

(1) Number of pages 14
(2) Date of repair 22 4 43
(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

DRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1475

Press
Mis.

217-218

Dated 24-10 - 1872.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
24th October 1872.*

No. 217. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 9th January 1872, No. 70:—

Read the following letters:—

From R. K. PUCKLE, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 24th October 1871, No. 456.

ABSTRACT.—Furnishing the comments called for in Board's Proceedings No. 3,671, dated 20th October 1871, relative to the conservancy of forests in the Tinnevely District.

From the same officer, dated 26th October 1871, No. 461.

ABSTRACT.—Furnishing information on the several points called for in Government Proceedings No. 981, dated 3rd June 1871, relative to Tinnevely ghaut-forests, and submitting copies of correspondence showing how much damage was done to the hills on the Travancore frontier, together with copy of a decree in appeal in the matter of a forest-dispute, also sketches of the hills claimed by the Zemindars.

From the same officer, dated 20th November 1871, No. 502.

ABSTRACT.—Reporting on renting the Sivagiri forest on referring to Major Beddome's report on the subject.

From the same officer, dated 15th December 1871, No. 527.

ABSTRACT.—Bringing to notice the indiscriminate forest clearing that took place on the eastern slope of the hills adjoining the Travancore territory injurious to the interests of the British Government, submitting correspondence in reference to the claim set up by both Governments in respect of the locality in which the felling occurred, and suggesting the expediency of settling the dispute in favour of the British Government.

THESE letters will be submitted to Government with reference to their Proceedings quoted by the Collector. As Government anticipated the further information now submitted is not of much value as evidence either way, and the conclusion Mr. Puckle comes to is that all the Zemindars in his district have undoubtedly exercised some rights of ownership (however vague and undefined) over the forests in their neighbourhood, and have always asserted a claim to the primeval forests extending as far as the boundary of the district from times anterior to the British rule.

2. It seems, therefore, to be out of the question to expect to get possession of any of them without payment of some reasonable compensation to the Zemindars; and the amount of this compensation is given by Mr. Puckle for the tracts of country noted in the margin.

1. Sivagiri Lease	...	Rs. 5,000 per annum.
2. Chokampatti and Vyra-		
vankulam do.	...	„ 1,500 or 2,000
3. The "Kattalei" Hill	...	„ 4,000
4. Mahendragiri	...	„ 1,000

3. In his third letter recorded above Mr. Puckle adheres to his estimate of the value of the forests generally without referring especially to Major Beddome's

remarks about the "Kattalei malei." As, however, it cannot apparently be got for less the Board would advise its being rented like the rest for Rs. 4,000 a year without any assignment of land-revenue from assessed land at the foot. As to the others they strongly advise Government to accept Mr. Puckle's proposals, and take the forests on a lease from the ostensible owners. As forests are waste lands, and as the lease is asked for and granted with the view of permanent improvement being effected in the forests, there seems little doubt that the puttass, if properly worded, would be binding on the several Zemindars' successors under Clause 4, Section 11, Madras Act VIII. of 1865. On this point, however, the Government may think proper to consult the Advocate-General. It will be for the Government to consider whether this course, if feasible, would be preferable to taking possession of the forests for "public purposes"—a procedure which will be admissible if Section 43 of the Draft Forest Bill should in course of time become law, and may perhaps be admissible even now under the existing law.

4. The Singampatti estate will remain under the Collector's charge as Agent of the Court of Wards for many years, and the same system of conservancy will be carried out there as in the rest of the district. Ultimately a lease may perhaps be obtained for it by the Collector as in the other cases.

5. Lastly, the Board earnestly recommend that the boundary between Travancore and Tinnevely be settled at once; and if it does not coincide with the water-shed in any point, it should be permanently demarcated and surveyed. The correspondence referred to by Mr. Puckle in paragraph 4 of the first letter, and the last letter recorded above (with its enclosures) with much that has gone before, show how desirable it is that boundaries should be fixed *before* disputes and complications arise.

No. 218.

ORDER THEREON, 24th October 1872, No. 1,475.

Forests, No. 10.

Two distinct questions are raised in the papers submitted with these Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

2. One relates to a portion of the boundary between Travancore and Tinnevely, north of the Mahendragiri mountain, regarding which the Government observe that in paragraph 4 of his letter dated 29th May 1871 (Proceedings, 29th June 1871, No. 1,123, Revenue Department), the Resident stated that the Travancore Government were willing to accept the water-shed on the ghaut-range as the boundary between the two States.

3. South of this mountain the boundary was settled by the G. O. above quoted, and practically the acceptance north of it by the Travancore State of the boundary proposed by this Government has settled the rest of the question.

4. The Resident will, therefore, be directed to request the Travancore authorities to notify that this natural boundary defines the line of separation between the States by the mutual agreement of the Governments, except in those localities (as south of the Mahendragiri and between Shencotta and Tenkasi) where another line has been already settled. The Resident will communicate with the Collectors of Tinnevely and Madura on the subject, and those officers will take

the necessary steps to prevent or punish any invasion of Government rights on the eastern side of this boundary.

5. The second question is as to the forest tracts which are claimed as belonging to the several Zemindaris lying adjacent to the ghaut-range in the Tinnevely District, and of which it is very desirable to obtain the management in view to the conservation of the Forests, and to prevent the denudation of the hill-country in which important sources of irrigation are situated.

6. The claims of the Zemindars are doubtless in many places well founded, but in many other instances there seems to be little doubt that equally good claims could be maintained on behalf of Government villages. The rights of property would, however, appear to have been very generally exercised by the Zemindars, and the Government have come to the conclusion that the best course to adopt is to induce them to surrender their claims to such extent as may be necessary for securing the object in view, in consideration of a reduction of peshkush.

7. The Governor in Council therefore desires that the Board will instruct the Collectors of Madura and Tinnevely to prepare definite proposals for the approval of Government, and submit them with a statement showing the present and proposed peshkush of each estate, the nature and extent of the surrender proposed, and whether the Zemindar concerned agrees to the proposal.

8. With this information before them the Government will be in a position to frame a definite proposal for the sanction of the Government of India.

(True Extract.)

(Signed)

W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin.
„ the Collector of Madura.
„ the „ Tinnevely.
„ the Inspector of Forests.

Exd. F. R. Dantleman.

CONCERNS BOTH BRITISH INDIA
AND INDIAN STATES.

Forests in Tinnevely District.—Proceedings Board of Revenue regarding their acquisition and the settlement of the boundary between Travancore and Tinnevely, with orders thereon.

OCTOBER.
Nos. 217-218.

G. O., 24th October 1872, No. 1,475.

Recd.

Encl.

Dated October 24th.

cc., cc., cc.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

REVENUE.

Colt. of 1872, Madras.

30-9-26
19-5-30
18-5-30

12-4

18-5-30

No. 70.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 9th January 1872.

Read the following letters:—

From R. K. PUCKLE, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 24th October 1871, No. 456.

ABSTRACT.—Furnishing the comments called for in Board's Proceedings, No. 3,671, dated 20th October 1871, relative to the conservancy of forests in the Tinnevely District.

From the same Officer, dated 26th October 1871, No. 461.

ABSTRACT.—Furnishing information on the several points called for in Government Proceedings, No. 981, dated 3rd June 1871, relative to Tinnevely Ghaut forests, and submitting copies of correspondence showing how much damage was done to the hills on the Travancore frontier, together with copy of a decree in appeal in the matter of a Forest dispute, also sketches of the hills claimed by the Zemindars.

From the same Officer, dated 20th November 1871, No. 502.

ABSTRACT.—Reporting on renting the Sivaghiri forest on referring to Major Beddome's report on the subject.

From the same Officer, dated 15th December 1871, No. 527.

ABSTRACT.—Bringing to notice the indiscriminate forest clearing that took place on the eastern slope of the hills adjoining the Travancore territory injurious to the interests of the British Government, submitting correspondence in reference to the claim set up by both Governments in respect of the locality in which the felling occurred, and suggesting the expediency of settling the dispute in favour of the British Government.

THESE letters will be submitted to Government with reference to their Proceedings quoted by the Collector. As Government anticipated, the further information now submitted is not of much value as evidence either way, and the conclusion Mr. Puckle comes to is that all the Zemindars in his district have undoubtedly exercised some rights of ownership (however vague and undefined) over the forests in their neighbourhood and have always asserted a claim to the primeval forests extending as far as the boundary of the district from times anterior to the British rule.

2. It seems therefore to be out of the question to expect to get possession of any of them without payment of some reasonable compensation to the Zemindars; and the amount of this compensation is given by Mr. Puckle for the tracts of country noted in the margin.

* 1. Sivagiri—Lease...	Rs. 5,000 per annum.
2. Chokampatti and Vyravan-kulam do. ...	1,500 or 2,000
3. The "Kattalei" Hill ...	4,000
4. Mahendragiri..	1,000

3. In his third letter recorded above Mr. Puckle adheres to his estimate of the value of the forests generally without referring especially to Major Beddome's remarks about the "Kattalei malei." As however it cannot apparently be got for less the Board would advise its being rented like the rest for Rupees 4,000 a year without any assignment of land revenue from assessed land at the foot. As to the others they strongly advise Government to accept Mr. Puckle's proposals, and take the forests on a lease from the ostensible owners. As forests are waste lands, and as the lease is asked for and granted with the view of permanent improvement being effected in the forests, there seems little doubt that the puttahs, if properly worded, would be binding on the several Zemindars' successors under Clause 4, Section 11, Madras Act VIII. of 1865. On this point, however, the Government may think proper to consult the Advocate-General. It will be for the

Government to consider whether this course, if feasible, would be preferable to taking possession of the forests for "public purposes," a procedure which will be admissible if Section 43 of the Draft Forest Bill should in course of time become law; and may perhaps be admissible even now under the existing law.

4. The Singampatti estate will remain under the Collector's charge as Agent of the Court of Wards for many years, and the same system of conservancy will be carried out there as in the rest of the district. Ultimately a lease may perhaps be obtained for it by the Collector, as in the other cases.

5. Lastly the Board earnestly recommend that the boundary between Travancore and Tinnevely be settled at once; and if it does not coincide with the water-shed in any point it should be permanently demarcated and surveyed. The correspondence referred to by Mr. Puckle in paragraph 4 of the first letter, and the last letter recorded above (with its enclosures) with much that has gone before, show how desirable it is that boundaries should be fixed before disputes and complications arise.

(A true Extract.)

J. W. Remington
Sub-Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,

with original letters and enclosures to be returned

Copy to the Collector of Tinnevely.

„ to the Conservator of Forests.

Exd. J. Talloch.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 24th October 1872.

Read the following *Proceedings of the Board of Revenue*

Submitting to Govt. letters from Collector of Tinnevely on the subject of Forests, with recommendation that Kattalai Hill forest be rented for Rs. 4,000 a year without any assignment of land revenue from assessed land at the foot of the hill, that certain other forests be taken on lease from ostensible owners, & that boundary between Travancore & Tinnevely be settled at once.

H. E. 9th January 1872, No. 70.

Two distinct questions are raised in the papers submitted with these Proceedings of the Board of Revenue. One relates to a portion of the boundary between Travancore and Tinnevely north of the Mahendragiri Mountain

BOARD of REVENUE,

MADRAS. No. 222

PROCEEDINGS: 5TH JANUARY 1872, No. 70.

Q. 18 Jan 72

Received. 18th

Exd. 11

JANUARY.

No. 70.

Forests in Tinnevely District.—Letters from Collector on subject of, submitted to Government, with recommendation that Kattalai Hill forest be rented for Rupees 4,000 a year without any assignment of land revenue from assessed land at the foot of the hill, that certain other forests be taken on lease from ostensible owners, and that boundary between Travancore and Tinnevely be settled at once.

S.O. No. 1475-24 Oct 72

*No. 217
16: Oct 72 11:24 AM
To Govt*

29th September 72 No. 396-392

October 10

mountain, regarding
which the Govt. observe
that in para 4 of his letter
dated 29th May 1871 (Proc.
29th June 1871 N. 1123 Rev. Dep.)
the Resident stated that
the Travancore Govt. were
willing to accept the water-
shed on the ghaut range
as the boundary between
the two States.

South of this
mountain the boundary
was settled by the G. O.
above quoted, and practically
the acceptance north of it
by the Travancore State
of the boundary proposed
by this Govt. has settled.

the rest of the question.

The Resident will
therefore be directed to
request the Travancore
Authorities to notify that
this natural boundary
defines the line of sep-
aration between the States,
by the mutual agreement
of the Govts., except in
those localities (as south
of the Mahendragiri, and
between Thencotta and
Tinkasi) where another
line has been already
settled. The Resident
will communicate with
the Collectors of Trinevelly
and Madurai on the
subject.

subject, and those officers
will take the necessary
steps to prevent or punish
any invasion of Gov^t
rights on the eastern side
of this boundary.

The second question
is as to the forest tracts
which are claimed as be-
longing to the several
Zemindars lying adjacent
to the Ghaut range in the
Tinnivelly District, and of
which it is very desirable
to obtain the management
in view to the conservation
of the Forests, and to
prevent

11
prevent the denudation
of the hill country in
which important sources
of irrigation are situated.

The claims of the
Zemindars are doubtless
in many places well
founded, but in many
other instances there seems
to be little doubt that
equally good claims
could be maintained
on ^{behalf} the part of Gov^t
villages. The rights of
property would, however,
appear to have been very
generally exercised by
the

the Zsmindars, and the Govt have come to the conclusion that the best course to adopt is to induce them to surrender their claims to such extent as may be necessary for securing the object in view, in consideration of a reduction of Peshkush.

The Governor in Council therefore desires that the Board will instruct the Collectors of Madura and Tinnevely to prepare definite proposals for the approval

of

of Govt and submit them with a statement showing the present and proposed Peshkush of each Estate, the nature and extent of the surrender proposed, and whether the Zsmindar concerned agrees to the proposal.

With this information before them the Govt will be in a position to frame a definite proposal for the sanction of the Govt of India.

L.R.

14 To the Ad of Rev Secy 2 Nov 72
4 - Resident in Travancore & Cochin —
1 - Collr of Madura —
1 - " of Tinnevely —
3 - Encl pro of Forms —

L.R.

No. 217-218

G. C.

Trust in Jesus

1670

De. 1670

1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680

1670-1680 R. 24th Oct.