Revenue (~~190~~ 1898) Department.

PRESS SERIES.

G.O., No. 162

DATED 18-3-98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Passing orders regarding the levy of charges for water taken by crops on dry lands

FURTHER PAPERS.

G O	No.	Department.	Date.	G O.	No.
G.O.	345	Rev	15.6.98		
~~Cw 293/99~~					
G.O.	729	Rev	27.10.99		
CW 1703/03.					

Government {1898} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. } 1898. *Enclosures*

Regd. } 1898. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 162, 18th March 1898.

MARCH.

Water rate.

Passing orders regarding levy of charges for water taken to crops on dry land.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture), No. 347, dated 7th May 1897 :—

Read—the following letter from S. H. WYNNE, Esq., Collector and District Magistrate, North Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement and Director of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture, dated Chandragiri, 11th March 1897, Cur. No. 594-Ver. :—

With reference to Board's Proceedings, dated 21st August 1896, No. 202 (Revenue Settlement, &c.), I have the honour to request orders as to how a second crop of paddy is to be charged when the first crop is a dry crop systematically watered. Under the ruling contained in paragraph 3 of Board's Proceedings, dated 9th September 1890, No. 272, the water-rate would be higher than if two wet crops were raised. But these latter proceedings were passed long before the new rate was sanctioned. As I understand it, the new rate is, as it were, a substitute for the full rate which used to be charged in such case [*i.e.*, rate (*a*) in schedule to Standing Order No. 4] and therefore a second crop of paddy should be charged under rate (*b*) in the schedule. I have charged accordingly in a case before me, but I request definite orders as the manner in which the schedule is amended by no means makes it clear. There is similar obscurity as to a second dry crop systematically watered. Is it like a dry crop occasionally watered to be charged at the same rate as a first crop? The words "whether first or second crop" used in rate (*d*) are not repeated in rate (*e*). If not, what is the charge to be?

Read—also the following letter from A. E. CASTLESTUART STUART, Esq., I.C.S., F.G.S., F.L.S, F.R.G.S., Collector of South Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement and Director of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture, dated Cuddalore, 11th March 1897, Ref. on Regr. No. 364-Ver. :—

In continuation of my letter, Ref. on Regr. No. 290-Ver. of the 3rd instant, I have the honour to append a scale of water-rates based on my interpretation of the Board's Standing Order, No. 4 and its appendix. I shall be glad to know, at a very early date, if this interpretation is correct. It will be observed that I make rate (*b*) common to rates (*a*) and (*e*).

2. As the jamabandi is in progress, I have circulated the scale for adoption by the respective Settlement-officers—

Description of crops raised on dry lands.	First-class source of irrigation. Water-rate for first crop. Rs. A. P.	Water-rate for second crop. Rs. A. P.
1. First crop wet, second crop wet	4 0 0	2 0 0
2. First crop wet, second crop dry systematically irrigated	4 0 0	2 0 0
3. First crop dry, systematically irrigated, second crop wet	3 0 0	2 0 0
4. First crop wet, second crop dry occasionally watered	4 0 0	2 0 0
5. First crop dry occasionally watered, second crop wet	2 0 0	4 0 0
6. First crop dry systematically irrigated ... Second crop dry systematically irrigated ...	3 0 0	2 0 0
7. First crop dry systematically irrigated ... Second crop dry occasionally watered ...	3 0 0	2 0 0
8. First crop dry occasionally watered, second crop dry systematically irrigated	2 0 0	3 0 0

Under the second-class irrigation sources three-fourths of the above rates should be charged.

Resolution—No. 347, dated 7th May 1897.

In the first of the letters read above, the Collector of North Arcot inquires, with reference to Board's Proceedings, No. 202, dated 21st August 1896, Revenue Settlement, &c, (1) "how a second crop of paddy is to be charged when the first crop is a dry crop systematically watered," and (2) what should be the charge for a second dry crop systematically irrigated.

2. Both these questions are also raised, among others, in the second of the papers read above, in which the Collector of South Arcot gives an analysis of the table of rates appended to Standing Order No. 4, and inquires whether his analysis is correct. Both the Collectors are of opinion that a wet crop raised as second crop after a first systematically irrigated dry crop, should be charged under item (*b*) of the table; but in respect of a similar wet crop grown after an occasionally irrigated dry crop, the Collector of South Arcot would levy the rate fixed under item (*a*) for wet crop. The reason for this differential treatment is not apparent. The wet crop comes as second crop in both cases, and should be charged alike; the fact that the first grown dry crop was irrigated more regularly in the one case than in the other cannot affect the question as to how the subsequently grown wet crop should be treated. Item (*b*) of the table contemplates the case of a second wet crop raised on the same land in which a first *wet* crop has been raised and charged for under item (*a*). If the same land has been cultivated with two wet crops, the charge for the first crop should be Rs. 4 and for the second crop Rs. 2—total Rs. 6.*

* Under first-class irrigation sources.

Where the first crop is not a wet crop, the wet crop subsequently grown should be charged under article (*a*). The application of this principle, however, will make the total charge for two crops, where the first crop is a systematically irrigated dry crop, Rs. 7, which is more than the total charge for two wet crops. But the rates proposed by the two Collectors, viz., Rs. 3 + 2, would give a less total charge than that on an occasionally irrigated dry crop followed by a wet crop, viz., Rs. 2 + 4 or 6. The best course seems to be to prescribe a total charge of Rs. 6 in all cases in which two irrigated crops are raised on the same land and one of them at least is a wet crop.

3. Turning to the second question raised by the Collector of North Arcot, namely, how a second dry crop systematically irrigated should be charged, it is observed that the Collector of South Arcot would charge Rs. 3 if the crop, dry, was only occasionally watered. As the principle is analogous to that followed when a wet crop is charged under item (*a*) even when it is a second crop, the Board approves the Collector's scale.

4. The other items of the South Arcot Collector's analysis are correct.

5. The following foot-note, which embodies the alterations approved in paragraphs 2 and 3 above, will be added to the first appendix to Board's Standing Order, No. 4, paragraph 2 :—

"When a regularly irrigated dry crop is preceded or followed by a *wet* crop on the same land, the total charge will be Rs. 6 under first class irrigation source and Rs. 4–8–0 under second-class sources; when the same crop is followed by an irrigated *dry* crop, the total charges will be Rs. 5 and Rs. 3–12–0, respectively."

6. The necessary correction slips will be issued in the Land Revenue Department.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) R. V. SRINIVASIAR,
Secretary.

To the Collector of North Arcot.
" " of South Arcot.
Copy to other Collectors.
" to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
" " Land Revenue Department.
" " Deputy Director of Land Records and Agriculture.

Read—the following Minute by the Hon'ble Sir HENRY BLISS, K.C.I.E., dated 25th February 1898:—

I cannot agree to the order which it is proposed to issue in regard to the charge of water-rate on irrigated crops grown on lands classed as "dry" and assessed accordingly.

The orders which it is intended to amend were issued as long ago as 1874 and prescribed the uniform rate of Rs. 4 per acre as that to be charged for the irrigation of "wet" crops grown on "dry" lands, with lower rates to meet the cases of second "wet" crops and of "dry" crops which were only occasionally watered. Since then prices have increased enormously; and it would therefore seem to follow that the rates to be charged for the utilization of the surplus water at the disposal of Government should be increased. Instead of increasing them, however, it is actually proposed to reduce them to an extent which seems more or less uncertain, but which must be considerable.

There are some inaccuracies in the draft order which might well be commented on. But I will leave them unnoticed. I am only desirous, for the present, of recording this protest against an unnecessary sacrifice of revenue.

Order—No. 162, Revenue, dated 18th March 1898.

Miscellaneous.

The Government observes that its approval should have been obtained previous to the issue of the rule proposed by the Board.

2. The Government resolves to take this opportunity of reviewing the whole table of rates for water taken to crops on dry land.

3. From the papers noted in the margin, it will appear that originally the rates for water not only varied in different districts, but that in one and the same district, there were frequently more than a hundred different rates. In some cases, no definite principle was observed in charging these rates, but, generally, the principle followed was to charge as water-rate in respect of land classed as "dry" the difference between the wet and dry assessment. This fact accounts for the great number of rates noticed above in several districts. To produce uniformity, it was decided to charge one fixed set of rates on all lands in all districts with certain exceptions made for special reasons.

Board's Proceedings, No. 955, dated 10th June 1872.
Board's Proceedings, No. 2328, dated 15th November 1873.

4. From time to time, this set of rates has been modified or enlarged to meet cases which experience proved to be not provided for in the original rules. The object of these changes was to fix the charges for water in approximate proportion to the benefit derived from its use. Thus, the charge for water taken for a first crop varies as the crop is a wet crop, a dry crop systematically irrigated, or a dry crop occasionally irrigated; and in the case of a second crop the charge varies according to the extent to which it is irrigated and the nature of the first crop.

5. In the case of second-crop charges, however, the existing rules result in much irregularity as shown below.

6. The following table exhibits the table of rates as fixed by the rules in force and the rule proposed by the Board:—

No.	First crop on dry land.	Second crop on dry land.	Charge for		Total charge.	Remarks.
			First crop	Second crop.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
1	Wet	Wet	4 (a)	2 (b)	6	The rates in columns 4 and 5 are for first-class sources only. Three-fourths of these rates are charged for second-class sources.
2	Do.	Systematically irrigated, dry	4 (a)	2 (f)	6	
3	Do.	Occasionally irrigated, dry.	4 (a)	2 (d)	6	
4	Systematically irrigated, dry.	Wet	3 (e)	3 *	6	
5	Do.	Systematically irrigated, dry.	3 (e)	2 (f)	5	
6	Do.	Occasionally irrigated, dry.	3 (e)	2 (d)	5	
7	Occasionally irrigated, dry.	Wet	2 (d)	4 †	6	
8	Do.	Systematically irrigated, dry	2 (d)	3 *	5	
9	Do.	Occasionally irrigated, dry.	2 (d)	2 (d)	4	

* According to the Board's proposed rule. † *Vide* G.O., No. 792, Revenue, dated 9th October 1890.

Note.—The letters (a) (b), &c., refer to the rules in the appendix to Board's Standing Orders (4), paragraph 2.

Thus, it will be seen that the second crop charge does not vary in cases 1, 2 and 3 and also in cases 5 and 6, although the extent to which the crop is irrigated varies; while in cases 7, 8 and 9 it does.

7. Moreover, the Government is of opinion that the total charge in cases 2, 3, 4 and 7 is unduly high.

8. To remedy the inequalities and inconsistencies pointed out above, the Government resolves to adopt the following scheme of rates:—

No.	First crop on dry land.	Second crop on dry land.	Charge for		Total charge.	Remarks.
			First crop.	Second crop.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			Rs.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	
1	Wet	Wet	4	2 0 0	6 0 0	The rates in columns 4 and 5 are for water taken from first-class sources. Three-fourths of these rates should be charged for second class sources.
2	Do.	Dry systematically irrigated.	4	1 8 0	5 8 0	
3	Do.	Dry occasionally irrigated.	4	1 0 0	5 0 0	
4	Dry systematically irrigated.	Wet	3	2 8 0	5 8 0	
5	Do.	Dry systematically irrigated.	3	2 0 0	5 0 0	
6	Do.	Dry occasionally irrigated.	3	1 8 0	4 8 0	
7	Dry occasionally irrigated.	Wet	2	3 0 0	5 0 0	
8	Do.	Dry systematically irrigated.	2	2 8 0	4 8 0	
9	Do.	Dry occasionally irrigated.	2	2 0 0	4 0 0	

9. These rates will be regarded as tentative, and the Board is requested to report on their working and financial effect after they have been in operation for two faslis.

10. The question has been raised whether the distinction made between first and second class sources in respect of supply to "dry" cultivation is sound. In such cases the water charged for is surplus water, that is, water not required in the particular year for the irrigation of the "wet" lands comprised in the "ayacut" of the irrigation work; and it may be argued that there is no reason why in these circumstances

surplus water derived from a second class irrigational source should be charged at a lower rate than such water from a first-class source; that its value is independent of the source from which it comes; that the water is charged for only when it is taken; and that there is no compulsion to take it. On the other hand, a ryot is liable to be charged for occasional irrigation if he takes any water at all, and whether the supply is abundant or scanty; and it may be urged that the uncertainty as to whether there will be a sufficient supply of surplus water during all the time the crop is on the ground is really just as great as the uncertainty in regard to the normal supply to the normal ayacut, upon which principle the classification of sources proceeds; that although the ryots are not compelled to take water for "dry" lands or for second crop, it is desirable, in their interest as well as in the interest of Government, to induce them to do so, and for this end to charge more for surplus water the continuance of which is assured than for a surplus, the continuance of which is less assured; and that on these grounds the difference of charge between first and second class sources is justifiable. The question, however, is one of fact and the Board is requested to enquire into the matter and, when submitting the report called for in the preceding paragraph, to state whether the difference of advantage exists and whether it is properly measured by the difference in the prescribed rates.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture).
„ the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).

Exd. Shaik Karim.

Copies.

Revenue Department.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 162, REVENUE, DATED 18th MARCH 1898.

[Subject.—*Water-rate on dry lands.*]

From the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement), No. 347, dated 7th May 1897.
To Secretary—

The Government having sanctioned * in July last the introduction of an intermediate water-rate of Rs. 3 per acre to be charged in the case of dry crops systematically irrigated with Government water at regular intervals, the Board of Revenue amended † the appendix to Standing Order No. 4 and fixed the scale of water-rates as follows:—

* G.O., No. 3038, dated 30th July 1896.

† G.O., No. 3782, dated 22nd September 1896.

	First class.	Second class.
	Rs.	Rs.
(*a*) Water-rate for a single wet crop raised on dry land per acre.	4	3
(*b*) Second crop on the same land	2	1½
(*c*) For sugar-cane, betel, etc., requiring water longer than an ordinary wet crop per acre	6	4½
(*d*) For dry crop *occasionally* watered whether first or second crop per acre	2	1½
(*e*) For dry crops *systematically* irrigated at regular intervals ...	3	2¼

On a reference made by the Collectors of North Arcot and South Arcot, the Board of Revenue has found that the above scale is incomplete inasmuch as it does not provide for all cases of double crop irrigation on dry lands, and has accordingly ordered the insertion of the following clause as a foot-note and has sent a *copy* of its proceedings to Government.

"*Foot-note.*—When a regularly irrigated dry crop is preceded or followed by a *wet* crop on the same land, the total charge will be Rs. 6 under first-class irrigation source and Rs. 4–8–0 under second-class sources; when the same crop is followed by an irrigated *dry* crop, the total charges will be Rs. 5 and Rs. 3–12–0 respectively."

The Board, however, should not have caused the addition to be made to the Standing Order without first obtaining the approval of Government to the charges proposed to be levied.

This needs to be pointed out.
G.S.

First crop.	Second crop.	Under existing rules as far as they are clear.			Collector of South Arcot's scale.			Board's scale.			Remarks.
		Rates for		Total.	Rates for		Total	Rates for		Total.	
		1st class.	2nd class.		1st class.	2nd class.		1st class.	2nd class.		
ON DRY LAND.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
1. Wet	Wet	4 (*a*)	2 (*b*)	6	4	2	6	4	2	6	This table gives the rates for first-class sources only.
2. Wet	Systematically irrigated.	4	2 ?	6	4	2	6	4	2	6	
3 Wet	Occasionally irrigated.	4 (*a*)	2 (*d*)	6	4	2	6	4	2	6	
4. Systematically irrigated.	Wet	..	?	..	3	2	5	4 3	2 3	6	
5. Systematically irrigated.	Systematically irrigated.	3	2 ?	5	3	2	5	3	2	5	
6. Systematically irrigated.	Occasionally irrigated.	3 (*e*)	2 (*d*)	5	3	2	5	3	2	5	
7. Occasionally irrigated.	Wet	2 (*d*)	4 *	6	2	4	6	2	4	6	
8. Occasionally irrigated.	Systematically irrigated.	2	2 ?	4	2	3	5	2	3	5	
9. Occasionally irrigated.	Occasionally irrigated.	2 (*d*)	2 (*d*)	4	Does not say.			2	2	4	

Note to table.—The letters (*a*), (*b*), (*d*), (*e*) refer to the existing rules—*vide* page 1 of this note.

* *Vide* Board's Proceedings, No. 272, dated 9th September 1890, paragraph 3, last sentence—recorded in G.O., No. 792, dated 9th October 1890.

The above table gives all the possible cases that can occur. It will be seen that in five cases, viz., Nos. 1, 3, 6, 7 and 9, the rules are clear as to the rate to be charged. *Cases Nos.* 2, 5 *and* 8 are doubtful as rule (*e*) does not contain the words "whether first or second crop" which occur in rule (*d*). *Case No.* 4 is doubtful because the rule in paragraph 3 (last sentence) of Board's Proceedings recorded in G.O., No. 792, dated 9th October 1890 refers only to a wet crop following an occasionally irrigated dry crop (for at that time "systematic irrigation" was treated as "wet"). To turn to the solutions of the above cases by the Collector of South Arcot and the Board:

[This is incorrect. Please see rates sanctioned in G.O., Mis. No. 755, Revenue, dated 10th February 1897. Second crop systematic irrigation is to be charged Rs. 2 and Rs. 1–8 according as first or second class sources.]
N.E.M.
14–7–97.

Cases Nos. 2, 5 *and* 8.—The Collector and the Board would charge a systematically irrigated second crop Rs. 2 except when the first crop is "occasionally irrigated" in which case they would make the systematically irrigated second crop pay Rs. 3.

[This is according to the G.O., No. 755, dated 10th February 1897.]
N.E.M.
14–7–97.
[New. Contrary to above Government Order.]
N.E.M.
14–7–97.

Case No. 4.—The Collectors of North and South Arcot would apply rule (*b*) to rule (*e*) as well as to rule (*a*). The reason given by the Collector of North Arcot is that the systematic irrigation rate is a sort of substitute for the old wet rate in some cases when the latter used to be charged. Hence he would charge a wet crop following a systematically irrigated dry crop, Rs. 2 which is the rate laid down in rule (*b*) for a wet crop following a wet crop.

The Board points out that the Collectors propose to charge a wet crop following an occasionally irrigated dry crop Rs. 4, *i.e.*, Rs. 2 + Rs. 4 for both crops, but on the other hand that they propose to charge a wet crop only Rs. 2 if it follow a systematically irrigated dry crop. The Board states "The wet crop comes as second crop in "both cases and should be charged alike; the fact that the first grown dry crop was

"irrigated more regularly in the one case than in the other cannot *affect* the question "as to how the subsequently grown wet "crop should be treated." The Board would therefore charge a wet crop grown either as first or second crop together with a dry crop whether occasionally or systematically watered Rs. 4 (for first-class sources). But this decision of the Board would give a total rate of Rs. 7 for a dry crop systematically watered followed by a wet crop. As this would be more than the charge for two wet crops the Board solves the difficulty by making a rule that the total charge is not to exceed Rs. 6 where two irrigated crops, *i.e.*, either systematically or occasionally, are raised on the same land and one at least is a wet crop.

Submitted that it will affect the question if the exhaustion of the land by the first crop be taken into account.
N.E.M.
29–6–97.

It is submitted that the objection to the Board's rules is that the total charge under them for cases 1, 2, and 3 and also for cases 5 and 6 is the same. The total rates in cases 2 and 3 appear moreover to be unduly high. On the other hand the Collectors' proposals are illogical as pointed out by the Board.

The present rates do not appear to have been fixed upon any definite principles. Possibly the following principles may be said to underlie them:—(1) The charge for water should vary according to the benefit received; (2) in the case of the first crop, this benefit may be taken to vary according to the quantity of water used; (3) but in the case of the second crop regard must also be had to the extent to which the land has been exhausted by the first crop. The introduction of a rate for "systematically irrigated crop" makes the application of these principles rather complicated.

Taking the water-rates for first crop wet, first crop systematically watered and first crop occasionally watered to be Rs. 4, 3, and 2 respectively and that a second crop wet after a first crop wet should be charged Rs. 2 and applying the above principles, the following scale might be laid down:—

First crop.	Second crop.	First crop charge.	Second crop charge.	Total.
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1. Wet	Wet	4	2	6
2. Do.	Systematically irrigated	4	1½	5½
3. Do.	Occasionally do.	4	1	5
4. Systematically irrigated	Wet	3	2½	5½
5. Do.	Systematically irrigated	3	2	5
6. Do.	Occasionally do.	3	1½	4½
7. Occasionally irrigated	Wet	2	3	5
8. Do.	Systematically irrigated	2	2½	4½
9. Do.	Occasionally do.	2	2	4

Three-fourths the above rates for second-class sources.

These rates are well devised and should be adopted. The Board should be told that they ought not to have added to the Standing Order in the way they have without the prior approval of Government. It has always been assumed that Standing Orders could not be altered except with the approval of Government, but is there any order to this effect?
J. G. ROSE].
8–7–97.

A

* Rs. 6, 5½, 5, 4½ and 4.

The above scale would appear to meet the objections which may be taken both to the Board's scheme and to that of Mr. Stuart. It, however, would be productive of some inconvenience in actual calculation in the case of lands under second-class sources, but the fractions will be As. 2, As. 4, As. 6, etc., *i.e.*, never less than $\frac{1}{8}$th rupee. It has five rates, * but apparently this is unavoidable if we are to recognize three degrees of watering, *i.e.*, wet, systematic and occasional and are to give effect to these distinctions.

N. E. MARJORIBANKS.
29–6–97.

To Honourable Member—

It is worth noting that prior to the introduction of the existing water-rates the method of charging for water when a water-rate would now be charged was to charge the difference between the wet and dry rates. The water-rates and the charge for a second crop on dry land watered which have been in force for many years have been fixed quite arbitrarily, but to represent something less than the difference above referred to. The scale proposed by the Under Secretary has this much to recommend it that the charge on the combination of any two crops, whichever comes first, is in all cases the same, *e.g.*, rates 2 and 4. The Board's average rate is 5½, while the Under Secretary's is 5. The adoption of the latter rates will yield therefore eight per cent. less revenue.

B] *If* the same amount is irrigated under each rate.

J.G.

G. STOKES.
5-7-97.

To Secretary—

With reference to the Hon'ble Mr. Grose's notes on the note for orders it is submitted :—

(1) With reference to the concluding portion of the note, marked **A**, please see paragraph 4 of G.O., No. 1002, Revenue, dated 24th October 1887. The existing rules on the subject of water-rate have been promulgated with the sanction of Government and hence the Board should not have altered them without Government sanction.

It cannot of course be told quite accurately, but in such a case the percentage of difference between the two applications of the rates and between the two average rates is not likely to be great.

G.S.
19-7-97.

This should, it is submitted, be done.

G.S.
19-7-97.

G.O., No. 384, dated 25th March 1874.
They were finally approved in G.O., No. 539, dated 4th March 1879.

(2) With reference to the note marked **B**, it would be difficult to tell with any accuracy the financial effect of the proposed scale without elaborate statistics of the areas of dry land cultivated in past faslis with wet, systematically irrigated dry and occasionally irrigated dry, crops. As a safe-guard it is submitted that the new scale may be made tentative and the Board requested to report on its working and financial effect after it has been in force for two faslis. From the paper marginally-noted, it will be seen that the present rules were at first tentative.

A draft Government Order is submitted for approval. As the adoption of a new scale of rates involves the modification of previous Government Orders, the papers are circulated to the Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss also.

Owing to a bad mistake made by the office in not marking "back" and "further" papers on certain Government Orders, G.O., No. 755, dated 10th February 1897, was not brought to notice when writing the first note for orders. This Government Order settles three cases in the table given on page 2 of the note. The necessary alterations are shown in brackets on page 2 of the note. But the arguments against the rates are in no way weakened thereby.

N.E.M.
16-7-97.

To Honourable Member—
To Hon'ble Sir Henry Bliss, K.C.I.E.—

It will be seen that the rates sanctioned in G.O., No. 755, dated 10th February 1897, are open to the objection that the charge for the same combination of crops is not always the same, *e.g.*, Nos. 6 and 8 on page 2 of the note. I think it would be a good thing to cancel the Government Order in question and try the rates now proposed tentatively.

A.E.H.
25-11-97.

G.S.
19-7-97.

So do I.

J.G.
22-7-97.

It seems to me that the difficulty which has been felt in dealing with this subject arises to a great extent from the fact that it has been assumed that the total charge for water when both first and second crops are irrigated must not exceed Rs. 6 ; and it is with the view of getting over this difficulty and of securing a valueless uniformity that proposals are made, the effect of which will be that there will be some loss of revenue. But why should there be any loss of revenue ? The rates * now in force were, I make out, settled as far back as 1874. I recollect thinking at the time how extremely foolish they were. The price of produce varied at that time between district and district to a very great extent. Yet the same water-rate was charged in all districts without any consideration of the different rates of profit made by the ryots in different districts by the use of Government water. Why the particular rate of Rs. 4 was selected, I do not know; but I presume it was because that was the rate charged in the majority of cases, *i.e.*, in the Gódávari and Kistna districts, the water-rate charge in which must have been (and be) a great deal more than that in all the rest of the Presidency put together. The existing variations in the price of produce are not of course as great as they were in 1874, but they are still so considerable as, in my opinion, to point to the inadvisability of prescribing uniform rates of water-charge for all districts. Uniformity in these matters is, I may almost say, the curse of the administration. It has, however, in this matter, been the rule for more than twenty years, so I suppose a change is not likely to be accepted. I fail, however, to see why the rates of more than twenty years ago should be maintained in the face of the great rise which has taken place in this period in the price of produce, and especially I fail to see why at this juncture proposals should be put forward which will have the effect of reducing the revenue. It should certainly be the other way. The water-rate in Gódávari and Kistna has been raised to Rs. 5. They are the cheapest (or some of the cheapest) districts. It seems to me that, except in the special cases of the Rushikulya and Kurnool canals, the rate should be raised to Rs. 5 in the rest of the Presidency as well as in Gódávari and Kistna. I should like this question to be discussed before going farther. With a charge of Rs. 5 for wet, Rs. 3 for systematically irrigated dry and Rs. 2 for occasionally irrigated dry, and a maximum of Rs. 7 when both crops are irrigated one way or another, it seems to me that a much better scale might be made out and a small additional revenue be realized.

	RS.
* Wet	4
Dry, systematically irrigated ...	3
Dry, occasionally irrigated	2

C

H. W. B[LISS].
24-7-97.

To Hon'ble Mr. Grose again—

H.W.B.

Uniformity in some matters is bad, but I don't think uniformity in such matters as water-rate is "the curse of the administration." When I came to the country, the want of uniformity in the water-rates placed ryots completely at the mercy of village officers: now they are not, and it is possible at jamabandi to check the charge properly: then it was absolutely impossible. The result of the introduction of the uniform rates as shown in the Board's Proceedings recorded in G.O., No. 539, dated 4th March 1879, was a great increase in revenue and in the extent of land cultivated. Nor do I think that the rise in the price of produce since the rates were fixed twenty years ago justifies a general increase in the rates now, without further inquiry. No doubt many of the lands which now pay Rs. 4 could easily pay Rs. 5, &c., but how could they be selected? We have no data for determining the net produce of a second crop, and every district would have to be resettled with all the harassment of the population and the other drawbacks of a settlement, which the Government of India has pointed out, before such data could be prepared. It is necessary to keep the rate low, since it is to be the same for all descriptions of land. We are bound by orders from higher authorities and declarations of our own to the half-net system, and we have to take care that any new water-rate does not transgress it. Mr. Clerk in his report on the settlement of Gódávari

D E F G

shows that on the half-net principle, if Rs. 5 is charged as water-rate, no less than 145,256 acres will be over-assessed. This will be the same in all other districts. It is true that a 4-rupee rate causes the half-net to be exceeded (though to a much smaller extent); but long usage has established it, and experience shows that it can be charged as a general rate for the whole Presidency. I do not think Rs. 5 can. Moreover in the middle of such a season as this, the time is not propitious for increasing taxation. I doubt if by the modifications I have approved in the water-rate rules, we shall lose any revenue. I believe that the extent of water-rate cultivation, and therefore the quantity of grain produced in the country would increase, and this would be in accordance with the soundest policy.

But the orders now passed, whatever they may be, will not come into force in the middle of the current season of scarcity. If they did, what harm would they do? They are to fix the charge to be made for surplus water, not required for the wet lands and therefore supplied to dry lands. Now, suppose at this moment surplus water is anywhere available (and no doubt in some places it is), the supply would be to ryots who would get double prices, or something like double prices, for the produce they would raise by means thereof. They would gladly pay 25 per cent. extra, and I can't see why they should not be made to do so.

H.W.B.
30-7-97.

J.G.
26-7-97.

To Secretary—

The papers on the subject of water-rates for crops raised on dry lands are re-circulated to the Honourable Member with reference to the Hon'ble Mr. Grose's note above, dated 26th July 1897. It is thought that the Honourable Member may wish to see the Hon'ble Mr. Grose's note before the papers are circulated to His Excellency.

2. With reference to the portion marked **C** of the Honourable Member's note, dated 24th July 1897, on page 5, it is submitted that the rate Rs. 3 for a systematically irrigated dry crop has been but recently (1896) sanctioned. Please see G.O., Mis. No. 3038, dated 30th July 1896. This is however a minor matter.

N.E.M.
28-7-97.

To Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss, K.C.I.E.—

The standard rates for water-rate are set out in Board's Proceedings of 15th November 1873 and no doubt came into force from 1874 as stated by the Honourable Member.

G.S.
29-7-97.

I disagree altogether with what the Hon'ble Mr. Grose says at **D**. The rate prescribed in each district was not at the option of the jamabandi officer, but was prescribed in the district "hukumnamah" and was perfectly well known. The exception was (in a few cases) where the paimash prescribed wet as well as dry rates, in which case the difference, which also was on record, was charged.

The Hon'ble Mr. Grose's remarks at **E** read as if the same lands were year after year charged with water-rate. But, except in Gódávari, Kistna and Kurnool, is this the case? If it is, it is clear that the classification of such lands should be altered and that they should once for all be transferred from dry to wet. But I do not think it is the case. A man owns a piece of land, classed as dry, but commanded by a tank or channel. If water is plentiful, he takes it and raises a wet crop. If not, he raises a dry crop. It is for him to judge whether it is worth his while to take the water and raise the wet crop. Considering the rise of prices since 1874, I don't believe that, if not deterred by a water-rate of Rs. 4 in 1874, he would be deterred by a water-rate of Rs. 5 now. It is not for Government to select, but for the ryot.

As to **F**, it may be quite true that we have no data for determining the yield of a *second* crop, though I did not know that it was. But, even so, I do not see the bearing of the remark on a proposal to fix the charge for a *first* crop at so much, nor can I see the relevancy of the remarks at **G**. The half-net has nothing whatever to do with the matter. The half-net comes in when Government fixes the assessment of land, which the ryot has to pay or give up his land. It is, in fact, a case of compulsion and not to be moderate would be at least in the direction of killing the goose which lays the golden eggs. But in the matter of water rate there is no compulsion at all. A ryot takes water or leaves it as he likes.

With reference to the Hon'ble Mr. Grose's remarks as to uniformity, I see that in the Board's Proceedings of November 15th, 1873, which issued under his auspices as Secretary, the desire to aim at uniformity was expressly disavowed.

H.W.B.
30-7-97.

To Secretary—

The papers on the subject of the rates to be charged for water taken to crops on dry land are circulated to His Excellency as the Hon'ble Mr. Grose and the Hon'ble Sir Henry Bliss differ in their views of the matter.

The Government recently sanctioned a special rate of Rs. 3 per acre for water taken for a first crop systematically irrigated on dry land. Previously there were only two degrees of irrigation recognised, viz., irrigation for a wet crop and that for an ordinary dry crop which is only occasionally watered. The rates for such crops, when first crops, were Rs. 4 and Rs. 2, respectively. The Board passed certain orders as to the rates to be charged for the water taken for a combination (as first crop and second crop) of any two of the above classes of crops. The result of the Board's orders is exhibited in tabular form on page 2 *supra*. It will be seen to involve inconsistencies and inequalities.

To remedy this a scale was drawn up and approved by the Hon'ble Mr. Grose (page 3). It will be seen that in this scale, the highest charge for any combination of two crops is Rs. 6. As the scale, however, is graduated the total revenue which would result from its adoption would probably be less than that which would be raised under the Board's scale although the extent of the decrease cannot be foretold with any accuracy. Please see the Secretary's note on page 4. The Hon'ble Sir Henry Bliss does not consider that any risk of such decrease of revenue should be incurred and considers that the rates for (water to) first crop, wet, dry systematically irrigated, and dry occasionally irrigated, should be fixed at Rs. 5, 3 and 2 respectively, instead of at Rs. 4, 3 and 2 respectively as at present.

The views of the two Honourable Members are set out in full in their notes.

It will thus be seen that the question for decision is, should the rate for water taken for a "wet" crop on dry land be raised from Rs. 4 to Rs. 5? This increase will necessarily cause a general increase in the rates for second crop and therefore in the rates for any combination of two crops.

Both the Honourable Members apparently agree as to the necessity for a graduated scale and it does not appear that the Hon'ble Sir Henry Bliss wishes to revert to the system in force previous to 1873 when the rates varied from district to district and there were sometimes more than 100 rates in the same district.

N.E.M.
3-8-97.

To His Excellency the Governor—

G.S.
3-8-97.

[H. E. has noted at page 4 *supra*.]

To Secretary—

Upon the current, the office note pages 1 to 3 were written. Upon the Hon'ble Mr. Grose's orders on page 3, the office-note, page 4, was written and with a draft

Government Order was circulated to the Hon'ble Mr. Grose and to the Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss. The Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss did not agree with the draft order (*vide* his note, page 5). The Hon'ble Mr. Grose, however, maintained his views and passed the draft order with certain modifications of the wording thereof (*vide* note, pages 5 and 6). The papers were then sent back to the Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss, with office-note, page 6. The Honourable Member maintained his view (*vide* his note, pages 6 and 7, and also on margin of page 6). The papers were then circulated to His Excellency with the office-note, page 7. His Excellency has agreed that a former G.O., No. 755, dated 10th February 1897, should be cancelled and the rates approved by the Hon'ble Mr. Grose tried tentatively (*vide* page 4).*

* His Excellency's initials are dated 25th November 1897, but the file came into the office to-day—4th December 1897.

The draft Government Order as it stands cancels all previous orders on the subject. These may be read at the head of the Government Order. The draft Government Order also orders the proposed rates to be tried tentatively for two faslis.

G.S.F.

Thus His Excellency concurs with the Hon'ble Mr. Grose. Submitted that the papers may now be recirculated to the Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss before the Government Order issues.

N.E.M.
4-12-97.

To the Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss—

The draft which has been approved by the Hon'ble Mr. Grose and His Excellency is recirculated to the Honourable Member before issue.

G. S. Forbes.
7-12-97.

I have put up a minute of dissent.

H.W.B.
9-12-97.

Minute of Dissent.

I cannot agree to the order which it is proposed to issue in regard to the charge of water-rate on irrigated crops grown on lands classed as "dry" and assessed accordingly.

The orders which it is intended to amend were issued as long ago as 1874 and prescribed the uniform rate of Rs. 4 per acre as that to be charged for the irrigation of "wet" crops grown on "dry" lands, with lower rates to meet the cases of second "wet" crops and of "dry" crops which were only occasionally watered. Since then, prices have increased enormously; and it would therefore seem to follow that the rates to be charged for the utilization of the surplus water at the disposal of Government should be increased. Instead of increasing them, however, it is actually proposed to reduce them to an extent which seems more or less uncertain, but which must be considerable.

The rate of Rs. 4 per acre above mentioned (and the lower rates dependent thereon) were, and are to be continued, for the supply of surplus water from irrigation sources of the first class. For such supply from second-class irrigation sources a lower scale of rates was prescribed and is proposed to be continued. This distinction is not based on any sound principle; indeed, it seems to show that the principles on which surplus water should be charged for have not received adequate consideration. Irrigation sources are classed not according to their size or the acreage dependent on them, but according to the certainty and permanency with which they can be reckoned on to supply water to their "ayacuts," that is, to the areas ordinarily watered by them and classed as "wet" in the Government accounts and assessed accordingly. It is right therefore, that "wet" lands watered by an irrigation source of the first class should bear higher rates of assessment than "wet" lands watered by an irrigation source of the second class, which affords a supply of a more precarious nature. But that is not the matter dealt with in these papers. The question dealt with is the charge which should be made for surplus water, that is, for water not

required in the particular year for the irrigation of the lands comprised in the "ayacut" of the work. It is clear that, if there is a surplus, the inferiority of the second class irrigation source has for the time being disappeared, and that the second class is temporarily on a level with first-class irrigation sources. There is no reason, therefore, why water supplied from the one should be charged for at a lower rate than that supplied from the other. Apart from this, however, the charge to be made for water should in such circumstances depend on the value of the water to the person who proposes to make use of it, rather than on the classification of the work from which it is derived. A ryot who holds "dry" land is under no compulsion whatever to take water and grow a "wet" crop or irrigate his "dry" crop. If he does not think it will pay him to take the water, he need not, and will not, take it. He is in quite a different position from the holder of "wet" lands, who has to pay the higher assessment imposed on his lands because they are classed as "wet," whether he likes to or not. He should, therefore, be charged for the use of surplus water what it may be supposed to be worth to him, less such a sum as will make it worth his while to incur the extra trouble and expense involved in irrigated as compared with unirrigated cultivation. Whatever the source, therefore, from which surplus water is supplied, the person who uses it should pay for it at the same rate. If he does not do so, a further loss is caused to the State.

There are some inaccuracies in the draft order which might well be commented on. But I will leave them unnoticed. I am only desirous for the present of recording this protest against an unnecessary sacrifice of revenue.

9th December 1897.

H.W.B.

To Secretary—

The Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss's minute of dissent raises an important question which was not discussed in the former notes and I beg to submit that it might be advisable to circulate the minute before issue of the Government Order.

When the current first came in, it was assumed (1) that Government did not wish to raise the 4-rupee rate, (2) that the distinction between water supplied from first-class sources and that supplied from second-class sources was to continue, and (3) that the distinction between the irrigation for wet crops, dry crops systematically watered and dry crops occasionally watered was to be observed. The note, pages 1 to 3 showed that the existing scale did not observe point (3) and a scale which would give effect to these distinctions was suggested and the Hon'ble Mr. Grose approved of it. The Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss objected, however, to the needless sacrifice of revenue which he considered the adoption of this scale would involve and suggested that the 4-rupee rate might be raised to Rs. 5 and the scale adapted accordingly. The Hon'ble Mr. Grose objected to this and His Excellency concurred with the Hon'ble Mr. Grose. Point (1) has thus been affirmed and point (3) has not been questioned.

The Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss in his minute of dissent raises the question as to whether the distinction* between first and second class sources is sound. This point has not been raised before. If the Hon'ble Mr. Grose and His Excellency accept the Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss's views on this point and the distinction is done away with, probably no revenue will be lost and the objects of Government attained in all respects.

* *i.e.*, in respect of supply to "dry" cultivation.

G.S.F.

The origin of the distinction was as follows. In the tirvajasti rules originally circulated by the Board to all Collectors there was only one scale of water-rates irrespective of the sources from which water might be taken. Please see rules in Board's Proceedings, No. 955, dated 10th June 1872.

It was the Collector of Bellary† (*vide* letter in Board's Proceedings, No. 2328, dated 15th November 1873) who first suggested that there should be a distinction between sources of irrigation "the supply of which is regular and to be depended upon" and those "the supply in

† Mr. J. H. Master.

which is precarious and not regular." The Board considered that "the proposed distinction as to the value of sources of irrigation is obviously fair and equitable" and that "the principle should be applied in all districts to which the rules apply." (Paragraph 6 of Board's Proceedings in G.O., No. 384, dated 25th March 1874.) The Government approved and confirmed the revised scale allowing for two classes of irrigation (G.O., No. 384, dated 25th March 1874).

The Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss points out that the distinction is not sound. It does not matter whether the source of supply is precarious or not. The water is charged for *only when it is taken* and there is no compulsion to take it.

It seems extraordinary that the distinction should have lived so long. Perhaps the explanation is that the first-class rates were (originally) too high for general application and that this distinction cured the defect in practice by allowing lower rates in some tracts though on a wrong principle. The Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss has pointed out that water is now more valuable than it was twenty-five years ago. If the distinction between first and second class sources be abolished and the moderate and graduated scale proposed be made to apply to all sources, I submit that all objections will be met.

N.E.M.
14-12-97.

Not at all. Why should any one pay less than what the use of the water is worth at the present time, because he formerly paid the smaller sum which represented its value twenty-five years ago?

H.W.B.
25-2-98.

To Honourable Member—

I recirculate the papers, as a novel point has been raised by the Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss.

There is one point, however, which the Under Secretary seems to overlook in his note above, that even with regard to a supply to "dry" land from a first or second class source, there does exist an element of distinction founded on the difference of source.

No doubt water is charged only if it is taken, and if it is surplus water; but we do not measure the water and a ryot who takes any quantity is charged whether the supply holds out or not. It is quite intelligible that the supply from the surplus of first-class source may be more assured than that from a second-class source. It does not of course necessarily follow, but probably it is on the whole what does occur. In such case, a ryot may not be prepared to pay the higher rate for surplus water from a second-class source; the risk of failure is greater, in other words the price of the advantage should be lower.

It is probably on some such considerations that the difference has been maintained in the rules. It is, however, a question of fact, which, if necessary, the Board may ascertain,—whether the difference of advantage does exist and whether it is properly measured by the difference in the prescribed rates.

G.S.F.
18-12-97.

As the Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss has so strong an opinion on the point, a paragraph should be added to the Government Order calling for the opinion of the Board in the terms suggested by the Secretary.

In my opinion, however, the distinction between first and second class sources of irrigation is right. The argument against it is, that the water-rate charge is for *surplus* water, and that this surplus, whether it comes from a first-class source or a second-class source, is equally valuable. This argument would be conclusive with regard to the ordinary commodities of trade, but it is not conclusive with respect to irrigation, which may last for a long time, and will be charged at the same cost, whether it is abundant or scanty. My experience has led me to believe that the doubt as to whether there will be a sufficient surplus during all the time that a water-rate crop is on the ground is just as great as the doubt as to whether the normal supply to the normal ayacut is certain or not. It is more certain in the case of first-class sources than of second-class sources. Though ryots are not compelled to take

water for dry lands or for second crop, it is desirable, in their interest as well as ours, to induce them to do so, and for this purpose we should charge more for a surplus the continuance of which is assured, than for a surplus the continuance of which is not assured. Moreover, the ryot knows that he will be charged the same, even if he gets little or no water for a portion of the time the crop is on the ground.

J.G.

To the Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss—

G.S.F.
7-1-98.

If the draft Government Order on which I minuted is altered, please let me have it again in its final state, that I may reconsider my minute.

I see the question* I asked on the draft order has not been answered. Is this because it can't be answered? If so, the Government Order should be corrected, so as to be at least accurate as to facts.

H.W.B.
10-1-98.

* Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss's query on first sentence of paragraph 3 of draft order—

The whole of the papers are not put up, so I cannot check the accuracy of the word "frequently." I should like to know in how many districts there were more than a hundred different rates. By "100" I suppose "a hundred" is meant.

H.W.B.

To Secretary—

From the Collector's letters read in Board's Proceedings, No. 955, dated 10th June 1872, the following facts may be gathered with regard to the rates in each district:—

Ganjám, page 2583.†—"When dry land is converted into wet in this district, the wet rate of assessment is at once charged thereon and its extent transferred from 'dry' to 'wet' in the accounts of the same year;" . . . "no separate water cess is levied."

† The references are to the pages of the Board's Proceedings volume.

Practically therefore the water-rate was the difference between the wet and dry rates. No information as to the number of these is given for Ganjám.

Vizagapatam, page 2586.—"In this district, there is no rate fixed for tirvajasti. The practice is to ascertain the difference between the wet and dry rates and to charge it in addition to the ordinary assessment."

No definite information as to the number of different rates which would be thus arrived at is given.

Góldvari, page 2587.—There was a fixed scale of rates in force at the time of the Board's Proceedings.

Kistna, page 2588.—There was a fixed scale of water-rates in the Masulipatam delta. In the Guntúr delta and the upland tracts, the Collector reported that the wet assessment was consolidated. It is not reported what the rates for dry lands watered would be. Presumably, there were none such, all being classed as wet. Separating the water-rate from the dry assessment a variety of rates appeared (*vide* the statement appended to the Collector's letter, page 2591). The exact number is not however stated.

Nellore, page 2592.—Here again the tirvajasti was the difference between the dry assessment and the "adjoining" wet assessment. "The present rates of tirvajasti are as numerous as the original wet rates." The number of these however is not definitely stated.

Cuddapah, page 2596.—There were six classes of rates of tirvajasti containing in all (230 + 48 + 321 + 69 + 52 + 23) rates = 743 rates.

Bellary, *page* 2598.—There were 41 wet rates, but apparently only two rates for water taken to dry lands, *viz.*, Rs. 5 under the Tungabhadra and Rs. 4 elsewhere.

Kurnool, *page* 2600.—"The tirvajasti upon a given land is ascertained by deducting dry assessment of the land from the wet assessment of a land of similar quality in the neighbourhood." In consequence the rates totalled 712.

Chingleput, *page* 2605.—"Tirvajasti has been collected at no less than 186 rates."

North Arcot, *page* 2617.—In 1855, a fixed scale of rates, viz., Rs. 3-8-0 per cawny for dry grains and Rs. 7 per cawny for paddy, &c., had been fixed.

South Arcot, *page* 2618.—There was a fixed scale for the district.

Tanjore, *page* 2625.—While the district had been settled there was a fixed scale. In other parts, the rate was charged on the old tirvajasti system, viz., difference of dry and wet assessments. In these parts, the rates varied in different fields of the same village and were "very numerous."

Trichinopoly, *page* 2629.—Apparently there were only four rates for the whole district.

Madura, *page* 2631.—The practice was to charge the difference between wet and dry rates. In three taluks, the wet assessment of the class of every field was fixed. In the other three taluks when dry was converted into wet, the wet assessment was fixed with reference to the nature of the irrigation and the assessment of neighbouring wet lands. The number of rates that thus ensued is not stated.

Tinnevelly, *page* 2635.—"When dry land is cultivated as wet with the help of Government water . . . the ordinary wet assessment of the neighbouring land was charged" . . . "The present rates vary very much . . . Each village having its own special rates . . ."

Coimbatore, *page* 2639.—Only 82 acres were "dry" temporarily cultivated as "wet". On 42 acres of this, the difference between the dry and wet assessment was charged. On the remainder a fixed scale prescribed by the Board in 1855.

Nilgiris, *page* 2641.—The question did not arise in this district.

Salem, *page* 2641.—Apparently the difference between dry and wet assessment was charged. The Collector talks only of "average" rates.

South Canara, *page* 2642.—The question did not arise.

Malabar, *page* 2644.—The question did not arise.

The question did not arise in (1) *Malabar*, (2) *South Canara* and (3) *Nilgiri Hills*. Of the remaining seventeen districts, the practice of charging the difference between the wet and dry assessments obtained to a greater or less extent in *Ganjám Vizagapatam*, *Nellore*, *Cuddapah*, *Kurnool*, *Chingleput*, *Coimbatore*, *Salem*, *Tanjore*, *Madura* and *Tinnevelly*, *i.e.*, in eleven districts. Wherever definite figures are quoted, *e.g.*, Cuddapah, Kurnool and Chingleput, the rates are many more than one hundred and it is submitted that there must have been quite this number (and more) wherever the same system prevailed.

N.E.M.
24-1-98.

To Hon'ble Sir H. Bliss—

No doubt where the principle of charge was, as it generally was, the difference between the *wet* and *dry* assessments, there was a very great number of different rates actually charged. But the multiplicity was not really a fact of so much importance as one might think. The wet and dry rates were always known and the difference was a matter of instantaneous calculation. The principle was simple enough; as a fact, however, there were these numerous resulting rates.

Of no importance at all. There were not these numerous rates in any one village and if there had been, it would not have mattered, since the rates were based on a fixed and simple principle and were perfectly well-known.

H.W.B.
25-2-98.

Honourable Member will see that the proposal is to issue the Government Order with the addendum asking the Board to report further on the possibility of abolishing the distinction between the rates from first and second class sources.

When the reply is received, the matter will be open to further consideration.

G.S.F.
5-2-98.

On this understanding, I have struck out from my minute the paragraph dealing with the question of different charges for water from first and second class sources.

H.W.B.
25-2-98.

To Secretary—

I have added a paragraph to the draft Government Order. May it now issue?

N.E.M.
26-2-98.

Send me the draft Government Order in proof, together with Sir H. Bliss's minute also in proof.

G.S.F.
28-2-98.

To Under Secretary—

Two proof copies of the draft Government Order are submitted—one with the minute read in full and the other with the heading only and in the form intended for issue.

N.K.
9-3-98.

To Secretary—

N.E.M.
10-3-98.

Get a clean proof as revised by me.

G.S.F.
11-3-98.

To Secretary—

A clean proof is put up as ordered.

N.K.
14-3-98.

To Honourable Member—

Please see proof of Government Order within, with special reference to para. 10.

G.S.F.

Seen and approved.

J.G.
17-3-98.

Issue.

G.S.F.
18-3-98.

B.P. (Ry.) 202
21.8.96
B.P. (Ry.) 272
9.9.96

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

1897.

Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture),

MADRAS.

Recd. } 1897. Enclosures

Regd. } 1897. Spare copies

Printed May th.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
24 MAY 97
REV

Proceedings, 7th May 1897, No. 347.

MAY.

Water-rate.—Passing orders on letters regarding the charge of — on a second crop raised on dry lands.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE
(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture).

Read—the following letter from S. H. WYNNE, Esq., Collector and District Magistrate, North Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement and Director of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture, dated Chandragiri, 11th March 1897, Cur. No. 594-Ver. :—

With reference to B.P., dated 21st August 1896, No. 202 (Revenue Settlement, &c.), I have the honour to request orders as to how a second crop of paddy is to be charged when the first crop is a dry crop systematically watered. Under the ruling contained in paragraph 3 of B.P., dated 9th September 1890, No. 272, the water-rate would be higher than if two wet crops were raised. But these latter proceedings were passed long before the new rate was sanctioned. As I understand it, the new rate is, as it were, a substitute for the full rate which used to be charged in such case [*i.e.*, rate (*a*) in schedule to Standing Order No. 4] and therefore a second crop of paddy should be charged under rate (*b*) in the schedule. I have charged accordingly in a case before me, but I request definite orders as the manner in which the schedule is amended by no means makes it clear. There is similar obscurity as to a second dry crop systematically watered. Is it like a dry crop occasionally watered to be charged at the same rate as a first crop? The words "whether first or second crop" used in rate (*d*) are not repeated in rate (*e*). If not, what is the charge to be?

Read—also the following letter from A. E. CASTLESTUART STUART, Esq., I.C.S., F.G.S., F.L.S., F.R.G.S., Collector of South Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement and Director of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture, dated Cuddalore, 11th March 1897, Ref. on Regr. No. 364-Ver. :—

In continuation of my letter, Ref. on Regr. No. 290-Ver. of the 3rd instant, I have the honour to append a scale of water-rates based on my interpretation of the Board's Standing Order No. 4 and its appendix. I shall be glad to know, at a very early date, if this interpretation is correct. It will be observed that I make rate (*b*) common to rates (*a*) and (*e*).

2. As the jamabandi is in progress, I have circulated the scale for adoption by the respective Settlement-officers :—

Description of crops raised on dry lands.	First-class source of irrigation. Water-rate for first crop.	Water-rate for Second crop.
	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
1. First crop wet, second crop wet	4 0 0	2 0 0
2. First crop wet, second crop dry systematically irrigated	4 0 0	2 0 0
3. First crop dry, systematically irrigated, second crop wet	3 0 0	2 0 0
4. First crop wet, second crop dry occasionally watered	4 0 0	2 0 0
5. First crop dry occasionally watered, second crop wet	2 0 0	4 0 0
6. First crop dry systematically irrigated ... Second crop dry systematically irrigated ...	3 0 0	2 0 0
7. First crop dry systematically irrigated ... Second crop dry occasionally watered ...	3 0 0	2 0 0
8. First crop dry occasionally watered, second crop dry systematically irrigated	2 0 0	3 0 0

Under the second-class irrigation sources three-fourths of the above rates should be charged.

Resolution—dated 7th May 1897, No. 347.

In the first of the letters read above, the Collector of North Arcot inquires, with reference to B.P., dated 21st August 1896, No. 202 (Revenue Settlement, &c.), (1) "how a second crop of paddy is to be charged when the first crop is a dry crop systematically watered," and (2) what should be the charge for a second dry crop systematically irrigated.

2. Both these questions are also raised, among others, in the second of the papers read above, in which the Collector of South Arcot gives an analysis of the table of rates appended to Standing Order No. 4, and inquires whether his analysis is correct. Both the Collectors are of opinion that a wet crop raised as second crop after a first systematically irrigated dry crop, should be charged under item (*b*) of the table; but in respect of a similar wet crop grown after an occasionally irrigated dry crop, the Collector of South Arcot would levy the rate fixed under item (*a*) for wet crop. The reason for this differential treatment is not apparent. The wet crop comes as second crop in both cases, and should be charged alike; the fact that the first grown dry crop was irrigated more regularly in the one case than in the other cannot affect the question as to how the subsequently grown wet crop should be treated. Item (*b*) of the table contemplates the case of a second wet crop raised on the same land in which a first *wet* crop has been raised and charged for under item (*a*). If the same land has been cultivated with two wet crops, the charge for the first crop should be Rs. 4 and for the second crop Rs. 2—total Rs. 6.*

* Under first-class irrigation sources.

Where the first crop is not a wet crop, the wet crop subsequently grown should be charged under article (*a*). The application of this principle, however, will make the total charge for two crops, where the first crop is a systematically irrigated dry crop, Rs. 7, which is more than the total charge for two wet crops. But the rates proposed by the two Collectors, viz., Rs. 3 + 2, would give a less total charge than that on an occasionally irrigated dry crop followed by a wet crop, viz., Rs. 2 + 4 or 6. The best course seems to be to prescribe a total charge of Rs. 6 in all cases in which two irrigated crops are raised on the same land and one of them at least is a wet crop.

3. Turning to the second question raised by the Collector of North Arcot, namely, how a second dry crop systematically irrigated should be charged, it is observed that the Collector of South Arcot would charge Rs. 3 if the crop dry was only occasionally watered. As the principle is analogous to that followed when a wet crop is charged under item (*a*) even when it is a second crop, the Board approves the Collector's scale.

4. The other items of the South Arcot Collector's analysis are correct.

5. The following foot-note, which embodies the alterations approved in paragraphs 2 and 3 above, will be added to the first appendix to Board's Standing Order No. 4, paragraph 2 :—

"When a regularly irrigated dry crop is preceded or followed by a *wet* crop on the same land, the total charge will be Rs. 6 under first-class irrigation source and Rs. 4–8–0 under second-class sources; when the same crop is followed by an irrigated *dry* crop, the total charges will be Rs. 5 and Rs. 3–12–0, respectively."

6. The necessary correction slips will be issued in the Land Revenue Department.

(True Copies and Extract.)

P. V. Srinivasan
Secretary.

To the Collector of North Arcot.
" " of South Arcot.
Copy to other Collectors.
" to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
" " Land Revenue Department.
" " Deputy Director of Land Records and Agriculture.

Exd. C. M. Thumbusawmy.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE

(REVENUE SETTLEMENT, LAND RECORDS AND AGRICULTURE).

READ—the following G.O., Mis. No. 755, Revenue, dated 10th February 1897 :—

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (R. S., L.R. and Agri.), dated 28th December 1896, No. 463 :—

Read—the following letter from J. K. BATTEN, Esq., Acting Collector of Trichinopoly, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement and Director of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture, dated 26th November 1896, Ref. on Cur. No. 2825-Rev. :—

Adverting to B.P., No. 202 (Settlement, &c.), dated 21st August 1896, I have the honour to enquire whether the rates of Rs. 3 and Rs. 2–4–0 are to be repeated for a second dry crop raised on dry land and systematically irrigated at regular intervals or whether only half the rates are to be charged. If the rates are to be repeated, the total charge for the two dry crops will be the same as that for two wet crops raised on dry land, which will be hard on the ryots raising dry crops.

Resolution—dated 28th December 1896, No. 463.

In the letter read above, the Collector of Trichinopoly enquires whether the rates sanctioned in B.P., No. 202, dated 21st August 1896, for dry crops systematically irrigated at regular intervals, viz., Rs. 3 and Rs. 2–4–0, apply to the first crop only or to first and second crop equally.

2. In the latter case, not only, as pointed out by the Collector, will the total charge for two crops be equal to that on two wet crops, but the charge for a second dry crop will be more than that for a second wet crop, though, as a matter of fact, dry crops do not consume as much water as a wet crop.

3. The rates for a second dry crop of the description referred to by the Collector may, the Board considers, be fixed at Rs. 2 and Rs. 1–8–0, respectively, which are also the rates fixed for a second wet crop and for a dry crop, whether first or second, watered occasionally.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. V. SRINIVASIAR,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
Copy to the Collector of Trichinopoly.

Order—Mis. No. 755, Revenue, dated 10th February 1897.

The rates proposed in paragraph 3 of the B.P. read above are approved and sanctioned.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. STOKES,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement, &c).

RESOLUTION—dated 19th February 1897, No. 146.

Communicated to all Collectors for information and guidance.

2. The first appendix to Board's Standing Order No. 4, paragraph 2, will be amended as follows:—

For clause (*e*), substitute the following:—

	First-class tanks, river and spring channels.	Second-class tanks, river and spring channels.
	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.
For dry crops systematically irrigated at regular intervals, if first crop	3 0 0	2 4 0
For dry crops systematically irrigated at regular intervals, if second crop	2 0 0	1 8 0

3. The necessary correction slips will be issued in the Land Revenue Department.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) R. V. SRINIVASIAR,
Secretary.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) P. GOVINDA MENON,
Second Assistant.

To all Collectors.
„ the Land Revenue Department.
Copy to the Deputy Director, Land Records.

Exd. P. Seetharam.

1897.

Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture),

MADRAS.

Printed March 5th.

Proceedings, 19*th Feb.* 1897, *No.* 146.

Water-rate.—Communicating G.O. sanctioning proposed — for a second dry crop systematically irrigated at regular intervals and amending the appendix to S.O. accordingly.

Re:- water rate on dry lands.

The Honble Mr J. Grose C.I.E.

Pres.

+Go 3038 / 12.9.96

*Go 3782 / 12.9.96

C No. 4354 of 1897.

For orders:

The Govt having sanctioned in July last, the introduction of an intermediate water rate of Rs 3 per acre to be charged in the case of dry crops systematically irrigated with Govt water at regular intervals the Board of Revenue amended the appendix to S.O. No 4. and fixed the scale of water rates as follows:—

	1st class	2nd class
(a) water rate for a single wet crop raised on dry land per acre.	4.	3.
(b) second crop on the same land	2.	1½
(c) for sugar cane, betel &c requiring water longer than an ordinary wet crop per acre	6.	4½
(d) for dry crop occasionally watered, whether first or second crop per acre	2.	1½
(e) for dry crops systematically irrigated at regular intervals	3.	2¼

On a reference made by the Collectors of North Arcot and

c 6/7/97

R.C. 18/12/97. 2.6/1/98. R.C. 7/1/98. R. 11/1/98.

and South Arcot, the Board of Revenue has found that the above scale is incomplete inasmuch as it does not provide for all cases of double crop irrigation on dry lands, and has accordingly ordered the insertion of the following clause as a foot-note and has sent a copy of its Proceedings to Govt.

Foot-note.

"When a regularly irrigated dry crop is preceded or followed by a wet crop on the same land, the total charge will be Rs 6 under first-class irrigation source and Rs 4-8-0 under second-class sources; when the same crop is followed by an irrigated dry crop, the total charges will be Rs 5 and Rs 3-12-0 respectively."

The Board however, should not have caused the addition to be made to the S.O. without first obtaining the approval of Govt to the charges proposed to be levied. Probably the

This ends the printed ext. 9.2.97

1st Crop	2nd Crop.	Under existing rules as for as they are clear Rates for			Collector of South Arcot Scale Rates for			Board's scale Rates for			Remarks.
on dry land		1st C Rs	2nd C As	Total Rs	1st C Rs	2nd C Rs	Total Rs	1st C Rs	2nd C Rs	Total Rs	
1. wet	wet	4(a)	2(b)	6	4	2	6	4	2	6	This table gives the rates for 1st Class sources only.
2. wet	Supplematically irrigated	4	2	6	4	2	6	4	2	6	
3. wet	occasionally irrigated	4(a)	2(d)	6	4	2	6	4	2	6	
4. Supplematically irrigated	wet	?			3	2	5	3½	2½	6	
5. supplematically irrigated	supplematically irrigated	3	?2	5	3	2	5	3	2	5	
6. supplematically irrigated	occasionally irrigated	3(c)	2(d)	5	3	2	5	3	2	5	
7. occasionally irrigated	wet	2(d)	4*	6	2	4	6	2	4	6	
8. occasionally irrigated	supplematically irrigated	2	?	4	2	3	5	2	3	5	
9. occasionally irrigated	occasionally irrigated.	2(d)	2(d)	4	doesn't say.			2	2	4	

Note to table. The letters (a) (b) (d) (e) refer to the existing rules vide page 1 of this note.

* Vide B.P. No 272 dy Sept 1890 para 3 (last sentence) recorded in G.O. No 792 dy 4th Oct 1890. Flag A.

This is wrong: Please see rules Landholders in G.O. This was fixed at Rs 5-5-0 Rs dt 10. Feb 97 2nd crop supplematically with charges 2 Rs & 1/8 acc as 1st or 2nd class sources. Th 9.97

The above table gives all the rates for landholders in various cases possible cases that can occur. It will be seen that in 5 cases viz Nos 1, 3 6 7 & 9 the rules are clear as to the rate to be charged. Cases Nos 2 & 5 are doubtful as rule (c) does not contain the words "whether first or second crop" which occur in Rules (a) Case No 4 is doubtful because the rule in para 3 (last sentence) B.P. recorded in G.O. Flagged A refers only to a wet crop following an occasionally irrigated dry crop (for at that time "supplemental irrigation" was treated as "wet") To turn to the solutions of the above cases by the Collector

34

of South Arcot and the Board.

Cases 2, 5, & 8. The Collector & the Board would charge a systematically irrigated 2nd crop Rs 2 except when the 1st crop is "occasionally irrigated" in which case they would make the systematically irrigated 2nd crop pay 3 Rs.

Case 4.

The Collector of North & South Arcot would apply Rule (b) to Rule (c) as well as to Rule (a). The Reason given by the Collector of North Arcot is that the systematic irrigation rate is a sort of substitute for the old wet rate in some cases when the latter used to be charged. Hence he would charge a wet crop following a systematically irrigated dry crop 2 Rs which is the rate laid down in Rule (b) for a wet crop following a wet crop.

The Board points out

5 P

This is according to the G.O. 755 of 10 Feb 97 — Fayt
[illegible] 14.7.97

New contrary to above G.O.
[illegible] 14.7.97

6 P

Submitted that it will affect the question if the exhaustion of the land by the 1st crop be taken into account
[illegible] 29.6.97

5

That the Collector propose to charge a wet crop following an occasionally irrigated dry crop Rs 4 i.e. Rs 2 + Rs 4 for both crops but on the other hand that they propose to charge a wet crop only Rs 2 if it follow a systematically irrigated dry crop. The Board states "the wet crop comes "as second crop in both cases "& should be charged alike; the "fact that the first grown "dry crop was irrigated "more regularly in the one "case than in the other "cannot affect the question "as to how the subsequently "grown wet crops should be "treated." The Board would therefore charge a wet crop grown either as first or second crop together with a dry crop whether occasionally or systematically watered, Rs 4 (for 1st class sources). But this decision of the Board would give a total rate of Rs 7 for a dry crop systematically watered followed by a wet crop. As this

would be more than the charge for two wet crops the Board solves the difficulty by making a rule that the total charge is not to exceed Rs 6 where two irrigated crops are raised on the same land & one at least is a wet crop.

Her estimates that the objection to the Bds rules are that the total charge under them for cases 1 2 & 3 ~~are~~ is ~~above~~ the same. Besides, I abstract ~~the~~ objection that in dealing with the other hand the Members proposals are identical as pointed out by the Board.

~~The proposals~~ ~~objection~~ ~~rules~~ ~~under~~ ~~Board~~ ~~taken~~ (1) that the charge for water should ~~possible~~ vary according to the benefit received; (2) that in the case of the 1st crops, this benefit may be taken to vary according to the seasons of each year;

(3) but that in the case of the 2nd crop regard must also be had to the extent to which the land has been exhausted by the 1st crop.

The introduction of a rule for "Systematically irrigated crops" makes the application of these principles rather complicated.

Taking the water rates for 1st crop wet; 2nd crop systematically watered & 1st crop occasionally watered to be 4 Rs 3 Rs & 2 Rs respectively & that a 2nd crop wet after a 1st crop wet should be charged 2 Rs and applying the above principles the following scale might be laid down

	1st crop	2nd crop	1st Crop charge Rs	2nd Crop charge Rs	Total Rs
1.	wet	wet	4	+ 2	= 6
2.	wet	systematically irrigated	4	+ 1½	= 5½
3.	wet	occasionally irrigated	4	+ 1	= 5
4.	systematically irrigated	wet	3	+ 2½	= 5½
5.	systematically irrigated	systematically irrigated	3	+ 2	= 5
6.	systematically irrigated	occasionally irrigated	3	+ 1½	= 4½
7.	occasionally irrigated	wet	2	+ 3	= 5
8.	occasionally irrigated	systematically irrigated	2	+ 2½	= 4½
9.	occasionally irrigated	occasionally irrigated	2	+ 2	= 4

¾ The above rates for 2nd crops

and also for cases 5 & 6 the same.

The total rates in cases 2 & 3 appear moreover to be unduly high.

The present rules do not appear to have been fixed upon any definite principles. Possibly the following principles may be said to underly them:

Paper

4

The above scale would appear to meet the objections which may be taken both to the Board's scheme & to that of Mr Stuart. It however would be productive of some inconvenience in actual calculation in the case of lands under 2nd class sources but the fractions will be 2 as 4 as 6 as etc. i.e. never less than $\frac{1}{8}$ Re. It has 5 rates but apparently this is unavoidable if we are to recognise three degrees of watering i.e. wet systematic & occasional & are to give effect to these distinctions

[illegible]
29.6.97

It is worth noting that prior to the introduction of the existing water-rates the method of chargimg for water when a water-rate would now be charged, was to charge the difference between the wet and dry rates. The water-rates and the charge for a 2nd crop on dry land watered which have been in force for many years have been fixed quite arbitrarily, but to represent something less

These rates are well devised & shd be adopted. The Bd shd be told that they ought not to have added to the S.O. in the way they have without the prior approval of Govt. It has always been assumed that SO's could not be altered except with the approval of Govt, but is there any order to this effect?

A

JG [illegible]
8/7/97

Rs Rs Rs Rs Rs
6, 5½, 5, 4½, 4,

(See [illegible] in [illegible] [illegible])

than the above. The scale proposed by the U.S. has this much to recommend it that the charge on the combination of any two crops, whichever comes first, is in all cases the same, e-, g-, rates 2 & 4. The Board's average rate is 5 4/9, while the U.S.'s is 5. The adoption of the latter rates will yield therefore 8% less revenue.

[illegible]
5/7/97

B

If the same amount is irrigated under each rate..

5

Water rates
For orders.

11

11 P.

The Hon Mr Grove C.I.E.
The Hon Sir H Blin K.C.I.E.

It seems to me that the difficulty which has been felt in dealing with this subject arises to a great extent from the fact that it has been assumed that the total charge for water when both 1st & 2nd crops are irrigated must not exceed Rs 6; and it is with the view of getting over this difficulty & of securing ~~[illegible]~~ a valueless uniformity that proposals are made the effect of which will be that there will be some loss of revenue. But why should there be any loss of revenue? The rates ~~[illegible]~~ B C ~~[illegible]~~ were, I make out, settled as far back as 1874. I recollect thinking at the time how extremely foolish they were. The price of produce varied at that time between district & district to a very great extent. Yet the same water rate was charged in all districts without any consideration of the different rates of profit made by the ryots in different districts by the use of Govt water. Why the particular rate of Rs 4 was selected, I do not know; but I presume it was because that was the rate charged in the majority of cases, i.e., in the 57 & 63 districts, the water rate charge in which must have been (and be) a great deal more than that in all the rest of the Pres. put together. The existing variations in the price of produce are not of course so great as they were in 1874, but they are still so considerable as in my opinion, to point to the inadvisability of prescribing uniform rates of water charge for all districts. Uniformity in these matters is, I may almost say, the curse of the administration — I has however, in this matter, been the

× Wet	Rs 4
dry systematically irrigated	3
dry occasionally irrigated	2

It can not of course be told quite accurately but in such a case the ~~difference~~ the percentage of difference ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ between the two applications of the rates and between the two average rates is not likely to be great.

19.7.87

With reference to the Hon Mr Grove's notes on the note for orders (appended) it is submitted:—

(1) With ref to the concluding portion of the note ~~in page 8~~ marked A: please see para 4 of G.O. No 1002 Rev D 24 Oct 87. The existing rules on the subject of water rate have been promulgated with the sanction of Govt & hence the Bd should not have altered them without Govt sanction.

(2) With ref to the note ~~on page 9~~ marked B:— it would be difficult to tell with any accuracy the ~~[illegible]~~ financial effect of the proposed scale without elaborate statistics of the areas of dry land cultivated ~~[illegible]~~ in part fasli with wet, systematically irrigated dry & occasionally irrigated dry crops. As a safe-

guard it is submitted that the new scale might made tentative and the Board requested to report on the working & financial effect after it has been in force for two fasli. From the papers marginally noted it will be seen that the present rules were at first tentative.

A letter and plan of a new scale and rules for modification of previous G.O.s on the papers are circulated

A draft G.O. is submitted for approval. (Please see after the Misl for order) as the adoption of a new scale of rules involves the modification of previous G.O.s the papers are circulated to the Hon Sir H. Klein also.

Sections. Owing to a bad mistake made by the office in not marking "Back" & "further" papers on certain G.Os, G.O. No 755 of 10th Feb 1897 was not brought to notice when writing the first note for order. This G.O. selects 3 cases in the table given on page 3 of the

This Misl to be submitted to Hon'ble Member in charge

19.7.97

15 P.

+ G.O. No 384 of 25th Mar 1874. Hd F.
They were finally approved by G.O. 4 Mar 29 No 539. Hd G.

* Unless more than 20 years' [illegible] change is not likely to be accepted. Should however any thing approaching a change in the rates of more than 10% per cent be sanctioned in the face of the practice which has taken place in this Division in the fixing of produce, and especially Should the Revenue Officers at this juncture put forward which will have the effect of reducing the income. It should be noted that the water rate in Hd K is [illegible] Rs 5— They are the best irrigated & Rs 5— They are the cheapest (among the cheapest) districts. (Please see after the Misl for order) It seems true, except in the special cases of the Ruskaliya & Kurnool canals, that rates should be raised Rs 5 in the rest of the Presidency as well as in Hd K. I should like this question discussed hopefully further. With a charge of Rs 5 per wet, Rs 2½ for occasionally irrigated dry & Rs 2 for occasionally irrigated dry, with remission of Rs 2½ when both crops are irrigated one wet & one dry, it seems to me that a much better sub might be made out & annulled. I am to be realized. Hd.
This matter is under discussion 24/7/97

15/7/97 No. 1

Hon'ble Member in charge of the Revenue Department

Hd E

"Uniformity" in some matters is bad, but I don't think uniformity in such matters as water-rates is. "The essence of the old administration" when I came to this Country, two years ago, consisted in the water-rates fixed uniformly in two districts not completely at the mercy of village officers: now they are not, & it is possible at present to check the charges properly: then it was absolutely impossible. The result of the introduction of the uniform rates as shown in the Hd has resulted in G.O. 539 4.3.97 a great increase in revenue and in the extent of land cultivated. How do I think that this rise in the price of produce since the rates were fixed 20 years ago justifies a general increase in the rates now, without further inquiry. No doubt many of the lands Rs 4 could easily pay Rs 5 &c, &c, but how could they be selected? We have no data for determining the net produce of a tract, & every district would have to be resettled before all the assessment of the population & the other drawbacks of a settlement, which G of I has pointed out, before such data could be prepared. It is necessary to keep the rates low, since it is upon the same for all descriptions of land. We are bound by orders from higher authorities & declarations of Govt our own to help rent of wet, and we have [illegible] that every new [illegible] does not [illegible] it. The Board in his report on the settlement is following [illegible] that no help rent [illegible] Rs 5 is charged on wet. The necessary alterations are marked in blue pencil on pages 3 to 5 of the note. But the arguments against the rules are in no way weakened thereby.

Mr
16/7/97

Letter from Mr [illegible] to Hon'ble Mr Hodgson dated 2 July 1897
It will be seen that the rates fixed in G.O. No 755 of 10 Feb 97 are open to the objection that the charge for the same combination of crops is not always the same. E.g. Nos. 6 & 8 on p. 3 of the first note. I think it will be a good thing to cancel this G.O. in favour of the rules now proposed by the Board.

Hd G 28.11.97

16/7/97

Press Print by Mr [illegible] dated 24.7.97 on pp. 11-12 (2) and this print [illegible] X on file 12 [illegible]

D. 26-7-97 21

...ation rules, as was [illegible] ...
...cases will be over assessed. This
will be true same in all other
districts. It is true that as Rs
rules will cause less land - not
to be assessed (though for much
smaller extent); but long usage
has established it, & experience
shows that it can be pleaded as
a general rule for the whole
Presidency. I do not think Rs cases.
Moreover in the middle of
such a season as this, there
is not propitious for increasing
assessment. I doubt if any two
modifications I have approved
on this account make more
than a few rupees. I believe
that the extent of water-rates
cultivation, & therefore the quantity
of grain produced on this country will
increase, & that we be in accordance
with the principle policy -

JG
26.7.97

16P

(Mr Price)

But the rules now passed, whatever
they may be, will not come into force
in the middle of the current season of
scarcity. If they did, what harm would
they do? They are to fix the charge to be
made for surplus water, not required
for wet lands & therefore supplied
to dry lands. But suppose at this moment
surplus water is anywhere available
(and no doubt in some places it is), the
supply would be to right who would get
double prices, & something like double prices,
for the produce they would raise by
means thereof. They would gladly pay
25% extra, and I don't see why they
should not be made to do so.

BS
30/7/97

C. No: 4352

5

The Hon Sir Henry Wilcocks K.C.I.E.

I disagree altogether with what the Hon'ble Secretary at B. The rate prescribed in Government was not at the option of the Collector of each district was not at the option of the Collector, but was prescribed in the Land Revenue Code, & was frequently well known. The exception was (in a few cases) also known. The exception was (in a few cases) also the fair rate prescribed for wet as well as dry lands, in which case the difference, which also was small, was recouped.

The Hon'ble Gentleman's remarks at B. had as if the same land were year after year charged with water rate. But, exception (if, K.S. Okerson) is this the case? First it is clear that the classification of the whole lands should be altered so that they should not be assessed at the same dry & wet rate. But I do not think it is the case. A man owns a piece of land classed as dry, but commanded by a tank or channel of water is planted, he states it as dry crop. His next crop. Next, he raises a dry crop. He is then to be charged the water rate. Consider the water rate since 1874, should be applied rise of prices since 1874, should be levied that if not determined by a water rate of Rs 4 in 1874, he would be determined by a water rate of Rs 5 now. This not for Govt to select, but for the Legislature. As to Mr it may be quite true that we have no data for determining the yield though I did not know a second crop, I do not see that it can. But, even so, I do not see the hearing of the remark on a proposal for the charge per second crop at so much per cent on the value of the crop. The relevancy of the remarks at B. The help but has nothing whatever to do with the matter. The help not comes in through the assessment of land, which the ryot has to pay a piece of his land. This, in fact, was a charge on irrigation and not the moderate would be altogether the direction of shifting the present charge from the shoulders of the large landowners to those of the small. But in the matter of the Hon'ble Mr Chapman's note

The Standard rate for water rate was fixed in 1874 Rs: 1-4 Acre: 75 and has almost come into force since 1874 as stated by the Hon'ble Mr.

29.7.97

R.C. 31/7/97
1891

19P

(In duty)

The papers on the subject of water rates for crops raised on dry lands are circulated to the Hon Member with reference to the Hon Mr Groom's note dated 26.7.97 (marked with red chalk) on the next page but one. It is hoped that the Hon Member may wish to see the Hon Mr Groom's note before the papers are circulated to His Excellency.

2. With reference to the portion of the Hon Member's note (on the next page marked with blue pencil) it is submitted that the rate Rs 3 for a systematically irrigated dry crop has been but recently (1896) sanctioned. Please see G.O. No 30 383 30-7-97 flagged C. This is however a minor matter

WRL
28.7.97

2

Water rate there is no compulsion at all. Ary't takes water ~~at~~ alleaves it as he likes.

With refce to the Hon Mr Gross's remarks as to uniformity, I see that in the B.P. of Novr 15, 1873, which ~~[illegible]~~ issued under his auspices as Secretary, the desire to aim at uniformity was expressly disavowed -

HS
30/7/97

22P

D/4 1,000—20-2-96.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

C - No. 4354

From the Board

23P

Dated 189 .

His Excellency the Governor

FOR ORDERS.

To Secy.

The papers on the subject of the rates to be charged for water taken to crops on dry land are circulated to H.E. as the Hon Mr Grove and the Hon Sir Henry Bliss differ in their views of the matter

The Govt recently (~~Flag C~~) sanctioned a special rate of Rs 3 per acre for water taken for a 1st crop systematically irrigated on dry land. Previously there were only two degrees of irrigation recognised viz irrigation for a wet crop & that for an ordinary dry crop which is only occasionally watered. The rates for ~~these~~ such crops when 1st crops were Rs 4 & Rs 2 respectively. The Board passed certain orders as to

R.C. 30/11/97.

C/3/897.

FOR ORDERS.

the rates to be charged for the water taken for a combination (as 1st crop & 2nd crop) of any two of the above classes of crops.

The result of the Board orders is exhibited in tabular form on page 3 ~~of the first~~ supra ~~of the note for orders~~. It will be seen to involve inconsistencies & inequalities.

To remedy this a scale was drawn up & approved by the Hon Mr Goore (page ~~of the 1st note for orders~~). It will be seen that in this scale the highest charge for any combination of two crops is Rs 6. As the scale however is graduated the total revenue which wd result from its adoption would probably be less than that ~~now~~ which wd be raised under the Board's scale although the extent of the decrease ~~this~~ cannot be foretold with any accuracy. Please see the Secy's note on page 9 ~~of the first note for orders~~.

The Hon Sir H Blin does not consider that

any ~~such~~ risk of ~~dim~~ such decrease of revenue should be incurred and consider that the rates for (water to) 1st crop, wet, dry systematically irrigated, & dry occasionally irrigated should be fixed at Rs 5, 3, respectively instead of ~~the~~ at Rs 4 3 & 2 respectively as at present.

The views of the two Hons are set out in full in their notes ~~appended~~.

It will then be seen that the question for decision is, shd the rate for water taken for a "wet" crop on dry land be raised from Rs 4 to Rs 5? This increase will necessarily cause a general increase in the ~~scale~~ rates for 2nd crop & therefore in the rates for any combination of two crops.

Both the Hons apparently agree as to the necessity for a graduated scale & it does not appear that the Hon Sir H Blin wishes to revert to the system in force previous

10

to 1873 when the rates varied from district to district & there were sometimes more than 100 rates in the same district.

[illegible] 3/8/97

To H.E. the Governor

[illegible] 3/8/97.

[H.E. has [illegible] page - [illegible]]

D/4 1,000—8-4-97.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

No. 4354

From the Bd

Dated 7 May 1897.

FOR ORDERS.

Upon the current, the office note pages 11 to 19 (pages numbered in blue pencil were written. Upon the Hon Mr Grover's orders on page 18, the office notes pp 7 to 10 were written & with a draft G.O. pp 21 to 26 was circulated to the Hon Mr Grover & to the Hon Sir H Bliss. The Hon Sir H Bliss did not agree with the draft order (vide his note pp 7 & 8). The Hon Mr Grover however maintained his views & passed the draft order with certain modifications of the wording thereof (vide note pp 8 9 & 10). The papers were then sent back

I have put up a minute of dissent

[illegible] 9/12/97

Press

Press

[illegible] 7-12-97

R.C. 8/12/97

to the Hon Sir H Bliss with office note p. 25. The Hon member maintained his view (vide his note pp 5 & 6 and also on p. 10). The papers were then circulated to H.E. with the office note pp. 1 to 4. His Excellency has agreed that a former G.O. No 755 dy 10 Feb 97 should be cancelled & the rates approved by the Hon Mr Grover tried tentatively (vide p. 9.)+

The draft G.O. as it stands cancels all previous orders on the subject. These may be read at the head of the G.O. The draft G.O. also orders the proposed rates to be tried tentatively for 2 fasts.

Thus His Excellency concurs with the Hon Mr Grover. Submitted that the papers may now be recirculated to the Hon Sir H Bliss before the G.O. issues. [illegible]

FOR ORDERS.

+ H.E.'s initials are dated 26.11.97 but the file came into the office today. 4.12.97

To the Hon Sir H. Bliss.
The draft (on p. 21 et seq.) which has been approved by Hon Mr Grover & H.E. is recirc. to the H.C. before issue.
8.12.97

Water rates on dry lands. 29

Note.

The Hon Sir H Bliss's minute of dissent raises an important question which was not discussed in the former notes and I beg to submit that it might be advisable to circulate the minute before issue of the G.O.

When the current first came in, it was assumed (1) that Govt did not wish to raise the 4 R. rate (2) that the distinction between water supplied from 1st Class sources and that supplied from 2nd Class sources was to continue & (3) that the distinctions between the irrigation for wet crops, dry crops systematically watered & dry crops occasionally watered was to be observed. The note pp 1 to 8 showed that the existing scale did not observe point (3)

Than rearranged the notes & repaged them in red chalk so as to read continuously

and a scale which would give effect to these distinctions was suggested and the Hon Mr Grove approved of it. The Hon Sir H Blin objected however to the needless sacrifice of revenue which he considered the adoption of this scale wd involve and suggested that the 4 Rs rate might be raised to 5 Rs and the scale adapted accordingly. The Hon Mr Grove objected to this & His Excellency concurred with the Hon Mr Grove. Point (1) has thus been affirmed and point (3) has not been questioned.

32 P

The Hon Sir H Blin in his minute of dissent raises the question as to whether the distinction between 1st & 2nd Class sources is sound. This point has not been raised before. If the Hon Mr Grove & H.E. accepts the Hon Sir H Blin's views on this point & the distinction is done away with, probably no revenue will be lost

i.e. in respect of supply to "dry" cultivation.
S.K.

and the ~~charge for water~~ objects of Govt attained in all respects.

The origin of the distinction was as follows. In the Tirvajasti rules originally circulated by the Board to all collectors there was only one scale of water rates irrespective of the sources from which water might be taken. Please see rules in B.P. 955/10672 (flagged A) in the volume put up.

33 P

Mr J.H. Master

It was the Collector of Bellary (vide letter in B.P. No 2328 dy 15-11-73 (flagged B) in volume) who ~~at~~ first suggested that there should be a distinction between sources of irrigation "the supply of which is regular & to be depended upon" and those "the supply in which is precarious & not regular". The Board considered that that the proposed

13

distinction as to the value of sources of irrigation is obviously fair & equitable" and that "the principle should be applied in all Districts to which the rules apply." (Para 6 of B.P. in G.O. 384/25-3-74 flagged F)

The Govt approved and confirmed the revised scale allowing for two classes of irrigation (G.O. No 384 dy 25-3-74 F).

The Hon Sir H Bliss points out that the distinction is not sound. It doesn't matter whether the source of supply is precarious or not. The water is charged for only when it is taken and there is no compulsion to take it.

It seems extraordinary that the distinction should have lived so long. Perhaps the explanation is that the 1st Class rates were (originally) ~~originally too~~ too high for general application and that this distinction

34 P

[illegible] D, in [illegible] No 2305 [illegible]

35 P

Not at all — why should anyone ~~[illegible]~~ pay less than what the use of the water is worth at the present time, because he ~~paid~~ formerly paid the smaller sum which represented its value 25 years ago?

HS
25/2/98

36 P

14

cured the defect in practice by allowing lower rates in ~~a great~~ ~~many~~ some tracts though on a wrong principle. The Hon Sir H Bliss has pointed out that water is now more valuable than it was 25 years ago. If the distinction between 1st & 2nd Class sources be abolished and the moderate and graduated scale proposed be made to apply to all sources, I submit that all objections will be met.

HM
14/12/97

H.M.

I recirculate the pp. as a novel point has been raised by the Hon Sir H. Bliss

There is one point however which the U.S. seems to overlook in his note above that even with regard to a supply ~~for~~ to "dry" land from a 1st or 2nd class source; there does ~~[illegible]~~ exist an element of distinction founded on the difference of source.

54

No doubt water is charged only if it is taken, & it is surplus water; but we do not ~~not dog~~ measure the water & a ryot who takes any quantity is charged whether the supply holds out or not. It is quite intelligible that the supply from the surplus of a 1st-class source may be more assured than that from a 2d-class source. It does not of course necessarily follow, but probably it is on the whole what does occur. In such case, a ryot may not be prepared to pay the higher rate ~~from~~ for surplus water from a 2d-class source; ~~as~~ the risk of failure is greater, in other words the price of the advantage should be lower.

It is probably on some such considerations that the difference has been maintained in the rules. It is however a question of fact, which if necessary the Bd may ascertain, whether

37 P.

As the Hon Sir H Bliss has so strong an opinion on the point, a paragraph should be added to the GO, calling for the opinion of the Bd, in the terms suggested by the Sec.

In my opinion, however, the distinction between 1st & 2d class sources of irrigation is right. The argument against it is, that the water-rate charge is for surplus water, & that this surplus whether it comes from a 1st C. source or a 2d C source is equally valuable. This argument would be conclusive with regard to the ordinary commodities of trade, but it is not conclusive with respect to irrigation, wh may last for a long time, & will be charged at the same cost, whether it is abundant or scanty. My experience has led me to believe that the doubt as to whether there will be a sufficient surplus during all the time that a water-rate crop is on the ground is just as great as the doubt as to whether the normal supply to the normal ayacut is certain or not. It is more certain in the case of 1st C sources than of 2d C sources. Though ryots are not compelled to take water for dry lands or for 2d crop, it is desirable, in their interest as well as ours, to induce them to do so, & for this purpose we should charge more for a surplus the continuance of wh is assured, than for a surplus the continuance of wh is not assured. Moreover, the ryot knows that he will be charged the same, even if he gets little or no water for a portion of the time the crop is on the ground.

JG

To the Hon Sir H. Bliss

15 S.P. 7.18.

38 P 35

the difference of advantage does exist & whether it is properly measured by the difference in the prescribed rates.

S.P. 18/11/7

39 P.

110 P

If the draft G.O. on which I minuted is altered, please let me have it again in its final state, that I may reconsider my minute.

HS

10/1/98

I see the question I asked on p. 15 has not been answered — Is this because it can't be answered? If so, the G.O. should be corrected, so as to be at least accurate as to facts

HS

Secy

With reference to the Hon members note please see note overleaf

24/1/98

36

T. Sevy

From the Collectors letters read in B.P. 955 & 10 June 1872, the folly facts may be gathered with regard to the rates in each District.

Ganjam p. 2583.*

"When dry land is converted into wet in this District the wet rate of assessment is at once charged thereon and its extent transferred from "Dry" to "wet" in the accounts of the same year"; xx" no separate water cess is levied."

Practically therefore the water rate was the difference between the wet & dry rates. No information as to the number of these is given for Ganjam.

Vizagapatam p. 2586.

"In this district there is no rate fixed for Trivajasty. The practice is to ascertain the difference

41 P.

Vol put up.

* (in vol. [illegible])

42 P.

between the wet and dry rates & to charge it in addition to the ordinary assessment."

No definite information as to the no of different rates which wd be thus arrived at is given.

p. 2587. Godaveri

There was a fixed scale of rates in force at the time of the B.P.

p. 2588 Kistna

There was a fixed scale of water rates in the Masulipatam Delta. In the Guntur Delta and the upland tracts the Collector reported that the wet assessment was consolidated. ~~then~~ It is not reported what the rates for dry lands watered wd be. Presumably, there were none such, all being ~~all than were~~ claimed as wet. Separating the water rate from the ~~wet &~~ dry assessment a variety of rates appeared

16

(vide the statement appended to the collector letter p 2591) the exact number is not however stated.

Bellon p. 2592.

Here again the Trivagasty was the difference between the dry assessment & the "adjoining" wet ~~rate~~ assessment.

"The present rates of Trivagasti are as numerous as the original wet rates." The no. of these however is not definitely stated.

Cuddapah p. 2596.

There were six classes of rates of Trivagasty containing in all (230 + 48 + 321 + 69 + 52 + 23) rates = 743 rates

Bellary p. 2598

~~Apparently there~~ There were 41 wet rates but apparently only 2 rates for water taken to dry lands viz Rs 5 under the Toongabadra & Rs 4 elsewhere.

Kurnool p 2600.

"The Trivagasty upon a

43 P

44 P

given land is ascertained by deducting dry assessment of the land from the wet assessment of a land of similar quality in the neighbourhood."

In consequence the rates totalled 712.

Chingleput p. 2605.

"Trivagasty has been collected at no less than 186 rates."

North Arcot p. 2617

In 1855 a fixed scale of rates viz 3½ Rs per cawny for dry grains & 7 Rs per cawny for paddy etc, had been fixed

South Arcot p. 2618 There was a fixed scale for the district.

Tanjore p. 2625.

When the District had been settled there was a fixed scale. In other parts the rate was charged on the old Trivagasty system viz.

17

difference of dry & wet assessments. The there parts the rates varied in different fields of the same bilage & were "very numerous."

Tinnevelly p. 2629.

Apparently there were only 4 rates for the whole distrit

Madura p. 2631.

The practice was to charge the difference between wet & dry rates. In 3 talooks the wet assessment of the class of every field was fixed. In the other 3 talooks when dry was converted into wet, the wet assessment was fixed with reference to the nature of the irrigation & the assessment of neighbouring wet lands. The no. of rates that thus ensued is not stated.

Tinnevelly p. 2635

"When dry land is is cultivated as wet with the

help of yost water xxx the ordinary wet assessment of the neighbouring land was charged". xxx

"The present rates vary very much xxx each village having its own special rates xxx

Coimbatore p. 2639

Only 82 acres were "dry" temporarily cultivated as "wet." On 42 acres of this the the difference between the dry & wet assessment was charged. On the remainder a fixed scale prescribed by the Bd. in 1855.

Nilgiris p. 2641

The question did not arise in this Distrit.

Salem p. 2641

Apparently the difference between dry & wet assessment was charged. The Collector takes only of "average" rates

18

South Canara p. 2642
The question did not arise.
Malabar p. 2644.
Ditto.

~~As finally approved issued by the Bd in G.P. 2328 d. 15 Nov 73 the rates did not apply to Ganjam Tanjore Madura Kurnool~~ (1) Malabar (2) South Canara & the (3) Nilgiri Hills. Of the remaining 17 (seventeen) districts the practice of charging the difference between the wet & dry assessments obtained to a greater or less extent in Ganjam Vizagapatam Nellore Cuddapah Kurnool Chingleput Coimbatore Salem Tanjore Madura & Tinnevelly i.e. in 11 districts.
Wherever definite figures are quoted e.g. Cuddapah Kurnool & Chingleput the rates are many more

47P

~~p. 6877 of the Vol. pub.~~

The question did not arise in

48P

49P

Letter Sir H Bliss

H.M. will see that the proposal is to issue the G.O. with the addendum asking the Bd. to report further on the possibility of abolishing the distinction bet. the rates from 1st & 2nd class sources.
When the rept is received the matter will be open to further consid.

On this understanding, I have struck out from my minute the paragraph dealing with the question of different charges for water from 1st & 2nd class sources. H.W.B.

Of no importance at all. There were not these numerous rates in any one village and if there had been it wd. not have mattered, since the rates were based on a fixed & simple principle & were perfectly well known. HB 25/2/98

119 C. 7/2/98 R. 25/2/98

than one hundred (100) and it is submitted that there must have been quite this number (& more) wherever the same system prevailed.

24.1.98

(A.M.)

No doubt where the principle of charge was, as it generally was, the difference between the wet & dry assts. there was a very great number of different rates actually charged. But the multiplicity was not really a fact of so much importance as one might think. The wet & dry rates were always known & the difference was a matter of instantaneous calculation. The principle was simple enough: & as a fact however there were these numerous resulting rates.

5/4/98

Sec. I have added a paragraph to the draft E.S. on pp. 15 to 20 above. May it now [illegible]

Lend me for the draft G.O. in proof together with Sir H Blm's Minute also in proof

E.H 28/1/98

Two proof copies of the draft G.O. are submitted. one with the minute read in full and the other with the minute heading only and in the form intended for issue.

Mk 9/3/98

10/3/98

Get a clean proof as revised by me

E.H 11.3.98

a clean proof is put up by as ordered.

elk 14/3/98

Minute

I comment upon the order which it is proposed to issue in regard to the charge for water rate on irrigated crops grown on lands classed as "dry" and assessed accordingly.

The orders — which it is intended to amend — were issued as long ago as 1874 and provided the uniform rate of Rs 4 per acre as that to be charged for the irrigation of "wet" crops grown on "dry" lands, with lower rates for the cases of 2nd "wet" crops and "dry" crops which were only occasionally irrigated. Since then, prices have increased enormously; and it would therefore seem to follow that the rates to be charged for the utilization of the surplus water & that the disposal of such should be increased. Instead of increasing them, however, it is actually proposed to reduce them to an extent which seems more than uncertain, but which must be considerable.

The rate of Rs 4 per acre above mentioned (and the lower rates dependent thereon) were for the supply of surplus waters from irrigation sources of the first class. For such supply from second class irrigation sources on a lower scale of rates was prescribed and is proposed to be continued. This distinction is not based on any sound principle; indeed, it seems to me that the principle on which surplus water should be charged for have not received

, and are to be continued,

adequate consideration. Irrigation sources are classed, not according to their size or the acreage dependent on them, but according to the certainty and permanency with which they can be reckoned on to supply water to their "ayacuts," that is, to the areas ordinarily watered by them and classed as "wet" in the Govt accounts and assessed ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ accordingly. It is right, therefore, that "wet" lands ~~irrigated~~ watered by an irrigation source of the first class should bear higher rates of assessment than "wet" lands watered by an irrigation source of the second class, which affords a supply of a more precarious nature. But that is not the matter dealt with in these papers. The question dealt with is the charge which should be made for surplus water, that is, for water not required in the particular year for the irrigation of the lands comprised in the "ayacut" of the work. It is clear that, if there is a surplus, the ~~[illegible]~~ inferiority of the second class irrigation source has for the time being disappeared ~~[illegible]~~ and that the second class is temporarily on a level with first class irrigation sources. There is no reason, therefore, why water supplied from the ~~[illegible]~~ one should be charged for at a lower rate than that supplied from the other. Apart from this, however, the charge to be made for water should in such circumstances depend on the value of the water to the person who proposes to make use of it, rather than on the classification of the work from which it is derived. A ryot who holds "dry" land is under no compulsion whatever to take water and grow a "wet" crop or irrigate his "dry" crop. If he does not think it will pay him to take the water, he need not, and will not, take it. He is in quite a different position from the holder of "wet" lands, who has to pay the higher assessment imposed on his lands because they are classed as "wet", whether he likes to or not. He should, therefore, be charged for the use of surplus water what it may be supposed to be worth to him, less such a sum as will make it worth his while to incur the extra trouble & expense involved in irrigated as compared with unirrigated cultivation. ~~[illegible]~~

Whatever the source, therefore, from which surplus water is supplied, the person who uses it should pay for it at the same rate. If he does not do so, a further loss is caused to the State.

There are some inaccuracies ~~minor points~~ in the draft order which might well be commented on. But I will leave them unnoticed. I am only desirous for the present of recording this protest against ~~what I consider~~ an unnecessary sacrifice of revenue.

H. W. Wilson

Feb 25, 1898

~~Dec 9, 1897~~

2

A

Read Current Number 4352.

G.O.

The Govt observes that its approval should have been ~~previously~~ obtained previous to the issue of the rule proposed by the Board.

2 The Govt resolves to take this opportunity of reviewing the whole table of rates for water taken to crops on dry land.

3. From the papers noted in the margin it will appear that originally the rates for water not only varied in different districts but that in one & the same district there were frequently more than 100 different rates. In some cases no definite principle was observed in charging these rates, but, generally, the principle followed was to charge as water rate in respect of land classed as "dry" the difference between the wet & dry assessment. This fact accounts for

JG
22/7/97

B.P. No 955 dy 10 June 72
BP No 2328 dy 15 Nov 73.

The whole of the papers are not put up, so I cannot check the accuracy of the word "frequently". I should like to know in how many districts there were more than a hundred different rates. By "100" I suppose "a hundred" is meant. [redacted] BS

the great number of rates
& rates above in several
districts. To produce uni-
formity it was decided to
fix the charge one fixed set
of rates on all lands in
in all Districts with certain
exceptions made for special
reasons. ~~From time~~

4. From time to time
this set of rates has been
modified or enlarged to
meet cases which experience
proved to be not provided
for in the original rules.
~~The effect of etc these changes~~
~~has is to proportion the charge~~
~~for water to the benefit~~
The effect of these changes was
to proportion the charges
for water in approximate
proportion to the benefit
derived from its use. Thus
the charge for water taken
for a first crop varies
~~according to the amount~~
~~taken or extraction for wet~~
crops, or dry crops as the
crop is a wet crop, a dry
crop systematically irrigated

This is an astounding mis-statement. It is expressly stated that uniformity was not the object aimed at. HS

extent would be is anticipated to
that on return of that first crop
by

~~and is subsequently fixed~~
~~& levied~~

or a dry crop occasionally
irrigated; and in the case of
a 2nd crop the charge
varies according to the
~~extent of irrigation~~
~~the nature of the crop with~~
~~respect to irrigation~~
~~and also according to that~~
~~of the first crop.~~
of the first crop.

5. In the case of second
crop charges, however, the
existing rules ~~cannot~~
~~easily not this effect~~
~~satisfactorily but entail~~
~~much inequality~~ result
in much inequality as
shown below.

6. The following table
Exhibits the table of rates
as fixed by the rules in
force and the rule proposed Ex. [illegible]

No.	1st crop on dry	2nd crop land	Charge for 1st crop	2nd crop	Total charge	Remarks
1.	wet	wet	4(a)	2(b)	6	The rules in
2.	wet	systematically irrigated dry	4 (a)	2(f)	6	columns
3.	wet	occasionally irrigated dry	4(a)	2(d)	6	4 & 5 are
4	systematically irrigated dry	wet	3(e)	3*	6	for first
5.	systematically irrigated dry	systematically irrigated dry	3(e)	2(f)	5	crop towards
6.	systematically irrigated dry	occasionally irrigated dry	3(e)	2(d)	5	exp. there-
7.	occasionally irrigated dry	wet	2(d)	4†	6	for this
8.	occasionally irrigated dry	systematically irrigated dry	2(d)	3*	5	rules to
9.	occasionally irrigated dry	occasionally irrigated dry	2(d)	2(d)	4	charge for 2nd crop [illegible]

Note:- The letters (a) (b) etc refer to the rules in the appendix to B.S. Order (H) para 2.
* According to the B.de proposed rule.
† Vide G.O. No 792 Rev D 9 Oct 1890.

Thus it will be seen that the 2nd crop charge ~~is the same~~ does not vary in cases 1, 2 & 3 and also in cases 5 & 6, although the ~~irrigation of the crop~~ ~~nature of the 2nd crop~~ extent wh the crop is irrigated varies; while in cases 7 8 & 9 it does ~~the 2nd crop charge varies according to the irrigation nature of the 2nd crop.~~

~~Again, the irrigation extent wh of the first crop is irrigated varies in cases 2 & 5, but the 2nd crop is charged the same in both cases.~~ Para 7

I think this shd be omitted

JG

However the Govt is, also, of opinion that the total charges in cases 2, 3, 4, & 7, is unduly high.

8 To remedy the inequalities & inconsistencies pointed out above, the Govt resolves to adopt the following ~~table~~ scheme of rates

	1st crop on dry land	2nd crop on dry land	Charge for 1st crop	Charge for 2nd crop	Total charge	Remarks
	2	3	4 Rs	5 Rs	6 Rs	7
1.	wet	wet	4	2	6	the rates in
2.	~~Dry~~ wet	Dry systematically irrigated	4	1½	5½	cols 4 & 5 are
3.	wet	Dry occasionally irrigated	4	1	5	for water taken
4.	Dry systematically irrigated	wet	3	2½	5½	from 1st class
5.	Dry systematically irrigated	Dry systematically irrigated	3	2	5	sources. Three
6.	Dry systematically irrigated	Dry occasionally irrigated	3	1½	4½	fourths of them
7.	Dry occasionally irrigated	~~Dry~~ wet	2	3	5	rates shd be
8.	Dry occasionally irrigated	Dry systematically irrigated	2	2½	4½	charged for
9.	Dry occasionally irrigated	Dry occasionally irrigated	2	2	4	2nd class sources.

9 8. These rates will be regarded as tentative and the Board will be requested to report on their working and financial effect after they have been in operation for two fasts

15/8/37

9. The Govt doubts whether the distinction made between first & second class sources in respect of supply to "dry" cultivation is sound. The supply from a second class source may be precarious but the water is charged for only when it is taken & there is no compulsion to take it. On

I have reversed this para. in the proof

11/8/8

the other hand, a ryot is liable to be charged ~~the~~ for occasional irrigation if he takes any water at all & in this view, the ~~distinction~~ difference of charge between 1st & 2nd Class sources may be justifiable. The question however is one of fact & the Board is requested to enquire into the matter &, when submitting the report called for ~~above~~ in the preceding paragraph, ~~to~~ to state whether the difference of advantage exists and ~~[illegible]~~ whether it is properly measured by the difference in the prescribed rates.

[illegible]
25/2/98

Initials attender

C. No. 4354

Proof 5/3/98

Government {1898} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd 12/3/98

H.M.

Recd. } 1898. Enclosures

Regd. } Spare copies

Please see proof of G.O. within, with special reference to para 10

G.O., No. ~~12~~, ~~18~~ th March 1898.

[illegible]
? 11/3/98
Seen & approved
[illegible]
17/3/98

MARCH.

Now clean proof
[illegible]
18/3/98
[illegible]

Note for the Despr.

Two sets of copies have to be printed one with the minute in full & the other with the minute in abstract.

[illegible]
18/3.

L.C. 15/3/98

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture), No. 347, dated 7th May 1897 :—

Read—the following letter from S. H. WYNNE, Esq., Collector and District Magistrate, North Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement and Director of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture, dated Chandragiri, 11th March 1897, Cur. No. 594-Ver. :—

With reference to Board's Proceedings, dated 21st August 1896, No. 202 (Revenue Settlement, &c.), I have the honour to request orders as to how a second crop of paddy is to be charged when the first crop is a dry crop systematically watered. Under the ruling contained in paragraph 3 of Board's Proceedings, dated 9th September 1890, No. 272, the water-rate would be higher than if two wet crops were raised. But these latter proceedings were passed long before the new rate was sanctioned. As I understand it, the new rate is, as it were, a substitute for the full rate which used to be charged in such case [*i.e.*, rate (*a*) in schedule to Standing Order No. 4] and therefore a second crop of paddy should be charged under rate (*b*) in the schedule. I have charged accordingly in a case before me, but I request definite orders as the manner in which the schedule is amended by no means makes it clear. There is similar obscurity as to a second dry crop systematically watered. Is it like a dry crop occasionally watered to be charged at the same rate as a first crop? The words "whether first or second crop" used in rate (*d*) are not repeated in rate (*e*). If not, what is the charge to be?

Read—also the following letter from A. E. CASTLESTUART STUART, Esq., I.C.S., F.G.S., F.L.S, F.R.G.S., Collector of South Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Revenue Settlement and Director of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture, dated Cuddalore, 11th March 1897, Ref. on Regr. No. 364-Ver. :—

In continuation of my letter, Ref. on Regr. No. 290-Ver. of the 3rd instant, I have the honour to append a scale of water-rates based on my interpretation of the Board's Standing Order, No. 4 and its appendix. I shall be glad to know, at a very early date, if this interpretation is correct. It will be observed that I make rate (*b*) common to rates (*a*) and (*e*).

2. As the jamabandi is in progress, I have circulated the scale for adoption by the respective Settlement officers—

Description of crops raised on dry lands.	First-class source of irrigation. Water-rate for first crop			Water-rate for second crop.		
	Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.
1. First crop wet, second crop wet	4	0	0	2	0	0
2. First crop wet, second crop dry systematically irrigated	4	0	0	2	0	0
3. First crop dry, systematically irrigated, second crop wet	3	0	0	2	0	0
4. First crop wet, second crop dry occasionally watered	4	0	0	2	0	0
5. First crop dry occasionally watered, second crop wet	2	0	0	4	0	0
6. First crop dry systematically irrigated ... Second crop dry systematically irrigated ...	3	0	0	2	0	0
7. First crop dry systematically irrigated ... Second crop dry occasionally watered ..	3	0	0	2	0	0
8. First crop dry occasionally watered, second crop dry systematically irrigated	2	0	0	3	0	0

Under the second-class irrigation sources three-fourths of the above rates should be charged.

Resolution—No. 347, dated 7th May 1897.

In the first of the letters read above, the Collector of North Arcot inquires, with reference to Board's Proceedings, No. 202, dated 21st August 1896, Revenue Settlement, &c., (1) "how a second crop of paddy is to be charged when the first crop is a dry crop systematically watered," and (2) what should be the charge for a second dry crop systematically irrigated.

2. Both these questions are also raised, among others, in the second of the papers read above, in which the Collector of South Arcot gives an analysis of the table of rates appended to Standing Order No. 4, and inquires whether his analysis is correct. Both the Collectors are of opinion that a wet crop raised as second crop after a first systematically irrigated dry crop, should be charged under item (*b*) of the table; but in respect of a similar wet crop grown after an occasionally irrigated dry crop, the Collector of South Arcot would levy the rate fixed under item (*a*) for wet crop. The reason for this differential treatment is not apparent. The wet crop comes as second crop in both cases, and should be charged alike; the fact that the first grown dry crop was irrigated more regularly in the one case than in the other cannot affect the question as to how the subsequently grown wet crop should be treated. Item (*b*) of the table contemplates the case of a second wet crop raised on the same land in which a first *wet* crop has been raised and charged for under item (*a*). If the same land has been cultivated with two wet crops, the charge for the first crop should be Rs. 4 and for the second crop Rs. 2—total Rs. 6.*

* Under first-class irrigation sources.

Where the first crop is not a wet crop, the wet crop subsequently grown should be charged under article (*a*). The application of this principle, however, will make the total charge for two crops, where the first crop is a systematically irrigated dry crop, Rs. 7, which is more than the total charge for two wet crops. But the rates proposed by the two Collectors, viz., Rs. 5 + 2, would give a less total charge than that on an occasionally irrigated dry crop followed by a wet crop, viz., Rs. 2 + 4 or 6. The best course seems to be to prescribe a total charge of Rs. 6 in all cases in which two irrigated crops are raised on the same land and one of them at least is a wet crop.

3. Turning to the second question raised by the Collector of North Arcot, namely, how a second dry crop systematically irrigated should be charged, it is observed that the Collector of South Arcot would charge Rs. 3 if the crop, dry, was only occasionally watered. As the principle is analogous to that followed when a wet crop is charged under item (*a*) even when it is a second crop, the Board approves the Collector's scale.

4. The other items of the South Arcot Collector's analysis are correct.

5. The following foot-note, which embodies the alterations approved in paragraphs 2 and 3 above, will be added to the first appendix to Board's Standing Order, No. 4, paragraph 2 :—

"When a regularly irrigated dry crop is preceded or followed by a *wet* crop on the same land, the total charge will be Rs. 6 under first class irrigation source and Rs. 4-8-0 under second-class sources; when the same crop is followed by an irrigated *dry* crop, the total charges will be Rs. 5 and Rs. 3-12-0, respectively."

6. The necessary correction slips will be issued in the Land Revenue Department.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) R. V. SRINIVASIAR,
Secretary.

To the Collector of North Arcot.
" " of South Arcot.
Copy to other Collectors.
" to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
" " Land Revenue Department.
" " Deputy Director of Land Records and Agriculture.

Read—the following Minute by the Hon'ble Sir HENRY BLISS, K.C.I.E., dated 25th February 1898 :—

I cannot agree to the order which it is proposed to issue in regard to the charge of water-rate on irrigated crops grown on lands classed as "dry" and assessed accordingly.

The orders which it is intended to amend were issued as long ago as 1874 and prescribed the uniform rate of Rs. 4 per acre as that to be charged for the irrigation of "wet" crops grown on "dry" lands, with lower rates to meet the cases of second "wet" crops and of "dry" crops which were only occasionally watered. Since then prices have increased enormously; and it would therefore seem to follow that the rates to be charged for the utilization of the surplus water at the disposal of Government should be increased. Instead of increasing them, however, it is actually proposed to reduce them to an extent which seems more or less uncertain, but which must be considerable.

There are some inaccuracies in the draft order which might well be commented on. But I will leave them unnoticed. I am only desirous, for the present, of recording this protest against an unnecessary sacrifice of revenue.

Order—No. 162, Revenue, dated 18th March 1898.

Misl Miscellaneous Circle

The Government observes that its approval should have been obtained previous to the issue of the rule proposed by the Board.

2. The Government resolves to take this opportunity of reviewing the whole table of rates for water taken to crops on dry land.

3. From the papers noted in the margin, it will appear that originally the rates for water not only varied in different districts, but that in one and the same district, there were frequently more than ~~100~~ a hundred different rates. In some cases, no definite principle was observed in charging these rates, but, generally, the principle followed was to charge as water-rate in respect of land classed as "dry" the difference between the wet and dry assessment. This fact accounts for the great number of rates noticed above in several districts. To produce uniformity, it was decided to charge one fixed set of rates on all lands in all districts with certain exceptions made for special reasons.

Board's Proceedings, No. 955, dated 10th June 1872.
Board's Proceedings, No. 2328, dated 15th November 1873.

4. From time to time, this set of rates has been modified or enlarged to meet cases which experience proved to be not provided for in the original rules. The object of these changes was to fix the charges for water in approximate proportion to the benefit derived from its use. Thus, the charge for water taken for a first crop varies as the crop is a wet crop, a dry crop systematically irrigated, or a dry crop occasionally irrigated; and in the case of a second crop the charge varies according to the extent to which it is irrigated and the nature of the first crop.

5. In the case of second-crop charges, however, the existing rules result in much irregularity as shown below.

6. The following table exhibits the table of rates as fixed by the rules in force and the rule proposed by the Board :—

No.	First crop on dry land.	Second crop on dry land.	Charge for First crop.	Charge for Second crop.	Total charge.	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
1	Wet	Wet	4 (a)	2 (b)	6	The rates in columns 4 and 5 are for first-class sources only. Three-fourths of these rates are charged for second-class sources.
2	Do.	Systematically irrigated, dry	4 (a)	2 (f)	6	
3	Do.	Occasionally irrigated, dry.	4 (a)	2 (d)	6	
4	Systematically irrigated, dry.	Wet	3 (e)	3 *	6	
5	Do.	Systematically irrigated, dry.	3 (e)	2 (f)	5	
6	Do.	Occasionally irrigated, dry.	3 (e)	2 (d)	5	
7	Occasionally irrigated, dry.	Wet	2 (d)	4 †	6	
8	Do.	Systematically irrigated, dry.	2 (d)	3 *	5	
9	Do.	Occasionally irrigated, dry.	2 (d)	2 (d)	4	

* According to the Board's proposed rule. † *Vide* G.O., No. 792, Revenue, dated 9th October 1899.

Note.—The letters (a) (b), &c., refer to the rules in the appendix to Board's Standing Orders (4), paragraph 2.

Thus, it will be seen that the second crop charge does not vary in cases 1, 2 and 3 and also in cases 5 and 6, although the extent to which the crop is irrigated varies; while in cases 7, 8 and 9 it does.

7. Moreover, the Government is of opinion that the total charge in cases 2, 3, 4 and 7 is unduly high.

8. To remedy the inequalities and inconsistencies pointed out above, the Government resolves to adopt the following scheme of rates :—

No.	First crop on dry land.	Second crop on dry land.	Charge for First crop.	Charge for Second crop.	Total charge.	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			Rs.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	
1	Wet	Wet	4	2 0 0	6 0 0	The rates in columns 4 and 5 are for water taken from first-class sources. Three-fourths of these rates should be charged for second-class sources.
2	Do.	Dry systematically irrigated.	4	1 8 0	5 8 0	
3	Do.	Dry occasionally irrigated.	4	1 0 0	5 0 0	
4	Dry systematically irrigated.	Wet	3	2 8 0	5 8 0	
5	Do	Dry systematically irrigated.	3	2 0 0	5 0 0	
6	Do.	Dry occasionally irrigated.	3	1 8 0	4 8 0	
7	Dry occasionally irrigated.	Wet	2	3 0 0	5 0 0	
8	Do.	Dry systematically irrigated.	2	2 8 0	4 8 0	
9	Do.	Dry occasionally irrigated.	2	2 0 0	4 0 0	

9. These rates will be regarded as tentative, and the Board is requested to report on their working and financial effect after they have been in operation for two faslis.

10. The ~~Government do not~~ whether the distinction made between first and second class sources in respect of supply to "dry" cultivation is sound. ~~The supply from a second class source may be precarious, but~~ the water is charged for only when it is taken, and there is no compulsion to take it. On the other hand, a ryot is liable to be charged for occasional irrigation if he takes any water at all, ~~and in this view the~~ that has been raised

In such cases the water charged for is surplus water, that is, water not required in the particular year for the irrigation of the "wet" lands comprised in the 'ayacut' of the irrigation work; it may be argued that there is no reason why such surplus water derived from a second class source should be charged at a lower rate than water from a first class source; that its value is independent of the source from which it comes; that

difference of charge between first and second class sources ~~may be~~ justifiable. The question, however, is one of fact and the Board is requested to enquire into the matter; and, when submitting the report called for in the preceding paragraph, to state whether the difference of advantage exists and whether it is properly measured by the difference in the prescribed rates.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture).
" the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).

Accepted 24/3/98 and it may be urged that whether the supply is abundant a scanty is, the uncertainty as to whether there will be a sufficient supply of surplus water during all the time the crop is on the ground is really just as great as the uncertainty in regard to the normal supply to the normal area, upon which principle the classification of sources proceeds; that although the ryots are not compelled to take water for "dry" lands or for second crops it is desirable, ~~that~~ in their interest as well as in the interest of Govt., to induce them to do so, & for this end to charge ~~less~~ more for & surplus water the continuance of which is assured than for a surplus the continuance of which is less assured; & that on these grounds the

Exd. Shaik Karim

Copies.

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

Number of copies required. { Order complete. / Letter only. / Order complete with Letter

Read again G O., No. , dated 190 .

Current No.

Enclosures to C. No.

Order of Government.

Letter of Government.

ment with ditto.

Papers not filed up, being meant for reference in original.

N.B.—
A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.