

(1) Number of Pages 18
(2) Date of repair 21-2-68
(3) Initials of the Referencer 26.4.88

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Rev DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1621	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	11-11-1875	196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 144. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd October 1875, No. 2,755:—

Read the following letter from J. HOPE, Esq., Acting Collector of Kurnool, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Kurnool, 27th August 1875, No. 301.

I HAVE the honor to reply to paragraph 4 of G. O., No. 2,996, dated 21st October 1874, reviewing Mr. Latham's report for August 1874.

2. Mr. Latham brings forward two charges against the Curnams, first, that "they *don't* record all applications" for canal water; secondly, "they *don't* send advices to the Overseers in time to be of use, the intervals varying for a month downwards."

3. Up to the date of my receiving the G. O. (26th November 1874), Mr. Latham did not report to me any instance in which the Curnams were said to have been remiss in the discharge of their duty, except one in Kullur (near Kurnool), to which he drew my attention in a demi-official note some time after the publication of the rules. In this case, however, I found on personal inquiry that the Curnam was right in refusing the application.

4. I accordingly wrote to Mr. Latham on the 28th idem, requesting him to inform me in what village he noticed "dilatoriness" or "impenetrable resistance" on the part of the Curnams, and whether these cases had been brought by the Canal Overseers to the notice of the Tahsildar or the Revenue Inspector of the range, as was arranged immediately after the introduction of the new rules. The enclosed copies of reply from that officer, and of the Deputy Collector's report, which was received only on the 15th ultimo, will enable the Board to judge how far Mr. Latham's "complaint" is founded on fact.

5. Mr. Latham had apparently no information before him when he wrote his report for August, because in his reply dated 14th January 1875, he merely refers me to a memorandum which he drew up with the Deputy Collector at the settlement of the Nandikotkur Taluq in 1872-73, before the new rules were passed, contradicting in general terms the assertion made by Mr. Chase in his letter recorded in Board's Proceedings, No. 427, dated 21st March 1873. The Conservancy Engineer, Mr. Wilks, has however no complaint to make against the Curnams in his section (comprising the first ninety-three miles), and believes that "most of the Curnams" that he has "personally seen, seem to be anxious to work with the Company's officers." He thinks that "in time the actual working of the system will go on smoothly," though he fears that "it gives the Curnams an almost unlimited influence over the ryots."

6. Mr. Dodson, Conservancy Engineer of the lower sections, does not give a very favorable account of the way in which the Curnams did their work, but even he is apparently unable to quote more than nine instances of what he calls failure to act according to the rules. In nearly every case, including the three which occurred in September and November after the date of Mr. Latham's report, the complaint is simply that the Curnam refused to meet the Overseer "to measure up some fields." In one case the Curnam "was worshipping his god," when called by the Amin. In some, the Curnams deny the accusation, while in others again they have given satisfactory explanations before the Deputy Collector.

7. In the matter of transmitting applications to the Canal officers, there appears to have been some delay on the part of the Curnams; but this could have been easily avoided, if Mr. Latham had adopted the suggestions contained in a letter I addressed to him so early as the 15th July 1874. In that letter, I proposed amongst other measures for the successful working of the new rules, that pillar boxes should be put up in each village for the Curnams to put in the duplicate copies of the applications, or that the bankers should be directed to receive the copies each day or every alternate day, as might suit them best. To this, Mr. Latham replied on the 17th July, suggesting that the Curnams should "forward tickets (applications) once or twice a week regularly, by some regular tappal, to the Overseer, but that for sudden demand, a special messenger be found, say the applicant himself." As the stations and ranges of the Overseer were not known to me, I asked to be furnished with a list of them, with a view to arrange a system of beats for facilitating the transmission of these applications to the Overseers. The list was received on the 7th August, and orders were sent to the taluqs on the 10th idem, directing Curnams to send the duplicate copies of applications to Canal Overseers twice a week. Again, in my letter, No. 119, dated 29th idem, I pointed out that "delay might occur, if these officers (the Overseers) are absent from their stations as they frequently are," and suggested that, "in these cases, it would be a good plan if they are directed to receive from the Curnams duplicates of copies that may remain with them at the time of the Overseer's or Amin's visit to the village." If the bankers, Amins, and Overseers co-operated with the village officials in the manner suggested by me, it is hardly possible that the delay complained of could have occurred. As it was, it is a matter for congratulation that the complaint is limited only to a few villages, considering that the Amins and Overseers are so few and so scattered, and are generally engaged on other work connected with the repair of the Canal and its channels, &c.

8. The Deputy Collector's report was received on the 15th ultimo, but, as only a few weeks previously the Government had decided that applications should in future be received by Canal Overseers, I thought the report called for by Government in October 1874 would not be required. I only discovered my error when I received the Board's reminder, calling upon me to expedite the report in question. I beg the delay may be excused.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. H. LATHAM, Esq., Chief Engineer and Manager, Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to J. HOPE, Esq., Acting Collector of Kurnool, dated Kurnool, 14th January 1875, No. 5.

In reply to your, No. 152, of 28th November last, I have the honor to enclose the letters marginally noted and the lists asked for. Mr. Dodson has missed the point, in sending no definite cases; and I have again written to him, but will not delay the letters and list of places visited by the Amins until he can reply.

2. As to the dilatoriness and impenetrable resistance of Curnams, I cannot do better than refer you to the settlement at Nandikotkur in 1872-73,* the only one with which I am intimately acquainted. My loss of hope has been, so far, justified. Mr. Wilks calculates† that there has been a falling off of cultivation in his division

* Mr. Wilks' No. 294, of 15th ultimo.
† Mr. Dodson's, No. 8, of 9th instant.

* The last under direct applications.
† List enclosed.

in old villages, happily more than recovered by villages in the 5th and 6th Sections, in which channels have been for the first time made available. But the only taluq which has maintained progress, so far as I know, is that of Prodatur, worked on the last year's system of application through Overseers; in which the increase of wet cultivation is about 75 per cent., though no extension of channels has been made to new villages this year.

3. Mr. Wilks' report seems to me to show that the new system has been worked with more than a little pains in his division. Considering that it is the first year, and that it was very late before the rules were out, I should anticipate much improvement next year; but I agree with Mr. Wilks that the forbidding of application through the Canal officers is no doubt an evil, commercially speaking. The prohibition is inconvenient to ryots. Every inconvenience to ryots in the process of getting water is heavily paid for by the general public; but, no doubt, any inconvenience absolutely unavoidable is no sign of error of Government, but would merely prove that the most beneficial works may be constructed and placed at the public disposal, and yet that the unavoidable hindrances to the use of them by willing farmers should take a very prominent position in any estimates formed of their practical beneficence.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. HOPE,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From A. RAMACHENDER ROW, Deputy Collector, to J. HOPE, Esq., Acting Collector of Kurnool, dated Bachipally, 10th July 1875, No. 83.

I HAVE the honor to submit the report called for in your docket, No. 72, dated 16th January last, on the letters noted in the margin from the Conservancy Engineers of the upper* and lower† sections, and also in your wrapper No. 23, dated 29th January last, on a letter‡ from the Conservancy Engineer, lower section, to the Chief Engineer, Madras Irrigation and Canal Company.

2. Mr. Wilks, Conservancy Engineer of the upper section, in which is included a portion of the Nundial Taluq, has no complaint to make against the Curnams in regard to the working of the new rules. He states that most of the Curnams, he has personally seen, "seem to be anxious to work with the Company's officers." It seems, therefore, that the Curnams and the Company's Overseers and Amins work in perfect harmony in that section.

3. In the lower section, numerous instances of the Curnam's neglect or refusal to aid the Company's subordinates are quoted.

4. In paragraphs 2 and 3 of Mr. Dodson's letter, No. 8, dated 9th January last, the complaint being general, I requested that gentleman to favor me with specific instances of neglect or refusal. The result of this reference was the receipt of a copy of his letter, No. 23, dated 21st January 1875, to the Chief Engineer, which was forwarded to me for report with your wrapper, No. 23, above quoted.

5. The complaints are distributed over the (three) taluqs of Nundial, Sirwell and Koilkuntla, and I shall deal with them *seriatim*, blending together the subject-matter of both the letters from Mr. Dodson, and arranging them according to the taluqs to which they relate.

6. IN NUNDIAL TALUQ.—(1) *Nundial Village*, (2) *Chabrole Village*.—In the absence of any specific complaint for these villages, it is presumed that the general complaint contained in paragraph 2 of the refusal of the Curnams to work with the Amins in the matter of registration of applications is applicable.

(3.) *Kottopally, a hamlet of Nundial*.—It is stated that the Curnam frequently refused to issue tickets for a second crop, although the ryots were anxious to commence the said crop "during the last two months" (i.e., November and December 1874).

Mr. Dodson's letter, No. 8, dated 9th January 1875.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
11th November 1875.*

There are two Curnams for Cusbah Nundial and its hamlet Kottapally. They have kept regular diaries of their irrigation work.

As regards the first head of complaint, they allege that on the 24th August 1874, Amin Gurusawmy did not come to the Nundial village choultry, while on the 27th idem, they had been to the hamlet of Moolasagaram on duty.

2ndly.—I visited Kottapally on the 16th January last, and examined the diaries and the counterfoil of tickets and other irrigation accounts kept by the Curnams. I find that during

6th to 9th inclusive.
11th and 12th
14th to 17th do.
20th, 21st and 23rd.
27th and 29th to 31st

August 1874, they visited the hamlet of Kottapally thirteen* days on irrigation duty; and owing to its proximity to the cusbah, they returned to the latter after inspection on seven

days, sojourned at the hamlet on four days and spent the forenoon on the remaining two. On the 24th and 25th October following, they visited the said hamlet in company with the Amin. They received applications and issued tickets for second crops on the 3rd and 22nd December 1874, and 1st January 1875, the Amin being with them all the time.

Under these circumstances, the accusation against them cannot be sustained. The Chabrole Curnam simply denies the charge. He kept no diary. He has since been ordered to be removed from office for general inefficiency.

(4.) *Ayalur*.—It is stated that the Curnam did not meet the Overseer to assist "in measuring up certain fields," although he was requested to do so on the 6th September 1874.

Paragraph 2, Mr. Dodson's letter, No. 23, dated 21st January 1875.
It appears that the Curnam was required to meet the Overseer at 7 A.M. on the 7th September 1874; but owing to the heavy fall of rain, the bund of the Ayalur tank was over-topped by water that morning, and the Curnam, with the aid of the Reddi, was compelled to take immediate steps to strengthen the banks, which he accordingly did. This work detained him till 10 A.M. at the tank. On his return to the village, he had to send a report in a Magisterial case to the Sub-Magistrate's Court, which kept him at work till 1 P.M., at which hour, he states, he went to the Overseer at the Ayalur bungalow. This explanation appears to be satisfactory.

(5.) *Aiyavarkodur*.—On the 11th November 1874, the Amin is said to have requested the Curnam to meet him, to measure certain lands shown in Form B, and this the latter, it is stated, refused to do. The Curnam states there was neither the call nor the refusal.

7. IN *SIRWELL TALUQ.*—(1). *Kotakundakur*, (2). *Chintakunta*, (3). *Jillella*.—The complaint against the Curnams of these villages is the same as against Kottapally (No. 3, paragraph 6, Nundial Taluq). They deny having neglected their duty in the manner stated.

Paragraph 4, Mr. Dodson's letter No. 8.

(1a.) Again, it is alleged that on the 10th August 1874, the Curnam of Kotakundakur refused to meet Overseer Ayasawmy for measuring lands, saying that he was worshipping God. The Curnam denies having been called, or having given such a reply.

Paragraphs 5, 7 and 8, Mr. Dodson's letter, No. 23, 21st January 1875.

(1b.) On another occasion (date not given), the Curnam is alleged to have refused to meet the same Overseer or give tickets. This is equally denied. The Curnam further alleges that on the 12th November 1874, he went, as requested by the said Overseer, with him to measure the land belonging to Palasagaram Soobbaya and issued a ticket, in which the said Overseer has set his name as an attesting witness. Here the Curnam gives the particular occasion on which he had done a duty which it is alleged he did not perform.

(3a.) The Jillella Curnam is alleged to have refused on the 6th August 1874 to meet Amin Luke Brewin for measuring lands. This is denied by the Curnam.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
11th November 1875.*

(3b.) The same Curnam is stated to have, on the 14th November 1874, refused to meet Mr. Dumphy for the purpose of inquiring into some cases of surreptitious irrigation. The Curnam states that he was in his house at the time the banker sent by Mr. Dumphy came to the village choultry in search of him, and that he afterwards went up to that gentleman who was on the Canal bank. He adds that Mr. Dumphy simply put him the question "where he had been," and that nothing further took place.

(3c.) It is further alleged that the same Curnam had frequently refused to attend on Overseer Veloo Moodalyar. This is denied by the Curnam, who even cites an instance of his having helped the said Overseer and Amin Luke Brewin in measuring lands.

(4.) *Gotalur*.—General complaint as stated for Nundial Village No. (1), paragraph 6.

The Curnam states that he used his best exertions in inducing ryots to file applications for water, but that only a few applied. He states he acted in concert with the Overseer in the registration of applications.

8. IN *KOILKUNTIA TALUQ.*—(1). *Perayapally*, (2). *Kristipad*, (3). *Kondapuram*, (4). *Arjunapuram*.—General complaint as against Nundial No. (1), paragraph 6.

The Curnams deny the truth of the complaint. With the exception of the Kondapuram Curnam who sent in his tickets from time to time, the rest admit that they kept them back until they accumulated for a month when they despatched them. This is contrary to your instructions, and when these Curnams attended my office at Ayalur, I warned them against such neglect for the future.

(2a.) The Kristipad Curnam is alleged to have, on the 13th August 1874, agreed to meet Overseer Ayasawmy to measure lands, but failed to do so, without assigning a reason. This is denied.

Paragraph 8, Mr. Dodson's letter No. 23.

9. On the whole, it will be seen that in several cases it is difficult to bring home to the Curnams the fact of their having neglected their duty in irrigation matters. In some cases satisfactory explanation has been tendered. It cannot be denied, however, that some of the Curnams have been less careful in the discharge of their duties. This may be attributed in part to the novelty of the rules which have hardly a full season's trial, while in some cases, the propensity to look after their own agricultural concerns has very likely predominated over a strict sense of duty.

10. The Tahsildar of Koilkuntia observes that he would have checked these irregularities, if timely notice of the same had been given him by the Company's officers. I agree with the Tahsildar, and submit that such a long list of defaults extending over a period of several months could not have been recorded, had the local officers been communicated with, in the first instance.

11. It is now useless to comment on this subject, in that the Government Order recently issued* modifying Rule II. sets the matter at rest. It remains to be seen how far the current

* No. 1,327, dated 8th May 1875.

year will remedy the defects of the past in respect to the speedy registration of applications. The Company's Amins and Overseers are few, they are stationed far apart, and have a number of villages to attend to. Practically, the difficulties felt by the ryots may be greater. We should not be surprised if they hunt after the Company's Overseers and Amins from village to village and wait for their convenience. As the registration of applications is, I believe, but one of the numerous duties they are called upon to perform, it would have been better if the rule had been so modified as to leave it optional to the ryots to put in their applications to the Curnams or the Company's subordinates, and that was the original shape into which the draft rule had been thrown into, before the Committee met at Cuddapah in January 1874.

12. I may as well quote the words of Conservancy Engineer Mr. Wilks on this head. "I think in time the actual working of the system will go on smoothly, but it gives the Curnam an almost unlimited influence over the ryots; there can be no doubt that direct applications to the

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
11th November 1875.*

Overseers are better. There are some men who would rather apply to the latter ; others prefer the Curnam, and in this way a complete check would be kept."

13. It is, however, a source of congratulation that the Kurnool District, in which the best portion of the Canal lies, did not afford real grounds to induce Government to make the modification.

14. I shall submit the information called for in the latter part of paragraph 3 of your docket under acknowledgment, on the receipt of a reply from the Company's Assistant Conservancy Engineer.

(True Copy.)

(Signed)

J. HOPE,
Acting Collector.

SUBMITTED for the information of Government with reference to G. O., 26th October 1874, No. 186.

2. Though there have been a few cases of dilatoriness or neglect on the part of Curnams in the Kurnool District, the reports show that Mr. Latham's sweeping complaint is not borne out. It is admitted that the superior revenue officers have done all they can; and it seems to the Board that if the people really wanted the water, no amount of obstructiveness by the Curnams would prevent them from getting it.

3. The change, however, which was desired by the Canal officers has been made (G. O., 8th May 1875, No. 1,327, Public Works Department), and applications are now made to the Company's servants. It remains to see the effect.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed)

H. E. STOKES,
Acting Secretary.

No. 145.

ORDER THEREON, 11th November 1875, No. 1,621.

Miscellaneous.

COMMUNICATED to the Public Works Department, with reference to paragraph 4 of the Proceedings in that department, dated 21st October 1874, No. 2,996.

2. The Government concur in the Board's conclusions.

(True Extract.)

(Signed)

L. A. CAMPBELL,
Under-Secretary to Government.

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

Exd. W. H. French.

5
1621

No. 2,755.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 2nd October 1875.

Read the following letter from J. HOPE, Esq., Acting Collector of Kurnool, to H. E. STOKES, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Kurnool, 27th August 1875, No. 301:—

I HAVE the honor to reply to paragraph 4 of G. O., No. 2,996, dated 21st October 1874, reviewing Mr. Latham's report for August 1874.

2. Mr. Latham brings forward two charges against the Curnams, first, that "they *don't* record all applications" for canal water; secondly, "they *don't* send advices to the Overseers in time to be of use, the intervals varying for a month downwards."

3. Up to the date of my receiving the G. O. (26th November 1874), Mr. Latham did not report to me any instance in which the Curnams were said to have been remiss in the discharge of their duty, except one in Kullur (near Kurnool), to which he drew my attention in a demi-official note some time after the publication of the rules. In this case, however, I found on personal inquiry that the Curnam was right in refusing the application.

4. I accordingly wrote to Mr. Latham on the 28th idem, requesting him to inform me in what village he noticed "dilatoriness" or "impenetrable resistance" on the part of the Curnams, and whether these cases had been brought by the Canal Overseers to the notice of the Tahsildar or the Revenue Inspector of the range, as was arranged immediately after the introduction of the new rules. The enclosed copies of reply from that officer, and of the Deputy Collector's report, which was received only on the 15th ultimo, will enable the Board to judge how far Mr. Latham's "complaint" is founded on fact.

5. Mr. Latham had apparently no information before him when he wrote his report for August, because in his reply dated 14th January 1875, he merely refers me to a memorandum which he drew up with the Deputy Collector at the settlement of the Nandikotkur Taluq in 1872-73, before the new rules were passed, contradicting in general terms the assertion made by Mr. Chase in his letter recorded in Board's Proceedings, No. 427, dated 21st March 1873. The Conservancy Engineer, Mr. Wilks, has however no complaint to make against the Curnams in his section (comprising the first ninety-three miles), and believes that "most of the Curnams" that he has "personally seen, seem to be anxious to work with the Company's officers." He thinks that "in time the actual working of the system will go on smoothly," though he fears that "it gives the Curnams an almost unlimited influence over the ryots."

6. Mr. Dodson, Conservancy Engineer of the lower sections, does not give a very favorable account of the way in which the Curnams did their work, but even he is apparently unable to quote more than nine instances of what he calls failure to act according to the rules. In nearly every case, including the three which occurred in September and November after the date of Mr. Latham's report, the complaint is simply that the Curnam refused to meet the Overseer "to measure up some fields." In one case the Curnam "was worshipping his god," when called by the Amin. In some, the Curnams deny the accusation, while in others again they have given satisfactory explanations before the Deputy Collector.

Colt. of 1875

REVENUE.

For PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Dated November, 11th.

Recd.

G. O. 11th November 1875, No. 1,631

NOVEMBER.

No. 144-145.

Irregularity Company's Canal.—Communicating to the Public Works Department Proceedings of the Board of Revenue submitting the report of the Collector of Kurnool on the dilatoriness of Curnams in receiving applications for water from

7. In the matter of transmitting applications to the Canal officers, there appears to have been some delay on the part of the Curnams; but this could have been easily avoided, if Mr. Latham had adopted the suggestions contained in a letter I addressed to him so early as the 15th July 1874. In that letter, I proposed amongst other measures for the successful working of the new rules, that pillar boxes should be put up in each village for the Curnams to put in the duplicate copies of the applications, or that the bankers should be directed to receive the copies each day or every alternate day, as might suit them best. To this, Mr. Latham replied on the 17th July, suggesting that the Curnams should "forward tickets (applications) once or twice a week regularly, by some regular tappal, to the Overseer, but that for sudden demand, a special messenger be found, say the applicant himself." As the stations and ranges of the Overseer were not known to me, I asked to be furnished with a list of them, with a view to arrange a system of beats for facilitating the transmission of these applications to the Overseers. The list was received on the 7th August, and orders were sent to the taluqs on the 10th idem, directing Curnams to send the duplicate copies of applications to Canal Overseers twice a week. Again, in my letter No. 119, dated 29th idem, I pointed out that "delay might occur, if these officers (the Overseers) are absent from their stations as they frequently are," and suggested that, "in these cases, it would be a good plan if they are directed to receive from the Curnams duplicates of copies that may remain with them at the time of the Overseer's or Amin's visit to the village." If the bankers, Amins and Overseers co-operated with the village officials in the manner suggested by me, it is hardly possible that the delay complained of could have occurred. As it was, it is a matter for congratulation that the complaint is limited only to a few villages, considering that the Amins and Overseers are so few and so scattered, and are generally engaged on other work connected with the repair of the Canal and its channels, &c.

8. The Deputy Collector's report was received on the 15th ultimo, but, as only a few weeks previously the Government had decided that applications should in future be received by Canal Overseers, I thought the report called for by Government in October 1874 would not be required. I only discovered my error when I received the Board's reminder, calling upon me to expedite the report in question. I beg the delay may be excused.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. H. LATHAM, Esq., Chief Engineer and Manager, Madras Irrigation and Canal Company, to J. HOPE, Esq., Acting Collector of Kurnool, dated Kurnool, 14th January 1875, No. 5.

In reply to your No. 152 of 28th November last, I have the honor to enclose the letters marginally noted and the lists asked for. Mr. Dodson has missed the point, in sending no definite cases; and I have again written to him, but will not delay the letters and list of places visited by the Amins until he can reply.

2. As to the dilatoriness and impenetrable resistance of Curnams, I cannot do better than refer you to the settlement at Nandikotkur in 1872-73, * the only one with which I am intimately acquainted. My loss of hope has been, so far, justified. Mr. Wilks calculates † that there has been a falling off of cultivation in his division

* The last under direct applications.
† List enclosed.

in old villages, happily more than recovered by villages in the 5th and 6th Sections, in which channels have been for the first time made available. But the only taluq which has maintained progress, so far as I know, is that of Prodatur, worked on the last year's system of application through Overseers; in which the increase of wet cultivation is about 75 per cent., though no extension of channels has been made to new villages this year.

3. Mr. Wilks' report seems to me to show that the new system has been worked with more than a little pains in his division. Considering that it is the first year, and that it was very late before the rules were out, I should anticipate much improvement next year; but I agree with Mr. Wilks that the forbidding of application through the Canal officers is no doubt an evil, commercially speaking. The prohibition is inconvenient to ryots. Every inconvenience to ryots in the process of getting water is heavily paid for by the general public; but, no doubt, any inconvenience absolutely unavoidable is no sign of error of Government, but would merely prove that the most beneficial works may be constructed and placed at the public disposal, and yet that the unavoidable hindrances to the use of them by willing farmers should take a very prominent position in any estimates formed of their practical beneficence.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. HOPE,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From A. RAMACHENDER ROW, Deputy Collector, to J. HOPE, Esq., Acting Collector of Kurnool, dated Bachipally, 10th July 1875, No. 83.

I HAVE the honor to submit the report called for in your docket, No. 72, dated 16th January last, on the letters noted in the margin from

* 1. No. 234, dated 15th December 1874, to the Chief Engineer.
† 2. No. 8, dated 9th January 1875, to Chief Engineer.
‡ No. 23, dated 21st January 1875, herewith returned.

the Conservancy Engineers of the upper* and lower† sections, and also in your wrapper No. 23, dated 29th January last, on a letter‡

from the Conservancy Engineer, lower section, to the Chief Engineer, Madras Irrigation and Canal Company.

2. Mr. Wilks, Conservancy Engineer of the upper section, in which is included a portion of the Nundial Taluq, has no complaint to make against the Curnams in regard to the working of the new rules. He states that most of the Curnams, he has personally seen, "seem to be anxious to work with the Company's officers." It seems, therefore, that the Curnams and the Company's Overseers and Amins work in perfect harmony in that section.

3. In the lower section, numerous instances of the Curnams' neglect or refusal to aid the Company's subordinates are quoted.

4. In paragraphs 2 and 3 of Mr. Dodson's letter, No. 8, dated 9th January last, the complaint being general, I requested that gentleman to favor me with specific instances of neglect or refusal. The result of this reference was the receipt of a copy of his letter, No. 23, dated 21st January 1875, to the Chief Engineer, which was forwarded to me for report with your wrapper, No. 23, above quoted.

5. The complaints are distributed over the (three) taluqs of Nundial, Sirwell and Koilkuntla, and I shall deal with them *seriatim*, blending together the subject-matter of both the letters from Mr. Dodson, and arranging them according to the taluqs to which they relate.

6. IN NUNDIAL TALUQ.—(1) *Nundial Village*, (2) *Chabrole Village*.—In the absence of any specific complaint for these villages, it is presumed that the general complaint contained in paragraph 2 of the refusal of the Curnams to work with the Amins in the matter of registration of applications is applicable.

Mr. Dodson's letter, No. 8, dated 9th January 1875.

(3.) *Kottapally, a hamlet of Nundial.*—It is stated that the Curnam frequently refused to issue tickets for a second crop, although the ryots were anxious to commence the said crop "during the last two months" (i. e., November and December 1874).

There are two Curnams for Cusbah Nundial and its hamlet Kottapally. They have kept regular diaries of their irrigation work.

As regards the first head of complaint, they allege that on the 24th August 1874, Amin Gurusawmy did not come to the Nundial village choultry, while on the 27th idem, they had been to the hamlet of Moolasagaram on duty.

2ndly.—I visited Kottapally on the 16th January last, and examined the diaries and the counterfile of tickets and other irrigation accounts kept by the Curnams. I find that during

* 6th to 9th inclusive.
11th and 12th.
14th to 17th. do.
20th, 21st and 23rd.
27th and 29th to 31st

August 1874, they visited the hamlet of Kottapally thirteen* days on irrigation duty; and owing to its proximity to the cusbah, they returned to the latter after inspection on seven

days, sojourned at the hamlet on four days and spent the forenoon on the remaining two. On the 24th and 25th October following, they visited the said hamlet in company with the Amin. They received applications and issued tickets for second crops on the 3rd and 22nd December 1874, and 1st January 1875, the Amin being with them all the time.

Under these circumstances, the accusation against them cannot be sustained. The Chabrole Curnam simply denies the charge. He kept no diary. He has since been ordered to be removed from office for general inefficiency.

(4.) *Ayalur.*—It is stated that the Curnam did not meet the Overseer to assist "in measuring up certain fields," although he was requested to do so on the 6th September 1874.

It appears that the Curnam was required to meet the Overseer at 7 A.M., on the 7th September 1874; but owing to the heavy fall of rain, the bund of the Ayalur tank was over-topped by water that morning, and the Curnam, with the aid of the Reddi, was compelled to take immediate steps to strengthen the banks, which he accordingly did. This work detained him till 10 A.M. at the tank. On his return to the village, he had to send a report in a Magisterial case to the Sub-Magistrate's Court, which kept him at work till 1 P.M., at which hour, he states, he went to the Overseer at the Ayalur bungalow. This explanation appears to be satisfactory.

(5.) *Aiyavarkodur.*—On the 11th November 1874, the Amin is said to have requested the Curnam to meet him, to measure certain lands shown in Form B, and this the latter, it is stated, refused to do. The Curnam states there was neither the call nor the refusal.

Paragraph 3, Mr. Dodson's letter No. 23.

7. IN SIRWELL TALUQ.—(1). *Kotakundakur*, (2). *Chintakunta*, (3). *Jillella.*—The complaint against the Curnams of these villages is the same as against Kottapally (No. 3, paragraph 6, Nundial Taluq). They deny having neglected their duty in the manner stated.

Paragraph 4, Mr. Dodson's letter No. 8.

(1a.) Again, it is alleged that on the 10th August 1874, the Curnam of Kotakundakur refused to meet Overseer Ayasawmy for measuring lands, saying that he was worshipping God. The Curnam denies having been called, or having given such a reply.

Paragraphs 5, 7 and 8, Mr. Dodson's letter No. 23, 21st January 1875.

(1b.) On another occasion (date not given), the Curnam is alleged to have refused to meet the same Overseer or give tickets.

This is equally denied. The Curnam further alleges that on the 12th November 1874, he went, as requested by the said Overseer, with him to measure the land belonging to Palasagaram Scobbaya and issued a ticket, in which the said Overseer has set his name as an attesting witness. Here the Curnam gives the particular occasion on which he had done a duty which it is alleged he did not perform.

(3a.) The Jillella Curnam is alleged to have refused on the 6th August 1874 to meet Amin Luke Brewin for measuring lands. This is denied by the Curnam.

(3b.) The same Curnam is stated to have, on the 14th November 1874, refused to meet Mr. Dumphy for the purpose of inquiring into some cases of surreptitious irrigation. The Curnam states that he was in his house at the time the banker sent by Mr. Dumphy came to the village choultry in search of him, and that he afterwards went up to that gentleman who was on the Canal bank. He adds that Mr. Dumphy simply put him the question "where he had been," and that nothing further took place.

(3c.) It is further alleged that the same Curnam had frequently refused to attend on Overseer Velco Moodalyar. This is denied by the Curnam, who even cites an instance of his having helped the said Overseer and Amin Luke Brewin in measuring lands.

(4.) *Gotalur.*—General complaint as stated for Nundial Village No. (1), paragraph 6.

The Curnam states that he used his best exertions in inducing ryots to file applications for water, but that only a few applied. He states he acted in concert with the Overseer in the registration of applications.

8. IN KOILKUNTALA TALUQ.—(1). *Perayapally*, (2). *Kristipad*, (3). *Kondapuram*, (4). *Arjunapuram.*—General complaint as against Nundial No. (1) paragraph 6.

The Curnams deny the truth of the complaint. With the exception of the Kondapuram Curnam who sent in his tickets from time to time, the rest admit that they kept them back until they accumulated for a month when they despatched them. This is contrary to your instructions, and when these Curnams attended my office at Ayalur, I warned them against such neglect for the future.

(2a.) The Kristipad Curnam is alleged to have, on the 13th August 1874, agreed to meet Overseer Ayasawmy to measure lands, but failed to do so, without assigning a reason. This is denied.

Paragraph 8, Mr. Dodson's letter No. 23.

9. On the whole, it will be seen that in several cases it is difficult to bring home to the Curnams the fact of their having neglected their duty in irrigation matters. In some cases satisfactory explanation has been tendered. It cannot be denied, however, that some of the Curnams have been less careful in the discharge of their duties. This may be attributed in part to the novelty of the rules which have hardly a full season's trial, while in some cases, the propensity to look after their own agricultural concerns has very likely predominated over a strict sense of duty.

10. The Tahsildar of Koilkuntla observes that he would have checked these irregularities, if timely notice of the same had been given him by the Company's officers. I agree with the Tahsildar, and submit that such a long list of defaults extending over a period of several months could not have been recorded, had the local officers been communicated with, in the first instance.

11. It is now useless to comment on this subject, in that the Government Order recently issued* modifying Rule II. sets the matter at rest. It remains to be seen how far the current

* No. 1,327, dated 8th May 1875.

year will remedy the defects of the past in respect to the speedy registration of applications. The Company's Amins and Overseers are few, they are stationed far apart, and have a number of villages to attend to. Practically, the difficulties felt by the ryots may be greater. We should not be surprised if they hunt after the Company's Overseers and Amins from village to village and wait for their convenience. As the registration of applications is, I believe, but one of the numerous duties they are called upon to perform, it would have been better if the rule had been so modified as to leave it optional to the ryots to put in their applications to the Curnams or the Company's subordinates, and that was the original shape into which the draft rule had been thrown into, before the Committee met at Cuddapah in January 1874.

12. I may as well quote the words of Conservancy Engineer Mr. Wilks on this head. "I think in time the actual working of the system will go on smoothly, but it gives the Curnam an almost unlimited influence over the ryots; there can be no doubt that direct applications to the Overseers are better. There are some men who would rather apply to the latter; others prefer the Curnam, and in this way a complete check would be kept."

13. It is, however, a source of congratulation that the Kurnool District, in which the best portion of the Canal lies, did not afford real grounds to induce Government to make the modification.

14. I shall submit the information called for in the latter part of paragraph 3 of your docket under acknowledgment, on the receipt of a reply from the Company's Assistant Conservancy Engineer.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. HOPE,
Acting Collector.

SUBMITTED for the information of Government with reference to G. O., 26th October 1874, No. 186.

2. Though there have been a few cases of dilatoriness or neglect on the part of Curnams in the Kurnool District, the reports show that Mr. Latham's sweeping complaint is not borne out. It is admitted that the superior revenue officers have done all they can; and it seems to the Board that if the people really wanted the water, no amount of obstructiveness by the Curnams would prevent them from getting it.

3. The change, however, which was desired by the Canal officers has been made (G. O., 8th May 1875, No. 1,327, Public Works Department), and applications are now made to the Company's servants. It remains to see the effect.

(True Copies and Extract.)

A. H. Latham
Acting Secretary.

To the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
Copy to the Acting Collector of Kurnool.

Ed. W. H. French.

Irrigation Company's Canal.—Report of Collector of Kurnool with reference to dilatoriness of Curnams complained of by Mr. Latham in receiving applications for water from —, submitted to Government.

OCTOBER.
No. 2,755.

Received

20 October 1875

Recd 1601-111 Kurnool
1874-

Encl.

20/10/75

PROCEEDINGS, 2ND OCTOBER 1875, No. 2,755.

BOARD OF REVENUE,
MADRAS.

No 1875. 64/75

No 4089

No 1483

10/10/75 - 3-4
26/10/74 - 186 km
26/10/74 - 192 km
24/10/75 - 1106 km

Revenue Dept.

No 1621

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 11th October 1875

Read the following

Proceedings of the Board of

Revenue.

Subm report of Cth.
of Kurnool with reference to dilatori-
ness of Curnams complained of by Mr.
Latham in receiving applications for
water from Irrigation Company's Canal

Id. E. 2? Oct/75 No 2755

Communicated to
the Public Works Dept.

with reference to
para 4 of the Proceedings
in that Department
dated 21st Oct 1874 No 2996

The Govt. Council

2-

in the Board's conclusions.

NO 120

21 To the Board of Directors
14 The Board of Directors

W. H. P.

40.

Dilatoriness of Cur
rums in receiving ap
plications for water
from J. H. C.

C.
C.
S.