A M.
10—29-6-99.

Local & Munl. (189) Department.

PRINTED.

G.O., No. 1751 M

DATED 23—11—1899

[The notes to this G.O. will be printed after release from this file]

[Despatch Abstract.]

Vellore Municipal Council.

Ordering with remarks, the issue notifications withdrawing from the Municip Council of Vellore the privilege of electing Chairman, reducing the number of members to be appointed by election from fifteen to sev removing M.R.Ry. A. C. Seshagiri Raw fro of Chairman & Councillor.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Government (1899) of Madras.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL.

Recd.	1899.	*Enclosures*	
Regd.		*Spare copies*	

G.O., No. 1751 M., 23rd November 1899.

NOVEMBER.

Municipal Council.

Ordering, with remarks, the issue of notifications withdrawing from the — of Vellore the privilege of electing its Chairman, reducing the number of members to be appointed by election from fifteen to seven, and removing M.R.Ry. A. C. Seshagiri Rao from the offices of Chairman and Councillor.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Government (1899) of Madras.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL.

Recd. } 1899.
Regd.

Enclosures
Spare copies

G.O., No. 1751 M., 23rd November 1899.

NOVEMBER.

Municipal Council.

Ordering, with remarks, the issue of notifications withdrawing from the — of Vellore the privilege of electing its Chairman, reducing the number of members to be appointed by election from fifteen to seven, and removing M.R.Ry. A. C. Seshagiri Rao from the offices of Chairman and Councillor.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Read—again the following papers :—

G.O., No. 986 M., dated 14th July 1899.

Abstract.—Proposing, for reasons stated, to reduce the number of elective seats on the Vellore Municipal Council from fifteen to seven, and to withdraw from the Council the privilege of electing its Chairman ; and requesting the Municipal Council to state its objections, if any, to these proposals.

G.O., No. 987 M., dated 14th July 1899.

Abstract.—Requesting, with remarks, M.R.Ry. A. C. Seshagiri Rao, Chairman and Councillor of the Vellore Municipality, to show cause why he should not be removed from both these offices.

Read—also the following papers :—

From the Chairman, Municipal Council, Vellore, dated 15th August 1899, No. 1712.

Abstract.—Forwarding the Municipal Council's reply to G.O., No. 986 M., dated 14th July 1899.

From the Collector of North Arcot, dated 21st September 1899, Dis. No. 1609—D-Eng.

Abstract.—Submitting his remarks on the Vellore Municipal Council's reply to G.O., No. 986 M., dated 14th July 1899.

From the Chairman, Municipal Council, Vellore, dated 19th August 1899, No. 1729.

Abstract.—Submitting his explanation with reference to G.O., No. 987 M., dated 14th July 1899.

From the Collector of North Arcot, dated 31st October 1899, Ref. on No. 1476-Eng.

Abstract.—Submitting, for the orders of Government, certain correspondence between the Secretary, Vellore Municipal Council, and the Chairman of the Municipality.

From the Collector of North Arcot, dated 16th November 1899, Ref. on No. 1476-Eng.

Abstract.—Submitting, with remarks, Sub-Collector's letter, dated 11th November 1899, bringing to notice certain matters connected with Vellore municipal administration.

Order—No. 1751 M., dated 23rd November 1899.

It has been a matter of grave regret to the Government that it has been compelled to examine the manner in which the administration of the Vellore Municipality has been conducted for some time past, and to arrive at the conclusion that it is necessary to exercise the powers given under the Madras District Municipalities Act (IV of 1884) in view to make municipal administration in that town more efficient.

2. In January 1899, the Government received a memorial from some of the municipal councillors of the town, containing allegations seriously reflecting on the administration of municipal affairs in Vellore. The Plague Commissioner and the Collector of the district also from time to time reported very unfavourably on the state of affairs there. The Government, however, was unwilling to take serious notice of the maladministration of the municipal executive until ample enquiry had been made and full opportunity afforded to all concerned to tender such explanations as were possible. The Government has now before it the reports made by the Sub-Collector on the memorial referred to above, with the records of the enquiry made by that officer ; it also has carefully considered the report of the Sub-Committee of the Municipal Council on the various charges of maladministration that have been formulated, together with the minute of dissent submitted by one of the members of that Committee as well as the explanation of the Chairman, and it now proceeds to pass orders on the whole matter.

3. The charges which have been made regarding the administration of municipal affairs in the town of Vellore may be formulated under the following four heads, and His Excellency the Governor in Council will state the conclusions he has arrived at on each charge :—

(1) It is stated that the incompetency and apathy of the municipal executive in the matter of the management of the finances of the corporation have been such that the Municipality is now practically in a state of bankruptcy.

(2) It is said that the Chairman of the Council and the Council itself have persistently refused to give the Secretary of the Council the power and support necessary to enable him to conduct his duties with efficiency.

(3) The grossly discreditable state of the town as regards cleanliness and sanitation is said to show that the work of the Council for a long time past has been characterised by general inefficiency.

(4) The personal apathy and neglect of duty on the part of the present Chairman are said to have been such as to show that he is unfit to conduct the duties of his important office.

4. As regards the first charge against the Municipality, His Excellency the Governor in Council notices that while in the review of the administration for the year 1895–96 the administration of the Municipality was characterised as having been more efficient than in the previous year, the review for the year 1897–98 showed that there had been a serious retrogression in the conduct of affairs. The Government remarked that the administration had been neither efficient nor satisfactory, and in the current year it was noted that the assessment and collection of the taxes had been mismanaged and that there had been general laxity and retrogression in almost every branch of the administration. In the matter of accounts it may be noted that the Accountant-General's audit report for 1896–97 showed that the accounts of the Vellore Municipality were among the worst in the Presidency. The Municipal Council has, therefore, had ample warning that its affairs were not in a satisfactory condition, and it knew, moreover, that with the approach of plague, it was specially incumbent upon it to husband its resources to the greatest possible extent.

5. An examination of the accounts of the Municipality for 1898–99 shows that the year closed with a *minus* balance of Rs. 4,410, and that during the year the Government advanced to the Municipality a loan of Rs. 10,000. The actual plague expenditure during the year, on the other hand, was shown in the accounts as Rupees 10,029. It is clear, therefore, that the plea put forward that the expenditure on plague measures is the sole cause of the present state of embarrassment in which the

Municipal Council finds itself, is not correct, the expenditure having been almost the same as the amount of the grant made to the Municipality. In any case it was the special duty of the Municipality to husband its resources during the year with very special care, and the following figures will show how culpably the Council neglected its duty in this respect. As to the house-tax, out of a demand of over Rs. 9,300, only Rs. 7,200 were collected, no less than 23·2 per cent. or almost a quarter of the tax remaining uncollected at the close of the year. No plea can possibly be raised that the demand was heavy, as the total demand per house is only Rs. 1-3-0—exactly half the average assessment per house for all the Municipalities of the Presidency. An examination of the papers before Government, moreover, shows that the cause of this most unsatisfactory state of affairs was the total neglect of any serious attempt to collect the tax until the close of the calendar year. The excuse that the Municipal Chairman delayed issuing demands as he hoped to be able to revise the list only shows that the Chairman and his office did not understand the provisions of the Municipal Act. The case of the land tax was even worse, as no less than 65·3 per cent. of the demand remained outstanding at the close of the year.

As regards the tax on arts and professions, His Excellency the Governor in Council can only characterise the administration as scandalous. Out of an initial demand of almost Rs. 8,000, no less than Rs. 2,763 were remitted on appeal, showing that either the original assessment of the tax or the subsequent remissions were recklessly made. The plea now put forward by the Chairman that the large amount of remissions was due to plague is clearly an after-thought and is incorrect. It is further clear from the papers before the Government that the conduct of the Council in dealing with applications for remissions was most discreditable. The remissions were granted without sufficient enquiry, and in spite of the fact that attention had been drawn by Government to the unsatisfactory manner in which this tax was levied in the Municipality, no less than 116 appeals appear to have been disposed of without any record of reasons for the reduction of the taxes. Very grave allegations have been made against the Council as to the motives which influenced them in their decisions in this matter, and that these were made is entirely due to the very discreditable manner in which the administration of the tax was conducted. The Government, after a careful examination of all the papers before it, can arrive at no other conclusion than that the conduct of the Council in this matter has been a grave scandal.

In the matter of the minor sources of income in the Municipality the administration appears to have been almost equally faulty. The number of dogs licensed is clearly only a small fraction of the number of dogs in the town, while no proper care has been exercised in the matter of the tax on horses.

Accompanying the grossly careless manner in which the taxes in the Municipality have been assessed and collected, there appears to have been corresponding laxity in the grant of remissions to the contractors. The Council granted to certain contractors a remission of almost Rs. 2,000, which the Collector reports to have been wholly unnecessary, while the Council's action in fining the market contractor Rs. 500 subsequently for irregularities in the matter of the levy of fees in the market has been characterized by the Collector as vindictive, closely following, as it did, the tender of evidence by the contractor in connection with the enquiry held by the Sub-Collector.

The result of the apathy of the Council and the gross neglect of their ordinary duties on the part of the executive of the Municipality was that the year closed, as has been shown, with a large *minus* balance. Since the close of the year the Government has thrice been compelled to assist the Council with further loans, and the Collector continues to report that the state of affairs in the Municipal office is nothing less than a public scandal. His Excellency the Governor in Council is convinced that, even had incapacity as regards proper financial control formed the only charge against the Municipality, it would have been necessary to take the measures permissible under the Municipal Act in view to place matters on a better footing. There are, however, the further complaints against the administration to be considered.

6. In August 1898 M.R.Ry. Swamidas Mudaliyar was appointed Secretary of the Municipal Council, on the recommendation of the Council, and it is a complaint

against the Chairman and the Council that the Secretary appointed by a majority of the Council has never, since his appointment, received the support or the powers necessary to make it possible for him to carry on his duties with success. After a perusal of all the papers on this subject, the Government has come to the conclusion that the feeling of hostility shown by certain of the Councillors and the Chairman against the Secretary has made his position an impossible one and that with a faction in the Council against him and the manager of the office ready to thwart him at every turn, municipal administration has been brought into contempt. The position of a Secretary in an office where he has no power to dismiss or to fine and where the manager and clerks know that a considerable section of the Council with the Chairman will support them against him must be intolerable, and it is nothing short of a scandal that the present Chairman of the Council has allowed matters to drift into their present condition. The complaints against the Secretary are for the most part frivolous, while the manager of the office has been permitted when complained of by the Secretary to submit explanations containing remarks of an unseemly character about the head of his office. The manager has been in a state of indebtedness for a long time past and there is reason for serious suspicion as to his conduct in his relations with contractors and others. The Government agrees with the district authorities in considering that the Chairman has shown culpable apathy in dealing with the enquiries which should have been made into the manager's conduct, and the present chaotic condition of the municipal office is the result of the Chairman's gross weakness in administration.

7. As regards the general sanitary work done by the executive of the Municipality, the Collector reports that the town is in a discreditable condition, the streets are many of them said to be filthy, the markets badly looked after, and the system of private scavenging most unsatisfactory. As regards the last subject, the system was worked at a heavy loss during the year 1898–99, the number of houses attended to decreased, and only a little more than half of the payments due were recovered. All these facts point to faulty administration and confirm the truth of the charge made against the Municipal Council.

8. It has in the last place been said that the Chairman personally has shown great indifference and want of energy in carrying out his duties as Municipal Chairman. The Plague Commissioner was of opinion that much of the difficulty of the plague administration at Vellore would have been avoided had the Chairman been active in his support of the executive, and it is also clear that in the definite matter of the repair of an important source of water-supply the Chairman omitted to carry out the wishes of the Municipal Council. The papers before Government further show that the Chairman has exercised no sufficient control over the office and has omitted to take suitable notice of the complaints made from time to time against the manager. As regards the control exercised over the out-door establishment, the state of the town and the large arrears under the principal taxes show that no proper supervision was exercised by the Chairman during the year. The Government regrets that it must accept the report of the district authorities that the Chairman's conduct of affairs has brought municipal administration in Vellore into contempt.

9. The Municipal Council and the Chairman have had the opportunity for explanation required under sections 12 and 19 of Act IV of 1884, and His Excellency the Governor in Council is of opinion that the explanations afforded are unsatisfactory and form no sufficient reason why orders should not now be passed in accordance with the intentions of Government as expressed in the orders read at the head of these proceedings. The following notifications will, therefore, be published, under which the privilege of electing its Chairman will be withdrawn from the Vellore Municipal Council and the number of councillors to be appointed by election reduced from fifteen to seven. The present Chairman will also now be removed from the Municipal Council and the Collector will be requested to nominate a gentleman for the post of Chairman who will be free from the influence of the factions which have worked so much evil in Vellore, and who will give the present Secretary the support necessary to enable him to carry out his duties. A proper enquiry should at once be made into the

conduct of the manager, whose salary should also be reduced, if this has not been already done :—

NOTIFICATIONS.

I.

Whereas the Municipal Council of Vellore, as at present constituted, appears unequal to the administration of municipal affairs in an efficient manner, His Excellency the Governor in Council is pleased to declare, under the provisions of section 12 of Act IV of 1884, as amended by Act III of 1897, and in modification of Notification No. 24, published in the *Fort St. George Gazette Extraordinary*, dated 19th March 1885, that the Chairman of the Municipal Council of Vellore shall be appointed by the Governor in Council and that the number of Councillors to be appointed by election shall be seven.

II.

Under clause (iv) of sub-section (1) of section 19 of the Madras District Municipalities Act IV of 1884, as amended by Act III of 1897, His Excellency the Governor in Council hereby removes M.R.Ry. A. C. Seshagiri Rao from the offices of Councillor and Chairman of the Vellore Municipality, as his continuance in these offices is, in the opinion of Government, likely to bring the municipal administration into contempt.

10. In conclusion, His Excellency the Governor in Council puts on record an expression of his regret that, in such an important town as Vellore, municipal administration should have drifted into such an unsatisfactory condition as to necessitate the measures now ordered to be taken.

(True Extract.)

H. TREMENHEERE,
Secretary to Government.

To the Chairman, Municipal Council, Vellore,
" Collector of North Arcot.
Gazette.

Exd. A. F. Eccleston.

Board's Govt. Ref. No. 351/Eng of 1899. Confidential

Local & Munl. (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 2209 M

TO BE RETURNED WITH REPLY.

From

The Chairman, Municipal Council,
Vellore

No. 1712

Order No. 9189 4-9-99

Referred to the Collector of North Arcot, for early remarks.

For Secretary to Govt.

Dated 15th August 1899.

Received 17th August 1899.

Registered

Enclosures 6

Spare copies

Referred to the Ag. Sub Collector for very early remarks

ag. C.W.

5.9.99

SUBJECT.

Forwarding the Municipal Co
reply to G.O., No. 986, dated 14
1899.

To,
The Collector of North Arcot.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Confidential

Local & Munl. (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 2209 M

Zaciammmi Mudalai's minute of dissent from the report is not in the file. Ask him to submit it separately. 30-8-99 — since received & enclosed —

Desp

From

The Chairman,
Municipal Council,
Vellore

No. 1712 of 99

N°. 2189 4-9-99

~~Order~~

AA 29.8.99

Referred to the Collector of North Arcot for early remarks.

Copy on file docket
f desp

MHamnett

Asst Secretary to Govt.

VR 23/8/99

Desp. 4/9/99

Dated 15th August 1899.

Received 17-8-99

Registered —

Enclosures Six.

Spare copies nil

SUBJECT.

Forwarding ~~report~~ the m... of Co... G.O. No 986 dated the 14 Jul... ~~Cause why the Council be degraded &c &c.~~

Note

This Communication has not come thro' the Coll. It is desirable to have the Coll's remarks on the Sub Committee's report, as the G.O. calling on the Council to show cause why its constitution sho... The Collector of N. Arcot.

Note called has wanted on their report.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Confidential

No 1712 of 99.

1A

Vellore Municipal Office,

Dated 15th August 1899.

From

M. R. Ry. A. C. Seshaghiri Row Avergal,
CHAIRMAN, MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
VELLORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENTS,
Fort St. George.

Sir,

With reference to the Proceedings of the Madras Government No 986 M. dated 14th July 1899, and which was received in this Office on the 17th idem, I have the honor to submit a copy of the council's resolution No 1 dated 14th August 1899 adopting the sub Committee's report thereon as that of Council.

2. The Sub Committee was appointed o 29th July last and it sat up to the 10th and going carefully into the charges bro by the memorialists, and it has succ in shewing that these charges are fal exaggerated and have been made malicious and interest motives

3. In the discussion of the Sub Comm

report with regards to the Profession - tax it was brought out in debate that the original assessments as prepared by the assessing Councillors in August last were then correct, but that in the month of October last when the appeals were being heard there was an appreciable fall in the income of the several tradesmen and others owing to the plague scare. Owing to several cases of imported plague in October last, and to the effect of the prevalence of plague, at Bangalore and at other places, had on trade here, necessitating people leaving the town by hundreds, the Council as a special concession in this year only esolved to grant large remissions.
r this reason also the Council was reed to remit to its several contractors ut Rs 5000 from its anticipated income he year. Hence the true cause for the remissions granted.

wish specially to draw the attention nment to the fact that amongst all minority who were in favor

of the amendments were 3 of the signatories to the memorial.

5. In the several recommendations of the sub Committee and Council, I heartily concur for reasons therein mentioned.

6. In conclusion it remains for me to add that my own explanation, called for in the Proceedings of the Madras Government No 987 M dated 14th July last, and which was received by me on the 21st idem, will be submitted within the 20th instant through the Divisional Officer.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant

Chairman.

Copd. by

Compd. by

Masulipatam.
7-8-98.

B

Mr France.

I received your letter of the 18th ult. reminding me of the testimonial I promised to give you. I was unable to reply sooner owing to illness.

I had charge of the Vellore Municipality for about a month in the early part of this year. I found it necessary to employ you on outdoor municipal work during that time and I found that you did your work energitically and in an efficient man

(Signed) W.C. Holme.

2 Endorsement on application for the post Secretary, Tuticorin Municipality by M.R.Ry A.C. Seshagiri Row Avergal, Chairman.

Forwarded for favourable Considera

Mr France is an experienced Municipa Servant. He knows his business well. Concur with the opinion expressed by Habibulla Sahib, late Chairman.

(Signed) A.C. Sesha
Chai

10.

Endorsement of the Chairman, on the application of Mr G.A. France, Manager, for the post of Secretary in the Tuticorin Municipality.

Forwarded to the Chairman, Municipal Council, Tuticorin.

Mr France is a man of vast experience in Municipal matters. He is honest, hard-working and intelligent. He deserves the appointment aimed at.

(Signed) A.C. Seshagiri Row.
Chairman.
25.3.99.

"True Copy"

Chairman

MEETING No. 23

Extract from Proceedings at a GENERAL / SPECIAL *Meeting of the Municipal Council for the Town of Vellore, dated* 14th August 1899.

PRESENT.

* * * * *

~~Res: No.~~

1. M. R. Ry: A. C. Seshagiri Row Avergal.
2. N. Mac Michael I.C.S. Sub Collector.
3. Reverend D. Wilson Kidd B.a.
4. Reverend A. J. Scudder M.a.
5. M. R. Ry. V. Nadamuni Mudaliar Avergal
6. " " V. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal.
7. " " T. Ponnakoti Mudaliar Avergal.
8. " " Manikka Chettiar Avergal
9. " " Subroya Chettiar Avergal.
10. " " K. Krishnasami Naidu garu.
11. " " Gopala Krishna Mudaliar Avergal.
12. " " Pona Sami Mudaliar Avergal
13. " " C. Siva Row Avergal.
14. " " Narayanasami Reddiar Avergal.
15. " " Zahir Hajee Azizulla Sahib.
16. " " Sheik Ahmed Sahib.
17. " " Subadar Ahmed Khan Sahib

Resolution No. 1.-

Read again Proceedings of 1st de in

Gover

vernment No 986. M. dated 14th July 1899 with two enclosures.

Read also report of the Sub Committee appointed at the meeting of the 29th July 1899.

Proposed by Reverend D. W. Kidd B.A., and seconded by Zakir Hajee Azizulla Saheb "that the Sub Committee's report be adopted, as it stands, by the Council, and forwarded to Government as the Council's reply to Government proposals as contained in G. O. No 986. M. dated July 14. 1899.

1st Amendment – Proposed by Reverend H. J Scudder M.A. and seconded by the Sub Collector that para 19 (1) of the Sub Committee's report be omitted.

not carried.

5 for and 11 against – one not voting. (M. R. Ry. Narayanasami Reddiar Avergal)

d Amendment. – Proposed by Reverend J Scudder M.A. and seconded by the Collector that para 19 (3) be omitted.

not carried.

6 for and 11 against.

endment – Proposed by Reverend H. J. der M.A. and seconded by the Sub Collector that para 19 (4) be omitted as the Secretary not had proper chances of showing whether he is fit or unfit for the position.

not carried

6 for, 10 against – one not voting (Sheik Ahmed Sahib).

Here the Sub Collector left the meeting.

The original proposal being put to vote is carried.

11 for, and 5 against

Proposed Reverend D. W. Kidd B.A. and seconded by M. R. Ry. C. Siva Row Avergal that if the Government still think that the Municipal Council should be punished, the only adequate sentence would be that Local Self Government should cease to be tried in Vellore.

not carried.

7 for, 9 against

(Signed) A C Seshagiri Row
Chairman

"True Extract"

Chairman

MEETING NO. 21

Extract from Proceedings at a GENERAL/SPECIAL *Meeting of the Municipal Council for the Town of Vellore,*

dated 29th July 1899.

PRESENT.

* * * * *

~~Res: No~~.

1. Reverend D. Wilson Kidd B.A., Chairman Delega
2. N. Mac. Michael Esquire. Sub Collector.
3. Reverend H. J. Scudder M.A.
4. M. R. Ry. V. Nadamuni Mudaliar Avergal
5. " " T. Punniakoti Mudaliar Avergal
6. " " V. Subroya Chettiar Avergal
7. " " V. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal.
8. " " T. Narayanasami Reddiar Avergal
9. " " C. Siva Row Avergal.
10. " " Manikka Chettiar Avergal
11. " " K. Krishnasami Naidugaru.
12. " " V. Pounasami Mudaliar Avergal.
13. " " Subadar Ahmed Khan Sahib

Resolution No 1. -

Read Proceedings of the Madras Government No 986 M. dated 14th July 1899.

Proposed by Reverend D. W. Kidd and seconded by M. R. Ry: C. Siva Row Avergal.

1. That a Sub Committee be formed to si
de in

if any, to the proposals of Government.

Carried unanimously.

2. That the Sub Committee shall submit its report to a meeting of the Council to be held on Tuesday August 8. 1899.

Carried unanimously.

That this Sub Committee consist of:—

1. Reverend D. W. Kidd.
2. M. R. Ry. C. Siva Row Avergal.
3. " " V. Nadamuni Mudaliar Avergal.

Carried unanimously.

(Signed) D. Wilson Kidd
Chairman Delegate.

"True Extract"

Chairman

MEETING NO. 22

Extract from Proceedings at a GENERAL ~~SPECIAL~~ Meeting of the Municipal Council for the Town of Vellore, dated 5th August 1899.

PRESENT.

* * * * *

R.S. ~~No.~~

1. M. R. Ry: A. C. Seshagiri Row Avergal, Chairman.
2. N. MacMichael Esquire, I.C.S. Sub Collector.
3. Reverend D. Wilson Kidd B.A.
4. Reverend H. J. Scudder M.A.
5. M. R. Ry. Nadamuni Mudaliar Avergal.
6. " " C. Siva Row Avergal.
7. " " V. Periasami Mudaliar Avergal.
8. " " T. Cunniakoti Mudaliar Avergal.
9. " " V. Sabraya Chettiar Avergal.
10. " " V. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal.
11. " " V. Gopala Krishna Mudaliar Avergal.
12. " " Manikka Chettiar Avergal.
13. " " K. Krishnasami Naidu garu.
14. " " Narayanasami Reddiar Averg
15. " " Zakir Haji Azizulla Sahib.
16. " " Subadar Ahmed Khan Sahi

Resolution No 14.—

Reverend Kidd reports that the

Committee's report will not be rea

the m

meeting of the 8th Instant, as originally fixed and that it would be brought to the meeting of the 14th Instant.

Approved unanimously.

(Signed) A. C. Seshagiri Row.
Chairman

"True Extract"

Chairman

Report of the Sub Committee.

A

1. G. O. No 986. M. dated July 14. 1899, proposes to punish and degrade the Vellore Municipality by –

(1) Reducing the number of elected Councillors from 15 to 7, which is a reflection on the electors.

(2) Withdrawing the council's power of choosing its own Chairman, of course, this proposal has been made by Government in the interest of Local Self Government, which the Government is anxious not only to foster but also to make efficient.

2. This proposal of Government is instigated by 5 Councillors who in December 26. last, being Councillors, (two having lost their seat since viz Subadar Major Hussain Khan Sahib and M. R. Ry: T. Govinda Reddiar Avergal), wrote a petition to Government making certain charges and suggesting the very measures which Government proposes to adopt. It is s

a proceeding that Municipal Councils in

meetings at the 8th Instant [illegible]

themselves should try to injure and ruin the body to which they belong, that it is necessary to ask—

(1) What are the municipal antecedents of the petitioners?

(2) Why did they complain?

(3) Why complain in December 1898.?

It has to be noted that the elected members of the Council are divided into two parties — a very good thing indeed if only this fact does not degenerate into personal animosity, self-seeking or unfair practises. Of one party M. R. Ry: Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal is the acknowledged leader, and the other signatories were members.

(1) As to these individuals—

M. R. Ry. K. Krishnasami Naidu garu became a counciller for the first time on December 6. 1898, and on December 26 he signed this petition with the others. He asserts in it that he had made all reasonable attempts to rectify the matters complained of and and these attempts futile. Is this written bona-fide? Is this Councillor's opinion mature or words worth listening to?

Subadar Major Hussain Khan Sahib — talks Hindustani — knows no English and very little Tamil. As the council's proceedings are conducted in English and Tamil he has known very little of what is going on in Council. Sometimes when his vote is asked for he will enquire, but often he votes steadily with M. R. Ry Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal in blind ignorance, And yet, or rather, and so he has put his name to the sneering words "A large portion of the council do not possess attainments" i.e. Educational attainments. He is not however wanting in his own mental qualities. He vacated his seat on March 23. 1899. He wished to serve again; but there was a flaw in his nomination. A petition was put in before the Chairman to allow the nomination, but was rejected on the ground that his statement in support of the petition was not true, but was a pure concoction. He then petitioned the collector whose order was that the C n

ide in

man's decision was confirmed. Is Th

fit person to bring charges against the Chairman, the Council, the manager &c?

M. R. Ry. T. Govinda Reddiar Avergal – In an original suit in the District Munsiff's Court, in which he was a witness for the Council No 75 of 1894, during the Chairmanship of the present Secretary, judgment was given in which the following occurs:–

"The next witness called was Govinda Reddy a commissioner and a village magistrate of the Town - - - - - . I can hardly conceive anything more wicked or disgraceful – than the statement of this Councillor and he was put forward by the Chairman as a witness to prove plaintiff's fraud. His statements were so palpably false that I considered it my duty to ask him to appear the following day to show cause why he should not be sent to a magistrate for perjuring himself. He appeared and offered an apology to the Court and I have refrained taking any further steps as I am about so soon to leave the District, still I must note my displeasure

and

and surprise that a man with such a little regard for veracity should be permitted to hold the position of a Town Councillor."

M. R. Ry. V. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal – who as the leader, gives his character to the proceedings of those who blindly sign his petition, has a very bad record. In Proceedings of the Collector, North Arcot, dated August 26-1886. the following is recorded:–

"M. R. Ry. V. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal being a party and speaking on the spur of the moment, may I think in fairness be excused for the retort he made which was certainly discourteous and ill founded. Far different is the view that must be taken of his antecedent conduct in obtaining two signatures to a petition by misrepresenting its purport. His best friend will not contend that a man capable of such conduct is really fit to sit on the Council of his native town – though it cannot be forgotten or forgiven, it must not be made the ground of any official action now - - - - - . If M. R. Ry. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal gives trouble, let him be quietly pushed aside in

" a constitutional manner. He is evidently
" not a man deserving to be made a muni-
"-cipal idol of ---- I hope Colonel Taylor
" will accept my assurance --- of my
" regret that he should have been dis-
" courteously treated in open Council by a
" person so unscrupulous as Mr Eswarappa
" Mudaliar".

Again in G. O. No 430 M. dated May 11-1887 there is a letter from the same Collector dated December 11-1886, in which occurs this sentence-
" Mr Eswarappa Mudaliar, Rao Bahadur, does
" not consult his own dignity and the dignity
" of the Council by getting up Mahazarnamahs"–

It would perhaps be unnecessary to refer to these opinions, were it not that, as we shall show, his present action has the same characteristics of getting up petitions of troublesomeness and of unscrupulousness, as to the way he gets them up and as to their contents. Now not only do all these have reference to their municipal antecedents, but also they are judgments of others on them.

We trust on reconsideration the Government will see how dangerous it is to rely on a man who has already been officially declared

to

to be unfit to sit on the Council of his native town, even when supported by 4 Councillors of whom 2 probably knew nothing about the matter complained of but simply followed their leader.

It is acknowledged that if such gentlemen as these and their followers were as a majority fairly representative of the way in which the electors voted, disfranchisement would be perfectly just. But it has to be remembered that two of them have already lost their seats and thus the electors have as soon as possible purged themselves of all complicity with their antecedents, as well as by anticipation with the complaints of the petitioning Councillors.

(2) Then we ask why have these Councillors presented a petition that certain improvements have not been effected during the 7 months tenure of the Chairmanship of M. R. Ry. A. C. Seshagiri Row Avergal, when with reference to one of the points - Private scavenging para 8 - they acknowledge that it would take a year or two to complete these improvements. The

reason

reasons are that M. R. Ry: V. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal's party was steadily growing less and that M. R. Ry A. C. Seshagiri Row Avergal was not of that party, as was Mr Habibulla Sahib, the previous Chairman. Both the previous Chairman and M. R. Ry Kannu Chettiar Avergal lost their seats last year to the opposite party, making a difference of 4 votes. Subsequently to the petition Subadar Major Hussain Khan Sahib, and M. R. Ry T. Govinda Reddiar Avergal have also lost their seats — a further 4 votes when these candidates are gazetted. Also in another case one of that party was supplanted by an independent. Finding himself the leader of an unpopular party, M. R. Ry. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal sought to damage the other party by reducing the elected Councillors from 15 to 7. He has not made his proposals to Government with a view to improve Local Self-Government but simply out of pique, and as a last chance to rehabilitate himself in the Council.

(3) And why did he choose the end of last year for this move? In general because he

he found matters pressing hard on him, and more particularly on account of the new Secretary who was his own nominee. The Council asked Government to postpone this appointment and Government refused on December 17. 1898 — (received December 22. 1898). M. R. Ry. V. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal knew that whereas at the time of his election on February 24. 1898, the new Secretary had a majority of one only. By the shift of parties he would be in a minority and that his position would be precarious. Hence his representation to Government, on December 26. 1898, which was made not in the interest of the municipality but of the new Secretary.

II. Charges.

3. We next come to the charges on which the proposed degradation of the Council is founded.

These are of 3 classes

(1) Things which the Council itself has done or left undone.

(2) Things for which the Council is responsible because they were done or left undone by the Chairman elected by them.

(3) Charges against the manager for which the council seems to be held responsible, because the Chairman it is asserted did not take proper notice of them.

4. And first it is to be noticed that this G.O. seems to have had a double origin.

(1) The complaint of the minority to which we have to refer as to each charge of Government.

(2) The report of the Plague Commissioner as to the state of the council's finances, we do not know from whence he got his information? It was not obtained officially in our office.

5. In answering these charges we are not called upon to travel some years back. The complaints of the minority and the consequent proposals of Government limit our enquiries to the time when the present Chairman M. R. Ry. A. C. Seshagiri Row Avergal took the Chair, viz May 25. 1898. It will be necessary to make special notes of this date, because we shall find certain specific charges of matters which happened previous to that date, and also because the general

condition

condition of things in the municipality was just the same, when not slightly improved, as obtained in the time of the last Chairman. This lays the complaining minority open to the retort why did you not complain of him? It will show the utter mala-fide of the complaint on which the G. O. is based.

6. "The house-tax collection is disgracefully in arrears"

We will see how much the petitioners have misrepresented this matter. They complain

(1) Of the late issue of demands. In G. O. No 1831. M. dated August 21. 1897 para 3, it was directed "the registers of this tax should be revised during the "current year", 1897-98, while Mr Mahamad Habibulla Sahib was Chairman. This was not done. After M. R. Ry. A. C. Seshagiri Row Avergal took the Chair he reported (see G. O. No 1290. M. dated July 18-1898 para 8, Chairman's letter dated May 31-1898), that the Council has resolved to revise the house tax Register in the current year 1898-99, and the Government ordered this to be done without delay, so that Government already knew last year that these demand notices were

not being, and could not be issued" in the early part of the Official year". While this revision was in progress G. O. No 1474 M. Mis dated August 20. 1898 was received, pointing out that this revision could not have effect till the next year. This G. O was received on August 23. 1898 and the demand notices on the old rates began to be issued on September 1. 1898. We submit that greater expedition than this could not have been expected, and that it reflects very great credit on the Chairman and his staff.

(2) The petitioners say that these demand notices for the 1st half year were being issued at the date of their petition, December 26. 1898. This is most disingenuous. They began on September 1. and on December 26. only 6 remained to be issued, the last being issued on January 5. 1899. For the previous year the last was issued on February 8. 1898.

1st half been done only [illegible]

(3) They add that the tax for the 2d half year will have to be collected in the next year. As a fact 48 out of 76 demand notices for the 2d half year were issued before March 31. 1899. The whole might very well have been issued

if

if the Plague had not been in Vellore.

(4) They add that the Budget for 1898-99 would be seriously affected. For 1897-98 Budget estimates Rs.10,000, actuals Rs.7929. The Budget estimates for 1898-99 was raised to Rs.12,000, as it was anticipated that the registers would be revised. As they were not, it is only right to revert to the estimate for the previous year Rs.10,000. The Collections were Rs.9268. So that it is a vicious misrepresentation to assert that the realization of revenue was seriously affected.

(5) It may be well here to compare the Collection of this tax from June 1. to December 31. 1898 with that of the previous year.

From June 1. to December 31. 1897 — Rs.978-9-6
—— do —— do — 1898 — Rs.2764-4-6.

7. The G. O. refers to arrears to be collected after the year for which they were due. On April 1 1898, for 1897-98, these amounted to Rs.2310, and on April 1. for 1898-99, these were Rs.2180, an improvement, though slight, in spite of the plague causing many houses to be vacated, in the matter for which Chairman ought to have credit.

8. The Profession-tax for 1898-99.

(1) was arbitrarily assessed. In the first place Councillor M. R. Ry. T. Punniakoti Mudaliar Avergal was not one of the assessing Councillors as asserted by the petitioners.

As to the assessment being arbitrary, it was conducted on the same principles, in the same way, and by much the same Councillors as in the previous year.

(2) "On appeal this was reduced or enhanced according to the whims of individual Councillors" —

In the first place we have looked through the Proceedings and we find not a single case of enhancement. This can be left out of the charge.

As to reductions — It is asserted by Government that these have been ruled by the whims of the Councillors and by the petitioners owing to relationship. There is not a single instance brought forward, and general and vague charges though easily made are difficult to prove or disprove. The following items should be brought to notice:—

M. R. Ry. Krishnasami Naidugaru's tax was reduced on appeal from Rs 12 to Rs 8 at the meeting of October

17.

17. 1898. This gentleman is one of the Signat. though not then a Councillor. The other 4 sign were present at the meeting. M. R. Ry. Govinda Reddiar Avergal, at a meeting on October 22-1898, when he was present as well as the other 3 signatory Councillors, had his profession tax reduced from Rs 8 to Rs 2. M. R. Ry. Narayanasami Reddiar Avergal October 13. from Rs 25 to Rs 12. M. R. Ry. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal November 3. from Rs 8 to one rupee. Every time Councillor M. R. Ry Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal was present and also 1, two or more of his Co-signatories; there is nothing on record to show that any of the petitioners objected to their own reductions. Moreover the following relations of M. R. Ry. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal had their taxes reduced —

~~Komarasami Mudaliar from Rs 25 to Rs 12.~~

Parasurama Mudaliar from Rs 12 to Rs 4.

Singaravelu Mudaliar from Rs 25 to Rs 12.

~~Doraisami Mudaliar from Rs 8 to Rs 4.~~

(3) "That the assessment of this tax is seized "upon as an opportunity for harassing voters "who have not supported certain Councillors at "elections."

In general we do not understand how where

voting

8. voting is by ballot, any counciller can know for certain whether an elector has voted for him or some one else.

The one case referred to by petitioners is that of Maligai Arunachella Chetty. Their implication that they have other cases may be taken for what it is worth. In this case a complaint was made to the Sub Collector who called for an explanation on certain details which was duly supplied by the Chairman. As nothing further was heard, the petition must have been dismissed. This case is not proved, and with it the whole allegation falls to the ground.

(4) With reference to G. O. No 1290. M. dated July 18 1898, and the Sub Collector's letter, as quoted in G. O. No 1756. M. Mis. dated 18th October 1898; (received in this office on October 24. 1898); this latter could not govern the Proceedings of the Council revising the tax, as the meetings for revision were very nearly finished. No doubt it will be attended to this year.

(5). In the register as approved by the Audit department, there is no column for reasons. In some cases reasons have been given. Even when not recorded the Council heard

reasons

reasons for reduction in every case.

9. "Carts and Animals are not properly taxed":—

(1) The petitioners say that no report is called for at the beginning of the year of carts, animals &c. This is false. In the register of letter received, it is recorded that Sanitary Inspectors submitted such reports in May 1898 and it appears to have been in custom.

(2) No notice in Form C. was sent—

Of course, the snare lies in that little word all. As a matter of exact facts, in the 1st half of 1898-99, 463 such notices were issued and in the 2d half 465.

(3) "As to measurements of horses"—

There is no rule that it should be done when the form C issued are returned duly filled up and signed and especially if the money is remitted at the same time, no measurements are taken.

Jutka ponies are in a kind of way measured. It is quite possible that the measuring machine is wrong. These petitioners must be very horsey people if they can at a glance tell the height of an animal. Even if in two cases only a mistake has been made by non-professional measurers it is very excusable. These Councillors should not have troubled Government till they have first brought the mistake if there was one to the notice of the Chairman or the Council.

(4). Dogs — And here it should be remarked how the petitioners endeavour to support their facts by irrelevant statements, para 6. (2) Mr. Kidd drew the attention of the Chairman (M. R. Ry. A. C. Seshagiri Row Avergal) to it. What is only to be guessed is to the imperfect collection of the dog-tax. Whether he has mentioned it or not in the present Chairman's time seems doubtful but he certainly did so most strongly when Mr. Habibulla Sahib was Chairman.

The petitioners assert that there are over 1000 dogs excluding stray pariah dogs in the Town. We deny it till it is proved. Anyhow no municipality in India ever attempts to tax stray pariah dogs. All that is possible is to kill them during the two months allowed. Again they say that in the 1st half (we suppose 1898-99) 27 dog licenses were issued and 13 in the 2nd. This is absolutely

false.

false. In the 1st half 12 dog licenses were issued and in the 2nd, 15. The petitioners purposely tried to mislead Government in this matter as more than half of the 2nd half had to run when they wrote. Further compare the past years —

Dog licenses
1896-97 — 4 in the year
1897-98 — 15 in the year.
1898-99 — 27 in the year.

So far then as implied by the petitioners, was there any apathy on the part of the present Chairman? His work showed a distinct improvement over that of his predecessor.

10. "The market is mismanaged" —

(1) No board is put up in front of each platform as suggested by Councillor M. R. Ry. Eswarappa Mudr. Avergal which was not sanctioned by the Council. Will the Government please to notice that the date of Mr. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal's letter is January 1. 1898 while Mr. Habibulla Sahib was Chairman. How can this enter into a complaint against M. R. Ry. A. C. Seshagiri Row Avergal's administration? It only remains to be said that this latter gentleman has this year already caused such boards

to be put up in addition to the one large board grates which has always been in the market although there is no rule to that effect.

(2) Latrines - It is not true that there were two latrines for the market. There is one latrine with dry earth provided, and one urinal for which dry earth is never provided. This latter has since been demolished by order of the Council. This complaint shows these gentlemen to be either densely ignorant as to sanitation or else dishonest.

(3) Market filthy -

There was a letter from the District Medical and Sanitary Officer to this effect dated 16th May 1898 before M. R. Ry. A. C. Seshagiri Row Avergal took the Chair. Mr. Holmes I.C.S. who was ex-officio Chairman at the time, had the matter attended to at once. Counciller M. R. Ry. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal has only once recorded a visit between May 25 and December 26. 1898 viz July 25, and he made some remarks in the 2nd Ward Sanitary Inspector's Report Book about latrines. All the other matters subsequently complained of no boards, filthy, and no gates, were not mentioned by him. On August 11. 1898, the District Medical and Sanitary Officer visited the market and said nothing about these matters. Therefore we may assume that the market then was not filthy. Beyond the ipse-dixit of the petitioners there is nothing to show that on December 26. 1898, the market was filthy.

(4) "No Gates" - This is absolutely nonsense. Gates could not be put up and if they could they would be of no use, except at nights. There are in the market one peon and 2 sweepers besides the market Inspector who can easily keep out stray cattle.

All these charges of mismanagement of the market fall to the ground when examined and with the rest go to show the mala-fides of the petitioners.

11. "The repeated strictures of Government on "the neglect of Private Scavenging system are "entirely ignored."

The only strictures of Government had reference to payments in advance.

to be put up in addition to the one large board grates which has always been in the market although there is no rule to that effect.

(2) Latrines - It is not true that there were two latrines for the market. There is one latrine with dry earth provided, and one urinal for which dry earth is never provided. This latter has since been demolished by order of the Council. This complaint shows these gentlemen to be either densely ignorant as to sanitation or else dishonest.

(3) Market filthy -

There was a letter from the District Medical and Sanitary Officer to this effect dated 16th May 1898 before M. R. Ry. A. C. Seshagiri Row Avergal took the Chair. Mr. Holmes I.C.S. who was ex-Officio Chairman at the time, had the matter attended to at once. Counciller M. R. Ry. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal has only once recorded a visit between May 25 and December 26. 1898 viz July 25, and he made some remarks in the 2nd Ward Sanitary Inspector's Report Book about latrines. All the other matters subsequently complained of no boards, filthy, and no gates, were not mentioned by him. On August 11. 1898, the District Medical and Sanitary Officer visited the market and said nothing about these matters. Therefore we may assume that the market then was not filthy. Beyond the ipse-dixit of the petitioners there is nothing to show that on December 26. 1898, the market was filthy.

(4) "No Gates" - This is absolutely nonsense. Gates could not be put up and if they could they would be of no use, except at nights. There are in the market one peon and 2 sweepers besides the market Inspector who can easily keep out stray cattle.

All these charges of mismanagement of the market fall to the ground when examined and with the rest go to show the mala-fides of the petitioners.

11. "The repeated strictures of Govern s the "the neglect of Private Scavenging "entirely ignored." objected

The only strictures of Government had ref to payments in advance.

(1). "There are nearly 7000 houses in the town" This is dishonest. As a matter of fact there are only 2016 houses which have latrine of which about 900 were served by the municipality.

(2) "As to the collection of fees in advance quarterly". There seems to be no G.O. in this office necessitating this. Previous to January 1. 1898 monthly bills were issued in arrears, now they are being issued in the quarter for which they are due except 1st quarter of 1899 and 1900. This is in accordance with the Auditor's last report, "If the fees cannot be collected in "advance endeavours should be made to "collect them at least before the expiry of "the quarter to which they appertain - as is "done in some other municipalities". This payment in advance is not required by section 218 as stated by the petitioners. Knowing how necessary it is to verify their has only..

May 25 arrangement of Private scavenging and by the powers delegated to the Secretary. For the quarter April 1 to June 30. 1899, the draft assessment registers of houses

served

---

served by the municipality has not been received. The Secretary should have seen to this.

12. "The Sanitation of the Town is said to be neglected" ie by the Chairman.

(1) This is a wide statement and a wide question. The Sanitation of the Town cannot be satisfactory until there is proper drainage and a proper water-supply. As it is, Vellore does not show badly in its normal death rates.

(2). That the lowest part of the staff does fail to do its work satisfactorily goes without saying, that Inspectors are not fit for their posts, was reported by the District Medical and Sanitary Officer in December 1897, before May 1898 and nothing was done by the then Chairman. On April 23. 1899, the Council at last resolved to carry out the recommendations of the Sanitary Commissioner to have trained men and to dismiss the whole staff on July 31. 1899.

Some two or three of the petitioners objected to these men being dismissed!! so much so that Councillors M.R.Ry. Krishnasami Naidugaru and M.R.Ry. Narayanasami Reddiar Avergal wrote a letter, considered in the meeting of the 25th ultimo, proposing to cancel the previous resolution!! This was just prevented—there were 4 votes against, 3 for, and 3 neutral. Of the 3 signatories who are still in Council, 2 voted for cancelling and one gave no vote. So genuine is their desire for sanitation. Of the four who prevented this retrograde movement, 3 were of the number of the "majority" against whom this petition is directed.

(3). The petitioners quote a passage from an endorsement which they assert to be from the District Medical and Sanitary Officer—no doubt Government thought and was intended to think that this was from Lieutenant Colonel John Lancaster, I. M. S., but it is not. It is signed "Peter N. Lakshmanan" and not even "for District Medical and Sanitary Officer" but as Assistant Surgeon in charge. Here is dishonesty again.

4). They assert that the present Chairman has not been able to effect any improvements and they imply that he has not tried. The following is an extract from a letter

letter

letter in September 1898 addressed to the present Chairman by the District Medical and Sanitary Officer Lieutenant Colonel John Lancaster I. M. S. himself, from whom the petitioners acknowledge there is no appeal.

"I have seen you in several parts of the Town in my rounds to various parts of the town. I have also met you by appointment at different parts in connection with Sanitary matters. You have also been ready to help me in all matters which were brought to your notice and which I have much pleasure to acknowledge."

This charge not only fails but redounds to the credit of the Chairman.

13. "The Chairman has failed to carry out the resolutions of the Council in several cases."—

The only case mentioned has reference to Velapady Tank. The simple history of this is:—

On August 26 1898 on the representation of Mr Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal the Council resolved to repair this Tank by the Overseer under Mr Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal's supervision. At that very time the District Medical and Sanitary Officer called on the Chairman to erect a segregation camp and the Overseer's services were required for this purpose. The building was burnt down and had to be reerected. Meanwhile heavy rains came down and filled the tank so that no repairs could be done. And this was reported by the Overseer. This was a gross misrepresentation to say that this tank is largely resorted to by travellers. This is a temple tank. There is another tank not far from it where there is a chuttram for travellers.

14. It is alleged that he the present Chairman has suppressed enquiry into acts of misconduct on the part of the Municipal Office Manager and has taken no notice of the fact that the present manager is involved in debt. As these matters will no doubt be departmentally enquired into or at all events the manager will have some chance of defending himself, it is sufficient now to notice a few points in illustration of the charges insisted on in the C. O.

(1) The suppression of enquiry into the manager's conduct.

This, of course, has reference primarily to the cart of one Ramasami Naidu, which looms so large and appear so often in the Complaint. So far from repressing enquiry the Chairman sat for some hours till 6.45. P.M. on December 3. 1898 and then adjourned till the 5th at 4 P.M. At the adjournment Ramasami Naidu withdrew his petition. This was recorded and the matter ended. The records of the Chairman's proceedings occupies 9 pages in his own handwriting. Thus the charges against the manager for exacting a bribe and against the Chairman for negligence fall to the ground.

Another similar charge of suppressing enquiry by the Chairman is contained in para 11 of the Sub Collector's report. One story stands till another is told. Had the Sub Collector had all the papers before him he would not probably have come to the conclusion which he did come to. The story as told by our papers and our enquiries on them is this:— On June 30. owing to the Collection of arrears of taxes being very bad, the manager, under verbal orders of the Chairman, began to accompany the Bill-Collectors. On August 12. 1898 he went for this purpose to Ramanaikanpoliam, and was assaulted in the execution of his duty. Meanwhile the two Bill-Collectors Doraisami Mudaly and Chinnasami Naidu put in a written petition to the Chairman not to allow the manager to go to Ramanaikanpoliam as the people threatened to assaulted him. This the Chairman endorsed with an order that the manager was not to go for collection. This endorsement was not sent to the manager and he did not see it till after the assault. A complaint of this assault was made to the Police on August 12 1898 who took the matter up. On August 15. 1898 a petition signed by 54 names was received by the Chairman charging the manager with malpractises in the collection. Of Course this was a self-defence. A notice was on August 31. 1898 sent by the Chairman to the petitioners to appear before him on September 2. 1898, Only 8 out of the 54 names were traceable!! and these 8 signed the notice. From September 2. till September 9. 1898 not a single one of them appeared to substantiate the charge and the Chairman closed the case by rejecting the petition. Meanwhile on August 20. 1898 a similar petition was sent to the Sub Collector, who forwarded it to the Chairman for report, and on September 24. 1898 the Chairman replied reporting his action as above stated. The Sub Collector enquired further as to service of notice on petitioners and the information as given above was supplied and the matter was finally disposed of by the Sub Collector No 2872 dated November 14. 1898, and he simply returned the papers to the Municipal Office. This matter therefore ended in nothing. This proves that the Chairman did not suppress enquiry, and that the manager is innocent of the charge made against him.

Another similar charge is in the matter of one Ramasami Chetty. As to this it is to be noticed:-

(a) It happened during the Chairmanship of Mr Mahamad Habibulla Sahib, October 22. 1897 to 14-1-98- Why then is it int[illegible]ed?

a petition against the rule of the present Chairman? It can only have been in the hope that the Government would not notice the date, and think this another flaw in the present Councils' action. A case must be very bad when such devices have to be resorted to.

(b) The conclusion of petitioners is "the charge stands on record unrefuted". It should be the charge stands not only unproved, but positively without a scrap of evidence in support of it. This seems to be the procedure of petitioners. They bring all kinds of charges, and then expect that they should be disproved. Surely Government cannot support them in such an unjust and unreasonable attitude.

(c) The Chairman sent a notice addressed to Ramasami Chetty - 43. Thatha Street, Saidapet, calling upon him to appear and substantiate his charges. Because he did not do so the Chairman rejected the petition. The reason that he did not appear was that he was not found, as the server serving the notice reported that

no

no such person was at the address given, nor to be found elsewhere.

(d) The Chairman added "It is open to the mana-"ger to take such action as he may consider "necessary against the petitioner," and these Councillors remark with an insinuating sneer that "he took no steps whatever to do so". Of course, if the man could not be found for the Chairman, the manager could do nothing.

(2). As to the Chairman taking no notice of the manager's being in debt - it is to be noticed that:-

(a) The petitioners say he "is head and shoulders "in debt"-

This is one of those general statements of the petition which are absolutely unsupported by a tittle of evidence and is not true - The manager denies that he ever represented to a court that he was heavily in debt - Owing to family circumstances he was in debt, and it was more convenient to pay his creditors all round by instalments - But that is all - his assets have been in excess of his debts according to a return made by him.

(b). Unless the Sub Collector's report is read carefully, any one would conclude that 14 summonses were served on the manager through the present Chairman – there were only 6.

(c). The petitioners seem to think that it was to the manager's discredit that he was paying his innumerous creditors by instalments. If he had not done so, he might indeed have been condemned, but out of the mouth of the petitioners, it is to be recorded to his credit that he was doing so.

(d) The manager was never "in a chronic and "hopeless condition of indebtedness". (Rules for the conduct of Government Servants Part III Rule 39) and therefore the Chairman could not take notice of his debts. This is proved by the fact that he now reports that he owes only Rs 168-1-4 less than 3 month's pay. We cannot leave this part of the complaint without putting on record a long catena of testimonials received by Mr France from 1876 to the present year. The least effect of these, except on a violently prejudiced mind, would be to raise a presumption that he is not

guilty

---

guilty of the charges brought against him, but that probably he is the victim of a conspiracy of unscrupulous persons.

15. It is affirmed that "the Chairman and a "majority of the Council have ignored the "Secretary, and made his position a sinecure "by refusing to give him authority over the "Municipal Servants employed in the Municipal Office and in the collection of Municipal revenues."

(1) This is one of the direct charges against the Council.

(2) By whom has this been "affirmed"? Not by the petitioners, nor is there anything about it in the extract from the Sub Collector's report. Who then is this other accuser of this Council who is kept out of sight? and what are the data on which he has formed and formulate his opinion? There is reason to suspect that it is the Secretary himself, who has made secret complaints against the Council to the Plague Commissioner and to the District Official

(3) And here it must be put on record our strong disapproval of the attitude of the present Secretary towards the Chairman and Council.

He

(c He is always dancing attendance on the Sub-Collector and seems to consider himself the Subordinate of the District Officials, whereas he is the Subordinate of the Municipal Council. How far he is encouraged in this
(c or in communicating facts privately to them, it is impossible to say.

(4) The charges against the Council are that:—

(a) It has refused to give the Secretary proper authority; and therefore

(b) it has ignored him and made his position a sinecure.

(c (5) Before proceeding to answer these charges, it is to be noticed that the Office of Municipal Secretary was an entirely new experiment,— and one therefore in which it behoved all parties to move warily, also the Council had no precedent or interpretation to guide it. It was quite to be expected that, while acting perfectly bona fide some mistakes might be made.

(6) Now what has the Municipal Council done in the matter of delegation of powers to the Secretary, to give him authority over Municipal Servants?

On

On April 23 1898, in obedience to a G.O., a special meeting was held on the subject of delegation in general, with reference to Section 39 A(d). When the Council came to Section 42, the question arose whether the words "as the Municipal "Council may determine" applied to the whole of the Section. The Council considering that they did apply proceeded to take the matter into consideration, and expressed its approval among other things of the delegation, to the Secretary, of powers under Section 42 (1) with a limit.

G.O. No 1440 M. Mis dated 16.8.98 approved of these Proceedings and thereby seemed indirectly to approve of the Council taking into consideration Section 42. It was only in G.O. No 986 dated July 14. 1899 that it was ruled that herein the Council was mistaken, also it would appear that there was an oversight in the Proceedings of April 23. 1898 in not mentioning sub Sections (2) and (3) especially the latter as to "fining, reducing, or dismissing" directly this was brought to its notice, the mistake was corrected by the Council in Proceedings dated 5th May 1899 – Resolution No 1.

(7)

(7). We submit that this is not *refusing to give the Secretary Authority over the Municipal servants*. It is to be particularly noticed:-

(a) Section 42(3) gives the Chairman the *option* of delegating his powers to fine, reduce, dismiss; as compared with Section 42(1) which lays on him the necessity of doing so.

(b) Section 42(3) does not allow the Chairman to delegate absolute powers, but "*subject to* "*------ such control as may from time to* "*time, be prescribed by the Governor in Council*" The Council by agreeing to give absolute power to the Secretary over servants drawing Rs 10 and less exceeded its powers, and acted with greater liberality than it had a right to do. This is not to *refuse*!.

(c). In this way the whole Sanitary staff except Inspectors and 2 out of 4 Bill-Collectors- the majority of the Municipal Servants- were placed absolutely at the mercy of the Secretary. One would not think this in reading the Complaint quoted in this G.O.

(d) But after all is said, Government has ruled on the same date that the Council has no power either to consent or refuse to

the

the delegation of powers to the Secretary under Section 42. So where is the Council's responsibility?

(8) But have the Chairman and the Council, by its majority, in this or any other way, made the Secretary's position *a sinecure*- i.e. a position in which he has no work to do, and nothing to care about? The Secretary has constantly complained that, with outdoor and office work together, he has more than he can thoroughly attend to.

The following are the powers delegated to him and therefore the duties he is expected to perform, with remarks on his performance:-

General Powers.

1. Making payments of all bills sanctioned by the Chairman or Council	1. By his own acknowledgment, he does not himself pay Bills which are paid by cheque at the office. One cheque has been mis-paid.
2. Signing fair copies of Chairman's drafts of letters.	(2) - -
3. Countersigning pay abstracts.	3. Not done.

4. Remitting money to the Bank.	4. " "
5. Signing English abstracts of vernacular vouchers.	6. Does not have English abstracts made nor sign.
6. Conducting Auction sales to £ 5.	6. " "
7. Examining Cash Chitta and Cash Book.	7. Does not do.
8. Monthly accounts of Cash and Bank balances.	8. Does not do.
9. Signing monthly ledger.	9. No ledger was posted between April 1. and July 20. – much less certified by the Secretary.
10. Signing Account Current	10 " "
11. Signing deposit advance and miscellaneous registers.	11. Not done.
12. Inspecting Lights.	12. No. Reports received
13. Signing Chairman's orders on petitions –	13. " "

Powers under Act.

Forwarding Council's proceedings to Revenue Officer.

31.(3). Custody of records. ——	Many missing.
32(1). Carrying out of Resolutions of Council. ——	
(2) Monthly reports. ——	not done as Council did not prescribe.
52.(3) Receipts for taxes paid.	
56. Notice of non-payment of Profession-tax. ——	not done.
61. Call on landlords for list of persons liable to tax. ——	not done.
62. —— Do —— employers.	
80. Blank Forms for horses &c.	
82. Notice on non payment.	
83 Receipt for same.	
85(31) } 86. } Registration of Carts ——	
89. Seizure of carts	
90. Subsequent procedure.	
95.(21.) } 96. } Sale of seized property at tolls ——	
100. Correction of assessment books. ——	
102. Notice of distraint–	
134. Vaccinations ——	not done.

(7). We submit that this is not refusing t

138. (1) Enquiry to un-vaccinated children —	not done.
(2)	
159. Closing of Streets —	
165. Acquirement of land for projecting buildings.	
170. Temporary erections.	
171. License for hoarding for repairs. —	
173(A) Debris removal —	
182. Numbers on buildings.	
188. Offensive and dangerous trades —	Required notice not given and therefore such trades not stopped.- (case of Tannery).
209. Construction of drains -	
218. Private Scavengering -	not attended to. and diminished.
281. Liability for damage to the Property —	

From the above it will appear that:—

(a) Very considerable powers have been delegated by the Council to the Secretary - his office, if efficiently worked, is by no means a sinecure.

(b) The efficiency of his work does not depend in very many cases upon his power to fine reduce or dismiss Municipal Servants, but on his own efforts.

(c) In these special cases he himself has failed.

(d) Therefore neither he, nor anyone on his behalf has any right to object that the Council has given a sinecure.

(9) Nor has the Council ignored him - Two Councillors complained to the Council that the Secretary was not doing his work properly. This was considered in Council at its meeting held on 25th May last and the Secretary's explanation in the meeting of June 8 1899. The Secretary would probably have rather had the Council ignore him than this.

(10) The Secretary will as he has already done probably plead that he was occupied with plague business, that he had no time to do his own work properly - Plague work he was authorized to do by the Chairman - Anyhow it proves that the Chairman and Council did not make his position a Sinecure nor ignore him. He had by his own showing more

work than he could honestly do, and he had to neglect both Office and outdoor work, so that it was not want of power to fine, reduce, and dismiss that hindered his doing his proper duties. At the same time it is inconceivable that in giving him plague work the Chairman should have intended him to neglect his own. It is also unintelligible why the Special Plague Officer should have required so much work from the Secretary when there was such a very large special plague staff available. It is a pity too that the Secretary did not at once report that he was unable to do both his own and also plague work.

16. This whole charge against the Council about the Secretary by whomsoever made will not bear examination. The Council claims that it has proved its own absolute i[illegible]ence.

17. here remains only the charge about the st te of the municipal finances.

The Plague Commissioner represented, when [illegible] about them, nor how he came by his that "there were no funds to

meet

"meet the heavy expenditure on account of plague" He should have said not sufficient funds; and he gave as the reason that "the municipal "taxes had not been collected," it is to be understood he meant that not every one of them had been collected. The C. O. states, referring to a later period that "the municipal "finances are in a critical state &c

Full information has already been supplied to the Government on this latter point. It does not matter what the income was when an Officer, who has no responsibility for the municipal finances, comes to Vellore and expects the money to be spent on the one item of plague more than its income. It has already been reported by the Council to Government that the plague expenses incurred were often unauthorized, and on the whole unnecessarily lavish and extravagant, out of all proportion at all events with the means at the disposal of the municipality.

Let the Municipal Council be constituted in any way whatever, the result under all these circumstances would be the same, viz that the Mu cipality would be in a state of insolvency. There is therefore here no ground to alter its present constitution, much less to punish the present Council by degradation.

Summary.

18. It appears therefore that

(1) The municipal antecedents of the complaining minority are such as not to entitle them to credence.

(2) The electorate has deserved well of Government, in that two of them have already lost their seats. Had such men continued in a majority or in a steady minority there would have been good reasons to take away from the electors 8 out of 15 of their representatives. As they are in a decreasing minority, the electors should not be punished.

(3). The cause of their complaint makes not for efficiency but pure selfishness. As they could no longer dominate the Council from within, even with the help of their own chosen Secretary, they sought to dominate it from without by the power of Government. To carry out their ideas would be to undo the work of Self Government.

(4) The several charges on which the complainants' recommendations were based prove to be utterly false, or gross misrepresentations and exaggerations, and therefore should recoil on their own heads.

(6) The Chairman and Council have passed through a critical financial period, owing to plague, and are doing their best not to be overwhelmed by the crisis. It is anticipated that there may be fresh re-crudescence of plague in 2 or 3 months. The Council feels confident that if it is left to itself to manage this epidemic, this will be done as efficiently and with much less friction and expense than the last outbreak. Anyhow it would be a mistake to change in the process.

(6) The Secretary has proved himself incompetent; and that there will be no peace in the Council, nor efficient work will be turned out in the municipality, so long as the present Secretary holds that post.

Recommendations.

19. The Council therefore recommend that:—

1) The Council should not be deprived of its powers to elect its Chairman.

(2). The electors should not be deprived of 8 out of 15 representatives.

(3) M. R. Ry. V. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal be removed from office, as likely to bring the municipal administration into contempt (section 19(1 IV), and that both he and M. R. Ry. T. Govinda Reddiar Avergal be declared by the Governor in Council, ineligible for election for a fixed period – (section 19(2)).

4. The present Secretary M. R. Ry. P. Samidappa Mudaliar be removed from his office at as early a date as possible.

(signed) D. Wilson Kidd.

This report was received by me at 9. A.m. this day, and as desired by Reverend D. W. Kidd I send this on to M. R. Ry C. Siva Row Avergal (at 9.30. A.m.). My minute of dissent will be recorded in a separate sheet of paper and forwarded to the Chairman later on in the course of the day to allow of the same being translated into Tamil in time.

(Signed) V. Nadamuni Mudaliar.
11.8.99

I Concur.

(Signed) C. Siva Row.
11.8.99.
1. P.m.

"True Copy"

by Ch.
iy.

Chairman

This had better go with the Municipal Chairman's letter to the Coll. for reply

V. 2768

From

V. Adaiyani Mudr.,
Municipal Councillor,
Vellore.

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
30. AUG.-1899
LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

To

The Secretary to Government,
Local and Municipal Depts.
Fort Saint George.

Sir,

I beg to submit that G.O. No. 986 dated 14th July 1899 asking the Municipal Council, Vellore, to show cause why the privilege of electing its Chairman may not be withdrawn and why the number of elective seats may not be reduced from 15 to 7 was received on the 17th July 1899. It was placed at the meeting of the Council held on the 29th idem when the Chairman-delegate Rev. D.W. Kidd proposed that a Sub Committee consisting of the Rev. D.W. Kidd, M.R.Ry C. Siva Rao Avl. and myself, should be formed to draft a report to the effect that the changes contemplated by the G.O. above referred to should not be introduced. After some discussion by the Sub Collector and Ex-Officio Councillor it was resolved that the Sub Committee should report, stating objections, if any, to the proposals of Government.

2. At a preliminary meeting of the Sub Committee

it was arranged that the Rev. D.W. Kidd should draft the report. When this draft report was placed before the Sub Committee, I objected to certain statements made in it. In one or two cases, my objections were accepted, and in others, the opinion of the majority prevailed. I then stated that I would record a minute of dissent separately.

3. As the Sub Committee's report which was ready on the 10th August evening — was a big one and I had to look into certain records, I was not able to send my minute of dissent on the 11th Idem. On the following day I wrote to the Chairman and asked him if he would circulate my minute if sent to him. His reply dated 13th August — was that it was too late and that I should deliver it at the special meeting to be held the next day at 7.30 P.M. for the discussion of the subject. Later on in the day, he wrote to me — "After reconsideration I think I may circulate it". As it was really too late then, I thought I might [illegible] as originally suggested by the Chair[illegible] it at the meeting; and [illegible] present Rev. D.W. Kidd, the Chairman [illegible] I did. But he was opposed to its being con[illegible] some Councillors Sub Collector, the Rev. H. J. [illegible] dered then though he was of opinion that it should [illegible] [illegible]corder & some Councillors thought along with the Sub Comm[illegible] be received and submitted is adopted by a majority [illegible] [illegible]ttee's report which [illegible] the Council. I was

however, not allowed to put in the minute of dissent.
I was hesitating whether or not I should submit
the minute direct to Govt when the proceedings of a
majority of the Council of the 22nd August '99 decided,
for me the course which I should adopt.
At that meeting, the Council or rather a majority
of them, without, in my opinion, any justifiable
grounds whatever passed a resolution that the
Secretary was insubordinate. I forwarded to the
Chairman my minute of dissent to the above
resolution. I beg to add that the next proposal
made at the meeting mentioned above by the
Rev. D.W. Kidd was that, subject to the approval
of Govt, the Secretary should be dismissed three
months after that date, and this proposal was
seconded by another Councillor. But subsequently
seeing that the municipal Act required that a special
meeting should be held for that purpose alone, the Rev.
D.W. Kidd requested that the proposal which was
entered in the minute-book be struck out; and this
was done by the Chairman.

4. In these circumstances and with a sense of
the duty which I owe to myself and to the public
of Vellore as a municipal Councillor and as a citizen
I beg to submit my minute of dissent from the report
of the Sub Committee which I understand has
been submitted to Government.

I beg to remain
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

27.8.99.

From

V. Nadamuni Mudr.,
Municipal Councillor
Vellore

To

The Secretary to Govt.
Local & Munl Dept
Madras

Dated 27th August 1899

Minute of dissent — Submitting his — to the Report of the Sub Committee adopted at the Vellore Munl meeting held on the 14th August 1899.

Minute of dissent by V. Nadamuni Mudaliyar (One of the members of the Sub Committee appointed by the Municipal Council, Vellore at the meeting of the 29th July 1899 to draft a report stating objections, if any, to the proposals of Govt. to withdraw from the Vellore Municipal Council the power of electing its Chairman and to reduce the number of elective seats from 15 to 7) to the Report of the Sub Committee adopted by a majority of the Municipal Council at the meeting held on the 14th August '99.

—

The Sub Committee's report consists of 19 paras of which paras 2 to 5 deal chiefly with the motives and antecedents of the Councillors whose petition elicited the Govt. Order under reference (No. 986 M. dated 14th July 1899). Although there is much in these paras that I cannot subscribe to, I pass them over as they are beside the points on which Govt. has called on the Council to report. In this minute, I shall confine my remarks to 1st the Sub Committee's replies to questions raised by Govt. and 2ndly the Sub Committee's own recommendations to Govt., Briefly stated they are:

No 1729 of 1899 1 Vellore

Municipal Councillors' Office
Dated 19th August 1899

Confidential

To

The Secretary to Government
Local and Municipal Department
Fort Saint George
Through the Sub Collector and
Collector
North Arcot.

LOCAL & MUNICIPAL DEPT.
CURRENT No. 2747 M

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Proceedings of Madras Government, No 987 M. Mis dated 14th July 1899, calling upon me to shew cause why I should not be removed from the Offices of Chairman and Councillor of this Municipality for reasons therein mentioned.

2. The proceedings in question was received by me on the 21st July last, and I respectfully reply to several complaints seriatim.

(1) Late issue of demand notices of house tax.

The allegation that the demand notices for the first half of 1898-99, were issued "only in December 1898" is false. Register of bills issued, maintained in the Office, shews that they began to be issued from the 1st

September 1898, and that at the time of the Complaint, viz 26th December 1898, there only remained six out of 76 Books to be issued, the last being issued on the 5th January 1899, while that for the previous year, viz 1897-98, was issued on the 8th February 1898. I may here add that according to the Audit Manual notices should ordinarily be issued from the month of June of each year, vide Para 6 Chapter 3 Audit Manual. So that the statement of the Complainants that they ought to have been issued in the early part of the Official Year is incorrect. The reason why the notices were issued from September and collections thereafter made was due to the fact that the house-tax registers were under revision, as reported by me on the 31st May 1898 (Vide Government Order No. 1290 M dated 18th July 1898), the revision, not having been undertaken by my predecessor in 1897-98 as directed in Government Order 1831 M dated 21st August 1897 para 3. While the revision was in progress, I received another Government Order, 1474 M Mis dated 20th August 1898, which reached me on the 23rd idem that the revision could not have effect till the following financial year. I at once fell back on the old rate, and had notices prepared and issued from the 1st September 1898, as above stated.

With reference to the collections

I subjoin the following statement for the information of Government.

	Rs as p
Amount collected from 1st June to 31st December 97 during the time of my predecessor is	978-9-6
Amount collected from 1st June to 31st December 98 during my time is	2764-4-6

The records of the Municipal Office shew that prior to my time the preliminaries, viz preparation of bills, issue of notice, revision, and appeal before collection, were generally made until December, and the actual collections were regularly begun from January. The net demand under house-tax being Rupees 9,000 and odd, it would have been impossible, even if every pie of this amount had been collected when plague broke out, to have met the unprecedented Expenditure under plague-charges, which amounted to more than Rupees 28,000.

The balance to be collected on the 1st April 1899 was only Rupees 2180, against 2310 in the time of my predecessor.

(2) Non issue of printed table in the Form contained in Schedule C

This I may say is another false statement made by the petitioners. For the records in the Municipal Office shew that 463 Notices were issued in the 1st half of 1898-99, and 465 in the 2nd half to all the residents who possess Vehicles and animals without reference to their Nationality. A copy of form issued is herewith sent from which it will be seen that no difference is made between Vehicles with Springs and without Springs, so far as notice is concerned. I may here add that that form is printed at Lawrence Asylum Press, under the supervision of the Inspector of the Local Fund Accounts.

(3) Failure to take steps to compel dog owners to take out licenses.

I most respectfully submit that on no occasion was my notice drawn to the fact, either orally or in writing, by any person about the Non-issue of licenses to dogs. I emphatically deny that there were 1000 dogs in the town unlicensed. There may be stray-dogs to some extent, but these are periodically destroyed. I find in this town that dogs are kept mainly by Europeans and Eurasians, and not by other castes.

I append below for the information of Government the Number of dog-licenses issued during the past 3 years.

1896-97	4 dogs	In my Predecessor's time
97-98	15 — do —	
98-99	27 — do —	In my time

(4) No report was called for as to the Number of Vehicles in each ward.

I beg respectfully to submit this is another instance of the false charges made by the petitioners.

The records shew that such lists were called for by Mr Holmes, Ex-Officio Chairman from Mucpl subordinates and submitted by them just before I took charge of Office from him viz May 1898. Anyhow if these lists had not been called for, as they were, the responsibility should fall upon Mr Habibullah Saib and Mr Holmes who occupied the chair in April and May.

(5.) Private-Scavenging

Complainants have purposely misled the Government in this matter. Although there are about 7000 houses in the Town, only 2016 of these possess private Latrines. Out of which Number about 900 are served by the Municipal Agency. Owing to the short tenure of my Office, namely 7 months, and owing to my time being mainly occupied in taking measures to combat plague and Cholera during that period, I was not able to make any further extension in the private scavenging agency, however desirous I was to do so.

With reference to the collection

of fees in advance I respectfully submit that previously for some time, monthly bills were issued in arrears. During my period of Office, they were issued in the quarter for which they were due in accordance with the suggestions of the Auditor in his last report viz

"If the fees cannot be collected in "advance, endeavours should be made "to collect them before the expiry of the "quarter to which they appertain as is "done in some other Municipalities."

I may here add that from January 1899 private scavenging is under the management of the Secretary; and on resuming the Chairmanship after three months' leave, I find that he has not carried on my plan, as no bills at all were issued in the Quarter, April 1 to June 30. 1899.

(6) Failure of repairs to the Velapadi Tank.

It is true the Council resolved to repair this tank on the 26th August 1898. This was ordered to be done departmentally, as no Contractors would undertake to do this work although tenders were invited for three successive meetings. At about the very same period I was called upon by the District Medical and Sanitary Officer

to select sites and to erect segregation camps etc. The Overseer, who was directed to carry out repairs of the tank departmentally, could not do it, as he was engaged with me and the District Medical and Sanitary Officer in selecting sites and erecting sheds. The sheds were erected but burnt down, necessitating their reerection. In the meanwhile, there were heavy rains and the tank was full, as reported by the Overseer, and so repairs could not be done. It is gross misrepresentation to say M.R.Ry Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal repeatedly requested me to give orders for the execution of the work, he addressing me only once on the subject, as also to say that that tank is largely resorted to by the travellers. It is a temple tank so constructed that it is rather difficult for travellers to resort to it for water. I may here state that there is another large tank close by attached to a Choultry, specially built for the use of travellers who largely resort to it. Also that during my short tenure, the water supply to the Town was not neglected, for I had one new well sunk, six tanks and 17 wells repaired

repaired and cleaned of silt.

(7) Chairman drawing an advance of Rupees 35.

On the 15th of July 1898 I brought forward a proposal to address Government on the subject of having a modified water-supply scheme prepared by the Sanitary Engineer, the same being a *desideratum*. Thereupon the Council resolved as follows.

"Postponed for further
"Consideration. Meanwhile
"the Chairman accompanied by the
"Overseer is requested to visit Con-
"jeeveram Trichinopoly and
"Cuddapah and report to the
"Council the working of the
"water-supply scheme in those
"Towns. Their expenses to be met
"by the Municipality." In accordance with this resolution I visited Trichinopoly in the month of August last. I drew an advance of Rupees 35, which amount was entered in the Register of Advances recoverable in accordance with Chapter 8 para 8 of the Audit Manual. On my return from Trichinopoly

I

I submitted my travelling allowance bill for the whole Costs, in the prescribed form Viz Rupees 43-14-0, and I was paid the balance of Rupees 8-14-0 as per resolution of the Council No 11 dated 5th of January 1899. After my return from Trichinopoly I intended visiting Conjeeveram and Cuddapah, but not being able to do so, owing to the prevalence of Cholera and plague, I postponed the submission of my report, until I visited the other two places. It has been erroneously stated by the petitioners, for the purpose of misleading Government, that there is a strict prohibition against drawing money in advance in the Audit Notes of 1896-97. I append an Extract from the Audit report of that year on the subject of Advances. From which it will be seen that the allegation of the petitioners is not borne out.

"Advances" Para 63

" The balance of 88 Stamped Agree-
"ment forms, the Expenditure on
"which was rightly debited to
"Advances, was verified. It would
"be well if the Chairman signed
"or initialled the register kept of
"the Stock in token of the verification
"of it."

64. "There was no permanent

"advance for postage and receipt stamps, they being purchased on indents prepared. Under the plan in some cases expenditure appeared in excess which was met from the permanent advance. The simple and more correct plan would be as elsewhere to purchase a stock from the permanent Advance replenish it as it runs out, debits appearing in the permanent Advance Account and corresponding Credits in the postage Accounts which would prevent complications as now."

65. "Advances were made in some cases to Contractors from whom no security was also obtained. See Items 6 and 7 of the Register for 1896-97."

66. "There was great delay in the adjustment of advances as will be seen from items 2 and 3 of the Advance Register. See also para 61 last notes."

From the above it will be seen that the statement of the petitioners that there is a strict prohibition against drawing money in advance is not true. But that on the other hand it allows the payment of advances pending early and final adjustment.

(8) Failing to take action in the matter of the complaint of M. R. Ry. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal against the Manager

for declining to show the Audit Notes for 1896-97. This again is not true. On receipt of M. R. Ry. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avl's report against the Manager, I called for an explanation from the Manager which he submitted. He drew my attention to Section 31 of the amended Act, and G. O. No. 2597 a. M dated 24th November 1897, stating that as the records were in the custody of the Chairman and as the Municipal Council had to regulate the times and conditions on which access is to be had to the records (which however was not done by the Council) so as to obviate any undue interference with the conduct of public business and with the discipline of the Office Establishment, he was doubtful under these circumstances whether he could allow M. R. Ry. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal to see the record without the permission of the Chairman, seeing that G. O. No. 184 M dated 22nd February 1888 was based on Act 4 of 1884 which did not specifically state, as the amended Act does, that the Chairman shall have the custody of all the records, so in order that his doubts might be cleared he referred the matter to me. I thought there was some justification in the Manager's action, and referred M. R. Ry. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal to the Council. But instead of getting a ruling from the Council, he now appears to have troubled the Government.

(9) Supervision of Public Works, &c.:—

Here is another instance of incorrect allegation. When the election of Chairman took place Mr. Holmes the Sub Collector was Ex-Officio Chairman and the same was conducted by ballot. Immediately after the result of the ballot was declared, Mr. Holmes destroyed the voting papers on the spot. It is therefore impossible for me to know who voted for and who against me. I cannot understand why this allegation should be made? unless they wish to insinuate that the supervising Councillors derive some benifit pecuniary or otherwise — a fact of which I am entirely ignorant. As is the practice, the Public Works bills were generally sent to the respective Ward Councillors, in such cases where I could not personally check-measure the work — as far as I see from the records no work was executed in MRRy Eswarappa Mudaliar's Ward, except the Construction of a drain within the Compound of Mr. Sequirah. This work was supervised by another Councillor of the same Ward and Rev: Kidd. Much work was not done during the year owing to plague &c. Some bills were also sent to MRRy Kristnasamy Naidu Garu one of the petitioners.

(10) Revision of Voters and Candidates lists by MRRy Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal not acted upon.

I respectfully, once more, bring to the notice of the Government that facts are misrepresented to Government. The Voters' and Candidates' lists referred to were submitted to the Office on the 30th of September 1898 by Councillors who prepared them in accordance with rules 3 and 5 of the old Election rules published in G. O No. 1876 M Local and Municipal dated 8th December 1890.

According to rule 3 a of these rules "Every Owner of houses or lands "situated within the limits of the Munici-"pality paying a house or land tax, or ag-"gregate house and land taxes, amounting "to Rs 3-12-0 per annum and upwards "shall be entitled to have his name registered "as a Voter."

In accordance with this rule, the Municipal Councillors appointed under rule 7 to draw up lists of persons entitled to vote in each Ward, entered in such lists the names of those who from their personal knowledge they knew to have the requisite property qualification under Clause (a) of rule 3. It will be observed that the rule quoted above did not require such ownership to be evidenced by registration in the Municipal books, as was required in the case of persons qualified for election as Councillors under rule 5 (a) which runs thus:—

"Every owner of houses or lands situated "within the limits of the Municipality "who is liable to pay a house or land tax, "or aggregate house and land taxes, "amounting to Rs 7-8-0 per annum and "upwards, provided that such ownership "is evidenced by registration in the Mu-"nicipal books." This was the practice hitherto in vogue before the revised election rules came into force on the 1st of January 1899.

In accordance with rule 10 of the old election rules MRRy Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal's objections were considered by the Council at their meeting held on the 10th November 1898, at which MRRy Eswarappa Mudaliar was present, when his attention was drawn by the Council to the difference between rules 3 and 5, viz to become Voters, it is not necessary that ownership should be evidenced by registration in Municipal books. It is enough if the Council was convinced that a certain person is the owner of a certain property. The inclusion and omission of persons in the Voters' and Candidates' lists was the act of the Council, and not of the Chairman. I am inclined to believe that the action of the council was rightly being supported by the old election rules. I cannot therefore understand how the Sub Collector came to the conclusion that in at least 18 out of 41 cases scrutinized, the Chairman's (Council's?) orders were certainly wrong? Probably the old rules were not brought to the notice of the Sub Collector, or else he would have arrived at a different conclusion. Evidently the Petitioners must have misled him by a reference to rule 3 of the revised Election rules, which provides that in the case of registered Voters also, ownership should be evidenced by registration in the Municipal books.

The new rule runs thus;-

"3. The following persons shall be "entitled to have their names registered "as Voters

"(a) All persons owning buildings "or lands situated within the limits of the "Municipality who are liable to pay to "the Municipality a tax on buildings "or on lands amounting either seperately "or in the aggregate to Rs 4-00 per annum "and upwards, provided such ownership "is evidenced by registration in the Municipal books."

If M.R.Ry. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal were dissatisfied with the decision of the Council it was open to him under rule 17 to have addressed the Collector for him to take the necessary action. Instead of doing this, he has given Government unnecessary trouble.

3. With reference to para 2 of the G.O. under reference, namely, that one Chabu Myah Market Contractor was giving loans to me, I beg to state that the allegation is utterly false. I am not acquainted with this man at all. But I know him only by name as a Co-partner with Asidulla, and the latter always represented the firm in all transactions in which I was concerned, nor had I any occasion to borrow money from this man. I noticed from the G.O. in question that the amount alleged to have been borrowed is not stated. If the allegation is a bonafide one, why was not a bill sent or demand made? I have got my own suspicions about this man and the entries in the Account book. The giving of loans it will be observed was not mentioned in the memorial to Government presented by petitioners. The market contractors were fined Rs 500-00 in the end of March last for extorting higher rates of rent, than those prescribed, from the stall-holders etc. I have also often fined them, as Contractors for the supply of rice to the Langer Khana, for supplying bad rice to and cheating the paupers. I may here add that at the sale of the market contract in the beginning of March

for 1899-1900, these very persons, although they were the highest bidders, were refused the Contract owing to the fact that they had extorted higher rates than those prescribed from the stall-holders, as also to their being heavily involved in debt. It may perhaps be urged on their behalf that they were given the light Contract. But it must be remembered that in the case of lighting the payments are made to them after the close of the month and that these payments can be easily withheld in case of any misconduct on their part. Whereas in the case of the market contract, the Contractors collect rents in advance from the stall-holders and pay the Municipality in arrears, so that in case of any misappropriation, extortion &c the Council in taking legal action against them will be put to great inconvenience and loss. Even this light Contract had to be cancelled after the lapse of a month for breach of Contract and misappropriation of Chimneys &c. Even for the amount due to these Contractors for a short period several attachments were received from the District Munsiff's Court at Vellore and the amount was remitted to the Court. Hence I believe that at the instigation of M. R. Ry. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal, who must have promised Chabu Miya to get all fines &c refunded, he must have made false entries in his Account books in support of his allegation.

4. With reference to the charge of general mal-administration of the Municipality recited in G. O. No 986 M. Mis dated 14-7-99, I respectfully

beg

beg to request Government to accept the the Council's report thereon as my explanation.

5. Having answered the specific charges contained in the proceedings of the Madras Government, No 987 M. Mis dated 14-7-99, I now proceed to supplement the report of the Council, in reply to proceedings of the Madras Government No 986 M. Mis dated 14th July, 1899, with reference to the alleged mal-administration of the Municipality,

(1). As regards suppression of enquiry into acts of misconduct &c on the part of the Municipal Office Manager. It is alleged by the petitioners that the charge of bribery against the Manager by Ramasamy Naidu was fully proved, and that I compelled him to withdraw the charge. I humbly submit that this allegation is not true. Ramasamy Naidu is a close friend of M. R. Ry. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal, who unasked, reported in the diary of the Sanitary Inspector of the 3rd Division that Ramasamy Naidu's cart was a new one. I gave Ramasamy Naidu an opportunity to substantiate his charge. He produced his son and servant as his witnesses. I examined them and recorded their evidence on the 3rd December last and adjourned the further enquiry till the 5th idem. On which day Ramasamy Naidu, seeing that his statement and those of his witnesses differed materially from each other, voluntarily withdrew the charge stating in writing that unknowingly he preferred the charge, and requested to the return of his original petition dated 17th November 1898 and I allowed it. He also orally expressed his regret to the Manager and begged to be excused. The issue of the license ultimately was due to MRRy Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal's report which was accepted as final.

(2) With reference to the allegation that the Municipal Manager borrowed money from Contractor Sheik Ahmed Sahib in 1894, I humbly submit that this was not in my time. However both the Manager and Sheik Ahmed Sahib, being questioned by me, deny the allegation.

(3) As to the Manager compelling his subordinates to stand as sureties, I am ignorant of this. Neither the petitioners nor the subordinates ever complained to me about this. The Manager denies having ever compelled his subordinates.

(4) With reference to the allegation that the Manager is in a chronic state of indebtedness I concur with the Council that this is not the case. The petitioners, when mentioning his liabilities, must have wilfully suppressed the fact that he had to his credit in the Savings Bank Rs 300-0-0 deposited as security for his office, in the name of the Chairman.

(5) About MRRy Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal questioning the Manager about ballot-papers.

On the 4th of October 1898 MRRy Kristnasamy Naidu Garu one of the signaturies

signaturies was duly elected as Councillor for the first time; MRRy Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal taking a prominent part in canvassing votes for his friend. On the 5th October MRRy Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal came to the office and seems to have asked the Manager whether the ballot-papers were sent to the Collector. The Manager thinking that he purposely called to obtain information regarding those who did not vote for MRRy Kristnasamy Naidu Garu, replied that the ballot papers had been sent away. MRRy Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal complained to me that the ballot-papers were missing from the Cash Chest, and when I asked the Manager to explain, he said that the Cash Chest was accessible to the Shroff and others, during the day, who had on a previous occasion been reported by certain Councillors to have given information as to how certain voters voted, so to avoid repetition of this he secured the ballot-papers on the 5th morning in an almirah, under double lock and key, from which he produced them before me, and I sent the same to the Collector. The manager was not insubordinate or insolent in my presence to MRRy Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal.

(6) The incident about the bill collector, namely bringing a Criminal Case against the Manager for insult, seems to have taken place in 1896, when I was not Chairman. I cannot therefore understand why it is introduced now in the memorial.

(7) Sanitation neglected.

In addition to the remarks already made by the Council, I beg to bring the following facts to the notice of Government in order to account for the Assistant Surgeon's uncalled for remarks. It is an open secret that he is a friend of M.R.Ry. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal, and a partisan of his faction. I have no hesitation in stating that the remarks quoted in the memorial were purposely made by him so that they might find a place in the memorial. He further sent a copy of these remarks to the then Sub Collector which is unprecedented. As a rule I almost daily inspected the Town, as may be seen from a reference to Doctor Lancaster's letter quoted in the report of the Council under the head of Sanitation, and inflicted heavy fines on the Contractors for neglect of duty. That the Assistant Surgeon had a very strong motive for criticising my administration may be gathered from the following facts. In the end of March 1898, Mr. Habibulla Saib the then Chairman had paid a bill for furniture which the Assistant Surgeon certified in writing had been fully supplied. When that bill was brought before the Council for sanction, during my time, it was not passed, on the ground that some of the Articles mentioned in the bill had not been supplied even upto the date of the meeting, viz 15th July 1898. Although the Assistant Surgeon, through the District Medical and Sanitary Officer, was asked

asked to report on the Councillor's letter of Complaint, and notwithstanding the fact that a year has elapsed since then, he has quite ignored my letter on the subject and the subsequent reminders. I firmly believe that he has not shown them to Doctor Lancaster upto this moment. Again subsequent to this certain other bills had to be adjusted for medicines purchased from Messrs Turnbull & Co at Madras. The Council declined to pass these bills as it turned out that the medicines were ordered without the permission of the Chairman or Council being previously obtained. The District Medical and Sanitary Officer was addressed on the subject. After a time the Assistant Surgeon came to me in person and represented that Doctor Lancaster was annoyed at the letter and thought it an impertinent one, and asked me to write a letter of apology. Before I could do, an offensive letter was addressed to me. I thereupon wrote to Doctor Lancaster about it. The following letter, to my surprise, was received from him:-

"I am very sorry regarding this misunderstanding. I have not seen your first "official letter, nor have I seen the reply "to it from my Office. I was away at "Arkonam and returned with a bad head-"ache. Yesterday Mr. Lakshman showed "me your second letter, but I did not "go into the subject. If the reply from "my Office has been in any way discourteous "please accept my regret. It is all probably a little misunderstanding, so do "not think any more of it. You and I have "enough of anxieties without these little worries.

Asst Surgeon

"I am sure our relations will always be "as pleasant as before."

From this it will be seen whether any credence should be given to Mr Peter Lakshman's remark about the Sanitary Administration of the Town as also in the face of Doctor Lancaster's opinion quoted in the Council's report about sanitation. It is evident that the Assistant Surgeon's motive in writing this report was not to benefit sanitation but to injure me as Chairman. In connection with this subject I would earnestly request Government to consider whether Mr Lakshman, the present Assistant Surgeon, can any longer be retained in this Town?

(8) Excessive reductions in Profession Tax

In addition to what the Council has stated on the subject, I beg to add the following information. The Original Assessments were no doubt correctly fixed in August 1898 by myself and the Assessing Councillors, who are themselves Merchants; when existing circumstances justified the said assessments. But when the Appeals were being heard, from the latter part of October, matters changed for the worse. Owing to the prevalence of plague at Bangalore Bombay and other centres of trade, as also to the fact of there being imported cases of plague at the time in Vellore, there was a great and appreciable fall in trade. Under these circumstances alone, the Council was induced, as a special concession for this year only, to grant such large remissions. For this self-same reason the Council

was

was obliged to forego much of its revenue from rents and tolls by granting Contractors remissions to the extent of about Rs 5000-0-0. The allegation therefore of the petitioners, that profession tax is on appeal reduced or enhanced according to the whims of individual Councillors, is, like other statements of theirs, false. Inasmuch as elections are conducted by secret ballot, it is impossible for one to know who votes and who does not vote in favour of a Candidate, for him to reduce or enhance in the case of the former or latter.

6. It now remains for me to add that I believe I have successfully proved the several charges made against me, and referred to in the two G.O's above quoted, to be either false or exaggerated. The antecedents of most of the Memorialists have been sufficiently explained by the Council, especially those of the Ring-leader M.R.Ry. Eswarappa Mudaliar Avergal. He has been shown to be an unscrupulous person, and an expert in the art of getting up Mahazars and of obtaining signatures by misrepresentation. He has, since my assumption of Office, often written to me insulting letters, and troubled me with others unconnected with public interests, so much so, that I was forced to bring his conduct to the notice of the Council at a meeting held on the 16th September 1898 when the following Resolution was passed:-

"As M.R.Ry. Eswarappa Mudaliar

"says that he had no intention of imputing
"bad motives to the Chairman at the
"time of writing the letter under question,
"the Chairman wishes to drop the matter.
"Papers recorded."

Again, at a meeting held on the 25th November 1898, another insulting letter of his was considered by the Council, when the following resolution was passed:-

"Recorded as M. R. Ry. Eswarappa had "apparently no intention of hurting any-"body's feelings." With reference to his conduct I beg to quote the following extract from Doctor Lancaster's letter:-

"I regret to note the tone of Coun-"cillor Eswarappa Mudaliar's letter "to you. I am of opinion that all "Councillors (whatever their individual "views and opinions on various matters "may be) should always in correspondence "or at the table treat the chair with due "respect and courtesy."

7. In the present instance he has falsely and maliciously brought charges against me and has misled the Sub Collector and the Government, and has given trouble to one and all. Peace and harmony in the conduct of Municipal Affairs can only be obtained by re-moving him from the Office of Councillor under Section 19 of the Municipal Act, as his further retention will bring the Municipality into continued contempt.

8. Finally, it now remains for me to add that much of the unpleasantness that has arisen and the trouble that

has

has been given to Government could well have been avoided, if the Sub Collector had in a Constitutional manner asked me to explain matters, when I should have been very glad to comply with his request. But instead of doing this he sent me the following notice:-

"The Chairman Vellore Municipal "Council is informed that an enquiry "will be held on 10-4-99 at 8 A. M. "and on subsequent days at Vellore "into the petition of V. Eswarappa Mudali "and 4 other Councillors of Vellore, "bringing to notice certain serious "irregularities in the administration "of the Vellore Municipality. The "Enquiry will be public and the Chair-"man will be at liberty, if he wishes, "to cross examine the witnesses produced."

Considering this notice to be informal and discourteous, and seeing that there was no provision in the Municipal Act authorizing such enquiry, I wrote to the Sub Collector requesting him to be good enough to let me know under what provision of law he purposed holding the said enquiry and recording evidence of witnesses. But he was not pleased to comply with my request. Hence I did not attend. I further re-quested him to supply me with a copy of the Memorial but he declined to do so and held the enquiry behind my back. Another reason for my not attending the enquiry was due to the fact that I believed the Sub Collector to be prejudiced against me, because when I first went to visit him on his arrival, he, without dwelling upon general topics relating to Municipal Administration, confined his conversation simply to the non-delegation of full powers to the Secretary. The manner and tone of his conversation led me to believe that he was violently prejudiced against me.

9. Under the circumstances set forth above I most respectfully request that the Government will be pleased to dismiss the petition under reference, to cancel its orders thereon, viz Proceedings Nos 986 and 987 M Mis dated 14th July 1899, and to deal with the petitioners as the Government may deem necessary.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most Obedient Servant

Chairman

Confiden

3

of Chairman and Councio

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

.O., No. 986-M, dated 14th July 1899.
" " 987-M " "
ent No. 2209-M of 1899, dated from the
No. 2535-M of 1899, dated from the
" 2547-M 1899,

SUBJECT.

Maladministration - Vello
Municipality.

HM

FOR ORDERS.

I should like a resumé of the position & the Secy's views as to the action that should now be taken.

MA 30.10.99.

in Int no 208 B.1.
23-2-99

In December 18
MRRy Easwarappa Mud
and four other Municipa
Councillors of Vellore subm
a petition to Government po
ing out some irregularities
the administration of the
cipality and requesting th
drastic measures might
in order to place matte on
satisfactory footing. This p
was referred to the Collecto
North Arcot for remarks a
reports submitted by the
and by the Sub Collector

7481

man, in [illegible]

then reported his ~~were~~ wired were no such records.

6. Para

4

...marks of the Sub-Collector
...t out in the accompany-
...ular statement:—

Confidential

Sub Collector & Joint Magistrate's Office,

No. Camp, Vellore, 20th September 1899.

From
N. McMichael, Esquire, I.C.S.,
Ag Sub Collector and Joint Magistrate of
North Arcot.

To
R. H. Campbell, Esquire, I.C.S.,
Collector and District Magistrate,
North Arcot.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward No 1729 of 1899 dated 19th August 1898 from the Chairman, Municipal Council, Vellore, with the following remarks.

2. Para 2(1). The memorialists do not allege that the demand notices were issued only in December 1898.

3. Para 2(2). The allegation in the memorial is that notices were not sent to all owners, and it is quite true.

4. Para 2(3). Even the European and Eurasian Communities possess far more than 27 dogs.

5. Para 2(4). I called for the records referred to here during my inquiry last April, and it was then reported that there were no such records.

6. Para 2 (5). The Auditor's suggestions do not over-rule repeated Government Orders. The Chairman might also have added the reason for the non-issue of bills during the quarter April–June. It was that it was not known whether the charges were to be made according to the old or according to the revised rates of housetax. The matter was settled at a Council meeting in August.

No remark on para 2 (6)

7. Para 2 (7). No report has yet to my knowledge been made by the Chairman.

Do. 2 (8)

8. Para 2 (10). In para 13 of my original report on the memorial I have by oversight written as though my remarks there referred to para 11 of the memorial. My remarks there were perfectly correct, but they had reference to the lists prepared by the Chairman under the new Election Rules. In my Dis No. 818 of 1899 dated 29th April 1899 I have fully reported to you on this point, and enclosed a copy of the lists with the Chairman's orders, so that my contention may be verified at once.

9. Para 3. According to the Contractor's allegations, the advances were not loans at all.

10. Para 5 (1). The three contradictory orders of the Chairman remain un[illegible]plained.

11. Para

11. Para 5 (4). The Council has wilfully suppressed the fact that it was only subsequent to my enquiry and to the manager's withdrawal of his security that he began to reduce his debts.

12. Para 5 (5). The main fact to be noted here is that the ballot papers were in the manager's custody.

13. Para 5 (7). I am not concerned with relations between the Chairman and the Assistant Surgeon. The truth of the Assistant Surgeon's remarks is borne out by the Sanitary Commissioner's report.

14. Para 8. Regarding this, I have only to say that the notice to the Chairman was given in the usual form. A notice in exactly the same form was given to the memorialists. There were certain allegations in the memorial which, I considered, required the examination of witnesses for their proof or disproof. The notice was in the form in which notice is always given by me to petitioners and counterpetitioners in Revenue enquiries. So far as the Chairman is concerned, it is not of the least importance whether the enquiry held by me was a revenue enquiry or merely a departmental one. If he thought that there were really any legal objections to my holding the enquiry, his proper procedure would have been to state his objections before the enquiry began,

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

No 19

Vellore
27.10.93.

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
31 OCT 93
NORTH ARCOT

From
P. Samydoss Mudr
Secretary Vellore Municipality
To
R. H. Campbell Esquire
Collector of North Arcot

Through the Chairman Vellore Municipality

Sir

I beg respectfully to submit, for your kind perusal & such action as you may deem fit & expedient to take, Copies of correspondence which has taken place between the Chairman & myself. On the 17th Inst I brought to the notice of the Chairman by means of an office note the present unsatisfactory state of the office & the fact that certain individuals who were not conversant with the English language were holding appts for which a knowledge of English is a sine qua non. I took such a step in the interest of the Munl. administration & as one with a sense of the responsibility devolving on me as its Secretary. But I am told by the Chairman in his endorsement thereon that my remarks against a particular clerk are attributable to some prejudice, which I have formed against him & that I am actuated by motives in writing so. It is needless for me to say that the Chairman's observations are based on surmises and presumptions. As I considered that my honesty was thereby questioned, my attacked openly, I considered it my duty to respectfully protest against such an unfounded impression & to disabuse his mind of the uncharitable construction which he had put upon my report. Accordingly on the 18th idem I wrote to him and assured him that in trying to bring to his notice certain defects & drawbacks which I noticed in the administration of affairs in the office, I was in no way actuated by any motives & this explanation of mine has only drawn from his pen such remarks against me as are now brought to notice. These remarks speak for themselves. I think that such treatment accorded to me by the Chairman himself will only tend to lower me still more in the estimation of the office Estt who as you are already aware are neither obedient nor respectful towards me & hamper me considerably in the discharge of my duties.

I beg &c

(Sd) P. Samy dos [illegible]
Asst Secretary.

True copy submitted to the Collector.

P Samy dos [illegible]
[illegible] Secretary

Office Note

I beg to bring to your notice that the office Establishment relating to the account branch and the bill collectors are not at all working as satisfactorily as they ought to do and some of them are unfit to hold the appointments owing to their ignorance of English Language. My repeated orders to keep the books correct and written up to date have not been obeyed. You are aware I have ~~no means~~ manner of control over them and therefore my authority is openly disregarded. I give below a few cases of ~~gross~~ irregularities in the keeping of accounts in the office.

(a) Profession tax register does not bear the date of credit for the last 15 days.

(b) Profession tax register pages 66, 67 and 68 contain errors which would not have been committed if the writers knew English of him and his business which facts you [illegible] me a person unsuited for work [illegible]. Now he has become unfit to [illegible] once he [illegible] fit [illegible] short period he became unfit!! you want further to report the whole establishment as also the servants on Collection duty. You may possibly remember when I was left to make some arrangements in Collection department you made me understand that the Collector's were working hard and the [illegible] were good. Now they have become unfit!! so that the only competent clerks being on the face of earth is yourself. I cannot understand why at this stage of matters you make a report [illegible] all the [illegible] servants [illegible] some of them you think [illegible] to protect you. It is my [illegible] [illegible] Municipal affairs [illegible] [illegible] you say.

I don't care for all this stuff. You are responsible for the work. You must make the clerks work. There is no use of saying this man is [illegible] and that man is unfit. The inference that you bring forward that you have no powers to [illegible] [illegible]. You better suggest your own arrangements I shall see to their propriety and to your [illegible].

(Signed) A. C. Seshagiri Rao
19-10-99

True Copy submitted to the Collr.
[illegible]
30/10/99 Munl. Secretary.

NORTH ARCOT, COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
Chittoor 31st October, 1899
Refer No. 1476/Eng OF 1899.

FROM
R. H. Campbell Esquire
ag COLLECTOR AND DISTRICT MAGISTRATE,
North Arcot,

TO
THE Secretary to Government
Local & Municipal Departme
Madras.

SIR,

I have the honor to forward the enclosed correspondence for the orders of Government. The Chairman has not yet forwarded the allegations submitted through him by the Secretary so I am not in possession of his explanation. I submit however that no explanation is possible for the outrageously offensive tone which the Chairman has seen fit to adopt towards his Secretary. I have underlined the most —