

Revenue (1899) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 1102

DATED 15th March 99

[Despatch Abstract.]

My Mr.
Recommending questions proposed by Hon. Mr. R. K. N. Subba Rao Pantulu
Hon. Mr. R. K. N. Subba Rao Pantulu
Lam, with their replies thereto, re: the
imposition of enhanced water rate on lands
held on Zamindari or in any tenure in
Godavari & Krishna Dts.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Revenue Department

Question proposed to be
by the Honble Mr. Subba
Pantulu at the Leg
ative Council will
to be held on the 9th in

Answer wanted by Legislative
by 5 PM on the 4th.

XXXVI. (a) With reference to the answer of Government to question
XXX at the meeting of the Council held on 1st February 1898, that the reason
the enhanced water-rate of five rupees an acre was imposed on lands held on za
dari or inam tenure in Godavari and Kistna districts, was that "they we
the whole more favourably circumstanced" than the neighbouring ryotwari
exempted in some instances from the enhanced rate, will Government be
to state what it means by their being "more favorably circumstanced."

(b) Is it a fact that there are several lands in the said districts
zamindari or inam tenure that deserve to be exempted from the enhanced ra
for the circumstance that they were favourably assessed at the time of the perm
settlement or at the franchisement of inams, and has Government made any en
into the matter?

It is not in a position to answer the above in the affirm
d to order an enquiry whether there are any zamini
be exempted from the enhanced rate?

To Under Secretary.

At the meeting of
Legislative Council on
the 1st February 1898, the
Honble Mr. Subba Rao Pantulu
interpellated Govt. as to whether
it was a fact that in the
of Godavari and Kistna distri

Question No. XXX - vide page 11
of report the copy of questions
and answers under No.
699 d. 11.2.98.

G and held on Zamindari
in tenure was exempted
the enhanced water-rate
.5 per acre but that
labouring by the lands of
low quality has been
exempted, and requested
G.O explanation of the policy
wh. in according different
ment to neighbouring
3. In noting on the
to be given to the
the's question, the
any observed as follows -
a reply to the effect
no Zamindari or in an

Pages 14-15 of the notes stitched with
G.O. 6993 11.2.98.

8 were exempted, the
having taken into
consideration the fact
that Zamindaris and inams
more favourably
assessed - which is the
given by the collector
letters quoted in
(see note) - then we
land ourselves in a
discussion over the ques-
tion of assessment and

Page 13 of the notes stitched with
G.O. 6993 11.2.98 O + para 6
of the Goswami Coll's letter in G.O.
4856 2.12.95 + para 9 of
the Kistner collector's letter in
the same G.O.

"whether water rate is a
"payment independent of
"assessment or forming a
"part thereof. But it is
"difficult to see how this
"is to be avoided". The
O answer given to the Honble
Members's question was as
follows: - "The Hon. Mem-
"should be aware for
S "G.O. No. 3696 dated
"September 1896, to
"was communicated
"that Zamindari and
"lands were not ex-
"in any cases, and
"reason was that they are
"considered that they are
"the whole area of
"the circumstances,
"that the exemption
"was a mere tempo-
"expedient in the
"certain ryotwari hold-
"till final settlement
"need not be extended to
"such lands".

The Honble Subba Rao
Pantulu

argument ^{which} renders
the question liable to
speculation under Rule 9
of the Question Rules (p. 42
of the pamphlet). The
argument ~~may be~~ is
a doubt fallacious
easy to answer; but
is submitted that this
is no reason why the
Govt should ~~hesitate~~
over it ^{as to argue itself} when the
issue only for the
purpose of giving of
information as to facts.
If the question
is admitted, the
answer appended
submitted

the
4/3/88

I think the proposed
answer on next page
will do
4/5/88

It would be a complete
& satisfactory answer if
we could say that it
was at the option of the
Landlord to demand
to refuse the water if
they thought the price of it
too high -
The recent decision of the
High Court declare that no
charge can be made ~~for~~
for "involuntary flow":
The decision is well
known, and if they are
not utilised it is because
the ryots' advisers wish to
avoid forcing Govt to
put on a consolidated
charge.
The resettlement is now
so near at hand that I
think we might boldly say
that the Landlords &
Landlords need not take
the water if they deem the
charge of Rs 5 per acre
too high -
vide my proposed answer
Hd
4-3-88

(a) If the Hon member will refer
to the answer he proposes
to quote he will see that
the Govt considered that
the generally more favorable
circumstances of zamindari
& inam lands rendered
unnecessary the extension
of such lands of the
concern of exemption from
the enhanced water rate
allowed to certain ryotwari
lands ~~proportionately~~

I don't like this - The
law is clear viz that
no charge can be made
for the water unless it
is supplied on the
application of the ryot -
no charge can be
made for involuntary
flow -
I think we might
boldly make an answer
to the following effect -

Suggested answer to Q. 42
to be put by the Hon Mr
N. Subba Rao Pantulu
at the next meeting
of the Leg. Council

by "more favorable
circumstances" the
meant in the main
particular.
That the Zamindari
& inam lands are
more favorable
assessed.

(b) + (c)
The Govt cannot
that any land can
be ^{rightly} held
deserve to be exempted
from any assessment
other than that may be levied
or custom be ~~levied~~
imposed thereon. When
holding that Zamindari
& inam lands should
be ~~exempted~~
concession

ferred to above need
not be extended to
zamindari & inam
lands, the Govt was
satisfied that the
circumstances of these
lands did not call
for the concession & therefore
it seems no reason now
to order detailed
enquiries into as regards
these lands.

Me
4/3/81

Proposed answer: -
The lands referred to
were favourably
circumstanced because
they pay a much lower
assessment than the
ryotwari lands -
The remedy open to
persons who deem Rs 5
per acre an excessive
charge for irrigation
is to relinquish the water -
This being so Govt
does not consider that any
Zamindari or Inam land
deserves "to be supplied
at a lower rate"

(c.) Govt sees no
sufficient reason at
present to institute
the proposed enquiry
M.S.
4-3-89

Legislative Council - Questions & Answers

The Hon'ble M.R.Ry. N. SUBBA RAO PANTULU Garu:—

XXXV. (a) With reference to the answer of Government to question No. XXX at the meeting of the Council held on 1st February 1898, that the reason why the enhanced water-rate of five rupees an acre was imposed on lands held on zamindari or inam tenure in Gódvári and Kistna districts, was that "they were on the whole more favourably circumstanced" than the neighbouring ryotwari lands, exempted in some instances from the enhanced rate, will Government be pleased to state what it means by their being "more favourably circumstanced."

(b) Is it a fact that there are several lands in the said districts held on zamindari or inam tenure that deserve to be exempted from the enhanced rate but for the circumstance that they were favourably assessed at the time of the permanent settlement or at the enfranchisement of inams, and has Government made any enquiry into the matter?

(c) If Government is not in a position to answer the above in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to order an enquiry whether there are any zamindari or inam lands that deserve to be exempted from the enhanced rate?

The Honourable Mr.

XXXV (a) The lands referred to are more favourably circumstanced because they pay a much lower assessment than the ryotwari lands.

(b) The remedy open to persons who deem Rs. 5 per acre an excessive charge for irrigation is to relinquish the water. This being so, Government does not consider that any zamindari or inam land "deserves" to be supplied at a lower rate.

(c) Government sees no sufficient reason at present to institute the proposed enquiry.

15/3/99

Go. Dis. No. 1102 7/5th March '99.

Recorded.

Me
14.3.99

Me
15/3/81

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____ } 189
 When examined _____
 When signed _____

READ AGAIN G.O., No. _____, DATED
 189 .

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

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

A A A A A A A

N.B.—

- A = Copy in full.
- B = Not to be copied.
- P = Copy abstract only.
- Q = Copy heading only.