

Revenue (1899) Department.

ORDINARY.

G.O. No. 411

DATED 28th June

[Despatch Abstract.]

*Curtailment of work in Revenue offices*

*Passing orders on the Board's proceedings  
Submitting Mr. Inyess proposals for the —  
by the grant of larger powers to the Board of  
revenue to collectors and divisional officers*

# BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
|      |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |

# FURTHER PAPERS.

| G.O.        | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|-------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
| enc 5874/99 |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |
| enc 2907/99 |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |
| enc 5686/00 |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |

## Government of Madras.

### REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Recd.

Enclosures

1899.

Regd.

Spare copies

G.O., No. 411, 28th June 1899.

JUNE.

### Curtailment of work in Revenue Offices.

Passing orders on P. O.'s Proceedings submitting Mr. Meyer's proposals for the — by the grant of larger powers to the Board of Revenue, to Collectors and Divisional Officers.

## GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

## REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 388, dated 11th November 1897:—

(FULL BOARD.)

Read—the following letter from W. S. MEYER, Esq., I.C.S., on Special Duty, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, Madras, No. 32, dated 3rd November 1897:—

In my letter No. 30, dated 29th October 1897, I have dealt with certain proposals for decentralization which will require legislation to carry them out, and indicated the form which such legislation might conveniently take. I have now the honour to submit other proposals for delegation of powers, &c., which can, if approved, be carried out departmentally. My letter will fall under four sections, the first three of which will deal with the grant of larger powers to the Board, Collectors and Divisional officers, respectively, while the fourth will contain suggestions in regard to miscellaneous matters.

## I.—GRANT OF LARGER POWERS TO THE BOARD.

2. Under Standing Order No. 21, the sanction of Government is required for the transfer of land from one taluk to another. I think that this power might safely be allowed to the Board when the transfer is not of such importance as to have any appreciable effect on the work or relative importance of the taluks concerned; and Collectors might be allowed to sanction transfers of land between villages in the same taluk subject to the similar condition that the transfer is not of such importance as to necessitate any revision of either village establishment. At present they are allowed by the Standing Orders to make "petty transfer," but the nature of these is not clearly defined.

3. The Board should have full power to resume 'money allowances granted for the upkeep of temples and mosques, or the performance of religious service, where the conditions of the grant are not fulfilled. The only reference to such money allowances now made in paragraph 2 of Standing Order No. 117, is its penultimate sentence, which allows Collectors to resume on their own authority "inam lands and money allowances held by pagodas, which have been abandoned, or have been in a ruined condition for upwards of 12 years;" and even there, I may note, the alteration of the word "pagodas" into "temples, mosques, &c.," is obviously necessary.

4. Under Article 55 of the Civil Account Code annual returns of all persons serving under Government and Local Boards have to be submitted to the Accountant-General; and under note (b) to the same article the date of birth of each officer must be given, and if it has been entered wrongly can only be corrected except in the case of clerical error with the sanction of Government. The power of rectifying *bona fide* mistakes, which may have been made in this matter, might well be delegated to the Boards and other heads of large departments.

5. Under Article 98 (m) of the Civil Account Code all recurring charges have to receive the sanction of Government. I think that the Board and other heads of departments might well be allowed to pass orders in regard to the fixing and alteration of the pay of non-pensionable menial servants in offices under their control and that the Government of India might be moved to amend the article accordingly.

It seems particularly absurd that the sanction of Government should have to be applied for to entertain a part-time sweeper or scavenger on one or two rupees a month for some taluk mofussil office as is now necessary. (See for example the cases sanctioned in G.O., Mis. No. 2870, Revenue, dated 20th July 1896, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3464, dated 29th July 1896, and G.O., No. 2960, dated 27th July 1896, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3538, dated 1st August 1896). But I may note that superfluous references in these instances might be avoided by the simple method of debiting the pay of part-time menials to "Contingencies," a course already approved by Government in the case of Local and Municipal servants of this description—*vide* G.O., No. 1892, Local, dated 1st October 1897, copy of which is herewith forwarded.

6. Again under Article 98 (k) of the Civil Account Code, articles of European manufacture cannot be purchased in the country to an extent of over Rs. 10 without the sanction of the Local Government. (See for instance G.O., Mis. No. 3180, Revenue, dated 8th August 1896, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3827, dated 19th August 1896). I think the Government of India might well be moved to extend the sanctioning powers of the Board and other Heads of departments up to a limit of Rs. 100. Lamps, for example, can be obtained at establishments like Mr. Ditmar's in Bombay quite as easily and cheaply in respect of ordinary retail transactions as from Europe. If this be approved Collectors, who can now only purchase such articles up to a limit of Rs. 5,\* might have their powers extended to Rs. 10.

7. The Board might well be given power to sanction for special reasons (*e.g.*, for the recent Pushkaram festival in Gódvári) the grant of *district holidays* supplementary to, or in substitution for, those notified in G.O., No. 126, Public, dated 19th February 1895 (Board's Proceedings, No. 77, dated 7th March 1895). At present applications for such additional or alternative holidays must, under this Government Order, be submitted to Government.

8. Finally I submit that the Board might be allowed the same power of altering its Standing Orders as is now enjoyed by it in the Separate Revenue Department with reference to Salt and Abkari Circular Orders. It should, that is, send Government a copy of every alteration made or new Standing Order issued, but need not obtain previous sanction for such emendation, it being, of course, understood that no alteration should be made in matters of general land revenue principle or policy until the same has been approved by Government. Even then, however, the actual wording of the revised Standing Orders might well, I think, be left to the Board.

## II.—ADDITIONAL POWERS TO BE GRANTED TO COLLECTORS.

9. Power to grant lands free of assessment and to exempt occupied lands from assessment when required by local bodies for communal purposes.—Under paragraph 3 of Standing Order, No. 12-A, Collectors are already competent to exercise this power in regard to land required for roads. In G.O., No. 142, Revenue, dated 24th March 1896, Government negatived a suggestion of the Board that Collectors should be given the same power to serve local

bodies in respect to other communal purposes, and such applications have still, under the Standing Order above quoted, to go to Government through the Board.

I venture to ask for a re-consideration of this order for the reasons stated below, which I quote from a letter written by Mr. Nicholson as Collector of South Canara which the Board transferred to me in connection with my special duty:—

"2. I have before me a case in which about 13 cents of unassessed dry land is applied for by the Coondapoor Taluk Board for the erection of a Primary school. Under existing orders I am obliged to make a reference to the Board in view to obtain the sanction of Government for the alienation, and I have done so separately.

"3. Cases of this kind are not very rare. In 1896 there were three applications from local bodies; and this year there was another besides the one referred to above. In none of these cases has the extent of lands applied for exceeded 75 cents. As local bodies give increased

attention to sanitation, education, public health, etc., applications for small bits of lands for public latrines, wells, primary schools, dispensaries, medical officers' quarters and the like, will also increase. The revenue-free grants made in such cases are not alienations of a permanent nature, but are conditional grants revocable when lands are not required for the purposes for which they were granted.

"4. Collectors have power to grant any amount of land for road purposes and they are not likely to be too lavish in making similar grants for other purposes to local bodies.

"5. I do not, however, ask for power to grant any extent of land when required for other than road purposes, but would request the Board to fix the maximum within which Collectors could make such grants; this might be one acre of dry land and a quarter acre of wet land, which latter, however, would seldom or never be required.

"6. My object in making the reference is to avoid the necessity for troubling the Board and Government with applications for grants in petty cases, seeing that Collectors' recommendations in such cases are generally approved. Collectors might send an annual return of such alienations for the information of Government and the Board."

10. I think that, under the limitations which Mr. Nicholson proposes (viz., one acre of dry or  $\frac{1}{4}$  acre of wet land as a maximum for any grant made by Collectors of their own authority), there would be no risk of Collectors abusing the power which it is proposed to entrust to them. There will be the further check of the statement proposed in Mr. Nicholson's last paragraph which, I may say, is submitted for the information of the Government of India even under present circumstances.

11. *Entertainment of process servers, etc.*—(1) Under Standing Order No. 111 as amended by paragraph 2 (vii) of Board's Proceedings, No. 232, dated 26th June 1896, the Collector has already been given the power of sanctioning the entertainment, when necessary, of batta peons to supplement the work of serving processes under Act II of 1864 by the village establishments. The salaries of these peons are paid out of the fees realised for the service of process.

(2) Under Standing Order No. 180 temporary peons may be similarly entertained and paid for service of processes under Acts VIII of 1865, III of 1895 and III of 1869, and Regulation IX of 1822. Here, however, no establishment can be entertained without the sanction of the Board of Revenue, and in some cases of Government also (paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Standing Order). I think that in these instances, likewise, Collectors may be given power to entertain the establishment themselves, as has been done under certain conditions in regard to process servers entertainable under section 12 of the Village Courts Act (*vide* G.O., No. 671, Judicial, dated 29th March 1893, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3152, dated 25th May 1893), subject, of course, to the restriction that its cost is fully covered by process fees and involves no extra charge to the State. As a matter of fact, VIII of 1865 is the only Act above referred to, the service of processes under which does occasionally require extra hands.

12. Further, I think that, in the case of process servers appointed for the purposes of Act II of 1864, Collectors might be allowed to prescribe a maximum scale of establishment for each taluk, and that Divisional officers might be given the discretion of putting this scale wholly or partially in force as occasion may require. If, for instance, the Collector held that six batta peons might, under certain circumstances, be allowed for a taluk, the Divisional officer would decide when the conditions justified the entertainment of some or all of these.

13. I have already proposed in paragraph 4 of my letter No. 29 of 26th October 1897, that, subject to the necessary sanction for entertaining process establishment, the selection of the individuals to be employed might be left with Tahsildars.

14. *Petty construction and repairs.*—Collectors have power to sanction estimates for the minor civil works coming within the scope of Standing Order No. 189 up to Rs. 1,000 in each case, provided such works have been entered and passed in their budgets; they can also transfer allotments from one sanctioned work to another (paragraphs 5 and 6 of Standing Order No. 189). I think that, as a natural corollary of this, a Collector should be empowered, so long as he does not exceed the original amount of his budget allotment, to transfer (within a limit of Rs. 1,000 for any one work) an allotment sanctioned for a work which, it is found, cannot be conveniently undertaken within the year to a work not originally provided for. At present (paragraph 5 of the Standing Order) he cannot apparently do this without the sanction

of the Board. The course now proposed would facilitate the working out of budget allotments within the year without unnecessary reference. Where, however, the district budget allotment under this head is proposed to be exceeded, a reference to the Board will, of course, be necessary.

15. I fail to see why the monthly statement of expenditure to be sent in by Collectors to the Accountant-General under paragraph 12 of Standing Order No. 189 should be accompanied by a progress report, and would suggest that the latter statement be discontinued.

16. *Minor Irrigation Works.*—The present practice is that, after the budget for the ensuing year has been passed by Government, and the Board has allotted lump grants under this head to each district, Collectors send in to the Board for sanction, through the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, a list of the individual works they propose to execute therefrom, with a rough estimate of the cost of each (paragraphs 3 and 4 of Standing Order No. 187). When the proposals in this list have been approved of the detailed estimates are passed by the Collector himself (paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of the Standing Order). The Collector may further, when the necessity arises, transfer funds originally allotted by him from one sanctioned work to another; but must not transfer any part of the allotment to a work not included in the list as sanctioned by the Board without informing that authority (paragraph 7 *ibid*).

17. But with reference to the reorganization of the minor irrigation establishments now under contemplation, it has been ruled—*vide* papers noted in the margin—that hereafter Collectors shall themselves sanction only such estimates as are not in excess of Rs. 250 and "do not include the construction of new masonry works other than simple tank sluices, nor any material deviation from

the standard of efficiency laid down by the Tank Restoration Scheme" (Board's Proceedings, No. 90, Settlement, dated 2nd February 1897); and that other estimates shall be sent up in detail to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for sanction. It appears that these latter estimates will be over one-third of the whole number (Board's Proceedings, No. 255, Settlement, dated 10th August 1895, paragraph 7); and I venture to think that, given the greater professional assistance which the Collector will have at his disposal under the new scheme, he might well deal himself with all estimates up to Rs. 500 which satisfy the condition above quoted, as was indeed proposed by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation himself (paragraph 6 of his letter printed at page 3 of Board's Proceedings, No. 255, Settlement, dated 10th August 1895). According to the statistics quoted in paragraph 7 of the same Proceedings, this would give about 11 per cent. of the total number of estimates to the Chief Engineer for check.

18. I presume that, whatever be the limit adopted for the Collector's own sanction, the list now required in paragraphs 3 and 4 of Standing Order No. 187 will no longer be necessary, as the Chief Engineer will see the estimates of important works individually, and that all that will be necessary will be to apply to the Board for a lump allotment and to submit the information required in form 1 of the appendix to Standing Order No. 187 with each estimate sent to the Chief Engineer.

19. Further, I would allow the Collector, within the limit of his sanctioned allotment, to put in hand on his own authority works not included therein in lieu of others which it is found inconvenient to undertake, subject to the condition that the estimates for such works are within his powers of sanction. This will materially facilitate the expenditure of grants within the year, by reducing the delay caused by references to higher authority.

Again I would allow the Collector to sanction (within his lump allotment) excesses up to 10 per cent. on estimates sanctioned by the Chief Engineer, and to deal similarly with estimates passed by himself which, by excess expenditure, have passed his limit. If, for instance, the Collector's limit of sanction is Rs. 500 and he passes an estimate for Rs. 480, I would allow him to pass an excess in actuals up to Rs. 48 though this would technically bring the work within the Chief Engineer's control.

20. Under Standing Order No. 187, paragraph 39, a monthly progress report showing the expenditure in and up to the month on each sanctioned minor irrigation work has to be forwarded by every Tahsildar in duplicate to the Collector and the Divisional officer. Monthly district statements used likewise, under paragraph 46 of Standing Order No. 187, to be sent in by Collectors to the Board; but in paragraph 3

\* In Board's Proceedings, No. 417, Settlement, dated 10th December 1896, paragraph 1 (a) of G.O., No. 516,\* Revenue, dated 8th October 1896, it was ruled that these might be quarterly for the first nine months of the year. I cannot find how-

ever that the necessary alteration has yet been made in the Standing Order. I would suggest that the Standing Order be further modified so as to permit of Collectors who think it desirable allowing the same procedure in respect to the reports of Tahsildars. Nor does it seem necessary, except during the last three months of the year when matters become more urgent, that there should be separate returns from the Taluk office to the Divisional officer and the Collector. They need, I think, only be sent to the Divisional officer, who would compile a consolidated statement for his division which he would submit with his remarks to the Collector.

21. Under Article 1136 of the Civil Service Regulations sanction for journeys performed outside the district in which an officer is employed rests with the Board. A general permission to Collectors to send officers out of the district for certain purposes would, I think, be advisable. Recently, for instance, the sanction of the Board had, I find, to be obtained in the case of a duffadar who was sent from the Tiruvallūr taluk to the Board's office with an urgent paper which had been specially called for (Board's Proceedings, No. 3044, Routine, dated 14th October 1897).

I may mention as another instance in point that, when at Nellore, I had once occasion to send an urgent call to my Local Fund Engineer, who was then in the extreme north-west of the district, to return to head-quarters. He very properly went the quickest way, which was to march out of the district for a little distance on to the Southern Mahratta Railway, and train *via* Guntakal and Rénigunta to Nellore. But my Treasury Deputy Collector informed me that his pay and travelling allowance for the journey could not be passed without the sanction not only of the District Board but of Government!

22. Under paragraph 2 of Standing Order No. 279 (Old Edition), all cases of personal property of intestates falling under section 16, clause 7 of Regulation III of 1892 must be reported by the District Magistrate to the Subordinate (or District)

† Please see also G.O., No. 850, Judicial, dated 14th April 1875. Judge, however trifling their value. But in G.O., † No. 365, Judicial, dated 15th

March 1872, Government authorized District Magistrates to sell the moveable property of deceased persons and credit the sale-proceeds to Government in cases where they are unclaimed for three months and amount in value to Rs. 50 or under. I request that the Standing Order may be amended accordingly. I was lately informed in Tanjore that, owing to ignorance of the Government Order last quoted, a case of property valued at one anna had been referred to the Sub-Court, and that most of the other similar references related to property worth less than Rs. 10.

23. I have already noted under section I (paragraphs 2 and 6) the extended powers I would give Collectors in regard to transfers of land between villages and the purchase of articles of European manufacture.

24. Court of Wards' matters.—Under Standing Order No. 219, as modified by Court's Proceedings, No. 8 of 23rd April 1897, Collectors have to obtain the sanction of the Board, in its capacity as Court of Wards, for every original work in an estate, the cost of which is estimated to exceed Rs. 300 and for repair works in excess of Rs. 500. I think that where the expenditure is within a budget allotment already passed by the Court, these figures might be raised to Rs. 500 and Rs. 1,000, respectively. The estate budgets contain detailed lists of the works it is proposed to undertake during the year.

25. I would further give Collectors a power of sanctioning the free grant of timber in wards' estates to village communities and private individuals when necessary similar to that which they enjoy in regard to Government forest produce under section 104 of the Forest Code as it now stands. At present applications for any such grant have to go up to the Court of Wards for orders.

### III.—ADDITIONAL POWERS TO BE GRANTED TO DIVISIONAL OFFICERS.

26. Power to sanction transfers of land from dry to wet and vice versa.—This power now vests in Collectors, and the Board on a previous occasion was not prepared to give it to Divisional officers—*vide* last item in Appendix B to Board's Proceedings, No. 89, Settlement, dated 7th May 1896. I submit, however, that the Divisional officer might well be allowed to recognise actual facts by definitely transferring from one head to the other lands which have been actually cultivated under the other head (e.g., dry land on which wet crops have been raised), for, say, three consecutive years. There should be the further condition that in the case of lands under Major Irrigation works, the Public Works authorities have no objection. The Collector will, of course, in this as in other cases, retain the power of cancelling or modifying a Divisional officer's order when he thinks it desirable.

27. Transfer of land from assessed to unassessed.—Divisional officers can transfer land from unassessed to assessed under paragraph 18 of Standing Order No. 30. The converse power, in cases where the land is unfit for cultivation or is required for village site or other communal purposes, now rests with Collectors who have, however, to submit a statement annually to the Board of the transfers made for village-site, etc. (See Board's Proceedings, No. 378, Land Revenue, of 29th June 1893). It would seem feasible to give the same powers to Divisional officers, who might submit to the Collectors half-yearly returns showing the cases in which they have exercised it.

28. Power to order the sale of valuable unassessed lands to be transferred to assessed and granted on patta.—Under the note to paragraph 18 of Standing Order No. 30, this power is now vested in Collectors. The right to sell (under paragraph 13 of Standing Order No. 30) assessed lands which are the subject of rival darkhast claims the merits of which cannot be easily decided has been granted to Divisional officers (*vide* item 23 in Appendix A to Board's Proceedings, No. 459, dated 16th December 1895, and G.O., No. 142, Revenue Department, dated 24th March 1896). There seems therefore no good reason why the similar power now in question should not be exercised by them. If the course is open to objection an appeal will certainly be lodged before the Collector.

29. Again the sale of disputed darkhast lands by Divisional officers need not be subject to formal confirmation by the Collector as at present. There will always be the right of appeal to him.

30. Village Officers' Special Test Examinations.—Divisional officers might be given power to receive applications for admission to the Special Test Examinations, to decide in cases of doubt as to the degree of relationship to the existing village officers of applicants claiming to pay a lower fee on this account to permit applicants to appear for the examination elsewhere than in the division to which they belong, and to sign the certificates for issue to the successful candidates. At present these powers vest in the Collector under Rules III, VI, XI and XII of the rules issued in the notification appended to G.O., No. 589, Revenue, dated 29th June 1891. Their delegation to Divisional officers will relieve the Collector of an appreciable amount of petty work.

31. Power to sanction refunds of sale-proceeds of impounded cattle.—In G.O., No. 691, Revenue Department, dated 12th August 1889, the power to sanction such refunds where the amount had been held in deposit as unclaimed, on a satisfactory claim being put in, was conferred on District Magistrates provided the application was made within three months from date of deposit. This power might now be extended to Sub-Divisional Magistrates who may be held, I think, to act as agents for the District Magistrate under section 17 of the Cattle Trespass Act.

22. In this connection I may note that under High Court's Circular No. 383, dated 21st August 1896 (copy enclosed), the refund of judicial fines cancelled on

appeal may be directed by the original court which imposed and levied the fine, and refunds are now made in taluk treasuries on the strength of such orders accompanied by the necessary voucher. Paragraph 6 of Standing Order No. 237, which mentions the Collectors as the authority competent to sanction such refunds, seems therefore to be obsolete and might be modified as follows:—

"Treasury officers may refund judicial fines under the procedure laid down in that behalf by the High Court from time to time."

33. *Expenditure on Trigonometrical Survey Stations.*—The very small power of incurring expenditure on Trigonometrical Survey stations (up to an average of Rs. 4 annually for each) which Collectors are authorised to incur under Standing Order No. 282 (Old Edition) might well be made over to the Divisional officers.

34. I have already noted in section II (paragraph 12) the extended power which I would confer on Divisional officers in the matter of *entertaining process-servers* under Act II of 1864.

#### IV.—MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS.

35. *Sales of assessed waste lands on the Nilgiris, etc.*—Mr. Tremenhore has pointed out to me that, under the rules contained in the appendix to Standing Order No. 33, assessed waste lands sold on the Nilgiri and Shevaroy Hills and in Wynad have to be the subject of a tedious and intricate title-deed which has to go up to Government and to be signed by the Revenue Secretary, who has likewise to initial every petty error (copyists' or otherwise which may be discovered in the deed. It seems to me that, though these title-deeds, which are accompanied by plans and schedules of boundaries, may have been necessary formerly, when they related to tracts which had not been properly surveyed, they have now lost their *raison d'être*, especially since it has been decided that the annual assessment subject to which the land is sold shall not as hitherto be capable of redemption—*vide* G.O., No. 459, Revenue Department, dated 11th September 1896, paragraph 11. There seems no reason therefore why an ordinary patta should not suffice, as in the case of lands in other districts sold under the provisions of paragraph 13 and the note to paragraph 18 of Standing Order No. 30. Mr. Tremenhore promised me a further memorandum on the subject, but has not yet been able to send it; so all that I would suggest at present is that the matter be referred to the Collectors of Nilgiris, Salem and Malabar for report.

36. *Board's Standing Order No. 201 regarding provision of carts, etc., for troops on the march*—is obsolete in the following respects:—

(a) *Paragraph 2 (1) of the Standing Order.*—The register of cart-owners herein prescribed is of no practical use, and so far as I know, is not maintained in most districts, while if maintained it is not checked. As a matter of fact Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars, who are directed by Standing Order No. 205, paragraph 3 (7), to accompany bodies of troops on the march through their charges, are also required to procure the required number of carts from the nearest villages where carts are usually available. They use their local knowledge and influence and procure them through the village headmen. The register prescribed may, therefore, safely be dispensed with.

(b) *Clauses 3 and 4 of paragraph 2.*—These provisions are out of date, as the Tahsildar of the taluk through which the troops pass makes the necessary arrangements locally; nor is there any necessity for the maintenance of the register prescribed by clause 5.

(c) *Clause 6.*—The rates of hire herein ordered to be fixed and published in the District Gazette twice a year are practically useless. These rates depend upon the seasons of the year (*e.g.*, carts are always dearer than usual at ploughing and harvest times, or in rainy weather), and on a number of varying local circumstances; and the prices are as a matter of fact estimated, when occasion demands by the Tahsildar of the taluk through which the troops pass, and finally settled after a personal interview with the officer commanding the regiment or detachment. The notifications now prescribed, which involve half-yearly returns from all Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars in independent charge, might therefore be done away with.

(d) *Paragraph 3.*—The register of carts herein prescribed is furnished by the Taluk officer attending on the regiment.

I recommend therefore that the Standing Order be revised with reference to these considerations.

37. *Inspection of Taluk Treasuries and Offices by Divisional Officers.*—(1) Standing Order No. 226 (New Edition) is headed "Examination of subordinate treasuries," but the questions entered in the appendix to paragraph 1 of this order relate largely to the taluk records also. I would therefore alter the heading of the Standing Order to the wording at the head of my present paragraph, so as to make it clear that the mere treasury inspection is not all that a divisional officer need pay particular attention to, as some of them are now apt to imagine.

(2) Further the record questions in the appendix might be revised with reference to the present "disposal number" system, and the answering of the questions should be made compulsory, as the return will then give useful information in regard to records which will save the necessity for separate reports on this subject which are now submitted in most districts. As paragraph 1 of the Standing Order now stands, the questions are now supposed to be merely for the guidance of the examining officer.

(3) The report should further be submitted to the Collector at once, whereas at present Divisional officers sometimes wait till they have to submit the information required for the preparation of the annual report to the Board prescribed in paragraph 2 of the Standing Order. Collectors could then note, without delay, matters on which their orders may be required.

38. *Conduct of crop experiments by Divisional officers and Tahsildars.*—I think that nearly every district officer would bear me out in saying that the conduct of these annual experiments by Divisional officers and Tahsildars under the orders issued in Board's Proceedings, No. 328, Settlement, dated 7th August 1893, is in the generality of cases a farce. As the Board said when previously discussing the matter (paragraph 6 of Board's Proceedings, No. 473, Settlement, dated 29th June 1892), "the ordinary district staff, even if it were competent for such enquiries, is already so overburdened in the discharge of its ordinary duties that it could not devote sufficient time to carry out the experiments on a sufficiently large scale to be useful or valuable;" and, as a matter of fact, the smallest possible fields are habitually selected, and the process of cutting, sifting and weighing the crop, &c., is carried out in the most perfunctory manner. Sir Edward Buck's letter of 27th June 1893 printed in Board's Proceedings, No. 328, Settlement, dated 7th August 1893, gave the Local Governments full discretion as to the class of officers to be selected to conduct the experiments; and I submit that to have any value they should be made by men who have passed through the Agricultural College or are otherwise specially qualified to deal with the matter. A limited number of experiments so conducted would be of far greater utility than the present returns and could be subjected to more careful examination in the Board's office.

39. *Remittances from Sub-Registrars at Stations where there is a Sub treasury.*—Under Rule 29 of the rules printed at page 14 of G.O., No. 1631, Judicial, dated 12th October 1896 (copy enclosed), Sub-Registrars at stations where there is a treasury are required to remit their collections to the treasury every day on which it is open for cash transactions. I think that it would be sufficient if the collections were ordinarily remitted once a week, Sub-Registrars being permitted to send their cash chests to the taluk treasury for safe custody at night in case the collections accumulate before the date of remittance. This course would save a considerable amount of treasury work.

40. *An annual statement showing the number of Revenue Inspectors trained in survey* has now to be submitted by every Collector to the Board under Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 7003, Settlement, dated 24th August 1892, and when discussing proposals for the curtailment of work in the Settlement Department in Board's Proceedings, No. 89, Settlement, dated 7th May 1896, \* In Board's Proceedings, No. 417, Settlement, and G.O., No. 516, \* Revenue Department, dated 10th December 1896, the Board and Government held (paragraph 21 of the Board's Proceedings and paragraph 15 of the Government Order) that this return could not be discontinued, as it is required for the Land Records and Agriculture Administration report.

I venture to ask for a reconsideration of this order, as I see from the figures quoted in paragraph 10 of the Administration report for 1895-96 reviewed in G.O., No. 701, Revenue, dated 8th December 1896, that the survey training of Revenue Inspectors is now practically complete. Out of 626 Revenue Inspectors, 592 had undergone survey training and, with the exception of two men who had been specially exempted and two who were survivors of the old Inspectors on smaller pay, the rest (28 in number as two places were vacant) were all only acting men. This being so, I cannot find that the Government of India requires the habitual insertion of statistics on the subject.

If, however, the return is still to be kept up, it should obviously be compiled in the office of the authority by whom Revenue Inspectors are appointed, i.e.—at present the Collector—as he must know the qualifications of the men he puts in. At present in some districts the return is compiled in the Taluk offices.

41. The following suggestions are made in view of *diminishing copying and registering work in revenue offices and saving the time now occupied in perusal of practically useless papers* :—

(1) *Good copying machines* should be supplied to Collectors and Taluk offices. (They are specially necessary in the latter where large numbers of circulars have to be sent out to village officers.) Those now supplied are very inferior and get out of order easily. I have often seen district circulars turned out by them which were all but illegible.

(2) The Board now sends round to Collectors and other Revenue officers a variety of papers, especially on forest matters, which are of no practical use to them and which involve registration in the office. I will cite as an instance Board's Proceedings, No. 325, Forest, dated 30th July 1897, which relates to a pattern of turban (not described in the Board's Proceedings) prescribed for Rangers and Deputy Rangers. So again Board's Proceedings, No. 313, Forest, dated 11th August 1897, calls for a report (regarding grading of managers in Forest offices, &c.) on a matter the Collector must personally deal with, but nevertheless the Collector of Salem tells me that he received fourteen spare copies of the Proceedings which appear to have been meant for Tahsildars.

(3) When the Board prints important general Proceedings the orders on proposals in which require the approval of Government the present practice is to communicate to Collectors, &c., copies of (1) the original Proceedings, and (2) the reference thereto.

As (1) is habitually reprinted with (2), its preliminary communication seems quite superfluous, while the recollection of it is apt to bewilder officers who may forget that the final word has not yet been spoken. The paper can only be recorded pending the receipt of the orders of Government. My remark of course does not apply to Proceedings which contain any instructions which the Board can issue of its own authority and desires to be immediately acted on.

(4) I think that all routine Government Orders, which would simply have to be communicated to Collectors, &c., might well go direct to them from the Government Office, a copy being at the same time sent to the Board for information. To send the orders to the Board only and let it communicate, as is now generally done, causes waste of time; and where, as so often happens, the Government Order is type-written, the labour of making out an extra copy in the Government Office is inappreciable.

42. I venture to submit that the compilation of the revised edition of the *Board's Standing Orders* should be carried out as soon as possible. Three chapters—one dealing with office routine, petitions and grant of copies, one with wild animals, escheats and other sundry matters, and one with matters relating to public servants, which therefore contains some of the most important of all the Standing Orders—are now available for general and ready reference only in the old edition; and that is now so overlaid with correction slips that it is positive torture to have to look up anything therein.

Further, I beg to propose (on the suggestion of Mr. Tremmenleere) that, as the revised edition when complete will form as ungainly and bulky a volume as the old book does, the Standing Orders should be divided hereafter into two parts—the one dealing with matters relating to Land Revenue and Settlement, the other containing the Separate Revenue Chapters (Abkari, Stamps and Customs) which deal with matters in regard to which Land Revenue officers are less familiar and have therefore to make more constant reference to the Standing Orders.

43. Lastly, I would submit that much trouble and time would be saved by Divisional officers and Collectors refusing to call for *reports from subordinates* on petitions addressed to them which relate to matters primarily within the competence of such subordinates to deal with. For instance, if an application for house-site is addressed to the Divisional officer, the petitioner should either be referred to the Tahsildar or the petition transferred to him for disposal. The Tahsildar will then only have to address the Divisional officer if the matter proves to be outside his own competence to deal with, e.g., if the house-site applied for, and which he thinks should be given, is above the usual scale. Several officers are in the habit of saving themselves immediate trouble by referring nearly every petition that comes on to them to the Tahsildar, &c., for report.

Again when a paper or papers of any length have to be referred for report or remarks to a subordinate officer the points on which his views are required should be clearly indicated.

*Resolution*—No. 388, dated 11th November 1897.

The proposals embodied in the letter read above have been discussed by the Full Board at a meeting at which Mr. Meyer was present. The Board resolves to submit, for the approval of Government, all Mr. Meyer's suggestions with the exception of the following items, which appear to be open to objection or to require some amendment.

2. *Paragraph 5 of the letter, Article 98 (m), Civil Account Code—Sanction for fixing or altering the pay of non-pensionable menial servants.*—The Board considers that Mr. Meyer's alternative proposal may be accepted, and that charges of this nature may be debited to "Contingencies," the power of sanction being given to the Board or to the head of the department concerned.

*Paragraph 14 of letter—Petty construction and repairs to minor civil works.*—Mr. Meyer proposes to allow Collectors to transfer allotments from sanctioned to non-sanctioned works within the limits of his ordinary powers (Rs. 1,000 for each work), and provided that his total budget allotment is not exceeded. The Board is not prepared to accept this suggestion. The existing practice does not give rise to any friction, and in cases of emergency the Collector can always act in anticipation of sanction. It is, in the Board's opinion, undesirable that a Collector should have a free hand in the utilization of allotments on works not formally sanctioned by the controlling authority; control must necessarily be weakened thereby, and the preparation of an annual list of works for sanction would become a useless formality. Even if it be considered that some modified powers of transfer of allotments to unsanctioned works should be delegated to Collectors, a report must necessarily be required in all but petty cases, and no saving of work would result from the change.

*Paragraph 16—Minor irrigation works.*—The Board is not prepared to dispense with the lists of works which are now submitted to it under paragraphs 3 and 4 of Standing Order No. 187. The preparation of these lists conduces to a well considered distribution of the district allotment and furnishes the Board with information which it ought to possess. It would, however, appear to be unnecessary to submit the lists through the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, and if that officer consents to the change, they may hereafter be submitted to the Board direct.

*Paragraph 22—Reports in regard to moveable property of persons dying intestate.*—The Standing Order will at once be brought into conformity with the orders of Government.

*Paragraph 26—Transfers from dry to wet and vice versa.*—On the conditions specified by Mr. Meyer the Board would accept his proposal to delegate to Divisional officers the power of making such transfers, but the said conditions should be carefully borne in mind.

*Paragraph 27—Transfer of land from assessed to unassessed.*—The Board considers that it would be safer to retain this power in the hands of the Collector, who should as at present submit to the Board an annual list of such transfers.

*Section IV—Miscellaneous matters—Paragraph 35—Sales of assessed lands on the Nilgiris, &c.*—All land sold subject to assessment should, as suggested, be given on an ordinary patta unless there happen to be any special conditions attached to the sale. The purchaser at a sale merely buys the preferential right to a patta. Reports will be called for as proposed by Mr. Meyer.

*Paragraph 36.*—Board's Standing Order No. 204 will be amended accordingly.

*Paragraph 39—Remittances from Sub-registrars at stations where there is a sub-treasury.*—This is a question for the Inspector-General of Registration to decide. The Board raises no objection to the proposal.

*Paragraph 40—Annual statement of Revenue Inspectors trained in Survey.*—This return may be discontinued.

*Paragraph 41—Regarding copying and distribution of papers.*—(1) Mr. Meyer's remarks will be brought to the notice of the Superintendent of Stationery. It is essential that, if copying machines are supplied at all, they should be of good quality and capable of being easily and efficiently worked.

(2) & (3) The question of the distribution of Board's Proceedings has lately been engaging the Board's attention (*vide*) Board's Proceedings, No. 2, dated 5th January 1897; but, as Mr. Meyer points out, the selection of papers for general circulation requires to be carefully supervised. No hard-and-fast rule can be laid down, but the Board will endeavour to reduce the issue of its Proceedings to Collectors and their subordinates as far as possible. It may, however, be noted that when proposals which require the sanction of Government are printed and circulated to districts, as in the case of forest notifications under sections 4 and 16, the final orders of Government are usually communicated without reprinting the Board's Proceedings on which they have been passed. The Board's Proceedings is indeed reprinted in the Government Order, but in circulating the orders to the districts, the previous papers are printed in abstract. The procedure would in many cases be simplified by adopting Mr. Meyer's suggestion, and the Board will take steps to do so wherever possible.

(4) The Board recommends Mr. Meyer's proposal for favourable consideration. The effect of the present decentralization will indeed tend to reduce, very considerably, the number of cases in which the formal sanction of Government will be required, but even so there must remain numerous classes of orders which may be counted as matters of routine. In such cases it would save time and labour if the final order was intimated direct from the Government Office to the Collector concerned.

*Paragraph 4—Board's Standing Orders.*—The necessity for the speedy completion of the work of revising its Standing Orders has been frequently urged by Government, and the Board has endeavoured to carry out this duty as quickly as was compatible with efficient scrutiny. It has already been pointed out\* that work of this nature is unavoidably delayed, when it has to pass through the hands of one or more officers who can only devote their attention to it fitfully and sometimes at long intervals. The revision has now been practically completed and the remaining chapters are for the most part in type; but

it is probable that still further corrections will be required in view of the numerous proposals made by Mr. Meyer for decentralization and improvement of business methods, and for this reason the final issue of the revised orders is delayed.

*Paragraph 43—Calling for reports from subordinates.*—The rule advocated by Mr. Meyer has, the Board believes, been very generally adopted, but Collectors will again be instructed to bear it in mind and to enforce it upon Divisional officers. It will doubtless save trouble to all concerned if the points upon which report is required are, as far as practicable, specified in the reference order.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) L. D. SWAMIKANNU,  
for Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.  
Copy to W. S. Meyer, Esq., I.C.S.

ORDER—No. 411, Revenue, dated 28th June 1899.

Miscellaneous.

With the Proceedings read above the Board of Revenue submits to Government, with its remarks, certain proposals made by Mr. Meyer in pursuance of the instructions conveyed to him in G.O., No. 1243, Judicial, dated 27th August 1897, for the curtailment of work in Revenue offices. The proposals are grouped into four sections, the first three of which chiefly relate to the grant of larger powers to the Board of Revenue, to Collectors and Divisional officers, respectively, while the fourth contains suggestions in regard to certain miscellaneous matters. These proposals will be dealt with below *seriatim*.

2. I. GRANT OF INCREASED POWERS TO THE BOARD—(i) *That the Board be empowered to sanction transfers of land from one taluk to another, provided that such transfers will not appreciably affect the work or relative importance of the taluks concerned, and that Collectors be allowed to order transfers between villages in the same taluk subject to the proviso that such transfers do not necessitate the revision of the establishment of either village (paragraph 2 of Mr. Meyer's letter).*—A taluk is not merely a revenue administrative unit, but also the unit for criminal and other jurisdiction and for other purposes. Further, transfers from taluk to taluk are not frequent, and the need of a reference to Government in the matter consequently does not involve any appreciable amount of additional labour. It is expedient, therefore, that the power to order alteration in taluk boundaries should rest with the Government. As regards transfers between villages, the Government considers that the power to make such transfers should vest in the Board as hitherto.

(ii) *That the Board be allowed full power to resume money allowances granted for the upkeep of temples and mosques or the performance of religious service in cases where the conditions of the grant are not fulfilled (paragraph 3 of Mr. Meyer's letter).*—The proposal is approved.

(iii) *That the power of sanctioning rectification of bonâ fide errors made in regard to entries of date of birth in the annual returns of establishments furnished to the Accountant General under article 55 of the Civil Account Code be delegated to the Board and other heads of large departments (paragraph 4 of Mr. Meyer's letter).*—The Government sees no sufficient necessity to sanction the proposed delegation.

(iv) *That the Board and other Heads of Departments be allowed to fix and alter the pay of non-pensionable menial servants in the offices under their control (paragraph 5 of Mr. Meyer's letter).*—The proposal will be considered in the Financial Department.

(v) *That the power now possessed by the Board and other Heads of Departments of purchasing in this country articles of European manufacture, subject to a limit of value of Rs. 10, without the sanction of the Local Government, be extended up to a limit of*

Rs. 100, and that Collectors, who may now purchase such articles only up to a limit of Rs. 5, have their power extended to Rs. 10 (paragraph 6 of Mr. Meyer's letter).--Orders will issue in the Financial Department on this proposal.

(vi) That the Board be empowered to sanction for special reasons the grant of district holidays supplementary to, or in substitution of, those notified by Government (paragraph 7 of Mr. Meyer's letter).--The Government considers that there exists no sufficient reason for altering the present practice under which applications for such additional or alternative holidays have to come before Government.

(vii) That the Board be given the same power of altering its Standing Orders as is now enjoyed by it in the Separate Revenue Department, with reference to Salt and Abkari Circular Orders (paragraph 8 of Mr. Meyer's letter).--The Government considers it undesirable to sanction any departure from the existing practice as prescribed in G.O., No. 1002, Revenue, dated 24th October 1887.

3. II. GRANT OF ENLARGED POWERS TO COLLECTORS--(i) That Collectors be empowered to grant lands free of assessment and to exempt occupied lands from assessment when required by local bodies for communal purposes subject to a maximum limit of one acre in the case of dry and one-fourth of an acre in the case of wet land (paragraphs 9 and 10 of Mr. Meyer's letter).--The Government is of opinion that it is the value of the land to be granted that should chiefly be considered rather than its area. Collectors will for the future be empowered, subject to a limit of capitalized value of Rs. 250, to grant lands to local bodies for public purposes, the nature of which entitles these bodies to hold the land revenue, free under the orders contained in G.O.s, No. 259, Revenue, dated 3rd April 1889, and No. 44, Revenue, dated 15th January 1892. The power now possessed by the Collectors of granting lands for Local Fund road up to a limit of capitalized value of Rs. 3,000 will remain unaffected. The Board will be empowered to sanction revenue-free grants of land to local bodies for similar public purposes up to a limit of capitalized value of Rs. 3,000. Cases exceeding the latter limit will be submitted to Government as heretofore for approval and submission to the Government of India for sanction.

(ii) That Collectors be empowered to sanction the entertainment of temporary establishment for service of processes under Acts VIII of 1865, III of 1895 and III of 1869 and Regulation IX of 1822, subject to the condition that the cost of the establishment is fully covered by process fees realized and involves no extra charge to the State (paragraph 11 of Mr. Meyer's letter).--The Government is not prepared to accept the proposal. Such establishment should be sparingly employed.

(iii) That in the case of process-servers appointed for the purposes of Act II of 1864, Collectors be allowed to prescribe a maximum scale of establishment for each taluk, and that Divisional officers be given the discretion of putting the scale wholly or partially in force as occasion may require (paragraph 12 of Mr. Meyer's letter).--The Government considers it desirable that the Collector's previous sanction should be obtained in every case in which such special agency is sought to be employed. The proposal is accordingly negatived. In G.O., No. 680, Revenue, dated 14th November 1898, the Government has accepted the proposal that Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars in independent charge should have the power to appoint, grant leave to and remove special process-servers employed under Madras Acts II of 1864 and I of 1883.

(iv) That Collectors be empowered, in the case of petty construction and repairs to minor civil works, to transfer allotments from sanctioned to non-sanctioned works within the limits of their ordinary powers (Rs. 1,000 for each work) and provided that their total budget allotment is not exceeded (paragraph 14 of Mr. Meyer's letter).--The Government agrees with the Board in considering that the existing practice does not give rise to any inconvenience and that no saving of work would result from the proposed change. The proposal will therefore be negatived.

(v) That the submission of the progress report of petty construction and repairs to minor civil works which accompanies the monthly statement of expenditure furnished by Collectors to the Accountant-General under paragraph 12 of Board's Standing Order No. 1-9 (New Edition) may be discontinued (paragraph 15 of Mr. Meyer's letter).--The proposal is approved. From the Board's remarks against entry No. A-20 on

page 31 of Board's Proceedings, No. 105, dated 22nd April 1899, the Government notes that, as a matter of fact, the progress report is not now submitted to the Accountant-General.

(vi) That the limit up to which Collectors may themselves sanction estimates for the execution of minor irrigation works be raised from Rs. 250 to Rs. 500 (paragraphs 16 and 17 of Mr. Meyer's letter).--The proposal is approved. The existing proviso will be maintained that Collectors may not sanction estimates which relate to the construction of new masonry works other than simple tank sluices or which involve any material deviation from the standard of efficiency laid down by the Tank Restoration Scheme. Further, as it is necessary that the Tank Restoration memoirs should be kept up to date, all estimates for new masonry works or alteration of existing ones in tanks which have been investigated under the Tank Restoration Scheme should be sent to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for examination.

(vii) That the returns required to be submitted by Collectors to the Board in the case of minor irrigation works under paragraphs 3 and 4 of Board's Standing Order No. 187 (New Edition) may be discontinued (paragraph 18 of Mr. Meyer's letter).--The Board is not prepared to dispense with the submission of the returns in question, but considers that they may be sent to it direct instead of through the Chief Engineer for Irrigation as is now the case. The Government accepts the Board's view.

(viii) That in the case of minor irrigation works the Collector be allowed to sanction within his lump allotment excesses up to 10 per cent. on estimates sanctioned by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and to deal similarly with estimates passed by himself which by excess expenditure have passed his limit of sanction (paragraph 19 of Mr. Meyer's letter).--The proposal is accepted.

(ix) That the monthly progress report of expenditure on each sanctioned minor irrigation work now submitted by every Tahsildar to the Collector may be discontinued, except for the last three months of the year, and that the similar monthly reports to Divisional officers may be submitted quarterly for the first nine months of the year. Divisional officers submitting a consolidated return to the Collector (paragraph 20 of Mr. Meyer's letter).--The first part of the proposal is approved. The Government considers that the monthly report should continue to be submitted to the Divisional officer, who will send to the Collector quarterly for the first nine months of the year a consolidated return relating to the works in his division. The orders on this return in the appendix to Board's Proceedings, No. 105, dated 22nd April 1899, should therefore be modified so as to prescribe a monthly return from the Tahsildar to the Divisional officer.

(x) That Collectors be given general permission to sanction journeys of officers subordinate to them outside the limit of their districts for certain purposes (paragraph 21 of Mr. Meyer's letter).--The subject should be regulated by the orders contained in G.O., No. 117, Financial, dated 18th January 1899, communicated to the Board with G.O., No. 432, Revenue, dated 30th January 1899.

(xi) That the limit of estimated cost up to which Collectors may, subject to provision in the budget, sanction original works and repairs in estates under the management of the Court of Wards be raised from Rs. 300 and Rs. 500, respectively, Rs. 500 and Rs. 1,000, respectively (paragraph 24 of Mr. Meyer's letter).--The Government has no objection to the proposal.

(xii) That Collectors be given power to sanction the free grant of timber in wards' estates to village communities and private individuals when necessary similar to that which they enjoy in regard to Government forest produce under section 104 of the Forest Code (paragraph 25 of Mr. Meyer's letter).--It is observed that under paragraph 2-H of the Proceedings of the Court of Wards, No. 8, dated 22nd April 1897, recorded in G.O., No. 2822, dated 4th June 1897, Collectors have already been authorized in the matter.

4. III. GRANT OF ADDITIONAL POWERS TO DIVISIONAL OFFICERS. Divisional officers be empowered to sanction transfers from "wet" to "dry" and vice versa of lands actually cultivated under the other head for three consecutive years, subject to the

concurrence of the Public Works authorities in the case of lands under major irrigation works (paragraph 26 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government does not consider the proposed delegation to be expedient.

(ii) That Divisional officers be allowed to transfer land from assessed to unassessed (paragraph 27 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government agrees with the Board that it would be safer to retain the power in the hands of the Collector, and the proposal is accordingly negatived.

(iii) That Divisional officers be empowered to order the sale of valuable unassessed lands to be transferred to assessed and granted on patta (paragraph 28 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government considers that the power in question should continue to be vested in the hands of the Collector.

(iv) That the sale of disputed darkhast lands by Divisional officers need not be subject to formal confirmation by the Collector as at present is the case (paragraph 29 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The proposal is approved.

(v) That Divisional officers be empowered (a) to receive applications for admission to the Village Officers' Special Test Examinations, (b) to decide in cases of doubt as to the degree of relationship to the existing incumbents of village offices of applicants claiming to pay a lower fee on that account, (c) to permit applicants to appear for the examination elsewhere than in the division to which they belong, and (d) to sign certificates for issue to the successful candidates (paragraph 30 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The proposed delegation of powers is sanctioned.

(vi) That the power of sanctioning refunds of sale-proceeds of impounded cattle in cases where the amount has been held in deposit as unclaimed, on a satisfactory claim being put in within three months from the date of deposit be extended to Sub-Divisional Magistrates (paragraph 31 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The proposal is approved.

(vii) That paragraph 8 of Board's Standing Order No. 237 (New Edition) under which Collectors alone can sanction refunds of judicial fines cancelled on appeal may be modified as follows: "Treasury officers may refund judicial fines under the procedure laid down in that behalf by the High Court from time to time" (paragraph 32 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The proposed amendment of the Standing Order is sanctioned.

(viii) That the power of incurring expenditure on trigonometrical survey stations (up to an average of Rs. 4 annually for each) which is now vested in Collectors be made over to Divisional officers (paragraph 33 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government accepts the proposal.

5. IV. MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS—(i) That the question whether in the case of waste lands sold on the Nilgiri and Shevaroy Hills an ordinary patta may not be substituted for the intricate title-deed now in use be referred to the Collectors of the Nilgiris, Salem and Malabar for report (paragraph 35 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The revision of the rules for the sale of waste lands is now under the consideration of Government and orders will issue in due course.

(ii) That Board's Standing Order No. 201 (New Edition) regarding the provision of carts, etc., for troops on the march be altered in certain respects (paragraph 36 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—Orders will issue separately on this matter.

(iii) That the heading of Board's Standing Order No. 226 (New Edition) be altered into "inspection of taluk treasuries and offices by Divisional officers," that the questions relating to records in the appendix to paragraph 1 of the Standing Order be revised with reference to the "disposal number" system and the answering of the questions be made compulsory, and that Divisional officers be required to submit to Collectors their reports soon after inspection (paragraph 37 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—These proposals are approved.

(iv) That the annual crop experiments now made by Divisional officers and Tahsildars should be conducted only by men who have passed through the Agricultural College or are otherwise specially qualified to deal with the matter (paragraph 38 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government is not at present prepared to modify the existing orders on the subject.

(v) That Sub-Registrars at stations where there is a sub-treasury be required to remit their collections to the treasury once a week instead of as now is the case on every day on which the treasury is open for cash transactions (paragraph 39 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The proposal will be considered in the Judicial Department.

(vi) That the annual statement showing the number of Revenue Inspectors trained in survey submitted by Collectors to the Board may be discontinued (paragraph 40 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The discontinuance of the return is sanctioned.

(vii) In paragraph 41 of his letter Mr. Meyer makes a few suggestions "in view of diminishing copying and registering work in revenue offices and saving the time now occupied in perusal of practically useless papers." One of the suggestions is to the effect that all "routine" orders of Government, which would simply have to be communicated to Collectors, etc., may go direct to them from the Government Office, a copy being at the same time sent to the Board for information. The Board recommends the proposal for favourable consideration. It is observed that the practice referred to is at present followed in the Government Office whenever possible; but the Government considers that it would be inexpedient to prescribe it as a general rule.

(viii) Paragraph 42 of Mr. Meyer's letter—The Standing Orders of the Board of Revenue.—It has already been ordered in G.O., No. 217, Revenue, dated 22nd April 1898, that the chapters relating to Stamps, Abkari and Customs should be excluded from the Board's Standing Orders and that the remaining chapters be divided into two volumes.

(ix) Paragraph 43 of Mr. Meyer's letter—Calling for reports from subordinate officers.—The Government concurs in the views expressed by the Board in regard to Mr. Meyer's suggestions on this subject.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) N. E. MARJORIBANKS,  
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).  
" the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement,  
Land Records and Agriculture).  
" the Financial Department.  
" the Public Works Department (Irrigation).  
" the Judicial Department.  
" the Accountant-General.  
" W. S. Meyer, Esq., I.C.S.

Mr. P.S.M.  
Have got it better  
marked in paper &  
written are correctly  
printed.  
16/10/01

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 411, REVENUE, DATED  
28TH JUNE 1899.

[SUBJECT—Proposals for delegation of powers to the Board, Collectors and Divisional Officers.]

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 388, dated 11th November 1897.

To Secretary—

This is the last batch of Mr. Meyer's proposals. I have taken it up last although it was one of the first received as many of the references were locked up with other files under disposal. Even now several references are needed, but these relate chiefly to proposals which must be dealt with in the Financial Department and so the file has not been delayed further on this account.

The present proposals relate to the grant of larger powers to the Board, Collectors and Divisional officers, respectively, and to certain miscellaneous matters. Mr. Meyer has stated his proposals in four sections accordingly. The Full Board has discussed the proposals at a meeting, at which Mr. Meyer was present, and submits them for the approval of the Government with certain exceptions in cases where the Board sees objections or in which it is competent to pass orders itself.

The proposals for convenience of reference are given *serialim* below with the Board's remarks (where any) and with any observations that a reference to the connected pages suggest.

I.—GRANT OF LARGER POWERS TO THE BOARD.

Mr. Meyer's Letter—

2. Under Standing Order, No. 21, the sanction of Government is required for the transfer of land from one taluk to another. I think that this power might safely be allowed to the Board when the transfer is not of such importance as to have any appreciable effect on the work or relative importance of the taluks concerned; and Collectors might be allowed to sanction transfers of land between villages in the same taluk subject to the similar condition that the transfer is not of such importance as to necessitate any revision of either village establishment. At present they are allowed by the Standing Orders to make "petty transfers" but the nature of these is not clearly defined.

(The Board accepts without remarks.)

Transfers from taluk to taluk are not frequent, and therefore a reference to Government does not involve any real question of additional labour.

The substantial objection to delegating the power to the Board is that a taluk is not merely a revenue administrative unit, but also the unit for criminal and other jurisdiction, and for other purposes: and therefore the authority which alters the limits should be an authority which can take these other

As regards transfers from one taluk to another, the order requiring the sanction of the Government is G.O., No. 244, dated 9th February 1864. No particular reason was assigned. But in G.O., No. 71, dated 1st February 1896, the Government, in reiterating the order, stated that such transfers involve changes of jurisdiction. This no doubt is true; but, if the transfer does not appreciably affect the work or relative importance of the taluks,

factors into consideration. The Board has no cognizance of these: and the alteration of taluk boundaries should therefore remain with Government.

G. S. FORDES.  
H. M. W[INIERBOTHAM].  
10-5-99.  
A. E. H[AVELOCK].  
27-6-99.

\* G.O., No. 244, dated 9th February 1864. If there is to be an appeal to the Board by persons dissatisfied with a Collector's alteration of a village, the matter might as well go direct to the Board for decision as it does now. Village boundaries are mostly very ancient and should not be altered lightly.

G.S.F.  
mitted that the power limited as proposed may be safely entrusted to the Collector.

N. E. MARJORIBANKS.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

3. The Board should have full power to resume money allowances granted for the upkeep of temples and mosques, or the performance of religious service, where the conditions of the grant are not fulfilled. The only reference to such money allowances now made in paragraph 2 of Standing Order No. 117 is its penultimate sentence, which allows Collectors to resume on their own authority "inam lands and money allowances held by pagodas, which have been abandoned, or have been in a ruined condition for upwards of 12 years"; and even there, I may note, the alteration of the word "pagodas" into "temples, mosques, etc.," is obviously necessary.

(The Board accepts without remark.) Standing Order No. 117 deals with inams that have been settled by the Inam Commissioner. But the portion of paragraph 2 quoted by Mr. Meyer is based on Extracts of Minutes of Consultation, No. 1555, dated 28th November 1854.

In G.O., No. 438, Revenue, dated 6th August 1893, the Government rejected a proposal of Mr. Meyer's that the Board should be authorized to deal with all questions in regard to the resumption of charitable inams for default of the service for which they were instituted and the transfer of the proceeds of such inams to Local Boards for charitable objects. The Government order stated:

"The Government considers that in the case of private endowments the Board may proceed under section 13 of Regulation VII of 1817 to make such arrangements as to the appropriation of the income as to it seems right and fit. But in the case of assignments of public revenue, A | "the Board has no power to resume even *pro forma*, and the Government considers that for this reason and also on general grounds the devolution of such endowments should be reserved for the decision of the Government itself."

The portion marked A is correct if it be read as meaning that the Board has no power to resume with a view to re-assignment. Where, however, resumption is absolute, i.e., where the money allowance is discontinued altogether or the lands are fully assessed as ryotwari, then it will be seen that the Board has such power generally in the case of inam lands (settled by the Inam Commissioner) and the Collector also in certain cases (twelve years' neglect) with regard to both inam lands and money allowances held by pagodas.

There appears to be no legal objection to giving the Board the power of resuming money allowances now proposed by Mr. Meyer.

It is not clear whether Mr. Meyer would confine this proposal to money allowances held by institutions, Hindu and Muhammadan, etc., or would also include money allowances held by individuals for religious service.

N.E.M.

To Honourable Member—

I would give the Board the power of *resumption* of the money allowances referred to when the conditions of the grant have not been fulfilled.

G.S.F.  
H.W.  
10-5-99.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

4. Under article 55 of the Civil Account Code annual returns of all persons serving under Government and Local Boards have to be submitted to the Accountant-General; and under note (b) to the same article the date of birth of each officer must be given, and if it has been entered wrongly can only be corrected except in the case of clerical error with the sanction of Government. The power of rectifying *bond-fide* mistakes, which may have been made in this matter, might well be delegated to the Boards and other heads of large departments.

(The Board accepts without remark.) This matter is one for the Financial Department to decide. It may be noted here that the date of birth is that entered in the service book, and the objection to the proposal seems to be that that date should not be altered without the very best reason shown. For one *bond fide* mistake there will be hundreds of fraudulent attempts on the part of subordinates nearing 55 years of age or who entered the service before they were 18 or after they were 40, etc. The knowledge that any alteration must go up to the Government stifles many such attempts. The Government rarely accords its approval—*vide* a recent case (G.O., No. 2847, dated 7th July 1898).

N.E.M.

The Financial Department's remarks should be obtained.

To Financial Department u.o.

G.S.F.  
21-2-99.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

5. Under article 98 (m) of the Civil Account Code all recurring charges have to receive the sanction of Government. I think that the Board and other Heads of departments might well be allowed to pass orders in regard to the fixing and alteration of the pay of non-pensionable menial servants in offices under their control and that the Government of India might be moved to amend the article accordingly.

It seems particularly absurd that the sanction of Government should have to be applied for to entertain a part-time sweeper or scavenger on one or two rupees a month for some taluk mofussil office as is now necessary. See for example the cases sanctioned in G.O., Mis. No. 2870, Revenue, dated 20th July 1896, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3464, dated 29th July 1896, and G.O., No. 2960, dated 27th July 1896, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3538, dated 1st August 1896. But I may note that superfluous references in these instances might be avoided by the simple method of debiting the pay of part-time menials to "Contingencies", a course already approved by Government in the case of Local and Municipal servants of this description—*vide* G.O., No. 1892, Local, dated 1st October 1897, copy of which is herewith forwarded.

The Board's remarks—

Paragraph 5 of the letter, article 98 (m), Civil Account Code—Sanction for fixing or altering the pay of non-pensionable menial servants.—The Board considers that Mr. Meyer's alternative proposal may be accepted, and that charges of this nature may be debited to "Contingencies", the power of sanction being given to the Board or to the head of the department concerned.

There appears to be no administrative objection. The discretion of Heads of Departments will necessarily be limited by the amount of their Budget Grants. The question is for the Financial Department.

N.E.M.

To Financial Department u.o.

G.S.F.  
20-2-99.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

6. Again under article 98 (k) of the Civil Account Code articles of European manufacture cannot be purchased in the country to an extent of over Rs. 10 without the sanction of the

Local Government. (See for instance G.O., Mis. No. 3180, Revenue, dated 8th August 1893, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3827, dated 19th August 1896.) I think the Government of India might well be moved to extend the sanctioning powers of the Board and other Heads of Departments up to a limit of Rs. 100. Lamps, for example, can be obtained at establishments like Mr. Ditmar's in Bombay quite as easily and cheaply in respect of ordinary retail transactions as from Europe. If this be approved, Collectors, who can now only purchase such articles up to a limit of Rs. 5,\* might have their powers extended to Rs. 10.

\* G.O., No. 481, Revenue, dated 21st September 1896.

The Board accepts without remark.

This again is a question of financial control and is for the Financial Department. Administrative purposes would probably be better served as officers making such purchases for their own use are likely to get more suitable articles than those procured on indent from Europe.

N.E.M.

G.S.F.  
20-2-99.

To Financial Department u.o.

The points on the previous and this page of the notes (which have been detached from the main file) require the remarks of Financial Department. Will Financial Department kindly note and return the sheets.

Board's Proceedings, No. 388 (Land Revenue),  
dated 11th November 1897.

A copy of the Board's Proceedings  
(current) is with the papers.

G.S.F.  
5-5-99.

To Financial Department u.o.

#### FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

Note.

(1) *Page 2 of Revenue Notes.*—Article 55 (b), Civil Account Code, says that the date of birth entered in the service book of an officer can only be altered, except in the case of a clerical error, under the orders of the Local Government. There is no provision in the Code under which Government can delegate the power to order such corrections to any lower authorities. In case it is intended to concede the power to heads of departments, the sanction of the Government of India will be necessary. The only reason which can be assigned in favour of the delegation is that thereby the necessity is saved to make references frequently to Government on such a small matter in which heads of departments might very well be trusted to use their discretion. But the evils which might result from the acceptance of Mr. Meyer's suggestion far outweigh all such considerations. It is submitted that, for the reasons given in the Revenue Department note, this suggestion of Mr. Meyer's cannot be accepted.

(2) *Page 3 of Revenue Notes.*—The next suggestion of Mr. Meyer amounts to the delegation to heads of departments of the power to entertain non-pensionable menial servants, such as scavengers, suppliers of drinking water, etc., to fix or alter their pay and to charge their wages to *Contingencies* instead of to *Establishments*.

Under article 98 (a), Civil Account Code, no salary charges of any kind, except in the few cases mentioned in the article, and no additions to pay may be charged as contingent expenditure or included in contingent bills. Article 98 (m), Civil Account Code, lays down that no charge which binds Government beyond a single payment may be incurred without the sanction of Government. The pay of the menial servants referred to by Mr. Meyer is generally very small; they in most cases do not devote their whole time to the public service, and their service is not pensionable. Yet inasmuch as they form a portion of the regular establishments, any change in

Letter No. 3214, dated 22nd October 1894,  
in G.O., No. 3135, Judicial, dated 19th  
December 1894.

regard to them requires, under article 57 of the Civil Account Code, the sanction of Government. This was the view held by the Accountant-General in 1894. But when it was represented to him that it was a great waste of time to treat such

servants as members of the regular establishment and to submit proposition statements for them and\* he was asked if he would raise any objection to the payment of the wages of such servants from contingencies in view to avoiding the necessity for preparing proposition statements and seeking the sanction of Government in each case, the † Accountant-General stated that he had no objection to the course suggested.

\* G.O., No. 3135, Judicial, dated 19th  
December 1894.

† Letter No. 1448, dated 6th June 1895, in  
G.O., No. 1343, Judicial, dated 24th June  
1895.

ant-General stated that he had no objection to the course suggested.

In 1897 the Accountant-General again expressed the opinion that there was

Letter No. 375, dated 4th September 1897 in  
G.O., No. 1829 L. dated 1st October 1897.

‡ Items 40-45, Financial—C. No. 383 of  
1899.

General's letter No. 503, dated 26th January 1899.

In this letter the Accountant-General changes his opinion, and holds that inasmuch as the wages of sweepers, etc., are recurring charges, the sanction of Government is required in each case and no rule exists under which heads of departments and offices may be allowed to exercise the power. He has asked the sanction of the Government of India to be obtained to the delegations already made and to such as may hereafter be made. Revenue may, it is submitted, be asked to transfer this proposal to Financial where it will be dealt with along with the Accountant-General's letter now under disposal.

(3) *Page 3 of Revenue Notes.*—The next suggestion of Mr. Meyer is to move the Government of India to extend the sanctioning powers in regard to Europe-made articles of the Board of Revenue and other heads of departments up to a limit of Rs. 100 and of Collectors to Rs. 10.

He says that certain Europe-made articles, as for instance lamps, can be obtained in India as easily and cheaply as from Europe.

Under article 98 (k) of the Civil Account Code, only petty purchases locally of Europe-made articles not exceeding Rs. 10 in value is permitted. But for articles exceeding that amount the previous sanction of Government should be obtained.

The wording of the article shows clearly that the intention, when it was framed, was to discourage the purchase in India of Europe-made articles, except in the very special cases mentioned, as it would be on the whole more economical to obtain them through the India Office. The only instance in which power has been delegated to

G.O., No. 431, Revenue, dated 21st September 1896.

Item 36 in the enclosure to Financial C.  
No. 383 of 1899.

G.O., No. 108, Revenue, dated 29th January  
1892.

sanction the local purchase of Europe-made articles costing more than Rs. 10 is that of the power given to the Board of Revenue to sanction the purchase of clocks and time-pieces for the use of subordinate offices even though they cost more than Rs. 10 each. Even this it strictly speaking a "general sanction" and not a delegation.

The Accountant-General has, however, included it in his list of delegations requiring the sanction of the Government of India.

Experience shows that there is not very much necessity for Europe-made articles costing over Rs. 10 each in subordinate offices, and, even when applications for the sanction of the purchase of such are submitted, adequate reasons showing the necessity for such purchases have to be given. Lamps, which Mr. Meyer alludes to, costing more than Rs. 10 are not generally furnished to such offices.

It is submitted that, before the Government of India can be moved to amend the article in question, very good reasons will have to be given, and it is for orders whether, saving the necessity for obtaining the previous orders of Government can be a sufficient reason for addressing the Government of India.

I would try.

G. SICKES.  
1-6-99.

As regards extending to Collectors, who now have the power to purchase locally Europe-made articles costing Rs. 5, the power to purchase articles up to Rs. 10 each there is no account objection, but it is submitted that the necessity they are under to address the Board of Revenue for articles costing Rs. 6 to Rs. 10 each acts as a deterrent against the purchase of any but the most absolutely needed articles. This delegation might however be safely granted.

C. M. SCHMIDT.  
31-5-99.

To Revenue Department u.o.

G.S.  
1-6-99.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Submitted to the Under Secretary.

P.E.  
3-6-99.

To Honourable Member—

The views of the Financial Department may be accepted.

Approved.

N.E.M.  
8-6-99.

H.W.  
14-6-99.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

7. The Board might well be given power to sanction for special reasons, e.g., for the recent Pushkaram festival in Gódavari, the grant of *district holidays* supplementary to, or in substitution for, those notified in G.O., No. 126, Public, dated 19th February 1895 (Board's Proceedings, No. 77, dated 7th March 1895). At present applications for such additional or alternative holidays must, under this Government order, be submitted to Government.

The Board accepts without remark.

The objection to this proposal seems to be, I submit, that the orders of the Board can apply only to the Revenue offices in the district. It might perhaps be inconvenient to empower all other Heads of Departments in the same way. A Government order

Yes.

G.S.F.

G.S.F.  
20-2-99.

would apply to all departments and officers of Government. The occasions for such an order will be, or should be, very rare and so there would be very little time and trouble saved by making such a delegation of power. If any general delegation is to be made, the Public Department should, it is submitted, issue the orders.

N.E.M.

I see no sufficient necessity for altering the present practice.

G.S.F.  
20-2-99.  
H.W.  
A.E.H.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

8. Finally I submit that the Board might be allowed the same power of altering its *Standing Orders* as is now enjoyed by it in the Separate Revenue Department with reference to Salt and Abkari Circular Orders. It should, that is, send Government a copy of every alteration made or new Standing Order issued, but need not obtain previous sanction for such emendation, it being, of course, understood that no alteration should be made in matters of general land revenue principle or policy until the same has been approved by Government. Even then, however, the actual wording of the revised Standing Orders might well, I think, be left to the Board.

The Board accepts without remark.

The analogy drawn between the Board's Standing Orders and the Board's Circular Orders in the Salt and Abkari Department seems hardly justified. The Circular Orders appear to deal largely with a great number of matters of *detail* quite within the powers

And this is the mainspring of our whole administration in this Presidency.

G.S.F.

of the Commissioner to regulate; while the Board's Standing Orders contain the main principles of the Land Revenue administration. The Standing Orders merely embody in convenient form the gist of all important orders relating to the Land Revenue administration. Where it is undoubtedly within the competence of the Board to deal finally with any matter, there seems no objection to allowing the Board to embody its decision in the Standing Orders. But where the matter is beyond the Board's powers or whether there is any doubt as to whether the Board has power, it is submitted that the orders of the Government should be taken first before any amendment of the Standing Orders is made. Even after the orders of the Government are issued it seems doubtful whether the draft Standing Order embodying the new decision should not be submitted for the prior approval of the Government. Mistakes may arise as to the exact meaning and intention of the Government; a copy of the

True.

G.S.F.

Standing Order, if submitted merely for information, is apt to escape that scrutiny which it would receive if submitted for orders; and lastly, if the Government alters, in any way, the Standing Order so submitted, confusion is likely to arise as the subordinate officers will have received the order from the Board before the "correction slip" issues.

G.S.F.

N.E.M.

Since writing the above I have had further search made and find that the existing rule on the subject of the alteration of the Board's Standing Order is much as suggested above. It is in paragraph 4 of G.O., No. 1002, Revenue, dated 24th October 1887:—

"The Government consider that the volume of the Standing Orders may be issued by the Board on their own responsibility, taking care that, where alterations are made in the rules prescribed by the Government now in force, their sanction is specifically obtained for them."

N.E.M.

I would not alter the present practice.\* The Board's Standing Orders are accepted all over the Presidency, not only by officials but by the people at large as the final expression of the Government policy or practice.

G.S.F.

\* I concur.

H.W.  
10-5-99.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

## II.—ADDITIONAL POWERS TO BE GRANTED TO COLLECTORS.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

9. Power to grant lands free of assessment and to exempt occupied lands from assessment when required by local bodies for communal purposes.—Under paragraph 3 of Standing Order No. 12-A, Collectors are already competent to exercise this power in regard to land required for roads. In G.O., No. 142, Revenue, dated 24th March 1896, Government negatived a suggestion of the Board that Collectors should

be given the same power to serve local bodies in respect to other communal purposes, and such applications have still, under the Standing Order above quoted, to go to Government through the Board. I venture to ask for a reconsideration of this order for the reasons stated below, which I quote from a letter written by Mr. Nicholson as Collector of South Canara which the Board transferred to me in connection with my special duty:—

be given the same power to serve local bodies in respect to other communal purposes, and such applications have still, under the Standing Order above quoted, to go to Government through the Board. I venture to ask for a reconsideration of this order for the reasons stated below, which I quote from a letter written by Mr. Nicholson as Collector of South Canara which the Board transferred to me in connection with my special duty:—

"2. I have before me a case in which about 13 cents of unassessed dry land is applied for by the Coondapoor Taluk Board for the erection of a Primary school. Under existing orders I am obliged to make a reference to the Board in view to obtain the sanction of Government for the alienation, and I have done so separately \* \* \*

"3. Cases of this kind are not very rare. In 1896 there were three applications from local bodies; and this year there was another besides the one referred to above. In none of these cases has the extent of lands applied for exceeded 75 cents. As local bodies give increased attention to sanitation, education public health, &c., applications for small bits of lands for public latrines, wells, primary schools, dispensaries, Medical officers' quarters and the like, will also increase. The revenue-free grants made in such cases are not alienations of a permanent nature, but are *conditional* grants revocable when lands are not required for the purposes for which they were granted.

"4. Collectors have power to grant any amount of land for road purposes and they are not likely to be too lavish in making similar grants for other purposes to local bodies.

"5. I do not, however, ask for power to grant any extent of land when required for other than road purposes, but would request the Board to fix the maximum within which Collectors could make such grants; this might be one acre of dry land and a quarter acre of wet land, which latter, however, would seldom or never be required.

"6. My object in making the reference is to avoid the necessity for troubling the Board and Government with applications for grants in petty cases, seeing that Collectors' recommendations in such cases are generally approved. Collectors might send an annual return of such alienations for the information of Government and the Board."

10. I think that, under the limitations which Mr. Nicholson proposes (viz., one acre of dry or  $\frac{1}{4}$  acre of wet land as a maximum for any grant made by Collectors of their own authority), there would be no risk of Collectors abusing the power which it is proposed to entrust to them. There will be the further check of the statement proposed in Mr. Nicholson's last paragraph which, I may say, is submitted for the information of the Government of India even under present circumstances.

The Board accepts the proposal without remark.

In 1872 (Resolution No. 1—141, dated 6th February 1872) the Government of India issued rules restricting alienations of land. In G.O., No. 259, dated 3rd April 1889, this Government held that when land revenue is alienated permanently or for an indefinite period as in the case of rent-free grants to public bodies \* \* \* the Resolution of 1872 must be construed as applicable on the ground that such alienations had the same financial effect as alienations of the proprietary right in lands and that the sanction of the Government of India should be obtained whenever the land revenue proposed to be alienated when capitalized exceeded the limits prescribed in the Resolution of 1872. In this Presidency, however, it was the practice for the Collector to give lands to land to poramboke. The Government of India were addressed as the rules of 1872 contained no provision enabling the Local Government to delegate its power and asked to sanction the delegation to the Board of Revenue and to Collectors the power of granting Government waste land for the construction of roads to local bodies and for remitting the Government revenue on occupied lands when taken up by local bodies for the same purpose.

\* Rs. 3,000 when the land is given as a site for the construction of Government schools, hospitals, dispensaries or other public works, at the cost of recognised Local funds.

local bodies for roads by transferring the

Letter No. 233-A, dated 23rd March 1891.

asked to sanction the delegation to the Board of Revenue and to Collectors the power of granting Government waste land for the construction of roads to local bodies and for remitting the Government revenue on occupied lands when taken up by local bodies for the same purpose.

G.O., No. 259, dated 3rd April 1889, contained the orders of this Government as to the classes of land occupied by local bodies which would be held exempt from payment of assessment and which would not. Briefly the principle was that lands which yielded no return to the local bodies and are devoted to purposes should pay no assessment, but that lands from which income was raised should pay assessment.

In replying to our letter, No. 233-A, dated 23rd May 1891, the Government of India stated they had no objection to Collectors and the Board being empowered as proposed in the matter of grants for roads but desired the orders in G.O., No. 259,

dated 3rd April 1889, to be kept in abeyance pending the issue of general orders by the Government of India. In Mr. Muir Mackenzie's letter, No. 2486-419, dated 17th November 1891, the instructions in G.O., No. 259, dated 3rd April 1889, were approved. The Government of India said that the principle stated above might be generally applied "subject to the condition that when the value of the land revenue proposed to be remitted capitalised at 4 per cent. exceeds the limits laid down in the Resolution of February 1872, the previous sanction of the Government of India shall be obtained to such remission".

Thus the rules are anomalous. For while a Collector can grant lands for a Local Fund road up to a capitalised value of Rs. 3,000, the Government must be asked to sanction the grant of 10 cents for a school site. Submitted that a preferable rule to that proposed by Mr. Meyer would be one empowering the Collector to grant lands to local bodies for public purposes (of the nature which entitles them to hold the land revenue free) up to limit of capitalised value of, say, Rs. 250. The Board might be empowered up to limit of Rs. 1,000; while anything between Rs. 1,000 and Rs. 3,000 would come up to Government, and anything over Rs. 3,000 would go to India as at present. It is, I submit, the value of the land to be granted that should be considered and not so much its area. As under G.O., No. 795, dated 16th September 1893 (paragraph 3 of India's Resolution), the capitalised value is to be taken at 25 times the assessment, this rule would enable the Collector to grant or exempt from assessment land assessed at Rs. 10; and the Board, land assessed at Rs. 40. The rule as to roads may perhaps remain.

Yes. G.S.F. See note on next page. It would give the Board full power up to the Rs. 3,000 capitalised value. Of this value or over the case would be submitted to Government in view of the sanction of the Government of India being procured, if this Government approved.

G.S.F. As under G.O., No. 795, dated 16th September 1893 (paragraph 3 of India's Resolution), the capitalised value is to be taken at 25 times the assessment, this rule would enable the Collector to grant or exempt from assessment land assessed at Rs. 10; and the Board, land assessed at Rs. 40. The rule as to roads may perhaps remain.

It seems doubtful whether India's sanction would be necessary for the delegation. As it was applied for in the case of grants for roads it should perhaps be applied for now also.

N.E.M.

To Honourable Member—

I agree with Mr. Marjoribanks' proposed rule except that I would as noted in margin of preceding page give the Board full power up to the Rs. 3,000.

The alienations in question are only conditional, as pointed out by Mr. Nicholson. Careful and correct returns should, of course, be sent in yearly; and indeed under the rules all such alienations have to be reported: and thus the practice of Collectors and the Board will be kept under supervision.

The sanction of the Government of India is *not* required to the delegation in my opinion. So long as their sanction is obtained for alienations above the prescribed amount, we may regulate matters as we please.

G.S.F.  
20-1-99.

I agree with the Secretary.

H.W.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

11. *Entertainment of process-servers, &c.*—(1) Under Standing Order No. 111 as amended by paragraph 2 (vii) of Board's Proceedings, No. 232, dated 26th June 1896, the Collector has already been given the power of sanctioning the entertainment, when necessary, of batta peons to supplement the work of serving processes under Act II of 1864 by the village establishments. The salaries of these peons are paid out of the fees realised for the service of process.

(2) Under Standing Order No. 180 temporary peons may be similarly entertained and paid for service of processes under Acts VIII of 1865, III of 1895 and III of 1869, and Regulation IX of 1822. Here, however, no establishment can be entertained without the sanction of

the Board of Revenue, and in some cases of Government also (paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Standing Order). I think that in these instances, likewise, Collectors may be given power to entertain the establishment themselves, as has been done under certain conditions in regard to process-servers entertainable under section 12 of the Village Courts Act (*vide* G.O., No. 671, Judicial, dated 29th March 1893, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3152, dated 25th May 1893), subject, of course, to the restriction that its cost is fully covered by process-fees and involves no extra charge to the State. As a matter of fact, VIII of 1865 is the only Act above referred to, the service of processes under which does occasionally require extra hands.

(The Board accepts without remark.)

Board's Standing Order No. 180 is based on the rules issued by the High Court and the Board of Revenue with approval of the Local Government and the sanction of the Government of India under sections 20, 22 and 23 of the Court-fees Act VII of 1870.

These rules as originally issued will be found in G.O., No. 1210, Judicial, dated 1st August 1873. The rules under section 20 about the fees to be charged have undergone alteration in particulars subsequently. But the rules under section 22, for fixing the number of peons necessary for serving processes in the courts subordinate to the District Judge and the District Magistrate and under section 23 for fixing the number of peons required for serving processes in the courts of the Collector of a district and the Courts subordinate to him, have not been changed.

The appointment of process-servers under Act II of 1864 would come under the rule framed under section 23 of the Act, which rule merely requires the sanction of the Board of Revenue for any increase in the sanctioned scale. Upon objection taken by the Accountant-General, however, Government ordered that such sanctions by the Board should be reported to the Government for confirmation on financial grounds (G.O., No. 1108, dated 8th September 1880).

The Accountant-General does not appear however to have raised any objection to the delegation in G.O., No. 142, dated 24th March 1896, to Collectors of the power of sanctioning temporary process-servers to aid the village officers under Act II of 1864.

The power of sanctioning any such temporary establishments under Act VIII of 1865 would however apparently be regulated by the rules under section 22 of the Court-fees Act since Act VIII of 1865 is administered by Revenue Courts subordinate to the District Court? In this case it is the District Judge who should be empowered (*vide* Rule 4 of the rules under section 22 in G.O., No. 1210, Judicial, dated 1st August 1873), and this is a question for the High Court.

It seems however hardly worth while to disturb existing arrangements as such establishments are rarely needed and should be sparingly employed.

I would leave things as they are.

N.E.M.

G.S.F.  
H.W.  
10-5-99.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

12. Further, I think that, in the case of process-servers appointed for the purposes of Act II of 1864, Collectors might be allowed to prescribe a maximum scale of establishment for each taluk, and that Divisional Officers might be given the discretion of putting this scale wholly or partially in force as occasion may require. If, for instance, the Collector held that six batta peons might, under certain circumstances, be allowed for a taluk, the Divisional officer would decide when the conditions justified the entertainment of some or all of these.

(The Board accepts without remark.)

Submitted that the employment of such agency is generally to be discouraged and it would be well therefore to make Divisional Officers to go up to the District Collector every time they think a need for their employment has arisen.

N.E.M.

Divisional officers are often very inexperienced and I think the Collector's sanction better be always procured.

G.S.F.  
H.W.  
A.E.H.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

13. I have already proposed in paragraph 4 of my letter No. 29 of 26th October 1897 that, subject to the necessary sanction for entertaining process establishment, the selection of the individuals to be employed might be left with Tahsildars.

Orders have issued on this separately.

N.E.M.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

14. *Petty construction and repairs.*—Collectors have power to sanction estimates for the minor civil works coming within the scope of Standing Order No. 189 up to Rs. 1,000 in each case, provided such works have been entered and passed in their budgets; they can also transfer allotments from one sanctioned work to another (paragraphs 5 and 6 of Standing Order No. 189). I think that, as a natural corollary of this, a Collector should be empowered, so long as he does not exceed the original amount of his budget allotment, to transfer (within a limit of Rs. 1,000 for any one work) an allotment sanctioned for a work which, it is found, cannot be conveniently undertaken within the year to a work not originally provided for. At present (paragraph 5 of the Standing Order) he cannot apparently do this without the sanction of the Board. The course now proposed would facilitate the working out of budget allotments within the year without unnecessary reference. Where, however, the district budget allotment under this head is proposed to be exceeded, a reference to the Board will, of course, be necessary.

The Board's remarks—

Paragraph 14 of letter—*Petty construction and repairs to minor civil works.*—Mr. Meyer proposes to allow Collectors to transfer allotments from sanctioned to non-sanctioned works within the limits of his ordinary powers (Rs. 1,000 for each work), and provided that his total budget allotment is not exceeded. The Board is not prepared to accept this suggestion. The existing practice does not give rise to any friction, and in cases of emergency the Collector can always act in anticipation of sanction. It is, in the Board's opinion, undesirable that a Collector should have a free hand in the utilization of allotments on works not formally sanctioned by the controlling authorities; control must necessarily be weakened thereby, and the preparation of an annual list of works for sanction would become a useless formality. Even if it be considered that some modified powers of transfer of allotments to unsanctioned works should be delegated to Collectors, a report must necessarily be required in all but petty cases, and no saving of work would result from the change.

G.S.F.  
H.W.  
A.E.H.

Submitted that the proposal may therefore be negated.

N.E.M.

On the same subject, viz., petty construction and repairs to minor civil works Mr. Meyer makes the following suggestion:—

15. I fail to see why the monthly statement of expenditure to be sent in by Collectors to the Accountant-General under paragraph 12 of Standing Order No. 189 should be accompanied by a progress report, and would suggest that the latter statement be discontinued.

The Board accepts without remark.

In their circular orders \* Nos. XXVII, dated 29th September 1868, and XV, dated 21st May 1869, the Board per-

\* Please see the Board's volumes for September 1868 and May 1869 put up. scribed a monthly statement of expenditure and a monthly progress report to be sub-

mitted to it. The circumstances under which the progress report as well as the statement of expenditure came to be submitted to the Accountant-General are not clear. In the case of minor irrigation works (Standing Order No. 187) the statement of expenditure goes to the Accountant-General (paragraph 42), while the progress report goes to the Board (paragraph 46). There seems no objection to a similar procedure being adopted in the case of "petty construction and repairs."

N.E.M.

To Honourable Member—

I agree.

G.S.F.  
H.W.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

16. *Minor Irrigation Works.*—The present practice is that, after the budget for the ensuing year has been passed by Government, and the Board has allotted lump grants under this head to each district, Collectors send in to the Board for sanction, through the Chief

Engineer for Irrigation, a list of the individual works they propose to execute therefrom with a rough estimate of the cost of each (paragraphs 3 and 4 of Standing Order No. 187). When the proposals in this list have been approved the detailed estimates are passed by the Collector himself (paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of the Standing Order). The Collector may further, when the necessity arises, transfer funds originally allotted by him from one sanctioned work to another; but must not transfer any part of the allotment to a work not included in the list as sanctioned by the Board without informing that authority (paragraph 7 *ibid*).

17. But with reference to the reorganization of the minor irrigation establishments now under contemplation, it has been ruled—*vide* papers noted in the margin—that hereafter Collectors shall themselves sanction only such estimates as are not in excess of Rs. 250 and “do not include the construction of new masonry works other than simple tank sluices, nor any material deviation from the standard of efficiency laid down by the tank

Restoration Scheme” (Board’s Proceedings, No. 90, Settlement, dated 2nd February 1897); and that other estimates shall be sent up in detail to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for sanction. It appears that these latter estimates will be over one-third of the whole number (Board’s Proceedings, No. 255, Settlement, dated 10th August 1895, paragraph 7); and I venture to think that, given the greater professional assistance\* which the Collector will have

\* The establishment recently sanctioned by the Secretary of State (*vide* G.O., No. 743, dated 5th December 1898) shown on page 10 of G.O., No. 696, dated 7th December 1896.

at his disposal under the new scheme, he might well deal himself with all estimates up to Rs. 500 which satisfy the condition above quoted, as was indeed proposed by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation himself (paragraph 6 of his Board’s Proceedings, No. 255, Settlement, dated 10th August 1895). According to the statistics quoted in paragraph 7 of the same Proceedings, this would give about 11 per cent. of the total number of estimates to the Chief Engineer for check. The Board accepts the suggestion without remark.

In G.O., No. 476, dated 22nd July 1895.

March 1895. The Chief Engineer, Colonel Drake-Brockman, thought a limit of Rs.

In G.O., No. 696, dated 7th December 1896, page 6.

adhered to its former suggestion and the

G.S.F.  
H.W.

The limit of Rs. 250 was first suggested by the Board in Board’s Proceedings, No. 77-A, Settlement, dated 12nd March 1895. The Chief Engineer, Colonel Drake-Brockman, thought a limit of Rs. 500 could be safely sanctioned, but the Board in Board’s Proceedings, No. 255, Settlement, dated 10th August 1895, Government accepted its view in G.O., No. 4110, dated 18th October 1895. There seems no objection to accepting the Board’s altered view.

N.E.M.

Mr. Meyer goes on to suggest—

18. I presume that, whatever be the limit adopted for the Collector’s own sanction, the list now required in paragraphs 3 and 4 of Standing Order No. 187 will no longer be necessary, as the Chief Engineer will see the estimates of important works individually, and that all that will be necessary will be to apply to the Board for a lump allotment and to submit the information required in Form 1 of the Appendix to Standing Order No. 187 with each estimate sent to the Chief Engineer.

But the Board objects to this and states:—

Paragraph 16—*Minor irrigation works*.—The Board is not prepared to dispense with the lists of works which are now submitted to it under paragraphs 3 and 4 of Standing Order No. 187. The preparation of these lists conduces to a well considered distribution of the district allotment and furnishes the Board with information which it ought to possess. It would, however, appear to be unnecessary to submit the lists through the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, and if that officer consents to the change, they may hereafter be submitted to the Board direct,

G.S.F.  
H.W.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

Yes, if Honourable Member agrees to the Board’s view.

G.S.F.  
H.W.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

Submitted that the Board’s view may be accepted. The Public Works Department (Irrigation Branch) may be consulted about the discontinuance of the submission of the returns to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

N.E.M.

Mr. Meyer makes, with regard to minor irrigation works a suggestion similar to that in paragraph 14 of his letter as regards petty construction and repairs. He states:—

19. Further, I would allow the Collector, within the limit of his sanctioned allotment, to put in hand on his own authority works not included therein\* in lieu of others which it is found inconvenient to undertake, subject to the condition that the estimates for such works are within his powers of sanction. This will materially facilitate the expenditure of grants within the year, by reducing the delay caused by references to higher authority.

The reasons which the Board give against adopting the similar proposal in the case of petty construction and repairs would seem to apply in this case also; but the Board says nothing on the point. The proposal may, it is submitted, be negated.

H.W.

N.E.M.

To Honourable Member—

Yes: we need say nothing about it.

G.S.F.  
H.W.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

The next suggestion of Mr. Meyer’s as regards this subject (Minor Irrigation Works under Revenue officers) is as follows:—

Again I would allow the Collector to sanction (within his lump allotment) excesses up to 10 per cent. on estimates sanctioned by the Chief Engineer, and to deal similarly with estimates passed by himself which, by excess expenditure, have passed his limit. If, for instance, the Collector’s limit of sanction is Rs. 500 and he passes an estimate for Rs. 480, I would allow him to pass an excess in actuals up to Rs. 48 though this would technically bring the work within the Chief Engineer’s control.

The Board apparently accepts the suggestion.

Submitted that the Public Works Department may be asked to advise whether there is any objection.

Of course the knowledge that any excess will have to go up for sanction with reasons stated acts as a check on careless estimating. It would be useful to know whether such excesses are of ordinary occurrence and generally unavoidable owing to the nature of the work or whether they are rare and betoken carelessness. In the former case, the delegation to Collectors would appear to be open to no objection; in the latter, it might be well to retain the present practice.

N.E.M.

To Honourable Member—

I would accept the proposal.

H.W.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

I do not think objection need be taken to allowing the 10 per cent. excess over estimate: but the Board should take to task the Collector where the excess is plainly due to careless estimating?

G.S.F.

Mr. Meyer’s last suggestion on the subject of Minor Irrigation Works is as follows:—

20. Under Standing Order No. 187, paragraph 39, a monthly progress report showing the expenditure in and up to the month on each sanctioned minor irrigation work has to be forwarded by every Tahsildar in duplicate to the Collector and the Divisional-officer. Monthly district statements used likewise, under paragraph 46 of Standing Order No. 187, to be sent in by Collectors to the Board; but in paragraph 3 of G.O., No. 516,\* Revenue, dated 8th October 1896, it was ruled that these might be quarterly for the first nine months of the year.

\* In Board’s Proceedings, No. 417, Settlement, dated 10th December 1896, paragraph 4 (a).

I cannot find, however, that the necessary alteration has yet been made in the Standing Order. I would suggest that the Standing Order be further modified so as to permit of Collectors who think it desirable allowing the same procedure in respect to the reports of Tahsildars. Nor does it seem necessary, except during the last three months of the year when matters become more urgent, that there should be separate returns from the Taluk office to the Divisional-officer and the Collector. They need I think only be sent to the Divisional-officer, who would compile a consolidated statement for his division which he would submit with his remarks to the Collector.

The Board makes no remark as to the necessary amendment of the Standing Order and apparently accepts the other suggestions. As regards the proposal to make the returns from the Tahsildars quarterly except for last three months of the year, it is submitted that the monthly returns have their use in two ways: first they bring the matter to the Tahsildar's mind repeatedly, and second they give the Divisional-officers more frequent opportunity for applying the necessary stimulus. It is submitted that it is well known how great a tendency there is to defer the utilization of these grants till the end of year. In the last three months desperate efforts are made; the work runs great danger of being scamped, and perhaps is generally scamped, in order to get the amount spent and the completion certificate sent in by 31st March. Monthly returns from the beginning of the year draw attention to the matter continuously at short intervals.

I agree. I found it was only by keeping a constant eye on the monthly returns that I got the grants fully expended or expended as far as it was possible to do so.

G.S.F.

The suggestion to dispense with separate returns to the Collector except for the last three months does not, however, seem open to any objection.

Very well. It is most important that the Collector himself should keep his eye on the progress of these works. I would have the monthly returns to him during the last four months of the year.

G.S.F.

There is generally water in the tanks in December and but little work can be done in that month.

H.W.

I agree to above.

H.W.

A.E.H.

27-6-99.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

21. Under Article 1136 of the Civil Service Regulations sanction for journeys performed outside the district in which an officer is employed rests with the Board. A general permission to Collectors to send officers out of the district for certain purposes would, I think, be advisable. Recently, for instance, the sanction of the Board had, I find, to be obtained in the case of a duffadar who was sent from the Tiruvallur taluk to the Board's office with an urgent paper which had been specially called for (Board's Proceedings, No. 3044, Routine, dated 14th October 1897).

I may mention as another instance in point that, when at Nellore, I had once occasion to send an urgent call to my Local Fund Engineer, who was then in the extreme north-west of the district, to return to head-quarters. He very properly went the quickest way, which was to march out of the district for a little distance on to the Southern Mahratta Railway, and train *via* Guatukul and Rinigunta to Nellore. But my Treasury Deputy Collector informed me that his pay and travelling allowance for the journey could not be passed without the sanction not only of the District Board but of Government!

The Board accepts without remark. The question is one for the Financial Department. The Accountant-General might be asked whether there is any account objection to such a delegation. If there is not, Collectors should presumably be asked to report "the certain purposes" for which such permission should be given in each particular district.

N.E.M.

P.E.

To Honourable Member—

This recent order must be taken as the standing instruction.

G.S.F.

Very well.

H. W.

A.E.H.

27-6-99.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

22. Under paragraph 2 of Standing Order No. 279 (Old Edition), all cases of personal property of intestates falling under section 16, clause 7, of Regulation III of 1802 must be reported by the District Magistrate to the Subordinate (or District) Judge, however trifling their value. But in G.O.,\* No. 365, Judicial, dated 15th March 1872, Government authorised District Magistrates to sell the moveable property of deceased persons and credit the sale-proceeds to Government in cases where they are unclaimed for three months and amount in value to Rs. 5) or under. I request that the Standing Order may be amended accordingly. I was lately informed in Tanjore that, owing to ignorance of the Government Order last quoted, a case of property valued at one anna had been referred to the Sub-Court, and that most of the other similar references related to property worth less than Rs. 10.

\* Please see also G.O., No. 850, Judicial, dated 14th April 1876.

The Board's remarks—

Paragraph 22—Reports in regard to moveable property of persons dying intestate—The Standing Order will at once be brought into conformity with the orders of Government.

No further action is needed.

N.E.M.

G.S.F.

H.W.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

23. I have already noted under section I (paragraphs 2 and 6) the extended powers I would give Collectors in regard to transfers of land between villages and the purchase of articles of European manufacture.

G.S.F.

These matters have been duly noted on above pages 2, 3 and 10.

N.E.M.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

24. Court of Wards' matters.—Under Standing Order No. 219 as modified by Court's Proceedings, No. 8 of 23rd April 1897, Collectors have to obtain the sanction of the Board, in its capacity as Court of Wards, for every original work in an estate, the cost of which is estimated to exceed Rs. 300 and for repair works in excess of Rs. 500. I think that where the expenditure is within a budget allotment already passed by the Court, these figures might be raised to Rs. 500 and Rs. 1,000, respectively. The estate budgets contain detailed lists of the works it is proposed to undertake during the year.

G.S.F.

H.W.

A.E.H.

27-6-99.

The Board has apparently accepted this suggestion in its capacity as the Court of Wards. Submitted that the Government need not object.

Under Board's Standing Order No. 189, paragraph 5—

"Divisional officers may sanction estimates for such new works as well as for such repairs as are entered in the list of petty construction and repairs for the year up to a limit of Rs. 100 in each case. The Collector's sanction is sufficient up to Rs. 1,000 in each case." \*\*

N.E.M.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

25. I would further give Collectors a power of sanctioning the free grant of timber in wards' estates to village communities and private individuals when necessary similar to that which they enjoy in regard to Government forest produce under section 104 of the Forest Code as it now stands. At present applications for any such grant have to go up to the Court of Wards for orders.

The Board has apparently accepted this proposal also. Under paragraph 24 of Court of Wards' Proceedings, No. 8, Press, dated 22nd April 1897, recorded in G.O., No. 2822, dated 4th June 1897—

"Collectors can grant free of charge estate timber up to the value of Rs. 200 in each case. Such grants may be made to village communities to sections of the community in their collective capacity and in cases of necessity to private individuals. In all other cases applications for free grants must be submitted for the Court's orders."

Under section 104 of the Forest Code—

"Subject to the control of the Board of Revenue the Collector may authorise the grant of permits for the collection of timber and other produce free of charge in cases of special poverty or calamity or in other exceptional cases."

The Court of Wards' rule is therefore much the same except that a limit of Rs. 200 is imposed. This seems sufficiently liberal. Mr. Meyer's remark that applications for such grant have to go up to the Court for sanction is not therefore correct in all cases.

G.S.F.  
H.W.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

N.E.M.

### III.—ADDITIONAL POWERS TO BE GRANTED TO DIVISIONAL-OFFICERS.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

26. Power to sanction transfers of land from dry to wet and vice versa.—This power now vests in Collectors, and the Board on a previous occasion was not prepared to give it to Divisional officers—*vide* last item in Appendix B to Board's Proceedings, No. 89, Settlement, dated 7th May 1896.\* I submit, however, that the Divisional-officer might well be allowed to recognise actual facts by definitely transferring from one head to the other lands which have been actually cultivated under the other head (e.g., dry land on which wet crops have been raised), for, say, three consecutive years. There should be the further condition that in the case of lands under Major Irrigation works, the Public Works authorities have no objection. The Collector will, of course, in this as in other cases, retain the power of cancelling or modifying a Divisional-officer's order when he thinks it desirable.

\* In G.O., No. 516, dated 8th October 1896.

The Board's remarks—

Paragraph 26—Transfers from dry to wet and vice versa.—On the conditions specified by Mr. Meyer, the Board would accept his proposal to delegate to Divisional-officers the power of making such transfers, but the said conditions should be carefully borne in mind.

The strong tendency is to extend wet ayakats beyond the power of the tank.

H.W.

No reason was assigned by the Board for rejecting the proposal in 1896. Submitted that the present proposal may be accepted.

N.E.M.

To Honourable Member—

I concur.

H.W.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

I am doubtful about this. It is an alteration of the settlement; and considering the inexperience of many Divisional-officers, I would make the Collector's sanction necessary. Delegation may go too far.

G. S. FORBES.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

27. Transfer of land from assessed to unassessed.—Divisional-officers can transfer land from unassessed to assessed under paragraph 18 of Standing Order No. 30. The converse power, in cases where the land is unfit for cultivation or is required for village-site or other communal purposes, now rests with Collectors who have, however, to submit a statement annually to the Board of the transfers made for village-site, &c. (See Board's Proceedings, No. 378, Land Revenue, of 29th June 1893). It would seem feasible to give the same powers to Divisional-officers, who might submit to the Collectors half-yearly returns showing the cases in which they have exercised it.

The Board's remarks—

Paragraph 27—Transfer of land from assessed to unassessed.—The Board considers that it would be safer to retain this power in the hands of the Collector, who should as at present submit to the Board an annual list of such transfers.

Submitted that the Board's view may be accepted and the proposal negatived.

To Honourable Member—

Certainly.

N.E.M.

G.S.F.  
H.W.  
A.E.H.

27-6-99.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

28. Power to order the sale of valuable unassessed lands to be transferred to assessed and granted on patta.—Under the note to paragraph 18 of Standing Order No. 30, this power is now vested in Collectors. The right to sell (under paragraph 13 of Standing Order No. 30) assessed lands which are the subject of rival darkhast claims the merits of which cannot be easily decided has been granted to Divisional-officers (*vide* item 23 in Appendix A to Board's Proceedings, No. 45, dated 16th December 1895, and G.O., No. 142, Revenue, dated 24th March 1896). There seems therefore no good reason why the similar power now in question should not be exercised by them. If the course is open to objection an appeal will certainly be lodged before the Collector.

The Board accepts the proposal without remarks.

Under Board's Standing Order No. 18 applications for unassessed lands on cultivation should be stamped 8 annas and should be presented either to the Tahsildar or the Divisional-officer. Enquiry should be made whether the land falls under channel or communal poramboke or whether its grant is otherwise objectionable on any of the grounds set out in the Standing Order. If the grant appears unobjectionable, the Divisional-officer can pass orders directing its transfer to the head of "ayan" or "assessed" land and its grant on patta or disposal under the darkhast rules.

The note to the Standing Order states that—

"In the case of specially valuable unassessed lands the grant of which on patta is unobjectionable, the Collector may, after recording his reasons for the same, order the right of occupying the land to be sold to the highest bidder."

Now, it is submitted that it will rarely be the case that the grant of specially valuable unassessed land on patta is unobjectionable. Such land is usually required for communal purposes of some kind. It would seem unsafe to entrust Divisional-officers, the majority of whom are Deputy Collectors,\* with the power to order such lands to be sold and assigned on patta.

The case of assessed land disputed on darkhast seems quite different. Here the land is assessed; it is meant to be assigned; the only difficulty is to decide to which of the contending claimants it is to be assigned; and if the rules do not provide a solution, selling the land is the easiest method of solving the difficulty.

If any private interest is infringed, no doubt an appeal will be made to the Collector. But no private person is likely to stir in the matter if it is only the interests of the State or the community that are sacrificed.

N.E.M.

To Honourable Member—

H.W.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

The power to dispose of unassessed or poramboke lands should be jealously guarded, and I would retain it vested in the Collector of the district.

G.S.F.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

29. Again the sale of disputed darkhast lands by Divisional-officers need not be subject to formal confirmation by the Collector as at present. There will always be the right of appeal to him.

The Board accepts the proposal without remark.

Submitted that the cases where the rules do not provide a decision of rival darkhast claims are not numerous. The rules are, however, somewhat complex and perhaps it may be urged that Divisional-officers are apt to adopt the easy plan of putting up the land for sale. This is the course too which is often urged on the Divisional-officers when one of the contending parties is more wealthy or influential than the others.

It would be perhaps safer to maintain the present practice.

N.E.M.

To Honourable Member—

H.W.

A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

I would accept the Board's proposal in this case.

G.S.F.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

30. *Village Officers' Special Test Examinations.*—Divisional-officers might be given power to receive applications for admission to the Special Test Examinations, to decide in cases of doubt as to the degree of relationship to the existing village officers of applicants claiming to pay a lower fee on this account, to permit applicants to appear for the examination elsewhere than in the division to which they belong, and to sign certificates for issue to the successful candidates. At present these powers vest in the Collector under Rules III, VI, XI and XII of the rules issued in the notification appended to G.O., No. 589, Revenue, dated 29th June 1891. Their delegation to Divisional-officers will relieve the Collector of an appreciable amount of petty work.

The Board accepts without remark.

Submitted that the Government may approve of the suggestion. There seems

G.S.F.

H.W.

A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

nothing to be gained by keeping these powers in the Collector's hands and their exercise must take up a certain amount of time which could be better occupied. The word "Collector" in the rules appears, however, to have been intended to include "Divisional-officer;" for in rule III the words "Collector of the district" are expressly used. Even here the decision of the Divisional-officer on the matter referred to, viz., the degree of relationship entitling the candidate to pay a reduced fee, would however seem to be sufficient.

Although Collector in a legislative enactment includes the Divisional-officer, I do not think it is so used in the Board's Standing Orders, or in executive proceedings.

G.S.F.

relationship entitling the candidate to pay a reduced fee, would however seem to be sufficient.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

N.E.M.

31. *Power to sanction refunds of sale-proceeds of impounded cattle.*—In G.O., No. 691, Revenue Department, dated 12th August 1889, the power to sanction such refunds where the amount had been held in deposit as unclaimed, on a satisfactory claim being put in, was conferred on District Magistrates, provided the application was made within three months from date of deposit. This power might now be extended to Sub-Divisional Magistrates who may be held, I think, to act as agents for the District Magistrate under section 17 of the Cattle Trespass Act.

The Board accepts the proposal without remark.

Section 17 of the Cattle Trespass Act (clause 3) is as follows:—

The surplus unclaimed proceeds of the sale of cattle shall be sent to the Magistrate of the District, who shall hold them in deposit for three months, and, if no claim thereto be preferred and established within that period, shall, at its expiry, dispose of them as hereinafter provided.

Cases, however, happen where although the claimant prefers his claim within three months of the date of deposit the inquiry is not completed before the end of the three months; but at the end of three months the unclaimed balance is credited to the Pound Fund.

G.O., No. 691, dated 12th August 1889, empowered the District Magistrate to refund the money in such cases where the claim was ultimately admitted.

In his opinion in G.O., No. 172, Revenue, dated 22nd March 1893, the Advocate-General held that the section required the claim to be preferred and established, i.e., the necessary evidence adduced before the end of the three months and that, if this were done, it would not matter if the District Magistrate's order admitting the claim was passed after the end of the three months; the money could still be refunded as the order merely declared that the claims had been advanced and established before the end of the three months. The Advocate-General seemed, however, to hold that if the claim was not advanced or if all the necessary evidence was not adduced before the end of the three months, the District Magistrate could not, by an order passed subsequent to the end of the three months, refund the money.

In other words, the Act allows refund only where the District Magistrate finds that the claim was advanced and established before the end of three months from the date of deposit.

If this view is correct it would be useless to empower Sub-Divisional Magistrates to direct such refunds as the District Magistrate could more conveniently do so at the same time that he admits the claim.

If the claim be established to the satisfaction of the District Magistrate, I think that is clearly sufficient, no matter by whom it is enquired into.

H.W.

A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

The section quoted above does not, however, I submit, say that the claim should be "preferred and established" before the Magistrate of the district, but it seems clearly implied that the District Magistrate alone can admit such claims.

N.E.M.

To Honourable Member—

It will be no one's interest to raise any difficulty. I would accept the proposal.

H.W.

A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

I would not alter the existing procedure. There is the danger of running counter to the provisions of the law.

G.S.F.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

32. In this connection I may note that under High Court's Circular No 383, dated 21st August 1896 (copy enclosed), the refund of judicial fines cancelled on appeal may be directed by the original Court which imposed and levied the fine, and refunds are now made in taluk by the strength of such orders accompanied by the necessary voucher. Paragraph 6 of Standing Order No. 237, which mentions the Collectors as the authority competent to sanction such refunds, seems therefore to be obsolete and might be modified as follows:—  
"Treasury officers may refund judicial fines under the procedure laid down in that behalf by the High Court from time to time."

G.S.F.

H.W.

A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

The Board makes no remark. There seems, I submit, to be no objection to the proposed amendment.

N.E.M.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

33. *Expenditure on Trigonometrical Survey stations.*—The very small power of incurring expenditure on Trigonometrical Survey stations (up to an average of Rs 4 annually for each) which Collectors are authorised to incur under Standing Order No. 282 (Old Edition) might well be made over to the Divisional-officers.

G.S.F.

H.W.

A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

The Board accepts the proposal without remark.

The only objection that suggests itself is that Collectors should perhaps know when these important stations are out of repair.

N.E.M.

An annual report goes to the Director of Surveys (or whatever his title is)

H.W.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

34. I have already noted in section II (paragraph 12) the extended power which I would confer on Divisional-officers in the matter of *entertaining process-servers* under Act II of 1864.

This has been dealt with above, page 10.

N.E.M.

#### IV.—MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

35. *Sales of assessed waste lands on the Nilgiris, &c.*—Mr. Tremenhoe has pointed out to me that, under the rules contained in the appendix to Standing Order No. 33, assessed waste lands sold on the Nilgiri and Shevaroy Hills and in Wynnad have to be the subject of a tedious and intricate title-deed which has to go up to Government and to be signed by the Revenue Secretary, who has likewise to initial every petty error (copyists' or otherwise) which may be discovered in the deed. It seems to me that, though these title-deeds, which are accompanied by plans and schedules of boundaries, may have been necessary formerly, when they related to tracts which had not been properly surveyed, they have now lost their *raison d'être*, especially since it has been decided that the annual assessment subject to which the land is sold shall not as hitherto be capable of redemption—vide G.O., No. 459, Revenue Department, dated 11th September 1896, paragraph 11. There seems no reason therefore why an ordinary patta should not suffice, as in the case of lands in other districts sold under the provisions of paragraph 13 and the note to paragraph 18 of Standing Order No. 30. Mr. Tremenhoe promised me a further memorandum on the subject, but has not yet been able to send it; so all that I would suggest at present is that the matter be referred to the Collectors of Nilgiris, Salem and Malabar for report.

The Board's remarks—

*Section IV—Miscellaneous matters—Paragraph 35—Sales of assessed lands on the Nilgiris, &c.*—All lands sold subject to assessment should, as suggested, be given on an ordinary patta unless there happen to be any special conditions attached to the sale. The purchaser at a sale merely buys the preferential right to a patta. Reports will be called for as proposed by Mr. Meyer.

|          |                                                                                                                       |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| G.S.F.   | The revision of the rules for the sale of waste lands is now under separate disposal. No action seems necessary here. |
| H.W.     |                                                                                                                       |
| A.E.H.   |                                                                                                                       |
| 27-6-99. |                                                                                                                       |

N.E.M.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

36. Board's Standing Order No. 204 regarding provision of carts, &c., for troops on the march—is obsolete in the following respects:—

(a) *Paragraph 2 (1) of the Standing Order.*—The register of cart-owners herein prescribed is of no practical use, and so far as I know, is not maintained in most districts, while if maintained it is not checked. As a matter of fact Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars, who are directed by Standing Order No. 205, paragraph 3 (7), to accompany bodies of troops on the march through their charges, are also required to procure the required number of carts from the nearest villages where carts are usually available. They use their local knowledge and influence and procure them through the village headmen. The register prescribed may therefore safely be dispensed with.

(b) *Clauses 3 and 4 of paragraph 2.*—These provisions are out of date, as the Tahsildar of the taluk through which the troops pass makes the necessary arrangements locally; nor is there any necessity for the maintenance of the register prescribed by clause 5. Namely that the Collector should get the carts ready at his outcherry and send word to the Commanding Officer to receive them.

(c) *Clause 6.*—The rates of hire herein ordered to be fixed and published in the District Gazette twice a year are practically useless. These rates depend upon the seasons of the year (e.g., carts are always dearer than usual at ploughing and harvest times, or in rainy weather), and on a number of varying local circumstances; and the prices are as a matter of fact estimated, when occasion demands, by the Tahsildar of the taluk through which the troops pass, and finally settled after a personal interview with the officer commanding the regiment or detachment. The notifications now prescribed, which involve half-yearly returns from all Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars in independent charge, might therefore be done away with.

(d) *Paragraph 3.*—The register of carts herein prescribed is furnished by the Taluk officer attending on the regiment.

I recommend therefore that the Standing Order be revised with reference to these considerations.

The Board's remarks—

Paragraph 36.—Board's Standing Order No. 204 will be amended accordingly.

No order of the Government seems necessary.

N.E.M.

This can be done after return of the file.

G.S.F.

H.W.

A.E.H.

29-6-99.

But see whether the order as to the register of carts does not follow upon orders of the Government of India.

G.S.F.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

37. *Inspection of Taluk Treasuries and offices by Divisional-officers.*—(1) Standing Order No. 226 (New Edition) is headed "Examination of subordinate treasuries," but the questions entered in the appendix to paragraph 1 of this order relate largely to the taluk records also. I would therefore alter the heading of the Standing Order to the wording at the head of my present paragraph, so as to make it clear that the mere treasury inspection is not all that a Divisional-officer need pay particular attention to, as some of them are now apt to imagine.

(2) Further the record questions in the appendix might be revised with reference to the present "disposal number" system, and the answering of the questions should be made compulsory, as the return will then give useful information in regard to records which will save the necessity for separate reports on this subject which are now submitted in most districts. As paragraph 1 of the Standing Order now stands, the questions are now supposed to be merely for the guidance of the examining officer.

(3) The report should further be submitted to the Collector at once, whereas at present Divisional-officers sometimes wait till they have to submit the information required for the preparation of the annual report to the Board prescribed in paragraph 2 of the Standing Order. Collectors could then note, without delay, matters on which their orders may be required.

G.S.F.

H.W.

A.E.H.

27-6-99.

The Board makes no remark.

Submitted that these proposals may be approved. They all seem clearly necessary.

N.E.M.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

38. *Conduct of crop experiments by Divisional-officers and Tahsildars.*—I think that nearly every district officer would bear me out in saying that the conduct of these annual experiments by Divisional-officers and Tahsildars under the orders issued in Board's Proceedings, No. 323, Settlement, dated 7th August 1893, is in the generality of cases a farce. As the Board said when previously discussing the matter (paragraph 6 of Board's Proceedings, No. 473, Settlement, dated 29th June 1892), "the ordinary district staff, even if it were competent for such enquiries, is already so overburdened in the discharge of its ordinary duties that it could not devote sufficient time to carry out the experiments on a sufficiently large scale to be useful or valuable"; and, as a matter of fact, the smallest possible fields are habitually selected, and the process of cutting, sifting and weighing the crop, &c., is carried out in the most perfunctory manner. Sir Edward Bick's letter of 27th June 1893, printed in Board's Proceedings, No. 323, Settlement, dated 7th August 1893, gave the Local Governments full discretion as to the class of officers to be selected to conduct the experiments; and I submit that to have any value they should be made by men who have passed through the Agricultural College or are otherwise specially qualified to deal with the matter. A limited number of experiments so conducted would be of far greater utility than the present returns and could be subjected to more careful examination in the Board's office.

(The Board accepts without remark).

The Board's quinquennial report on these experiments will be found in G.O., No. 5781, dated 11th November 1897. Whatever may be the value of these experiments as a guide to the average yield per acre of the principal crops in this Presidency, it is submitted that they are of use to the Divisional-officer himself (where he is not a native) as they give him some

The native is generally as blissfully ignorant as the European.

definite knowledge of the various soils, methods of cultivation, manuring and the outturns, which is, perhaps, more useful to

him than the figures of the Settlement Department. Mr. Meyer seems to think that the work is generally scamped, with what reason is not clear. It ought to be most interesting to young officers who usually haven't an idea of the ryots' methods of cultivation and don't know *ragi* from *cholum*.

H.W.

N.E.M.

To Honourable Member—

My recollection is that these crop experiments are conducted under orders from the Government of India. I have seen elaborate reports from other Presidencies. I have now read file XXIV. I would merely say—  
Government is not at present prepared to modify the existing orders on this subject.

H.W.

10-5-99.

A.E.H.

27-6-99.

The practice is most useful, at any rate as an educative experience; but as data for future settlements I fear it is useless, at any rate as at present conducted. The experiments should not, however, be given up, but conducted as the Board suggests, and where they are conducted, Assistant Collectors and Deputy Collectors (who have not passed through the taluk ranks) should be required to attend.

G.S.F.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

39. *Remittances from Sub-Registrars at stations where there is a Sub-treasury.*—Under rule 29 of the rules printed at page 14 of G.O., No. 1631, Judicial, dated 12th October 1896 (copy enclosed), sub-registrars at stations where there is a treasury are required to remit their collections to the treasury every day on which it is open for cash transactions. I think that it would be sufficient if the collections were ordinarily remitted once a week, sub-registrars being permitted to send their cash-chests to the taluk treasury for safe custody at night in case the collections accumulate before the date of remittance. This course would save a considerable amount of treasury work.

Paragraph 39—*Remittances from Sub-Registrars at stations where there is a Sub-treasury.*—This is a question for the Inspector-General of Registration to decide. The Board raises no objection to the proposal.

H.W.

The Judicial Department may be asked to consider this matter.

N.E.M.

G.S.F.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

40. *An annual statement showing the number of Revenue Inspectors trained in survey* has now to be submitted by every Collector to the Board under Board's Proceedings, No. 7003, Settlement, dated 24th August 1892, and when discussing proposals for the curtailment of work in the Settlement Department in Board's Proceedings, No. 89, Settlement, dated 7th

\* In Board's Proceedings, No. 417, Settlement, dated 10th December 1896, May 1896, and G.O., No. 516,\* Revenue, dated 8th October 1896, the Board and Government held (paragraph 21 of the Board's Proceedings and paragraph 15 of the Government Order) that this return could not be discontinued, as it is required for the Land Records and Agriculture Administration report.

I venture to ask for a reconsideration of this order, as I see from the figures quoted in paragraph 10 of the Administration report for 1895-96, reviewed in G.O., No. 701, Revenue, dated 8th December 1896, that the survey training of Revenue Inspectors is now practically complete. Out of 626 Revenue Inspectors, 592 had undergone survey training, and with the exception of two men who had been specially exempted and two who were survivors of the old Inspectors on smaller pay, the rest (28 in number as two places were vacant) were all only acting men. This being so, I cannot find that the Government of India requires the habitual insertion of statistics on the subject.

If, however, the return is still to be kept up, it should obviously be compiled in the office of the authority by whom Revenue Inspectors are appointed,—i.e., at present the Collector—as he must know the qualifications of the men he puts in. At present, in some districts, the return is compiled in the Taluk offices.

The Board's remarks—

40. *Annual statement of Revenue Inspectors trained in survey.*—This return may be discontinued.

The form of the administration report of the Department of Land Records and Agriculture is now regulated by the instructions contained in the eighth of the eight resolutions issued by the Government of India last year. The instructions on the matter in question are as follows:—

“The annual report of the department should contain a brief notice of the progress made in efficiency and in knowledge of survey (attained by) the Land Record Establishments; of any new measures which have been taken during the year to improve the standard of the Land Record officers; of the extent to which promotion has been granted to the higher revenue service; and of any other circumstances of a general character which may indicate that the gradual improvement of the land record staff is held in view.”

As the instruction of the existing Revenue Inspectors is practically complete and as all future Revenue Inspectors must pass a survey test, it is submitted that the annual return referred to by Mr. Meyer may be discontinued.

G.S.F.

H.W.

A.E.H.

27-6-99.

N.E.M.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

41. The following suggestions are made in view of diminishing copying and registering work in Revenue offices and saving the time now occupied in perusal of practically useless papers:—

(1) Good copying machines should be supplied to Collectors and Taluk offices. (They are specially necessary in the latter where large numbers of circulars have to be sent out to village officers.) Those now supplied are very inferior and get out of order easily. I have often seen district circulars turned out by them which were all but illegible.

The Board's remarks—

41. *Regarding copying and distribution of papers.*—(1) Mr. Meyer's remarks will be brought to the notice of the Superintendent of Stationery. It is essential that, if copying machines are supplied at all, they should be of good quality and capable of being easily and efficiently worked.

The Government may, it is submitted, agree. From paragraph 5 (and of page 3 and top of page 4) of G.O., No. 892, Financial, dated 18th October 1898, it would appear that several efforts have been made by the Superintendent of Stationery to get a good machine for manifolding.

G.S.F.

H.W.

A.E.H.

27-6-99.

N.E.M.

Mr. Meyer's letter—

41. (2) The Board now sends round to Collectors and other Revenue officers a variety of papers, especially on forest matters, which are of no practical use to them and which involve registration in the office. I will cite as an instance Board's Proceedings, No. 325, Forest, dated 30th July 1897, which relates to a pattern of turban (not described in the Board's Proceedings) prescribed for Rangers and Deputy Rangers. So, again, Board's Proceedings, No. 343, Forest, dated 11th August 1897, calls for a report (regarding grading of Managers in Forest offices, etc.) on a matter the Collector must personally deal with, but nevertheless the Collector of Salem tells me that he received fourteen spare copies of the Proceedings which appear to have been meant for Tahsildars.

(3) When the Board prints important general Proceedings, the orders on proposals in which require the approval of Government, the present practice is to communicate to Collectors, etc., copies of (1) the original Proceedings, and (2) the final Proceedings containing the orders of Government and the Board's remarks with reference thereto.

As (1) is habitually reprinted with (2), its preliminary communication seems quite superfluous, while the recollection of it is apt to bewilder officers who may forget that the final word has not yet been spoken. The paper can only be recorded pending the receipt of the orders of Government. My remark of course does not apply to Proceedings which contain any instructions which the Board can issue of its own authority and desires to be immediately acted on.

*The Board's remarks thereon—*

41. (2) & (3) The question of the distribution of Board's Proceedings has lately been engaging the Board's attention (*vide* Board's Proceedings, No. 2, dated 5th January 1897); but, as Mr. Meyer points out, the selection of papers for general circulation requires to be carefully supervised. No hard-and-fast rule can be laid down, but the Board will endeavour to reduce the issue of its proceedings to Collectors and their subordinates as far as possible. It may, however, be noted that when proposals which require the sanction of Government are printed and circulated to districts, as in the case of forest notifications under sections 4 and 16, the final orders of Government are usually communicated without reprinting the Board's Proceedings on which they have been passed. The Board's Proceedings is indeed reprinted in the Government Order, but in circulating the orders to the districts, the previous papers are printed in abstract. The procedure would in many cases be simplified by adopting Mr. Meyer's suggestion, and the Board will take steps to do so wherever possible.

No particular orders of the Government seem required on the above matter, but in this connection I venture to submit a suggestion. It would be very convenient and save a good deal of time if the Board would submit such of its "Press" Proceedings as require the orders of the Government before they can be communicated to Collectors, etc., in proof in half margin. References could then be entered in the Government office in the margin and any brief notes that might seem required. Longer notes would follow in continuation of the Board's Proceedings. After issue of the Government Order, the Board's Proceedings and the Government Order would be printed in the usual manner. The Board now sends up its Proceedings in a very complete form and a further précis in the Government office is usually unnecessary. All being wanted is that the references should be fully put up and any other former orders throwing light on the matter indicated. But the form of the communication is so inconvenient that any criticisms or suggestions to be clear have to be accompanied by a repetition of what is already said in the current. If the current were kept in half margin proof till the orders issued, this inconvenience and resulting loss of time would be avoided. Of course no attempt should be made in the Government office to alter or correct the Board's Proceedings in any particular though it be in proof.

*Under Secretary—*

It would be enough if they sent us 2 or 3 copies in galley proof which might be cut up, i.e., only important Proceedings. Half margin copies would not be any more convenient and would necessitate recomposing the type. But this is a matter which we can settle demi-officially with the Board.

G.S.F.  
H.W.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

If the suggestion be thought worth trying, the Board might be asked its opinion about it demi-officially.

*Mr. Meyer's letter—*

41. (4) I think that all routine Government orders, which would simply have to be communicated to Collectors, etc., might well go direct to them from the Government office, a copy being at the same time sent to the Board for information. To send the orders to the Board only and let it communicate, as is now generally done, causes waste of time; and where, as so often happens, the Government order is type-written, the labour of making out an extra copy in the Government office is inappreciable.

*The Board's remarks thereon—*

41. (4) The Board recommends Mr. Meyer's proposal for favourable consideration. The effect of the present decentralization will indeed tend to reduce, very considerably, the number of cases in which the formal sanction of Government will be required; but even so there must remain numerous classes of orders which may be counted as matters of routine. In such cases it would save time and labour if the final order was intimated direct from the Government office to the Collector concerned.

N.E.M.

This practice is followed in the Government office wherever possible. But it is not very often possible. In many cases it may be necessary to give the Board an opportunity of making further remarks to Government or of issuing further instructions on the matter dealt with before the Government order reaches the Collector or Collectors.

Yes: to adopt it as a general practice would be most unsafe. The Board not unfrequently has to ask for further instructions or explanations before communicating the Government orders to Collectors etc.

G.S.F.  
H.W.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

N.E.M.

*Mr. Meyer's letter—*

42. I venture to submit that the compilation of the revised edition of the *Board's Standing Orders* should be carried out as soon as possible. Three Chapters—one dealing with office Routine, petitions and grant of copies, one with wild animals, escheats and other sundry matters, and one with matters relating to public servants, which therefore contains some of the most important of all the Standing Orders—are now available for general and ready reference only in the old edition; and that is now so overlaid with correction slips that it is positive torture to have to look up anything therein.

Further, I beg to propose (on the suggestion of Mr. Tremeneere) that, as the revised edition when complete will form as ungainly and bulky a volume as the old book does, the Standing Orders should be divided hereafter into two parts—the one dealing with matters relating to Land Revenue and Settlement, the other containing the Separate Revenue chapters (Abkari, Stamps and Customs) which deal with matters in regard to which Land Revenue officers are less familiar and have therefore to make more constant reference to the Standing Orders.

*The Board's remarks—*

42. *Board's Standing Orders.*—The necessity for the speedy completion of the work of revising its Standing Orders has been frequently urged by Government, and the Board has endeavoured to carry out this duty as quickly as was compatible with efficient scrutiny. It has already been pointed out \* that work of this nature is unavoidably delayed when it has to pass through the hands of one or more officers who can only devote their attention to it fitfully and sometimes at long intervals. The revision has now been practically completed and the remaining chapters are for the most part in type; but it is probable that still further corrections will be required in view of the numerous proposals made by Mr. Meyer for decentralization and improvement of business methods, and for this reason the final issue of the revised orders is delayed.

The Board has been separately told to proceed with the revision of the Standing Orders according to the orders already issued on Mr. Meyer's proposals. Draft amendments have in several cases been submitted by the Board already and are under disposal. This being, as far as known, the last batch of proposals awaiting orders, the final revision of the Standing Orders ought to be complete in six months' time. As regards the suggested arrangement of the Standing Orders, the Government (G.O., No. 217, dated 22nd April 1898) has already approved of the exclusion of the chapters relating to Stamps, Customs and Abkari, as these will be dealt with in separate manuals, and ordered that "to facilitate reference, the book should be divided as nearly as possible into two volumes of equal size; the appendices to each chapter being, if the Board see no objections, printed immediately after the chapter to which they relate."

No further orders are therefore now required.

N.E.M.  
G.S.F.  
H.W.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

*Mr. Meyer's letter—*

43. Lastly, I would submit that much trouble and time would be saved by Divisional officers and Collectors refusing to call for reports from subordinates on petitions addressed to them which relate to matters primarily within the competence of such subordinates to deal with. For instance, if an application for house-site is addressed to the Divisional Officer, the

petitioner should either be referred to the Tahsildar or the petition transferred to him for disposal. The Tahsildar will then only have to address the Divisional officer if the matter proves to be outside his own competence to deal with, e.g., if the house-site applied for, and which he thinks should be given, is above the usual scale. Several officers are in the habit of saving themselves immediate trouble by referring nearly every petition that comes on to them to the Tahsildar, etc., for report.

Again, when a paper or papers of any length have to be referred for report or remarks to a subordinate officer, the points on which his views are required should be clearly indicated.

*The Board's remarks—*

43. *Calling for reports from subordinates.*—The rule advocated by Mr. Meyer has, the Board believes, been very generally adopted, but Collectors will again be instructed to bear it in mind and to enforce it upon Divisional-officers. It will doubtless save trouble to all concerned if the points upon which report is required are, as far as practicable, specified in the reference order.

G.S.F.  
H.W.  
A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

Submitted that the Government may concur in these remarks and suggestions.

N.E.M.  
31-12-98.

*To Honourable Member—*

Please see marginal remarks.

G.S.F.

The notes on paragraphs 4, 5 and 6, pages 2 and 3 of the notes, have been taken out and sent to Financial Department for remarks. They will be submitted to Honourable Member on return from that department.

G.S.F.

*To Under Secretary—*

Please see the draft order below. A draft D.O. is also submitted with reference to the Secretary's remarks at page 23 of the notes.

2. The file relating to proposals (iii), (iv) and (v) of section I, which was sent to the Financial Department for remarks un-officially has just returned, and is submitted to the Under Secretary separately.

Circulated to Honourable Member.  
N.E.M.

3. The file relating to the subject of the proposed amendment of Standing Order No. 204 (New edition) has been sent down to Madras, as directed by the Under Secretary, to the Registrar's section for noting on the question raised by the Secretary (at page 26 of the notes). This has not yet been sent up.

\* Send a reminder.  
N.E.M.

4. The draft order should go to the Public Works Department (Irrigation) for concurrence with reference to the orders on proposal (viii) of section II and perhaps, also, in view of the orders on some of the other proposals in regard to Minor Irrigation works. It is for consideration whether the draft order need go to the Judicial Department for counterinitials, in view of the order on proposal No. (v) of section IV.

5. In regard to proposal No. xiv of section II, it is respectfully submitted that the Under Secretary has quoted the section of the Forest Code, apparently from a copy in which the correction slip issued in 1895 to the section in question had not been pasted. It will be observed that the

Yes.  
N.E.M.  
13-6-99.

power which Collectors possess under the Court of Wards' Proceedings referred to in the notes on this proposal of sanctioning free grants of timber from Wards' estates is exactly the same as is possessed by Collectors under section 104 of the Forest Code of making free grants of timber from Government forests.

P.E.  
3-6-99.

The draft as now revised will go to Public Works Department (Irrigation) for favour of concurrence or remarks with regard to the proposals regarding Minor Irrigation works, section II, clauses (vi), (vii), and (viii); Public Works Department (Irrigation) will be requested kindly to pass on the file to Judicial for remarks with reference to the proposed orders in section III (vi) and section IV (v).

As the paper is long pending, it is requested that these references may be treated as urgent.

To Public Works Department (Irrigation) U.O. to be kindly passed on to Judicial u.o.

N.E.M.  
13-6-99.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, IRRIGATION.

With regard to section II, clause (vi), I wish to point out that if the Tank Restoration Memoirs, which have been prepared with so much labour and expense and which are intended to be permanent reliable records, are not kept up to date, their utility will be greatly diminished. The chief reason for sending estimates for masonry works to me is that the memoirs and plates may be corrected. I think, therefore, that all estimates for new masonry works or alteration of existing ones in tanks which have been investigated under the Tank Restoration scheme should be sent to me for examination.

I have no objection to clauses (vii) and (viii).

W. HUGHES.  
14-6-99.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

*Note for the Chief Secretary—*

Please see page 17 of the draft order. Judicial is only asked to consider the question. There is, therefore, no objection to counterinitialling the draft.

A. R. KNAPP.  
16-6-99.

As regards paragraph 17 of the order, this note is counterinitialled.

G. STOKES.  
16-6-99.

To Revenue Department u.o.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

*To Secretary—*

The notes regarding the proposals in paragraphs 4 to 6 of Mr. Meyer's letter vide pages 2 to 5 (f) *supra* have returned from circulation. The necessary orders have been embodied in their appropriate place in the draft order below.

P.E.  
17-6-99.

- (1) The Hon'ble Mr. Arundel, C.S.I.
- (2) His Excellency the Governor.

The notes above discuss in detail certain proposals for the delegation of powers made by Mr. Meyer. The draft G.O., below is based on the orders of the Hon'ble Mr. Winterbotham and is submitted for approval.

N.E.M.  
17-6-99.

As this is an order in the Revenue Department, it should have gone to the Hon'ble Mr. Winterbotham first.

I have been through it and see nothing to take exception to.

A.T.A.  
19-6-99.

H.W.  
19-6-99.

A.E.H.  
27-6-99.

Issue.

N.E.M.  
28-6-99.

# Government of Madras.

## REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

*Recd.*

*Regd.*

1899.

*Enclosures*

*Spare copies*

---

---

G.O., No. 411, 28th June 1899.

---

---

JUNE.

### Curtailment of work in Revenue Offices.

Passing orders on Board's Proceedings submitting Mr. Meyer's proposals for the — by the grant of larger powers to the Board of Revenue, to Collectors and Divisional Officers.

## GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

## REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue), No. 388, dated 11th November 1897:—

(FULL BOARD.)

Read—the following letter from W. S. MEYER, Esq., I.C.S., on Special Duty, to the Secretary to the Commissioners of Land Revenue, Madras, No. 32, dated 3rd November 1897:—

In my letter No. 30, dated 29th October 1897, I have dealt with certain proposals for decentralization which will require legislation to carry them out, and indicated the form which such legislation might conveniently take. I have now the honour to submit other proposals for delegation of powers, &c., which can, if approved, be carried out departmentally. My letter will fall under four sections, the first three of which will deal with the grant of larger powers to the Board, Collectors and Divisional officers, respectively, while the fourth will contain suggestions in regard to miscellaneous matters.

## I.—GRANT OF LARGER POWERS TO THE BOARD.

2. Under Standing Order No. 21, the sanction of Government is required for the transfer of land from one taluk to another. I think that this power might safely be allowed to the Board when the transfer is not of such importance as to have any appreciable effect on the work or relative importance of the taluks concerned; and Collectors might be allowed to sanction transfers of land between villages in the same taluk subject to the similar condition that the transfer is not of such importance as to necessitate any revision of either village establishment. At present they are allowed by the Standing Orders to make "petty transfer," but the nature of these is not clearly defined.

3. The Board should have full power to resume money allowances granted for the upkeep of temples and mosques, or the performance of religious service, where the conditions of the grant are not fulfilled. The only reference to such money allowances now made in paragraph 2 of Standing Order No. 117, is its penultimate sentence, which allows Collectors to resume on their own authority "inam lands and money allowances held by pagodas, which have been abandoned, or have been in a ruined condition for upwards of 12 years;" and even there, I may note, the alteration of the word "pagodas" into "temples, mosques, &c.," is obviously necessary.

4. Under Article 55 of the Civil Account Code annual returns of all persons serving under Government and Local Boards have to be submitted to the Accountant-General; and under note (b) to the same article the date of birth of each officer must be given, and if it has been entered wrongly can only be corrected except in the case of clerical error with the sanction of Government. The power of rectifying *bona fide* mistakes, which may have been made in this matter, might well be delegated to the Boards and other heads of large departments.

5. Under Article 98 (m) of the Civil Account Code all recurring charges have to receive the sanction of Government. I think that the Board and other heads of departments might well be allowed to pass orders in regard to the fixing and alteration of the pay of non-pensionable menial servants in offices under their control and that the Government of India might be moved to amend the article accordingly.

It seems particularly absurd that the sanction of Government should have to be applied for to entertain a part-time sweeper or scavenger on one or two rupees a month for some taluk mofussil office as is now necessary. (See for example the cases sanctioned in G.O., Mis. No. 2870, Revenue, dated 20th July 1896, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3464, dated 29th July 1896, and G.O., No. 2960, dated 27th July 1896, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3538, dated 1st August 1896). But I may note that superfluous references in these instances might be avoided by the simple method of debiting the pay of part-time menials to "Contingencies," a course already approved by Government in the case of Local and Municipal servants of this description—*vide* G.O., No. 1892, Local, dated 1st October 1897, copy of which is herewith forwarded.

6. Again under Article 98 (k) of the Civil Account Code, articles of European manufacture cannot be purchased in the country to an extent of over Rs. 10 without the sanction of the Local Government. (See for instance G.O., Mis. No. 3180, Revenue, dated 8th August 1896, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3827, dated 19th August 1896). I think the Government of India might well be moved to extend the sanctioning powers of the Board and other Heads of departments up to a limit of Rs. 100. Lamps, for example, can be obtained at establishments like Mr. Ditmar's in Bombay quite as easily and cheaply in respect of ordinary retail transactions as from Europe. If this be approved Collectors,

\* G.O., No. 481, Revenue, dated 21st September 1896. who can now only purchase such articles up to a limit of Rs. 5,\* might have their powers extended to Rs. 10.

7. The Board might well be given power to sanction for special reasons (e.g., for the recent Pushkaram festival in Gódvári) the grant of *district holidays* supplementary to, or in substitution for, those notified in G.O., No. 126, Public, dated 19th February 1895 (Board's Proceedings, No. 77, dated 7th March 1895). At present applications for such additional or alternative holidays must, under this Government Order, be submitted to Government.

8. Finally I submit that the Board might be allowed the same power of *altering its Standing Orders* as is now enjoyed by it in the Separate Revenue Department with reference to Salt and Abkari Circular Orders. It should, that is, send Government a copy of every alteration made or new Standing Order issued, but need not obtain previous sanction for such emendation, it being, of course, understood that no alteration should be made in matters of general land revenue principle or policy until the same has been approved by Government. Even then, however, the actual wording of the revised Standing Orders might well, I think, be left to the Board.

## II.—ADDITIONAL POWERS TO BE GRANTED TO COLLECTORS.

9. Power to grant lands free of assessment and to exempt occupied lands from assessment when required by local bodies for communal purposes.—Under paragraph 3 of Standing Order, No. 12-A, Collectors are already competent to exercise this power in regard to land required for roads. In G.O., No. 142, Revenue, dated 24th March 1896, Government negatived a suggestion of the Board that Collectors should be given the same power to serve local bodies in respect to other communal purposes, and such applications have still, under the Standing Order above quoted, to go to Government through the Board. *Vide* item 6 of appendix A to Board's Proceedings, No. 459 of 16th December 1895, and paragraph 2-I (d) of the Government Order.

I venture to ask for a re-consideration of this order for the reasons stated below, which I quote from a letter written by Mr. Nicholson as Collector of South Canara which the Board transferred to me in connection with my special duty:—

"2. I have before me a case in which about 13 cents of unassessed dry land is applied for by the Coondapoor Taluk Board for the erection of a Primary school. Under existing orders I am obliged to make a reference to the Board in view to obtain the sanction of Government for the alienation, and I have done so separately."

"3. Cases of this kind are not very rare. In 1896 there were three applications from local bodies; and this year there was another besides the one referred to above. In none of these cases has the extent of lands applied for exceeded 75 cents. As local bodies give increased

attention to sanitation, education, public health, etc., applications for small bits of lands for public latrines, wells, primary schools, dispensaries, medical officers' quarters and the like, will also increase. The revenue-free grants made in such cases are not alienations of a permanent nature, but are conditional grants revocable when lands are not required for the purposes for which they were granted.

"4. Collectors have power to grant any amount of land for road purposes and they are not likely to be too lavish in making similar grants for other purposes to local bodies.

"5. I do not, however, ask for power to grant any extent of land when required for other than road purposes, but would request the Board to fix the maximum within which Collectors could make such grants; this might be one acre of dry land and a quarter acre of wet land, which latter, however, would seldom or never be required.

"6. My object in making the reference is to avoid the necessity for troubling the Board and Government with applications for grants in petty cases, seeing that Collectors' recommendations in such cases are generally approved. Collectors might send an annual return of such alienations for the information of Government and the Board."

10. I think that, under the limitations which Mr. Nicholson proposes (viz., one acre of dry or  $\frac{1}{4}$  acre of wet land as a maximum for any grant made by Collectors of their own authority), there would be no risk of Collectors abusing the power which it is proposed to entrust to them. There will be the further check of the statement proposed in Mr. Nicholson's last paragraph which, I may say, is submitted for the information of the Government of India even under present circumstances.

11. *Entertainment of process servers, etc.*—(1) Under Standing Order No. 111 as amended by paragraph 2 (vii) of Board's Proceedings, No. 232, dated 26th June 1896, the Collector has already been given the power of sanctioning the entertainment, when necessary, of batta peons to supplement the work of serving processes under Act II of 1864 by the village establishments. The salaries of these peons are paid out of the fees realised for the service of process.

(2) Under Standing Order No. 180 temporary peons may be similarly entertained and paid for service of processes under Acts VIII of 1865, III of 1895 and III of 1869, and Regulation IX of 1822. Here, however, no establishment can be entertained without the sanction of the Board of Revenue, and in some cases of Government also (paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Standing Order). I think that in these instances, likewise, Collectors may be given power to entertain the establishment themselves, as has been done under certain conditions in regard to process servers entertainable under section 12 of the Village Courts Act (*vide* G.O., No. 671, Judicial, dated 29th March 1893, in Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 3152, dated 25th May 1893), subject, of course, to the restriction that its cost is fully covered by process fees and involves no extra charge to the State. As a matter of fact, VIII of 1865 is the only Act above referred to, the service of processes under which does occasionally require extra hands.

12. Further, I think that, in the case of process servers appointed for the purposes of Act II of 1864, Collectors might be allowed to prescribe a maximum scale of establishment for each taluk, and that Divisional officers might be given the discretion of putting this scale wholly or partially in force as occasion may require. If, for instance, the Collector held that six batta peons might, under certain circumstances, be allowed for a taluk, the Divisional officer would decide when the conditions justified the entertainment of some or all of these.

13. I have already proposed in paragraph 4 of my letter No. 29 of 26th October 1897, that, subject to the necessary sanction for entertaining process establishment, the selection of the individuals to be employed might be left with Tahsildars.

14. *Petty construction and repairs.*—Collectors have power to sanction estimates for the minor civil works coming within the scope of Standing Order No. 189 up to Rs. 1,000 in each case, provided such works have been entered and passed in their budgets; they can also transfer allotments from one sanctioned work to another (paragraphs 5 and 6 of Standing Order No. 189). I think that, as a natural corollary of this, a Collector should be empowered, so long as he does not exceed the original amount of his budget allotment, to transfer (within a limit of Rs. 1,000 for any one work) an allotment sanctioned for a work which, it is found, cannot be conveniently undertaken within the year to a work not originally provided for. At present (paragraph 5 of the Standing Order) he cannot apparently do this without the sanction

of the Board. The course now proposed would facilitate the working out of budget allotments within the year without unnecessary reference. Where, however, the district budget allotment under this head is proposed to be exceeded, a reference to the Board will, of course, be necessary.

15. I fail to see why the monthly statement of expenditure to be sent in by Collectors to the Accountant-General under paragraph 12 of Standing Order No. 189 should be accompanied by a progress report, and would suggest that the latter statement be discontinued.

16. *Minor Irrigation Works.*—The present practice is that, after the budget for the ensuing year has been passed by Government, and the Board has allotted lump grants under this head to each district, Collectors send in to the Board for sanction, through the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, a list of the individual works they propose to execute therefrom, with a rough estimate of the cost of each (paragraphs 3 and 4 of Standing Order No. 187). When the proposals in this list have been approved the detailed estimates are passed by the Collector himself (paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of the Standing Order). The Collector may further, when the necessity arises, transfer funds originally allotted by him from one sanctioned work to another; but must not transfer any part of the allotment to a work not included in the list as sanctioned by the Board without informing that authority (paragraph 7 *ibid*).

17. But with reference to the reorganization of the minor irrigation establishments now under contemplation, it has been ruled—*vide* papers noted in the margin—that hereafter Collectors shall themselves sanction only such estimates as are not in excess of Rs. 250 and "do not include the construction of new masonry works other than simple tank sluices, nor any material deviation from the standard of efficiency laid down by the 'Tank Restoration Scheme' (Board's Proceedings, No. 90, Settlement, dated 2nd February 1897); and that other estimates shall be sent up in detail to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for sanction. It appears that these latter estimates will be over one-third of the whole number (Board's Proceedings, No. 255, Settlement, dated 10th August 1895, paragraph 7); and I venture to think that, given the greater professional assistance which the Collector will have at his disposal under the new scheme, he might well deal himself with all estimates up to Rs. 500 which satisfy the condition above quoted, as was indeed proposed by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation himself (paragraph 6 of his letter printed at page 3 of Board's Proceedings, No. 255, Settlement, dated 10th August 1895). According to the statistics quoted in paragraph 7 of the same Proceedings, this would give about 11 per cent. of the total number of estimates to the Chief Engineer for check.

18. I presume that, whatever be the limit adopted for the Collector's own sanction, the list now required in paragraphs 3 and 4 of Standing Order No. 187 will no longer be necessary, as the Chief Engineer will see the estimates of important works individually, and that all that will be necessary will be to apply to the Board for a lump allotment and to submit the information required in form 1 of the appendix to Standing Order No. 187 with each estimate sent to the Chief Engineer.

19. Further, I would allow the Collector, within the limit of his sanctioned allotment, to put in hand on his own authority works not included therein in lieu of others which it is found inconvenient to undertake, subject to the condition that the estimates for such works are within his powers of sanction. This will materially facilitate the expenditure of grants within the year, by reducing the delay caused by references to higher authority.

Again I would allow the Collector to sanction (within his lump allotment) excesses up to 10 per cent. on estimates sanctioned by the Chief Engineer, and to deal similarly with estimates passed by himself which, by excess expenditure, have passed his limit. If, for instance, the Collector's limit of sanction is Rs. 500 and he passes an estimate for Rs. 480, I would allow him to pass an excess in actuals up to Rs. 48 though this would technically bring the work within the Chief Engineer's control.

20. Under Standing Order No. 187, paragraph 39, a monthly progress report showing the expenditure in and up to the month on each sanctioned minor irrigation work has to be forwarded by every Tahsildar in duplicate to the Collector and the Divisional officer. Monthly district statements used likewise, under paragraph 46 of Standing Order No. 187, to be sent in by Collectors to the Board; but in paragraph 3

\* In Board's Proceedings, No. 417, Settlement, dated 10th December 1896, paragraph 4 (a) of G.O., No. 516,\* Revenue, dated 8th October 1896, it was ruled that these might be quarterly for the first nine months of the year. I cannot find how-

ever that the necessary alteration has yet been made in the Standing Order. I would suggest that the Standing Order be further modified so as to permit of Collectors who think it desirable allowing the same procedure in respect to the reports of Tahsildars. Nor does it seem necessary, except during the last three months of the year when matters become more urgent, that there should be separate returns from the Taluk office to the Divisional officer and the Collector. They need, I think, only be sent to the Divisional officer, who would compile a consolidated statement for his division which he would submit with his remarks to the Collector.

21. Under Article 1136 of the Civil Service Regulations sanction for journeys performed outside the district in which an officer is employed rests with the Board. A general permission to Collectors to send officers out of the district for certain purposes would, I think, be advisable. Recently, for instance, the sanction of the Board had, I find, to be obtained in the case of a duffadar who was sent from the Tiruvallūr taluk to the Board's office with an urgent paper which had been specially called for (Board's Proceedings, No. 3044, Routine, dated 14th October 1897).

I may mention as another instance in point that, when at Nellore, I had once occasion to send an urgent call to my Local Fund Engineer, who was then in the extreme north-west of the district, to return to head-quarters. He very properly went the quickest way, which was to march out of the district for a little distance on to the Southern Mahratta Railway, and train *via* Guntakal and Rénigunta to Nellore. But my Treasury Deputy Collector informed me that his pay and travelling allowance for the journey could not be passed without the sanction not only of the District Board but of Government!

22. Under paragraph 2 of Standing Order No. 279 (Old Edition), all cases of personal property of intestates falling under section 16, clause 7 of Regulation III of 1892 must be reported by the District Magistrate to the Subordinate (or District)

† Please see also G.O., No. 850, Judicial, dated 14th April 1875. Judge, however trifling their value. But in G.O., † No. 365, Judicial, dated 15th

March 1872, Government authorized District Magistrates to sell the moveable property of deceased persons and credit the sale-proceeds to Government in cases where they are unclaimed for three months and amount in value to Rs. 50 or under. I request that the Standing Order may be amended accordingly. I was lately informed in Tanjore that, owing to ignorance of the Government Order last quoted, a case of property valued at one anna had been referred to the Sub-Court, and that most of the other similar references related to property worth less than Rs. 10.

23. I have already noted under section I (paragraphs 2 and 6) the extended powers I would give Collectors in regard to transfers of land between villages and the purchase of articles of European manufacture.

24. Court of Wards' matters.—Under Standing Order No. 219, as modified by Court's Proceedings, No. 8 of 23rd April 1897, Collectors have to obtain the sanction of the Board, in its capacity as Court of Wards, for every original work in an estate, the cost of which is estimated to exceed Rs. 300 and for repair works in excess of Rs. 500. I think that where the expenditure is within a budget allotment already passed by the Court, these figures might be raised to Rs. 500 and Rs. 1,000, respectively. The estate budgets contain detailed lists of the works it is proposed to undertake during the year.

25. I would further give Collectors a power of sanctioning the free grant of timber in wards' estates to village communities and private individuals when necessary similar to that which they enjoy in regard to Government forest produce under section 104 of the Forest Code as it now stands. At present applications for any such grant have to go up to the Court of Wards for orders.

### III.—ADDITIONAL POWERS TO BE GRANTED TO DIVISIONAL OFFICERS.

26. Power to sanction transfers of land from dry to wet and vice versa.—This power now vests in Collectors, and the Board on a previous occasion was not prepared to give it to Divisional officers—*vide* last item in Appendix B to Board's Proceedings, No. 89, Settlement, dated 7th May 1896. I submit, however, that the Divisional officer might well be allowed to recognise actual facts by definitely transferring from one head to the other lands which have been actually cultivated under the other head (e.g., dry land on which wet crops have been raised), for, say, three consecutive years. There should be the further condition that in the case of lands under Major Irrigation works, the Public Works authorities have no objection. The Collector will, of course, in this as in other cases, retain the power of cancelling or modifying a Divisional officer's order when he thinks it desirable.

27. Transfer of land from assessed to unassessed.—Divisional officers can transfer land from unassessed to assessed under paragraph 18 of Standing Order No. 30. The converse power, in cases where the land is unfit for cultivation or is required for village site or other communal purposes, now rests with Collectors who have, however, to submit a statement annually to the Board of the transfers made for village-site, etc. (See Board's Proceedings, No. 378, Land Revenue, of 29th June 1893). It would seem feasible to give the same powers to Divisional officers, who might submit to the Collectors half-yearly returns showing the cases in which they have exercised it.

28. Power to order the sale of valuable unassessed lands to be transferred to assessed and granted on patta.—Under the note to paragraph 18 of Standing Order No. 30, this power is now vested in Collectors. The right to sell (under paragraph 13 of Standing Order No. 30) assessed lands which are the subject of rival darkhast claims the merits of which cannot be easily decided has been granted to Divisional officers (*vide* item 23 in Appendix A to Board's Proceedings, No. 459, dated 16th December 1895, and G.O., No. 142, Revenue Department, dated 24th March 1896). There seems therefore no good reason why the similar power now in question should not be exercised by them. If the course is open to objection an appeal will certainly be lodged before the Collector.

29. Again the sale of disputed darkhast lands by Divisional officers need not be subject to formal confirmation by the Collector as at present. There will always be the right of appeal to him.

30. Village Officers' Special Test Examinations.—Divisional officers might be given power to receive applications for admission to the Special Test Examinations, to decide in cases of doubt as to the degree of relationship to the existing village officers of applicants claiming to pay a lower fee on this account to permit applicants to appear for the examination elsewhere than in the division to which they belong, and to sign certificates for issue to the successful candidates. At present these powers vest in the Collector under Rules III, VI, XI and XII of the rules issued in the notification appended to G.O., No. 589, Revenue, dated 29th June 1891. Their delegation to Divisional officers will relieve the Collector of an appreciable amount of petty work.

31. Power to sanction refunds of sale-proceeds of impounded cattle.—In G.O., No. 691, Revenue Department, dated 12th August 1889, the power to sanction such refunds where the amount had been held in deposit as unclaimed, on a satisfactory claim being put in, was conferred on District Magistrates provided the application was made within three months from date of deposit. This power might now be extended to Sub-Divisional Magistrates who may be held, I think, to act as agents for the District Magistrate under section 17 of the Cattle Trespass Act.

22. In this connection I may note that under High Court's Circular No. 383, dated 21st August 1896 (copy enclosed), the refund of judicial fines cancelled on

appeal may be directed by the original court which imposed and levied the fine, and refunds are now made in taluk treasuries on the strength of such orders accompanied by the necessary voucher. Paragraph 6 of Standing Order No. 237, which mentions the Collectors as the authority competent to sanction such refunds, seems therefore to be obsolete and might be modified as follows:—

"Treasury officers may refund judicial fines under the procedure laid down in that behalf by the High Court from time to time."

33. *Expenditure on Trigonometrical Survey Stations.*—The very small power of incurring expenditure on Trigonometrical Survey stations (up to an average of Rs. 4 annually for each) which Collectors are authorised to incur under Standing Order No. 282 (Old Edition) might well be made over to the Divisional officers.

34. I have already noted in section II (paragraph 12) the extended power which I would confer on Divisional officers in the matter of *entertaining process-servers* under Act II of 1864.

#### IV.—MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS.

35. *Sales of assessed waste lands on the Nilgiris, etc.*—Mr. Tremeneere has pointed out to me that, under the rules contained in the appendix to Standing Order No. 33, assessed waste lands sold on the Nilgiri and Shevaroy Hills and in Wynnaad have to be the subject of a tedious and intricate title-deed which has to go up to Government and to be signed by the Revenue Secretary, who has likewise to initial every petty error (copyists' or otherwise which may be discovered in the deed. It seems to me that, though these title-deeds, which are accompanied by plans and schedules of boundaries, may have been necessary formerly, when they related to tracts which had not been properly surveyed, they have now lost their *raison d'être*, especially since it has been decided that the annual assessment subject to which the land is sold shall not as hitherto be capable of redemption—*vide* G.O., No. 459, Revenue Department, dated 11th September 1896, paragraph 11. There seems no reason therefore why an ordinary patta should not suffice, as in the case of lands in other districts sold under the provisions of paragraph 13 and the note to paragraph 18 of Standing Order No. 30. Mr. Tremeneere promised me a further memorandum on the subject, but has not yet been able to send it; so all that I would suggest at present is that the matter be referred to the Collectors of Nilgiris, Salem and Malabar for report.

36. *Board's Standing Order No. 204 regarding provision of carts, etc., for troops on the march*—is obsolete in the following respects:—

(a) *Paragraph 2 (1) of the Standing Order.*—The register of cart-owners herein prescribed is of no practical use, and so far as I know, is not maintained in most districts, while if maintained it is not checked. As a matter of fact Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars, who are directed by Standing Order No. 205, paragraph 3 (7), to accompany bodies of troops on the march through their charges, are also required to procure the required number of carts from the nearest villages where carts are usually available. They use their local knowledge and influence and procure them through the village headmen. The register prescribed may, therefore, safely be dispensed with.

(b) *Clauses 3 and 4 of paragraph 2.*—These provisions are out of date, as the Tahsildar of the taluk through which the troops pass makes the necessary arrangements locally; nor is there any necessity for the maintenance of the register prescribed by clause 5.

(c) *Clause 6.*—The rates of hire herein ordered to be fixed and published in the District Gazette twice a year are practically useless. These rates depend upon the seasons of the year (e.g., carts are always dearer than usual at ploughing and harvest times, or in rainy weather), and on a number of varying local circumstances; and the prices are as a matter of fact estimated, when occasion demands by the Tahsildar of the taluk through which the troops pass, and finally settled after a personal interview with the officer commanding the regiment or detachment. The notifications now prescribed, which involve half-yearly returns from all Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars in independent charge, might therefore be done away with.

(d) *Paragraph 3.*—The register of carts herein prescribed is furnished by the Taluk officer attending on the regiment.

I recommend therefore that the Standing Order be revised with reference to these considerations.

37. *Inspection of Taluk Treasuries and Offices by Divisional Officers.*—(1) Standing Order No. 226 (New Edition) is headed "Examination of subordinate treasuries," but the questions entered in the appendix to paragraph 1 of this order relate largely to the taluk records also. I would therefore alter the heading of the Standing Order to the wording at the head of my present paragraph, so as to make it clear that the mere treasury inspection is not all that a divisional officer need pay particular attention to, as some of them are now apt to imagine.

(2) Further the record questions in the appendix might be revised with reference to the present "disposal number" system, and the answering of the questions should be made compulsory, as the return will then give useful information in regard to records which will save the necessity for separate reports on this subject which are now submitted in most districts. As paragraph 1 of the Standing Order now stands, the questions are now supposed to be merely for the guidance of the examining officer.

(3) The report should further be submitted to the Collector at once, whereas at present Divisional officers sometimes wait till they have to submit the information required for the preparation of the annual report to the Board prescribed in paragraph 2 of the Standing Order. Collectors could then note, without delay, matters on which their orders may be required.

38. *Conduct of crop experiments by Divisional officers and Tahsildars.*—I think that nearly every district officer would bear me out in saying that the conduct of these annual experiments by Divisional officers and Tahsildars under the orders issued in Board's Proceedings, No. 328, Settlement, dated 7th August 1893, is in the generality of cases a farce. As the Board said when previously discussing the matter (paragraph 6 of Board's Proceedings, No. 473, Settlement, dated 29th June 1892), "the ordinary district staff, even if it were competent for such enquiries, is already so overburdened in the discharge of its ordinary duties that it could not devote sufficient time to carry out the experiments on a sufficiently large scale to be useful or valuable;" and, as a matter of fact, the smallest possible fields are habitually selected, and the process of cutting, sifting and weighing the crop, &c., is carried out in the most perfunctory manner. Sir Edward Buck's letter of 27th June 1893 printed in Board's Proceedings, No. 328, Settlement, dated 7th August 1893, gave the Local Governments full discretion as to the class of officers to be selected to conduct the experiments; and I submit that to have any value they should be made by men who have passed through the Agricultural College or are otherwise specially qualified to deal with the matter. A limited number of experiments so conducted would be of far greater utility than the present returns and could be subjected to more careful examination in the Board's office.

39. *Remittances from Sub-Registrars at Stations where there is a Sub-treasury.*—Under Rule 29 of the rules printed at page 14 of G.O., No. 1631, Judicial, dated 12th October 1896 (copy enclosed), Sub-Registrars at stations where there is a treasury are required to remit their collections to the treasury every day on which it is open for cash transactions. I think that it would be sufficient if the collections were ordinarily remitted once a week, Sub-Registrars being permitted to send their cash-chests to the taluk treasury for safe custody at night in case the collections accumulate before the date of remittance. This course would save a considerable amount of treasury work.

40. *An annual statement showing the number of Revenue Inspectors trained in survey* has now to be submitted by every Collector to the Board under Board's Proceedings, Mis. No. 7003, Settlement, dated 24th August 1892, and when discussing proposals for the curtailment of work in the Settlement Department in Board's Proceedings,

No. 89, Settlement, dated 7th May 1896, and G.O., No. 516,\* Revenue Department, dated 10th December 1896.

\* In Board's Proceedings, No. 417, Settlement, and G.O., No. 516,\* Revenue Department, dated 8th October 1896, the Board and Government held (paragraph 21 of the Board's Proceedings and paragraph 15 of the Government Order) that this return could not be discontinued, as it is required for the Land Records and Agriculture Administration report.

I venture to ask for a reconsideration of this order, as I see from the figures quoted in paragraph 10 of the Administration report for 1895-96 reviewed in G.O., No. 701, Revenue, dated 8th December 1896, that the survey training of Revenue Inspectors is now practically complete. Out of 626 Revenue Inspectors, 592 had undergone survey training and, with the exception of two men who had been specially exempted and two who were survivors of the old Inspectors on smaller pay, the rest (28 in number as two places were vacant) were all only acting men. This being so, I cannot find that the Government of India requires the habitual insertion of statistics on the subject.

If, however, the return is still to be kept up, it should obviously be compiled in the office of the authority by whom Revenue Inspectors are appointed, i.e.—at present the Collector—as he must know the qualifications of the men he puts in. At present in some districts the return is compiled in the Taluk offices.

41. The following suggestions are made in view of *diminishing copying and registering work in revenue offices and saving the time now occupied in perusal of practically useless papers* :—

(1) *Good* copying machines should be supplied to Collectors and Taluk offices. (They are specially necessary in the latter where large numbers of circulars have to be sent out to village officers.) Those now supplied are very inferior and get out of order easily. I have often seen district circulars turned out by them which were all but illegible.

(2) The Board now sends round to Collectors and other Revenue officers a variety of papers, especially on forest matters, which are of no practical use to them and which involve registration in the office. I will cite as an instance Board's Proceedings, No. 325, Forest, dated 30th July 1897, which relates to a pattern of turban (not described in the Board's Proceedings) prescribed for Rangers and Deputy Rangers. So again Board's Proceedings, No. 313, Forest, dated 11th August 1897, calls for a report (regarding grading of managers in Forest offices, &c.) on a matter the Collector must personally deal with, but nevertheless the Collector of Salem tells me that he received fourteen spare copies of the Proceedings which appear to have been meant for Tahsildars.

(3) When the Board prints important general Proceedings the orders on proposals in which require the approval of Government the present practice is to communicate to Collectors, &c., copies of (1) the original Proceedings, and (2) the final Proceedings containing the orders of Government and the Board's remarks with reference thereto.

As (1) is habitually reprinted with (2), its preliminary communication seems quite superfluous, while the recollection of it is apt to bewilder officers who may forget that the final word has not yet been spoken. The paper can only be recorded pending the receipt of the orders of Government. My remark of course does not apply to Proceedings which contain any instructions which the Board can issue of its own authority and desires to be immediately acted on.

(4) I think that all routine Government Orders, which would simply have to be communicated to Collectors, &c., might well go direct to them from the Government Office, a copy being at the same time sent to the Board for information. To send the orders to the Board only and let it communicate, as is now generally done, causes waste of time; and where, as so often happens, the Government Order is type-written, the labour of making out an extra copy in the Government Office is inappreciable.

42. I venture to submit that the compilation of the revised edition of the *Board's Standing Orders* should be carried out as soon as possible. Three chapters—one dealing with office routine, petitions and grant of copies, one with wild animals, escheats and other sundry matters, and one with matters relating to public servants, which therefore contains some of the most important of all the Standing Orders—are now available for general and ready reference only in the old edition; and that is now so overlaid with correction slips that it is positive torture to have to look up anything therein.

Further, I beg to propose (on the suggestion of Mr. Tremenhoe) that, as the revised edition when complete will form as ungainly and bulky a volume as the old book does, the Standing Orders should be divided hereafter into two parts—the one dealing with matters relating to Land Revenue and Settlement, the other containing the Separate Revenue Chapters (Abkari, Stamps and Customs) which deal with matters in regard to which Land Revenue officers are less familiar and have therefore to make more constant reference to the Standing Orders.

43. Lastly, I would submit that much trouble and time would be saved by Divisional officers and Collectors refusing to call for *reports from subordinates* on petitions addressed to them which relate to matters primarily within the competence of such subordinates to deal with. For instance, if an application for house-site is addressed to the Divisional officer, the petitioner should either be referred to the Tahsildar or the petition transferred to him for disposal. The Tahsildar will then only have to address the Divisional officer if the matter proves to be outside his own competence to deal with, e.g., if the house-site applied for, and which he thinks should be given, is above the usual scale. Several officers are in the habit of saving themselves immediate trouble by referring nearly every petition that comes on to them to the Tahsildar, &c., for report.

Again when a paper or papers of any length have to be referred for report or remarks to a subordinate officer the points on which his views are required should be clearly indicated.

*Resolution*—No. 388, dated 11th November 1897.

The proposals embodied in the letter read above have been discussed by the Full Board at a meeting at which Mr. Meyer was present. The Board resolves to submit, for the approval of Government, all Mr. Meyer's suggestions with the exception of the following items, which appear to be open to objection or to require some amendment.

2. *Paragraph 5 of the letter, Article 98 (m), Civil Account Code—Sanction for fixing or altering the pay of non-pensionable menial servants.*—The Board considers that Mr. Meyer's alternative proposal may be accepted, and that charges of this nature may be debited to "Contingencies," the power of sanction being given to the Board or to the head of the department concerned.

*Paragraph 14 of letter—Petty construction and repairs to minor civil works.*—Mr. Meyer proposes to allow Collectors to transfer allotments from sanctioned to non-sanctioned works within the limits of his ordinary powers (Rs. 1,000 for each work), and provided that his total budget allotment is not exceeded. The Board is not prepared to accept this suggestion. The existing practice does not give rise to any friction, and in cases of emergency the Collector can always act in anticipation of sanction. It is, in the Board's opinion, undesirable that a Collector should have a free hand in the utilization of allotments on works not formally sanctioned by the controlling authority; control must necessarily be weakened thereby, and the preparation of an annual list of works for sanction would become a useless formality. Even if it be considered that some modified powers of transfer of allotments to unsanctioned works should be delegated to Collectors, a report must necessarily be required in all but petty cases, and no saving of work would result from the change.

*Paragraph 16—Minor irrigation works.*—The Board is not prepared to dispense with the lists of works which are now submitted to it under paragraphs 3 and 4 of Standing Order No. 187. The preparation of these lists conduces to a well considered distribution of the district allotment and furnishes the Board with information which it ought to possess. It would, however, appear to be unnecessary to submit the lists through the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, and if that officer consents to the change, they may hereafter be submitted to the Board direct.

*Paragraph 22—Reports in regard to moveable property of persons dying intestate.*—The Standing Order will at once be brought into conformity with the orders of Government.

*Paragraph 26—Transfers from dry to wet and vice versa.*—On the conditions specified by Mr. Meyer the Board would accept his proposal to delegate to Divisional officers the power of making such transfers, but the said conditions should be carefully borne in mind.

*Paragraph 27—Transfer of land from assessed to unassessed.*—The Board considers that it would be safer to retain this power in the hands of the Collector, who should as at present submit to the Board an annual list of such transfers.

*Section IV—Miscellaneous matters—Paragraph 35—Sales of assessed lands on the Nilgiris, &c.*—All land sold subject to assessment should, as suggested, be given on an ordinary patta unless there happen to be any special conditions attached to the sale. The purchaser at a sale merely buys the preferential right to a patta. Reports will be called for as proposed by Mr. Meyer.

*Paragraph 36.*—Board's Standing Order No. 204 will be amended accordingly.

*Paragraph 39—Remittances from Sub-registrars at stations where there is a sub-treasury.*—This is a question for the Inspector-General of Registration to decide. The Board raises no objection to the proposal.

*Paragraph 40—Annual statement of Revenue Inspectors trained in Survey.*—This return may be discontinued.

*Paragraph 41—Regarding copying and distribution of papers.*—(1) Mr. Meyer's remarks will be brought to the notice of the Superintendent of Stationery. It is essential that, if copying machines are supplied at all, they should be of good quality and capable of being easily and efficiently worked.

(2) & (3) The question of the distribution of Board's Proceedings has lately been engaging the Board's attention (*vide* Board's Proceedings, No. 2, dated 5th January 1897); but, as Mr. Meyer points out, the selection of papers for general circulation requires to be carefully supervised. No hard-and-fast rule can be laid down, but the Board will endeavour to reduce the issue of its Proceedings to Collectors and their subordinates as far as possible. It may, however, be noted that when proposals which require the sanction of Government are printed and circulated to districts, as in the case of forest notifications under sections 4 and 16, the final orders of Government are usually communicated without reprinting the Board's Proceedings on which they have been passed. The Board's Proceedings is indeed reprinted in the Government Order, but in circulating the orders to the districts, the previous papers are printed in abstract. The procedure would in many cases be simplified by adopting Mr. Meyer's suggestion, and the Board will take steps to do so wherever possible.

(4) The Board recommends Mr. Meyer's proposal for favourable consideration. The effect of the present decentralization will indeed tend to reduce, very considerably, the number of cases in which the formal sanction of Government will be required, but even so there must remain numerous classes of orders which may be counted as matters of routine. In such cases it would save time and labour if the final order was intimated direct from the Government Office to the Collector concerned.

*Paragraph 4—Board's Standing Orders.*—The necessity for the speedy completion of the work of revising its Standing Orders has been frequently urged by Government, and the Board has endeavoured to carry out this duty as quickly as was compatible with efficient scrutiny. It has already been pointed out\* that work of this nature is unavoidably delayed, when it has to pass through the hands of one or more officers who can only devote their attention to it fitfully and sometimes at long intervals. The revision has now been practically completed and the remaining chapters are for the most part in type; but

it is probable that still further corrections will be required in view of the numerous proposals made by Mr. Meyer for decentralization and improvement of business methods, and for this reason the final issue of the revised orders is delayed.

*Paragraph 43—Calling for reports from subordinates.*—The rule advocated by Mr. Meyer has, the Board believes, been very generally adopted, but Collectors will again be instructed to bear it in mind and to enforce it upon Divisional officers. It will doubtless save trouble to all concerned if the points upon which report is required are, as far as practicable, specified in the reference order.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) L. D. SWAMIKANNU,  
for Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Copy to W. S. Meyer, Esq., I.C.S.

ORDER—No. 411, Revenue, dated 28th June 1899.

Miscellaneous.

With the Proceedings read above the Board of Revenue submits to Government, with its remarks, certain proposals made by Mr. Meyer in pursuance of the instructions conveyed to him in G.O., No. 1243, Judicial, dated 27th August 1897, for the curtailment of work in Revenue offices. The proposals are grouped into four sections, the first three of which chiefly relate to the grant of larger powers to the Board of Revenue, to Collectors and Divisional officers, respectively, while the fourth contains suggestions in regard to certain miscellaneous matters. These proposals will be dealt with below *seriatim*.

2. I. GRANT OF INCREASED POWERS TO THE BOARD—(i) *That the Board be empowered to sanction transfers of land from one taluk to another, provided that such transfers will not appreciably affect the work or relative importance of the taluks concerned, and that Collectors be allowed to order transfers between villages in the same taluk subject to the proviso that such transfers do not necessitate the revision of the establishment of either village (paragraph 2 of Mr. Meyer's letter).*—A taluk is not merely a revenue administrative unit, but also the unit for criminal and other jurisdiction and for other purposes. Further, transfers from taluk to taluk are not frequent, and the need of a reference to Government in the matter consequently does not involve any appreciable amount of additional labour. It is expedient, therefore, that the power to order alteration in taluk boundaries should rest with the Government. As regards transfers between villages, the Government considers that the power to make such transfers should vest in the Board as hitherto.

(ii) *That the Board be allowed full power to resume money allowances granted for the upkeep of temples and mosques or the performance of religious service in cases where the conditions of the grant are not fulfilled (paragraph 3 of Mr. Meyer's letter).*—The proposal is approved.

(iii) *That the power of sanctioning rectification of bonâ fide errors made in regard to entries of date of birth in the annual returns of establishments furnished to the Accountant General under article 55 of the Civil Account Code be delegated to the Board and other heads of large departments (paragraph 4 of Mr. Meyer's letter).*—The Government sees no sufficient necessity to sanction the proposed delegation.

(iv) *That the Board and other Heads of Departments be allowed to fix and alter the pay of non-pensionable menial servants in the offices under their control (paragraph 5 of Mr. Meyer's letter).*—The proposal will be considered in the Financial Department.

(v) *That the power now possessed by the Board and other Heads of Departments of purchasing in this country articles of European manufacture, subject to a limit of value of Rs. 10, without the sanction of the Local Government, be extended up to a limit of*

Rs. 100, and that Collectors, who may now purchase such articles only up to a limit of Rs. 5, have their power extended to Rs. 10 (paragraph 6 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—Orders will issue in the Financial Department on this proposal.

(vi) That the Board be empowered to sanction for special reasons the grant of district holidays supplementary to, or in substitution of, those notified by Government (paragraph 7 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government considers that there exists no sufficient reason for altering the present practice under which applications for such additional or alternative holidays have to come before Government.

(vii) That the Board be given the same power of altering its Standing Orders as is now enjoyed by it in the Separate Revenue Department, with reference to Salt and Abkari Circular Orders (paragraph 8 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government considers it undesirable to sanction any departure from the existing practice as prescribed in G.O., No. 1002, Revenue, dated 24th October 1887.

3. II. GRANT OF ENLARGED POWERS TO COLLECTORS—(i) That Collectors be empowered to grant lands free of assessment and to exempt occupied lands from assessment when required by local bodies for communal purposes subject to a maximum limit of one acre in the case of dry and one-fourth of an acre in the case of wet land (paragraphs 9 and 10 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government is of opinion that it is the value of the land to be granted that should chiefly be considered rather than its area. Collectors will for the future be empowered, subject to a limit of capitalized value of Rs. 250, to grant lands to local bodies for public purposes, the nature of which entitles these bodies to hold the land revenue, free under the orders contained in G.O.s., No. 259, Revenue, dated 3rd April 1889, and No. 44, Revenue, dated 15th January 1892. The power now possessed by the Collectors of granting lands for Local Fund road up to a limit of capitalized value of Rs. 3,000 will remain unaffected. The Board will be empowered to sanction revenue-free grants of land to local bodies for similar public purposes up to a limit of capitalized value of Rs. 3,000. Cases exceeding the latter limit will be submitted to Government as heretofore for approval and submission to the Government of India for sanction.

(ii) That Collectors be empowered to sanction the entertainment of temporary establishment for service of processes under Acts VIII of 1865, III of 1895 and III of 1869 and Regulation IX of 1822, subject to the condition that the cost of the establishment is fully covered by process fees realized and involves no extra charge to the State (paragraph 11 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government is not prepared to accept the proposal. Such establishment should be sparingly employed.

(iii) That in the case of process-servers appointed for the purposes of Act II of 1864, Collectors be allowed to prescribe a maximum scale of establishment for each taluk, and that Divisional officers be given the discretion of putting the scale wholly or partially in force as occasion may require (paragraph 12 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government considers it desirable that the Collector's previous sanction should be obtained in every case in which such special agency is sought to be employed. The proposal is accordingly negatived. In G.O., No. 680, Revenue, dated 14th November 1898, the Government has accepted the proposal that Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars in independent charge should have the power to appoint, grant leave to and remove special process-servers employed under Madras Acts II of 1864 and I of 1882.

(iv) That Collectors be empowered, in the case of petty construction and repairs to minor civil works, to transfer allotments from sanctioned to non-sanctioned works within the limits of their ordinary powers (Rs. 1,000 for each work) and provided that their total budget allotment is not exceeded (paragraph 14 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government agrees with the Board in considering that the existing practice does not give rise to any inconvenience and that no saving of work would result from the proposed change. The proposal will therefore be negatived.

(v) That the submission of the progress report of petty construction and repairs to minor civil works which accompanies the monthly statement of expenditure furnished by Collectors to the Accountant-General under paragraph 12 of Board's Standing Order No. 1-9 (New Edition) may be discontinued (paragraph 15 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The proposal is approved. From the Board's remarks against entry No. A-20 on

page 31 of Board's Proceedings, No. 105, dated 22nd April 1899, the Government notes that, as a matter of fact, the progress report is not now submitted to the Accountant-General.

(vi) That the limit up to which Collectors may themselves sanction estimates for the execution of minor irrigation works be raised from Rs. 250 to Rs. 500 (paragraphs 16 and 17 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The proposal is approved. The existing proviso will be maintained that Collectors may not sanction estimates which relate to the construction of new masonry works other than simple tank sluices or which involve any material deviation from the standard of efficiency laid down by the Tank Restoration Scheme. Further, as it is necessary that the Tank Restoration memoirs should be kept up to date, all estimates for new masonry works or alteration of existing ones in tanks which have been investigated under the Tank Restoration Scheme should be sent to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for examination.

(vii) That the returns required to be submitted by Collectors to the Board in the case of minor irrigation works under paragraphs 3 and 4 of Board's Standing Order No. 187 (New Edition) may be discontinued (paragraph 18 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Board is not prepared to dispense with the submission of the returns in question, but considers that they may be sent to it direct instead of through the Chief Engineer for Irrigation as is now the case. The Government accepts the Board's view.

(viii) That in the case of minor irrigation works the Collector be allowed to sanction within his lump allotment excesses up to 10 per cent. on estimates sanctioned by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and to deal similarly with estimates passed by himself which by excess expenditure have passed his limit of sanction (paragraph 19 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The proposal is accepted.

(ix) That the monthly progress report of expenditure on each sanctioned minor irrigation work now submitted by every Tahsildar to the Collector may be discontinued, except for the last three months of the year, and that the similar monthly reports to Divisional officers may be submitted quarterly for the first nine months of the year, Divisional officers submitting a consolidated return to the Collector (paragraph 20 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The first part of the proposal is approved. The Government considers that the monthly report should continue to be submitted to the Divisional officer, who will send to the Collector quarterly for the first nine months of the year a consolidated return relating to the works in his division. The orders on this return in the appendix to Board's Proceedings, No. 105, dated 22nd April 1899, should therefore be modified so as to prescribe a monthly return from the Tahsildar to the Divisional officer.

(x) That Collectors be given general permission to sanction journeys of officers subordinate to them outside the limit of their districts for certain purposes (paragraph 21 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The subject should be regulated by the orders contained in G.O., No. 117, Financial, dated 18th January 1899, communicated to the Board with G.O., No. 432, Revenue, dated 30th January 1899.

(xi) That the limit of estimated cost up to which Collectors may, subject to provision in the budget, sanction original works and repairs in estates under the management of the Court of Wards be raised from Rs. 300 and Rs. 500, respectively, Rs. 500 and Rs. 1,000, respectively (paragraph 24 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government has no objection to the proposal.

(xii) That Collectors be given power to sanction the free grant of timber in wards' estates to village communities and private individuals when necessary similar to that which they enjoy in regard to Government forest produce under section 104 of the Forest Code (paragraph 25 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—It is observed that under paragraph 2-H of the Proceedings of the Court of Wards, No. 8, dated 22nd April 1897, recorded in G.O., No. 2822, dated 4th June 1897, Collectors have already been authorized in the matter.

4. III. GRANT OF ADDITIONAL POWERS TO DIVISIONAL OFFICERS—(i) That Divisional officers be empowered to sanction transfers from "wet" to "dry" and vice versa of lands actually cultivated under the other head for three consecutive years, subject to the

concurrence of the Public Works authorities in the case of lands under major irrigation works (paragraph 26 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government does not consider the proposed delegation to be expedient.

(ii) That Divisional officers be allowed to transfer land from assessed to unassessed (paragraph 27 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government agrees with the Board that it would be safer to retain the power in the hands of the Collector, and the proposal is accordingly negatived.

(iii) That Divisional officers be empowered to order the sale of valuable unassessed lands to be transferred to assessed and granted on patta (paragraph 28 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government considers that the power in question should continue to be vested in the hands of the Collector.

(iv) That the sale of disputed darkhast lands by Divisional officers need not be subject to formal confirmation by the Collector as at present is the case (paragraph 29 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The proposal is approved.

(v) That Divisional officers be empowered (a) to receive applications for admission to the Village Officers' Special Test Examinations, (b) to decide in cases of doubt as to the degree of relationship to the existing incumbents of village offices of applicants claiming to pay a lower fee on that account, (c) to permit applicants to appear for the examination elsewhere than in the division to which they belong, and (d) to sign certificates for issue to the successful candidates (paragraph 30 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The proposed delegation of powers is sanctioned.

(vi) That the power of sanctioning refunds of sale-proceeds of impounded cattle in cases where the amount has been held in deposit as unclaimed, on a satisfactory claim being put in within three months from the date of deposit be extended to Sub-Divisional Magistrates (paragraph 31 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The proposal is approved.

(vii) That paragraph 6 of Board's Standing Order No. 237 (New Edition) under which Collectors alone can sanction refunds of judicial fines cancelled on appeal may be modified as follows: "Treasury officers may refund judicial fines under the procedure laid down in that behalf by the High Court from time to time" (paragraph 32 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The proposed amendment of the Standing Order is sanctioned.

(viii) That the power of incurring expenditure on trigonometrical survey stations (up to an average of Rs. 4 annually for each) which is now vested in Collectors be made over to Divisional officers (paragraph 33 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government accepts the proposal.

5. IV. MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS—(i) That the question whether in the case of waste lands sold on the Nilgiri and Shevaroy Hills an ordinary patta may not be substituted for the intricate title-deed now in use be referred to the Collectors of the Nilgiris, Salem and Malabar for report (paragraph 35 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The revision of the rules for the sale of waste lands is now under the consideration of Government and orders will issue in due course.

(ii) That Board's Standing Order No. 204 (New Edition) regarding the provision of carts, etc., for troops on the march be altered in certain respects (paragraph 36 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—Orders will issue separately on this matter.

(iii) That the heading of Board's Standing Order No. 226 (New Edition) be altered into "inspection of taluk treasuries and offices by Divisional officers," that the questions relating to records in the appendix to paragraph 1 of the Standing Order be revised with reference to the "disposal number" system and the answering of the questions be made compulsory, and that Divisional officers be required to submit to Collectors their reports soon after inspection (paragraph 37 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—These proposals are approved.

(iv) That the annual crop experiments now made by Divisional officers and Tahsildars should be conducted only by men who have passed through the Agricultural College or are otherwise specially qualified to deal with the matter (paragraph 38 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The Government is not at present prepared to modify the existing orders on the subject.

(v) That Sub-Registrars at stations where there is a sub-treasury be required to remit their collections to the treasury once a week instead of as now is the case on every day on which the treasury is open for cash transactions (paragraph 39 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The proposal will be considered in the Judicial Department.

(vi) That the annual statement showing the number of Revenue Inspectors trained in survey submitted by Collectors to the Board may be discontinued (paragraph 40 of Mr. Meyer's letter).—The discontinuance of the return is sanctioned.

(vii) In paragraph 41 of his letter Mr. Meyer makes a few suggestions "in view of diminishing copying and registering work in revenue offices and saving the time now occupied in perusal of practically useless papers." One of the suggestions is to the effect that all "routine" orders of Government, which would simply have to be communicated to Collectors, etc., may go direct to them from the Government Office, a copy being at the same time sent to the Board for information. The Board recommends the proposal for favourable consideration. It is observed that the practice referred to is at present followed in the Government Office whenever possible; but the Government considers that it would be inexpedient to prescribe it as a general rule.

(viii) Paragraph 42 of Mr. Meyer's letter—The Standing Orders of the Board of Revenue.—It has already been ordered in G.O., No. 217, Revenue, dated 22nd April 1898, that the chapters relating to Stamps, Abkari and Customs should be excluded from the Board's Standing Orders and that the remaining chapters be divided into two volumes.

(ix) Paragraph 43 of Mr. Meyer's letter—Calling for reports from subordinate officers.—The Government concurs in the views expressed by the Board in regard to Mr. Meyer's suggestions on this subject.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) N. E. MARJORIBANKS,  
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Land Revenue).  
" the Board of Revenue (Revenue Settlement,  
Land Records and Agriculture).  
" the Financial Department.  
" the Public Works Department (Irrigation).  
" the Judicial Department.  
" the Accountant-General.  
" W. S. Meyer, Esq., I.C.S.