M.R.O. I—4,002—16 9-48.

(1) Number of pages

(2) Date of repair

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

Government of Madras

Public Works DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 810 Ms. Press
B.P. No. Mis.

30-3-76.

Dated ~~28-2-~~ 1876

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 1 [illegible] 1c 1.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, *28th February* 1876.

No. 331. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 10th February 1876, No. 403 :—

Read the following letter from W. D. HORSLEY, Esq., Collector of Cuddapah, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 12th January 1876, No. 9 :—

I HAVE the honor to report on Board's footnote, Miscellaneous No. 822, dated 4th February 1875, to G. O., No. 175,* dated 21st January 1875.

2. I find it difficult to answer the general question what I have done to further the interests of the Canal and Irrigation Company. I am under the impression that I have done all that was in my power to do. In present circumstances, I must confess it is not possible for me to do very much. I see faults, but I am powerless to correct them. The Company do not consult their own interests when they charge an exorbitant rate for water, but I know for certain that it is utterly useless for me to raise any voice against it from the manner in which the question was treated at the meeting held here last year. Then, again, I am never consulted in any way by the officers of the Company. They apparently endeavour to keep everything as much as possible in their own hands without reference to me. My predecessors were treated precisely in the same way. When I took office, my predecessor informed me that he was in perfect ignorance of canal matters, and that when he assumed charge he could learn nothing from his predecessor. I endeavoured to gain an insight into the working of the canal by settling the annual demand for the Cuddapah Taluq, a duty which has always been left to the Deputy Collector on special duty, but that apparently did not bring me and the canal officers on closer terms. They content themselves with making complaints that they receive no assistance from Government officials, but omit to state that they have not applied for assistance. I know that there are shortcomings on the part of the Tahsildar of Cuddapah, who is, as I have before reported to the Board, an exceedingly bad Revenue officer, but on no occasion have I received any complaints against him from the officers of the Company.

[illegible] 1872-73

3. Mr. Dodson says that no application forms were issued to the Curnams. The rules regarding applications were published in the District Gazette, and every endeavour was made by the Deputy Collector and Tahsildars to make the rules known to the village officials. Printed forms of applications could not at first be given to the Curnams, as the District Press was full of work, but the Curnams were told to issue manuscript copies. In spite of this, the Deputy Collector found that applications were still received by the Company's Overseers. He wrote to Mr. Dodson requesting him to enforce upon his subordinates "the strict observance of Rule II.,"

* G.O., No. 178, dated 26th January 1875, Revenue Department.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th February 1876.

complaining that the Curnams being kept in ignorance of what water had been applied for, they were unable to prepare the canal cultivation accounts. In reply, Mr. Dodson promises to do nothing. He simply says:—"My Overseers and Amins have been giving tickets to ryots, because the Curnams of the villages in your district all stated that they had received no orders to give tickets to the ryots, and had no forms for that purpose." He further said that the Curnams might inspect the books of the Amins. If, as Mr. Dodson says, the Curnams stated that they had received no orders to give tickets, how came it that the Curnams complained to the Tahsildar that the tickets were issued by the Company's Officers. The Deputy Collector wrote to Mr. Dodson on the statement of the Curnams. The fact that the Curnams said anything on the subject makes it quite clear that they had received their orders, and were willing to act up to them, if permitted to do so. I have not the least doubt that the Company's Amins were perfectly willing to continue receiving applications for water in spite of the rule as it then existed to the contrary, because applications of any kind whether for land or for water, and whether made to Curnams or to Company's Amins, are usually accompanied by a small payment of money. This advantage the Company's Amins were unwilling to relinquish until the irregular manner in which the applications were made was brought to Mr. Dodson's notice by the Deputy Collector, when a flimsy excuse was made by the Company's subordinates. This excuse reflected on the conduct of Revenue officials, and was, as I have stated in a former letter, too readily swallowed by Mr. Dodson.

4. I quite admit as I have said in former letters that village officials are capable of every kind of misconduct, but I have not the slightest reason to believe that the underlings of the Company are one whit better than the Curnams. It would be quite unnatural if they were. I was only the other day informed by an Overseer lately in the Company's service that the Amins were not to be trusted, and required to be closely watched. I can find nothing about this in Mr. Dodson's reports. It is always the Curnams who do wrong.

5. If Mr. Dodson wants my assistance he should apply for it, and then he may complain if he does not get it. He has not the slightest grounds for leading the Government to suppose that I neglect the interests of the Company. He knows perfectly well that at the settlement of the demand for Fasli 1282 I did all in my power to further the interests of the Company.

1872-73
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Submitted to Government, with reference to G.O., 26th January 1875, No. 178, Revenue Department.

2. The Board are satisfied that it is the desire of the Collector to give every assistance in his power to the canal officers and to promote the interests of the Company; and they agree with Mr. Horsley that Mr. Dodson, having never sought assistance or indicated in what way it might be acceptable, has no reason to complain of not getting it.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Acting Secretary.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th February 1876.

No. 332.

Order thereon, 28th February 1876, No. 293.

Miscellaneous.

Communicated to the Public Works Department with reference to the G. O. in that department, dated 21st January 1875, No. 175.

(True Extract.)

Secretary to Government.

To the Public Works Department.
„ the Board of Revenue.

Exd. J. W. Lewis.

I think this matter shd not have been dealt with without communication with the Member of Govt. The matter is a very important one. It seems that under ¶ 15 of Rev: minute no explanation of past failures are obtained & no means to prevent similar or future failures are prescribed — J

I am at a loss to account for the disposal of this important matter by the Secretary in the Revenue Department without circulating the paper to any member.

The shortcomings of Mr. Horsley in this matter of the canal came ~~up~~ under discussion with papers recorded in Progs: of Govt: of 21 Jany /75 and more than once previously I believe in Council. The Governor and both Civil members perused the papers and initialled the remarks

my

My note was to the effect: "In the meantime the Collector will be required to explain through the Board of Revenue what measures he has taken to advance the interests of the Canal and bring the new rules into operation" &c. to Mr. Master see Mr. Dodson's report. The contrast between the action of the Collectors of Kurnool & Cuddapah is probably correctly judged by the men's character.

What is the result? Mr. Horsley does not even notice the order for nearly a year and the explanation then submitted is open to all the reflections which the Chief Engineer for Irrigation makes on it. I am satisfied that indifference if not obstruction has characterised Mr. Horsley's conduct throughout in the matter of the Canal and the Govt. should I think refuse to share the Board's satisfaction.

7c

I would bring Col: Mullins' memo on record & state that Govt. share his views and then refer the matter back to the Revenue Dept. to take such notice of the conduct as it deserves

18/3

would as Sir W. R. suggests bring Col. M's memo on record - state that Govt. are of opinion that ~~the~~ matter has not received the attention it requires - refer back to the Bd. for immediate report of the measures they deem necessary to ensure proper knowledge of rules & distribution of tickets & of the arrangements made to secure their being carried out - & add that the action of Mr. H. does not satisfy the Govt.

(I do not wish to pledge myself to sharing all the views expressed in Col. M's letter)

I concur.

9C

C No 155

Iregno

BW
Ph 30 March 76. 495–496

FORMER CASES.

Current No. of 187 .

M. WORKS FORM No. 3.

Current No. 1556

From The Revenue Dept

No. 293
Dated 28 Feb 1876
Recd. 2 March

Subject:— Irrig: & Canal: Company — Communicating to the Rev. Pro: of the Board of Revenue submitting report regarding measures taken by the Collector to advance the interest of the —

~~Recorded~~

I agree with Col Mullins W.M. 8/3
& have transmitted his Memo:
to the Hon'ble Sir W. Robinson with a view (see note by Sir W.R.)
to notice being taken in the Revenue
Dept of Mr. Horsley's conduct
R.A.E.

ENCLOSURES.

From to

" with order

LATER CASES.

Current No. of 187

Orders and Proceedings in file.

Department.	No.	Date.	ENDORSEMENTS.		
			Department.	No.	Dated.
P.W.D.	3128	20/4/74			
"	175	21/1/75			

Pd 30 March 76 R.W. 495

Cir 15-3-76.

No 2

P. 3
11C

Memorandum

for the information of the Honorable R. S. Ellis.—

As the order in the Revenue Department No. 293 of the 28th February 1876 has not gone into the subject of the representations made by the Madras Irrigation and Canal Company's Officers, or examined into the grounds of the satisfaction expressed by the Board of Revenue, it is probable that no useful purpose would be served by an order on the merits in the Public Works Department. It seems however to be unlikely that the Company will share in the satisfaction of the Board, neither is there apparently any reason why the Government should be satisfied.—

In the first place the order of the 21st January 1875 No. 175 was com=
=municated

communicated to the Collector of Cuddapah by the Board of Revenue on the 4th February following, and the Collector's reply is dated 12th January 1876.—

Mr. Dodson the Canal Officer then in charge of the lower half of the canal, had brought to notice a marked contrast between the means taken in the Kurnool and Cuddapah Districts respectively to make the new rules known, and to instruct the Curnums. He stated that copies of the rules, placards and a plentiful supply of application forms had been provided in Kurnool, and that these obvious requirements had been left unattended to in Cuddapah; that in Kurnool the Collector had shown a personal interest in the matter, and that the Deputy Collector had visited most of the villages and explained fully the advantages of the new rules, while in Cuddapah no such action had been taken.—

Thoroughly & most [illegible]

Mr. Dodson was an officer long conversant with the canal, who could hardly have been mistaken as to the marked difference which he observed in the two Districts, and on referring to Mr. Horsley's letter, on a subject which it would seem ought to have been deemed of too much importance to have been shelved for nearly a year, it will be seen that Mr. Dodson's remarks on the absence of measures for making the new rules known to the people generally are confirmed, for it would seem that the publication of the rules was confined to the District Gazette, if indeed they were therein printed, for the Collector alludes

alludes only to the rules regarding applications, which if taken literally would mean Rule II only. Again the District Press being full of work no printed forms of application were provided, and the Curnums, who have at no time shown any desire to do the work entrusted to them, were thus left with a ready excuse for doing nothing.-

It may be supposed that by G. O. of the 21st January 1875 No. 175 it was intended that the Collector should give a resumé of the action taken by him on the sanction by Government of the new rules, and of the instructions he issued. It would appear to be fair to conclude that he did nothing in regard to them beyond the mere routine work which was unavoidable, and that, so far as the application forms were concerned, was very badly done.

Yes

of as much -

Mr. Horsley appears to think that he had nothing to do but to sit still until specific complaints were made to him by the Canal Officers, but it is evident that the proper time for action was before reasons for specific complaints could arise, and that this action should have had for its object 1st the dissemination of information among the subordinate Revenue Officers and the villagers, and 2nd the conviction by the Tahsildars and Curnums that the Collector was determined that their part of the work should be performed thoroughly.-

While deprecating the expression of dissatisfaction by the Canal Officers before they had made any specific complaints and waited to see what would come of them, a course of proceeding which experience had probably made them believe to be futile, for it must be remembered that the monthly reports have from time to time contained specific complaints of the negligence of subordinate of area was not encouraging, it was not insignificant.—

Wm. 9/3

Pg 30 March 76 RN 495a-

Cn 15-3-76

No. 810 Public Works Department

19.0

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 30th March /76-

READ the following:—

Proceedings of Government Revenue Dept } (R.O. No 293 dt 28 Feby /76)

Memorandum by the Chief Engr for Irriga } (— dt 9 Mar /76)

Ordered that the Memorandum by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation be recorded with an expression of the opinion of the Governor in Council that the important subject with which it deals has not received the attention it requires either at the hands of the Collector of Cuddapah or of the Board of Revenue

2. The Collector's ~~Mr Horsley's~~ letter does not satisfy the Governor in Council that the interests of the Company and

and of the Government have been duly studied. The subject will now be referred back to the Board, through the Revenue Department, for immediate report of the measures they deem necessary to ensure proper knowledge of rules, distribution of tickets &ca and of the arrangements requisite to secure their being carried out

495/6

Rev: Dept. 21
Ch. Engr for Irrign 5
Desp. 13-4-76

17

Ex'd

M.R.O. 1—4

15576

Govt. of {1876} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

The Revenue Dept.

31/3

Dated

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G. O., 30th March 1876, No. 810

Nos. 495/6

Madras Irrigation & Canal Company — Passing orders on the subject of the measures taken by the Collector of Cuddapah to advance the interests of the —

Entd. in Regr.
25-4-76