

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2383

Press
~~Mis.~~

284-285

Dated 24 - 12 - 1861.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
24th December 1861.*

No. 284. Read the following Proceedings of the Madras Government in the Military Department, dated 18th December 1861, No. 4,640 :—

*Referring for consideration the claims of Croo-
paramdoss and Seetaramdoss for certain lands
in the Cantonment of Berhampore.*

(Vide Military Proceedings, 18th December
1861, Nos. 467A. 467D.)

No. 285. ORDER THEREON, 24th December 1861, No. 2,383.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to their Proceedings 17th October
1861, No. 5,698, for further report.

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

2.

MILITARY DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following papers:—

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department.

Referring to this Department, a letter from the Collector of Ganjam, remarking that it is a mischievous mistake to suppose that wet cultivation in the vicinity of dwellings is in the slightest degree objectionable on sanitary grounds.

Here enter 31st October 1861, No. 2077.

Referred to the Provincial Commander-in-Chief, (Quarter Master General's Department) and to the Principal Inspector General Medical Department, for remark.

1st November 1861.

Memorandum from the Principal Inspector General Medical Department, Fort Saint George, 26th November 1861, No. 180; to the Secretary to Government, Military Department, Fort Saint George.

With reference to the Proceedings of Government, Military Department, dated 1st instant, the Principal Inspector General has the honor to remark, that there is no satisfactory evidence, that wet cultivation in the neighbourhood of towns or Military Cantonment, is prejudicial to the public health; on the contrary there is some reason for supposing that its influence is rather favorable to the purity of the atmosphere in the neighbourhood.

2. The views of the Collector of Ganjam, and of the Board of Revenue on this subject, are strictly in accordance with the scientific knowledge of the day, and the Principal Inspector General cannot but approve of them.

From the Quarter Master General of the Army, Fort Saint George, 6th December 1861, No. 278; to the Secretary to Government, Military Department.

I have the honor, by order of the Provincial Commander-in-Chief, to forward, for the information of Government, an original communication from the Officer Commanding Northern Division, affording the explanation called for by the order of Government, dated 1st ultimo, on the subject of cultivation within the limits of the Cantonment of Berhampore.

2. The Officer Commanding that Station places the dispute in an entirely new aspect; and, at the same time, affords a very striking instance of the effect of having wet cultivation in the vicinity of the hutting Lines. He also states that the land is the property of Government; and if such, then of course the cultivation should be discontinued, and the claim to Compensation falls to the ground. But both this and the area of the land, are subjects which can be enquired into only by the Revenue Board.

From the Officer Commanding Northern Division, Head Quarters, Waltair, 28th November 1861, No. 390; to the Quarter Master General of the Army, Fort Saint George.

With reference to your Memorandum, No. 1668, dated 2nd instant, forwarding Extract from Proceedings of the Madras Government, No. 5698, dated 17th ultimo, I have the honor to forward, for the information of the Provincial Commander-in-Chief, copy of a letter, No. 229, dated 22nd instant, from the Officer Commanding Berhampore, affording full explanation of the circumstances under which he prohibited wet cultivation within the limits of the Cantonment, viz., that the men's Lines were rendered unhealthy by the wet cultivation,—that the land in question is the property of Government, and is within Military limits, and if left uncultivated, will be thoroughly dry.

From the Officer Commanding Berhampore, 22nd November 1861, No. 229; to the Deputy Assistant Quarter Master General Northern Division, Wallair.

1. With reference to your Memorandum 909, of the 9th instant, I have the honor to inform you that the circumstances under which wet cultivation was prohibited by me within the limits of the Cantonment, are as follows:—

2. About the end of June last, the Conservancy Committee, of which I am President, in the execution of their duty, visited the boundaries of the Cantonment on the Town side, and found a portion of the ground within the limits enclosed for wet cultivation. Captain Nicholls, one of the Members, who has been nearly eight years in the Station, four of which he was Staff Officer, immediately pointed out that the land taken up belonged to Government, and that in 1854 or 1855, he, as Staff Officer, prohibited its being cultivated. On that occasion no remonstrance was made by the complainants, and the ground was left un'illed—I accordingly ordered the fence to be removed. The Collector then interfered and requested that cultivation might not be hindered "on land situated beyond the present limits of the Cantonment."

3. To a second letter I replied that I had "not encroached upon the wet land of the complainant, neither had I in any way altered or extended the limits of the Cantonment." In a latter letter he writes, "adverting to your prohibition of the cultivation of a plot of ground belonging to one Crooparamdoss Barajee, which you have recently discovered to be within the limits of Berhampore Cantonment, but which has always hitherto been cultivated, I have the honor to request you will explain your reasons for prohibiting this cultivation, to enable me to bring before Government the owner's claim to Compensation." My reply was that I had "strong objections to wet cultivation within the limits of the Cantonment on sanitary grounds." I should here correct two mis-statements in the Collector's letter. The ground has not recently been discovered to be within Cantonment limits, nor has it "always" been hitherto cultivated.

4. In reply to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 5698, which you have forwarded, with copy of Mr. Forbes' letter to the Secretary, I have now the honor to state that no fresh land has been taken from the complainant, that on measurement, instead of 5 acres, as stated by the Collector, it consists of less than $3\frac{1}{2}$ acres, that the swamp he alludes to, is beyond, and not within the limits of the Cantonment, that the ground in dispute will be thoroughly dry when left uncultivated, except perhaps in one spot where they made bricks two or three years ago without permission, and that I have frequently walked over the ground when cultivation was not allowed.

5. Mr. Forbes has thought proper to reiterate his assertion to the Board that the land was "lately pronounced" within the limits, although I had acquainted him that such was not the fact. The Collector expresses a strong opinion on the grounds on which I raise an objection to wet cultivation in this locality, for as he states "it is not near the Lines, the Parade Ground or Military Buildings, and still further removed from the Officers' houses." He does not seem to know that the thickly populated Pensioners' Lines are situated within twenty yards of the spot, or, if he knows it, he must consider the duty of a Commanding Officer to be confined to those only who are actually in the service of the State, and not to extend to all within the limits of the Cantonment.

6. I cannot conceive the grounds on which the Collector has recommended Compensation to be given to these men for 5 instead of $3\frac{1}{2}$ acres, when it is confidently asserted by many of the old residents, including the pensioned Sheristadar, who marked out the Cantonment in 1821, under the orders of Mr. Cazalet, the Collector, that, the ground claimed by Crooparamdoss and Seetaramdoss does not belong to them. Had a proper inquiry been instituted before the submission of the claim to the Board of Revenue, I have every reason to believe that the above fact would have been elicited.

7. In conclusion, I beg with all deference, to the opinion expressed by the Board of Revenue, to deny most emphatically their assertion that wet cultivation in the vicinity of dwelling houses is not injurious, and that to suppose so, is a "mischievous mistake." A circumstance which occurred in the Regiment under my Command, established the reverse as a fact beyond dispute. 1856 and 1857, the men of the Grenadier Company of the 5th Regiment, suffered from Rheumatism and pain in the limbs; an inspection of the Huts shewed them to

in the walls and flooring. This could only be attributed to their being situated in the immediate vicinity of wet cultivation. Shortly after the Paddy Fields were relinquished, the change had an immediate effect, the Huts became perfectly dry, the Lines healthy and the sickness is now no greater in that Company than in any other. The mischief here laid solely in the Paddy Fields.

ORDER, No. 4640, 18th December 1861.

The Governor in Council observes that the grounds on which the cultivation of the land referred to in the foregoing correspondence, has been prohibited, are untenable. It is however stated by Major Wyndham, that the proximity of the cultivation to a portion of the Lines of his Regiment, had the effect of rendering the houses damp and thus caused sickness, but it is not shown that any measures were adopted to cut off the communication with the wet land, or to prevent by draining the dampness complained of.

2. The principal question however for the consideration of Government in this case, is the title to the land of the parties stated to be the Proprietors, which appears to be altogether denied by the Officer Commanding the Station, in paragraph 6 of his letter; and until this is substantiated, no claim for Compensation can be entertained. This point will, accordingly, be referred for consideration in the Revenue Department.

(True Extract.)

William W. C.
Deputy Secretary to Government.

To the Revenue Department. *With 5 spare Copies*
" Quarter Master General.
" Principal Inspector General Medical Department.

Exd. T. Stubbs.

R 31 Oct 1861/72 373

Received 1861 Sept 14
of 1000 for 1000

1861 3046

Dec: of 1861 in the

Uly. Department

Oct. 18 1861
Received 23 31

1861 4640

To Dr. of 1861 14
1861 373

My dear Sir
15 April 62 - 8. 763

1861 4 4 285

Received for consideration
of the 1861 14
of 1861 14
of 1861 14

Received for
consideration of
1861 14

1861 14

1

1861 14

Received for consideration
of 1861 14
of 1861 14
of 1861 14

1861 14

Received for consideration
of 1861 14
of 1861 14
of 1861 14