M.R.O. 1—30,000—16-10-29.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2360 Press ~~Mis.~~

263-264

Dated 18-8 August 1869

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 18th August 1869.

No. 263. Read the following letter from R. E. MASTER, Esq., Director of Revenue Settlement, to the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort Saint George, dated 30th July 1869, No. 1,004-25:—

In reply to Government order, dated 13th instant, No. 2,025, referring for my observations the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue of the 17th ultimo, No. 4,358, on a letter from the Acting Collector of Coimbatore, dated 26th May last, No. 98, I have the honour to state that I have little doubt but that the opinion expressed by Major Hessey in his letter to Mr. Webster, to the effect that it is unlikely that any wholesale removal of demarcation stones in the villages of Coimbatore and Anuparpolliem in the Coimbatore Talook has taken place, and that it is far more probable that stones were never put down is correct.

2. In the earlier demarcation executed by this department, the use of stones for field-marks was not compulsory, though the demarcators were instructed that stones formed the best possible marks, and should be made use of when procurable within a reasonable distance. According to the practice then in force, the villages, regarding which complaint is now made, were demarcated with earthen mounds. The demarcation was performed in 1861, now eight years ago, and the survey early in the following year. Two years and a half later the Superintendent of Revenue Survey wrote to me, complaining that the stones in the Coimbatore Talook could not be found, and that their absence rendered the testing of the survey very difficult. I beg to annex copy of my letter to the Superintendent on the subject, dated 30th June 1864, No. 805, which will sufficiently explain why there were no stones, and my reasons for declining then to place them. It will not be considered surprising that five years later the stones should still be wanting. I may add that on my visiting Coimbatore a few months after assuming charge of the department in 1862, I prohibited, for the future, the use of any other material than stone for field-marks.

From the Officiating Director of Revenue Settlement, to the Superintendent of Revenue Survey, dated 30th June 1864, No. 805.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your docket, dated 3rd instant, No. 358, giving cover to an original letter* from Captain Hessey, with three enclosures from Lieutenant Baynes, on the subject of the disappearance of demarcation in the Coimbatore Talook, and requesting me to communicate to you the measures taken to remedy the state of affairs reported.

* 1st June, No. 610.

2. In the first of his three letters, Lieutenant Baynes states that on visiting the village of Moneagarpolliem for the purpose of comparing the demarcation-marks on the ground with the Survey Map, he did not find a single original stone marking the field-demarcation, though the ryots had apparently stuck up a few stones the day before in incorrect situations. By the aid of the hedges however he was able to ascertain that, with the exception of some slight errors in detail, the Map was accurate. The Carnum stated that field-stones had never been erected, which statement was corroborated by the late Acting Deputy-Director Mr. Stuart.

3. It is quite true that in the earlier demarcation in the Coimbatore District, and throughout the greater part of the Coimbatore Talook, stones were not used for field-marks, earthen mounds having been placed for that purpose. It is not surprising that these mounds, being composed of friable soil, should, after the lapse of three years, have, in a great measure, disappeared; but this is of the less consequence, as the enclosed nature of the country and the existence of artificial fences easily admits of the comparison of the fields with the Map. It is certainly to be regretted that

stones were not used from the first as field-marks in Coimbatore; and on my visiting the district in 1862, I prohibited for the future the use of any other material, though I did not consider it worthwhile to incur the great expense which the re-demarcation with stone of the tract of country that had already been completed with earthen mounds would have involved.

4. In his second letter Lieutenant Baynes states that the "test correction" of the village of Coimbatore has been stopped, because an important portion of the village boundary is undemarcated, and because in an extensive tract of wet cultivation, he cannot find a single field-mark. He adds that as the Curnum states that stones were never erected, the Ameens' measurements must have been made on the verbal testimony of the Curnum and Tolies.

5. It is probably true, for the reasons given in paragraph 3, that field-stones never were erected, but it does not follow that earthen marks were not put up. If they were, the Ameens' measurements must have been made from them, but if there were no marks at all, I submit that it was the duty of the Ameens to have stopped work and reported the omission, and that they were not justified in making their measurements on the verbal testimony of the Curnums and Tolies. My Assistant in Coimbatore has ascertained from Lieutenant Baynes that the boundary survey of the Coimbatore village took place in January 1862, and the field-survey in the month following. I am entitled to assume that the demarcation was then sufficiently good to allow of the survey being made, but I cannot hold myself responsible, after the lapse of two years and a half, for the perfect maintenance of earthen demarcation, nor can I undertake now, at great expense, to renew that demarcation with stone. I will, however, direct my Assistant to renew the demarcation of the important portion of the village boundary, which has disappeared, as the labour and expense involved will be trifling. It is, I think, to be regretted that your department has been unable to test the correctness of the original survey at an earlier period.

6. In his third letter Lieutenant Baynes states that in consequence of the absence of field-marks in the village of Kurumbapalaiyam, it is impossible to survey the porambokes, as they have never been separately demarcated. The survey of this village (both boundary and field) was, I find, effected more than two years ago, *viz.*, in May 1862, and I should have supposed that the porambokes would have been measured at the same time. The marks must then have been sufficient for the purpose. I think you will agree with me that I cannot reasonably be expected to renew them now.

7. The original enclosures to your docket are herewith returned.

No. 264. ORDER THEREON, 18th August 1869, No. 2,360.

Land Revenue.

MR. MASTER'S attention will be drawn to paragraph 2 of the Deputy-Superintendent's letter, dated 20th May 1869, No. 431, printed in the G. O., under date 13th July 1869, No. 2,025, from which it would appear that the sketches furnished by the Settlement Department showed that demarcation *stones* should have been forthcoming.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. S. ELLIS,
Chief Secretary.

To the Director of Revenue Settlement.
,, the Board of Revenue.

Ind. F. R. Bantleman.

No 2360

Proceedings of the Madras Govt
Under date the 8th Sept 1869

RD

Read the following
letter from the Director
of Revenue Settlement
No. 30 July 1869 — No 1004/25

WDL

Dr Master's attention
will be drawn to para
2 of the Govt Supt's letter
dated 20 May 1869 No 488
printed in the G. O. under
date 13 July 1869 No 2020
from which it would
appear that the Sketches
furnished by the Settlement
demarcation
Dept showed that Stones
should have been forthcoming

13 Letter Dr of Rev Dept 20
14 Letter Govt of Rev Dept 1

40

Govt of Madras
Revenue
Settlement

Transmitted 21 Aug 1869
Rec'd 1869