Sectt. I (i)-I—10,006—7-10-76.

(1) Number of pages 20

(2) Date of repair 31.8.1972

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 1137 Press
B.P. No. Mis.

Dated 19.3.1877 197 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Depa
19th March 1877.

No. 593. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Reveune, March 1877, No. 1,120 :—

Read the following letter from J. G. HORSFALL, Esq., Acting Collector Arcot, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cuddalore, 28th February 1877, No. 96.

WITH reference to the Board's Proceedings, dated 13th instant, No. ——, I have the honor to submit, for the favorable consideration and orders of the Board, the accompanying copy of a letter* received from the Acting Head Assistant Collector.

*No. 118, dated 24th February 1877.

2. Mr. Thomson represents as the result of "careful observation and inquiry" in his division that the scale of Punjah remission sanctioned in the above Proceedings is insufficient for the circumstances of the past season, because the rain-fall was unfavorable, the rain that fell being fitful and out of season; because the present year was preceded by a bad season, which was not the case last year, and consequently the husbandmen are in a more impoverished condition and less able to meet the stress than they were last year; and because, since they usually dispose of their crops beforehand upon contract, they do not really realize much advantage from the great rise in prices. He points out that the remissions granted for Fasli 1285 were on a more liberal scale than that now sanctioned, although the season under reference has been actually worse, and that the Board's rule for Punjah remissions, as it now stands, seems to necessitate individual inquiry, which it will be extremely difficult to carry out satisfactorily.

3. The accounts I have received from all parts of the district, the Chedambram Taluq excepted, are very unfavorable, and the state of things in the district has, I consider, altered for the worse since Mr. Garstin's personal inspection of portions of the Villapuram and Trinomalai Taluqs (*vide* his letter of the 18th December last). The rain-fall subsequent to the date of that letter has been only ·68 inches, and this confined to the four taluqs shown in the margin.

Chedambram	·8
Cuddalore	1·29
Villapuram	·25
Virdachellam	·4
	4)2·74
	·68

4. Under these circumstances, I would respectfully request the Board to reconsider their orders and to sanction the rates proposed by me, or, at least, that the scale sanctioned by the Board in their Proceedings, dated 11th March last, No. 713, for Fasli 1285 may be made applicable for the current Fasli also.

5. I may add that the rates of remission proposed by me in my letter, dated the 5th instant, No. 38, were lower than those represented by Mr. Thomson, Sri Baliah, and S. Vencatasubbiah, as actually required for the taluqs in their respective charges.

6. Should the Board still consider that the scale now sanctioned is sufficient, I beg to be favored with instructions on the following points, on which questions have been raised :—

(1.) What is the limit of outturn which may be considered as total failure? *i.e.*, is any (and, if so, what) allowance to be made for seed sown and cost of cultivation, or is the mere fact of reaping sufficient to take a field out of this category?

(2.) Is the remission sanctioned limited to the food-grains named in my letter, or is it to be extended to all dry crops?

7. As the Jammabandi will be commenced throughout the district in a few days, I request the Board's early instructions.

Enclosure No. 1.

From J. THOMSON, Esq., Acting Head Assistant Collector, to J. G. HORSFALL, Esq., Acting Collector of South Arcot, dated Tindivanum, 24th February 1877, No. 118.

I have the honor to request that the Board may be asked to reconsider their orders on the subject of Punjah remission, at least so far as this division is concerned. I am fully alive to the general undesirability of altering, or seeking to have altered, orders once issued, but I think it is my duty, as more immediately responsible and not without knowledge by careful observation and inquiry, to represent my opinion that the orders the Board have passed are not sufficient for the circumstances of the past season.

2. It would be almost sufficient to state that the remissions granted in this year contrast unfavorably with those allowed in the last. Then remission was granted where crops had completely failed on at least one-third of the extent of occupation. This I understand was full remission on the affected portions. Where the general outturn of the principal grain crops was less than one-third of the average, remissions to the extent of the three last kists might be granted at the discretion of the settling officer; when this was thought insufficient report was to be made. Even waste and irrigated dry land, where the irrigation was over three years' standing, shared in the remission similarly with unirrigated.

3. It is true that the actual total of the rain-fall for the year was not so very much different from the total of 1875, but the fall was, as the Tahsildar of Villapuram expresses it, not seasonable, as a perusal of the following table will show:—

In Villapuram & Tindivanum

April	3·75	1·00
May	0·65	2·55
June	1·75	3·45
July	4·83	5·15
August	6·05	9·65
September	2·55	3·70
October	2·05	2·25
November	4·05	1·60
December	0·25	·0

Moreover, a continuing yearly deficient rain-fall will produce not the same but a yearly increasing amount of hardship.

4. I would ask a perusal of my letter, No. 68, of the 3rd instant. I proposed full remission on varagu and rain-fed paddy, because, except in some few villages in the Vanoor Division of Villapuram Taluq, I do not hear of, and certainly have not seen, any dry land under these sorts of cultivation that has been estimated to yield more than 2 kalams a cawny, because all the latter dry crops of the year were more or less unprofitable, because varagu is a crop of general cultivation, and also in order to obviate the laborious and always unsatisfactory task of inquiring into the outturn of Punjah crops in each village or each tract which a sliding scale of or a partial remission entails. The crops I mention deserve to be called total failures. Complaints reach me now from all quarters of the badness of the ground-nut crop now in course of being gathered, the nut having either never formed or been worm-eaten.

5. The Tahsildar of Villapuram still adheres to his proposal to remit three-fourths of the assessment on varagu and the Tahsildar of Tindivanum to his of full remission on varagu and ground-nut and one-fourth for other food crops. The late Deputy Tahsildar of Gingee, who was my office Head Clerk, thinks that one-third remission would suffice for Gingee Division if given generally without distinction of crop kind or outturn, and that for Puttadars below 25 Rupees a remission of three-fourths would not be excessive.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
19th March 1877.

6. Where it appears, as it does in some villages, that the crop has not been so bad as it is generally, a discretion as to remission should be conceded to the settling officer.

7. It is very true that prices are high in this year, but many of the ryots gain little by this, as their crops are foresold as agreed on rates for advances, and many towards the west of Tindivanum Taluq have but little to live on in the best of times.

8. If the Board adhere to their order, it will be necessary to define a total failure. I would put it at 1½ kalams, certainly not at less than 1 kalam a cawny. The terms of the order seem to contemplate a much more searching inquiry than Standing Order 137-1 allows, and the labor required cannot be profitable. It may easily be imagined how difficult it will be for the settling officer to ascertain whether a field yielded 1 or 2 kalams when every one knows the principle on which remission is to be granted.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. G. HORSFALL,
Acting Collector.

The Board adhere to the orders already issued. No allowance is to be made for seed sown or cost of cultivation, and when any crop is reaped there is a partial yield. The orders did not refer to any particular crop.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Secretary.

No. 594. Order thereon, 19th March 1877, No. 1,137.

—Land Revenue, No. 13. RECORDED.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Officiating Chief Secretary.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. A. F. Goodall.

Revenue Department

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

Dated 10th March 1877

B/D G.O. R. No. 2236 Read the following No. 96.

From

J. G. Horsfall Esquire

Acting Collector of South Arcot.

To H. E. Stokes Esquire

Secretary to the Board of

Revenue

Madras.

Sir

With reference to the Board's Proceedings dated 13th Instant No. I have the honor to Submit for the favorable consideration and orders of the Board the accompanying copy of a letter received from the Acting 4th Assistant Collector.

2. Mr. Thomson represents as the result of "careful observation and enquiry" in his Division

*No. 118 dated 24th February 1877

Govt. of [illegible] Madras.

REVENUE.

The BOARD of REVENUE

[illegible] March, 1877.

G.O. 10th March 1877, No. 1,191.

[illegible]

MARCH

Nos. 693-694.

Proceedings—Recording Board's proceedings adhering to the recommendation regarding the scale of fees for the current year, and directing that the orders be applied to any [illegible] step.

Decision that the Scale of Punjah remission Sanctioned in the above Proceedings is insufficient for the circumstances of the past season, because the rainfall was unfavorable, the rain that fell being fitful and out of season; because the present year was preceded by a bad season which was not the case last year and consequently the husbandmen are in a more impoverished condition and less able to meet the stress than they were last year and because since they usually dispose of their crops beforehand upon Contract they do not really realize much advantage from the great rise

rise in prices. He points out that the remissions granted for Fasli 1285 were on a more liberal scale than that now Sanctioned although the season under reference has been actually worse, and that the Board's rule for Punja remissions as it now stands seems to necessitate individual enquiry which it will be extremely difficult to carry out satisfactorily.

3. The accounts I have received from all parts of the District, the Chedambram Taluq excepted, are very unfavorable and the state of things in the Districts has, I consider, altered

altered for the worse since Mr Garstin's personal inspection of portions of the Villapuram and Trinomalai Talugs (Vide his letter of the 18th December last) The rainfall subsequent to the date of that letter has been only .68 inches and this confined to the four Talugs shewn in the Margin.

Chedambaram .8
Cuddalore 1.29
Villapuram .25
Vredachellam .4
4 | 2.74
.68.

4. Under these circumstances I would respectfully request the Board to reconsider their orders and to sanction the rates proposed by me or at least that the scale sanctioned by the Board in their proceedings dated 11th March last No 713 for Fasli 1285 may be made applicable for

for the Current Fasli also.

5. I may add that the rates of remission proposed by me in my letter dated the 5th Instant No 38 were lower than those represented by Mr Thomson, Sri Baliah and Sr Venkata subbiah as actually required for the Talugs in their respective Charges.

6. Should the Board still consider that the scale now sanctioned is sufficient I beg to be favored with instructions on the following points on which questions have been raised.

(1) What is the limit of outturn which may be considered as total failure? i.e. is any (if so what) allowance to be made for Seed sown and Cost of Cultivation,

or

1137/6

or is the mere fact of reaping sufficient to take a field out of this category. (2) Is the remission sanctioned limited to the food grains named in my letter or is it to be extended to all dry crops.

6. As the jamma bandi will be commenced throughout the District in a few days I request the Board's early instructions. I have &c

Collector's Office
Cuddalore
28th Feby 1877

(Sd) J. G. Horsfall
Acting Collector

No 118.

From J. Thomson Esquire
Asst & Asst Collector
South Arcot.

To J. G. Horsfall Esquire
Asst Collector of South Arcot

Sir

I have the honor to request that

that the Board may be asked to reconsider their orders on the subject of poonjah remission at least so far as this decision is concerned. I respectfully allude to the general undesirability of altering or seeking to have altered orders once issued, but I think it is my duty as more immediately responsible and not without knowledge by careful observation and enquiry to represent my opinion that the orders the Board have passed are not sufficient for the circumstances of the past season

2. It would be almost sufficient to state that the remissions

remissions granted in this year contrast unfavorably with those allowed in the last. Here, remission was granted where crops had completely failed or at least $\frac{1}{3}$ of the extent of occupation. This I understand was full remission on the affected portions. Where the general outturn of the principal grain crops was less than $\frac{1}{3}$ of the average remissions to the extent of the three last years might be granted at the discretion of the Settling officer, when this was thought sufficient report was to be made. Even waste and irrigated dryland where the irrigation was over three years standing

shared

shared in the remission similarly with unirrigated.

3. It is true that the actual total of the rain fall for the year was not so very much different from the total of 1875, but the fall was, as the Tahsildar of Villapuram expresses it, not seasonable as the perusal of the following table will show:

	In Villapuram Taluq	In Tindivanam Taluq
March	.00	.00
April	3.75	1.00
May	0.65	2.55
June	1.75	3.45
July	4.83	5.15
August	6.05	9.65
September	2.55	3.70
October	2.05	2.25
November	4.05	1.60
December	0.25	.0

Increase

Moreover a continuing yearly deficient rainfall will produce not the same, but a yearly increasing amount of hardship.

4. I would ask a reperusal of my letter No 68 of the 3rd Instant. I proposed full remission on Varagu and Rainfed paddy because except in some few villages in the Vanoor division of Villapuram Taluq, I do not hear of and certainly have not seen any dry land under these sorts of cultivation that has been estimated to yield more than two Kalams a Cawny, because all the latter dry crops of the year were more or less unprofitable, because Varagu

113/8

Varagu is a crop of general cultivation, and also in order to alleviate the laborious and always unsatisfactory task of enquiring into the outturn of poonjah crops in each village or each tract which a sliding scale of or a partial remission entails. The crops I mention deserve to be called total failures. Complaints reach me now from all quarters of the badness of the ground which crop now in course of being gathered, the wet having either never formed or been worm eaten

5. The Thasildar of Villapuram still adheres to his proposal to remit 3/4 ths of the Assessment on Varagu and the Tahsildar of

of Tindivanum to his of full remission on Varagu and ground nut and ¼ for other food crops. The late Dr Jahsildar of Gingee who was my office Head Clerk thinks that ⅓ remission would suffice for Gingee division if given generally without distinction of crop nature and that for puttadars below 25 Rs a remission of ¾ths would not be excessive

6. Where it appears as it does in some villages that the Crop has not been so bad as it is generally, a discretion as to remission should be conceded to the Settling Officer.

Officer.

7. It is very true that prices are high in this year but many of the ryots gain little by this as their crops are forsold as agreed on rates for advances, and many towards the west of Tindivanum Taluq have but little to live on in the best of times.

8. If the Board adhere to their order, it will be necessary to define a total failure. I would put it at 1½ Kalam certainly not at less than one Kalam a Canny. The terms of the order seem to Contemplate a much more searching enquiry than standing order 137/1 allows and the labor required cannot be profitable. It may easily

easily be imagined how difficult it will be for the settling officer to ascertain whether a field yielded one or two Kalams when everyone knows the principle on which remission is to be granted.

H.M. Ass.t Collector's Office, Paikiadanum 24th Feb.y 1877

I have &c
(Sd) J. Thomson
&c H.M. Ass.t Collector

(True Copy)
(Sd) J.G. Horsfall
Acting Collector

The Board adhere to the orders already issued. No allowance is to be made for seed down or cost of cultivation and when any crop is reaped there is a partial yield. The orders did not refer to any particular Crop.

(True Copy extract)
(Sd) H.E. Sotheby
Secretary

To
To the Collector of South West

(True Copy)
H Dickens
Secretary

To
The Secretary to Government N.D.

Rev: 1877 Dept

No. 1685

Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue
dated 18th March
Recd 12 " 1877
Desp 20

Adhering to the orders
already issued by the Board
regarding the scale of
Poonja remissions for the
current Fusli and stating
that the orders did not
refer to any particular
crop in reply to the
letter from the Collector
of South Arcot

For Orders 19/3/77

M
13.3.77

Recd

19-3-77

14 Ex. the Bd of Revenue 20-3-77

592-74

Encl to Govt Mlt & Misc Ltr. 17/3/77 R. 19:
C. 15: Mar 77. R. 17/3/77