Revenue (1898) Department.

PRESS SERIES.

G.O., No. 226-26.

Dated 25 april 1898

[Despatch Abstract.]

Enclosing the Accountant General's Memorandum regarding the extent to which provision in Act I of 1858 may be taken advantage of in meeting the expenditure incurred on account of the maintenance & repairs of minor irrigation works under the Revenue Department to be forwarded to the Govt. of India.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

1898

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

1897.

Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture),

MADRAS.

Recd. 21 Jany } 1898.
Regd. 24 "

Enclosures

Spare copies

Printed January th, 1898.

Proceedings, No. 746, 18th December 1897.

DECEMBER.

Minor Irrigation Works.—Submitting to Government a report as to what extent the provisions of Act I of 1858 were taken advantage of in meeting the expenditure incurred on account of the maintenance and repairs of — under the Revenue Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture).

Read—again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), No. 471, dated 29th June 1897.

Read—also the following papers:—

From the Collector of Anantapur,	dated	10th	Nov.	1897, Dis. No.	6301.
" " of Arcot, North	"	18th	"	" "	2361-Eng.
" " of Arcot, South	"	12th	Aug.	" Ref. "	495-V.S.
" " of Bellary	"	31st	"	" Dis. "	5558.
" " of Chingleput	"	19th	Sept.	" " "	2816.
" " of Coimbatore	"	28th	Aug.	" " "	2980-Rev.
" " of Cuddapah	"	30th	Nov.	" " "	6549-Rev.
" " of Ganjám	"	24th	Aug.	" " "	1635-Ver.
" " of Gódávari	"	22nd	Sept.	" " "	3311-Ver.
" " of Kistna	"	16th	"	" " "	836-Genl.
" " of Kurnool	"	26th	"	" " "	2806-Genl.
" " of Madura	"	8th	Oct.	" " "	3856.
" " of Nellore	"	14th	Oct.	" Ref. "	520 G.B.-Ver.
" " of Nellore	"	28th	Nov.	"	3929-Ver.
" " of Salem	"	5th	Sept.	" Regr. "	4607.
" " of Tanjore	"	12th	"	"	4472-Rev.
" " of Tinnevelly	"	6th	"	" Dis. "	1768-Genl.
" " of Trichinopoly	"	18th	"	" Ref. (*d*)	on Cur. No. 108-B. & G.
" " of Vizagapatam	"	22nd	"	" Dis. No.	3728.

Resolution—No. 746, dated 18th December 1897.

In connection with certain proposals now before the Government of India relative to the organization of a permanent staff of qualified Upper and Lower Subordinates for the efficient maintenance of the Minor Irrigation Works in charge of Revenue Officers in the Madras Presidency, the Under Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, enquired in his letter No. 1471-G, dated 3rd June 1897, to what extent the provisions of Act I of 1858 were taken advantage of in meeting the expenditure incurred on account of the maintenance and repairs of the tanks under the Revenue officers. This having been referred to the Board of Revenue, the Collectors of all districts, except Madras, Malabar, the Nilgiris and South Canara, were directed in B.P., No. 471, dated 29th June 1897, to submit a report on the question. They were also requested to submit a statement furnishing, for the last five years, information regarding (1) value of labour contributed by ryots, (2) contribution made by ryots in money in lieu of labour, and (3) fines imposed and collected under section 6 of Act I of 1858. The letters read above are the replies received from the Collectors. An abstract of their reports is appended (Appendix I).

2. The Collectors of the marginally-noted districts report that, in their districts, the provisions of Act I of 1858 have rarely been resorted to, as without the intervention of Revenue officers, the ryots have generally contributed labour towards the execution of such works as removal of silt from spring and supply channels and of prickly-pear from the tank-bunds, closing gullies and pits and constructing ring bunds in front of breaches. In Nellore, Chingleput, South Arcot, Trichinopoly and in portions of Kistna and North Arcot, the provisions of the Act are reported to have been generally availed of. The Collector of Bellary reports that there is no recorded information on the subject; while the Collector of Cuddapah states that ryots do not generally execute customary repairs to irrigation works and that he has taken steps to enforce the provisions of the Act in future.

Ganjám.	Anantapur.
Vizagapatam.	Tanjore.
Gódávari.	Salem.
Kistna (Sub-Collector's Division).	Coimbatore.
Kurnool.	Madura.
	Tinnevelly.

3. The information furnished by Collectors regarding contributions made by ryots and recoveries made from them is tabulated in the annexed statement (Appendix II). It will be seen that the value of labour contributed by ryots during the past five years amounted to Rs. 72,617, the bulk of the amount having been contributed by ryots in Tinnevelly, North Arcot and Nellore. The contribution in money by ryots in lieu of labour amounted to Rs. 21,553, of which Rs. 16,488 appertain to the Tinnevelly district. The amount charged and recovered under section 6 of Act I of 1858 for neglect on the part of the ryots to contribute the customary labour required of them was only Rs. 467, and more than half this amount was collected in Nellore. The Board, however, considers that much value cannot be attached to the statistics embodied in the statement (especially as regards value of labour contributed by ryots) as several Collectors have reported that no registers have been maintained in their districts. In Tinnevelly and Trichinopoly, it is reported that ryots in addition to executing kudimaramat work required of them contribute also either in the shape of labour or money towards the cost of repairs of Minor Irrigation Works. In Salem, the Collector reports an instance in which Rs. 300 were contributed by ryots holding lands under a certain tank.

(True Extract.)

K. V. Srinivasan
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
" all Collectors, except Madras, Malabar, South Canara and the Nilgiris.
Copy to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

APPENDIX I.

A *Précis* of the Collectors' reports.

Ganjám.—The Collector reports that the provisions of Act I of 1858 have never been resorted to in his district, the customary labour on Minor Irrigation Works having been contributed by the ryots themselves without the interference of Revenue officers.

Vizagapatam.—The Collector states that very little advantage has been taken of the provisions of Act I of 1858 in meeting the expenditure on maintenance and repairs of tanks under the Revenue officers; that in Golgonda and Sarvasiddhi taluks small tanks having an ayakat of 10 acres and less are left to the care of the ryots holding the ayakat; and that in the Palkonda taluk, the ryots undertake repairs costing below Rs. 20 under kudimaramat whenever occasion requires. No records of the value of the kudimaramat work is reported to have been kept.

Gódávari.—The Collector states that the provisions of Act I of 1858 have never been enforced in the district in Government villages.

Kistna.—The Collector reports that, in the Sub-Collector's Division comprising four taluks,* there was no necessity in the last five years for putting the provisions of Act I of 1858 into operation; that in the Head-Assistant Collector's Division (Bezwada and Nandigáma) the ryots generally contribute labour whenever necessity arises; that in the General Duty Deputy Collector's Division,† labour to the value of Rs. 105 was contributed by ryots and that voluntary labour costing about Rs. 300 is being contributed every year by the ryots in the Avanigadda Deputy Tahsildar's Division of the Bandar taluk.

* Tenali. Bápatla. | Guntúr. Sattenapalle.

† Narasaraopet. Palnad. | Vinukonda.

Nellore.—The Collector merely submits a statement showing the value of labour contributed and contribution in money and fines imposed under Act I of 1858 during the last five years.

Cuddapah.—The Collector submits a statement showing the collections under Act I of 1858 during the last five years and states that no accounts have been maintained in the taluks for the labour contributed by the ryots and that correct figures cannot therefore be ascertained now. He states also that ryots do not generally execute the customary labour, that no serious attempt has been made to enforce it and that, during the jamabandi of fasli 1306, he has issued stringent orders to enforce the provisions of the Act to the fullest extent on pain of refusal of remissions under the irrigation sources concerned. He thinks that all applications for remissions should be refused summarily in cases where repairs to tanks have to be carried out on a large scale owing to chronic neglect on the part of the ryots, and states that he has been following this course.

Anantapur.—The Collector states that it has been the practice in the district for the ryots to carry out the usual kudimaramat labour such as filling up gullies and pits formed by heavy rains, but that the approximate cost of such repairs cannot be determined now, as no register has been maintained in the district. He reports that a standing order was issued in 1893 to all subordinate officers to the effect that kudimaramat must be enforced whenever necessary, and states that no fines were imposed and collected under section 6 of Act I of 1858 as no case of neglect or refusal by ryots to comply with the requisition for customary aid had occurred.

Bellary.—The Collector states that there is no recorded information to show whether, during the last five years, any fines were collected under section 6 of Act I of 1858, or whether the ryots contributed labour or money towards the maintenance and repairs of minor irrigation works.

Kurnool.—The Collector states that all the four Divisional officers of the district report that the provisions of Act I of 1858 were never resorted to at any time during the last five years.

Chingleput.—The Collector states that it is reported that the provisions of the Act are enforced when ryots fail to contribute customary labour in times of emergency to save tanks from breaching, to remove prickly-pear from tank-bunds and to keep river and spring channels free of silt at all times of the year. From the circumstance, however, that no registers have been maintained in taluks to show the value of labour contributed by the ryots and that no contribution in money was collected from them in lieu of labour, nor fines imposed during the past five years, the Collector concludes that the Act could not have been enforced to any large extent.

North Arcot.—The Collector reports that recourse is not generally had to the provisions of the Act in meeting expenditure on minor irrigation works, but that the provisions of the Act have been put into force in the Chittoor, Arcot and Vellore taluks in a few instances. He states further that in all the taluks the ryots contribute a great deal of customary labour towards repairs to spring channels and supply channels without any recourse to the Act being necessary.

South Arcot.—The Collector reports that the provisions of the Act are freely taken advantage of for clearance of silt in channels, removal of prickly-pear from tank-bunds and channels. He states that in many cases in which pipe sluices are provided for in the sanctioned estimates, on account of their cheapness, the ryots concerned provide masonry sluices at their own cost; that no fines were imposed, labour having been contributed by the ryots freely in the generality of cases and on the application of slight and beneficient official pressure in some; that as no registers have been maintained to show the value of labour, it is not possible to furnish particulars in the form prescribed by the Board and that when kudimaramat is not done, remissions are refused in cases where ryots' failure to contribute labour has led to the advancement of remission claims.

Tanjore.—The Collector reports that, during the last five years, there were no cases in which the provisions of Act I of 1858 were taken advantage of in meeting the expenditure on minor irrigation works.

Trichinopoly.—The Collector states that the provisions of Act I of 1858 have not been strictly enforced in the case of tanks, although the ryots are made to do what is necessary when the supply to tanks is full and their safety is endangered and when breaches do occur. He stated that no registers have been maintained to show which ryots contributed labour and

not, and that consequently no fines are levied from the ryots that fail to contribute labour. The Collector adds that, when repairs to minor irrigation works have to be executed, the ryots holding lands under them are required to contribute a portion of the estimated amount either in the shape of labour or money on the ground that the repairs have been necessitated owing partly to their neglect to do kudimaramat work, and that in cases where the ryots agree to contribute labour, the works are given to them on contract.

Madura.—The Collector reports that recourse to Act I of 1858 has been found necessary only in very few cases, as the ryots have always been ready to contribute labour when called upon to do so, and it is usual for the ryots to execute all repairs in connection with tanks irrigating 10 acres or less and petty and emergent repairs in case of tanks and channels irrigating larger areas. He states further that, as no record is kept of work done, it is not possible to furnish information regarding value of labour contributed by ryots, and that the precise extent to which customary labour is enforced varies with the energy of the Tahsildar.

Tinnevelly.—The Collector reports that ryots in the district have been generally carrying out the ordinary customary works of repair of minor irrigation works, such as clearance of silt in sluices and irrigation channels, putting up ring-bunds and other petty works; but that there is no information on record to show the extent and value of customary labour done by them. He states further that, in addition to the execution of the customary repairs, the ryots generally contribute also either in labour or money towards the ordinary repairs of minor irrigation works; that the penal provisions of Act I of 1858 have not been enforced in his district, and the necessity for it rarely arises; that no fines have been collected under section 6 of the Act, and that in one case in the Sankaranayinárkóyil taluk where the ryots did not put up ring-bunds, remission was refused.

Coimbatore.—The Collector reports that the provisions of the Act are not taken advantage of in the district and that no customary contribution in money or labour is levied from the ryots, as they generally carry out by kudimaramat the customary repairs to irrigation works.

Salem.—The Collector states that it is reported that village communities contribute labour generally in all taluks in removing prickly-pear on tank-bunds and channel banks, in clearing silt and in preventing and closing breaches; but that the value of labour so contributed during the last five years cannot be definitely stated, as no accounts have been kept to show it and the estimates thereof furnished by Tahsildars cannot be relied on. He states further that there was only one case of contribution in money, in lieu of labour, amounting to Rs. 300 during the last five years; that there has been no occasion to enforce the provisions of the Act and that no fines were collected thereunder.

APPENDIX II.

Districts.	Value of labour contributed by ryots.	Contribution in money by ryots in lieu of labour.	Fines imposed and collected under section 6 of Act I of 1858.
1	2	3	4
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Ganjám	..	..	..
Vizagapatam	364	..	..
Gódávari	..	..	..
Kistna	1,805	295	70
Nellore	13,870	1,091	267
Cuddapah	7,579	1,713	93
Anantapur	810	412	..
Bellary	..	..	..
Kurnool	..	..	..
Chingleput	1,201	..	..
North Arcot	14,217	464	..
South Arcot	..	..	..
Tanjore	..	..	..
Trichinopoly	8,800	790	..
Madura	75	..	37
Tinnevelly	23,896	16,488	..
Coimbatore	..	..	..
Salem	..	300	..
Total ...	72,617	21,553	467

Exd. P. Seetharam.

f. 2225-226/
15.4.98

Read B.G. 8th December 97 No 1074

Note

With reference to the prop
now before the Govt of India rel
to the organization of a perm
staff of qualified appraisers
subordinates for the effective
tenance of the minor irrigati
in charge of Revenue offic
presidency (vide letter No 69
7th December 1896), the Govt of
enquired, in its letter No 3 J
No 1471, printed in B.G. of 2
No 471, to what extent the
of Act I of 1858 were tak
advantage of in meeting the
incurred on account of the
nance & repairs of the tan
Revenue officers. With the
read above, the Bond of
submits a report on the su
It will be seen from the
that in most districts
provisions of Act I of 18
rarely or never been re
as almost the interven
Revenue officers the repo

C. 14/3/98

contribute the customary unpaid labour towards the execution of such works as removal of silt from spring channels & supply channels of prickly pear from tank bunds, closing gullies & pits and constructing ring bunds in front of breaches and that in the Districts in which the provisions of the Act have been resorted to, the value of labour contributed by ryots during the last five years amounted to Rs 72617, the recorded contributions in money by ryots in lieu of labour to Rs 21533, & the fines imposed & collected under section 6 of Act I of 1858 to Rs 467. The Board points out that much value cannot be attached to these statistics as several Collectors have reported that no registers have been maintained in their Districts.

Attention is invited to Rule of Board's standing Order No 186 which runs as follows:—

It is the duty of Collectors to see

Paras 9 the current.

"irrigation works is performed in each
"village of their Districts as authorized
"by section 6 of Act I of 1858. This
"customary labour is invariably to
"be performed by the ryots themselves
"or at their expense, except in cases
"where the villagers have agreed
"to the payment of a cess in lieu of
"it. Only such labour as is customary
"can be exacted & no precise money
"limit can be laid down. In most
"districts it will include the following
"(1) To fill up gullies or other inequalities
"caused by rain, the treading of cattle &
"upon the bunds of tanks & channels
"(2) To cut the growth on bunds of prickly
"pear & any similar rank & pernicious
"weed. (3) To clear away such undergrowth
"from the bunds of tanks as may be
"considered by the Executive Engineer
"to be injurious. (4) To clear out the
"deposits from tank sluices and from
"weir & spring channels to such an
"extent as will afford a sufficient
"opening for the supply of water &
"flow to the fields. (5) To keep clear &
"repair the earthwork of petty channels
"channels & clear away the accumulations
"in all channels issuing from tanks

"which obstruct the flow of water to
"the fields. (6) To keep in order the supplying
"channels of tanks to such extent
"as is sanctioned by local custom.
"(7) To water the bunds of all tanks
"during rainy weather, to tunf the
"parts eaten in by the waves which
"appear leaky; to open & close the
"calingulas; and generally to perform
"minor duties of this nature to prevent
"breaches & other accidents. (8) To construct
"temporary dams at breaches & where required
"to temporarily strengthen the bunds
"of tanks during the season of
"cultivation. And in general, by the
"constant care & attention which residents
"on the spot can alone exercise, to preserve
"the works of irrigation, in which they
"& the public have a common interest,
"from those small injuries which,
if unchecked, will lead to serious
loss & expense. (9) To uncover the
sluices in tank bunds, so as to enable
the officers of the department of Public
Works, to inspect them in case they
should require repair."

Under the rules embodied in
Standing Order No 187, the
maintenance of minor irrigation works

by the Revenue Deptt. is, as a rule,
limited to the repair of masonry &
earthwork, and to the reconstruction
of injured works. (para). No new
works are ordinarily executed from
the Maintenance grant but in cases
where it is found to be useless
to carry out repairs without providing
new sluices, such sluices are constructed
in accordance with the standard
plans furnished by the P.W. Deptt.
Restoration of works which have
deteriorated by continued neglect
is also carried out provided the cost
do less than one fifth of the aggregate
revenue during the preceding five years.
When the cost exceeds this limit
the work is classed as original work.
All works are executed either
by contract or by departmental agency.
(para 12) and the annual cost of
supervision & check in the case of
works in charge of the Revenue Deptt
should not exceed 15 per cent of
the annual grant (para 67).

3. It will be seen from the above
that, under the provisions of Act II
of 1858 the ryots are expected to
to contribute the customary labour

a sum equal to twice the value of the labour towards the execution of petty repairs to minor irrigation works while government has to see that such labour is contributed properly & has also to ~~supervise~~ carry out repairs of masonry work, reconstruction of ingress works &c. There is already an establishment entertained by Collectors for the carrying out of the repairs & improvements of minor irrigation works (ie for supervision & check) but this is at present treated as temporary & non-pensionable and the rate of pay that could be offered is low. It has consequently been found impossible to secure the services of trustworthy & really competent hands and whenever the works in hand require professional skill have to be executed reference has to be made to the officers of the Public Works Dept for advice & help. These officers have always sufficient work of their own considerable delay occurs. It was with a view to remedy these defects & to ensure not only

executed but also that the amounts allotted are fully utilized on the works that it was proposed to employ in lieu of the existing temporary & low paid hands, a permanent staff of qualified & trained upper & lower subordinates at an annual cost of Rs 71,376. The sanction of the Secretary of State has been applied for to the scheme framed by the Govt of India under articles 277(4) of the Civil Accounts Code Vol I.

4- The object of the reference made by the Govt of India is not clear; it seems to suggest that minor irrigation repairs should be carried out under the Act. This point was not raised when the Govt of India was addressed in December '96. Attention is invited to the file of papers relating to the Madras Amendment Bill which was abandoned in 1884. It may be pointed out to the Govt of India that while the ryots are required under Act I of 1858 merely to contribute customary labour or a sum equal to twice the value of that labour

…rounds such petty repairs as
…referred to in para 17 of Roads'
…standing Order No 186, the forest has
…carry out repairs of masonry
…earthwork, reconstruction of
…injured works &c. and that the
…Executive staff proposed to be
…employed is in lieu of the
…existing temporary & ill paid
…hands employed by Collectors
…supervision & check.

…Forwarding the inform-
…ation collected to the Govt.
…of India, it seems, should not
…be made clear, as suggested
…above, that the purpose
…for which this Establishment
…is the permanent establish-
…ment cannot be met by
…a more extended
…application of Act I of 1858.
…The establishment is wanted
…to supervise & check the
…work to which the Govt. can
…only be made to contribute

1874.

A great deal of labour
is as a matter of fact
contributed by the Ryots
in the way of clearing sullies
removing silt, keeping tanks
bunds & channels free from
vegetation &c; but no specific
record of all this is kept &
the bulk of it is carried
out in pursuance of long
usage, without the direct &
definite intervention of the
Revenue authorities; although at
the same time the system does
not exist & is constantly kept up
to the mark by the oral
directions of the Collr & Dy
Superintendents at Jummabandi.
All such work is really
Kudimaramat under the
Act.

The work executed by
the minor irrigation dept. is,
however now that the days
of pot sluices have been
left behind, is of a higher

order that can be safely entrusted to Kudumaramat, and a Kanied, estabt, must be employed.

Nevertheless every Mo in an irrigation dist is able to secure some contributions towards the repair of such works. If a work has become defective fallen into serious disrepair requiring a disproportionate expenditure at first sight, & the Mo can have the state of the crops reflect to perform systematic kudumaramat, he will refuse & put it in the year's list under a contribution is promised. In this way, otherwise a good deal of money is indirectly obtained which indirectly represents kudumaramat, in cases in which it would be quite impossible to enforce it under the Act.

In some cases the Act is directly enforced: but the practical & legal difficulties of

The manner in wh. the obligation is enforced depends a great deal upon the Mo's like everything else in a district.

28/3/98

doing so are many; & the Govt I think has no particular reason to inquire into the manner in wh. the ryots generally fulfill their obligations at their own time & in their own way in other respects. If we set about making a district legal question of it I am sure we should get far less by it than we do.

The situation may be explained to the C.J.D., they being reminded at the same time that we are not asking for any real increase of expenditure, but that this caution was required only because we proposed to have a fixed estab - instead of a temporary estab.

S.R. 26/8/98

What is the [illegible]
Early [illegible] & what has been proposed
& what has been
Government established?

2/4/97

Please see para 5 of G.O. 37 dated
1896 No 696. Taking an annual grant
of Rs 4·50 lakhs for Minor irrigation
works the cost of the proposed
establishment viz Rs 7,376 comes
to 15·86 p.c on the total outlay
against a limit of 15 per cent
allowed under the existing orders.
The actual cost of establishments
& contingencies varies considerably
from year to year. In 1895-96 the expenditure
incurred by the Rev. Deptt on Minor
irrigation works including establishment
charges was Rs 37,192 & the
expenditure on account of establishments
& contingencies was Rs 39,492 or
11·91 per cent whereas in 1896-
the total expenditure was Rs 40[illegible]
& the expenditure on account of
establishment & contingencies
Rs 38499 or 10·45 per cent.
The statement in the draft

vide page 2 of
G.O. 383
3-8-96.

vide page 4 of
G.O. 585A
17-7-97.

proposed establishments a
the limit of 15 per cent on
the total outlay which as a
matter of fact is exceeded in several districts.
G.P.
2/4/98

Read B.P. 3/18 December 97 No 746
(C. No 592)

G.O. No 225 of 25th April 1898

Ordered that the following
letter be despatched to the Govt
of India.

21/4/98

No 226

To The Secretary to the Govt of India,
Public Works Dept.

Sir,

With reference to Mr. Walker's letter
No 83 June 1897 No 1471-G, enquiring to
what extent the provisions of Act
of 1858 are taken advantage of in
meeting the expenditure incurred
account of the maintenance & repa
of the tanks under the Revenue Offic
I am directed to forward a copy
the marginally noted Pro. of the B
of Revenue embodying a report
the subject. It will be seen from
report that in most districts the
provisions of the Act have rarely

Print full.

Govt. 24/4 23/4

23/4/98

Copies sent here by 23/4

B.P. No 746 dy 18.12.97 (Sect)

specifically enforced;
~~have been resorted to to check~~
~~the intervention of Revenue Officers~~
~~the ryots generally contribute free~~
customary unpaid labour and that being
generally contributed without ~~any interference~~
~~in disputes to which the provisions~~
recourse to the Act. ~~of the Act have been resorted to~~ The
value of the labour so contributed by ryots
during the last five years has been valued at
Rs 72,617 while the contributions in money
by ryots in lieu of labour were Rs 2,553
and the fines imposed & collected under
Section 6 of the Act to Rs 467 These figures understate the value of the labours rendered as
~~in all cases to which registers have been~~
registers have been maintained in Several Districts
2. A great deal of labour is also in fact contributed by the ryots in the way of clearing gullies, removing silt, keeping tanks bunds & channels free from vegetation and the like of which no specific record is kept. ~~While~~
These petty repairs are carried out in pursuance of long usage, ordinarily without any further ~~active~~ intervention on the part of the Revenue Officers beyond keeping ryots constantly reminded of their duty, & in certain cases, perusing at the annual settlement Remission
~~to the works by the local Officers~~
~~Dist. Officers~~

Considerable contributions are also made by the ryots in order to secure the early repair of minor works for wh. the annual allotments wd. prove to be insufficient or which might not, owing to the disproportionate cost of the repairs, be undertaken at all. In these & other ways a considerable large amount of labour & money is contributed each in circumstances which it might be impossible to enforce the Obligation of Kudi-waramat under the Act. It is extremely difficult to determine precisely the legal liability of the ryots in such cases. But the Board of Rev. has no reason to be dissatisfied with the manner in wh. the ryots generally fulfill their obligations in this respect.

3. I am now to add that the Govt. of Madras entirely agree with the Board of Revenue as to the desirability of the early sanction of the W.H.

the Sec^y of State to the entertain-
-ment of the establishment
mentioned in the letter from our
Revenue dep^t of the 7th Dec^r 1896 No 697 R.
The Special estab^t asked for is,
(as explained in that letter)
proposed in place of the existing
temporary estab^t employed
now for many years employed
by Collectors in connection with
the repairs of these very important
irrigation works, and while the
entertainment of the staff will
not involve any real increase
of expenditure!

8/4/98

40/2

Government {1898} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. / Regd. } 1898. Enclosures / Spare copies

G.O., No. 225, 25th April 1898.

APRIL.

Ordering that a copy of the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Settlement), embodying a report as to what extent the provisions of Act I of 1858 were taken advantage of in meeting the expenditure incurred on account of the maintenance and repairs of minor irrigation works under the Revenue Department, be forwarded to the Government of India; and requesting that the sanction of the Secretary of State may be obtained for the entertainment of the establishment mentioned in the letter from this department, dated 7th December 1896, No. 697.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), No. 746, dated 18th December 1897 :—

Read—again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R.S., L.R. and Agri.), No. 471, dated 29th June 1897.

Read—also the following papers :—

From the Collector of Anantapur, dated 10th Nov. 1897, Dis. No. 6301.
" " of Arcot, North " 18th " " " " 2361-Eng.
" " of Arcot, South " 12th Aug. " Ref. " 495-V.S.
" " of Bellary " 31st " " Dis. " 5558.
" " of Chingleput " 19th Sept. " " " 2816.
" " of Coimbatore " 28th Aug. " " " 2980-Rev.
" " of Cuddapah " 30th Nov. " " " 6549-Rev.
" " of Ganjám " 24th Aug " " " 1625-Ver.
" " of Gódávari " 22nd Sept. " " 3311-Ver.
" " of Kistna " 16th " " " 836-Genl.
" " of Kurnool " 26th " " " 2806-Genl.
" " of Madura " 8th Oct. " " " 3856.
" " of Nellore " 14th " " Ref. " 520 G.B.-Ver.
" " of Nellore " 28th Nov. " " 3929-Ver.
" " of Salem " 5th Sept. " Regr. " 4607.
" " of Tanjore " 12th " " " 4472-Rev.
" " of Tinnevelly " 6th " " Dis. " 1768-Genl.
" " of Trichinopoly " 18th " " Ref. (*d*) on Cur. No. 106-B. & G.
" " of Vizagapatam " 22nd " " Dis. No. 3728.

Resolution—No. 746, dated 18th December 1897.

In connection with certain proposals now before the Government of India relative to the organization of a permanent staff of qualified Upper and Lower Subordinates for the efficient maintenance of the Minor Irrigation Works in charge of Revenue Officers in the Madras Presidency, the Under Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, enquired in his letter No. 1471-G., dated 3rd June 1897, to what extent the provisions of Act I of 1858 were taken advantage of in meeting the expenditure incurred on account of the maintenance and repairs of the tanks under the Revenue officers. This having been referred to the Board of Revenue, the Collectors of all districts, except Madras, Malabar, the Nilgiris and South Canara were directed in B.P., No. 471, dated 29th June 1897, to submit a report on the question. They were also requested to submit a statement furnishing, for the last five years, information regarding (1) value of labour contributed by ryots, (2) contribution made by ryots in money in lieu of labour, and (3) fines imposed and collected under section 6 of Act I of 1858. The letters read above are the replies received from the Collectors. An abstract of their reports is appended (Appendix I).

2. The Collectors of the marginally-noted districts report that, in their districts, the provisions of Act I of 1858 have rarely been resorted to, as without the intervention of Revenue officers, the ryots have generally contributed labour towards the execution of such works as removal of silt from spring and supply channels and of prickly-pear from the tank-bunds, closing gullies and pits and constructing ring bunds in front of breaches. In Nellore, Chingleput, South Arcot, Trichinopoly and in portions of Kistna and North Arcot, the provisions of the Act are reported to have been generally availed of. The Collector of Bellary reports that there is no recorded information on the subject; while the Collector of Cuddapah states that ryots do not generally execute customary repairs to irrigation works and that he has taken steps to enforce the provisions of the Act in future.

Ganjám.	Anantapur.
Vizagapatam.	Tanjore.
Gódávari.	Salem.
Kistna (Sub-Collector's Division).	Coimbatore.
Kurnool.	Madura.
	Tinnevelly.

3. The information furnished by Collectors regarding contributions made by ryots and recoveries made from them is tabulated in the annexed statement (Appendix II). It will be seen that the value of labour contributed by ryots during the past five years amounted to Rs. 72,617, the bulk of the amount having been contributed by ryots in Tinnevelly, North Arcot and Nellore. The contribution in money by ryots in lieu of labour amounted to Rs. 21,553, of which Rs. 16,488 appertain to the Tinnevelly district. The amount charged and recovered under section 6 of Act I of 1858 for neglect on the part of the ryots to contribute the customary labour required of them was only Rs. 467, and more than half this amount was collected in Nellore. The Board, however, considers that much value cannot be attached to the statistics embodied in the statement (especially as regards value of labour contributed by ryots) as several Collectors have reported that no registers have been maintained in their districts. In Tinnevelly and Trichinopoly, it is reported that ryots in addition to executing kudimaramat work required of them contribute also either in the shape of labour or money towards the cost of repairs of Minor Irrigation Works. In Salem, the Collector reports an instance in which Rs. 300 were contributed by ryots holding lands under a certain tank.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. V. SRINIVASIAR,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
" all Collectors, except Madras, Malabar, South Canara and the Nilgiris.
Copy to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

APPENDIX I.

A *Précis* of the Collectors' reports.

Ganjám.—The Collector reports that the provisions of Act I of 1858 have never been resorted to in his district, the customary labour on Minor Irrigation Works having been contributed by the ryots themselves without the interference of Revenue officers.

Vizagapatam.—The Collector states that very little advantage has been taken of the provisions of Act I of 1858 in meeting the expenditure on maintenance and repairs of tanks under the Revenue officers; that in Golgonda and Sarvasiddhi taluks small tanks having an ayakat of 10 acres and less are left to the care of the ryots holding the ayakat; and that in the Palkonda taluk, the ryots undertake repairs costing below Rs. 20 under kudimaramat whenever occasion requires. No records of the value of the kudimaramat work is reported to have been kept.

Gódávari.—The Collector states that the provisions of Act I of 1858 have never been enforced in the district in Government villages.

Kistna.—The Collector reports that, in the Sub-Collector's Division comprising four taluks,* there was no necessity in the last five years for putting the provisions of Act I of 1858 into operation; that in the Head Assistant Collector's Division (Bezwada and Nandigáma) the ryots generally contribute labour whenever necessity arises; that in the General Duty Deputy Collector's Division,† labour to the value of Rs. 105 was contributed by ryots and that voluntary labour costing about Rupees 300 is being contributed every year by the ryots in the Avanigadda Deputy Tahsildar's Division of the Bandar taluk.

* Tenali. | Bápatla. | Guntúr. | Sattenapalle.

† Narasaraopet. | Palnad. | Vinukonda.

Nellore.—The Collector merely submits a statement showing the value of labour contributed and contribution in money and fines imposed under Act I of 1858 during the last five years.

Cuddapah.—The Collector submits a statement showing the collections under Act I of 1858 during the last five years and states that no accounts have been maintained in the taluks for the labour contributed by the ryots and that correct figures cannot therefore be ascertained now. He states also that ryots do not generally execute the customary labour, that no serious attempt has been made to enforce it and that, during the jamabandi of fasli 1306, he has issued stringent orders to enforce the provisions of the Act to the fullest extent on pain of refusal of remissions under the irrigation sources concerned. He thinks that all applications for remissions should be refused summarily in cases where repairs to tanks have to be carried out on a large scale owing to chronic neglect on the part of the ryots, and states that he has been following this course.

Anantapur.—The Collector states that it has been the practice in the district for the ryots to carry out the usual kudimaramat labour such as filling up gullies and pits formed by heavy rains, but that the approximate cost of such repairs cannot be determined now, as no register has been maintained in the district. He reports that a standing order was issued in 1893 to all subordinate officers to the effect that kudimaramat must be enforced whenever necessary; and states that no fines were imposed and collected under section 6 of Act I of 1858 as no case of neglect or refusal by ryots to comply with the requisition for customary aid had occurred.

Bellary.—The Collector states that there is no recorded information to show whether, during the last five years, any fines were collected under section 6 of Act I of 1858, or whether the ryots contributed labour or money towards the maintenance and repairs of minor irrigation works.

Kurnool.—The Collector states that all the four Divisional officers of the district report that the provisions of Act I of 1858 were never resorted to at any time during the last five years.

Chingleput.—The Collector states that it is reported that the provisions of the Act are enforced when ryots fail to contribute customary labour in times of emergency to save tanks from breaching, to remove prickly-pear from tank-bunds and to keep river and spring channels free of silt at all times of the year. From the circumstance, however, that no registers have been maintained in taluks to show the value of labour contributed by the ryots and that no contribution in money was collected from them in lieu of labour, nor fines imposed during the past five years, the Collector concludes that the Act could not have been enforced to any large extent.

North Arcot.—The Collector reports that recourse is not generally had to the provisions of the Act in meeting expenditure on minor irrigation works, but that the provisions of the Act have been put into force in the Chittoor, Arcot and Vellore taluks in a few instances. He states further that in all the taluks the ryots contribute a great deal of customary labour towards repairs to spring channels and supply channels without any recourse to the Act being necessary.

South Arcot.—The Collector reports that the provisions of the Act are freely taken advantage of for clearance of silt in channels, removal of prickly-pear from tank-bunds and channels. He states that in many cases in which pipe sluices are provided for in the sanctioned estimates, on account of their cheapness, the ryots concerned provide masonry sluices at their own cost; that no fines were imposed, labour having been contributed by the ryots freely in the generality of cases and on the application of slight and beneficient official pressure in some; that as no registers have been maintained to show the value of labour, it is not possible to furnish particulars in the form prescribed by the Board and that when kudimaramat is not done, remissions are refused in cases where ryots' failure to contribute labour has led to the advancement of remission claims.

Tanjore.—The Collector reports that, during the last five years, there were no cases in which the provisions of Act I of 1858 were taken advantage of in meeting the expenditure on minor irrigation works.

Trichinopoly.—The Collector states that the provisions of Act I of 1858 have not been strictly enforced in the case of tanks, although the ryots are made to do what is necessary when the supply to tanks is full and their safety is endangered and when breaches do occur. It is stated that no registers have been maintained to show which ryots contributed labour and which

not, and that consequently no fines are levied from the ryots that fail to contribute labour. The Collector adds that, when repairs to minor irrigation works have to be executed, the ryots holding lands under them are required to contribute a portion of the estimated amount either in the shape of labour or money on the ground that the repairs have been necessitated owing partly to their neglect to do kudimaramat work, and that in cases where the ryots agree to contribute labour, the works are given to them on contract.

Madura.—The Collector reports that recourse to Act I of 1858 has been found necessary only in very few cases, as the ryots have always been ready to contribute labour when called upon to do so, and it is usual for the ryots to execute all repairs in connection with tanks irrigating 10 acres or less and petty and emergent repairs in case of tanks and channels irrigating larger areas. He states further that, as no record is kept of work done, it is not possible to furnish information regarding value of labour contributed by ryots, and that the extent to which customary labour is enforced varies with the energy of the Tahsildar.

Tinnevelly.—The Collector reports that ryots in the district have been generally carrying out the ordinary customary works of repair of minor irrigation works, such as clearance of silt in sluices and irrigation channels, putting up ring-bunds and other petty works; but that there is no information on record to show the extent and value of customary labour done by them. He states further that, in addition to the execution of the customary repairs, the ryots generally contribute also either in labour or money towards the ordinary repairs of minor irrigation works; that the penal provisions of Act I of 1858 have not been enforced in his district, and the necessity for it rarely arises; that no fines have been collected under section 6 of the Act, and that in one case in the Sankaranáyinárkóyil taluk where the ryots did not put up ring-bunds, remission was refused.

Coimbatore.—The Collector reports that the provisions of the Act are not taken advantage of in the district and that no customary contribution in money or labour is levied from the ryots, as they generally carry out by kudimaramat the customary repairs to irrigation works.

Salem.—The Collector states that it is reported that village communities contribute labour generally in all taluks in removing prickly-pear on tank-bunds and channel banks, in clearing silt and in preventing and closing breaches; but that the value of labour so contributed during the last five years cannot be definitely stated, as no accounts have been kept to show it and the estimates thereof furnished by Tahsildars cannot be relied on. He states further that there was only one case of contribution in money, in lieu of labour, amounting to Rs. 300 during the last five years; that there has been no occasion to enforce the provisions of the Act and that no fines were collected thereunder.

APPENDIX II.

Districts.	Value of labour contributed by ryots.	Contribution in money by ryots in lieu of labour.	Fines imposed and collected under section 6 of Act I of 1858.
1	2	3	4
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Ganjám	..	..	..
Vizagapatam	364	..	..
Gódávari	..	..	..
Kistna	1,805	295	70
Nellore	13,870	1,091	267
Cuddapah	7,579	1,713	93
Anantapur	810	412	..
Bellary	..	..	..
Kurnool	..	..	..
Chingleput	1,201	..	..
North Arcot	14,217	464	..
South Arcot	..	..	..
Tanjore	..	..	..
Trichinopoly	8,800	790	..
Madura	75	..	37
Tinnevelly	23,896	16,488	..
Coimbatore	..	..	..
Salem	..	300	..
Total ..	72,617	21,553	467

Order—No. 225, Revenue, dated 25th April 1898.

Irrigation No. 5.

Ordered that the following letter be despatched to the Government of India.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

Exd. A. F. Eccleston.

50 Copies.

1898.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

From

The Government of Fort St. George.

Recd. } 1898. *Enclosures*

Regd. } *Spare copies*

Letter, No. 226, 25th April 1898.

APRIL.

Forwarding to the Government of India a copy of the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Settlement) embodying a report as to what extent the provisions of Act I of 1858 were taken advantage of in meeting the expenditure incurred on account of the maintenance and repairs of minor irrigation works under the Revenue Department; and requesting that the sanction of the Secretary of State may be obtained for the entertainment of the establishment mentioned in the letter from this department, dated 7th December 1896, No. 697.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

From

The Hon'ble Mr. G. S. FORBES, I.C.S.,
Acting Secretary to the Government of Madras,

To

The SECRETARY to the GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
Public Works Department,

Dated Ootacamund, 25th April 1898.

Sir,

Irrigation No. 6.

With reference to Mr. Walker's letter, dated 3rd June 1897, No. 1471-G., enquiring to what extent the provisions of Act I of 1858 are taken advantage of in meeting the expenditure incurred on account of the maintenance and repairs of the tanks that are in charge of Revenue officers, I am directed to forward a copy of the marginally-noted Proceedings of the Board of Revenue embodying a report on the subject. It will be seen from this report that in most districts the provisions of the Act are but rarely specifically enforced; the customary labour being generally contributed without recourse to the Act. The value of the labour so contributed by ryots during the last five years has been valued at Rs. 72,617, while the contributions in money by ryots in lieu of labour were Rs. 21,553 and the fines imposed and collected under section 6 of the Act to Rs. 467. These figures understate the value of the labour rendered as in several districts no registers have been maintained.

Board's Proceedings (Settlement), No. 746, dated 18th December 1897.

2. A great deal of labour is, as a matter of fact, contributed by the ryots in the way of clearing gullies, removing silt, keeping tank-bunds and channels free from vegetation and the like, of which no specific record is kept. These petty repairs are carried out in pursuance of long usage, and ordinarily without any further authoritative intervention on the part of the Revenue officers beyond keeping the ryots constantly reminded of their duty, and, in certain cases, refusing at the annual settlement remission for loss of crop occasioned by failure of water owing to the persistent neglect of the ryots to give the customary attention to the minor irrigation work on which the cultivation depends. Considerable contributions are also made by the ryots in order to secure the early repair of minor works for which the annual allotments would otherwise be insufficient or which might not, owing to the disproportionate cost of the repairs, be undertaken at all. In these and other ways a large amount of labour and money is contributed in circumstances in which it might be impracticable to enforce the obligation of kudimaramat under the Act; for it would be extremely difficult to determine precisely the legal liability of the ryots in many such cases. On the whole His Excellency in Council has no reason to be dissatisfied with the manner in which the ryots generally fulfil their obligations in this respect.

3. I am now to ask that the Government of India will be good enough to obtain the early sanction of the Right Honourable the Secretary of State to the entertainment of the establishment mentioned in the letter from this department of the 7th December 1896, No. 697 R. As explained in that letter, the special establishment asked for is proposed in place of the existing temporary establishments now and for many years employed by Collectors in connection with the repair of these very important irrigation works, and the entertainment of the staff will not involve any real increase of expenditure.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

Extl. A. F. Eccleston.

0 Copies.

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

READ AGAIN G. O., No.
189

GRANT No.

ENCLOSURE TO G. O. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DATES.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, SOME MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—
A = Part printed.
B = Ought to be printed.
P = Printable if copy
Q = Printed largely.

ORDER OF COPIES REQUIRED.

Order complete.
Large copy.
Order complete with Tables.