1
242-4

Revenue Department

Minutes of Consultations

30th March 1858

(6)

Back hos 85 & 86.

Order No 424 D/ 30th March 1858

பாதுகாப்பு பிரிவு-1

செப்பனிடுபவர் பெயர் பி. திப்பையா

செப்பனிடுவதற்காக எடுத்துக் கொள்ளப்பட்ட நாள் 16-5-08

செப்பனிட்டு முடித்த நாள் 11-08

25/3/11/08

சரிபார்க்கும் முதல் மு. நி. பா. எ. கையொப்பம்

19/2

சரிபார்க்கும் உ.நி.பா.எ. கையொப்பம்

சரிபார்க்கும் உதவியாளர் கையொப்பம்

2
424

Fort Saint George, Revenue Consultation of 30th March 1858.

No. 85. Read the following Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue; dated 18th March 1858, No. 971.

In Consultation 18th March 1858.

Read letter from the Acting Collector of Malabar, dated 10th August 1857, reporting on the settlement of the land and extra sources of Revenue of that Province for Fusly 1266, A. D. 1856-57.

(Here enter No. 20.)

The details of the settlement will be incorporated in the Board's general report, and it is sufficient here briefly to remark that it amounted to Rupees 25,92,697-10-8 and exhibits a net increase of Rupees 81,380 over the preceding year. Of this increase nearly one half or Rupees 34,955 occurred in the land revenue.

2. The season was only moderately favorable both as regards the fall of rain and healthiness. The Monsoon set in early and the first crops suffered in some places from an excess of water, while the after rains proved scanty for the second crops. Small pox and Cholera visited the district, but to no marked extent, and in the Southern talooks the cattle suffered from a murrain.

3. The prices of grain continued very high, and garden produce was good, the trees having recovered from the effect of previous droughts. These circumstances facilitated the punctual realization of the land revenue, and the Board observe with satisfaction that out of a demand of Rupees 17,14,534, only Rupees 21,135 remained uncollected at the close of the Fusly, and that even of this sum only Rupees 6,135 were due by the ryots, the remaining Rupees 15,000 having been withheld by the Beebee of Cannonore.

4. The Board now proceed to notice those parts of Mr. Robinson's report and its accompanying statements which call for observation.

5. On comparing the number of Puttahs given in statement No. 1, and para. 2 of the Report it appears that the former only shows the Puttahs which were newly issued during the year in consequence of changes in the ryots' holdings. But that statement is intended to show the total number of Puttahs held by the ryots, and Mr. Robinson is requested to prepare it hereafter on this principle, shewing in his report how many of those Puttahs remained undisturbed, and how many of them were newly issued during the settlement. The Board wish also to be informed, with reference to enclosure No. 1, if they are to understand that the European Officers distributed the Puttahs in person, at the villages therein specified. It is also wished that a note should be added to Quinquennial statement No. 16, explaining whether the single Puttahs entered in Column 5 include Moturpha Puttahs or are confined to the land revenue.

6. Statement No. 1, should also be made complete by entering one village for Cochin and its dependencies instead of leaving Column 6 blank, unless some better course offers. It is observed that Column 6 also of this statement has been left blank as respects Cochin though in the return for Fusly 1265 ten days were entered as the period occupied in the settlement.

7. In the next report the Board wish to receive an account of the principles on which the revenues in Cochin are levied. In para. 17 of the Jummabundy report for fusly 1265 a statement was given shewing the amount of revenue under each head, but the mode in which the revenue is fixed, and the method of its collection, whether by rents or otherwise, were not described. These particulars once clearly given will render future calls for information unnecessary.

Dated 25th September in Consultation 17th October 1856.

8. The Board in para. 9 of their review of the Jummabundy report for fusly 1264 requested the Collector to consider some method of representing the extent of Nunjah cultivation in acres, as the method then pursued of adding together the entries of different measures, and thus forming a total under the denomination of Parahs was obviously incorrect, and deprived the statement of usefulness and value. Mr. Robinson expressed an opinion† that the information thus required was dispensed with by Mr. Secretary Bourdillon's Memo. of 23d August 1856 regarding the new forms of account, but the consequence apparently is that the entries of Nunjah land in the statement No. 3, now forwarded have been omitted, and the statement is thus deprived of most of its value. The

Proceedings 29th August 1856.

* *Neggady.*
Patham.
Neggady seed.
Pothies.

† *Letter dated 27th February in Consultation 6th May 1857 para. 9.*
In from Government 3d in Consultation 6th September 1856.

Board therefore request Mr. Robinson to consider some scale for converting into acres in the Jummabundy accounts the local land measures until they are abolished by a Survey. A proximate idea of the extent of Nunjah cultivation will then be given and its yearly variations can be noted.

9. Another point which attracts the Board's attention, is the imperfect manner in which the lands held by the ryots continue to be entered in the Jummabundy Chittahs. No effective check against concealed cultivation can be practicable, unless the lands are specified in detail according to some Pymash or Survey and such a precaution is the more necessary now that permanent puttahs are extensively given and diminish the annual enquiry. From Mr. Robinson's letter of 5th* August last, which was reviewed by the Board and the Government on 23d November and 19th December† the Board fear that in many parts of the district no old trustworthy accounts exist for this purpose, but they wish to know in what condition the old Survey accounts are, and how far their re-copying, to which allusion was made in para. 23 of the Jummabundy report for Fusly 1259, has been completed. Where no accounts exist to throw some light on the extent of land held by a ryot, it will be advisible to give yearly puttahs, lest from the puttahs being unchanged they should hereafter lead to a claim to hold in permanence on the beriz entered in them whatever land the ryots might assert they held when the puttahs were issued.

* *In Consultation 23d November* 1857.
† *In Consultation 23d December* 1857, *No.* 1330, *R. D.*

10. Statement No. 3, shows in its 9th column the extent of garden cultivation in acres. These entries are founded on the information obtained by Mr. Commissioner Græme from the village officers and cannot be relied on as accurate. Without also returns of the number of trees, on which the revenue is levied and not on the land, the statement might lead to mistaken inferences, as a comparison of its 9th and 12th columns would appear to show that the garden assessment varied from 3 annas per acre in Wynaad to upwards of Rupees 20 per acre in Cochin. The Board therefore wish a detail of the tree tax to be given in addition to this statement as lately explained in their Proceedings of 6th May last.

11. The entries in statement No. 6, do not give that clear information regarding lands held on cowle which the Board desire to have. For example the lands held on cowle "as per last fusly" are limited to the head of Nunjah, but the Board are led to believe that much of the cowle land is garden, and observe from statement No. 6, for Fusly 1265, that in that year alone cowles were granted for 1,396 acres of garden land. Again the assessment of these lands has been left blank because, as explained in paras. 19 and 20 of the Jummabundy report for Fusly 1265, the tax is not levied on the soil but on the trees after they become productive. Information should however be given annually of the cowle garden lands on which the trees have become productive and are assessed to the revenue. The Board also wish to know under which item in statement 4, the cowle remissions of statement No. 6, amounting to Rupees 10,698, have been brought.

12. It is observed that the particulars of the sundry items in Enclosure A to statement 3, amounting to Rupees 67,739-4-0 have not been shewn on the back of statement No. 4, as provided for in the forms. This is to be attended to in future.

13. Statement No. 3, is intended especially to shew the pure ryotwar land revenue, but the beriz entered in column 26 includes some Amany and other items. It should have been Rupees 16,38,084-8-9 instead of Rupees 16,99,594-1-0 so as to correspond with the ryotwar land revenue entered in column 6 of Statement No. 10.

14. Statement No. 5 shews that in some instances remissions were allowed for withered crops (Shavy) where the loss fell below 10 per cent. of the beriz. On such an indulgence being granted the special reasons which led to it should be explained in the report.

15. In para. 35 Mr. Robinson observes that he forwards a statement (enclosure 19) which gives in abstract the result of the garden survey made in the 4 Deshoms comprising the Durmapatam Umshom of the Cotiote talook. These gardens have formed the subject of previous correspondence, and it was decided by Government that the Jenm right, now belonging to

E. M. C. 17th in Cons. 27th November 1854, *No.* 1490, *Revenue Department.*

3
424

Government was to be sold to the present occupants, and their assessment was to be revised and modified. The Board await a report explaining the mode in which the results shewn in this abstract statement, have been arrived at, with particulars as to the number of trees, productive and unproductive, as they stood in the accounts and as they were found at the Survey. They also wish to know what has been done about disposing of the Jenm right to the occupants, and how the number of gardens has increased from 556, the number mentioned in the previous correspondence, to 724 as shewn in this statement. Mr. Robinson will also explain from what change in the talooks, these gardens are now said to be in the Cotiote talook instead of in Tellecherry as before.

	Arrearse of.	
	F. 1254	1257 *F.*
1265.....	8 14 5	14 13 6
1266.....	10 1 3	23 1 7

16. On scrutinizing statement No. 13, the recoverable balances of Fuslies 1254 and 1257 are entered at rather larger amounts than in the statement for Fusly 1265. The difference is shewn in the margin and should be explained.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES, *Secretary.*

No. 88. ORDER THEREON, No. 424; dated 30th March 1858.

Ordered that the foregoing [illegible]act be recorded.

(Signed) H. FORBES,
Acting Secretary to Government.

4
424

No. 971.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 18th March 1858.

In Con. 18th March 1858. Read letter from the Acting Collector of Malabar, dated 10th August 1857, reporting on the settlement of the land and extra sources of Revenue of that Province for Fusly 1266, A. D. 1856-57.

(Here enter No. 20)

The details of the settlement will be incorporated in the Board's general report, and it is sufficient here briefly to remark that it amounted to Rupees 25,92,697-10-8 and exhibits a net increase of Rupees 21,380 over the preceding year. Of this increase nearly one half or Rupees 34,055 occurred in the land revenue.

2. The season was only moderately favorable both as regards the fall of rain and [illegible] The monsoon set in early and the first crops suffered in some places from an excess of water, while the after this proved scanty for the second crops. Small pox and Cholera visited the district, but to no material extent, and in the Southern talooks the cattle suffered from a murrain.

3. The prices of grain continued very high, and garden produce was good, the trees having recovered from the effect of previous droughts. These circumstances facilitated the punctual realization of the land revenue, and the Board observe with satisfaction that out of a demand of Rupees 17,14,594, only Rupees 21,135 remained uncollected at the close of the Fusly, and that even of this sum only Rupees 6,135 were due by the ryots, the remaining Rupees 15,000 having been withheld by the Bunder of Cannanore.

4. The Board now proceed to notice those parts of Mr. Robinson's report and its accompanying statements which call for observation.

5. On comparing the number of Puttahs given in statement No. 1 and para 2 of the Report [illegible] appears that the former exceeds the Puttahs given in the latter by [illegible] on enquiry of changes in the ryots' holdings. But that statement is intended to show the total number of puttahs held by the ryots, and Mr. Robinson is requested to prepare it hereafter on this principle, shewing in his report how many of those puttahs remained undisturbed, and how many of them were newly issued during the settlement. The Board wish also to be informed, with reference to enclosure No. 1, if they are to understand that the European Officers distributed the puttahs in person, at the villages therein specified. It is also wished that a note should be added to Quinquennial statement No. 16, explaining whether the single puttahs entered in Column 5 include Moturpha puttahs or are confined to the land revenue.

6. Statement No. 1, should also be made complete by entering one village for Cochin and its dependencies instead of leaving Column 3 blank, unless some better course offers. It is observed that Column 6 also of this statement has been left blank as respects Cochin [illegible] in the return for Fusly 1265 ten days were entered as the period occupied in the settlement.

7. In the next report the Board wish to receive an account of the principles on which the assessment [illegible] Cochin are levied. In para. 17 of the summary of Report for Fusly 1265 a statement was given shewing the [illegible] of property [illegible] land, but it is [illegible] mode in which the revenue is fixed, and the method of its collection, whether by rents or otherwise, were not explained. These particulars once clearly given will render future calls for information unnecessary.

8. The Board in para. 9 of their review of the Jummabundy Report for Fusly 1265 requested the Collector to consider some method of representing the extent of Nunjah cultivation in acres, as the method then pursued of adding together the entries of different measures, and thus forming a total under the denomination of Parahs was obviously incorrect, and deprived the statement of usefulness and value. Mr. Robinson expressed an opinion that the information thus required was dispensed with by Mr. Secretary Bourdillon's Memo. of 23d August 1856, regarding the new forms of account, but the consequence apparently is that the

Pollam.
Nunjah seed.
Puthas.

† Letter dated 27th Feb. in con. 6th May 1857 para 9.
In from Govt. 3d in con. 6th Sept. 1856

entries of Nunjah land in the statement No. 3, now forwarded have been omitted, and the statement is thus deprived of most of its value. The Board therefore request Mr. Robinson to consider some scale for converting into acres in the Jummabundy accounts the local land measures until they are abolished by a Survey. A proximate idea of the extent of Nunjah cultivation will then be given and its yearly variations can be noted.

9. Another point which attracts the Board's attention, is the imperfect manner in which the lands held by the ryots continue to be entered in the Jummabundy Chittahs. No effective check against concealed cultivation can be practicable, unless the lands are specified in detail according to some Pymash or Survey and such a precaution is the more necessary now that permanent puttahs are extensively given and diminish the annual enquiry. From Mr. Robinson's letter of 5th† August last, which was reviewed by the Board and the Government on 23d November and 10th December* the Board fear that in many parts of the district no old trustworthy accounts exist for this purpose, but they wish to know in what condition the old Survey accounts are, and now far their re-copying, to which allusion was made in para. 23 of the Jemmabundy report for Fusly 1259, has been completed. Where no accounts exist to throw some light on the extent of land held by a ryot, it will be advisable to give yearly puttahs, lest from the puttahs being unchanged they should hereafter lead to a claim to hold in permanence on the beriz entered in them whatever land the ryots might assert they held when the puttahs were issued.

† In Con. 23d Nov. 1857.

* In Con. 23d Dec. 1857. No. 1320. R. D.

10. Statement No. 3, shows in its 9th column the extent of garden cultivation in acres. These entries are founded on the information obtained by Mr. Commissioner Græme from the village officers and cannot be relied on as accurate. Without also returns of the number of trees, on which the revenue is levied and not on the land, the statement might lead to mistaken inferences, as a comparison of its 9th and 12th columns would appear to show that the garden assessment varied from 3 annas per acre in Wynaad to upwards of Rupees 20 per acre in Cochin. The Board therefore wish a detail of the tree tax to be given in addition to this statement as [illegible] in their Proceedings of 6th May last.

11. The entries in statement No. 6, do not give that clear information regarding lands held on cowle which the Board desire to have. For example the lands held on cowle "as per last fusly" are limited to the head of Nunjah, but the Board are led to believe that much of the cowle land is garden, and observe from statement No. 6, for Fusly 1265, that in that year alone cowles were granted for 1396 acres of garden land. Again the assessment of these lands has been left blank because, as explained in paras. 19 and 20 of the Jummabundy report for Fusly 1265, the tax is not levied on the soil but on the trees after they become productive. Information should however be given annually of the cowle garden lands on which the trees have become productive and are assessed to the revenue. The Board also wish to know under which item in statement 4, the cowle remissions of statement No. 6, amounting to Rupees 19,698, have been brought.

12. It is observed that the particulars of the sundry items in Enclosure A to statement 3, amounting to Rupees 67,739-4-0 have not been shewn on the back of statement No. 4, as provided for in the forms. This is to be attended to in future.

13. Statement No. 3, is intended especially to shew the pure ryotwar land revenue, but the beriz entered in column 26 includes some Amany and other items. It should have been Rupees 16,38,084-8-9 instead of Rupees 16,99,591-1-0 so as to correspond with the Ryotwar land revenue entered in column 6 of statement No. 10.

14. Statement No. 5 shews that in some instances remissions were allowed for withered crops (Shavy) where the loss fell below 10 per cent of the beriz. On such an indulgence being granted the special reasons which led to it should be explained in the report.

15. In para. 35 Mr. Robinson observes that he forwards a statement (Enclosure 19) which gives in abstract the result of the garden Survey made in the 4 Deshoms comprising the Durmapatam Umshom of the Cotiote talook. These gardens have formed the subject of previous correspondence, and it was decided by Government that the Jenm right,

E. M. C. 17th in Con. 27th Nov. 1854, No. 1160 R. D.

5
424

now belonging to Government was to be sold to the present occupants, and their assesment was to be revised and modified. The Board await a report explaining the mode in which the results shewn in this abstract statement, have been arrived at, with particulars as to the number of trees, productive and unproductive, as they stood in the accounts and as they were found at the Survey. They also wish to know what has been done about disposing of the Jenm right to the occupants, and how the number of gardens has increased from 556, the number mentioned in the previous correspondence, to 724 as shewn in this statement. Mr. Robinson will also explain from what change in the talooks, these gardens are now said to be in the Cotiote talook instead of in Tellicherry as before.

	Arrears of.	
	F. 1254 ... 1257 F.	
1265	8 14 5	14 18 6
1266	10 1 5	23 1 7

16. On scrutinizing statement No. 13, the recoverable balances of Fuslies 1254 and 1257 are entered at rather larger amounts than in the statement for Fusly 1265. The difference is shewn in the margin and should be explained.

(A true Extract.)

Secretary.

W. ROBINSON, Esq., *Acting Collector of Malabar.*
Copy to Government, Revenue Department.

Revenue 1858 Dept.
Cons. 30th March

N° 390

Extract from the Proceed-
-ings of the Board of Revr

Dated 31st
Mar 9th March 1858.

N° 1971

Reviewing the Report
of the Collector of Malabar
on the Settlement of the Lands
and on the sources of Revenue
of that Province for Fasly
1216.
1856-57

N° 1824
Recorded
30 March 1858