M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 2387 — Press ~~Mis.~~

202-203

Dated 13-12-1869.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
13th December 1860.

No. 202. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 23rd October 1860, No. 4,863 :—

Read letter from the Director of Revenue Settlement, dated 6th September 1860, No. 849.

(In Cons. 10th September 1860, No. 4,507.)

Read again letter from the same Officer, dated 3rd October 1860, No. 980.

(In Cons. 19th October 1860, No. 5,327.)

Read also Order of Government, dated 21st September 1860, No. 4,673.

(In Cons., 22nd September 1860, No. 4,760.)

1. In his letter above recorded, the Director of Revenue Settlement offers his remarks on certain points noticed in the Board's Proceedings, dated 14th July last, No. 3,247, on his annual Report.

2. In paragraphs 2 to 9 Mr. Newill discusses the Board's observations in six of those Proceedings regarding the data on which his calculations of the area of work done were based. The Board expressed the opinion that data of a more satisfactory character might be obtained, and the Government also consider that "more certainty as to the rate of the *Paragraph* 3. excess" of the actual area over the Curnums' accounts "ought to be attainable than the vague Estimates now put forward from year to year." Mr. Newill explains the difficulties he has had to contend with in this matter, and states that the greatest care is now taken to ensure the utmost accuracy attainable under existing circumstances. Under his explanation the Board resolve to dispense with the preparation at present of the comparative statement proposed by them, but the course pointed out in the last sentence of paragraph 6 of their Proceedings will be carried out as directed by Government. For the rest, they will rely on Mr. Newill's furnishing as complete and accurate returns of the work done as he can supply. As regards the exact determination of the cost of each of the several processes, some difficulty will be experienced if individual villages are thus treated, and the Board are willing to modify their requisition, and to substitute Táluqs for villages : over such an area the exceptional circumstances which would disturb calculations limited to single villages, will cease to operate materially, and the calculation will be as near an approximation to accuracy as can be expected. The villages already completed can be grouped together so as to secure a sufficiently large area for the counteraction of these derangements.

3. The Board have requested that the probable cost of Demarcation, and *Paragraph* 10. the necessary correction of the Estimates, may be separately reported on in full detail.

4. Mr. Newill explains that the arguments in paragraph 23 of his Report *Paragraph* 11. relate to the distribution of the cost on the *whole out-turn* of the season. The Board (paragraph 13 of their Proceedings) were led by the expressions used by Mr. Newill in paragraph 22 of his report, to infer that the cost had been distributed over the *assumed area*.

5. The Board have addressed Government on the subject of European *Paragraph* 12. agency in their Proceedings, dated 15th October 1860.

Paragraph 13. 6. Mr. Newill's observations in paragraph 13 call for no remark.

7. The explanation of the Superintendent of the Survey was obtained *Paragraph* 14. during Mr. Newill's absence from the Presidency, from Captain Priestley, who was then at Madras. Printed copies have since been furnished to Mr. Newill, and their not having been sent in the first instance was an oversight which would have been rectified at once if Mr. Newill had brought it to notice.

8. The Board pointed out in paragraph 19 how the Demarcation and Survey *Paragraph* 15. should proceed together, viz., by adjusting the relative strength of the two departments, and so to equalise the speed at which they advance.

9. The Board will separately dispose of the questions of the transfer of village boundaries, &c., to the Collector's care, and the preparation of the maps. The only other point in this paragraph is the maximum limit of survey waste, noticed in paragraph 7 of the Order of Government above recorded.

Paragraph 16.

10. The Board have discussed this question with Mr. Newill and Captain Priestley, and the conclusion arrived at is that it is undesirable to break up survey fields, or rather that it is useless to survey fields in such a manner that they must be broken up when required for cultivation. The land thus surveyed is chiefly immemorial waste; likely, however, from position or other circumstances, to be taken up for cultivation at an early period. The maximum area is not often adopted, and the fields are "generally laid out in much smaller sizes." But there is nothing gained in retaining a maximum so much in excess of what can be adhered to in practice. The Board think that the actual size of the fields must be left very much to the discretion of the Officer who superintends their demarcation, who must be guided by the average size of the holdings in the village where the waste occurs, the natural configuration of the ground, and other circumstances which cannot be defined beforehand. In the early surveys, the extent of land which a pair of bullocks could plough, used to be the standard, but it is better to leave the matter more to the judgment of the Demarcation Officer, who will bear in mind that it is the convenience of the people that must be aimed at, and that, if his fields are too large, Government must either allow them to be broken up, whereby the advantage of the survey will be lessened, or the fields will continue waste to the loss both of Government and the people. Two other expedients may be adopted, viz., either to allow the people to sub-divide fields exceeding certain limits, provided the sub-division is not below a certain minimum, and the person who sub-divides pays the expense of surveying and marking off his plot, or to permit portions to be taken up without regular sub-division on an annual tenancy, which, unlike the full Ryotwary tenure, might be terminated by the holder or Government at option at the close of each Fasli. Both these alternatives, however, are intricate in practice, and the Board are of opinion, in which Mr. Newill concurred, that the best plan will be to lay out the fields in convenient sizes. The Board propose, therefore, that the minimum and maximum limits hereafter should be from 2 to 6 acres in irrigable, and from 4 to 12 acres in unirrigable land. The Director should carefully scrutinize the proceedings of his subordinates in this respect. Where the waste may already have been numbered as fields in the village accounts, it should be surveyed accordingly, subject to the usual limit of 2 and 4 acres now in force in regard to occupied lands.

11. The employment of Curnums in measuring interstitial fields will be separately disposed of, when the information expected from Captain Priestley is received.

Paragraph 17.

12. Arrangements should be made to obviate the delays alluded to in this paragraph.

Paragraph 18.

13. The Board intended that copies of all papers of importance should be sent as soon as possible to the Survey Department, and that Captain Priestley should have ready access to any records he may wish to see, of which copies are not, or cannot conveniently be supplied to him.

Paragraph 21.

14. The subject of paragraphs 22 to 30, viz., the separation of the Demarcation and Classification Departments, has been disposed of in the Board's Proceedings of this date, No. 4,864.

Paragraphs 22 to 30.

15. The Board do not gather whether Mr. Newill proposes to reduce the time now allotted to field work, or merely contemplates the possibility of having to do so at no distant period. This is a matter in which experience is the only safe guide, and a definite proposal should be submitted for the orders of Government, if the Director thinks it necessary to make such a change otherwise than as a temporary arrangement.

Paragraph 31.

16. The rest of the above letter does not appear to call for any remark.

17. The same is the case with Mr. Newill's second letter above recorded.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
13th December 1860.

18. As regards paragraph 9 of the Order of Government, the Board request Mr. Newill to make the necessary modification in the rule referred to.

19. In paragraph 75 of their Proceedings of the 14th July last, the Board referred to the correspondence regarding the settlement of the Manárgudi and Chellambaram Táluqs of South Arcot, on which Government have since passed orders.*

* *No.* 1,906, *Revenue Department, dated* 19*th in Cons.* 20*th October* 1860, *No.* 5,344.

20. Resolved that a copy of these Proceedings be submitted to Government, whose early orders are requested on the subject discussed in paragraph 10.

No. 203. ORDER THEREON, 13th December 1860, No. 2,387.

1. In these Proceedings the Board of Revenue review two letters from the Director of Revenue Settlement, relating to their Proceedings on his last annual Report and the order of Government thereupon. The first of these letters was written previous to the Order of 21st September, No. 1,673, but did not come under notice on that occasion.

2. No lengthy orders are required on these papers. The Government agree in the remarks of the Board in paragraph 1. The question alluded to in paragraph 10, viz., the maximum limit of "Survey waste," appears to have been carefully considered by the Board in conjunction with the Director Revenue Settlement and the Superintendent Revenue Survey, and the Governor in Council has, therefore, no hesitation in acceding to the Board's proposal that the minimum and maximum limits hereafter should be from 2 to 6 acres in irrigable and 4 to 12 acres in unirrigable land. It is to be understood that the demarcation will still divide the waste land now under consideration into as convenient fields as circumstances may permit.

3. The Government presume that a copy of Mr. Newill's letter of the 6th September has been sent to Captain Priestley with reference to paragraph 12 of the Proceedings under review.

4. The subject of paragraph 14 has already* been disposed of.

* *7th December* 1860, *No.* 2,334.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Deputy Secretary to Government.

Revenue Settlement Office,
Madras, 3rd October 1860.

No. 980

From
H. Newill Esq.
Director of Revenue Settlement.

To
J. D. Sim Esq.
Secretary to the Board of Revenue
for Fort St. George.

Sir,

Referring to the order of Govern-
ment dated 21st ultimo No. 1673, on the Board's
Proceedings of 11th July last No. 3217, sub-
mitting the Reports on the Settlement and Survey
operations for the past year, I have the
honor to observe that explanation on the
principal points on which it is required
by Government is contained in my letter
of 6th September 1860 No. 849, which did
not come under review at the same time
as the Annual Reports and the Board's
Remarks on the same.

To Govt.
Copy sent to Board.

2 I have to request that the question
referred in para 8 of the Government
order, and discussed in my letter above
quoted

quated may come under early consi-
deration, as steps are required to be taken
either to presume work in the Nellore Dis-
trict on the same footing as before, or
else to modify the Procedure as proposed
in my letter. Captain Priestley is expected
to return to Madras from Ceylon in a few
days, and I would suggest as early a
day as practicable afterwards for the Con-
ference proposed by Government.

3 In reference to the opinion
expressed in Para 3 of the Government
order that "the measure in use in any
village is always constant" I have
called for further detail information
and the result will be submitted
when received.

4 In reference to the remarks
of Government on Para 8 of the Board's
Proceedings, I beg to explain that the cost
for demarcation and Classification res-
pectively was apportioned in the manner
minutely described in my report for
the previous year in proportion to the
time spent on each of these operations,
whether by servants of one or the other
branch, so that the charges are correctly
given

given as those actually incurred for demar-
cation and Classification respectively.
The excess of charge for Classification in the
Krishna party compared with that of
the Godavary is only trifling
(Rupees 357) while the
difference in area on
the other side is only 15 sq. miles, the operations
on the calculations of detailed area costing
in the one case Rupees 40-2-0 per
Square Mile, in the other Rupees 41-8-0.
per Square Mile.

	Classified area	Charges
Godavary	712	28594
Krishna	697	28951
	15	357

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant.

H. Elliot
Director of Revenue Settlement.

J. D. Sim Esq
Secretary to the Board of Revenue
Fort St. George

Revue Deptt

No. 2387.

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 13th Nov. 1860

Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

Submitting for the orders of Govt with the Board's opinion correspondence with the Director of Revenue Settlement offering remarks on the Board's observations regarding the data on which his calculations of the area of work done were based.

(Here enter 23rd Oct. 1860 No. 4863)

In these Proceedings the Board of Revenue review two letters from the Director of Revenue Settlement relating to their Proceedings on his last Annual report and the order of Govt thereupon. The first of these

2. No lengthy orders are required on these papers. The Govt agree in the remarks

Original to Govt
Bd of Rev Ord
dated 13th Nov 1860
No. 2387

Revenue Board Letter.
From
No. 5327.
Director Rev Settlement.

Survey & Settlement Office
Bangalore 22nd Oct 1860

Sir

In reply to your letter
No. 9880
dated 19th Inst
I beg to state that the explanation
called for by you in the Proceedings
of the Board of Revenue in
letter No. 4863 dated 23rd Inst
will be given in a separate
letter which I shall have the honor
to address to the Board of Revenue
in course.

I have &c.

W. M.

Letters was written previous to the order of 21st Sept. No. 4643, but did not come under notice on that occasion.

remarks of the Board in paragraph 1. The question alluded to in para 10 viz: the maximum limit of Survey "waste" appears to have been carefully considered by the Board in conjunction with the Director of Revenue Settlement and the Superintendent Revenue Survey, and the Governar in Council has therefore no hesitation in according to the Board's proposal that the minimum and maximum limits hereafter should be from 2 to 6 acres in irrigable and 4 to 12 acres in unirrigable land. It is

3. The Govt presume that a copy of Mr Newill's letter of the 6th September has been sent to Captain Priestley with reference to para 12 of the Proceedings under review.

4. The subject of para

the understood that the Director will still divide the [illegible] into as convenient fields as circumstances may permit.

x 7 Dec 1869 - No 2884 -

para 14 has already been disposed of.

x

12 Copies Board of Revenue Circ 14
3 " Director of Revenue Settlement
7 " Superintendent of Revenue Survey

Note on page 2

The present maximum is 20 acres for all kinds of land - But of course a large majority of the fields are not made so large - Still there is a tendency, naturally enough, to keep the fields large so that [illegible] small - The 6th max. of 12 acres is certainly large enough in the present circumstances of the people - But it is to large even

I D S

Revenue 1860 Depart.
Pro: of Govt. for December

No 2387.

Pro: of the Madras Govt.
Dy 13th December 1860.

Regarding the Annual Returns of the Survey for 1859-60

(14)

350-381
21-9-60

309-318
19-10-60

On the Boards review of two letters from the Dy. of Revenue Settlement offering remarks regarding the data on which the calculations of the area of work done were based

No 202 & 203.