

(1) Number of Pages.....14
(2) Date of repair.....15.7.66
(3) Initials of the Referencer.....*SH*

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	370	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	20.3.1874	196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Government whether it will not be advisable to dispense with the preparation of these Statistics until the district is surveyed.

4. *Statement No. 2.*—The Board propose to open a column next to Column 3 for the entry of the names of the Wurgdars. They seem to have lost sight of the fact that in this district the wurg takes its name from that of the Wurgdar, and that an entry as proposed by them will be simply a repetition.

5. *Statement No. 10.*—The Board propose altering the heading of Column 3 of this Statement into "name of the Wurgdar." As the Kudutaladar in this district is responsible for the assessment, his name will be better. But every Kudutaladar is not a Wurgdar, although all Wurgdars may be Kudutaladars, hence the heading "Individual" was considered most appropriate.

6. *Statement No. 11.*—In this statement the Board consider it unnecessary to shew the demand and collections of each individual sharer in a wurg, on the ground that any attempt to determine the individual liability in a joint Estate may lead to needless complications and disputes. In this opinion I, in some measure, concur. I think that if we accept divisions of the total assessment due on an Estate, admit them into our accounts, and make direct collections accordingly, we are in a measure compromised, and liable by implied consent to have the permanency of those divisions forced on us by a Civil suit, even though the divisions may be very unequal, and the more heavily assessed parts resigned in consequence, and the under-assessed parts tenaciously held to our detriment. Still I should point out that such a measure would be something like a revolution in the tenures of a large part of the district; many who now pay direct to Government would then have to pay to the Wurgdar, and would not like the change. The practice at present is, that the assessment is levied on the entire block of land comprized in an Estate, and not on the extent included in one man's holding, and that when a division is proposed by parties, their individual liability is represented by them to the Collector, who instead of attempting to apportion the lands between the parties, owing to the unsurveyed condition of the district, simply takes care that the total of the several sums to be paid to Government is equal to the total demand on the Estate. On failure of payment of assessment by one Kudutaladar, not only his land is made liable, but any extra portion or the whole Estate is also attached and sold. Under these circumstances, it becomes necessary to maintain accounts to exhibit the demand, collection, and balance of each Kudutaladar in a particular wurg. Should the present practice be abandoned, then only can these details be dispensed with.

7. It is for the Board to decide whether, or not, the present practice is to be abandoned. Theoretically I think it wrong. Practically, it has brought no difficulties as yet. I think it is time enough to abandon it, when it proves mischievous in practice. I would therefore counsel no change in this matter till we have the facilities of a survey or the exigencies of a difficulty.

SUBMITTED to Government with reference to their Order, dated 29th October 1872, No. 1,504.

2. *Paragraph 2 of the Collector's letter.*—The Board adhere to their opinion that Columns 17 to 20 may be omitted. The information regarding the particulars

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
20th March 1874.*

Read again Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 9th October 1872, recorded in the Proceedings of Government, dated 29th idem, No. 1,504.

No. 192. Read also the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 11th December 1873, No. 2,532:—

Read the following letter from H. S. THOMAS, Esq., Collector of South Canara, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Seeradi, 29th October 1873, No. 1,831A:—

WITH reference to the Proceedings of Government, dated 29th October 1872, No. 1,504, I have the honour to state that most of the alterations suggested by the Board of Revenue in the forms of Village Accounts, submitted by my predecessor with his letter to the Board, dated 13th February 1871, No. 217, are of an unimportant nature, and may be adopted. Some of them, however, are not exactly suited to the peculiarities of this district, and cannot therefore be introduced with advantage. These will be noticed below:—

2. *Register A, Enclosure 2.*—The Board suggest the omission of Columns 17 to 20 inclusive, and to give the same particulars in the Column of Remarks. At present the reasons for the transfer and the order under which the transfer is effected and other particulars of an important nature that do not find place in the several columns of the Statement, are entered in the Column of Remarks, and if the entries to be made in Columns 17 to 20 are also to be thrust into the same column, inconvenience will result, and, moreover, the information will not be as prominent and distinct as it would be under separate headings.

3. *Register C.*—The Board and Government are fully aware that, in this district, no information is available to shew the area under cultivation, and whatever may have been Mr. Webster's reasons to entrust the preparation of this Statement to the Wurgdars, I am still of opinion that any attempt to prepare this return will be, on the whole, worthless. The unsurveyed condition of the district, coupled with the mischievous uncertainties of Kumki and Kumari and the desire of the people to avoid others knowing the actual extent under their occupancy lest the assessment on the land should be enhanced, must necessarily influence the wurgdars in the preparation of these returns. It may, therefore, be easily inferred what would be the character of the information that would be furnished by them. On the other hand, if the work is to be entrusted to the already overworked shanbhogues, as directed in the Board's Proceedings, dated 29th May 1873, No. 893, the Returns will not be a bit more reliable, for their preparation will be made by guess, and at the best will be the rudest approximations which we shall have no means of checking. It would besides be a difficult matter for the shanbhogue to traverse the lands in his Magany to form an estimate of the cultivated extent. There is but one shanbhogue for several villages, and the cultivated lands are mostly situated in villages separated by hills and forest, and cannot, therefore, be easily reached. I have the honour, therefore, to beg the consideration of

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
20th March 1874.*

of dates, etc., of documents under which transfers are made is not of so much importance as to require prominent entry under separate headings.

3. *Paragraph 3.*—The Board are aware of the difficulties put forward by the Collector, but they consider that an attempt should be made to obtain the information, and even if the endeavour should prove unsuccessful there can be no harm in Register C. finding a place in the forms of the Village Accounts.

4. *Paragraph 4.*—The Board believe that the name of the wurgdar is known against him that is not to be shown in the accounts separately.

5. *Paragraph 5.*—If the Kudutaladar pays the money, his name will appear in the new column proposed to be opened for "the name of the person by whom the money is paid." The Board do not think that any revenue process can be issued against a Kudutaladar who is not the registered holder though there is no objection to the money paid by him being received. The Board think that the alteration proposed by them is material.

6. *Paragraph 6.*—The Board consider it to be wrong in principle to show each sharer's demand in the Accounts separately, and still to hold the property of the other sharers liable when a default occurs. They do not apprehend any "revolution in the tenures of the district" by the change proposed since each sharer may still continue to pay for his share, and his name will appear in the accounts as a joint-holder, and as the person who paid the money. It is only the demand against him that is not to be shown in the accounts separately.

7. *Paragraph 7.*—The Board do not think that any revenue process can be issued against a Kudutaladar who is not the registered holder though there is no objection to the money paid by him being received. The Board think that the alteration proposed by them is material.

No. 193. ORDER THEREON, 20th March 1874, No. 370.

Miscellaneous.

THESE forms have received the careful consideration of the Collector and the Board, and need no remarks

from Government except to settle the points in which there is a difference of opinion.

2. *Register A, Enclosure 2.*—Under the circumstances stated by the Collector, he may be allowed to retain columns 17 to 20 in this statement, instead of crowding the column of "Remarks" with several particulars.

3. *Register C.*—The Government concur with the Board in considering it necessary to procure the statistics of the cultivation in the district, and they trust the Collector will do his best to make this return as accurate as possible. Once the Collection Register is fairly started it can be improved year by year until reasonable accuracy is attained.

4. *Statement No. 10.*—The alterations proposed by the Board are approved. The names of both the registered holder, and of the person from whom the money is received, should be shown in this statement.

5. *Statement No. 11.*—Under the circumstances stated by the Collector in paragraph 6 and 7 of his letter, the Government would not introduce any change in the present practice of the district in regard to showing the demand and collection of each individual share in a wurg, in this statement.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
20th March 1874.*

6. With these remarks the forms, as revised by the Board of Revenue, are approved.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Secretary to Government.

No. 2,532.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 11th December 1873.
Read the following letter from H. S. THOMAS, Esq., Collector of South Canara,
to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Seeradi,
29th October 1873, No. 1,831a:—

With reference to the Proceedings of Government, dated 29th October 1872,
No. 1,504, I have the honour to state that most of the alterations suggested by the
Board of Revenue in the forms of Village Accounts, submitted by my predecessor
with his letter to the Board, dated 13th February 1871, No. 217, are of an unim-
portant nature, and may be adopted. Some of them, however, are not exactly
suited to the peculiarities of this district, and cannot therefore be introduced with
advantage. These will be noticed below:—

2. *Register A, Enclosure 2.*—The Board suggest the omission of Columns 17 to
20 inclusive, and to give the same particulars in the Column of Remarks. At
present the reasons for the transfer and the order under which the transfer is
effected and other particulars of an important nature that do not find place in the
several columns of the Statement, are entered in the Column of Remarks, and if the
entries to be made in Columns 17 to 20 are also to be thrust into the same column,
inconvenience will result, and, moreover, the information will not be as prominent
and distinct as it would be under separate headings.

3. *Register C.*—The Board and Government are fully aware that, in this
district, no information is available to shew the area under cultivation, and what-
ever may have been Mr. Webster's reasons to entrust the preparation of this
Statement to the Wurgdars, I am still of opinion that any attempt to prepare this
return will be, on the whole, worthless. The unsurveyed condition of the
district, coupled with the mischievous uncertainties of Kunki and Kumari and the
desire of the people to avoid others knowing the actual extent under their occu-
pancy lest the assessment on the land should be enhanced, must necessarily influ-
ence the wurgdars in the preparation of these returns. It may, therefore, be easily
inferred what would be the character of the information that would be furnished
by them. On the other hand, if the work is to be entrusted to the already over-
worked shanbhogues, as directed in the Board's Proceedings, dated 29th May 1873,
No. 893, the Returns will not be a bit more reliable, for their preparation will be
made by guess, and at the best will be the rudest approximations which we shall
have no means of checking. It would besides be a difficult matter for the shan-
bhogue to traverse the lands in his *Magany* to form an estimate of the cultivated
extent. There is but one shanbhogue for several villages, and the cultivated lands
are mostly situated in villages separated by hills and forest, and cannot, therefore,
be easily reached. I have the honour, therefore, to beg the consideration of
Government whether it will not be advisable to dispense with the preparation of
these Statistics until the district is surveyed.

4. *Statement No. 2.*—The Board propose to open a column next to Column
3 for the entry of the names of the Wurgdars. They seem to have lost sight of the
fact that in this district the wurg takes its name from that of the Wurgdar, and that
an entry as proposed by them will be simply a repetition.

Forms of Village Accounts for South
Canara.—Approved generally by the Board of Revenue,
with remarks relative to cer-
tain disputed points.



NOV. 192193

MARCH

G. O. 20th March 1874, No. 870.

Recd.

Dated March 20th.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE

To

REVENUE.

Subt. of 1874 30th March

5. *Statement No. 10.*—The Board propose altering the heading of Column 3 of this Statement into "name of the Wurgdar." As the Kudutaladar in this district is responsible for the assessment, his name will be better. But every Kudutaladar is not a Wurgdar, although all Wurgdars may be Kudutaladars, hence the heading "Individual" was considered most appropriate.

6. *Statement No. 11.*—In this statement the Board consider it unnecessary to shew the demand and collections of each individual sharer in a wurg, on the ground that any attempt to determine the individual liability in a joint Estate may lead to needless complications and disputes. In this opinion I, in some measure, concur. I think that if we accept divisions of the total assessment due on an Estate, admit them into our accounts, and make direct collections accordingly, we are in a measure compromised, and liable by implied consent to have the permanency of those divisions forced on us by a Civil suit, even though the divisions may be very unequal, and the more heavily assessed parts resigned in consequence, and the under-assessed parts tenaciously held to our detriment. Still I should point out that such a measure would be something like a revolution in the tenures of a large part of the district; many who now pay direct to Government would then have to pay to the Wurgdar, and would not like the change. The practice at present is, that the assessment is levied on the entire block of land comprized in an Estate, and not on the extent included in one man's holding, and that when a division is proposed by parties, their individual liability is represented by them to the Collector, who instead of attempting to apportion the lands between the parties, owing to the unsurveyed condition of the district, simply takes care that the total of the several sums to be paid to Government is equal to the total demand on the Estate. On failure of payment of assessment by one Kudutaladar, not only his land is made liable, but any extra portion or the whole Estate is also attached and sold. Under these circumstances, it becomes necessary to maintain accounts to exhibit the demand, collection, and balance of each Kudutaladar in a particular wurg. Should the present practice be abandoned, then only can these details be dispensed with.

7. It is for the Board to decide whether, or not, the present practice is to be abandoned. Theoretically I think it wrong. Practically, it has brought no difficulties as yet. I think it is time enough to abandon it, when it proves mischievous in practice. I would therefore counsel no change in this matter till we have the facilities of a survey or the exigencies of a difficulty.

SUBMITTED to Government with reference to their Order, dated 29th October 1872, No. 1,504.

2. *Paragraph 2 of the Collector's letter.*—The Board adhere to their opinion that Columns 17 to 20 may be omitted. The information regarding the particulars of dates, etc., of documents under which transfers are made is not of so much importance as to require prominent entry under separate headings.

3. *Paragraph 3.*—The Board are aware of the difficulties put forward by the Collector, but they consider that an attempt should be made to obtain the infor-

ation, and even if the endeavour should prove unsuccessful there can be no harm in Register C. finding a place in the forms of the Village Accounts.

4. *Paragraph 4.*—The Board believe that the name of the wurg is known by the name of the *original* wurgdar, and that the name of the *present* wurgdar may be different. If this however is not the case, they have no objection to the column proposed being omitted.

5. *Paragraph 5.*—If the Kudutaladar pays the money, his name will appear in the new column proposed to be opened for "the name of the person by whom the money is paid." The Board do not think that any revenue process can be issued against a Kudutaladar who is not the registered holder though there is no objection to the money paid by him being received. The Board think that the alteration proposed by them is material.

6. *Paragraph 6.*—The Board consider it to be wrong in principle to show each sharer's demand in the Accounts separately, and still to hold the property of the other sharers liable when a default occurs. They do not apprehend any "revolution in the tenures of the district" by the change proposed since each sharer may still continue to pay for his share, and his name will appear in the accounts as a joint-holder, and as the person who paid the money. It is only the demand against him that is not to be shown in the accounts separately.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

J. E. M.
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
" the Collector of South Canara.

Exd. G. A. Turton.

Revenue Department.

N^o 370

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

Under date the 20th March 1874

Read again Proceedings of
the Board of Revenue dated

9th October 1872 recorded in
the Proceedings of Government
dated 29th Idem N^o 1504-

Read also the following Pro-
ceedings of the Board of
Revenue.

Submitting with remarks
Collector's letter objecting to certain
alterations proposed by Board
in forms of Village Accounts
for South Canara District,

H.C. 11th December 1873, N^o 2532.

These forms have
received the careful consid-
eration of the Collector and
the Board, and need no
remarks from Government
except to settle the points
in which there is a differ-
ence of opinion.

2 Register

029 October 1873

Rec: 1873: 244
C 4062

1873.

Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 11TH DECEMBER 1873, N^o 2,532.

24th 19th Dec 1873.

Encl.

5425

1873

Received

20th Dec 1873

DECEMBER.

No. 2,532.

Forms of Village Accounts for South
Canara District.—Collector's letter objecting to
certain alterations proposed by Board in—
submitted to Government, with remarks.

S.O. No 370-20 March 1874

192

the form as per 1873-1874

1873-1874, 1874-1875

more theoretical ones.
 An application of the
 Ryotwari condition of the
 East Coast to the whole of
 a different conditions
 of land & tenure. The
 Collector is far nearer
 the truth when he says
 that the change for which
 there is no earthly need
 would create something
 like a revolution in
 the tenures of a large
 part of the District.

7-0
 Memo of Mr. [unclear] [unclear]
 [unclear]

against him. It
 has never been fixed
 by the [unclear] and he
 cannot there fore
^{refuse} ~~dispute~~ its force
 recognition by the
 [unclear] but I know
 there are still
 expectations when
 he says it will
 be a kind of revolution.
 But [unclear]
 to [unclear] no [unclear]
 [unclear] has to
 [unclear] from the
 protest by [unclear]
 [unclear] to its [unclear]
 [unclear] [unclear] though
 I consider the [unclear]
 right is [unclear]
 [unclear]

24/2 [unclear]
 The [unclear] proposal
 makes no change
 as regards tenures or
 pay rents or rights.
 Every [unclear] - holder
 will pay what he
 has [unclear] -
 the [unclear] manner
 he now pays it. The
 only difference is that
 the demand is against
 him.

I understand that
 the proposal of the
 Board might involve
 a change in the
~~present system of~~
 the [unclear] system
 may not [unclear]
 in [unclear] to a large
 established system
 against which no
 objections are stated;
 and the proposal
 is therefore [unclear]
 it does not seem
 desirable to adopt it.

B. & W. of [unclear] [unclear]
 25 [unclear] [unclear] 23-3-74

Formal bill
Account for Santa
Cruz de