

Revenue (1899) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 293

DATED 19th January 1899

[Despatch Abstract.]

Recording Progs of the B^d of Rev Submissions
to Govt the explanation of the Dy Collector,
Jammalwada, for delay in starting
gratuitous relief.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 8698

8/19/1899

From

The Board of Revenue
Revenue Settlement Land
Records and Agriculture
Madras.

Order Mis No 293 17/19th Jan 1899.

Recorded.
for
18.1.99
Jme

No. 7251 Mis.

Dated 17. December 1898

Received 20

Registered 21

Enclosures 1

Spare copies



To the Board of Rev (Rev. Secy)

CS
17-1-99
RS
17-1-99

SUBJECT,

Submitting to Government,
with remark, the explanation
of the Dy. Collector Jammala
Madugu for delay in starting
gratuitous relief.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.



Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Revenue Settlement, Land Records and Agriculture),

Dated 17th December 1898.

No. 7251 Miscellaneous.

READ The following letter from the Collector of Cuddapah, D.O. no. 106 of 98, dated 12th January 1898:-

* Communicating to the Collector of Cuddapah, D.O. no. 2879, Res. dated 18th June 97, I have the honour to forward herewith the explanation of

A. M. R. V. Parayanasaamy Pillai, Special Deputy Collector on Famine duty in regard to his delay in starting gratuitous relief.

2. The Board called upon him to explain why he failed to carry out the implicit orders contained in B.P. no. 306 dated 19th April 97. Instead of giving a direct reply to this simple question, he has

has wandered away from the point, and discussed (vide paras 2 to 6 of his explanation) the orders of the Board and Government issued between December and March. This he has done to shew how he was led to misunderstand the orders of 19th April 1897, and to prove that such misapprehension was bonafide, he has ~~alluded~~^{affuded} to the orders issued by him to Tahsildars and to the references made by him to me. In short, his explanation is that he misapprehended the scope of the orders, in the absence of a copy of G.O. NO. 216 dated 30-3-97. This G.O.

Printed in B. P. NO. 306 dated 3-4-97, spare copies of which were received by me only on 4-5-97, and I was therefore unable to send it to him along with B. P. NO. 306 dated 19th April 97, of which Cyclo-Styled copies were furnished to me by the Board along with the original. I do not consider this explanation satisfactory. If B. P. NO. 306 dated 19th April 97 were read along with the sections of the Famine Code quoted therein, no one could make any mistake about the real scope of the orders.

2. In para 7, Mr R. R. Parayanasaomy Pillai tries to explain why he failed to carry out the orders even partially, so far as he understood their scope, - (ie), why he did not give relief to the dependants of relief workers, to whom, he had, no doubt, the orders applied. To quote his own words, he says, "I submit that I was doubtful whether they should be relieved by grain doles or in kitchens. I thought it best to wait until orders were received on my reference on the subject on 1st May as if these should be received in kitchens which are the best test of need in most cases. I should be granting grain doles to several people who did not probably deserve them". The delay in this case is said to have been due to his inability to decide what kind of relief, whether grain doles or cooked food should be given.

4. I leave it to the Famine Com-missioners to decide how far these explanations are acceptable, as they come from an officer in whom he

asked

asked me to place implicit confidence, and of whose work and character he seems to have the very highest opinion.

5. I may, however, submit for the information of Government, that gratuitous relief in this district was started early enough, and within a reasonable time after the receipt of orders from the Board. The statements to the contrary that have been made appear to me to be groundless. Setting aside B.P. No. 207 dated 9-3-97 received by me on 18-3-97 which relates only to dependants of relief workers, the first general order on the subject was B.P. No. 278 dated 3-4-97 containing G.O. No. 216 dated 30-3-97. This was a big order containing instructions on various points and was received in my office on 17th April 1897; but as spare copies were received only on 4-5-97, it could not be carried earlier. Within 4 days of the receipt of this B.P., another general order viz. B.P. No. 306 dated 19th April 97 was received by me

203
25-3-97
F

265
26-4-97
E

by me and as Cyclostyled spare copies were received from the Board's Office along with the original, I issued clear instructions on the 22nd April 1897, to start relief immediately. By the 15th of May, kitchens were actually opened and were at work at Taluk Head quarters. Grain doles were also commenced at the same time.

Proposals for opening kitchens in villages were received from the Deputy Collector and disposed of by me on the following dates:—

Pulivendla - Received 20-5-97. orders issued 21-5-97.

Proddatore, received 25-5-97 - orders issued 27-5-97.

Gammalamadapu received 25-5-97. Orders issued 29-5-97.

In the last week of May, nearly two thousand persons were relieved, while in the first week of June, the number rose to 3960. In my opinion there was no need to give gratuitous relief in this district earlier

earlier than the middle of May.

6. The submission of this explanation which was very greatly delayed by the Deputy Collector has been further delayed by me owing to pressure of famine and jamabandi work, and the work connected with the distribution of the charitable fund money, and my ill health.

Resolution:-

Submitted to Government in regard to G.O. 2879 Mis. dated 7.6.97.

2. The principal reason for the delay made by the Deputy Collector in starting gratuitous relief appears to have been the fact that there was delay in the Collector's office in communicating to the Deputy Collector a copy of B.P. $\frac{278}{3.4.97}$, - the delay being due to the late receipt of spare copies. In the absence of B.P. $\frac{278}{3.4.97}$, the Deputy Collector could not be expected to fully understand the instructions given in B.P. $\frac{306}{19.4.97}$, which reached him prior to the receipt of B.A.

$\frac{265}{26-4-97}$ B.P. $\frac{278}{3.4.97}$. In the circumstances, it is submitted that the Deputy Collector's

E Explanation may be accepted.

3. The Board much regrets the delay in the submission of these papers to Government.

(True Copy and Extract)

R. B. Miniswar
Secretary.

To

The Secretary to Government

Revenue Department, with the Deputy Collector's explanation in original, (to be returned.)

Recd
19.4.97

E

me. val put up

Explanation.

I have been called upon by the Collector and the Board to explain delay in starting gratuitous relief in the three taluks of my Division. The

23 AUG 97

SECRETARY

order directing the grant of gratuitous relief in

villages is G.O No $\frac{276}{30.3.97}$ embodied in B.P. No

$\frac{276}{3.4.97}$. This order reached me on 14th May last

On the night of 12th May a telegram was received from the Collector calling on me to "report immediately what action taken regarding village

gratuitous relief." Six other orders were received

at the same time referring to the order regarding the starting of village gratuitous relief

and calling on me to explain why it had not

been started already. That was the first time

that I understood that this kind of relief had

to be given. Without loss of time, I started a

kitchen the next day at Proddatur and wire

to the Tahsildars of Jammalamadugu and

Pulimela to do so too in their Kasba villages

Steps were at once also taken to start the issue

of grain doles in all villages and to open

other central kitchens.

2. In B.P. No $\frac{3738}{26.5.97}$ Mis: under reference, it is

stated that "the orders issued in Board's Pro-

ceedings No 306 of 97 were explicit" and I am

called upon to explain why I failed to carry

7log 7

26-4-97
E

Proddatur
Collector

7log 7

7log 7

7log 7

out these orders. I submit that B.P. No 306 of 1897 dated 19th April was received by me on the night of 27th idem while at Sarabhu and I have to explain delay in starting relief from 28th April to 13th May - 16 days.

3. At the time that this order was received matters stood thus: - The grant of gratuitous relief either in kitchens or by grain doles in villages requires the sanction of Government.

L.G. No 760 Press. Rev: the Government said B.P. No 1095-197

that gratuitous relief was not likely to be needed in any portion of the affected

tracts for a very considerable time to come

and prohibited the appointment of Circle Inspectors. The Board thereon asked whether

that Govt. order prohibited the employment of Circle Inspectors to enquire into cases

of destitute persons in villages. (Vide B.P. No 10

6.1.97) The G.O. on this subject is not here with me. But from Collector's Ref 7290 1.2.97, B.P. No 50

I observe that Government refused to sanction the appointment of Circle Inspectors

Then the question of relieving the young and old dependants of relief workers cropped up.

From B.P. No: 1361 printed in B.P. No: 306 19.4.97 it appears that the grant of money doles, in G.O. No 67 3.2.97

appears that the grant of money doles, in G.O. No 67 3.2.97

appears that the grant of money doles, in G.O. No 67 3.2.97

appears that the grant of money doles, in G.O. No 67 3.2.97

appears that the grant of money doles, in G.O. No 67 3.2.97

appears that the grant of money doles, in G.O. No 67 3.2.97

appears that the grant of money doles, in G.O. No 67 3.2.97

appears that the grant of money doles, in G.O. No 67 3.2.97

to such dependants which is provided for in Sec: 92 of the Famine Code. It was apparently intended that they should be fed in the government kitchens. The Board asked if the prohibition applied to dependants who on account of caste objections will not partake of food in the kitchens. The dependants of relief workers were provided food in kitchens. It was brought to the notice of government that several dependants could not go to the works to which kitchens are attached on account of distance. Government ordered in G.O. No: 94 Rev that "when many workers come from a distance, a kitchen for their children might be established near their village." In communicating this order the Board said that this should be acted upon where necessary. It also pointed out to Government that in order to secure proper control over such kitchens and the admissions thereto, the organization contemplated in Sec: 75 of the Famine Code should be gradually perfected and requested Govt. to reconsider its orders on the subject of making inquiries regarding destitute persons in their villages.

In B.P. No 207 para 5, Sub para 2 to 9.3.97 203
Board directed the opening of the kitchens 25.3.97
for dependants of relief workers at once.
The Government had expressed its opinion
that gratuitous relief would not be
required for a long time and refused
to sanction the appointment of Circle
Inspectors to enquire about destitutes in
villages. The correspondence was regarding
payment of money doles to dependants of
relief workers who would not on account
of caste objections partake of cooked food
in kitchens and kitchens for others. At this
time the B.P. No: 306 was received 7 May
embodying G.O. No 1704 Mis: (ast, referring 306
Solely to dependants of relief workers of the 19.4.97
two classes above mentioned (Vra para 2)
and I believed that the relief of this class
of persons was all that was ordered
and had to be carried out. G.O. No 216 30.3.97
was referred in the G.O.; but that order
was not received by me then as already
stated. It was received only on the night
of 14th May. Para 4 of the Board's order
on the above G.O. No 1704 referred to
gratuitous relief in villages under Sec: 75 of the Famine

but this as well in the then state of things I
understood to refer only to the dependants
of relief workers in their own villages. As
it was the Government that had to sanction
the grant of gratuitous relief in villages to
all destitutes and such sanction, I was not
aware of. I could not believe that it
was sanctioned. I understood that the
grant of gratuitous relief under Secs: 64-83
and 85 was sanctioned only to a
particular class of people viz the depen-
dants of relief workers. In this view I
understood para 4 of the B.P. also to refer
to the dependants. The starting of special
kitchens for them and the grain doles to them
at their villages could be sanctioned only
under the above sections of the Famine
Code and it did not occur to me
that the quotation of these sections
both in the G.O. and in the B.P. necessarily
meant that more than this partial
application of them was sanctioned.
After G.O. No 216 was received
everything seemed clear: but before
that order was received by me in
the circumstances stated above, I
could not put the interpretation that
I now find is the proper one.

4. I have stated above the reasons for my misapprehending the Govt. and the Board's order. I shall show below that this misapprehension is not an after thought - a subsequent invention to escape having to answer for neglect of duty. In my footnote to B. P. No 306 under reference, ^{19.4.97} which I wrote to the ^{me} ~~habildars~~ on 18th May I wrote as follows: - "It will be observed that this refers only to the dependants of relief workers including apparently those relieved by the Weavers Scheme." "Let's of these should be prepared at once in the form given in Sec: 75 of the Famine Code." In my letter to the Collector dated the same day I wrote as follows: - "I beg to know also if the B.P. under reference (B.P. No 306 ^{19.4.97} was meant) ^{me} refers also to the dependants of weavers relieved under the weavers relief scheme and whether as in the case of kitchens attached to works, ^{for} respite of relief under Sec: 75 may be of destitute people who owing to old age &c are incapable of earning a livelihood." Again in my letter dated 10th May to the Collector submitting proposals for the division of

of Proddatur and Jammalamadhy talukas into circles & for the appointment of Circle Inspectors I wrote - "I have in my letter No 269 ^{2.5.97} requested orders as to (1) whether money doles are to be given to destitutes also as in kitchens attached to relief works (2) whether weavers dependants are also to be relieved and whether the order directing the opening of Kitchens for these may be considered as cancelled. "If all these people are to be relieved there will, I think, be enough work for all officers put in charge of circles; but if only the dependants of relief workers are to be granted the relief, there may be no work in some villages, chiefly in the circles of the Proddatur taluk. Further quotations will be wearisome.

5. G. O. No 216 ^{30.3.97} not having been received when B. P. No 306 ^{18.7} was received, I should have asked the collector for a copy of the same. I thought it was one of the several unimportant orders that are quoted in G.O.s and B.P.'s which are not communicated to me. However I asked for it in my letter dated 10th May to the Collector above quoted. Nevertheless in regard to this matter I plead guilty.

76 In his ~~Collected~~ letter Ref No. 392 ⁷ 20/5/97
the Collector has remarked that if I
felt a doubt as to the exact scope
of the B.P., I should have wired to
him for instructions. I did not feel
a doubt as to its scope as will be
apparent from the quotations I made
above and so did not wire to the
Collector. In my letter Ref No 269
2.5.97 dated 18th May (copy enclosed) I asked
for instructions as to whether destitutes,
not being dependants of relief workers,
may be gratuitously relieved as in kitchens
attached to works. I exhibited in this letter
the misapprehension that I was labouring
under and as soon as I was ^{disabused} ~~disarmed~~
of this misapprehension on the night of
12th May by a telegram and several
written orders, I took action to obey the
orders of Government, the Board and
the Collector with the least possible delay.
If these orders reached me earlier after
the 18th, I should have done the same.

77 In Collector's letter No: 450 20.5.97, I
have been called upon to state why, granting
that I understood the Board's order to
refer to dependants of relief workers only,
I did not grant relief to them until 12th May.

3.
I have also been directed to give a list of
the villages inspected in the interval
and the No: of dependants of relief
workers registered. I did not ~~inspect~~
inspect any villages for registry of
dependants until the 1st May. On the
20th I travelled from Surabhi to Vempale
in which place I expected the Fortnightly
Narrative from the Tahildars due that
day. I arrived at Vempale at about
2 p.m. I think, and after despatching
my Fortnightly Narrative to the Collector
that day, I started for Proddatur
via Yerrapuntha. I reached Proddatur
in the afternoon of the 29th. I
inspected the Bollavarani work on the
30th and went to Chinna Danloor
on 1st, where I inspected the Chinna Dan-
loor Channel work. It was on that
day that I wrote my letter Ref No 269
2.5.97 above quoted. As I understood the
Board's order to refer to dependants of
relief workers only and in view of the Board's
remark in para 3 stating that it is
less expensive to give grain than to
give food in kitchens, I requested in
that letter to be informed whether the
order given in B.P. No: 207
9.3.97 directing
the opening of kitchens for all such people

might be considered as cancelled. Reply to this was received on the night of 12th May. From the 1st to 3rd, I inspected the Cherina Dandloor Channel work and examined the list of recipients of money doles from the Indian famine charitable Relief Fund in Cherina Dandloor village, the Peddasethipale Channel work. From the 4th to 12th (both days inclusive) I visited the following villages for registration of relief besides inspecting relief works.

Villages	No registered	
1. Chinasettipale —	16	25. Chintakunta — 40
2. Razupalem —	15	26. Lingaladevire — 5
3. Tangaloor —	25	27. Gangavaram — u
4. Godegudoor —	a few persons	28. Gaddanayopal — u
5. Ajayavaripale —	no destitutes	29. Vanipenta — 101
6. Vengalayopal —	5	30. Maydukoor — 2
7. Arakati nanula —	60	31. Sowapuram — u
8. Parlapad —	18	32. Anjaloor — u
9. Enurapalem —	7	33. Dayankhanpale — u
10. Jondaladevire —	11	34. Somayazulopal — 4
11. Cherina Jannavararam —	8	35. Gollavandopal — u
12. Velavali —	26	36. Nandiyalanpet — 9
13. Duvoor —	15	37. Elampale — u
14. Gudipad —	7	38. Chennayogari pale — a few
15. Cherina Singanapale —	4	
16. Sallabasevarayopal —	4	
17. Gollapale —	4	
18. Bayanapale —	1	
19. Pichapad —	u	
20. Somapuram —	7	
21. Bhadrupale —	4	
22. Nerravada —	1	
23. Cheepad —	2	
24. Morayopal —	2	

causes registered
by the Village
officers checked

It is not at present possible to say how many of them are dependants of relief workers as such separate information has not been noted in my diary. I registered also destitutes as I had asked the question as to whether there should be relief too and wished to be prepared in case I should be told to relieve them. As to the query why I did not relieve the dependants of relief workers, I submit that I was doubtful whether they should be relieved by grain doles or in kind. I thought it best to wait until some line was drawn as my reference on the subject on 10th May, as, if there should be relief in kind, which are the best test of need in such cases, I should be granting grain doles to several people who did not probably deserve them. I visited 38 villages in about a week handling whole days in going from village

Current No. 8698 of-1898

From the Board of Revenue (Sett)

7251ms Dated 17 — 12 —

1898.

FOR ORDERS. 30225

M.V. Naraniyasami Pillai
as Dy C.M.
Not in the list

In Volume put up

With reference to G.O. 2879
7-6-97
the Board submits the explanation
from ~~for~~ called for in para 2 of
its order 3738
26-5-97 from the Dy
Collector Cuddalore for delay
in starting gratuitous relief in
villages in his division in spite
of the explicit ~~orders~~ in B.P.
306
19-4-97. This B.P. it will be
seen from a perusal of the papers
therein, was issued after a reference
to Govt in connection with the
relief of dependants of relief workers,
but also refers to G.O. 216
31-3-97 which
authorized gratuitous relief in
villages. The Dy Collector's explana-
tion is that ~~the~~ the G.O. of the 31st
march was received by him some-
time after B.P. 306
19-4-97 and that
as previously the Govt had ~~not~~
declined to sanction gratuitous
relief in villages he understood

1898
REVENUE DEPT.
Encl. No. 1
Cur. No. 8698

Enc. No. 1 to Dy C.M. Reg. No. 25 of 1898

the B.P. of the 19th April 1897 to refer only to the relief of dependants and was not aware that the instructions therein referred also to general gratuitous relief till the receipt of ~~some~~ sometime after of B.P. 278 3-4-97 embodying the G.O. of the 31st March 1897.

2. The collector says that if B.P. 306 19-4-97 were read along with the sections of the Famine Code quoted therein there could be no room for mistaking its scope, that the explanation is unsatisfactory, and that there was delay even in carrying out the B.P. in the partial manner in which the Dy. Collector understood it. The Board says that in the absence of B.P. 278 3-4-97 the Dy. Collr. could not be expected to fully understand the instructions in B.P. 306 19-4-97 and that the explanation may be accepted.

3. The papers may be recorded. The Dy. Collr. is as Dy. Collr. M.V. Narayanasamy Pillai to 1/4 on 10/11/97

R.S.
6-1-99

See

10.11

11-1-99

16-1-99

Please see draft order on the docket of the current. Mil

FOR ORDERS.

E

Paras 2 & 3 of the Collector's letter in the current.

When given for copying _____
When copied _____
When examined _____
When signed _____

189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No.

189 ,

DATED

CURRENT

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

.. .. A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING WANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

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