M.R.O. 14-5,450—22-10-25.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 15-5-6 Press ~~Mis.~~

Dated 25-6- 1866.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 538. Read the following letter from the Honorable C. PELLY, Member of the Board of Revenue, to the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Madras, 23rd June 1866, No. 1,949 :—

I should be obliged by your taking the order of Government on the few points connected with the revision of Revenue Establishments, and favoring me with a reply at your earliest convenience, that I may close my Report on these Establishments.

No. 539. ORDER THEREON, 25th June 1866, No. 1,556.

Miscellaneous.

1. The Government approve the exclusion of the Cantonment Joint Magistrates' Establishments from Mr. Pelly's revised list.

2. The Ganjam Maliah Sub-Magistrates will be included in the list, as in the case of the Jeypore Sub-Magistrates in Vizagapatam.

3. The allowance to the Purla Kimedy Estate is properly excluded from Mr. Pelly's list of Establishment.

4. The exclusion of the Clerk employed in Madras Town for selling Postage labels is also approved.

5. The Government desire that the Madras Town Establishment for stamping Weights and Measures be excluded from Mr. Pelly's list. The charge should either be defrayed from the fees, or the work transferred to the Municipality.

6. In the present position of the question regarding District Survey Establishments, they had better be excluded altogether from the list.

7. The exclusion of the temporary Establishments for preparing the District Registers of deaths is approved.

8. The Government await the Board's report on the question of the Establishment for the Registration of Deeds in the Madras Collector's Office.

9. Mr. Pelly's proposal to place the Tanjore Shroffs on the same footing as men of the class occupy in other Districts is approved.

10. The Government see no reason to include the class of Deputy Collectors in the general list. These officers stand on a totally different footing from the Establishments to which it refers, and should be entered separately without reference to Districts at the head of the list.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Honorable C. Pelly.
„ the Board of Revenue.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

31/4

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 25th June 1866.

No. 538. Read the following letter from the Honorable C. PELLY, Member of the Board of Revenue, to the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated Madras, 23rd June 1866, No. 1,949:—

I should be obliged by your taking the order of Government on the few points connected with the revision of Revenue Establishments, and favoring me with a reply at your earliest convenience, that I may close my Report on these Establishments.

No. 539. ORDER THEREON, 25th June 1866, No. 1,556.

Miscellaneous.

1. The Government approve the exclusion of the Cantonment Joint Magistrates' Establishments from Mr. Pelly's revised list.

2. The Ganjam Maliah Sub-Magistrates will be included in the list, as in the case of the Jeypore Sub-Magistrates in Vizagapatam.

3. The allowance to the Purla Kimedy Estate is properly excluded from Mr. Pelly's list of Establishment.

4. The exclusion of the Clerk employed in Madras Town for selling Postage labels is also approved.

5. The Government desire that the Madras Town Establishment for stamping Weights and Measures be excluded from Mr. Pelly's list. The charge should either be defrayed from the fees, or the work transferred to the Municipality.

6. In the present position of the question regarding District Survey Establishments, they had better be excluded altogether from the list.

7. The exclusion of the temporary Establishments for preparing the District Registers of deaths is approved.

8. The Government await the Board's report on the question of the Establishment for the Registration of Deeds in the Madras Collector's Office.

9. Mr. Pelly's proposal to place the Tanjore Shroffs on the same footing as men of the class occupy in other Districts is approved.

10. The Government see no reason to include the class of Deputy Collectors ~~now~~ in the list. These officers stand on a totally different footing from the Establishments to which it refers.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Honorable C. Pelly.
,, the Board of Revenue.

Exl. S. T. Augustin.

---

was not communicated

Memo: on which
orders are requested

I have not included
in the revised Establish-
-ment the allowances of
the Contonment Joint Magis-
-trates and their establish-
-ments as the cost is debitable
to "Law and Justice". In
the Order of Government
dated 18th July 1862 No. 1136
sanction was granted for
these charges in the Civil
and Military Departments.
The sum finally sanctioned
was 11520 of which Rs. 2196
was to be debited to Military
and the remainder Rs. 9324
to Civil. In this I trust
I am right.

Yes

2. I find from some
correspondence in the Board's
office with the Collector of
Ganjam, that certain Mahal
Sub Magistrates were sanctioned
by Government in their order
date 8th May 62 Judicial
Department, but this order
was not communicated

to

to me. I however find from the list of Establishments furnished by the Collector, that the cost of the two Sub Magistrates Establishment is Rs-374 per Mensem or £488 per annum. This should I think properly be included in the Land Revenue Establishment as it was the case with similar Establishments in Jeypoor of Vizagapatam. I have brought this to the notice of Government in my letter dated 16th June 1866. Shall I include it? 4/4

3. In their order dated 27th October 1864 Rs. 1994 Govern-ment sanctioned the payment of Rs. 356 annually to the Pusla Zemindary Estate in consideration of the work done for Government at the Zamindar's Treasury which has been established there with Police guards at an annual cost of Rs. 1070. I have not included this sum in the Revised Establishments as it is debitable to Land Revenue as an item of Contingent charge. I believe I am right in not including this charge in my Establishments. 4/4

4

4. In Para: 12 of their order dated 23d November 63 the Government sanctioned the employment of a Clerk in the Madras Town on a salary of 30 Rs per month for selling Postage labels. It was also stated that the question of the Department to which the pay of the Clerk should be charged need not then be discussed and that it should be treated as a part of my revision and fully explained in due course to the Supreme Government. I am of opinion that the Cost is chargeable to the

the Postal Department as the sales of the labels are credited to that Department. I have for this reason not included it in the list of my revised Establishments. but desire the Orders of Government on the point.

5. The fees for Stamping weights and measures had first been ordered by the Government of India to be credited to Local Funds and the Stamping Establishment sanctioned by the Government for Madras town was to be excluded from my list of revised Establishments. but the Government of India have afterwards directed that the fees in question should be credited to General Revenues. The Board proposed to entertain two Stamping Establishments for each District at a monthly cost of £10 Rs for each Establishment. The Government approved and recommended it for the sanction of the Government of India, but in their letter dated 23d October 165 the Supreme Government deferred passing orders on the proposition for increasing

increasing the Establish-
ments in the ten Districts
where such Establish-
ments have been
hitherto employed,
and sanctioned the
proposed new charge
for the other nine
Districts for one year
pending explanation
on certain points regarding
the scale of fees. The
Government desired the
Board to consider how
far any actual necessity
exists for maintaining
permanent Establish-
ment and whether
itinerating

itinerating Establishments
paid by the job would
not effect every purpose.
This Order has been
communicated to Collectors
for report and their replies
are being received. It
will be some time before
the subject is disposed of.
I have therefore included
in my revised list of
Establishments only
the Stamping Esta-
blishment of Madras
Town which has been
maintained for a
very long time and
which is of a permanent
nature. Am I
right

right in the course I
have adopted?

6. In connection with
the Revision of Revenue
Establishments, I had
recommended the permanent
entertainment of a small
Survey Establishment
in each District so that
the Collectors may avail
of their services whenever
required for Survey pur-
poses. The Government
desired the Board to
Consult a few of the
Collectors as to the
need of such Establish-
ments and the Board
after Communication

communication with the
Collectors informed the
Government that the employ-
ment of a small Survey
Establishment would be
useful for many purposes
and accordingly recom-
mended it at a monthly
cost of 97 Rupees. The opinion
of the Superintendent of
Revenue Survey was then
called for and that officer
proposed an establishment
of a superior description on
a different plan which the
Board recommended to Govern-
ment. In their order dated
22d May 1866 No. 1218 the Govern-
ment deferred passing orders
on the District Survey
Establishment

Establishments proposed by
Major Nelsey pending
information as to the data
on which he framed them.
and as the amount of work
likely to be completed yearly
by each party. Thus the subject
of Survey Establishments
has not yet been finally
disposed of. Though the
Survey Establishments of
Ganjam and Kistna have
been sanctioned in the
orders of Government,
dated 25th February and
19th June 1863 as permanent,
they are now treated as
temporary pending the
disposal of the general
question. I have for this
reason

reason not included them
in the revised list of
Establishments. The orders
of Government are requested
on this subject.

7 In connection with
the registration of deaths
the Board recommended
an Establishment of Rs. 35
per month in each District
for preparing abstracts
for Village Registers. The
Government sanctioned
it experimentally for a year
subject to report thereafter
of the amount of work done
by the Clerks in question
and the necessity for two
additional men in each
Office

office for doing it, and the Government called for report. In submitting the Revenue Budget for 1866/67 to Government the Board suggested that the Establishment for the Registration of deaths may be incorporated with the Land Revenue Establishments as the whole time of the additional establishment is not likely to be occupied. In their order dated 9th April 1866 No. 355 Government however deferred passing any final orders on the subject until the report called for is submitted This addition to the Revenue Establishment

Establishment permanently is therefore a matter for future consideration and will not be entered in any list now, unless so ordered by Government.

8 In the revised list an Establishment for the registration of the title deeds is provided in the Madras Town at a monthly cost of Rs. 213, but a separate Registers office having been established in Madras under Act XVI of 1864 the Board required of the Collector of Madras whether the maintenance of the special Establishment is necessary

The

The Collector stated that it was not required but he considered still that a small establishment is necessary to register and fill in. Title deeds under the free hold rules and for some other purposes. This was reported to Government who referred the matter to the Registrar General and to the Govt. Solicitor. The opinion of the former has been received and disposed of, but that of the latter has been referred to the Board and the matter remains to be disposed of by Government after the receipt of the Board's

reply. If the Board's suggestion for the proposed small establishment at a monthly cost of Rs. 66 be approved the cost of the revised establishment will be reduced by Rs. 147 a month or 1764 per annum. I shall await the disposal of this point before closing my statement.

9. In the Treasury and Stamps Department of the Tanjore District, there are 2 sheriffs on salaries of 12 Rs. per mensem

the minimum rate
of pay allowed to this
class of men in all
the other districts is
Rs 15, I would therefore
alter the pay of the
2 shroffs in Canjam
to that amount as I
consider that there
is a reason for an excep-
tional rate in a sin-
gle district is anoma-
lous. If this alter-
ation is approved, I
will submit a letter
for its formal sanc-
tion that the Ac-
countant General
may pass the amount
10. Deputy Collrs. There
are four classes of Dy
Collrs drawing salaries
of

Rs 600, 500, 350 & 250 Rs each.
The salaries are not at-
tached to the districts
in which they may be
employed, but are given
to the men wherever
employed. It is there-
fore not practicable
in making up the state-
ment to fix any par-
ticular salary, as the
salary of the Dy Collr
of such & such a dis-
trict, which may
be liable to be chan-
ged at any time. There
is however a fixed ab-
stract of the num-
ber of Dy Collrs to
each district for Treas-
ury, General & Sala-
ries. I propose that
I have to take an average

of the whole pay
and to allot that
as the amount in ma-
king up the Statement.
There are 6 Coll[r]s on
600 Rs each = 3600
12 — 500 —— = 6000
12 — 350 —— = 4200
20 — 250 —— = 5000

Total 50
viz: 19 on Treasury
20 on Jemmah
11 on Salt

Total 50 —— Rs 18800
average pay: — 376

I amend therefore em-
-bracing the Statement in the
following manner, for instance

Districts	Land Revenue				Salt		Total	
	Treasury		General					
	No	average Salary	No	average Salary	No	average Salary	No	average Salary
1 Ganjam	1	376	6	"	1	376	2	752
2 Vizagapatam	1	376	"	"	1	376	2	752
3 Godavery	1	376	1	376	1	376	3	1128
4 Rishnah	1	376	1	376	1	376	3	1128
5 Nellore	1	376	1	376	1	376	3	1128
6 Cuddapah	1	376	1	376	"	"	2	752
7 Bellary	1	376	1	376	"	"	2	752
8 Kurnool	1	376	1	376	"	"	2	752
9 Madras	1	376	1	376	1	376	3	1128
10 N. Arcot	1	376	1	376	"	"	2	752
11 S. Arcot	1	376	1	376	1	376	3	1128
12 Tanjore	1	376	2	752	1	376	4	1504
13 Trichinopoly	1	376	1	376	"	"	2	752
14 Madura	1	376	1	376	1	376	3	1128
15 Tinnevelly	1	376	1	376	1	376	3	1128
16 Combaconum	1	376	2	752	"	"	3	1128
17 Salem	1	376	1	376	"	"	2	752
18 Canara	1	376	"	"	1	376	2	752
19 Malabar	1	376	3	1128	"	"	4	1504
Total	19	7144	20	7520	11	4136	50	18800

If this is not approved of I request instructions how to debit each district with the cost of the 6 Coll[r]s salary.

Charles Pelly

Member

Revenue Board Office
Madras.
23rd June 1866.

Revenue Department

N°-1556

Proceedings of the Madras Government under date the 25th June 1866.-

Read the following Letter from the Honorable E. Kelly, Member of the Board of Revenue-

Requesting order of Govt on the few points connected with the division of Revl Establishments-

(Here enter 23d June 1866, N° 1949/-

The Govt approval the exclusion of the Cantonment Joint Magistrates Establishments from Mr Kelly's revised List-

The Conjeeram Madras Sub Magistrates will be included in the List as in the case of the Jeypore Sub Magistrates in Vizagapatam-

The allowance to the Curla Kimedy Estate properly excluded from Mr Kelly's List of Establishment-

The

Rev-1809/56.

Proc-25th June 66 No 1538.

Memo on which order of Government is required on the few points connected with the revision of Revenue Establishments.

dt 25th June 66 No 1538

Submitted from the Board of Revenue recommending the Establishments of the Joint Magistrates of Ganjam and Vizagapatam for the orders of Government.

dt 23 June 1866 No 1949.

The exclusion of the clerk employed in Madras town for selling postage labels is also approved.

The Govt desire that the Madras Town Establishment for stamping weights and measures be excluded from Mr. Kelly's list. The charge should either be defrayed from the fees or the work transferred to the Municipality.

In the present exposition of the question regarding District Survey Establishments, they had better be excluded altogether from the list.

The exclusion of the temporary establishments for preparing the District Registers of deaths is approved.

The Govt await the Board's report on the question of the establishment for the Registration of

of deaths in the Madras Collectorate office.

Mr. Kelly's proposal to place the Sanyasi shroffs on the same footing as men of the same class occupy in other districts is approved.

The Govt see no reason to include the class of Deputy Collectors at all in the list. These officers stand on a perfectly different footing from the Establishments to which it refers.

[illegible]

4 Copies Letter Hon'ble C. Kelly dated 26. 14 — B. of Revenue

21/4

Revenue 1866 No 1/4
Pro of Govt for June

23/12
5-12-12

No 1556.

Pro of the Madras
Government
of 25 June 1866

Passing orders on
the points submit-
ted by Mr Petley in
connection with the
revision of Revenue
Establishments.

No 538-539.