M.R.O. 14—5,450—22-10-25.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 301 Press ~~Mis.~~

35-36

Dated 4—2—1867

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 35. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 22nd January 1867, No. 460.

Read the following letter from the Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Chepauk, 7th January 1867, No. 31-2:—

1. I have the honor to request permission to forward some remarks which seem called for by the letter from the Director of Revenue Settlement, and that from the Collector of Tinnevelly, as given in the Board's Proceedings, dated 8th December 1866, No. 8,732.

2. I think Mr. Master misapprehends the gist of Major Hessey's letter and enclosures. Complaint is not made that no notice was taken of the representations of the Survey Department; the complaint is that the demarcation was, and *still is*, most defective. Orders were doubtless issued, but they have been apparently ineffectual. Major Barber, in his letter that accompanies this, mentions that Khandams of 600 and 800 acres were lately in existence with offsets 1,000 links long. This Officer also states that the non-existence of marks is accounted for by their never having been erected, and this statement, he says, will be borne out by the reports to the Revenue authorities. However, as noted both by Majors Hessey and Barber in their letters that form enclosures to mine, the non-agreement of sketches with the ground, and of registers with both, was a more serious obstacle than the want of marks on the ground.

3. In the letter of the Collector of Tinnevelly, he enumerates the impediments to the progress of the Survey, which may for convenience be classed under ten heads.

I. Separation of the Survey from Revenue Department.
X. Separation of Survey and Settlement, and exaltation of former into a separate department.

4. I have nothing to say regarding Mr. Puckle's impugning the wisdom of the arrangements sanctioned by Government after a trial of some years. It is natural that he, as an Officer of the Demarcation and Settlement Department, should not view, with favor, arrangements that have followed on the disruption of that department. The first and last causes of what cannot be called "slow progress," but the almost total stoppage of the Survey in Tinnevelly, Nos. I. and X., therefore, do not fall within my province to consider.

II. Minute exactness required by Survey.

5. As to No. II., the minute exactness is not greater in Tinnevelly than elsewhere. It will, I imagine, be readily understood that were what Mr. Puckle calls "minute exactness" not required, nothing worthy of the name of Survey could be performed, and no trustworthy maps constructed, the whole would degenerate into a rough Paimash, and this, I believe, is what Mr. Puckle advocates; but I am not aware that either the Board of Revenue or Government share his views.

III. The people having been kept in ignorance of what the Survey means.

6. I do not think the people having been kept in ignorance can be charged to the Survey, and indeed it is not clear that Mr. Puckle intends that it should be. It will be observed that an

appeal from Major Hessey gave rise to almost the only information officially communicated to the people through the District Gazette.

IV. The Survey Officers having no feelings in common with the villagers.

7. It is difficult to meet this charge, principally from failing to understand exactly how the sympathy or the want of it is shewn. It is not indeed apparent why Survey Officers, as a rule, should be less sympathetic than officers of any other department. I think that it would be fairer and more correct to say that the ryots have neither hope nor fear regarding the Survey, whereas the Department of Public Works, the Police, and the Revenue Departments, including the Settlement, appeal strongly to one or the other. I venture to remark that, with all the fellow-feeling of the Revenue authorities, they have, I believe, failed to obtain the willing co-operation of the people of the district.

V. The Survey Officers regarding them as coolies who will not work.

8. As to the Survey Officers regarding the ryots as coolies, it is impossible to deal with such a broad assertion. Government has given Survey Officers certain orders, which they are bound to carry out, and certain powers to assist them in doing so. Why the due exercise of authority delegated to the Survey Department should not be equally justified as of that given to the Revenue Department, or that the Survey Officers should be for exercising it said to regard the ryots as coolies who will not work, is not apparent.

VI. The Survey Officers mostly ignorant of the vernacular.

9. There are only four out of nineteen officers employed in the districts who have not passed an examination in the vernacular. Of these, one has a good colloquial knowledge, and two have only lately joined the department; I do not think, therefore, the statement that mostly the Survey Officers are ignorant of the vernacular is borne out. It may perhaps not be out of place here to note that the late Chief Revenue Officer of the district was unacquainted with the vernacular.

VII. The Survey Officers overlook the object for which the Survey was instituted.

10. The object that I believe Survey Officers have in view is the execution of a good survey, the details of which have been laid down by the Revenue Board and Government, who I may take it for granted, knew the object they had in view when issuing their instructions.

VIII. The Survey Officers have always held aloof from the Revenue authorities and even from the Settlement.

11. That the Officers of the Survey Department have systematically held aloof from the Revenue authorities, is, I venture to say, a misapprehension of Mr. Puckle's. I think I may safely appeal to the Collectors of Rajahmundry, Masulipatam, Guntoor, Cuddapah, Kurnool, Salem, South Arcot, Trichinopoly, and to the three Collectors of Tinnevelly prior to Mr. Puckle, to state whether they have had cause to make a similar complaint. The causes of difference with the Settlement Department arose, I may say, wholly from demarcation, and I really do not see that the Survey Officers were altogether the offenders.

IX. The Survey Officers carry out their work with an exactness unsuited to the people with whom they have to deal.

12. That the Survey Officers carry out their work with an exactness unsuited to the people with whom they have to deal, must refer either to the subordinates of the Survey or to the ryots. That in all other districts the accuracy demanded is attained is a reply to the former supposition, and to the latter it may be urged that, for a litigious people, whose land is sub-divided *ad infinitum*, great accuracy is apparently necessary. Mr. Puckle has been misinformed with regard to the case adduced by him of Amin's work being, as a rule, rejected unless when plotted it agreed in shape with the demarcation sketch. I think what must have been meant is that, unless each field contained the same number of sides, and showed the same number of marks as the demarcation sketch, it was presumed some had been left out or put in by the Amin, and consequently such field was marked for test. This is, I submit, a very different matter from that stated by Mr. Puckle.

13. In thus addressing the Board, I must express my regret at having what I trust the Board may consider just cause for defending the Survey Officers against such very sweeping charges, and charges so difficult in general to rebut. It is far more agreeable, on the other hand, to be able to acknowledge, as I heartily do, that Mr. Puckle is most anxious to support the Survey as Collector of the District, and were he satisfied to perform the more than ample work assigned him as Collector and Settlement Officer, without endeavouring also to control the details of Survey, I feel convinced matters would progress much more satisfactorily for all parties.

14. In conclusion, I have to request the permission of the Board, to my sending direct to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, copies of this letter and enclosures, so that the subject may not be disposed of before receiving them.

From Major W. H. HESSEY, Deputy Superintendent of Revenue Survey, to the Superintendent of Revenue Survey, dated Chepauk, 22nd December 1866.

1. I have the honor to request that you will allow me to offer a few remarks on Mr. R. E. Master's letter, No. 1,315/46, of 8th October 1866.

Printed with Proceedings of the Revenue Board, No. 8,732, of 8th December 1866.
Submitting to Government, with remarks, letters from Acting Superintendent of Revenue Survey and Officiating Director of Revenue Settlement, on subject of slow progress of Survey in Tinnevelly being attributable to bad demarcation in Southern Talooks.

2. In paragraph 2 Mr. Master states that it is pretty plainly intimated in letter, No. 1,277/18, of the 19th September 1866, which I, as Acting Superintendent of Revenue Survey, had addressed to the Secretary to the Revenue Board on the subject of delays to the survey in Tinnevelly (also printed with the above Proceedings) that, though constant representations had been made to the Settlement Department, they had not been responded to.

3. I regret extremely that I should have been so misapprehended. Mr. Master has always most courteously and promptly replied to all letters I have had to address to him.

4. I am perfectly aware that Mr. Master did give prompt orders on the subject of revision of demarcation, but what I stated in my letter to the Collector of Tinnevelly, I then believed to be the fact that no steps had been taken to remedy the very unsatisfactory state of things. I was guided in my belief by Major Barber's reports and by my own observations. If steps had been taken, they were certainly inadequate to attain the end proposed.

5. In my diary I have noted the actual villages and sub-divisions of villages I examined; the statements I have there made are, I think, not contradicted by any person.

6. In paragraph 3 Mr. Master lays great stress on the time that elapsed between Demarcation and Survey. If nothing worse than absence of stones had been complained of, the difficulty would not have been so great.

7. In my letter to Mr. Puckle, referred to above, I said not a single word about the absence of stones from sandy tracts. It was utter disregard of the fundamental principles of demarcation in most valuable irrigated land that I complained of.

8. In that letter I entered more fully into the defects in the demarcation, and the method I thought most fitted to remedy these defects, than I thought right to do in a letter to the Board. I respectfully request your attention to that letter, and comparison of the remarks therein contained with the facts recorded in my diary.

9. In paragraph 8, Mr. Master quotes a report from Mr. Puckle, containing a statement that Tenkaray Talook was being revised, and would be completed in the year 1864. Orders may have been given for revision, but the demarcation is still very bad indeed. Mr. Puckle in that letter distinctly declined to go over the ground again ; how far he was justified in his refusal I leave you to judge from my diary and report.

See letter B.

10. If the people, as stated by Mr. Puckle in his letter, have been kept in ignorance of what the Survey means, I would, with deference, represent that the Survey had no power to hold out any promise to the ryots, and that the Settlement Department, as represented by the demarcation, were the proper persons, on entering the district, to have explained the object of the "troublesome process." I believe that it was in consequence of a suggestion made by me that Mr. Puckle, as Settlement Officer, did, in September last, publish a notice conveying some very valuable information to villagers on the subject of the Demarcation, Survey, and Settlement.

From the Deputy Superintendent, No. 4, Revenue Survey, to the Superintendent of Revenue Survey, dated Chepauk, 22nd December 1866.

1. In acknowledging the receipt of Proceedings of the Revenue Board, No. 8,732, of 8th December 1866, I have the honor to forward a few remarks respecting points that appear to have been overlooked. In the first place, I maintain that the defects complained of in the Tenkasy Talook, in 1863, have not been rectified in the following instances, viz., Khandams of 800 and 600 acres, and offsets 1,000 links in length. Mr. Puckle, on the subject being brought to his notice, directed some of his demarcators to redemarcate entirely six of the villages, and the Khandams are now being divided into blocks of 150 to 200 acres.

Refers to paragraph 2 of letter from R. E. Master, Esq.

2. It is only lately that the demarcation of the Southern Talooks has been acknowledged to be bad; it has been repeatedly reported in Proceedings of the Officiating Director of Revenue Settlement, "demarcation of Tinnevelly reported good." The delay in commencing the survey of Tenkasy, after the demarcation was said to have been completed, was too short to be the cause of the absence of the marks ; the fact is that they were only put on paper, and not on the ground, reports of which have been repeatedly made. I trust the "attempt" to secure accuracy in the Survey has been successful, as, until a certain amount of fictitious work is deliberately allowed, I know of no alternative. Remarking on delay in commencing survey of Tenkaray Talook, have only to bring to your notice that Mr. Symonds was distinctly informed that due notice should be given to enable him to revise the defective demarcation before I commenced the Survey, and I had distinct orders from you not to take up more talooks.

Paragraph 3 of letter from R. E. Master, Esq.

Paragraphs 8 to 11.

3. I perfectly agree with Mr. Master, that, when once the Demarcation Department has performed its duty, and the marks been once properly erected, they should be kept in order by the Revenue Department ; but I still maintain that proper marks never have been erected. If you will call for the reports received by the Revenue authorities from the different talooks, you will find that the marks are missing by thousands. In addition to this, you are aware, that the sketches do not agree with the ground, and in many cases the land registers do not agree with either.

Paragraph 13.

4. Mr. Puckle has been misinformed that Amin's measurements are, as a rule, rejected if they do not nearly correspond with the shapes of the fields as shewn by the demarcation sketches. I have long known that his sketches are utterly untrustworthy ; but as they might in some cases be correct if any discrepancies between them and the Amin's sketches are discovered, I have the places inspected, so that I may decide which is correct ; the other remarks are too general to reply to. Maps have undoubtedly been plotted and re-plotted, but in nine instances out of ten from defective demarcation.

The Collector's letter, paragraph 3.

5. I regret that I have not a copy of my letter informing Mr. Symonds that I would give him due notice before I commenced the survey of the sandy tracts, but I will send for it.

Remarks of the Board, paragraph 2.

6. The small party of demarcators placed under my orders have been fully employed in correcting bad work. The progress of survey of the Nangunary Talook will shew the difference caused by their being under my orders, and although it is not called an irrigated talook, it has about 500 tanks, the fields under them are small, and the southern part is sandy, and therefore required immediate survey, as much as the Tenkaray Talook.

---

1. Submitted to Government, in continuation of the Board's Proceedings of 8th December 1866, No. 8,732.

2. The Board are satisfied that neither Mr. Master nor Mr. Puckle had any intention whatever to depreciate the value of the labors of the Survey Officers.

3. Mr. Puckle's Progess Report would in ordinary course have been simply recorded ; but on the particular occasion in question, the Board considered that in justice to Mr. Symonds they could not withhold it from Government.

No. 36. ORDER THEREON, 4th February 1867, No. 301.

Land Revenue.

Recorded, with reference to G. O. dated 15th January 1867.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. GROSE,
Under Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Pro 8th January 1867 No 122-24
Pro 15th " " 271-274

41

Rev - 1867. Department.
Pro of Govt for February

No. 233.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 22nd January 1867.

Dep 25-
Rev-28

No. 460.

Submitting to Government, letter from Superintendent of Revenue Survey, forwarding remarks on letters of Director of Revenue Settlement and Collector of Tinnevelly on backwardness of Survey Maps in that district.

R. 301 to Secy
Rec'd 15 Jany 67.
Cr. Sheby for V.P.

Rec'd 29 Dec 66

A. 35 & 36