M.R.O. 14—10,000—21-4-22.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 768 Press
~~Mis.~~
9 91

Dated 6-4- 1861.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 90. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 7th March 1861, No. 1,282:—

Read again letter from the Collector of North Arcot, dated 21st April 1860, No. 84.
(In Cons. 24th April 1860, No. 1,868.)
Read also letter from the same Officer, dated 28th June 1860, No. 153.
(In Cons. 2nd July 1860, No. 3,182.)

1. These papers refer to an application from the Collector for the refund of a sum of Rupees 7,529-12-1, to the parties from whom it has been collected on account of waste portions of fields charged to them, and in submitting the same for the sanction of Government the Board think it necessary to enter into some detail respecting the matter.

2. A question first arose in 1857 regarding Stallacummy remissions, when a notification was about to be issued in North Arcot, on the occasion of the publication of the new rates of assessment, and the correspondence which passed on the subject between the Collector and the Board is given in the margin. After some discussion on the matter, the Board thought it proper that in order to prevent the breaking up of recognized "stulls" or fields, some restriction ought to be laid on the grant of waste lands. They desired that waste lands should be granted in entire fields except when these might be unusually large, and they originally proposed that in such cases no application should be acceded to if for a smaller extent than 2 acres in irrigated and 16 in unirrigated land. Afterwards the latter limit was reduced to 8 acres, and finally 2 Cawnies of irrigated and 6 of unirrigated were fixed as the minima. The Collector, however, represented the difficulty of carrying this rule also into effect, and the Board on further consideration of all the circumstances, finally decided that the minimum extent should be 1 Cawny and 2 Cawnies, respectively. These several orders were acted upon as they were issued.

From Collr. dated 21st, in Cons. 24th December 1857, No. 5,164.
To " " 24th " " No. 4,686.
From " " 30th December 1857, in Cons. 9th January 1858, No. 60.
To " " 9th January 1858, No. 110.
From " " 19th February, in Cons. 29th March 1858, No. 842.
To " " 29th March 1858, No. 1,113.
From " " 17th April, in Cons. 24th June 1858, No. 1,646.
From " " 11th, in Cons. 12th January 1859, No. 159.
To " " 4th April 1859, No. 1,182.
From " " 16th, in Cons. 18th April 1859, No. 1,748.
From " " 25th " 27th " " " 1,814.
To " " 13th May 1859, No. 1,747.

3. Mr. Sullivan then Sub-Collector in charge, however, entered into a full discussion of the matter and pointed out that the enforcement of the rule would operate prejudicially to the Ryot and greatly check cultivation. The Board, therefore, abandoned the restriction, and directed that such portions of the survey fields as were actually taken up for cultivation should be entered in the accounts, and denoted by subsidiary numbers.

From Sub-Collector in charge, 25th, in Cons. 27th June 1859, No. 3,02[illegible]

Proceedings 29th August 1859, No. 3,383.

4. It was with reference to this order that the Collector requested sanction in the first letter above recorded for the refund of the assessment charged on the unoccupied portions of waste lands. The Board, however, called for information on certain points connected with the subject, and this is now afforded in the second of the letters recorded at the head of these Proceedings.

Proceedings 2nd June 1860, No. 2,636.

5. The refund sought by the Collector is only for those *unoccupied* portions of waste and Porumboke fields charged to the Ryots under the rules which were passed by the Board on the 29th March 1858, and 13th May 1859, but which were subsequently cancelled on 29th August 1859; it is not for *uncultivated* portions of fields as the Board at first supposed. With reference to this last order, revised settlement accounts were prepared excluding the charge made on the Ryots under the former orders, but in some cases collections had already been made and brought

to account; and it is for the refund of these sums that the Collector requests sanction. Under these circumstances the Board have no hesitation in recommending the application of the Collector, and they accordingly request that the sanction be granted for the refund of Rupees 7,529-12-1, to be made to the Ryots, from whom it has been collected in the Táluqs noted in the margin.

	Rs.	A.	P.
Chendrageri...	75	2	1
Kaveripak...	1,168	2	9
Sholinghur...	14	10	4
Tiruvalam..	784	14	10
Satgar	234	11	6
Palmanair..	21	8	9
Areot..	173	7	6
Vellore..	827	3	5
Tiruvatur..	1,284	15	8
Polur..	2,121	13	11
Wandawash..	604	14	2
Satiavedu..	218	3	2
	7,529	12	1

6. The Board much regret the delay which has occurred in the disposal of this matter.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM, *Secretary.*

No. 91. ORDER THEREON, 6th April 1861, No. 768.

1. In these Proceedings the Board of Revenue apply for permission for the refund of a sum of Rupees 7,529-12-1, to a number of Ryots in the North Arcot District, being the assessment levied on unoccupied portions of Survey or Register fields; which unoccupied portions were charged in the Jamábandi of Fasli 1268, contrary to the practice of the District, under orders from the Board which were afterwards rescinded.

2. The Government sanction the refund recommended. The Board will instruct the Acting Collector to take care that it really reaches those for whom it is intended.

3. It is much to be regretted that this repayment has been so long delayed; Fasli 1268 having terminated on the 30th June 1859. The Collector's first detailed application for leave for the refund was made on the 21st April 1860; and his second and last letter furnishing some information called for by the Board, was dated as long ago as June 28th 1860. Thus it was allowed to remain undisposed of in the Board's office for nearly nine months, though involving no difficulty.

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

IN CON. 2ND JULY 1860, No. 3,182.

From J. D. ROBINSON, Esq., Acting Collector of NORTH ARCOT,
dated Chittur, 28th June 1860, No. 153.

With reference to the Board's Proceedings of the 2nd instant, No. 2,633, I have the honor to state that on receipt of their order of the 29th March 1858, No. 1,113, prescribing the terms on which waste survey fields were to be made over for cultivation, and fixing two Kanis in Nunjah and six in Punja as the minimum in cases where owing to extent, sub-division became necessary, Mr. Whittingham issued a circular directing all Tahsildars to carry out those instructions and to charge all uncultivated portions of waste survey fields *and porumboke* taken up that Fasli (1268) wherever the actual cultivation fell short of the prescribed limit.

2. Mr. Whittingham's instructions were made applicable as well to land for which there were durkhasts, as to that which had been taken up by the ryot of his own accord and without formal tender, and waste was charged on both alike at the above minimum limits. The measure was productive of such universal discontent, that Mr. Whittingham found it necessary on the 16th April to recommend some modification of the rule. The Board on this were pleased in their order of the 13th May to rule that one kani in Nunja and two kanis in Punja should be the minimum standard. Mr. Whittingham's mistake in extending the operation of the rule to porumboke as well as to waste survey fields occupied without darkhast does not then appear to have attracted attention, meanwhile, the accounts of the greater part of the district had been prepared and closed under the provisions of the order dated 29th March 1858.

3. The Tahsildars were however directed to prepare and submit fresh accounts showing the amounts to be deducted under the orders of the 13th May from the account prepared according to the former rules, and the balances against the ryots as they would thus stand modified. Those portions of the district which had not already been settled under the rule of 29th March 1858, were dealt with on the terms of the Board's order of the 13th May 1859.

4. On the 25th June 1859, Mr. Sullivan represented to the Board the impracticability of carrying out even the orders of the 13th May 1859. In their reply to this communication,* the Board observe that in their late circular regarding putta remissions it was ordered that portions of survey fields taken up for cultivation should be denoted by subsidiary numbers, no directions were given in regard to the size of fields, and that it was not their wish to enforce any rule on the subject for the present they also observed that they looked to the revised rates of assessment for the gradual dis-appearance of small holdings.

* 29th August 1859, No. 3,383.

5. On the 21st July, the district came under my charge, and on receipt of the last mentioned order, I at once authorized the Tahsildars to write off the balances remaining uncollected out of the amount charged under former orders on waste and porumboke lands occupied without durkhast and directed a fresh account to be prepared showing the sums which would require to be refunded under the views conveyed in the Board's proceedings of the 29th August.

6. My proceedings are alluded to in paragraph 6 of my letter dated 12th September 1859, No. 226, where I say that sanction will be solicited for the refund of this money as soon as the accounts have been prepared. These accounts reached me from the Taluqs after considerable delay, and show that the sum of Rupees 7,529-12-1 would be liable to refund under the explanation given above. On the 21st April 1806, I accordingly solicited the Board to obtain the sanction of Government for that purpose.

7. The Board ask me in paragraph 4 of their Proceedings now under reply, to report what measures have been taken to prevent the village community from misusing the power entrusted to them on Mr. Bourdillon's recommendation in respect to waste lands, and to state how the rule has worked. I have not been able to find either from personal enquiry during my Jamabundi tour or from the darkhast registers that any such general village tenders have been made; cultivation is gradually but surely extending on all sides, but the applications for land are individual, and although the jealousy in respect of strangers and interlopers may be stronger than formerly, we have no instance that I am aware of villages combining to take up in a lump and distribute among

themselves circumjacent waste. This privilege was, I presume, conceded under an impression that the reduction of assessment and non-interference with private enterprize and improvements would greatly stimulate competition.

8. Competition has no doubt been much promoted by these causes, but the rule which gives to the mirasdar and resident villager the first refusal is so generally known throughout the district, that I very much doubt whether village communities will hurry into such general engagements, and believe that as heretofore such land will for the most part owe its gradual reclamation and improvement to individual enterprize and capital.

9. The uncultivated portions (stalla kami) of regular holdings have been uniformly charged, and refund is only asked for in the case of unoccupied portions of waste and porumboke stulls charged to the ryot under the minimum rules of the 29th March and 13th May on the strength of his having broken ground in them, in the common course of extended cultivation. In cases where formal darkhasts were made, the matter was disposed of in the spirit of the Board's orders, and the Ryot was held responsible for such entire stulls or sub-division of fields as under the the provisions he had engaged to cultivate. All short comings in such engagements have been regarded as cases of stulla cumi and find no place in the list of waste land for which remission is now claimed.

10. It will thus be apparent to the Board, that the waste portion of fields for which I ask remission are not as they suppose, the uncultivated pieces of stulls leased out on durkhast, but lands which had never been occupied and were only saddled on the ryot because he happened when these rules came into play to be in occupation of a part of the stull to which they belonged. In respect of such lands the Board's question as to how the survey fields were sub-divided is not therefore applicable.

11. The portions of waste for which I *do* ask remission were, when belonging to classified fields, assessed according to the Tarum, when mere porumboke according to the highest class of similar lands adjoining to them. The grounds on which I consider refund necessary are, 1st, that these minimum rules have from first to last been received and enforced under a species of protest both on the part of the Collector and the cultivator, that the minimum standard twice changed within a few months and was finally cancelled by an order removing all restrictions as to extent; that the district was dealt with under all three rules according as the Jamabundi was earlier or later; and that to enforce a settlement under such circumstances would be to give to one Taluq the benefit of a happy accident in which its less fortunately placed neighbour would not share; I would add, too, that the ryots are somehow or other under the impression that the collections which I now beg permission to refund will be returned, as petitions have been received praying that these may be taken as a set off against their regular kistbandi payments.

12. I regret that I have not at hand the means of preparing such a statement as that called for in the concluding sentence of paragraph 7 of the Board's proceedings under reply.

13. The accounts particular are in the hands of the karnams, and it would take so much time to collect and abstract them that I have thought it better to submit my report at once, in the hope that it will be found sufficiently explanatory to enable the Board to dispose of the question without such additional details.

Revenue Bd. Office,
Fort St. George,
24th December 1857.

No. 4686.

From,
J. D. Sim, Esqre,
Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue.

To,
The Collector of
North Arcot,

Sir,

Para 1. I have the honor to inform you that the Notification shewing the changes in the rates of assessment, already printed and enclosed in your letter of 17th December is generally approved by the Board of Revenue.

In Cons: 24th Dect 1857. No. 5116.

2. With reference to your letter of 21st December 1847 enclosing translation of the Notification as to the object and consequences of the new Rates of assessment, I am desired by the Board to inform you that they approve of the Notification, but consider that it would be advisable to insert in it, instead of the wide terms &c. in para 7, that in consequence of the general reduction of assessment, remission will not be given for

In Cons: 24th Dect 1857. No. 5164.

Translation

Enclosure No 2 in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Government Revenue Department dated 7th March 1851 No 1282

Letter from the

No Collector of North Arcot to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue dated 28th June 1860 No 153 regarding the Common which would have survey fields over the whole area for assessment.

Shamilat Bunger or Khat Toondoo, or by whatever local term Parts of fields left waste, is known, — not for land left waste from last years Puttah unless Razeenamah has been tendered in writing early in the season. Also that Teazgary is abolished throughout the District.

Revenue Bd. Office,
Fort St. George,
24th December 1857.

Shave & Co. ca

(Signed.) J. D. Sim.
Acting Secretary.

(A true Copy.)

Secretary.

Compd.
C. Burton
"

Revenue Department

No. 110

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 9th January 1858.

In Consy 2d January 1858 to

Read letter from Collector of North Arcot dated December 30th 1857 — asking instructions as to the rule for "Stulla kummee" or portions of fields left waste.

(Here Enter No. 337)

Under the explanation afforded by Mr. Whittingham, the Board do not consider it necessary, to insert in the Notification the clause proposed in their Acting Secretary's letter of 24th December, 1857 No. 4886, and the Notification in that respect, may stand as it is.

2. The practice in North Arcot, of allowing Stulls, or Pymash, fields to be broken up into separate holdings is one which, should no longer be permitted and the rule that prevails as to Stulla Kummee, namely to charge as one with teeruva on a waste portion of a Stull, if

Enclosure No 4 in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Government - Revenue Department dated 5th March 1858 No 1282.

Letter from the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue to the Collector of North Arcot dated dated 24th December 1857 No 4886 forwarding the Notification relating to the assessment of Stulla Kummee fields.

if the rest of it consists of Puttah holdings fully cultivated, seems to be by no means sanctioned in para 10 of the Jummabundy Hookumnamah enclosed in the Collector's letter of 23d. December 1847. That para refers simply to a "portion of a Stull" and has no reference to 'holdings' forming parts of a Stull.

Informs 9th January 1849

3. The present Notification will of course put an end to the practice of granting permission on portions of these holdings left waste, but before passing orders for charging the waste of the Stull which is not a 'Holding' on those who do occupy the holdings that make up the rest of the Stull, the Board would wish to receive some further information from the Collector. The only restriction they will impose at present is, that no Waste Stulls be granted to Durkhastdars except in whole Stulls, except where the Stull is above 4 acres of Nunjah or 16 of Poonjah in which case it may be made into 2 fields.

4 The Board wish to be informed if the Holdings forming a Stull, such as described in para 3 of Mr. Whittingham's letter, have each a number, separate from the Stull or Pymash number, and how these numbers are arranged. Whether a separate Puttah is given for each, and its content stated; and whether in general the Pymash number, and its boundaries and recorded extent are obtainable, so that in any future survey they may be recognized, measured and mapped. The Board are disposed to think that where a Stull does not exceed 2 acres of Nunjah or 8 of Poonjah, any portion of it left waste should be charged to the occupant, or jointly to the occupants, of the remainder. It is most desirable that every means should be taken to discourage the splitting up of fields into these fragments, and as before directed no new puttahs should be given

given for a portion of a Mull if it does not exceed
4 acres of Nunjah or 16 of Poonjah. The sub division
of those Mulls and the issue of a separate pullah
for each portion has never, as far as the Board are
aware, been authorized. —

5. The Board do not observe in the notification any reference to the abolition of the "Jeazgary" remissions. —

6. With reference to para 8 of Mr. Whittingham's letter, the Board concur with him that the rule by which land left waste from last years Pullah, is not to obtain remission, should not be enforced till next fusly. —

/True Extract/

/Signed/ A. D. Sim,
Acting Secretary

To
The Collector of
North Arcot

/True Copy/

Secretary

Comps
Chrestien

North Arcot
Collectors Circuit Cutchery
Nagalapoor 19th February
1858.

No. 30

From

C. Whittingham Esqre
Collector of North Arcot

To

G. S. Forbes Esqre
Secretary to the Board
of Revenue
Fort St. George

Sir.

The Board of Revenue in para 3 of Extract from their Proceedings No 110 dated 9th January 1858 adverting to the unauthorized practice that has always obtained in this District of not bringing to account portions of stulls left waste direct "that no waste stulls be granted to Durkastdars except in whole stulls, except where the stull is above 4 acres of

Nunjah,

Enclosure No 6 in Cl.
Proceedings of the Board of
Revenue to the Secretary to
Government Revenue Department
dated 4th March 1858 No 1282.

No 107

Letter from the
Collector of North Arcot
to the Secretary to the Board
of Revenue dated 30th Dec.
1857. No 5334. Regarding circular
Orders to be issued as to the sale
of Stalks Remarks.

Nunjah, or 16 of Punjah. I would however beg to submit for their consideration, whether the enforcement of such an order may not be found to operate as effectually in contracting the cultivation of waste land, as the high rates of assessment which have been recently reduced.

2. The practice of subdividing stalls or Pymash numbers is so widely extended in this District, especially in irrigated land that I have reason to believe that but few irrigated fields are to be found of the extent of even one Cawney. By the term field I here mean that portion of land contained between four varapoos or banks. Two reasons are usually assigned for the existence of their subdivisions

of

Para 24 Ests M. Cons. 14 Augt 1855 No 951.

of Pymash fields; one, the practice of equal partitions of property among heirs, and the other, the facility with which men without any capital, or any interest in the soil, have been allowed to obtain land. A third reason, Viz: the difference level in parts of a Pymash or survey field, has not apparently been noticed; yet I believe it to be the most powerful motive for these subdivisions.

3. As the purposes of irrigation require that the water should stand at nearly the same depth in each part of the irrigated field, any inequality of level must be got rid of. This might be done either by removing the soil from the higher to the lower portion of the field, which would entail

labour

labour and injure the field by exposing the subsoil, or by forming the field by varapoos, or small embankments into a succession of terraces. This latter method is universally adopted. When the Pymash field has been thus subdivided, the varapoos or banks that have been thrown up, and which are intended to be permanent, make it more convenient to plough and cultivate these subdivisions as separate fields, and it often happens unless the Pymash number is small that a want of water, or of means, prevents a ryot from cultivating more than one or two of these subdivisions before the season has passed. The remaining portions of the stull is left waste, and the

the assessment on it is not charged to the ryot. When the ryot is wealthy, and the means of irrigation abundant, the whole of these subdivisions are cultivated, and unless the original boundary of the Pymash field has been altered the formation of these subdivisions is unobjectionable.

4. When however a portion only of a Pymash number is cultivated, the present practice is open to the very serious objection, that the assessment paid on that field is not according to its extent by the Pymash or survey measurements, but according to the unchecked and unrecorded measurements made by the Curnum. Thus in the village of Nagalapooram, Poonjay Pymash Number 1964 contains 184 Cawnies, of which 23

Cawnies

Cawnies were cultivated this year by 43 different ryots The linear measurements of each ryots holding were made by the curnums, & and the cudjan on which these linear measurements have been recorded, will be preserved only till the Jamabundy settlement has been made. The extent of each holding will appear in each ryot's separate puttah as part of Pymash No. 1964 but the holdings will not have a separate number again in the village of Colamarucoopsum, & Poonjah Pymash No. 211 Contains 600 Cawnies. Twelve ryots have this year cultivated 24 Cawnies of this Pymash field; and last year twelve other ryots cultivated 98 Cawnies of the same number in both instances, the demand against the ryots on account

Para 4 Board's Pro:

of

of this considerable extent of cultivation rested upon the unchecked measurements made by the Curnums. I may observe here, lest the small number of ryots cultivating so large an extent should lead to misconception, that tho the cultivation was made nominally by 12 persons, only, about 50 other ryots were in fact co-sharers with the 12 puttahdars.

In the village of Sursutha-vellore, Pymash Punjah field No. 428 contains 18 Cawnies. This year 11 Cawnies were cultivated by 6 ryots with many co-sharers, whose names do not appear. The amount of the teerwah of these 11 Cawnies, viz 44-10-1 has been levied on the Curnums &, measurements.

Rs. a. p.

5. To what extent this objectionable system prevails in regard to the smaller Pymash fields, I am

unable

unable at present to state. The subject does not appear to have engaged attention hitherto, and no accounts are at hand to throw light on the subject. I have however, during my residence at this place, had an account prepared for 5 Villages of this Talook to show what proportion of the Pymash fields have been this year cultivated in full, and what in part only. It will be seen from this account, an abstract of which is herewith submitted, that even when the Pymash field does not exceed one Cawney in Nunjay, and 3 Cawnies in Poonjay, it is sometimes cultivated only in part. In the town of Nagalapooram in which the land is of good quality, the proportion of Pymash numbers of the above extent, partly cultivated, is to the numbers fully cultivated in poonjah, no less than

than 7½ per cent, and in Nunjah it is more than 6 per cent. It would seem therefore, that this objectionable system prevails even when the Pymash fields are of a moderate size. This account shows also that in these 5 villages, the total extent of land which pays assessment this year, not on the authorized Pymash accounts, but on the unchecked measurements of the Curnum, is in Poonjah 236 Cawnies, or more than half the total cultivation, and in Nunjah 185 Cawnies, or rather more than 7½ per cent of the cultivation.

6 The order of the Board, that in future when land is taken up for cultivation, the occupation of parts only of a Pymash field, unless the whole is paid for, is to be prohibited, will put a stop to the extension of the present evil system. The only point of which I would beg to solicit their consideration is the extent of the Pymash field to

to which their order might apply, without incurring the risk of limiting cultivation of waste. I think the account submitted, though partial and incomplete, suggests a doubt whether 16 Cawnies for poonjay is not too large an extent to prohibit the subdivision of. It will be seen that in these Villages few fields of even the smaller extent of from 3 to 6 Cawnies of poonjay are wholly cultivated. I am of opinion speaking not only from the data furnished by this account but from general information, that it would be super having in view the large extension of cultivation anticipated from the recent reduction of assessment, to confine the operation of the Board's orders prohibiting the partial occupation of Pymash fields to poonjay Numbers not exceeding 3 Cawnies in extent. The same considerations induce

induce me to suggest that 1 Cawny, and not 4 acres of Nunjah land be fixed on as the extent which may not be occupied in part only.

7. I have I believe in this communication replied to all the questions but one contained in para 4. of the Boards Proceedings. I have stated that the holdings forming parts of a Mull are not numbered, that the extent of the holdings is entered in the ryots puttahs according to the Curnums measurements as part of the Pymash Number, which number is repeated in the puttah of each ryot who has cultivated any part of that number. It is not unusual for a ryot to cultivate portions of several Pymash numbers. For this he receives one puttah. In this puttah those portions are entered as being so many annas & ths of such and such a Pymash number.

8. The reply to the remaining question, "whether in general the Pymash number and its boundaries and recorded extent are obtainable,

so

so that in any future survey they may be recog=
=nized". I would beg to be permitted to defer till
I have obtained fuller information on the subject.
My present impression, derived partly from pers=
=onal observation, and partly from information
is that although the practice of Sub division
of Pymash numbers is so universal, the outer
Pymash boundaries of irrigated fields, especi=
=ally near villages, may be recognized, but
that the boundaries of unirrigated land, es=
=pecially at a distance from the villages, are
in too many instances irrecouerable. It is this
latter circumstance that throws such serious
difficulties in the way of adjusting boundary
disputes.

North Arcot - - - - - - - -
Coll^rs Circuit Cutcherry - - -
Nagalapooram - - - - - - -
in the Sutwaid Taluk
19^th February 1858 - -

I have &c^a

(Signed) C. Willingham.

Collector.

To

G. S Forbes, Esq^re

Secretary to the Board
of Revenue.
Fort St. George.

(True Copy)

Secretary.

Comp^d
C. Hirton

No. 1113.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 29th March 1858.

Enclosure No. 1 in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Government Revenue Department dated 29th March 1858 No. 1282.

Encl. 1.

R. 20/3/58.

Letter from the Collr. of North Arcot to the Secretary to the Board of Rev. dated 19th February 1858 No. 30 regarding the cancelling of the practice of withholding the Register Kistcondy until all kists are realized.

Name of Village	Total Pymash Field Number	Irrigated
1	2	3
Nagalapoorum	338	76
Sunta Vellore	240	22
Moodoor	354	67
Pondoor	242	64
Cottamareecooppum	78	7
Total		36

North Arcot .....
Coll^{r}'s Cutcherry .....
Nagalapoor in .....
Sultanaid Salug .....
20th February 1858.

nvenience to the ryot, of partitioning off a field into terraces by banks, according to level, but they do ot admit that it is therefore necessary for the revenue authorities to follow him into these details, and as- gn a fixed teerwa for each plot or bed. There must be a limit below which the revenue authorities can- ot recognize a separate field with a separate teerwa, however convenient to the ryot to sub-divide his eld for purposes of irrigation; and moreover the argument does not apply to Poonjah lands. The Board e disposed to attribute the general breaking up of the original Pymash stulls to the system of partition n inheritance, and to the desire of labourers without capital to try their chance on a fraction of land, when ey can get the village servants to connive at the infringement.

7. The very facts that Mr. Whittingham mentions, as to the arrangement by which the teerwa f these *portions* of stulls is determined, only shews still more forcibly the desirableness of checking ne system. He states that the Curnums profess to measure the extent cultivated, and enter in the Ac- ount the portion of teerwa due to that portion, and the rest as "remitted." It would appear from the ollector's letter, that most of the Pymash stulls are thus broken up, consequently the area under cultiva-

No. 1113.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 29th March 1858.

Poonjah.

Pymash Field Nos 3 Cawnies and below 3 Cawnies.			above 3 to 6 Cawnies.			above 6 to 9 Cawnies			Above 9 to 12 Cawnies			above 12 to 15 Cawnies			above 15 Cawnies			Total		
Total Number	Field Nos above 3 Cawnies which are cultivated in full	Partially cultivated	Total Number	Cultivated in full	Partially cultivated	Total Number	Cultivated in full	Partially cultivated	Total Number	Cultivated in full	Partially cultivated	Total Number	Cultivated in full	Partially cultivated	Total Number	Cultivated in full	Partially Cultivated	Total Number	Cultivated in full	Partially cultivated
3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
295	71	54	21	2	7	5	4	3	3	4	2	2	4	2	12	4	8	338	73	76
206	51	6	12	2	6	7	2	3	4	4	4	1	1	4	14	1	7	240	57	22
306	184	32	16	2	6	7	1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	21	4	21	354	187	67
198	57	44	34	1	14	4	4	4	3	1	2	1	4	4	2	4	4	242	59	64
70	60	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	2	78	65	7
	423	141																	441	236

nvenience to the ryot, of partitioning off a field into terraces by banks, according to level, but they do ot admit that it is therefore necessary for the revenue authorities to follow him into these details, and as-gn a fixed teerwa for each plot or bed. There must be a limit below which the revenue authorities can-ot recognize a separate field with a separate teerwa, however convenient to the ryot to sub-divide his eld for purposes of irrigation; and moreover the argument does not apply to Poonjah lands. The Board e disposed to attribute the general breaking up of the original Pymash stulls to the system of partition n inheritance, and to the desire of labourers without capital to try their chance on a fraction of land, when ey can get the village servants to connive at the infringement.

7. The very facts that Mr. Whittingham mentions, as to the arrangement by which the teerwa these *portions* of stulls is determined, only shews still more forcibly the desirableness of checking e system. He states that the Curnums profess to measure the extent cultivated, and enter in the Ac-ount the portion of teerwa due to that portion, and the rest as "remitted." It would appear from the ollector's letter, that most of the Pymash stulls are thus broken up, consequently the area under cultiva-

No. 1113.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 29th March 1858.

Read letter* from the Co[illegible]

Nunjah

Total Pymash Field Number.	Pymash Field Number 1 Cawny below 1 Cawny.			Pymash Field Number above 1 to 2 Cawnies.			Pymash field Number above 2 to 3 Cawnies			Pymash field Nos above 3 to 4 Cawnies			Pymash field Nos above 4 to 5 Cawnies			Pymash field Nos above 5 Cawnies			Total		
	Total Number	Cultivated in full	Partially Cultivated	Total Number	Cultivated in full	Partially Cultivated	Total Number	Cultivated in full	Partially Cultivated	Total Number	Cultivated in full	Partially Cultivated	Total Number	Cultivated in full	Partially Cultivated	Total Number	Cultivated in full	Partially Cultivated	Total Number	Cultivated in full	Partially Cultivated
24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45
1478	1291	1116	74	146	99	31	20	12	7	8	2	5	6	2	4	7	"	6	1478	1231	127
441	331	294	8	47	41	1	25	21	1	6	5	"	8	5	2	24	14	5	441	380	17
414	407	375	18	5	4	"	1	"	1	"	"	"	"	"	"	1	"	"	414	379	19
327	226	206	14	55	50	5	22	20	1	8	8	"	6	6	"	10	9	1	327	299	21
112	97	94	"	9	8	1	2	2	"	1	1	"	"	"	"	3	3	"	112	108	1
																			2397	185	

(Signed) C. D. Whittingham.
Collector.

(True Copy)
[signature]
Secretary.

[illegible] into terraces by banks, according to level, but they do not admit that it is therefore necessary for the revenue authorities to follow him into these details, and assign a fixed teerwa for each plot or bed. There must be a limit below which the revenue authorities cannot recognize a separate field with a separate teerwa, however convenient to the ryot to sub-divide his field for purposes of irrigation; and moreover the argument does not apply to Poonjah lands. The Board are disposed to attribute the general breaking up of the original Pymash stulls to the system of partition in inheritance, and to the desire of labourers without capital to try their chance on a fraction of land, when they can get the village servants to connive at the infringement.

7. The very facts that Mr. Whittingham mentions, as to the arrangement by which the teerwa of these *portions* of stulls is determined, only shews still more forcibly the desirableness of checking the system. He states that the Curnums profess to measure the extent cultivated, and enter in the Account the portion of teerwa due to that portion, and the rest as "remitted." It would appear from the Collector's letter, that most of the Pymash stulls are thus broken up, consequently the area under cultiva-

No. 1113.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 29th March 1858.

* Dated 19th Feb. in Con. 29th March 1858.

Read letter* from the Collector of North Arcot, submitting observations in regard to para. 3 of Board's Proceedings dated 9th January 1858, in which they direct that "no *waste* stulls shall be granted to Durkastdars but in *whole* stulls, except where the stull is above 4 acres of Nunjah and 16 of Poonjah."

[Here enter No. 30.]

Mr. Whittingham seems to have misunderstood the views of the Board in their Proceedings of 9th January 1858.

2. Their first direction had reference only to lands *lying waste*, and for which under the reduced assessment, it was expected Durkhasts would be made. The Board did not direct that no Durkhasts should be received for land in extent under 16 acres of Poonjah or 4 of Nunjah, but that where there were defined "Stulls" or fields *already in existence*, no Durkhasts should be received for *parts* of Stulls, unless they were of an unusually large size. There would have been nothing extraordinary had the Board directed that Durkhasts should not be received for *portions* of *any* stull. They however were willing to make exception in particular cases, and cannot see any grounds in what Mr. Whittingham states, to induce them to reduce the extent to that proposed in para. 6, where Mr. Whittingham seems to mix up the question of Durkhasts for *waste* land, and the assessment on portions of stulls *already* broken up.

3. The Collector will observe that if Durkhasts are made for only 1 acre of Poonjah, as long as it is a defined "stull," the Durkhast may be accepted. The object of the Board was not so much to oblige the taking up of large holdings, as to prevent the breaking up of recognized stulls or fields. The rule refers only to *waste* lands, and the Board consider that when persons find it to their advantage to offer to cultivate these lands, the Government may reasonably decline to accept offers for fractions of fields.

4. The second question is that of stulls which have been already broken up, and the broken portions of which pay teerwa according to their extent (as reported by the Curnum), and the teerwa of the rest of the field is remitted.

5. This state of things the Collector himself admits is objectionable. It is a system which tends to encourage petty and pauper holdings, and offers serious hindrances to the operations of a Survey such as has lately been commenced under authority of Government. With the view of placing some limit on this system, the Board suggested, but did not order, that where a stull did not exceed 8 acres of Poonjah or 2 of Nunjah, it should be liable for the whole teerwa, whether it was entirely or partially cultivated. The actual maximum was not to be determined on till the Collector should have given the matter his consideration.

6. The Collector seems to think that in many instances the Pymash stulls have been broken up, on Nunjah land, on account of the differences of level in the same field. The Board are fully aware of the convenience to the ryot, of partitioning off a field into terraces by banks, according to level, but they do not admit that it is therefore necessary for the revenue authorities to follow him into these details, and assign a fixed teerwa for each plot or bed. There must be a limit below which the revenue authorities cannot recognize a separate field with a separate teerwa, however convenient to the ryot to sub-divide his field for purposes of irrigation; and moreover the argument does not apply to Poonjah lands. The Board are disposed to attribute the general breaking up of the original Pymash stulls to the system of partition on inheritance, and to the desire of labourers without capital to try their chance on a fraction of land, when they can get the village servants to connive at the infringement.

7. The very facts that Mr. Whittingham mentions, as to the arrangement by which the teerwa of these *portions* of stulls is determined, only shews still more forcibly the desirableness of checking the system. He states that the Curnums profess to measure the extent cultivated, and enter in the Account the portion of teerwa due to that portion, and the rest as "remitted." It would appear from the Collector's letter, that most of the Pymash stulls are thus broken up, consequently the area under cultiva-

tion, and the Government demand, depend upon what may be the Curnum's measurements, without any check whatever, nor is there any *permanent* record,* as these portions may be enlarged or decreased at any time.

Para 4 of Collr's letter.

8. The Collector in para. 4 notices some instances where it would be hard to charge for the whole stull, when only a portion is cultivated. In these instances the stulls or Pymash numbers are upwards of 100 acres. But the Board never intended that the whole teerwa should be levied on such fields; and proposed the extent at 8 acres of Poonjah, and any field above that extent *might* be broken up.

9. With regard to the extent to be fixed on, below which portions of waste stulls are not to be tendered for, Mr. Whittingham in para. 6 is of opinion, with reference to an enclosed statement, that 16 cawnies* for Poonjah is too much. The Statement only shews that in 5 villages very few fields above 6 cawnies are cultivated. The Board are quite aware that none but the smallest fields are generally cultivated in full, but it is this very fractional cultivation of Pymash fields, that they wish to discourage. Mr. Whittingham proposes the extent be fixed at 1 cawny for Nunjah and 3 for Poonjah, and the Board will not object to this arrangement as regards stulls already partially cultivated; but in regard to the land yet lying waste, they consider it no hardship to require a Durkhastdar to take a whole stull, *except* where it is of a size that might if the rule were enforced, discourage cultivation. This limit, under the views expressed by Mr. Whittingham, the Board have no objection to lower, to 2 cawnies of Nunjah and 6 of Poonjah.

* The Board said 16 acres or less than 13 cawnies.

10. The Board trust that the Collector will take means to check the returns sent in by the Curnums, and establish some kind of record in the village accounts. Resort might also be had to test measurements, made under the supervision of a trustworthy agent. As regards such exceptionally large stulls, as those referred to in para. 4 of the Collector's letter, it would be better to subdivide them at once into fields, defined by boundaries of 3 or 4 cawnies each.

11. The Board observe, that Mr. Whittingham states (para. 7), that a portion cultivated of a stull is entered in the Puttah (according to its supposed area), as part of the Pymash number; but they would wish him to state if the remainder of the field is brought to account under the Head of Shamelat Bunjer, Stulla kummee, &c. or any notice taken of it.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary.

To
C. WHITTINGHAM, Esq.,
Collector of North Arcot.

No. 66.

From,
C. Whittingham, Esquire,
Collector of North Arcot

To,
G. S. Forbes Esquire,
Secretary to the Board of Revenue
Fort St. George

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Extract Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 29th March 1858 No. 1113, conveying the finial orders of the Board on the subject of not granting to Dumbatdars exemption for the entire stalls, except where the stall is above a certain extent- This extent the Board have now fixed at 2 Cawnies of Nunjah, and 6 of Poonjah- A notification has at once been issued and will be circulated in every village giving publicity to this order.-

2. In para 4 of these Proceedings, the Board take up the question of the assessment on portions of stalls already broken up- I regret to find from these Proceedings that I failed to express myself

Enclosure No 38 in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Government Revenue Department dated 19th March No 1282

Rs. 70 2 6 7-

Proceedings of the Collr of North Arcot South Division to the Board of Revenue dated 29th March 1858 No 1113 regarding the granting of certain Exemptions to Dumbatdars Stalls.

myself with sufficient clearness, and thereby conveyed the impression that I offered any suggestion on the subject of waste portions of stills already cultivated in part.

3. I was aware that the first instructions of the Board referred only to Lands lying waste, and the chief purpose of my letter of the 19th February was to endeavour to lower the limit which they had fixed, because I thought that 4 acres of Kunjah, and 16 acres of Poonjah, was too high, and would, I apprehended "operate in contracting the cultivation of waste Land." I therefore suggested that 1 Cawny of Kunjah, and 3 of Poonjah should be the limit. In support of this opinion, I quoted the practice with regard to partially cultivated Land, and endeavoured by comparison to show that, if applicants for waste Lands were required to take whole stills, except where the still was of the extent first fixed upon by the Board, much waste Land would in consequence

consequence not be taken up for cultivation.

4. I had no intention of making any proposal regarding stills already broken up. In their Proceedings of 9th January 1858 para 3, the Board had stated that "before passing orders for charging for the waste portion of stills already occupied, they would wish to receive some further information". It was my object in paras 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of my letter to supply this information, and I regret that these paras have been so carelessly expressed as to convey the impression that I had mixed up the question of Durkhast for waste Land, and the assessment on portions of stills already broken up.

5. With regard to this latter question which is that on which I would respectfully solicit the Board to reconsider their order, I would beg to suggest that for the present, matters should remain where they were placed by the order of the Board conveyed in their Proceedings dated 9th January 1858. That order directs that "the practice of granting remissions on portions of holdings

holdings (which are often but a small portion of the Stull) be put an end to, but defer passing orders regarding the assessment on the waste portions of stulls, till sufficient information is obtained." I do not consider the information submitted with my letter of the 19th February sufficient to warrant the introduction of so great an innovation, tho' it was I believe full on the points noticed by the Board. I would propose to ascertain to what extent present occupants of Land would be affected by any rule which would require them to pay for whole stulls partly occupied, unless the stull were beyond a given extent. The case of persons in possession is very different from that of Durkhastdars, who, as the Board observe, cannot complain that conditions are affixed to the acquisition of land.

6. In reply to para 11 of the Board's Proceedings of the 29th March I beg to state that the portion of the stull

still left waste, should, according to rule 16 of the printed rules for the guidance of Curnums preparing the Village accounts, be entered in Column 8 of No. 4. This rule is not however always observed; and as the ryots under whose names the waste is entered are not liable for its assessment, the propriety of the rule seems questionable, until the question of the assessment on portions of stulls left waste is finally disposed of.

7. The subjects noticed in para 10 of the Board's Proceedings will receive the consideration they deserve; and the measures in connection with them which it may seem desirable to adopt will be submitted to the Board for their approval.

North Arcot,
Collector's Cutcherry,
Chittoor 17th April 1858.

I have the honor &c
(Signed) C. Whittingham
Collector

(A true Copy)

Secretary.

Comps
C. Boulton

Enclosure No 9 in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Government Revenue Department dated 4th March 1861 No 1282.

Letter from the Collr of North Arcot to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue dated 17th April 1858 No 66 regarding the introduction of any new rule regarding the quantity of land which a Ryot must take up or relinquish.

No. 1182.

From

J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue.

To

C. WHITTINGHAM, Esq., Collector of North Arcot.

SIR,

Dated 28th March in Con. 2d April 1859, My. No. 926. In M. S.

With reference to the accompanying Official Memo. from the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, I am directed by the Board of Revenue to request that you will report without delay whether you have introduced any new rule regarding the quantity of land which a Ryot must take up or relinquish.

In Con. 12th January 1859, No. 150.

2. The Rules which accompanied your letter dated 11th January 1859, will be considered by the Board when the replies of other Collectors to the same reference are received.

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE,
Fort St. George,
4th April 1859.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
(Signed) J. D. SIM,
Secretary.

alteration of field numbers, [illegible]

6. I would beg therefore earnestly to solicit that the occupation of waste be as before entirely unrestricted in extent, until the survey in progress shall have reached this District, and the demarcation of fields and sub-division into more convenient extents than at present, shall render the operation of such rule more equitable.

7. I beg the favor of an early reply as the present season for the cultivation of Poonjay is setting in most favorably, and the abolition of the rule will greatly promote that cultivation.

8. Until the pleasure of the Board is known, I have at the present Jummabundy withheld such of the puttahs as are effected by the rule.

ENC. 1.

ABSTRACT.—Statement shewing, in a few instances, the operation of the Rule.

IN CON. 27TH APRIL 1859, No. 1814.

From C. WHITTINGHAM, Esq., Collector of NORTH ARCOT,

dated North Arcot, 25th April 1859, No. 111.

1. I have the honor, with reference to my letter of the 16th instant, No. 103, giving a succinct account of the circumstances which led to the enactment of the rule, prohibiting the sub-division of Stulls or Pymash fields newly taken up for cultivation unless the Stull exceeds 6 cawnies of Poonjay, or 2 cawnies of Nunjay; to solicit for the reasons herein given, the complete abrogation of that rule.

2. The question of prohibiting the sub-division of Stulls was first raised by the Board, as was shown in my letter above quoted; and although in the course of the correspondence which ensued, I stated my opinion that the rule referred to, would, under greater limitations as to extent of land than proposed by the Board, tend to remove the evils resulting from an unrestrained division of Stulls, it has been found that the operation of the rule has created so much discontent, has borne so heavily in many instances on the ryots, and often worked so unjustly in consequence of the imperfect demarcation of fields, as to call for its abolition.

3. In consequence of imperfect demarcation of field boundaries, a ryot, under the impression that he is taking up only the waste portion of a field included in his holding, unwittingly occupies a few annas, perhaps, of a neighbouring waste field of cawnies, and is immediately saddled with the assessment of upwards of 4 cawnies of waste land, or he commences as he supposes to cultivate 3 or 4 cawnies of one field, and finds that they constitute portions of 2 or more fields, when he finds himself liable for all the waste of these fields, within the limit specified in the rule. It may be said that the ryot should first ascertain the point alluded to; but the curnum himself is often unable to decide upon it without measurements, too often requiring to be commenced from a distant point, and which are impracticable when the occupation of large tracts of waste is in question.

4. So great has been the desire to take up waste in consequence of the recent reductions of assessment, that the knowledge that he would be liable to pay for the uncultivated portions of fields within the limits of the rule, has not deterred the ryot from taking it up, as is shown by the accompanying statement in which the operation of the rule is exhibited in certain cases. The hope that the rule would not be enforced has doubtless tended to obviate its effect in hindering cultivation of waste, an effect which will in the current fusly, have the full force, if the ryots find that the rule is to stand.

5. Another serious evil is to be apprehended from the continuance of the rule, viz., the alteration of field numbers, to escape the application of the rule.

6. I would beg therefore earnestly to solicit that the occupation of waste be as before entirely unrestricted in extent, until the survey in progress shall have reached this District, and the demarcation of fields and sub-division into more convenient extents than at present, shall render the operation of such rule more equitable.

7. I beg the favor of an early reply as the present season for the cultivation of Poonjay is setting in most favorably, and the abolition of the rule will greatly promote that cultivation.

8. Until the pleasure of the Board is known, I have at the present Jummabundy withheld such of the puttahs as are effected by the rule.

ENC. 1.

ABSTRACT.—Statement shewing, in a few instances, the operation of the Rule.

5. On one point Mr. Whittingham has misunderstood the scope of the Board's orders, and his own functions. In his letter of 25th April, para. 3, he observes that owing to the indistinctness of boundaries, the Board's rule will act harshly, since a person who unintentionally crosses the boundary of a field and cultivates a few Annas of land in a new field, becomes thereby liable to a heavy assessment. But it was never intended that mere errors should be thus punished. The Collector has power to adjust all such cases, and the annual Settlement is expressly held to allow complaints to be heard in those exceptional instances where the Hookumnamah rules operate with unintended harshness. If a Ryot unintentionally extends his cultivation into a new field, from the boundaries being indistinct, the penalty which he would incur under the minimum rule may be suspended in the current Settlement; but the proper boundary is to be shown to him by the Curnum, and in the following year he must abide by the District rule, or retire from the field on which he had encroached, so that it may be available for another party. Cases of this kind are of no novelty; they have always prevailed under the old Shamilat Bunjer rules, and been successfully dealt with in the manner now pointed out. The Board cannot therefore allow the important principle of preserving Survey fields to be given up on this account.

In Con. 27th April 1859, No. 1814.

6. The foregoing remarks have reference to *unoccupied Survey fields*; no orders, it is observed, have been issued regarding the Waste portions of *occupied Survey fields*. On the latter point the Board await the information which the Collector will have to submit on the completion of the enquiries now going forward.

From Collector 16th April 1859, para. 9.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM,
Secretary.

To
C. WHITTINGHAM, Esq., Collector of North Arcot.

Enclosure No. 14 in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Government (Revenue) dated 18th April 1859, No. 1282.

Receipt to the above from North Arcot to the Board of Revenue dated 13th May 1859 No. 1747 regarding the Summary of the Correspondence that has taken place regarding the Boundaries of Survey Fields with a copy thereof.

In Con. 27th June 1859, No. 3029.

From A. W. SULLIVAN, Esq, Sub Collector in charge, NORTH ARCOT,
dated Chittoor, 25th June 1859, No. 177.

Before sending a full reply to the Extract from Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 13th May last, No. 1747, for which I am not at present fully prepared, I have the honor to submit for their consideration the following observations having reference to certain particulars connected with para. 3 of those Proceedings, on which it is highly desirable that early and explanatory orders should be issued to the Tahsildars, and publicly made known to the ryots of the district.

2. The orders and proclamations issued by Mr. Whittingham to the talooks, on the 19th and 20th May respectively, amount to little more than translations of para. 3 of the Board's Proceedings and afford no explanation whatever, the consequence has been a great amount of references from the Tahsildars, to which, from an imperfect appreciation of the views of the Board and the difficulties attending the carrying of them out, it has apparently been found hitherto impracticable to forward satisfactory replies.

3. This state of things is one, however, which cannot be allowed to exist longer as it is likely to produce dissatisfaction and seriously to interfere with cultivation and its settlement.

4. I have gone into the subject since I have been in charge, and on looking carefully at para. 3 of the Proceedings, it appears to me that the taking up of waste survey fields, in either Nunjay or Poonjay, presents itself under three distinct aspects: 1st Fields, of not less than one Cawny in Nunjay and two Cawnies in Poonjay, but not of sufficient extent to admit of division without the divisions falling short of the above minimum.

2dly. Fields of such extent as to admit of sub-division into two or more parts without any such part falling short of the minimum fixed.

3dly. Fields of waste which actually, in the survey accounts, fall short of the minimum fixed.

5. Were it possible to exercise control over the ryots, of such a nature, as to regulate the number that should be at liberty to enter upon the cultivation of particular fields, with reference to the number of holdings of which they are capable on the conditions laid down by the Board, their instructions could be carried out.

6. My own impression however is that this is impossible; I will take for instance a field of say $3\frac{4}{16}$ Cawnies Poonjay waste; if only *one* ryot cultivates any portion of it under the Board's orders, he becomes answerable for the whole field, because it is not capable of division without the divisions falling short of the Board's minimum.

7. Supposing however as is very frequently the case that two or more ryots enter on the cultivation of the same survey waste field in different parts of it, how are they to be prevented, and how can the waste, if any is left, be adjudicated; and if none is left, how can they be refused puttahs for their several portions of the field although such portions be below the minimum prescribed by the Board?

8. I do not see how the difficulty can be met, except by either rendering it imperative on each ryot to obtain permission to enter on the cultivation of a field, or by prescribing a rule that the first ryot touching a field should be held answerable for it all if not capable of sub-division in the mode prescribed by the Board; but to both of these modes, independent of their intrinsic impracticability, there is the radical objection of the necessity they would beget of constant interference with the ryot on the part of the public native subordinates which it has been the policy of recent years to diminish in erery possible way.

9. My own conviction is that one of the principal and most beneficial results of the revision of the assessment will be the gradual disappearance of the smaller class of land-holders, and, that pending that result, any direct interference as to the size of holdings on the part of the authorities will prove abortive, or must, if enforced, lead to the evil noticed at conclusion of the last para, and to all its concomitant evils.

10. That the Board may have the matter fully before them, I herewith submit two statements marked A. and B. in which are entered a number of cases in Nunjay and Poonjay, which though not of actual occurrence, are of a nature actually and constantly occurring.

11. I have left Columns 11 and 12 vacant; the former as the Board will perceive, is in fact the Column of settlement; and in order, on the one hand, that I may fully understand the intentions of the Board, and on the other, that they may be fully possessed of the difficulty of carrying out the in

structions in para. 3 of their Proceedings where more ryots than one have entered on the cultivation of the *same* survey field, I should wish to see the settlement entered in Column 11 on the basis of those instructions.

12. The great difficulty appears to me, in such cases, to be to determine to whom any waste left in a survey field is to be charged, and how it is to be apportioned.

13. I shall be glad also to be informed as to whether the Board concur with me, in the event of their being ordered to be carried out, that their instructions at para. 3 of their Proceedings are to be considered as applicable to peramboke lands, or lands surveyed but not assessed in this district.

—

ENC. 1.—A.

POONJAH.

Nos. of Cases.	No. of the Field.	Whole extent of the Field.	Cultivation up to Fusly 1267. Names of the Ryots.	Cultivation up to Fusly 1267. Extent cultivated.	Remaining waste.	Deduct extent unfit for cultivation.	Net waste.	Cultivation of Fusly 1268. Names of the Ryots.	Cultivation of Fusly 1268. Extent cultivated.	Cultivation of Fusly 1268. Extent of waste chargeable.	Cultivation of Fusly 1268. Total of Columns 10 and 11.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		C. A. C.		C. A. C.	C. A. C.	C. A. C.	C. A. C.		C. A. C.		
1	15	11 8 0	1 Ramun.	1 0 0	10 8 0	0 8 0	10 0 0	1 Ramun...	2 8 0		
								2 Cooppun..	2 4 0		
								3 Coollun ..	2 0 0		
								4 Mooneyan	1 8 0		
								5 Gopauloo.	0 8 0		
									8 12 0		
2	16	10 0 0	„ ...	0 0 0	10 0 0	0 0 0	10 0 0	6 Casavun..	1 12 0		
3	18	8 0 0	„ ...	0 0 0	8 0 0	0 0 0	8 0 0	7 Cooppun..	1 8 0		
								1 Ramun...	2 0 0		
								8 Govindun	2 8 0		
								4 Mooneyan	1 12 0		
									6 12 0		
4	19	8 0 0	„ ...	0 0 0	8 0 0	0 0 0	8 0 0	1 Ramun...	2 8 0		
5	20	6 0 0	1 Ramun.	1 0 0	5 0 0	0 0 0	5 0 0	4 Mooneyan	1 0 0		
								1 Ramun...	1 8 0		
								3 Coollun...	2 0 0		
									4 8 0		
6	21	5 0 0	„ ...	0 0 0	5 0 0	0 0 0	5 0 0	3 Coollun...	1 8 0		
7	22	4 0 0	„ ...	0 0 0	4 0 0	0 0 0	4 0 0	9 Moottun..	1 0 0		
								1 Ramun ...	0 8 0		
								3 Coollun...	1 0 0		
									2 8 0		
8	23	4 0 0	„ ...	0 0 0	4 0 0	0 0 0	4 0 0	1 Ramun....	2 8 0		
9	24	3 8 0	„ ...	0 0 0	3 8 0	0 0 0	3 8 0	1 Ramun....	1 8 0		
								2 Cooppun..	0 8 0		
									2 0 0		
10	25	3 8 0	„ ...	0 0 0	3 8 0	0 0 0	3 8 0	1 Ramun....	1 0 0		

POONJAH.—(*Continued.*)

Nos. of Cases.	No. of the Field.	Whole extent of the Field.	Cultivation up to Fusly 1267. Names of the Ryots.	Cultivation up to Fusly 1267. Extent cultivated.	Remaining waste.	Deduct extent unfit for cultivation.	Net waste.	Cultivation of Fusly 1268. Names of the Ryots.	Cultivation of Fusly 1268. Extent cultivated.	Cultivation of Fusly 1268. Extent of waste chargeable.	Cultivation of Fusly 1268. Total of Columns 10 and 11.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		C. A. C.		C. A. C.	C. A. C.	C. A. C.	C. A. C.		C. A. C.		
11	26	3 0 0	...	0 0 0	3 0 0	0 0 0	3 0 0	3 Coollun...	1 0 0		
								1 Ramun....	0 12 0		
									1 12 0		
12	27	3 0 0	...	0 0 0	3 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 Ramun....	2 0 0		
13	28	2 8 0	...	0 0 0	2 8 0	0 0 0	2 8 0	2 Cooppun..	0 2 0		
								1 Ramun....	0 4 0		
								3 Coollun...	1 0 0		
									1 6 0		
14	29	2 8 0	...	0 0 0	2 8 0	0 0 0	2 8 0	1 Ramun....	1 6 0		
15	30	2 0 0	...	0 0 0	2 0 0	0 0 0	2 0 0	3 Coollun...	0 6 0		
								1 Ramun....	0 8 0		
									0 14 0		
16	31	2 0 0	...	0 0 0	2 0 0	0 0 0	2 0 0	1 Ramun....	0 4 0		
17	32	1 8 0	...	0 0 0	1 8 0	0 0 0	1 8 0	3 Coollun...	0 12 0		
								1 Ramun....	0 2 0		
									0 14 0		
18	33	1 8 0	...	0 0 0	1 8 0	0 0 0	1 8 0	3 Cooun ...	0 4 0		
19	34	0 12 0	...	0 0 0	0 12 0	0 0 0	0 12 0	1 Ramun....	0 2 0		
								4 Mooneyen	0 4 0		
									0 6 0		
20	35	0 12 0	...	0 0 0	0 12 0	0 0 0	0 12 0	1 Ramun....	0 2 0		

CHITTOOR,
25th June 1859.

(Signed) A. W. SULLIVAN,
Sub Collector in charge.

—

ENC. 2.—B.

NUNJAH.

Nos. of Cases.	No. of the Field.	Whole extent of the Field.			Cultivation up to Fusly 1267.			Remaining waste.			Deduct extent unfit for cultivation.			Net waste.			Cultivation of Fusly 1268.								
					Names of the Ryots.	Extent Cultivated.											Names of the Ryots.	Extent cultivated.			Extent of waste chargeable.			Total of Columns 10 and 11.		
1	2	3			4	5		6			7			8			9	10			11			12		
		C.	A.	C.		C.	A.	C.	C.	A.	C.	C.	A.	C.	C.	A.	C.		C.	A.	C.						
1	10	8	0	0	1 Ramun....	2	0	0	6	0	0	0	4	0	5	12	0	1 Ramun.....	0	12	0						
																		2 Cooppun...	1	0	0						
																		3 Mootun....	0	4	0						
																		4 Mooneyen..	0	14	0						
																		5 Narrainan..	1	4	0						
																			4	2	0						
2	15	8	0	0	2 Cooppun.	2	0	0	6	0	0	0	4	0	5	12	0	3 Moottun...	1	12	0						
3	14	5	0	0	...	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1 Ramun.....	1	0	0						
																		3 Moottun...	0	12	0						
																		6 Coollun....	1	8	0						
																			3	4	0						
4	16	5	0	0	...	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	1 Ramun.....	2	8	0						
5	18	4	8	0	...	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	1 Ramun.....	1	8	0						
																		3 Moottun...	1	0	0						
																		6 Coollun....	0	8	0						
																			3	0	0						
6	19	4	8	0	...	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	3 Moottun....	0	12	0						
7	20	4	0	0	...	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3 Moottun...	0	8	0						
																		1 Ramun.....	2	8	0						
																			3	0	0						
8	21	4	0	0	...	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1 Ramun.....	1	0	0						
9	22	3	8	0	...	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	3 Moottun...	1	0	0						
																		1 Ramun.....	0	12	0						
																			1	12	0						
10	23	3	8	0	...	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	1 Ramun.....	1	0	0						
11	24	2	8	0	...	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	1 Ramun.....	1	0	0						
																		2 Cooppun...	0	8	0						
																			1	8	0						
12	25	2	8	0	...	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	1 Ramun.....	0	12	0						

NUNJAH—(*Continued.*)

Nos. of Cases.	No. of the Field.	Whole extent of the Field.			Cultivation up to Fusly 1267.			Remaining waste.			Deduct extent unfit for cultivation.			Net waste.			Cultivation of Fusly 1268.								
					Names of the Ryots.	Extent cultivated.											Names of the Ryots.	Extent cultivated.			Extent of waste chargeable.			Total of Columns 10 and 11.		
1	2	3			4	5		6			7			8			9	10			11			12		
		C.	A.	C.		C.	A.	C.	C.	A.	C.	C.	A.	C.	C.	A.	C.		C.	A.	C.						
13	26	2	0	0	...	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2 Cooppun...	1	0	0						
																		1 Ramun.....	0	4	0						
																			1	4	0						
14	27	2	0	0	...	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	6 Coollun....	1	0	0						
																		3 Moottun...	0	6	0						
																			1	6	0						
15	28	2	0	0	...	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	6 Coollun....	1	0	0						
16	29	1	8	0	...	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	1 Ramun.....	0	4	0						
																		2 Cooppun....	0	2	0						
																			0	6	0						
17	30	1	8	0	...	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	1 Ramun.....	0	12	0						
18	31	1	0	0	...	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	6 Coollun....	0	4	0						
																		2 Cooppun...	0	4	0						
																			0	8	0						
19	32	1	0	0	....	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 Cooppun...	0	14	0						
20	33	0	14	0	...	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	1 Ramun.....	0	2	0						
																		2 Cooppun...	0	4	0						
																			0	6	0						
21	34	0	14	0	...	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	6 Coollun....	0	4	0						
22	35	0	10	0	...	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	2 Cooppun...	0	2	0						
																		1 Ramun.....	0	4	0						
																			0	6	0						
23	36	0	10	0	...	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	3 Moottun...	0	8	0						

CHITTOOR,
25th June 1859.

(Signed) A. W. SULLIVAN,
Sub Collector in charge.

Enclosure No 15 in the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Government Revenue Department dated 7th March 1861 No 1282.

Letter from the Sub Collector in charge of North Arcot to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue dated 25th June 1859 No 177 regarding the taking up of waste survey fields

30

No. 2,636

29

No. 3383.

PROCEEDINGS of the BOARD of REVENUE, dated 29th August 1859.

Read letter from the Sub Collector in charge of North Arcot, dated 25th June 1859, No. 177, submitting for the Board's consideration and orders, observations having reference to certain particulars connected with paragraph 3 of the Board's Proceedings of the 13th May 1859, No. 1747, regarding the minimum in nunjah and poonjah waste survey fields to be taken up for cultivation.

(In Con. 27th June 1859, No. 3029.)

The Board observe that in their late circular regarding puttah remissions, it was ordered that portions of survey fields taken up for cultivation should be denoted by subsidiary numbers. No directions were given in regard to the size of fields, nor is it the wish of the Board to enforce any rule on the subject for the present. They will look to the operation of the revised rates of assessment for the gradual disappearance of small holdings, but if this end can be further promoted by the introduction of a rule of the nature contemplated, this important step should also be taken. The Acting Collector will be pleased to give this subject his best consideration, bearing in mind that the boundaries of survey fields should not be broken up.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM,
Secretary.

To J. D. ROBINSON, Esq., Acting Collector of North Arcot.

...ode of dealing with portions occupied out of large survey fields was pointed out. They accordingly referred the Collector to that Circular, and observed at the same time that if the ...bject of discouraging small holdings can be further promoted by the introduction of a rule of the nature ...ontemplated, that important step should also be taken.

Board's Pro., dated 29th August 1859.

6. Mr. Robinson refers to the above Order as the authority under which the refund is applied ...or, but the Board do not see that any refund was intended in the above Order. If, according to the Board's Orders of 13th May 1859, large survey fields were sub-divided and portions of such sub-divisions left waste were charged with Assessment, no *Stullacummy* remissions are properly allowable, and there is consequently no necessity for returning the money so collected. The Collector's present application ...s likely to revive the *Shamilat Bunjer*, remissions, which are prohibited by Government.

7. With reference to these observations Mr. Robinson is requested to re-consider his application, ...nd if he still thinks that the refund is necessary, he will submit a full report on the subject. He will ...tate in what manner the survey fields were sub-divided, on what principle the portions of waste were ...harged, and on what grounds he considers the refund necessary. He will also submit a statement showing the extent of entire fields, the portions under occupation, and the extent thereof cultivated and left waste, the amount charged for waste, and that recommended to be refunded.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM,
Secretary.

To J. D. Robinson, Esq., Acting Collector of North Arcot.

Exd. J. Wright.

...on unoccupied portions of

No. 2,636.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 2nd June 1860.

Read letter from the Collector of North Arcot, dated 21st April 1860, No. 84.

(In Con., 24th April 1860, No. 1,868.)

In this letter the Collector requests the Board to obtain the sanction of Government for the early refund of a sum of Rupees 7,529-12-1, to the parties from whom it has been collected on account of waste portions of fields charged to them under certain orders of the Board.

2. The Board do not gather from the present letter the principles on which waste portions of fields were charged to the Ryots, and why a refund of the sum already collected apparently during Fasli 1238, has now become necessary, and they cannot submit this application without full particulars.

3. The Orders of the Board referred to by the Collector, viz., 29th March 1858, and 13th May 1859, have reference only to lands lying waste for which it was expected Durkhasts would be made in consequence of the reduction of assessment. The object of the Board in issuing those Orders was simply to prevent the breaking up of recognised stulls or fields and to prescribe a minimum below which sub-divisions of large fields cannot be recognised as separate fields with separate Assessment. The minimum so fixed ultimately is very moderate, viz., one kani for Nunjah and two kanis for Punjah. It is certainly not desirable that with a moderate assessment, waste survey fields should be broken up in numerous insignificant plots.

4. The Board's Orders as above stated, referred to waste lands newly occupied, and such a rule was considered the more particularly necessary in North Arcot, because, as already observed by the Board, the distribution of waste land had been left to the village community at the late Collector Mr. Bourdillon's recommendation. In paragraph 4 of the Board's Proceedings, dated 13th May 1859, the Collector was asked in reference to the above remark to explain what measures were taken to prevent the village communities from mis-using the power entrusted to them in respect to waste lands, and how the rule worked. This does not appear to have been answered, and Mr. Robinson is now requested to reply to this point fully with as little delay as possible.

In Con., 27th June 1859, No. 3,029.

5. On the representation made by Mr. Sullivan in his letter dated 25th June 1859, as to the difficulty of carrying out the instructions already adverted to, the Board stated that they were not disposed to enter again into a discussion on the subject or to direct the strict enforcement of the rule, more especially as a Circular was issued on the 8th August 1859, in which the mode of dealing with portions occupied out of large survey fields was pointed out. They accordingly referred the Collector to that Circular, and observed at the same time that if the object of discouraging small holdings can be further promoted by the introduction of a rule of the nature contemplated, that important step should also be taken.

Board's Pro., dated 29th August 1859.

6. Mr. Robinson refers to the above Order as the authority under which the refund is applied for, but the Board do not see that any refund was intended in the above Order. If, according to the Board's Orders of 13th May 1859, large survey fields were sub-divided and portions of such sub-divisions left waste were charged with Assessment, no *Stullacummy* remissions are properly allowable, and there is consequently no necessity for returning the money so collected. The Collector's present application is likely to revive the *Shamilat Bunjer*, remissions, which are prohibited by Government.

7. With reference to these observations Mr. Robinson is requested to re-consider his application, and if he still thinks that the refund is necessary, he will submit a full report on the subject. He will state in what manner the survey fields were sub-divided, on what principle the portions of waste were charged, and on what grounds he considers the refund necessary. He will also submit a statement showing the extent of entire fields, the portions under occupation, and the extent thereof cultivated and left waste, the amount charged for waste, and that recommended to be refunded.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) J. D. SIM,
Secretary.

To J. D. Robinson, Esq., Acting Collector of North Arcot.

Exd. J. Wright.

one unoccupied portions
of

R. D.—

No. 768

Proceedings of the Madras Govt.
Under date the 6th April 1867.
Read the following
Progs. of the Bd. of Revr.

Submit with Bd's recommendation application from the Collr. of N. Arcot for the refund of a sum of Rs. 4,529-12-1, to the ryots from whom it has been collected on account of waste portions of fields charged to them.—

(Here enter 4th March 1867 No. 1282)

In these Progs: the Bd. of Revr. apply for permission for the refund of a sum of Rupees 4,529-12-1, to a number of Ryots in the N. Arcot District, being the assessment levied on unoccupied portions of

Enclosure No. 1 to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue to the Secretary to Government Revenue Department dated 4th March 1867 No. 1282

Read

Proceedings of the Collector of North Arcot from the Secretary to the Board of Revenue dated 2nd June 1866 No. 2536 regarding the application of the Ryots for a refund of Rs. 4529-12-1

of Surveyor Register
fields; which unassess-
-ed portions were changed
in the Jamabandi of
F. 1268, contrary to the
practice of the District,
under orders from the
Board which were af-
-terwards rescinded -

2 The Govt. sanction the
refund recommended -
The Bd. will instruct
the Acting Collr. to
take care that it
really reaches those
for whom it is intended -

3 — It is much to be
regretted that this re-
-payment has been so
long delayed; Finally
1268 having terminated
on the 30th June 1859 -
The Collr. first detail-
-ed application for
leave for the refund
was made on the 21st
April 1860; and his
second and last letter
furnishing some in-
-formation called for
by the Bd., was dated
as long ago as June
28/60 - Thus it was
allowed

allowed to remain undisposed of in the Bd's office for nearly nine months, though involving no difficulty. ~~obstacles~~

13 Copies. Board of Revenue with 7 Encls Desp. 8.
3 " Accountant's Journal. N
3 " Civil Auditor. N

Refund of certain Sums
to certain Ryots in the
N. Arcot District.

Revenue 1861 Department.
Pro: of Govt for April

No 768.

Pro: of the Madras Govt
Dt 6th April 1861.

Sanction refund of Rupees
7529-12-1 to certain Ryots in
North Arcot on account of
waste portions of field charged
to them.

No 90 to 91.

Soon

Read 27th March & 3 April.