

(1) Number of Pages.....12.....
(2) Date of repair.....2-12-68.....
(3) Initials of the Referencer.....S.K.....

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	112	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
No. 225-226		
Dated	27. 1. 1876.	196

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 225. Read the following despatch from the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India:—

Revenue,
No. 34.

INDIA OFFICE, LONDON,
18th November 1875.

Sir,—The despatch of your Excellency in Council, dated 23rd July, No. 8 of 1875, submitting a report by Mr. Barlow on the Mirasi system in Chingleput, with suggestions for remedial measures, has been considered by me in Council.

2. Mr. Barlow has investigated the intricate questions involved in the Mirasi system in Chingleput with care, and has stated the results of his inquiry with clearness. His conclusions point to the antagonism between Mirasidars and Payakaris as the cause of the unsatisfactory condition of the villages in which Mirasi tenures have existed. This antagonism is chiefly evoked by the nonpayment of the fees called "Swatantram" claimed by the Mirasidars and by the conflicting interests of Puttadars and occupiers, and constant disputes as to the payment of the assessment in villages in which "Samadhyam Puttas" prevail. These puttas, under which the Payakaris cultivate tracts held in coparcenary by the Mirasidars, are stated to extend to nearly one-third of the assessed land in each village.

3. Mr. Barlow proposes with respect to the first evil that agreements should be taken from the Payakaris before granting a putta for the payment of the "Swatantram," and with respect to the second evil, to grant separate receipts to the Payakaris for such payments of revenue as they make to Government officers.

4. On the first of these propositions, Mr. Puckle, the Director of Revenue Settlements, suggests that, except in such instances as the Payakaris have always paid "Swatantrams," or in which they can without difficulty be prevailed on to pay them, no interference should be made as to the past, but that for the future "Swatantrams" should be registered against all lands now held by Mirasidars and against the "immemorial waste." So that, if a Mirasidar gives up lands which he now cultivates, the Payakari taking them will know the amount due for "Swatantram," and his liability to pay it. The same course will be pursued with respect to lands hitherto waste, which may be taken up by Payakaris. Mr. Puckle states that the Mirasidars will be quite content if they are assured of their "Swatantrams" in future, and will gladly resign lands which they now hold and pay for merely for the purpose of keeping them from outsiders who have petitioned for them.

5. The Board of Revenue and your Excellency in Council have approved of Mr. Puckle's proposal.

6. With respect to Mr. Barlow's proposition relative to the grant of sub-receipts to Payakaris holding under "Samadhyam" puttas, Mr. Puckle and the Board of Revenue have objected to the plan suggested, on the ground that it will subvert the existing revenue system, and greatly embarrass the accounts, that it has always been the policy of the Government to look to the Puttadar, and the Puttadar alone, for the realisation of the revenue. Various other objections indicative of the difficulties which will attend Mr. Barlow's plan when in operation are also urged, and Mr. Puckle states that the course which he proposes to follow when making the new settlement, the introduction of which has been sanctioned, will remove the cause of the present unsatisfactory complications and render the measure suggested by Mr. Barlow unnecessary.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th January 1876.*

7. Mr. Puckle states that he has in hundreds of villages in other districts divided the common lands, and that he sees no difficulty in following the same course in Chingleput. If this division be effected through the agency and with the consent of the Mirasidars themselves, there will then be no "Samadavam Puttas," and each tenant will hold under a particular Mirasidar, and not under a coparcenary body. Mr. Puckle further states that the Mirasidars are very desirous of having their common lands divided.

8. Under these circumstances, your Excellency in Council has determined not to adopt Mr. Barlow's proposal, but to trust to Mr. Puckle's influence for effecting the thorough reform, of which a brief outline is given in his letter to the Board of Revenue.

9. I approve of the proceedings of your Excellency in Council as set forth in the Resolution of your Government; and I desire that an expression of my commendation may be communicated to Mr. Barlow and to Mr. Puckle for the care and intelligence with which they have treated this complicated and important subject.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) SALISBURY.

His Excellency the Honorable

The Governor in Council, Fort St. George.

No. 226.

ORDER THEREON, 27th January 1876, No. 112.

Land Revenue No. 3.

COMMUNICATED to the Board of
Revenue and the Director of Revenue
Settlement.

2. The Board will communicate to Messrs. Barlow and Puckle, in the usual course, the expression of the Secretary of State's commendation, as contained in the last paragraph.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,

Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

and the Acting Director of Revenue Settlement.

Wm. F. R. Sutherland.

3/10

India Office,

London, 18th November 1875.

Revenue,

No. 314

To His Excellency the Honourable the Governor
in Council, Fort St. George.

SIR,

Para. 1. The Despatch of your Excellency in Council, dated 23rd July, No. 8 of 1875, submitting a report by Mr. Barlow on the Mirasi system in Chingleput, with suggestions for remedial measures, has been considered by me in Council.

2. Mr. Barlow has investigated the intricate questions involved in the Mirasi system in Chingleput with care, and has stated the results of his inquiry with clearness. His conclusions point to the antagonism between Mirasidars and Payakars as the cause of the unsatisfactory condition of the villages in which Mirasi tenures have existed. This antagonism is chiefly evoked by the non-payment of the fees called "swatantrams" claimed by the Mirasidars, and by the conflicting interests of Pattadars and co-proprietors, and constant disputes as to the payment of the assessment in villages in which "Samadayan Pattas" prevail. These pattas, under which the Payakars cultivate tracts held in coparcenary by the Mirasidars, are stated to extend to nearly one third of the assessed land in each village.

3. Mr. Barlow proposes, with respect to the first evil, that agreements should be taken from the Payakars, before granting a patta for the payment of the "swatantrams," and with respect to the second evil, to grant separate receipts to the Payakars for such payments of revenue as they make to Government officers.

4. On the first of these propositions, Mr. Puckle, the Director of Revenue Settlements, suggests that, except in such instances as the Payakars have always paid "swatantrams," or in which they can without difficulty be prevailed on to pay them, no interference should be made as to the past, but that, for the future, "swatantrams" should be registered against all lands now held by Mirasidars, and against the "commoner's waste." So that if a Mirasidar gives up lands which he now cultivates, the Payakar taking them will know the amount due for "swatantrams," and his liability to pay it. The same course will be pursued with respect to lands hitherto waste, which may be taken up by Payakars. Mr. Puckle states that the Mirasidars will be quite content if they are assured of their "swatantrams" in future, and will gladly resign lands which they now hold and pay for merely for the purpose of keeping them from outsiders who have petitioned for them.

5. The Board of Revenue and your Excellency in Council have approved of Mr. Puckle's proposal.

6. With respect to Mr. Barlow's proposition relative to the grant of sub-receipts to Payakaris holding under "samadayan" puttas, Mr. Puckle and the Board of Revenue have objected to the plan suggested, on the ground that it will subvert the existing revenue system, and greatly encumber the accounts, that it has always been the policy of the Government to look to the Puttadar, and the Puttadar alone, for the realization of the revenue. Various other objections indicative of the difficulties which will attend Mr. Barlow's plan when in operation are also urged, and Mr. Puckle states that the course which he proposes to follow when making the new settlement, the introduction of which has been sanctioned, will remove the cause of the present unsatisfactory complications, and render the measure suggested by Mr. Barlow unnecessary.

7. Mr. Puckle states that he has in hundreds of villages in other districts divided the common lands, and that he sees no difficulty in following the same course in Chingleput. If this division be effected through the agency and with the consent of the Alirashidars themselves, there will then be no "Samadayan Puttas," and each tenant will hold under a particular Munsidar, and not under a co-tenure body. Mr. Puckle further states that the Munsidars are very desirous of having their common lands divided.

8. Under these circumstances, your Excellency in Council has determined not to adopt Mr. Barlow's proposal, but to trust to Mr. Puckle's influence for effecting the thorough reform of which a brief outline is given in his letter to the Board of Revenue.

9. I approve of the proceedings of your Excellency in Council as set forth in the Resolution of your Government, and I desire that an expression of my commendation may be communicated to Mr. Barlow and to Mr. Puckle for the care and intemperance with which they have treated this complicated and important subject.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient humble servant,

W. H. Murray

No. 9.

Revenue
18 Nov. 1875

The
Letter to Fort George

No 34

Recd

SC No 112. 27 January 1876

Approving of proceedings
of Madras Govt in connection with Mr. Barlow's
report on the Mirasi system in Chingleput.

No. 112

Revenue Department

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 27 January 1876.

Read the following
Despatch from the Right
Honorable the Secretary of State.

Approving of proceedings
of Madras Government in connection
with Mr. Barlow's report on the Mirasi
system in Chingleput.

(H.C. 18. November 1875 No. 34)

Communicated to
the Board of Revenue and the
Director of Revenue Settlements.

The Board will com-
municate to Messrs. Barlow and
Fry, in the usual course, the
expression of the Secretary of
State's commendation, as contained
in the last para.

14. Little Orundey, Revenue, 20 Jan. 7
15. The Acting Collector

[Signature]

30

On the subject of
regarding the
report on the
system of

1871