4. The original estimates prepared by Mr. Puckle were framed on the Engineer's assurance that channels would carry water sufficient for 55,724+ Acres, but experience has shown that since the anicut has been completed water has not reached the end of the channels at all. It must be remembered, however, that the seasons have been very adverse, and the work has had no chance of showing its full capabilities. There is ample land which could be irrigated if water is available, and the whole question of the probable revenue therefore depends entirely upon the capacity of the channels to supply water, which can only be determined by Public Works Department. The Board therefore suggest that the Chief Engineer for Irrigation be requested to estimate the quantity of water available for each village commanded by the channel for 1st and 2nd crop. When this is done, a better estimate of the probable return can be made.

5. The extent irrigated and the actual revenue realized ever since the completion of the anicut are shown below in comparison with the figures previous to that period:—

	AREA CHARGED AS IRRIGATED.			Revenue.
	1st Crop.	2nd Crop.	Total.	
Average of 7 years previous to Fasli 1281	ACRES.	ACRES.	ACRES.	RS.
1281	13,033	6,554	19,587	1,13,853
1282	13,607	7,615	21,222	1,33,333
1283	13,497	3,686	17,183	1,01,724
1284	13,064	9,584	22,648	1,40,166
1285	14,922	11,333	26,255	1,54,631
	15,948	14,071	30,019	1,58,657

6. In reporting that the cause of large remissions in Fasli 1284 on the lands under the anicut was a deficient supply of water, Mr. Stuart again raises the question of the propriety of refusing remissions on lands compounded for two crops when one crop fails, and observes that in Fasli 1285, 7,246 Acres of land which were either waste or in which crops withered were charged under the rules with an assessment of Rupees 23,015. He is of opinion that ryots should be allowed the option of having the lands reclassified as single crop, subject to water-rate when a second crop is raised. The question has, however, been fully considered and disposed of in Board's Proceedings noted in the margin.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

W. H. French
Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with three original Statements to be returned and copies of Board's Proceedings, dated 9th March 1876, No. 662, 17th March 1876, No. 768; and 13th November 1876, No. 2,812.

Copy to the Collector of Tinnevely.
" to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" to the Director of Revenue Settlement.

Exd. W. H. French.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
21st February 1877.

No. 630. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated February 1877, No. 389:—
Read the following letter from A. J. STUART, Esq., Acting Collector of Tinnevely, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 3rd November 1876, No. 651.

In reply to Board's Proceedings, No. 733, dated 14th March 1876, I have the honor to submit comparative statements for the north and south Srivykuntham channels, showing the areas likely to be irrigated as estimated by Mr. Puckle in 1872, and those now thought probable by the Tahsildar, a very competent officer and thoroughly acquainted with his taluq. The Board will find the population of each village in the first column, and the condition of the ryots as well as explanations of variations in estimate in the last column.

2. The revision of assessment on the north side has resulted in an increase of revenue of Rupees 7,743, but this is included in the figures already given by me for Fasli 1284.

3. The remissions for Fasli 1284, amounting to Rupees 31,035, were in part the result of a deficient supply of water in the kar season, and also to a large extent were caused by the ryots having taken into holding more land than there was any prospect of cultivating for kar for a long time to come if ever. This remission to a great extent disappears in the current fasli, owing to the rule that no remission is to be granted on lands compounded for two crops when only one crop fails, the result being that the large extent of 7,246 Acres assessed at Rupees 23,015, waste and withered in kar, has been paid for by the ryots.

4. I am of opinion that this state of things is likely to be permanent, and ought to be met by granting option to the ryots of having their lands reclassified as single crop with a change of half or two-thirds single-crop assessment on a second crop if cultivated successfully. The opportunity would not be taken advantage of except when there is no probability of a second crop being permanent, and then, I think, it is only just to allow the opportunity. The ryots, there can be no doubt, had exaggerated ideas of the quantity and certainly of the supply for kar, and ought to be allowed the opportunity for at least five years to come of retracting their consent to the compounded charge.

5. I beg to enclose also a Statement No. 4, in the form of No. 3 of my letter contained in Board's Proceedings under reply, giving the information already tabulated for a number of years for the past Fasli 1285 also. It will be seen by comparison of the figures of 1285 with those of 1284, that the area of holdings on putta at wet rates has remained nearly the same, that the area cultivated for Peshanam has increased by nearly 1,000 Acres, while that cultivated for kar has diminished by more than 3,000 Acres. The kar season was unusually unfavorable, but still I cannot but regard this as confirming my low estimate of the increase to be expected in the kar season. It shows how near the ultimate limit we have come when a difference in season will reduce the area cultivated in kar, already 7,000 Acres less than that held and paid for, by as much as 3,000 Acres more.

6. As regards the statement now submitted, I beg to state that it expresses the views of the Tahsildar who is certainly very well qualified to form an opinion both by thorough knowledge of the taluq acquired in a four years' residence there, and by the

Board of Revenue

MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 1st FEBRUARY 1877, No. 389.

Copy to Subj.

8.1.

2.0.12.1877

Received

12 Feb 1877.

FEBRUARY.
No. 389.

Srivykuntham Agent—in Tinnevely District.
— Submitting to Government letter from Collector regarding area likely to be brought under irrigation under —, and suggesting that Oh Engineer for Irrigation be requested to estimate quantity of water available for each village compounded by the channel for 1st and 2nd crop.

Sanjivani

Communicated to the

Public Works Dept in

continuation of 1.6.19.5

May 1876 with 646 and with

collected reference to him

4 of the Revenue Board

Copy above 21-2-77

21 Feb 1877

14. 18.7.1877

with 3 sub.

that he is himself a very intelligent officer. According to his estimate, 1,000 Acres under the south channel and 463 Acres under the north channel, total 1,463 Acres, may be expected to come into cultivation eventually besides the area now held on patta, and he expects the whole of this will be cultivated for both crops. This is for the Tenkarai taluq only. The total would thus be 18,801 Acres assessed at Rupees 1,97,986 for both crops together.

To this must be added for Ottapidaram taluq 241 Acres of first crop and 24 Acres of second crop cultivated this year, and about 2,000 Acres more for first crop, which in course of time will probably come into cultivation at the end of the north channel, and perhaps 200 for second crop:—

or 2,241 Acres first crop assessed at ...	Rs.
224 " second crop assessed at ...	11,205
Total ...	1,120
	12,325

The grand total would thus give—

21,042 Acres for Peshanam first crop ...	Rs.
19,025 " for kar second crop ...	assessed at ... 2,10,311

7. I regret that I cannot agree with the Tahsildar in the estimate of the areas likely to be ultimately irrigated, as I think the figures already given by me are much more probable. The Board have taken my safe estimate for the comparisons and observations made by them. If my probable estimates were taken they would have a fair idea of what I think may be expected; the safe estimate is what I am sure of, the other what I believe will most probably result. This will give 31,255 Acres assessed at Rupees 1,79,631 as my estimate of what is probable, against 40,067 Acres assessed at Rupees 2,10,311 as the Tahsildar's estimate, and 55,724 Acres assessed at Rupees 2,92,793 as Mr. Puckle's estimate of 1872. I consider it most probable that some of the land now in holding on the south side will go out of wet holding for want of water supply, and that on the north side besides present holdings, there will eventually be about 2,000 Acres of land cultivated near Tuticorin for one crop only. This will probably be a good many years in coming to pass, as that part of the country is thinly populated and a good deal must be done in the way of draining and improving the lands to be cultivated.

The widest difference between my estimate and the Tahsildar's is in the extent likely to be cultivated in kar; I do not think this will rise beyond 10,000 Acres; he thinks 18,800 will eventually be successfully sown. The remaining difference is in Peshanam, where I think present holdings will not be fully reached on the south side, and he thinks that 1,400 Acres more than this will come into cultivation.

8. I think, as regards the Tenkarai taluq, that the ryots have from the first taken too sanguine a view of the possible irrigation. As remarked in my previous letter, any extension can only be by means of tanks already existing, and which cannot be very greatly enlarged without encroaching on the lands taken up for cultivation. Moreover, though the supply in the river is abundant, I doubt the carrying power of the main canals under present conditions to supply a larger area than that estimated. For the villages at the end of the south main channel, I can say certainly that it is

nothing but the absence of a sufficient water supply which has prevented their working up to the area held by them or near it, and I do not see under existing conditions of channels and tanks, that this state of things can be very materially improved.

9. The reasons why there is so great a difference between my estimate and the Tahsildar's or Mr. Puckle's probably is that Mr. Puckle estimated in 1872, took into account nearly all the land which was then reported to be within command of the channels: while subsequent experience of four years shows that only such area as can be commanded by tanks can be expected to come into cultivation: credit was given to the channels for being able to carry all the water that was wanted, and it was thought that the only difficulty was to find land lying low enough for command. Experience shows that the channels fed by freshes of varying amount are not in their present state capable of carrying more water than suffices for a limited area, far below, in my opinion, the total of what the level of the channel commands.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 1 to 3.—Statements.

In 1872, Mr. Puckle estimated the total area likely to be brought under irrigation under the Srivykuntham anicut at 55,724*

* G.O., dated 2nd August 1872, No. 1,153.

	1st Crop.	2nd Crop.	Total.
	ACRES.	ACRES.	ACRES.
South Canal ...	13,510	13,382	26,892
North Canal ...	14,416	14,416	28,832
	27,926	27,798	55,724

+ South Canal ...	Rs. 1,72,829
+ North Canal ...	1,54,294
	3,27,123

G.O., dated 19th July 1875, No. 1,085.

	Rs.
+ North Channel ...	1,54,294
+ South Channel, Fasli 1284 ...	91,602
Increase under South Channel ...	49,495
	2,95,391

	ACRES.
§ 1st Crop ...	17,922
2nd Crop ...	11,333
	29,255

Acres, assessed at Rs. 3,27,123. Again, in reporting on the effects of the Revenue Settlement of the lands under the southern canal, he stated that besides the revenue brought to account up to Fasli 1284, which, exclusive of remissions, amounted to Rs. 91,602, an increase of Rupees 49,495 was expected from the lands under that channel. This together with the previously estimated revenue under the northern channel amounted to Rs. 2,95,391† (not Rupees 2,92,793 as entered in paragraph 8 of the Board's Proceedings, dated 14th March 1875, No. 733). Mr. Stuart, however, having reported in January 1876 that not more than 29,255§ Acres can be safely estimated as capable of being brought under irrigation, he was called upon to report more fully on the subject, and the letter above recorded is the reply.

2. Mr. Stuart still adheres to his former opinion, and states that while he is sure that 29,255 Acres will be brought under irrigation, it is probable that under 1st and 2nd crops 31,255 Acres assessed at Rupees 1,79,631 may be irrigated, but not more. He states that this large difference between his estimate and that of Mr. Puckle's is due to Mr. Puckle having taken into account nearly all the land which was then reported to be within the command of the channels, but that subsequent experience of

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
21st February 1877.

years has shown that channels are not capable of supplying as much water as is required for so large an extent. The Tahsildar of the Tenkasi taluq, in which the lands are mostly situated, estimates the probable area to be irrigated at 37,602 Acres, assessed at Rupees 1,97,986, and adding to this the area likely to be irrigated in the

	ACRES.
* First crop ...	21,042
Second crop ...	19,025
* Total ...	40,067

Ottapidaram taluq, the total area estimated by the Tahsildar comes to 40,067* Acres, assessed at Rupees 2,10,311. Mr. Stuart, however, does not consider that the Tahsildar's estimate can be realized. He

thinks that some of the lands now occupied on the south side will not be cultivated as wet for want of water supply.

3. The extent now actually irrigated or charged is irrigated under the 1st and 2nd crops is 30,025+ Acres, assessed at +30,019 Acres, assessed at Rupees 1,58,657, according to the channel register. Rupees 1,58,672, and, according to Mr. Stuart, not more than 1,230 Acres are likely to be brought under irrigation hereafter.

4. The original estimates prepared by Mr. Puckle were framed on the Engineer's assurance that channels would carry water sufficient for 55,724+ Acres, but experience has shown that since the ancient has been completed water has not reached the end of the channels at all. It must be remembered, however, that the seasons

	ACRES.
* First crop ...	27,096
Second crop ...	27,096
Total ...	55,724

have been very adverse, and the work has had no chance of showing its full capabilities. There is ample land which could be irrigated if water is available, and the whole question of the probable revenue therefore depends entirely upon the capacity of the channels to supply water, which can only be determined by Public Works Department. The Board therefore suggest that the Chief Engineer for Irrigation be requested to estimate the quantity of water available for each village commanded by the channel for 1st and 2nd crop. When this is done, a better estimate of the probable return can be made.

5. The extent irrigated and the actual revenue realized ever since the completion of the ancient are shown below in comparison with the figures previous to that period:—

	AREA CHARGED AS IRRIGATED.			Revenue.
	1st Crop.	2nd Crop.	Total.	
Average of 7 years previous to Fasli 1281	ACRES.	ACRES.	ACRES.	RS.
1281 ...	13,033	6,554	19,587	1,18,853
1282 ...	13,607	7,615	21,222	1,33,333
1283 ...	13,497	8,686	17,183	1,01,724
1284 ...	13,064	9,584	22,648	1,40,166
1285 ...	14,922	11,333	26,255	1,54,631
	15,948	14,071	30,019	1,58,657

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
21st February 1877.

6. In reporting that the cause of large remissions in Fasli 1284 on lands under the alicut was a deficient supply of water, Mr. Stuart again raises the question of the propriety of refusing remissions on lands compounded for two crops when one crop fails, and observes that in Fasli 1285, 7,246 Acres of land which were either waste or in which crops withered were charged under the rules with an assessment of Rupees 23,015. He is of opinion that ryots should be allowed the option of having their lands reclassified as single crop, subject to water-rate when a second crop is raised. The question has, however, been fully considered and disposed of in Board's Proceedings noted in the margin.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

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

No. 631. ORDER THEREON, 21st February 1877, No. 754.

Irrigation, No. 6.

Communicated to the Public Works Department in continuation of G.O., 19th May 1876, No. 646, and with

especial reference to paragraph 4 of the Revenue Board's Proceedings above recorded.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Secretary to Government.

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

Erd. F. R. Bantleman.

Dist. of 1877. Madras.

To

REVENUE.

THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

At, to, &c.

Date February 21st.

By

For

G.O. 2nd February 1877. No. 734

FEBRUARY.

Nos. 630-631.

Seiyunthan, Agent to Tinselly District.
—Communicating to Public Works Department Board's Proceedings submitting letter from the Collector regarding area likely to be brought under irrigation under — with special reference to paragraph 4 of Board's Proceedings suggesting that Chief Engineer for Irrigation be requested to estimate quantity of water available for each village commanded by the channel for 1st and 2nd crop.