

(1) Number of pages 22

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.
B.P. No.

1586

Press
Mis.

Dated

28-4-1877

197

Not to be folded or roughly handled

150/5

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
23th April 1877.*

No. 691. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 4th April 1877, No. 1,511:—

Read the following letter from F. R. H. SHARP, Esq., Acting Collector of Tanjore, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Vallam, 24th March 1877, No. 1,139.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the following subject.

2. The Acting Sub-Collector in a letter, No. 122, of the 19th ultimo, brought to notice that it has hitherto been the practice in his division (as I believe, in the district generally) to decide on remission for wet lands after particular inquiry in each case in which remission is applied for. He considered this at variance with the Board's orders, and wished to know if it might be put a stop to.

3. Mr. Cruickshank was informed in reply (in this office letter, No. 778, of the 28th ultimo) that the practice in question was in accordance with the Board's orders and should be continued.

4. The Sub-Collector in his letter, No. 151, of the 3rd instant, objected that paragraph 2 of the Board's orders on remissions (Standing Order No. XX of 1872) prohibits inquiry into individual losses.

5. I do not gather from the correspondence whether the reference was more particularly to applications in the case of lands alleged to be totally waste or partially so. But I am informed in the office that lands completely waste were alluded to as it is exceptional and almost without precedent to grant remissions for partial losses. The Board have directly and indirectly expressed their disapproval of the obviously objectionable attempt to estimate individual losses and to make detailed inquiries. But the clause commencing "In granting this remission, &c.," in the rules of 1872, obviously from the arrangement of printing and numbering of paragraphs, as well as less clearly from its wording, refers only to partial losses, and it may be argued that, in the absence of such qualifying clause to Rule I, it must be assumed *per contra* that there must be detailed inspections of particular fields in cases where lands wholly waste are concerned.

6. There are frequently cases in which detailed inspection is less requisite under Rule I than under Rule II, *e.g.*, if a tank has not a drop of water in it throughout the season, as is the case unhappily with so many this year, it is obviously unnecessary to inspect particular fields in its ayacut. There are frequently cases again in which prior to inspection it is impossible to tell whether there may have been complete or partial failure of crops, and it is impossible to predict whether Rule I or Rule II will be applied.

7. I suggest that the clause now qualifying Rule II should be extended as far as possible to Rule I, and that attempts at estimating the losses of individuals, whether for complete or partial loss of crop, be discouraged.

Your letter, No. 151, dated 3rd March 1877.
2. The subject of your letter is about to be referred for the orders of the Board of Revenue, and, pending their instructions, there is no objection to omitting the inspection of particular fields in large tracts of waste.

8. I submit the correspondence for orders, having meanwhile written to the Sub-Collector as per margin.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th April 1877.*

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From A. CRUICKSHANK, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector, to F. R. H. SHARP, Esq., Acting Collector of Tanjore, dated Thiruppondy, 19th February 1877, No. 122.

Over 2,000 petitions have been presented for remission of assessment on wet lands in the Negapatam Taluq alone. It has hitherto been the practice in this division to examine the land of every petitioner and report the result of the inquiry in each case. This is not in accordance with the Board's rules on the subject, but as the practice has been long in force, I have the honor to request instructions whether it is to be *still continued* or put a stop to. If it is to be continued, the Tahsildar must get some assistance to get through so many petitions, as it is impossible that he and his Revenue Inspectors can, unaided, examine all before the settlement must commence.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) F. R. H. SHARP,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From H. S. THOMAS, Esq., Collector, to A. CRUICKSHANK, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector of Tanjore, dated Tanjore, 28th February 1877, No. 778.

Your letter of the 19th instant, No. 122.

2. The number of remission petitions presented this year must no doubt be very many, and it is not so only in the Negapatam, but in almost every other taluq in the district.

3. The practice of examining the land of every petitioner and reporting the result of the inquiry in each case appears to be in accordance with the remission rules, as it cannot be ascertained, unless after inspection, that a particular field is left waste or that the crop is totally lost. Please, therefore, refer me to the Board's rules you refer to.

Board's Circular Order No. XX of 1872.

4. However difficult the examination of the fields may be, we have no other alternative than to go through the work as usual with the aid of the existing establishment. This will no doubt tend to the settlement of the taluqs being commenced at a late period which we cannot help under the peculiar adverse character of the present season.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) F. R. H. SHARP,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

From A. CRUICKSHANK, Esq., Acting Sub-Collector, to F. R. H. SHARP, Esq., Acting Collector of Tanjore, dated Vallam, 3rd March 1877, No. 151.

With reference to your letter of the 28th ultimo, No. 778, I have the honor to refer you to paragraph 2 of the order quoted by you, wherein it is distinctly stated that no attempt is to be made to estimate individual losses and the procedure to be followed is laid down.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) F. R. H. SHARP,
Acting Collector.

The Board concurs with the Collector; his instructions quoted in paragraph 8 are correct and meet the wants of the present exceptional year. The circumstances of the district are, however, such that the special practice alluded to cannot be set aside in ordinary years.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Secretary

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th April 1877.*

No. 692. ORDER THEREON, 28th April 1877, No. 1,586.

Land Revenue, No. 12.

THE Board's views are approved.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.

Per A. F. Goodall.

1586
Revenue Department

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

Dated 4th April 1877

No. 154

Read the following:-

N^o 1139

Board's
G.O. No 3147

From,

J. K. H. Sharp Esquire
Ag. Collector of Tanjore

To
H. E. Stokes Esquire
Secretary to the Board of Revenue
Madras

Sir,

I have the honor to address
you on the following subject.

2. The Acting Sub. Collector
in a letter N^o 122 of the 19th
ultimo brought to notice that
it has hitherto been the practice
in his Division (as I believe in
the District generally) to decide
on permission for wet lands after

17th April 1877
Views expressed by the Board of Revenue regarding the inspection of —
REVENUE.
THE BOARD OF REVENUE.
Dated April 28th.
G.O. No 3147, No. 1,586.
APRIL
Nos. 691-692.

particular enquiry in each case in which permission is applied for. He considered this at variance with the Board's orders and wished to know if it might be put a stop to.

3. Mr. L. Quickshank was informed in reply (in this office letter no 778 of the 20th ultimo) that the practice in question was in accordance with the Board's orders and should be continued.

4. The Subcollector in his letter No 161 of the 3rd Instant objected that para 2 of the Board's orders on permissions (standing order No 77 of 1872) prohibits enquiry into individual losses.

5. I do not gather from the correspondence whether the reference was more particularly to applications

in the case of lands alleged to be totally waste or partially so. But I am informed in the Office that lands completely waste were alluded to, as it is exceptional and almost without precedent to grant permissions for partial losses. The Board have directly and indirectly expressed their disapproval of the obviously objectionable attempt to estimate individual losses and to make detailed inquiries.

But the clause commencing "In granting this permission" in the rules of 1872, obviously from the arrangement of printing and numbering of paragraphs, as well as less clearly from its wording, refers only to partial losses; and it may be argued that in the absence of such qualifying clause to Rule I it must be assumed *per contra* that

that there must be, detailed inspections of particular fields in cases where lands wholly waste are concerned.

6. There are frequently cases in which detailed inspection is less requisite under Rule I than under Rule II, e. g. if a tank has not a drop of water in it through out the season as is the case unfortunately with so many this year, it is obviously unnecessary to inspect particular fields in its neighbourhood.

There are frequently cases again in which prior to inspection it is impossible to tell whether there may have been complete or partial failure of crops and it is impossible to predict whether Rule I or Rule II will be applied.

7. I suggest that the clause now qualifying Rule II should

20/6
should be extended as far as possible to Rule I and that attempts at estimating the losses of individuals whether for complete or partial loss of crop be discouraged.

* Your letter no. 151 dated 3 rd March 1877.	8. I submit the correspondence for orders having meanwhile written to the Subcollector as per margin
2. The subject of your letter is about to be referred for the orders of the Board of Revenue, and pending their instructions, there is no objection to omitting the inspection of particular fields in large tracts of waste.	

Saijore Collectors' Office
Vallam 24th March 1877

Shaw & Co
15th St. Sharp
ag. collector

The Board concurs with the collector, his instructions quoted in para 8 are correct and meet the wants of

of the present exceptional year.

The circumstances of the District
are however such that the
special practice alluded to
cannot be set aside in
ordinary years.

/ True copy & Extract

/ S/ H. E. States

Secretary

To
The Collector of Tanjore

/ True copy /

Business
Secretary

To
The Secretary to Government

Revenue Department
with copy of enclosures

Respectfully

H. Narasimhaiah

Tanjore Sub Collector's Office
 Thiruppundy 19th February 1877

N^o 122

I am
 The Ag. Sub Collector of Tanjore
 To The Collector of Tanjore

Sir, Over 2000 petitions have
 been presented for permission of
 assessment on wet lands in the
 Nagapatam Taluq alone. It
 has hitherto been the practice
 in this division to examine the
 lands of every petitioner and
 report the result of the inquiry
 in each case. This is not in
 accordance with the Board's
 rules on the subject but as the
 practice has been long in force
 I have the honor to request in
 instructions

Recd: 18.7.98
 No. 2017

Proceedings of the

Board of Revenue

of the District (1877).

Page 34.

Recd: 18.7.98

No. 2017

Order No. 1586

The Board's orders are approved

28-4-77

574/177

Concerning with the

Tanjore District on the

the views expressed by

him in regard to the

impairing of waste fields

in the lands in trust.

Ag. S. C. to the Ag. S. C. (1877-78-79)
 (1877-78-79)

691-92
 6/4/77 27/4/77

Instructions whether it is to be still
continued or a put a stop to.

If it is to be continued the
Sahildar must get some assistance
to get through so many petitions
as it is impossible that he and
his Revenue Inspector can un-
aided examine all before the
settlement must commence.

I have &c

/s/ J. Quirkshank

Asst Collector

(True copy)

/s/ N. Sharp

Asst Collector

(True copy)

W. H. H.

Secretary

Captain
H. H. H.

Tayore Collection office

N^o 278
Tayore 28th February 1877

To
The Acting Sub-collector
Tayore

1586/9
Sir,
your letter of the 19th instant
No 122.

2. The number of Remission
petitions presented this year must no
doubt be very many and it is not so only
in the Negapalām but in almost every
other Taluk in the District.

3. The practice of examining the
land of every petitioner and reporting the
result of the enquiry in each case appears
to be in accordance with the Remission
Board Circular Order No XX of 1872 rules as it cannot be
ascertained unless after
inspection, that a particular field is left
waste or that the crop is totally lost. Please
therefore, refer me to the Board rules you
refer

Enclosed in Board's

Proceedings, 17th

April 1877 to

the Secretary to

Govt. P. O.

1882
20/7/77

P 28-4-77 to 1586

refer to.

4 However difficult the examination of
the fields may be, we have no other alternative
than to go through the work as usual with
the aid of the existing establishment. This
will no doubt tend to the settlement of
the Tuleys being commenced at a late
period which we cannot help under the
peculiar adverse character of the present
season.

I have etc

Signed H. V. Thomas

Collector

True Copy

H. Sharp

as Collector

True Copy

H. Evans

Secretary

Top M. M. M. M. M.

Taiyore Sub Collection Office
Vallam 3rd March 1877

No 151

1580/11

From The Acting Sub Collector of
Taiyore

To The Collector of Taiyore

With reference to your letter of the
28th ultimo No 778, I have the honor to refer
you to para 2 of the order quoted by you,
wherein it is distinctly stated that no
attempt is to be made to estimate individual
scores and the procedure to be followed is
laid down.

I have etc
Signed A. Crickshaw
As Sub Collector

True copy
Signed H. Sharp
As Collector

True copy 1

W. Lums
Secretary

Copy to M. M. M. M. M.

Enclosed with

Proceedings dated 4th

April 1877 to the Collector

of Govt. N. B.

1880: 2
20/7/77

No 28-4-77-15-15-56

(11)

Guatemala in 1877

December 1877

1877, 18th Dec

1877, 18th Dec

1877, 18th Dec

1877, 18th Dec