M.R.O. 14—18,000—27-9-21.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2299 Press ~~Mis.~~

270. 271

Dated 15. 12 — ~~19~~ 1863

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 15th December 1863.

No. 270. Read the following letter from W. ROBINSON, Esq., Inspector General of Madras Police, to J. D. SIM, Esq., Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, No. 3,222 :—

SIR,

1. I have the honor to draw the attention of Government to the practice obtaining in certain Districts of separating the duty of collecting the Revenue from the Civil and Criminal functions of the Head of the Village.

2. This system is opposed both to the letter and the spirit of the Law. It weakens and divides the authority which should be concentrated in one Village Head—introduces confusion and frequently antagonism into the management of the Village, and shifts the responsibilities attaching by Law to the real Head or Revenue Collector of the Village to a mere paper official whom the Law in no way recognises. In fact, destroys all legal responsibility.

3. Clause 1 of Section 3, Regulation IV of 1816 defines, as Head of a Village, "the person who collects the Revenue and under whose authority the Village Servants act." Section 2 constitutes this person *alone*, by virtue of his office as Head of the Village, to be Village Moonsiff. And under Regulation XI of 1816 the Criminal functions and responsibilities attached to the Head of the Village, devolve upon this same individual—the Collector of the Revenues. Thus the Law prohibits any separation of these offices. The Collector of the District may select the individual, under certain conditions; but he may not separate the functions joined by Law.

4. But this provision of the Law is in many Districts very generally set aside. In North Arcot, Madras, Coimbatore and some other Districts, the illegal separation of these offices is, I fear, the rule rather than the exception. The results are unfavorable to the general management of the country. In the Ceded Districts, Malabar and elsewhere, where the Law is strictly followed, and the management of the village is vested in one man, as Potail or Head of the Village, the value of the provision of the Law is seen and appreciated.

5. The practice of separating these offices involves a great abuse. The Puttah Monygar in some Districts is a mere Cutcherry hack appointed by the Tahsildars. In others he is a Meerasidar, and frequently possesses considerable influence, but the greater his power the more the authority of the Moonsiff is weakened. He accepts his Revenue duties; but does not undertake the more onerous and unpopular toils of Village Moonsiff and Head of the Village. And the Criminal responsibilities are illegally exacted from a nominal Moonsiff who is not in fact liable, and has no authority under the Law. I have no hesitation in saying that many decisions which have been passed affecting the persons styled Village Moonsiffs under the separate system are utterly illegal.

6. There is no sound reason for setting the Law at naught by separating these offices. The collection of Revenue is daily becoming an easier matter; while the importance of strengthening the general management of the village is more and more felt. Collectors should make their Tahsildars look to the proper Head of the Village for the collection of the Revenue. And the efficient performance of this duty would in reality be stimulated by vesting the Village Head as required by Law, with all Civil and Criminal functions. In fact the Law leaves no discretion.

7. It is unnecessary to repeat the arguments adduced in my letter, dated 15th July 1863, No. 1,814, regarding the great importance of increasing the influence of the Heads of Villages and comforting our Village institutions by every possible means. Nothing can tend so surely to strengthen their position as to carry out the Law which has been so long evaded in some Districts.

8. I therefore beg to submit for the consideration of Government the expediency of issuing orders to give immediate effect to the Law in all Districts.

No. 271. ORDER THEREON, 15th December 1863, No. 2,299.

Forwarded to the Board of Revenue for early report.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,

Deputy Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

neral management of the Village is more and more felt. Collectors should make their Tahsildars look to the proper Head of the Village for the collection of the Revenue. And the efficient performance of this duty would in reality be stimulated by vesting the Village Head as required by Law, with all Civil and Criminal functions. In fact the law leaves no discretion.

7. It is unnecessary to repeat the arguments adduced in my letter, dated 15th July 1863, No. 1814, regarding the great importance of increasing the influence of the Heads of Villages and comforting our Village institutions by every possible means. Nothing can tend so surely to strengthen their position as to carry out the Law which has been so long evaded in some Districts.

8. I therefore beg to submit for the consideration of Government the expediency of issuing orders to give immediate effect to the Law in all Districts.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
W. ROBINSON,
Insp. Genl. of Madras Police.

R. C. No. 1706 of 63-
Dft. 7 fr. 1310: 14-6-65 KD

267-915

Pro. of the Board of Rev-
2d Sess. 65. C. A. 1527. in
14—294/5.

No. 2704 2714

Decr 63 R 15

Revue 1865 Septbr.
Pro. of Govt for Decr
No 2947.

From
The Inspector Genl
of Marras Police

Dated
Revd 3d Decr 1865

Lr from / No. 2299. 1st Decr
With an order
draw the
attention of Govt to
the practice obtaining
in certain Dts of
separating the duty
of collecting the Reve-
nue from the Civil &
Criminal functions
of the Head of the
Village, & suggesting
that some immediate effect
may be given to the Law in this

No. 2299.

Forwarded to the
Bd of Revenue for
Report

Fort St. George
15th December 1865

14 Copies to the Bd of Revenue Despt 17 Decr MC Pi. 15