M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 939 Press ~~Mis.~~

71-72

Dated 7-6- 1860.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 71. Read the following letetr from G. F. FISCHER, Esq., Proprietor of Salem Muttha, to His Excellency Sir C. E. TREVELYAN, K. C. B., Governor in Council, Fort Saint George, dated March 1860.

I do myself the honor of addressing your Excellency in Council in the matter of the Petition embodied in the address from myself and the raiyats of my Muttha, which I had the honor of presenting to your Excellency on the occasion of your late visit to Salem; and I respectfully request your Excellency's forbearance and impartial consideration. It was impossible within the limits of the address referred to, to do more than mention briefly our request; and, in the discussion which your Excellency subsequently permitted, many things prevented a clear and complete elucidation of the subject. Therefore I take the liberty of stating the question at length to your Excellency in Council, feeling assured on the one hand, that your Excellency at present labors under misconceptions which it is in my power to remove; and on the other that your Excellency's ability, impartiality and liberality, will conduce to results highly satisfactory to my impoverished raiyats.

2. I desire, first, to remove the idea which your Excellency appears to entertain, that I am asking a benefit for myself. It must clearly be understood at the outset that I seek no improvement of my own position; that all, so far as regards myself, that I ask for, is to be protected from injury; and that the benefits I request for my raiyats can only advantage me very indirectly, and at a period of time too remote to make them of any great consequence to me personally. In point of fact, I shall in one respect be a loser, by the reduction of the Assessment: my per centage on the collections will of course amount to less when those collections are reduced. Could I be assured that one result of the denial to my raiyats of the benefits granted the Ain raiyats will *not* be the eventual desertion of my lands for Government holdings; and could I be content to see my people struggling with desperation to pay me my just dues, while their fellow-countrymen around them, their very neighbours, pay their taxes with ease, and have a surplus wherewith to make merry; I would then seek no reduction of my present Assessment. But it is not so; and I, therefore, once more beg your Excellency to reduce my kist; not for my own benefit, but on condition that I remit to my raiyats the full amount of such reduction.

3. The question, then, is one, not so much between Government and myself; as between Government and my raiyats. And I beg respectfully to submit, on behalf of the latter, that they are entitled, equally with the rest of their fellow subjects, to the paternal consideration of the Government. On what grounds, inapplicable to my raiyats, have the Ain people been thus benefited? Are they subjects of Her Majesty? So are my people. Are they loyal to the Crown? So are my people. Are they good Citizens? So are my people. Do they, in relation to the State, stand in any way, as respects their claims to good Government, and their right to the privileges of good Citizens, different from the raiyats of my Muttha? By no means. Being then equally loyal to the Crown, equally obedient to the law, and equally contributing their share to the maintenance of the State, they are, I conceive, equally entitled to the consideration of the Government.

4. This being acknowledged, as it doubtless will be, by your Excellency, it is only necessary to show that my Muttha stands as much in *need* of a reduction of the Assessment as did the surrounding Ain country. And here I should state, that what is requested is not a *general* reduction, in the sense of a reduction of *every* man's kist: but a reduction of all *over* assessed land, "a reduction in those cases in which the necessity for it can be proved." We do not ask for *more* than has been granted the Ain raiyats: but for as much, and only as much. The documents which accompanied the address presented by me to your Excellency on the 3rd instant are sufficient, I think, to show to your Excellency, that much of the Muttha land is greatly over-assessed. A comparision of those statements with similar ones relative to direct Government holdings, will prove that if our neighbours had to pay exorbitant tax, so had we. And necessarily so: for the permanent Assessment was fixed *before* the Muttha was formed; and the Muttha was consequently at that time a portion of the Ain country, similarly treated, and similarly assessed. It connot be urged against our request that our assessment has been permanently fixed; first, because no Government has the

power to make irrevocable laws, or to legislate for all future time; secondly, because revenue as well as judicial legislation must mutate with time, and the progress of events; and thirdly, because such an objection is equally conclusive against reductions in the Ain country.

5. Why has the State sanctioned permanent remissions in the Government holdings? Firstly, and remembering the gracious words of Her Majesty's Proclamation, I believe *principally*, from a desire to benefit the people, to stimulate them to a career of industrious enterprise, to better their condition, and render them happy, as far as it is in the power of the State to render them happy. And have not my raiyats a claim upon the Government for the same paternal treatment? Do *they* need, or do *they* deserve, no such encouragement? Is the Government unmindful of *their* happiness? Will not *their* prosperity conduce to the strength of our Sovereign? Will not *their* contentment tend in some degree to the security of the Empire? In *their* gratitude, will there be no reward?

6. Remissions have been made in the Ain country; secondly, in the expectation that waste lands will be extensively taken up, and the area of cultivation increased so greatly as to provide in reality a larger revenue to the State. Were this the *only* or the *principal*, reason for the reductions, I confess, I should despair of the success of my Petition; for in my Muttha there is little or no waste land whereby the Government might be recompensed. But I cannot think that Her Majesty's Government will deny the just prayer of my raiyats; will refuse to stretch out its arm to relieve them; will decline to apply to them a measure which would reanimate them, lay the basis of a lasting prosperity and enable them to contribute in just proportion to the glory, as they do to the maintenance, of this great Empire; merely for the sake of a few thousand Rupees. Though the reduction would not probably be repaid the Government in *kind*, it would amply in the increased happiness and prosperity of the people: in the consequent increased demand for manufactures; in the stimulated industry, the peaceful and loyal content, the improved civilization, and the grateful benisons of those for whom I plead.

7. The question may be viewed in another aspect. I, as Mutthádár, stand, as regards Government, in precisely the position of an Ain raiyat; as regards my people, I stand in the position of Government, I am an Ain raiyat of the Government, a raiyat of larger growth, still a raiyat, and as such entitled to claim the benefit of the measure granted to my fellow raiyat. My holding is over-assessed; as an Aim raiyat I respectfully submit my claim to a reduction of my Assessment.

8. As regards my people, I stand in the place of Government. They look to me for the boon which Government has granted to the Ain raiyat; but it is impossible for me to grant it unless the Government enable me to do so. It is my duty, before God and my country, and my conscience, to cherish my people, to foster every improvement, to encourage them in the path of progress; in one sense, as the *agent*, in another as the *competitor*, as it were, of Government. As the agent of Government, I look to it for the means whereby to lay the foundation of my people's prosperity; as the competitor, I respectfully protest against a competition in which the Government refuse me the means of starting on an equality.

9. The denial of my prayer will be practically a breach of faith to myself, an injustice to my people, and eventually injurious to myself and injurious to the Government. Practically, a breach of faith to myself, because the Muttha was granted to the first holder, and through him to me, under the important and *actuating* circumstance of a permanent kist being fixed, not on the Muttha alone, but on all the surrounding country. The contract was made under circumstances which have now become materially and essentially altered; under the especial circumstance of the Muttha and Ain country being similarly situated and of that similarity of situation being intended to be *permanent*. The relations have varied; the similarity is destroyed; the Ain Assessment has *not* proved permanent. The destruction of the similarity is a breach of the contract. I submit that as I have performed my part, Government should perform its; and preserve the Ain and Muttha lands in their proper position towards each other, either by reducing the Assessment on *both*, or by not reducing it on either. The denial of my prayer will be a breach of contract, further, in tending to render me unable to fulfil my portion of it, by practically offering a premium to my raiyats to desert the Muttha for the Ain lands.

10. The denial of my prayer will be an injustice to my people; as, for no fault of their own, for no merit of their neighbours; it places them in a far inferior position to those neighbours to

that in which they stood to them before; it reduces them from equality to inferiority; it places them under the greatest disadvantages in the race of progress; it is to them a practical denial of a right to the care of the State which they support: it is to them a practical sentence, as involving the principle, of outlawry. The Ain raiyats, for no merit of their own, are relieved of a heavy burden; the Muttha raiyats, for no fault of their own, are condemned to continue under it. The Ain raiyats, for no merit of their own, have had their lands increased, the Muttha raiyats, for no fault of their own, have had theirs decreased, in value.

11. The denial of my prayer will eventually be injurious to myself. How can I expect my raiyats to cultivate their lands, when they can get lands in the Ain country on terms so much easier than those I can grant them? my Muttha will be deserted eventually; it will be impossible for me to hold it: it will relapse to Government; and *then* its Assessment will be reduced to a level with that of the Ain country. Surely this eventuality cannot be in the contemplation of *Her Majesty's* Government?

12. The denial of my prayer will be an injury to the Government, as anything which retards the progress of any portion of its subjects, any thing which tends to restrain the free and confident application of capital; any thing which prevents or damps enterprise; any thing which places one portion of its subjects at a disadvantage in regard to another, must eventually be.

13. In order, as far as my poor ability serves me, to leave no portion of this important subject unventilated, I beg respectfully to submit a few remarks on your Excellency's reply to the address previously referred to, and which has called forth this letter. Your Excellency's remarks appear based on the erroneous supposition that our Petition was mainly for my benefit; and it is with confidence that I hope that my repeated assurance that what I ask is for the benefit of my raiyats, will create a change in your Excellency's mind favorable to my Petition.

14. Your Excellency says, "in reply to this,* I must "observe; first, that there has been no general reduction "of the Assessment in the Ain portion of the District, but "only in those cases in which the necessity for it has been proved."

* "That the Kusba Muttha of Salem has not participated in the reduction of Assessment which has been granted to the Ain holders."

15. In respect to *all* lands, the reduction has not been general, because all lands did not require it. In respect to over-assessed lands the reduction has been general, nay, universal. I ask for my raiyats, no more than has been granted to their neighbours; I ask not a reduction of every man's kist, but a reduction of all over-assessment, a "reduction in all cases where the necessity for "it can be proved."

16. Your Excellency further says; "secondly, that the Mutthádár purchased his Estate "with a full knowledge of all the antecedent circumstances."

17. The Mutthádár asks nothing for himself, as for himself. He would be perfectly willing to abide by the conditions of the contract, if the material and *actuating* circumstances remained the same. But these latter have been changed by the Government; the contract has virtually been broken; the value of his land has been greatly depreciated.

18. Your Excellency goes on to say, "and that the great rise of prices which has since "taken place has been greatly to his advantage and that of the persons holding under him."

19. I beg respectfully to dispute this position. But supposing it correct, I submit with deference, that it does not affect the question at issue, which is not the *absolute* affluence of the Muttha raiyats or the *absolute* improvement in their circumstances, but their affluence and improvement *relatively* to those of the Ain raiyats. If the Muttha raiyats have benefited by the great rise in prices, so have the Ain raiyats, and the question between the two remains the same. But I beg permission to remark that it is a mistake to suppose that the great rise in prices has been greatly to the advantage of the Mutthádár and his raiyats. As regards the Mutthádár peculiarly, it has been positively disadvantageous; for his fixed per centage on the collections, being in money and not in kind, is of less value when prices are high than when they are low. As regards the raiyats, and myself as a member of the community, it would be difficult to show wherein we have benefited by the high prices.

20. In the first place, high prices are owing to failure of rain, and the consequent diminished production: and are regulated by the sum which, *relatively to the quantity produced*, will meet the expenses of production. High prices imply scarcity: the high rates multiplied by the small quantity in a bad year, only equal the low rates multiplied by the large quantity in a good year. Wherein, then, is the advantage to the cultivator? in a good season my field yields five cundagums of grain, worth 10 Rupees. In a bad season my field yields only two and a half cundagums. If I sell these two and a half cundagums for 10 Rupees, I neither lose nor gain by the difference of seasons.

21. In the second place, high prices do not benefit the raiyats, for while he *receives* a high price for his own article, he has to *pay* a correspondingly high price for his neighbours. In fact, high prices *injure* him; for while, what he receives for his own produce, equals in *total* what he received in time of plenty, what he *pays* for his neighbour's produce *exceeds* what he paid then. And thus it is, that in times of plenty the raiyat eats rice, and in times of scarcity dry grain; thus it is that when low prices obtain, the raiyot works on his farm and cooly labor is scarce, and when high prices reign, he hires himself out as a cooly.

22. Your Excellency proceeds to remark that "we are all equally interested in the maintenance of the just claims of the State."

23. I will not examine the question how far the exorbitant Assessment complained of is a *just* claim upon the part of the State: nor whether the State has not, by granting the reductions in the Ain country, and by granting them as a *right*, and not as a *boon*, practically acknowledged its injustice. It is sufficient to admit to the full the propriety of the Muttha raiyats paying each his just proportion to the revenue of the country; and to protest against the Muttha raiyats being made to pay *more* in proportion than their fellows of the Ain country, as the enforcement on the part of the State of an unjust claim.

24. Your Excellency further observers: "the testimony you bear to the improvement of your condition from the judicious outlay of capital, and from remissions on the more highly assessed lands on the part of its present proprietor, is honorable to him and satisfactory to me; and I hope that he will meet the reward of his liberal and spirited conduct." Gratifying as is this remark to me, I must beg permission to observe that it does not affect the question at issue. Great or small as may be the absolute improvements in the condition of my tenantry which I have been fortunate enough to create, it matters not in the question as between the Muttha and the Ain raiyats. And, unless your Excellency grant our prayer, the reward I am likely to reap eventually, should Providence spare my life long enough, will be to see my Muttha deserted for the Ain country, and sequestered by the Government.

25. The concluding sentence of your Excellency's reply clothes an argument which cuts both ways; which is as effective against reductions in the Ain country, as against reductions in the Muttha; which, if over-ruled in the case of the former, is powerless in that of the latter.

26. In the conversation which followed your Excellency's reply to our address, your Excellency stated that if the Mutthádár wished to annul his contract he must be prepared to render his accounts. I am perfectly aware that, whether I wish to annul the contract (which the Government has already annulled) or not, the Government has the power at any time to call upon me to submit my accounts, and I am perfectly ready to do so, and to show your Excellency, that my profits have been a moderate interest upon my outlay.

27. Hoping for your Excellency's favorable consideration and early decision.

No. 72. ORDER THEREON, 7th June 1860, No. 939.

1. In this letter the proprietor of the Salem Muttha prays that the reductions lately made in the Assessments in the Government villages of the District, may be extended to him. This request is supported by a variety of arguments, which are stated with considerable ingenuity. There is much in them from which the Government entirely dissent; but it is not necessary to notice them in detail, because the answer to the whole is simple and brief.

2. The late reductions in Salem and other Districts were a financial operation, similar in kind to those effected in branches of the English Revenue, where taxes were reduced in the confidence that increased consumption would replace the sum given up. The expectation in this case was that the amount of revenue surrendered would be speedily made good, and more than made good, by extended cultivation; there was no intention at all to give up any revenue permanently; and the result has agreed with the expectation.

But this operation is obviously inapplicable to Zamíndáris and Mutthas, because the Government Revenue from such properties is fixed, and incapable of increase by any extension of cultivation; the increased gain from which goes to the proprietor and not to the Government.

3. But precisely the same action is within the power of the proprietors themselves. As the benefit of all improvements made by a landlord, and of all extension of cultivation, accrues to the landlord, he may adopt the same means of extending cultivation, and in very many cases this has actually been done. If it be true, as urged by the Salem Mutthádár, that he has little or no waste land from which to repay himself, the reason is that all the waste lands in the Muttha at the time of its formation, have already been fully brought under cultivation; in other words that he is already enjoying a much larger income from the property than it yielded originally.

Paragraph 6.

4. The expression "fixed per centage" which occurs more than once in the letter, with reference to the Mutthádár's profit from his Estate, is likely to mislead. His profit is not at all a "fixed per centage on the collections."* It is true that the Peshkash was originally fixed at a certain proportion of the computed rent; but being once fixed it is invariable, and all excess in the "collections," over the amount assumed at that time, is clear profit to the Mutthádár.

* Paragraph 16.

5. Mr. Fischer talks of the danger of his raiyats leaving their land in his Estate to go and take new land in Government villages; and he anticipates that his Muttha will be deserted, and that being unable to pay his Peshkash, he will lose his Estate.† The Government have not the slightest apprehension that any part of these, anticipations will be realized.

† Paragraph 11.

(Signed) J. D. BOURDILLON,
Secretary to Government.

Memorandum

With reference to Mr. Matthey's remarks on the Salem Mutta draft, I now circulate some papers which I have procured from the Board of Revenue showing the assets of the Mutta. The most important document is statement B in the letter from the Special Commissioner to Government, dated August 2nd 1802, which gives the cultivation and waste of the villages forming the Mutta, the jamá for several years, and the permanent settlement then formed. —

2. — The following Table gives the particulars

on

in a compendious form.—

	Pergunah.	Nimpah.	acres Total.
Col. 1 Land cultivated in F. 1211 (1800/01)	4,524.	991.	5515.
Col. 2 Land unoccupied in 1211 but cultivated in former years.	324.	38.	362.
Col 3. Land waste and unreclaimed but cultivable.	228.	"	228.
Total cultivable Waste	5076	1029.	6105.
Percentage of waste cultivated land to cultivation of F. 1211.	7.	4.	7.
— Do. — Do. — of cultivable unreclaimed to — do — do	5	"	4
— Do. — of the whole cultivable waste to — do — do	11	"	11

	Rupees
Col 5. Jumá of F. 1211	5979
Col 6 — Do. — of F. 1210	5710
Col 7 Average land rent of 9 years including F. 1210	5005.
Col 8. Permanent Jumá proposed by the Collector	4779
Col 10 — Do. — Do. — proposed by the Commissioner	5000.
Col. 13 Additional rent falling due in F. 1212 and 1213 to the advantage of the proprietors.	20.

3.— It will be seen that in the year which was taken as the basis of the settlement viz: F. 1211, there was cultivable waste to the extent of 11 per cent of the cultivated land. No doubt this waste was not all equal to the cultivated in quality, and the unreclaimed waste would probably be brought into cultivation by Cowle- But still it was an available source of income, the receipts from which were only postponed.

4.— It will be seen also that there was in fact much more than that 11 per cent of available land, for while the Jumá of F. 1211, being the Revenue from the cultivation of that year, less any remission given, was Rupees 5,979; the permanent

permanent settlement was
Pags. 5,000 - This left the
Zemindar or Muttadar
a profit of 979 Pagodas, to
which is to be added 20 Pa-
godas to accrue (from Cowle
probably) in the years 1212 and
1213, making in all one Pags.
profit to the Muttadar, in
addition to all the cultivable
which was equal yto above 10 percent more-
waste - I do not include
the Monigaram pay at the dis-
posal of the Muttadar being
99 Pagodas (Col. 14) ; be-
cause that may be looked
on as forming a necessary part
of the cost of collection in
one shape or another.

5. On the foregoing facts
it appears to me that taking
things as they were at the
time of the settlement no
claim to reduction can be
made out, and that the
argument

argument in the draft-as to
the resources of the Muttadar in
the waste, is sustained. But,
in fact, things are much more
favorable to him and to his
Raiyats than they were at
the settlement, from the very
high prices. -

6. Further the argument
remains unchanged that the
reduction in the Spot's village
was not intended as a sa-
crifice of Revenue, and has
not proved so; whereas the
reduction now asked for would
be a sacrifice of Revenue
without possibility of re-
covery. It certainly appears
to me that no ground
has been established for
such a sacrifice, and it must
be remembered that if con-
ceded in this case, it must
be allowed to all the Mut-
tadars throughout the country

7— I caused search to be made for cases such as are referred to at the close of Mr. Mattley's remarks, of reductions similar to that asked for by Mr. Fischer. No such cases have been found, but a case has been met with and is put up in which the Board refused a reduction claimed on similar grounds by the auctioneers for three lots in St. Croix; for the same reasons as those given in the draft —

May 28.

~~This Memorandum does~~ The information contained in this Memorandum strongly supports the view had already taken of the subject

WW May 29-60.

I think the papers now submitted show

that Mr Strike has no power to act as he has done. The Marquis left a house in Jersey which was permanently occupied — and could not be let — except with the furniture in it. Mr Strike in his petition only deals in acres & houses & gives us no data to judge of it. Those which we now have I think justify us in rejecting the Judge's decision

W W

— as the depts of the Assistants are deemed sufficient, I pass the draft — but continue of opinion that when applications of this kind come on Shortly the Assistants of our Custom, justice requires us to make an enquiry before rejecting them —

In reference to the last Para of the Memo, I had in recollection the Shores Villages of Trespalene & Carossoy in St Croix — They were given on Shares for 3 lives, and to solve a difficulty of the

present hint, Govt in 1855
brought up the Notwendi
suit, & gave to the ryots the
benefits of the reduction of upt
allowed elsewhere.

Several other applications have occurred
besides that of Vadlamudi re Kistna
viz the Mokhasa of Mounagy in Salem.
the Mokhasa Village of Mundagapet in
S. Arcot & the Shrotagery Zemindary in
Tinnevelly - but these not proper at-
hand to shew how they were settled.

Yule

Mounagy Mutha. Salem

On the 6 Sept 1856 the Secretary to the Board of Revenue forwarded to the Collector of Salem a petition presented by some ryots of the Mounagy Mutha in the Naukal Taluq, complaining that the Muthadar did not allow them the reductions lately granted by the Government in the Inam villages. The Board requested the Collector to inform them whether the Muthadar was willing to put his ryots on an equality with those of the Circar villages, if his Peishkash permitted it, and if so to send a statement shewing the resources of the Mutha viz. the cultivable Ayacut, both waste and cultivated, the assessment leviable by the Muthadar, and the extent of Arudro karambu, and Varamboku: also in what manner and on what calculations the Mutha Peishkash was fixed.

20 August 1858. The Collector in reply forwarded a report by his Sub Collector dated 3 July 1857.

Mr. Dyas notes first as to the general question that a claim for remission grounded on reductions of assessment in surrounding Govt lands is not tenable in general because when the Muthas were originally made, a special provision was introduced to meet such an emergency, i.e. waste lands were given into the bargain, to enable the Muthadars if requisite, to lower their rates & increase their cultivation.

C28 Thing / Rs Inam

As to the particular instance in question, the complaint of the ryots was that the mutthadar compelled them to pay such rates as he chose, though the land was not that on which the original peishkash was fixed, i.e. it was not cultivated at that time, but was waste land included in the boundaries of the mutha, and had been brought under cultivation with much trouble and expenditure on their part. Another complaint was that the mutthadar had set up an exclusive right to the pasturage of all the waste lands in the mutha. Their prayer was that Govt would interfere & secure them such favorable terms as were granted by Govt to the ryots.

Mr Dykes observed that while there may be some truth in the ryots' representation, the facts as stated in the petition itself clearly show that the mutthadars do not require any reduction to be made in their peishkash, nor the ryots themselves, the enquiry if made led him to think that supposing such reduction was made, the ryots would reap no benefit.

The fact appeared to be that the mutthadars had on taking (covered the rates on the basis of which the peishkash had been originally fixed) at all events in good land subsequently brought under cultivation themselves, a fair profit & the ryots the benefit of a percentage reduction. Again with the view of the specific reduction asked for, & the prosperity resulting

Mr Dykes concluded that as the mutthadars themselves stood in no need of reduction, the best way to operate for the relief of the ryots would be to improve the tenure & condition of those holding Govt lands. The mutthadars would then be obliged to concede what was just, or lose their ryots, who would find a better investment for their capital in taking up lands held direct of Government.

The Collector in forwarding this report did not think it necessary to go into the subject, because the Govt had already decided, on a petition of a similar nature from certain ryots of the Karba Mutha of Salem, that they would not interfere in the internal arrangements of permanently settled estates," nor "could they reduce the "peishkash payable by the proprietor"

G. 2976 of 1839.

would depend upon the accounts, which in a mutha, could not be dependent upon, especially when the interests of the mutthadar and his ryots were identical.

As to the question put by the Board the mutthadars stated that they would be very happy to take any reduction they could get, and that they would make such reductions to their ryots as might seem just and proper to themselves. Mr Dykes did not therefore read any of the statements called for by the Board, especially as they could be made without the aid of a separate establishment.

Mr Dykes concluded that as the mutthadars themselves stood in no need of reduction, the best way to operate for the relief of the ryots would be to improve the tenure & condition of those holding Govt lands. The mutthadars would then be obliged to concede what was just, or lose their ryots, who would find a better investment for their capital in taking up lands held direct of Government.

The Collector in forwarding this report did not think it necessary to go into the subject, because the Govt had already decided, on a petition of a similar nature from certain ryots of the Karba Mutha of Salem, that they could not "interfere in the internal arrangements of permanently settled estates," nor "could they reduce the "peishkash payable by the proprietor"

They left it open to the latter to give what remissions he pleases, and to remunerate himself by the extension of cultivation which will follow.

The Board seem to have taken no action on this Report, for on the 11th March 1860 they asked the Collector whether he required any orders upon it now. Mr Knox replied on 21 March 1860, that no further orders were necessary, especially as Sir Charles Trevelyan had personally explained to Mr Fischer that no remissions wd be granted to Mundagapatt Muthadars.

Cuddalore

On the 26 Dec. 1855, the Collector of S. Arcot reported the petition presented by the Muthadars of this village, who complained that in consequence of the temporary reduction which had been granted in the 20 villages of the Taluq, they were unable to collect the full kists from the ryots of the village in question; they requested that they might be allowed to resign the village, returning back from Govt the sum they had paid for it — but proclaimed it at public auction, for Rs. 3550-

Mr Hall did not think it advisable that Government should repurchase the village for that sum, but agreed to ascertain the exact sum for which the parties would be willing to relinquish their rights.

5 Jan 1856 / No 54. The Board requested him to do so, and also to inform them what reduction in the Peishkash of the Muthadars would be required in order to meet the loss of Revenue which the Muthadars would incur by reducing the kists of their ryots to the same footing with those holding Govt lands.

15 Feb. 1856. Mr Hall replied that the Muthadars altogether declined to part with their village, but had consented to grant a reduction of 20 per cent on Punjai land to their ryots, if 315 Rs were remitted from their annual peishkash of Rs. 2683- This sum of 315 Rs was 20 per cent on the average revenue for the last five years on the Punjai cultivation.

4 April 1856. No. 987. The Board observed that no information had been given regarding the Punjai lyacut & the portion still waste. They were unable to judge, therefore, what gain the Muthadars might expect from an increase of cultivation when the Punjai assessment is modified. They requested that this information might be supplied them, and also the same regarding the Punjai and garden lands.

From the statements which accompanied the Collector's letter of the 14 April 1856, it appears that of the entire ayacut - Kanjai - was 334 kanis - of this 192 kanis were Puramboke and Inam and of the remaining 161 kanis 130 were usually cultivated and 31 were waste. In Punjai - the total ayacut was kanis 720 reduced by Puramboke and Inam to kanis 540. of which 431 were usually cultivated and 109 were waste. There was no garden land in the Zemindary

It does not appear whether the Board passed any order in this case.

Swarajya Zamindari

Jammelly

The Zamindar prayed that the peishkash on his estate might be reduced from Rs. 56,000 & Rs. 42,000 per annum, and the Collector supported the application, being of opinion that the Zamindar was over assessed, under high rates of commutation having been taken into calculation when the peishkash was originally fixed. The Board partially agreed on this ground, but looking at the other elements which entered into the calculation of assets; at the prosperous state of the estate; and the capabilities of it at various times since the permanent settlement: they came to the conclusion that had the Zamindar used proper management, and taken care of the works of irrigation, the estate would have been a profitable one - they therefore declined to recommend to Govt any concession.

See B^d's Proceedings of 27 April 1858 - No. 1489. where the subject is fully examined.

C G^n
18 Sept 58.

(12)

Forwarded for
information to the
Collector of Salem
with the request
that he will
return the papers
after perusal

The Collector
can give no
information
regarding
the case
referred to
in his memo.
on the Salem
Case. They are
for information only
Mr. Fischer's
case not
recent application, this
the same application was
made in 1857 & rejected.

Sept. 21.

No. 939

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 7th June 1860

Read the following letter
from G. F. Fischer Esqre
Proprietor of Salem
Mutta

Prays that his
Mutta may be allowed
to participate in the reduc-
tion of assessment lately
granted to the surrounding
Ainlands.

(Here enter March 1860)

In this letter the
proprietor of the Salem Mutta
prays that the reductions
lately made in the assess-
ments in the Government
villages of the District may
be extended to him. The
request is supported by a
variety of arguments, which
are stated with considerable
ingenuity. There is much
in

in them from which the
Govt. entirely dissent; but
it is not necessary to notice
them in detail, because
the answer to the whole
is simple and brief -

2 The late reductions
in Salaries and other Dis-
tricts were a financial
operation, similar in
kind to those effected in
branches of the English
Revenue, where taxes were
reduced in the confidence
that increased consumption
would replace the remi-
tted rate. The expectation
in this case was that the
amount of revenue sur-
rendered would be speedily
made good, and more than
made good, by extended
cultivation; there was no
intention at all to give up
any revenue permanently.

and

and the result has agreed
with the expectation.

But this operation
is obviously inapplicable
to Zamindaries and
Inuttas, because the
Govt. Revenue from such
properties is fixed, and
incapable of increase by
any extension of cultivation,
the increased gain from
which goes to the proprie-
tor and not to the Govt.

3. But precisely
the same action is within
the power of the proprietors
themselves or the tenants
of it of all improvements
made by a landlord,
and of all extensions of
cultivation, accruing to
the landlord, he may
adopt the same means
of extending cultivation,

and

~~and have expressly given~~
~~this than actually been~~
~~drawn off. It be true, as~~
~~urged by the Salem~~ Co
Muttadár, that he has little
or no waste land from which
to repay himself, the
reason is that all the
waste lands in the Mutta
at the time of its forma-
tion, have already been
fully brought under cul-
tivation; in other words
that he is already en-
joying a much larger
income from the property
than it yielded originally.

Para 6.

The expression "fixed
percentage" which occurs
more than once in the letter,
~~paper~~, with reference
to the Muttadárs pro-
fit from his Estate,
is likely to mislead.

His

Para 16.

~~His profit is not at all~~
~~a fixed percentage on~~
~~the collections.~~ It is true
that the Peishkash was
originally fixed at a cer-
tain proportion of the
computed rent, but being
once fixed it is invariable,
and all excess in the "collections" over the
amount ~~of the collections~~
assumed at that time,
is clear profit to the
Muttadár.

Raiyats

5. Mr Fischer talks
of the danger of his rai-
yats leaving their land
in his estate to go and
take new land in Go-
vernment villages; and
he anticipates that his
Mutta will be deserted,
& that being unable to
pay his Peishkash he
will lose his Estate.

Para 11.

The

The Government should not the slightest objection whatever that any part of these entire portions will be realized.

Copy.

From
G. F. Fescher Esqre
Capt. R.E.
to
Lieut. Col. Reid
13th Regt with Inclosure
Fescher's Letter.

Revenue 1860 Department
Pro: of Govt for June.

No 939.

Pro: of the Madras Government.
Dep.t June 1860

Passing orders on a letter from G. F. Fischer Esquire Proprietor of Salem Mutha praying that the reductions lately made in the Assessments in the Govt Villages of the District may be extended to him.

No 71 & 72

Read 30th May 28th May & 21st June