Legislative (1895) Departmen

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No 80-81-81 A.

Dated 27th August 1895

with an
appx
Memo

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

MEMORIALS.

Directing that the -- addressed to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State by the Madras Landholders' Association praying for the repeal of Madras Act II of 1894 (The Madras Proprietary Estates' Village Service Act, 1894); be transmitted to the Government of India and that the memorialists be informed accordingly.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following paper:—

From the President, Madras Landholders' Association, dated 24th April 1895.

Abstract.—Submitting, for transmission to the Right Hon'ble the Secretary of State, a memorial praying for the repeal of the Madras Proprietary Estates' Village Service Act II of 1894.

Order—27th August 1895, No. 80, Legislative.

The memorial will be transmitted to the Government of India and the memorialists informed accordingly.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary to Govt.

To the Memorialists.

Exd. C. M. Brisson.

Govt. of {1895} Madras.

LEGISLATIVE.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

Copy for record

G.O., 27th August 1895, No. 80.

Passed

D
25-5-55

AUGUST.

Memorial.

Directing that the — addressed to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State by the Madras Landholders' Association praying for the repeal of Madras Act II of 1894 (The Madras Proprietary Estates' Village Service Act, 1894) be transmitted to the Government of India, and that the memorialists be informed accordingly.

1895.

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

From the Government of
Fort St. George.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

Copy for record

Letter, &c., 27th August 1895, Nos. 81, 81-A.

Passed

D
25-5-55

AUGUST.

This will be the office copy for record as it contains the final corrections in Enclosure B.

D
25-5-55

Memorial.

Transmitting to the Government of India, with remarks, — from the Madras Landholders' Association to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State praying for the repeal of Madras Act II of 1894 (The Madras Proprietary Estates' Village Service Act, 1894).

27th August 1895, Nos. 81, 81-A, Legislative.

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

Letter—from

THE CHIEF SECRETARY to the GOVERNMENT of
FORT ST. GEORGE,

To

THE SECRETARY to the GOVERNMENT of INDIA,
Department of Revenue and Agriculture.

Sir,

In transmitting the accompanying memorial addressed to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State by the Madras Landholders' Association, I am directed to explain that the delay in submission is due to two circumstances, viz. :—

(1) that the substance of the memorial rendered it necessary to refer to voluminous records relating to transactions which took place at the beginning of the century;

(2) that His Excellency the Governor in Council deemed it desirable to place the Secretary of State in possession of information which would demonstrate the gross inaccuracy of certain statements made by the memorialists.

2. The memorialists protest against Madras Act II of 1894 (the Madras Proprietary Estates' Village Service Act, 1894) and pray that "Her Majesty's Government will exercise its power of repealing the Act according to section XXI of the Indian Councils Act."

Section XXI of that Act relates to Bills brought forward in the Council of the Governor-General and the memorialists presumably intended to refer to section XLI under which it is lawful "for Her Majesty to signify, through the Secretary of State for India in Council, her disallowance" of any law or regulation passed by the Legislative Council of the Government of Fort St. George and assented to by the Governor of Fort St. George and by the Governor-General. As required by that section an authentic copy of Madras Act II of 1894 was transmitted to the Secretary of State in May 1894, and in his despatch No. 20, Legislative, dated 21st June 1894, Mr. Fowler intimated that the Act had been considered in Council and that it would be left to its operation. Under these circumstances His Excellency the Governor in Council presumes that it will suffice to deal very briefly with the subject matter of the present memorial, more especially as the greater portion of it is identical with the memorial relating to the same subject and received from the same body which was submitted to the Government of India with my letter, dated 26th February 1894, No. 30.

3. The arguments upon which the memorialists base their protest are briefly summarized and answered below :—

(1) *There was undue haste and irregularity of procedure in passing the bill and giving assent to it.* So far as this Government is concerned this argument has been completely met in paragraphs 5 and 6 of my letter No. 30, dated 26th February 1894, which are extracted below for convenience of reference :—

> "5. In paragraph 5 the petitioner contends that the Proceedings of the Legislative Council were not strictly regular. In this connection I am directed to request that the attention of His Excellency the Governor-General may be invited to the speech of the Advocate-General recorded on pages 24 and 25 of the Abstract Proceedings of the Council on the 20th December 1893. It will be observed that the legal adviser of Government was of opinion that the procedure in regard to the Bill was, throughout, in conformity with the rules and the petitioner himself admits that, before the Bill was passed into law, the literal requirements of the rules had been complied with.
>
> "6. In paragraph 6 of the petition the Council is charged with precipitancy in passing the Bill into law. His Excellency in Council admits that, under ordinary circumstances, he would have preferred to leave the Bill before the public for a longer period after the second report of the Select Committee was presented, before taking steps to secure the passage of the Bill into law. But the circumstances were not ordinary. The Hon'ble Mr. Garstin, who had been in charge of the measure throughout, retired on the 9th January, and it would have been contrary to the public interests to entrust the Bill to any member who was ignorant of the exact nature of the discussions which had taken place on the subject in the Select Committees. Further it is to be noted that the principle of the measure, that is the extension of the control of Revenue officers over the most important class of village officers in proprietary estates and the enfranchisement of the inams appertaining to that class, had been exposed to the criticism of the public since 1883. The Bill of 1893 certainly differed in many important respects from the earlier measure; mainly in its extension to other classes of village officers and the levy of a cess. But it is not denied that full publicity was given to the Bill of 1893 in its earlier stages and the only objection raised is that the Bill, as finally amended by the Select Committee, was not before the public for a reasonable time. As, however, has been observed above, the effect of the amendments proposed by Select Committee in its report, dated the 28th November 1893, was to restrict, not to enlarge, the scope of the measure and the rate of cess to be imposed, so that objections which might have been raised to the Bill in its earlier stages would apply with less, rather than more, force to the measure in the form in which it finally left the Select Committee. It is also to be noted that the Council took the somewhat unusual course of referring the measure back to the Select Committee with the special object of ensuring the fullest consideration to the petitions which had been received. Had the Council, instead, proceeded on the 15th November 1893, as it might have done, *itself* to consider the various objections raised and, thereafter, to pass the Bill into law, the complaint that the Bill had not been before the public for a reasonable time could not have been made. It should also be mentioned that the prolongation of the discussion upon the Bill did not result in the production of much new and valuable criticism. Memorials, it is true, poured in but they were many of them identical and in print, thus proving that they had been distributed by some central body, and the same objections and arguments were repeated again and again. All the more important petitions were in English and publication in the vernaculars of the Bill in the state it had assumed after undergoing a second revision at the hands of the Select Committee was a mere formality. The statement in the present memorial that the Bill as finally revised was not published in English before the 12th December 1893 when the Hon'ble Mr. Garstin presented the second report of the Select Committee is not correct. It was so published on the 5th December, as stated above, and the Landholders' Association itself (and at least one other body) submitted a petition regarding the Bill in its revised form which was duly considered by the Council.
>
> "Having in view all these facts, it appeared to the Government and to the Council generally that no injustice would be done by passing the Bill into law without further delay."

With reference to the undue haste alleged to have taken place with the Government of India it will be noticed that the memorialists labour under the erroneous impression that the Act should have been laid before the Supreme Legislative Council whereas the law merely requires that the Governor-General himself should assent to it.

(2) *Karnams and other village officers in proprietary estates are not servants of the State and there is no need to make them such.*—The same question was raised in paragraph 9, clause (1) of the memorial forwarded with my letter, dated 26th February 1894, No. 30, and was answered in paragraphs 8 and 9 of that letter, copies of which are subjoined:—

> "8. It is manifest from paragraph 9 (1) of the memorial that the writer is under an entire misapprehension as to the existing law. The village officers in proprietary estates are not, at present, in any way subject to the control of the proprietors. Section 11 of Regulation XXV of 1802, section 5 of Regulation XXIX of 1802 and section 7 of Regulation VI of 1831 render this clear. On the other hand, the new Act gives a limited power of control to the proprietor. No doubt many proprietors have in times past acted most illegally and have assumed a *de facto* authority over their village establishments which the law does not recognize, while in some districts the powers vested in the officers of Government have been allowed to drop out of sight; but this state of things is not consistent with public policy and the intention of the new Act is to restrict the proprietors in the exercise of an authority to which they are not entitled by law. The statement that proprietors and village servants alike are opposed to the Act may be generally true, though it is manifest from certain of the petitions received that the village officers in some cases are desirous of more definite legislative restrictions upon the power over them which has been assumed by some proprietors. As to the remainder, it is no more than natural that, being now entirely uncontrolled, in any practical manner, by any authority, they should object to being brought under control. But such an objection should not prevail.
>
> "9. The argument in paragraph 9 (3) of the memorial appears to His Excellency in Council, so far as he understands it, to be unsustainable. Section 5 of Regulation XXV of 1802 relates to the old Déśa Kával or general police and not to the establishments of village watchers. The landed emoluments of village watchers have not undergone general resumption at the hands of Government and this is conclusively proved by the fact that this class of village officers, under various denominations, still exists in most estates and enjoys the emoluments annexed to its offices by the State. The fact that neither in the original regulations nor in the permanent sanads were the zamindars or their village watchmen assigned any police duties is of no importance for, as early as 1816, their liability to perform such duties was recognized by legislative enactment as a pre-existing fact."

(3) *The joint subordination of karnams to the State and to the proprietor has proved a failure in Bengal.*—His Excellency the Governor in Council has no direct knowledge as to the system in vogue in Bengal which is alleged to have broken down, but he has no hesitation in affirming that in Madras the partial subordination of the karnam to the State and to the proprietor has not proved a failure.

(4) *The substitution of money payments to village servants for inams was tried and condemned early in the century.*—The obvious answer to this statement is that money payments to village officers have subsequently been in force for a period of some thirty years, *i.e.*, since the introduction of the Village Cess Act of 1864 (Madras Act IV of 1864) and have proved a complete success.

(5) *The Bill was generally opposed by Collectors.*—This objection, which is not a new one, is answered in paragraph 3 of my letter, dated 26th February 1894, No. 30, an extract from which is subjoined:—

> "3. The Government is not aware of the authority for the assertion in paragraph 3 of the memorial to the effect that District officers are almost unanimously opposed to the measure. On the contrary, the Government believes that District officers almost, if not quite, unanimously feel the absolute necessity of bringing the village servants in zamindaris under control. In this connection, a perusal is solicited of the remarks made by His Excellency the Governor on 5th January (page 12 of the printed Proceedings of the Council). Probably the petitioner refers to the opinions recorded in 1871—1875 when the extension of the Village Cess Act, 1864, to zamindaris was mooted. It is hardly necessary to observe that the opinions then given cannot be applied to the enactment now under consideration."

(6) *The Act is a violation of the permanent settlement.*—As was remarked in paragraph 10 of my letter just quoted, it is hardly necessary to observe that the position taken up by the memorialists is untenable, though perhaps not unnatural. The same objection was discussed in paragraph 4, clause 4 of my letter, dated 9th April 1895, No. 32, in which it was pointed out that the contention that the Sanad-i-Milkiyat Istimrar is a contract possessing legal validity apart from Regulation XXV of 1802 is opposed to the ruling reported on pages 14—27 of Volume IX of the Madras Series of the Indian Law Reports, in which the High Court held that the clause of the Sanads which repeats the declaration contained in Regulation XXV of 1808 as to the exclusion of certain items of revenue is surplusage and that in the event of any difference between the Sanad and the Regulation, the Courts must be guided by the latter.

(7) *The Act assumes that village service inams were excluded from the assets in the calculation of the peishcush of proprietary estates whereas they were in fact included.*—In paragraph 4, clause 1, of my letter, dated 9th April 1895, No. 32, Legislative, a similar contention was referred to with the remark that the village service inams were, so far as could be ascertained, almost invariably excluded in the

Memorial regarding the Proprietary Estates Village Service Act.

calculation of the peishcush of proprietary estates. The memorialists quote in support of their assertion extracts from certain instructions issued in the year 1799 and from a report of Mr. Hurdis, a Collector, who carried out the permanent settlement of the zamindaris of the Dindigul Province. The arguments which they now set out in detail were briefly mentioned in the debates of the Legislative Council regarding the Village Offices' Hereditary Succession Bill and at the meeting held on the 19th March 1895, the Honourable Mr. Gibson who was in charge of the Bill pointed out that the memorialists were mistaken in the construction which they placed upon the records from which they quoted. The memorialists now submit that the Honourable Member "evidently misunderstood the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue and the Government of the day in settling the question raised by Mr. Hurdis;" in proof of this contention they quote isolated paragraphs from Mr. Hurdis's report and have evidently done so without careful perusal of the whole of that document and the orders passed upon it. It is unnecessary in the body of this letter to go into this question at length, but for reference, if deemed necessary, a brief note is enclosed summarizing the correspondence relating to the settlement of the Dindigul Province and proving conclusively the inaccuracy of the memorialists' contention. It will suffice here to remark that the Honourable Mr. Gibson was absolutely correct in his statement of the case and to express the surprise of His Excellency the Governor in Council that the memorialists should persist in statements which have no warranty in fact and are calculated to confuse the point at issue. Further, even if the accuracy of their contention be admitted, it is to be noted that section 27, clause 3 of the Act, expressly provides for compensation in the shape of reduction of peishcush in cases in which village service inams were included in the assets upon which the peishcush was calculated at the time of the permanent settlement.

4. Having thus disposed of the subject-matter of the memorial, His Excellency the Governor in Council desires to draw special attention to particular statements made therein.

(1) The memorialists speak of the landholders as being "inadequately represented" in the Legislative Council and describe the Maharaja of Vizianagram who is the one representative of landed interests as "evidently feeling the desirability of supporting the Government even though it be prejudicial to his own interests and the interests of the other Zamindars of the Presidency whom he is supposed to represent."

The Landholders' Association was certainly not prejudiced by want of advocacy on the part of the Maharaja of Vizianagram for they were permitted to represent their case by counsel when the Bill was under discussion. It should, however, none the less be pointed out that the Bill against which they protest affects the Maharaja very much more than any other individual Zamindar in this Presidency. In enclosure B to this letter will be found statistics relating to the principal zamindaris of the Presidency from which it will be seen that the Maharaja of Vizianagram pays a far larger peishcush than any other proprietor and that the population of his estate is far greater than that of any other, being in fact almost equal to the total population of the three estates of the Zamindars of Venkatagiri, Karvatnagar and Kalahasti who are the principal members of the Madras Landholders' Association.

(2) His Excellency the Governor in Council would next comment upon the memorialists' allegation that "from their experience in relieving the distressed in their own estates and of the relief given by Government in such places, what is done by Government in the zamindari tracts is only of a supplemental character, unlike in ryotwari villages where the whole burden falls upon the Government, the Zamindars themselves being largely interested in their estates."

The memorial is signed by the Zamindar of Venkatagiri, the President of the Association, in two taluks of whose estate, forming considerably more than half his zamindari, there was so much suffering during the distress which existed in 1891–92, that the Government had to expend a sum of Rs. 1,33,878 in affording relief to the sufferers. Against this expenditure by Government the Zamindar made an allotment of only Rs. 13,400 (early in 1892, that is to say, nearly a year after the commencement of the distress), but, as the Zamindar has persistently neglected all calls for a statement of outlay brought up to the close of operations, it has never been ascertained, whether the whole of this was actually spent. This sum was assigned for expenditure upon the repair of irrigation works, and inasmuch as it was reported that it was not likely to bring the Zamindar in any revenue, the Government expressed its pleasure at his action in undertaking the repairs with the view of relieving the suffering poor in his estate, although owing to his having adopted the contract system, the works did not really benefit the poor and weakly, but merely gave employment to able-bodied professional labourers. It need hardly be said that this appreciative notice was chiefly made with a view to encourage the Zamindar to further liberality. So far however as the records show the only other relief to the distressed which was afforded by him consisted in the distribution of some cloths and some cooked-food on the occasion of His Excellency the Governor's visit to the estate in April 1892. In a letter reporting his action, the Zamindar made excuses for not doing more in the direction of famine relief on the ground that his treasury was empty by reason of bad seasons and family disputes. The present Zamindar can hardly be held responsible for the acts of his predecessor; but the wanton assertion to which he has with others committed himself in this memorial may appropriately be answered by a reference to what took place in the Venkatagiri zamindari during the great famine of 1877. The scandalous mismanagement of the late Zamindar was detailed at length in a report submitted by the Special Famine officer, Mr. C. S. Crole, now Member of the Board of Revenue. His conclusions were summed up in the following words:—

> "The time seems to have come to punish him for his repeated breaches of faith and for the gross mal-administration which has, in the face of so many warnings, caused wholesale death by starvation among the people of an estate which, in my humble opinion, it would be a crime any longer to leave to the tender mercies of a man who has proved himself so utterly unworthy of his position. I would, therefore, strongly recommend that the zamindari be at once taken under Government management.
>
> "As the Rajah lays claim, in a sort of half-hearted way, to having done something towards relief works, it may be as well to notice the point.
>
> "At the outset his assertion is rendered more than doubtful by the fact that 1,767 out of 2,410, or nearly three-fourths of the whole of the Nellore paupers in the Madras camps on the 10th of March, the date of the last return, came from Venkatagiri. If his people had work, why should they run away?
>
> "It is very difficult to know what works have been going on under the Rajah's auspices. One thing is certain. They are quite insignificant in amount and extent, and it is hardly possible to imagine that the repairs of an ordinary year would not have been more numerous."

The conduct of the Zamindar formed the subject of frequent report to Government and the transactions terminated in his resignation in favour of his son, in consequence of the severe censures to which it had been found necessary to subject him.

The Zamindar of Kalahasti is perhaps the personage of next importance among the memorialists. His estate suffered from distress in 1891 and 1892, and during that period the Government expended therein a sum of Rs. 1,07,169 in famine relief while the Zamindar himself did practically nothing. It is true that he applied to Government for a loan in order to enable him to start some minor irrigation works with the alleged object of affording immediate employment to the distressed and that a sum of Rs. 10,000 was advanced to his Diwan for this purpose; but the loan though originally sanctioned was subsequently cancelled, owing to an injunction from the civil court, and the cost of the works actually carried out under the orders of the Diwan was debited to Government. These two instances will serve to show how little weight is to be attached to the memorialists' protestations regarding their munificence in helping the distressed during famine years and the very "supplemental character" of the aid afforded by Government.

5. In order that the Government of India may not attach undue importance to the alleged representative character of the Association which the memorialists form, I am to state that the Association contains only 111 members or less than one-eighth of the total number of holders of proprietary estates in the Presidency. Its permanency is doubtful and it has only been in existence for some five years.

6. I am finally to express the opinion of His Excellency the Governor in Council, that for the foregoing reasons the representations of the memorialists are totally unworthy of consideration.

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

OOTACAMUND,
27th August 1895.

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary to Govt.

ENDORSEMENT—dated 27th August 1895, No. 81-A, Legislative.

Copy to the Government of India, Legislative Department.

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary to Govt.

ENCLOSURE A.

Summary of the Correspondence relating to the Settlement of the Dindigul Province by Mr. Hurdis.

Mr. Hurdis's procedure was as follows:—

I. He estimated the assets on the basis of ryotwar survey rents of the then cultivated lands (excluding inams and shrotriems), and as these rents were progressively increasing during a period of three years for which the estates were let on cowle, he at first proposed to take as permanent Jamma (assessment) the beriz (demand) of the last year of the three-year period. This beriz amounted to star pagodas 131,315. (This figure will be denoted below by the letter *A*.)

II. The inam lands he divided into two categories—

(1) Those to be *resumed* including under this head the *Village Sibbandy* (*servants*) *maniams*.

(2) Those not to be interfered with (pagoda inams, &c.).

The inams of the first class were valued at star pagodas 10,093. (This figure will be denoted below by the letter *B*.)

The total asset for peishcush (excluding certain "Sournadayam" (payment in money as distinguished from payment in kind) and quit-rents on shrotriems) thus amounted to $A + B$ or star pagodas 141,408.

III. It then appears to have occurred to him that, if the proprietors were required to pay to Government the whole of this amount, there would be no margin left to them to meet cost of collection, &c., and as he thought that it would be some years before any margin accrued to them by extension of cultivation, and as in the meantime it would be difficult to find purchasers for these estates, he made two proposals to meet this difficulty.

(*a*) To reduce *A* by taking in lieu thereof the *average* beriz of the three cowle years referred to in paragraph 1 *supra*. The reduced amount was star pagodas 118,118. (This will be denoted by A_1.)

He proposed accordingly to fix the peishcush at $A_1 + B = 128,220$.*

(*β*) At the same time he also suggested that *B* should be entirely given up to the proprietors to be utilized by them in maintaining the village sibbandy.

The Board thereupon pointed out that *B* was never meant to be included in the peishcush, that the procedure previously followed in such cases was to exclude these inams from the assets, and recommended to Government that *B* should be excluded in the case of the Dindigul Poliams.

Even as regards *A*, the Board was of opinion that that amount would not leave sufficient margin to the proprietors. It accordingly reduced the amount to star pagodas 109,189 (a figure which will be denoted by A_2) and proposed to fix the peishcush at A_2 + certain items of assets derivable from "Sournadayam" and quit-rent from Shrotriemdars, not included in A_2.

The Board wrote at the same time that if the Government did not agree to its proposal to exclude the sibbandy maniams, the figure to be taken in place of A_2 would be $A_2 + B$ and the total peishcush including the assets from Sournadayam and quit-rent mentioned above which amounted to star pagodas 1,970, would thus be 121,252.

The Board's proposals contained therefore two principal recommendations.

(1) To exclude the village Sibbandy Maniams from the peishcush.

(2) To reduce further the main item of peishcush from A_1 (proposed by the Collector) to A_2 (proposed by the Board).

The orders of Government on these two proposals were as follow:—

† "4. With reference to the alienations which have been hitherto appropriated for the support of the village sibbandy and which were under a misapprehension of the general instructions included with the aggregate assets of the zamindaris, the Governor in Council entirely approves your rejection of them from the amount of the permanent rent."

† G.O., dated 24th October 1804.

* * * * * *

"7. The Governor in Council observes that the assessment proposed by the late Collector is considered by you to be too high in proportion to the full value of the zamindaris and His Lordship in Council entirely approves the principle on which you have recommended a reduction for the purpose of leaving to the Zamindars such a reasonable profit as may secure them against failure in the discharge of their engagements with adequate means for their support."

---

* There is a difference of nine between this figure and the correct total which is probably due to certain payments in the shape of "Poruppu" (a special form of low quit-rent) made by the inamdars.

"8. The Governor in Council therefore confirms in perpetuity the settlement which you have recommended for the zamindaris of the Province of Dindigul amounting in number to forty."

It is clear from the above that in the case of the Dindigul estates dealt with in Mr. Hurdis's report the village service inams were *not included* in the assets on which the peishcush was fixed.

ENCLOSURE B.

Statistics relating to the Principal Zamindaris.

District.	Name of estate.	Population as per census of 1891.	Rent of fasli 1303.	Peishcush.
			RS.	RS.
1. Vizagapatam	Jeypore	~~564,782~~ (a)	..	16,000
2. Do.	Vizianagram	867.275	16,82,074	4,94,137
3. Nellore	Venkatagiri	382,406	9,45,954	3,73,112
4. Madura	Ramnad	652,252	6,95,450	3,13,877
5. Do.	Sivaganga	412,624	7,43,132	2,57,430
6. North Arcot	Karvetnagar	328,697	9,44,415	1,73,887
7. Do. and Nellore	Kalahasti	245,157	6,00,368	1,73,141
8. Gódávari	Pittapur	223,346	8,70,775	2,44,065
9. Ganjám	Parlákimedi	~~232,897~~ (b)	4,58,703	87,823
10. Vizagapatam	Bobbili	~~128,785~~ (c)	3,79,862	89,514
11. North Arcot	Punganúru	91,823	..	66,796

(a) 733,173
(b) 188,208
(c) 252,050

Exd. J. P. Oliver.

Judicial C. Nos: 102, 104 & 117 of 95

For orders

In connection with the memorials from the Madras Landholders' Assocn: and from the Rajas of Venkatagiri, Kalahasti and Karvetnagar, appealing to the Secretary of State against the Madras Proprietary Estates Village Service Act (II of 94) and Madras Hereditary Village Offices Act, His Excellency considers that it would be useful ~~if~~ to furnish such information to the Secy. of State as would enable him to estimate at its proper worth the tall talk of the Zamindars as to relief measures adopted by them in times of scarcity or famine.

They say in their memorial in Leg. C. No. 104: (pp 3-4)

= In the development of arguments on the very day the Bill* was passed, His Excellency the President

(said)

* Propd: Estates Villge. Service Bill.

laid great stress upon the importance of Statistical returns by Karnams for purposes of famine relief. But the memorialists submit that, from their experience in relieving the distressed in their own estates and of the relief given by the Govt. in such places, what is done by Govt. in Zemindari tracts is only of a supplemental character, unlike in ryotwari villages where the whole burden falls on the Govt., the Zemindars themselves being largely interested in helping the distressed in their estates. . . ."

With the view of showing the Zemindars in their true colors, His Excellency desires that information may be furnished as follows:

I. That a statement may be sent up showing the amount expended by Govt. during 1891-92 in the different Zemindaris.#

As complete information is not available here, it is submitted that a telegram may be sent to the Bd. A draft telegram is submitted below.*

II. That a statement may be furnished showing numbers relieved in each Zemindari.

The annexed statement (marked B) shows the numbers relieved on works and gratuitously at kitchens in each month in the three Zemindaris of Venkatagi~~ri~~, Kalahasti and Punganur and ~~the~~ the corresponding numbers ~~are compared with~~ for the two districts of N. Arcot and Nellore are also entered in the statement for purposes of comparison. In 1892 the Venk. Zemin supplied about 2/3 of the Famine coolies employed in the Nellore District.

III. That attention should

# This has been obtained and the figures are entered at the foot of the statement marked B appended.

R.P.
3/7.

* Paper marked A.

The sums expended by Govt. were as follows:—

From Feby 1891 to Sept 1892—

	Rs
Kalahasti —	1,07,169
Punganur —	16,605
Venkatagiri —	1,35,821
	2,59,595

Punganur is not concerned in the Memorial — Nearly 2½ lakhs have been spent by Govt. in the Zamindaris of two out of the three memorialists — In Karvetnagar Famine works were not needed —

Against this expenditure by Govt. the Zemindar of Venkatagiri early in 1892 made an allotment of Rs 13,400 for repairing his tanks and he should be drawn to the fact that in spite of constant enquiry by the Collr., urged on by Govt., he never could get from the Zemindar of Venkatagiri or his Dewan *any particulars* *whatever* as to what he was doing in the way of affording relief to his tenants.

His Excellency's ~~desire~~ remark that this should be rectified; attention is invited to para. 145 of the Collr's general report of 27.1.93 No. 1288 Tour (vide Bd. Pro. of 18.2.93 No. 65 in the file of reports received with the Bd. general report reviewed in G.O. of 4.5.94 No. 302) which runs as follows

“At the end of Dec.* and early in Jany.# the acting Collector£ finding distress in Podili and Darsi Zemindari divisions and in the Zemindari villages of Northern Govt. taluks requested the Zemindars of Venkatagiri, Kalahasti and Muthialpad to put in hand irrigation works with a view to afford employment to those in need. The three latter did practically nothing. The Raja of Venkatagiri carried out some irrigation repairs in Darsi and Podili. On 23rd Aug. 1892 and again on the 11th Dec. 1892 I called for a return from Venkatagiri which would have shown the expenditure on ~~the~~ these works in 1892, but the return was not furnished. I found on inspection that the Zemindari works were open to the same objection as the earlier Public Works Department works -- in having a contract form which did

also distributed some cloths & some cooked food on the occasion of H.E. the Govr's visit in April 1892.

In his letter reporting his action in the direction of Famine Relief - the Zemindar makes excuses for not doing more on the ground that his treasury is empty by reason of bad

— with reference to

seasons & family disputes.

So far as appears from the records the above is the extent of the Venkatagiri Zemindari munificence - and of this he has the assurance to write in the memorial - "The Memorialists submit, from their experience in relieving the distress in their own estates, x x x that what is done by Govt. in Zemindari tracts is only of a supplemental character!"

* 1891

# 1892

£ Mr. Higgens.

x Venkatagiri Estate consists of

Venkatagiri & Polur } in the South

Darsi & Podili } in the North

and of a number of villages scattered about in different taluks in Nellore.

(There is also a village in the Kistna dist. belonging to the Raja) did not really and in practice secure the employment of the needy — *vide* also para. 3 at page 4 and para. 5 at page 10 of G.O. of 12.5.'92 No. 482 Rev; and para. 4 at page 3, para. 6 at page 8 of G.O. of 3.6.92 No. 568, as also para 2 of the G.O.

IV. The references quoted in item III above support His Excellency's remark that "in '92 there was the likelihood of great trouble in Nellore and especially in the Venkatagiri Zemindari and for all the information we could get thousands might have died and I believe many would have but for Govt. interference". ~~Kalahasti did also~~

V. His Excellency's remark that Kalahasti absolutely did nothing and did not pretend to —" is quite right so far as the Nellore district is concerned. As regards N. Arcot — it will be remembered that the Zemindar applied for a loan of Rs 4 lakhs to be spent on irrigation works: that the loan was at first sanctioned by the Govt. and Rs 10,000 advanced to the Zemindar's Dewan ~~[illegible]~~ to enable him to start some minor irrigation works with the object of affording immediate ~~relief to~~ employment to the distressed; but that afterwards the grant of the loan was abandoned and the cost of works carried out under the orders of the Dewan ordered to be debited to famine relief — *vide* para. 7 of—

of the N. Arcot Colr's General Report of 3.11.92 No. 1282 - Indexed in B.P. of 7.12.92 No. 778 in the File of Colr's Reports with the Bd's General Report reviewed in G.O. of 4.5.94 No. 302..

VI. As to His Excellency's remarks that the Venkatagiri Zamindar protests too much and he must be shown up, it is respectfully submitted that while it is true that the Zamindar protests too much, it has to be remembered that in one or two papers the Govt. ~~and~~ the Bd. of and the Collr. of Nellore have ~~spoken~~ written favourably regarding the Zamindari doings in connection with the distress in his estate. ~~and~~

A few of these remarks are extracted below:

In

Should be spent 3,600! He has the reputation of being a very wealthy zamindar and even if he spent 13,000 it would be a mere flea bite

In its Pro. of 30.1.92 No. 1072 (G.O. of 8.2.92 No. 756) the Bd. reported as follows

"The Raja (of Venkatagiri) has already commenced carrying out repairs to the irrigation works of his estate in the Darsi and Podili divisions to a cost of Rs 13,400 of which Rs 9,800 remains to be +spent; and on receipt of further information he hopes to amplify the list, although owing to family disputes and the bad seasons, his finances are not in a flourishing condition. The talukas alluded to do not possess much wet land and the Raja's expenditure on irrigation works is not likely to bring him any direct revenue. He is undertaking the works for the purpose of relieving the suffering poor

poor of his estate. The Bd. has great pleasure in bringing the Raja's action to the notice of Govt. by whom it will no doubt be fully appreciated".

On the Bd. Pr. the Govt. passed order as follows: (G.O. of 8.2.92 No. 756)

"The Govt. notes with much pleasure the action of the Raja of Venkatagiri in undertaking the repairs of numerous irrigation works solely with the view of relieving the suffering poor in his estate".

Of course this appreciative notice of the Zemindar must be admitted. It was doubtless meant as an encouragement - a keen sense of favours to come -

G.G. 3/8

When His Excellency visited Darsi and Podili in April 1892 the Raja made a show of liberality and the fact is noticed in ~~paras.~~ the Collr. report - vide paras. 3 & 4 at pages 4 & 5 of G.O. of 12.5.92 No. 482. In the Collr. general report in the file with the Bd's general reports already referred to, he has written as follows (para. 95)

"His Excellency the Govr. accompanied by the Famine Commissioner arrived at Vemulapad on the 10th April - - - - -. The next morning, 11th April His Excellency proceeded to Chinna Arihatla in Podili division and similarly inspected the relief works in progress there, and after examining the condition of the people distributed to the needy about 600 cloths sent for that purpose by the Raja of Venkatagiri and ~~Raja~~ Sir Savalay Ramaswamy Mudliar. On the 12th April His Excellency passed on to Darsi where in commemoration of the Governor's visit, the Raja of Venkatagiri's officers distributed cloths and cooked food to the poor. 1892.

On

On the 13th April His Excellency left Dalsi for Hurichedu Railway station, where also he distributed cloths for the Raja of Venkatagiri — — —".

It is matter for consideration whether in the circumstances mentioned above, it will not be best for Govt. to content itself with making a general remark to the effect that nothing worth mentioning was done by the Zemindars during the recent distress, to afford relief to the poor in their estates

VII. His Excellency's remark that "Whatever may be said about the Maharaja of Vizianagaram, the Landholders' Representative in the Leg. Council, the Bill protested against affecting him very much more than almost any other single Zemindar in the Presidency": is correct, as will be seen from the statement marked C put up which shows the area, population, rental and peishcush of the (x) principal Zemindaris.

VIII. Mr. Chole's report regarding the state of the Venkatagiri Zemindari at the time of the great famine, referred to in the Hon. Mr. Grose's note is put up. (vide ~~B.d vol. for May 1877~~) pp. 4709 – 4717 of the vol. of Rev. Dept. Pro. for May 1877). # Does the H.M. intend that this report should be referred to now in showing up the Zemindars

R.V.S.
29/6.

Yes – with a brief statement of facts and figures – given above –

LLG

Perhaps a far larger Peshkush than any other – and the population of Vizianagram (844,168) is greater than that of the 3 memorialising Zemindaris put together – (800,850) –

LLG 3/8.

Complete.

(x) Information is not available as regards the ~~number~~ of the different classes of village officers maintained in the several estates.

It would of course be open to the present Zemindar to say he cannot be held responsible for the evil deeds of his predecessors – but a ref. to what occurred in the Venkatagiri estate in 1877 would be a fair & effectual rejoinder to his wanton assertion that in time of famine the Zemindars do everything & Govt. little or nothing –

LLG 3/8.

Average number of persons relieved on works and at Kitchens (the latter being shown in red ink) in each month during the years 1891 & 92. And the Amounts Expended by Govt.

B

	Kalahasti	Punganur	Total North Arcot Dt.	Venkatagiri	Total Nellore District.
February 1891	..	..	155	"	"
March ..	352	..	1,736 26	"	"
April ..	935 144	..	3,312 760	"	"
May ..	2,039 386	..	6,367 1102	"	"
June ..	2,151 607	..	7,208 1,355	..	"
July ..	1,612 1023	..	6,571 1,794	63	398
August ..	3,270 1,900	..	8,499 2,994	454	2,502
September ..	4,398 2,624	..	10,248 4,374	728	3,885
October ..	4,111 1,842	..	10,408 3,339	627	3,916
November ..	3,004 1,518	..	5,287 2,197	16	1,030
December ..	1,831 859	..	2856 1,455	..	1,153
January 1892	515 132	..	736 356	1,615	5,841
February ..	..	87	87	1,760	3,753
March ..	..	161 30	161 30	2,505	5,688
April ..	..	690 60	690 60	3,606	6,644
May ..	..	1,514 52	1514 52	7,281	11,107 95
June ..	..	1,798 45	1,798 45	14,759	22,744 111
July ..	..	471 17	471 17	10,535 44	16,723 175
August	..	..	..	1,991 45	2,846 122
September.	..	..	..	.. 4	.. 7
Amount Expended by Govt.	Rs 1,07,169	Rs 16,605		Rs 1,35,821	Total of 3 Zemindaris 2,59,595

Statistics relating to the Principal Zamindaris.

District 1	Name of Estate 2	Area in sq. miles 3	Population as per census of ~~1881~~ 1891 4	Rental — Fasli 1303 R. 5	Peishcush. R. 6	Remarks. 7.
1. Vizagapatam	Jeypore	11,526	~~[illegible]~~ 589, 119	.. (?)	16.000	
2. do:	Vizianagaram	3.000	844, 168	16, 82, 074	4, 94, 137	
~~3~~4 Madura.	Ramnad	2.112	476, 268	6, 95, 450	3. 13, 877	
~~4~~3 Nellore	Venkatagiri	2.117	300, 865 ✓	9. 45, 954	3. 73, 112	
5. Madura	Sivaganga	1,551	432, 428	7. 43, 132	2. 57, 430	
6. N. Arcot.	Karvetnagar	690	275. 830 ✓	9. 44. 415	1. 73. 887	
7. N Arcot & Nellore,	Kalahasti	595	224, 155 ✓	6. 00. 368	1. 73, 141	
8. Godavari	Pittapur	371	184, 078	8. 70, 775	2. 44. 065	
9. Ganjam	Parlakimedi	993	280, 132	~~[illegible]~~ 4. 58. 703	87. 823	
10. Vizagm:	Bobbili	920	158, 178	3. 79. 862	89. 514	
11. ~~Punganoor~~ N. Arcot	Punganur	532	109, 282	..	66, 796	
~~12. N~~	Foot note	These areas are given differently in different books.	Better quote Census of 1891.			

R.

1R

(A)

Telegram.

To.

The Bd. of Rev.
(Rev. Sett.)

Please report amount expended on works and gratuitous relief in Venkatagiri, Kalahasti and Punganur Zemindaris and numbers[P] relieved in each during recent scarcity in 1891–92.

R.H.
29/6.

[illegible] 29/6.

[P] The numbers may also be asked for to serve as a check on the figures compiled in this Office.
R.H.

For reply: vide ~~[illegible]~~:
G.O. of 5. 7. 95 No. 2675
of C. No. 4839 ~~[illegible]~~:
~~[illegible]~~.

The information is tabulated in the Statement marked B appended. R.H.

persons relieved and amount spent

ber of

92.

on

Gratuitous relief								
Katagiri	Kalahasti				Punganur			
	No.	amount			No.	amount		
		Rs	A	P		Rs	A	P
	"	"	"	"	"	"	-	-
No gratuitous relief	144				"	"	-	-
	386				"	"	-	-
	607				"	"	"	"
	1,023	Rs.			"	"	"	"
	1,900	15,192			"	"	"	"
	2,624				"	"	"	"
	1,842				"	"	"	"
	1,518				"	"	"	"
	859				"	"	"	"
	132				"	"	"	"
	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
	"	"	"	"	30			
	"	"	"	"	60			
	"	"	"	"	52	277	"	8
	"	"	"	"	45			
	"	"	"	"	17			

Secretary

Statement showing the average number of
month during the years of 1891 & 1892.

Months.	on work.					
	Venkatagiri		Kalahasti		Punganur	
	No.		No.	amount spent	No.	amount spent.
				Rs A P		Rs A P
March 1891	„		352	Rs. 1,07,169	„	„ „ „
April „	„		935		„	„ „ „
May „	„		2039		„	„ „
June „	„		2151		„	„ „ „
July „	„		1612		„	„ „ „
August „	27	No special relief works were opened in this Division but these were return as employed.	3270		„	„ „ „
September „	64		4398		„	„ „ „
October „	38		4111		„	„ „ „
November „	16		3004		„	„ „ „
December „			1831		„	„ „ „
January 1892	„		515		„	„ „ „
February „	„		„	„ „ „	87	Rs. 16,605
March „	„		„	„ „ „	161	
April „	„		„	„ „ „	690	
May „	„		„	„ „ „	1514	
June „	„		„	„ „ „	1798	
July „	„		„	„ „ „	471	

1895
REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Enclosure No. 1
To Current No. 4791

(13—1,000—21-1-93.)

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture).

Dated 3rd July 1895.
No. 3417 Mis.

READ—telegram from the Government of Madras, Revenue Department, dated 29th June 1895.

Resolution.

The Board begs to submit herewith a statement showing, as far as possible, the information called for. In Venkatagiri, no regular relief works were opened, nor was gratuitous relief ever given. The expenditure on works in Kalahasti and Punganur

is

is that given by the Collector; that shown in these Zemindaries under gratuitous relief is according to the approximate figures reported by the relief officers, no separate details for the finally audited figures being available here.

(True Extract)

Secretary.

To
The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department.

With Statement.

+ Sd

Revenue 1895. Deptt.

(Sett. 20—2,000-27-3-95.)

Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records
and Agriculture),

MADRAS.

Current Number 4791

To

The Secretary to
Government,
Revenue Department

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
5 JUL 95
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Recd 5 June

No. of Enclosures. 1/

Proceedings, dated 3rd July 1895.
No. 3417 Mis.

Subject.

Submitting to Government a Statement showing the numbers relieved and amount spent in certain Zamindaries during the recent scarcity.

C. No. 4791 of 95

G.O. Mis No. 2675 d/ 5th July 95

The following telegram will be despatched to the Bd. of Rev (Rev. Sett.).

"Your Pro. 3rd July No. 3417. You have overlooked that Polur Darsi and Podili belong to Venkatagiri Zamindari. Please ~~report~~ ~~sanctioned~~ wire amount spent in the Zamindari taking together all its divisions."

R.V.S.
5/7.

W. 5/7

To

The Board of Rev: (R.S. L.R. & A.)

5/7

DISPOSED OF BY GOVT ORDER
Mis. No. 2675
Date 5th July 95

C. No. 4791.

Re. numbers relieved and amount spent on relief in certain Zemindaris during 1891-92

Desp: deferred

Despd 5/7

R.W. 5/7

Code Class. DS

INDIAN TELEGRAPHS.

Monthly Number. 441

To (Office)	Ootacamund
From (Office)	Ms Triplicane
Words.	30/17
Day.	6
Hour.	20
Minute.	5
Official Instructions.	[illegible]
To (Person)	Revenue
From (Person)	Board Settlement

GOVERNMENT REVENUE DEPARTMENT 8 JUL 95

Government telegram fifth amount spent one works Venkatagiri Zemindari rupees 1,35,821 on gratuitous relief rupees 3.51 for numbers please see pages 64 65 67 appendices famine report

32 Word Form.

F.C1.

Recd. from LN. at Hrs. Mts. by

Sent to LN. at Hrs. Mts. by

Telegraph Master.

G. P.—No. 29 T—25-5-94—40,00,000.

OOTACAMUND 7.7.95

O/18 10,000—25-3-95.

ABSTRACT.

(1895.)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Current Number. 4839

Tel:
From

The Board of Revenue
(R.S.L.R.&A)

Dated 6 July
Received 8 "
Enclosures

No.

SUBJECT.

Stating the amount spent on relief works in Venkatagiri Zemindari.

C. Nos: 4839 & 4923.

Lodged.

R.W. 3/7.

Revenue Board Office Madras

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture).

Dated 8th July 1895.

No. 3532 Misc

READ telegram from Government, Revenue Department, dated 5th July 1895.

Resolution

Ordered that the following telegram be despatched:—

"Government telegram fifth. Amount spent on works Venkatagiri Zemindari, Rs 135,821; on gratuitous relief, Rs 351. For numbers, please see pages 64, 65, 67 appendices Famine report."

	On Gratuitous relief Rs	On works Rs
Darsi Podili	351	133,494
Venkatagiri & P.Rur		2,327
	351.	135,821.

Total 136,172

(True Extract)

Secretary

To
The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

Exd 8/7

Revenue Department

1895.

Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture),

MADRAS.

Current Number 4923

(This is fair copy of C. No. 4839)

To

The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

10 JUN 95

Rd 10th July

No. of Enclosures.

Proceedings, dated 8th July 1895,
No. 3532 Mis

Subject.

Famine Relief Works

Ordering the despatch of a telegram to Government regarding the amount spent on certain heads of ———.

10/7

INDIAN TELEGRAPHS

Code Class. D S

Monthly Number. 1046

To (Office) Ootacamund

From (Office) Madras Triplicane

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instructions.
39/14	17	19	9	W P 1

To (Person) Madras Revenue

3

From (Person) Board Settlement

Expenditure works darsi and podili together rupees 133474 twice 66747 [illegible] report expenditure each separately without reference collector report called for on gratuitous relief podili rupees 351 darsi nil

Recd. from ... LN. ... At ... Hrs. ... Mts. by

Sent to OOTACAMUND 17-8-95 At ... Hrs. ... Mts. by

Telegraph Master.

F. C1.

G. G. P.—No 227 T—11 9-93—20,00,000.

$\frac{O}{18}$ 10,000—25-3-95.

ABSTRACT.

(1895.)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Current Number, 5995

Tel.

From

The Board of Revenue

(Rev: Settlet. L. R & Agri:).

Dated 17 Augt.

Received 18 "

Enclosures

No.

SUBJECT.

Furnishing the information

expenditure on famine relief

ks in Darsi and Podili.

Lodged.

The following telegram will be despatched to the Bd. of Rev. Rev. Sett.

" Your Pro. No. 3532 of 8th July last. Please wire soon ~~early~~ amounts spent on works and on gratuitous relief in Darsi and Podili divisions."

R.V.L.
17/8.

[illegible] 17/8

Desp. urgent.

Delmdespd
17/8.

Months	Podili				Darsi			
	No.	Amount			No.	Amount		
		R	A	P		Rs	A	P
January 1892	1,615				"			
February "	1,760				"			
March "	2,505				"			
April "	3,606				"			
May "	7,281	132,149	11	4	"	1,344	10	9
June "	14,694				65			
July "	10,499				36			
August "	1,991				"			

Superintendent
Secretary

24/8

[illegible]
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
Enclosure No. 1
Current No. 6447

(13—1,000—31-1-93.)

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture).

Dated 22d August 1895.
No. 4486 Mis.

READ—telegram from the Collector of Nellore, dated 20d August 1895 furnishing information regarding the amount spent on works Podili and Darsi and gratuitous relief during the recent famine.

Resolution

The following telegram will be despatched to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department:—

"Board's telegram 17th. Expenditure works Podili 132,150 and Darsi 1,345. Gratuitous relief

relief Podili 383; Darsi nil. Proceedings follows."

2. Rs 351 previously reported as being Expenditure incurred on gratuitous relief was merely the approximate figure (as observed in Board's Proceedings No 3417 Misc dated 3rd July 1895) reported during the distress. The amount Rs 383 now telegraphed by the Collector apparently represents the finally audited figure.

3. A memorandum giving details of the numbers employed in each division is attached.

/ True Extract /

Secretary

To The Secretary to Government
Revenue Dept with memo.
Copy to the Collector of Nellore do

Ms. 24/8

(Estt. 20—2,000-27-3-95.)

Revenue 1895. Dept

Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture),

MADRAS.

Current Number 6147.

To

The Secretary to Government

Revenue Department

27/8

REVENUE DEPARTMENT ORDER.
ROUTINE SERIES
No. 1364
27 August 1895

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
24 AUG 95
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Recd 24 Aug

No. of Enclosures. 1.

Proceedings, dated 22 August 1895
No. 4486 Mis

Subject.

Telegraphing the Expenditure on works and on Gratuitous relief incurred in the Darsi and Podili Divisions during the recent famine

Read also G.O. R. No. 1364 d/27 Aug: 1895

Recorded.

R.V. 24/8

Wd 27/8

Leg: C. Nos. 102. 104 of
11 7 95.

Note
With reference to His Excellency's remarks on the note for orders on Leg. C. No. 104.

To.
The Under Secretary
Judicial Dept.

Recd. 6.30 pm. on ~~4~~3.8.95.
D

COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE
MADRAS CITY POLICE

Egmore 9th August 95.

My dear Carr

Yr D.O. No 77 dated 7th.

I have no list of members of the Landholders' Association but will endeavour to get one as soon as possible.

Sir Savalay came to see me this morning about some business of his own and I asked him incidentally about the Association — of which he is a member.

He says it is kept alive by the Rajah of Venkatagiri, who helps it liberally with money — paying up the subs of defaulting subscribing (or non subscribing) members — and of the Hony Secretary, Muthukumaraswamy the surrender of Chittambedu.

Paul Peter Pillai the agent of the Association has been sent home at its expense to push its interests, but the members appear there taken the measure of P.P.P., got pretty accurately and have very little confidence in his disinterestedness or loyalty to them

Sir Savalay remarked that the Annasamy was an honest intelligent man whose acquaintance I might be glad to make. Of course I said I should be very glad to see him.

With refer. to your notes of the [illegible] of Arcot —

Why do you spell Jains with a d.? The poor French J. requires this help but the English one can stand on its own bottom

Yours sincerely
M E G D

List of Members

of the

Madras Landholders' Association

Note. It is requested that
this List may be returned
to S.B. for file, after
perusal.

H. Carr.

A. S. B.

D.D.G.
14-8-35

List of the Members of the Madras Landholders' Association.

No	Name of Estates	Name of Districts	Full Title ~~or~~ Form of Address in English.
1	Parlakimidi	Ganjam District	Sahib Meharban-i-Dostan Sri Viraprata, paradra Gajapatti Narayana Devu Garu, Zemindar of Parlakemidi.
2.	Chinna Kimedi	Do	Sri Braja Kisora Devu Garu, Zemindar of Pratapagi
3.	Serugadu	Do	Sri Lakshmi Narasimha Deo Garu, Zemindar of Serugada.
4.	Chikati	Do	Sahib Meharban-i-Dostan Sri Kisora Chandra Rajendra Devu Garu, Zemindar of Chikati.
5.	Pata Tekkali	Do	Meharban-i-Dostan Sri Gajapatti Radhika Patta Mahadevi Garu, Proprietrix of Pata Tekkali.
6.	Mandasa	Do	Sahib Meharban-i-Dostan Sri Vasudeva Rajamani Raja Devu Garu, Zemindar of Mandasa.
7.	Tarla	Do	Sri Rama Chandra Sur Harichandana Deo Garu, Zemindar of Tarla.
8.	Urlam	Do	M. R. Ry. Zemindarni Garu of Urlam.

List of the Members of the Madras Landholders' Association – (Continued).

No.	Name of Estates	Name of District	Full Title or Form of Address in English
9.	Sowdam Hunda	Ganjam District	M. R. Ry. T. Siva Row Pantulu Garu.
10.	Baruva	Do	Magata Divan Bakshi Mahapatro Garu, Malukdar of Baruva
11.	Peta	Do	Vasudevapatti Khadanga Garu, Malukdar of Peta.
12.	Bobbili	Vizagapatam	Raja Sahib Meharban-i-Dostan Raja Sri Rau Venkata Swetachalapathi Runga Rau Bahadur of Bobbili Garu.
13.	Annakapalle, &c	Do	Meharban-i-Dostan, Annakapalle &c. Proprietor Sri Raja Gode Narayana Gazapathi Row Garu.
14.	Sangamvalasa	Do	Sahib Meharban-i-Dostan Sangamvalasa Zemindar Mrat-yunjaya Nissankulu Bahadur Garu.
15.	Shermuhammadpuram	Do	Shermuhammadpuram, Proprietrix Sri Ankitam Atchai-yamma Garu.
16.	Kasimkota	Do	Kasimkota, &c., Proprietrix Marella Venkata Maha Laksh-mamma Garu.
17.	Paltair	Do	M. R. Ry. Zemindar Garu of Paltair
18.	Nidadavole	Godavery	Tahavar va jalalat Dastagaha Rani Papamma Row Bahadur Zemindar of Nidadavole, Circar Mustafanagar and Ellore, &c Sa Jamahu.
19	Tyajampudi	Do	Zubdatal Yekaran Raja Vellanki Peda Venkata Krishna Rau, Proprietor Tyajampudi, Ba-aufiat Bashand.
20.	Polavaram	Do	Sri Kotcharlakota Ramachendra Venkata Krishna Rau Garu, Proprietor, Polavaram.
21.	Konitivada	Do	Zubdatal Yekaran Paduri Sri Ramachendra Jagannada Rau, Proprietor Konitivada, Ba-aufiat Bashand.
22.	Kerlampudi	Do	Sri Raja Rau Buchchi Sitayya Inuganti Venkayyamma Garu, Sri Inuganti Venkata Rajagopala Bachi Jammiah Garu, Proprietrices, Mutta Kerlampudi.
23.	Devarakota	Kistna	Zabdatal Yakaran, Srimanta, Raja Yarlagadda Malli-karjuna Prasada Nayudu, Bahadur, Zemindar, Pargana Devarakota, Ba-aufiat Bashand.
24.	Weyyur Pargana	Do	Tahavvur Va jalalat Dastugaha Raja Rangiah Appa Rau Bahadur, Zemindar of Muramma Mutta, Salla-mahu.
25.	Chintalapati Vontu	Do	Shahamat Martabat Va Ali Manzilat Raja Vasi-reddi Umamaheswara Prasad, Nayudu Bahadur, Zemindar of Chintalapati Vontu, Salla-Mahullah-hutalah.

List of the members of the Madras Landholders' Association — (Continued).

No.	Name of Estate	Name of District	Full title or Form of Address in English.
26	Gannavaram Mutta	Kistna	Tahavour-va-jalalat Dastugaha Raja Varadaraja Appa Rao Bahadur, Zemindar of Gannavaram Mutta, Sallamahu.
27.	Vallur Samut	Do	Zubdatal Yakaran Raja Bommadevara Venkata Narasimha Nayudu Bahadur, Zemindar of Vallur, &c., Ba-aufiat Bashand.
28	Musunur Mutta	Do	Tahavour-va-jalalat Dastugaha Raja Ramachandra Apparow Bahadur, Zemindar of Musunma Mutta, Sallamahu.
29.	Mailavaram Mutta	Do	Zubdatal Yakaran Raja Suraneni Lakshmi Venkamma Row Bahadur, Zemindar, Paragana Mailavaram, Ba-aufiat Bashand.
30.	Venkatagiri	Nellore	Raja Sahib Mushafak Meharban Kharamfarmaya Mukhlisan Umda-e-Raja Raje, The Honorable Velugoti Sri Raja Gopala Krishna Yachendrulavaru Bahadur, K.C.I.E., Pancha Hazar Munsubdar. President
31.	... ...	Do	H. H. Sri Rajah Muthukrishna Yachendrula Varu
32.	Mutyalapadu	Do	Tahavour-va-jalalat Dastagaha Raja Venkata Narasimha Bhupala Bhale Raw, Zemindar, Taluk Mutyalapadu, Ba-aufiat Bashand.
33.	Buchireddipoliem	Do	M. R. Ry. Zemindar Garu of Buchireddipoliem.
34.	Kalahasti	North Arcot	Rajà Sahib Mushafak Meharban Tavajjah Guster-i-Mukhlisan Salamahulla Hutalah Bade Ishtiyaki Sami Malakhati Massarrath Azat Mashakud-i-Kater-i-Eklas Mazahar Muhardananda Darozam. A Vice-President
35.	Karakambadipoliem	Do	M. R. Ry. Zemindar Garu of Karakambadipoliem.
36.	Karvetnuggur	Do	Rajah Sahib Meharban Tavajjah Gusher-i-Mukhlisan Salamahulla Huttalah Bade Sharhi Shoki Mulakhat-i-Massarrath Azat Mushakud-i-Kater-i-Eklas Mazahar Muhardananda Darozam.
37.	... ...	Do	M. R. Ry. Krishna Doss Balamukunda Doss Avergal. (Lessee).
38.	Punganur	Do	Sahib Mushfak Méharbán Karamfarmáyé Dostan Rajé Sugatur Yimmidi Sankara Royel Yesovantti Bahádur Samastanam Panganúr Sahibja Sallamahullah Hutalah, C.I.E.

List of the Members of the Madras Landholders' Association—(Continued).

No.	Name of Estates	Name of Districts	Full title or Form of Address in English.
39.	Kangundi …	North Arcot	Sahib Meharbani-Doston Kamminayani Subbaraju Nai-navaru Nayudu Samastanam-i-Kangundi Sallamahu.
40.	Bungaripoliem	Do	Meharbani Dostan Polegar Seshama Nayudu Bungaripoliyan Sallamahu.
41.	Naraganipoliem	Do	Mr P. V. Ramasawmy Raju, B.A., Barrister-at-law (Secee).
42.	Kallur Poliem	Do	M. R. Ry. Zemindar Garu of Kallur Poliem.
43.	Ekattur	Chinglepet	Raja Sir Savalai Ramasawmy Mudaliar, Kt., C.I.E.
44.	Tiruvur	Do	Raja Venkata Gopala Rau Garu.
45.	… … … …	Do	M. R. Ry. Muthiya Mudaliar Avergal.
46.	Sunambattu	Do	M. R. Ry. C. Muthukumarasawmy Mudaliar Avergal, B.A.
47.	Seyyur	Do	Reg. the Hony Secretaries [illegible] M. R. Ry. K. Tyagaraja Vaidyanatha Mudaliar and three others.
48.	Kayapakkan	Do	Do Muttu Kumarappa Reddiar
49.	Panaiyur	Do	Do Kullappa Mudaliar and Arumuga Mudaliar
50.	Pallavaram	Do	Rai Raja Eswara Doss Dayavanta Bahadur.
51.	Sembedu … …	Do	M. R. Ry. P. Rungiah Nayudu.
52.	Manali	Do	M. R. Ry. Chinna Kesavaraya Mudaliar Avergal.
53.	Nallathoor	Do	M. R. Ry. Shunmuga Roya Mudaliar Avergal.
54.	Arambakkam	Do	M. R. Ry. Vedachala Mudaliar and two others.
55	Kottur	Do	A. Ismail Sahib and A. Abdulla Sahib
56	… …	Do	Nawbob Mahamed Mahmood Khan Bahadur
57	Soranjeri	Do	M.R.Ry. V. Somayaji Krishnama Charyar
58	Vayalur	Do	M.R.Ry. Lakshmi Narasimha Reddiar
59	Endattur	Do	M.R.Ry. Venkata Varadarajulu Naidu & two others
60	Anaikkattu	Do	M.R.Ry. C. Damodara Mud. & C.E. Arunagiri Mud.
61	Pavunjur	Do	M.R.Ry. Virasawmi Reddiar
62	Athipet	Do	M.R.Ry. P. Theagaroya Chettiar B.A
63	Markhanam	South Arcot	M.R.Ry. Nachiappa Mud. aoft or Appadurai Mud. aoft
64	Chennappa Naicken-poliem	Do.	M.R.Ry. Sankanah Naidu
65	~~Vettavalam~~	Do	M.R.Ry. Arunachella Vasanta Krishna Vanadaraya
6			~~Sankkaraiya Bhandariyar.~~
66	Tiruvavoodaithurai	Tanjore	Maha Sannidhanam of Pandara Sannadi of Tiruvavoodaithurai Mutt
67	Dharmapuram	Do.	— do — do. Dharmapuram Mutt.
68	Tirupanandal	Do.	Do — do Thumbiranswamy of Tirupanandal Mutt.

of the members of the Madras Landholders Association (continued).

No.	Name of Estates	Name of District	Full Title or form of Address in English
69	Sankara Chariar Mutt	Tanjore	~~His Holiness~~ Sankara Chariar Mutt.
70.	~~Kollakotai~~	Do.	M.R.Ry. Vijaya Ragunatha Rangasawmi Singappuliyar
71	~~Taunikadam~~	Do.	~~M.R.Ry. Swasawmi Oodyar avl. Mirasidar & Shrotriemdar~~
72	~~Puadi~~	Do.	~~M.R.Ry. A. S. Appasawmi Vandyar avl. Mirasidar~~
73	Pappanadu	Do.	~~M.R.Ry. Swaminatha Vijayastevar avl. Zemindar~~
74	Udaiyarpalaiyam	Trichinopoly	May Kachi-Uva-Rangappa-Kalakka-Tola Udaiyar, the distinguished Zemindar of Udaiyarpalaiyam and who is equally respected as ourselves, live in happiness.
75.	Kattuputtur	Do.	M.R.Ry. Mirasi Milladar of Kattuputtur
76	Ariyalur	Do.	M.R.Ry. Kodiyalam Vasudeva Iyengar avl. Mirasidar and Milladar
77	~~Turaiyur~~	Do.	May Prasanna-Venkatachella Reddiar, the distinguished Zemindar of Turaiyur & who is equally respected as ourselves, live in happiness.
78	Ariyalur Pohem	Trichinopoly	M.R.Ry. Mandavaroya Pillai, Mirasidar
79.	Namakal	Salem	~~M.R.Ry. Muthialammal avl. Zemindarni of Namakal~~
80	Salem	do.	Mrs Jessie Fowlkes, Zemindarni of Salem
81	~~Irakkupatti~~	Do.	~~M.R.Ry. Venkata Chariar avl.~~
82	do.	do.	~~M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Aiyangar~~
83	~~Putthoor~~	do.	~~M.R.Ry. Raya Gounder, Zemindar avl.~~
84	Ramnad	Madura	M.R.Ry. Bhaskaraswami Sethupati avl. Zemindar of Ramnad. A Vice President
85	Sivaganga	do.	M.R.Ry. Periya Swami alias Udayana Tevar avl. ~~Zemindar of Sivaganga~~
86.	do.	do.	Messrs Orr, Shanack and Ryan (~~Lessees~~).
87	Kannivadi	do.	M.R.Ry. Appayaswami Nayakker avl. Zemindar ~~of Kannivadi~~
88	~~Vellur~~	do.	~~M.R.Ry. Perumall Nayakkar avl. Zemindar of Vellur~~
89	~~Ammayanayakkanur~~	do.	~~M.R.Ry. Bommachchi Nayakkar avergal~~ Zemindar of Ammaya Nayakkanur
90	~~Peraiyur~~	do.	~~M.R.Ry. Nagaiyaswami Tumbichchi Nayakkar~~ avergal, Zemindar of Peraiyur.

List of the Members of the Madras Landholders' Association - (Continued).

No.	Name of Estates	Name of Districts	Full title or Form of Address in English.
91.	Bodinayakkanur	Madura	M. R. Ry. Kamulu Ammal Avergal, Zemindarni of Bodinayakanur.
92.	Gandamanayakkanur	Do	M. R. Ry. Tirumalai Gandama Kondala Nagayya Ramakrishnaswami Nayakkar Avergal, Zemindar of Gandamanayakkanur.
93.	Uttappanaikanoor	Do	M. R. Ry. Tirumalai Muttu Linga Thumbaya Velliyaswami Uttappa Nayakkanoor Avergal. Zemindar of Uttappa Nayyakkanur.
94	Sundaiyur	Do	M. R. Ry. Kuppaiyaswami Kulappa Nayakkar Avergal Zemindar of Sandaiyur.
95.	Doddappa-Nayakanoor	Do	M. R. Ry. Kadiraswami Nayakar, Avergal, Zemindar of Doddappa-Nayakkanur.
96.	Tiruguana Sambanda Mutt	Do	Maha Sannidhanam of Rai Bahadur Pandara Sannadi of Tiruguana Sambanda Mutt.
97.	Vadugapatti	Do	M. R. Ry. Srinivasa Aambiah Hakkadar of Vadagapatti.
98.	Sivagiri	Tinnevelly	M. R. Ry. Z[illegible]dar Avergal of Sivagiri
99.	Settur	Do	M. R. Ry. Do Do of Settur
100	Urkadu	Do	M. R. Ry. Do Do of Urkadu.
101	Singampatti	Do	M. R. Ry. Do Do of Singampatti
102	Attangarai	Do	M. R. Ry. Do Do of Attangarai
103.	Sevvalpatti	Do	M. R. Ry Do Do of Sevvalpatti.
104.	Ilavarasanandal P. I.	Do	M. R. Ry. Zemindar Avergal
105	Do Part II.	Do	Do
106	Aynar-Nagaram	Do	M. R. Ry. Mittadar Avergal
107.	Kollapatti	Do	M. R. Ry. Zemindar Avergal of Kollapatti
108.	Vanamamalai	Do	Maha Sannidhanam of the Jeer of Vanamamalai Matt
109.	... ...	Malabar	Manavaknamen Erlapand Raja
110	... ...	Bellary	Hon'ble A. Sabapathy Mudaliar
111-	... ...	South Adyar Madras	Mr. Syed Mahammed Sahib Bahadur.

14-8-33

S. Bavanandam Pillai
Inspector of Police
A III

List of the ~~Ex~~ Members of the Landholders' Association Madras —

Note for the Under Secretary Leg: Dept.

District.	Number of Zamindaris &c
North Arcot.	15.
South Arcot.	4.
Bellary	1.
Chingleput.	217.
Coimbatore	13.
Ganjam.	65 {Ancient Zemindaris — 18 (Principal Divns — 10) {Pry. Estates — 47 (Principal Divns — 6)
Godavari.	101, Proprietary Estates — (6 sub-divisions) }
Kistna	45.
Madura.	30. [24 Palayapattus].
Malabar.	119. {Zemindar — 1. Raja receiving malikhana — 1. Palaiyapattus — 46 (5 Sub-divns). Jannis receiving malikhana (4 sub-divns.) 24 other leading Jannis — 47 (1 Sub-divn.)
Nellore	4.
Salem	177
Tanjore.	14.
Tinnevelly Dt.	69. (Mittas — 48) (4 subdivisions — 3 of Mittas)
Trichinopoly	6
Vizagapatam.	58 (Prty. Estates — 44)
Total	938

Note containing information obtained regarding

(i) The comparative importance of the Zamindari of Vizianagram as compared with other Zamindaries.

(ii) The nature of the famine relief work performed by the Zamindars of Venkatagiri, Kalahasti & Karvetnagar

(iii) The exact constitution of the Landholders' Assocn.

D
15.8.95

Code Class. D.S. INDIAN TELEGRAPHS Monthly Number. /383

To (Office) Ootacamund From (Office) Madras Triplicane

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instructions.
29/17	22	19	16	D.S.

To (Person) Madras Revenue From (Person) Board Settlement

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
23 AUG 95
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Boards telegram 17th. Expenditure works podili 132150 and darsi 1345 gratuitous relief podili 383 darsi nil proceedings follows.

132,150
1,045
383
133,878

figs reptd

132,150
1,345
133,495
383
133,878

Recd. from ... LN. Sent to ... LN.

At ... Hrs. ... Mts. by ... Hrs. ... Mts. by ... Telegraph Master.

OOTACAMUND 22-8-95

82 Word Form.

F.C 1.

C. G. P.—No. 28 T—25-5-94—40,00,000

E

Note.

With reference to the draft letters to the Govt. of India on Leg: Comments
I. No. 104 &
II. Nos: 102 & 107.

I.

The addition made in the margin ~~of~~ at page 12 of the draft letter is a correct statement of the case (vide the penultimate sentence[a] of para. 145 at page ~~40~~ 35 of the Coll's general report in the file of reports with G.O. of 4.5.95 No. 302 - 302A).

2. The case can be put even more strongly by adding to the effect that even the amount actually expended did not really benefit the poor and the wealthy as the works were carried out on the

[a] This and the sentence preceding it are extracted below

"The Rajah of Venkatagiri carried out some irrigation repairs in Darsi & Podili. On 23rd Aug. 1892 and again on the 11th Decr. 1892, I called for a return from Venkatagiri which would have shown the expenditure on these works in 1892, but the return was not furnished".

the contract system and the Collr. found when he inspected them that the labourers actually working were strong healthy people, mostly professional tank-diggers and that ordinary coolies complained that the works were not suited to their capacities and that they could not earn a living by attending them. (vide para. 3 at page 4 of G.O. of 12-5-92 No. 482 and the closing sentence of para. 145 of the Collr's general report quoted in para. 1 (supra).

3. As to the first part of the sentence of the draft, which runs as follows:

"Against this expenditure, the Zemindar made an allotment of Rs 13,400 early in 1892, that is to say, nearly a year after the commencement of the dis-

distress ---"

attention is invited to the following points.

(1) The Venkatagiri Zemindari comprises the divisions or Taluks of

		area in sq. miles
[A]	Venkatagiri	456
	Polur	442
		898

in the South and of

[B]	Darsi	588
	Podili	631
		1,219

in the North and portions of certain Govt. taluks.

[A] was the area in which along with the (Govt) taluks in the South of the district, distress was felt in 1891; but the distress there was never severe, and although certain relief works were started in those areas in July 1891 and were attended by coolies from [A] the number was never large(x) and the total expenditure incurred on

(x) No. relieved on works.

1891.	(from Venkatagiri & Polur)	Total for the Dist.
July.	63	398
Aug.	464	2,502
Sep.	728	3,885
Oct.	627	3,916
Novr.	16	1,030
Decr.	..	1,153.

on their account was only Rs 2,327;(x)

Whereas,

[B] and the Govt. taluks of Udayagiri, Kanigiri and Ongole, in the north began to suffer after the failure of the N-E. Monsoon of 1891-92, which ushered in the second period of distress in the district. It was during this period that larger measures of relief were undertaken, the distress being most severe in [B] the coolies belonging to it numbering about 15000# in one month and the total expenditure incurred by Govt. on their account amounting to Rs 133,845, as against only Rs 2,327 expended in A ~~[illegible]~~ during the first period of distress.

(2) Another point to which attention is invited is the fact that

(x) The foll. information has been obtained ~~by~~ from the Bd. (~~[illegible]~~ vide Rev. C. No. 5975/95-)

	Amt. on gratuitous relief Rs.	spent on works Rs.	Total Rs.
Venkatagiri & Polur	..	2.327	2.327
Darsi & Podili	.. 383 351	133.494 (5)	133.845 (x)
	351 383	135.827	136.172

x revised fig. 133,878

[illegible]

Nos: relieved on works.

#	in Darsi & Podili	in the whole dist. excluding [illegible]
1	2	3
1893		
Jany.	1,615	5,871
Feby.	1,760	3.753
Mar.	2,505	5,688
April	3,606	6.644
May	7.281	11.107
June	14,759	22,744
July	10.535	16.723
Aug	1.991	2,876
Sept	..	..

that the allotment of Rs 13,400 and the expenditure of Rs 3,600 referred to in the draft letter, appertain only to [B], while

(3) As regards [A], it will be noted that the Zamindar wrote as follows in his letter(x) of 24-1-92 read in B.P. 30-1-92/1072 in G.O. 8-2-92/756 Rev.:

"Neither the Govt. nor the District Bd. relieved last year people of their distress in my southern taluks to any appreciable extent, and I have had to spend between 30 and 40 thousand of Rupees upon irrigation and other works to afford relief to the poor" (last clause para. 4-5 of his letter).

Beyond the Zamindari statement quoted above, there is nothing to show what amount was act-

(x) This is the letter from which the above quoted figures (viz. 13,400 & 3,600) are taken and to which reference is made in the bottom sentence at page 12 of the draft letter.

actually spent by him: but in the closing sentence of para. 30 of the Colr's General report in the file with G.O. $\frac{4.5.94}{302-302A}$ the Collr. has stated as follows

"It is to be added that the Rajah of Venkatagiri carried out the usual season repairs to his irrigation works in Polur and Venkatagiri Divisions and in the Zemindari portion of Gudur taluk, and it is believed he did so to much more than the usual extent".

In these circumstances it is submitted for consideration whether this portion of the draft letter may be put in a slightly modified form as shown in pencil.

II.

II. (Draft on C. Nos 102 & 107).

—

(1) The word 'even' inserted ~~at~~ in line 1, page 5 of the draft may, it is thought, be omitted, as what is meant to be stated appears to be that if the three Zemindars are right in their contension that the Govt. has no control over the emoluments of the village officers in their estates, it is open to them to get this established in a Court of law and thus escape the operation of the Act (III of '95). — *vide* sec 3, the definition of Emoluments in sec. 4 and the proviso to sec. 21 of the Act.

Quite so.

This appears to be also the meaning intended by the Hon. Mr. Gibson in his speech in introducing the Bill, in which he remarked as foll-

follows

"And if, in any particular case, this was not done,(a) I may point out that by section 3 and by the definition of emoluments in sec. 4 of the Bill, village offices, to which emoluments are not annexed(b) by the State, would not fall within the scope of the Bill." (page 51 of the Pro. of the Leg. C.)

(a) that is, village service inams were not excluded from the assets of the Permanent Sett.

(b) The wording has been slightly amended in the Act.

(2) In the last sentence but one at page 4 of the draft, reference may be made also to letter to India No. 31 of 26.2.94.

(3) May it not be stated (vide first sentence of para. 2 of the draft) that the memorials relate to the Madras Hereditary Village Offices Act III of 1895, instead of to the Bill

R.V.L.
19/8.

L.G. 19/8

To the Secretary of State

Appeal against the Madras Proprietary Estates ~~Bill~~ Village Service Act from the Madras Landholders Association

d/ 24 April 1895

For orders.

The position shd. be explained as below. W. H. 25/6

The Landholders Association prays that ~~the Secretary of State~~ "Her "Majesty's Govt. will exercise its power "of repealing the act according to section "XXI of the Indian Councils Act".

2. Section XXI (21) of the act applies to a different case vizt. that of Bills initiated in the Governor General's Council.

Section 41 is the corresponding section relating to bills brought forward in the Bombay or Madras Legislative Council. —

It is to be noted that this section does confer on "Her Majesty's Govt." the power of "repealing the Act" - but merely the power of disallowing it at the time when an authentic copy is transmitted to the Secretary of State. In this case such power was not exercised — G.O. d/ August 1894 No. 97 contains a copy the Secretary of State's despatch sta that the act has been considered Council & will be left to its oper

It would be as well to point out again the constitution of the Landholders' Assn. I think 91 individuals out of the 910 in the Presidency.

Then again it would be very useful if we could send up the statement of the amount expended by Govt. during 1891-92 in the different Zemindaries — I cannot recall any beyond Kalahasti and Venkatagiri & Punganur at this moment — but they would I think be sufficient: we should also show the numbers relieved and attention should be drawn to the fact that in spite of constant enquiry by the Collector — urged on by Govt. we never could get from the Zemindar of Venkatagiri or his Dewan *any particulars whatever* as to what he was doing in the way of affording relief to his tenants. (This must be verified — there was much correspondence at the time on the subject) Certainly when I was in his district I never could find any relief works but those of Govt. There has been a great deal too much loose talk among these gentlemen of how much they do in times of distress — &

2. The memorial cannot however be with-held & must with refce to Memorial Rules A.IV be forwarded with a "covering letter containing a full statement of facts and an expression of opinion"

3. The ~~pet memorial~~ bound enclosure to the memorial is a duplicate of that which accompanied their petition to the Govt. of India – transmitted with remarks in G.O. of 26 February 1894 No. 30 – Except for the addition of items 4, 5, 18, 20, 22 and 23 – as shown in the table of contents. None of these contain any ~~matter~~ material facts which ~~was~~ were not before the Govt. of India at the time when the Bill was under consideration. – It will suffice therefore to discuss the petition itself apart from ts enclosures.

The memorialists base their protest on the following grounds:

(i) Undue haste and irregularity of procedure in passing and sanctioning the Bill

vide. paras 1 & 2 of memorial
paras 5 & 6 of petn. to India

So far as this Govt. is concerned this charge has been completely answered in paras 5 & 6. of the letter to India (G.O. $\frac{30}{26.2.94}$)

It is for the Govt. of India to refute the llegation that there was undue haste in nctioning the Bill on the part of the Supreme× ouncil

(ii) Karnams and other village officers in proprietary estates are not servants of the state there is no need to make them such

vide paras 2 to 7 of memorial
para. 7(1) of petn. to India to 9.(3)

This question was briefly raised in para. 9(1) of petn. to India – and answered in paras 8 and 9 of the letter of this Govt (G.O. $\frac{30}{26.2.94}$) –. The arguments are now set out at length by memorialists, but it is submitted, call for no further reply – particularly at the

W

It should be stopped – and they must be shown up in their proper colours. In '92 there was the likelihood of great trouble in Nellore & especially the Venkatagiri Zemdr. & for all the information we could get thousands might have died, & I believe many would have, but for Govt. interference. Kalahasti did absolutely nothing – & did not pretend to – but this Venkatagiri fellow protests too much, & he must be shown up. Let the office see to this. The rest of the reply as the note says can well be furnished out of the previous G.O's and the First Assistant's note on the 1799 business. This might be served up hot. It is monstrous their making the allegation they do. They must be jumped on. Treat these papers as urgent. Mr. Fowler had better finish these things. W

15 June

Yes W

At the time of the Great Famine the present zemindar's father resigned in favour of his son for fear he shd be dispossessed of his whole estate see numerous reports

JG 25/6

× It is the Govr. Genl. who assents, not the G.G. in C. The arguments as to the time reqd. by the Members of the "Viceregal Council" to "ponder" are therefore irrelevant

JG 11/6

(The Govr. Genl. wd. be advised by the Depts. concerned)

---

para 8 of memorial

(iii) The subordination of Karnams to the State and the proprietor proved a failure in Bengal

The argument does not apply to Madras – where ~~joint~~ part subordination to the State has not proved a complete failure

W

para. 10 of memorial

(iv) The substitution of money payments for inams in this Presidency proved a failure & had to be discontinued early in the century

Money payments have been in force now for 30 years i.e. since the Village Cess Act of 1864 & have proved a success.

W

para. 11 of memorial
para 3 of petn. to India

(v) The Bill was opposed by Collectors

This is answered in para. 3 of the letter to India (G.O. $\frac{30}{26.2.94}$)

W

para 12 of memorial
para 9(4) of petn. to India

(vi) The Act is a violation of the permanent settlement

This is remarked on in para. 10 of the letter to India (G.O. $\frac{30}{26.2.94}$) – and in para 4(4) of G.O. $\frac{31}{9.4.95}$ which points out that the terms of a permanent sanad cannot over-ride the provisions of Regulation XXV of 1802

W

(vii) The Act assumes that village service inams were excluded ~~from in the calculations~~ from the assets in the calculation of peshcash when they were in fact included

This is dealt with briefly in para 4(1) of G.O. $\frac{31}{9.4.95}$ – and at length in the accompanying note by the Revenue First Assistant which shews conclusively that the memorialists are altogether wrong in their assumption & that the Hon. Mr Gibson was right. Further it is to be noted that section 27(3) of the Act provides for a reduction of peshcash in those rare cases where services inams were included in the assets

5. It is submitted that in the foregoing arguments there is nothing material

has not already been and in the consider-ation of the Govt. of India except the arguments on the last point vii, & that it will suffice to forward this petn with a remark to that effect, & a ~~few~~ brief addition pointing out the error into which the memorialists have fallen regarding the orders passed on Mr. Stuart's Settlement Report, & the remark that section 21 of the Indian Councils Act does not apply

D
30-5-95. 1/6/95

This Landholders Association Rajah of Vencapherry & his Dewan & Paul Pillay are a persistent nuisance & will not take no for an answer. This appears to be about the last card that they can play

1/6

It would be as well too to point out that whatever may be said about the Maharajah of V'apuram the Landholder's representative in the Leg. Council, the Bill protested against affects him very much more than almost any other single Zemindar in the Presidency, verify this - but anyhow if this is not correct it should be shown what his position is. - acreage - population - peishcush - and that his loyal acceptance of the Bill is eminently significant.

13 June

Memorial regarding the Proprietary Estates Village Service Act

H. E. & Co.

thro the (Revenue Secretary) for Govnt.

104

C 14/6 Ship C 17/6
R 17/6 R 25/6

---

181. The Maniums stand in accounts as follows:-

		guntahs - a	chuckrams - fs - a
Wooliga	Tursey	3,289 - 11¼	1,556 - 8 - 13¼
	cultivated	24,827 - "	13,200 - 1 - 14½
	Total	28,116 - 11¼	14,754 - " - 11¾

Hence the increase of cultivation could only extend to the value of the land at present waste, and even that might not produce the estimated value in the expiration of three years, and ultimately be less profitable to him, than had he cultivated so much of the Ain Tursey.

In discussing the Surveyor Barcez statement I shall show that its direct union with the Ain would be but little profit, if not a positive loss to the proprietor.

182. The chiller Enaums proposed to be added to the Zemindary stand thus in accounts.

		guntahs - a	chuckrams - fs - a
chiller	Tursey	517 - ¾	277 - 2 - 6
	cultivated	784 - 12¾	451 - 9 - 10¾
	Total	1301 - 13½	729 - 2 - ¾

The present value or what it might be made in its most extended form, is almost too trifling to reason upon and whether added to the Jumma

or

has not of
it will make little difference in the rent of the Zemindars.

183. The Cannelly of Dindigal to be assumed and added to the Zemindaries is as follows.

		Guntas – as	Chuckarams – fo – a
Cannelly	Survey	1,256 – 1/4	816 – 6 – 9
	cultivated	2,406 – 8 1/2	3000 – 8 – 10 1/4
	Total	3,362 – 8 3/4	3817 – 5 3/4

This general abstract which includes all the Cannelly lands, as well those with the Poligars as well those belonging to the sequestered and forfeited Pollioms shows the value of what it is and to what it may be extended in the Zemindaries to which it is attached.

---

239. Hence my reason for preferring the average of the Cowle from the Survey to that of the three last years in proposing the permanent Jumma, and although it may be said, that the full x rents have been collected on the first set of Zemindaries and that thence the adverting of the average will be x in favor of the two last sets. I would suppose the rate of reduction on each in the first set from the full rent, would be sufficiently satisfactory to the Zemindar, and place him on terms of equality with those, whose rents (viz. in second andx third sets) had not been fully collected that is to the extent of the Cowle.

240. The average on the Cowle for three years being taken gives a reduction of 10 12/16 per cent on the Jumma of fusly 1214 or Star Pagodas 13196 - 28 - 72 this reduction is made in proportion on the average of each Zemindari respectively taken hence the different rates of reduction on each.

241. This diminution leaves as the aggregate permanent Jumma for the Ain Sircar lands 118,118 - X30- 20 and this sum although 10 12/16 per cent below the ultimate beriz of 1214, is an increasex above the general average of 91181 Star Pags. 42 f. 52 Ch. equal to 29 8 1/2 per cent and above the average of the years 1206, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, under the present management 36 7 3/4 per cent and above the first six years viz. 1200 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 - 99 1/4 per cent.

242. To the total thus made is to be added the Village Sibbendy Mauniams and assumed Inams according to references, - this total 10,101 S. Pags. -16 f. - 57 C. added to the permanent Jumma on the Ain Sirkar Land, gives 128,220 S. Pags.- 6 f. - 77C equalling a diminution of the settled Jumma for fusly 1214 of - 2 - 5 12/16 per cent. in the aggregate.

243. The total for Permanency may be subject to discussion, and although the Mauniams are directed to be added by the orders of the Board of Revenue, it may perhaps be expedient to make the settlement without this addition.

246. This ultimate rent is to the extent in value of the land on which it is assessed, hence further benefit from this - land cannot be expected; the fact is then obvious that the Zemin-dar, if in addition to this rent the Sibbendy and assumed Enaums be annexed for the benefit of Government by averaging their -- value in the value of the Ain Sirkar lands, can derive no advantage from these lands in Cowle sufficient to establish the inter mediate security for the rents of the country which Government require.

5

247. Hence in the sale of the Estates little immediate benefit could arise to the Sirkar and the speculator could purchase no certain advantages direct, neither could he calculate on any but by extended cultivation, which the disbursement of his capital in purchasing proprietary right would in all probability prevent.

248. It therefore occurred to me better to submit a reduction to your Board on the ultimate Jumma, previous to adding the Enaums than risk the loss of such advantages as permanency with vigilance might bring into the Country and convinced that the assessment laid on the lands giving the revenue for fusly 1214 was to its extent just - I thought it better to afford the difference, in the many zemindaries the several averages give to the Zemindar, which would enable him to pay in proportion for his right. than apparently to check the sales by keeping the ultimate rent with the addition of the Enaums on all.

250. The addition of the Sibbendy Mauniams and assumed Enaums to the ultimate rent of 1214 though answered by the land giving the rated value, would have been cause of greater probable failure in sales and probable ultimate failure in rent because the expenses of these Sibbendy would fall on the Zemindar, without the means of paying it - I therefore made the reduction in account equal to the average of the Cowles as before noted previously to adding the Sibbendy &c. Enaums assumed.

251. The reduction from the ultimate Jumma of fusly 1214 being made leaves as the

	S. pags.	f.	C.
Permanent Jumma - - - - - - - - -	118118 -	30-	20
To which addSibbendy &c. assumed Enaum - -	10101 -	15-	57
The total is - - -	128220 -	0-	77

being in the total 3095 - 13 -/5 or 2 5 11/16 per cent. less -- than the Bareez settled for fusly 1214, the Sonardyem 1444 -24-3 4 is not added in either side and therefore does not affect either

252. A reference to the Centage in some few Zemindaries will show a considerable disadvantage to them and but little advantage to others; this however arises from the greater proporti on of Enaum land in those Zemindaries than in others; the whole -- sum absolutely reduced viz. 3095 - 13 - 15 is however submitted as too small for compensation of the Sibbendy the Zemindars must employ.

253. To suggest that all village mauniams should stand as they are free from the Sirkar lands, but controllable by the Zemindar and that the rents should remain as settled would xxxxx appear to militate against orders , but in every respect it occurs to me as what will be more productive to Revenue, more easy to be understood by Sirkar servants and more satisfactory to -- the inhabitants my sole reason for proposing reduction arose fxx from the orders to add the Sibbendy &c. to the benefit of the --

Sirkar

Sirkar which if done would not give the Zemindar any means of even probable advantage in the first instance, and would as previously observed check the sales in the disposal of the Zemindaries.

254. My meaning is that what now constitute the Village Mauniams should as they are be the property of the Zemindar and under his control his vigilance may reduce the expense and that reduction may indemnify him on the present assessment of the -- Estates until the extended cultivation makes it profitable, and under this impression I respectfully submit that the Estates be held as the ultimate Jumma viz. for 1214 declares them , or as they progressively fall by Cowle from 1212 to that period and ~~th~~ that the Sibbendy &c. be given up as they are in indemnification to the purchaser.

Extent and value of Enam lands & amount of Sornadayem.

25. Previously to stating the permanent assessment proposed for the several Zemindaries, we shall notice the extent and value of the Enams or free gift lands, and the revenue - derived from the Sornadayem or collections in ready money distinguishing those which ought to be abolished and such as --- should continue to be paid to the Zemindars.

26. The total extent of Enam land in the district is Cawnies 29,790 8 1/4 valued at Star Pagodas 21,689- 41- 19 from which should be deducted Cawnies 10,003 8 1/3 at present waste calculated to be capable of producing a Revenue of Star Pagodas 5439 - 20 - 33 leaving the Enam land at present under cultivation Cawnies 19,786 15 1/2 assessed at Star Pagodas 16,241 - 20 - 60.

27. Referring to the 15th. Paragraph of the Board's Circular instructions to the Collectors for the formation of the permanent settlement, which directs '' that the permanent settlement is to be fixed exclusive of all existing alienated lands whether exempt from the payment of public revenue with- or without due authority, the Village Mauniams or lands held by private and public servants in lieu of wages excepted - the whole of which are to be considered annexed to the Sircar land and declared responsible for the public revenue assessed on the Zemindary'' the Collector has proposed that of the total extent of Enam lands above noticed 46 7 1/16 per cent or Cawnies

9

Cawnies 14,505 13 1/2 be resumed and 51 8 9/16 per cent. or Cawnies 15,284 10 1/2 permitted to remain with the present possessors, the extent and value of the uncultivated land proposed to be resumed is as follows:--

Extent & value of Enam lands proposed to be resumed.

Extent of uncultivated land	Cawnies 2200 1/2	value	1606-23-73
Extent of cultivated land	,, 12305 13	value	10092-33-34
Total	14505 13 1/2		11699-12-27

and that the Enamdars retain possession of

Extent and value of Enam lands -- proposed to be continued.

Uncultivated land	7803 8 1/4	value	3832-46-40.
and of cultivated land	7481 2 1/4	value	6157-32-32.
Total	15284 10 1/2		9990-28-72.

from this amount however the Enamdars pay to the Sircar a quit rent denominated Pooropo, which has been included by the Collector in the Sornadayem receivable by the Zemindars.

28. A reference to the Collectors statements will exhibit in detail the Enams which are proposed to be added to ~~th~~ the Sircar lands and those recommended to be continued, the -- former consist principally of the Wortega Enam or the allowance set apart to compensate the services of the village Sibbendy the Chillery Enam or donations to Dancing girls, Poets, Musicians &c. and of alienations made by the Poligars for the Cauvelly , the Enams proposed to be continued are either such as were granted for the support of religious establishments or such as ~~xxx~~ attention to the prejudices of the natives has induced the Collector to give up; they consist of the Devadayam, Bramadayam and some few of the Chillery Enams.

29. With respect to that portion of the resumed Enams which was appropriated to the support of the village Sibbendy the Collector has remarked that he was induced to propose -- their resumption merely in compliance with the orders of the Board referred to above, for that in his own opinion they -- ought to be continued as at present, observing that, as the xb Sibbendy in question must be supported by the Zemindars, the x addition of their allowances at present enjoyed by them, would absorb the whole of the immediate profit allowed to the Proprietors whose profit could arise only from the increase of cultivation and would check the sale of the Estates.

30. The orders of the Board of Revenue referred to Mr. Hurdis, do not direct that the service lands should be resumed but that they should be annexed to the sircar lands and in like manner with those of the latter description be at the disposal of the Proprietor for the payment of the village sibbendy: by this interpretation of the 15th. para of the general instructions we have been guided in the reports which have -- been submitted to your Lordship's consideration it being the lands of Cauzies and Government Revenue Officers, Curnams excepted, which are to be added to the Jumma and these persons x to be provided for by Government the exemption of the Curnam lands which form part of the village service land confirms the foregoing interpretation as being correct, we have not therefore included the value of resumed Enams in the amount to be paid by the Proprietors of the Estates: the whole extent of Enam land cultivated is but 4 per cent. on the total sircar lands or Star Pagodas 6 3/16 per cent on their value.

40. The permanent jumma recommended for the 40 estates by the Collector amounts to the sum of Star Pagodas 118118-30-20 and is 54 15/16 per cent. above the average of the three years of fusli 1206, 1207, & 1208, 21 15/16 per cent above the average of fusli 1209, 1210 &1211, 7 9/16 per cent below the average - of fusli 1212, 1213 &1214 and, as before remarked 10 12/16 per cent below the survey value of fusly 1214.

41. From the foregoing calculations it appears that the profit allowed to the Proprietors cannot in any point of view be considered ~~a~~ equivalent to the deductions which has been -- allowed in other districts as necessary to secure the punctual discharge of the revenue and to afford an adequate profit to the Proprietors.

Mode of assessment observed - by the Board.

42. Under these considerations we have revised the assessments proposed by Mr. Hurdis, allowing a larger immediate profit to the Proprietor, reducing it however in proportion to the extent of improvable waste lands in each estate, as far as 200 per cent beyond which it is improbable that the waste can be retrieved.

43. In estates where the quantity of uncultivated falls considerably below 100 per cent on the cultivated land we have allowed 18 per cent deduction from the ultimate survey assessment of fusli 1214 as the immediate profit of the proprietor decreasing this per centage in proportion to the cultivable waste to the extent above stated - so that the lowest immediate profit from the estates will be 15 per cent and the average of the whole extent 16 $\frac{14\frac{1}{4}}{16}$ per cent or Star Pags. 109189- but though the permanent jumma here proposed be below the ultimate value of the district as fixed by the survey, yet it is considerably above the average either of the six years following the cession, the six first of the management of the present Collector and the general average for the time the district has been in our possession.

44. The total permanent jumma of the district as above stated is Star Pags. 109189 which together with the amount of the Sornadayem to be collected by the proprietors and the sum of Star Pags.~~XXX~~- 517- 29- 32 to be paid by the shrotriemdars make the total payment to the sircar star Pags. 1111$\overset{9?}{\underline{5}}$1-8- 66: should your Lordship not approve our suggestion of confirming the whole of the allowances to village sibbendy and of the Enams to remain as at present the amount proposed to be resumed by the Collector will be also added to the assessment of the several estates making a total of S. Pags. 121252 -24-43 with respect to the shrotriem quit rent above noticed, the Collector observed that the villages of this description have been measured and assessedin the same manner as those of the

Sircar, and ~~24~~ 3/4 of the total rent fixed as the tribute of the shrotriemdar leaving 1/4 to be enjoyed by him.

G. O. of 24th Oct. 1804

To the President and Members of the Bd. of Rev.

The alienations for the support of of village sibbendy alienated from the calculation of the permanent rent.

§. 4. With respect to the alienations which have been ~~kxxh~~ hitherto appropriated for the support of the village sibbendy and which were under a misapprehension of the general instructions in cluded with the aggregate assets of the Zemindaries, the ~~Board~~ Govr in Council entirely approves ~~the~~ your rejection of them from the amount of the permanent rent.

Approve the reduction of the assessment proposed by the late Collector.

§. 7. The ~~Board~~ Governor in Council observes that the assessment proposed by the late Collector is considered by ~~the Board of Revenue~~ you to be too high in proportion to the full value of the Zemindaries -- and His Lordship in Council entirely approves the principle on which ~~they~~ you have recommended a reduction for the purpose of leaving to the Zemindars such a reasonable profit as may secure them against failure in the discharge of their engagements with adequate means for their ~~x~~ support.

Confirm the settle -ment recommended for the Zemindaries of Dindigul.

§. 8. ~~Resolved~~ The Govr in Council therefore ~~to~~ confirms in perpetuity the settlement which ~~the Board of Revenue~~ you have recommended for the Zemindaries of the province of Dindigul amounting in number to forty.

XXX

This file contains the following Extracts.

I. Mr. Hurdis's Report (dated 16th Feby. 1803) on the Permanent Settlement of Dindigal Polliams.
Paras. 181–183: 239–243: 246–248 & 250–254.

II. Bd.'s Letter to Govt. of 3rd. Septr. 1804, submitting I.
Paras: 25–30 & 40–44

III. Govt. letter to Bd. of 24th Oct. 1804, passing orders on II
Paras: 4, 7 & 8.

Leg. C. No. 104 of '95

Note

The only new matter in the present Memorial seems to be what is contained in pp 13–16 thereof.

2. The statements made in page 13 do not call for remarks.

3. At page 14, the Memorialists quote from the speech of the Honourable Mr. Gibson and proceed to comment thereon: the comments being to the effect that the Honourable Member had misunderstood the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue and the Government of the day in settling the questions raised by Mr. Hurdis

4. The Honourable member, it is submitted, was quite correct in all that he said in regard to Village Service Inams, and it is matter for surprise that the Memorialists should still persist in their error and make statements which are either unwarranted or are calculated to confuse the point in issue.

5 The point in issue ~~was~~ is whether in the case of the Dindigal Poliams reported

This note gives a correct statement of the case –

LG 3/8.

reported on by Mr Hurdis, the village Service Inams were *included* in the assets on which the Peishcush was fixed.

The Honourable Mr Gibson stated [to the following effect:—] that Mr Hurdis – *included* these inams in the assets under the impression that para 15. of the Board's general instructions ~~dated~~ of October 1799[×] directed such inclusion; that at the same time he recommended that they be not included; That in submitting his report to Government the Board pointed out that Mr Hurdis had misunderstood para 15[#] of the General Instructions. and it recommended that the Inams in question should not be included in the peishcush; and that the Government passed orders accordingly.

6. The Memorialists, however, will not proceed beyond a few paragraphs of Mr Hurdis' report in which he states he included the Sibbandy inams under Board's instructions (which course the Board points out to be a mistake), and instead of asking to be furnished with proof

of

[×] Pp. 317-35 of the Fifth Report Vol. II

[#] Page 321 of the Fifth Report.

---

of the Honourable member's statements in his speech (if they thought that they needed to be ~~[illegible]~~ verified), they proceed to write as if those statements were not correct.

7. That the Honourable member's statements were quite correct, will appear from a perusal of the correspondence marginally noted (a).

8. A brief summary of ~~this~~ the correspondence is subjoined.

9. Mr Hurdis's procedure was as follows:—

I. He estimated the assets on the basis of ~~a~~ ryotwar survey rents of the then cultivated lands; (excluding inams and Shrotriems) and as these rents were progressively increasing during a period of three years during which the estates were let on cowle, he at first proposed to take as permanent jamma, the beriz of the last year of the 3-year period. This beriz amounted to Star pagodas 131,315 (c). (This figure will be denoted below by the letter A)

II. The Inam lands he divided into two categories (d);—

(1) Those to be *resumed* including

under

(a) I. ~~[illegible]~~ Paras 119, 120, 123, 127-31, 133, 136, (b) 239-43, 246-48 & 250-54 of Mr Hurdis's report.

II Paras 25-30 & 40-44 of B.P. No. dated 3-9-1804 submitting Mr Hurdis's Report to Govt.

III. Paras ~~2, 6 & 7~~ 4 7 & 8 of the G.O. thereon No. dated 24-10-1804

(b) These paras are printed in the Fifth Report vol. II pp.

The other paras mentioned above are extracted in the file marked XXX put up.

Summary of the Correspondence relating to the settlement of the Dindigal Province by Mr Hurdis

(c) Paras 107-118 of Mr Hurdis's Report at pp. 381-3 of Fifth Report Vol. II.

(d) Paras 119-134 of the Report – Pp. 383-86 of Fifth Report Vol. II under this head the village sibbandy maniams.

(2.) Those to be left alone, Pagoda inams &c.

The Inams of the 1st class were valued at Star pagoda 10,093 (This figure will be denoted below by the letter B).

~~So that~~ the total asset for peishcush (excluding certain sowrnadayam and quit rents on Shrotriams) thus amounted to A + B(e) or Star pagodas 141,408.

III. It then appears to have occurred to him that if the proprietors were required to pay to Government the whole of this amount there would be no margin left to ~~them~~ them to meet cost of collection &c., and as he thought that it would be some years before ~~[illegible]~~ any margin accrued to them by extension of cultivation, and as in the meantime it would be difficult to find purchasers for these estates,(f) he made two proposals to meet this difficulty:—

(a) To reduce A by taking in lieu thereof the average beriz of the three cowle years referred to in para 9. I. Supra. This reduced amount was star pagodas(g) 118,118. (This will be denoted by A_1)

He proposed accordingly to fix the peishcush at $A_1 + B$(h) = 128,220

(b) At the same time, he also suggested that B ~~may~~ should be entirely given up to the Proprietors to be utilized by them in maintaining the village Sibbandi(j).

10. The Board thereupon pointed out(k) that B was never meant to be included in the peishcush; that the procedure previously followed till then in such cases was to exclude these inams from the assets: and ~~it~~ it re-commended to Government that B should be excluded in the case of the Dindigal Poliams.

11. Even as regards A_1 the Board was of opinion(l) that that amount would not leave sufficient margin to the proprietors. It accordingly reduced the amount to Star Pagodas 109,189 (~~call it~~ a figure which will be denoted by A_2) and proposed to fix the peishcush at A_2 + certain ~~c~~ items ~~being~~(m) of assets derivable from Sowrnadayam and quit rent from Shrotriamdars, not included in A_2.

(e)

$$\begin{array}{rl} A = & 1,31,315 \\ B = & \underline{10,093} \\ & 1,41,408 \end{array}$$

vide para 136 at p. 385 of the Fifth Report. Vol. II.

(f) Paras 242-7 of Mr. Hurdis's Report – vide pages 4-5 of the file marked $\overline{\underline{XXX}}$ pol. pp.

(g) Paras 239-41 and paras 248-50 of the Report, in the file marked $\overline{\underline{XXX}}$ page 5.

(h)

$$\begin{array}{rl} A_1 = & 118,118 \\ B = & \underline{10,101}^{(i)} \\ & 128,220. \end{array}$$

(Vide para 251 of the report. – in the file marked $\overline{\underline{XXX}}$ page 6).

(i). There is a difference of 8 9 between this figure and the net total ~~figure previously given~~ in para Supra. This which is probably due to certain payments in the shape of "Poruppu" ~~paid~~ made by the inamdars.

(j.) Paras 253-54 of his report in the file marked $\overline{\underline{XXX}}$ (pp. 6-7)

K. Paras 25-30 of its pro: dated 3. 9. 1804 in the file marked $\overline{\underline{XXX}}$. – pp. 8-10.

(l.) Paras 40-42 of its pro: in the file marked $\overline{\underline{XXX}}$ page 11.

(m)

Paras 44 of the B. P. (file marked $\overline{\underline{XXX}}$). pp. 12-13

12. The Board wrote at the same time that if the Government did not agree to its proposal to exclude the Sibbandy Inamams, the figure to be taken in place of A_2 would be $A_2 + B$ and the total peishcush would then be 121,252(n)

(n).

A_2 = 109,189

B = 10,093

1453 (o)

(p) 517 ~~(p)~~ 1,990

121,252.

(o) Sournadayam

(p) quitrent payable by Shrotriemdars

13. The Boards' proposals contained therefore two principal recommendations ~~[illegible]~~:—

(1) To exclude the village Sibbandy Inamams from the peishcush

(11) To reduce further the main item of peishcush, from A_1 (proposed by the Collector) to A_2 (proposed by the Board).

14. The orders of Govt. on these two proposals were as follow:— G.O. of 24.10.1804.

(q) ~~(p)~~ Para 4. "With reference to "the alienations which have been "hitherto appropriated for the "support of the village Sibbandy "and which were under a mistake-"apprehension of the general in-"structions included with "the aggregate assets of the "Zemindaries, the Governor in Council "entirely approves your rejection of them from the amount of the permanent rent."

(q) Letter to the President and Members of the Board of Rev. Extracted in File marked XXX — page 14.

"7. The Governor in Council observes that the assessment proposed by the late collector is considered by you to be too high in proportion to the full value of the Zemindaries and His Lordship in Council entirely approves the principle on which you have recommended a reduction for the purpose of leaving to the Zemindars such a reasonable profit as may secure them against failure in the discharge of their engagements with adequate means for their support.

"8. The Governor-in-Council therefore confirms in perpetuity the settlement which you have recommended for the Zemindaries of the province of Dindigal amounting in number to forty.

15. It is clear from the above that in the case of the Dindigal Estates dealt with in Mr Hurdis's Report the village service Inams were not

not included in the assets on which the peish cush was fixed.

In fact it would appear further that in excluding the village certain petty inams Sibbandy Inams, which ought to have been included were also excluded; for the Excluded amount B (= 10,101 or 10,093) was the total value of (y) 3 classes of inams (1st) village Sibbandy; (2nd) certain Chillar inams & (3rd) certain cawelly inams of which second & third the 2nd & 3rd were resumable

R. V. L.
28/5

(y).
'vide paras: 127 to 131 of the report at pp. 384-85 of the fifth Report vol II; and paras (5) 181-83 of the same report (in the file marked XXX) in which the details of these classes of inams are given.

(5)

		assesst: on cultivated lands.	
village Sibbandy (para-181)	--	13,200	C. Chakrams
chillar (para-182)	--	457	
cawelly (para-183)	-	3,000	
		16,651	C. Chakrams

= 10,093 st. pagodas

Notes in orders regarding the Memorial of the Landholders Association against the Proprietary Estates Act

D
5 8 51.

[G/9]
2,000—2-4-95.

Current No. 236.

Legislative DEPARTMENT.

Telegram

From The Collector of Vizagapatam.

No. -

Dated 28th
Received 29th } August 1895.
Enclosures -

SUBJECT.

Stating that the information asked for in Govt Telegram no. 535 of 27th instant is being tabulated & will be reported as soon as possible.

Lodge pending reply

D
29/8/95

[G/9]
2,000—2-4-95.

Current No. 240.

CURRENT No. 136

Code Class. DS **INDIAN TELEGRAPHS.** Monthly Number. 1693

To (Office) Ootacamund	From (Office) Vizagapatam

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instructions.
19/3	28	18		DS

To (Person) Madras	From (Person) Collector

CHIEF SECRETARY 29. AUG. 1895 GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Your Telegram yesterday
535 information being
tabulated will be reported
as soon as possible

32 Word Form.

F.C.1.

Recd. from LN. Sent to LN.

At Hrs. Mts. by At Hrs. Mts. by

OOTACAMUND 28-8-95

Telegraph Master.

C.G.P.—No 29 T-15 ...

to last census.

Sent to NS
4/9

[G/9]
2,000—2-4-35.

Current No. 240-

Legislative DEPARTMENT.

Telegram

From the collector of
Vizagapatam

No. -

Dated 3rd } Sept. 1895
Received 4th }

Enclosures "

SUBJECT.

Stating that, in continuation of his telegram of the 28th ultimo, the population of the Vizianagram Zamindari is 867275 according to last census.

Subd to WA
4/9

Code Class. ~~[illegible]~~ DS INDIAN TELEGRA

To (Office) Ootacamund From (Office) Vizagapatam

Words. 21/10 Day. 3 Hr. [illegible] Minute. 20 Official Instructions. Sd

CHIEF SECRETARIAT
4 SEP 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

To (Person) Madras From (Person) Collector

My telegram 28th ultimo population of ~~[illegible]~~ Vizianagram zamindari is 867275 according to last census

Recd. from LN. Sent to LN.

At Hrs. Mts. by

OOTACAMUND 3-9-95

Telegraph Master

C. G. P. No. 8 T— 7-93—40,00,000.

32 Word Form

Name of the Zemindary	Taluk or Deputy Tahsildar's Division in which the Zemindari is situated	Area in Square Miles	Population of				(a) Particulars are given in these Columns only in regard to Zemindari Deputy Tahsildari Division
			Zemindari Villages	a Inam Villages	(a) Government Villages	Total	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Kalahasti	Kalahasti in North Arcot & Chingleput	874	122,021	25,839	"	147,860	
	Atmakur Taluq Nellore	42	4,799	"	"	4,799	
	Udayagiri Taluq Do	417	44,837	"	"	44,837	
	Kavali Taluq Do	126	14,226	"	"	14,226	
	× Kanigiri Taluq Do	347	23,699	2,111	"	25,810	
	× Kandukur Taluk Do	22	7,625	"	"	7,625	
	Total	1828	217,207	27,950	"	245,157	
Venkatagiri	Kanigiri Taluq Nellore	227	28,617	8,103	"	36,720	
	Grand Total	2055	245,824	36,053	"	281,877	

/sd/ P. Seeta Row
Deputy Collector

/True Copy/

P. Seeta Row
Deputy Collector

W. [illegible]
31-8-95

Enclosure No 1

1005
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
Enclosure No.
Current No. 6380

NELLORE COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
DATED 30th August 1895.

No. 2265
ver

M. R. Ry

From P. Seeta Row Pantulu Garu
Deputy Collector of Nellore.

To the Secretary to the Board of Revenue
Land Revenue Madras.

Sir,

With reference to Board's Proceedings (Land Revenue) No 4169 Mis: dated 20th August 1895 the Collector being on tour, I have the honor to submit herewith the statement showing separately the area and population of Kalahasti and Venkatagiri Zemindaries as directed by the Board.

I have the honor &c.

(Sd) P. Seeta Row
Deputy Collector

(True Copy)

P. Seeta Row
Deputy Collector

Eng. ; 24-11-94.]

31-8-95

Enc No 2

Copy of a letter

From the Collector of

Nellore.

To

The Secretary to the Board
of Revenue, Land Revenue
Madras

Dated 30 August 1895

No. 2265/Ver

~~*Subject.*~~

1895
REVENUE D PARTMENT.
Enclosure No. 2
Current No. 6386

NELLORE COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
DATED 30 August 1895.
Desp'd 31

No. 2266/ver

From M. R. Ry
P. Seeta Row Pantulu Garu
Deputy *Collector of Nellore.*

To the Secretary to Government
Revenue Department Madras.

Sir,

With reference to the Board's Proceedings No 4169 Mis: dated 20th August 1895, the Collector being on tour I have the honor to submit ~~herewith~~ copies of the letter and statement submitted to the Board of Revenue.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obt Servant
P Seeta Rau
Deputy Collector

31-8-95

Eng.; 24-11-94.]

Revenue 1895 Dept
Current Number 6386.

From the Collector of
Nellore.

To
the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department
Madras

Dated 30 August 1895
Recd 3 Sept

No. 2266/V ~~Encl~~ 2

3 SEP 95

Subject.

Submitting copies of letter and statement sent to the Board about the area and population of the Kalahasti and Venkatagiri Zamindaries.

1895
Septr
Enclsr. No. 2
No. 249.

Dis **No.** 2904/Ver **of 1895.**

North Arcot, Collector's Office,
Chittoor 28th Augt **1895.**

From

S. H. Wynne Esquire
Collector and District Magistrate,
North Arcot.

To

The Secretary to the Commissioner of Land Revenue,
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to para 4 of the Bd's proceedings No: 4169 Mis: of 20th Instant, I have the honor to report that, as there are no other means than those adopted by the Board, of checking the figures in the statement that accompanied the above proceedings, no modifications can be suggested in respect of the area and population of the Karvetinagar and the Punganur zemindaris and of the portion of the Kalahasti zemindari lying in this and the Chingleput Districts.

I have &c
(Signed) S. H. Wynne
Collector

True copy submitted to the ~~Chief~~

(Revenue Department)
Secretary to Government with refe-
-rence to para 5 of the Boards Progs:
No: 4169 Mis: dated 20th August 1895.

N. Arcot Collr's office
Chittoor 28th August 95

J Boro
for Collector.

Revenue 1895 Sept

Current Number 6392

FROM

THE COLLECTOR AND

DISTRICT MAGISTRATE,

North Arcot.

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to

Government

(Revenue Department)

31 AUG 95

No. of Enclosures.

Recd 31 Augt

Letter, dated 28th August 1895.

Dis No. 2904/Rev of 1895.

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Govt copy of the letter reporting to the Board that no modifications can be suggested in the area & population of certain Zemindaris in N. Arcot Dt.

1895

Sepr

3

249.

Enclosed

in a letter

From

the Collector of

Madura

Dis No 3208 of 95

Dated 4th September 1895

Memo showing the area and population of Ramnad and Sivaganga Zemindaris.

1895

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Enclosure No. 1

Current No. 6557

Memo showing the area and population of Ramnad a d Sivaganga Zemindaries Madura District

Name of the Zemindari	Taluk or Deputy Tahsildar's division in which the Zemindari is situated	Area in Square miles	Population of				Particulars are given in these columns only in regard to Zemin Dy Tahr's divisions	Remarks
			Zemindari villages	(a) Inam villages	(a) Government villages	Total		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Ramnad	Ramnad	2104	79905	47264	1283	12845		
	Muducolatur		103620	41617	"	14523		
	Tirushuli		133377	56516	"	18989		
	Pamban		(a) 17664	"	"	17664		
	Tiruvadanai		(b) 110048	(b) 62241	"	17228		
	Total	2104	444614	207638	1283	65353 1283 652,25		
Sivaganga	Sivaganga	1680	(c) 94164	(c) 64007	"	15817		
	Tirupatur		(d) 158739	(d) 65836	"	22457		
	Tirupuvanam		19794	10084	"	2987		
	Total	1680	272697	139927	"	41262		

(a) There are no Government villages in Pamban; the information given in villagewar census of 1891 being incorrect: vide Board's Proceedings no: $\frac{1992\ \text{mis}}{18\,4\,95}$ Sett

(b) In the statement submitted by the Board to the government, the villages as under assigned for purposes of chutram, Devastanam, Madappuram Local Fund and Kovil appear to have been included under Zemindari instead of under Inam:

Inam:	29114	Zemin	89627
Chatram:	9893	Cowle	20421
Devastanam	1964		110048
Madappuram	3204		
Local Fund	32		
Kovil	12		
	62241		

(c) The same remarks as against (b) as per particulars given below:-

Zemin.	94164	Inam	60676
		Chatram	514
		Devastanam	690
		Jeevitham	2127
			64007

(d) The same remarks as against (b) and (c) apply here also, as under,

Zemin	158739.	Inam	55041
		Devasthanam	9736
		Madapuram	1059
			65836

Madura
4.9.95

83/Ply

for Acting Collector

Copy of Communication Dis. No. 3208 dated 4th September 1895 from the Collector of Madura to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Land Revenue Madras

---

With reference to the Boards Proceedings No 4169 Miscellaneous dated 20 August 1895, Calling on me to report if any modifications are required to be made in the Statement of area and population of Ramnad and Sivagunga Zamindaries submitted by the Board to Government, I have the honor to state that modifications as per details given in the Column of remarks of the enclosed explanatory memo - appear to be necessary. The villages assigned for purposes of Chattram, Devastanam &c:- should, I think be classified under Inam instead of under Zamindari (vide

vide also Board's Proceedings No. $\frac{246}{18-6-94}$

(Settlement.)

Dis. No. 3238 of 95

Submitted with copy of enclosure to the Secretary to Government (Revenue Department) for information with reference to para 5 of the Proceedings quoted above.

Twin.
Ag. Collector

Madura Collector's Office
Camp Teni
4th September 1895

Revenue 1895 Dept.

Current Number 6557

From

The Collector of
Madura

Disposal No. 3208 **of 1895**

Dated 4th } ~~August~~ September 1895
Received 9th }

Enl.

DESPATCHED
7 - SEP. 95

5
Lepee
4
269

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
9 SEP 95
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Submitting Copy of letter to Board submitting with reference to B.P. $\frac{4169}{20\text{-}8\text{-}95}$ mis that modifications as per enclosed memo appear to be necessary regarding the population of Ramnad and Sivaganga Zemindaries Madura Dt.

Name of Estate	Taluk or Division	Area in acres as per census of 1881.	Area in Sq miles.	Population as per census of 1891.	Remarks
Pittapur Estate.	1 Pittapur Division	53,601-0.	83 $\frac{3}{4}$.	43,496.	
	2 Cocanada Do	66,134. 0.	103 $\frac{1}{3}$.	97,531	
	3 Tuni Division.	35,547-0.	55 $\frac{1}{2}$.	16,263	
	4 Ramachendrapur Taluk	23,174-57.	36 sq miles	20,851	
	5 Amalapur Tq.	42765-6.	67 sq miles	27,240	
	6 Rajahmundry Tq.	30,179-90	47 sq miles	16,368	
	7 Peddapur Tq.	366-15	$\frac{183}{320}$ Do.	695	
	8 Narsapur Tq.	185-22.	$\frac{37}{128}$ Do.	1615	
		251,952-84	nearly 394	223,346	

(Sd) V A Brodie
Ag Collector
[illegible]
Dy for Collector

DTR
3/9

1895
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
Enclosure No. 1
Current No. 1560

No. 2782/Ver 9/95.

GODAVARI DISTRICT,
COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
Co~~canada~~, 2 - 9. 1895
ds 3

FROM

V A Brodie Esquire,
Ag Collector,
Godavari District.

TO

The Secretary to the Government
of Madras, Revenue Department
Madras.

SIR,

Adverting to Board's Proceedings dated 20. 8. 95 No 4169 Mis (Land Revenue) I have the honor to submit herewith a revised statement showing the area and population of the Pittapur Estate. It will be observed that the figures given in this statement do not tally with those reported by the Board. In the Pittapur, Cocanada and Tuni Divisions, there are several villages which do not belong to the Rajah of Pittapur. The figures given in Board's Proceedings 3-10.94/416 represent the total area and population of those Divisions.

2. As some of the villages belonging to the Pittapur Estate lie also in the Taluks of Peddapur and Narsapur, they have also been entered in the revised statement

3. The area of most of the villages cannot be accurately given as they were not regularly surveyed. In their case, however, the area given in the census tables of 1881 has been adopted.

I have the honor &c.

Sir,

your most obedient Servt

(Sd) V.A. Brodie

Ag Collector.

Dy for Collector

[illegible] 3-9-95

Revenue {1895} Department.

Current Number 6560.

From

The Collector,
Godavari District.

No. 2782/Rev

Dated 2 }
Despatched 3 } — 9 — 1895.
Received 9 }

Enl.

...T OF MADRAS
9 SEP 95
...DEPT...

SUBJECT.

Submitting information regarding the area & population of the Cittapur Estate.

1895
[illegible] Dept.
Enclos. No. 5
To
249.

Name of the Zemindari	Taluk or depy. Tahsildar's division in which the Zemindari is situated.	Area in square miles.	Population of				Remarks.
			Zemindari villages.	Inam villages.	Government villages.	Total	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Parlakimedi.	Parlakimedi Deputy Tahsildar's division.	⊗ 614	2,21,003.	31,047	"	252,050	⊗ Excluding the area of the agency or maliah tracts which are claimed on behalf of Government.

232897

Chatapur }
11th September 1895 }

J Thompson
For Collector.

Compd

1895
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
Enclosure No. 1
Current No. 6878

Dis No. 884/Surv of 95.

Ganjam Collector.
Chatrapur 11th September 18,

From.

C. J. Weir, Esquire, I.C.S.,
Collector of Ganjam.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Revenue department,
Madras.

Sir,

Referring to Board's Proceedings No. 4169 Mis., dated 20-8-95 (Land Revenue) I have the honor to submit herewith a revised Statement showing the area and population of the Parlakimedi Zemindari.

2. At page 68 of the Taluk and Village Statistics of the Census of 1891, 6 of the villages of Parlakimedi Estate are stated to belong to Government. This is a mistake as there are no Government villages in that Estate. The 6 villages are Zemindari Jerayati Villages and one of them is a municipality.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

A Thompson
For Collector.

Compd

Revenue 1895 Dept

Current Number 6818

From

The Collector of

Ganjam.

To

The Secretary to Government,

Revenue Department,

Madras.

Dated Chatrapur 11th September 1895.

despatched. 11th do

Received. 18th "

Dis No. 884/Eng of 95

18 SEP 95
MADRAS
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Enc: 1.

Subject

Submitting a revised statement showing the area and population of the Parlakimedi Zemindari.

C. nos. 5975
6152
6386
6392

Jeypore ~~564.982~~
733.173

Bobbili ~~128.793~~
188.208

Parlakimedi ~~232.877~~
252.057

5
Dept
6
249

Area of Vizagapatam District.

Name of Taluk or Zamindari	Area furnished to the Superintendent of Census. Agency	Non-Agency	Total	Area now computed from the 1/8 inch maps received from the Collector of Vizagapatam in April 1891. Agency	Non-Agency	Total	Difference between Cols. 4 and 7.	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9.
			Square Miles.					
Golugonda including Uratla Zamindari	829	477	1,306	739	525	1264	-42	
Sarvasiddhi	.	342	342	.	360	360	+18	
Palaconda	217	211	428	168	334	502	+74	
Veeravilli	135	392	527	131	424	555	+28	
[illegible]kapalli	.	310	310	.	297	297	-13	
Vizagapatam	.	139	139	.	173	173	+34	
Bimlipatam	.	218	218	.	207	207	-11	
Srungavarapukota	154	237	391	164	274	438	+47	
Vizianagram	.	263	263	.	294	294	+31	
Gajapatinagram	40	308	348	.	333	333	-15	no area shown under the Agency in the 1/8 inch Ma
Cheepurupalli	"	547	547	.	549	549	+2	
Bobbili	.	234	234	.	268	268	+34	
Salur	.	198	198	200	180	380	+182	
Parvatipur	164	414	578	398	401	799	+221	
Jeypur	9546	.	9546	10823		10823	-335	
Pachipenta	615	.	615					
Madugula	997	.	997					
Total	12677	4290	16987	12623	4619	17242	+255	

Survey Office
Madras
21st August 1891

True copy

(Sd) J. H. Burke
Dy for Superintendent
Madras Sur

Rlamworth

Enclosure No 2

letter from the Collector of Vizagapatam to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue Madras dated 9th September 1895

[illegible] No 1345

Subject

Statement showing the area of the Vizagapatam District furnished by the Superintendent of the Madras Survey.

1895
REVENUE ARTMENT.
Enclosure No. 2
Current No 6957

Name of the Zamindari	Taluk or Deputy Tahsildar's Division in which the Zamindari is situated	Area in square miles	Population of Zamindari Villages	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5
Vizianagram	1. Part of Golugonda		1,688	
	2. Do Sarvasiddhi		15,279	
	3 Do. Anakapalli		65,608	
	4 Do. Vizagapatam		20,122	
	5. Srungavarapukota		1,29,323	
	5(a) Do agency		4,020	
	6. Bimlipatam		1,15,309	
	7. Vizianagram		1,66,658	
	8 Part of Chipurupalli		1,13,483	
	9 Do Gajapatinagram		97,164	
	10 Do Palakonda		9,276	
	11 Do Bobbili		20,865	
	12 Do Veeravilli		1,08,480	
	Total		8,67,275	✓
Bobbili ✗	1. Part of Bobbili		86,687	
	2. Do of Salur		1,491	
	3 Do of Palakonda		1,00,030	
	Total		1,88,208	
Jeypur ✗	1. Bissamcuttack		62,145	
	2. Gunupur		1,13,822	
	3. Jeypur		1,40,580	
	4. Koraput		74,476	
	5. Malkanagiri		28,277	
	6. Nowrangapur		1,16,399	
	7. Rayagada		91,228	
	8. Part of Parvatipur		40,239	
	9 do Pottangi		41,673	
	10 Padwa		24,336	
	Total		7,33,173.	

Sd L. C. Miller
Ag. Collector

True copy

[illegible]

Enclosure one

In a letter from the Collector of Vizagapatam to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue Madras dated 9th September 1895

To Dis. No. 1345

Subject -

Statement showing the population of the Zemindaries of Visianagram Bobbili and Jeypur.

1895
VENUE DEPARTMENT.
nclosure No. 1
Current No. 8957

[V. C. P.—30-10-94.—300.]

~~Rc. C.~~ / Dis. No. 1345

VIZAGAPATAM COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
Dated 9th September 1895.

From
L. C. Miller Esqr
~~F. D'A. O. Wolfe Murray Esqr.,~~
Ag. Collector,
Vizagapatam District.

To
L. M. Wynch Esqr
Secretary to the Commissioners of
Land Revenue,
Madras.

Sir,

As directed in Board's Proceedings No 4169 dated the 20th ultimo, I have the honor to send herewith a statement showing the population of the Zamindari Estates of Vizianagram, Bobbili and Jeypur and to state that I am as desired sending a copy of this letter and statement to Government for information.

2. It is not possible to give separately the area of each Zamindari Estate as portions of the one are interspersed with portions of the other in several of the Revenue Divisio in which the Zamindari Estate is situated

Revenue 1895 DEPARTMENT.

Current Number 6957

FROM

THE COLLECTOR OF VIZAGAPATAM.

(A)

TO

THE SECRETARY TO THE COMMISSIONERS OF
LAND REVENUE,
MADRAS.

Dated 9th } September 1895.
Received 14th }

17 SEP 95

~~R.C.~~ Dis. No. 1345

ENCLOSURES. 2

Subject.

Submitting a statement showing the population of the Zamindaries of Vizianagram Bobbili and Jeypore.

5
[illegible]
7
249

situated. In 1891 the Superintendent of the Madras Survey computed the area of the different Taluqs of the District excepting the agency from the Scale of the Atlas Sheet map 1 inch = 8 miles and furnished this Office with a statement, a copy of which I beg to enclose for the Board's information.

I have &c
(Sd) L. C. Miller
ag. Collector

(True Copy)

Submitted to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Madras for information.

For ag. Collector

Telegram to the Bd. of Rev. Land Rev.

Please furnish early statement showing area and population according to Census 1891 of follg. Zamindaries

Jeypore
Vizianagaram
Ramnad
Venkatagiri
Sivaganga
Karvetnagar
Kalahasti
Pittapur
Parlakimedi
Bobbili &
Punganur

R.V.S.
14/8.

14/8

Wired
14/8

E DESPATCH

Despd 27/8

Deferred Telegram to the Coll r. of Vizagapatam

525x" Board's Resolution to which
"number 4169. Please wire
"population of Vizianagram
"Zamindari according to last
"Census"

D
27-8.55

Dor. Deferred

Name of the Zemindari	Taluk or Deputy Tahsildar's division in which the Zamindari is situated	Area in Square miles	Population of Zemindari Villages	(a) Inam Villages	(a) Government Villages	Total	(a) Particulars are given in these Columns only in regard to Zamindari Dy. Tahsildar's divisions
Jeypore	Jeypore	⊗ 7823	140580	"	"	140580	
	Nowrangapore		116,399	"	"	116,399	⊗ This figure includes the area of the whole of Pottangi and Padwa also.
	Koraput		74,476	"	"	74,476	
	Malkangiri & part of Pottanghi		28,277	"	"	28,277	
	Gunupur	# 3,000	113,822	"	"	113,822	# This figure includes the area of the Bissemcuttack division
	Rayaghada		91,228	"	"	91,228	
	[Vide paras 3 and 4 of the Administration Report for Fasli 1300 submitted with B.P. 27-4-93 No 2631 Rev:]						
(A) 7.33.173 (C. No A).	Total	10,823 *:	564782	"	"	564,782	*: The area of the Zemindari is given as 11526 Sq. miles in the list of titles and title-holders.
Ramnad	Ramnad	2104	79,905	47,264	12,83	128,452	
	Mudukulathur		103,620	41,617	"	145,237	
	Tiruchuli		133,377	56,516	"	189,893	
	Pambau		"	"	17664	17,664	
	Tiruvadanai		143,175	29,114	"	172,289	C. No. 6537
	Total	2104	460,077	174,511	18947	653,535	
Venkatagiri	Darsi Division	616	84,631	"	"	84,631	
	Podili division	564	68,466	"	"	68,466	
	Polur division	358	58,265	"	11,328	69,593	
373.734 11.328-Gd. 382,406	Venkatagiri division	426	56,387	"	"	56,387	
	Gudur Taluk	171	30,555	"	"	30,555	
	Kanigiri Taluk						
	Ongole Taluk	168	47382	"	"	47,382	C. No. 6386
Total excluding the portion situated in Kanigiri for which particulars are not available		2303	345,686	"	11,328	357,014	Kanigiri 367 3,93,73

Name of the Zamindari	Taluk or Deputy Tahsildar's division in which the estate is situated	Area in Square Miles	Population of Zamindari Villages	Population of Inam Villages	Population of Govt. Villages	Population of Total	
Sivaganga	Sivaganga		97495	60676	–	158,171	
	Tirupattur	1680	169,534	55041	–	224,575	(C. No. 6557)
	Tiruppuvanam		19,794	10084	–	29,878	
	Total	1680	286,823	125,801	–	412,624	
Karvetnagar	Puttur		155546	–	–	155,546	
	Tiruttani	943	171,704	1,447	–	173,151	
	Total	943	327250	1,447	–	328,697	
Kalahasti	Kalahasti in North Arcot and Chingleput —	874	122,021	25,839	–	147,860	(C. No. 6380)
	Atmakur Taluk Nellore	42	4,799	–	–	4,799	Kanigiri 25,810
	Udayagiri Taluk -do-	417	44,837	–	–	44,837	Kandukur 7,625
	Kavali Taluk -do-	126	14,226	–	–	14,226	Total
	Kanigiri Taluk -do-						245157
	Kandukur Taluk -do-						
Total excluding	the portion situated in Kanigiri and Kandukur for which information is not available	1459	185,883	25,839	–	211,722	
Pittapur (Para 3 of Collr's report in C.P. 8-2-92 / 420.)	Pittapur division	192	83,824	–	–	83,824	
	Cocanada division	190	120,907	–	–	120,907	
	Tuni division	216	50,896	–	–	50,896	
	Amalapur Taluk						
	Ramachandrapur Tq.						
	Rajahmundry Taluk						(C. No. 6560).
Total excluding	the villages in Amalapur, Ramachandrapur and Rajahmundry	598	255,627	–	–	255,627	223346

52

Name of Zamindari	Taluk or division in which the estate is situated	Area	Population of Zamindari Villages	Population of Inam Villages	Population of Govt. Villages	Population of Total	
Parlakimedi	Parlakimedi	⊗ 614	201,850	31,047	19,153	252,050 19,153 232,897	⊗ Excluding the area of the Agency or Maliah tracts which are claimed on behalf of Government.
Bobbili	Bobbili	268	110866	17919	–	128,785	1,88,208
Punganur	Punganur	648	76,401	15422	200	92,023 200 91,823	(C. No. A)

252 050
(C. No. 6818).

Secretary.

22/8

1895
Legis. Depart.
Enclos. No. 1
To 249.

1895
REVENUE DEPARTMENT.
Enclosure No. 1
Current No. 6182

CURRENT No. 249

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE MADRAS

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue).

Dated 20 August 1895.

No. 4169 Mis

READ Telegram from Government Revenue Department dated 14 August 1895. No:

Resolution

With reference to the telegram from Government read above, a statement showing the area and population of the Zamindaris mentioned therein, as per the census of 1891, is herewith submitted.

2. The Survey area and population are not shown for each Zamindari as a whole in any account available in this office. They have had to be tabulated from the particulars for Revenue Divisions furnished by the Divisional charges statement (B.P. $\frac{3-10-94}{416}$) and the census tables of 1891. In regard to portions of the Kalahasti and Venkatagiri Zamindaris

zamindaris, which are situated in Government taluks of the Nellore Dt, the area has been entered with reference to the figures in Column 5 of the statement printed in B.P. $\frac{11-2-88}{64}$ (Settlement). The Census tables show that portions of same zamindari ~ divisions consist of Government and inam villages. The population of these villages is exhibited in Columns 5 and 6 of the statement, but their area cannot be ascertained.

3. The Board has been unable to report the information called for in the case of Vizianagram, as portions of it are interspersed with portions of other zamindaris in several of the Revenue Divisions in which the Estate is situated. The same difficulty has been experienced in the case of portions of the Jeypore, Pittapur ~ Venkatagiri and Kalahasti ~ Estates situated in the taluks marginally noted.

Estate.	Taluks
Jeypore	Pottangi & Bissemcuttack Divisions.
Pittapur ...	Amalapur, Ramachandrapuram and Rajahmundry
Venkatagiri ...	Kanigiri
Kalahasti ...	Kanigiri and Kandukur.

4. A copy of the statement will be forwarded to the Collectors concerned with the request that they will report what modifications, if any, should be made therein, and to furnish information with reference to para 3 above.

5. To save delay, Collectors should forward a copy of their replies direct to Government.

(True Extract)

Secretary.

To The Secretary to Govt.
Reve. Deptt. with a statement.

" Collector of Ganjam
" Vizagapatam
" Godavari
" Nellore
" N. Arcot
" Madura
} with copies of the statement

CW Exd HL 22/8

Revenue 1895. Dept.

Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

MADRAS.

~~Current Number 6182~~

To the Secretary to Govt. Revl. Dept.

also C. nos. 6386
6392
6557
6560
6818

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS 26 AUG 95 ... DEPARTMENT

Recd 26 Aug.

Proceedings, dated 20 – 8 – 1895,
4169 No., Mis. ~~Routine~~. Enclosures. 1

Subject.

Submitting to Government a statement showing the area & population of certain Zamindaries, calling for certain information from Collectors in connection therewith and requesting them to submit a copy of their replies direct to Govt.

Please register, refg. and return this to me soon.

R.H. 26/8

UNDER SECRETARY PUBLIC ... 26 SEP 95

Legislative Dept.

CURRENT No: 249.

Read C. nos: 6182
6386
6392
6557
6560
6818
6957.

Endorsement
~~G.O. Mis.~~

Transferred to the Legislative Department.

W. Wilson
Secretary to Govt.
R. D.

Ootacamund 25th Sept. 1895

Recd 25 } do.
Regd. 26 }

Enc. 7.

Read in G.O. 79 - 82

Legislative Dept.

Legis. 27/8/95

Paper to be read in Proceeding.

Current No. 104 of 1895, dated 24th April 1895 from the President, Madras Landholders' Association

Note.
The delay in submitting this draft (the especial urgency of which became less by reason of Mr. Fowler's leaving the S. of S.) is due to the fact that the information called for in the Rev. Dept. was only received one 10 days since & required to be supplemented by further information as to the exact constitution of the Assocn. The draft was a troublesome one & I was obliged to postpone taking it up for a day or two because of the Police administration report which was even more urgent.

D
15-8-95

W
22 Aug

The Memorialists (Q & O.)

ORDER 27th Aug 1895, No. 80.

P.S.

The memorial will be transmitted to the Govt. of India and the memorialists informed accordingly (from orders)

D
13-8-95

J.S.
16/8/95

W.S.
26/8/95

W

J.S.
27/8

Letter No. 81.

To P.S.

Despd. with encs. 28/9

The Secretary to the Govt. of India, ~~Legislative~~ Dept.

Sir,

In transmitting the accompanying memorial addressed to the Right Hon. the Secretary of State by the Madras Landholders' Association, I am directed to explain that the delay in submission is due to two circumstances viz.

(1) that the substance of the memorial

2

memorial rendered it necessary to refer to ~~a~~ voluminous records relating to transactions which took place at the beginning of the century.

(3) that His Excellency the Governor in Council deemed it desirable to place the Secretary of State in possession of information-~~not readily available~~- which would demonstrate the gross inaccuracy of certain statements made by the memorialists.

2. The memorialists protest against Madras Act II of 1894 (the Madras Proprietary Estates Village Service Act 1894) and pray that "Her "Majesty's Govt. will exercise its power "of repealing the Act according to sec. "XXI of the Indian Councils Act".

Sec. XXI of that Act relates to bills brought forward ~~by~~ in the Council of the Governor-General and the memorialists presumably intended to refer to sec. XLI under which it is lawful "for Her Majesty to signify through "the Secretary of State for India "in Council, Her disallowance" of any law or regulation passed by the Legislative Council of the Govt. of Fort St. George and assented to by the Governor

3 28

x G.o. 97 Leg
14-8-94

Governor of Fort St. George and by the Governor-General. As required by that section an authentic copy of Madras Act II of 1894 was transmitted to the Secretary of State in May 1894, and in his Despatch No. 30 Legis., dated 21st June 1894, Mr. Fowler intimated that the Act had been considered in Council and that it would be left to its operation. Under these circumstances His Excellency the Governor in Council presumes that it will suffice to deal very briefly with the subject matter of the present memorial, more especially as the greater portion of it is identical with the memorial relating to the same subject and received from the same body which was submitted to the Govt. of India with my letter dated 26th February 1894, No. 30,

very briefly
stet

'very briefly' is rather horrible
W

3. The arguments upon which the memorialists base their protest are briefly summarized and answered below.

(1) There was ~~an~~ undue haste and and irregularity of procedure in passin the bill and giving assent to it.

So far as the Govt. is ~~con-~~ concerned

concerned this argument has been completely met in paragraphs 5 and 6 of my letter No.30, dated 26th February 1894 which are extracted below for convenience of reference.

"5. In paragraph 5 the petitioner contends that the Proceedings of the Legislative Council were not strictly regular. In this connection I am directed to request that the attention of His Excellency the Governor-General may be invited to the speech of the Advocate-General recorded on pages 24 and 25 of the Abstract Proceedings of the Council on the 20th December 1893. It will be observed that the legal adviser of Government was of opinion that the procedure in regard to the Bill was, throughout, in conformity with the rules and the petitioner himself admits that, before the Bill was passed into law, the literal requirements of the rules had been complied with.

"6. In paragraph 6 of the petition the Council is charged with precipitancy in passing the Bill into law. His Excellency in Council admits that, under ordinary circumstances, he would have preferred to leave the Bill before the public for a longer period after the second report of the Select Committee was presented, before taking steps to secure the passage of the Bill into law. But the circumstances were not ordinary. The Hon'ble Mr. Garstin, who had been in charge of the measure throughout, retired on the 9th January, and it would have been contrary to the public interests to entrust the Bill to any member who was ignorant of the exact nature of the discussions which had taken place on the subject in the Select Committees. Further it is to be noted that the principle of the measure, that is the extension of the control of Revenue officers over the most important class of village officers in proprietary estates and the enfranchisement of the ináms appertaining to that class, had been exposed to the criticism of the public since 1883. The Bill of 1893 certainly differed in many important respects from the earlier measure; mainly in its extension to other classes of village officers and the levy of a cess. But it is not denied that full publicity was given to the Bill of 1893 in its earlier stages and the only objection raised is that the Bill as finally amended by the Select Committee was not before the public for a reasonable time. As, however, has been observed above, the effect of the amendments proposed by Select Committee in its report dated the 28th November 1893 was to restrict, not to enlarge, the scope of the measure and the rate of cess to be imposed, so that objections which might have been raised to the Bill in its earlier stages would apply with less, rather than more, force to the measure in the form in which it finally left the Select Committee. It is also to be noted that the Council took the somewhat unusual course of referring the measure back to the Select Committee with the special object of ensuring the fullest consideration to the petitions which had been received. Had the Council, instead, proceeded on the 15th November 1893, as it might have done, *itself* to consider the various objections raised and, thereafter, to pass the Bill into law, the complaint that the Bill had not been before the public for a reasonable time could not have been made. It should also be mentioned that the prolongation of the discussion upon the Bill did not result in the production of much new and valuable criticism. Memorials, it is true, poured in but they were many of them identical and in print, thus proving that they had been distributed by some central body, and the same objections and arguments were repeated again and again. All the more important petitions were in English and publication in the vernaculars of the Bill in the state it had assumed after undergoing a second revision at the hands of the Select Committee was a mere formality. The statement in the present memorial that the Bill as finally revised was not published in English before the 12th December 1893 when the Hon'ble Mr. Garstin presented the second report of the Select Committee is not correct. It was so published on the 5th December, as stated above, and the Landholders' Association itself (and at least one other body) submitted a petition regarding the Bill in its revised form which was duly considered by the Council.

"Having in view all these facts, it appeared to the Government and to the Council generally that no injustice would be done by passing the Bill into law without further delay."

With

With reference to the undue haste alleged to have taken place with the Govt. of India it will be noticed that the memorialists labour under the ~~delusion~~ erroneous impression that the Act should have been laid before the Supreme Legislative Council whereas ~~in fact~~ the law merely requires that the Governor-General himself should assent to it.

(2) Karnams and other village officers in proprietary estates are not servants of the State and there is no need to make them such.

The same question was raised in para 9 clause (1) of the memorial forwarded with my letter dated 26th Feb. 1894, No.30, and was answered in paras 8 and 9 of that letter copies of which are subjoined ~~for convenience of reference.~~

"8. It is manifest from paragraph 9 (1) of the memorial that the writer is under an entire misapprehension as to the existing law. The village officers in proprietary estates are not, at present, in any way subject to the control of the proprietors. Section 11 of Regulation XXV of 1802, section 5 of Regulation XXIX of 1802 and section 7 of Regulation VI of 1831 render this clear. On the other hand, the new Act gives a limited power of control to the proprietor. No doubt many proprietors have in times past acted most illegally and have assumed a *de facto* authority over their village establishments which the law does not recognize, while in some districts the powers vested in the officers of Government have been allowed to drop out of sight; but this state of things is not consistent with public policy and the intention of the new Act is to restrict the proprietors in the exercise of an authority to which they are not entitled by law. The statement that proprietors and village servants alike are opposed to the Act may be generally true, though it is manifest from certain of the petitions received that the village officers in some cases are desirous of more definite legislative restrictions upon the power over them which has been assumed by some proprietors. As to the remainder, it is no more than natural that, being now entirely uncontrolled, in any practical manner, by any authority, they should object to being brought under control. But such an objection should not prevail.

"9. The argument in paragraph 9 (3) of the memorial appears to His Excellency in Council, so far as he understands it, to be unsustainable. Section 5 of Regulation XXV of 1802 relates to the old Désa Kával or general police and not to the establishments of village watchers. The landed emoluments of village watchers have not undergone general resumption at the hands of Government and this is conclusively proved by the fact that this class of village officers, under various denominations, still exists in most estates and enjoys the emoluments annexed to its offices by the State. The fact that neither in the original regulations nor in the permanent sanads were the Zamindars or their village watchmen assigned any police duties is of no importance for, as early as 1816, their liability to perform such duties was recognized by legislative enactment as a pre-existing fact."

(3) The joint subordination of Karnams to the State and to the proprietor has proved a failure in Bengal.

His Excellency the Governor in Council has no direct knowledge as to the system in vogue in Bengal which is alleged to have ~~proved a failure~~ broken down, but he has no hesitation in affirming that in Madras the partial subordination of the Karnam to the State and to the proprietor has not proved a failure.

(4) The substitution of money payments to village servants for inams was tried and condemned early in the century.

The obvious answer to this statement is that money payments to village officers have subsequently been in force for a period of some 30 years, i.e. since the introduction of the Village Cess Act of 1864 (Madras Act IV of 1864) and have proved a complete success.

(5) The Bill was generally opposed by Collectors.

This objection which is not a new one is answered in para 3 of my letter dated 26th February 1894, No.30, an extract from which is subjoined.

"3. The Government is not aware of the authority for the assertion in paragraph 3 of the memorial to the effect that district officers are almost unanimously opposed to the measure. On the contrary, the Government believes that district officers almost, if not quite, unanimously feel the absolute necessity of bringing the village servants in zamíndárís under control. In this connection, a perusal is solicited of the remarks made by His Excellency the Governor on 5th January (page 12 of the printed Proceedings of the Council). Probably the petitioner refers to the opinions recorded in 1871—1875 when the extension of the Village Cess Act, 1864, to zamíndárís was mooted. It is hardly necessary to observe that the opinions then given cannot be applied to the enactment now under consideration."

(6) The Act is a violation of the permanent settlement.

As was remarked in para 10 of my letter just quoted, it is hardly necessary to observe that the positio taken up by the memorialists is untenable, though ~~perhaps~~ not unnatural. The same objection was discussed in para 4 clause 4 of my letter dated 9th April 1895, No.33, in which it was pointed out that the contention that the Sanad-i-Milkiyat Istimrar is a contract possessing legal validity apart from Regulation XXV of 1803 is opposed to the ruling reported on pages 14-27 of Volume IX of the Madras Series of the Indian Law Reports, in which the High Court held that the clause of the Sanads which repeats the declaration contained in Regulation XXV of 1803 as to the exclusion of certain items of revenue is surplusage and that in the event of any difference between the Sanad and the Regulation, the Courts must be guided by the latter.

(7) The Act assumes that village service inams were excluded from the assets in the calculation of the peshcush of proprietary estates whereas they were in fact included

In para 4, clause 1, of my letter dated 9th April 1895, No. 80, Legislative, a similar contention was referred to with the remark that the village service inams were ~~as a fact~~ almost invariably so far as could be ~~[illegible]~~ ascertained excluded in calculation of the peshcush of proprietary estates. The memorialists quote in support of their assertion extracts from certain instructions issued in the year 1799 and from a report of Mr. Hurdis, ~~one of the~~ a collector who carried out the permanent settlement of the Zemindaries of the Dindigul Province. The arguments which they now set out in detail were briefly mentioned in the debates of the Legislative Council regarding the ~~Hereditary Village Offices'~~ Village officers' hereditary succession Bill and in the meeting held on the 19th March 1895, the Hon. Mr. Gibson who was in charge of the ~~Hereditary Village Offices'~~ Bill pointed out that the memorialists were mistaken in the construction which they placed upon the records from which they quoted. The memorialists now

submit.

Memorial regarding the Proprietary Estates Village Service Act.

ORDER.

---

submit that the Hon. Member e

misunderstood the Proceedings

Board of Revenue and the Govt o

in settling the question raised

Hurdis ; ~~and~~ in proof of ~~their~~ this c

they quote isolated paragraphs fr

Hurdis's report ~~without putting~~ and have evidently don

without careful perusal of

~~selves to the trouble of~~ perusing

~~intelligence~~ the whole of that documen

and the orders passed upon it. It is unnecessary in the body of this letter to go into this question at length but for ~~the~~ ~~purposes of~~ reference ~~of the Govt. of India~~ if deemed necessary, a brief note + is enclosed summarising the correspondence relating to the settlement of the Dindigul Province and proving conclusively the inaccuracy of the memorialists contention. It will suffice here to remark that the Hon. Mr Gibson was absolutely correct in his statement of the case and to express the surprise of His Excellency the Governor in Council that the memorialists should persist in ~~their error and continue to make~~ statements which have no warranty in fact and are calculated to confuse the point at issue.

+ Enclosure A.

Even if the accuracy of this contention be admitted,

Further it is to be noted that sec. 37

clause

10

Clause 8
for ~~the~~ y co the Act expressly provides
reductio ompensation in the shape of
~~cases~~ of peshcush ~~in~~ those ~~rare~~
case which inams were *included* ~~calculated~~
in the assets upon which the peshcush
was calculated at the time of the Permanent Settlement.

4. Having thus disposed of the subject matter of the memorial, H.E. the Governor in Council desires to draw special attention to particular statements made therein.

(1) The memorialists speak of "the landholders as being inadequately represented in the Legislative Council and describe the Maharajah of Vizianagram who is the one representative of landed interests as evidently feeling the desirability of supporting the Govt. even though it be prejudicial to his own interests and the interests of the other Zemindars of the Presidency / whom he is supposed to represent."

The Landholders Association was certainly not prejudiced by want of advocacy on the part of the Maharajah of Vizianagram for ~~the~~ they were permitted to represent their case by Counsel when the Bill was under discussion. It should, however, none the less be pointed out

that

[Enclosure B.]

that the Bill against which t
affects ~~him~~ the Maharajah very much / more than
individual ~~single~~ a Zemindar ~~throughout the~~ in this
dency. In ~~an~~ enclosure B to thi
will be found statistics relat
principal Zemindaries ~~in~~ of the P
from which it will be seen tha
Maharajah of Vizianagram pays a
larger peshcush than any other ~~Zemn.~~ prop.
and that the population of his estate is far greater than that of any other, being in fact in excess of the total population of the three estates of the Zemindars of Venkatagiri, Karvetnagar and Kalahasti who are the principal members of the Madras Landholders' Association.

(2) H.E. the Governor in Council would next ~~desires to~~ comment upon the memorialists' ~~statement~~ allegation that "from their experience in relieving the distressed in "their own estates and of the relief given "by Govt. in such places, what is done "by Govt in the Zemindari tracts is only "of a supplemental character, unlike "in ryotwari villages where the whole "burden falls upon the Govt., the Zemin-"dars themselves being largely intereste "in their estates".

The memor by the
aindar

12

clause 8

, the Presd of the Association,

Zemindar of Venkatagiri in ~~whose estate there was considerable distress during the recent famine of 1891 and 1892.~~ (a)

two taluks of whose estate, forming considerably more than half his Zemindari, there was so much suffering during the distress which existed in 1891 that the Govt. had to expend a sum of Rs. ~~133,848~~ 133,878 in affording of relief to the sufferers

In ~~that period the Govt. expended a sum of Rs. 185821 in relieving the distressed in the Venkatagiri Zemindari~~. Against this expenditure by Govt. the Zemindar made an allotment of only Rs. 18400 early in 1892, that is to say, nearly a year after the commencement of the distress, ~~and~~ later it has never been ascertained, as the Zemindar has persistently neglected all calls for a statement of outlay brought up to the close of the (operations ~~famine~~) whether ~~an outlay of Rs 3600 was actually~~ [illegible] the whole of ~~only~~ this was ~~really~~ actually spent.

1 only

This sum was assigned for expenditure upon the repair of irrigation works and inasmuch as it was reported that ~~it~~ was not likely to bring ~~him~~ the Zemindar in any revenue, the Govt. expressed its pleasure at his action in undertaking the repairs with the view of relieving the suffering poor in his estate. It need hardly be said that this appreciated notice was chiefly made with a view to encourage the Zemindar to further liberality. So far however as the records show the only (other) real? relief to the distressed which was afforded by him consisted in the distribution of some cloths cloths? and some cooked food on the occasion of H.E. the Governor's visit to the estate in April 1892. In a letter reporting of his action, the Zemindar made excuses for not doing more in the direction of famine relief on the

Period of distress

H

although [illegible] to able-bodied professional labourers.

(a) The Govt. had decided to call this ~~not~~ famine but only distress.

R.K.S.

I would have the S. of S. to draw this inference or omit the passage — L.G. 19/5

I have spoken to

those portions of the estate which suffered most [illegible] during the distress of 1891-92.

Or this sentence may be omitted.

13

the ground that his treasury

by reason of bad season and f

putes. It ~~is therefore to be~~

~~ed that the~~ paltry ~~instances quoted abo~~

~~the entire extent of the Venk~~

Zemindar's ~~munificence and c~~ outlay for the relief of (his estate in the years 1891-92.)

~~has the assurance to write in~~

~~rial "Memorialists submit from~~

~~"experience in relieving the distre~~

~~"in their own estates that what is done~~

~~"by the Govt. in the Zemindari tract is~~

~~"only of a supplemental character.~~"

The present Zemindar can hardly be held responsible for the ~~evil deeds~~ acts of his predecessor; but the wanton assertion to which he has with others committed himself in this memorial may appropriately be answered by a reference to what took place in ~~his~~ the Venkatagiri Zemindari ~~in~~ during the great famine of 1877. The scandalous mismanagement of the late Zemindar was detailed at length in the report submitted by the Special Famine Officer, Mr. C.S.Crole, now Member of the Board of Revenue. His conclusions ~~based solely on the experience of the famine were somewhat~~ summed up in the following words. "The time seems to have come to punish him "for his repeated breaches of faith and

x vol. of BP for May 1877 p 4715

14

"ae he
" has, in ross mal-administration which
" caused whe face of so many warnings,
" the peopl wesale death by starvation among
" humble op of an estate which, in my
" any long inion, it would be a crime
" of a man to leave to the tender mercies
" utterly who has proved himself so
" woul unworthy of his position. I
" d, therefore, strongly recommend
" that the Zemindari be at once taken
" under Govt. management."

"As the Rajah lays claim, in a
" sort of half hearted way, to having
" done something towards relief works,
" it may be as well to notice the point."

"At the outset his assertion is
" rendered more than doubtful by the fact
" that 1767 out of 2410, or nearly 3/4 of
" the whole of the Nellore paupers in
" the Madras Camps on the 10th of March,
" the date of the last return, came from
" Venkatagiri. If his people had work,
" why should they run away?"

"It is very difficult to know
" what works have been going on under the
" Rajah's auspices. One thing is certain.
They are quite insignificant in amount
and extent and it is hardly possible to
imagine that the repairs of an ordinary

year

G.O. ~~37~~ 1930 Rev
28 11 78

year would ~~have~~ not have been more

The conduct of
dar formed the subject of fre
and the transactions terminate
resignation in favour of hi
~~the close of 1878, no doubt~~
quence of the severe censure
it had been found necessary to a
him.

The Zemindar of Kalahasti is perhaps the personage of next importance among the memorialists. His estate suffered from distress in 1891 and 1893 and during that period the Govt. expended a sum of Rs. Rs.107169 in famine relief while the Zemindar himself did practically nothing. It is true that he applied to Govt. for a loan in order to enable him to start some minor irrigation works with the alleged object of affording immediate employment to the distressed and that a sum of Rs.10000 was advanced to his Diwan for this purpose; but the loan though originally sanctioned was subsequently cancelled, owing to an injunction from the Civil Court ~~because~~ the cost of works actually carried out under the orders of the Diwan was debited to Govt. These two instances will serve to show how little weight is to be attached to the memorilists' protestations regardin

10

the 5

...heir munificence in helping the distressed during famine years and the very "supplemental character" of the aid afforded by Govt.

5. In order that the Govt. of India may not attach undue importance to the alleged representative character of the Association which the memorialists form, I am to state ~~draw attention to my letter dated 14th March 1894. No. 47, Leg. and to repeat the remark therein contained, viz.~~ "that the Association contains only 87 members or less than one eighth ~~1/10~~ of the total number of holders of proprietary [illegible] estates in the Presidency. Its permanency is doubtful and it has only been in existence for some five ~~less than four~~ years. ~~It is apparent therefore that the Association claims an importance which it is far from actually possessing.~~

[* vide note containing list submitted by Col. [illegible]]

6. I am finally to state ~~to conclude by stating~~ that the opinion of H.E. the Governor in Council is ~~considers~~ that for the foregoing reasons ~~no weight should be attached to~~ the representations of the memorialists are totally unworthy of consideration

16.8.95

R.V.T. 16/8

19/8 [But in suggested modifications above -

Matter talked over and Sunday alterations & corrections made accordingly. 20/8/95

Enclosure A

Summary of the Correspondence relat

the Settlement of the Dindigul Province by Mr. Hur

Mr. Hurdis's procedure was as follow

I. He estimated the assets on the basis of ryo rents of the then cultivated lands, (excluding inams a shrotriems), and as these rents were progressively increa during a period of three years for ~~during~~ which the estates were let on cowle, he at first proposed to take as permanent Jamma [assessment] the beriz [demand] of the last year of the three year period. This beriz amounted to star pagodas 131,315. (This figure will be denoted below by the letter A)

II. The inam lands he divided into two categories.-

(1) Those to be resumed including under this head the Village Sibbandy (Servants) Maniams.

(2) Those not to be interfered with ~~left alone~~, (Pagoda inams etc.)

The inams of the first class were valued at star pagodas 10,098. (This figure will be denoted below by the letter B)

The total asset for peishcush (excluding certain "sournadayam"* and quit rents on shrotriems) thus amounted to A+B or star pagodas 141,408.

*(payment in money as distinguished from payment in kind)

[131,315 + 10,093]

III. It then appears to have occurred to him that if the proprietors were required to pay to Government the whole of this amount, there would be no margin left to them to meet cost of collection etc., and as he thought that it would be

some

" he ... their mun

" years before any margin accrued to them by extension

" of cultivation, and as in the meantime it would be difficult

" to find purchasers for these estates, he made two proposals

" to meet this difficulty.-

(2) To reduce A by taking in lieu thereof the average beriz of the three cowle years referred to in para I Supra. The reduced amount was star pagodas 118,118. (This will be denoted by A_1)

He proposed accordingly to fix the peishcush at A_1 + B= 128,330 + (B) At the same time he also suggested that B should be entirely given up to the proprietors to be utilized by them in maintaining the Village Sibbandy

+ There is a difference of 9 between this figure and the correct total which is probably due to certain payments in the shape of 'Poruppu' made by the inamdars.

The Board thereupon pointed out that B was never meant to be included in the peishcush, that the procedure previously followed in such cases was to exclude these inams from the assets, and recommended to Government that B should be excluded in the case of the Dindigul Poliams.

Even as regards A, the Board was of opinion that that amount would not leave sufficient margin to the proprietors. It accordingly reduced the amount to star pagodas 109,189 (a figure which will be denoted by A_2) and proposed to fix the peishcush at "A_2 + plus certain items of assets derivable from "Sournadayam" and quit rent from Shrotriemdars, not included in A_2.

The Board wrote at the same time that if the Government did not agree to its proposal to exclude the Sibbandy Maniams, the figure to be taken in place of A_2 would be A_2+B and the total peishcush would thus be 131,352.

The Board's proposals contained therefore two principal recommendations.

(1) To exclude the Village Sibbandy Maniams from peishcush.

(2) To reduce further the main item of peishcush, (proposed by the Collector) to A_2(proposed by the

The orders of Government on these tw

were as follow.- G.O. dated 24th October 1804.

4. ''With reference to the alienations which

'' hitherto appropriated for the support of the Village

''Sibbandy and which were under a misapprehension of the

'' general instructions included with the aggregate assets

"of the Zamindaries, the Governor in Council entirely approves

'' your rejection of them from the amount of the permanent rent.''

"7 " The Governor in Council observes that the

" assessment proposed by the late Collector is considered by

" you to be too high in proportion to the full value of the

" Zamindaries and His Lordship in Council entirely approves the

" principle on which you have recommended a reduction for the

" purpose of leaving to the zamindars such a reasonable profit

" as may secure them against failure in the discharge of their

" engagements with adequate means for their support.

8. " The Governor in Council therefore confirms in

" perpetuity the settlement which you have recommended for the

" Zamindaries of the province of Dindigul amounting in number

" to forty."

It is clear from the above that in the case of the Dindigul estates dealt with in Mr. Hurdis's Report on the Village Service Inams were not included in the assets on which the peishcush was fixed.

Enclosure B

Statistics relating to the Principal Zamindaries

District	Name of estate	Area in sq. miles	Population as per census of 1891	Rental of fasli 1308	Peishc
Vizagapatam	Jeypore	11,526	564,782	, ?	16,0
--Do--	Vizianagram	3000		16,82,074	4,94,137
Nellore	Venkatagiri	2,117	357,014	9,45,954	3,73,112
Madura	Ramnad	2,112	653,535	6,95,450	3,13,877
--Do--	Sivaganga	1,551	412,624	7,43,182	2,57,430
N. Arcot	Karvetnagar	690	328,629	9,44,415	1,73,887
-Do-& Nellore	Kalahasti	595	211,722	6,00,368	1,73,141
Godavari	Pittapur	871	255,627	8,70,775	2,44,065
Ganjam	Parlakimidi	998	252,050	4,58,703	87,823
Vizagapatam	Bobbili	920	128,785	3,79,862	89,514
N. Arcot	Punganur	532	94,023	,,	66,796

Note.-- These areas are given differently in different books.

12 9 9 8

+ Accurate information will be ready shortly

834,168
500/

Regarding the Memorial from the

Madras Landholders' Association

L. No. 104/95

H E & Cue

Draft for approval

The Revenue Secy for favour of concurrence

20/8 C.S.S. 22/8

R/23/8

27TH AUGUST 1895, No. 80, LEGISLATIVE.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From the President, Madras Landholders', Association, dated 24th April th August 1895, No. 5/ 5/ II of 1894.

ABSTRACT.—Submitting, for transmission to the Right Hon'ble the Secretary of State, a memorial praying for the repeal of the Madras Proprietary Estates' Village Service Act, 1894.

ORDER—27th August 1895, No. 80, Legislative.

The memorial will be transmitted to the Government of India and the memorialists informed accordingly.

(True Extract.)

Ag. Under Secy. to Govt.

D

9 5 95

To the Memorialists.

Exd. C. M. Brisson.

Govt. of {1895} Madras.

LEGISLATIVE.

Issued

Recd. Encl.

G.O., 27th August 1895, No. 80.

AUGUST.

Memorial.

Directing that the — addressed to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State by the Madras Landholders' Association praying for the repeal of Madras Act II of 1894 (The Madras Proprietary Estates' Village Service Act, 1894) be transmitted to the Government of India, and that the memorialists be informed accordingly.

Please see the pieces on the

27th August 1895, No. 81, Legislative.

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

Letter—from

The ~~UNDER~~ Chief SECRETARY to the GOVERNMENT of
FORT ST. GEORGE,

To

The SECRETARY to the GOVERNMENT of INDIA,
Department of Revenue and Agriculture.

Sir,

In transmitting the accompanying memorial addressed to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State by the Madras Landholders' Association, I am directed to explain that the delay in submission is due to two circumstances, viz. :—

(1) that the substance of the memorial rendered it necessary to refer to voluminous records relating to transactions which took place at the beginning of the century;

(2) that His Excellency the Governor in Council deemed it desirable to place the Secretary of State in possession of information which would demonstrate the gross inaccuracy of certain statements made by the memorialists.

2. The memorialists protest against Madras Act II of 1894 (the Madras Proprietary Estate~~s~~ Village Service Act, 1894) and pray that "Her Majesty's Government will exercise its power of repealing the Act according to section XXI of the Indian Councils Act."

Section XXI of that Act relates to Bills brought forward in the Council of the Governor-General and the memorialists presumably intended to refer to section XLI under which it is lawful "for Her Majesty to signify, through the Secretary of State for India in Council, her disallowance" of any law or regulation passed by the Legislative Council of the Government of Fort St. George and assented to by the Governor of Fort St. George and by the Governor-General. As required by that section an authentic copy of Madras Act II of 1894 was transmitted to the Secretary of State in May 1894, and in his despatch No. 20, Legislative, dated 21st June 1894, Mr. Fowler intimated that the Act had been considered in Council and that it would be left to its operation. Under these circumstances His Excellency the Governor in Council presumes that it will suffice to deal very briefly with the subject matter of the present memorial, more especially as the greater portion of it is identical with the memorial relating to the same subject and received from the same body which was submitted to the Government of India with my letter, dated 26th February 1894, No. 30.

3. The arguments upon which the memorialists base their protest are briefly summarized and answered below :—

(1) *There was undue haste and irregularity of procedure in passing the bill and giving assent to it.* So far as this Government is concerned this argument has been completely met in paragraphs 5 and 6 of my letter No. 30, dated 26th February 1894, which are extracted below for convenience of reference :—

"5. In paragraph 5 the petitioner contends that the Proceedings of the Legislative Council were not strictly regular. In this connection I am directed to request that the attention of His Excellency the Governor-General may be invited to the speech of the Advocate-General recorded on pages 24 and 25 of the Abstract Proceedings of the Council on the 20th December 1893. It will be observed that the legal adviser of Government was of opinion that the procedure in regard to the Bill was, throughout, in conformity with the rules and the petitioner himself admits that, before the Bill was passed into law, the literal requirements of the rules had been complied with.

"6. In paragraph 6 of the petition the Council is charged with precipitancy in passing the Bill into law. His Excellency in Council admits that, under ordinary circumstances, he would have preferred to leave the Bill before the public for a longer period after the second report of the Select Committee was presented, before taking steps to secure the passage of the Bill into law. But the circumstances were not ordinary. The Hon'ble Mr. Garstin, who had been in charge of the measure throughout, retired on the 9th January, and it would have been contrary to the public interests to entrust the Bill to any member who was ignorant of the exact nature of the discussions which had taken place on the subject in the Select Committees. Further it is to be noted that the principle of the measure, that is the extension of the control of Revenue officers over the most important class of village officers in proprietary estates and the enfranchisement of the inams appertaining to that class, had been exposed to the criticism of the public since 1883. The Bill of 1893 certainly differed in many important respects from the earlier measure; mainly in its extension to other classes of village officers and the levy of a cess. But it is not denied that full publicity was given to the Bill of 1893 in its earlier stages and the only objection raised is that the Bill, as finally amended by the Select Committee, was not before the public for a reasonable time. As, however, has been observed above, the effect of the amendments proposed by Select Committee in its report, dated the 28th November 1893, was to restrict, not to enlarge, the scope of the measure and the rate of cess to be imposed, so that objections which might have been raised to the Bill in its earlier stages would apply with less, rather than more, force to the measure in the form in which it finally left the Select Committee. It is also to be noted that the Council took the somewhat unusual course of referring the measure back to the Select Committee with the special object of ensuring the fullest consideration to the petitions which had been received. Had the Council, instead, proceeded on the 15th November 1893, as it might have done, *itself* to consider the various objections raised and, thereafter, to pass the Bill into law, the complaint that the Bill had not been before the public for a reasonable time could not have been made. It should also be mentioned that the prolongation of the discussion upon the Bill did not result in the production of much new and valuable criticism. Memorials, it is true, poured in but they were many of them identical and in print, thus proving that they had been distributed by some central body, and the same objections and arguments were repeated again and again. All the more important petitions were in English and publication in the vernaculars of the Bill in the state it had assumed after undergoing a second revision at the hands of the Select Committee was a mere formality. The statement in the present memorial that the Bill as finally revised was not published in English before the 12th December 1893 when the Hon'ble Mr. Garstin presented the second report of the Select Committee is not correct. It was so published on the 5th December, as stated above, and the Landholders' Association itself (and at least one other body) submitted a petition regarding the Bill in its revised form which was duly considered by the Council.

"Having in view all these facts, it appeared to the Government and to the Council generally that no injustice would be done by passing the Bill into law without further delay."

With reference to the undue haste alleged to have taken place with the Government of India it will be noticed that the memorialists labour under the erroneous impression that the Act should have been laid before the Supreme Legislative Council whereas the law merely requires that the Governor-General himself should assent to it.

(2) *Karnams and other village officers in proprietary estates are not servants of the State and there is no need to make them such.*—The same question was raised in paragraph 9, clause (1) of the memorial forwarded with my letter, dated 26th February 1894, No. 30, and was answered in paragraphs 8 and 9 of that letter, copies of which are subjoined:—

"8. It is manifest from paragraph 9 (1) of the memorial that the writer is under an entire misapprehension as to the existing law. The village officers in proprietary estates are not, at present, in any way subject to the control of the proprietors. Section 11 of Regulation XXV of 1802, section 5 of Regulation XXIX of 1802 and section 7 of Regulation VI of 1831 render this clear. On the other hand, the new Act gives a limited power of control to the proprietor. No doubt many proprietors have in times past acted most illegally and have assumed a *de facto* authority over their village establishments which the law does not recognize, while in some

districts the powers vested in the officers of Government have been allowed to drop out of sight; but this state of things is not consistent with public policy and the intention of the new Act is to restrict the proprietors in the exercise of an authority to which they are not entitled by law. The statement that proprietors and village servants alike are opposed to the Act may be generally true, though it is manifest from certain of the petitions received that the village officers in some cases are desirous of more definite legislative restrictions upon the power over them which has been assumed by some proprietors. As to the remainder, it is no more than natural that, being now entirely uncontrolled, in any practical manner, by any authority, they should object to being brought under control. But such an objection should not prevail.

"9. The argument in paragraph 9 (3) of the memorial appears to His Excellency in Council, so far as he understands it, to be unsustainable. Section 5 of Regulation XXV of 1802 relates to the old Déśa Kával or general police and not to the establishments of village watchers. The landed emoluments of village watchers have not undergone general resumption at the hands of Government and [illegible] is conclusively proved by the fact that this class of village officers, under various denominations, still exists in most estates and enjoys the emoluments annexed to its offices by the State. The fact that neither in the original regulations nor in the permanent sanads were the zamindars or their village watchmen assigned any police duties is of no importance for, as early as 1816, their liability to perform such duties was recognized by legislative enactment as a pre-existing fact."

(3) *The joint subordination of karnams to the State and to the proprietor has proved a failure in Bengal.*—His Excellency the Governor in Council has no direct knowledge as to the system in vogue in Bengal which is alleged to have broken down, but he has no hesitation in affirming that in Madras the partial subordination of the karnam to the State and to the proprietor has not proved a failure.

(4) *The substitution of money payments to village servants for inams was tried and condemned early in the century.*—The obvious answer to this statement is that money payments to village officers have subsequently been in force for a period of some thirty years, *i.e.*, since the introduction of the Village Cess Act of 1864 (Madras Act IV of 1864) and have proved a complete success.

(5) *The Bill was generally opposed by Collectors.*—This objection, which is not a new one, is answered in paragraph 3 of my letter, dated 26th February 1894, No. 30, an extract from which is subjoined:—

"3. The Government is not aware of the authority for the assertion in paragraph 3 of the memorial to the effect that District officers are almost unanimously opposed to the measure. On the contrary, the Government believes that District officers almost, if not quite, unanimously feel the absolute necessity of bringing the village servants in zamindaris under control. In this connection, a perusal is solicited of the remarks made by His Excellency the Governor on 5th January (page 12 of the printed Proceedings of the Council). Probably the petitioner refers to the opinions recorded in 1871—1875 when the extension of the Village Cess Act, 1864, to zamindaris was mooted. It is hardly necessary to observe that the opinions then given cannot be applied to the enactment now under consideration."

(6) *The Act is a violation of the permanent settlement.*—As was remarked in paragraph 10 of my letter just quoted, it is hardly necessary to observe that the position taken up by the memorialists is untenable, though perhaps not unnatural. The same objection was discussed in paragraph 4, clause 4 of my letter, dated 9th April 1895, No. 32, in which it was pointed out that the contention that the Sanad-i-Milkiyat Istimrar is a contract possessing legal validity apart from Regulation XXV of 1802 is opposed to the ruling reported on pages 14—27 of Volume IX of the Madras Series of the Indian Law Reports, in which the High Court held that the clause of the Sanads which repeats the declaration contained in Regulation XXV of 1808 as to the exclusion of certain items of revenue is surplusage and that in the event of any difference between the Sanad and the Regulation, the Courts must be guided by the latter.

(7) *The Act assumes that village service inams were excluded from the assets in the calculation of the peishcush of proprietary estates whereas they were in fact included.*—In paragraph 4, clause 1, of my letter, dated 9th April 1895, No. 32, Legislative, a similar contention was referred to with the remark that the village service inams were, so far as could be ascertained, almost invariably excluded in the

Memorial regarding the Proprietary Estates Village Service Act.

calculation of the peishcush of proprietary estates. The memorialists quote in support of their assertion extracts from certain instructions issued in the year 1799 and from a report of Mr. Hurdis, a Collector, who carried out the permanent settlement of the zamindaris of the Dindigul Province. The arguments which they now set out in detail were briefly mentioned in the debates of the Legislative Council regarding the Village Offices' Hereditary Succession Bill and at the meeting held on the 19th March 1895, the Honourable Mr. Gibson who was in charge of the Bill pointed out that the memorialists were mistaken in the construction which they placed upon the records from which they quoted. The memorialists now submit that the Honourable Member "evidently misunderstood the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue and the Government of the day in settling the question raised by Mr. Hurdis;" in proof of this contention they quote isolated paragraphs from Mr. Hurdis's report and have evidently done so without careful perusal of the whole of that document and the orders passed upon it. It is unnecessary in the body of this letter to go into this question at length, but for reference, if deemed necessary, a brief note is enclosed summarizing the correspondence relating to the settlement of the Dindigul Province and proving conclusively the inaccuracy of the memorialists' contention. It will suffice here to remark that the Honourable Mr. Gibson was absolutely correct in his statement of the case and to express the surprise of His Excellency the Governor in Council that the memorialists should persist in statements which have no warranty in fact and are calculated to confuse the point at issue. Further, even if the accuracy of their contention be admitted, it is to be noted that section 27, clause 3 of the Act, expressly provides for compensation in the shape of reduction of peishcush in those rare cases in which village service inams were included in the assets upon which the peishcush was calculated at the time of the permanent settlement.

4. Having thus disposed of the subject-matter of the memorial, His Excellency the Governor in Council desires to draw special attention to particular statements made therein.

(1) The memorialists speak of "the landholders as being inadequately represented in the Legislative Council and describe the Maharaja of Vizianagram who is the one representative of landed interests as evidently feeling the desirability of supporting the Government even though it be prejudicial to his own interests and the interests of the other Zamindars of the Presidency whom he is supposed to represent."

The Landholders' Association was certainly not prejudiced by want of advocacy on the part of the Maharaja of Vizianagram for they were permitted to represent their case by counsel when the Bill was under discussion. It should, however, none the less be pointed out that the Bill against which they protest affects the Maharaja very much more than any other individual Zamindar in this Presidency. In enclosure B to this letter will be found statistics relating to the principal zamindaris of the Presidency from which it will be seen that the Maharaja of Vizianagram pays a far larger peishcush than any other proprietor and that the population of his estate is far greater than that of any other, being in fact in ~~excess of~~ almost Equal to the total population of the three estates of the Zamindars of Venkatagiri, Karvatnagar and Kalahasti who are the principal members of the Madras Landholders' Association.

(2) His Excellency the Governor in Council would next comment upon the memorialists' allegation that "from their experience in relieving the distressed in their own estates and of the relief given by Government in such places, what is done by Government in the zamindari tracts is only of a supplemental character, unlike in ryotwari villages where the whole burden falls upon the Government, the Zamindars themselves being largely interested in their estates."

The memorial is signed by the Zamindar of Venkatagiri, the President of the Association, in two taluks of whose estate, forming considerably more than half his zamindari, there was so much suffering during the distress which existed in 1891-92, that the Government had to expend a sum of Rs. 1,33,878 in affording relief to the sufferers. Against this expenditure by Government the Zamindar made an allotment of only Rs 13,400 (early in 1892, that is to say, nearly a year after the commencement of the distress), but it has never been ascertained, as the Zamindar has persistently neglected all calls for a statement of outlay brought up to the close of operations

whether the whole of this was actually spent. This sum was assigned for expenditure upon the repair of irrigation works, and inasmuch as it was reported that it was not likely to bring the Zamindar in any revenue, the Government expressed its pleasure at his action in undertaking the repairs with the view of relieving the suffering poor in his estate, although owing to his having adopted the contract system, the works did not really benefit the poor and weakly, but merely gave employment to able-bodied professional labourers. It need hardly be said that this appreciative notice was chiefly made with a view to encourage the Zamindar to further liberality. So far however as the records show the only other relief to the distressed which was afforded by him consisted in the distribution of some cloths and some cooked-food on the occasion of His Excellency the Governor's visit to the estate in April 1892. In a letter reporting his action, the Zamindar made excuses for not doing more in the direction of famine relief on the ground that his treasury was empty by reason of bad seasons and family disputes. The present Zamindar can hardly be held responsible for the acts of his predecessor; but the wanton assertion to which he has with others committed himself in this memorial may appropriately be answered by a reference to what took place in the Venkatagiri zamindari during the great famine of 1877. The scandalous mismanagement of the late Zamindar was detailed at length in a report submitted by the Special Famine officer, Mr. C. S. Crole, now Member of the Board of Revenue. His conclusions were summed up in the following words:—

> "The time seems to have come to punish him for his repeated breaches of faith and for the gross mal-administration which has, in the face of so many warnings, caused wholesale death by starvation among the people of an estate which, in my humble opinion, it would be a crime any longer to leave to the tender mercies of a man who has proved himself so utterly unworthy of his position. I would, therefore, strongly recommend that the zamindari be at once taken under Government management.
>
> "As the Rajah lays claim, in a sort of half-hearted way, to having done something towards relief works, it may be as well to notice the point.
>
> "At the outset his assertion is rendered more than doubtful by the fact that 1,767 out of 2,410, or nearly three-fourths of the whole of the Nellore paupers in the Madras camps on the 10th of March, the date of the last return, came from Venkatagiri. If his people had work, why should they run away?
>
> "It is very difficult to know what works have been going on under the Rajah's auspices. One thing is certain. They are quite insignificant in amount and extent, and it is hardly possible to imagine that the repairs of an ordinary year would not have been more numerous."

The conduct of the Zamindar formed the subject of frequent report to Government and the transactions terminated in his resignation in favour of his son, in consequence of the severe censures to which it had been found necessary to subject him.

The Zamindar of Kalahasti is perhaps the personage of next importance among the memorialists. His estate suffered from distress in 1891 and 1892, and during that period the Government expended therein a sum of Rs. 1,07,169 in famine relief while the Zamindar himself did practically nothing. It is true that he applied to Government for a loan in order to enable him to start some minor irrigation works with the alleged object of affording immediate employment to the distressed and that a sum of Rs. 10,000 was advanced to his Diwan for this purpose; but the loan though originally sanctioned was subsequently cancelled, owing to an injunction from the civil court, and the cost of works actually carried out under the orders of the Diwan was debited to Government. These two instances will serve to show how little weight is to be attached to the memorialists' protestations regarding their munificence in helping the distressed during famine years and the very "supplemental character" of the aid afforded by Government.

5. In order that the Government of India may not attach undue importance to the alleged representative character of the Association which the memorialists form, I am to state that the Association contains only 111 members or less than one-eighth of the total number of holders of proprietary estates in the Presidency. Its permanency is doubtful and it has only been in existence for some five years.

6. I am finally to express the opinion of His Excellency the Governor in Council, that for the foregoing reasons the representations of the memorialists are totally unworthy of consideration.

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

OOTACAMUND,
27th August 1895.

Chief
~~Ag.~~ Under Secy. to Govt.

Endorsement – dated 27th August 1895 No. 81A Legislative

Copy to the Govt. of India Legve. Dept.

Chief
~~Ag. Under~~ Secy. to Govt.

[illegible] (L) – L

(β)

including the assets from 'Sournadayam' and quit-rent mentioned above which amounted to star pagodas 1,970,

---

ENCLOSURE A.

Summary of the Correspondence relating to the Settlement of the Dindigul Province by Mr. Hurdis.

Mr. Hurdis's procedure was as follows :—

I. He estimated the assets on the basis of ryotwar survey rents of the then cultivated lands (excluding inams and shortriems), and as these rents were progressively increasing during a period of three years for which the estates were let on cowle, he at first proposed to take as permanent Jamma (assessment) the beriz (demand) of the last year of the three-year period. This beriz amounted to star pagodas 131,315. (This figure will be denoted below by the letter *A*).

II. The inam lands be divided into two categories—

(1) Those to be *resumed* including under this head the *village sibbandy* (*servants*) *maniams.*

(2) Those not to be interfered with (pagoda inams, &c.).

The inams of the first class were valued at star pagodas 10,093. (This figure will be denoted below by the letter *B*).

The total asset for peishcush (excluding certain "Sournadayam" and quit-rents on shrotriems) thus amounted to $A + B$ or star pagodas 141,408.

III. It then appears to have occurred to him that, if the proprietors were required to pay to Government the whole of this amount, there would be no margin left to them to meet cost of collection, &c., and as he thought that it would be some years before any margin accrued to them by extension of cultivation, and as in the meantime it would be difficult to find purchasers for these estates, he made two proposals to meet this difficulty.

(1) To reduce *A* by taking in lieu thereof the *average* beriz of the three cowle years referred to in paragraph 1 *supra*. The reduced amount was star pagodas 118,118. (This will be denoted by A_1.)

He proposed accordingly to fix the peishcush at $A_1 + B = 128,220$ * (B) at the same time he also suggested that *B* should be entirely given up to the proprietors to be utilized by them in maintaining the village sibbandy.

The Board thereupon pointed out that *B* was never meant to be included in the peishcush, that the procedure previously followed in such cases was to exclude these inams from the assets, and recommended to Government that *B* should be excluded in the case of the Dindigul Poliams.

Even as regards *A*, the Board was of opinion that that amount would not leave sufficient margin to the proprietors. It accordingly reduced the amount to star pagodas 109,189 (a figure which will be denoted by A_2) and proposed to fix the peishcush at A_2 + certain items of assets derivable from "Sournadayam" and quit-rent from Shrotriemdars, not included in A_2.

The Board wrote at the same time that if the Government did not agree to its proposal to exclude the sibbandy maniams, the figure to be taken in place of A_2 would be $A_2 + B$ and the total peishcush would thus be 121,252.

The Board's proposals contained therefore two principal recommendations.

(1) To exclude the village Sibbandy Maniams from the peishcush.

(2) To reduce further the main item of peishcush from A_1 (proposed by the Collector) to A_2 (proposed by the Board).

The orders of Government on these two proposals were as follow :—

G.O., dated 24th October 1804.

4. "With reference to the alienations which have been hitherto appropriated for the support of the village sibbandy and which were under a misapprehension of the general instructions included with the aggregate assets of the zamindaris, the Governor in Council entirely approves your rejection of them from the amount of the permanent rent."

7. "The Governor in Council observes that the assessment proposed by the late Collector is considered by you to be too high in proportion to the full value of the zamindaris and His Lordship in Council entirely approves the principle on which you have recommended a reduction for the purpose of leaving to the Zamindars such a reasonable profit as may secure them against failure in the discharge of their engagements with adequate means for their support."

8. "The Governor in Council therefore confirms in perpetuity the settlement which you have recommended for the zamindaris of the Province of Dindigul amounting in number to forty."

It is clear from the above that in the case of the Dindigul estates dealt with in Mr. Hurdis's report the village service inams were *not included* in the assets on which the peishcush was fixed.

---

* There is a difference of nine between this figure and the correct total which is probably due to certain payments in the shape of "Poruppu" made (a special form of low quit-rent) by the inamdars.

ro/

h/ V S ( )/

~~Cash~~ In payment in money as distinguished from

A + B italics

payment in kind

A_1/

A_1+B italics

(β)

A_2

A_2 B italics?

italics?

ENCLOSURE B.

Statistics relating to the Principal Zamindaris.

867,275

District.	Name of estate.	Population as per census of 1891.	Rent of fasli 1303.	Peishcush.
			RS.	RS.
1. Vizagapatam	Jeypore	5,64,782	..	16,000
2. Do.	Vizianagram	..	16,82,074	4,94,137
3. Nellore	Venkatagiri	~~357,012~~	9,45,954	3,73,112
4. Madura	Ramnad	653,535	6,95,450	3,13,877
5. Do.	Sivaganga	412,624	7,43,132	2,57,430
6. North Arcot	Karvetnagar	328,620	9,44,415	1,73,887
7. Do. and Nellore ..	Kalahasti	~~211,722~~	6,00,368	1,73,141
8. Gódávari	Pittapur	~~255,627~~	8,70,775	2,44,065
9. Ganjám	Parlákimedi	~~252,050~~	4,58,703	87,823
10. Vizagapatam	Bobbili	128,785	3,79,862	89,514
11. North Arcot	Punganúru	91,023	..	66,796

~~Note Accurate information will be ready shortly.~~

~~393,784~~ ✓
382,406

652,252 ✓

245,157 ✓

223,346 ✓

232,892 ✓

94,823 ✓

357,014
328,929
211,722
897,365
867,275
30,090

956,260
867,275

Exd. J. P. Oliver.

2.9.95

1895.

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

From the Government of
Fort St. George.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

Letter, 27th August 1895, No. 81, 81A

AUGUST.

Memorial.

Transmitting to the Government of India, with remarks, — from the Madras Landholders' Association to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State praying for the repeal of Madras Act II of 1894 (The Madras Proprietary Estates' Village Service Act, 1894).

[R.O. / 10]
10,000 – 25-3-12.

De

ets.

(Order complete with Letter.

31/

12-7

2/8

8-12

2