

- (1) Number of pages 16 pages (33 sheets)
(2) Date of repair 2-1-1985
(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. *1708, Revenue* Press.
B.P. No. Mis.

Dated *22-10-1878*

197 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1708

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

22nd October 1878, No. 1,708.

Read the following paper:—

No. 244. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd September 1878, No. 2,436.

Read the following letter from J. B. PENNINGTON, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Courtallam, 16th August 1878, No. 616:—

HAVING completed the revision of village establishments in the five taluks of the river-irrigated valley sanctioned in G.O., No. 3,355, dated 5th December 1877, I have the honor to bring the following points to the notice of the Board for their orders.

2. In carrying out the scheme it was impossible in certain villages to find residents fit to be made Munsifs, and such villages had to be left under the management of the Munsifs of the adjacent villages in accordance (generally) with the old practice. A list (No. I) showing the villages in which such arrangements had to be made is herewith forwarded.

3. There are certain villages comprising several hamlets situated at some distance from the chief villages, all of which hamlets had separate Munsifs before.* The scheme however allows only one Munsif for the entire village. In the case of these villages it was thought desirable (with reference to the remarks of Government in paragraph 3, G.O., No. 865, dated 29th June 1876,) to let the present Munsifs remain undisturbed, as it is most inconvenient for Police and other public purposes that hamlets should be miles away from their Munsifs. I append another list (No. II) of such villages and hamlets which require separate Munsifs with brief reasons (taken down at the time) showing the necessity for the extra appointments.

4. From these explanations it will be seen that it is only in cases of actual necessity that additional Munsifs are provided. These Munsifs may be paid at the rate of 3 Rupees per mensem from the savings of the General Fund as given below:—

	Rs.
Savings as given by Mr. Puckle in his scheme embodied in G.O., No. 3,355, dated 5th December 1877	1,943
Add the pay of twenty-one Munsifs and one Nirkatti for villages provided in the scheme, but who are not really required as shown in the List No. I	804
Total	2,747
Deduct reduction in the cess sanctioned in the aforesaid Government Order for the villages of Viravanallur and Shermadevi in the Ambasamudram Taluk	1,646
Balance	1,101

This being a balance from the General Fund can be most advantageously utilized

	RS.	A.	P.	
* 24 Munsifs, at Rupees 3 ...	72	0	0	in providing the additional Munsif-Monigars for the villages shown in List No. II.*
6 Taliaries, at " 3 ...	18	0	0	5. It will be observed that I have
Total per annum ...	90	0	0	allowed the extra Taliaries required
Annular ...	1,080	0	0	Rupees 3 each because (for reasons stated below) I think that is the very least salary that can be allowed with regard to present prices, and the balance is more

than sufficient to pay the Munsifs at the rate of 3 Rupees each. That however is, in my opinion, adequate remuneration as they are not altogether dependent on their pay; and 36 Rupees a year is probably in most cases a good deal more than they have to pay as assessment. In fact, I should be glad to raise the pay of the Vetties and Taliaries everywhere by reducing the pay of the Munsifs to a minimum of Rupees 2 instead of 3 Rupees, if the scheme would admit of this being done, and if the assets of the two villages of *Shermadevi* and *Viropanallur* which are not derived from the cess could be appropriated to the purposes of other villages (the cess being raised again so as just to cover their own expenses) some improvement might be made in the pay of these lower servants even as it is.

6. Petitions are constantly presented for additional Monigars in several large villages to represent the different castes; and I am still of opinion that more latitude should have been allowed me in adapting the establishments to the circumstances of each village, and it does not seem right (for instance) that a pariah Puttadar should be compelled to employ a Vakil to convey his kists to the Monigar; but as the Board have negatived my proposals on the subject in their Proceedings, No. 850, dated 28th March 1878, I need say no more about it.

7. I feel bound, however, to call particular attention to what appears to me to be a serious blot in the scheme generally; I mean the pay of the Vetties and Taliaries in Classes 7 & 18, and of the Curnams in the last class. It appears to me to be altogether wrong in principle to fix salaries at a point below the barest subsistence allowance; and after all that has been said about raising the position of the Curnams, it is, in my opinion, most unsatisfactory to find that 90 out of the 449 Curnams now appointed receive only Rupees 4 a month, or very considerably less than a common cooly. Only so lately as last year the Board were pleased to sanction an increase† to the pay of Curnams so as to bring it up to a minimum of Rupees 5.

8. The Taliaries and Vetties on Rupees 2 or 3 a month are even worse off, for it is almost impossible for them to eke out their livelihood, as the Curnams no doubt may to a certain extent by any legitimate means; because under the new system their time should be fully occupied with their Government duties. Complaints of the smallness of the pay are already rife, and in some cases I have heard of resignations and of considerable difficulty in filling vacancies.

9. I should be obliged if the Board would kindly pass orders on this letter at an early date as it will be convenient to have the several points raised in it settled before I begin the revision of establishments in the four northern taluks.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

List of Village Officers sanctioned but not required.

Taluk.	VILLAGE.		ASSETS.			PROPOSED TO BE DEPT'S D WITH.		Remarks.
	Number.	Name.	Village cess.	General Fund.	Total.	Cost of establishment as per revision.	Savings.	
	As per Taluk Map.	As per Scheme.						
Ambasamudram.	57	50	Udayamurtandapuram. Population 83.	Rs. 63	Rs. 158	Rs. 60	Rs. 98	There does not appear to be any necessity for a Munisif for this village, or in fact for a separate village establishment at all. The Village Munsif of Terla Arayanayakupuram lying close by may have charge. Perhaps the Talayari and Vetti might be retained on higher pay.
	58	75	Tiruttin. Population 72	52	143	96	47	A separate Munsif is not procurable and is not required for this petty village clubbed with Kausa-hippuram. The Munsif of Marudur may have charge.
	55	79	Udayarkulam. Population 838...	80	81	96	...	The only plan seems to be to have this village in charge of the Vagakkulam Munsif as usual.
Tinnevely.	90	85	Virupendiyaspatanam. Population 1,355.	84	84	96	...	For Munsif Moeigar there is a consensus of opinion in favor of the present arrangement (the Tiruchendur Munsif being in charge), as it is impossible for the two parties of Christians to agree upon a resident Munsif and the result of appointing one before appears to have been so disastrous that the present arrangement had to be reverted to.
	42	41	Kodugani. Population 25...	...	85	86	25	No Munsif is required for this small village (of twenty-five people) clubbed with Korkai. It will be more convenient to have it in charge of the Munsif of Korkai.
	49	46	Vasavappapuram. Population 2,900.	126	574	480	94	Munsif of Korkai. Nirgani not required.
				126	743	686	119	

Revenue of Village Munsifs in the Taluk of the Pannai District. - Sanctioning the Collector's proposals as to the establishment of Munsifs in the Taluk of the Pannai District. - The Taluk of the Pannai District is divided into 10 villages, each of which is to have a Munsif. The Taluk of the Pannai District is divided into 10 villages, each of which is to have a Munsif. The Taluk of the Pannai District is divided into 10 villages, each of which is to have a Munsif.

70 P 5425/79
57/10/81

List of Village Officers sanctioned but not required—(Continued).

Taluk.	VILLAGE.			ASSETS.			Cost of estab- lishment Savings as per revision.	Offices.	Annual cost.	Remarks.
	Number.		Name.	Village cont.	General Fund.	Total.				
	As per Taluk Map.	As per Scheme.								
Nanganeri.	1	1	Vaśākarai. Population 223 ...	28.	57	28.	60	Munsif	35	This is an Ezhogam village belonging to Tiruvadu- chural Manam. It is clubbed with Pannai lying close by. No separate Munsif is required. The Munsif of Pannai may have charge.
	4	3	Erunkalapatti. Population 338 ...	45	50	60	...	Do.	35	The only Pottadar of this village who could be ap- pointed Munsif is Lakshminayar, who is non- resident and in other respects not a desirable per- son. It is a desirable village to dispose with the appointment of a Munsif to this village and let the present arrangement by which the Munsif of Devanahalli (with which it is clubbed) has charge of this village stand.
	205	5	Turavankulam. Population 417 ...	38	40	60	...	Do.	25	See note for Erunkalapatti. This is one of the three villages forming one Curman's charge. Must be in charge of the Munsif of Kallakulam, one of these three villages.
	22	12	Vaśākalatu. Population 333 ...	41	...	60	...	Do.	35	There being no qualified resident the best plan seems to be to put this village in charge of the Munsif of Singanailam Pedaganam near which it lies, though clubbed with Pannai.
	23	12	Polyankulam. Population 152 ...	19	...	60	...	Do.	30	As no separate Munsif is required for this small vil- lage clubbed with Munnadai the Munsif of Munnadai may have charge.
	34	18	Mahayankulam. Population 327 ...	14	...	60	...	Do.	35	This is one of five villages forming one Curman's charge and requires no separate Munsif, being very small. May be most conveniently managed by the Munsif of Pannai.
	31	42	Krishnakulam. Population 120 ...	31	85	60	25	Do.	35	The most convenient plan will probably be for the Munsif of Solapudur with which it is clubbed to have charge of this village also. With such a po- tential body of landlords as the Kalakad Panmayars it would be merely mischievous to appoint out- siders who must be Shannas or such low castes to ap- pointments in their villages.
	64	35	Sripattanamperi. Population 161.	28	40	60	...	Do.	35	No one in this Ezhogam village is fit to be a Mun- sif except the Ezhogamdar, who is non-resident. The appointment may be dispensed with the Mun- sif of Pannai.

all of Pillekudam (with which it is clubbed) doing
the work.
Separate Munsif not required. May be conveni-
ently managed by the Munsif of Battapuram with
which it is clubbed.
Separate Munsif not required. May be conveni-
ently managed by the Munsif of the Battapuram
near which it lies.
Munsif of Kila Vaypankulam with which this is club-
bed may have charge as no separate Munsif is
required for it, being a very small village.
There seems to be no object to appointing a separate
Munsif for this village of fifty-one people. It may
be attached to Eruradi, a large village lying close
by.
The most convenient plan is to let the Munsif Mo-
niger of Daundankulam near which it lies take
charge of this village, though it is clubbed with
other villages.
The Munsif of Suddankulam may conveniently look
after this village with which it is clubbed. The
population is only thirty Shannas, Pallars, &c.,
none of them landholders.
Should remain as it is under the Munsif of Kunda-
kulam with which it is clubbed.
The Munsif of Singaperi with which it is clubbed
may have charge of this small village, which re-
quires no separate Munsif.

26	37	Turanakurichi. Population 175 ...	19	2	21	60	...	...	...	36
71	38	Kariyakulam. Population 210 ...	21	3	25	60	...	...	...	36
100	38	Tamarakulam. Population 104 ...	12	3	15	54	...	...	...	56
94	51	Ponakurichi. Population 51 ...	37	2	39	96	...	...	...	36
147	81	Melapattankulam. Population 98.	52	...	53	72	...	...	...	36
213	19	Devendraperi. Population 107 ...	34	2	36	60	...	...	...	36
191	100	Tiladam. Population 33 ...	20	2	22	20	...	...	...	36
199	103	Pettasari. Population 95 ...	14	3	17	60	...	...	...	36
Total ...			533	42	550	1,602	25	...	...	376
Deduct pay of 1 Talukdar and 1 Vetti to be retained.			1,121	284	1,705	1,460	289	...	...	553
Total ...			...	...	...	...	...	...	...	48
Total ...			...	...	...	...	...	...	...	804

(Signed) J. B. PENNINGTON,
Collector.

1708
4

OCTOBER 1878, No. 1,708.

3. The Government concentrates of pay assigned to certain of their Service Inams at five- some remuneration in this form

arks of the Board on the inadequate but observed that the enfranchisement sament still leaves them practically

tract.)

igned) L. A. CAMPBELL,
Under Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue,
the Director of Revenue Settlement

Exd. A. F. Goodall.

1708/6

Enclosure in R. D. Pro.
Of 2nd Septem supp'd the
Sey to Govt R. D. P.
2436

2 2 Venkateswaram

Population 3233

2 Padmalapathu

1 3 Disturbance which has
1 3 Separate church already who
should be retained for
of administration

3 3 Sanku Madathu

1 Pengampathu

1 3

There does not appear to be

p 5603

2 Sthalapathu

1 3

Any sufficient reason for

3 Ramalingapuram

1 3

removing any of these churches
the total office in different

centres hamlets or a

large area.

6 6 Padampathu 2594

1 3 Church of Entkapanam

69 61 Mala Temple 2699

1 3 Church of Vengalmadachalam

81 93 Sanku Viramam

1 3

Church of this village
hamlet for the benefit of the
Thamir & other low Caste.

p 493

No. II

list of villages for which churches are needed in addition to the churches already mentioned

Village

No.

Notes on the
History of the
Church

Arme

Hamlets

Remarks

1708

142 78 Perungudi

p 5415

Vadakkankulam

1 3

if church also a separate
church for Donations from
the present staff.

is separate church of
for Vadakkankulam is very
necessary and some amount

There seems to have been

claim having been made

2 2 Venkateswaram

Population 3233

2 Vadamalapuram

3 3 Sathu Madathu

p 4603

1 Pungampattu

2 Sthapukalapuram

3 Ramalingapuram

1 3 Detant Kambal which have

1 3 Separate Khumsis already who should be retained for Communion of Administration

1 3 There does not appear to be

1 3 Any sufficient reason for

1 3 removing any of these Khumsis

who hold office in different

86 77 Tirumiruthampulke

p 392

1 3 Tirumiruthampulke

86 45 Puliyarthurathi

p 3469

1 3 Puliyarthuram

142 78 Perungudi

p 5415

1 3 Vasakankulam

1 3 A special Khumsi of Khumsis

for the Kottam only of Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

is not a public Khumsi and Tirumiruthampulke

Munsi before and there is from
nothing against him.

161 88 Karachanthu 1 Pandol

p 1653 2 Prasi

1 3 This man certainly should be retained
One Munsi is practically
needed, the village being really
a township consisting of many
distant villages.

8 8 Sudattanandal Vagattulam

p 3639

1 3 This man must be appointed
Munsi for Vagattulam
as Munsi there is much
required

123 41 Korkai Amarakadu

p 2400

1 3 Munsi for the
benefit of the Thamar

81 46 Sundamangalam Pennakayal

p 2568

1 3 If possible this man should
be appointed Munsi

with a small salary for
the benefit of his outlying
village and to look after
the pearl bank to be
set up again another Mun
si for Vagattulam is much
required.

114 102 Palanthalam p 1500 Chettikulani

115 110 Chennadu Sandupattu Pami Karkudi
p 2935

1 3 Sandorungum Pellar should
be appointed if possible he ap
pointed as Munsi for
Sas for his old village as
usual

121 116 Kulasegaramam Manappadu

p 7837

1 3 might be appointed Munsi for
as per of Manappadu

133 128 Chettam p 2519 Idagankudi

1 3 It is proposed to be ap
pointed for Idagankudi

ex freely promised by Mr.
Parker himself.

19 18 Sinalapere p 3074 Sanaipettai

1 3 slight the appended manuscript
for Sanaipettai (Lelbani
village)

39 36 Sandiyaperi p 5512 Palayapettai

1 3 On seems thought a 2nd
manuscript seems to be required
for this outgoing hamlet.

100 89 Padakulamp 556 cheyanayakapuram

1 3 seems to be required for this
outgoing hamlet.

68 63 Kila Varanana Pothakulam
Annam p 5490

1 3 A separate manuscript
strong as is much required
for this outgoing hamlet
where also the Collector's Office
may be situated

24 72

Traversely J.
16. August 1878

Edw J. B. Pennington
Collector

(True Copy)

L. L. G. J.
Secretary

Edw

6-0-12 8-1-16
Aut 170 in 1266-

Test No II

98	Prunus	48
	Elaeagnus	24
	Yucca	24
		<hr/> 96

There does not appear the any
necessity for a dismissal for this village
or in fact for a separate village
establishment at all. The village has
need of fewer than a separate
village close by may have charge.
Perhaps the Salangari and Vette might
be retained on higher pay.

91 52 43 96 47 Spring 36

A separate Ministry is not practicable
and is not required for this poetry
it may be clothed with a thousand forms
The Ministry of all men may have
Charge.

80 1 81 96 " Memory 36

The only plan seems to be to have this
Village in Charge of the Sagastiklam
himself as usual.

Y. m. v. v. v.

51
2011

Stentor

Aug 26 Vacant after dinner

60674

448 126 846 488 94 Argent 36

Signature not required

614 126 7423 636 119 - 108

1-1 Vatakari

223

59 - 59 60 - May 36

This is an Egatogam village belong-
ing to Tiruvadan durai Brath. It is
Chukkas with Pottai lying close by. A
separate Munsif is required. The
-dip of Pottai may have charge.

4 3 Omkarnath

338

45 5 50 60 v. Thursday 36

The only Paddas of this village who
could be appointed Mayor is Lath
Mana nuyt who is now resident & in
other respects not a desirable person. It
seems desirable therefore to choose and
the appointment of a Mayor & other

Angewandte

34 18 Malayan Kulam
p. 227

14 14 60

May 36

This is one of five villages forming one Mamam's Charge in Begunna. No separate Mamam being very small, may be most conveniently managed by the Mamam of Pattanam one of those five.

81 52 Kudman Kulam
p. 120

81 4 85 60

25 May 36

The most convenient plan will probably be for the Mamam of Talacpudut with which it is Chukko to have charge of this village also. With such a powerful body of land holders as the Thalakat Pannay are, it would be merely necessary to appoint one who must be a Pannay or such low Caste to appointments in their village. As one in this Eglogam village is fit to be a Mamam except the Eglogam law is now pending. The appointment may

64 35 Suparantupuri
p. 161

28 12 40 60

May 36

As one in this Eglogam village is fit to be a Mamam except the Eglogam law is now pending. The appointment may

64 39 Poma Kurchi
p. 195

19 2 24 60

May 36

may be dispensed with, the Mamam of Chakulam (with which it is Chukko) doing the work.

91 38 Kariyakulam
p. 210

21 5 26 60

May 36

Dr. P. by Mamam of Battarpuram near which it lies.

109 38 Pamasankulam
p. 104

12 3 15 54

May 36

Mamam of Kula Vepankulam with which this is Chukko may have charge as no separate Mamam is required for it being a very small village. There seems to be no object in appointing a separate Mamam for this village of 51 people. It may be attached to Cennu De a large village

94 51 Poma Kurchi
p. 57

39 2 39 96

May 36

Appointing a separate Mamam for this village of 51 people. It may be attached to Cennu De a large village

lying close by
1708
19

1708
21
Lest No. I

Each one in 38 Pairs
of 2000 each number 198
The King to George 100
No. 2436

Nov 30/14/1908
40.22 Oct 1/18 L 246-

M. 2436

1708
22Proceedings of the Board of Revenue
Dated 2^d September 1875.

No. 1016. Read the following

From

J. B. Cunningham Esq.

Collector of Simnaulty

To

O. A. Galton Esq.

Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Marras.

Sir,

Having completed the revision of
Village Establishments in the 5 Taluqs of the
river irrigated valley mentioned in Govern-
ment order M. 3355, dated 5 December 1877,

I have the honor to bring the following points
to the notice of the Board for their orders.

In carrying out the scheme it
was impossible to confine villages to fixed
recidents fit to be inside Munsifs, and
such villages had to be left under the
management of the Munsifs of the adjacent
villages.

villages in accordance (generally) with the old practice. A list showing the villages in which such arrangements had to be made is herewith forwarded.

3. There are certain villages comprising several hamlets situated at some distance from the chief villages all of which hamlets had separate Munsifs before. The scheme however allows only one Munsif for the entire village. In the case of these villages it was thought desirable (with reference to the remarks of Government in para 3 Government order No 865 dated 29 June 1876) to let the present Munsifs remain undisturbed, as it is most inconvenient for police and other public purposes that hamlets should be miles away from their Munsifs. I append another list of such villages and hamlets which require separate Munsifs with brief reasons (taken down at the time) showing the necessity for the extra appointments.

* No I

* Such villages are in fact rather towns - ships having often an area of many miles.

* Some are one or two miles apart from the chief village.

* No II

From

4. From these explanations it will be seen that it is only in cases of actual necessity that additional Munsifs are provided. These Munsifs may be paid at the rate of 3 Rs per mensem from the savings of the General Fund as given below. Savings as given by Mr Puckle in his scheme embodied in Government Order, No 3355 dated 5 December 1877 - - - - - Rs 1943

Add the pay of 21 Munsifs and 1 Karkatti for villages provided in the scheme, but who are not really required as shown in the list No II. - - - - - 804

Total 2747

Deduct reduction in the cess collections in the aforesaid Government Order for the villages of Viravanathur and Shernadur in the Ambasamudram Taluk - 1646

Balance 1101

This being a balance from the General Fund can be most advantageously utilized in providing the additional Munsif Mangars for the villages shown in list No 2.

* 24 Munsifs at Rs 3-72-0
6. Karkattis at Rs 3-18-0
Total for Mangars 90-0
Deduct Amount 1088-0

It

5. It will be observed that I have allowed the extra Talainjaries required Rs 3 each, because (for reasons stated below) I think that is the very least salary that can be allowed with regard to present prices, and the balance is more than sufficient to pay the Brunsifs at the rate of 3 Rs each. That however is, in my opinion, a dequate remuneration as they are not altogether dependent on their pay; and 36 Rs a year is probably in most cases a good deal more than they have to pay as assessment. In fact I should be glad to raise the pay of the Vetties and Talainjaries every where by reducing the pay of the Brunsifs to a minimum of Rs 2 instead of 3 Rs, if the scheme would admit of this being done; and if the assets of the two villages of Shurmadore and Viravannalur which are not deprived from the cess could be appropriated to the purposes of other villages (the cess being raised again so as just to cover their own

expenses) some improvement might be made in the pay of these lower servants even as it is.

6. Petitions are constantly presented for additional Branjars in several large villages to represent the different castes, and I am still of opinion that more latitude should have been allowed me in adapting the establishments to the circumstances of each village, and it does not seem right (for instance) that a parish puttadar should be compelled to employ a Vahel to convey his hits to the Branjars; but as the Board have negatived my proposals on the subject in their Proceedings No 850 dated 28 March 1878, I need say no more about it.

7. I feel bound however to call particular attention to what appears to me to be a serious blot in the scheme generally, I mean the pay of the Vetties and Talainjaries in clauses 7 to 18, and of the

Cornams in the last class. It appears to me to be altogether wrong in principle to fix salaries at a point below the least subsistence allowance, and after all that has been said about pausing the position of the Cornams it is, in my opinion, most satisfactory to find that 90 out of the 449 Cornams now appointed receive only Rs 4 a month, or very considerably less than a common cooly. Only so lately as last year the Board were pleased to sanction an increase to the pay of Cornams so as to bring it up to a minimum of Rs. 5.

* Proceedings
in 3250 dated
12 July 1877

8 The Salaries and Vettis on Rs 2003 a month are even worse off, for it is almost impossible for them to eke out their livelihood, as the Cornams no doubt may to a certain extent, by any legitimate means, because under the new system their time should be fully occupied with their Government duties. Complaints of the smallness of pay are already

already rife, and in some cases I have heard of resignations and of considerable difficulty in filling vacancies.

9 I should be obliged if the Board would kindly pass orders on this letter at an early date as it will be convenient to have the several points raised in it settled before I begin the revision of establishments in the 4 brother Taluqs.

I have &c

Immerelly collector's / Signed J. B. Pennington
from Fatcherry, Fort St. George
16 August 1878 3 Collector

Submitted for the orders of Government.

2. The collector reports having carried out the revision of village establishments in the 5 Taluqs of the river irrigated valley and submits for sanction the following modifications of the scheme sanctioned in G.O. dated 5 December 1877, No 3355. Mr Pennington states that in 21 villages specified in list No I it was impossible to find a resident

* Immerelly
Ambasaram
Tinkasi
Kanguneri
Tinkarai

resident-mysots who were qualified to discharge
the duties of Dronseiff and as with the
exception of one there are petty villages
the population of which ranges from ^{Vinupandya-}
25 to 417 and as a rule is under 2000 so
he proposes that they should be adminis-
tered as hitherto by the Dronseiffs of the
adjacent villages. In regard to the village
noted above the population of which
is 1255 Mr Pennington observes that there
is a consensus of opinion in favor of the
present arrangement (the Trichenchi Dron-
seiff being in charge) as it is impossible
for the two parties of Christians to agree
upon a resident Dronseiff and the result
of appointing one before was so disas-
trous that the existing arrangement
had to be reverted to. Under the circum-
stances represented and as it is observed
that the service fees which range from
Rs 12 to 95 indicates that the villages are
financially

financially considered are comparatively
unimportant, the Board are of opinion
that the Collector's proposals may be ac-
cepted as also his recommendation that
the services of a briganti in the village of
Vasarappapuram which are said not to be
required, should be dispensed with. The
exceptional circumstances noted in regard
to Vinupandya-pattanam seem to point to the
inexpediency of disturbing the existing
state of things.

3. The foregoing arrangements if carried
out will set free Rs 804 from the General
fund which with other savings noted in
para 4 the Collector proposes to apply in the
payment of 24 Dronseiffs and 6 Taluquas -
costing Rs 1080 per annum in the villages
specified in list No 2. Three villages in the
scheme sanctioned in L.D. above quoted
were attached as hamlets to other villages
but as their population ranges from 392
to 8572 and in most cases exceeds 2000, it

is clear that convenience of administration requires that they should have a separate Broomfield and the Board therefore support this portion of the Collector's proposals also.

The inadequate remuneration provided for village service in the lower stages of villages commented on by the collector has on more than one occasion attracted the Board's attention and they are prepared to give every consideration to proposals showing for this object the remedy of an acknowledged defect, but all available funds have been utilized and the recommendations to reduce the Broomfield's pay to Rs 2 in order to give the Vetties and Salaries Rs 3 does not commend itself to them. On the other hand they favor the collector's suggestion that the cess in Shornadur and Viravannallur should be raised sufficiently

1708
53

822
sufficiently to cover the cost of village services, thereby setting free other assets to be utilized where they are more required. In view to this arrangement being carried out the collector should submit a scheme in detail.

(True Copy & Extract)

W. J. G. S.
Ag. Secretary.

To

The Secretary to Government, R.D.
with copies of 2 enclosures.

W. J. G. S.
W. J. G. S.

villages.

- (2) That in the case of the hamlets & villages enumerated in list no II, the existing Munsiffs be retained, or additional Munsiffs appointed, the scheme providing but one Munsiff for the parent village and its hamlets.
- x 24 men at Rs 3 each.
- (3) That six additional Talukars at Rs 3 each be appointed.
- (4) That the Muzgathi sanctioned for Nasavappapuram be dispensed with.
- (5) That the pay of the Vethies and Talukars be raised everywhere to Rs 3 by reducing the pay of the Munsiffs to a minimum of Rs 2 instead of Rs 3 and by raising the Cess of Sheruadevi and Viravallur so that the other assets of these villages might become available for expenditure where they are more required.
- (6) That additional Muzgars be appointed in ^{several} large villages

to represent the different Castes.

(7) That the pay of the Vethies and Talukars in classes 7 to 18 and of the Curmies in the last class be raised.

The Board support the first four proposals on the following grounds-

Proposal (1) because the Collector finds it impossible to secure a resident not qualified to discharge the duties of Munsiff, because with the exception of one village, there are butty villages with a population ranging from 25 to 417 because the villages are financially ~~unimportant~~ ^{and a} less ranging from Rs 12 to 95, and because Virupandiappattanam has two parties of Christians who can never agree upon a resident Munsiff and the appointing of one before was so disastrous that the

* As to this objection, please see clause III para 3 of G.O. 1st March 1877 No. 874

Virupandiappattanam

existing arrangement had to be
reverted to.

Proposal (2) because the popula-
tion of the villages ranges from
392 to 8512 and in most cases
exceeds 2000 and because the
convenience of administration
requires that they should have
a separate Munsiff -

Proposal (3) No information is given
as regards the 6 proposed Taluques
either in the Collector's letter or in the
list.

Proposal (4) because the services
of a Lingaite are not required
in the village.

In regard to the 5th and 7th
proposals, the Board in acknowledging
the inadequacy of the remuneration
provided for the ~~lower~~ servants in
the lower classes of villages express
their readiness to consider proposals
having for their object the remedy
of the defect ^{but} observe that all

1708/20
available funds have been utilized.
The Board do not support the Collector's
proposal to reduce the Munsiff's pay
to Rs 2 in order to raise that of the
Deputy and Taluques to Rs 3 - They
however favor the Collector's suggestion
to raise the cess in Shermadevi and
Viravanathur in view to set free
the other assets thereof.

As regards the 6th proposal,
the Collector would not now press it
as the Board have once negatived
it, although he still thinks that
additional Mouigards are needed.
The Board have not noticed this
proposal, apparently because
their Proceedings dated 28th March
1878 No 850 have disposed of
the matter.

The Collector's proposals
while setting free No 804, will involve

* Not Communicated to Govt.

a cost of Rs 10 80. The difference
is proposed to be met from the
savings of the General fund.

The Board have called on
the Collector to submit a scheme
in detail in view to the above
arrangements being carried out.

1708
31

B N 3874-

Memo. for orders.

Modifications in the scheme
for the revision of Village Estab-
lishments in certain Taluqs
in Tinnevely District.

Cir

C 23-9-78
R 2-10-78
R 21-10-78
R 22-10-78

1708
32

Revenue Department

No 1708

Proceedings of the Madras Government
under date the 22 October 1878

Read the following proceedings of
the Board of Revenue dated 2nd
September 1878 no 2436.

His Grace the Governor in
Council sanctions the Collector's
proposals with the modifications
proposed by the Board.

Md
22/10

2. The requirements of the
law as to the limitation of the
cess and its appropriation where
raised must be strictly observed.

Note: It seems improper
to pay this for in the
the village division
the for have agreed with
the Board in ordering
an enhancement of the

3. The Government must observe that the enfranchise-
ment of the Board
marks on the inadequate rates
applied to certain village
of pay for Cessions, the Governor
must observe that the enfranchise-
ment

ment of their service Indians
at $\frac{5}{8}$ of assessment still
leaves them practically some
remuneration in this form.

Y
S

114 To the Board of Revenue on 21 Oct
25 The Or of Revenue and S

60
4

Y

1708
33

611 3874-

Draft 50-

Sanctioning the modifications
proposed in the scheme of
Village Establishments. *Timor*

1708
33

W. L. Robinson
Dubai

244-245-