L. & M.
9,000-8-8-96.

Local & Munl. (1895.) Departmen

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 2082 L

DATED 31st Octr 1895.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Ranipet Channel.

Passing remarks on the subject of the contamination of the channel water by the distillery refuse at Ranipet in the North Arcot district.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

---

[7]

Miscellaneous.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPT.

G.O., DATED 31-10-96
No. 2082 L.

INDEXED.

When given for copying.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Rampet Channel

Passing remarks on the subject of the contamination of the channel water by the distillery refuse at Rampet in the N. Arcot Distt.

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED
189 . No , MISCELLANEOUS.

BACK PAPER, No. of 189

FURTHER PAPER, No. of 189

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

N.B.—
A — Copy in full.
B — Not to be copied.
P — Copy abstract only.
Q — Copy heading only.

Copied by 31/10

Examined by

---

mendation made in the notes that the discharge into the Channel of the wash from the distillery should be put a stop to.

Channel at Ranipet

3. It would appear to be necessary to ~~suggest~~ remark that the Dep. San. Commr. should in future make him self thoroughly acquainted with the suggestions & recommendations of previous inspecting officers before making proposals or notes of his own inspections.

C.S. (from orders)

2082 L

30/10/95 (from orders)

25/10/95

TO The Collector & District Magistrate, N. Arcot. P & Q
Sanitary Commissioner. P & Q

Despd. 1/11/95

[G./24]
500—26-6-94.

L & M DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings :—

Again G. O., dated 189 , No.
Again G. O., dated 189 , No.
Current No. 2381. L. of 189 , dated from

Current No. 2779. L. of 189 , dated from

ORDER. No. 2082 Luis. 31-10-95

Apparently no action in respect of the channel is at present called for in the interests of sanitation ~~at present~~.

2. The Govt. considers that inasmuch as the Depy. San. Commrs. inspection notes were referred to the Collector by Govt for attention, that officer was ~~entirely~~ justified in bringing to ~~the~~ notice the previous correspondence on the question, & soliciting ~~orders~~ instructions as to ~~whether~~ the steps that should be taken upon the ~~D. San. Commrs.~~ recom-

---

District Board President's recommendation that things should remain as they were. This letter of the Collector having been referred to the Sanitary Commissioner for his remarks, the second of the currents read above is his reply. The Sanitary Commissioner tries to justify the action of his Deputy. But it is plain that the Deputy Sanitary Commissioner was not aware of the previous correspondence on the subject, especially the report of the Sanitary Commissioner communicated with G.O. No. 2466L. dated 27th Novr. 1894, because, if he was, he would not have made the recommendation contained in his report communicated with G.O. No. 1278L. dated 20th July 1895.

V.R
16/10/95

Submitted that Govt. may say that no action appears to be called for in the interests of sanitation, & with reference to Dr. King's remarks on the fact that Mr. Wynne referred the question to Govt. may say that Mr. W. was right in so doing. The Dy. San. Commr. might also be requested to read at least the last report of his office on towns & places he visits, before writing inspection notes of them

W.C.R 22/10/95

Sd 23/10/95.

Fouling of the Irrigation channel at Ranipet by the discharge of the Distillery wash.

FOR ORDERS.

2381 & 2779 L.

H.M.

This is a trumpery business & I don't see why it need have come to me — How can I possibly say whether anything ought to be done to a chl in Ranipet?

HA
24/10/95

[G./24]
500—26-6-94.

L&M DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings :—

Again G. O., dated 189 , No.

Again G. O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. 2381 L. of 189 , dated from

Current No. 2779 L. of 189 , dated from

ORDER. No. 2082 Luis. 31-10-95

Apparently no action in respect of the channel is at present called for in the interests of sanitation~~, at present~~.

2. The Govt. considers that inasmuch as the Depy. San. Commrs. inspection notes were referred to the Collector by Govt for attention, that officer was ~~entirely~~ justified in bringing to ~~the~~ notice the previous correspondence on the question, & soliciting ~~orders~~ instructions as to ~~whether~~ the steps that should be taken upon the ~~D. San. Commrs.~~ recom-

---

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. 2381 L. of 1895, dated 12th August 1895 from the Collector of North Arcot

Current No. 2779 L. of 1895, dated 24th Septr. 1895 from the Sanitary Commissioner for Madras.

FOR ORDERS.

vide G. O. No 2100 Judl. 29-8-86.

In August 1886 the District Magistrate of North Arcot was instructed, on the complaint of the villagers of Ranipet, &c., to intimate to Messrs. Morrison and Sons that unless they forthwith stopped the discharge of the wash from their distillery into the bed of the Pálár at Ranipet, action would be taken against them under Chapter X of the Criminal Procedure Code. As regards the future disposal of the wash the Government said that if the proposal to discharge it into the Vannivédu river channel commended itself to Messrs. Morrison & Sons, they were at liberty to make ~~an~~ the experiment of ~~it~~ doing so at their own risk, and this suggestion was apparently adopted by them.

Now says that the channel water is not used for drinking purposes

2. In his report on the condition of the rural tracts in this district in 1893 the Sanitary Commissioner (Surgeon-Lieut-Col: Laing) stated that one drinking-water channel of Ranipet had been rendered

2/10

further repce called for on 3-10-95

rendered quite unfit ~~to be~~ for a drinking water supply owing to the discharge into it of the refuse from the distillery and that there was an abominable smell at the channel. This report was as usual communicated to the District Board for attention.

vide G. O. No. 344 L. Loc. & Muni. d 17-2-93.

3. When the town of Ranipet was again inspected by the Sanitary Commissioner (Surgeon Lieut-Col. King) in August 1894, the villagers complained to him that the use of the water of the channel into which the distillery wash was discharged injured their crops and that ~~it~~ such discharges was objectionable because the water was also used for drinking. The Sanitary Commissioner thought that if the water was used for drinking purposes the practice of launching the wash into it should be discontinued, but that there could be no reasonable objection to it if the channel was used for irrigation only. This report was also communicated to the District Board for attention.

vide G. O. No 2466 L. Loc. & Muni. d 27-11-94.

W. Wynne now says that the channel water is not used for drinking purposes.

4. In his report on the inspection of Ranipet in June 1895, the Deputy Sanitary Commissioner stated that there was a channel in the town, not used for drinking purposes, which was smelling badly and was said to be contaminated by the refuse from the distillery, which should be put a stop to. This report was also communicated to the Local Boards concerned for attention – vide G.O. No. 1278 L. Local and Municipal dated 20th July 1895.

5. On this report the Collector Mr. Wynne complained (Current No. 2381 L) that it was not proper for the Deputy Sanitary Commissioner to treat of a matter involving such serious consequences to private interests in so casual a manner, as he did not say why the practice should be put a stop to, what the contamination of the irrigation channel not used for drinking purposes consisted of, or in what way the matter was one in which the interests of sanitation were concerned. He therefore requested orders as to what, if any, action should be taken, as none could be taken under Chapter X of the Criminal Procedure Code. Mr. Wynne further said that it was pointed out to the Sanitary Commissioner that the water of the channel in question was not used for drinking purposes as supposed by him in his report communicated with G.O. No. 344 L. d 17th Feb. 1893, and that he made no reply to this, and was presumably satisfied with

the

2/11 further report called for on 3-10-95

District Board President's recommendation that things should remain as they were. This letter of the Collector having been referred to the Sanitary Commissioner for his remarks, the second of the currents read above is his reply. The Sanitary Commissioner tries to justify the action of his Deputy. But it is plain that the Deputy Sanitary Commissioner was not aware of the previous correspondence on the subject, especially the report of the Sanitary Commissioner communicated with G.O. No. 2466L. dated 27th Novr. 1894, because if he was, he would not have made the recommendation contained in his report communicated with G.O. No. 1278L. dated 20th July 1895.

V.R.
16/10/95

Submitted that Govt. may say that no action appears to be called for in the interests of sanitation, & with reference to Dr. King's remarks on the fact that Mr. Wynne referred the question to Govt. may say that Mr. W. was right in so doing. The Dy. San. Commr. might also be requested to read at least the last report of his office on towns & places he visits, before writing inspection notes of them

W.C.R. 22.10.95

23/10/95.

Fouling of the Irrigation channel at Ranipet by the discharge of the Distillery wash.

FOR ORDERS.

H.M.

2381 & 2779L.

This is a trumpery business & I don't see why it need have come to me. How can I possibly say whether anything ought to be done or not in Ranipet?

24/10/95

Local & Municipal Dept.

CURRENT No. 2779 L

Local and Municipal DEPARTMENT.

From

W. G. King

SURGEON LIEUT.-COL. ~~J. A. LAING~~,

SANITARY COMMISSIONER FOR MADRAS,

To

THE Chief Secretary to Government Local & Municipal

No. 1653/S

Dated 24th
Despatched 25th
September 1895.
Received 25 SEP 95

ENCLOSURES. C No. 2381 L retd

Subject.

Submitting remarks called for in No. 1252 dated 4th Septr. 1895 regarding the Contamination of the Channel water by the distillery refuse at Ranipettai.

[960—8-12-92.]

2/10 further info called for on 3-10-95

No 1653/S

Office of Sanitary Commissioner
Fort Saint George 24th September 1895

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT.
Dispd 25 - 9 - 95.
CURRENT No. 2771 L

From,

Surgeon Lieut Col. W. G. King M.B., C.M., D.P.H.
Sanitary Commissioner for Madras

To,

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Local & Municipal Department,
Fort Saint George.

Sir,

With reference to Endorsement of Government No 1252 dated 4th September, I have the honor to point out that G. O. No 2100 dated 9th Aug 1886, Judicial, to which Mr Wynne ag. Collector of North Arcot refers, does not give the owners of the distillery the unquestionable right to discharge their refuse into the channel in question. The permission was apparently tentative on the part of Government. In regard to Mr Wynne's declamation as to the manner in which the Deputy Sanitary Commissioner fulfilled his duty in this matter, I fail to see he has any just cause of complaint, or is in possession of any special reason for addressing Government on the subject. The Deputy Sanitary Commissioner states distinctly that the channel "smells badly": that being so, it was his duty to bring the matter to the notice

× This is not the point. The question is whether the discharge causes a nuisance which "ought to be put a stop to".

× The reason he addresses Govt. is obvious – the remark of Govt's San. adviser that the discharge "ought to be put a stop to" was communicated to him "for attention".

Sanitary Commissioner for Madras.

notice of the local authorities as a "nuisance", and it was also quite within his functions to add that this "should be put a stop to" leaving it to the local authorities to decide how this should be done, or to receive instruction should they not be able to cope with the matter.

2. Mr Wynne seems to have forgotten that this office issues advice not orders, and that hence an appeal to Government as to what he should do under the circumstances was premature. I venture to think that had he not considered this advice appropriate, the ends of the public service would have been sufficiently subserved had he informed me of any doubts he might entertain on the matter for any further opinion, before proceeding to lay the matter before Government. Had he done so, I certainly should have referred him to para 5 of my Report on this subject embodied in G.O. No 2466 L dated 27th November 1894, which I think takes a sufficiently broad view of the matter in question. It seems to me, having regard to the advice therein given that the local authorities should now be required to state (1) whether the channel is used for irrigation only, or for both irrigation and drinking purposes (2) whether damage to the crops does ensue from the mingling of the "wash" with the water as stated by the ryots - the latter being, of course, a question which has but indirect sanitary interest. In writing the report referred to, I believed I had given sufficient basis for definite action by the local authorities after they had satisfied themselves as to the points specially brought to their attention as requiring definite answers prior to their taking action.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant
W E King
Surg. Lieut Col.
Sanitary Commr for Madras

It is "within his function" to give any advice he likes but there seems no reason why he shd not exercise care to see that his advice is reasonable, & that it does not ~~make~~ call for action which has already been decided by his own San Commr to be unnecessary.

Submitted that it was not premature. The D. San. Commrs remark was forcible, & was commd to him for attention. If he did nothing he wd be to blame. As he thinks the advice wrong he can but represent his opinion to Govt. His reference for an opinion wh. has been given orders by Govt. to appeal to the officer on whose report the orders were based.

The Dy. Sany. Commr himself says that the "water-channel not used for drinking purposes smells badly and is said to be contaminated by the refuse from the Distillery"

To The Sanitary Commissioner for Madras.

22/8

[illegible] Municipal Dept.
[illegible] No. 2381 L

main

THE COLLECTOR AND
No. 16345
DISTRICT MAGISTRATE,
North Arcot.

To The Chief Secretary
to Government
Local and Municipal Department

No. of Enclosures. nil

Letter, dated 12 August 1895.
Re far Cur No. 1141 of 1895.
Eng.

CHIEF SECRETARY'S
SUBJECT.
16 AUG 95

making some observations in regard to the contamination of the Channel water by the distillery refuse at Ranipett, and requesting orders if any action is to be taken in the matter

TO BE RETURNED WITH REPLY

No. 1252

Referred to the Sanitary Commissioner for remarks.

(By order)
W. Francis.
Ag. Under Secretary.

V.R.
22/8/95
Fort St George,
Aug 95
h

To The Sanitary Commissioner for Madras.

22/8

Recommendation that things should Remain as they are.

I have the honor &c,

Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servant,

C. C. Arthur Jennings

For Collector

Copied [illegible]

Compd - Y

Procedure Code without evidence which there is nothing in the Inspect. notes to indicate that the Deputy Sanitary Commissioner is capable of supplying.

3. I may add that the Sanitary Commissioner 2 years and a half ago made some sweeping remarks on the matter after an inquiry, which was so imperfect that he supposed the Channel was a drinking channel - vide G.O. No. 344 L, dated 17th February 1893 - On the facts being pointed out to him, he made no reply and presumably was satisfied with the District Board President's recommendation

The matter was reported
a subsequent Inspection
note - please see para. 5 of
the notes printed in G.O. d 27th *
Nov 1894, No 2466 L.

+ RV 520.S / 2/3/93

* RV 2698 / 4/12/94.

into the irrigation Channel for the last nine years or so. The Deputy Sanitary Commissioner does not say why the practice is "to be put a stop to", what the "Contamination" of the irrigation Channel not used for drinking purposes consists of, or in what way the matter is one in which the interests of sanitation are concerned. I do not think it is proper for that officer to treat of a matter involving such serious consequences to private interests in so casual a manner.

2. I request orders as to whether any action is to be taken and, if so, of what nature. It is obvious that no action could be taken under Chapter X of the Criminal Procedure

Refer

No. 1141/Cursory of 1895.

North Arcot, Collector's Office,
12th August 1895.

DESPATCHED
14 AUG 95

From

G. H. Wynne Esquire
Collector and District Magistrate,
North Arcot.

Local & Municipal Dept.
CURRENT No. 2381 L

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Local and Municipal
Department.

Sir,

I have the honor, with reference to G.O. no. 1278 L, dated 20th July 1895, to call attention to the following remark of the Deputy Sanitary Commissioner "There is a second water channel not used for drinking purposes which smells badly and is said to be contaminated by the refuse from the distillery. This should be put a stop to", and to G.O. no. 2100 Judicial, dated 9th August 1886.

In accordance with the latter, the distillery wash has been discharged

into

Rt 1455.S / 1/8/95

para 3 of the note as printed in the G.O.

x Not Commund.

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed } 189 .

Read again G.O., No. Dated
189 ,

Current No.

Enclosures to C. No.

Order of Government .. .. .. A A A A A A A

Letter of Government.

Statement with ditto.

Papers not filed up, being meant for despatch in original.

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.