1162

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,*
*24th October* 1873.

Read the following :—

No. 224. Proceedings of the Court of Wards, dated 20th September 1873, No. 1,889.

Read again the following papers—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 23rd December 1872, No. 2,452.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, dated 13th May 1873, No. 73, Revenue Department.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, dated 15th August 1873, No. 855.

Read also the following letter from C. G. MASTER, Esq., Collector of Ganjam, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Court of Wards, dated Chetterpore, 7th August 1873, No. 1,834 :—

I HAVE the honour, with reference to the Court's Proceedings, dated 23rd December last, No. 2,452, to submit copy of a letter (and its enclosures), dated 16th April last, (received 16th idem) No. 103, which should have been forwarded sooner.

2. I do not consider it necessary to say more about the delay regarding which Mr. Grahame was called for explanation in paragraph 2 of the Proceedings under reply, than to remark that under the circumstances described by him, it was not surprizing that the matter escaped recollection, and that the omission to report was certainly not intentional.

3. With reference to paragraph 4, I have to state that on the 11th June 1872, I received a telegram from Mr. Grahame as follows :—" Kimedy Supervisor suspended, apparently forgery. Can you send a man to act, If so ? let him join sharp." I replied that I had no one to send. On the 17th idem, I received a letter from Mr. Grahame, (13th June 1872, No. 204) telling me that he had authorized the Overseer to perform the Supervisor's duties until further orders, and that he would let me know the result of the case against T. Ramayya after it was closed.

4. On the 29th July 1872, I received a letter, dated 25th idem, No. 107, in which Mr. Grahame asked me to obtain a legal opinion on some questions relating to this very case. I forwarded the letter on to Government the same day, and the Order thereon, dated 16th August 1872, No. 1,113, Judicial Department, reached the district on 3rd September, a few days after I had quitted it on leave.

5. This letter contains a full description of the land transactions in which T. Ramayya had been engaged, and of the circumstances which led to the charge of forgery being preferred. I enclose a spare copy of the Government Order, and I must express my great regret that the matter was not reported to the Court at the time. I can only suppose that when the matter was first brought to my notice by telegram, I considered it advisable to wait for further particulars, and that when it came up again in the shape of a reference on the Magisterial side, I thought the submission of the question to Government all that was immediately called for. I quite see that the Court should have been informed at the first.

report as from time to time he could arrange to visit them. No change was to be made in the existing system of supplying funds or auditing expenditure. Overseer Venkata Row was afterwards appointed* a supernumerary Supervisor of 2nd grade and directed to join Kimedy.

* G. O., 23rd May 1873, No. 1,413, Public Works Department, Court's Miscellaneous Proceedings, 3rd June 1873, No. 3,345.

13. It is obvious that the Estate will not require the services of an Overseer on 100 Rupees (Vira Mallesalingam's present pay) besides those of a Supervisor on Rupees 150, and if an officer of the latter grade is to be retained, Vira Mallesalingam will have to revert to his former position. Mr. Grahame in his present letter refers to the opinion which he expressed in November last on this very point and to the unfairness of putting a stranger over the head of the present Overseer, whose local knowledge and length of service in the estate "ought to plead against his supersession." He begs that the Court will reconsider the question of appointing a new man as Supervisor, and I would support his request on the grounds which he adduces, as well as because of the unnecessary additional expense which will be incurred thereby. For it appears to me, that if the Estate is to be under Mr. Lever, all we want is one good man in the taluq with such subordinate agency as is usual, and that unless we throw out Vira Mallesalingam altogether, which would be very hard upon him, we shall have almost more than we require under present arrangements.

14. It seems to be necessary also that the relative position of the Revenue Officer in charge of the Estate and of the Public Works Department should be defined. If it is not, I apprehend clashing. The District Engineer has just called† upon Mr. Lever to report on the system of supplying funds to the Estate, and audit and to send in a Statement of establishment with dates of past and present appointments, with qualifications, etc. The Principal Assistant Collector, to whom Mr. Lever had of course to refer, writes‡ to say that he does not see why the District Engineer should require the information. He asks for it, I presume, under the impression that the Public Works in Kimedy are as much under him as the other ranges of the district, and if this be so, of course he has every right to ask for any information he chooses. The question to be decided is, whether any alteration is to take place in the position of the Principal Assistant Collector, *i. e.*, is he to remain as at present the head of the department in Kimedy, keeping the accounts of the expenditure and initiating budgets, etc., or is he to occupy a place similar to that which he already occupies in the Chicacole Range as the Revenue Officer in charge of the Sub-division of the district?

† 12th June 1873, No. 297.

‡ 12th July 1873, No. 195.

15. I hope the Court will acquit me of any want of respect if I say that I think their recent§ censure of the Principal Assistant Collector was rather too severe. I believe that Mr. Grahame has done as much as any one ever did in the way of supervision: I would also point out that it is owing entirely to Mr. Grahame's inquisitiveness, that the heretofore unsatisfactory character of the administration of Public Works in Kimedy has been brought to prominent notice. I know we are all theoretically

§ Court's Proceedings, 5th July 1873, No. 1,206, paragraph 6.



responsible for every thing which goes amiss in the divisions entrusted to us, and so far of course, are amenable to rebuke and must ever be so, as it is morally and physically impossible that a Revenue Officer and Magistrate should ever do the *whole* of his duty to his own satisfaction. I am confident, however, that Mr. Grahame does not spare himself. I have reason also for believing that his predecessors made frequent visits of inspection, and as both Captain Beckley and Mr. Harris reported* favourably on the state of the Public Works in the Estate after seeing, more or less cursorily, what was going on, there was no reason for suspecting that any thing much was amiss.

* *Vide* Mr. Harris's report forwarded with Mr. Ellis's letter, dated 24th May 1870, No. 652, in which there is particularly favourable mention of the late Supervisor.

16. So far as I can judge, the Kimedy Estate must now come under the regular control of the District Public Works Department, who will be responsible for the estimates and the execution of the necessary works. In this event, the position of the Principal Assistant Collector must be hereafter different to what it has been. If the maintenance of the roads generally should fall upon the Local Funds with reference to the recently† expressed opinion of the Court, there is all the more reason for the direct management being in the hands of the Public Works Department.

† Court's Proceedings, 17th May 1873, No. 821, paragraph 12.

17. But there is one question which has not yet been touched upon though it is a very important one, and that is, on what terms will the Government undertake supervision of the Public Works in the Estate? Major Beckley remarked to me some months ago that even the probability of the Estate being again brought under the District Engineer, would much affect the distribution of Range Officers, as the expenditure in Kimedy is equal to about half the expenditure in the rest of the Ganjam District. Mr. Lever, I imagine, owes his present appointment to this "probability." The expenditure on the Estate has of the late averaged Rupees 61,872 per annum‡, and though the Court on a former§ occasion doubted whether this expenditure would continue, the budget recently‖ submitted shows that it is necessary to be liberal in this respect. Should the Government therefore apply to the Estate, the same principles on which they have been dealing with Local Funds, viz., charging 25 per cent. *Vide* Government Order, 5th September 1872, No. 1,183, we should find ourselves saddled with a charge of say Rupees 15,000 as the bare cost of *supervision* exclusive of the local subordinate establishment, which would probably have to be maintained as well, in the same way as the Local Fund Petty Establishment is kept up.

| | Rs. |
|---|---|
| ‡ 1277... ... ... ... | 48,294 |
| 1278 .. ... ... ... | 68,184 |
| 1279... ... ... ... | 74,084 |
| 1280... ... ... ... | 69,571 |
| 1281... ... ... ... | 49,230 |
| Total... | 3,09,363 |
| Average per annum... | 61,872 |

§ Court's Proceedings, dated 11th July 1872, No. 1,276, paragraph 2.

‖ Dated 18th July 1873, No. 1,604.

18. It may appear to the Court that the desired supervision will, under this view of the case, be purchased at too high a rate, and that it may be still necessary

to continue the arrangement under which the Supervisor was specially exempted from any departmental control (paragraph 6, Court's Proceedings, dated 5th July 1873, No. 1,206). It is true, as far as I can learn, that when the Estate was formerly under the charge of the District Engineer, no separate charge was made for his supervision, but times have changed. It is also to be remembered that the Estate pays a commission to Government for "management" and this amounted for Fasli 1281, (1871-72) to Rupees 4,168 at 1½ per cent. on the collections. I do not suppose, however, that this would include Public Works Supervision.

---

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From W. F. GRAHAME, Esq., Acting Principal Assistant-Collector, to C. G. MASTER, Esq., Acting Collector of Ganjam, dated Chicacole, 16th April 1873, No. 103.

I HAVE the honour to reply to your foot-note to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, No. 2,452, dated 23rd December 1872.

2. As regards the delay in writing to the Court of Wards about the Parlah Kimedy Department Public Works, I can only express my regret that it occurred. When the Government Order appointing D. Kistniah to the charge of the Kimedy Range reached me, I was in camp. I proposed to write to the Court of Wards pointing out the advisability of appointing a European Officer to the Department Public Works, and ordered a draft letter to be prepared. The Overseer in charge of Kimedy Range during T. Ramayya's suspension wrote to me pointing out the hardship of his case in being superseded by a man lately appointed to the Public Works Department, when he himself had been seventeen and a half years in it, of which fifteen years had been spent in the Kimedy Estate. I ought of course to have written at once, and my only excuse is that after I had ordered a draft to be written, I forgot all about the matter. You may not think this so surprising when you remember that I had more work on my hands than I could get through in the day. All the Settlement Reports were then being prepared, the District Report, the Sub-division Report, and one on Kimedy Estate: the budgets of both Local Fund Circles were in the hands of the Sub Committees, of both of which I was a Member; I had in my own hands two of the Revenue and Magisterial Divisions of the district; as it happened there was a good deal of crime to be dealt with just then, and I was the only full power Magistrate in the district and Senior Assistant Magistrate's Divisions; and there were several special reports being written, some of them of considerable length. These various matters so filled up my time and engaged my attention, that I quite forgot about the Kimedy Public Works. I do not say I ought not to have remembered it, but I do say that I did not wilfully cause delay as the Court of Wards seem to consider, so far as I gather from their Proceedings.

3. As I mentioned before, my principal object in writing was to urge on the Court of Wards the advisability of employing an European in Kimedy Range. Secondarily (though it came first in my letter) I wished to point out that there was on the spot a man in my opinion quite as fit as T. Ramayya to be in charge of Kimedy Range if the Court of Wards refused to appoint a European. I learn from a late Proceedings of the Board of Revenue that they intend to put a 2nd class Supervisor in charge of Kimedy; I have received a letter from the man now in charge protesting against this step. I must myself point out the unfairness to Vira Mallesalingam of putting a stranger over his head. I have in my former letter of 24th November given my reasons for recommending that if any native be put in charge of the Estate Public Works, Vira Mallesalingam should be put in. His local knowledge and his great length of service in the Estate ought to plead against his supersession by a complete stranger. I do not know if Vira Mallesalingam was originally in the Government Public Works Department. If he was, he left it for the service of the Estate, and I think he ought not to suffer thereby, when an opportunity presents itself at which

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,*
*24th October* 1873.

he might very legitimately expect promotion. I therefore beg that you will request the Court of Wards to re-consider the proposal to put in a stranger.

4. As regards the blame awarded to me as one of the district officers "for their silence regarding the unsatisfactory proceedings of T. Ramayya," I have only to say that as soon as I found it necessary to suspend T. Ramayya, I telegraphed you, and that my letter on the Magisterial side, No. 107, dated 25th July 1872, gave an account of the matter for which Ramayya was suspended. Up to the time when I telegraphed to you, I had not completed my inquiries as to the land Ramayya had acquired in the Estate, and I did not think I ought to write on the subject until I could report in some detail.

5. From the time I took charge of this Sub-division, I heard things which made me doubt if T. Ramayya was a man to be fully trusted. I did not, however, for a long time hear anything certain directly affecting his character or likely to affect his usefulness. Early in 1872 I learned that he held land in the Estate. In March 1872, I called on Ramayya to submit a Statement of lands held by him or his relations. On the 18th of March, I received the statement.* In this I found entered eleven different pieces of land aggregating ——† acres and bearing sist of Rs. 994-8-2. Of the eleven pieces of land, three assessed at Rupees 447-9-9 and containing ——† acres were entered in the name of T. Ramayya's daughter S. Latchiminarasamma. Opposite to the entry of these three pieces of land was a note. "These lands of the villages were purchased by my son-in-law Samineni Subbarow, in the name of his wife, with the dowry money given by me at the time of my daughter's marriage which is customary in respectable families. I have no interference whatever with the lands." Four other pieces of land containing——* acres and bearing Rupees 227-2-2 sist were entered in the name of T. Ramayya's nephew T. Venkateredi Naidoo† and four more pieces of land containing——† acres and bearing Rupees 319-12-3 are entered in the name of Ramayya's son T. Jagannatharao or his son T. Sooryaprakasarao. Opposite to these items is a remark that Ramayya's brother had bought this land and entered it in the name of his own or Ramayya's sons, because the brother does not live at Kimedy, but is a merchant trading in various places. I made another reference to Ramayya about the age of his sons and about land held by others of his relations. Ramayya's reply about the age of his sons was received on 1st April, although dated 23rd March. The reply about lands held by his relations is dated 27th March, but was inadvertently only initialed by me, so I cannot say on what day I received it. This statement‡ contains the entries of seven pieces of land, bearing Rupees 421-1-1 sist, in the name of four men C. Jagannadharao Naidu, C. Kurmiah, T. Saradhi and C. Sriramulu. Kurmiah was on Ramayya's recommendation appointed Gumastah in Kimedy Range Office. T. Saradhi on Ramayya's recommendation was appointed Head Lascar, but resigned when Ramayya left. C. Sriramulu is Ramayya's Cook and is still with him. He could not have acquired land without Ramayya's knowledge. C. Jagannadharao was a Gumastah under Ramayya and it is unlikely he acquired land himself. I cannot believe Ramayya's statement that he had no interference with these pieces of land. In April, died Ramayya's daughter, Latchiminarasamma, in whose name had been entered the three pieces of land bearing Rupees 447-9-9 sist. In May, the Manager of Kimedy reported that Ramayya's wife had applied for a transfer to her own name of the land hitherto standing in her daughter's name, and she applied for the transfer on the ground that the land had been bought with her own money, and only nominally entered in her daughter's name. In the same month the husband of the deceased girl applied to me for a copy of the Statement of lands which Ramayya had sent in. I ordered him to appear in person to ascertain why he wanted it, because it was more or less privileged. Before he appeared, on the 7th of June, one of Ramayya's subordinates, a Clerk

* Copy sent A.
† Number of acres not given.

* Number of acres not given.

† Though Ramayya calls this person his nephew, I have reason to believe that he is really Ramayya's son and was given to Ramayya's brother to adopt.
(Signed) W. F. G.

‡ Copy sent B.

on the petty Establishment named Venkataratnam, appeared before me and gave me three papers. One purported to be a letter from Ramayya to his brother-in-law, telling the latter that the bearer would explain everything. Venkataratnam deposed that he had been by Ramayya ordered to give the three papers to the brother-in-law, and direct the latter to have the former Statement of lands abstracted from the records of the Principal Assistant Collector's Office and another statement substituted therefor. This other statement was one of the three papers Venkataratnam had brought, and the third was a copy of the application made by Ramayya's wife to the Manager. Venkataratnam did not know who wrote the second statement, but he had seen Ramayya sign it. On examining this new statement it was found to contain, with the exception of the remarks column, the same information as the former statement for which it was to be substituted. In the remarks column both entries had been changed. The entry opposite to the lands held in the daughter's name now ran, "these lands were purchased by my wife's own money in the name of her daughter, and she (my wife) is now enjoying them." The alteration in the other statement was of no importance. I magisterially inquired into the matter, and it turned out that Ramayya's son-in-law wanted the copy of the statement to use in a Civil Court to enforce his right to the land, if Ramayya did not give it up to him. I committed Ramayya to stand his trial for forgery, and he was acquitted. I do not know on what grounds he was acquitted. From the evidence of the son-in-law it was very clear that Ramayya had bought the land, and that the son-in-law was a mere go-between, if he ever appeared in the matter. It is rumoured in the Estate that Ramayya has put by a very large sum of money, and I am inclined to believe this from the fact that Ramayya told me during the investigation that he wished to resign. He rose from being a common Maistry, and it is needless to compare his origin with his state, as he was, when he left Kimedy, possessed of many hundreds of acres of land, and able to pay heavy fees to Vakils to defend him or to decline to prosecute him. I may add that I am convinced myself that Ramayya signed both the papers, the one he sent in and the one to be substituted; and that I know he has admitted to at least one credible witness that he signed both. When I put the second statement before him so folded up that he could see only the signature, he admitted that he had written the signature, but he steadily denied that he knew anything about the paper to be substituted.

6. The Manager was called on for an explanation as to why he had been silent so long about the goings on of T. Ramayya. I forward translations of his letters. From them you will see that at least twice the Manager called attention to Ramayya's doings, and that Mr. Hope reported on the matter to the then Collector. I forward a copy of Mr. Hope's letter.

7. In conclusion, I shall state that I am now trying to get from Ramayya an explanation of various matters which he left in considerable darkness and involvement when he left Kimedy. I wished him to remain to explain them, but he went away without doing so, and now I am obliged to address him through the District Engineer.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Collector.

---

Enclosures Nos. 2 and 3.—Statements of lands possessed by the Supervisor's relatives.

---

Enclosures Nos. 4 and 5.—Reports from Manager of Kimedy Estate.

---

Enclosure No. 6.—Copy of Mr. Hope's letter.

---

Enclosure No. 7.—Copy of Acting Collector's letter, dated 26th January 1870, to the Principal Assistant Collector.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,*
*24th October* 1873.

Enclosure No. 8.—Copy of G. O., 16th August 1872, No. 1,113, Judicial Department.

---

The Court resolve to submit the above letter from the Collector of Ganjam (7th August) to Government.

1. The Court accept the explanation given by the Collector and Principal Assistant Collector of their omission to inform them of the irregular acquisition of lands by T. Ramayya and of his committal to the Sessions Court. They are of opinion that the Manager is deserving of censure for not having fully informed Mr. Grahame earlier of the Supervisor's wrong doings: his having made a report to a former Principal Assistant did not relieve him of the duty of repeating the warning.

Paras. 4, 5, Procs. Board, 23rd Dec. 1872.

2. The Court solicit the attention of Government to the administration of public works in the Estate in the past and in the future.

3. The Government (G. O., 15th August 1873, No. 855) await a report from the District Engineer through the Public Works Department on the conduct of Tai Ramayya, who is now in charge of a Government range. The Court now lay before Government the facts reported in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Collector's letter. The committal of T. Ramayya on a charge of forgery was followed by his discharge on the ground that there was no case before the Sessions Court owing to the fact that a new Public Prosecutor having been appointed immediately before the trial there had been no time to instruct him, and on his asking for an adjournment on that ground the Sessions Court declined to grant one. It is further reported that the lands acquired by T. Ramayya in the Estate in the names of members of his family are situate in seventeen villages and that he has an interest by mortgage or otherwise in lands in six other villages.

4. With the additional information as to the past before them the Court are constrained to re-consider the administration of Public Works in the Estate in the future. So long ago as 1859 the Government wrote "In the Kimedy Estate the works shall be under the District Engineer as respects design * * the Kimedy Estate will be an executive range and the Assistant Agent there will be the Executive Engineer in charge of it." The expenditure on Public Works has always been large and the maintenance alone of the excellent roads which intersect the country is a heavy charge. The expenditure in the five years 1277 to 1281 was 3,09,363 Rupees, the estimate for the Hiramandalam bridge 1,10,000 is sanctioned, and of that work half the cost is to be borne by the Estate, roads are being traced which communicate with the country above the passes and which will be expensive to construct and to maintain, it is desired and the Court think it desirable to build a Palace which shall be a suitable residence for the proprietor of this great Estate; but, even if the expenditure (62,000 Rupees per annum) of the last five years is not exceeded, the contribution for the bare cost of supervision at 25 per cent. under G. O., 5th September 1872, No. 1,183, will amount to about Rupees 16,000 per annum, exclusive of the local subordinate establishment.

5. The Court of Wards are constrained to urge in the interests of their Wards that the question be re-considered before it is decided to lay such a charge upon the Estate.

6. The Collector wrote, dated 4th May 1872, "it would be decidedly for the advantage of the Estate if a European Officer of experience was put in charge of the Public Works in Kimedy * * we should have the undivided services of the officer, whoever it may be, who is employed in Kimedy."*

* In Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, dated 26th July 1872.

The Court were of opinion then that an Overseer who should work under the supervision and control of the Principal Assistant and of the Manager would be the most suitable arrangement, "they *could not in any case approve* of a European Officer being placed in charge of the *Chicacole Taluq in addition to Kimedy*." Further in their Proceedings, dated 23rd December 1872, the Court urged the Government to place at their disposal a competent officer to examine and report on the works of all kinds completed or in progress in the Estate.

7. Government in their Order, dated 30th January 1873, No. 241, Public Works Department, informed the Court, that they could not spare an officer to make the inspection and report desired: that the system under which the Public Works in Kimedy had been carried out by an Overseer directly subordinate to the Principal Assistant, who in turn was occasionally visited and advised by the District Engineer can no longer continue: and that they propose to constitute Kimedy as a Sub-division of the Chicacole Range placing both in charge of Ensign Lever. This arrangement was accepted by the Court in their Proceedings, dated 4th March 1873, and this acceptance they desire now to be permitted to withdraw.

8. Whoever the officer may be in charge of Kimedy he must be directly subordinate to one of two authorities;—the Principal Assistant representing the authority of the Court of Wards and of the Collector and Agent to Government;—or the Departmental Superior of such officer as the Public Works Department place in charge of the sub-division which they would constitute. As long as a Supervisor or Overseer was in charge of the Estate the Principal Assistant was from time to time visited and advised by the District Engineer (or, during the years in which a different system prevailed, by some other Engineer Officer of experience) nor did the system work ill as far as efficient construction of works is concerned. The Court believe that the irrigation works and roads on the Estate have been designed with a due regard to its wants, and that their execution has been good. Under existing Rules however the advice of the District Engineer will be no longer available unless the excessive charge which they have above deprecated be laid on the Estate.

9. The Court are of opinion that the most economical and efficient plan would be to employ a competent European Engineer unconnected with the Department Public Works who would work directly under their orders and whose services they might utilize in Forest supervision.

10. The services of such an officer could be secured at less than half the cost of Department Public Works supervision and they would be given constantly and wholly to the Estate.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 24th October 1873.*

No. 225. Proceedings of the Court of Wards, dated 20th September 1873, No. 1,892.

Read the following letter from C. G. MASTER, Esq., Collector of Ganjam, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Court of Wards, dated Chetterpore, 29th August 1873, No. 2,022:—

WITH reference to the state of the season, I asked, among other gentlemen, Mr. C. W. Voss, of Kimedy, to keep me informed of the prospects of the crops, etc.

2. In sending in his first report Mr. Voss has made the general observations contained in the accompanying copy of his letter, dated 16th instant. Mr. Voss has exceptional advantages for forming a judgment, and I think his opinion is entitled to every consideration.

3. I have asked him to favour me with the detailed account referred to in the concluding paragraph of his letter.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From Mr. C. W. VOSS, to C. G. MASTER, Esq., Collector of Ganjam, dated Purla Kimedy, 16th August 1873.

I SHALL have much pleasure in complying with your request of the 9th instant though my reports will only refer to the eastern and western divisions of the estate within which my work is.

2. I avail of this opportunity to say a few words on the position of these two divisions with respect to water-supply, and, if the figures of the past eleven years may be relied on, I have the most exceptional year to judge by. No year compares with this for drought to date.

3. The estate is naturally almost independent of the risk of seasons, this year even there having been no lack of water but lack of the means to distribute it. It is a sad sight to see the life of a country ebbing to the sea, and sadder to know the fault lies at our own door.

4. The anicut across the Mahendra Tanaya could, and should, insure us against critical times, whereas it waters only seventeen villages of the fifty it was designed for, or not a sixth part of the country I believe it might. A canal of three miles, say, debouchre upon a small tract of land, which the water overruns and thence pours into the river and is lost. Unfinished work is very general; a good project is marred because it is not carried out. An anicut is built, and the irrigation unattended to. A tank—I instance the Lakshmana Sagaram in particular—is put under cultivation before provision has been made to water the country it commanded. A canal is half dug, re-entered in the budget, struck out, and left. Money is thus frittered away all over the estate. Some time since I suggested to the Acting Principal Assistant Collector the advisability of one division being taken at a time, its wants supplied, and then passing on to the next division. Under the present system money is undeniably sunk, whereas I venture to think my plan would relieve the estate in a few years of public works, and the establishment, which is wholly inadequate to meet the requirements of such extended and multifarious operations, could with justice be made answerable for good and sound work on the limited scale.

5. If the subject be of sufficient interest and importance I shall be happy to submit a detailed account of works that I believe would guarantee this part of the estate against drought.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Collector.

THE Court resolve to submit copy of Mr. Voss' letter to Government in support of their preference for a resident European professional officer. It is true that an unprofessional observer is liable to be misled as to the practical merits

and capabilities or defects of irrigation works; but the Court's observations on the late Overseer Tye Ramayar's work, which have already been submitted to Government, are quite consonant with Mr. Voss' criticisms.

---

No. 226. ORDER THEREON, 24th October 1873, No. 1,162.

Miscellaneous.

THE foregoing Proceedings of the Court of Wards, with the enclosures, will be forwarded to the Department of Public Works for information, in continuation of former papers* regarding Supervisor Tai Ramaya, and for advice on the questions raised as to the appointment of a Supervisor in supersession of Overseer Vira Mallesalingam, as to the position of the Court's Agent, and as to the charge for supervision.

* G. O., No. 855, dated 15th August 1873.

† G. O., Public Works Department, 30th April 1873, No. 203.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
*Acting Secretary to Government.*

To the Public Works Department.
,, the Court of Wards.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

Revenue Dept.

No 1162

Pros of the Madras Govt.

Under date the 24 October 1873.

Read the following Pro-
-ceedings of the Court of Wards

Submg. letter from Coll. regarding certain charges against Supervisor Ramayya in connection with execution of Public Works in Purla Kennedy Estate, Ganjam &c.

H. G. 20 Sept. 73. No. 1889

Submg. letter addressed to Coll. by Mr. Voss regarding irrigation works in Purla Kennedy Estate, Ganjam &c.,

H. G. 20 Sept. 73, No. 1892

The foregoing Proceed-
-ings of the Court of Wards with the enclosures will be forward-
-ed to the Department of Public Works for information in continuation of former papers regarding Supervisor Sai Ramayya, and for advice

on

* G. O. No 835 dated 15 Augt. 1873.

20/10

Govt. of [1873] Madras.

To

REVENUE.

THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated October 24th.

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 24th October 1873, No. 1,162.

OCTOBER.

Nos. 224—226.

*Public Works in Purla Kinedy Estate, in the Ganjam District.*—Forwarding to the Department of Public Works' Proceedings of the Court of Wards regarding certain charges against Supervisor Ramayya in connection with the execution of —, and requesting advice on the questions raised as to the appointmen of a Supervisor in lieu of Overseer Vira Mallesalingam.

Vide C. No 433 of 1874

on the questions raised as to the appointment of a Supervisor in supersession of Overseer Vira Mallesalingam, as to the position of the Court's agent, and as to the charge for supervision

Sd

G.O. P.W.D. 30 April 1873, N°203

4

21 To the P.W. Depte
14 " Court of Wards } Dec 4 1873.

E.O

Supervisor for the Public
Nursery Estate, Gargaon &c.

c. 21 Oct, to 24 Oct