Revenue (1898) Department.

PRESS SERIES.

G.O., No. 108

Dated 23rd February

[Despatch Abstract.]

Passing orders on Board's Pros. subm.ts of revised proposals for the revision of Tahsildars' & Dy. Tahsildars' establishments in the Presidency.

Government {1898} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd.	} 1898.	*Enclosures*
Regd.		*Spare copies*

G.O., No. 103, 23rd February 1898.

FEBRUARY.

Revision of Tahsildars' and Deputy Tahsildars' Establishments in the Presidency.

Passing orders on Board's Proceedings submitting to Government revised proposals for the —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 224, dated 7th July 1897 :—

Read—Reports submitted by Collectors with reference to paragraph 23 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, relating to the revision of taluk establishments.

Read—Government Order, No. 624, Revenue Department, dated 14th November 1896.

Read—letter from V. A. BRODIE, Esq., Collector of Gódávari, dated 27th May 1897, Ref. No. 2056-Ver., stating that two more peons are needed for the Bhadráchalam taluk.

Resolution—No. 224, dated 7th July 1897.

With its Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, the Board submitted to Government a scheme for improving the position of Tahsildars' and Deputy Tahsildars' establishments in the Presidency and requested Collectors at the same time to verify the figures in the several statements upon which the Board's proposals were based and to submit any suggestions which they might have to offer on the subject. The total additional expenditure involved in the Board's scheme was Rs. 1,31,412 per annum.

2. In the order first read above, Government approved of the Board's proposals with certain modifications chiefly in the apportionment of the number of hands in the several grades of pay and called for a proposition statement for submission to the Government of India. The result of the modifications made by Government was a reduction of the additional expenditure involved in the Board's scheme from Rupees 1,31,412 to Rs. 92,610.

3. Some of the Collectors consulted consider the reductions proposed by the Board in the number of clerks and peons in certain taluk offices to be impracticable and some have taken the opportunity to apply for the entertainment of additional hands in some of the taluks and Deputy Tahsildars' offices which the Board did not propose to strengthen. The Collectors' proposals and the Board's recommendations thereon have been tabulated under the heads "Taluk clerks", "Taluk peons" and "Deputy Tahsildars' establishments" and printed as Appendices I, II and III, respectively, to

these Proceedings. The net result of the Board's final recommendations under each of the three heads specified above is as shown below :—

—	As now existing.		As proposed by the Board in Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896		As approved by Government in Government Order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896.		As now recommended by the Board.	
	Number.	Cost.	Number.	Cost.	Number.	Cost.	Number.	Cost.
		RS.		RS		RS.		RS.
Taluk Clerks	1,351	21,897	1,347	28,300	1,347	26,607½	1,372	27,042½
Do. Shroffs	224	3,020	224	3,464	224	3,020	224	3,025
Do. Muchis	..	..	157	1,099	157	1,099	157	1,099
Do. Dufterbunds ..	154	1,082	157	1,103	157	1,103	157	1,103
Do. Peons including Duffadars) ..	3,470	21,133	3,330	23,115	3,330	22,178	3,364	22,382
Deputy Tahsildars' Establishments.								
Clerks	340	5,352½	340	6,042½	340	6,042½	343	6,122½
Shroffs	18	234½	18	264½	18	234½	29	347½
Dufterbunds	148	1,036	148	1,036	148	1,036	152	1,075½
Peons	604	3,669	604	3,950	604	3,820	610	3,864
Total per mensem ..	..	57,424	..	68,374	..	65,140½	..	66,061
Total per annum ..	..	6,89,088	...	8,20,488	..	7,81,686	..	7,92,732
Increase ..	..	..	..	+1,31,400*	..	+92,598*	..	+1,03,644

* The decrease of Rs. 12 as compared with the figures 1,31,412 and 92,610 in paragraph 2 above is due to the fact that in calculating the total number of Deputy Tahsildars' offices with peons drawing Rs. 7, the Kodaikánal Deputy Tahsildar's office in Madura which has already a peon on Rs. 7 was erroneously treated as an office with peons on Rs. 6 only.

4. The subjoined statement shows the number of taluks in each district classified with reference to the number of clerks to be allotted to each under the Board's present proposals :—

—	Number of taluks with					
	Six clerks.	Seven clerks.	Eight clerks.	Nine clerks.	Ten clerks.	Total number of taluks in the district.
Ganjám	..	..	..	2	1	3
Vizagapatam	..	1	2	..	..	3
Gódávari	1	..	4	4	1	10
Kistna	..	..	3	6	3	12
Nellore	..	..	6	2	1	9
Cuddapah	..	..	5	5	1	11
[illegible]	..	1	6	1	..	8
Bellary	..	..	2	6	..	8
Kurnool	..	..	1	6	1	8
Chingleput	..	..	2	4	..	6
North Arcot	..	2	1	5	1	9
South Arcot	..	..	1	6	1	8
Tanjore	..	..	1	6	2	9
Trichinopoly	..	..	1	3	1	5
Madura	..	..	3	3	..	6
Tinnevelly	..	..	4	3	2	9
Coimbatore	..	..	3	6	1	10
Salem	..	..	2	4	3	9
South Canara	..	..	1	4	..	5
Malabar	..	..	3	4	2	9
Total ..	1	4	51	80	21	157

5. *Tahsildar's establishments—Clerks.*—The following statement compares the number and cost of the existing establishment with the number and cost of the proposed establishment according to the different rates of pay :—

Existing establishment.			Proposed establishment as per scale sanctioned by Government.		
Number of clerks.	Pay of each clerk.	Total cost.	Number of clerks.	Pay of each clerk.	Total cost.
	RS.	RS.		RS.	RS.
1	30	30	157	30	4,710
3	25	75	178	25	4,450
317	20	6,340	309	20	6,180
1	17	17	313	17½	5,477½
1,029	15	15,435	415	15	6,225
1,351	..	21,897	1,372	..	27,042½

It will be seen that the increased expenditure under this head comes to Rs. 5,145½ or Rs. 61,746 per annum against Rs. 56,526 estimated by Government.

6. In paragraph 2 (i) of its order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, Government observes that the provision made by the Board for the retention of only one clerk on Rs. 15 in each taluk office makes the proportion of clerks of that grade to the total number of clerks vary from 16⅔ per cent. in taluks provided with six clerks to 10 per cent. in those provided with ten clerks and that, as, in the majority of the Government establishments, the proportion of clerks drawing Rs. 15 greatly exceeds the maximum of 16⅔ per cent. proposed by the Board, the acceptance of the Board's proposal will open the door to demands for similar treatment from other offices which cannot equitably be refused but compliance with which will cost *several lakhs of rupees* per annum. The Board submits that the retention of so low a proportion of clerks on the Rs. 15 grade was not a new proposal. In the proposition statement accepted by Government in paragraph 7 of its order, No. 396, dated 18th March 1884, Mr. Garstin had provided for the retention of one clerk on Rs. 15 in taluks for which six, seven or nine clerks had been allotted by him, and of two such clerks in the taluks to which he had assigned eight or ten clerks. The Board's proposal, as will be seen from paragraph 6 of its Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, was to reduce the number of clerks on Rs. 15 to 1, even in the case of the taluks provided with eight or ten clerks, and by leaving out the grade on Rs. 22½ proposed by Mr. Garstin to re-adjust the number of clerks in the several grades proposed for the several taluks so as to leave the total cost of each scale of establishment with six clerks, seven clerks, &c., as fixed by Mr. Garstin, substantially unaffected. But Government has increased the number of clerks on Rs. 15 to two in the case of taluks to be provided with six, seven or eight clerks and to three in the case of taluks with a strength of nine or ten clerks—a proportion not contemplated in Mr. Garstin's proposition statement. The revision of the scale as made by Government has, no doubt, resulted in a large saving as compared with Mr. Garstin's scale, but has reduced its attractiveness which it was the main object of Mr. Garstin's and the Board's schemes to ensure.

The Board also begs leave to point out that the extension of its proposal in regard to the number of Rs. 15 appointments to Government establishments generally will not entail an additional cost of *several lakhs of rupees* as apprehended by Government. According to the Civil Budget estimates for 1897-98, the total number of clerks drawing Rs. 15 and under in all Government establishments consisting of more than two clerks each was 1,938 out of a total strength of 5,241. The additional cost that would be entailed (1) by raising the pay of each of these clerks in excess of a tenth of the total strength to Rs. 17½ and (2) by raising the pay of one-half of the number in excess to Rs. 17½ and that of the other half to Rs. 20 would be as shown below or not much more than half a lakh of rupees :—

One-sixth or 16⅔ per cent. of the total strength which is the maximum proposed by the Board is 874
One-tenth or 10 per cent. of the strength (the minimum) is 524
The additional cost that would be entailed by increasing the pay of $\frac{1,938-524}{1,938-874}$ clerks to Rs. 17½, comes to $\frac{1,414}{1,064} \times 2\frac{1}{2}$ or Rs. $\frac{3,535}{2,660}$ per mensem, or Rs. $\frac{42,420}{31,920}$ per annum.
If half the above mentioned number of clerks were paid Rs. 17½ and the remaining half Rs. 20 per mensem the additional cost would be Rs. 47,880 or Rs. 63,630 according to the number affected.

If, in consideration of the circumstances set forth above, Government is of opinion that the scale of establishment originally proposed by the Board may be adopted, the additional cost will amount to Rs. 82,416 per annum or Rs. 20,670 in excess of the proposals contained in the last paragraph :—

Number of clerks.	Pay of each clerk.	Total cost.
	RS.	RS.
157	30	4,710
313	25	7,825
335	20	6,700
410	17½	7,175
157	15	2,355
	Total ...	28,765 per mensem.
	Cost of the existing establishment per mensem	21,897
	Difference ...	6,868 per mensem.
	or	82,416 per annum.

The Board would strongly advocate the acceptance of this scale, if possible, as it feels confident that the only hope of materially increasing the efficiency of taluk establishments lies in improving the prospects before those who may be inclined to enter the service.

7. The attention of all Collectors, except those of Madras and Nilgiris, is drawn to paragraph 2 (1) of the Government Order read above regarding the pay and position of the Recordkeeper.

8. *Shroffs.*—The Collector of Cuddapah proposes that the second shroff on Rs.10 in the Jammalamadugu taluk may be abolished. The Board approves the Collector's recommendation. The Collector of Bellary points out that, leaving out of account the extra gumastah sanctioned in Government Order, No. 130, dated 28th February 1889, and employed as a shroff (*vide* Board's Proceedings, No. 323, dated 15th May 1889), the number of clerks in the Bellary taluk is nine and not ten as shown in column 4 of Appendix A., section II, to Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896. The Collector states that the additional shroff is still necessary and the shroff will therefore be retained. The net increase of cost will be Rs. 5 per mensem or Rs. 60 per annum.

The shroff in Wynaad and one of the shroffs at Chirakkal in the Malabar district are now paid Rs. 20 each. In paragraph 2 of its Order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, Government desires the Board to consider whether their pay should not be altered so as to conform to the general scale, any extra amount being paid in the shape of a local allowance, if necessary. The Collector is requested to favour the Board with his opinion on this point.

9. *Dufterbunds or Attenders.*—The Collector of Kistna recommends that the pay of dufterbunds should be raised to Rs. 8, as they are often entrusted with the duties of clerks and occupy a position between the taluk gumastahs and the inferior staff. The Board does not recommend the proposal, as Government has already decided in paragraph 2 (iv) of its order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, that no increase in the pay of this class of servants is called for.

10. *Peons.*—In paragraph 13 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, it was proposed to reduce the number of taluk peons (3,313) by 140 or to 3,173. The number of peons now proposed to be retained after a full consideration of the Collectors' proposals comes to 3,207 or 34 more than that originally recommended. The additional cost involved in the proposals will be Rs. 1,249 per mensem as shown below or Rs. 14,988 per annum against Rs. 12,540 arrived at by Government:—

	Cost per mensem. RS.
157 duffadars at Rs. 9 each ...	1,413
157 × 3 peons at „ 8 „ ...	3,768
157 × 5 „ at „ 7 „ ...	5,495
1,951 peons at „ 6 „ ...	11,706
Total ...	22,382
Cost per mensem of the existing establishment ...	21,133
Increase per mensem ...	1,249
Do. per annum ...	14,988

11. *Deputy Tahsildar's establishments—Clerks.*—In paragraph 3 (i) of its order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, Government approved the Board's proposal to raise from Rs. 15 to Rs. 20, the pay of the senior clerk in those offices which were provided with two or more clerks each. The Board placed the number of such offices at 138, but this number must now be raised to 140, a second clerk having been since proposed for the Venkatagirikóta Deputy Tahsildar's office in North Arcot (*vide* Appendix III) and the Kumbakónam Town Deputy Tahsildar's office having been added to the list as it appears that the two clerks employed there are paid Rs. 15 each, whereas in paragraph 15 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, it was assumed that one of them was paid Rs. 20. Adding to the above increase, the cost of the additional clerks * and of the increased pay or local allowances recommended in Appendix III for the existing clerks, the total increased cost will be Rs. 8,400 + Rs. 840 or Rs. 9,240 per annum.

	Cost per mensem. RS.
* Increase of pay to each of the two clerks in the Bissemkatak Deputy Tahsildar's office ...	10
A third clerk for the Vissannapet Deputy Tahsildar's office ...	15
A second clerk for the Venkatagirikóta Deputy Tahsildar's office ...	15
A third clerk for the Tirupati Deputy Tahsildar's office ...	15
Local allowance of Rs. 5 to each of the two clerks in the Deputy Tahsildar's office, Shevaroys ...	10
Increase of pay to the Head Clerk, Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office ...	5
Total ...	70
Cost per annum ...	840

12. *Shroffs.*—The Board did not originally contemplate any increase in the number of shroffs. The Collector of Vizagapatam, however, recommends that each of the seventeen Deputy Tahsildars' offices in his district which have no shroffs at present should be provided with a shroff in each. The Board considers it sufficient to allow a shroff on Rs. 10 for each of the twelve offices noted in the margin. The appointment of a shroff for Párvatípuram may be deferred as a temporary shroff is already employed and paid from the funds of the Kurupam and Belgaum estates under the Court of Wards. The cost of eleven shroffs will be Rs. 11 × 10 per mensem or Rs. 1,320 per annum. Adding to this Rs. 36 which represents the annual cost of an increase of Rs. 3 per mensem to the pay of the shroff in the Deputy Tahsildar's office, Coonoor, the total additional expenditure will be Rs. 1,356 per annum.

Anakapalle.	Koraput.
Párvatípuram.	Rayagada.
Veeravalle.	Salur.
Vizagapatam.	Bobbili.
Gunupur.	Nowrangapur.
Chípurupalle.	Malkanagiri.

The shroff in the Ramnad Branch treasury is paid Rs. 35 (*vide* Government Order, No. 2141, dated 6th October 1862). With reference to paragraph 3 (ii) of Government Order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, the Collector of Madura is requested to state whether his pay cannot be reduced to Rs. 15 so as to conform to the general scale.

13. *Dufterbunds.*—In paragraph 17 of its Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, the Board observed that there were seven Deputy Tahsildars' offices not provided with attenders. It is now proposed to provide four of these offices with an attender each. The Collector of Vizagapatam suggests and the Board recommends that the pay of the attender in the Bissemkatak Deputy Tahsildar's office be raised from Rs. 10 to 15. The extra expenditure involved in these proposals will be Rs. 39½ * per mensem or Rupees 474 per annum.

	Cost per mensem. RS.
* Entertainment of an attender in Ootacamund ...	7
Entertainment of an attender in Coonoor ...	7
Entertainment of an attender in Gudalur ...	7 + 3½ (a)
Entertainment of an attender in Shevaroys ...	7 + 3 (b)
Total ...	34½

(a) Wynaad allowance. (b) Local allowance.

14. *Peons.*—With reference to paragraph 18 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, the Collectors of Gódávari and Nilgiris report that the additional peons provided by Mr. Garstin for the Deputy Tahsildars' offices at Cocanada, Ootacamund and Coonoor are necessary. It is also proposed to allow an additional peon to the Deputy Tahsildar's office at Vissannapet. The extra cost involved will be Rs. 44 † per mensem or Rs. 528 per annum. Adding to this the cost of increasing the pay of one peon in each of 151 ‡ Deputy Tahsildars' offices, viz., Rs. 1,812 (*vide* paragraph 3 (iv) of Government Order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896), the increased cost under this head will be Rs. 2,340 per annum.

	Cost per mensem. RS.
† Cocanada (one additional peon) ...	6
Vissannapet (do.) ...	6
Ootacamund (two additional peons).	16
Coonoor (do.) ...	16
Total ...	44

‡ Excluding Kodaikánal Deputy Tahsildar's office which has already a peon on Rs. 7.

15. The total additional expenditure involved in the revised proposals for improving the position of the taluk establishments will thus be Rs. 1,03,644 per annum as detailed below against the estimate of Rs. 92,610 framed by Government:—

	RS.
Taluk clerks ...	61,746
„ Shroff ...	60
„ Muchis ...	13,188
„ Dufterbunds ...	252
„ Peons ...	14,988
Deputy Tahsildar's clerks ...	9,240
„ „ Shroffs ...	1,356
„ „ Dufterbunds ...	474
„ „ Peons ...	2,340
Total ...	1,03,644

If the recommendation made in paragraph 6 is accepted, the total additional cost will be Rs. 1,24,314.

On orders being passed on the above proposals, the necessary proposition statement will be submitted for transmission to the Government of India.

16. The Collector of Malabar suggests that in the future all appointments of taluk clerks should be made by Divisional-officers, as they are in a better position than Collectors to judge of the capabilities of these officials. Under existing orders,

Divisional-officers have power to appoint clerks on Rs. 20 and under in their divisions subject to report to, or veto by, the Collector (*vide* Appendix A to Board's Proceedings, No. 527, dated 11th September 1893). The same power may be extended to all classes of taluk gumastahs whatever their pay, but as Collectors do not generally interfere with the Divisional-officer's nominations, the Board does not consider that any other change in the present system is called for. On the other hand, it is desirable that Collectors should retain the power of vetoing in their hands so that they may be in a position to see that educated and competent men are appointed to taluk offices.

The Collector of Gódávari suggests that the pay of the last grade in the Huzur and Divisional offices should be raised to Rs. 25 and Rs. 20, respectively, so as to induce graduates to take up the appointments. As the proposal is outside the scope of the present scheme, the Collector should address the Board separately on the subject.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. C. C. CARR,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
,, all Collectors.

APPENDIX I.

District.	Taluks.	Number of existing clerks (other than Special gumastahs).	Special gumastahs for work connected with				Number allowed according to the Board's scale.	Number proposed by Collectors.	Board's recommendations.	Number finally proposed.	Reasons for alterations.
			Abkári.	Income-tax.	Special Funds.						
Ganjám ..	Berhampur ..	10	..	..	1		9	10	The Board approves of the Collector's proposals.	10	The Collector (Mr. C. J. Weir) protests against losing three hands. He urges unhealthiness of Berhampur and Goomsur and confusion of accounts in taluks which have had to be rectified recently by a special officer. It is further pointed out that the Berhampur and Goomsur taluks will increase in importance in a few years owing to the Rushikulya irrigation and that the work of the taluks will increase instead of by two, and to give Goomsur an extra hand so that the district strength may remain at 28.
	Chicacole ..	10	1	..	1		8	9		9	
	Goomsur ..	8	..	..	1		8	9		9	
Vizagapatam	Golgonda ..	6	1	..	..		7	8	The Board recommends that the Golgonda and Sarvasiddhi taluks may each be allowed an additional clerk.	8	According to scale Golgonda is entitled to nine hands and Sarvasiddhi to eight. The Collector (Mr. Horne) urges these facts, also the unhealthiness of Golgonda and the need for the extra hand at Sarvasiddhi. Even with an additional hand, Golgonda would have fewer hands than is allowed by the scale.
	Palkonda ..	8	1	..	1		8	8		8	
	Sarvasiddhi ..	6	1	..	..		6	7	The Collector (Mr. V. A. Brodie) protests against the reduction of one hand in the Rajahmundry taluk on the ground that the treasury transactions and other work in that office are very heavy and complicated owing to the fact that Rajahmundry is the central and the most important station in the district where nearly a dozen offices are located.	7	
	Rámachandrapuram.	9	1	..	1		10	10		10	
	Narsapur ..	9	1	..	1		9	9		9	
	Tanuku ..	9	1	..	1		9	9		9	
	Amalápuram	9	1	..	1		9	9		9	
	Bhimavaram	8	1	..	1		8	8		8	
	Ellore ..	8	1	..	1		8	8		8	
	Rajahmundry	9	1	..	1		8	9		9	
	Bhadráchalam	5	..	..	..		6	6		6	
	Yernagúdem	8	1	..	1		8	8		8	
	Peddapuram	8	1	..	1		8	8		8	
	Répalle ..	9	2	..	1		10	11	Répalle is a first-class taluk and stands on the same footing as first-class taluks in other districts. The Collectors of Nellore and Tanjore have made similar recommendations for their first-class taluks. The Board does not consider that there is need to strengthen further any of these taluks. The Collector's proposal to appoint a Stationary Sub-Magistrate for the Palnad taluk will be separately submitted for the orders of Government.	10	Répalle and Palnad each. The appointment of a Stationary Sub-Magistrate for Palnad is also recommended. The Collector further applies for an additional hand for which no change was proposed by the Board. In regard to Gudivada, it is pointed out among other things that the number of villages in the taluk is 226 while that in Répalle which is a first-class taluk is only 154 and that the revenue of Gudivada is elastic and will rise as high as that of Répalle (12 lakhs) as soon as the lands under the Pedabanka channel come fully under occupation. The Collector protests against the reduction of hands at Bandur for the reasons that the revenue work under the Collector.
	Gudivada ..	9	2	..	1		9	10		10	
	Bápatla ..	9	2	..	1		9	9		9	
	Palnad ..	9	..	..	1		10	11		10	
	Narasaopet ..	9	..	..	1		9	9		9	
	Guntúr ..	9	..	..	1		9	9		9	
Kistna ..	Sattenapalle ..	8	..	..	1		8	8		8	
	Bandur ..	9	2	..	1		8	9		9	
	Bezwada ..	8	1	..	1		8	8		8	
	Vinukonda ..	8	..	..	1		9	9		9	
	Nandigama ..	8	1	..	1		8	8		8	
	Nuzvid ..	8	2	..	1		8	9		9	

Goomsur taluks will greatly rise in importance in a few years owing to the Rushikulya irrigation and that the work of the taluks will increase instead of by two, and on that account. He therefore proposes to retain the present strength at Berhampur, to reduce Chicacole by one hand only instead of by two, and to give Goomsur an extra hand so that the district strength may remain at 28.

According to scale Golgonda is entitled to nine hands and Sarvasiddhi to eight. The Collector (Mr. Horne) urges these facts, also the unhealthiness of Golgonda and the need for the extra hand at Sarvasiddhi. Even with an additional hand, Golgonda would have fewer hands than is allowed by the scale.

The Collector (Mr. V. A. Brodie) protests against the reduction of one hand in the Rajahmundry taluk on the ground that the treasury transactions and other work in that office are very heavy and complicated owing to the fact that Rajahmundry is the central and the most important station in the district where nearly a dozen offices are located.

Mr. Atkinson wants an additional hand for *Répalle* and *Palnad* which are already allowed one extra hand each. The appointment of a Stationary Sub-Magistrate for Palnad is also recommended. The Collector further applies for an additional hand for each of the taluks of Gudivada and Nuzvid for which no change was proposed by the Board. In regard to Gudivada, it is pointed out among other things that the number of villages in the taluk is 226 while that in Répalle which is a first-class taluk is only 154 and that the revenue of Gudivada is elastic and will rise as high as that of Répalle (12 lakhs) as soon as the lands under the Pedabanka channel come fully under occupation. The Collector protests against the reduction of hands at Bandur for the reasons that the revenue work under the Collector has increased (the number of papers in 1895 being 11,212 as against 7,801 in 1893) and as the taluk has no Stationary Sub-Magistrate. As regards Bandur the present strength of the establishment will be left uninterfered with for the special reasons urged by the Collector.

Pending orders on the above proposal, the number of clerks already provided for the taluk will be allowed to stand. As regards Gudivada, the Board supports the Collector's recommendation. The additional clerk applied for for the Nuzvid taluk may also be allowed as the revenue work has been gradually increasing and the direct collection of water-tax in the villages forming the Gudur zemindari entails additional work on the taluk establishment.

As regards Bandur the present strength of the establishment will be left uninterfered with for the special reasons urged by the Collector.

District.	Taluks.	Number of existing clerks (other than Special gumastahs).	Special gumastahs for work connected with			Number allowed according to the Board's scale.	Number proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for alterations.	Board's recommendations.	Number finally proposed.
			Abkári.	Income-tax.	Special Funds.					
Nellore ..	Nellore	9	1	..	1	10	11	The Collector (Mr. Scott) recommends the entertainment of an additional clerk for each of the taluks of Nellore, Gudur, Ongole and Kandukur and protests against the proposed reduction in Atmakúru. But no special reasons have been assigned in any of these cases.	None of these taluks are shown to deserve special treatment. The remarks made in the case of Répalle apply to Nellore.	10
	Gudur	9	1	..	1	9	10			9
	Ongole	9	1	..	1	9	10			9
	Atmakúra	9	..	..	1	8	9			8
	Kavali	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Kandukur	8	1	..	1	8	9			8
	Rapur	8	..	..	1	8	8			8
	Udayagiri	8	..	..	1	8	8			8
	Kanigiri	8	..	..	1	8	8			8
Cuddapah ..	Cuddapah	10	1	..	1	9	10	The Collector (Mr. A. C. Tate) points out that the proposal to reduce Cuddapah and Proddatur overlooks the fact that special clerks were allowed to these taluks on account of the Kurnool-Cuddapah canal and recommends the retention of one extra clerk out of two at Proddatur and of one at Cuddapah (*vide* Government Order, No. 1134, Revenue, dated 17th September 1883, and Board's Proceedings, No. 282, dated 17th April 1889).	The Board supports the Collector's recommendation.	10
	Vayalpad	8	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Pullampet	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Kadiri	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Proddatur	10	1	..	1	8	9			9
	Pulivendla	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Jammalamadugu ..	9	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Madanapalle ..	8	..	..	1	8	8			8
	Ráyachóti	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Badvel	8	..	..	1	9	9			9
	Sidhout	8	1	..	1	9	9			9
Anantapur.	Tadpatri	9	1	..	1	9	8	The Collector (Mr. Mounsey) points out that Kalyandrug needs the full establishment of a fifth grade taluk (eight clerks), as the existing establishment cannot cope with the work and that at least one more hand should be added to the present strength: he offers to give up one clerk, if necessary, from Tadpatri which is a light taluk.	The Boardapproves the Collector's recommendation which is to transfer one of the clerks from Tadpatri to Kalyandrug.	8
	Gooty	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Anantapur	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Hindúpur	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Penukonda	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Madakasíra ..	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Dharmavaram ..	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Kalyandrug ..	6	1	..	1	6	8			8
Bellary ..	Bellary	9	1	..	1	9	9	The Board supposed that the Bellary taluk office had ten clerks and proposed to reduce the strength by one. The Collector (Mr. Tremenheere) points out that the 10th clerk is a shroff and that no reduction is called for. Hospet is entitled, according to scale, to nine clerks and the Collector contends for the full number as the work there has hitherto been badly done.	The Collector's proposals are approved ..	7
	Adóni	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Hospet	8	..	..	1	8	9			9
	Alur	9	..	..	1	9	9			9
	Kúdligi	8	..	..	1	8	8			9
	Harpanahali ..	8	..	..	1	9	9			8
	Rayadrug	8	..	..	1	8	8			9
	Hadagalli	8	..	..	1	9	9			8
Kurnool ..	Keilkuntla	9	1	..	1	9	9	The Collector (Mr Mullaly) states that Pattikonda should be retained at its present strength as it is a litigious and heavy taluk and accordingly suggests that the additional clerk proposed for Ramallakot may be allowed for Pattikonda as the work in the former taluk is comparatively light. As regards Nandyal the Collector points out that an extra clerk is necessary on account of the canal and that no reduction should therefore be made in the existing number.	The Collector's proposals are approved. The Board observes that one clerk on Rs. 15 was sanctioned for Nandyal for canal work—*vide* Government Order, No. 1134, dated 17th September 1883, and Board's Proceedings, No. 282, dated 17th April 1889.	9
	Nandyal	10	1	..	1	9	10			10
	Ramallakot	8	1	..	1	9	8			8
	Nandikotkur ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Pattikonda ..	9	1	..	1	8	9			9
	Markapur	8	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Cumbum	8	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Sirvel	8	1	..	1	9	9			9

District.	Taluks.	Number of existing clerks (other than special gumastahs).	Special gumastahs for work connected with			Number allowed according to the Board's scale.	Number proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for alterations.	Board's recommendations.	Number finally proposed.
			Abkári.	Income-tax.	Special Funds.					
Chingleput..	Madurántakam ..	9	1	..	1	9	9	The Collector (Mr. Forbes) states that one clerk in each of the taluk offices at Chingleput and Saidapet should not be dispensed with as the treasury work in the former is heavy owing to the location of several other offices at the station, while in the latter the collection work is very troublesome involving the issue of a large number of processes.	The Board approves the Collector's recommendations.	9
	Conjeeveram ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Saidapet	9	..	..	1	8	9			9
	Tiruvallúr	9	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Chingleput	9	1	..	1	8	9			9
	Ponnéri	9	1	..	1	8	8			8
North Arcot.	Walajapet	10	1	..	1	10	10	The Collector (Mr. Wynne) protests against reduction of Vellore and Chittoor which are heavy offices and points out that Chendragiri and Polur have both fewer hands than is allowed by the scale. In consideration of this fact he requests that the district strength may be left undisturbed.	Do. do.	10
	Arcot	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Wandiwash ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Gudiyáttam ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Vellore	9	1	1	1	8	9			9
	Chittoor	9	1	..	1	8	9			9
	Chendragiri ..	7	1	..	1	7	7			7
	Polur	7	1	..	1	7	7			7
	Palmanér	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
South Arcot.	Tindivanam ..	9	1	..	1	10	10	The Collector (Mr. A. E. Castlestuart Stuart) points out that Kallakurchi has no Deputy Tahsildar and is otherwise heavy; also that it is hard to give the same establishment to Tiruvannámalai which is a much lighter taluk. He therefore recommends that the number of hands at Kallakurchi may not be reduced.	Do. do.	10
	Villupuram ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Chidambaram ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Cuddalore	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Vriddhachalam ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Tirukkóyilúr ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Kallakurchi ..	9	1	..	1	8	9			9
	Tiruvannámalai ..	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
Tanjore ..	Tanjore	9	1	..	1	10	11	The Collector (Mr. Stokes) recommends the addition of one clerk to each of the offices at Tanjore, Kumbakónam and Mannárgudi and states that the work in the last-named taluk is not done well even with the existing establishment.	The proposal to retain Mannárgudi at its present strength is approved. The taluks of Tanjore and Kumbakónam have already been strengthened by the revision scheme and the Board considers that nothing further need be done for them.	10
	Kumbakónam ..	9	2	1	1	10	11			9
	Nannilam	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Negapatam	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Máyavaram ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Pattukkóttai ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Tirutturaippúndi ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Mannárgudi ..	9	1	..	1	8	9			9
	Shiyáli	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
Trichinopoly.	Trichinopoly ..	9	1	1	1	10	10	The Collector (Mr. Batten) points out that Perambalúr is a heavy taluk, because there is no Deputy Tahsildar and asks that the present strength may be retained.	The Board supports the Collector's recommendation.	10
	Musiri	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Udaiyárpálaiyam ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Perambalúr ..	9	1	..	1	8	9			9
	Kulittalai	9	1	..	1	8	8			8
Madura ..	Madura	9	1	1	1	9	9	No alterations are proposed	....	9
	Dindigul	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Tirumangalam ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Mélúr	9	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Palni	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Periyakulam ..	9	1	..	1	8	8			8

District.	Taluks.	Number of existing clerks (other than Special gumastahs).	Special gumastahs for work connected with: Abkári.	Income-tax.	Special Funds.	Number allowed according to the Board's scale.	Number proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for alterations.	Board's recommendations.	Number finally proposed.
Tinnevelly ..	Srívaikuntam ..	9	1	..	1	10	10	The Collector (Mr. Higgens) applies for an additional clerk for Nángunéri alleging that the work in connection with the revenue collections and minor irrigation works is heavy. He also recommends that Ambásamudram be given a Stationary Sub-Magistrate and that the pay of certain Deputy Tahsildars be raised from Rs. 100 to 120.	The Board does not consider that Nángunéri requires special treatment. The Collector's proposal for the appointment of a Stationary Sub-Magistrate for Ambásamudram will be separately submitted to Government. As regards increase of pay to certain Deputy Tahsildars, the Board considers that the proposal is beyond the scope of the present reference and the scale already adopted with reference to the then state of the work cannot now be altered in favour of a particular district.	10
	Tinnevelly ..	9	1	* 1	1	9	9			9
	Srívilliputtúr ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Ambásamudram ..	9	1	..	1	10	10			10
	Nángunéri	9	1	..	1	9	10			9
	Ottappidáram ..	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Sáttúr	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Sankaranayinárkóyil	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Tenkási	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
Coimbatore ..	Erode	9	1	..	1	10	10	The Collector (Mr. Bradley) deprecates reduction at Karúr which is a heavy taluk on account of irrigation disputes and asks for an extra clerk at Kollegal which is indeed entitled to nine clerks according to scale. Kollegal being notoriously unhealthy, there is ample reason for giving it the full establishment according to scale.	Kollegal being notoriously unhealthy may be strengthened by the addition of one hand as proposed, and Karúr retained at its present strength.	10
	Palladam	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Coimbatore	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Satyamangalam ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Dhárápuram ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Karúr	9	1	..	1	8	9			8
	Pollachi	9	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Udamalpet	9	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Bhaváni	8	1	..	1	8	8			9
	Kollegal	8	1	..	1	8	9			10
Salem ..	Salem	9	1	1	1	10	10	No alterations are proposed	....	10
	Tiruchengódu ..	9	1	..	1	10	10			9
	Námakkal	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Atur	9	1	..	1	9	9			10
	Hosúr	9	1	..	1	10	10			9
	Krishnagiri	8	1	..	1	9	9			8
	Uttangarai	8	1	..	1	8	8			9
	Dharmapuri ..	8	1	..	1	9	9			8
	Tiruppattúr ..	8	1	..	1	8	8			
South Canara	Mangalore	9	2	..	1	9	9	The Collector (Mr. Welsh) points out that Coondapoor is heavy, because it has no Deputy Tahsildar and that it has received an addition of 20 villages from Udipi. He therefore recommends that Coondapoor may be retained at its present strength. He also recommends the addition of a clerk to Uppinangadi, taking away, if necessary, one from Kasaragod from which a number of villages was recently transferred to Uppinangadi (*vide* Government Order, No. 831, Revenue, dated 20th December 1895).	The Collector's proposals are approved ..	9
	Udipi	9	2	..	1	9	9			9
	Kasaragod	9	2	..	1	9	8			8
	Uppinangadi ..	8	2	..	1	8	9			9
	Coondapoor	9	2	..	1	8	9			9
Malabar ..	Ponnáni	10	1	..	..	10	10	The Collector (Mr. Hewetson) points out that an extra clerk at Chirakkal was specially given to help the Tahsildar in treasury work on the abolition of the Cannanore sub-treasury. He accepts the reduction in Kurumbranát, but proposes to transfer a shroff from Chirakkal to relieve that office. He also asks for another hand for Wynaad which is entitled according to scale to ten clerks, *i.e.*, to two in excess of the present number and in fact two clerks have already been sanctioned for it in anticipation of the present revision.	The Collector's proposals are approved ..	10
	Palghat	9	1	..	..	9	9			9
	Ernad	9	1	..	..	9	9			9
	Walavanad ..	9	1	..	..	9	9			9
	Wynaad	8	..	..	..	9	10			10
	Kurumbranát ..	8	1	..	..	8	8			8
	Chirakkal	8	1	..	..	8	9			9
	Calicut	8	1	..	..	8	8			8
	Kóttayam	8	1	..	..	8	8			8

* For six months.

APPENDIX II.

District.	Taluks.	Existing number of peons	Number allowable according to Board's scale.	Number proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for alterations.	Board's recommendations.	Number finally proposed.
Ganjám	Goomsur	22	20	22	The Collector points out that no reduction is feasible in the number of peons in the Berhampur and Goomsur taluks, as in the former, extra peons are required for the two additional Revenue Inspectors recently sanctioned on account of Rushikulya irrigation (Government Order, No. 506, Revenue, dated 1st October 1896), and as in the latter many peons are always ill owing to the unhealthy climate.	The Board considers that, for the reasons urged by the Collector, the existing number of peons in Goomsur and Berhampur may be left undisturbed.	22
	Chicacole	21	20	20			20
	Berhampur	21	20	21			21
Vizagapatam ..	Golgonda	16	16	16	No changes proposed	....	16
	Palkonda	17	17	17			17
	Sarvasiddhi ..	15	15	15			15
Godávari ..	Rámachandrapuram.	22	20	22	The Collector protests against the abolition of two peons in the taluks of Peddapuram, Amalápuram, Ramachandrapuram, Ellore, Tanuku and Narsapur, as the Tahsildars concerned have to depute one or two peons to assist the dependent Deputy Tahsildars who have much revenue work to do and sub-jails to look after. He also points out that the existing number of peons in Rajahmundry is necessary, as it is a central place through which the officers of several departments and troops constantly pass. The Collector also proposes (*vide* paragraph 2 (v) of Government Order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896) an increase of two peons to the Bhadráchalam taluk.	The Board recommends that, for the reasons urged by the Collector, the reduction in the number of peons may be limited to one instead of two in the six taluks having dependent Deputy Tahsildars' divisions and that the existing number of peons in Rajahmundry may be left undisturbed. The additional peons proposed for Bhadráchalam may be sanctioned.	21
	Narsapur	22	20	22			21
	Tanuku	22	20	22			21
	Amalápuram ..	22	20	22			21
	Bhimavaram ..	21	19	19			19
	Ellore	21	19	21			20
	Rajahmundry ..	21	19	21			21
	Bhadráchalam ..	8	8	10			10
	Yernagúdem ..	21	19	19			19
	Peddapuram ..	21	19	21			20
Kistna	Gudivada	22	22	22	The Collector states that a reduction of the number of peons in the taluks of Bandur, Bápatla, Guntúr, Sattenapalle and Narasaraopet is not possible, as two of the taluk peons are detailed for doing duty under the Stationary Sub-Magistrate and the Division Deputy Tahsildar (the peons allotted to them being insufficient) and as the remaining peons are barely sufficient for the performance of their multifarious duties in the taluks.	The Board recommends that one extra peon may be allowed for the taluks of Bandur, Bápatla and Guntúr as there are dependent Deputy Tahsildars' offices in those taluks. As the scheme allows a muchi for each taluk, the peons now said to be employed in doing that work will be available for other duties.	22
	Bandur	21	19	21			20
	Bápatla	22	21	22			22
	Guntúr	21	19	21			20
	Sattenapalle ..	21	19	21			19
	Répalle	23	23	23			23
	Nandigama	21	21	21			21
	Bezwada	21	21	21			21
	Narasaraopet ..	21	19	21			19
	Vinukonda	21	21	21			21
	Palnad	21	21	21			21
	Nuzvid	21	22	22			22
Nellore	Nellore	22	21	21	No changes proposed	....	21
	Gudur	22	21	21			21
	Ongole	21	20	20			20
	Atmakúru	21	19	19			19
	Kavali	21	21	21			21
	Kandukur	21	19	19			19
	Rapur	21	21	21			21
	Udayagiri	21	21	21			21
	Kanigiri	21	21	21			21
Cuddapah ..	Cuddapah	23	21	21	Do.	....	21
	Ráyachóti	21	20	20			20
	Kadiri	21	20	20			20
	Voyalpad	21	22	22			22
	Madanapalle ..	22	20	20			20
	Jammalamadugu ..	21	19	19			19
	Proddatur	22	20	20			20

District.	Taluks.	Existing number of peons.	Number allowable according to Board's scale.	Number proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for alterations.	Board's recommendations.	Number finally proposed
Cuddapah—*cont.*	Pulivendla	21	19	19	No changes proposed	....	19
	Badvel	21	21	21			21
	Sidhout	21	21	21			21
	Pullampet	21	20	20			20
Anantapur ..	Anantapur	21	19	19	Do.	....	19
	Penukonda ..	21	19	19			19
	Hindupur	21	21	21			21
	Madakasira ..	21	21	21			21
	Dharmavaram ..	18	21	21			21
	Gooty	22	20	20			20
	Tadpatri	22	20	20			20
	Kalyandrug ..	18	21	21			21
Bellary	Bellary	21	20	20	Do.	....	20
	Rayadrug	21	21	21			21
	Hadagalli	21	21	21			21
	Harpanahalli ..	21	21	21			21
	Hospet	21	20	20			20
	Kudligi	21	20	20			20
	Alúr	21	21	21			21
	Adóni	21	20	20			20
Kurnool ..	Ramallakot	22	22	22	Do.	....	22
	Nandikotkur ..	21	22	22			22
	Nandyal	22	20	20			20
	Sirvel	21	22	22			22
	Cumbum	21	21	21			21
	Markapur	21	22	22			22
	Pattikonda	21	20	20			20
	Koilkuntla	21	21	21			21
Chingleput ..	Saidapet	22	20	22	The Collector considers that it is not possible to reduce the present strength of peons in the Saidapet and Tiruvallúr taluks. In the former taluk about 350 summonses have to be issued monthly (besides processes under Act II of 1864). Moreover, the vicinity of Saidapet to Madras, the location of the Collector's head-quarters at the station and of Government House at Guindy as well as the occasional demands for services in connection with the movements of troops through the taluk all add to the calls on the services of peons. As regards Tiruvallúr, it is pointed out that many of the villages lie at great distances, the most distant villages since the transfer of the Kanchinad taluk of the Kalahasti zemindari from the North Arcot district being 65 miles from the taluk head-quarters (*vide* G.O., No. 314, dated 21st April 1893).	The Board approves the Collector's proposals.	22
	Conjeeveram ..	22	20	20			20
	Madurántakam ..	22	20	20			20
	Tiruvallúr ..	21	20	21			21
	Chingleput ..	21	19	19			19
	Ponneri	21	19	19			19
North Arcot ..	Chittoor	22	21	21	No changes proposed	....	21
	Chandragiri ..	21	19	19			19
	Palmanér	21	21	21			21
	Arcot	22	21	21			21
	Vellore	21	19	19			19
	Gudiyáttam ..	21	20	20			20
	Wallajapet ..	22	21	21			21
	Wandiwash ..	22	22	22			22
	Polúr	21	20	20			20

District.	Taluks.	Existing number of peons.	Number allowable according to Board's scale.	Number proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for alterations.	Board's recommendations.	Number finally proposed.
South Arcot ..	Cuddalore	21	21	21	No changes proposed	....	21
	Chidambaram ..	22	21	21			21
	Tindivanam ..	24	23	23			23
	Tiruvannámalai ..	21	20	20			20
	Villupuram ..	22	21	21			21
	Vriddhachalam ..	21	21	21			21
	Tirukkóyilúr ..	22	21	21			21
	Kallakurchi ..	21	21	21			21
Tanjore	Shiyali	21	19	21	The Collector states that no reduction in the number of peons is possible as twelve peons (the number proposed to be reduced) are employed as sub-jail warders. As regards Tanjore he observes that as the taluk is extensive, peons going to distant villages are unable to return soon and that as the head-quarters taluk of the district it requires more peons than other taluks.	All the taluks in Tanjore have been provided with stationary Sub-Magistrates and the duty of looking after the sub jail at the taluk head-quarters devolves on one of the peons of the stationary Sub-Magistrates and not on the taluk peons—*vide* G.O., No. 1329, Judicial, dated 1st June 1894. The only taluks in which an extra peon will be required are those of Máyavaram, Mannárgudi and Pattukkóttai in each of which there is a dependent Deputy Tahsildar with a sub-jail in charge of revenue peons. The number of peons already allowed for the Tanjore taluk is 22 and it is not proposed to make any reduction. The Board does not consider that any addition to the present strength is called for.	19
	Máyavaram ..	21	19	21			20
	Kumbakónam ..	22	21	22			21
	Negapatam ..	21	19	21			19
	Nannilam	22	20	22			20
	Pattukkóttai ..	21	20	21			21
	Tanjore	22	22	22			22
	Mannárgudi ..	21	20	21			21
	Tirutturaippúndi ..	22	21	22			21
Trichinopoly ..	Trichinopoly ..	22	21	22	The Collector states that the present strength of peons in the Trichinopoly taluk cannot be reduced as the Trichinopoly town is the head-quarters station of the district and of the South Indian Railway Company. Two native regiments are also stationed there. The Collector, however, offers to spare a peon from the Kulittalai taluk for which he considers 19 peons sufficient.	The Board approves the Collector's proposals.	22
	Musiri	22	21	21			21
	Kulittalai	21	20	19			19
	Perambalúr ..	21	20	20			20
	Udaiyárpálaiyam ..	22	22	22			22
Madura	Periyakulam ..	20	20	20	The Collector states that it is not possible to reduce the number of peons in the Madura taluk without seriously interfering with the despatch of work, as, Madura being the head-quarters of the district, special calls on the services of the peons are frequent. The number of peons for this taluk was twenty-two before 1891 and as that number was insufficient, a peon from each of the four taluks of Periyakulam, Dindigul, Mélúr and Tirumangalam was transferred to it—*vide* G.O., No. 194, Financial, dated 17th March 1891.	A stationary Sub-Magistrate with *two* peons having, since 1891, been sanctioned, the number of peons will be reduced from 26 to 24.	20
	Mélúr	20	20	20			20
	Dindigul	21	22	22			22
	Palni	19	21	21			21
	Madura	26	22	26			24
	Tirumangalam ..	21	21	21			21
Tinnevelly ..	Tinnevelly	22	20	20	The Collector states that the Nángunéri and Ottappidáram taluks are very extensive having an area of 701 and 1,061 square miles, respectively. He adds that the work of the latter taluk is particularly heavy owing to the frequent necessity for services of notices in inquiries relating to the appointment of village officers in zemindari and inam villages, refund of surplus sale-proceeds of impounded cattle, payment of compensation and for collection of income-tax, land-cess, &c.	For the special reasons urged by the Collector the Board considers that the existing number of peons in the Nángunéri taluk (which has a dependent Deputy Tahsildar) which has 214 villages may be left undisturbed and that the number attached to Ottappidáram may be reduced by one instead of by two.	20
	Ottappidáram ..	21	19	21			20
	Srívaikuntam ..	22	22	22			22
	Nángunéri	22	21	22			22
	Tenkási	21	19	19			19
	Ambásamudram ..	21	21	21			21
	Srívilliputtúr ..	22	21	21			21
	Sáttúr	21	20	20			20
	Sankaranayinárkóyil.	21	19	19			19

District.	Taluks.	Existing number of peons.	Number allowable according to Board's scale.	Number proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for alterations.	Board's recommendations.	Number finally proposed.
Coimbatore ..	Coimbatore	22	21	21	The Collector states that the reduction of one peon proposed in each of the Erode and Dhárápuram taluks should not be insisted upon, as there is a Stock Inspector and pony-breeding operations are going on in each. He adds that one peon is permanently attached to the Stock Inspector and one or more are always employed in connection with the Government stallions.	In the circumstances brought to notice by the Collector the present strength of peons in the Erode and Dhárápuram taluks will be retained.	21
	Karúr	21	19	19			19
	Dhárapuram ..	21	20	21			21
	Bhaváni	21	21	21			21
	Erode	22	21	22			22
	Udamalpet	21	19	19			19
	Palladam	22	20	20			20
	Pollachi	21	19	19			19
	Satyamangalam ..	22	21	21			21
	Kollegal	21	21	21			21
Salem	Salem	22	21	21	No changes proposed	....	21
	Tiruchengodu ..	22	22	22			22
	Námakkal	21	20	20			20
	Atur	21	20	20			20
	Hosúr	21	22	22			22
	Krishnagiri ..	21	21	21			21
	Uttangarai	21	22	22			22
	Dharmapuri ..	21	22	22			22
	Tiruppattúr ..	21	19	19			19
South Canara ..	Mangalore	21	20	21	The Collector states that no reduction can be made in the existing number of peons. He points out that the district being hilly, communications are difficult and have to be carried on mainly by peons and that taluk peons are attached to sub-jails at the taluk head-quarters and are deputed to work under Deputy Tahsildars. There is a Deputy Tahsildar in each taluk except in Coondapoor.	There is a Stationary Sub-Magistrate at the head-quarters of each of the taluks and the duty of looking after the sub-jail devolves under Government Order, No. 1329, Judicial, dated 1st June 1894, on one of the Sub-Magistrate's peons. There is therefore no necessity for allowing taluk peons to serve as sub-jail warders. The four taluks in which there are dependent Deputy Tahsildars will be allowed one additional peon each.	21
	Uppinangadi ..	21	19	21			20
	Udipi	21	19	21			20
	Coondapoor ..	21	19	21			19
	Kasaragod	21	19	21			20
Malabar	Calicut	21	19	19	The Collector points out that the ansoms in Malabar are, unlike East Coast villages, very extensive, and the larger the number of peons who are the means of communication between the taluk and the village officers, the greater the facility in the despatch of business; and the Sub-Collector in whose division the taluks of Chirrakkal, Kottayam and Kurumbranát are situated is of opinion that if the proposed increase to the pay of peons cannot be granted without reducing their number he would much rather dispense with the increase in pay. The Special Assistant Collector in whose division the Ernad and Walavanad taluks are situated is also against the proposed reduction.	In the circumstances reported, the Board would recommend that the number of peons in each of the taluks of Kottayam and Kurumbranát be reduced by one instead of by two as originally proposed.	19
	Chirrakkal	21	20	21			20
	Kottayam	21	19	21			20
	Kurumbranát ..	21	19	21			20
	Palghat	21	21	21			21
	Ponnáni	21	21	21			21
	Ernad	21	20	21			20
	Walavanad	21	20	21			20
	Wynaad	21	21	21			21

APPENDIX III.

PROPOSALS for additional establishments to certain Deputy Tahsildars' offices.

District.	Deputy Tahsildar's office.	Present strength and pay.	Strength and pay proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for addition to the number and the increase of pay recommended.	Board's recommendation.	Number of hands and pay finally approved by the Board.
			Clerks.			
Vizagapatam.	Bissemkatak ..	One clerk on Rs. 20. One clerk on Rs. 15.	One clerk on Rs. 25. One clerk on Rs. 20.	The Collector proposes that the pay of the clerks may be raised by Rs. 5 so that proper men may be obtained for the posts in that unhealthy place.	The Board's Fourth Member is of opinion that when the present scale of pay was sanctioned for the Agency clerks, Bissemkatak was not liberally treated. The division had only been created a short time before and it was not known that the place was so malarious. The Board therefore supports the Collector's recommendation.	One clerk on Rs. 25. Do. on ,, 20.
Gódávari ..	Cocanada	Three clerks on Rs. 15 each.	One additional clerk on Rs. 15.	With reference to paragraph 14 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, the Collector states that there is no necessity for an additional clerk in the Deputy Tahsildars' offices at Tuni and Pittapur. But as regards Cocanada he states that a fourth clerk is necessary on the grounds that the division has a good deal of delta irrigation and that as the town is a commercial seaport, a Municipality and the head-quarters of several offices, the Deputy Tahsildar's work is heavy and that when the office of the Superintendent of Sea Customs, Coringa, who has been giving relief to the Deputy Tahsildar by attending to collection work and keeping the sub-treasury in his charge is amalgamated with the Separate Revenue Department, the whole work of the division will devolve on the Deputy Tahsildar.	The Board considers that the question may be considered when the anticipated amalgamation of the Sea Customs Superintendent, Coringa, with the Separate Revenue Department is actually carried out.	One clerk on Rs. 20.* Two clerks on Rs. 15 each.
Kistna ..	Tenali, Ponnur, Mangalagiri, Jaggiapet, Tumurukode, Vissannapet, Avanigadda and Kaikulur.	Two clerks on Rs. 15 in each.	A third clerk on Rs. 15 for each.	The chief reason assigned by the Collector for proposing the increase is that the dependent Deputy Tahsildars have "from being a superior sort of Revenue Inspectors developed into Tahsildars of the divisions *minus* the latters' returns." The Collector states that the work in Vissannapet which is an independent Deputy Tahsildar's division is heavy (the number of Revenue and Magisterial cases disposed of in a year being 3,203 and 254, respectively).	The Board believes that the heaviness of work complained of is chiefly due to the tendency on the part of Tahsildars of throwing work which they should do and for which taluk offices are intended on Revenue Inspectors and Deputy Tahsildars. If this is avoided the necessity for the additional help proposed will not be felt. An additional clerk for the Vissannapet division seems necessary and provision will accordingly be made.	Tenali .. One on Rs. 20. ,, on ,, 15 Ponnur .. ,, on ,, 20. ,, on ,, 15. Mangalagiri .. ,, on ,, 20. ,, on ,, 15. Jaggiapet .. ,, on ,, 20. ,, on ,, 15. Tumurukode .. ,, on ,, 20. ,, on ,, 15. Avanigadda .. ,, on ,, 20. ,, on ,, 15. Kaikulur .. ,, on ,, 20. ,, on ,, 15. Vissannapet .. ,, on ,, 20 Two on ,, 15 each.
North Arcot.	Venkatagirikota ..	One clerk on Rs. 15.	One additional clerk.	There is only one clerk in the Deputy Tahsildar's office (*vide* paragraph 14 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896). The Collector reports that in consideration of the unhealthiness of the locality and of the fact that he has transferred eight villages of the Palmanér taluk to the Venkatagirikota division for magisterial purposes, the services of another clerk are required.	The Board approves the Collector's recommendation. He will, however, be requested to report the number of magisterial cases disposed of within the last three years.	One on Rs. 20. ,, on ,, 15.

* The pay of the senior clerk in each Deputy Tahsildar's office is shown as Rs. 20.

Proposals for additional establishments to certain Deputy Tahsildars' offices—*cont.*

District.	Deputy Tahsildar's office.	Present strength and pay.	Strength and pay proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for addition to the number and the increase of pay recommended.	Board's recommendation.	Number of hands and pay finally approved by the Board.
				Clerks—cont.		
....	Tirupati	Two clerks on Rs. 15 each.	One additional clerk.	The Collector states that the work in the Deputy Tahsildar's sub-treasury has increased considerably owing to the abolition of the sub-treasuries at Kálahasti, Puttúr and Tiruttani in 1893 as shown below:—	The Board supports the Collector's proposal.	One on Rs. 20. Two on Rs. 15 each.
		Average transactions for a month *before* the abolition of the sub-treasuries at Kálahasti, Puttúr and Tiruttani.		Average transactions for a month *after* the abolition of the sub-treasuries at Kálahasti, Puttúr and Tiruttani.		
		Receipts.	Charges.	Receipts.	Charges.	
		RS. 10,996	RS. 5,813	RS. 14,781	RS. 8,712	
		The Collector further points out that Tirupati District Munsif's court deposits are now being received into and paid from Chandragiri sub-treasury which is nearly seven miles from Tirupati to the great inconvenience of the parties and that when the inconvenience was represented by the District Judge he was informed that these transactions could not be conducted at Tirupati for want of a separate clerk for attending to the treasury work. Of the two clerks, one is said to be fully occupied with Magisterial work and the other attends to both revenue and treasury work and experiences great difficulty in getting through it. The Collector therefore recommends that a third clerk may be sanctioned.				
....	Arni	Two clerks on Rs. 15 each.	A Head accountant on Rs. 30.	The Inspector-General of Registration having objected to the Sub-registrar of *Arni* being in charge of the sub-treasury during the Deputy Tahsildar's absence on tour, the Collector proposed that an Head accountant on Rs. 30 who should be required to furnish a security of Rs. 500 should be appointed for the office, but the Board, in its Proceedings No. 495, dated 13th November 1894, expressed its inability to support the proposal in view of the then financial pressure and directed that the Head gumastah should continue to look after the work. The Collector now re-opens the proposal.	The pay of one of the clerks is to be raised and there seems no sufficient reason why the existing arrangement cannot be continued.	One on Rs. 20. ,, on ,, 15.
South Arcot.	Mannárgudi ..	Three clerks on Rs. 15 each.	....	The Collector states that a clerk from each of the two Deputy Tahsildars' offices has been working in the Sea Customs offices at Porto Novo and Cuddalore, respectively, and recommends that they may be restored to their offices as the work there is heavy and that the Sea Customs Department can afford to have a separate establishment of its own in consequence of the introduction of the Tariff Act.	The Board observes that the clerk of Panruti who was working in the Sea Customs office at Cuddalore was transferred to Chengam Deputy Tahsildar's office as there was only one clerk in that division. *Vide* Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 1721, dated 15th March 1893. As regards the clerk working at Porto Novo the Board considers that as the Sea Customs Superintendent at that station is exercising Magisterial powers, the clerk from Mannárgudi will still be required at Porto Novo for Magisterial work.	
	Panruti	Two clerks on Rs. 15 each.				

Proposals for additional establishments to certain Deputy Tahsildars' offices—*cont.*

District.	Deputy Tahsildar's office.	Present strength and pay.	Strength and pay proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for addition to the number and the increase of pay recommended.	Board's recommendation.	Number of hands and pay finally approved by the Board.
				Clerks—cont.		
Salem ..	Shevaroys	One clerk on Rs. 20. One clerk on Rs. 15.	Local allowance of Rs. 5 to each.	In paragraph 4 of its order No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, Government observed with reference to paragraph 15 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, that the question of the grant of a local allowance to the clerks in the Deputy Tahsildar's office should be fully considered and submitted for its orders. The Collector recommends that a local allowance of Rs. 5 may be granted to each of the clerks.	The Board supports the Collector's recommendation.	One clerk on Rs. 20. Local allowance Rs. 5. One clerk on Rs. 15. Local allowance Rs. 5.
The Nilgiris.	Coonoor	Pay of the Head clerk Rs. 25.	Pay of the Head clerk Rs. 30.	The Collector recommends that the pay of the Head clerk in the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office may be raised from Rs. 25 to Rs. 30 so as to be on a par with that of the Head clerk in Ootacamund and Gudalúr. It is further pointed out that Gudalúr where the treasury transactions are not so heavy as in Coonoor has been provided with a Taluk Sheristadar (Government Order, No. 1162, Revenue, dated 5th December 1891) while only an accountant on Rs. 25 has been sanctioned to attend to the treasury work at the latter place.	There seems no objection to the pay of the Head clerk in the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office being raised as proposed by the Collector.	Head clerk on Rs. 30.
				Shroffs.		
Vizagapatam.	(1) Anakápalle. (2) Párvatipur. (3) Veeravalle. (4) Vizagapatam. (5) Gunupur. (6) Chípurupalle. (7) Koraput. (8) Ráyagada. (9) Salúr. (10) Bobbili. (11) Nowrangapur. (12) Malkanagiri. (13) Bissemkatak. (14) Srungavarapukóta. (15) Gajapatinagaram. (16) Pottangi. (17) Padwa.	There are no shroffs in the seventeen Deputy Tahsildars' offices.	One shroff for each Deputy Tahsildars' office.	The Collector recommends that a shroff may be appointed for each of the seventeen Deputy Tahsildars' offices. He states that the numerous errors and omissions pointed out by the Accountant-General in his annual reports on the working of the treasuries occur mostly in the accounts received from the Deputy Tahsildars in charge of sub-treasuries and that this is due to the inadequacy of the establishments. The monthly average transactions that took place in the several sub-treasuries during the three years 1893–96 are as follows:—	From Government Order No. 1071, dated 21st June 1864, and Board's Proceedings, No. 9, dated 8th January 1890, it will be seen that Government has allowed shroffs to Deputy Tahsildars' offices in which the monthly transactions were Rs. 10,000. On this principle, the Board considers that a shroff may be allowed for each of the Deputy Tahsildar's offices, except Bissemkatak, Srungavarapukóta, Gajapatinagaram, Pottangi and Padwa and that the pay may be fixed at Rs. 10. The Board, however, observes that Párvatipur has already a temporary shroff on Rs. 10 paid from the funds of the Kurupam and Belgam estates under the management of the Court of Wards. The question of providing a shroff from the Government revenues may therefore be left over for consideration until the estates are actually handed over.	Eleven shroffs on Rs. 10 each.

	RS.		RS.
Anakápalle ..	60,369	Nowrangapur.	11,321
Párvatipur ..	58,776	Malkanagiri..	10,677
Veeravalle ..	33,394	Bissemkatak .	9,830
Vizagapatam .	30,022	Srungavarapukóta.	8,702
Gunupur ..	28,860	Gajapatinagaram.	6,967
Chípurupalle .	27,469	Pottangi ..	5,561
Koraput ..	26,435	Padwa ..	4,944
Ráyagada ..	26,370		
Salúr ..	25,320		
Bobbili ..	17,039		

The Collector considers that it is not advisable to leave the testing and counting of large sums of money entrusted to clerks.

Proposals for additional establishments to certain Deputy Tahsildars' offices—*cont.*

District.	Deputy Tahsildar's office.	Present strength and pay.	Strength and pay proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for addition to the number and the increase of pay recommended.	Board's recommendation.	Number of hands and pay finally approved by the Board.
				Shroffs—cont.		
Vizagapatam.	Vizianagram ..	One shroff on Rs. 10.	One shroff on Rs. 12.	The Collector states that it is difficult to get a shroff at Jeypore. In the other two cases the increase is recommended in view to make the pay equal to that of the shroffs of Sarvasidhi and Golgonda taluks.	In paragraph 3 (ii) of its order No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, the Government has observed that it is unnecessary to sanction any increase of pay to shroffs. The Board does not therefore recommend the Collector's proposal.	....
	Bimlipatam ..	One shroff on Rs. 10.	One shroff on Rs. 12.			
	Jeypore	One shroff on Rs. 13.	One shroff on Rs. 15.			
North Arcot.	Punganúr	....	One shroff ..	The Collector recommends that as the Punganur sub-treasury was recently re-established under Government Order, No. 3176, dated 13th August 1894, a deputy shroff on Rs. 10 may be sanctioned as in the case of Arni and Tirupati (Board's Proceedings, No. 9, dated 8th January 1890).	It appears that the sub-treasury had no shroff before its abolition. The Collector is therefore requested to report the average of the monthly transactions to enable the Board to see whether the entertainment of the proposed shroff is necessary.	....
The Nilgiris.	Coonoor	One shroff on Rs. 12.	One shroff on Rs. 17-8-0.	The Collector represents that whenever the post of shroff in the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office falls vacant great difficulty is experienced in finding men able to furnish a security of Rs. 500 and proposes that the pay may be raised from Rs. 12 to Rs. 17-8-0. The Collector adds that the transactions of the treasury have increased from Rs. 4,04,740 in 1887 when the post was first sanctioned to Rs. 16,52,956 in 1895.	Though Government has declined to sanction any increase to this class of officers the Board recommends that this may be treated as a special case. A pay of Rs. 15 would in the Board's opinion be sufficient.	One shroff on Rs. 15.
				Dufterbunds or Attenders.		
Vizagapatam.	Bissemkatak ..	Dufterbund on Rs. 10.	Proposes to increase the pay by Rs. 5.	The Collector proposes to increase the pay from Rs. 10 to Rs. 15 for the reasons assigned by him for the increase of pay to clerks in the Deputy Tahsildar's office.	The Board approves the Collector's recommendation.	One dufterbund on Rs. 15.
The Nilgiris.	Ootacamund. Gudalúr. Coonoor.	No dufterbunds at present.	One additional clerk for each office instead of the attender.	In paragraph 17 of its Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, the Board observed that the Deputy Tahsildars' offices in that district have not been provided with attenders. With reference to this remark the Collector states that the work in the Deputy Tahsildars' offices has been steadily increasing and that as it will be difficult to find qualified men for the post of attenders, an additional clerk for each Deputy Tahsildar's office may be sanctioned instead.	The Board is not prepared to recommend the appointment of clerks as proposed by the Collector. The Collector ought to be able to manage with attenders as in other districts.	Three attenders on Rs. 7 each.

Proposals for additional establishments to certain Deputy Tahsildars' offices—*cont.*

District.	Deputy Tahsildar's office.	Present strength and pay.	Strength and pay proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for addition to the number and the increase of pay recommended.	Board's recommendation.	Number of hands and pay finally approved by the Board.
				Dufterbunds or Attenders—cont.		
Salem ..	Shevaroys ..	No dufterbunds at present.	One dufterbund.	With reference to paragraph 17 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, the Collector states that while there are attenders in the offices of Deputy Tahsildars who have no treasury work or separate jamabandi for their divisions, there is none in the Shevaroys, and that in times of sickness there is only one gumastah available for work and sometimes none. The Collector therefore considers that an attender should be entertained and that his pay should be fixed at Rs. 10 in consideration of the fact that living on the hills is costly and that the attender is expected to assist in clerical work	The Board supports the Collector's recommendation, but is of opinion that as the pay of attenders in the plains is Rs. 7, Rs. 3 may be given in the shape of a local allowance as in the case of clerks in the division.	One dufterbund on Rs. 7. Local allowance Rs. 3.
				Peons.		
Gódávari ..	Cocanada	Two peons on Rs. 6 each.	One additional peon.	With reference to paragraph 18 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86 dated 4th March 1896, the Collector reports that the additional peon proposed by Mr. Garstin for the Cocanada division is necessary for the same reasons as have been urged by him for the entertainment of a fourth clerk in that division.	The entertainment of the peon appears necessary as the Revenue Inspector allowed for the division has not been provided with a separate peon.	One peon on Rs. 7. Two peons on Rs. 6 each.
Kistna ..	Vissannapet ..	Two peons on Rs. 6 each.	Do.	The Collector states that an additional peon is necessary for the reasons assigned by him for the entertainment of a third clerk in that division.	The Board approves the Collector's proposal.	One peon on Rs. 7. Two peons on Rs. 6 each.
Nellore ..	Zamindari. Polur .. Podili .. Darsi .. Venkatagiri. Dependent. Kota .. Addanki. Allur ..	Two peons in each on Rs. 6 each.	One additional peon for each of the first four and two for each of the last three.	The Collector states that there is a crying necessity for increasing the number of peons allowed to Deputy Tahsildars and that the two peons attached to their offices are found to be insufficient.	The Board sees no sufficient reason for treating these Deputy Tahsildars' offices exceptionally. If the services of additional peons are required in connection with revenue work, the necessary help should be obtained from the taluk staff.	....
Nilgiris ..	Ootacamund ..	One peon on Rs. 9. Two peons on Rs. 8 each.	....	With reference to paragraph 18 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, the Collector reports that the two peons proposed by Mr. Garstin for each of the Deputy Tahsildars' offices at Ootacamund and Coonoor are necessary as there are two Revenue Inspectors in each of the divisions who have not yet been provided with peons and who feel great inconvenience for want of them. The Collector proposes to fix their pay at Rs. 8.	The Board approves the Collector's proposal	One peon on Rs. 9. Four peons on Rs. 8 each.
	Coonoor ..	One peon on Rs. 9. Two peons on Rs. 8 each.				One peon on Rs. 9. Four peons on Rs. 8 each.
South Arcot.	Mannárgudi .. Panruti	....	....	The Collector states that a peon from the Mannárgudi Deputy Tahsildar's office and another from Panruti have been working in the Sea Customs Superintendents' offices at Porto Novo and Cuddalore, respectively, and requests that they may be restored to their respective Deputy Tahsildars, leaving the Sea Customs Department to make its own arrangements.	As the Sea Customs Superintendent at Cuddalore exercises no Magisterial powers, the Board in the Separate Revenue Department has no objection to the revenue peon working there from Panruti being relegated to his proper place. As the Sea Customs Superintendent at Porto Novo exercises Magisterial powers, the peon working there from Mannargudi should be allowed to continue.	....

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), Mis. No. 3023, dated 13th August 1897 :—

Read—the following letter from J. H. A. TREMENHEERE, Esq., Collector of the Nilgiris, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated 5th August 1897, R.G.B. No. 728 :—

With reference to paragraph 13 of the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 224, dated 7th July 1897, recommending the entertainment of an attender on Rs. 7 in each of the taluk offices in this district, I have the honour to observe that the pay proposed to be given to these attenders is below the amount which the last peon there gets, viz., Rs. 8, and that it is too low, and the cost of living too high to induce men of some educational qualifications to take up these posts. It is in view of these difficulties the pay of the last attender in the Collector's office has been fixed at Rs. 10. Even for this pay it is found difficult to find men of the same type as could be found for Rs. 7 on the plains.

For the same reasons I proposed the appointment of clerks on Rs. 15, but the proposal did not meet with the Board's approval. I would, therefore, strongly recommend that the pay of the attenders may be fixed at Rs. 10 for the Coonoor and Ootacamund Deputy Tahsildars' offices and Rs. 10 + 5 for Gúdalúr, and request that the Board will be pleased to support, at least, this proposal.

Resolution—Mis. No. 3023, dated 13th August 1897.

Submitted to Government, in continuation of Board's Proceedings, No. 224, dated 7th July 1897.

2. In the circumstances reported, the Board supports the Collector's recommendation. In view, however, of the fact that the attender in the Deputy Tahsildar's office, Gúdalúr, is to get the Wynaad allowance, his pay may be fixed at Rs. 8. The present proposals will raise the total additional expenditure involved in the revision of taluk establishments from Rs. 1,03,644 to Rs. 1,03,734.*

	RS.	A.	P.
* Pay fixed for the three attenders, as per paragraph 13 of Board's Proceedings, No. 224, dated 7th July 1897, *plus* Rs. 3-8-0, Wynaad allowance, for the attender in Gúdalúr	24	8	0
Pay as now proposed for the attender in—			
Ootacamund	10	0	0
Coonoor	10	0	0
Gúdalúr	8	0	0
Wynaad allowance	4	0	0
Total ...	32	0	0
Net increase per mensem ...	7	8	0
" " annum ...	90	0	0

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. C. C. CARR,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with the Collector's letter, in original, to be returned.
" Collector of the Nilgiris.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), Mis. No. 3385, dated 10th September 1897 :—

Read—the following letter from G. W. DANCE, Esq., Acting Collector of Malabar, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Camp, Manjeri, 2nd September 1897, No. 2131-Pub. :—

With reference to paragraph 8 of Board's Proceedings, No. 224, dated 7th July 1897, I have the honour to state that there is no objection to the proposed reduction in the pay of the shroff in Chirakkal taluk from Rs. 20 to Rs. 15, provided that it does

not affect the present incumbent, who may be given a personal allowance of Rs. 5 per mensem.

2. As regards the shroff in Wynaad, however, the Deputy Collector reports as follows :—

"I have found it rather difficult to obtain the services of competent hands as clerks on a salary of Rs. 15, with the usual Wynaad allowance, and as shroffs require a certain amount of technical knowledge for the efficient performance of their duties, I am afraid any reduction in the pay will render the office less attractive."

In consideration of the peculiar circumstances of Wynaad, I think the shroff's pay there may be left unaltered.

Resolution—Mis. No. 3385, dated 10th September 1897.

Submitted to Government, in continuation of Board's Proceedings, No. 224, dated 7th July 1897.

2. The Board supports the Collector's recommendations.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. C. C. CARR,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with Collector's letter in original, to be returned.
Copy to the Collector of Malabar.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), Mis. No. 4358, dated 16th November 1897 :—

Read—the following letter from S. H. WYNNE, Esq., Collector and District Magistrate, North Arcot, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, dated Camp, Vellore, 23rd October 1897, Dis. No. 3561-Ver. :—

With reference to appendix III to Board's Proceedings, No. 224, dated the 7th July last, I have the honour to append below the number of magisterial cases disposed of by the Sub-Magistrate of Venkatagirikota within the last three years :—

	Cases.
1894	62
1895	39
1896	65

2. A statement showing the average monthly transactions in the sub-treasury at Punganúru is enclosed. It will be seen therefrom that there has been a general increase in the transactions of the treasury since its re-establishment. The heavy sum under "Charges" in the year 1892–93 is due to the expenditure incurred on account of famine in that year. A copy of the Deputy Tahsildar's arzi, No. 491, dated 22nd September last, giving reasons for the entertainment of a shroff, is also submitted.

Enclosure.

From the Deputy Tahsildar, Punganúru, to the Deputy Collector in charge of Treasury, North Arcot, dated 22nd September 1897, Dis. No. 491.

Adverting to your memorandum, Ref. on Cur. No. 106-Board, dated 26th ultimo, I beg to forward, herewith, a statement of the average transactions prepared in the form received with the memorandum under reply.

2. The falling off under charges, after the re-establishment of the sub-treasury, as compared with the transactions before its re-establishment, particularly with 1892–93, is due to the greater amount of expenditure incurred in the year (1892–93) on account of payments made for road, &c., works, land improvement loans and kitchens, &c., started during the famine then prevailing. There having been no such expenditure in the subsequent years, the expenditure has fallen off a little.

3. The average expenditure before the re-establishment may be taken as 3,500, leaving out of consideration the expenditure incurred in the famine year 1892–93. It will be observed that there is a steady increase in the expenditure in the years 1895–96, 1896–97 and 1897–98. Moreover, after the re-establishment of the treasury, the zemindar of Punganúru remits the peshkash due by him here. As the clerk who looks after this work has to keep a good many accounts and registers connected with the treasury, which of late considerably increased, I beg to state that a shroff is necessary for this division.

4. As the Deputy Tahsildar is frequently away on circuit, the local sub-registrar is in charge of the sub-treasury on such occasions. But as neither the sub-registrar nor the head gumastah has paid any security, the appointment of a shroff is very necessary, so that the responsibility for all short receipts or over-payments may be fixed on him. Very frequently, even now, uncurrent, short weight and other objectionable coins are received into the treasury and remitted to the Huzur with the remittances owing to the want of skill on the part of the head gumastah in detecting them. But when the mistakes are found out in Huzur treasury, the Deputy Tahsildar is called on to make good for the loss.

5. For the above reasons the appointment of a shroff is essential.

Statement showing the average transactions in the Punganúru Sub-Treasury during the years indicated below.

Months.	1891–92.		1892–93.		1895–96.		1896–97.		1897–98.		Remarks.
	Receipts.	Charges.	Receipts.	Charges.	Receipts.	Charges.	Receipts.	Charges.	Receipts.	Charges.	
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
April	9,592	3,158	5,873	7,022	4,171	3,293	21,605	2,532	21,358	2,932	Transactions prior to the abolition of the sub-treasury—
May	4,649	2,772	4,954	11,530	4,850	3,547	12,118	4,080	13,814	3,451	
June	5,775	2,630	5,732	14,713	5,377	2,935	6,002	3,015	3,899	4,377	
July	6,990	3,371	6,078	10,078	5,456	3,036	6,598	3,683	4,939	5,328	Average receipts (monthly). Average charges (monthly).
August	6,221	4,017	2,788	3,039	4,202	3,040	4,996	6,874	8,106	6,060	1891–92 .. .. .. Rs. 5,858 Rs. 3,531
September	4,923	3,281	6,346	4,030	3,907	3,749	3,866	4,868	3,765	3,593	1892–93 .. .. .. 4,720 6,195
October	4,577	3,260	1,534	5,654	6,498	3,305	6,795	3,305	..	..	Transactions after the re-establishment of the sub-treasury—
November	3,584	2,988	4,891	3,442	4,038	4,192	3,125	3,331	..	..	1895–96 .. .. .. 9,763 3,462
December	5,896	2,885	5,268	5,282	14,011	3,338	5,224	6,526	..	..	1896–97 .. .. .. 12,358 4,606
January	6,413	3,133	4,540	2,798	21,320	2,920	5,047	4,477	..	..	1897–98 .. .. .. 8,480 4,290
February	5,717	3,723	3,532	2,853	21,026	3,026	49,498	4,313	..	..	
March	5,964	7,152	5,112	3,905	23,304	5,173	23,423	7,147	..	..	
Total ..	70,301	42,370	56,648	74,346	1,17,160	41,554	1,48,297	55,281	50,881	25,741	
Average ..	5,858	3,531	4,720	6,195	9,763	3,462	12,358	4,606	8,480	4,290	

Resolution—Mis. No. 4358, dated 16th November 1897.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings, No. 224, dated 7th July 1897.

2. Although the number of magisterial cases disposed of in the office of the Deputy Tahsildar of Venkatagirikota is too small to require the services of an additional clerk, the Board would retain the provision already made in view of the unhealthiness of the station.

	RS.
The cost as worked out in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3023, dated 13th August 1897	1,03,734
Add the pay of the shroff on Rs. 10 per mensem in the Punganúru Deputy Tahsildar's office ...	120
Total ...	1,03,854

3. As the average monthly transactions of the Punganúru Sub-Treasury exceed Rs. 10,000, the Board recommends the appointment of a shroff on Rs. 10 per mensem for that office.

4. If the above proposal is approved, the total additional expenditure involved in the revision of taluk establishments will come to Rs. 1,03,854 as shown in the margin.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) R. C. C. CARR,
Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
with the Collector's letter and its two enclosures,
in original (to be returned).

" Collector of North Arcot.

ORDER—No. 108, Revenue, dated 23rd February 1898.

Miscellaneous.

The Government in its order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, sanctioned a scheme for the strengthening of the Tahsildars' and Deputy Tahsildars' establishments at an additional expenditure of Rs. 92,610 *per annum* and requested the Board of Revenue to submit the necessary proposition statement for transmission to the Government of India.

In the papers read above, the Board of Revenue reports that some of the Collectors consider the reduction in the number of clerks and peons in certain Taluk offices, which was proposed by it and accepted by Government in the order above referred to, to be impracticable and that some have taken the opportunity to apply for the entertainment of additional hands in Tahsildars' and Deputy Tahsildars' offices which the Board did not propose to strengthen in the first instance. The Board also requests a reconsideration of paragraph 2 of the order which fixes the scale of pay to be allowed to clerks in the several grades of taluk offices and strongly advocates the acceptance of the scale suggested by itself in the Proceedings read in that order.

2. In view of the existing financial pressure and of the fact that the cost of the scheme, as a whole, has already considerably exceeded the amount originally estimated, the Government regrets it is unable to sanction the Board's proposals on the latter point. The scale of pay already adopted by Government will accordingly be adhered to.

3. As regards the first point, the several proposals made by Collectors and the Board's recommendations thereon which have been dealt with under the two main heads "Tahsildars' establishments" and "Deputy Tahsildars' establishments" will be considered below.

4. *Tahsildars' establishments—(a) clerks.*—The Board's recommendations under this head which are indicated in appendix I to its Proceedings, No. 224, dated 7th July

1897, involve as compared with the number previously sanctioned by Government the reduction of one hand in each of the three taluk offices of Tadpatri, Ramallakot and Kasaragod, and the addition of one hand to each of the marginally-noted 28 taluk offices. These proposals are well considered and have the approval of Government. The additional expenditure under this head will, therefore, be Rs. 61,746, instead of Rs. 56,526 as previously estimated.

Berhampur.	Pattikonda.
Chicacole.	Saidapet.
Goomsur.	Chingleput.
Golgonda.	Vellore.
Sarvasiddhi.	Chittoor.
Rajahmundry.	Kallakurchi.
Gudiváda.	Mannárgudi.
Bandur.	Perambalúr.
Nuzvid.	Karúr.
Cuddapah.	Kollegal.
Proddatur.	Coondapoor.
Kalyandrug.	Uppinangadi.
Hospet.	Wynaad.
Nandyal.	Chirakkal.

(*b*) *Shroffs.*—The proposals under this head are—

(1) to abolis[illegible] the second shroff on Rs. 10 in the Jamm[illegible]amadugu taluk;

(2) to retain t[illegible] additional shroff on Rs. 15 sanctioned for the Bellary taluk in G.O., No. 130, dat[illegible] 28th February 1889, and Board's Proceedings, No. 323, dated 15th May 1889;

(3) to leave the pay of the shroff at Wynaad unaltered; a[illegible]

(4) to reduce the pay of the shroff on Rs. 20 in the Chirakk[illegible] taluk to Rs. 15 subject to the grant of a personal allowance of Rs. 5 per mensem to the present incumbent.

These proposals, which, for the present, involve an additional expenditure of Rs. 5 *per mensem* or 60 *per annum*, are approved.

The Government also approves of the proposal to transfer one of the shroffs at Chirakkal to Kurumbranát; but it is presumed that in that case it will be unnecessary to entertain any temporary shroff at the latter station during the kist months, as at present.

(*c*) *Dufterbunds or Attenders.*—The Government agrees with the Board of Revenue in considering that no increase is called for in the pay of this class of servants. It appears that in Kistna servants of this class are often entrusted with the duties of a clerk. This is a mistake and the practice, wherever it exists, should be discontinued.

(*d*) *Peons.*—After a careful consideration of the Collectors' proposals, the Board of Revenue fixes the number to be retained at 3,207 instead of 3,173 or 34 more than the number already allowed by Government. The increase proposed is approved, the total additional expenditure involved being Rs. 14,988 *per annum* instead of Rs. 12,540 allowed in paragraph 2 (v) of G.O., No. 624, dated 14th November 1896.

5. *Deputy Tahsildars' establishments—(a) clerks.*—The Board proposes—

(1) to increase the pay of the two clerks in the Bissemkatak Deputy Tahsildar's office (Vizagapatam district) by Rs. 5 each;

(2) to allow a third clerk on Rs. 15 for Vissannapet (Kistna district) which is an independent Deputy Tahsildar's division;

(3) to allow a second clerk on Rs 15 for the Venkatagirikota Deputy Tahsildar's office (North Arcot district) raising the pay of the first clerk to Rs. 20;

(4) to allow a third clerk on Rs. 15 for the Tirupati Deputy Tahsildar's office;

(5) to grant a local allowance of Rs. 5 to each of the two clerks in the Deputy Tahsildar's office on the Shevaroys;

(6) to increase the pay of one of the clerks in the Kumbakónam Town Deputy Tahsildar's office from Rs. 15 to 20; and

(7) to increase the pay of the head clerk in the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office from Rs. 25 to Rs. 30.

The above proposals are approved, with the modification that in the first case the increase allowed should take the form of a local allowance, instead of an addition to pay. The effect of these proposals will be to raise the total additional expenditure to Rs. 9,240 *per annum*.

(*b*) *Shroffs.*—No expenditure under this head was previously anticipated, but under the circumstances now stated by the Board, the Government is pleased to allow a shroff on Rs. 10 for each of the thirteen Deputy Tahsildars' offices named on the margin. The appointment of a shroff for the Párvatípur Deputy Tahsildar's office need not be deferred as suggested. The increase of pay from Rs. 12 to 15 proposed for the shroff in the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office is also approved. There will, therefore, be an additional expenditure under this head of Rs. 1,596 *per annum.*

Anakápalle.	Salur.
Veeravalle.	Bobbili.
Vizagapatam.	Nowrangapur.
Gunupur.	Malkanagiri.
Chípurupalle.	Párvatípur.
Koraput.	Punganúru.
Rayagada.	

(*c*) *Dufterbunds or Attenders.*—One attender on Rs. 7 will be allowed for each of the Deputy Tahsildars' offices at the Shevaroys, Ootacamund, Coonoor and Gudalur. The attender at the last-mentioned station will be entitled to the usual Wynaad allowance of 50 per cent. of the pay, while in the other three cases a local allowance of Rs. 3 each is sanctioned. The Government is unable to sanction the increase proposed for the attender in the Bissemkatak Deputy Tahsildar's office. On the other hand, the pay of this appointment also should, on the present incumbent's vacating it, be reduced to Rs. 7, the difference of Rs. 3 being treated as a local allowance. The annual additional expenditure under this head will thus amount to Rs. 486.

(*d*) *Peons.*—The appointment of one additional peon for each of the Deputy Tahsildars' offices at Cocanada and Vissannapet and of two peons for each of the similar offices at Ootacamund and Coonoor is sanctioned. In all these cases the pay proper will be fixed at Rs. 6 each, a local allowance of Rs. 2 being granted in the case of those now sanctioned for the last two offices. This principle should be extended also to the existing peons' appointments in these two offices subject, however, to the condition that the present incumbents do not suffer. The annual additional expenditure under this head will, as explained in paragraph 14 of Board's Proceedings, No. 224, dated 7th July 1897, be Rs. 2,340.

6. The total additional expenditure, which the proposals for strengthening the taluk establishments as now revised involve, will, therefore, be Rs. 1,03,896 *per annum* as shown below :—

I. *Tahsildars' Establishments*—

	Rs.
(*a*) Clerks	61,746
(*b*) Shroffs	60
(*c*) Muchis	13,188
(*d*) Attenders	252
(*e*) Peons	14,988
Total ...	90,234

II. *Deputy Tahsildars' Establishments.*—

(*a*) Clerks	9,240
(*b*) Shroffs	1,596
(*c*) Attenders	486
(*d*) Peons	2,340
Total ...	13,662
Grand Total ...	1,03,896

7. The Board of Revenue is requested to submit the necessary proposition statement with the least practicable delay, so that the sanction of the Government of India may be obtained to the introduction of the scheme with effect from 1st July next at the latest.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue, Land Revenue, with enclosures.
„ the Financial Department.
„ the Accountant-General.

Exd. Md. Pahilvan.

60 Copies.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 108, REVENUE, DATED 23RD FEBRUARY 1898.

[SUBJECT.—*Revision of Tahsildars' and Deputy Tahsildars' Establishments in the Presidency.*]

Proceedings of the Board of Rev. (*Land Rev.*), *No.* 224, *dated* 7*th July* 1897.
" " ("), *Mis. No.* 3023, *dated* 13*th Aug.* 1897.
" " ("), *Mis. No.* 3385, " 10*th Sept.* "
" " ("), *Mis. No.* 4358, " 16*th Nov.* "

FOR ORDERS.

The Board, in its Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, * submitted to Government its proposals for improving the position of Tahsildars' and Deputy Tahsildars' establishments in the Presidency, and at the same time in paragraph 23 of its Proceedings requested Collectors to verify the figures in the several statements appended thereto, upon which its proposals were based, and to submit any suggestions which they might have to offer on the subject.

* G.O., No. 624, dated 14th November 1896.

2. In G.O., No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, the Government approved the Board's proposals generally as to the strength of the establishment to be allowed to each office, but, with a view chiefly to keep the cost as low as possible, allowed increased rates of pay to fewer number of clerks and of peons than that proposed by the Board and altogether disallowed any increase of pay to shroffs. The effect of these modifications was to reduce the additional expenditure from Rs. 1,31,412 to Rs. 92,610 a year. In accordance with these orders, the Board was requested to prepare and submit a proposition statement for transmission to the Government of India.

3. In the Proceedings above, the Board brings to notice that some of the Collectors consulted consider the reductions proposed by it in the number of clerks and peons in certain taluk offices to be impracticable and that some have applied for the entertainment of additional hands in some of the taluks and Deputy Tahsildars' offices which the Board did not propose to strengthen. The several proposals of the Collectors and the Board's recommendations thereon have been tabulated under the heads "Taluk clerks", "Taluk peons" and "Deputy Tahsildars' Establishments" and printed as appendices I, II and III, respectively, to the Proceedings. The Board also takes the opportunity to request Government to reconsider paragraph 2 of the order fixing the number of clerks in the several grades of pay for each taluk office and [illegible]tion the scale originally suggested by it.

4. To take the latter point first the Board originally proposed the following scale:—

Rates of pay.	Number on each rate of pay in taluks with				
	6 clerks.	7 clerks.	8 clerks.	9 clerks.	10 clerks.
Rs.					
30	1	1	1	1	1
25	1	2	2	2	2
20	2	2	2	2	3
17½	1	1	2	3	3
15	1	1	1	1	1
	127½	152½	170	187½	207½

With reference to the above the Government remarked:—"Provision is made "for the retention of only one clerk on Rs. 15 *per mensem* in each taluk and the "proportion of clerks of this grade to the total number of clerks thus varies from "16⅔ per cent. to 10 per cent. On comparing the total strength and scale of pay "that prevail in other offices, it is observed that, except in the newly organized offices "of the Conservators of Forests, there is not a single case in which so small a "proportion of the clerks as 10 per cent. draw Rs. 15 and less and that in the "majority of cases the proportion greatly exceeds the maximum of 16⅔ per cent. "proposed in the present scheme. The Board's proposals are thus likely to open "the door to demands for similar treatment from other offices which cannot equitably "be refused, but compliance with which will cost several lakhs of rupees *per annum*. "It is, moreover, essential that the additional cost should be kept as low as possible."

The following scale of pay was accordingly sanctioned:—

Rates of pay.	Number on each rate of pay in taluks with				
	6 clerks.	7 clerks.	8 clerks.	9 clerks.	10 clerks.
RS.					
30	1	1	1	1	1
25	1	1	1	1	2
20	1	1	2	2	2
17½	1	2	2	2	2
15	2	2	2	3	3
Monthly cost.	122½	140	160	175	200

The Board submits that the retention of so low a proportion of clerks, as that proposed by it, on Rs. 15 grade was not a new proposal. It observes: "In "the proposition statement accepted by Government in paragraph 7 of its order, "No. 396, dated 18th March 1884, Mr. Garstin had provided for the retention of one "clerk on Rs. 15 in taluks for which six, seven or nine clerks had been allotted by "him and of two such clerks in the taluks to which he had assigned eight or ten "clerks. The Board's proposal, as will be seen from paragraph 6 of its Proceedings, "No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, was to reduce the number of clerks on Rs. 15 to 1, "even in the case of the taluks provided with eight or ten clerks, and by leaving "out the grade on Rs. 22½ proposed by Mr. Garstin to re-adjust the number of clerks "in the several grades proposed for the several taluks so as to leave the total cost of "each scale of establishment with six clerks, seven clerks, etc., as fixed by Mr. Garstin, "substantially unaffected. But Government has increased the number of clerks on "Rs. 15 to two in the case of taluks to be provided with six, seven or eight clerks and "to three in the case of taluks with a strength of nine or ten clerks—a proportion "not contemplated in Mr. Garstin's proposition statement. The revision of the scale, "as made by Government, has no doubt resulted in a large saving as compared with "Mr. Garstin's scale, but has reduced its attractiveness which it was the main object "of Mr. Garstin's and Board's schemes to ensure."

The Board also points out that the extension of its proposal in regard to the number of Rs. 15 appointments to Government establishments generally will not entail an additional cost of *several lakhs of rupees* as apprehended by Government, but that as according to the civil budget estimates for 1897–98 the total number of clerks drawing Rs. 15 and less in all Government establishments, consisting of more than two clerks each, was 1,938 out of a total strength of 5,241, the additional cost that would be entailed—

(1) by raising the pay of each of these clerks in excess of a tenth of the total strength to Rs. 17½, and

(2) by raising the pay of one-half of the number in excess to Rs. 17½ and that of the other half to Rs. 20—

would not be much more than half a lakh of rupees.

5. In this connection attention is solicited to the remarks of Honourable Members against paragraph 5 of the office-note in G.O., No. 624, dated 14th November 1896. The scale was revised by the Hon'ble Sir Henry Bliss, and the other Members

of Government agreed with him. The Board states that, according to the civil budget estimates of 1897–98, the total number of clerks drawing Rs. 15 and under in all Government establishments (other than taluk establishments), consisting of more than two clerks each, was 1,938 out of a total strength of 5,241. It is not clear how the Board arrived at these figures. The correct figures seem to be 2,042 and 5,592, respectively.* But assuming that the Board's figures are correct, its estimate† as to what the additional expenditure would be of extending to other Government establishments the scale of pay it suggests for taluk establishment seems to be understated as shown below.

* 36·5 per cent.

†Please see calculations at the top of page 5 of the Board's Proceedings.

The total strength of the existing taluk establishment is 1,351, of whom 1,029 are on Rs. 15. The Board proposes to leave only 157 or about 11½ per cent. of the total strength and promote the rest as follows:—

		Total cost.
		RS.
	156 men on Rs. 30 each	4,680
	310 „ on „ 25 „	7,750
	18 „ on „ 20 „	360
	388 „ on „ 17½ „	6,790
Total ...	872	19,580
	Deduct cost of 872 men at Rs. 15 each	13,080
	Additional expenditure on 872 men is	6,500

I.e., an increase of 50 per cent. or Rs. 7½ per head.

The Board's proposals practically amount to this, that the number of clerks on Rs. 15 in an establishment should not be more than about 11½ per cent. of the total strength of the establishment and that the pay of all clerks on Rs. 15 in excess of that proportion should be raised by about 50 per cent. of their present salaries or Rs. 7½ each *per mensem*. Taking then the Board's figures as to other Government establishments, namely 5,241 total strength, and 1,938 clerks on Rs. 15 and under, the additional cost would be Rs. 7½ $(1{,}938 - \frac{11\frac{1}{2}}{100} \times 5{,}241)$ or Rs. 7½ (1,938—602) or Rs. 10,020 *per mensem* or Rs. 1,20,240 *per annum*. Even this figure must be below the mark, for there are several offices in which there are clerks on less than Rs. 15 and the Board apparently proposes to have only one clerk on Rs. 15 in an office and *none* on any lower pay.

Apart from the above objection it is submitted that, as this Government has already reported to the Government of India the scale it has decided to adopt, it is not desirable now to alter it, merely because the extension of such altered scale to other Government establishments will not involve such large additional expenditure as it previously apprehended. The only point is whether the scale suggested by Government is such as to attract deserving men under the present circumstances. In the concluding portion of paragraph 6 of its Proceedings, the Board strongly advocates the acceptance of its scale, if possible, "as "it feels confident that the only hope of "materially increasing the efficiency of ta-"luk establishments lies in improving the "prospects before those who may be "inclined to enter the service." Looking to the low rates of pay that are now allowed in taluk offices generally and the few prospects of promotion the gumastahs have had, it is not improbable that there are at least two or three men in each taluk office who are not worth more than their present pay of Rs. 15; they might under the Government

G.S.
7–9–97.

Of course the service will be more attractive if it is paid more. The question is whether this additional attractiveness is worth Rs. 20,670 a year, and, if so, whether we can get the Government of India to give us this Rs. 20,670. I don't think the scale Government has adopted should be changed.

J.G.
9–10–97.

scale be as well left on Rs. 15 and when vacancies occur in the higher grades, really competent outsiders may be directly taken to such higher grades. It is by this means that the efficiency of an office can be really improved. If, on the other hand, the Board's proposal to have only one clerk on Rs. 15 is sanctioned, a large number of undeserving men also will of necessity get promotion specially under paragraph 6 of G.O., No. 624, dated 14th November 1896.

So far as the taluk establishments are concerned, the cost under the Board's scale will be Rs. 20,670 *per annum* in excess of that under the Government scale.

6. In regard to the first point, *i.e.*, as to the additional hands applied for, the Collectors' proposals and the Board's recommendations thereon are given below :—

CLERKS.

Note.—The general scale as to the number of clerks to be allowed to the different classes of taluk offices in taluks in which Stationary Sub-Magistrates have been appointed—

1st-class taluks to have	10
2nd and 3rd class taluks to have ...	9
4th and 5th do. do.	8

In taluks in which *no* Stationary Sub-Magistrates have been appointed, an additional hand to be allowed if the circumstances really require it.

(1) *Ganjám.*—The Board proposed to take away one clerk from Berhampur and two from Chicacole; the Collector protests against losing three hands. He urges unhealthiness of Berhampur and Goomsur and confusion of accounts in taluks which have had to be rectified recently by a special officer. It is further pointed out that the Berhampur and Goomsur taluks will greatly rise in importance in a few years owing to the Rushikulya irrigation and that the work of the taluks will increase on that account. He therefore proposes to retain the present strength at Berhampur, to reduce the Chicacole by one hand only instead of by two and to give Goomsur an extra hand so that the district strength may remain at 28. * The Board approves the Collector's proposal.

*

—	Grade.	Existing strength.	Proposed strength.
Berhampur	II	10	10
Chicacole	V	10	9
Goomsur	IV	8	9
Total ..		28	28

V.P.
3-9-97.

G. STOKES.
7-9-97.

Approved. Experience shows that the same number of hands gives less strength in Ganjám than in more southern districts.

J.G.

(2) *Vizagapatam district.*—The taluks of Golgonda (third class) and Sarvasiddhi (fifth class) have each six clerks. The Board proposed to increase the number of clerks in Golgonda only by one, but the Collector states that according to scale Golgonda is entitled to *nine* hands and Sarvasiddhi to *eight* and also urges the unhealthiness of Golgonda and the need for an extra hand at Sarvasiddhi. The Board of Revenue now recommends that the Golgonda and Sarvasiddhi taluks may be allowed an additional clerk each.

V.P.

The Board's arguments are in many cases based on the grading of the taluks. It is true this grading has been accepted by Government, but it has been very badly done. There may be twice as much work to be got through in a second-class taluk in one district as there is in another. For instance Máyavaram is a second-class taluk in the new grading and so is Tiruchengod, but I have no hesitation in saying there is four times the work in the former than there is in the latter.

G.S.

Approved.

J.G.

(3) *Gódávari district.*—Rajahmundry has nine clerks, but as it isonly a *fourth*-class taluk, the Board proposed to reduce the number to eight. The Collector protests against the reduction on the ground that the treasury transactions and other work in that office are very heavy and complicated owing to the fact that Rajahmundry is the central and the most important station in the district where nearly a dozen offices are located. The Board of Revenue accepts the Collector's proposals.

Approved.

J.G.

(4) *Kistna district.*—The Collector of Kistna applies for an additional hand for Gudiváda and points out that the number of villages in the taluk is 226 and that the revenue is elastic and will rise as high as that of Répalle (12 lakhs) as soon as the lands under the Peddalanka channel come fully under occupation. He also applies for an additional clerk for Nuzvid where there is no Stationary Sub-Magistrate. The Board proposed to reduce the number of clerks at Bandur from nine to eight as it is only a fourth-class taluk, but the Collector protests against the reduction for the reasons that the revenue work has been gradually increasing and the direct collection of water-tax in the villages forming the Gudur zamindari entails additional work on the taluk establishment. The Board supports the Collector's recommendations in the three cases. Répalle and Palnad have nine clerks each at present. As the former is a first-class taluk and the latter, though only of the third class, has *no* Stationary Sub-Magistrate, the Board proposed to increase the number in each case by one. The Collector now applies for yet another hand for each taluk. But the Board considers that there is no need to strengthen the taluks any further.

—	Class.	Existing number of clerks.	Number previously proposed	Number *now* proposed
Gudiváda	II	9	9	10
Nuzvid	V	8	8	9

V.P.

G.S.

Approved.

I have doubts about Repalle. I am not sure about it, but I have always heard that there are the same sort of difficulties there as in Tanjore and Kumbakónam, and I believe they ought to have an extra clerk. Répalle is a very rich taluk.

J.G.

(5) *Nellore district.*—Nellore being a first-class taluk ,it was proposed to raise its strength from nine to ten clerks, while Atmakur being only a fourth-class one, it was proposed to reduce its strength from nine to eight. In the case of Gudur, Ongole and Kandukur, which are of the second, third and fourth class respectively, the existing strength of nine, nine and eight clerks was allowed to stand. The Collector now recommends the entertainment of an additional clerk for each of the taluks of Nellore, Gudur, Ongole and Kandukur and protests against the reduction in Atmakur. But no special reasons are reported to have been assigned in any of these cases and the Board considers that none of the taluks deserves any special treatment.

V.P.

G.S.

Approved.

I know Nellore to be by far the heaviest of the taluks. Gudur is also heavy, but I cannot say they should be treated specially. Ongole, Kandukur and Atmakur are ordinary taluks.

J.G.

(6) *Cuddapah.*—The Board of Revenue proposed to reduce the number of clerks in Cuddapah and Proddatur from ten in each case to nine and eight respectively, as they are only of the second and fourth class. The Collector points out that the proposal to reduce the number overlooks the fact that special clerks were allowed to these taluks on account of the Kurnool-Cuddapah canal and recommends the retention of one extra clerk out of two at Proddatur and of one at Cuddapah. The Board of Revenue supports the Collector's recommendation.

V.P.

I know the Cuddapah taluk needs the extra strength.

G.S.

Approevd.

J.G.

(7) *Anantapur district.*—Kalyandrug, a fifth-class taluk, though entitled to eight clerks, was allowed only six clerks (its present strength). The Collector now points out that the taluk needs the full establishment of eight clerks, as the existing establishment cannot cope with the work and that at least one more hand should be added to the present strength; he also offers, if necessary, one clerk from Tadpatri which is a light taluk. The Board approves of the transfer of one of the clerks from Tadpatri to Kalyandrug.

Approved. J.G.

(8) *Bellary district.*—The Board of Revenue supposed that the Bellary taluk office (a second-class one) had ten clerks and proposed to reduce the strength by one. The Collector points out that the 10th clerk is a shroff and that no reduction is called for. Hospet being a third-class taluk, is entitled according to scale to nine clerks, but the Board proposed that the present number of eight was sufficient. The Collector now contends for the full number as the work there has hitherto been badly done. The Board approves the Collector's proposals.

Approved. J.G.

(9) *Kurnool district.*—In the case of Nandyal and Pattikonda, which are of the third and fourth class respectively, the Board proposed to reduce the existing strength of ten and nine clerks, by one in each case, while in the case of Ramallakot (a third-class taluk) it was proposed to increase the number from eight to nine, especially as there is no Stationary Sub-Magistrate in that taluk. But the Collector remarks that Pattikonda should be retained at its present strength as it is a litigious and heavy taluk and accordingly suggests that the additional clerk proposed for Ramallakot may be allowed for Pattikonda as the work in the former is comparatively light. As regards Nandyal, the Collector points out that an extra clerk is necessary on account of the canal work and that the existing number should not be reduced. The Board of Revenue approves the Collector's proposals. It observes that one clerk on Rs. 15 was sanctioned for Nandyal for canal work—*vide* G.O., No. 1134, dated 17th September 1883.

Approved. J.G.

(10) *Chingleput district.*—Chingleput and Saidapet being of the fifth and fourth class respectively, the Board of Revenue proposed to reduce the strength of the taluk establishment from nine to eight in each case. The Collector protests against the proposal, as the treasury work in the former is heavy owing to the location of several other offices at the station, while in the latter the collection work is very troublesome involving the issue of a large number of processes. The Board of Revenue approves the Collector's recommendations.

Approved. J.G.

(11) *North Arcot district.*—The Board proposed to reduce the number of clerks in Vellore and Chittoor taluk offices from nine to eight as they are both of the fourth class. The Collector protests against the reduction proposed as they are heavy offices and requests that the district strength may be left undisturbed especially as Chandragiri and Polur, which under the scale are entitled to eight hands each, have been allowed only their present strength of seven hands. The Board approves the Collector's recommendations.

Approved. J.G.

(12) *South Arcot district.*—The Kallakurichi taluk office has nine clerks at present; but as it is only a fourth-class taluk, the Board proposed to reduce the number to eight. The Collector points out that Kallakurichi has no Deputy Tahsildar andis otherwise heavy, also that it is hard to give the same establishment to Tiruvannámalai which is a much lighter taluk. He therefore recommends that the number of hands at Kallakurichi may not be reduced. The Board approves the Collector's recommendation.

Approved. J.G.

(13) *Tanjore district.*—Tanjore (I), Kumbakónam (I) and Mannárgudi (IV) have been allowed ten, ten and eight clerks respectively against the number of nine in each case. The Collector recommends the addition of one clerk to each of the offices and states that the work in Mannárgudi is not done well even with the existing establishment. The Board approves the proposal to retain the Mannárgudi taluk at its present strength, but in the case of Tanjore and Kumbakónam which have already been strengthened by the revision scheme, it considers that nothing further need be done.

V.P.

I believe I was the Collector making the original recommendation. Tanjore taluk is a fearfully heavy taluk. I found the Abkári collection accounts and the Land Revenue collection accounts in the most alarming confusion while I was Collector there. In fact, I feared fraud, but could not prove it. The confusion was due to the fact that the establishment could not keep the accounts up to date. Kumbakónam is almost as heavy and though I was not able personally to look into the matter I believe it is as bad as Tanjore. Mannárgudi may go on as it is.

G.S.

The Tanjore and Kumbakonam taluks are *very* heavy taluks, and I think we should yield to the Collector's opinion that an extra clerk is needed.

J.G.

(14) *Trichinopoly district.*—The Collector points out that Perambalúr (IV) is a heavy taluk, because there is no Deputy Tahsildar, and asks that the present strength of nine clerks may be retained. The Board supports the Collector's recommendation.

Approved. J.G.

(15) *Tinnevelly district.*—Nángunéri is a third-class taluk, and the Board allowed its present strength of nine clerks. The Collector now applies for an additional clerk, alleging that the work in connection with the revenue collections and minor irrigation works is heavy. But the Board does not consider that the taluk requires special treatment.

Approved. J.G.

(16) *Coimbatore district.*—Karur is a fourth-class taluk and the Board proposed to reduce the strength of the establishment from nine to eight, while in the case of Kollegal (a fifth-class taluk) the existing number (eight) was allowed to stand. The Collector deprecates reduction at Karur which is a heavy taluk on account of irrigation disputes and asks for an extra clerk at Kollegal which is entitled to nine clerks according to scale as there is no Stationary Sub-Magistrate therein. Kollegal being notoriously unhealthy, there is ample reason, the Collector urges, for giving it the full establishment according to scale. The Board approves the Collector's proposals.

V.P.

G.S.

Approved. The work at Karur is very heavy and sickness prevented the full number of clerks at Kollegal from being at work at the same time all the while I was in Coimbatore.

J.G.

(17) *South Canara district.*—Kasaragod (III), Uppinangadi (IV) and Coondapoor (V) have been allowed nine, eight and eight clerks respectively against the present strength of nine, eight and nine. The Collector points out that Coondapoor is heavy, because it has no Deputy Tahsildar and that it has received an addition of twenty villages from Udipi. He therefore recommends that Coondapoor may be retained at its present strength. He also recommends the addition of a clerk to Uppinangadi taking away, if necessary, one from Kasaragod from which a number of villages was recently transferred to Uppinangadi—*vide* G.O., No. 831, Revenue, dated 20th December 1895. The Board approves of the Collector's proposals.

V.P.

There is for example little or no revenue work in the taluks of this district.

G.S.

Approved.

J.G.

(18) *Malabar district.*—The Collector points out that an extra clerk at Chirakkal (IV) was specially given to help the Tahsildar in treasury work on the abolition of the Cannanore sub-treasury. He also asks for another hand for Wynaad (III) which, having no Stationary Sub-Magistrate, is entitled according to scale to ten clerks, *i.e.*, to two in excess of the present number eight and in fact two clerks have already been sanctioned for it in anticipation of the present revision. The Board approves the Collector's proposals.

V.P.

G.S.

I approve of the Collector's proposal about the Wynaad; but I do not understand what it is proposed to do about Chirakkal and Kurumbranat. The Collector apparently wants to send a shroff to Kurumbranat from Chirakkal. Kurumbranat already has one permanent shroff on Rs. 15 and an additional shroff during the kist months.

J G.

(19) The Collectors of Madura and Salem have proposed no alterations.

7. The following statement shows the existing strength, the strength as proposed and approved by Government and that now proposed by the Board, for taluks in which any changes are suggested :—

District.	Taluk.	Existing strength.	Strength as originally proposed by the Board and approved by Government.	As now proposed by the Board of Revenue.	—
Ganjám	Berhampur	10	9	10	
	Chicacole	10	8	9	
	Goomsur	8	8	9	
Vizagapatam ..	Golgonda	6	7	8	
	Sarvasiddhi	6	6	7	
Gódávari ..	Rajahmundry ..	9	8	9	
Kistna	Gudiváda	9	9	10	I doubt whether Répalle should not have an extra clerk. J.G.
	Bandar	9	8	9	
	Nuzvid	8	8	9	
Cuddapah ..	Cuddapah	10	9	10	
	Proddatur	10	8	9	
Anantapur ..	Kalyandrug	6	6	7	
	Tadpatri	9	9	8	
Bellary	Hospet	8	8	9	
Kurneol	Nandyal	10	9	10	
	Pattikonda	9	8	9	
	Ramallakot	8	9	8	
Chingleput ..	Saidapet	9	8	9	
	Chingleput	9	8	9	
North Arcot ..	Vellore	9	8	9	
	Chittoor	9	8	9	
South Arcot ..	Kallakurchi	9	8	9	
Tanjore	Mannárgudi	9	8	9	I think Tanjore and Kumbakónam should each have an extra clerk. J.G.
Trichinopoly ..	Perambalúr	9	8	9	
Coimbatore ..	Karur	9	8	9	
	Kollegal	8	8	9	
South Canara ..	Coondapoor	9	8	9	
	Uppinangadi	8	8	9	
	Kasaragod	9	9	8	
Malabar	Wynaad	8	9	10	
	Chirakkal	9	8	9	I don't understand what is wanted with regard to Chirakkal and Kurumbranat. J.G. In regard to Chirakkal the Collector requests that the existing number of clerks be retained. V.P. 16-2-98.

I have noted opposite to each.

J.G.

8. The Board's proposals seem well considered and may, it is submitted, be approved. The number of taluks in each district classified with reference to the number of clerks to be allotted to each under the Board's present proposals is shown in the subjoined statement:—

—	Number of taluks with					
	Six clerks.	Seven clerks.	Eight clerks.	Nine clerks.	Ten clerks.	Total number of taluks in the district.
Ganjám	..	..	..	2	1	3
Vizagapatam	..	1	2	..	..	3
Gódávari	1	..	4	4	1	10
Kistna	..	..	3	6	3	12
Nellore	..	..	6	2	1	9
Cuddapah	..	..	5	5	1	11
Anantapur	..	1	6	1	..	8
Bellary	..	..	2	6	..	8
Kurnool	..	..	1	6	1	8
Chingleput	..	..	2	4	..	6
North Arcot	..	2	1	5	1	9
South Arcot	..	..	1	6	1	8
Tanjore	..	..	1	6	2	9
Trichinopoly	..	..	1	3	1	5
Madura	..	..	3	3	..	6
Tinnevelly	..	..	4	3	2	9
Coimbatore	..	..	3	6	1	10
Salem	..	..	2	4	3	9
South Canara	..	..	1	4	..	5
Malabar	..	..	3	4	2	9
Total ..	1	4	51	80	21	157
	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.	RS. A. P.
Cost for each office. As per Government scale.	122 8 0	140 0 0	160 0 0	175 0 0	200 0 0	..
Cost for each office. As per Board's scale.	127 8 0	152 8 0	170 0 0	187 8 0	207 8 0	..
Total cost .. As per Government scale.	122 8 0	560 0 0	8,160 0 0	14,000 0 0	4,200 0 0	27,042 8 0
Total cost .. As per Board's scale.	127 8 0	610 0 0	8,670 0 0	15,000 0 0	4,357 8 0	28,765 0 0

	RS. A. P.
Board's scale	28,765 0 0
Government scale	27,042 8 0
Difference *per mensem*	1,722 8 0 × 12
Difference *per annum*	20,670 0 0

9. *Shroffs.*—The Collector of Cuddapah proposes that the second shroff on Rs. 10 in the Jammalamadugu taluk may be abolished. The Board approves the proposal. It also approves the proposal of the Collector of Bellary to retain the additional shroff on Rs. 15 sanctioned in G.O., No. 130, dated 28th February 1889. There will thus be no change in the number of taluk shroffs; but there will be an increase in cost of Rs. 5 *per mensem* or Rs. 60 *per annum*.

Approved.

J.G.

10. *Dufterbunds or Attenders.*—The Collector of Kistna recommends that the pay of dufterbunds should be raised to Rs. 8, as they are often entrusted with the duties of clerks and occupy the position between taluk gumastahs and the inferior staff. But the Board does not recommend the proposal, as Government has already decided, in paragraph 2 (iv) of its Order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, that no increase in the pay of this class of servants is called for.

J. G.

It is submitted it is a mistake to entrust attenders with the duties of clerks, as they are thereby often led to think that they are above their legitimate work and thus neglect it.

PEONS.

11. Next as regards peons the Board of Revenue, after a full consideration of the Collectors' proposals, fixes the number to be retained at 3,207 instead of 3,173 sanctioned by Government, or 34 in excess. The additional cost involved in the proposals under this head will, as shown below, be Rs. 1,249 *per mensem* or Rupees 14,988 *per annum* against Rs. 12,540 arrived at by Government :—

		Rs.
157 duffadars at	Rs. 9 each ...	
157 × 3 peons	„ 8 „ ...	1,413
157 × 5 „	„ 7 „ ...	3,768
1,951 „	„ 6 „ ...	5,495
		11,706
		22,382
Deduct the cost *per mensem* of the existing establishment	...	21,133
	Total ...	1,249

12. The several cases in which increases are proposed and the grounds therefor are detailed below :—

(1) *Ganjám.*—The Board of Revenue proposed to reduce the number of peons in Goomsur taluk from 22 to 20, in Chicacole from 21 to 20, and in Berhampur from 22 to 20. But the Collector points out that no reduction is feasible in the number of peons in the Berhampur and Goomsur taluks, as in the former extra peons are required for the two additional Revenue Inspectors recently sanctioned on account of Rushikulya irrigation and as in the latter many peons are always ill owing to the unhealthiness of the climate. The Board considers that for the reasons urged by the Collector the existing number of peons in Goomsur and Berhampur may be left undisturbed. This means an increase of three peons as compared with the number previously suggested by the Board and approved by Government.

Approved.

J.G.

(2) *Gódávari.*—The Collector protests against the abolition of two peons in each of the taluks of Peddapuram, Amalápuram, Rámachándrapuram, Ellore, Tanuku, and Narasapur as the Tahsildars concerned have to depute one or two peons to assist the dependent Deputy Tahsildars who have much revenue work to do and sub-jails to look after. He also points out that the existing number of peons in Rajahmundry is necessary, as it is a central place through which officers of several departments and troops constantly pass. The Collector also proposes an increase of two peons to the Bhadráchalam taluk. The Board recommends that, for the reasons urged by the Collector, the reduction in the number of peons may be limited to one instead of two in the six taluks having dependent Deputy Tahsildars and that the existing number of peons in Rajahmundry may be left undisturbed. It also recommends that the additional peons proposed for Bhadráchalam may be sanctioned. The result will be an increase of ten peons over the number previously sanctioned.

Approved.

J.G.

(3) *Kistna.*—The Collector states that a reduction of two peons in each of the taluks of Bandar, Guntúr, Sattenapalle and Narasaraopet and of one peon in Bápatla is not possible, as two of the taluk peons are detailed for doing duty under the Stationary Sub-Magistrate and the Division Deputy Tahsildar and as the remaining peons are barely sufficient for the performance of their multifarious duties in the taluks. The Board recommends that one extra peon may be allowed for each of the taluks of Bandar, Bápatla and Guntúr or of three in all, as there are dependent Deputy Tahsildars' offices in those taluks. It remarks at the same time that, as the scheme allows a muchi for each taluk, the peons now said to be employed in doing that work will be available for other duties.

Approved.

J.G.

(4) *Chingleput.*—The Collector considers that it is not possible to reduce the present strength of peons in the Saidapet and Tiruvallúr taluks by two and one, respectively, as proposed. In the former taluk about 350 summonses have to be issued monthly besides processes under Act II of 1864. Moreover, the vicinity of Saidapet to Madras, the location of Collector's head-quarters at the station and of Government House at Guindy as well as the occasional demands for services in connection with the movements of troops through the taluk, all add to the calls on the services of peons. As regards Tiruvallúr it is pointed out that many of the villages lie at great distances, the most distant villages since the transfer of the Kanchinad taluk of the Kálahasti zamindari from the North Arcot district being 65 miles from the taluk head-quarters. The Board approves the Collector's proposals which mean an increase of three peons as compared with the number previously allowed.

Approved.

J.G.

(5) *Tanjore.*—The Collector states that no reduction in the number of peons is possible as twelve peons (the number proposed to be reduced) are employed as sub-jail warders. As regards Tanjore particularly he observes that, as the taluk is extensive, peons going to distant villages are unable to return soon and that, as the head-quarters taluk of the district, it requires more peons than other taluks. But the Board observes that all the taluks in Tanjore have been provided with Stationary Sub-Magistrates and the duty of looking after the sub-jail at the taluk head-quarters devolves on one of the peons of the Stationary Sub-Magistrates and not on the taluk peons *; that the only taluks in which an extra peon will be required are those of Máyavaram, Mannárgudi and Pattukóttai, in each of which there is a dependent Deputy Tahsildar with a sub-jail in charge of Revenue peons and that as regards the Tanjore taluk no addition to the present strength is in its opinion called for, the number of peons already allowed, namely 22, being left untouched.

V.P.

* *Office*—

Check this statement. It is incorrect as I remember. See correspondence from Salem.

G.S.
7-9-97.

To Secretary—

Please see paragraph 1 of G.O., No. 1329, Judicial, dated 1st June 1894, the original of which is submitted herewith.

Also paragraph 2 of G.O., No. 2518, Judicial, dated 20th October 1894.

V.P.
10-9-97.

In regard to the point referred to above, the point I raised before and which, I think should be taken into consideration here, is whether there is any good reason why these sub-jail warders should continue to be regarded as Land Revenue servants and whether after reducing accordingly the number of Revenue peons, these men should not go on to the jail budget.

G.S.

This is a separate matter entirely. The Board seems to be right in allowing an extra peon only for Máyavaram, Mannárgudi and Pattukóttai.

J.G.

(6) *Trichinopoly.*—The Collector states that the present strength of peons in the Trichinopoly taluk cannot be reduced by one as proposed, as the Trichinopoly town is the head-quarters station of the district and of the South Indian Railway Company, and as also two native regiments are stationed there. The Collector, however, offers

to spare one of the twenty peons allowed to the Kulitalai taluk. The Board approves the Collector's proposals which in effect involve no increase in the total number for the district.

Approved. J.G.

(7) *Madura.*—The Collector states that it is not possible to reduce the number of peons in the Madura taluk by four without seriously interfering with the despatch of work, as Madura being the head-quarters of the district special calls on the services of the peons are frequent. The number of peons for this taluk was 22 before 1891, and, as the number was insufficient, a peon from each of the four taluks of Periyakulam, Dindigul, Mélúr and Tirumangalam was transferred to it. But the Board of Revenue states that a Stationary Sub-Magistrate with two peons having since 1891 been sanctioned, the number of peons may be reduced from 26 to 24 instead of to 22 as originally proposed.

Approved. J.G.

(8) *Tinnevelly.*—The Board proposed to reduce the number of peons in Nángunéri and Ottapidáram Taluk offices from 22 and 21 to 21 and 19, respectively. The Collector states that the taluks are very extensive, having an area of 701 and 1,061 square miles, respectively, and adds that the work of the latter taluk is particularly heavy owing to the frequent necessity for services of notices in enquiries relating to the appointment of village officers in zamindari and inam villages, refund of surplus sale-proceeds of impounded cattle, payment of compensation and for the collection of income-tax, land-cess, &c. The Board considers that the existing number of peons in the Nángunéri taluk may be left undisturbed and that the number attached to Ottapidáram may be reduced by one instead of by two. The result is an increase of two peons over the number already allowed for the district.

Approved. J.G.

(9) *Coimbatore.*—The Collector states that the reduction of one peon proposed in each of the Erode and Dhárápuram taluks, should not be insisted on, as there is a Stock Inspector and pony-breeding operations are going on in each. He adds that one peon is permanently attached to the Stock Inspector and one or more are always employed in connection with the Government stallions. In the circumstances, the Board recommends that the present strength of peons in the two taluks be retained, *i.e.*, the number already allowed be increased by two.

Approved. J.G.

(10) *South Canara.*—The Collector states that no reduction can be made in the existing number of peons. He points out that the district being hilly, communications are difficult and have to be carried on mainly by peons and that taluk peons are attached to sub-jails at the taluk head-quarters and are deputed to work under Deputy Tahsildars, of whom there is one in each taluk except in Coondapoor. The Board observes that there is a Stationary Sub-Magistrate at the head-quarters of each of the taluks and the duty of looking after the sub-jail devolves on one of the Stationary Sub-Magistrate's peons, but that the four taluks in which there are dependent Deputy Tahsildars will be allowed one additional peon each, the number for the district being thus increased by four.

Approved. J.G.

(11) *Malabar.*—The Collector points out that the amsoms in Malabar are unlike east coast villages, very extensive, and the larger the number of peons who are the means of communication between the taluk and the village officers, the greater the facility in the despatch of business, and that both the Sub-Collector and the Special Assistant Collector are against the proposed reduction. The Board would recommend that the number of peons in each of the taluks of Kóttayam and Kurumbranát be reduced by one instead of by two as originally proposed, *i.e.*, that the number already allowed for the district be increased by two.

Approved. J.G.

13. The following statement shows (1) the existing number of peons, (2) the number originally allowed by the Board and approved by Government, and (3) the number now proposed by the Board in the taluks in which any alterations are suggested:—

District.	Taluk.	The number now existing.	The number proposed to be retained by the Board and approved by Government.	The number as now proposed by the Board.
Ganjám	Goomsur	22	20	22
	Berhampur	21	20	21
	Peddápuram	21	19	20
	Amalápuram	22	20	21
	Rámachandrapuram	22	20	21
Gódávari	Ellore	21	19	20
	Tanuku	22	20	21
	Narsapur	22	20	21
	Rajahmundry	21	19	21
	Bhadráchalam	8	8	10
Kistna	Bandur	21	19	20
	Bápatla	22	21	22
	Guntúr	21	19	20
Chingleput	Saidapet	22	20	22
	Tiruvallúr	21	20	21
Tanjore	Máyavaram	21	19	20
	Mannárgudi	21	20	21
	Pattukkóttai	21	20	21
	Tanjore	22	22	22
Madura	Madura	26	22	24
Tinnevelly	Nángunéri	22	21	22
	Ottappidáram	21	19	20
Coimbatore	Erode	22	21	22
	Dhárápuram	21	20	21
South Canara	Mangalore	21	20	21
	Uppinangádi	21	19	20
	Udipi	21	19	20
	Kasaragod	21	19	20
Malabar	Kóttayam	21	19	20
	Kurumbranát	21	19	20
	Total	..	603	637

14. *Deputy Tahsildars' Establishments—Clerks.*—The Board proposes, on the recommendations of the Collectors concerned,—

(1) to increase the pay of the two clerks in the Bissemkatak Deputy Tahsildar's office who are now paid Rs. 20 and Rs. 15, respectively, by Rs. 5 each on account of the unhealthiness of the locality;

V.P. G.S.

The increase may be allowed as a local allowance. J.G.

(2) to allow a third clerk on Rs. 15 for Vissannapet (Kistna district), which is an independent Deputy Tahsildar's division, on account of the heavy work therein (the number of revenue and magisterial cases disposed of in a year being 3,203 and 254, respectively);

Approved. J.G.

(3) to allow a second clerk on Rs. 15 to Venkatagirikota in consideration of the unhealthiness of the locality and of the fact that eight villages of the Palmanér taluk have been transferred to the Venkatagirikota division for magisterial purposes;

V.P. G.S.

The Board has told the Collector to report the number of magisterial cases disposed of within the last three years. It has approved, however, of the entertainment of a second clerk. This proposal may be sanctioned provisionally, but the Collector's report, about the number of magisterial cases, should be submitted to Government, and also a statement of the population of the eight villages. J.G.

(4) to sanction a third clerk on Rs. 15 for the Tirupati Deputy Tahsildar's office, the work in that sub-treasury having considerably increased since the abolition of the sub-treasuries at Kálahasti, Puttur and Tirutani in 1893;

Approved.

J.G.

(5) to grant a local allowance of Rs. 5 each to the two clerks in the Deputy Tahsildar's office at Shevaroys as suggested by Government in paragraph 4 of its order No. 624, dated 14th November 1896; and

Approved.

J.G.

(6) to increase the pay of the Head Clerk in the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office from Rs. 25 to Rs. 30 so as to be on a par with that of the Head Clerk in Ootacamund and Gudalur Deputy Tahsildars' offices. The Collector points out that Gudalur, where the treasury transactions are not so heavy as in Coonoor, has been provided with a Taluk Sarishatadar, while only an Accountant on Rs. 25 has been sanctioned to attend to the treasury work in the latter place.

Approved.

J.G.

G.S.

It is submitted that the proposals (2) (3), (4), (5) and (6), referred to above, may be sanctioned.

As regards (1), it is desirable that the increase proposed should take the form of a local allowance as in the case of No. (5)—*vide* also G.O., No. 276, dated 28th April 1897.

It seems inadvisable, at all events at present, to extend this principle to the case of the Head Clerk of the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office as the pay of the different clerical appointments in the Nilgiris appear generally to have been fixed with reference to the climate and the work to be done and without reference to the rates prevailing on the plains.

15. The Government in paragraph 3 (i) of its order No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, approved of the Board's proposal to raise, from Rs. 15 to Rs. 20, the pay of the senior clerk in those offices which were provided with two or more clerks each. The number of such offices was stated to be 138. But it has now to be raised to 140, as a second clerk has since been proposed for the Venkatagirikota Deputy Tahsildar's office in North Arcot, and as it appears that the two clerks in the Kumbakónam town Deputy Tahsildar's office get only Rs. 15 each—not Rs. 20 and Rs. 15 as previously supposed.

	RS.
* (1) Local allowance of Rs. 5 to each of the two clerks in the Bissemkatak Deputy Tahsildar's office.	10
(2) A third clerk for the Vissannapet Deputy Tahsildar's office.	15
(3) A second clerk for the Venkatagirikota Deputy Tahsildar's office.	15
(4) A third clerk for the Tirupati Deputy Tahsildar's office.	15
(5) Local allowance of Rs. 5 to each of the two clerks in the Deputy Tahsildar's office, Shevaroys.	10
(6) Increase of pay to the Head Clerk, Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office.	5
(7) Increase of pay, at Rs. 5 each, to the senior clerk in 140 Deputy Tahsildars' offices.	700
Total cost per mensem ...	770
" *per annum* ...	9,240

16. The cost of the additional clerks and of the increased pay and local allowances proposed will be Rs. 9,240 * *per annum* as shown on the margin.

17. *Shroffs.*—(*a*) The Board did not originally contemplate any increase in the number of shroffs. The Collector of Vizagapatam now proposes the entertainment of a shroff in each of the seventeen Deputy Tahsildars' offices in his district which have no shroffs at present. He states that the numerous errors and omissions pointed out by the Accountant-General in his annual reports on the working of the treasuries occur mostly in the accounts received from the Deputy Tahsildars in charge of sub-treasuries, and that this is due to the inadequacy of the establishments. But the Board of Revenue recommends only 11 shroffs on Rs. 10 each for the marginally-noted offices, because the monthly average transactions at those places exceed Rs. 10,000.

Anakápalle.	Rayagada.
Víravilli.	Sálúr.
Vizagapatam.	Bobbili.
Gunupur.	Nowrangapur.
Chipurupalle.	Malkanagiri.
Korapet.	

(*b*) The Board also considers that Párvatípuram should be allowed a shroff, as the average monthly transactions at that station amount to Rs. 58,776, but suggests that the appointment be deferred as there is already a temporary shroff paid from the funds of the Kurupám and Bélgam estates under the Court of Wards. It is observed, however, that the Privy Council has lately given a decision adverse to the Bélgam Ranee in regard to one-half of the estate, and the Kurupám minor will attain his majority in September 1898. Further, the Government levies a contribution of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the income of estates under its management, and it is a question whether it is fair to make the estates pay again for the shroff. In any case, as the estates will soon go out of the hands of the Court, it will probably be convenient to make provision for the pay of the Párvatípuram shroff also in the present scheme, unless it is thought that, for purposes of keeping down the expenditure, it should be omitted.

V.P.

G.S.

As the Board and the Collector agree I suppose this must be allowed, but I know nothing about the district. The Hon'ble Sir Henry Bliss knows a great deal.

J.G.
9-10-97.

I think Párvatípuram must be added to the eleven places where a Rs. 10 shroff is to be allowed.

J.G.
3-11-97.

(*c*) The Collector of North Arcot recommends the appointment of a deputy shroff for the Punganúr sub-treasury which was recently re-established under G.O., No. 3176, dated 13th August 1894; but as the sub-treasury had no shroff prior to its abolition, the Board of Revenue has called upon the Collector to report the average of the monthly transactions to see whether the services of a shroff are necessary. The report may be awaited.

V.P.

G.S.

Approved. According to the abstract in the Board's Proceedings, the Collector gives no reasons except that there is a sub-treasury there.

J.G.

(*d*) The Collector of the Nilgiris represents that whenever the post of shroff in the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office falls vacant, great difficulty is experienced in finding men able to furnish a security of Rs. 500 and proposes that the pay may be raised from Rs. 12 to Rs. 17-8-0. The Collector adds that the transactions of the treasury have increased from Rs. 4,04,740 in 1887, when the post was first sanctioned, to Rs. 10,52,956 in 1895, and the Board of Revenue recommends that, though the Government has declined to sanction any increase to this class of officers as a whole, this may be treated as a special case and proposes that the pay be increased to

Rs. 15 a month—the increase being intended as compensation for the heavy work involved not on account of the costliness of the place or unhealthiness of the locality—may be treated as addition to the pay.

V.P.

G.S.

I have no doubt this is necessary. I have already approved of raising the Head Clerk's pay by Rs. 5.

J.G.

18. The additional cost under the above head, as recommended by the Board of Revenue, will be $(11 \times 10 + 3) \times 12 =$ Rs. 1,356 *per annum.*

19. *Dufterbunds.*—(*a*) The Collector of Vizagapatam proposes to increase the pay of the attender in Bissemkatak from Rs. 10 to Rs. 15, and the Board of Revenue approves of the recommendation in view of the unhealthiness of the climate. Seeing that attenders elsewhere get only Rs. 7 each, the pay which the attender at Bissamkatak now gets, namely, Rs. 10, seems sufficient. In any case a further increase of as much as Rs. 5 is too liberal. It is also a question for consideration whether any pay in excess of Rs. 7 which the Government may agree to allow the attender, should not be treated as local allowance.

V.P.

G.S.

The local allowance which it is proposed to give the two clerks is only Rs. 5. Rs. 3 is enough for the dufterbund, and out of the present pay, Rs. 10, Rs. 7 should be reckoned as salary and Rs. 3 as local allowance in future; but this should not be done with regard to the present incumbent, as it will reduce his pension.

J.G.

(*b*) The Collector of the Nilgiris proposes, with reference to the Board's remark in paragraph 17 of its Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, that, as the work in the Deputy Tahsildars' offices at Ootacamund, Gúdalúr and Coonoor, has been steadily increasing and as it is difficult to find qualified men for the post of attenders, an additional clerk for each Deputy Tahsildar's office may be sanctioned; but the Board of Revenue is not prepared to recommend the appointment of clerks as proposed and says that the Collector ought to be able to manage with attenders as in other districts and recommends the entertainment of three attenders as noted on the margin.* It is a question for consideration whether in these cases also the pay may not be fixed at Rs. 7 each, a local allowance of Rs. 3 being sanctioned for the attenders at Ootacamund and Coonoor. The Gúdalúr man will get the Wynaad allowance of 50 per cent. of the pay. Although the principle of the local allowance has not been generally extended to the case of employés in the Nilgiris, it seems desirable to apply it in the case of any appointments which may hereafter be newly sanctioned.

	RS.
* Ootacamund	10
Coonoor	10
Gúdalúr	8
Wynaad allowance	4

V.P.

G.S.

It has not been proposed that Rs. 5 by which the Head Clerk's pay is increased and the increase to the shroff's pay should be treated as a local allowance because their pay has been fixed specially for Coonoor, without reference to the pay of similar officers on the plains. In the case of the dufterbund, however, it is fixed with reference to the pay of similar officers on the plains and the extra Rs. 3 should be a local allowance. So with regard to the pay of the dufterbund at Ootacamund, apparently, too, the Wynaad allowance for all servants should be treated as a local allowance, if we can do so under the Code.

J.G.

(*c*) There is no attender at present in the Deputy Tahsildar's office on the Shevaroys and the Collector of Salem considers that an attender should be entertained and that his pay should be fixed at Rs. 10 in consideration of the fact that living on the hills is costly, and that the attender is expected to assist in clerical work. The Board recommends the Collector's proposal, but is of opinion that, as the pay of attenders in the plains is Rs. 7, Rs. 3 may be given in the shape of local allowance. This is right.

Yes.
J.G.

20. The extra expenditure involved in the Board's proposals will be Rs. 47 *per mensem* or Rs. 564 *per annum.* But if it is thought that no increase is necessary to the Bissemkatak attender and that the pay of the Gúdalúr attender also may be fixed at Rs. 7, the increase will be only Rs. $40\frac{1}{2}$ *per mensem* or Rs. 486 *per annum.*

—	Proposed by the Board.	Sanctioned by Government.
Dufterbunds.	RS.	RS.
Bissemkatak	5	..
Ootacamund	10	7 + 3
Coonoor	10	7 + 3
Gúdalúr	8	7
Wynaad allowance	4	+ $3\frac{1}{2}$
Shevaroys	7	7
Local allowance	3	+ 3
	47	$40\frac{1}{2}$

21. *Peons.*—(*a*) There are two peons in the Deputy Tahsildar's office at Cocanada on Rs. 6 each and the Collector proposes an additional peon. The Board of Revenue recommends the entertainment of the peon as the Revenue Inspector allowed for the division has not been provided with a separate peon.

The Board recommends an additional peon on Rs. 7. I think this is right.

J G.

(*b*) Vissannapeta in the Kistna district has only two peons and the Collector states that an additional peon is necessary and the Board supports him.

Also in this case.

J.G.

(*c*) The Collector of Nilgiris reports that two additional peons for each of the Deputy Tahsildars' offices at Ootacamund and Coonoor are necessary as there are two Revenue Inspectors in each of the divisions who have not yet been provided with peons and who feel great inconvenience for want of them. Each of these offices has now one peon on Rs. 9 and two peons on Rs. 8 each. The Collector proposes to fix the pay of the new men at Rs. 8 so that each office will hereafter have one peon on Rs. 9 and 4 peons on Rs. 8 each. It is a question whether in each of these cases Rs. 2 may not be treated as local allowance, so that the pay proper may be reduced to what it is on the plains.

The additional peons on Rs. 8 are necessary, but I think their pay should be Rs. 6, and Rs. 2 should be a local allowance.

J.G.

(*d*) The extra cost involved will be Rs. 44 *per mensem* or Rs. 528 *per annum.* Adding to this the cost of increasing by one rupee, the pay of one peon in each of 151 Deputy Tahsildars' offices, viz., Rs. 1,812, the increased cost under this head will be Rs. 2,340 *per annum.*

(*e*) It is stated that the Kodaikánal Deputy Tahsildar's office has already a peon on Rs. 7 and no increase is proposed. It is not known what pay the peons in the office at Shevaroys get. Orders are requested as to whether the pay of the peons in these two offices may not be fixed as on the plains with a local allowance of Rs. 2 each—*vide* G.Os., No. 276, dated 28th April 1897, and Mis. No. 952, dated 18th February 1897.

We need say nothing about this. Any inquiry will result in an increase, and no increase has been asked for.

J.G.

22. The total additional expenditure involved in the revised proposals now submitted by the Board of Revenue for improving the position of the taluk establishments will be Rs. 1,03,734 *per annum* as detailed below against the estimate of Rs. 92,610 framed by Government:—

		RS.
	Taluk-clerks	61,746
	Shroffs	60
	Muchis	13,188
	Dufterbunds	252
	Peons	14,988
	Deputy Tahsildars' clerks	9,240
These will vary with the orders which may be passed on proposals in paragraphs 17 (*b*), 19 (*a*) and (*b*), and 21 (*e*) of the note.	Shroffs	1,356
	Dufterbunds	564
	Peons	2,340
	Total ...	1,03,734

RS.
1,03,734
20,670
1,24,404

If the scale of pay suggested by the Board for the taluk clerks be accepted, the additional cost will be Rs. 1,24,404.

V.P.

It should not be accepted.

G.S.

J.G.

23. The Board states that the necessary proposition statement will be submitted as soon as orders are passed on its present proposals.

24. In paragraph 16 of its Proceedings, the Board refers to a suggestion made by the Collector of Malabar that for the future all appointments of taluk clerks should be made by Divisional-officers on the ground that they are in a better position than Collectors to judge of the capabilities of these officials. Under existing orders Divisional-officers have power to appoint clerks on Rs. 20 and under in their divisions, subject to report to and veto by the Collector, and the Board thinks that the same power may be extended to all classes of taluk gumastahs whatever their pay. It does not consider that any other change is called for as Collectors do not generally interfere with the Divisional-officer's nominations. "On the other hand," it observes "it is "desirable that Collectors should retain the power of vetoing in their hands, so that "they may be in a position to see that educated and competent men are appointed to "taluk offices."

It is submitted that the Board's proposal may be approved.

V.P.
3-9-97.

This matter is before Government in another form.

G.S.

This must be considered with reference to the Board's proposals about Sub-Collectors, which I have not looked into yet.

J.G.

To the Hon'ble Mr. Grose.
" " *Sir Henry Bliss.*

G. STOKES.
14-9-97.

Most of the considerations now brought before Government relate to changes in the strength of the establishments proposed by the Board which Collectors think necessary because of the extra work, unhealthiness, etc., of some places. The changes which the Board recommends entail an expenditure of Rs. 11,034 in addition to the Rs. 1,03,644 approved by Government. I have noted above on the various proposals.

J. G[ROSE].
9-10-97.

Please put up a note showing the financial effect of the Board's proposals, so far as they have been approved by the Hon'ble Mr. Grose. I should like to see that before I go into details.

H. W. B[LISS].
12-10-97.

Office—

Prepare the note.

G S.
13-10-97.

To Secretary—

The cost of the proposals sanctioned in G.O., No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, is Rs. 92,610 *per annum.*

The Board's further proposals, which have now been approved by the Hon'ble Mr. Grose, fall under the two main heads "Tahsildars' establishments" and "Deputy Tahsildars' establishments."

A. The Tahsildars' Establishments—

Clerks—

(1) Increase in the number, 24.
(2) Do. in the total cost, Rs. 420.

The Honourable Member has also sanctioned three extra clerks—

1 for Répalle,
1 for Tanjore, and
1 for Kumbakónam.

Each of these taluks has already got ten clerks. If one more is allowed, the strength will rise to eleven in each. The question is what pay should be allowed to the new man. Looking to the scale sanctioned by Government in paragraph 2 of its Order, No 624, dated 24th November 1896, the increase should, it is thought, be in the number of hands on $17\frac{1}{2}$. If this is approved the cost of an establishment consisting of eleven hands will be Rs. 217-8-0.

The total additional expenditure, which the proposals sanctioned by the Hon'ble Mr. Grose under this head involve, is Rs. $420+3 \times 17\frac{1}{2}$ or Rs. 472-8-0 *per mensem.*

Shroffs—

(1) Increase in number, *nil.*
(2) Do. in cost, Rs. 5 *per mensem.*

Peons—

(1) Increase in number, 34.
(2) Do. in cost, Rs. 204.

B. Deputy Tahsildars' Establishments—

Clerks—

(1) Increase in number, 3.
(2) Do. in cost, Rs. 80.

Shroffs—

(1) Increase in number, * 12.
(2) Do. in cost, Rs. 120.

* Including one shroff for Párvatípuram not proposed by the Board, but sanctioned by the Honourable Member.

Dufterbunds—

(1) Increase in number, 4.
(2) Do. in cost, Rs. 40-8-0.

Peons—

(1) Increase in number, 6.
(2) Do. in cost, Rs. 43.

The total additional cost involved is thus—

	RS.	A.	P.
Tahsildars' Establishment—			
Clerks	472	8	0
Shroffs	5	0	0
Peons	204	0	0
Deputy Tahsildars' Establishment—			
Clerks	80	0	0
Shroffs	123	0	0
Dufterbunds	40	8	0
Peons	43	0	0
Total cost *per mensem* ...	968	0	0
Total cost *per annum* ...	11,616	0	0
Additional expenditure already sanctioned	92,610	0	0
Do. now sanctioned by Hon'ble Mr. Grose.	11,616	0	0
Total ...	1,04,226	0	0

against Rupees 11,124 proposed by the Board.

V.P.
21-10-97.

To the Hon'ble Sir Henry Bliss.

G.S.
21-10-97.

It seems to me that the Board has dealt with this matter in a very unsatisfactory way, from first to last. As I pointed out in my note on pages 18 and 19 of the office-note in G.O., No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, the Board, when called upon for proposals for spending ·54 on the improvement of the position of taluk gumastahs, launched out into all sorts of other questions as to which they were not asked, and proposed a total additional expenditure of Rs. 1,31,412 per annum, or much more than double the sum which they had been told was available. This scheme was cut down and proposals involving an additional expenditure of Rs. 92,610 per annum submitted to the Government of India in order to their obtaining the sanction thereto of the Secretary of State, the Board of Revenue being at the same time called upon to prepare and submit the necessary detailed proposition statement. Instead of confining itself to doing what it was told to do, the Board has now, a second time, gone beyond what it was told to do, and has proposed increases on the scale approved by Government which will cost (as modified by the Hon'ble Mr. Grose) Rs. 11,616 per annum more than the Rs. 92,610 which we have already reported to India as the sum-total of our requirements. The additional expenditure now to be proposed amounts, therefore, to Rs. 1,04,226 per annum or very nearly double what we started with.

I do not, of course, deny that we want more and better paid establishments in the taluks, nor did I expect that the detailed proposition statement which the Board was directed to prepare would tally to an anna with the estimate of Rs. 92,610, already sent to India. I did expect, however, that there would be some sort of correspondence between the sum we had mentioned and the detailed statement. As it is, the latter will exceed the former by more than 12½ per cent. It seems to me that if we go up to India with these new proposals we shall cut a ridiculous figure. Beginning with ·54, we allowed the Board to ask for 1·31; then we cut this down to ·93 and now we are going to put the estimated cost of our proposals up to 1·04. India may well ask, do we know our own minds? and what finality is there in our proposals?

In my opinion, an effort should be made to cut the present proposals down to something more nearly approaching the standard of Rs. 92,610, which we have ourselves set. If not, I fear that one of two things may happen:—Either India will reject our scheme altogether—a decision to which the existing state of the finances, both

Imperial and Provincial, will certainly prompt; or it will hack it about—an operation which would be much better performed locally than be left to those who are ignorant of our circumstances.

Pending a decision on this main question, I postpone consideration of details.

H.W.B.
23-10-97.

Resubmitted to the Hon'ble Mr. Grose; also submitted to His Excellency the Governor.

G.S.
27-10-97.

I do not remember how the ·54 of G.O., No. 1108, Financial, dated 15th December 1894, for improving the condition of taluk *gumastahs* was calculated, or the purport of G.O., No. 164, dated 16th January 1895, which is abstracted in the Board's Proceedings printed with G.O., No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, as calling for proposals to improve the position of taluk *establishments*, and I should like to see these two orders. In March 1896, the Board submitted proposals for improving all grades of the *establishment* of Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars, and in paragraph 23 requested Collectors to verify the figures it had adopted and make suggestions. On this we asked the Government of India to get us sanction for spending Rs. 92,610 on these establishments. Subsequently in letter, No. 2154, dated 22nd May 1897, we told the Government of India that the Collectors had reported as directed in the Board's Proceedings and said that additional establishments were necessary. After this the Government of India will expect some addition. I do not see reason to modify any of the additions of which I have approved. In deference, however, to the strong opinion of my Honourable colleague, I will consent to tell the Board to do the best it can for Rs. 1,00,000, and prepare proposition statements accordingly.

J.G.
3-11-97.

With reference to the Hon'ble Mr. Grose's instructions, G.Os., No. 1108, Financial, dated 15th December 1894, and No. 164, Revenue, dated 16th January 1895, are submitted herewith. The note under G.O., No. 839, dated 8th September 1891, explains how the cost of improving the position of taluk establishments was originally taken to be ·54 lakh *per annum*.

V.P.
5-11-97.

G.S.
5-11-97.

I see that the ·54 was calculated as the cost of improving taluk *establishments* (including gumastahs, shroffs, attenders, muchis and peons). In G.O., No. 1108, Financial, dated 15th December 1894, the following addition to the budget was ordered:— "Improvement of the position of taluk gumastahs, Rs. 54,000." But it directed that orders should be issued in the Revenue Department, calling for detailed proposals for the scheme "for improving the position of taluk *establishments*"; and in G.O., No. 164, Revenue, dated 16th January 1895, it was communicated to the Board, with the request that detailed proposals for improving the position of taluk *establishments* might be submitted, and no mention was made of the Rs. ·54. I cannot see, therefore, that the Board went beyond its instructions when it submitted proposals for improving other posts of the taluk establishments besides clerks, or when it advised that the cost of necessary improvements would be more than Rs. ·54.

J.G.
8-11-97.

I agree with what the Hon'ble Mr. Grose says above. I think, while, we are about this business, we should make it as complete as possible. I should accept the Board's proposals as modified by the Hon'ble Mr. Grose. I would ask for Rs. 1,04,226.

A. E. H[AVELOCK].
14-2-98.

N.B.—These papers have only just reached me. They are marked very urgent, so I will not attempt to go into detail.

A.E.H.
14-2-98.

To Secretary—

Before submitting a draft Government Order on this paper orders on the following points are solicited:—

1 *Paragraph* 6 (4) *of the office-note.*—Is an additional clerk to be allowed for the Répalle taluk office? The Hon'ble Mr. Grose remarks—

"I have doubts about Répalle."
"I am not sure about it."

Under all the circumstances, as these three clerks are not recommended by the Board, I think nothing should be said about them. The Government of India would probably "cut" this item.

J.G.

"I doubt whether Répalle should not have an extra clerk"— statement in paragraph 7 of office-note.

2. If an extra clerk for Répalle is to be allowed, what is his pay to be and what is to be the pay of the additional clerk sanctioned for Tanjore and Kumbakónam [paragraph 6 (13)]. It was suggested that it might be fixed at Rs. 17-8-0 (*vide* office-note on page 18), but no orders were passed on the point.

3. *Paragraph* 6 (18) *of the first office-note.*—The Honourable Member remarks—

"I do not understand what it is proposed to do about Chirakkal and Kurumbranát. The Collector apparently wants to send a shroff to Kurumbranát from Chirakkal. Kurumbranát already has one permanent shroff on Rs. 15 and an additional shroff during the kist months."

Chirakkal and Kurumbranat have nine clerks each at present; but as they are only fourth-grade taluks, it was proposed to reduce the number to eight in each case. The Collector accepts the reduction in the case of Kurumbranát, but not in the case of Chirakkal. He points out that an extra clerk for this taluk was specially given to help the Tahsildar in treasury work on the abolition of the Cannanore Sub-treasury. Please see entries in columns 3, 7 and 8 against the two taluks named at page 12 of Board's Proceedings, No. 224, dated 7th July 1897. The Board supports the Collector's proposal. May it be approved?

Yes.

J.G.

As regards shroffs, there seem to be three permanent men at Chirakkal (one on Rs. 20, one on Rs. 15 and one on Rs. 10); while at Kurumbranát there is one permanent man on Rs. 15 and one temporary man on Rs. 10 employed during the kist months. The Collector proposes to transfer one man from the former to the latter taluk with a view to afford some relief to this office. The Board supports the proposal and it may be accepted. In that case the temporary shroff will, it is presumed, be unnecessary.

Page 17 of G.O., No. 624, dated 14th November 1896.

Yes.

J.G.

4. *Paragraph* 14 (3) *of the office-note—Venkatagirikota Deputy Tahsildar's office.*—This office has only one clerk at present. The Collector reported that the services of another clerk were required in consideration of the unhealthiness of the locality and of the fact that he had transferred eight villages of the Palmanér taluk to the Venkatagirikota division for magisterial purposes. The Board approved the Collector's recommendation, but requested him to report the number of magisterial cases disposed of within the last three years. The Honourable Member has sanctioned the proposal provisionally, but has also directed that the Collector's report about the number of magisterial cases should be submitted to Government, together with a statement of the population of the eight villages. The report about the magisterial cases has since been received. It shows that the number of cases disposed of in 1894, 1895 and 1896 was 62, 39 and 65, respectively. With reference to this, the Board remarks that, although the number of cases disposed of in the office is too small to require the services of an additional clerk, the provision already made should be retained in view of the unhealthiness of the station. May the proposal be approved? Information as to the population of the eight villages is not available.

Yes.

J.G.

5. *Paragraph* 17 (*b*) *of the office-note.*—Referring to the proposal to allow a shroff on Rs. 10 for each of the eleven Deputy Tahsildars' offices in Vizagapatam, named, the Hon'ble Mr. Grose remarks: "As the Board and the Collector agree I "suppose this must be allowed, but I know nothing about the district. The Hon'ble "Sir Henry Bliss knows a great deal."

Yes. My knowledge of the district is not sufficient to warrant me in negativing the recommendations of the Board and the Collector.

J.G.

May the Honourable Member be understood as sanctioning the proposals? Neither the Hon'ble Sir Henry Bliss nor His Excellency the Governor considered the details of the proposals.

6. *Paragraph* 17 (*c*) *of the office-note.*—The Collector of North Arcot recommended the appointment of a shroff for the Punganur sub-treasury, but with a view to determine whether such appointment was necessary, the Board called upon the Collector to report the average monthly transactions. The Collector's reply has now been received and it shows that the average monthly transactions exceed Rs. 10,000. The Board accordingly recommends the appointment of a shroff on Rs. 10, as proposed by the Collector. May the recommendation be approved? (Please see G.O., No. 1071, dated 21st June 1864, and paragraph 4 of Board's Proceedings, No. 9, dated 8th January 1890, under G.O., Mis. No. 2147, dated 31st March 1890).

G. S. FORBES.

Yes.

J.G.

7. *Paragraph* 21 (*c*) *of the office-note.*—The Honourable Member has decided that the additional peons now sanctioned for Ootacamund and Coonoor Deputy Tahsildars' offices should get a pay of Rs. 6, with a local allowance of Rs. 2 each. May the principle be extended to the existing peons also, subject to the condition that the present incumbents do not suffer (*vide* Honourable Member's remarks on paragraph 19 of the office-note with reference to Bissemkatak attender)?

G.S.F.

Yes.

J.G.

8. In paragraph 2 (ii) of its order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, the Government called upon the Board to consider whether the pay of the shroffs of the Wynaad and Chirakkal taluks who draw Rs. 20 each, might not be altered so as to conform to the general scale, any extra amount being paid in the shape of a local allowance, if necessary.

Paragraph 8 (sub-para. 2) of B.P., No. 224, dated 7th July 1897.

The Collector of Malabar, to whom the Board made a reference on the point, states that there is no objection to the proposed reduction in the pay of the shroff in Chirakkal provided the present incumbent is granted a personal allowance of Rs. 5 *per mensem*, so that he may not suffer. But as regards the shroff in Wynaad, he thinks that his pay should be left unaltered. The Deputy Collector reports: "I "have found it rather difficult to obtain the services of competent hands as clerks on a "salary of Rs. 15 with the usual Wynaad allowance, and as shroffs require a certain "amount of technical knowledge for the efficient performance of their duties, I am "afraid any reduction in the pay will render the office less attractive."

The Board supports the Collector's recommendations. May they be sanctioned?

Yes.

J.G.
19-2-98.

V.P.
18-2-98.

To the Honourable Member—

For orders.

G. S. FORBES.
18-2-98.

To Secretary—

Please see draft below.

V.P.
22-2-98.

To the Honourable Sir Henry Bliss—

Draft for approval. The Hon'ble Mr. Grose's notes on points of difference or doubt are on pages 21 and 22 *supra*.

G.S.F.
22-2-98.

Seen. I think that by asking for so much we run a great risk of getting nothing.

H.W.B.
23-2-98.

Issue.

G.S.F.
23-2-98.

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 6489

SECT. GOVT. MADRAS 29 JUL 97 REV. DEPT.

From The Board of Rev., Land Rev.,

Order

No. 224.

Dated 7-7-97

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Subng. revised proposals for the revision of Taluk and Dy. Tahsildars' Estabts. in the Presy.

MM (with papers) 30/7

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
vide dx.	p. 1897 12.3.97.		

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Standing S.A. 26/2/98

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

1897.

Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

MADRAS.

Printed July 24th.

Proceedings, No. 224, 7th July 1897.

JULY.

Submitting to Government revised proposals for the revision of Taluk and Deputy Tahsildars' establishments in the Presidency.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE

(LAND REVENUE).

READ—Reports submitted by Collectors with reference to Board's Proceedings, paragraph 23 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, relating to the revision of taluk establishments.

READ—Government Order, No. 624, Revenue Department, dated 14th November 1896.

READ—letter from V. A. BRODIE, Esq., Collector of Gódávari, dated 27th May 1897, Ref. No. 2056-Ver., stating that two more peons are needed for the Bhadráchalam taluk.

RESOLUTION—No. 224, dated 7th July 1897.

With its Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, the Board submitted to Government a scheme for improving the position of Tahsildars' and Deputy Tahsildars' establishments in the Presidency and requested Collectors at the same time to verify the figures in the several statements upon which the Board's proposals were based and to submit any suggestions which they might have to offer on the subject. The total additional expenditure involved in the Board's scheme was Rs. 1,31,412 per annum.

2. In the order first read above, Government approved of the Board's proposals with certain modifications chiefly in the apportionment of the number of hands in the several grades of pay and called for a proposition statement for submission to the Government of India. The result of the modifications made by Government was a reduction of the additional expenditure involved in the Board's scheme from Rupees 1,31,412 to Rs. 92,610.

3. Some of the Collectors consulted consider the reductions proposed by the Board in the number of clerks and peons in certain taluk offices to be impracticable and some have taken the opportunity to apply for the entertainment of additional hands in some of the taluks and Deputy Tahsildars' offices which the Board did not propose to strengthen. The Collectors' proposals and the Board's recommendations thereon have been tabulated under the heads "Taluk clerks", "Taluk peons" and "Deputy Tahsildars' establishments" and printed as Appendices I, II and III, respectively, to

these Proceedings. The net result of the Board's final recommendations under each of the three heads specified above is as shown below :—

—	As now existing.		As proposed by the Board in Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896		As approved by Government in Government Order, No 264, dated 14th November 1896.		As now recommended by the Board.	
	Number.	Cost.	Number.	Cost.	Number.	Cost.	Number.	Cost.
		RS.		RS		RS.		RS.
Taluk Clerks	1,351	21,897	1,347	28,300	1,347	26,607½	1,372	27,042½
Do. Shroffs	224	3,020	224	3,464	224	3,020	224	3,025
Do. Muchis	..	..	157	1,099	157	1,099	157	1,099
Do. Dufterbunds ..	154	1,082	157	1,103	157	1,103	157	1,103
Do. Peons including Duffadars) ..	3,470	21,133	3,330	23,115	3,330	22,178	3,364	22,382
Deputy Tahsildars' Establishments.								
Clerks	340	5,352½	340	6,042½	340	6,042½	343	6,122½
Shroffs	18	234⅔	18	264⅔	18	234⅔	29	347⅔
Dufterbunds	148	1,036	148	1,036	148	1,036	152	1,075½
Peons	604	3,669	604	3,950	604	3,820	610	3,864
Total per mensem ..	..	57,424	..	68,374	..	65,140½	..	66,061
Total per annum ..	..	6,89,088	..	8,20,488	..	7,81,686	..	7,92,732
Increase ..	..	..	..	+1,31,400*	..	+92,598*	..	+1,03,644

* The decrease of Rs. 12 as compared with the figures 1,31,412 and 92,610 in paragraph 2 above is due to the fact that in calculating the total number of Deputy Tahsildars' offices with peons drawing Rs. 7, the Kodaikánal Deputy Tahsildar's office in Madura which has already a peon on Rs. 7 was erroneously treated as an office with peons on Rs. 6 only.

4. The subjoined statement shows the number of taluks in each district classified with reference to the number of clerks to be allotted to each under the Board's present proposals :—

—	Number of taluks with					
	Six clerks.	Seven clerks.	Eight clerks.	Nine clerks.	Ten clerks.	Total number of taluks in the district.
Ganjám	..	..	..	2	1	3
Vizagapatam	..	1	2	..	..	3
Gódávari	1	..	4	4	1	10
Kistna	..	..	3	6	3	12
Nellore	..	..	6	2	1	9
Cuddapah	..	..	5	5	1	11
Anantapur	..	1	6	1	..	8
Bellary	..	..	2	6	..	8
Kurnool	..	..	1	6	1	8
Chingleput	..	..	2	4	..	6
North Arcot	..	2	1	5	1	9
South Arcot	..	..	1	6	1	8
Tanjore	..	..	1	6	2	9
Trichinopoly	..	..	1	3	1	5
Madura	..	..	3	3	..	6
Tinnevelly	..	..	4	3	2	9
Coimbatore	..	..	3	6	1	10
Salem	..	..	2	4	3	9
South Canara	..	..	1	4	..	5
Malabar	..	..	3	4	2	9
Total ..	1	4	51	80	21	157

5. *Tahsildar's establishments—Clerks.*—The following statement compares the number and cost of the existing establishment with the number and cost of the proposed establishment according to the different rates of pay :—

Existing establishment.			Proposed establishment as per scale sanctioned by Government.		
Number of clerks.	Pay of each clerk.	Total cost.	Number of clerks.	Pay of each clerk.	Total cost.
	RS.	RS.		RS.	RS.
1	30	30	157	30	4,710
3	25	75	178	25	4,450
317	20	6,340	309	20	6,180
1	17	17	313	17½	5,477½
1,029	15	15,345	415	15	6,225
1,351	..	21,897	1,372	..	27,042½

It will be seen that the increased expenditure under this head comes to Rs. 5,145½ or Rs. 61,746 per annum against Rs. 56,526 estimated by Government.

6. In paragraph 2 (i) of its order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, Government observes that the provision made by the Board for the retention of only one clerk on Rs. 15 in each taluk office makes the proportion of clerks of that grade to the total number of clerks vary from 16⅔ per cent. in taluks provided with six clerks to 10 per cent. in those provided with ten clerks and that, as, in the majority of the Government establishments, the proportion of clerks drawing Rs. 15 greatly exceeds the maximum of 16⅔ per cent. proposed by the Board, the acceptance of the Board's proposal will open the door to demands for similar treatment from other offices which cannot equitably be refused but compliance with which will cost *several lakhs of rupees* per annum. The Board submits that the retention of so low a proportion of clerks on the Rs. 15 grade was not a new proposal. In the proposition statement accepted by Government in paragraph 7 of its order, No. 396, dated 18th March 1884, Mr. Garstin had provided for the retention of one clerk on Rs. 15 in taluks for which six, seven or nine clerks had been allotted by him, and of two such clerks in the taluks to which he had assigned eight or ten clerks. The Board's proposal, as will be seen from paragraph 6 of its Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, was to reduce the number of clerks on Rs. 15 to 1, even in the case of the taluks provided with eight or ten clerks, and by leaving out the grade on Rs. 22½ proposed by Mr. Garstin to re-adjust the number of clerks in the several grades proposed for the several taluks so as to leave the total cost of each scale of establishment with six clerks, seven clerks, &c., as fixed by Mr. Garstin, substantially unaffected. But Government has increased the number of clerks on Rs. 15 to two in the case of taluks to be provided with six, seven or eight clerks and to three in the case of taluks with a strength of nine or ten clerks—a proportion not contemplated in Mr. Garstin's proposition statement. The revision of the scale as made by Government has, no doubt, resulted in a large saving as compared with Mr. Garstin's scale, but has reduced its attractiveness which it was the main object of Mr. Garstin's and the Board's schemes to ensure.

The Board also begs leave to point out that the extension of its proposal in regard to the number of Rs. 15 appointments to Government establishments generally will not entail an additional cost of *several lakhs of rupees* as apprehended by Government. According to the Civil Budget estimates for 1897–98, the total number of clerks drawing Rs. 15 and under in all Government establishments consisting of more than two clerks each was 1,938 out of a total strength of 5,241. The additional cost that would be entailed (1) by raising the pay of each of these clerks in excess of a tenth of the total strength to Rs. 17½ and (2) by raising the pay of one-half of the number in excess to Rs. 17½ and that of the other half to Rs. 20 would be as shown below or not much more than half a lakh of rupees:—

One-sixth or 16⅔ per cent. of the total strength which is the maximum proposed by the Board is 874
One-tenth or 10 per cent of the strength (the minimum) is 524
The additional cost that would be entailed by increasing the pay of $\frac{1,938-524}{1,938-874}$ clerks to Rs. 17½, comes to $\frac{1,414}{1,064} \times 2\frac{1}{2}$ or Rs. $\frac{3,535}{2,660}$ per mensem, or Rs. $\frac{42,420}{31,920}$ per annum.
If half the above mentioned number of clerks were paid Rs. 17½ and the remaining half Rs. 20 per mensem the additional cost would be Rs. 47,880 or Rs. 63,630 according to the number affected.

If, in consideration of the circumstances set forth above, Government is of opinion that the scale of establishment originally proposed by the Board may be adopted, the additional cost will amount to Rs. 82,416 per annum or Rs. 20,670 in excess of the proposals contained in the last paragraph :—

Number of clerks.	Pay of each clerk.	Total cost.
	RS.	RS.
157	30	4,710
313	25	7,825
335	20	6,700
410	17½	7,175
157	15	2,355
	Total ...	28,765 per mensem.
Cost of the existing establishment per mensem ...		21,897
	Difference ...	6,868 per mensem.
	or	82,416 per annum.

The Board would strongly advocate the acceptance of this scale, if possible, as it feels confident that the only hope of materially increasing the efficiency of taluk establishments lies in improving the prospects before those who may be inclined to enter the service.

7. The attention of all Collectors, except those of Madras and Nilgiris, is drawn to paragraph 2 (1) of the Government Order read above regarding the pay and position of the Recordkeeper.

8. *Shroffs.*—The Collector of Cuddapah proposes that the second shroff on Rs. 10 in the Jammalamadugu taluk may be abolished. The Board approves the Collector's recommendation. The Collector of Bellary points out that, leaving out of account the extra gumastah sanctioned in Government Order, No. 130, dated 28th February 1889, and employed as a shroff (*vide* Board's Proceedings, No. 323, dated 15th May 1889), the number of clerks in the Bellary taluk is nine and not ten as shown in column 4 of Appendix A., section II, to Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896. The Collector states that the additional shroff is still necessary and the shroff will therefore be retained. The net increase of cost will be Rs. 5 per mensem or Rs. 60 per annum.

The shroff in Wynaad and one of the shroffs at Chirakkal in the Malabar district are now paid Rs. 20 each. In paragraph 2 of its Order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, Government desires the Board to consider whether their pay should not be altered so as to conform to the general scale, any extra amount being paid in the shape of a local allowance, if necessary. The Collector is requested to favour the Board with his opinion on this point.

9. *Dufterbunds or Attenders.*—The Collector of Kistna recommends that the pay of dufterbunds should be raised to Rs. 8, as they are often entrusted with the duties of clerks and occupy a position between the taluk gumastahs and the inferior staff. The Board does not recommend the proposal, as Government has already decided in paragraph 2 (iv) of its order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, that no increase in the pay of this class of servants is called for.

10. *Peons.*—In paragraph 13 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, it was proposed to reduce the number of taluk peons (3,313) by 140 or to 3,173. The number of peons now proposed to be retained after a full consideration of the Collectors' proposals comes to 3,207 or 34 more than that originally recommended. The additional cost involved in the proposals will be Rs. 1,249 per mensem as shown below or Rs. 14,988 per annum against Rs. 12,540 arrived at by Government :—

	Cost per mensem. RS.
157 duffadars at Rs. 9 each ...	1,413
157 × 3 peons at „ 8 „ ...	3,768
157 × 5 „ at „ 7 „ ...	5,495
1,951 peons at „ 6 „ ...	11,706
Total ...	22,382
Cost per mensem of the existing establishment ...	21,133
Increase per mensem ...	1,249
Do. per annum ...	14,988

11. *Deputy Tahsildar's establishments—Clerks.*—In paragraph 3 (i) of its order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, Government approved the Board's proposal to raise from Rs. 15 to Rs. 20, the pay of the senior clerk in those offices which were provided with two or more clerks each. The Board placed the number of such offices at 138, but this number must now be raised to 140, a second clerk having been since proposed for the Venkatagirikóta Deputy Tahsildar's office in North Arcot (*vide* Appendix III) and the Kumbakónam Town Deputy Tahsildar's office having been added to the list as it appears that the two clerks employed there are paid Rs. 15 each, whereas in paragraph 15 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, it was assumed that one of them was paid Rs. 20. Adding to the above increase, the cost of the additional clerks * and of the increased pay or local allowances recommended in Appendix III for the existing clerks, the total increased cost will be Rs. 8,400 + Rs. 840 or Rs. 9,240 per annum.

	Cost per mensem. RS.
* Increase of pay to each of the two clerks in the Bissemkatak Deputy Tahsildar's office	10
A third clerk for the Vissannapet Deputy Tahsildar's office	15
A second clerk for the Venkatagirikóta Deputy Tahsildar's office	15
A third clerk for the Tirupati Deputy Tahsildar's office	15
Local allowance of Rs. 5 to each of the two clerks in the Deputy Tahsildar's office, Shevaroys	10
Increase of pay to the Head Clerk, Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office	5
Total ...	70
Cost per annum ...	840

12. *Shroffs.*—The Board did not originally contemplate any increase in the number of shroffs. The Collector of Vizagapatam, however, recommends that each of the seventeen Deputy Tahsildars' offices in his district which have no shroffs at present should be provided with a shroff each. The Board considers it sufficient to allow a shroff on Rs. 10 for each of the twelve offices noted in the margin. The appointment of a shroff for Párvatípuram may be deferred as a temporary shroff is already employed and paid from the funds of the Kurupam and Belgaum estates under the Court of Wards. The cost of eleven shroffs will be Rs. 11 × 10 per mensem or Rs. 1,320 per annum. Adding to this Rs. 36 which represents the annual cost of an increase of Rs. 3 per mensem to the pay of the shroff in the Deputy Tahsildar's office, Coonoor, the total additional expenditure will be Rs. 1,356 per annum.

Anakapalle.	Koraput.
Párvatípuram.	Rayagada.
Veeravalle.	Salur.
Vizagapatam.	Bobbili.
Gunupur.	Nowrangapur.
Chípurupalle.	Malkanagiri.

The shroff in the Ramnad Branch treasury is paid Rs. 35 (*vide* Government Order, No. 2141, dated 6th October 1862). With reference to paragraph 3 (ii) of Government Order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, the Collector of Madura is requested to state whether his pay cannot be reduced to Rs. 15 so as to conform to the general scale.

13. *Dufterbunds.*—In paragraph 17 of its Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, the Board observed that there were seven Deputy Tahsildars' offices not provided with attenders. It is now proposed to provide four of these offices with an attender each. The Collector of Vizagapatam suggests and the Board recommends that the pay of the attender in the Bissemkatak Deputy Tahsildar's office be raised from Rs. 10 to 15. The extra expenditure involved in these proposals will be Rs. 39½ * per mensem or Rupees 474 per annum.

	Cost per mensem. RS.
* Entertainment of an attender in Ootacamund	7
Entertainment of an attender in Coonoor	7
Entertainment of an attender in Gudalur	7 + 3½ (a)
Entertainment of an attender in Shevaroys	7 + 3 (b)
Total ...	34½

(a) Wynaad allowance. (b) Local allowance.

14. *Peons.*—With reference to paragraph 18 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, the Collectors of Gódávari and Nilgiris report that the additional peons provided by Mr. Garstin for the Deputy Tahsildars' offices at Cocanada, Ootacamund and Coonoor are necessary. It is also proposed to allow an additional peon to the Deputy Tahsildar's office at Vissannapet. The extra cost involved will be Rs. 44 † per mensem or Rs. 528 per annum. Adding to this the cost of increasing the pay of one peon in each of 151 ‡ Deputy Tahsildars' offices, viz., Rs. 1,812 (*vide* paragraph 3 (iv) of Government Order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896), the increased cost under this head will be Rs. 2,340 per annum.

	Cost per mensem. RS.
† Cocanada (one additional peon) ...	6
Vissannapet (do.) ...	6
Ootacamund (two additional peons).	16
Coonoor (do.) ...	16
Total ...	44

‡ Excluding Kodaikánal Deputy Tahsildar's office which has already a peon on Rs. 7.

15. The total additional expenditure involved in the revised proposals for improving the position of the taluk establishments will thus be Rs. 1,03,644 per annum as detailed below against the estimate of Rs. 92,610 framed by Government:—

	RS.
Taluk clerks	61,746
„ Shroff	60
„ Muchis	13,188
„ Dufterbunds	252
„ Peons	14,988
Deputy Tahsildar's clerks	9,240
„ „ Shroffs	1,356
„ „ Dufterbunds	474
„ „ Peons	2,340
Total ...	1,03,644

If the recommendation made in paragraph 6 is accepted, the total additional cost will be Rs. 1,24,314.

On orders being passed on the above proposals, the necessary proposition statement will be submitted for transmission to the Government of India.

16. The Collector of Malabar suggests that for the future all appointments of taluk clerks should be made by Divisional-officers, as they are in a better position than Collectors to judge of the capabilities of these officials. Under existing orders,

Divisional-officers have power to appoint clerks on Rs. 20 and under in their divisions subject to report to, or veto by, the Collector (*vide* Appendix A to Board's Proceedings, No. 527, dated 11th September 1893). The same power may be extended to all classes of taluk gumastahs whatever their pay, but as Collectors do not generally interfere with the Divisional-officer's nominations, the Board does not consider that any other change in the present system is called for. On the other hand, it is desirable that Collectors should retain the power of vetoing in their hands so that they may be in a position to see that educated and competent men are appointed to taluk offices.

The Collector of Gódávari suggests that the pay of the last grade in the Huzur and Divisional offices should be raised to Rs. 25 and Rs. 20, respectively, so as to induce graduates to take up the appointments. As the proposal is outside the scope of the present scheme, the Collector should address the Board separately on the subject.

(True Copy and Extract.)

K D Swamikannu for Cy Secretary.

27 JUL 1897

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
,, all Collectors.

Exd. Md. Pahilvan.

[Appendix.

*To be stitched with copies of Board's Proceedings, No. 224, dated 7th July 1897.

APPENDIX I.

District.	Taluks.	Number of existing clerks (other than Special Gumastahs).	Special gumastahs for work connected with: Abkari.	Income-tax.	Special Funds.	Number allowed according to the Board's scale.	Number proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for alterations.	Board's recommendations.	Number finally proposed.
Ganjám ..	Berhampur ..	10	..	..	1	+ 9	10	The Collector (Mr. C. J. Weir) protests against losing three hands. He urges unhealthiness of Berhampur and Goomsur and confusion of accounts in taluks which have had to be rectified recently by a special officer. It is further pointed out that the Berhampur and Goomsur taluks will greatly rise in importance in a few years owing to the Rushikulya irrigation and that the work of the taluks will increase to give Goomsur an extra hand so that the district strength may remain at 28.	The Board approves of the Collector's proposals.	10
	Chicacole ..	10	1	..	1	+ 8	9			9
	Goomsur ..	8		..	1	+ 8	9			9
Vizagapatam	Golgonda ..	6	1	..	..	+ 7	8	According to scale Golgonda is entitled to nine hands and Sarvasiddhi to eight. The Collector (Mr. Horne) urges these facts, also the unhealthiness of Golgonda and the need for the extra hand at Sarvasiddhi. Even with an additional hand, Golgonda would have fewer hands than is allowed by the scale.	The Board recommends that the Golgonda and Sarvasiddhi taluks may each be allowed an additional clerk.	8
	Palkonda ..	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Sarvasiddhi ..	6	1	..	..	+ 6	7			7
	Rámachandrapuram.	9	1	..	1	10	10			10
	Narsapur ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Tanuku ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Amalápuram	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Bhimavaram	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
Gódávari ..	Ellore ..	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Rajahmundry	9	1	..	1	8	9			9
	Bhadráchalam	6	..	..	..	+ 6	6			6
	Yernagúdem	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Peddapuram	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Répalle ..	9	2	..	1	10	11	The Collector (Mr. V. A. Brodie) protests against the reduction of one hand in the Rajahmundry taluk on the ground that the treasury transactions and other work in that office are very heavy and complicated owing to the fact that Rajahmundry is the central and the most important station in the district where nearly a dozen offices are located.	*Répalle* is a first-class taluk and stands on the same footing as first-class taluks in other districts. The Collectors of Nellore and Tanjore have made similar recommendations for their first-class taluks. The Board does not consider that there is need to strengthen further any of these taluks. The Collector's proposal to appoint a Stationary Sub-Magistrate for the Palnad taluk will be separately submitted for the orders of Government.	10
	Gudivada ..	9	2	..	1	+ 9	10			10
	Bápatla ..	9	2	..	1	9	9			9
	Palnad ..	9	..	..	1	10	11			9
	Narasaropet ..	9	..	..	1	9	9			9
Kistna ..	Guntúr ..	9	..	..	1	9	9	Mr. Atkinson wants an additional hand for *Répalle* and *Palnad* which are already allowed one extra hand each. The appointment of a Stationary Sub-Magistrate for Palnad is also recommended. The Collector further applies for an additional hand for the taluks of Gudivada and Nuzvid for which no change was proposed by the Board. In regard to Gudivada, it is pointed out among other things that the number of villages in the taluk is 226 while that in Répalle which is a first-class taluk is only 154 and that the revenue of Gudivada is elastic and will rise as high as that of Répalle (12 lakhs) as soon as the lands under the Pedalanka channel come fully under occupation. The Collector protests against the reduction of hands at Bandur for the reasons that the revenue work has been gradually increasing and the direct collection of water-tax in the villages forming the Gudur zemindari entails additional work on the taluk establishment.	Pending orders on the above proposal, the number of clerks already provided for the taluk will be allowed to stand. As regards Gudivada, the Board supports the Collector's recommendation. The additional clerk applied for for the Nuzvid taluk may also be allowed as the revenue work has increased (the number of papers in 1895 being 11,212 as against 7,801 in 1893) and as the taluk has no Stationary Sub-Magistrate. As regards Bandur the present strength of the establishment will be left uninterfered with for the special reasons urged by the Collector.	9
	Bandur ..	8	1	..	1	+ 8	8			8
	Bezwada ..	9	2	..	1	8	9			9
	Vinukonda ..	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Nandigama ..	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Nuzvid ..	8	2	..	1	+ 8	9			9

District.	Taluks.	Number of existing clerks (other than Special gumastahs).	Special gumastahs for work connected with: Abkári.	Income-tax.	Special Funds.	Number allowed according to the Board's scale.	Number proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for alterations.	Board's recommendations.	Number finally proposed.
Nellore ..	Nellore	9	1	..	1	10 -	11	The Collector (Mr. Scott) recommends the entertainment of an additional clerk for each of the taluks of Nellore, Gudur, Ongole and Kandukur and protests against the proposed reduction in Atmakúru. But no special reasons have been assigned in any of these cases.	None of these taluks are shown to deserve special treatment. The remarks made in the case of Répalle apply to Nellore.	10
	Gudur	9	1	..	1	9 -	10			9
	Ongole	9	1	..	1	9 -	10			9
	Atmakúru	9	..	..	1	8 -	9			8
	Kavali	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Kandukur	8	1	..	1	8 -	9			8
	Rapur	8	..	..	1	8	8			8
	Udayagiri	8	..	..	1	8	8			8
	Kanigiri	8	..	..	1	8	8			8
Cuddapah ..	Cuddapah	10	1	..	1	+ 9 -	10	The Collector (Mr. A. C. Tate) points out that the proposal to reduce Cuddapah and Proddatur overlooks the fact that special clerks were allowed to these taluks on account of the Kurnool-Cuddapah canal and recommends the retention of one extra clerk out of two at Proddatur and of one at Cuddapah (*vide* Government Order, No. 1134, Revenue, dated 17th September 1883, and Board's Proceedings, No. 282, dated 17th April 1889).	The Board supports the Collector's recommendation.	10
	Vayalpad	8	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Pullampet	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Kadiri	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Proddatur	10	1	..	1	+ 8 -	9			9
	Pulivendla	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Jammalamadugu ..	9	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Madanapalle ..	8	..	..	1	8	8			8
	Ráyachóti	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Badvel	8	..	..	1	9	9			9
	Sidhout	8	1	..	1	9	9			9
Anantapur.	Tadpatri	9	1	..	1	— 9 -	8	The Collector (Mr. Mounsey) points out that Kalyandrug needs the full establishment of a fifth grade taluk (eight clerks), as the existing establishment cannot cope with the work and that at least one more hand should be added to the present strength: he offers to give up one clerk, if necessary, from Tadpatri which is a light taluk.	The Boardapproves the Collector's recommendation which is to transfer one of the clerks from Tadpatri to Kalyandrug.	8
	Gooty	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Anantapur	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Hindúpur	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Penukonda	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Madakasíra ..	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Dharmavaram ..	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Kalyandrug ..	6	1	..	1	+ 6 -	8			8
Bellary ..	Bellary	9	1	..	1	9	9	The Board supposed that the Bellary taluk office had ten clerks and proposed to reduce the strength by one. The Collector (Mr. Tremenheere) points out that the 10th clerk is a shroff and that no reduction is called for. Hospet is entitled, according to scale, to nine clerks and the Collector contends for the full number as the work there has hitherto been badly done.	The Collector's proposals are approved ..	7
	Adóni	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Hospet	8	..	..	1	+ 8 -	9			9
	Alur	9	..	..	1	9	9			9
	Kúdligi	8	..	..	1	8	8			9
	Harpanahali ..	8	..	..	1	9 -	9			8
	Rayadrug	8	..	..	1	8	8			9
	Hadagalli	8	..	..	1	9	9			8
Kurnool ..	Koilkuntla	9	1	..	1	9	9	The Collector (Mr Mullaly) states that Pattikonda should be retained at its present strength as it is a litigious and heavy taluk and accordingly suggests that the additional clerk proposed for Ramallakot may be allowed for Pattikonda as the work in the former taluk is comparatively light. As regards Nandyal the Collector points out that an extra clerk is necessary on account of the canal and that no reduction should therefore be made in the existing number.	The Collector's proposals are approved. The Board observes that one clerk on Rs. 15 was sanctioned for Nandyal for canal work—*vide* Government Order, No. 1134, dated 17th September 1883, and Board's Proceedings, No. 282, dated 17th April 1889.	9
	Nandyal	10	1	..	1	+ 9 -	10			10
	Ramallakot	8	1	..	1	— 9	8			8
	Nandikotkur ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Pattikonda ..	9	1	..	1	+ 8 -	9			9
	Markapur	8	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Cumbum	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Sirvel	9	1	..	1	9	9			9

District.	Taluks.	Number of existing clerks (other than special gumastah.)	Special gumastahs for work connected with: Abkári.	Income-tax.	Special Funds.	Number allowed according to the Board's scale.	Number proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for alterations.	Board's recommendations.	Number finally proposed.
Chingleput..	Madurántakam ..	9	1	..	1	9	9	The Collector (Mr. Forbes) states that one clerk in each of the taluk offices at Chingleput and Saidapet should not be dispensed with as the treasury work in the former is heavy owing to the location of several other offices at the station, while in the latter the collection work is very troublesome involving the issue of a large number of processes.	The Board approves the Collector's recommendations.	9
	Conjeeveram ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Saidapet	9	..	..	1	+ 8 -	9			9
	Tiruvallúr	9	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Chingleput	9	1	..	1	+ 8 -	9			9
	Ponnéri	9	1	..	1	8	8			8
North Arcot.	Walajapet	10	1	..	1	10	10	The Collector (Mr. Wynne) protests against reduction of Vellore and Chittoor which are heavy offices and points out that Chendragiri and Polur have both fewer hands than is allowed by the scale. In consideration of this fact he requests that the district strength may be left undisturbed.	Do. do.	10
	Arcot	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Wandiwash ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Gudiyáttam ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Vellore	9	1	1	1	+ 8 -	9			9
	Chittoor	9	1	..	1	+ 8 -	9			9
	Chendragiri ..	7	1	..	1	7	7			7
	Polur	7	1	..	1	7	7			7
	Palmanér	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
South Arcot.	Tindivanam ..	9	1	..	1	10	10	The Collector (Mr. A. E. Castlestuart Stuart) points out that Kallakurchi has no Deputy Tahsildar and is otherwise heavy; also that it is hard to give the same establishment to Tiruvannámalai which is a much lighter taluk. He therefore recommends that the number of hands at Kallakurchi may not be reduced.	Do. do.	10
	Villupuram ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Chidambaram ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Cuddalore	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Vriddhachalam ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Tirukkóyilúr ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Kallakurchi ..	9	1	..	1	+ 8 -	9			9
	Tiruvannámalai ..	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
Tanjore ..	Tanjore	9	1	..	1	10	11	The Collector (Mr. Stokes) recommends the addition of one clerk to each of the offices at Tanjore, Kumbakónam and Mannárgudi and states that the work in the last-named taluk is not done well even with the existing establishment.	The proposal to retain Mannárgudi at its present strength is approved. The taluks of Tanjore and Kumbakónam have already been strengthened by the revision scheme and the Board considers that nothing further need be done for them.	10
	Kumbakónam ..	9	2	1	1	10	11			10
	Nannilam	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Negapatam	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Máyavaram ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Pattukkóttai ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Tirutturaippúndi ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Mannárgudi ..	9	1	..	1	+ 8	9			9
	Shiyáli	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
Trichinopoly.	Trichinopoly ..	9	1	1	1	10	10	The Collector (Mr. Batten) points out that Perambalúr is a heavy taluk, because there is no Deputy Tahsildar and asks that the present strength may be retained.	The Board supports the Collector's recommendation.	10
	Musiri	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Udaiyárpálaiyam ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Perambalúr ..	9	1	..	1	+ 8	9			9
	Kulittalai	9	1	..	1	8	8			8
Madura ..	Madura	9	1	1	1	9	9	No alterations are proposed	....	9
	Dindigul	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Tirumangalam ..	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Mélúr	9	1	..	1	8	8			9
	Palni	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Periyakulam ..	9	1	..	1	8	8			8

District.	Taluks.	Number of existing clerks (other than Special gumastahs).	Special gumastahs for work connected with: Abkári.	Income-tax.	Special Funds.	Number allowed according to the Board's scale.	Number proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for alterations.	Board's recommendations.	Number finally proposed.
Tinnevelly	Srívaikuntam	9	1	..	1	10	10	The Collector (Mr. Higgens) applies for an additional clerk for Nánguméri alleging that the work in connection with the revenue collections and minor irrigation works is heavy. He also recommends that Ambásamudram be given a Stationary Sub-Magistrate and that the pay of certain Deputy Tahsildars be raised from Rs. 100 to 120.	The Board does not consider that Nánguméri requires special treatment. The Collector's proposal for the appointment of a Stationary Sub-Magistrate for Ambásamudram will be separately submitted to Government. As regards increase of pay to certain Deputy Tahsildars, the Board considers that the proposal is beyond the scope of the present reference and the scale already adopted with reference to the then state of the work cannot now be altered in favour of a particular district	10
	Tinnevelly	9	1	* 1	1	9	9			9
	Srívilliputtúr	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Ambásamudram	9	1	..	1	10	10			10
	Nánguméri	9	1	..	1	9	10			9
	Ottappidáram	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Sáttúr	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Sankaranayinárkóyil	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Tenkási	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
Coimbatore	Erode	9	1	..	1	10	10	The Collector (Mr. Bradley) deprecates reduction at Karúr which is a heavy taluk on account of irrigation disputes and asks for an extra clerk at Kollegal which is indeed entitled to nine clerks according to scale. Kollegal being notoriously unhealthy, there is ample reason for giving it the full establishment according to scale.	Kollegal being notoriously unhealthy may be strengthened by the addition of one hand as proposed, and Karúr retained at its present strength.	10
	Palladam	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Coimbatore	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Satyamangalam	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Dhárápuram	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Karúr	9	1	..	1	8	9			9
	Pollachi	9	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Udamalpet	9	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Bhaváni	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Kollegal	8	1	..	1	8	9			9
Salem	Salem	9	1	1	1	10	10	No alterations are proposed	....	10
	Tiruchengódu	9	1	..	1	10	10			10
	Námakkal	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Atur	9	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Hosúr	9	1	..	1	10	10			10
	Krishnagiri	8	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Uttangarai	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
	Dharmapuri	8	1	..	1	9	9			9
	Tiruppattúr	8	1	..	1	8	8			8
South Canara	Mangalore	9	2	..	1	9	9	The Collector (Mr. Welsh) points out that Coondapoor is heavy, because it has no Deputy Tahsildar and that it has received an addition of 20 villages from Udipi. He therefore recommends that Coondapoor may be retained at its present strength. He also recommends the addition of a clerk to Uppinangadi, taking away, if necessary, one from Kasaragod from which a number of villages was recently transferred to Uppinangadi (*vide* Government Order, No. 831, Revenue, dated 20th December 1895).	The Collector's proposals are approved ..	9
	Udipi	9	2	..	1	9	9			9
	Kasaragod	9	2	..	1	9	8			8
	Uppinangadi	8	2	..	1	8	9			9
	Coondapoor	9	2	..	1	8	9			9
Malabar	Ponnáni	10	1	..	..	10	10	The Collector (Mr. Hewetson) points out that an extra clerk at Chirakkal was specially given to help the Tahsildar in treasury work on the abolition of the Cannanore sub-treasury. He accepts the reduction in Kurumbranát, but proposes to transfer a shroff from Chirakkal to relieve that office. He also asks for another hand for Wynaad which is entitled according to scale to ten clerks, *i.e.*, to two in excess of the present number and in fact two clerks have already been sanctioned for it in anticipation of the present revision.	The Collector's proposals are approved ..	10
	Palghat	9	1	..	..	9	9			9
	Ernad	9	1	..	..	9	9			9
	Walavanad	9	1	..	..	9	9			9
	Wynaad	8	..	..	..	9	10			10
	Kurumbranát	9	1	..	..	8	8			8
	Chirakkal	9	1	..	..	8	9			9
	Calicut	8	1	..	..	8	8			8
	Kóttayam	8	1	..	..	8	8			8

* For six months.

APPENDIX II.

District.	Taluks.	Existing number of peons.	Number allowable according to Board's scale.	Number proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for alterations.	Board's recommendations.	Number finally proposed.
Ganjám	Goomsur	22	20	22	The Collector points out that no reduction is feasible in the number of peons in the Berhampur and Goomsur taluks, as in the former, extra peons are required for the two additional Revenue Inspectors recently sanctioned on account of Rushikulya irrigation (Government Order, No. 506, Revenue, dated 1st October 1896), and as in the latter many peons are always ill owing to the unhealthy climate.	The Board considers that, for the reasons urged by the Collector, the existing number of peons in Goomsur and Berhampur may be left undisturbed.	22
	Chicacole	21	20	20			20
	Berhampur	21	20	21			21
Vizagapatam	Golgonda	16	16	16	No changes proposed	....	16
	Palkonda	17	17	17			17
	Sarvasiddhi	15	15	15			15
Godávari	Rámachandrapuram	22	20	22	The Collector protests against the abolition of two peons in the taluks of Peddapuram, Amalápuram, Ramachandrapuram, Ellore, Tanuku and Narsapur, as the Tahsildars concerned have to depute one or two peons to assist the dependent Deputy Tahsildars who have much revenue work to do and sub-jails to look after. He also points out that the existing number of peons in Rajahmundry is necessary, as it is a central place through which the officers of several departments and troops constantly pass. The Collector also proposes (*vide* paragraph 2 (v) of Government Order, No. 624, dated 14th November 1896) an increase of two peons to the Bhadráchalam taluk.	The Board recommends that, for the reasons urged by the Collector, the reduction in the number of peons may be limited to one instead of two in the six taluks having dependent Deputy Tahsildars' divisions and that the existing number of peons in Rajahmundry may be left undisturbed. The additional peons proposed for Bhadráchalam may be sanctioned.	21
	Narsapur	22	20	22			21
	Tanuku	22	20	22			21
	Amalápuram	22	20	22			21
	Bhimavaram	21	19	19			19
	Ellore	21	19	21			20
	Rajahmundry	21	19	21			21
	Bhadráchalam	8	8	10			10
	Yernagúdem	21	19	19			19
	Peddápuram	21	19	21			20
Kistna	Gudivada	22	22	22	The Collector states that a reduction of the number of peons in the taluks of Bandur, Bápatla, Guntúr, Sattenapalle and Narasaraopet is not possible, as two of the taluk peons are detailed for doing duty under the Stationary Sub-Magistrate and the Division Deputy Tahsildar (the peons allotted to them being insufficient) and as the remaining peons are barely sufficient for the performance of their multifarious duties in the taluks.	The Board recommends that one extra peon may be allowed for the taluks of Bandur, Bápatla and Guntúr as there are dependent Deputy Tahsildars' offices in those taluks. As the scheme allows a muchi for each taluk, the peons now said to be employed in doing that work will be available for other duties.	22
	Bandur	21	19	21			20
	Bápatla	22	21	22			22
	Guntúr	21	19	21			20
	Sattenapalle	21	19	21			19
	Répalle	23	23	23			23
	Nandigama	21	21	21			21
	Bezwada	21	21	21			21
	Narasaraopet	21	19	21			19
	Vinukonda	21	21	21			21
	Palnad	21	21	21			21
	Nuzvid	21	22	22			22
Nellore	Nellore	22	21	21	No changes proposed	....	21
	Gudur	22	21	21			21
	Ongole	21	20	20			20
	Atmakúru	21	19	19			19
	Kavali	21	21	21			21
	Kandukur	21	19	19			19
	Rapur	21	21	21			21
	Udayagiri	21	21	21			21
	Kanigiri	21	21	21			21
Cuddapah	Cuddapah	23	21	21	Do.	....	21
	Ráyachóti	21	20	20			20
	Kadiri	21	20	20			20
	Voyalpad	21	22	22			22
	Madanapalle	22	20	20			20
	Jammalamadugu	21	19	19			19
	Proddatur	22	20	20			20

District.	Taluks.	Existing number of peons.	Number allowable according to Board's scale.	Number proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for alterations.	Board's recommendations.	Number finally proposed
Cuddapah—*cont.*	Pulivendla	21	19	19	No changes proposed	....	19
	Badvel	21	21	21			21
	Sidhout	21	21	21			21
	Pullampet	21	20	20			20
Anantapur ..	Anantapur	21	19	19	Do.	....	19
	Penukonda ..	21	19	19			19
	Hindupur	21	21	21			21
	Madakasira ..	21	21	21			21
	Dharmavaram ..	18	21	21			21
	Gooty	22	20	20			20
	Tadpatri	22	20	20			20
	Kalyandrug ..	18	21	21			21
Bellary	Bellary	21	20	20	Do.	....	20
	Rayadrug	21	21	21			21
	Hadagalli	21	21	21			21
	Harpanahalli ..	21	21	21			21
	Hospet	21	20	20			20
	Kudligi	21	20	20			20
	Alúr	21	21	21			21
	Adóni	21	20	20			20
Kurnool ..	Ramallakot	22	22	22	Do.	....	22
	Nandikotkur ..	21	22	22			22
	Nandyal	22	20	20			20
	Sirvel	21	22	22			22
	Cumbum	21	21	21			21
	Markapur	21	22	22			22
	Pattikonda	21	20	20			20
	Koilkuntla	21	21	21			21
Chingleput ..	Saidapet	22	20	22	The Collector considers that it is not possible to reduce the present strength of peons in the Saidapet and Tiruvallúr taluks. In the former taluk about 350 summonses have to be issued monthly (besides processes under Act II of 1864). Moreover, the vicinity of Saidapet to Madras, the location of the Collector's head-quarters at the station and of Government House at Guindy as well as the occasional demands for services in connection with the movements of troops through the taluk all add to the calls on the services of peons. As regards Tiruvallúr, it is pointed out that many of the villages lie at great distances, the most distant villages since the transfer of the Kanchinad taluk of the Kalahasti zemindari from the North Arcot district being 65 miles from the taluk head-quarters (*vide* G.O., No. 314, dated 21st April 1893).	The Board approves the Collector's proposals.	22
	Conjeeveram ..	22	20	20			20
	Madurántakam ..	22	20	20			20
	Tiruvallúr ..	21	20	21			21
	Chingleput ..	21	19	19			19
	Ponneri	21	19	19			19
North Arcot ..	Chittoor	22	21	21	No changes proposed	....	21
	Chandragiri ..	21	19	19			19
	Palmanér	21	21	21			21
	Arcot	22	21	21			21
	Vellore	21	19	19			19
	Gudiyáttam ..	21	20	20			20
	Wallajapet ..	22	21	21			21
	Wandiwash ..	22	22	22			22
	Polúr	21	20	20			20

District.	Taluks.	Existing number of peons	Number allowable according to Board's scale.	Number proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for alterations.	Board's recommendations.	Number finally proposed.
South Arcot ..	Cuddalore	21	21	21	No changes proposed	....	21
	Chidambaram ..	22	21	21			21
	Tindivanam ..	24	23	23			23
	Tiruvannámalai ..	21	20	20			20
	Villupuram ..	22	21	21			21
	Vriddhachalam ..	21	21	21			21
	Tirukkóyilúr ..	22	21	21			21
	Kallakurchi ..	21	21	21			21
Tanjore	Shiyali	21	19	21	The Collector states that no reduction in the number of peons is possible as twelve peons (the number proposed to be reduced) are employed as sub-jail warders. As regards Tanjore he observes that as the taluk is extensive, peons going to distant villages are unable to return soon and that as the head-quarters taluk of the district it requires more peons than other taluks.	All the taluks in Tanjore have been provided with stationary Sub-Magistrates and the duty of looking after the sub-jail at the taluk head-quarters devolves on one of the peons of the stationary Sub-Magistrates and not on the taluk peons—*vide* G.O., No. 1329, Judicial, dated 1st June 1894. The only taluks in which an extra peon will be required are those of Máyavaram, Mannárgudi and Pattukkóttai in each of which there is a dependent Deputy Tahsildar with a sub-jail in charge of revenue peons. The number of peons already allowed for the Tanjore taluk is 22 and it is not proposed to make any reduction. The Board does not consider that any addition to the present strength is called for.	19
	Máyavaram ..	21	19	21			20
	Kumbakónam ..	22	21	22			21
	Negapatam ..	21	19	21			19
	Nannilam	22	20	22			20
	Pattukkóttai ..	21	20	21			21
	Tanjore	22	22	22			22
	Mannárgudi ..	21	20	21			21
	Tirutturaippúndi ..	22	21	22			21
Trichinopoly ..	Trichinopoly ..	22	21	22	The Collector states that the present strength of peons in the Trichinopoly taluk cannot be reduced as the Trichinopoly town is the head-quarters station of the district and of the South Indian Railway Company. Two native regiments are also stationed there. The Collector, however, offers to spare a peon from the Kulittalai taluk for which he considers 19 peons sufficient.	The Board approves the Collector's proposals.	22
	Musiri	22	21	21			21
	Kulittalai	21	20	19			19
	Perambalúr ..	21	20	20			20
	Udaiyárpálaiyam ..	22	22	22			22
Madura	Periyakulam ..	20	20	20	The Collector states that it is not possible to reduce the number of peons in the Madura taluk without seriously interfering with the despatch of work, as, Madura being the head-quarters of the district, special calls on the services of the peons are frequent. The number of peons for this taluk was twenty-two before 1891 and as that number was insufficient, a peon from each of the four taluks of Periyakulam, Dindigul, Mélúr and Tirumangalam was transferred to it—*vide* G.O., No. 194, Financial, dated 17th March 1891.	A stationary Sub-Magistrate with *two* peons having, since 1891, been sanctioned, the number of peons will be reduced from 26 to 24.	20
	Mélúr	20	20	20			20
	Dindigul	21	22	22			22
	Palni	19	21	21			21
	Madura	26	22	26			24
	Tirumangalam ..	21	21	21			21
Tinnevelly ..	Tinnevelly	22	20	20	The Collector states that the Nángunéri and Ottappidáram taluks are very extensive having an area of 701 and 1,061 square miles, respectively. He adds that the work of the latter taluk is particularly heavy owing to the frequent necessity for services of notices in inquiries relating to the appointment of village officers in zemindari and inam villages, refund of surplus sale-proceeds of impounded cattle, payment of compensation and for collection of income-tax, land-cess, &c.	For the special reasons urged by the Collector the Board considers that the existing number of peons in the Nángunéri taluk (which has a dependent Deputy Tahsildar) which has 214 villages may be left undisturbed and that the number attached to Ottappidáram may be reduced by one instead of by two.	20
	Ottappidáram ..	21	19	21			20
	Srivaikuntam ..	22	22	22			22
	Nángunéri	22	21	22			22
	Tenkási	21	19	19			19
	Ambásamudram ..	21	21	21			21
	Srivilliputtúr ..	22	21	21			21
	Sáttúr	21	20	20			20
	Sankaranayinárkóyil.	21	19	19			19

District.	Taluks.	Existing number of peons.	Number allowable according to Board's scale.	Number proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for alterations.	Board's recommendations.	Number finally proposed.
Coimbatore ..	Coimbatore	22	21	21	The Collector states that the reduction of one peon proposed in each of the Erode and Dhárápuram taluks should not be insisted upon, as there is a Stock Inspector and pony-breeding operations are going on in each. He adds that one peon is permanently attached to the Stock Inspector and one or more are always employed in connection with the Government stallions.	In the circumstances brought to notice by the Collector the present strength of peons in the Erode and Dhárápuram taluks will be retained.	21
	Karúr	21	19	19			19
	Dhárapuram ..	21	20	21			21
	Bhaváni	21	21	21			21
	Erode	22	21	22			22
	Udamalpet	21	19	19			19
	Palladam	22	20	20			20
	Pollachi	21	19	19			19
	Satyamangalam ..	22	21	21			21
	Kollegal	21	21	21			21
Salem	Salem	22	21	21	No changes proposed	....	21
	Tiruchengodu ..	22	22	22			22
	Námakkal	21	20	20			20
	Atur	21	20	20			20
	Hosúr	21	22	22			22
	Krishnagiri ..	21	21	21			21
	Uttangarai	21	22	22			22
	Dharmapuri ..	21	22	22			22
	Tiruppattúr ..	21	19	19			19
South Canara ..	Mangalore	21	20	21	The Collector states that no reduction can be made in the existing number of peons. He points out that the district being hilly, communications are difficult and have to be carried on mainly by peons and that taluk peons are attached to sub-jails at the taluk head-quarters and are deputed to work under Deputy Tahsildars. There is a Deputy Tahsildar in each taluk except in Coondapoor.	There is a Stationary Sub-Magistrate at the head-quarters of each of the taluks and the duty of looking after the sub-jail devolves under Government Order, No. 1329, Judicial, dated 1st June 1894, on one of the Sub-Magistrate's peons. There is therefore no necessity for allowing taluk peons to serve as sub-jail warders. The four taluks in which there are dependent Deputy Tahsildars will be allowed one additional peon each.	21
	Uppinangadi ..	21	19	21			20
	Udipi	21	19	21			20
	Coondapoor ..	21	19	21			19
	Kasaragod	21	19	21			20
Malabar	Calicut	21	19	19	The Collector points out that the ansoms in Malabar are, unlike East Coast villages, very extensive, and the larger the number of peons who are the means of communication between the taluk and the village officers, the greater the facility in the despatch of business; and the Sub-Collector in whose division the taluks of Chirrakal, Kottayam and Kurumbranát are situated is of opinion that if the proposed increase to the pay of peons cannot be granted without reducing their number he would much rather dispense with the increase in pay. The Special Assistant Collector in whose division the Ernad and Wallavanad taluks are situated is also against the proposed reduction.	In the circumstances reported, the Board would recommend that the number of peons in each of the taluks of Kottayam and Kurumbranát be reduced by one instead of by two as originally proposed.	19
	Chirrakkal	21	20	21			20
	Kottayam	21	19	21			20
	Kurumbranát ..	21	19	21			20
	Palghat	21	21	21			21
	Ponnáni	21	21	21			21
	Ernad	21	20	21			20
	Walávanad	21	20	21			20
	Wynaad	21	21	21			21

APPENDIX III.

PROPOSALS for additional establishments to certain Deputy Tahsildars' offices.

District.	Deputy Tahsildar's office.	Present strength and pay.	Strength and pay proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for addition to the number and the increase of pay recommended.	Board's recommendation.	Number of hands and pay finally approved by the Board.
				Clerks.		
Vizagapatam.	Bissemkatak ..	One clerk on Rs. 20. One clerk on Rs. 15.	One clerk on Rs. 25. One clerk on Rs. 20.	The Collector proposes that the pay of the clerks may be raised by Rs. 5 so that proper men may be obtained for the posts in that unhealthy place.	The Board's Fourth Member is of opinion that when the present scale of pay was sanctioned for the Agency clerks, Bissemkatak was not liberally treated. The division had only been created a short time before and it was not known that the place was so malarious. The Board therefore supports the Collector's recommendation.	One clerk on Rs. 25. Do. on ,, 20.
Gódávari ..	Cocanada	Three clerks on Rs. 15 each.	One additional clerk on Rs. 15.	With reference to paragraph 14 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, the Collector states that there is no necessity for an additional clerk in the Deputy Tahsildars' offices at Tuni and Pittapur. But as regards Cocanada he states that a fourth clerk is necessary on the grounds that the division has a good deal of delta irrigation and that as the town is a commercial seaport, a Municipality and the head-quarters of several offices, the Deputy Tahsildar's work is heavy and that when the office of the Superintendent of Sea Customs, Coringa, who has been giving relief to the Deputy Tahsildar by attending to collection work and keeping the sub-treasury in his charge is amalgamated with the Separate Revenue Department, the whole work of the division will devolve on the Deputy Tahsildar.	The Board considers that the question may be considered when the anticipated amalgamation of the Sea Customs Superintendent, Coringa, with the Separate Revenue Department is actually carried out.	One clerk on Rs. 20.* Two clerks on Rs. 15 each.
Kistna ..	Tenali, Ponnur, Mangalagiri, Jaggiapet, Tumurukode, Vissannapet, Avanigadda and Kaikulur.	Two clerks on Rs. 15 in each.	A third clerk on Rs. 15 for each.	The chief reason assigned by the Collector for proposing the increase is that the dependent Deputy Tahsildars have "from being a superior sort of Revenue Inspectors developed into Tahsildars of the divisions *minus* the latters' returns." The Collector states that the work in Vissannapet which is an independent Deputy Tahsildar's division is heavy (the number of Revenue and Magisterial cases disposed of in a year being 3,203 and 254, respectively).	The Board believes that the heaviness of work complained of is chiefly due to the tendency on the part of Tahsildars of throwing work which they should do and for which taluk offices are intended on Revenue Inspectors and Deputy Tahsildars. If this is avoided the necessity for the additional help proposed will not be felt. An additional clerk for the Vissannapet division seems necessary and provision will accordingly be made.	Tenali .. One on Rs. 20. ,, on ,, 15. Ponnur .. ,, on ,, 20. ,, on ,, 15. Mangalagiri .. ,, on ,, 20. ,, on ,, 15. Jaggiapet .. ,, on ,, 20. ,, on ,, 15. Tumurukode .. ,, on ,, 20. ,, on ,, 15. Avanigadda .. ,, on ,, 20. ,, on ,, 15. Kaikulur .. ,, on ,, 20. ,, on ,, 15. Vissannapet .. ,, on ,, 20. Two on ,, 15 each.
North Arcot.	Venkatagirikota ..	One clerk on Rs. 15.	One additional clerk.	There is only one clerk in the Deputy Tahsildar's office (*vide* paragraph 14 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896). The Collector reports that in consideration of the unhealthiness of the locality and of the fact that he has transferred eight villages of the Palmanér taluk to the Venkatagirikota division for magisterial purposes, the services of another clerk are required.	The Board approves the Collector's recommendation. He will, however, be requested to report the number of magisterial cases disposed of within the last three years.	One on Rs. 20. ,, on ,, 15.

* The pay of the senior clerk in each Deputy Tahsildar's office is shown as Rs. 20.

Proposals for additional establishments to certain Deputy Tahsildars' offices—*cont.*

District.	Deputy Tahsildar's office.	Present strength and pay.	Strength and pay proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for addition to the number and the increase of pay recommended.	Board's recommendation.	Number of hands and pay finally approved by the Board.
				Clerks—cont.		
....	Tirupati	Two clerks on Rs. 15 each.	One additional clerk.	The Collector states that the work in the Deputy Tahsildar's sub-treasury has increased considerably owing to the abolition of the sub-treasuries at Kálahasti, Puttúr and Tiruttani in 1893, as shown below:—	The Board supports the Collector's proposal.	One on Rs. 20. Two on Rs. 15 each.
		Average transactions for a month *before* the abolition of the sub-treasuries at Kálahasti, Puttúr and Tiruttani.		Average transactions for a month *after* the abolition of the sub-treasuries at Kálahasti, Puttúr and Tiruttani.		
		Receipts.	Charges.	Receipts.	Charges.	
		RS. 10,996	RS. 5,813 ½	RS. 14,781	RS. 8,712	
		The Collector further points out that Tirupati District Munsif's court deposits are now being received into and paid from Chandragiri sub-treasury which is nearly seven miles from Tirupati to the great inconvenience of the parties and that when the inconvenience was represented by the District Judge he was informed that these transactions could not be conducted at Tirupati for want of a separate clerk for attending to the treasury work. Of the two clerks, one is said to be fully occupied with Magisterial work and the other attends to both revenue and treasury work and experiences great difficulty in getting through it. The Collector therefore recommends that a third clerk may be sanctioned.				
....	Arni	Two clerks on Rs. 15 each.	A Head accountant on Rs. 30.	The Inspector-General of Registration having objected to the Sub-registrar of *Arni* being in charge of the sub-treasury during the Deputy Tahsildar's absence on tour, the Collector proposed that an Head accountant on Rs. 30 who should be required to furnish a security of Rs. 500 should be appointed for the office, but the Board, in its Proceedings No. 495, dated 13th November 1894, expressed its inability to support the proposal in view of the then financial pressure and directed that the Head gumastah should continue to look after the work. The Collector now re-opens the proposal.	The pay of one of the clerks is to be raised and there seems no sufficient reason why the existing arrangement cannot be continued.	One on Rs. 20. ,, on ,, 15.
South Arcot.	Mannárgudi ..	Three clerks on Rs. 15 each.	....	The Collector states that a clerk from each of the two Deputy Tahsildars' offices has been working in the Sea Customs offices at Porto Novo and Cuddalore, respectively, and recommends that they may be restored to their offices as the work there is heavy and that the Sea Customs Department can afford to have a separate establishment of its own in consequence of the introduction of the Tariff Act.	The Board observes that the clerk of Panruti who was working in the Sea Customs office at Cuddalore was transferred to Chengam Deputy Tahsildar's office as there was only one clerk in that division. *Vide* Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 1721, dated 15th March 1893. As regards the clerk working at Porto Novo the Board considers that as the Sea Customs Superintendent at that station is exercising Magisterial powers, the clerk from Mannárgudi will still be required at Porto Novo for Magisterial work.	
	Panruti	Two clerks on Rs. 15 each.				

Proposals for additional establishments to certain Deputy Tahsildars' offices—*cont.*

District.	Deputy Tahsildar's office.	Present strength and pay.	Strength and pay proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for addition to the number and the increase of pay recommended.	Board's recommendation.	Number of hands and pay finally approved by the Board.
				Clerks—cont.		
Salem ..	Shevaroys	One clerk on Rs. 20. One clerk on Rs. 15.	Local allowance of Rs. 5 to each.	In paragraph 4 of its order No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, Government observed with reference to paragraph 15 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, that the question of the grant of a local allowance to the clerks in the Deputy Tahsildar's office should be fully considered and submitted for its orders. The Collector recommends that a local allowance of Rs. 5 may be granted to each of the clerks.	The Board supports the Collector's recommendation.	One clerk on Rs. 20. Local allowance Rs. 5. One clerk on Rs. 15. Local allowance Rs. 5.
Nilgiris ..	Coonoor	Pay of the Head clerk Rs. 25.	Pay of the Head clerk Rs. 30.	The Collector recommends that the pay of the Head clerk in the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office may be raised from Rs. 25 to Rs. 30 so as to be on a par with that of the Head clerk in Ootacamund and Gudalúr. It is further pointed out that Gudalúr where the treasury transactions are not so heavy as in Coonoor has been provided with a Taluk Sheristadar (Government Order, No. 1162, Revenue, dated 5th December 1891) while only an accountant on Rs. 25 has been sanctioned to attend to the treasury work at the latter place.	There seems no objection to the pay of the Head clerk in the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office being raised as proposed by the Collector.	Head clerk on Rs. 30.
				Shroffs.		
Vizagapatam.	(1) Anakápalle. (2) Párvatipur. (3) Veeravalle. (4) Vizagapatam. (5) Gunupur. (6) Chípurupalle. (7) Koraput. (8) Ráyagada. (9) Salúr. (10) Bobbili. (11) Nowrangapur. (12) Malkanagiri. (13) Bissemkatak. (14) Srungavarapukóta. (15) Gajapatinagaram. (16) Pottangi. (17) Padwa.	There are no shroffs in the seventeen Deputy Tahsildars' offices.	One shroff for each Deputy Tahsildars' office.	The Collector recommends that a shroff may be appointed for each of the seventeen Deputy Tahsildars' offices. He states that the numerous errors and omissions pointed out by the Accountant-General in his annual reports on the working of the treasuries occur mostly in the accounts received from the Deputy Tahsildars in charge of sub-treasuries and that this is due to the inadequacy of the establishments. The monthly average transactions that took place in the several sub-treasuries during the three years 1893–96 are as follows:—	From Government Order No. 1071, dated 21st June 1864, and Board's Proceedings, No. 9, dated 8th January 1890, it will be seen that Government has allowed shroffs to Deputy Tahsildars' offices in which the monthly transactions were Rs. 10,000. On this principle, the Board considers that a shroff may be allowed for each of the Deputy Tahsildar's offices, except Bissemkatak, Srungavarapukóta, Gajapatinagaram, Pottangi and Padwa and that the pay may be fixed at Rs. 10. The Board, however, observes that Párvatipur has already a temporary shroff on Rs. 10 paid from the funds of the Kurupam and Belgam estates under the management of the Court of Wards. The question of providing a shroff from the Government revenues may therefore be left over for consideration until the estates are actually handed over.	Eleven shroffs on Rs. 10 each.

	RS.		RS.
Anakápalle ..	60,369	Nowrangapur.	11,321
Párvatipur ..	58,776	Malkanagiri..	10,677
Veeravalle ..	33,394	Bissemkatak .	9,830
Vizagapatam .	30,022	Srungavarapukóta.	8,702
Gunupur ..	28,860	Gajapatinagaram.	6,967
Chípurupalle .	27,469	Pottangi ..	5,561
Koraput ..	26,435	Padwa ..	4,944
Ráyagada ..	26,370		
Salúr ..	25,320		
Bobbili ..	17,039		

The Collector considers that it is not advisable to leave the testing and counting of large sums of money entrusted to clerks.

Proposals for additional establishments to certain Deputy Tahsildars' offices—*cont.*

District.	Deputy Tahsildar's office.	Present strength and pay.	Strength and pay proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for addition to the number and the increase of pay recommended.	Board's recommendation.	Number of hands and pay finally approved by the Board.
				Shroffs—cont.		
Vizagapatam.	Vizianagram ..	One shroff on Rs. 10.	One shroff on Rs. 12.	The Collector states that it is difficult to get a shroff at Jeypore. In the other two cases the increase is recommended in view to make the pay equal to that of the shroffs of Sarvasidhi and Golgonda taluks.	In paragraph 3 (ii) of its order No. 624, dated 14th November 1896, the Government has observed that it is unnecessary to sanction any increase of pay to shroffs. The Board does not therefore recommend the Collector's proposal.	....
	Bimlipatam ..	One shroff on Rs. 10.	One shroff on Rs. 12.			
	Jeypore	One shroff on Rs. 13.	One shroff on Rs. 15.			
North Arcot.	Punganúr	....	One shroff ..	The Collector recommends that as the Punganur sub-treasury was recently re-established under Government Order, No. 3176, dated 13th August 1894, a deputy shroff on Rs. 10 may be sanctioned as in the case of Arni and Tirupati Board's Proceedings, No. 9, dated 8th January 1890).	It appears that the sub-treasury had no shroff before its abolition. The Collector is therefore requested to report the average of the monthly transactions to enable the Board to see whether the entertainment of the proposed shroff is necessary.	....
Nilgiris ..	Coonoor	One shroff on Rs. 12.	One shroff on Rs. 17-8-0.	The Collector represents that whenever the post of shroff in the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office falls vacant great difficulty is experienced in finding men able to furnish a security of Rs. 500 and proposes that the pay may be raised from Rs. 12 to Rs. 17-8-0. The Collector adds that the transactions of the treasury have increased from Rs. 4,04,740 in 1887 when the post was first sanctioned to Rs. 10,52,956 in 1895.	Though Government has declined to sanction any increase to this class of officers the Board recommends that this may be treated as a special case. A pay of Rs. 15 would in the Board's opinion be sufficient.	One shroff on Rs. 15.
				Dufterbunds or Attenders.		
Vizagapatam	Bissemkatak ..	Dufterbund on Rs. 10.	Proposes to increase the pay by Rs. 5.	The Collector proposes to increase the pay from Rs. 10 to Rs. 15 for the reasons assigned by him for the increase of pay to clerks in the Deputy Tahsildar's office.	The Board approves the Collector's recommendation.	One dufterbund on Rs. 15.
Nilgiris ..	Ootacamund. Gudalúr. Coonoor.	No dufterbunds at present.	One additional clerk for each office instead of the attender.	In paragraph 17 of its Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, the Board observed that the Deputy Tahsildars' offices in that district have not been provided with attenders. With reference to this remark the Collector states that the work in the Deputy Tahsildars' offices has been steadily increasing and that as it will be difficult to find qualified men for the post of attenders, an additional clerk for each Deputy Tahsildar's office may be sanctioned instead.	The Board is not prepared to recommend the appointment of clerks as proposed by the Collector. The Collector ought to be able to manage with attenders as in other districts.	Three attenders on Rs. 7 each. modified as follows:- Ootacamund — Rs 10 Coonoor — Rs 10 Gudalur — Rs 8 } Wages allowance Rs 4 }

F/C No. 7171/97

Proposals for additional establishments to certain Deputy Tahsildars' offices—*cont.*

District.	Deputy Tahsildar's office.	Present strength and pay.	Strength and pay proposed by Collectors.	Reasons for addition to the number and the increase of pay recommended.	Board's recommendation.	Number of hands and pay finally approved by the Board.
				Dufterbunds or Attenders—cont.		
Salem ..	Shevaroys ..	No dufterbunds at present.	One dufterbund.	With reference to paragraph 17 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, the Collector states that while there are attenders in the offices of Deputy Tahsildars who have no treasury work or separate jamabandi for their divisions, there is none in the Shevaroys, and that in times of sickness there is only one gumastah available for work and sometimes none. The Collector therefore considers that an attender should be entertained and that his pay should be fixed at Rs. 10 in consideration of the fact that living on the hills is costly and that the attender is expected to assist in clerical work	The Board supports the Collector's recommendation, but is of opinion that as the pay of attenders in the plains is Rs. 7, Rs. 3 may be given in the shape of a local allowance as in the case of clerks in the division.	One dufterbund on Rs. 7. Local allowance Rs. 3.
				Peons.		
Gódávari ..	Cocanada	Two peons on Rs. 6 each.	One additional peon.	With reference to paragraph 18 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, the Collector reports that the additional peon proposed by Mr. Garstin for the Cocanada division is necessary for the same reasons as have been urged by him for the entertainment of a fourth clerk in that division.	The entertainment of the peon appears necessary as the Revenue Inspector allowed for the division has not been provided with a separate peon.	One peon on Rs. 7. Two peons on Rs. 6 each.
Kistna ..	Vissannapet ..	Two peons on Rs. 6 each.	Do.	The Collector states that an additional peon is necessary for the reasons assigned by him for the entertainment of a third clerk in that division.	The Board approves the Collector's proposal	One peon on Rs. 7. Two peons on Rs. 6 each.
Nellore ..	Zamindari. Polur .. Podili .. Darsi .. Venkatagiri. Dependent. Kota .. Addanki. Allur ..	Two peons in each on Rs. 6 each.	One additional peon for each of the first four and two for each of the last three.	The Collector states that there is a crying necessity for increasing the number of peons allowed to Deputy Tahsildars and that the two peons attached to their offices are found to be insufficient.	The Board sees no sufficient reason for treating these Deputy Tahsildars' offices exceptionally. If the services of additional peons are required in connection with revenue work, the necessary help should be obtained from the taluk staff.	....
Nilgiris ..	Ootacamund ..	One peon on Rs. 9. Two peons on Rs. 8 each.	....	With reference to paragraph 18 of Board's Proceedings, No. 86, dated 4th March 1896, the Collector reports that the two peons proposed by Mr. Garstin for each of the Deputy Tahsildars' offices at Ootacamund and Coonoor are necessary as there are two Revenue Inspectors in each of the divisions who have not yet been provided with peons and who feel great inconvenience for want of them. The Collector proposes to fix their pay at Rs. 8.	The Board approves the Collector's proposal	One peon on Rs. 9. Four peons on Rs. 8 each.
	Coonoor ..	One peon on Rs. 9. Two peons on Rs. 8 each.				One peon on Rs. 9. Four peons on Rs. 8 each.
South Arcot.	Mannárgudi .. Panruti	....	....	The Collector states that a peon from the Mannárgudi Deputy Tahsildar's office and another from Panruti have been working in the Sea Customs Superintendents' offices at Porto Novo and Cuddalore, respectively, and requests that they may be restored to their respective Deputy Tahsildars, leaving the Sea Customs Department to make its own arrangements.	As the Sea Customs Superintendent at Cuddalore exercises no Magisterial powers, the Board in the Separate Revenue Department has no objection to the revenue peon working there from Panruti being relegated to his proper place. As the Sea Customs Superintendent at Porto Novo exercises Magisterial powers, the peon working there from Mannargudi should be allowed to continue.	....

108

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No.

From The Board of Revenue, Land Revenue. Madras

Order

No. 3023 Mis:

Dated 13th August 1897.

Received

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Government, with remarks, letter from the Collector of Nilgiris recommending that the pay of the attenders proposed in Board's Proceedings 224/7-7-97 for the Deputy Tahsildars' offices in the district may be increased.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

5,000
1-5-96.

4P

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE MADRAS

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

Dated 13th August — 1897.

No. 3023 — Mis. ~~Routine.~~

READ — letter from the Collector of Nilgiris R.G. Bat. 728/1897 dated 5th August 1897.

Resolution

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings 224/7-7-97

2. In the circumstances reported the Board supports the Collector's recommendation. In view, however, of the fact that the attender in the Deputy Tahsildar's office, Gudalur, is to get the Wynaad allowance, his pay may be fixed at Rs 8. The present proposals will raise the total additional expenditure involved in the revision of taluk establishments from Rs 1,03,644 to Rs 1,03,734

(True Extract)

Reelam
Secretary

To
The Secretary to Govt. R.D.
with the Coll'r letter in original to be returned
" Collector of Nilgiris

x. Pay fixed for the three attenders as per para 13 of BP 224/7-7-97 + Rs 3½ Wynaad allowance for the attender in Gudalur. — Rs 24½

Pay as now proposed for the attender in.

	Rs
Ootacamund	10
Coonoor	10
Gudalur	8
Wynaad allowance	4
Total	32
Net increase per mensem	Rs 7½
" " annum	90

4 M

1897.

Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

MADRAS.

To

Proceedings, dated 189 ,

No. Mis. / Routine.

Subject.

E

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 8024

16 SEP 97

From

The Board of Revenue,
Land Revenue, Madras

Order

No. 3385 Mis.

Dated 10th Septr. 1897

Received 15.9.97

Registered 16.9.97

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submg. to Govt. with Board's recommendation letter from the Collr. of Malabar re. the reduction of pay of certain shroffs in the Malabar District.

hm. 16/9.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

6P

8,000
3 7-97.

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE MADRAS.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue).

NO.3385 Mis.dated 10th Septr.1897.

Read letter from G.W.Dance Esq.,Ag.Collector of Malabar to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue Madras,No.2131-Pub.dated 2nd.September 1897.

Resolution.

Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings No.224 dated 7th July 1897.

2. The Board supports the Collector's recommendations.

(True Extract)

Secretary.

TO

The Secretary to Govt.,R.D.with the Collr's.letter in original to be returned.

Copy to the Collector of Malabar.

Q.B

189 .

Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

MADRAS.

To

Subject.

Revenue (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 10007.

SECY. GOVT. MADRAS 19 NOV 97 REV. DEPT.

From

The Board of Revenue, Land Revenue, Madras.

Order

No. 4358 Misc.

Dated 16th November 1897.

Received 19 "

Registered 20 "

Enclosures 3. 3

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Submg. to Govt. letter from the Collr. of North Arcot & recommending the entertainment of a second clerk in the Venkatagirikota Dy. Tahsildar's office & of a shroff in the Punganur sub. treasury.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

8,000
8-7-97.

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE MADRAS

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue).

No.4358 Mis.Dated 16th November 1897.

Read letter from S.H.Wynne Esqere.,Collector of ~~Km~~ North Arcot to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, Madras,Dis.No.3561-Ver.dated 23rd October 1897.

%-%-%-%-%-%-%-%-%-%-%-%-%

Resolution. Submitted to Government in continuation of Board's Proceedings No.224,dated 7th July 1897.

2. Although the number of magisterial cases disposed ~~A~~ of in the office of the Deputy Tahsildar of Venkatagirikota is too small to require the services of an additional clerk the Board —— would retain the provision already made in view of the unhealthi— ness of the station.

3. As the average monthly ~~average~~ transactions of the Punganur sub.treasury exceed Rs.10,000, the Board recommends the appointment of a shroff on Rs.10 per mensem for that office.

The cost as worked out in B.P. No.3023 dated 13.8.1897,Mis.	Rs. 103734
Add the pay of the shroff on Rs.10 p.m.in the Punganur Dy. Tahsildar's office.	120
~~Rs.~~	103854

4.If the above proposal is approved the total additional expenditure involved in the revision of taluk establishment will come to - Rs.103854 as shown in the margin.

To the Secretary to Govt.,R.D.with the Collr's.letter & its 2 enclos.in original to be returned.

the Collector of North Arcot.

(True Extract)

Secretary.

Q.B.

189 .

Board of Revenue

(Land Revenue),

MADRAS.

To

Subject.

Notes connected with G.O. No. 2108 R. 23-2-98

Subject: Revision of Tahsildars' & Deputy Tahsildars' establishments on the Revised Proposals

Relative to the Govt. Gen. C.R. " " 7171 of 1897

Also submitted to H.E. The Gov.

27-10-97

The Hon. Mr. Grose C.S.I.

The Hon. Sir Henry Blake K.C.S.I.

Right as to the considerations now brought before Govt. relative to changes in the strength of the establishments proposed by the Bd. W. Collectors think necessary because of the extra work in the altered taluks of some places. The changes W. the Bd recommends entail an expenditure of R 11,034 in addition to the R 1,03,644 approved in G.O. I have noted below on the various propositions.

JG
9/10/97

Please put up a note showing the final effect of the Bd's proposals, so far as they have been approved by the Hon. Mr. Grose — should like to see that before I go into details.

BS
12/10/97

Office.

Prepare the note?

12/10/97.

It seems true that the Bd has dealt with this matter in a very unsatisfactory way, from first to last. As I pointed out in my note on pp 1 & 2 of the

[illegible] 108 R. 23-2-98 [illegible]

" " 7171 of 1897

Proceedings of Bd (L.R.) No. 22243 [illegible]-7-97.

" " 3023 Mar. 21 12-8-97.

" " 3867 Mar. 5 10-9-97.

" " 4577 Mar. 5 16-11-97.

[illegible]

2. In G.O. No. 622, [illegible] 1896, the Government approved the Board's proposals [illegible] of the establishments [illegible] Tahsildars [illegible] Deputy Tahsildars [illegible] Bd. [illegible] Bd. [illegible] Bd.

[illegible] a proposition statement for transmission to the Government of India.

[illegible] In the Proceedings read above the Board brings to notice that some of the Collectors consulted consider the reductions proposed by it in the number of clerks and peons in certain taluk offices to be impracticable and that some have applied for the entertainment of additional hands in some of the taluks and Deputy Tahsildars' offices which the Board did not propose to strengthen. The several proposals of the Collectors and the Board's recommendations thereon have been tabulated under the heads 'Taluk clerks', 'Taluk peons' and 'Deputy Tahsildars' establishments' and printed as appendices I, II and III respectively to the Proceedings. The Board also takes the opportunity to request Government to reconsider para 2 of the order fixing the number of clerks in the several grades of pay for each taluk office and sanction the scale originally suggested by it.

1. To take the latter point first the Board originally proposed the following scale:-

⊗ Vide office note of 21/10/97

office note in G.O. 624 / 14.11.96 the Bd. when called upon for proposals for spending '54 on the improvement of the position of Taluk Sumastahs, launched out into all sorts of other questions as to which they were not asked, & proposed a total addl. expenditure of Rs 1,31,412 per annum, or much more than double the sum which they had been told was available. This scheme was cut down & proposals involving ~~the~~ an addl. expenditure of Rs 92,610 p.a. submitted to the Govt. of India in order to their obtaining the sanction thereto of the S. of S., the Bd. of Rev. being at the same time called upon to prepare & submit the necessary detailed propn. statel. Instead of confining itself to doing what it was told to do, the Bd. has now, a second time, gone beyond what it was told to do, & has proposed increases on the scale approved by Govt., which will cost (as modified by the Hon. Mr. Gross) Rs 11616 ⊗ per annum more than the Rs 92610 which we have already reported to India as the sum total of our requirements. The addl. expenditure now to be proposed amts., therefore, to Rs 104,226 per annum or very nearly double what we started with.

I do not, of course, deny that we want more & better paid establishments in the Taluks, nor did I expect that the detailed propn. statel. which the Bd. was

3

Rates of pay	Number on each rate of pay in taluks with				
	6 clerks	7 clerks	8 clerks	9 clerks	10 clerks
Rs.					
30	1	1	1	1	1
25	1	2	2	2	2
20	2	2	2	2	3
17 1/2	1	1	2	3	3
15	1	1	1	1	1
	127 1/2	152 1/2	170	187 1/2	207 1/2

directed to prepare would tally to an anna with the estimate of Rs 92610 already sent to India. I did expect, however, that there would be some sort of correspondence between the sum we had mentioned & the detailed statel. As it is, the latter will exceed the former by more than 12½%. It seems to me that if we go up to India with these new proposals we shall cut a ridiculous figure - Beginning with '54, we allowed the Bd. to ask for 1·31; then we cut this down to '93 & now we are going to put the estimated cost of our proposals up to 1·04 - India may well ask Do we know our own minds? and what finality is there in our proposals?

In my opinion, an effort should be made to cut the present proposals down to something more nearly approaching the standard of Rs 92610 which we have ourselves set - If not, I fear

With reference to the above the Government remarked :- 'Provision is made for the retention of only one clerk on Rs.15 per mensem in each taluk and the proportion of clerks of this grade to the total number of clerks thus varies from 16 2/3 per cent. to 10 per cent. On comparing the total strength and scale of pay that prevail in other offices, it is observed that, except in the newly-organized offices of the Conservators of Forests, there is not a single case in which so small a proportion of the clerks as 10 per cent. draw Rs.15 and less and that in the majority of cases the proportion greatly exceeds the maximum of 16 2/3 per cent. proposed in the present scheme. The Board's proposals are thus likely to open the door to demands for similar treatment from other offices which cannot equitably

be refused, but compliance with which will cost several lakhs of rupees per annum. It is, moreover, essential that the additional cost should be kept as low as possible.'

The following scale of pay was accordingly sanctioned.

Rates of pay	Number on each rate of pay in taluks with				
	6 clerks	7 clerks	8 clerks	9 clerks	10 clerks
Rs. 30	1	1	1	1	1
25	1	1	1	1	2
20	1	1	2	2	2
17 1/2	1	2	2	2	2
15	2	2	2	3	3
Monthly cost	Rs.122 1/2	Rs.140	Rs.160	Rs.175	Rs.200

The Board submits that the retention of so low a proportion of clerks, as that proposed by it, on Rs.15 grade was not a new proposal. It observes:-

'In the proposition statement accepted by Government in para 7 of its order No.596, dated 18th March 1884, Mr.Carstin had provided for the retention of one clerk on Rs.15 in taluks for which six, seven or nine clerks had been allotted by him and of two such clerks in the taluks to which he had assigned

that one of two things may happen:- Either India will reject our scheme altogether, a decision to which the existing state of the finances, both Imp. & Local, will certainly prompt; or it will hack it about, an operation which would be much better performed locally than by people who are ignorant of our circumstances.

Pending a decision on this main question, I postpone consideration of details.

WS 23/10/97

I do not remember how this 54 of G.O. 1108 7/15.12.94, for improving the condition of taluk gumastahs, was the prototype of GO 164/16.1.95, which is abstracted in the RD Pro forwarded with GO 624/14.11.96 as calling for proposals to improve the position of taluk establishments. In March '96, the RD submitted proposals for improving all grades of the estabts of Tahsildars & Dfr Tahsd

dars & in para 23 requested Collectors to verify the figures it had adopted & make suggestions. On this we asked the G of I to get us sanction for spending R 92,610 on these estabts. Subsequently in Letter 2154/22.5.97, we told the G of I that the Collrs had reported as directed in the RD Pro & said that add^l estabts were necessary. After this the G of I will expect some additions. I do not see reason to modify any of the additions of which I have approved. In deference, however, to the strong opinion of my Hon: Colleague, I will consent to tell the RD to do the best it can for R 1,00,000, & prepare proposition accordingly.

JG
3/11/97

With reference to the Hon. Mr Grose's instructions, GOs 1108 7/15.12.94 and 164 Rev/16.1.95 are submitted herewith. (tied with red tape)

The note flagged Y under G.O. No 839 d/ 8.9.91 explains how the cost of improving the position of taluk establishments was originally taken to be 5¾ lakh per annum. On that the F.M. commenced

8 or 10 clerks. The Board's proposal, as will be seen from para 6 of its Proceedings No.86, dated 4th March 1896, was to reduce the number of clerks on Rs.15 to 1, even in the case of the taluks provided with 8 or 10 clerks, and by leaving out the grade on Rs.22 1/2 proposed by Mr.Carstin to re-adjust the number of clerks in the several grades proposed for the several taluks so as to leave the total cost of each scale of establishment with 6 clerks, 7 clerks as fixed by Mr. Carstin, substantially unaffected. But Government has increased the number of clerks on Rs.15 to two in the case of taluks to be provided with 6, 7, or 8 clerks and to 3 in the case of taluks with a strength of 9 or 10 clerks - a proportion not contemplated in Mr.Carstin's proposition statement. The revision of the scale as made by Government has, no doubt, resulted in a large saving as compared with Mr.Carstin's scale, but has reduced its attractiveness which it was the main object of Mr.Carstin's and Board's schemes to ensure'.

The Board also point out that the extension of its proposal in regard to the number of Rs.15 appointments, to

Government

5/11/97.

Government establishments generally will not entail on additional cost of several lakhs of rupees as apprehended by Government but that as according to the Civil Budget Estimates for 1897-98, the total number of clerks drawing Rs.15 and less in all Government establishments consisting of more than two clerks each was 1938 out of a total strength of 5241, the additional cost that would be entailed

(1) by raising the pay of each of these clerks in excess of a tenth of the total strength to Rs.17 1/2 and

(2) by raising the pay of one half of the number in excess to Rs.17 1/2 and that of the other half to Rs.20, ~~[illegible]~~, would not be much more than half a lakh of rupees.

5. In this connection attention is solicited to the remarks of Hon'ble Members on page 9 of the Office Note in G.O. No.621, dated 14th November 1896. The scale was revised by the Hon'ble Sir Henry Bliss and the other Members of Government agreed with him. The Board states that according to the Civil Budget estimates of 1897-98 the total number of clerks drawing Rs.15 and under in all Government establishments (other

-tated as the cost of improving Taluk establishments (including Gumastahs Shroffs attenders muchis & peons) In G.O. 1108/15.12.94 the following addition to the Budget was ordered: "Improvement of the position of Taluk gumastahs R 54,000"; but it directed that orders shd be issued in the Rev. Dept. calling for detailed proposals for the scheme "for improving the position of Taluk estabts." & in G.O. 164/16.1.95 it was communicated to the Bd, with the ~~[illegible]~~ request that detailed proposals for improving the position of Taluk estabts might be submitted, & no mention was made of the R.54. I cannot see, therefore, that the Bd went beyond its instructions when it submitted proposals for ~~[illegible]~~ improving other parts of the Taluk estabts. besides clerks, or when it advised that the cost of necessary improvements wd be more than R.54.

JG
8/11/97

[illegible] statement [illegible]

36.5%

× Please see calculations at the top of page 5 of the Board's Proceedings.

consisting of more than 2 clerks each, was 1938 out of a total strength of 5[illegible]. It is not clear how the Board arrived at these figures. The correct figures seem to be 2042 and 5592 respectively. But assuming that the Board's figures are correct its estimate as to what the additional expenditure would be of extending to other Government establishments, the scale of pay it suggests for Taluk establishment, seems to be understated as shown below:-

The total strength of the existing taluk establishment is 1351 of whom 10[illegible] are on Rs.15. The Board proposes to [illegible] only 157 or about 11 1/2 per cent. of the total strength and promote the rest as follows:-

	Total cost.
156 men on Rs.30 each	Rs. 4680
310 men on Rs.25 each	" 7750
19 men on Rs.20 each	" 360
388 men on Rs.17 1/2 each	" 6790
872	Rs.19580
Deduct cost of 872 men at Rs.15 each	" 13080
Additional expenditure on 872 men is	Rs. 6500,

~~[illegible]~~ ie an increase of 50 per cent or Rs 7½ per head

The Board's proposals practically amount to this that the number of clerks on Rs.15 in an establishment should not

be

more than about 11 1/2 per cent. of the total strength of the establishment and that the pay of all clerks on Rs.15 in excess of that proportion should be raised by about 50 per cent of their present salaries or Rs.7 1/2 each per mensem. Taking then the Board's figures as to other Government establishments, namely 5241 total strength and 1033 clerks on Rs.15 and under - the additional cost would be Rs.7 1/2(1033 - $\frac{11\frac{1}{2}}{100}$ x 5241) or Rs.7 1/2(1033 - 603) or Rs.10,000 per mensem or Rs.120,240 per annum. Even this figure must be below the mark for there are several offices in which there are clerks on less than Rs.15 and the Board apparently proposes to have only one clerk on Rs.15 in an office and [illegible] any lower pay.

Apart from the above objection it is submitted that as this Government has already reported to the Government of India the scale it has decided to adopt, it is not desirable now to alter it, merely because the extension of such altered scale to other Government establishments will not involve such large additional expenditure as it previously apprehended. The only point is whether the scale suggested by Government is -

such

Letter No 625 dt 14-11-96

1 ff

7/9/17

Of course the service will be more attractive if it is paid more. The question is whether this additional attractiveness is worth R 20,670 a year, & if so whether we can get the G of I to give us this R 20,670. I don't think the scale Govt has adopted shd be changed.

such as to attract deserving men under the present circumstances. In the concluding portion of para 6 of its Proceedings, the Board strongly advocates the acceptance of its scale, if possible, 'as it feels confident that the only hope of materially increasing the efficiency of taluk establishments lies in improving the prospects before those who may be inclined to enter the service'. Looking to the low rates of pay that are now allowed in taluk offices generally and the few prospects of promotion the gumastahs have had, it is not improbable that there are at least 2 or 3 men in each taluk office who are not worth more than their present pay of Rs.15; they might under the Government scale be as well left on Rs.15 and when vacancies occur in the higher grades, really competent outsiders may be directly taken to such higher grades. It is by this means that the efficiency of an office can be really improved. If on the other hand the Board's proposal to have only one clerk on Rs.15 is sanctioned, a large number of undeserving men also will of necessity get promotion, specially under para 6 of G.O. No.624, dated 14th November 1896.

So

So far as the taluk establishments are - concerned, the cost under the Board's - scale will be Rs.20070 per annum in excess of that under the Government scale.

In regard to the first point, i.e. as to the additional hands applied for, the Collectors' proposals and the Board's recommendations thereon are given below:-

Clerks.

(1) Ganjam. The Board proposed to take away one clerk from Berhampore and two from Chikacole, the Collector protests against losing 3 clerks. He urges that the talukas of Berhampore and Chikacole dispatch of accounts in talukas which have yet to be rectified speedily by a special officer. It is further pointed out that the Berhampore and Chikacole talukas will shortly rise in importance in a few years owing to the Rushikulya Irrigation and that the work of the talukas will increase on that account. He therefore proposes to retain the present strength at Berhampore, to reduce the Chikacole by one hand only instead of by 2 and to give Ganjam an extra hand so that the district strength may remain at 28. The Board approves the Collector's proposal.

Note.

The general scale as to the number of clerks to be allowed to the different classes of taluk offices in talukas in which Sub-magistrates have been appointed

First class taluks to have 10 clerks

Second & Third } do 9 clerks

Fourth & Fifth } do do 8 clerks

In taluks in which no stationary submagistrates have been appointed, an additional hand to be allowed, if the circumstances really require it.

Approved. Experience shows that the same no. of hands gives less strength in Ganjam than in Southern districts.

	Grade	Existing strength	Proposed strength.
Berhampore	II	10	10
Chikacole	V	10	9
Ganjam	IV	8	9
		28	28

Viz[illegible] Dt.

* III class.

θ IV class

The Ws' arguments are in many cases based on the grading of the Taluks. It is true this grading has been accepted by Govt. but it has been very hastily done. There may be twice as much work to be done in a second class Taluk in one district as there is in another. For instance Bangarapalem is a 2nd class Taluk in the new grading and so is Perikipadu but I have no hesitation in saying there is four times the work in the former that there is in the latter.

F.A.
7.9.7.

Approved

* page 190 G.O. No 711 [illegible]

(2) Vizagapatam Dt.

The taluks of Golgonda* and Sarvasidhi θ have each six clerks. The Board proposed to increase the number of clerks in Golgonda only by one but the Collector states that, according to scale, Golgonda is entitled to eight hands and Sarvasidhi to eight and also urges the unhealthiness of Golgonda and the need for an extra hand at Sarvasidhi. The Board of Revenue recommends that the Golgonda and Sarvasidhi taluks may be allowed an additional clerk each.

(3) Godavari Dt.

Rajahmundry has nine clerks, but as it is only a fourth class taluk, the Board proposed to reduce the number to 8. The Collector protests against the reduction on the ground that the treasury transactions and other work in that office are very heavy and complicated owing to the fact that Rajahmundry is the central and the most important station in the district where nearly a dozen offices are located. The Board of Revenue accepts the Collector's proposal.

(4) Kistna Dt.

The Collector of Kistna applies for an additional hand for Cultivation & Point

points out that the number of villages in the taluk is 225 and that the revenue is elastic and will rise as high as that of Repalle (12 lakhs) as soon as the lands under the Peddalanka channel come fully under occupation. He also applies for an additional clerk for Nuzvid where there is no Stationary Sub-Magistrate. The Board proposed to reduce the number of clerks at Bandar from 9 to 8 as it is only a fourth class taluk, but the Collector protests against the reduction for the reasons that the revenue work has been gradually increasing and the direct collection of water tax in the villages forming the Gudur zamindari entails additional work on the taluk establishment. The Board supports the Collector's recommendations in the three cases. Repalle and Palnad have 9 clerks each at present. As the former is a first class taluk and the latter, though only of the third class, has no Stationary Sub-Magistrate, the Board proposed to increase the number in each case by one. The Collector now applies for yet another hand for each taluk. But the Board considers that there is no need to strengthen the taluks any further.

(5) Nellore Dt.

Nellore being a first --

	class	Existing Number of clerks	No. previously proposed	No. now proposed
Gudivada	II	9	9	10
Nuzvid	V	8	8	9

approved
JG

I have doubts ~~I am not sure~~ about Repalle I am not sure about it, but I have always heard that there are the same sort of difficulties there as in Tanjore & Cumbaconum, & I believe they ought to have an extra clerk. Repalle is a very rich taluk.
JG

JG

I know Nellore to be by far the heaviest of the Taluks. Gudur is also heavy, but I cannot say they should be treated specially. Ongole Kandukur & Atmakur are ordinary taluks.
JG

Approved
JG

class taluk, it was proposed to raise its strength from 9 to 10 clerks, while Atmakur being only a fourth class one it was proposed to reduce its strength from 9 to 8. In the case of Gudur, Ongole, and Kandukur which are of the second, third and fourth class respectively, the existing strength of 9, 9 and 8 clerks was allowed to stand. The Collector now recommends the entertainment of an additional clerk for each of the taluks of Nellore, Gudur, Ongole, and Kandukur and protests against the reduction in Atmakur. But no special reasons are reported to have been assigned in any of these cases and the Board considers that none of the taluks deserves any special treatment.

(6) Cuddapah.

The Board of Revenue proposed to reduce the number of clerks in Cuddapah and Proddatur from 10 in each case to 9 and 8 respectively, as they are only of the second and fourth class. The Collector points out that the proposal to reduce the number overlooks the fact that special clerks were allowed to these taluks on account of the Kurnool-Cuddapah canal and recommends the retention of one extra clerk out of two at Proddatur and of one at Cuddapah. The Board of Revenue supports

the

the Collector's recommendation.

(7) Anantapur Dt.

Kalyandrug, a fifth class taluk, though entitled to 8 clerks was allowed only 6 clerks (its present strength). The Collector now points out that the taluk needs the full establishment of 8 clerks, as the existing establishment cannot cope with the work and that at least one more hand should be added to the present strength: he also offers, if necessary, one clerk from Tadpatri which is a light taluk. The Board approves of the transfer of one of the clerks from Tadpatri to Kalyandrug.

(8) Bellary Dt.

The Board of Revenue supposed that the Bellary taluk office (a second class one) had ten clerks and proposed to reduce the strength by one. The Collector points out that the 10th clerk is a shroff and that no reduction is called for. Hospet being a third class taluk, is entitled according to scale to 9 clerks, but the Board proposed that the present number of 8 was sufficient. The Collector now contends for the full number as the work there has hitherto been badly done. The Board approves the Collector's proposals.

(9) Kurnool Dt.

In the case of Nandyal & Pattikonda

I know the Cuddapah Taluk needs the Extra Strength
[illegible] 7/9/7

approved

approved

Pattikonda, which are of the 3rd and 4th class respectively, the Board proposed to reduce the existing strength of 10 and 9 clerks, by one in each case, while in the case of Ramallakot (a 3rd class taluk) it was proposed to increase the number from 8 to 9, especially as there is no Stationary Sub-Magistrate in that taluk. But the Collector remarks that Pattikonda should be retained at its present strength as it is a litigious and heavy taluk and accordingly suggests that the additional clerk proposed for Ramallakot may be allowed for Pattikonda as the work in the former is comparatively light. As regards Nandyal the Collector points out that an extra clerk is necessary on account of the canal work and that the existing number should not be reduced. The Board of Revenue approves the Collector's proposals. It observes that one clerk on Rs.15 was sanctioned for Nandyal for canal work - vide G.O.No.1151, dated 17th September 1883.

(10) Chingleput Dt.

Chingleput and Saidapet being of the 5th and 4th class respectively, the Board of Revenue proposed to reduce the strength of the taluk establishment from 9 to 8 in each case. The Collector pro-

tests

approved

...tests against the proposal, as the ... work in the ... is heavy owing to the location of several other offices at the station, while in the Kulittalai taluk the collection work is very troublesome involving the issue of a large number of processes. The Board of Revenue approves the Collector's recommendations.

(11) N. Arcot Dt.

The Board proposed to reduce the number of clerks in Vellore and Chittoor taluk offices from 9 to 8 as they are both of the 4th class. The Collector protests against the reduction proposed as they are heavy offices and reports that the district strength may be left undisturbed especially as Chandragiri & Polur which under the scale are entitled to 8 hands each, have been allowed only their present strength of 7 hands. The Board approves the Collector's recommendations.

(12) S. Arcot Dt.

The Kallakurichi taluk office has nine clerks at present; it is classed only a 4th class taluk, the Board proposed to reduce the number to 8. The Collector points out that Kallakurichi has no Deputy Tahsildar and is otherwise heavy also that it is hard to give

the

approved

the same establishment to Tiruvannamalai which is a much lighter taluk. He therefore recommends that the number of hands at Kallakurichi may not be reduced. The Board approves the Collector's recommendation.

(13) Tanjore Dt.

Tanjore (I), Kumbakonam (I) and Mannargudi (IV), have been allowed 10, 10 and 8 clerks respectively against the number of nine in each case. The Collector recommends the addition of one clerk to each of the taluks and states that the work in Mannargudi is not done well even with the existing establishment. The Board approves the proposal to retain the Mannargudi taluk at its present strength, but in the case of Tanjore and Kumbakonam which have also by been strengthened by the revision scheme, it considers that nothing further need be done.

(14) Trichinopoly Dt.

The Collector points out that Perambalur (IV) is a heavy taluk, because there is no Deputy Tahsildar and asks that the present strength of nine clerks may be retained. The Board supports the Collector's representation.

(15) Tinnevelly Dt.

Tenkasi is a third class taluk. Was of the opinion that an extra

Approved

I believe I was the last making the original recommendation. Tanjore Taluk is a fearfully heavy Taluk. I found the Abkari establ. accounts and the Land Rev. establ. accounts in the most alarming confusion while I was last there. In fact I feared fraud but could prove it. The confusion was due to the fact that the Estab. did not keep the accounts up to date. Kumbaconam is almost as heavy and though I was not able personally to look into the matter I believe it is as bad as Tanjore. Mannargudi may go on as it is.

The Taluks of E. & W. Cambaconum are very heavy taluks, & I think two clerks is not too many.

[illegible] taluk and the Board allowed its [illegible] strength of 9 clerks. The Collector now applies for an additional [illegible] alleging that the work in connection with the revenue collections and [illegible] works is heavy. But the Board does not consider that the taluk deserves special treatment.

(16) Coimbatore Tk.

Kaiur is a Ninth class taluk & the Board proposed to reduce the strength of the establishment from 9 to 8, while in the case of Kollegal (a 8th class taluk) the existing number (8) was allowed to stand. The Collector deprecates the reduction at Kaiur which is a heavy taluk on account of irrigation [illegible] and [illegible] an extra clerk at Kollegal which is entitled to 8 clerks according to [illegible]. There is no [illegible] in Kaiur [illegible] Kollegal [illegible] and [illegible] there is a [illegible] Mr. Stokes urges [illegible] the establishment according to [illegible]. The Board approves the Collector's proposal.

(17) [illegible] Tk.

Kasaragod (Ill), [illegible] (IV) and Coondapur (V) have been allotted 9, 8 and 8 clerks respectively against the present strength of 8, 8 and 9. The Collector

approved

approved. The work at Kaiur is very heavy & sickness prevented the full number of clerks from being at work at the same time all the while I was at Coimbatore JG

There is for example little or no revenue work in the Taluks of this District

JG

Collector points out that Chandapur is heavy, because it has no Deputy Tahsildar and that it has received an addition of 10 villages from Udipi. He therefore recommends that [illegible] be retained at its present strength. He also recommends the addition of a clerk to Udipi taluk taking away, if necessary, one from Kadaba from which a number of villages was recently transferred to Udipi (vide G.O. No.831 Revs dated 20th December 1898). The Board approves of the Collector's proposals.

approved JG

(18) [illegible]

6. The Collector points out that an extra clerk at Tirthahalli (IV) was specially given to help the Tahsildar in treasury work on the abolition of the sub-treasury. He also asks for an additional clerk for [illegible] (III) which [illegible] the Statement of Establishments is a district special [illegible] to serve in 10 clerks i.e. to a [illegible] of the present [illegible] (8) [illegible]. He has already [illegible] sanctioned for it in anticipation of the present revision. The Board approves the Collector's proposals.

I approve of the Coll's proposal about the Wynaad; but I do not understand what he is proposing to do about Chirikal & Kurumbranat. The Coll. apparently wants to send a drogg to Kurumbranat from Chirikal. Kurumbranat already has one permanent drogg on R 15, and an add'l drogg during the last months

JG

(19) The Collectors of Malabar and Salem have proposed no alterations.

7. The following statement shows the

The existing strength, the strength as originally proposed by the Board and the new proposed by the Board, for taluks in which any changes are suggested:—

District.	Taluk.	Existing strength.	Strength as originally proposed by the Board approved by Govt.	As now proposed by the Board of Rev.	
Ganjam.	Berhampore	10	9	10	+1
	Chicacole.	10	8	9	+1
	Goomsur	8	8	9	+1
Vizagapatam	Golgonda	6	7	8	+1
	Sarvasidhi	6	6	7	+1
Godavari	Rajahmundry	9	8	9	+1
Kistna.	Gudivada	9	9	10	+1
	Bandur.	9	8	9	+1
	Nuzvid.	8	8	9	+1
Cuddapah	Cuddapah	10	9	10	+1
	Proddatore	10	8	9	+1
Anantapur.	Kalyandrug	6	6	7	+1
	Tadpatri	9	9	8	-1
Bellary	Hospet.	8	8	9	+1
Kurnool	Nandyal	10	9	10	+1
	Pattikonda.	9	8	9	+1
	Ramallakot	8	9	8	-1
Chingleput.	Saidapet	9	8	9	+1
	Chingleput.	9	8	9	+1
N. Arcot.	Vellore	9	8	9	+1
	Chittoor.	9	8	9	+1
S. Arcot	Kallakurichi	9	8	9	+1
Tanjore	Mannargudi	9	8	9	+1
Trichinopoly	Perambalur	9	8	9	+1
Coimbatore	Karur	9	8	9	+1
	Kollegal.	8	8	9	+1
S. Canara	Coondapur	9	8	9	+1
	Uppinangadi	8	8	9	+1
	Kasargod	9	9	8	-1
Malabar.	Wynad	8	9	10	+1
	Chirakkal	9	8	9	+1

I doubt whether Berhampore should have an extra clerk
JG

I think Tanjore & Coimbatore each have an extra clerk
JG

I didn't understand what is wanted with regard to Chirakkal & Kurnool
JG

In regard to chirakkal the collector requests that the existing establishment be retained.
CP.
16/2/98.

I have noted opposite to each
JG

3. The Board's proposals seem well considered, and it is submitted, for approval. The number of taluks in each district classified with reference to the number of clerks to be allotted to each taluk in the Board's present proposals is shown in the subjoined statement.

—	Number of taluks with					
	Six clerks.	Seven clerks.	Eight clerks.	Nine clerks.	Ten clerks.	Total number of taluks in the district.
Ganjám	..	..	..	2	1	3
Vizagapatam	..	1	2	..	..	3
Gódávari	1	..	4	4	1	10
Kistna	..	..	3	6	3	12
Nellore	..	..	6	2	1	9
Cuddapah	..	..	5	5	1	11
Anantapur	..	1	6	1	..	8
Bellary	..	..	2	6	..	8
Kurnool	..	..	1	6	1	8
Chingleput	..	..	2	4	..	6
North Arcot	..	2	1	5	1	9
South Arcot	..	..	1	6	1	8
Tanjore	..	..	1	6	2	9
Trichinopoly	..	..	1	3	1	5
Madura	..	..	3	3	..	6
Tinnevelly	..	..	4	3	2	9
Coimbatore	..	..	3	6	1	10
Salem	..	..	2	4	3	9
South Canara	..	..	1	4	..	5
Malabar	..	..	3	4	2	9
Total ..	1	4	51	80	21	157
	Rs	Rs	Rs	Rs	Rs	Rs
Cost for each office — as per Govt scale	~~122½~~	140	160	175	200	
Cost for each office — as per Bd's scale	127½	152½	170	187½	207½	
Total cost — as per Govt scale	122½	560	8160	14000	4200	27042½
Total cost — as per Bd's scale	127½	610	8670	15000	4357½	28765

28765 – Bd's scale
27042½ – Govt scale
1722½ – diff. per mensem
12
Rs20670 – do per annum

Approved

9. Thirdly. The Collector of Chingleput proposes that the 3rd sheriff on Rs.10 in the Tambaram taluk may be abolished. The Board approves the proposal. It also approves the proposal of the Collector of Bellary to cut the additional sheriff on Rs.15 sanctioned in G.O. No.170 dated 20th February 1896. There will thus be no change in the number of taluk sheriffs; but there will be an increase in cost of Rs.5 per mensem or Rs.60 per annum.

10. Dufterbunds or Attenders. The Collector of Kistna recommends that the pay of dufterbunds should be raised to Rs.8, as they are often entrusted with the duties of clerks and occupy the position between taluk gumastahs and the inferior staff. But the Board does not recommend the proposal, as Government has already decided in para 2 (iv) of its order No.624 dated 14th November 1896 that no increase in the pay of this class of servants is called for.

It is submitted it is a mistake to entrust attenders with the duties of clerks, as they are thereby often led to think that they are above their legitimate work and thus neglect it.

11. Next as regards peons the Board of Revenue after a full consideration of the Collector's proposals, fixes the number to be retained at 3,207 instead of [illegible] sanctioned by Government, or [illegible] in excess. The additional cost involved in the proposals under this [illegible], as shown below, be Rs.1,[illegible] [illegible] Rs.1,[illegible] per annum against Rs.1,[illegible] arrived at by Government.

157 duffadars at Rs.9 each	Rs.	1413
157 × 3 peons at Rs.8 each	"	3768
157 × 5 peons at Rs.7 each	"	5495
1951 peons at Rs.6 each	"	11706
	Rs.	22382
Deduct the cost p.m. of the existing establishment	"	21133
	Rs.	1249

12. The several cases in which increases are proposed and the grounds therefor, are detailed below:-

(1) Ganjam. The Board of Revenue proposed to reduce the number of peons in Goomsur taluk from 22 to 20, in Bhaskara Chicacole from 21 to 20, and in Berhampore from 22 to 20. But the Collector points out that no reduction is possible in the number of peons in the Berhampore and Goomsur taluks as in the [illegible] peons are required for the additional [illegible] inspectors recently sanctioned on account of Pushkuly [illegible] the latter many peons are always ill owing to the unhealthiness of the climate. The Board considers that for the reasons urged by the Collector the existing number of peons in Goomsur and Berhampore may be left undisturbed. This means an increase of [illegible] peons as compared with the number --- previously

Approved

12

[illegible] suggested by the Board and [illegible] by Government.

(2) Godavari :- The Collector [illegible] the abolition of 2 peons in each of the taluks of [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], [illegible], [illegible] and [illegible] as the Tahsildars [illegible] have [illegible] deputed one or two peons to assist the dependent Deputy Tahsildars who have much revenue work to do and sub-jails to look after. He also points out that the existing number of peons in Rajahmundry is necessary as it is a central place through which officers of several Departments and troops constantly pass. The Collector also proposes an increase of 2 peons to the Bhadrachalam taluk. The Board recommends that for the reasons urged by the Collector the reduction in the number of peons may be limited to one instead of two in the 6 taluks having dependent Deputy Tahsildars and that the existing number of peons in Rajahmundry may be left undisturbed. It also recommends that the additional peons proposed for Bhadrachalam may be sanctioned. The result will be an increase of 10 peons over the number previously sanctioned.

(3) Kistna :- The Collector states that a reduction of 2 peons in each of the

Approved

the taluks of Bandar, Guntur, Sattenapalle and Narasaraopet and of one peon in Bapatla is not possible as two of the taluk peons are detailed for doing duty under the Stationary Sub-Magistrate and the Division Deputy Tahsildar, and as the remaining peons are barely sufficient for the performance of their multifarious duties in the taluks. The Board recommends that one extra peon may be allowed for each of the taluks of Bandur, Bapatla and Guntur or of 3 in all, as there are dependent Deputy Tahsildars' offices in those taluks. It remarks at the same time that as the scheme allows a muchi for each taluk, the peons now said to be employed in doing that work will be available for other duties.

(4) Chingleput :- The Collector considers that it is not possible to reduce the present strength of peons in the Saidapet and Tiruvallur taluks, by two & one respectively as proposed. In the former taluk about 350 summonses have to be issued monthly besides processes under Act 11 of 1864. Moreover the vicinity of Saidapet to Madras, the location of Collector's head quarters at the station and of Government House at Guindy

Approved

as

as well as the occasional demands for services in connection with the [illegible] of troops through the taluk all add to the calls on the services of peons. As regards Tiruvallur it is pointed out [illegible] of the villages [illegible] distances, the most distant villages since the transfer of the Panchayat taluk of the Nalahasti-zamindari from the N. Arcot Dt. being 65 miles from the taluk head quarters. The Board approves the Collector's proposals which [illegible] increase of [illegible] peons as compared with the number previously allowed.

(3) Tarjore :- The Collector states that no reduction in the number of peons is possible as 12 peons (the number proposed to be reduced) are employed as jail warders. As regards Tarjore particularly he observes that as the taluk is extensive, peons going to distant villages are unable to [illegible] as the head quarters taluk of the district, it requires more peons than other taluks. [illegible] the taluks in Tarjore have been provided with stationary [illegible] of looking after the jail [illegible] head quarters devolves [illegible] of the peons of the [illegible] and not on the taluk peons; [illegible]

Approved

Office.
Check this statement. It is incorrect as I remember. In correspondence from Salem. [illegible]

Please see para 1 of G.O. No. 1329 Judicial dt 1-6-94 the original of which is submitted herewith.
also para 2 of G.O. 2518 Judl dt 20-10-94
[illegible] 10/9/97

In regard to the point referred to at the bottom of the last page the point I raised before and which I think the Collector into consideration here is whether there is any good reason why these Subjail Warders should continue to be regarded as Land Revenue servants and whether after reducing accordingly the number of Revs peons these men should not go on to the Jail Budget.

[illegible]
14/9/97.

This is a separate matter entirely. The Bd seems to be right in allowing an extra peon only for Mayavaram, Manargudi & Pathabhattai.

Approved

The only taluks in which an extra peon [illegible] Mayavaram, [illegible] and Pathabhattai in each of [illegible] Deputy [illegible] jail in charge of [illegible] that as regards the Tanjore [illegible] to the present strength [illegible] is in its opinion called for, the number of peons already allowed, nearly 22, being left untouched.

(4) Trichinopoly :- The Collector states that the present strength of peons in the Trichinopoly [illegible] be reduced by one as proposed, as the Trichy [illegible] the head quarters station of the district and of the South Indian Railway Company and as [illegible] stationed there. The Collector, however, offers [illegible] of the 10 peons allowed [illegible]. The Board approves the Collector's proposals, which [illegible] the total number of the district.

(5) Madura :- The Collector states that it is not possible to reduce the number of peons in the Madura taluk [illegible] with the [illegible] as Madura being the head quarters of the district special [illegible] the peons are [illegible]

[illegible]

Approved

[illegible]

Approved

peons over the [illegible] already allowed [illegible] District.

(9) [illegible] :- [illegible]

(10) [illegible] :- [illegible]

Approved

[illegible]

/8

[illegible]

(22) [illegible] :- The Collector [illegible] the Boat Creek villages, very [illegible] the means of communication [illegible] the Black and the village officers, [illegible] greater facility in the order [illegible] the Special [illegible] the proposed [illegible] Proceedings in lieu of the [illegible] for the district [illegible] that the [illegible] already [illegible] established [illegible].

Approved

Approved

25. The following statement shows (a) the existing number of posts (b) the number originally sanctioned by the Board and approved by Government and (c) the number now proposed by the Board, for the taluks in which establishments are maintained.

District.	Taluk.	The no. of posts existing.	The no. proposed to be retained by the Board & approved by Govt.	The no. as now proposed by the Board.		
Ganjam.	Goomsur.	22	20	22		
	Berhampore.	21	20	21		
Godavari.	Peddapuram	21	19	20		
	Amalapuram.	22	20	21		
	Ramachendrapuram	22	20	21		
	Ellore.	21	19	20		
	Tanuku.	22	20	21		
	Narsapur.	22	20	21		
	Rajahmundry.	21	19	21		
	Bhadrachalam.	8	8	10		
Kistna.	Bandur.	21	19	20		
	Bapatla.	22	21	22		
	Guntur.	21	19	20		
Chingleput.	Saidapet	22	20	22		
	Trivallur.	21	20	21		
Tanjore.	Mayavaram.	21	19	20		
	Mannargudi.	21	20	21		
	Pattukottai.	21	20	21		
	Tanjore	22	22	22		
Madura.	Madura.	26	22	24		
Tinnevelly.	Nanguneri.	22	21	22		
	Ottapidaram.	21	19	20		
Coimbatore.	Erode.	22	21	22		
	Dharapuram.	21	20	21		
S. Canara.	Mangalore.	21	20	21		
	Uppinangadi	21	19	20		
	Udipi.	21	19	20		
	Kasargod.	21	19	20.		
Malabar						

Malabar.	Kottayam.	21	19	20
	Kurumbaranad	21	19	20
			603	637

The increase may be allowed as a Local Allowance
JG

Approved
JG

The Bd has told the Coll^r to report the number of magisterial cases disposed of within the last 3 years. It has approved, however, of the entertainment of a second clerk. This proposal may be sanctioned provisionally; but the Coll^r report, about the number of magisterial cases, shd be submitted to Gov^t, & also a statement of the population of the 8 villages
JG

Approved
JG

Deputy Tahsildars' Establishments.
Clerks.

14. The Board proposes on the recommendations of the Collectors concerned

(1) to increase the pay of the 2 clerks in the Rissemkatak Deputy Tahsildar's office who are now paid Rs.20 and 10 respectively, by Rs.5 each, on account of the unhealthiness of the locality;

(2) to allow a 3rd clerk on Rs.15 for Vizianagaram (Mistri Di) which is an independent Deputy Tahsildar's Division, on account of the heavy work therein (the [illegible] of revenue and magisterial cases disposed of in a year being 7,[illegible] and [illegible] respectively);

(3) to allow a second clerk on Rs.15 to [illegible] in consideration of the unhealthiness of the locality & of the fact that 8 villages of the Palamanor taluk have been transferred to the Venkatagirikota Division for magisterial purposes;

(4) to sanction a third clerk on Rs.15 for the Tirupati Deputy Tahsildar's office, the work in that sub-treasury having considerably increased since the abolition of the sub-treasuries at Kalahasti, Puttur and Tirutani in 1893;

(5)

(a) To grant a local allowance of Rs.4 each [illegible] clerks in the Deputy Tahsildar's office at Shevaroys, as suggested by Government in para 4 of its order No.[illegible] dated 14th Nov. 1906.

approved

(b) to increase the pay of the Head clerk in the Sankari Deputy Tahsildar's office from Rs.35 to Rs.30:50 as to be on a par with that of the Head clerk in Ostachalam and Chinnam. The Collector points out that Sankari [illegible] where the treasury transactions are not so heavy as in the [illegible] provided with a Table Clerk [illegible] has been sanctioned to attend to the necessary work in the latter place. He is submitted that the proposals (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) [illegible] are not to be sanctioned.

Deputy Tahsildars' offices

approved

As regards (2) it is noted that the increase proposed will be in the form of a local allowance in the case of No.(b) — vide Misc. G.O. No. 276 dated 28th April 1897. It is submitted it is not advisable at present, to extend this principle to the case of the Head clerk of the Sankari Deputy Tahsildar's office —

	Rs.
(1) Local allowance of Rs.5 to each of the 2 clerks in the Dissanakotak Dy. Tahsildar's office ----------	10
(2) A 3rd clerk for the Vissampet Dy. Tahsildar's office	15
(3) A 2nd clerk for the Venkatagirikota Deputy Tahsildar's office ----------	15
(4) A third clerk for the for the Tirupati Deputy Tahsildar's office ----------	15
(5) Local allowance of Rs.5 to each of the two clerks in the Deputy Tahsildar's office, Shevaroys ----------	10

[illegible] the pay of the different clerks [illegible] appointments in the Tahsildars' offices appears [illegible] to be [illegible] with [illegible] to the clerks and the total [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] on the [illegible].

20. The [illegible] in para 3 (a) of the [illegible] No.[illegible], [illegible] 1906 [illegible] of the [illegible] proposal to [illegible] Rs.20 to Rs.25 [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] of offices in this district, [illegible] the [illegible] the [illegible] that the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] in his [illegible] [illegible] the working of the [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] Tahsildar [illegible] the office [illegible] [illegible] is due to the [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible]. But the Board of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Rs.10 [illegible] the monthly hydrostat [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] places since [illegible] Rs.20000.

(b) The Board [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

the post was first sanctioned, to [illegible] Rs.1,052,956 in 1895 and the Board of Revenue recommends that though the Government has declined to sanction any increase to this class of officers as a whole, this may be treated as a special case and proposes that the pay be increased to Rs.[illegible] a month. The increase [illegible] compensation for the [illegible] [illegible] the place [illegible] of the [illegible] pay. [illegible]

10. [illegible] the above [illegible] will be (11 × 10 + 7) × [illegible] = Rs.[illegible] annum

[illegible] (a) The [illegible] of the [illegible] Rs.10 to Rs.10 and the Board of Revenue approves of the recommendation in [illegible] of the [illegible] of the [illegible] Seeing that [illegible] Rs.7 each, the [illegible] at Bissamkatak [illegible] Rs.10 [illegible] sufficient. [illegible] increase of [illegible] Rs.[illegible] [illegible] It is [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] pay in [illegible]

Rs.7

I have no doubt this is necessary. I have already approved of raising the Head Clerk's pay by R5.

JG

The local allowance wh it is proposed to give the two clerks is only R5. R3 is enough for the Dafterband, & out of the present pay, R10, R7 shd reckoned as salary & R3 as local allowance in future; but this shd not be done with regard to the present incumbent, as it will reduce his pension

JG

Rs.7 which the Government may agree to allow the attendant, should not be treated as local allowance.

(b) The Collector of the Nilgiris proposes with reference to the Board's remark in para 17 of its proceedings No.[illegible] dated [illegible] March 1896, that as the work in the Deputy Tahsildars offices at Ootacamund, Gudalur and Coonoor has been steadily increasing and as it is difficult to find qualified men for the post of attendant [illegible] for each Deputy Tahsildar's office [illegible] [illegible] the appointment of [illegible] as proposed and [illegible] the Collector ought to be able to manage with attendants as in other districts and [illegible] [illegible] It is [illegible] for consideration whether in these cases also the pay may not be fixed at Rs.7 each; a local allowance of Rs.[illegible] being sanctioned for attendants at Ooty and Coonoor. The Gudalur man will get the Wynaad allowance of 50 per cent of the pay. Although the principle of the local allowance has not been generally extended to the case

Ootacamund	. .	Rs.10
Coonoor	. .	" 10
Gudalur	. .	" 8
Wynaad allowance		4

It has not been proposed that the R5 by wh the Head Clerk's pay is increased & the increase to the Shroff's pay shd be treated as a local allowance because their pay has been fixed specially for Coonoor, without reference to the pay of similar officers on the plains. In the case of the Dafterband, however, it is fixed with refce to the pay of similar officers on the plains & the extra R3 shd be a local allowance. So with regard

[illegible] employed in the Hill districts, it [illegible] desirable to apply it in the case of [illegible] appointments which [illegible] be by substitution.

(c) There is [illegible] Deputy Tahsildar's office in the Talukdaries and the Collection of Tahsildar's pay that an allowance of [illegible] and that Rs.[illegible] should be [illegible] Rs.10 [illegible] of the Tahsildar's [illegible] in addition to his [illegible] allowance. [illegible] Collector's proposal [illegible] Rs.7, Deputy [illegible] at Rs.[illegible] of [illegible] Rs.10. This is right.

27. [illegible] the Board's proposal will [illegible] Rs.17 per [illegible] or Rs.551 per [illegible] Rs.17 is thought [illegible] to pay [illegible] by the Tahsildar [illegible] that the pay of the Collector will [illegible] so may be fixed at Rs.7, the [illegible] will be only Rs. ~~41~~ 40½ per [illegible] per Rs. ~~[illegible]~~ 40½.

28. ~~[illegible]~~ (a) [illegible] Deputy Collector's [illegible] Rs.6 each and the Collector's [illegible] additional pay. The Board of Revenue [illegible]

[illegible] increase.

who pay the Deputy at Sotra. Apparently, too, the W. gives allowance for all servants and he treated as a Local allowance if we can do so under the Code.

Yes

	Rs.	
[illegible]	[illegible]	
[illegible]	10	7+3
[illegible]	10	7+3
[illegible]	[illegible]	7
[illegible]	[illegible]	14+3½
[illegible] Local allowance	7	7
[illegible]	3	+3
	47	40½

The Board's comments are a deduction from our Rs. I think this is right.

Also in this case

The additional pays in R 2 are necessary but I think their pay should be R 6, & R 2 should be a local allowance.

recognising the establishment of the post as the Revenue Inspector attached for the Division has not been provided with a permanent post.

(b) Vishamkatta in the Hatton Division is by 2 parganas the Collector of [illegible] stations that an additional post is necessary and the Board [illegible] this.

(c) The Collector of Nilgiris recommends that 2 additional posts for each of the Deputy Tahsildar's offices be sanctioned from [illegible] the necessary [illegible] the [illegible] 2 Revenue Inspectors in [illegible] 2. The Nilgiris are hard to get [illegible] pay [illegible] Rs.[illegible] for Tahsildar [illegible] Rs.6 and a [illegible] pay of Rs.[illegible] and a [illegible] pay of Rs.[illegible]. The Collector proposes to fix the pay of the [illegible] at Rs.9 so that each office will hereafter have one post on Rs.9 and 4 posts on Rs.6 each. It is a question whether in each of these posts Rs.3 may rightly be treated as local allowance, so that the pay proper will be reduced to what it is on the plains.

(d) The extra cost involved will be Rs.4[illegible] per month or Rs.500 per annum. [illegible] to fix the cost of increasing [illegible] by one Rupee, the pay of [illegible] in each of 151 [illegible]

Deputy

Deputy Tahsildars offices, viz: Rs.1818, the increased cost under this head will be Rs.2540 per annum.

(e) It is stated that the Kodaikanal Deputy Tahsildar's office has already a peon on Rs.7 and no increase is proposed. It is not known what pay the peons in the office at Chevaroys get. Orders are requested as to whether the pay of the peons in these two offices may not be fixed as on the plains with a local allowance of Rs.2 each—Grade G.Os. [illegible] and ~~G.O.~~ 952 mis dy 18th Feb. 1897.

22. The total additional expenditure involved in the [illegible] proposals now submitted by the Board of Revenue for improving the position of the taluk establishments will be Rs.1,03,734 per annum as detailed below against the estimate of Rs.[illegible] [illegible] by Government.

Taluk clerks	Rs.[illegible]
Bureaus	[illegible]
Cachis	[illegible]
Rifter hands	[illegible]
Peons	[illegible]
Deputy Tahsildars' clerks	[illegible]
Bureaus	[illegible]
Rifter hands	564
Peons	[illegible]
	Rs.103734

We need say nothing about this. Any ingiving will result in an increase, & no increase has been asked for.

JG

These will vary with the orders which may be passed on proposals in paras 17(b), 19(a) & (b), & 21(c) of the note.

103,734
20670
1,24,404

It shd not be accepted

JG

This matter is before Govt. in another form.

[illegible] 7/9/17

If the scale of pay suggested by the Board for the taluk clerks be accepted, the additional cost will be Rs.1,~~24,~~404.

23. The Board states that the necessary proposition statement will be submitted as soon as orders are passed on its present proposals.

24. In para 16 of its Proceedings the Board refers to a suggestion made by the Collector of Malabar that for the future all appointments of taluk clerks should be made by Divisional officers on the ground that they are in a better position than Collectors to judge of the capabilities of these officials. Under existing orders Divisional officers have power to appoint clerks on Rs.20 [illegible] in their divisions subject to [illegible] report [illegible] and veto by the Collector and the Board thinks that the same power may be extended to all classes of taluk gumastahs whatever their pay. It does not consider that any other change is called for as Collectors do not generally interfere with the Divisional officers' nominations. 'On the other hand' it observes 'it is desirable that Collectors should retain the power of vetoing in their hands, so that they may be in a position to see that educated and competent

22

potent men are appointed to taluk offices.

It is submitted that the Board's proposal may be approved.

14/9/97

This must be considered with refce. Wth Bd's proposals about Sub Collectors, which I have looked into get.

9/10/97

I agree with what the Hon. Mr. Grose says on the margin of pages 4 to 6 of this Note. I think while we are about this business, we should make it as complete as possible. I should accept the Bd's proposals ~~and~~ ~~[illegible]~~ as modified by the Hon. Mr. Grose. I would ask for Rs. 104,226.

A.G.H.
14.2.98

N.B. These papers have at only just reached me. They are marked very urgent, so I will not attempt to go into detail.

A.G.H. 14.2.98

[illegible]

Lde

The Hon. Sir Henry Bliss K.C.I.E.

C. Nos. 6489 and 7171 of 1897.

Note.

The cost of the proposals sanctioned in G. O. No. 624 dated 14th Novr. 1896, is Rs. 92,610 per annum.

The Board's further proposals which have now been approved by the Hon. Mr. Grose, fall under the two main heads "Tahsildars' establishments" and Deputy Tahsildars' offices"

A. The Tahsildar's establishments

Clerks -

(1) increase in the number - 24.

(2) increase in the total cost Rs. 420.

The Hon. Member has also sanctioned 3 extra clerks -

1 for Repalle

1 for Tanjore

and 1 for Kumbakonum.

Each of these taluks has already got 10 clerks. If one more is allowed, the strength will rise to 11 in each. The question is what pay should be allowed to the new man. Looking to the

scale

R.C. 22/10/97
Rec'd 26/10/97

3 Sep 97

scale sanctioned by Government in para 2 of its Order No. 624, dated 24th Novr. 1896, the increase should, it is thought, be in the number of hands on 17½. If this is approved the cost of an establishment consisting of 11 hands will be Rs. 217½.

The total additional expenditure, which the proposals sanctioned by the Hon. Mr. Grose under this head involve, is 420+3 X 17½ or Rs. 472½ per mensem.

Shroffs.

(1) increase in number - nil.

(2) increase in cost - - -Rs. 5 per mensem.

Peons.

(1) increase in number - 34.

(2) increase in cost - Rs. 204.

B. Deputy Tahsildars' establishments.

Clerks -

(1) increse in number - 3.

(2) increase in cost - Rs. 80.

Shroffs.

(1) increase in number - 12.*

(2) increase in cost - Rs. 123.

*including one shroff for Parvatipur not proposed by the Board but sanctioned by the Hon. member

Dufter bunds.-

(1) increase in number - 4.

(2) increase in cost - Rs. 40½

Peons.-

(1) increase in number - 6.

(2) increase in cost - Rs. 43.

The total additional cost involved is thus :-

	Rs.
Tahsildar's establishment -	
Clerks - - - - -	472½
Shroffs - - - - -	5
Peons - - - - -	204
Deputy Tahsildar's establishment. -	
Clerks - - - - - -	80
shroffs - - - - - -	123
Dufterbunds - - - -	40½
Peons - - - - - - -	43.
Total cost per mensem - -	968
Total cost per annum - - -	11,616
against ~~11,616~~ Rs 11,124 proposed by the Board.	~~11,124~~

Addl expenditure already sanctioned ——— 92610

Addl expenditure now sanctioned by Hon. Mr. Grose 11616

Total 1,04,226

21/10/97

21/10/97

Received at 6.30 PM on 18.2.98
JG

Under all the circumstances, as these 3 clerks are not recommended by the Bd, I think nothing shd be said about the Ins. G of I. wd probably "cut" this item.
JG

Secy.

Before submitting a draft G.O. on this paper I request the favour of order on the following points:-

1. Page 12 of the first office note.

Is an additional clerk to be allowed for the Repalle Taluk office. The Hon. Mr Gr. remarks:-

"I have doubts about Repalle
"I am not sure about it" p. 12.

"I doubt whether Repalle should
"not have an extra clerk". p. 20.

2. If an extra clerk for Repalle is to be allowed, what is his pay to be & what is to be the pay of the additional clerk sanctioned for Tanjore and Kumbhakonum (page 17). It was suggested that it might be fixed at Rs 17½ (vide page 2 of the second office note) but no order were passed on the point

C. 18/2/98
2.19/2/98
12.40 PM.

25

Page 19 of the first office note

The Hon. member remarks:-
"I do not understand
"what it is proposed to do
"about Chirakkal and
"Kurumbranat. The collector
"apparently wants to send
"a shroff to Kurumbranat
"from Chirakkal. Kurumbra-
"nat ~~has only~~ already has one
"~~shroff~~ permanent shroff
"on Rs 15 and an additional
"shroff during the hist
"months".

Chirakkal & Kurumbranat ~~each~~ have 9 clerks each at present; but as they are only fourth grade taluks, it was proposed to reduce the number to 8 in each case. The collector accepts the reduction in the case of Kurumbranat, but not in the case of Chirakkal. He points out that an extra clerk for this taluk was specially

given to help the ~~Treasury~~ Tahsildar in Treasury work on the abolition of the Cannanore Sub-treasury. Please see entries in Cols 3, 7, & 8 against the two taluks named, at page 12 of B.P. No 224 dt 7.7.97. C.No 6489/97. The Board supports the Collector's proposal. Ma it be approved?

Yes
29

Please see page 17 of G.O. 624 dt 14.11.96.

As regards shroffs, there seem to be three permanent men at Chirakkal (1 on Rs 20, 1 on Rs 15 & 1 on Rs 10) while at Kurumbranat there is one permanent man on Rs 15 & one temporary man on Rs 10 - employed during the ~~hist~~ months. The Collector proposes to transfer ~~fr~~ 1 man from the former to the latter taluk with a view to affording some relief to this office. The Board supports

26

the proposal and it may be accepted. In that case the temporary shroff will it is presumed, be unnecessary.

Yes
89

4. Page 32 of the note. Venkatagirikota Deputy Tahsildar's office. This office has only one clerk at present. The Collector reported that the services of another clerk were required in consideration of the unhealthiness of the locality and of the fact that he had transferred eight villages of the ~~Palm~~ Palmaner taluk to the Venkatagirikota Division for magisterial purposes. The Board approved the collector's recommendation but requested him to report the number of magisterial cases disposed of within the last three years. The Hon. member has sanctioned the proposal provisionally

C.No. 10,007/97

but ~~board~~ has also directed that the collector's report about the number of magisterial cases should be submitted to Govt., together with a statement of the population of the 8 villages. The report about the magisterial cases has since been received. It shows that the number of cases disposed of in 1894, 1895, & 1896 was 62, 39, and 65 respectively. With reference to this the Board remarks that although the number of cases disposed of in the office is too small to require the services of an additional clerk, the provision already made should be retained in view of the unhealthiness of the station. May the proposal be approved. Information as to the population of the 8 villages is not available.

Yes
89

27

5. ~~Referring~~ Page 35 of the office note

Referring to the proposal to allow a shroff on Rs 10 for each of the 11 Deputy Tahsildar's offices in Vizagapatam, named, the Hon. Mr Grose remarks:— "as the Board "and the collector agree "I suppose this must be "allowed, but I know nothing "about the district. The Hon. "Sir Henry Bliss knows a "great deal."

May the H.M. be understood as sanctioning the proposals? neither the Hon. Sir Henry Bliss nor His Excellency the Governor considered the details of the proposals.

Yes. My knowledge of the district is not sufficient to warrant me in negativing the recommendation of the Bd & the Cour.

JG

6. Page 36 of the office note

The Collector of N. Arcot recommended the appointment of a shroff for the Punganur Sub-treasury, but with a view to determine whether such appointment was necessary the Board called upon the Collector to report the average monthly transactions. The collector's reply has now been received and it shows that the average monthly transactions exceed Rs 10,000. The Board accordingly recommends the appointment of a shroff on Rs 10, as proposed by the collector. May the recommendation be approved? (Please see G.O. No 1071 dt 21.6.64 & para 4 of B.P. No 9 dt 8.1.90, under G.O. No 2147 mis dt 31.3.90.)

C.No 10007/97

Yes

JG

7. Page 40 of the office note. The Hon. member has decided that ~~in~~ the additional peons now sanctioned for ootacamund and coonoor Deputy Tahsildar offices should get a pay of Rs 6, with a local allowance of Rs 2 each. May the principle be extended to the existing peons also.

Yes

JG

subject to the condition that the present incumbents do not suffer. (vide H.M.'s remarks on page 37 of the note with reference to Bissamkatak attender.)

In para 2(ii) of its order No 624 d, 14.11.96, the Govt. called upon the Board to consider whether the pay of the shroffs of the Wynaad and Chirakkal taluks who draw Rs 20 each, might not be altered so as to conform to the general scale, any extra amount being paid in the shape of a local allowance if necessary.

The Collector of Malabar to whom the Board made a reference on the point, states that there is no objection to the proposed reduction in the pay of the shroff in Chirakkal

para 8 (sub para 2) of B.P. No 224 d, 7.7.97 (C.No. 6489/97)

C.No. 8024/97.

provided the present incumbent is granted a personal allowance of Rs 5 per mensem, so that he may not suffer. But as regards the shroff in Wynaad he thinks that his pay should be left unaltered. The Deputy Collector reports: "I have found it rather "difficult to obtain the "services of competent "hands as clerks on a "salary of Rs 15 with the usual "Wynaad allowance and as "shroffs require a certain "amount of technical knowledge "for the efficient performance "of their duties, I am afraid "any reduction in the pay "will render the office less "attractive".

The Board supports the Collector's recommendations. May they be sanctioned?

Yes
JG
19/2/98

18 Feb 98

H.M.
For orders
S.R. 8/1/98

29

Read C.Nos. 6439, 7171, 8024
and 10007 of 1897.

Mod. G.O. (Press) No. 1080 / 23rd Feby 1898.

The Hon. Sir H. Bliss
draft for approval
The Hon. Mr. Gross'
Notes on points of
difference a doubt
is at the bottom of
the bundle of Notes &
is marked Third Note
SH
22/2/98

Seen — I think
that by asking for so
much we run a great
risk of getting nothing —
Enquiry should be made
as to what became of the
papers between 8/11/97 when the
Hon. Mr. Gross last noted on the
1st Note and 14/2/98 when they
reached H.E. — A delay of over
3 months is a serious matter
& the person responsible should
be brought to book
SH
23/2/98

The Government in its order No. 624 dated 14th November 1896 sanctioned a scheme for the strengthening of the Tahsildars' and Deputy Tahsildars' establishments at an additional expenditure of Rs. 92,610 per annum and requested the Board of Revenue to submit the necessary proposition statement for transmission to the Government of India.

In the ~~first of the~~ papers read above, the Board of Revenue reports that some of the Collectors consider the reduction in the number of Clerks and peons in certain Taluk Offices, which was proposed by it and accepted by Government in the order above referred to, to be impracticable and that some have taken the opportunity to apply for the entertainment of additional hands in ~~some of the~~ Tahsildars' and Deputy Tahsildars' offices which the Board did not propose to strengthen in the first instance. The Board also requests a reconsideration of para 2 of the order, ~~quoted above~~ which fixes the scale of pay to be allowed to Clerks in the several grades of Taluk Offices and strongly

R.C. 22/2/98
Rec'd 23/2/98.

advocates the acceptance of the scale suggested by itself in the Proceedings read in that order.

2. In view of the existing financial pressure and of the fact that the cost of the scheme as a whole, has already considerably exceeded the amount originally estimated, the Government regrets it is unable to sanction the Board's proposals on the latter point. The scale of pay already adopted by Government will accordingly be adhered to.

3. As regards the first point, the several proposals made by Collectors and the Board's recommendations thereon which have been dealt with under the two main heads "Tahsildar's establishments" and "Deputy Tahsildar's establishments", will be considered below.

4. Tahsildar's establishments.

(a) Clerks - The Board's recommendations under this head which are indicated in Appendix I to its Proceedings No. 224 dated 7th July 1887 involve as compared with the number previously sanctioned by Government the reduction of one hand in each of the three taluk offices of Padpatri, Ramallakot and Kasaragod, and the addition of one hand to each of the marginally noted 23 taluk offices. These proposals are well considered and have the approval of Government. The additional expenditure under this head will, therefore, be Rs. 61,746, instead of Rs. 56,526 as previously estimated.

G.O. (Revenue) No. 317

Berhampur.	Pattikonda.
Chicacole.	Saidapet
Goomsur.	Chinglepet.
Golconda.	Vellore
Sarnasiddhi.	Chittoor.
Rajahmundry	Kallakurchi.
Gudivada.	Manmargudi
Bandar.	Perambalur.
Nuzvid.	Karur
Cuddapah	Hollegal.
Proddatur.	Coondapur.
Kalyandrug.	Lepinanjadi
Hospet	Wynaad
Nandyal.	Chirakkal.

(b) Shroffs - The proposals under this head are:

1. to abolish the second shroff on Rs. 10 in the Jammalamadugu taluk;
2. to retain the additional shroff on Rs. 15 sanctioned for the Bellary taluk, in G.O. No. 130 dated 23th February 1889 ~~for the Bellary Taluk;~~ and B.P. 323d, 15.5.89
3. to leave the pay of the shroff at Wynaad unaltered; and
4. to reduce the pay of the shroff on Rs. 20 in the Chirakkal Taluk to Rs. 15, subject to the grant of a personal allowance of Rs. 5 p.m. to the present incumbent.

(Revised under corrected)

G.O. 845 / 17.10.89.

These proposals which for the present involve an additional expenditure of Rs. 5 per mensem or 60 per annum are approved.

The Government also approves of the proposal to transfer one of the shroffs at Chirakkal to Kurumbranat; but it is presumed that in that case it will be unnecessary to entertain any temporary shroff at the latter station during the kist months, as at present.

(c) Dufterbunds or Attenders.

The Government agrees with the Board of Revenue in considering that no increase is called for in the pay of this class of servants. It appears that in Kistna servants of this class are often entrusted with the duties of a

clerk. This is a mistake and the practice, wherever it exists, should be discontinued.

(a) Peons - After a careful consideration of the Collectors' proposals, the Board of Revenue fixes the number to be retained at 3207 instead of 3173, or 34 more than the number already allowed by Government. The increase proposed is approved, the total additional expenditure involved being Rs. 14,988 per annum instead of Rupees 12,540 allowed, in para 2 (v) of G.O. No. 824 dated 14th November 1898.

5. Deputy Tahsildar's establishments.

(a) Clerks - The Board proposes

(1) to increase the pay of the two Clerks in the Bissemkatak Deputy Tahsildar's office (Vizagapatam Dt) by Rs. 5/ each;

(2) to allow a third clerk on Rs. 15/- for Vissannapet (Kistna District) which is an independent Deputy Tahsildar's Division;

(3) to allow a second clerk on Rs. 15 for the Venkatagirikota Deputy Tahsildar's office (N. Arcot Dt), raising the pay of the first clerk to Rs. 20/-;

(4) to allow a third clerk on Rs. 15/- for the Tirupati Deputy Tahsildar's office;

(5) to grant a local allowance of Rs. 5/ to each of the two clerks in the Deputy Tahsildar's office on the Shevaroys;

(6) to increase the pay of one of the clerks in the Kumbhakonam Town Deputy Tahsildar's office from Rs. 15- to 20/-; and

(7) to increase the pay of the Head Clerk in the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office from Rs. 25 to Rs. 30/-.

The above proposals are approved, with the modification that in the first case the increase allowed should take the form of a local allowance, instead of an addition to pay. The effect of these proposals will be to raise the total additional expenditure to Rs. 9,240 per annum.

(b) Shroffs - No expenditure under this head was previously anticipated, but under the circumstances now stated by the Board the Government is pleased to allow a shroff on Rs. 10/- for each of the thirteen Deputy Tahsildars' offices noted on the margin. The appointment of a shroff for the Parvatipuram Deputy Tahsildar's office need not, be deferred as suggested. The increase of pay from Rs. 12 to 15 proposed for the shroff in the Coonoor Deputy Tahsildar's office is also approved. There will, therefore, be an additional expenditure under this head of Rs. 1596 per annum.

Anakapalle. Salur.
Veeravalli. Bobbili.
Vizagapatam Nowrangapur
Cuncoor. Malkangiri
Chimnupalli. Parvatipur
Koraput. Punganur.
Rayagada.

(c) Dufterbunds or Attenders.

One Attender on Rs. 7 each will be allowed for each of the Deputy Tahsildars' offices at the Shevaroys, Ootacamund, Coonoor and Gudalur. The attender at the last mentioned station will be entitled to the usual Wynaad allowance of 50 per cent of

the pay, while in the other three cases a local allowance of Rs. [illegible] each is sanctioned. The Government is unable to sanction the increase proposed for the attender in the Hissarkatak Deputy Tahsildar's office. On the other hand the pay of this appointment also should, on the present incumbent's vacating it, be reduced to Rs. 7, the difference of Rs. 8 being treated as a local allowance. The annual additional expenditure under this head will thus amount to Rs. 156.

(d) Peons - The appointment of one additional peon for each of the Deputy Tahsildars' offices at Cocanada and Vissannapet and of two peons for each of the similar offices at Gotacamund and Coonoor, is sanctioned. In all these cases the pay proper will be fixed at Rs. 6 each, a local allowance of Rs. [illegible] being granted in the case of those now sanctioned for the last two offices. This principle should be extended also to the existing peons' appointments in these two offices, subject, however, to the condition that the present incumbents do not suffer. The annual additional expenditure under this head will, as explained in para 14 of Board's Proceedings No. 224 dated 7th July 1897, be Rs. 2340.

6. The total additional expenditure which the proposals for strengthening the Taluk establishments, as now revised involve will, therefore, be Rs. 1,03,396/ per annum as shown below:--

I. Tahsildars' Establishments.

	Rs.
(a) Clerks - - -	61,746
(b) Shroffs - -	60
(c) Muchis - -	13,188
(d) Attenders -	252
(e) Peons - - -	14,988
	90,234

II. Deputy Tahsildars' Establishments.

(a) Clerks - - -	9,240
(b) Shroffs - -	1,596
(c) Attenders -	486
(d) Peons - - -	2,340
	13,662
	1,03,396

7. The Board of Revenue is requested to submit the necessary proposition statement with the least practicable delay, so that the sanction of the Government of India may be obtained to the introduction of the scheme with effect from 1st July next at the latest.

[signature] 22/2/98

To the B? of Rev (L.R.) [signature] 24/2/98
" " Financial Dept
" " A.G.

From orders 60/5 [signature] 14/3/98

[signature] 22 Feb 98.

The Hon Sir Henry Bliss made the following remarks in the draft order regarding the scheme for the strengthening of the Tahsildars' and Dy. Tahsildars' establishments:—

"Enquiry should be made as to what became of the papers between 8.11.97 when the Hon Mr. Grose last noted on the first note and 14-2-98 when they reached His Excellency—a delay of over 3 months is a serious matter and the person responsible should be brought to book."

Circulation clerk.

When were the papers received from the Hon. Mr. Grose & when were they sent to H.E. the Governor.

P.A.
25 Feb 98.

Sir,— The papers were received by the Hon: Mr. Grose C. S. on 10.11.97. As is shown in the Circulation Register they were re-circulated to the Hon: member on 10.11.97 & after return from the Hon member, sent to H.E. the Governor on 15.11.97 in Box No. 4.

The papers came back

A.G.B.
25.2.98.

10-13-10

from the Govt. House on the 15th Feb. 1898.

Submitted to the Secretary. It is not clear why the ~~the~~ papers were sent to the Hon. Mr Grose on the 10th Nov. 97 - possibly there was a mistake made: but they were in the Govt House from the 15th Nov 97 to the 15th Feb. 98.

A copy of the G.O. has been despatched to the Board & another sent to the Press.

C.P.
28 Feb 98.

Hon. H. Blin to see

[illegible] 1/3/98

~~The~~ Someone in Govt House apparently responsible for delay - It is not H.E. - Please show him this

[illegible]
2/3/98

nos. 6489, 7171, 180 & 100071.

C/4 5,000—1-2-98.

H.C.

FROM CIRCULATION
WITH
REMARKS

C.P. 3/3/98.

I agree to an council by this Secy on 1/4/98

Note - Orders are humbly solicited whether this file shd be circulated to H.E. the Governor.

14-11-11

2-2-21