Marine (1897) Department.

G.O., No. 612 Marine

Dated 9 July 1897

[Despatch Abstract.]

Civil Apothecary John Pillai: Rpd: Public Dept: Commenting on the conduct of certain Mrs Brown &c who assisted at a public meeting held for the purpose of attacking the official character of — a public servant. Comt^d to the P.P. Mrs

[illegible]

[illegible]

INDEXED.

21/7/97

[illegible]

No. 6.
[2,000—28-10-96.]

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No	Department.	Date.
	206	Marine	25-3-96				

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Marine Department

Government {1897} of Madras.

PUBLIC.

Current Number 945

No 206 of 25.3.97

Recd. 27 } 1897. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 793, 25th June 1897.

Communicated to the Presidency Post Office

9/7/97

The PSO etc 206

Dept 14/7/97

JUNE.

Civil Apothecary John Pillai.

Dismissing, with remarks, petition from — appealing against the order of the Surgeon-General suspending him for three months for failure to bring to notice the omission of certain entries from his service book; commenting on the conduct of certain officers of Government, &c., who have assisted at a public meeting held for the purpose of attacking the official character of —, a public servant; and communicating the proceedings to all departments of the Secretariat in view to its communication to officers in the public service.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers :—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 3210, dated 31st July 1896.

Read—the following letter from M.R.Ry. M. GOPALA ROW, Inspector of Salt, Abkári and Customs Revenue, Tirukkóyilúr Circle, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Salt, Abkári and Separate Revenue, dated 24th July 1896, No. C. :—

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, Routine No. 2160, dated the 16th instant, calling on me to report if the facts mentioned in a letter published in the *Hindu* of the 27th ultimo are true, I beg to state that the contents of the said letter are true. The following Government servants were present at the meeting referred to :—

M.R.Ry. T. Varadarajulu Naidu, B.A., B.L., District Munsif, Tirukkóyilúr.
„ A. Ramalinga Iyer, M.A., Lecturer, Rajahmundry College.
„ C. Narasimha Charri, Inspector of Police, Tirukkóyilúr.
„ V. Masilamony Mudaliar, Sub-Registrar, Tirukkóyilúr.
„ M. Gopala Row, Inspector of Salt, Abkári and Customs Revenue.
„ T. Mathava Row, Prosecuting Inspector of Police, Cuddalore.
„ V. Narayana Row, Retired District Munsif.
„ L. Arunachala Iyer, Retired Revenue Inspector.
„ A. Nadamuny Naidu, Retired Taluk Clerk.

Resolution—Mis. No. 3210, dated 31st July 1896.

Submitted to Government with reference to its official memorandum, No. 101, Revenue, dated 13th July 1896.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) EDMUND MILLETT,
Assistant Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Endt. No. 1547-R.

Transferred to the Public Department, with reference to office-note, No. 135-A, dated the 9th ultimo.

Ootacamund,
10*th August* 1896.

(Signed) A. T. ARUNDEL,
Secy. to Govt., Revenue Dept.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 2nd September 1896, No. 401.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 17th September 1896, No. 434.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 25th September 1896, No. 447.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 16th October 1896, No. 481.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 23rd October 1896, No. 489.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 11th November 1896, No. 522.

From the President, District Board, South Arcot, dated 25th November 1896.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 26th November 1896, No. C.-84.

With reference to your memorandum, No. 1355, Public, dated the 9th July 1896, and this office letter ending with No. 522, dated the 11th November 1896, I have the honour to state that the report in the case of Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai of Tirukkóyilúr has just been received from the Collector of South Arcot and is herewith forwarded for the information of Government.

2. The report consists of letter No. C, dated the 18th November, from the Collector and two letters from the Deputy Collector and President of the Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr, who conducted the inquiry, together with a copy of the covering memorandum, No. 2-C, dated the 20th November 1896, from the District Medical and Sanitary Officer. I have kept back the voluminous enclosures to the Deputy Collector's reports as the facts are very clearly and lucidly discussed in the reports themselves, thereby doing away with the necessity of reading through them.

3. It will be seen from these reports and the Collector's letters that the apothecary has been made the subject of a base conspiracy on the part of the Brahmanical and other officials and vakils of the place, simply because he was not subservient to them and did his work honestly. He has been fully acquitted of the charges and allegations contained in the memorials submitted by the conspirators which have been proved to be malicious and entirely devoid of foundation.

4. Civil Apothecary John Pillai has since been relieved of his acting appointment at Tirukkóyilúr by the permanent incumbent in the ordinary course; the Collector however considers it desirable that he should be re-appointed to the station so that the public may be convinced that such machinations as have been brought to light will not be allowed to succeed. I agree in this view, but as at present there is no other appointment available for the permanent incumbent, I have posted John Pillai to do duty at Cuddalore until arrangements can be made for retransferring him to Tirukkóyilúr. I however await the instructions of Government regarding the Collector's proposal.

5. I fully concur with the Collector that the conduct of the accusers calls for exemplary punishment, and I trust that they will be dealt with in such a way as to protect medical subordinates from such base and malicious public charges in future.

Enclosures.

From Surgeon-Major J. C. MARSDEN, District Medical and Sanitary Officer, South Arcot, to the Secretary to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated Cuddalore, 20th November 1896, No. 2-C.

The papers in question are submitted herewith, together with confidential letter, No. C, dated 18th November 1896, from the President, District Board, South Arcot, which reviews the whole case.

2. There are two sets of papers from the President, Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr, consisting of reports, with enclosures, concerning (*a*) the manuscript memorial and (*b*) the printed memorial against the apothecary.

3. I have already, in my No. 135, dated 19th September 1896, submitted some remarks on the case, noting that my predecessors had reported favourably on this apothecary. He is also held in good repute by all the European officers in the district who are acquainted with him.

4. During my recent inspection of Tirukkóyilúr, I was quite satisfied with his work and he appeared popular with all except the memorialists. I took the opportunity of meeting the leading petitioners (those who were present in the station), and I heard their complaints, as well as the apothecary's explanations.

The complaints are all detailed in the accompanying file of correspondence.

The explanations I considered satisfactory. The apothecary is of a nervous disposition and he was disposed to be too verbose and, perhaps, not sufficiently alive to the fact that the district munsif was his official superior. He had, however, received great provocation and a little advice on this point seemed to be all that was needed.

5. In my opinion, the apothecary has cleared himself of the grave charges brought against him and he is most painstaking and diligent.

6. But it seems very evident that his position as union chairman has interfered with his other duties and has led to friction. I think that post should not be held by the medical officer.

7. It is also very evident that several of the memorialists have a strong grudge against him and they have, accordingly, raked up old stories, though they made no complaint at the time of the alleged occurrences.

Nothing can justify their conduct in this case.

From A. E. CASTLESTUART STUART, Esq., President, District Board, South Arcot, to the District Medical and Sanitary Officer, Cuddalore, dated Cuddalore, 18th November 1896, No. C.

I have the honour to forward, for your information and transmission to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, the confidential reports Nos. 9 and 10 of 1896, dated 29th September 1896, of the Deputy Collector, Tirukkóyilúr, and President of the Tirukkóyilúr Taluk Board, on (1) the manuscript and (2) the printed memorials submitted against Mr. John Pillai, late Civil Apothecary and Union Chairman of Tirukkóyilúr, in original, together with their respective enclosures.

2. The Deputy Collector and Taluk Board President has made a most thorough and exhaustive inquiry. His reports are so complete and the records are already so voluminous that I shall do as little as possible to swell the literature of the subject. I may state that whilst at Tirukkóyilúr lately I made personal inquiries which satisfy me that the Deputy Collector's conclusions are correct and his lucid exposition of what was a base conspiracy organized by a few officials of the place to ruin a brother official leaves little room for further comment. It was my intention to have addressed the heads of the various departments to which the implicated officials belong on the subject of the gross misconduct of their subordinates, but this would involve considerable delay in making several copies of the records, and this I desire to avoid having regard to the reminders received for these reports.

3. The inquiry has disclosed that the late Civil Apothecary, Mr. John Pillai, is entitled to be fully acquitted of the malicious charges recklessly brought against him by a few public servants and others whose animosity he appears to have incurred on account of his zealous performance of public duties, both as a medical officer and as chairman of the union at Tirukkóyilúr, and his personal independence of character. Had he been subservient to the district munsif in particular, it is improbable that this spurious agitation would have been manufactured in the manner disclosed by the Deputy Collector's reports. Mr. John Pillai has abundant material for both civil and criminal action against his traducers, but his reputation is in the hands of Government, to whom I request that the Surgeon-General will be so good as to forward these papers for orders—so far as the implicated officials are concerned. I am of opinion that, in the public interests, exemplary punishment should be meted out to the ringleaders.

4. The inquiry proves that the ringleaders were the following :—

(1) M.R.Ry. T. Varadarajulu Naidu Garu, District Munsif of Tirukkóyilúr,
(2) „ V. Masilamony Mudaliar Avargal, late Sub-Registrar of Tirukkóyilúr and Vice-President of the Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr,
(3) „ Srinivasa Row Avargal, First-grade Pleader of Tirukkóyilúr and Member of the District Board, as also of the Tirukkóyilúr Taluk Board,
(4) „ C. Narasimha Chariar Avargal, Inspector of Police, Tirukkóyilúr,
(5) „ Gopala Row Avargal, Inspector of Salt and Abkári Revenue,
(6) „ Govinda Odayar Avargal, Member of the Tirukkóyilúr Union Panchayat, and
(7) „ Sadasiva Pillai Avargal, a private Vakil of Tirukkóyilúr.

5. The records prove that the principal offender was the District Munsif of Tirukkóyilúr. It is astonishing that an officer in his position should, to gratify personal spite for imagined slight which, if it occurred at all, occurred some twelve months previously, have taken so prominent a part in the public meeting convened to condemn a brother officer in another department. That nine of the eleven pleaders of his court should have supported him is not surprising having regard to native character—or the absence thereof. He was ably seconded by the leading local vakil M.R.Ry. Srinivasa Row Avargal who did not consider it improper, though a member of a district board and also of the taluk board, to which the civil apothecary was directly subordinate both as the local medical officer and the chairman of the local union, to take a most prominent part in these scandalous proceedings. He admittedly drafted the manuscript memorial and was one of the five persons selected as a sub-committee of the public meeting to draw up the printed memorial, both of which may be characterized as a concatenation of misrepresentations. The Sub-Registrar M.R.Ry. Masilamony Mudaliar Avargal also took a very prominent part in the matter and attempted to induce the forest ranger to join the conspirators. This sub-registrar was reported to me to be endeavouring to tamper with the witnesses. He was accordingly transferred at my request by the Inspector-General of Registration, and, I believe, he is now in the Salem district. The Police Inspector M.R.Ry. Narasimha Charriar Avargal signed the memorial and took part in the meeting and attempted to induce the local sub-magistrate to join in the nefarious plot. The inspector of salt and abkári referred to has since been transferred; but his transfer had no connection with his part in this agitation. Govinda Odayar, a member of the union, was intriguing against his own chairman, the apothecary. The private vakil not being an official, may well be treated with contempt.

6. If the public servants who are implicated in this conspiracy had any valid grievances against the civil apothecary either in his capacity as a medical officer or as chairman of the union, they could easily and, of course, should have made their complaints against him to the proper authorities in the proper way. But for them to have banded together to get up a public meeting, touting for signatures and declaiming against a brother public servant, signing mahazars against him containing the most reckless and false charges, was an intolerable breach of the public rules and subversive of all discipline. No public officer can be expected to do his duty fearlessly if at any moment he is liable to find himself the object of hostile declamation in the streets at a public meeting deliberately convened by and presided over and attended by brother officers whose malevolent eloquence is in inverse ratio to the

truth of their utterances. The license of the native press of this country is such that ample scope is afforded for anonymous libellers to defame public servants with practical impunity; but this press has established for itself such a reputation for deliberate misrepresentation that its malicious vapourings can best be treated with merited contempt; but where, as in this case, public servants have not hesitated to conspire together publicly to attack a brother public servant, condign punishment is, in my opinion, imperatively necessary in the interests of public administration. Such agitation is expressly prohibited by rule 68 of the "Rules regulating the personal conduct of public servants."

7. As agitators of this kind are dangerous to the public peace and order, I venture to make the following recommendations for such consideration as they may be considered to merit by His Excellency the Governor in Council:—

(*a*) That the misconduct of the district munsif be brought to the notice of the High Court in view to his prompt transfer after such reduction, suspension or other punishment as may be deemed proper.

(*b*) That the sub-registrar referred to be suspended and reduced.

(*c*) That similar punishment be awarded to the inspectors of the police and of the salt and abkári, the latter to be subsequently transferred.

(*d*) That M.R Ry. Srinivasa Row Avargal, the district and taluk board member, be removed from the local boards under section 24 (1) (iii) of Act V of 1884, and his re-appointment or re-election be prohibited for a period of three years.

(*e*) That M.R.Ry. Govinda Odayar Avargal be similarly dealt with in respect of his appointment in the union panchayat.

8. In conclusion, as I understand, that Mr. John Pillai has lately, in the ordinary course, been relieved of his appointment at Tirukkóyilúr by the reversion of the permanent incumbent. I am of opinion that as this is just what the conspirators have been working for, it is desirable, if not absolutely necessary, that he should be re-appointed to Tirukkóyilúr at a very early date, so that the public may be convinced that such machinations as have been brought to light will not be allowed to succeed. In the public interests such a course seems expedient, for otherwise the transfer of this apothecary at this juncture must give rise to deplorable misconstruction. He has gone excellent work at Tirukkóyilúr and the hospital figures afford the best evidence of his popularity. I append copy of my inspection notes passed on the 6th September 1896 which also bears the remarks of the Deputy Collector, and Taluk Board President. I am confident that the Surgeon-General will not for a moment tolerate such intrigues as have been laid bare by the Deputy Collector and the retention of this medical subordinate at Tirukkóyilúr for some months at least to come together with the punishment of his traducers would, I think, be the best possible answer to the mahazars under reference.

From M.R.Ry. R. SUNDARASA MUDALIYAR Avargal, Deputy Collector on General Duties and President, Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr, to the Collector of South Arcot, dated Tirukkóyilúr, 29th September 1896, No. 10.

Adverting to your endorsement, dated 10th July 1896, on a printed memorial against Mr. John Pillai, Civil Apothecary, Tirukkóyilúr, I have the honour to submit his explanation with all the connected records as per enclosed list, and to report as follows.

2. The memorial was the outcome of a public meeting convened at Tirukkóyilúr on the morning of the 24th June 1896. Among the members present were the leading officials of the Judicial, Registration, Police and Abkári departments, as also most of the vakils of the local bar. The president of the meeting was Mr. Gopala Row, Inspector of the Salt and Abkári department, and he is stated to have taken notes of the several complaints made by some of the members present against the civil apothecary. It was resolved that as the local Apothecary Mr. John Pillai had been for a long time inattentive to his duties and had become highly unpopular and inaccessible to the public on occasions of urgent nature, a memorial should be submitted to the Surgeon-General, the Collector and the District Surgeon praying for

his removal from this station, and that a sub-committee of five gentlemen should draft the memorial and do the needful with special reference to the complaints made at the meeting.

3. According to the memorial itself the individuals who are stated to have represented at the meeting the complaints against the apothecary of their own or of others numbered only sixteen, while the signatures affixed to the memorial exceed 180. It was not possible to trace out all the signatories, nor could it be conceived how so many could have had any grievance in the absence of specific mention of it in the memorial itself. I therefore apportioned the work of examining the Tamil signatories to the Tahsildar, and requested him to submit a report detailing the circumstances which brought about the public meeting. His elaborate report which speaks volumes against the memorialists themselves is herewith submitted. He has examined some twenty persons, and I have recorded the statements of seventeen others, most of whom are officials and vakils.

4. It is necessary for a correct understanding of the whole facts of the case to deal with the subject in different sections, and I therefore propose to divide it into three sections as detailed below:—

I. The specific grievances embodied in the manual.

II. How, by whom, and with what motive a public meeting was arranged for, and the memorial drawn up with special reference to the action of public servant, members of the local board and of the union panchayat.

III. The popularity of the medical institution at Tirukkóyilúr.

5. *Section I.*—Of the sixteen persons who complained against the apothecary at the public meeting, six individuals are confined to a vague complaint of irregular attendance at the hospital referred to in paragraph 5 of the memorial, three gentlemen who had either no complaints to make or who had no desire to press their grievance are shown to have given utterance to the supposed grievances of four others who were not present at the meeting, and of whom only one was made to sign the memorial, and two persons—father and son—who are living together are shown in paragraphs 8 to 10 as two different complainants. Hence the actual number of individuals with specific complaints has to be taken as only seven.

As for the first charge of irregular attendance specified in paragraph 5 of the memorial, I examined the three persons named in the margin. The Tahsildar has examined a few others whose names do not appear in the body of the memorial. No one is able to specify the exact date and hour when they found the apothecary absent from the hospital, nor has any person who happened to go to the hospital cared to inquire if the medical officer had gone elsewhere on duty. This is an accusation, which it is easy to make, but not possible to bring home to the person charged, in the absence of particulars as to dates and hours. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Chari, who admits his obligation to the apothecary for gratuitous treatment, speaks of the absence of that officer from the hospital on some occasions, probably in November 1895. He cannot, however, specify the days and he has admittedly made no inquiry as to the cause of late attendance. He admits, however, having received medicines at the hospital about that time almost continuously for fifteen days. This vakil has, in the course of his examination before me, added a fresh count of charge—indifferent treatment—which does not find place in the memorial. On being questioned on this point, the vakil says that he considered his treatment indifferent, because he thought that the apothecary had been engrossed with other thoughts when he (vakil) narrated his case, but that he is unable to state definitely his reasons for calling the treatment an indifferent one. The vakil states that some two or three months after November 1895, he sent to the apothecary, without any demand, Rs. 4 with a letter thanking him for his services, and stating that the amount was not an adequate remuneration for his services; but that the money was returned by the apothecary with a note expressing that he valued friendship more than money. It may well be concluded how far the

(1) M.R Ry. Sreenivasa Charriar, Second-grade Pleader, Tirukkóyilúr.
(2) Ratnasabapatti Mudaliar, Head Clerk, Stationary Sub-Magistrate's Office.
(3) Marimuthu Naik, a ryot.

charge of indifferent treatment can be believed. In explanation of the omission of this new count of charge from the memorial, the vakil contents himself by attributing it to those who drafted the memorial, while he has affixed his signature to the memorial in English with a long title as Pleader, District Munsif's Court, Tirukkóyilúr, and he is one of the two gentlemen who signed a notice for convening the public meeting.

M.R.Ry. Ratnasabapathi Mudaliyar says that the apothecary has been uniformly kind and courteous to him, that on some occasions, when he happened to go to the hospital at about 7 A.M., the apothecary was not present, but that he is unable to give the dates, and that he made no enquiries as to the whereabouts of the officer at the time.

One Marimuthu Naik, who is stigmatized by the medical officer as an ex-convict says that he went to the hospital on one occasion at 7 A.M., and again the next day, that on the first day he was told that the apothecary had gone to the missionary's bungalow, that the apothecary was not seen the next day, but that he cannot mention the exact dates of his visit. This man seems to have uttered a deliberate falsehood by saying that he signed the memorial at the public meeting, while as a matter of fact it was drafted subsequently, and to have acted under the influence of one Govinda Udayar, who figures very prominently as will be seen from the sequel.

6. The next complaint is that of one David Carpenter, a Christian of the Local Danish Mission, and he was examined by the Tahsildar (*vide* page 15 of his report, dated 15th September 1896). In this case, the charge is that the apothecary refused to attend at the house of David Carpenter on a certain day in the first week of May 1896 for the treatment of his baby, five months old, though the child was then in precarious state. It is however admitted by the complainant that the baby was daily taken to the hospital and placed under the treatment of the apothecary for about ten days prior to its death, and that even on the last day when the medical officer's services could not be procured at his quarters, that officer was solicitous about the state of the child, in having deputed two or three persons to go and ascertain why the child was not brought to the hospital, and that the apothecary eventually turned up, in his own carriage, after 9 A.M. The apothecary's explanation is that he had paid due attention to the treatment of the baby, which was suffering from high fever coupled with lung complications, that on the last day when he had a call from David Carpenter during hospital hours, he explained to him the advantages of treatment in the hospital, and asked him to bring the child as usual, that David Carpenter consented to do so and returned home, that as the child was not brought up as agreed to, he (apothecary) ascertained through a servant of the hospital the state of the child and proceeded thereafter to the house of David Carpenter. It is also stated by the apothecary that he had attended at his quarters and treated gratuitously his other children in two severe cases of illness, and that this will be amply testified to by his own wife and other Christians. The apothecary has sent up a copy of a letter from the European Danish Missionary to the District Surgeon, which amply testifies to the good work of the medical officer done to the poor Christians without any charge and most willingly. It appears from the Tahsildar's report that David Carpenter was set up to prefer his complaint some six weeks after the death of his baby by a private vakil named Sadasiva Pillai, who owes a grudge to the apothecary in his capacity as union Chairman (*vide* correspondence ending with your letter, No. 166-D.B., dated 11th May 1896, in the Local Fund Branch). I need hardly say that the complaint of David Carpenter is quite unfounded as aptly remarked by the Rev. S. Berg. It is very strange that the fact of the previous treatment of the very baby by the apothecary has been suppressed from the memorial.

7. The next complainant is one Devarajaya, a girls' school teacher, Tirukkóyilúr, whose grievance is set out in paragraph 7 of the memorial. It is stated there that while Devarajaya's wife was in acute stage of labour, the apothecary declined to attend without *previous* payment of Rs. 15. The word "previous" is italicized in the memorial with a view to draw the attention of the authorities. But Devarajaya himself has on being cross-examined by the apothecary denied that the latter had refused to attend without *previous* payment. It is admitted by this teacher that the

apothecary sent the midwife to attend on the labour case in his house, and that on being told by the apothecary that the woman would have to be relieved by the application of instruments, Devarajaya hesitated, and that he proposed to consult elderly people. The apothecary is said to have demanded a fee of Rs. 15, and asked Devarajaya to make arrangements sharp. In this case there seems to have been a misconception of facts. Devarajaya says that when the prescribed amount of fee was mentioned to him, he did not offer anything less in consideration of his impoverished circumstances, and he understood the words of the apothecary "arrangements should be made soon" to mean steps to procure the fee required. But according to the apothecary's explanation, he wished to hurry his visit and to ask Devarajaya to decide once for all whether he had no objection to handling the case himself. Devarajaya was apparently in a fix when he was suddenly told that the woman in his house would have to be delivered by a male member of the medical profession at a time when he (Devarajaya) had gone to the apothecary's quarters simply to bring back the midwife. Hence it will be seen that no great weight can be attached to this complaint based on a misconception of facts. I have also heard of several instances of gratuitous treatment of labour cases by Mr. John Pillai, and there is no reason to suppose that in this particular instance he was unusually hard.

8. In paragraphs 8 to 10 of the memorial, Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar, B.A., B.L., first grade pleader, and his father Arunachala Aiyar figure as complainants, and the former has made his statement before me both for himself and his father, a retired revenue inspector. As regards the absence of the apothecary from the hospital between 4 and 5–30 P.M., Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar says that he does not remember the exact day when he took his step sister to the hospital who had thrust a tamarind seed in her nostril, that the apothecary was not then at his quarters, that no enquiry was made as to the whereabouts of the apothecary, and that the apothecary turned up after 5–30 P.M. and relieved the child. The vakil does not remember if the apothecary accounted for his absence by saying that he had been to the Sub-Magistrate's Court as a witness. The date is approximately fixed as one between the 10th May and 22nd June 1896, and the apothecary says that on that particular day he was absent in the Sub-Magistrate's Court which is corroborated by the compounder. Thus it will be seen that the complaint is not worth the paper in which it is set forth, and that it was apparently intended to swell the number of charges against the apothecary.

The next complaint embodied in paragraph 9 of the memorial is even according to the complainant's own showing a total misrepresentation of facts. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar admits that the hospital midwife did attend on his step mother in labour from 10 P.M. of the 13th May 1895 till 5 A.M. the next day, that finding the case too difficult for her she left his house at 5 A.M., saying she would go and consult the apothecary, that subsequently the midwife did not turn up, that his (Jayaramachandraiyar's) cousin Ramanadaiyar misunderstood what was wanted and went to call the apothecary instead of the midwife, that at about 10 A.M., Ramanadaiyar was again sent to the hospital to bring the midwife, and that he returned without the midwife and said that she had gone out to attend on some other case of labour. Mr. Arunachalaiyar was averse to allowing the apothecary to handle the case, though he had volunteered his services as admitted by Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar himself, and the hospital midwife had already expressed her inability to treat the case. I do not see how the apothecary or the midwife can be blamed in the circumstances. The apothecary says that as the midwife was unable to cope with the labour case, he sent her to attend on another labour case at Keelur, and I find from the birth register of Keelur village that on 14th May 1895 one Kaluvarayan had a son born dead. This goes to support the statement of the apothecary, and the information furnished by Ramanadan to Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar seems however to urge that his step mother's case should have been given preference. This is absurd on the fact of it inasmuch as the midwife was not quite equal to the task, and her services could he better utilized in the other case at Keelur. The midwife nevertheless turned up in Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar's house at 2 P.M. on 14th May 1895. The language in the memorial in regard to this complaint that the apothecary could not be *moved* is quite meaningless, if not malicious, and yet the very same Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar was one of the members of the sub-committee who drafted the memorial. It should be here noted that this complaint was thirteen months old at the date of the meeting.

The next complaint set forth in paragraph 10 of the memorial refers to the treatment of a baby eleven days old born to Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar's step mother spoken of in the labour case just disposed of. The apothecary opened a boil on the back of the baby at Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar's quarters some ten days after delivery, and on this occasion there was admittedly no delay in attendance on the part of the apothecary. The next morning when the apothecary passed along the street, without the necessary dressing materials and on some unknown business, he did not enter the house to see how the child was getting on (and it is not known to Mr. Ramachandraiyar if the apothecary then enquired Ramanadan about the child), nor was he invited by Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar to attend on the baby. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar was admittedly inside his house at the time. Immediately after Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar says he sent his cousin, Ramanadan, with a carriage to hospital to bring the apothecary, and Ramanadan returned without the apothecary, and explained that he was then very busy in the hospital. It was not then expressly given out by Ramanadan that the apothecary demanded fees, and that his failure to attend was attributable to it, though it was understood from Ramanadan's conversation with Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar that that might be the case. Ramanadan was again sent to the apothecary with an assurance as to the payment of any fee that might be demanded. At about 10 A.M., apparently after the hospital work was over, the apothecary went to Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar's and dressed the boil but refused to receive a sum of Rs. 5 though offered by Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar, explaining that he would receive the fee only after the child was cured. The apothecary attended at Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar's quarters more than twelve days, and cured the baby completely. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar never noticed any indifference in his treatment during the time the apothecary attended on the baby, and eventually sent of his accord Rs. 20 to the apothecary as his remuneration. Now I would ask would any same man, who cannot bring himself to stoop to foul means and misrepresent indubitable facts so much in favour of the apothecary, think of complaining against that very officer, and express his imaginary grievance in such strong language as to induce the authorities to believe that the medical officer was devoid of even the rudimentary principles of humanity, and heartless in exacting money, without regard to the sufferings of the patients. In fact, Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar has practically withdrawn all his complaints, and on being questioned as to the wording of paragraph 10 of the memorial purporting to have been drafted by himself and his comrades, members of the sub-committee, Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar says that the words in paragraph 10 are not his own, and that his father Arunachalaiyar does not know English. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar candidly admitted before me, when questioned as to why the good services of Mr. John Pillai were not represented at the public meeting, that the meeting was convened to condemn and not to applaud the action of the medical officer. I may, however, observe here that the candour and outspoken manner in which as a gentleman Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar has made his statement before me regardless of the dire consequences of incurring the wrath of the district munsif, and his friends, which seem to have threatened other members of the local bar, deserve consideration.

9. Paragraph 11 of the memorial deals with the grievance of Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar, Local Fund Assistant Engineer, who was not present at the meeting, and who seem to have signed the memorial under pressure from the Sub-Registrar Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar. It is said in the memorial that the apothecary, when sent for, *refused* to call on Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar when the latter was suffering one day from *high fever*. In his statement before me, Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar says that on 11th February 1896 he had fever (not high fever) that that day between 6 and 8 A.M. (hospital hours) he sent word to the apothecary asking him to attend at his quarters—two furlongs from the hospital—that he was informed that as the apothecary was then busy at the hospital, he had expressed his inability to comply with the request, that the compounder was however sent to him with the required medicines from the hospital, and that the fever subsided that night. Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar adds that the apothecary went to him the next morning and enquired about his health, and on being questioned as to the health of my child he (apothecary) gave out that it was in a critical state the previous day, that he (Pranathathihara Aiyar) knew that the apothecary had also to attend on my baby the previous day,

that before seeing the memorial in print, he had no serious attention of complaining against the apothecary, that he never desired any one to represent his grievance to the authorities or at the public meeting, that as the memorial in print did not fairly set out the whole facts of his case, he added a note in pencil at the close of paragraph 11 that the apothecary attended the next day when his services were not in need, but that as the sub-registrar objected to the appearance of such a record (favourable to the apothecary) in the body of the memorial itself, the pencil entry was scored out, and the same note repeated in ink just above his (Pranatharthihara Aiyar's) signature. The complaint is in itself shown to be frivolous, to say the least of it, inasmuch as the medical officer could not, in justice to his duties, be present in the hospital and at the same time in Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar's house to attend to an ordinary case of fever, but the highly reprehensible conduct of the officers in intentionally suppressing a salient fact from the body of the memorial, and transferring a note of it to an unnoticeable portion of the memorial amidst a number of signatures deserves comment. I shall, however, deal with the action of the officials in a separate section as premised. In his explanation in regard to this complaint, the apothecary rightly points out that the wording in the memorial is not justified by the facts deposed to by Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar himself, which do not refer to "high fever" and "refusal to attend" and that being unaware of the strained relations between himself (apothecary) and the Sub-Registrar, Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar, allowed himself to be carried away by the pressure of the sub-registrar, who had throughout acted with a sinister motive.

10. The next complainant, whose grievances are embodied in paragraphs 12, 13 and 14 of the memorial, is M.R.Ry. T. Varatharajulu Naidu Garu, B.A., B.L., District Munsif of Tirukkóyilúr. He wished to avoid his personal attendance before me for open enquiry on the score of his official position and the unpleasant idea of meeting the apothecary, and sent me a written statement of the facts of his complaint. But as his complaints had no reference to his official capacity, and as the apothecary stoutly protested against admitting on record any statement of the district munsif made behind his back and untested by cross-examination, the district munsif after much hesitation consented to depose before me. He pressed his charges most vehimently, added to a new charge which does not find place in the memorial, apparently because the three complaints in the memorial were all no less than ten months old on the date of the public meeting which he attended, and made an elaborate statement which I had to record on two days successively for full twelve hours.

The first complaint in chronological order is set forth in paragraph 13 of the memorial. The district munsif says that he had an abscess near one of his knees, and he sent word to the apothecary at about 7 P.M. on 28th July 1895 for dressing the abscess. The apothecary sent word in reply that he was much tired and could not therefore call over. A message was again sent to the apothecary asking him to send the compounder at least, but even this requisition was not complied with. The compounder was then sent for independently of the apothecary, and he (compounder) turned up at 8 P.M., and did the needful. The apothecary had already commenced the treatment and was asked by the district munsif either to attend himself, or to depute his compounder. On the morning of the *29th July 1895*, the apothecary attended on the district munsif at his quarters and continued to do so for about two days from that date. There was no need to cut open the abscess. On the night of the 28th July 1895 when the compounder turned up he bandaged the abscess in such a manner that it might not fall away during sleeping hours, applying to the abscess what the apothecary had previously prescribed. It is admitted by the district munsif that he might himself have bandaged it. In connection with this complaint, the apothecary says that if there was any real requisition for his attendance, he would certainly have attended on the district munsif as he had done before and after that date, that it is impossible for him to remember, after the lapse of nearly a year, the minute details of every individual case treated by him, and that it was usual with the district munsif and his people to apply for his services even in trivial cases. I would request a reference to the apothecary's explanation with regard to this and other complaints against him.

As regards paragraph 12 of the memorial, the district munsif's complaint refers to the treatment of another abscess near his anus, and in connection with this he *wrote* to the apothecary asking him to attend at his quarters on the *10th August 1895* to which he received a reply that, as it was a meeting day of the panchayat, and as he might be fully occupied with the hospital work, the apothecary could not call over *in the morning* and that he would attend later on. The district munsif waited till 12 noon without going to court, but the medical officer did not turn up. The apothecary's note, dated 10th August 1895, on a scrap of paper was preserved for full one year, and produced by the district munsif on *16th August 1896*. The district munsif admits that the apothecary turned up the next day (11th August), and that on the 12th August he opened the abscess as he had undertaken to do the previous day. The apothecary says that, to the best of his recollection, he went to the house of the district munsif in the afternoon of the 10th August 1895, and learnt that he had left his court which he would not have done if the disease was a serious one. But the district munsif refuses to believe it, and his contention is that had the medical officer appeared after his going to court, his servants would have given information of it. It is really very strange that the district munsif preferred to rely on his servants as to what happened a year ago, and would not believe the apothecary, though the district munsif's absence from his house could be ascertained without directly enquiring his own servants. I may also observe here that I find from an extract from the hospital visitors' book that it was on the 10th August 1895 that Mr. Roberts, the Assistant Collector, visited the hospital, and recorded his notes in the book.

The next paragraph (14) deals with the complaint of the district munsif in regard to the treatment of his daughter. He says that on the *22nd August 1895* at about 1 A.M., his daughter was seriously ill, and that he sent a lantern with two servants to the apothecary with an urgent request that he should come over to see the patient. The men returned with a medicine and said that the apothecary could not be induced to come at that hour. The medicine was not however administered as the apothecary had not seen the patient. In this instance there was no written communication between the district munsif and the apothecary. The apothecary says that he had seen the girl the previous evening at his quarters, and given the necessary medicines to be taken at stated hours for the night, that to the best of his recollection on that very night at about 9 o'clock a servant of the district munsif sent by his wife orally reported the state of the child, and asked for certain instructions as to the administration of medicine and diet for the night, that he forthwith gave the required instructions, and attended on the child the next morning, and that the allegation that the child which was stated to be very seriously ill at 2 A.M., was all right the next morning is enough to indicate the simple nature of the disease.

The fourth complaint of the district munsif which, for the first time, was brought to notice in his written statement sent to me on 16th August 1896, *i.e.*, seven weeks after the public meeting, refers to the apothecary's failure to attend on him in the early part of March 1896, when he (district munsif) had slight fever, and when a female member of his household had sent word to the apothecary in his name. It is however admitted by the district munsif at the close of sheet No. 6 of his statement made before me that the apothecary attended on him when he had slight fever. It is not clear whether this was not the occasion spoken of as referring to March 1896. The apothecary says in his explanation that to the best of his recollection, he saw the district munsif at his quarters and prescribed medicines on 5th March 1896.

As for remuneration * to the apothecary, the district munsif has attempted to show by a peculiar classification of the medical officer's visits, into official and friendly, and visits entitling him to remuneration and no fees, that the visits for which any fee was due were not more than the value (Rs. 5) of a tennis bat, which he had given him in the middle of 1895, and Rs. 3 which he has sent in cash on two different occasions after January 1896. The apothecary denies having received more than Rs. 2 in cash and says that, on receipt of this amount on 18th February 1896, he sent him a note thanking him and pointing out this payment as a new departure in his case, that the bat was merely given as a loan, and that the district munsif had

* *Vide* apothecary's separate list enclosed of medical attendance and quality of medicines supplied.

refused to accept Rs. 5 offered as its price. The bat was returned to the district munsif immediately after the meeting and that very day, and it was accepted by him. The district munsif wants me to believe that as the scale of fees for private attendance of the medical officer had not been fixed, there was no payment throughout the year 1895, except by way of the tennis bat, which he says, he intended to serve as remuneration, though he had not openly expressed it. But the district munsif did not care to know what was the fee due, apparently because he never meant to pay, and does not remember to have maintained a record of the number of official visits at his quarters and is unable to produce that officer's letter written to him so recently as 18th February 1896, while he has carefully preserved notes as to the dates of all his complaints against the apothecary, though nearly a year and old, and the scrap of paper written to him by that officer so far back as 10th August 1895. A careful perusal of the district munsif's statement made before me will convince the reader that he has strenuously and by a sustained effort tried his utmost to withhold or deny every information which may be construed favourable to the apothecary, that he has exerted to fill up all possible loopholes where the medical officer can be expected to afford reasonable explanation, and that he has positively asserted everything unfavourable to that officer even though the events referred to happened some months ago, and he based his assertions on the oral informations given him by his servants, who acted the part of messengers between himself and the apothecary. In this aspect, the district munsif's statement is a striking contrast to that of his Pleader Mr. Jayaramachandra-iyar, which is marked for candour and fairness. It is to be regretted that the district munsif's memory fails just where what may be elicited from him is likely to favour the contention of the apothecary even in regard to recent events, but his memory is very strong and probabilities rush in where an assertion touching incidents many months old is likely to bring home a charge to the medical officer. It seems as if the district munsif has carried a little too far his judicial acuman, and allowed his sense of fair dealing as a judicial officer to be overpowered by predominant self-interest. I shall however return to this subject in another portion of this report where it will be shown how much he has worked to bring about the memorial under report. His complaints are mainly based on what he was told by his servants, and the information was with reference to what happened some ten months ago. In the light of the explanation furnished by the apothecary, I cannot attach any weight to the charges, and the tennis bat incident will suffice to show at once whether it was becoming on an officer in the position of the district munsif to have treated the bat as a remuneration for the professional visits of the apothecary, while it was originally given him as a loan, and subsequently as a present when its price was offered by the apothecary. I may also observe here that the exact dates of the several complaints now given out by the district munsif do not find place in the memorial, that he has purposely omitted to sign the memorial, and that in a portion of his statement before me he says he is not responsible for the wording in the memorial.

11. The next gentleman who appears on the stage is Mr. Gopala Row, Inspector of the Salt and Abkári Department, Tirukkóyilúr circle, who had the honour of presiding at the public meeting held on 24th June 1896. He appears to have been smarting under some imaginary grievance against the apothecary in that he was not courteously received at the hospital on the occasion of his first visit without previous intimation, and that the apothecary had refused to give him a medical certificate to enable him to apply for sick leave. These two personal grievances all shown to be quite unfounded by the Tahsildar in his accompanying report, dated 15th September 1896, inasmuch as the apothecary was not to blame for omitting to do what he was not competent to do in the matter of sick certificate to be granted to a gazetted officer, and that Mr. Gopala Row should have previously announced his position when he first visited the hospital.

It is stated in paragraph 15 of the memorial that the apothecary did not attend, on being sent for by Mr. Gopala Row, when he was suffering from ear-ache and he had to seek the aid of the compounder who had the kindness to do the needful. Mr. Gopala Row evaded open enquiry in the presence of the apothecary, and he has sent me a written statement wherein he has improved his complaint by adding throat-ache to ear-ache. It appears from the explanation of the apothecary and his compounder's statement that Mr. Gopala Row never applied for medical aid for ear-ache, that

when Mr. Gopala Row wanted some medicine to apply to his throat, it was sent to him through the compounder, that there was no requisition from him for the services of the apothecary, that the disease, throat-ache, was introduced in Mr. Gopala Row's written statement after the apothecary recorded the statement of his compounder in regard to it, and that the accusation is quite unfounded and malicious. Mr. Gopala Row says in his written statement, dated 5th August 1896, that the apothecary was highly unpopular, and that a majority of the people have lost their confidence in him, while as a matter of fact several members of his own family are shown by the hospital records to have received in full confidence medical aid at the very same hospital managed by Mr. John Pillai. Mr. Gopala Row has purposely omitted to sign the memorial, though he was the president of the meeting. As he was subsequently transferred to Nandyal he could not be cross-examined by the apothecary. His unwarranted aspersions, out of interested motive, on the popularity of the apothecary, deserve severe notice.

12. The next complainant is one Rangasami Pillai, a peon of the local *District Munsif's Court*. His complaint as set forth in 16 of the memorial is that his boy with a cancerous ulcer in one of his jaws was placed under the treatment of the apothecary, that as the ulcer was emitting foul smell the apothecary kept him at a distance, and had the ulcer dressed by a ward cooly, and that the boy was under indifferent treatment. There is a marginal note in manuscript in the handwriting of the sub-registrar that the boy died since the date of the memorial, as if the death was due to indifferent treatment. But Rangasami Pillai, who does not know English, has in his statement before me distinctly stated that he noticed no sort of indifference in the treatment of the boy, that the apothecary regretted the result of the quack treatment in the interval and even apprized him of the dangerous consequences of it, but never ordered the boy to be kept aloof, that the boy's mother used to keep him at some distance because of the bad smell, that the apothecary examined the boy on the first day, and prescribed medicines, and that the boy was given the same kind of treatment as was given to the other patients in the hospital. It is also evident from this peon's statement that on the day of the public meeting he was sent for through another peon of the district munsif, and asked by the sub-registrar, Mr. Sreenivasa Row, and the retired district munsif to make a statement of his boy's case, that the sub-registrar and the district munsif are friends and that the former evinced special interest in enquiring about the death of the boy in the house of the district munsif. The only complaint of this peon is that the apothecary did not go near the boy after the first day, though the boy was every day taken in his presence and given prescription. It was the compounder who gave medicines to the boy as prescribed by the medical officer and the ulcer was washed by the ward cooly as is generally done in the case of other patients. There is virtually no valid ground of complaint against the apothecary. Facts have been distorted and misrepresented with unworthy motives for which the Sub-Registrar, Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar, was one of the few responsible. The language in the memorial is greatly misleading, and the sub-registrar who drafted it had an ulterior object which will be dwelt upon later on. This complaint having completely fallen to the ground the apothecary says that there is no need for him to offer his explanation in regard to it. This is one of a series of unsuccessful attempts at multiplying the charges against the apothecary, and the peon being a subordinate of the district munsif seems to have been induced to say something against the medical officer at the public meeting, apparently because he was encouraged by the presence of his master there with a number of complaints of his own against the same officer.

13. The next grievance embodied in paragraph 17 of the memorial is that of M.R.Ry. S. Sundraiyar, Tahsildar of Tirukkóyilúr. It was represented at the public meeting by the Sub-Registrar, M.R.Ry. Masilamani Mudaliyar, though the latter was not desired to do so. The tahsildar was not one of the members of the public meeting, nor has he affixed his signature to the memorial. The sub-registrar says that when he happened to meet the tahsildar on two occasions, he (sub-registrar) voluntarily mentioned to him that the apothecary had not been kind enough to attend on him forthwith, that the tahsildar did not contradict, and that in the course of his conversation with the tahsildar it was clear that he preferred native treatment to that

of the apothecary. It was therefore inferred by the sub-registrar that the tahsildar had a complaint against Mr. John Pillai, and he discharged the self-imposed duty of giving utterance to it by representing it to the chairman of the public meeting. The report of the tahsildar, dated 21st September 1896, which I have obtained regarding the allegations in paragraphs 17 and 21 of the memorial will go to show that he had not a shadow of grievance against the apothecary, that that officer did comply with his request and attend on him (tahsildar) as early as possible, that he (tahsildar) had a fall from horseback on 18th June 1895 at a place 9 miles from Tirukkóyilúr, and not from a carriage at a village 6 miles from the town as stated in the memorial, that his case was not one of grave urgency as stated in the memorial, that there was no *urgent request* for the attendance of the apothecary, that the expression "a conveyance drawn by a pony" was inserted in paragraph 17 of the memorial with a view to induce a belief that it was a swift conveyance, while, as a matter of fact, the pony which was the property of the sub-registrar himself was well known to be the slowest creature unable to walk even 2 miles an hour, and that he (tahsildar) had recourse to native treatment in September 1895 because of the simple nature of the disease he was then suffering from, and of his having, on a previous occasion, when he had an injury in his forearm by a fall, treated with indifference the instructions given him by the apothecary. The words of the tahsildar in the concluding paragraph of his report under reference may be quoted here for facility of reference—

"I beg to observe that I was neither present at the meeting, nor have I signed the memorial, nor have I asked any of those present at the meeting to represent my grievances, if any. The sub-registrar has nevertheless, to show himself in his true colours, discharged his self-imposed duty of representing me as one of the complainants, and in doing so, he has, as shown above, acquitted himself in a way most unbecoming, to say the least of it, an officer of his position, inasmuch as he has freely indulged himself in reprehensible distortion and suppression of facts with an ulterior object which pervades the memorial."

In this connection, I may also bring to notice that the tahsildar visited the hospital on 7th June 1896, *i.e.*, seventeen days before the date of the public meeting of which nothing was then known, and noted in the visitors' book that the institution was very popular, and that great credit was due to Mr. John Pillai for the interest he took in his work. It is absurd to say in the face of these remarks recorded so recently, that the tahsildar had really any grievance against the Apothecary, Mr. John Pillai. At page 26 of his report, dated 25th August 1896, Mr. John Pillai has, in view of the various false charges maliciously urged against him in the memorial, applied for permission to prosecute some of the leading men for defamation and damages if not also for false information; and this is a matter for the consideration of the authorities.

14. The next complaint set out in paragraph 18 of the memorial is represented as one which proceeded from myself, and this was, as admitted by the Sub-Registrar, Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar, ventilated by him at the public meeting. Here again there is a culpable suppression of facts. A few days after I joined this division, a ryot from a distant village represented to me in the office that he was unable to pay the high fee demanded by the apothecary for attendance in his village on a labour case. As I was informed that the scale of fees and the distance limit had not been fixed by this taluk board, I could not satisfactorily settle the matter. Subsequently, the subject came up for decision at a meeting of the taluk board, and I was for fixing the lower scale of fees referred to in the Government Order in consideration of the poverty of the masses in this division, and in support of my view I referred to the particular incident as admitted by the sub-registrar, who, as vice-president of the taluk board, was present at the meeting. The lower of the two scales was adopted, and a distance limit of 12 miles was fixed in a resolution of the taluk board at the meeting. This does not show in the least that Mr. John Pillai was unreasonable in his demands, or that he was unduly cruel in the particular case. The sub-registrar has apparently availed himself of his connection with the taluk board and misused the information he had obtained as a member and vice-president of the board to serve his end. The apothecary says that the distance he was desired to travel by the ryot in the case under reference was about 15 miles, that he had brought no conveyance, and that he was not prepared to pay any fee. I may say that if I had thought that Mr. John

Pillai was in any way to blame in the matter, I would certainly have called for his explanation, and settled the matter. But I had no just cause of complaint in the absence of definite rules on the subject, and the matter was therefore dropped at the time.

In paragraph 21 of the memorial, a reference is made to my having sent for medical aid from a distant station at a considerable cost as if I had no confidence in the medical treatment of Mr. John Pillai. This is another instance of exaggeration and misstatement of facts. In the course of twenty days from the close of January 1896, three children in my family died one after another, and they were not exclusively under the treatment of Mr. John Pillai. The first child had an attack of dysentery when I was absent in camp 40 miles off. It was for some days under the treatment of a native physician in my absence, and when Mr. John Pillai took up the case he found it almost hopeless. The child died immediately after my return to Tirukkóyilúr. Mr. John Pillai tried his best and devoted great attention to the treatment of the other two children, who were also occasionally under the treatment of others, but his labours proved fruitless. A woman from a village 5 or 6 miles from Tirukkóyilúr was sent for at the instance of the female inmates of my house for the treatment of the last baby, simply as a last chance, but after some days she gave up the baby as hopeless of cure. The woman was thereafter sent back with a remuneration of a few rupees. This course was adopted not because of want of confidence in the apothecary, but because we had to try the last chance as is occasionally done even by professional medical officers. It is very strange that so much has been made of this incident to condemn the apothecary as a medical officer who does not command confidence of the public. Even a few months ago, the apothecary has successfully treated my surviving children when they were suffering from fever. The Tahsildar, Mr. Sundara Iyer, says that on many occasions after he had a fall from his horse, he had recourse to the treatment of Mr. John Pillai for himself, his wife and children. It will thus be seen that the allegation in paragraph 21 of the memorial rests on very shaby foundation, and that it is calculated by the authors of the memorial, of whom the sub-registrar is one, to unfairly represent Mr. John Pillai as an unworthy member of the medical profession. I shall return to this subject when dealing with his general popularity.

15. The last specific charge against the apothecary is recorded in paragraph 19 of the memorial, and the officer who took upon himself the responsibility of representing it at the public meeting was Mr. Narasimma Chariar, the Inspector of Police, Tirukkóyilúr Division. This officer attended the meeting on 24th June 1896, and he has signed the memorial on 2nd July 1896, in his capacity as inspector of police. He says that he has made a report in his diary to the Superintendent of the convening of the public meeting, and of its object. It is not known if he has made his official superior understand that he figured as one of the complainants against the apothecary. He says distinctly that he had no grievance of his own against Mr. John Pillai, that on the other hand he was very much thankful to him for his having taken special care of his brother and treated him for a month for lunacy, that his requisition for the medical services of Mr. John Pillai was always readily complied with, that for all such services no remuneration was at any time demanded or paid, that even when a remuneration was offered, Mr. John Pillai declined to receive it, and that so far as medical treatment is concerned, he (police inspector) had no complaint against the apothecary. The police inspector had however official complaints against the Apothecary Mr. John Pillai in his capacity as a medical officer and union chairman. This is the very inspector of police who is responsible for the scandalous insinuation in paragraph 19 of the memorial that Mr. John Pillai is indirectly responsible for the death of a Pariah from Adichanallur, who had sustained injuries by a fall from a piccotah, and who, according to the memorial, died some two days after he was refused admission as an in-patient in the hospital in February or March 1896. In his statement before me, the inspector says that he had the information from an unknown female relation of the deceased Pariah, that when the latter was taken to the hospital, he was not taken as an in-patient, and that the medical officer had not taken sufficient pains to treat the patient. The inspector says that he got this information some ten days after the death of the injured Pariah, that the Pariah was not sent to the hospital by the police, and that no enquiry was made if the Pariah offered to be taken as an in-patient, and if he had not already been under the treatment of a native quack. There is

nothing said in the memorial itself of the indifferent treatment now spoken of by the inspector, and this was apparently a subsequent improvement to aggravate the charge against Mr. John Pillai. On referring to the records of inquest in this case, I find that the police reported the case as one of accidental death, that in reply to a reference from the sub-magistrate, the apothecary stated that, according to the information of the Pariah, he had sustained the injury by a beating, and that, after some correspondence on the subject between the magistrate and the police, the sub-magistrate examined certain blood relations of the deceased and others and found that the case to be one of accidental death. The police did not relish the idea of the apothecary furnishing certain information contrary to the line of their action. If there was any real ground of complaint against the apothecary, the blood relations of the deceased being the aggrieved parties would certainly have mentioned it when they were examined by the sub-magistrate in about five days after the death; but, as a matter of fact, I find no such thing in the records of the sub-magistrate's enquiry. The fact seems to be that the inspector had for about a year been cherishing strong official grudge against the apothecary, and he availed himself of the opportunity of a public meeting countenanced by officials and vakils to defame Mr. John Pillai by representing the imaginary grievance of an unknown person. It will be seen from what follows that the inspector is one of the worst offenders without a particle of gratitude for the gratuitous medical aid which he had so often received from Mr. John Pillai. The object in recording this unfounded complaint in paragraph 19 against Mr. John Pillai and in referring to his antecedents in a parallel case some years ago in the next following paragraph 20, needs hardly any comment, and the authors of the memorial, of whom the sub-registrar was certainly one, seem to have ingeniously exercised their powers of exposition by such an arrangement and sequence of allegations to improperly influence the authorities against Mr. John Pillai. The apothecary says that his suspension referred to in paragraph 20 of the memorial was some fifteen years ago, and that it was cancelled on his appeal. The records in the Surgeon-General's office may, if necessary, be referred to on the subject.

16. This memorial as its predecessor, the manuscript memorial already reported on by me, closes with a prayer not for the investigation of the various charges against the apothecary, but for his immediate transfer from the place. I have shown above in detail that the charges are utterly unfounded and imaginary, and it will be apparent from the sequel that in some instances they are malicious, and that the memorial was got up simply to pander to the wishes of a few discontended influential men in the town.

17. *Section II.*—On a perusal of the records of my enquiry and of the reports of the Tahsildar of Tirukkóyilúr, dated 15th and 21st September 1896, coupled with a consideration of the facts brought to notice by the apothecary in his report, dated 25th August 1896, I am led to conclude that the chief instigators of the public meeting and the subsequent printed memorial under report were the gentlemen named below, and that but for the district munsif such a well-attended public meeting would not have been possible:—

(1) M.R.Ry. J. Varatharajulu Naidu Garu, B.A., B.L., District Munsif, Tirukkóyilúr.
(2) M.R.Ry. V. Masilamani Mudaliyar Avargal, late Sub-Registrar and Vice-President, Taluk Board.
(3) M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal, 1st Grade Pleader and a Member of the District and Taluk Boards.
(4) M.R.Ry. C. Narasimma Chariar Avargal, Inspector of Police, Tirukkóyilúr Division.
(5) M.R.Ry. Govinda Udayan, Landholder and Member of the Union Panchayat.
(6) M.R.Ry. Sadasiva Pillai, Private Vakil, Tirukkóyilúr.

The first named gentleman felt aggrieved because, according to the information given him by his servants, the apothecary had refused to attend at his quarters on the 28th July 1895, and on the 10th and 22nd August 1895. In regard to these complaints, I may state here briefly that it was only on one occasion (10th August 1895), there was communication in writing between the two officers, and there was

then a satisfactory reply from Mr. John Pillai. The district munsif says that for the attendance of the apothecary on his son for a sham head-ache, he sent through his peon one rupee to Mr. John Pillai, the receipt of which is denied by the latter. It cannot be said in regard to this paltry sum either of the officers is uttering falsehood. Again the district munsif says that in March 1896 when his aunt sent word to the apothecary to attend on the district munsif for slight fever, Mr. John Pillai sent an hospital servant to the district munsif's house to ascertain how the sick child was getting on. In fairness to both the officers, the reasonable inference is that, in the first instance, the money was misappropriated by the peon, and that, in the second instance, some wrong information was given to Mr. John Pillai. These instances spoken to by the district munsif himself are sufficient to show what amount of confidence can be placed on his servants, and how far they can be relied on for accurate information. Whatever it may be, it was and it still continues to be the impression of the district munsif that the apothecary is to blame for not responding to his calls. In September 1895 when he (district munsif) went to see the tahsildar then on sick bed accompained by his friend, the sub-registrar, he was observed by the tahsildar to welcome every information against Mr. John Pillai. The district munsif had not the moral courage to represent his complaints in writing to the authorities, and he sought for a device of mentioning them in his private conversation with my predecessor Mr. Rajaratna Mudaliar, who left the district on transfer in the middle of October 1895, and then abandoned the idea of putting in a written complaint, though he seems to have cherished a plan of getting rid of Mr. John Pillai. The sub-registrar being his close friend and vice-president of the taluk board seems to have come in for aid. At the meeting of the taluk board held on 13th November 1895 at which Mr. Raghaviah presided, the sub-registrar moved a resolution on the pretext of economy to replace the two apothecaries in the division by second-class hospital assistants, as if lives of men are not so precious as the maintenance of roads, and the motion was seconded by his comrade Mr. Sreenivasa Row. A resolution was accordingly passed by a majority of the board, the dissenting members being the tahsildar and a vakil by name Mr. Parthasarathi Aiyangar. But even this attempt to replace Mr. John Pillai proved unsuccessful, inasmuch as the resolution of the taluk board was, on mature consideration, vetoed by the district board in spite of vehement support by Mr. Sreenivasa Row in the district board. I joined the division in the middle of December 1895, and the district munsif says that, on the very day of my assumption of charge, he made me understand that the apothecary was an indifferent medical officer. I do not remember to have heard of it. But it goes to show that the district munsif wished to influence me at the very outset against Mr. John Pillai, and eventually to secure his transfer. This was certainly not a commendable course. I subsequently noticed in the sub-registrar a spirit of opposition to Mr. John Pillai chiefly in his capacity as Chairman of the Tirukkóyilúr Union. I had then, however, no knowledge of the details of the past events. In February 1896, the sub-registrar and Mr. Sreenivasa Row, who as members of the taluk board had been requested to report on house-tax appeals, complained to me that the Union Chairman, Mr. John Pillai, had refused to lend one of the union servants to help them in inspecting the houses in the union and I pacified them and gave them the required aid. In April 1896, there was a report from Mr. Holman, Inspector of the Salt and Abkári Department, complaining of the action taken by Mr. John Pillai on sanitary grounds and bringing to notice his unpopularity. The report was referred to me, and I have in my endorsement on the tahsildar's report, Dis. No. 392, dated 24th May 1896, in the Local Fund branch, represented to you that the sub-registrar was lightly suspected of having set up Mr. Holman against Mr. John Pillai, and that the latter was not to blame in the matter. Again, on 7th May 1896, there were two petitions purporting to have been signed by seven union servants and complaining against Mr. John Pillai for exacting from them his private work. One of these petitions was addressed to you as President, district board (*vide* endorsement, dated 12th May 1896), and the other to the District Surgeon, and they were referred to me for disposal. The petitions were referred to the Stationary Sub-Magistrate for inquiry, and his report, dated 22nd June 1896, shows that the petitions were pseudonymous, that they were believed to have been got up by some of the enemies of Mr. John Pillai and that the union servants examined had no complaint against that officer—*vide* file enclosed.

Again, there was a manuscript memorial, dated May 1896, and addressed to the Surgeon-General. This contained a number of charges against the apothecary and union chairman, and it was, as admitted by Mr. Sreenivasa Row, drafted by himself. I have already reported on the memorial in my confidential No. 9 of 1896 and shown what action was taken in regard to it by Mr. Sreenivasa Row. Most of the allegations in the manuscript memorial against Mr. John Pillai in his capacity as apothecary are repeated in the printed memorial. On the very day (23rd June 1896) on which I received the manuscript memorial for report as to the genuineness of the signatures in it, a notice was issued for convening a public meeting the next morning (24th June 1896) which resulted in the printed memorial under report. The notice of the meeting was signed by Mr. Sreenivasa Row and another vakil, Mr. Sreenivasa Chariar.

In his statement before me, the district munsif says that he was not aware of the public meeting till he got the notice on the night of the 23rd June 1896, that he cannot say that it struck him at the time that he would be called upon to state what he had to say against the apothecary, that it was not mentioned in the notice that people should be ready with their complaints when they go to the meeting, and that nevertheless on the morning of the meeting day he took with him the apothecary's letter, dated 10th August 1895. He adds that he might have casually mentioned to some of his vakils his complaints against the apothecary. I may also observe here that nine out of the eleven vakils practising in his court have taken part in the public meeting, affixed their signatures to the printed memorial, while only one of them had specific complaints againt Mr. John Pillai, that five out of the eighteen signatories to the manuscript memorial in which his complaints are referred to are his vakils, and that, while I was recording his statement on 18th August 1896 after 5 P.M. to suit his convenience, four of his vakils headed by Mr. Sreenivasa Row who are all signatories to the printed memorial just like a number of others, sent a letter to me requesting to be present at the enquiry and put some questions to him, which, however, was not complied with inasmuch as the district munsif did not require their presence. It appears further from the tahsildar's report, dated 15th September 1896, that it was at the instance of the district munsif that Mr. Ramalinga Aiyar, M.A., who was put as a member of the meeting, was sent for and that it was the wish of the district munsif that his vakils should not expose his friend, the sub-registrar. Mr. Sreenivasa Row, who signed the meeting notice, says that he does *not like to give out the names of the persons* from whom there was a requisition for convening *the public meeting*. Similarly, Mr. Sreenivasa Chariar, who was a joint signatory to the meeting notice, has declined to answer the apothecary's query as to who took part in drafting the notice. Further, it is distinctly stated by Mr. Jaga Ramachandraiyar, B.A., B.L., another vakil of the same Court, but with quite different turn of mind as stated already, that the sub-registrar and the police inspector took the meeting notice to him and told him that he should attend the meeting and represent his grievances. This fact is, of course, denied by these two officers. It appears also from what is stated by Mr. Murugasa Pillai (the sub-magistrate) that the police inspector went to him on the morning of the meeting day and made him understand that he should also attend the meeting, when the Salt Inspector's carriage was kept waiting for him. This is further supported by other statements recorded by the tahsildar. There is also a statement taken from the Forest Range officer to the effect that he was invited by the sub-registrar to attend the meeting. Now I would ask whether the impression produced on reading together the various statements with due regard to the probabilities of the case is not such as to lead one to the conclusion that the meeting was pre-arranged among the district munsif, the sub-registrar, the inspector of police and Mr. Sreenivasa Row, and that there was a strong combination among them to press the charges as best as they could and to make the meeting a thorough success? Mr. Sreenivasa Row is unable to account satisfactorily for having resorted to memorials and a public meeting against the apothecary, a public servant under the control of the local board, in preference to representing, as he had a right to do, the charges or grievances at the taluk or district board of which he is a member, and his conduct deserves notice. I have no hesitation in concluding that the vakils joined together to support the district munsif, the sub-registrar whose recent departure on transfer he seems to have regretted very much, was ready to lend his helping hand, that the inspector of police smarting under some official

grievance against Mr. John Pillai, which will be detailed below, was of some use in arranging for the meeting and securing the attendance of members, and that Mr. Gopala Row, who had some unfounded complaints against Mr. John Pillai, was induced to preside at the meeting and invite complaints from the members present.

The inspector of police mentioned to me, after I closed his statement, that the misunderstanding between him and the apothecary arose from the date of the Tirukkóyilúr murder case disposed of a year ago, and on this information I referred to the records. In register case No. 3 of 1895, disposed of by the then Sub-Magistrate Mr. Krishnasamy Aiyar, on 10th June 1895, Mr. John Pillai gave evidence which went to show that it was a real case of murder, and the Sub-Magistrate has passed very severe strictures on the reprehensible and suspicious conduct of the police including the inspector (*vide* preliminary register enclosed for reference). In this case it does not appear that any notice was taken of the conduct of the inspector, and he having escaped unscathed seems to have worked in a revengeful spirit against the apothecary, by causing a charge sheet to be put in on 18th October 1895 against the apothecary's private servant and one of his union servants, charging them with theft of a bark of a tree worth *a pie* (*vide* calendar No. 36 of 1895 on the file of the Sub-Magistrate of Tirukkóyilúr). This case, however, ended in acquittal, and on a representation from the apothecary, the inspector seems to have been severely scolded by the Superintendent of Police. There was subsequently some correspondence between the apothecary and the Superintendent of Police through the District Magistrate in respect of gambling countenanced by the police here. These are the real official grievances which apparently set up the inspector to join the opposition, and represent at the public meeting the imaginary grievance of an unknown person against Mr. John Pillai. The inspector of police had to appear before me on the day of the meeting in my camp at Manalurput eight miles from Tirukkóyilúr in connection with a criminal case. He did not appear there before 2 P.M. He cared more for the success of the meeting, and he would not quit the meeting hall even though he was desired to return home by a Vakil Mr. R. Srinivasa Aiyangar of Cuddalore, who had also business in my court the same day at Manalurput. With these facts, I would request you to decide whether an officer, whose duty it is to preserve peace and order, can be let off with impunity, when he is shown to have stimulated an agitation in the town under cloak of his authority, which even a station-house officer of ordinary common sense would not have ventured to do.

As for Govinda Udayan No. 4, Union Panchayat member, he became very obnoxious and refractory in the matter of revision of house-tax, encroachments on public streets, and sanitation of the town. He was chiefly instrumental in retarding the work of the panchayat in these important branches of panchayat work. At a time when cholera was raging around Tirukkóyilúr, Govinda Udayan was reported by Mr. John Pillai in his letter, dated 14th August 1895, to have requested him very much to slacken the rule as to giving effect to the speedy removal of rubbish from the backyards of houses in the limits of the union, and it was ordered in your endorsement, dated 19th August 1895, that he should not again be nominated as a panchayatdar. But on a further representation from my predecessor, you intimated in your endorsement, Cur. No. 1140-D.B., dated 25th September 1895, that you had no objection to the re-appointment of Govinda Udayan provided no better man is availabe when he retires.

Again, it was reported to me by the Chairman Mr. John Pillai in his letter, dated 23rd March 1896, that the very same Govinda Udayan had refused to report on encroachments as desired by the panchayat with the assistance of two other members, and that he returned the list of encroachments twice.

It appears further from the panchayat resolution, No. 13, dated 20th March 1896, on this subject that Govinda Udayan was unguarded in his expression and mannerless.

There was subsequently another occasion when this Govinda Udayan had refused, on the pretext of caste prejudices, to do the work allotted to him of revising the house-tax for the current year by entering the Parachari included in his ward, and he expressed his sympathy with the tax-payers. This was reported to me by the chairman in his letter, dated 17th April 1896.

This Govinda Udayan, being a native physician and a channel monegar having control over the regulation of water-supply, commands some influence especially among the masses, and he is shown by the Tahsildar to have taken an active part in getting signatures to the memorial on various false pretexts. As he is reported to have refused to act on three different occasions, he has rendered himself liable to be removed from the panchayat under section 126 of the Local Boards' Act and Local and Municipal Notification No. 326, dated 17th May 1894. This Govinda Udayan was the neighbour of the late Sub-Registrar Mr. Masilamani Mudaliar and a relation of the owner of the house in which the latter was living, and he seems to have served as a useful weapon in the hands of the sub-registrar.

The next person to be noticed is one Sadasiva Pillai, a private vakil, and he owes a grudge to the apothecary, inasmuch as the latter pressed hard for prosecuting him for an offence under section 504, Indian Penal Code. The prosecution was not however sanctioned (*vide* your letter, Ref. No. 166-D.B., dated 11th May 1896). Hence it was that this Sadasiva Pillai worked against the apothecary jointly with Govinda Udayan in multiplying the number of signatures in the memorial under report, and this Sadasiva Pillai appears from the Tahsildar's report to have set up David, carpenter, on false pretexts to complain against Mr. John Pillai at the public meeting.

18. I now turn to the next subject of the steps taken to draft the memorial, and the special interest evinced in doing it by the Sub-Registrar Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar. According to the proceedings of the public meeting, a sub-committee consisting of the five gentlemen named in the margin with *power to add* was entrusted with the duty of drafting the memorial, and *do the needful* with specific reference to the complaints made at the meeting. Though the sub-registrar's name is entered last in the list, he was the very officer who took a prominent part in drawing up and completing the memorial. Nos. 2 and 4 were not heard of after the meeting, nor was it considered necessary by the remaining members to avail themselves of the power given them to add to their number. No. 2 Mr. Ramalinga Aiyar was merely a name-lender, and he left the district for Rajahmundry the day after the meeting. No. 4 Mr. Narayana Rao is the retired District Munsif who has settled himself at Tirukkóyilúr. He remained here on the 24th and 25th June 1896, but was not consulted by the other members. As for Mr. Jaya Ramachandra Aiyar, he admits having taken part in drafting the memorial, but this allegation is made apparently because he cannot well extricate himself from the other members of the sub-committee. His allegation will be found meaningless, when it is remembered that he has disowned the language in the memorial even in regard to one of his own complaints, and that he does not know who made certain alterations and interlineations in the printed memorial in manuscript, though the sub-registrar wants me to believe that he made them with the approval of the other two members Messrs. Jaya Ramachandra Aiyar and Sreenivasa Rao. It will thus be seen that truth groaning under the weight of a mass of glossy exaggerations and tissue of falsehood has at least come out in bold relief by pointing to the sub-registrar and his associate Mr. Sreenivasa Rao as the real authors of the memorial responsible for its wording. It should now be remembered that these were the identical gentlemen who, as members of the taluk board at its meeting held on 13th November 1895, succeeded in securing a resolution for replacing the apothecary by a second-class hospital assistant. It may even be said that of these two gentlemen, it was the sub-registrar who evinced greater interest and took more active part, backed up perhaps by a gentleman of better attainments, inasmuch as Mr. Sreenivasa Rao says that the manuscript interlineations and alterations are not in his handwriting and as the sub-registrar admits them to be his own, and states that he got the memorial printed at Vellore, his native place, though there is a printing press at Cuddalore. Further it has been elicited in the enquiry that it was the sub-registrar's acting peon (a Brahmin), who is also the son of an amin of the District Munsif's Court here, that took round the meeting notice to several residents of the town, and subsequently went round with the memorial and obtained signatures in it. The sub-registrar says that he had personal grievance against the apothecary, and yet he did not choose to

(1) M.R.Ry. L. A. Jaya Ramachandra Aiyar Avargal, B.A., B.L.
(2) A. Ramalinga Aiyar Avargal, M.A.
(3) V. Sreenivasa Rao Garu.
(4) V. Narayana Rao Pantulu Garu.
(5) V. Masilamani Mudaliyar Avargal.

represent it at the meeting, though complaints were then invited by the chairman and the members asked by him to come forward *boldly* and represent their grievances. He thought it safter to represent there the imaginary grievance of the Tahsildar. He had special interest, while sitting in the house of his friend the District Munsif, to enquire about the health of the son of a peon of the District Munsif, and the audacity to make a side note "since died" in manuscript to paragraph 16 of the memorial with the apparent object of aggravating the charge against Mr. John Pillai. He has studiedly introduced by manuscript interlineations the words "often" and "not unfrequently" in paragraph 3 of the memorial. Again, he is said to have induced the Assistant Engineer (L. F.) with an unworthy motive to transfer the manuscript note which he wished to note in favour of the apothecary from the body of the memorial to the signature portion of it, where it is almost sure to escape notice. Perhaps these are his special functions intended to be covered by the expression "*and do the needful*" in resolution No. 3 of the proceedings of the public meeting. What he wanted as the arch conspirator was an authority to draft a memorial, which was not to be submitted for the approval of a second meeting, and this he has succeeded by his stratagem in securing. When he made his statement before me, he refused to subject himself to cross examination by the apothecary, on the pretext that the latter had recently insulted him without any cause for provocation, and ordered him to be pushed out of the hospital by certain hospital servants, and when I asked him if he would answer the apothecary's queries, he refused to do even this. Hence the apothecary had not the advantage of eliciting from him facts which may tend to better strengthen his case. The subsequent conduct of the sub-registrar disclosed by the following two episodes will go to show that he was the chief instigator of the agitation in the town, whether for his own benefit or for the advantage of others. Having submitted the printed memorial on or about the 8th July 1896 (received by the Collector on 9th July 1896), the sub-registrar seems to have been brooding over the question of securing documentary evidence of Mr. John Pillai's late attendance and other irregularities in the hospital. On the morning of the 16th July 1896 (the date of receipt of the memorial by me was 14th July 1896) when I was at head-quarters, the sub-registrar visited the hospital without my knowledge and, in his capacity as vice-president of the taluk board, noted his remarks in the visitors' book. He remarked that the apothecary appeared at the hospital at 7–45 A.M. according to railway time, and 7–30 A.M. according to the hospital time, while several patients had been waiting for him, and that the in-patient register and the diet register had not been correctly written up. A copy of his remarks and the explanation of the apothecary accompany this report. The sub-registrar (vice-president) had never before visited the hospital, and recorded his remarks in the book. Again, on the same day at 11 A.M., the sub-registrar (vice-president) seems to have written to the apothecary for a copy of his remarks without reference to me. Finding this attempt fruitless, Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar wrote to me two days after, asking me for a copy of his remarks and of the apothecary's explanation to enable him to submit a report to me. As I was not in need of his report at that stage, the request was not complied with. There was subsequently another incident between Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar and the apothecary, and this I have designated "the carriage incident" for the sake of brevity.

On the morning of the 28th July 1896, Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar seems to have driven into the compound of the Police hospital in charge of the apothecary in his double bullock cart, in spite of the protest of the sweeper in attendance, and left there the cart and the bullocks. An altercation ensued between the two officers. Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar refused to take out the cart as desired, and it had eventually to be taken out forcibly by the hospital servants and left on the side of the road close by. The apothecary says he has orders not to allow carts inside the compound, which is kept scrupulously clean. Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar metamorphosed himself for the occasion into vice-president, and in exercise of that authority he seems to have insulted the apothecary by uttering the expression "you do not understand your position," sat opposite to the apothecary in the hospital dispensing room, and demanded paper, &c., to enable him to report him to me. The request was not of course complied with, and as Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar refused to quit the room as desired by the apothecary, the latter asked his compounder to lead him out of it,

because it was hospital time when patients had to be attended to. Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar went to me forthwith and asked me to enquire into his complaint. I did so accordingly, and the records of enquiry, together with an endorsement from the District Surgeon, dated 30th July 1896, are herewith submitted. In this case, there can be no doubt that Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar was the aggressor, and he cannot be exonerated from blame. The apothecary was threatened with a report, and he was asked to supply paper and pen for the purpose. This was certainly an unreasonable requisition with which Mr. John Pillai could not be expected to comply at the spur of the moment. But Mr. John Pillai would be considered to have acted more prudently, if he had kept down his temper and shown some consideration to the exasperated vice-president. I can, however, find nothing very serious to blame Mr. John Pillai in the special circumstances of the case and the strained relations between him and Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar, whom he looks upon as his arch enemy. This seems to be a disturbance created more with a view to its being taken as a pretext for avoiding cross examination in the enquiry which, the sub-registrar knows, I was about to convene, than for the purpose of asserting the authority of the one over the other. This incident happened on 28th July 1896, and I examined Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar on 4th August 1896.

19. In the meeting proceedings prefixed to the memorial will be found the names of the three gentlemen named in the margin, who have no local interest and who had nothing to do with the agitation against the medical officer. The first-named gentleman is a native of a village called Agaram some four miles from Tirukkóyilúr, and employed as a lecturer in the Rajahmundry College. He is a Master of Arts, and he had come to his village during the summer recess. He seems to have been specially sent for without previous notice of the public meeting, presumably because the authors of the memorial wished to have among them a gentleman with high university honours. He was put as a member of the sub-committee, while as a matter of fact he is ascertained to have left the district the day after the meeting. He took no part in the deliberations of the sub-committee.

M.R.Ry. A. Ramalinga Aiyar, M.A., of Rajahmundry.
" R. Sreenivasa Aiyangar, B.A., of Cuddalore.
" I. Madava Row of Cuddalore.

The next gentleman is Mr. R. Sreenivasa Aiyangar, B.A., of Cuddalore. The place of his residence is not noted in the proceedings, and the omission cannot but be intentional. He says that he stepped into the meeting hall simply to take home the inspector of police and remained there for half an hour as a spectator witnessing the *fun* of the meeting, that he had known the apothecary only by sight, and that the Chairman Mr. Gopala Row asked the members to come *boldly* forward to represent their grievances, if any.

Mr. I. Madava Row is the prosecuting Inspector of Police, Cuddalore. He says he went to the meeting hall to speak to the District Munsif in connection with a case sent by him, that he remained there only three or four minutes, that he had nothing to do with the meeting, and that he is very sorry to find his name in the proceedings of the meeting.

The two second-grade pleaders of the local District Munsif's Court named in the margin say that personally they have no complaint against Mr. John Pillai, but that they have signed the memorial believing the complaints of others and without caring to verify if they were well founded.

(1) M.R.Ry. Krishnasawmy Aiyar.
(2) " Ragunatha Row.

I have also examined the two other individuals named in the margin, and they say that personally they have no grievances against the apothecary, that nevertheless they attended the meeting in persuance of a notice and signed the memorial being heard of the complaints of others.

(1) M.R.Ry. Narayana Row Avargal, retired District Munsif.
(2) M.R.Ry. Rungasawmy Naidu, Private Vakil.

It will also be evident from the report of the Tahsildar, dated 15th September 1896, who submitted it after examining 20 out of the 166 Tamil signataries in the memorial, that in some instances the same signatures appear twice with seeming difference;

that even taking the number to be correct, it represents but 5 per cent. of the male population of the town; that in a number of instances signatures were obtained on blank sheets and by deceitful means by Govinda Udayan and Sadasiva Pillai already referred to above; that though the signatories have no real ground of complaint against the apothecary, they were induced to sign because of the influence of Govinda Udayan and of his misrepresentation of facts; that the two leading officers, the District Munsif and the Salt Inspector, as well as several others who were present at the meeting have not signed the memorial; that a number of persons who had no personal knowledge of the proceedings in the meeting or of the contents of the memorial have blindly signed the memorial; that the object of the authors of the memorial was to deceive the authorities by showing to them that it was countenanced by a good number of local residents and by officers of position and vakils, while the number of complainants among the signatures was less than half a dozen; that the District Munsif was the officer most interested in the transfer of the apothecary; that in his attempts to gain his object he was supported by nine out of the eleven pleaders of his Court, notably by his leading pleader Mr. Sreenivasa Row, as also by his intimate friend the Sub-Registrar Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar; that these two agents, aided by the Police Inspector Mr. Narasimmachari, were in their turn able to secure two unscrupulous sub-agent in the person of Govinda Udayan and Sadasiva Pillai; that these agents and sub-agents aided by sympathizers, friends and persons under their influence succeeded in getting up a mass meeting headed by the principal local officials and vakils, and a memorial signed by a number of local residents who had really nothing to complain of; that but for the presence and encouragement of the District Munsif, a public meeting of the kind could not have been possible; that at the time of the enquiry regarding the memorial there were frequent conferences among the officials and vakils at the quarters of the District Munsif, the sub-registrar, the inspector of police, the salt inspector and the leading pleader Mr. Sreenivasa Row; that there were sustained efforts at the time to throw obstacles in the way of getting at the truth; that ignorant signatories to the memorial were threatened with unpleasant consequences, should they, having once signed the memorial, omit to say something against the apothecary; and that though the Land Revenue department was not represented at the meeting in spite of strenuous efforts to secure at least the presence of the local Sub-Magistrate, that even the village officers of kusbah Tirukkóyilúr were so much in the hands of the authors of the memorial that they proved traitors to the Tahsildar in having suppressed certain facts within their knowledge and withdrawn their oral representations to the Tahsildar.

20. It will be seen from the above that the public servants who took part in the public meeting attended by about seventy persons, or in its creature, the printed memorial, are those named in the margin. Though the mass meeting may not be looked upon as a quasi-political gathering referred to in the Public Servants' Manual, there can be no doubt that such a collection for condemning the action of a public servant on unfounded allegations is certainly against the spirit of the rules, and it is not such as will be countenanced by Government.

(1) M.R.Ry. I. Varatharajulu Naidu Garu, B.A., B.L., District Munsif, Tirukkóyilúr.
(2) M.R.Ry. V. Masilamani Mudaliyar Avargal, late Sub-Registrar and Vice-President of the Taluk Board.
(3) M.R.Ry. Narasimmachariar, Inspector of Police.
(4) M.R.Ry. Gopala Row Avargal, Inspector of Salt and Abkári Revenue.
(5) Pranatharthihara Aiyar, B.C.E., Local Fund Assistant Engineer.

As for the District Munsif, he seems to have acted much behind the scene, and his connection with the whole affair has been traced by strong inferences from the statements of others. In his own interest it is desirable that he should at least have a transfer from the district.

As for Nos. 2 and 3, I have shown by a line of convincing arguments based upon patent facts that they have acted maliciously against the apothecary, and that there can be no doubt that they deserve suitable punishment in the hands of their departmental superiors.

Mr. Gopala Row (No. 4) has already left the district, and I do not think that any further action is needed in his case except perhaps a censure.

As for Pranatharthihara Aiyar (No. 5), I think he deserves censure for having allowed himself to be lead away by the representations of the sub-registrar. In this connection, I would invite your kind attention to the concluding paragraph of the enclosed apothecary's report, dated 25th August 1896.

21. *Section III.*—I now turn to the state of the medical institution at Tirukkóyilúr under the management of the Apothecary Mr. John Pillai. He took charge of the hospital in May 1894. It appears from the notes of visitors recorded in the Hospital Visitors' Book from time to time, that Mr. John Pillai has been successfully managing the institution, and that it is gradually rising in popularity. It will also be seen from the figures obtained from the hospital records and noted below that there has been increase from year to year in the number of in and out patients *admitted* for treatment, as also in the number of major and minor operations, and that therefore they go to show beyond doubt the growing popularity of the institution under Mr. John Pillai and the absurdity of the remarks in the memorial that he is highly unpopular and inaccessible to patients seeking medical aid:—

Particulars.	1893-94.	1894-95.	1895-96.
(1) In-patients	127	159	168
(2) Out-patients	9,072	10,025	10,542
(3) Major and minor operations	235	331	393

The total number of in and out patients *treated* during the first five months of the current official year was 12,542 against 10,738 for the corresponding period of the past official year, in spite of the memorial in June 1896 and the agitation created thereby in the town. This is an unmistakable proof on record of the facilities afforded to patients by Mr. John Pillai and of his popularity, and it will thus be seen that the sweeping allegations in the memorial by a few discontented resident officials and vakils condemning him for want of popularity and sympathy for the sufferings of the poor are wholly unfounded. I may also observe here that the Tahsildar, who has frequent opportunities of coming in contact with the residents of outlying villages in his division, has reported from informations he had from several villages that the services of the apothecary are duly appreciated by those who had occasion to resort to him for treatment, and that he has very often found him overzealous and earnest in the discharge of his duties, and I have no doubt that the Tahsildar's representations are well founded. In conclusion, I beg to state that there are no grounds whatever to justify the transfer of the apothecary, and that facts and figures point most eloquently to the desirability of his continuance at this station where he has gained popularity and the confidence of the public in general even at the sacrifice of remuneration to which he is entitled.

From M.R.Ry. R. SUNDARASA MUDALIYAR Avargal, Deputy Collector and President, Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr, to the Collector and President, District Board, South Arcot, dated 29th September 1896, No. 9.

With reference to your endorsement, dated 10th July 1896, on a manuscript memorial addressed to the Surgeon-General to the Government of Madras, I have the honour to report as follows.

2. The memorial sets out a number of allegations against Mr. John Pillai, Civil Apothecary and Union Chairman, Tirukkóyilúr. It is dated May 1896 and signed by eighteen persons, of whom five are vakils practising in the local District Munsif's Court including M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal, a member of the Taluk and District Board, and Ramachandra Aiyar Avargal, a member of the Tirukkóyilúr union panchayat presided over by Mr. John Pillai. Among the rest is a resident ryot named Govinda Udayan, also a member of the same panchayat, whose conduct is specially noted in my report on the subsequent printed memorial. There are no specific charges against Mr. John Pillai in his capacity as medical officer, except that he had ill-treated his compounder and omitted to attend at the private residence of some leading officials and vakils and that he used to parade himself on his bycicle on the streets during hospital hours. The memorialists make certain allegations against Mr. John Pillai as

chairman of the union, and I shall deal with them seriatim. One noteworthy fact about the memorial is that not one of the signatories to it has ventilated in it any of his grievances imaginary or real, and there is therefore virtually no one who can be called upon to substantiate any of the charges except Hanumanta Rao, whose specific allegation has reference to a resolution of the taluk board. As for the charges bearing on the working of the union under its present chairman, these are records sufficient to disprove them, and to show that some of them at least are malicious. It will be evident from my report on the subsequent printed memorial that the real wire-pullers worked behind the scene, and that they have, through their sympathizers and others, submitted the manuscript memorial to prejudice the minds of the authorities and prepare them without demur to receive as true all their allegations *en masse* against Mr. John Pillai in his capacity as medical officer. This manuscript memorial was received by me on the 23rd June 1896 for report as to the genuineness of the signatures, and that was the very day when a notice was sent out for convening a meeting against the apothecary. The meeting was held on the morning of the ensuing day, which resulted in the printed memorial containing specific charges against the medical officer. That meeting was headed by most of the leading officials and the local vakils, and as I have dwelt at length in my report on that memorial with my remarks, it will be superfluous to recapitulate them here. In view of the facts set forth above, it will be seen that there is scarcely any need to examine the signatories to the manuscript memorial under report. I have, however, examined two of the vakil signatories M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal and Krishnasamy Aiyar Avargal and four others * being among the signatories to the printed memorial are included in the list of those examined by the Tahsildar of Tirukkóyilúr in connection with that memorial.

* (1) Govinda Udayan.
(2) Rangasami Pillai.
(3) Rathnasabapathi Pillai.
(4) Bawani Sing.

3. The manuscript memorial, with a view apparently to bias the head of the medical department, starts with a narration of the antecedents of the apothecary that some years ago he was suspended, and transferred for neglect of duty, and the same is reproduced in paragraph 20 of the printed memorial with the modification, that the suspension was only a few years ago. Mr. John Pillai has in his explanation, with reference to the later printed memorial, stated that some fifteen years ago he was suspended under a misconception of facts, but that he was restored on appeal. It is not understood why the memorialists have thought fit to introduce this event, and suppress what followed unless it be with a motive to induce the authorities to attach undue weight to their unfounded allegations nor can the object of such a mention at the very outset, in the absence of a sinister motive, be perceived when it is remembered that the apothecary Mr. John Pillai was in charge of the same hospital here for full two years up to the date of the memorial. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal, first grade pleader and a member of the district and taluk board, admits having drafted the manuscript memorial, and states that he had not seen the records of suspension; that he is unable to mention the names of persons from whom he got the information; and that he does not know how the order of suspension was eventually disposed of. It is very strange that Mr. Sreenivasa Row is not aware of the name of the person who wrote the memorial.

4. The first charge against Mr. John Pillai mentioned in paragraph 4 of the memorial is that he whipped the hospital compounder some months ago, and that in spite of the representations of the latter to the then President, Taluk Board, that officer merely transferred the compounder. In this instance, the aggrieved party was the compounder according to the memorialist's own showing, and he is not one of the signatories. This is another instance in which the memorialists have sought to represent the medical officer as an unworthy specimen of humanity, though they were apparently not aware of the whole case as disclosed by the records. It was so far back as 5th September 1895 that the then compounder, Narayanasamy, submitted a petition to the District Medical Officer through the apothecary charging his official superior with assult and insult, and the complaint was forthwith sent up to the District Medical Officer with a covering letter bringing to notice the gross misconduct of the compounder and his culpable neglect of duty. The papers were received by

my predecessor with a demi-official letter dated 6th September 1895, from the District Medical Officer, and the compounder put in a petition to the President on the 11th idem withdrawing his complaint. The papers were recorded with a (confidential) note by my predecessor. It appears that in consideration of the strained relations between the compounder and the apothecary, the former was transfered * to the Kallakurichi hospital on or before the date of his complaint. It will thus be seen that the memorialists had taken upon themselves the onus of representing the supposed grievances of an hospital servant who had withdrawn his complaint. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal who drafted the memorial states † that the compounder complained of his having been beaten, but that he does not know what was done with the complaint to the District Magistrate.

* *Vide* copy of a letter from the President, Taluk Board, to the District Surgeon, dated 5th September 1895, with reference to an endorsement from the latter, dated 26th August 1895. The transfer had no reference to the compounder's complaint.

† Deposition accompanies the report on the printed memorial.

5. As for the charges of indifference to the sufferings of patients and of omission to attend in cases of grave urgency at the quarters of some of the leading officials including the District Munsif, the Tahsildar and the Local Fund Assistant Engineer directed against Mr. John Pillai in his capacity as a medical officer; it is enough to observe here that they appear in an undeveloped form in the manuscript memorial; that they have been subsequently amplified and formulated in the printed memorial dated June 1896, in drafting which the Sub-Registrar and vice-President of the taluk board is found to have taken a prominent part; and that I have this day separately reported on them in detail with the explanation of the apothecary. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal referred to in the last two paragraphs states that he had not heard of the Tahsildar's complaint himself; that it is not possible to give out the names of persons who made mention of that complaint; that the Local Fund Assistant Engineer had told him one or two weeks before the date of the memorial that the apothecary had failed to attend on him when he was suffering from fever; that he had not heard from the District Munsif of his complaint against the apothecary; and that he is not *inclined* to give the names of persons from whom he had heard of it. This vakil, in spite of his connection with the taluk and district boards, has admittedly taken a part in drafting the memorial without caring to verify its contents, as if that was the most appropriate course for him to reach the authorities for punishing a public servant under the control of the local boards, and he has flatly refused, for reasons best known, to mention the names of persons from whom he had heard of the complaints of the District Munsif. He admits that he has not at any time brought to the notice of the taluk or district board any of the complaints against the apothecary embodied in the two memorials. These are, however, matters which I have commented upon in my report on the printed memorial.

6. I shall now deal with the several charges against Mr. John Pillai as chairman of the Tirukkóyilúr union panchayat. He joined the hospital here as the medical officer in charge in May 1894, and in April 1895 he was appointed chairman of the union. It cannot be said that he was more greedy of powers than his predecessor Mr. Krishnaiyar, a local pleader, who it appears was a member of the panchayat as also of the taluk and district boards, and I fail to see how M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal is justified in having introduced paragraph 8 in the manuscript memorial, while he had not grudged the love of power in one of his colleagues. In his statement before me M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal says that he had heard of the apothecary's greediness for power from one of his friends, but that he is not prepared to give out the name of his friend who put him in possession of this information. This shows that there was a deep plot among the enemies of the apothecary and that there was a conspiracy to shoot him in the dark. In this connection I may observe that the District Medical Officer has once expressed it as his opinion that the local medical officer should have a seat in the taluk board as in the case of Mr. D'Sylva of Tindivanam.

7. In paragraph 9 of the memorial, reference is made to the chairman's unauthorized entry in private dwelling houses, and the case of one Sadasiva Pillai, a private

vakil, is quoted as an instance. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal on being questioned on the subject says that it is not possible for him to name the persons who complained of it. As for Sadasiva Pillai himself, he is not one of the signatories to the memorial under report, and yet his supposed grievance seems to have been represented by proxy. In this case, it was Mr. John Pillai who pressed for criminal prosecution against Sadasiva Pillai for the latter having insulted him openly, but in consideration of the special circumstances of the case, it was held that Mr. John Pillai would best assort his dignity by treating Sadasiva Pillai's conduct with silent contempt (*vide* District Board President's letter Ref. on Cur. No. 166-D.B. of 1896, dated 11th May 1896).

8. As regards the alleged unauthorized removal of lanterns referred to in paragraph 10 of the memorial, I have as yet received only one complaint against the action of the chairman Mr. John Pillai, and that was from a contractor named Mr. Hanumantha Row, who figures as one of the signatories to the memorial. The complaint was enquired into, and placed before the taluk board at a meeting held on 29th May 1896 and presided over by the vice-President M.R.Ry. Masilamani Mudaliyar. The matter was disposed of in resolution No. 10, dated 29th May 1896. But in view of the comments made in the resolution on the action of the union chairman and of doubtful ownership of the lantern, there has been some further correspondence from the chairman and the matter has not been finally disposed of by the taluk board. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal, seems to have made use of the information obtained by him as a member of the taluk board, and regardless of the interest of the board embodied it in the memorial and affixed his signature to it underneath that of the complainant Mr. Hanumantha Row himself. The threatened civil action against the taluk board will be awaited.

9. As regards the allegation in para. 11 of the memorial, I find on a reference to the records that the six persons named in the margin were appointed as members of the union panchayat after Mr. John Pillai had his appointment as chairman in April 1895, and that except in two cases Mr. John Pillai did not object to the re-appointment of the out-going members. It does not appear that he had any thing to do with the appointment of M.R.Ry. Ramachandraiyar Avargal, a pleader of the Local District Munsiff's Court. As for (*b*) Muthusawmy Pillai he was recommended by the Tahsildar in place of one Adinarayana Naidu whose re-appointment was righlty objected to by the chairman because of his old age. I recommended Muthialu Chetty (*c*) in place of Arunachala Aiyar, who had resigned his membership, and the chairman had no objection to the appointment. Sadagopa Naidu (*e*), a vakil, was recommended by the chairman in place of one Subbaramanier deceased. As for Govinda Udayan (*f*), he was an out-going member, and his re-appointment was recommended by the chairman himself. It was only in the case of Ramasamy Pillai (*d*) that he was put in place of the out-going member Sama Row (a vakil) at the instance of the chairman, inasmuch as the re-appointment of Sama Row was objected to on the score of his indifference and apathy to union work. This Sama Row, while his re-appointment was under consideration, and some two days after the vice-President had sent me a note suggesting the desirability of enquiring him as to his consent to continue in office, put in a petition to me on 21st January 1896 volunteering his services; but I did not accept his offer as it was thought undesirable to throw obstacles and impede the progress of union work by the addition of a useless member, and as there was already a member in the Panchayat reported against for presistent apposition to progress of work in the person of Govinda Udayan (*f*). The petitioner, Sama Row, who has apparently been backed up by the taluk board members Mr. Sreenivasa Row has affixed his signature to the memorial, and this is another instance of the want of interest of the latter in the proper and efficient management of union affairs. I need hardly observe here that facts have been exaggerated and misrepresented for which Mr. Sreenivasa Row is one of the individuals responsible. It is absurd to suppose that the chairman has almost succeeded in having in the union men of his own liking in the face of the fact that three out of the six new members have signed

(*a*) M.R.Ry. Ramachandraiyar Avargal, December 1895.
(*b*) M.R.Ry. Muthusamy Pillai
(*c*) „ Muthialu Chetti
(*d*) „ Ramasamy Pillai
} March 1896.
(*e*) Sadagopa Naidu.
(*f*) Govinda Udayan.

the printed memorial against Mr. John Pillai—(*a*), (*c*) and (*f*) and that one of them (*f*) has taken a most active part in getting up the memorial as will be seen from the Tahsildar's report on the printed memorial.

10. Referring to paragraph 12 of the memorial, I have to state here that there was no budget provision for any expenditure for making sanitary arrangements at the Keelur festival in February 1896; but a small amount of Rs. 10 was sanctioned as a special case at the request of the chairman. The money was not, however, spent, as it was reported later on that special coolies were not procurable for the purpose, but that the necessary sanitary arrangements were made with the ordinary union staff. The chairman being also the medical officer has done the needful, and there were no complaints when I inspected the locality in the course of the festival. It is very strange that Mr. Sreenivasa Row, who is also a trustee of the temple and who cannot be relieved of his responsiblity for the contents of the memorial, has thought it fit to note this item as one of the complaints against the chairman, while he had admittedly not referred to the correspondence on the subject nor complained to me on the occasion when I was on the spot.

11. The complaint in paragraph 13 of the memorial, regarding the chairman's refusal to carry out the diversion of the water course in the Pennar for drinking purposes is purely imaginary. A small amount of Rs. 25 was sanctioned for the purpose, and the chairman expressed his inability to carry out the work with such a small amount, and suggested the need for professional help. The work was then entrusted to the Tahsildar, who, with aid of village labour and collection of materials for putting up an embankment, did the needful within the sanctioned allotment. The work was also supervised by me personally, and this was certainly not a matter in which the chairman could be taken to task. Mr. Sreenivasa Row pleads ignorance of the agency through which the Tahsildar executed the work and of the details of the actual expenditure, while it is a well-known fact in the town that the Tahsildar collected a number of coolies for the purpose from different villages as also materials; and the records were accessible to have (Mr. Sreenivasa Raw) as a member of the taluk board.

12. The union sweepers and scavengers have not complained against the chairman in the way they are represented to have done in paragraph 14 of the memorial. There was a petition purporting to have been written by the union servants, and containing similar allegations and it was referred to the Stationary Sub-Magistrate for enquiry and report. I found from the report of that officer that the complaint was frivolous, that it was got up for the occasion, and that the petition itself was pseudonymous. This reminds me of a curious incident mentioned to me in the course of conversation by one of the official signatories to the printed memorial. In that case I was given to understand that the Sub-Registrar and vice-President of the taluk board attempted in a scheming manner to secure evidence to prove a charge of the same kind against the chairman, Mr. John Pillai, but that the proposal was subsequently given up. As, however, the information was not communicated to me officially, I am precluded from entering into the details of the case. It is a point worthy of consideration that Mr. Sreenivasa Row, who has drafted the memorial, has recorded such frivolous complaints in the memorial which will serve to stir up the union servants against the chairman, and this is certainly not what is expected of a member of the taluk and district boards. I may also draw your kind attention to the palpably inaugrous statements in paragraphs 14 and 15 of the memorial. When the memorialists or rather the authors of the memorial wanted to represent the imaginary shortcomings of the chairman, they complained in paragraph 14 of his having reflected the sanitary condition of the town by executing private work from the union servants. Again, when they wished to hand him up for neglect of his duty as a medical officer by frequent absence from the hospital during the hospital hours, they have very reluctantly given him a certificate for his good work (*vide* paragraph 15) as chairman of the union by way of inspection of houses for a general revision of house-tax, and of encroachments and close supervision of the work of union servants. The use of a bycicle on occasions in a town like Tirukkóyilúr, which comprises three detached portions in distant parts is certain to result in advantage to the public inasmuch as it facilitates speedy trips from one corner to another. The memorialists could not, however, bear to see the chairman using it at times, and they have taken

him to task as if his object is to parade on public streets. From what has come to my notice, I may say that Mr. John Pillai deserves credit for his earnest and zealous discharge of his duties as chairman, and that if he has erred at all, it was by excessive zeal and warm interest in improving the condition of the union.

13. The memorial closes with a prayer, not for an investigation of the charges set out therein, but for the transfer of Mr. John Pillai, on the allegation that he has proved a failure as a medical officer and chairman of the union. Mr. S. Krishnasamy Aiyar who has signed both the memorials states that he has personally no complaint against Mr. John Pillai; that on the other hand whenever he had occasion to seek his medical aid there was ready compliance with his request; that he knows nothing personally of the complaints in either of the memorials, but that he signed them both because he had understood from some of the respectable vakils and others that Mr. John Pillai was unpopular. This is simply rediculous on the face of it.

14. In conclusion, I beg to state that the charges complained of are purely imaginary, and that the memorial appears to have been got up by a few interested persons as a prelude to the later printed memorial which serves to expose on the stage the real actors, but which will be found destined to share the same fate, in spite of considerable official and vakil influence brought to bear, as will be seen from my report on that memorial.

15. The connected papers as per separate list are enclosed.

Enclosure.

Extract of Remarks from the Visitors' Book of the Local Fund Hospital, Tirukkóyilúr, by the President, District Board, South Arcot.

Inspected the hospital this morning. Found six in-patients (male) in the male ward and two male in-patients in the contageous disease shed, one female patient in the female ward. The wards, compound, out-houses including latrines, kitchen, dead-house were all clean and in good order. Similar remarks apply to the internal arrangements of the hospital. The medicines and instruments were neatly arranged and the latter were clean. The following figures show that this institution is doing good work under civil apothecary Mr. John Pillai who joined on 10th May 1894.

The number of *in-patients* treated in 1894–95 was 159. During the corresponding period in 1895–96, the number was 168. The number of *out-patients* treated in 1894–95 was 10,025 whilst the number treated during the corresponding period in 1895–96 was 10,542.

The following figures show the total number of all patients treated in his hospital during the last five months of 1896, compared with the total number treated in the corresponding month of 1895 :—

	1896.	1895.
April	1,745	1,703
May	2,151	2,021
June	3,383	2,166
July	2,951	2,387
August	2,312	2,467
Total ..	12,542	10,738

The following figures show the number of operations (major and minor) performed by the apothecary during the first two quarters of 1895 and 1896, respectively :—

1st quarter, 1895	65
2nd „ „	132
Total ..	197
1st quarter, 1896	91
2nd „ „	146
Total ..	237

These figures eloquently disprove the allegations recently made by a few local residents that the civil apothecary is unpopular. On the contrary, they conclusively establish the fact that he is doing excellent work and that the popularity of the institution is rapidly increasing under his management.

I find that the number of midwifery cases from 1st January to 31st August 1895 was 28, whilst the total number of these cases for the corresponding period in 1896 was 31. There is evidently room for improvement in this direction.

I find that medicines are given to the public gratis. This seems quite unnecessary in all cases where patients can afford to pay for medicines. The attention of the taluk board president should be drawn to this fact.

Three screens are required for the use of the hospital, and they should be provided by the taluk board at an early date.

(Signed) A. E. CASTLESTUART STUART,
President, District Board.

6*th September* 1896.

Submitted to the President, District Board, South Arcot, through the President, Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr.

(Signed) D. JOHN PILLAI,
Apothecary.

Tirukkoyilur,
7*th September* 1896.

Submitted to the President, District Board, South Arcot.

2. It appears from a comparative statement obtained from the apothecary Mr. John Pillai on 29th July 1896 that the popularity of the institution under his management is on the increase. The figures are noted below for reference :—

	1893–94.	1894–95.	1895–96.
In-patients	127	159	168
Out-patients	9,072	10,025	10,542

There can be no doubt that the public in general who resort to him for treatment appreciate his valuable services, and have full confidence in him. His sphere of duty as a medical officer is not confined to the town of Tirukkóyilúr, and it will be seen from my report on the memorial to be shortly submitted that the allegations against the apothecary of some discontented residents of the town, who appear to have been brought together under questionable influence and interested motives are unfounded and mostly malicious.

3. I am waiting for the Tahsildar's report as to the result of his enquiry which I expect to have in a day or two, and shall shortly submit my final report on the memorial against the apothecary.

4. Action will be taken on the last two paragraphs of the enclosed notes.

(Signed) R. SUNDARASA MUDALIAR,
President, Taluk Board.

Tirukkóyilúr,
13*th September* 1896.

From the President, District Board, South Arcot, dated 25th November 1896, Dis. No. 15-Tour.

Enclosures.

Petition from certain inhabitants of Tirukkóyilúr, South Arcot district, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 8th January 1897.

Most respectfully showeth,—That the petitioners and certain others sent up a memorial to the Surgeon-General in May 1896 and another in July 1896 to the Surgeon-General, the President, District Board, and the District Surgeon embodying their complaints against the then Local Fund Apothecary of the station Mr. D. John Pillai and requesting his transfer from that place.

2. That the said apothecary who had recently been sent out of the station to make room for the permanent incumbent is giving out that he expects soon to be posted back to the station permanently.

3. That the petitioners believe that expectation aforesaid of the apothecary is based upon the reports of the Acting Deputy Collector and the Collector, which, the petitioners respectfully submit, were prepared upon an incomplete and one-sided enquiry held by the Acting Deputy Collector and the Tahsildar.

4. That at the time of the enquiries some of the petitioners requested the Deputy Collector and the Collector (the former in writing also) to permit them to be present at the enquiries, which request was not complied with, though the apothecary had been given the fullest scope to cross-examine the signatories to the memorials and others.

5. That as the Tahsildar was an important witness in the matter, and as he had, subsequent to the first memorial dated May 1896, committed himself to certain statements in the hospital visitors' book very favourable to the apothecary, the petitioners requested that the Tahsildar should not be permitted to conduct any portion of the enquiry; but this request was also not complied with.

6. That the petitioners in their telegram dated 20th September 1896 have also represented to the Surgeon-General about the irregularities of the enquiries.

7. That the enquiries were generally conducted at unusual hours during nights at the houses of the Deputy Collector and the Tahsildar.

8. That the petitioners learn and believe that the said apothecary was suspended several times at different stations, and has been unpopular at various places for which he had to be transferred, which will be evident from a perusal of his service book and the papers connected with his antecedents.

9. The petitioners humbly pray that the threatened retransfer of the said apothecary may not be effected, and before allowing him to come back to the station, they may be allowed the opportunity of being heard by an independent European officer.

10. A copy of the memorial dated July 1896 is herewith submitted.

For this act of kindness the petitioners shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

Petition from certain inhabitants of Tirukkóyilúr Town, to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated July 1896.

Respectfully showeth,—That the civil apothecary Mr. D. John Pillai has been for nearly two years now presiding over the local hospital.

2. That ever since he assumed charge of his office at this station, he has continued to make himself unpopular in a variety of ways and has been unmindful of the medical needs of the people.

3. That he has been for a long time past irregular in his attendance at the hospital, often discourteous in his behaviour towards people anxious to avail themselves of his medical skill, and not unfrequently callous to the sufferings of the unfortunate patients resorting to him for medical aid.

4. That a public meeting was consequently held in this town on the morning of the 24th instant at which several persons came forward with specific complaints against the apothecary, which were noted down by the Chairman for being embodied in this memorial.

5. That on certain occasions, when Messrs. Streenivasachariyar and Naravanaswamy Iyer, Pleaders, and Messrs. Arunachella Naicker, Maurimuthu Naicker, Devanayaga Pillay and Krishnasawmy Udayan, local residents of the town, had to go to the hospital for medical aid, they found the apothecary to be very irregular in his attendance, and some of them had consequently to return home without receiving that aid which they had a right to expect.

6. That according to one David Asary of the Danish Mission he went to the apothecary with a decent conveyance and requested him to call over to his house to see his child, which was then in a dangerous condition, and the apothecary, who was then conversing with a Brahmin vakil, refused to go over to see the patient though the prescribed fee had been offered him, but directed the applicant to bring the child to the dispensary which he could not have done in the state in which the child then was; and when the apothecary actually came over to the applicant's house three hours later, his services proved to be of no avail and the child expired within two minutes after the medicine prescribed by the apothecary had been administered. The petition which the said David Asary meant to present to the District Surgeon on the subject is at his request submitted herewith.

7. That the apothecary declined to attend on the wife of Devarajiah, Headmaster of the local girls' school, when she was in an acute stage of labour about a fortnight ago, without a *previous* payment of a fee of Rs. 15 and he had not even the kindness to pay an ordinary visit.

8. That when Mr. Jayaramchendra Iyer, B.A. and B.L., First-grade Pleader, went to the dispensary at 4 P.M. about twenty days ago taking with him a child which had thrust into one of its nostrils a tamarind seed, the apothecary was not to be found at the dispensary, and that he had to patiently wait until 5-30 P.M. when the apothecary was fetched from his house by the hospital compounder.

9. That on the 2nd of Vyasi of Manmatha (14th May 1895) when the wife of Mr. Arunachella Iyer, a retired Revenue Inspector, was in labour, the apothecary refused to lend the services of the midwife, who had attended on her the previous night, on the plea that she had other engagements; although an earnest request was made to him at 7 A.M. which was repeated at 11 A.M. and the apothecary could not be moved though it was represented to him that the patient was hopelessly bad.

10. That a child of the said Mr. Arunachella Iyer, eleven days old, had a boil on its back which was opened by the apothecary one day; but he flatly declined to attend on it the next day until he was assured of sufficient remuneration; though a respectable request with a carriage was made to him and that before the promise of payment was made, the apothecary passed by the house of the said gentleman that day, but he had not the heart to call over and see how the child was doing.

11. The apothecary, when sent for, refused to call on Mr. Pranatharthyhara Iyer, B.A., B.C.E., Local Fund Assistant Engineer, when he was suffering one day from high fever.

12. That when the attendance of the apothecary was sought for by Mr. T. Varadarajulu Nayadu, B.A., B.L., District Munsif, when he had an abscess, he wrote to him that he had panchayat and hospital work to attend to, and that he would call later on, which he did not do, and that he did not turn up till he was again sent for the next day.

13. That when the said gentleman requested the apothecary's attendance at his house in connection with another abscess at about 7 P.M. one day, he sent word that he was too much tired to call over, and that when, in consequence, he was requested to lend the services of his compounder at least, he refused to comply with this request also on the ground that it was a late hour; and the compounder had therefore to be directly sent for who had the kindness to attend and do the needful.

14. That on another occasion when the daughter of the said gentleman was taken seriously ill at about 1 or 2 A.M. in the night, a lantern and two men were sent to the apothecary with a request for his attendance; but the apothecary refused to call over at that hour although his residence was within a hundred yards of the house of the District Munsif and it was considered unsafe to administer the medicine then sent as the patient had not been seen by him; and he appeared the next day at 7 A.M. when his services were not much needed.

15. That the apothecary did not attend when sent for by Mr. Gopal Row, Inspector of Salt, when he was suffering from ear-ache and he had to seek the aid of the compounder who had the kindness to do the needful.

16. That one Rungasawmi Pillai had his son treated for a fortnight in the dispensary for fever with no effect and when he changed the treatment a cankerous ulcer was formed in one of his jaws for which he has again been placed under hospital treatment and as it emits foul smell, the apothecary does not approach the boy but keeps him at a distance and directs a ward cooly to dress it and the boy is still under such indifferent treatment.

17. That when the Tahsildar Mr. Sundara Iyer had a fall from his carriage at a village six miles from this town, a conveyance drawn by a pony was sent to the apothecary at about 5 P.M., with an urgent request to go over to the place where the Tahsildar was, but he did not choose to comply with the request though the case was one of grave urgency.

18. That the Deputy Collector Mr. Sunderasa Mudaliar once expressed at a meeting of the Taluk Board that a certain person from a village in this taluk had complained to him with tears in his eyes and in a manner which moved him much that the apothecary had refused to go to his village to see his wife who was then in labour and in a dangerous stage, unless the whole of the fee demanded was paid to him at once, though he had been offered a portion of the fees then and there and promised the rest in the village.

19. That although a man from the village of Adichanellore who had fallen from a picota and received severe injuries was brought to the hospital, he was merely admitted as an out-patient and he died within two days after his admission as such.

20. That the apothecary had been at this very station a few years ago and he had to be suspended and transferred for having neglected an in-patient, who, in despair, committed suicide by drowning himself in a well adjoining the hospital.

21. That the apothecary does not command the confidence of the public in his medical treatment so much so, that several, notably the Deputy Collector and the Tahsildar, had on certain occasions to send for medical aid from distant stations at a considerable cost.

22. That the unsympathetic and indifferent nature of the apothecary, as evidenced by the facts above narrated, has rendered him so very unpopular that several leading men of the locality were put to the painful necessity of convening a meeting and making a public representation of their grievances in spite of the risk which they thereby run of precluding themselves from approaching the Apothecary any more for medical aid with any degree of confidence.

In conclusion the memorialists humbly pray that their grievances may be redressed at an early date by the removal of the present apothecary from this station and the appointment of a humane and large-hearted medical officer in his stead. For which act of kindness and generosity the memorialists shall as in duty bound ever pray.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 29th January 1897, No. C.—9.

With reference to my confidential letter No. C.—84, dated 26th November 1896, submitting papers in the case of Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai, I have the honour to state, for the information of Government, that this apothecary has since been suspended by me for three months for surreptitiously removing or causing to be removed from his service book certain pages containing entries regarding his previous suspension on two occasions.

Memorandum No. 378.

The Surgeon-General is requested to submit a copy of his proceedings suspending the apothecary.

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

12*th February* 1897.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 16th February 1897, No. 66.

With reference to your memorandum, No. 378, Public, dated 12th February 1897, I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of my Proceedings, No. 429, dated 29th January 1897, suspending Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai.

2. I also attach, for the information of Government, copies of the Proceedings* of my predecessors regarding this apothecary in 1882, 1885 and 1886.

* Surgeon-General Cornish's Proceedings, No. 4266, dated 15th August 1882.
Surgeon-General Furnell's Proceedings, No. 3251, dated 26th June 1885.
Surgeon-General Bidie's Proceedings, No. O—228, dated 6th June 1886.

Enclosures.

Proceedings of the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, No. 4266, dated 15th August 1882.

Read—letter No. 501 from the Acting Zillah Surgeon, Cuddalore, with enclosures, regarding the conduct of Civil Apothecary John Pillai in charge of the Local Fund dispensary, Tirukkóyilúr, in neglecting to relieve a mendicant, who applied for medical aid on the 12th July last.

Order—No. 4266, dated 15th August 1882.

The Surgeon-General considers that, unless all the witnesses in the case have perjured themselves, the charge of neglect against Civil Apothecary John Pillai is borne out. It is shown by the witnesses that a poor wayfarer in pain and suffering applied at the dispensary, and after waiting for some time, without securing any help, left the place and subsequently fell into a well receiving injuries from which he died.

2. The Civil Apothecary John Pillai denies any knowledge of the man's presence at the dispensary in the afternoon, but if the compounder's evidence is trustworthy, he was duly informed of the presence of a patient seeking relief, and the evidence of the man Babu Singh, shows that he saw the apothecary speaking to the patient, and that he took a message from the apothecary to the compounder requesting him to come to the hospital, which the compounder did.

3. Under these circumstances the Surgeon-General has no doubt that the Civil Apothecary John Pillai did see and converse with the man, but that he was too proud or too lazy to administer a dose of medicine, or to take measures for the relief of the patient in the absence of the compounder, and that owing to the delay in administration of medical relief the man wandered away and met with his death. The Surgeon-General in a circular No. 48 of 21st December 1880 informed medical subordinates that the delegation of their own proper duties to hospital servants would not be permitted and that some punishment would follow breach of rules.

4. Conduct, such as is described in the depositions of witnesses, is simply disgraceful to all concerned. John Pillai has shown himself to be unfit for his position, and will not be again employed in an independent charge until he has shown himself to be more trustworthy.

5. For this act of gross inhumanity and neglect of duty the Surgeon-General directs that John Pillai be suspended from rank, pay and allowances for a period of two months. At the end of the period of suspension he will be posted to some subordinate situation, where he will be under the supervision of a superior officer.

6. The Zillah Surgeon will be so good as to make arrangements in communication with the President for the immediate relief of John Pillai, and to report if any of the district subordinates are fit for the permanent charge at Tirukkóiyilúr.

7. The Civil Surgeon will also communicate with the President, Local Fund Board, in regard to the conduct of the hospital servants at Tirukkóyilúr. So far as the depositions go, the Surgeon-General thinks they are all unfitted for their positions and that it would be advisable to make a clean sweep of the establishment, but this is a matter entirely in the hands of the President of the Local Fund Board.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) A. J. STURMER, Surgeon,
Secy., Surgn.-Genl. with the Govt. of Madras.

Proceedings of the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, No. 3251, dated 26th June 1885.

Read—letter from the District Surgeon, Cuddalore, dated 15th June 1885, No. 23 and enclosures.

Order—No. 3251, dated 26th June 1885.

The correspondence shows that if the charges of neglect of duty and extorting fees from patients are not conclusively proved against Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai in charge of the Local Fund dispensary at Tiruvannámalai, he is eminently wanting in tact and conciliation, and is not fulfilling the purpose for which he has been placed in medical charge of Tiruvannámalai. His antecedent history at Tirukkóyilúr is also against him, where in 1882 he so far neglected his duty towards a sick mendicant who applied for relief, as to have led to his death. On that occasion he was suspended from rank, pay and allowances for two months and removed from independent charge. John Pillai does not appear to have profited by that lesson, and within a year of being re-employed in independent charge, has given occasion for dissatisfaction in the district, and for a request for his removal.

While holding with the District Surgeon that the charges of neglect of duty have not been established, it is very evident from the correspondence that, as medical officer of Tiruvannámalai, John Pillai has not earned the confidence and good will of the people from want of tact and judgment, and is not furthering the object of the Local Fund Board in providing medical relief for the Circle. The District Surgeon will therefore submit the whole correspondence (herewith forwarded) to the President for expression of his views as to whether it would not be desirable to replace John Pillai by a Civil Apothecary who would co-operate with the District authorities in the interests of the tax-payers. In that case John Pillai will be withdrawn to a subordinate charge, where he may be induced to qualify for an independent charge at some future time.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. ELCUM, Surgeon,
Secy., Surgn.-Genl. with the Govt. of Madras.

Proceedings of the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, No. O–228, dated 6th July 1886.

Read—the following papers:—

From the Superintendent, Lying-in-Hospital, Nos. 166 and 170, dated 18th and 20th June 1886, respectively.

From Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai, dated 28th June 1886.

Order—No. O–228, dated 6th July 1886.

The Surgeon-General regrets to receive such frequent complaints against Civil Apothecary John Pillai. In 1882 when attached to the Civil dispensary, Tirukkóyilúr, he so far neglected his duty towards a sick mendicant who applied for relief, as to have presumably led to his death, and was suspended on that occasion from rank, pay and allowances for two months and removed from independent charge.

On restoration to an independent post, charges were brought against him of neglect of duty and extorting fees from patients applying for aid at the Civil dispensary, Tiruvannámalai, and of want of tact and conciliation, and he was again removed from an independent to a subordinate charge.

The present correspondence shows still further neglect of duty on the part of the Civil Apothecary even in a subordinate position. An infant in the Lying-in hospital was found on the 17th June covered with acute scabies. No notice had been taken of the case by John Pillai, no attempt to apply a remedy, no report made to the Medical officer, or to his representative—the Senior Apothecary—on visiting the hospital, nor did the Civil Apothecary know the nature of the ailment. The fact of the admission and neglect were discovered by the Medical officer on the following day—not on the report of the Civil Apothecary, but by an accident.

When spoken to by the Medical officer regarding his neglect of duty and professional ignorance, he "became most insubordinate in manner and bearing," manifesting much contumacy when verbally ordered by the Medical officer to consider himself under suspension from duty.

According to his own showing John Pillai signally failed in his duty, for although the Senior Apothecary, in the absence of the Medical officer, went round the wards after the admission of the infant, John Pillai did not report the admission to him, but "thought best to show the infant the next day to the Doctor on his morning visit" and in that he failed also. In the meantime nothing was done to alleviate the sufferings of an infant covered with acute scabies.

Under all the circumstances of the case, and his previous misconduct coupled with his comparative ignorance of his profession, the Surgeon-General questions the advantage of retaining such a man in the public service; but requests that he may be warned that on the next occasion of misconduct he will not fail to move the Government for his dismissal from the service.

For his present offence the Surgeon-General sentences him to be suspended from duty and pay for one month, with effect from date of suspension by Surgeon-Major Branfoot.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. BIDIE, M.B., C.I.E.,
Surgeon-General with the Govt. of Madras.

Proceedings of the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, No. 429, dated 29th January 1897.

Read—the following papers:—

From the Superintendent, Government Maternity Hospital, No. 831, dated 1st December 1896, reporting that the service book of Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai sent to him for verification by the District Medical and Sanitary Officer, South Arcot, does not contain the pages bearing the entries regarding the Apothecary's suspension.

From the District Medical and Sanitary Officer, Minute No. 193, dated 16th December 1896, and No. D-C., dated 21st January 1897, forwarding the Apothecary's explanations.

Order—No. 429, dated 29th January 1897.

It is observed from the above correspondence that a new service book having been opened for Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai, doing duty Cuddalore, on the plea that the old one was in an unserviceable condition, it was sent by the District Medical and Sanitary officer, South Arcot, to the Superintendent, Government Maternity Hospital, Madras, for verification of the period during which the Apothecary was attached to his hospital.

2. While verifying the entries in the book with the records in the hospital, the Superintendent found that the new book contained no entries regarding the suspensions of the Apothecary, and on examining the old service book he discovered that the pages which contained such entries were missing from it.

3. The matter having been reported to this office, the Apothecary was called upon for explanation. He states that he is unable to account for the missing pages and that he only copied in the new service book such entries as were to be found in the old one.

4. The Apothecary's explanation is most unsatisfactory. He knew perfectly well that he was suspended more than once in his service and that the entries of such suspensions were made in his service book—so that if he had no connection with the surreptitious removal of the missing pages from the old book, he ought to have reported the fact to his medical officer when, in the course of preparing his new book, he found that the old one did not contain the missing pages.

5. His neglect to do so and his attempt to get the new book—without the entries of his punishments—passed through point to the fact that the pages from the old book were removed either by himself or at his instance or with his cognizance.

6. The presumption, supported as it is by very clear circumstantial evidence, is so strong that the Surgeon-General does not consider that the Apothecary can be given the benefit of doubt.

7. Such dishonest conduct on the part of an official calls for his summary dismissal, but in the present case, in the absence of direct evidence, the Surgeon-General considers that the ends of justice can be met by a lighter punishment. He accordingly directs that Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai be suspended for three months from his duty, pay and allowances from date of receipt by him of this order.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. SIMPSON, M.B., Surgn.-Captain,
Secy., Surgn.-Genl. with the Govt. of Madras.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 3rd March 1897, No. C.—20.

With reference to your memorandum, No. 513, dated 1st March 1897, I have the honour to forward Civil Apothecary John Pillai's letter of explanation, dated the 25th August 1896.

2. I also enclose, as requested, his appeal against his suspension in 1882 together with the District Medical and Sanitary officer's report thereon. His statement that the appeal resulted in his being restored to his office is wrong. The only effect of the appeal was that his suspension was reduced from two months to one month, but the order about his removal from independent charge stood fast, as will be seen from Surgeon-General Cornishe's remarks in pencil on the back of the report of the District Medical and Sanitary officer, South Arcot. I would also draw your attention to the proceedings of my predecessors in 1885 and 1886, copies of which were sent with my letter, No. 66, dated the 16th February 1897, and which will show that his punishment in 1882 was not cancelled.

From Apothecary D. JOHN PILLAI, dated 11th March 1897.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 13th March 1897, No. C.—25.

In continuation of my letters quoted in the margin, I have the honour to forward herewith an appeal submitted by Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai against his suspension as ordered in my proceedings No. 429, dated 29th January 1897, a copy of which has already been forwarded to Government, with my letter No. 66, dated 16th February 1897.

No. C.—9, dated 29th January 1897.
" 66, dated 16th February "
" C.—20, dated 3rd March "

2. According to G.O., No. 788, Public, dated 23rd October 1894, punishments by one of medical subordinates other than dismissal are not appealable, but as the Apothecary insists on his appeal being sent to Government in spite of this order, I consider it best to do so, and to lay the whole facts before Government.

3. On the 1st December 1896, I received an official letter from the Superintendent, Government Maternity Hospital, which I reproduce below for ready reference:—

I have the honour to forward, herewith, correspondence regarding the verification of entries in a new service book for Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai (with the old service book and a new one). I observe that the papers on which references were made to his suspension from duty in 1886 when posted to this hospital are missing, and I have reason to believe that entries referring to a former suspension (1882) are also missing from the book. A great deal of valuable time and trouble has been expended in verifying these entries, and if I had signed the new book as requested by the District Medical and Sanitary officer, South Arcot, no mention would have been made of suspension from duty when the Apothecary was at this hospital. I forward the books now, as I think that some explanation should be given by the Civil Apothecary regarding the torn and partially-destroyed record of service and the attempt made to obtain my signature to what would have been a false record.

* * * * * *

4. This was no doubt a very serious matter and the Apothecary was called upon for an explanation. His reply was not only unsatisfactory but evasive, as discussed in my proceedings quoted above.

5. His present appeal is chiefly based on his presumption that he explained to my satisfaction at a personal interview that the original service book had never been mutilated. On the other hand I was never before more convinced of the service book having been tampered with as I was when I closely inspected it. I send it herewith for the inspection of Government. It will be seen that the pages not being numbered in print, there is no difficulty whatever in some of them being removed or replaced by new ones and the fact that in the present instance all sheets are separate and joined together by a thread considerably confirms this suspicion. Above all, it will be noticed that the entries in the book from 1881 to 1889 (the period which comprised the two occasions the Apothecary was suspended) are all in the Apothecary's own handwriting instead of in the handwriting of the medical officers under whom he was employed or of their clerks, as is the case in all the subsequent entries. Moreover not a single entry from 1881 to 1889 has been attested by any medical officer as provided for in column 12 of the book, as is the case in all other entries, and the sheets containing entries from 1881 to 1889 are in a better and more serviceable condition than the latter portion of the book which was used much after them. All these facts coupled with Brigade-Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel Branfoot's evidence of having seen and remembered the entries of suspension in the book, conclusively prove that the book was tampered with, and the handwriting of the Apothecary is a sufficient proof of his complicity and guilt.

6. His other statements call for no remarks—suffice it to say that there was not the least prejudice against him in this office as will be seen from my letter No. C.—84, dated 26th November 1896.

7. I would request the attention of Government to the intemperate nature of the language in the appeal as it originally stood and which has been slightly modified on the Apothecary's attention being drawn to it.

Order—No. 793, Public, dated 25th June 1897.

His Excellency the Governor in Council is of opinion that the suspension of three months inflicted on Civil Apothecary John Pillai for failure to bring to notice the omission from his service book of the entries relating to his previous punishments was well merited, and his petition will accordingly be dismissed. A perusal of the later correspondence read above shows the Apothecary in a most unfavourable light, and the Government therefore directs that he be severely censured and that such censure be recorded against him. The allegation in John Pillai's petition that the signature of a public servant in his service book does not entail on him responsibility for the entries therein cannot be accepted; a public servant is responsible for everything that he signs. The Surgeon-General should take due notice of the discreditable way in which the Apothecary's service book has been kept.

2. With regard to the public meeting held at Tirukkóyilúr, the Government observes with surprise that among the individuals who took a prominent part were several officers of Government, certain retired public servants, and two members of local boards. That these persons should have assisted at a public meeting held for the purpose of attacking the official character of a public servant, was most improper, and they are deserving of severe censure for what, as they must have been aware, was a gross breach of decorum.

3. These proceedings will be communicated to all departments of the Secretariat for communication, in view to officers in the public service being warned to abstain from action of the nature of that commented on above.

(True Extract.)

for Chief Secretary.

To the Surgeon-General.
„ the Revenue Department.
„ the Local and Municipal Department.
„ the Judicial Department.
„ other Departments of the Secretariat.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyengar.

5 Sc. Asst Dwarandhies

Marine Department

Government {1897} of Madras.

PUBLIC.

Recd. / Regd. } 1897.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., No. 793, 25th June 1897.

Received 1st July 97
Communicated to the Officer.
by Due
Vr

To
The P.P.O.

JUNE.

Civil Apothecary John Pillai.

Dismissing, with remarks, petition from — appealing against the order of the Surgeon-General suspending him for three months for failure to bring to notice the omission of certain entries from his service book; commenting on the conduct of certain officers of Government, &c., who have assisted at a public meeting held for the purpose of attacking the official character of —, a public servant; and communicating the proceedings to all departments of the Secretariat in view to its communication to officers in the public service.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers :—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 3210, dated 31st July 1896.

Read—the following letter from M.R.Ry. M. GOPALA ROW, Inspector of Salt, Abkári and Customs Revenue, Tirukkóyilúr Circle, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Salt, Abkári and Separate Revenue, dated 24th July 1896, No. C. :—

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, Routine No. 2160, dated the 16th instant, calling on me to report if the facts mentioned in a letter published in the *Hindu* of the 27th ultimo are true, I beg to state that the contents of the said letter are true. The following Government servants were present at the meeting referred to :—

M.R.Ry. T. Varadarajulu Naidu, B.A., B.L., District Munsif, Tirukkóyilúr.
„ A. Ramalinga Iyer, M.A., Lecturer, Rajahmundry College.
„ C. Narasimha Charri, Inspector of Police, Tirukkóyilúr.
„ V. Masilamony Mudaliar, Sub-Registrar, Tirukkóyilúr.
„ M. Gopala Row, Inspector of Salt, Abkári and Customs Revenue.
„ T. Mathava Row, Prosecuting Inspector of Police, Cuddalore.
„ V. Narayana Row, Retired District Munsif.
„ L. Arunachala Iyer, Retired Revenue Inspector.
„ A. Nadamuny Naidu, Retired Taluk Clerk.

Resolution—Mis. No. 3210, dated 31st July 1896.

Submitted to Government with reference to its official memorandum, No. 101, Revenue, dated 13th July 1896.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) EDMUND MILLETT,
Assistant Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Endt. No. 1547-R.

Transferred to the Public Department, with reference to office-note, No. 135-A, dated the 9th ultimo.

Ootacamund,
10*th August* 1896.

(Signed) A. T. ARUNDEL,
Secy. to Govt., Revenue Dept.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 2nd September 1896, No. 401.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 17th September 1896, No. 434.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 25th September 1896, No. 447.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 16th October 1896, No. 481.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 23rd October 1896, No. 489.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 11th November 1896, No. 522.

From the President, District Board, South Arcot, dated 25th November 1896.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 26th November 1896, No. C.-84.

With reference to your memorandum, No. 1355, Public, dated the 9th July 1896, and this office letter ending with No. 522, dated the 11th November 1896, I have the honour to state that the report in the case of Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai of Tirukkóyilúr has just been received from the Collector of South Arcot and is herewith forwarded for the information of Government.

2. The report consists of letter No. C, dated the 18th November, from the Collector and two letters from the Deputy Collector and President of the Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr, who conducted the inquiry, together with a copy of the covering memorandum, No. 2-C, dated the 20th November 1896, from the District Medical and Sanitary Officer. I have kept back the voluminous enclosures to the Deputy Collector's reports as the facts are very clearly and lucidly discussed in the reports themselves, thereby doing away with the necessity of reading through them.

3. It will be seen from these reports and the Collector's letters that the apothecary has been made the subject of a base conspiracy on the part of the Brahmanical and other officials and vakils of the place, simply because he was not subservient to them and did his work honestly. He has been fully acquitted of the charges and allegations contained in the memorials submitted by the conspirators which have been proved to be malicious and entirely devoid of foundation.

4. Civil Apothecary John Pillai has since been relieved of his acting appointment at Tirukkóyilúr by the permanent incumbent in the ordinary course ; the Collector however considers it desirable that he should be re-appointed to the station so that the public may be convinced that such machinations as have been brought to light will not be allowed to succeed. I agree in this view, but as at present there is no other appointment available for the permanent incumbent, I have posted John Pillai to do duty at Cuddalore until arrangements can be made for retransferring him to Tirukkóyilúr. I however await the instructions of Government regarding the Collector's proposal.

5. I fully concur with the Collector that the conduct of the accusers calls for exemplary punishment, and I trust that they will be dealt with in such a way as to protect medical subordinates from such base and malicious public charges in future.

Enclosures.

From Surgeon-Major J. C. MARSDEN, District Medical and Sanitary Officer, South Arcot, to the Secretary to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated Cuddalore, 20th November 1896, No. 2-C.

The papers in question are submitted herewith, together with confidential letter, No. C, dated 18th November 1896, from the President, District Board, South Arcot, which reviews the whole case.

2. There are two sets of papers from the President, Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr, consisting of reports, with enclosures, concerning (*a*) the manuscript memorial and (*b*) the printed memorial against the apothecary.

3. I have already, in my No. 135, dated 19th September 1896, submitted some remarks on the case, noting that my predecessors had reported favourably on this apothecary. He is also held in good repute by all the European officers in the district who are acquainted with him.

4. During my recent inspection of Tirukkóyilúr, I was quite satisfied with his work and he appeared popular with all except the memorialists. I took the opportunity of meeting the leading petitioners (those who were present in the station), and I heard their complaints, as well as the apothecary's explanations.

The complaints are all detailed in the accompanying file of correspondence.

The explanations I considered satisfactory. The apothecary is of a nervous disposition and he was disposed to be too verbose and, perhaps, not sufficiently alive to the fact that the district munsif was his official superior. He had, however, received great provocation and a little advice on this point seemed to be all that was needed.

5. In my opinion, the apothecary has cleared himself of the grave charges brought against him and he is most painstaking and diligent.

6. But it seems very evident that his position as union chairman has interfered with his other duties and has led to friction. I think that post should not be held by the medical officer.

7. It is also very evident that several of the memorialists have a strong grudge against him and they have, accordingly, raked up old stories, though they made no complaint at the time of the alleged occurrences.

Nothing can justify their conduct in this case.

From A. E. CASTLESTUART STUART, Esq., President, District Board, South Arcot, to the District Medical and Sanitary Officer, Cuddalore, dated Cuddalore, 18th November 1896, No. C.

I have the honour to forward, for your information and transmission to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, the confidential reports Nos. 9 and 10 of 1896, dated 29th September 1896, of the Deputy Collector, Tirukkóyilúr, and President of the Tirukkóyilúr Taluk Board, on (1) the manuscript and (2) the printed memorials submitted against Mr. John Pillai, late Civil Apothecary and Union Chairman of Tirukkóyilúr, in original, together with their respective enclosures.

2. The Deputy Collector and Taluk Board President has made a most thorough and exhaustive inquiry. His reports are so complete and the records are already so voluminous that I shall do as little as possible to swell the literature of the subject. I may state that whilst at Tirukkóyilúr lately I made personal inquiries which satisfy me that the Deputy Collector's conclusions are correct and his lucid exposition of what was a base conspiracy organized by a few officials of the place to ruin a brother official leaves little room for further comment. It was my intention to have addressed the heads of the various departments to which the implicated officials belong on the subject of the gross misconduct of their subordinates, but this would involve considerable delay in making several copies of the records, and this I desire to avoid having regard to the reminders received for these reports.

3. The inquiry has disclosed that the late Civil Apothecary, Mr. John Pillai, is entitled to be fully acquitted of the malicious charges recklessly brought against him by a few public servants and others whose animosity he appears to have incurred on account of his zealous performance of public duties, both as a medical officer and as chairman of the union at Tirukkóyilúr, and his personal independence of character. Had he been subservient to the district munsif in particular, it is improbable that this spurious agitation would have been manufactured in the manner disclosed by the Deputy Collector's reports. Mr. John Pillai has abundant material for both civil and criminal action against his traducers, but his reputation is in the hands of Government, to whom I request that the Surgeon-General will be so good as to forward these papers for orders—so far as the implicated officials are concerned. I am of opinion that, in the public interests, exemplary punishment should be meted out to the ringleaders.

4. The inquiry proves that the ringleaders were the following :—

(1) M.R.Ry. T. Varadarajulu Naidu Garu, District Munsif of Tirukkóyilúr,
(2) „ V. Masilamony Mudaliar Avargal, late Sub-Registrar of Tirukkóyilúr and Vice-President of the Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr,
(3) „ Srinivasa Row Avargal, First-grade Pleader of Tirukkóyilúr and Member of the District Board, as also of the Tirukkóyilúr Taluk Board,
(4) „ C. Narasimha Chariar Avargal, Inspector of Police, Tirukkóyilúr,
(5) „ Gopala Row Avargal, Inspector of Salt and Abkári Revenue,
(6) „ Govinda Odayar Avargal, Member of the Tirukkóyilúr Union Panchayat, and
(7) „ Sadasiva Pillai Avargal, a private Vakil of Tirukkóyilúr.

5. The records prove that the principal offender was the District Munsif of Tirukkóyilúr. It is astonishing that an officer in his position should, to gratify personal spite for imagined slight which, if it occurred at all, occurred some twelve months previously, have taken so prominent a part in the public meeting convened to condemn a brother officer in another department. That nine of the eleven pleaders of his court should have supported him is not surprising having regard to native character—or the absence thereof. He was ably seconded by the leading local vakil M.R.Ry. Srinivasa Row Avargal who did not consider it improper, though a member of a district board and also of the taluk board, to which the civil apothecary was directly subordinate both as the local medical officer and the chairman of the local union, to take a most prominent part in these scandalous proceedings. He admittedly drafted the manuscript memorial and was one of the five persons selected as a sub-committee of the public meeting to draw up the printed memorial, both of which may be characterized as a concatenation of misrepresentations. The Sub-Registrar M.R.Ry. Masilamony Mudaliar Avargal also took a very prominent part in the matter and attempted to induce the forest ranger to join the conspirators. This sub-registrar was reported to me to be endeavouring to tamper with the witnesses. He was accordingly transferred at my request by the Inspector-General of Registration, and, I believe, he is now in the Salem district. The Police Inspector M.R.Ry. Narasimha Charriar Avargal signed the memorial and took part in the meeting and attempted to induce the local sub-magistrate to join in the nefarious plot. The inspector of salt and abkári referred to has since been transferred; but his transfer had no connection with his part in this agitation. Govinda Odayar, a member of the union, was intriguing against his own chairman, the apothecary. The private vakil not being an official, may well be treated with contempt.

6. If the public servants who are implicated in this conspiracy had any valid grievances against the civil apothecary either in his capacity as a medical officer or as chairman of the union, they could easily and, of course, should have made their complaints against him to the proper authorities in the proper way. But for them to have banded together to get up a public meeting, touting for signatures and declaiming against a brother public servant, signing mahazars against him containing the most reckless and false charges, was an intolerable breach of the public rules and subversive of all discipline. No public officer can be expected to do his duty fearlessly if at any moment he is liable to find himself the object of hostile declamation in the streets at a public meeting deliberately convened by and presided over and attended by brother officers whose malevolent eloquence is in inverse ratio to the

truth of their utterances. The license of the native press of this country is such that ample scope is afforded for anonymous libellers to defame public servants with practical impunity; but this press has established for itself such a reputation for deliberate misrepresentation that its malicious vapourings can best be treated with merited contempt; but where, as in this case, public servants have not hesitated to conspire together publicly to attack a brother public servant, condign punishment is, in my opinion, imperatively necessary in the interests of public administration. Such agitation is expressly prohibited by rule 68 of the "Rules regulating the personal conduct of public servants."

7. As agitators of this kind are dangerous to the public peace and order, I venture to make the following recommendations for such consideration as they may be considered to merit by His Excellency the Governor in Council:—

(*a*) That the misconduct of the district munsif be brought to the notice of the High Court in view to his prompt transfer after such reduction, suspension or other punishment as may be deemed proper.

(*b*) That the sub-registrar referred to be suspended and reduced.

(*c*) That similar punishment be awarded to the inspectors of the police and of the salt and abkári, the latter to be subsequently transferred.

(*d*) That M.R Ry. Srinivasa Row Avargal, the district and taluk board member, be removed from the local boards under section 24 (1) (iii) of Act V of 1884, and his re-appointment or re-election be prohibited for a period of three years.

(*e*) That M.R.Ry. Govinda Odayar Avargal be similarly dealt with in respect of his appointment in the union panchayat.

8. In conclusion, as I understand, that Mr. John Pillai has lately, in the ordinary course, been relieved of his appointment at Tirukkóyilúr by the reversion of the permanent incumbent. I am of opinion that as this is just what the conspirators have been working for, it is desirable, if not absolutely necessary, that he should be re-appointed to Tirukkóyilúr at a very early date, so that the public may be convinced that such machinations as have been brought to light will not be allowed to succeed. In the public interests such a course seems expedient, for otherwise the transfer of this apothecary at this juncture must give rise to deplorable misconstruction. He has done excellent work at Tirukkóyilúr and the hospital figures afford the best evidence of his popularity. I append copy of my inspection notes passed on the 6th September 1896 which also bears the remarks of the Deputy Collector, and Taluk Board President. I am confident that the Surgeon-General will not for a moment tolerate such intrigues as have been laid bare by the Deputy Collector and the retention of this medical subordinate at Tirukkóyilúr for some months at least to come together with the punishment of his traducers would, I think, be the best possible answer to the mahazars under reference.

From M.R.Ry. R. SUNDARASA MUDALIYAR Avargal, Deputy Collector on General Duties and President, Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr, to the Collector of South Arcot, dated Tirukkóyilúr, 29th September 1896, No. 10.

Adverting to your endorsement, dated 10th July 1896, on a printed memorial against Mr. John Pillai, Civil Apothecary, Tirukkóyilúr, I have the honour to submit his explanation with all the connected records as per enclosed list, and to report as follows.

2. The memorial was the outcome of a public meeting convened at Tirukkóyilúr on the morning of the 24th June 1896. Among the members present were the leading officials of the Judicial, Registration, Police and Abkári departments, as also most of the vakils of the local bar. The president of the meeting was Mr. Gopala Row, Inspector of the Salt and Abkári department, and he is stated to have taken notes of the several complaints made by some of the members present against the civil apothecary. It was resolved that as the local Apothecary Mr. John Pillai had been for a long time inattentive to his duties and had become highly unpopular and inaccessible to the public on occasions of urgent nature, a memorial should be submitted to the Surgeon-General, the Collector and the District Surgeon praying for

his removal from this station, and that a sub-committee of five gentlemen should draft the memorial and do the needful with special reference to the complaints made at the meeting.

3. According to the memorial itself the individuals who are stated to have represented at the meeting the complaints against the apothecary of their own or of others numbered only sixteen, while the signatures affixed to the memorial exceed 180. It was not possible to trace out all the signatories, nor could it be conceived how so many could have had any grievance in the absence of specific mention of it in the memorial itself. I therefore apportioned the work of examining the Tamil signatories to the Tahsildar, and requested him to submit a report detailing the circumstances which brought about the public meeting. His elaborate report which speaks volumes against the memorialists themselves is herewith submitted. He has examined some twenty persons, and I have recorded the statements of seventeen others, most of whom are officials and vakils.

4. It is necessary for a correct understanding of the whole facts of the case to deal with the subject in different sections, and I therefore propose to divide it into three sections as detailed below:—

I. The specific grievances embodied in the manual.

II. How, by whom, and with what motive a public meeting was arranged for, and the memorial drawn up with special reference to the action of public servant, members of the local board and of the union panchayat.

III. The popularity of the medical institution at Tirukkóyilúr.

5. *Section I.*—Of the sixteen persons who complained against the apothecary at the public meeting, six individuals are confined to a vague complaint of irregular attendance at the hospital referred to in paragraph 5 of the memorial, three gentlemen who had either no complaints to make or who had no desire to press their grievance are shown to have given utterance to the supposed grievances of four others who were not present at the meeting, and of whom only one was made to sign the memorial, and two persons—father and son—who are living together are shown in paragraphs 8 to 10 as two different complainants. Hence the actual number of individuals with specific complaints has to be taken as only seven.

As for the first charge of irregular attendance specified in paragraph 5 of the memorial, I examined the three persons named in the margin. The Tahsildar has examined a few others whose names do not appear in the body of the memorial. No one is able to specify the exact date and hour when they found the apothecary absent from the hospital, nor has any person who happened to go to the hospital cared to inquire if the medical officer had gone elsewhere on duty. This is an accusation, which it is easy to make, but not possible to bring home to the person charged, in the absence of particulars as to dates and hours. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Chari, who admits his obligation to the apothecary for gratuitous treatment, speaks of the absence of that officer from the hospital on some occasions, probably in November 1895. He cannot, however, specify the days and he has admittedly made no inquiry as to the cause of late attendance. He admits, however, having received medicines at the hospital about that time almost continuously for fifteen days. This vakil has, in the course of his examination before me, added a fresh count of charge—indifferent treatment—which does not find place in the memorial. On being questioned on this point, the vakil says that he considered his treatment indifferent, because he thought that the apothecary had been engrossed with other thoughts when he (vakil) narrated his case, but that he is unable to state definitely his reasons for calling the treatment an indifferent one. The vakil states that some two or three months after November 1895, he sent to the apothecary, without any demand, Rs. 4 with a letter thanking him for his services, and stating that the amount was not an adequate remuneration for his services; but that the money was returned by the apothecary with a note expressing that he valued friendship more than money. It may well be concluded how far the

(1) M.R Ry. Sreenivasa Charriar, Second-grade Pleader, Tirukkóyilúr.
(2) Ratnasabapatti Mudaliar, Head Clerk, Stationary Sub-Magistrate's Office.
(3) Marimuthu Naik, a ryot.

charge of indifferent treatment can be believed. In explanation of the omission of this new count of charge from the memorial, the vakil contents himself by attributing it to those who drafted the memorial, while he has affixed his signature to the memorial in English with a long title as Pleader, District Munsif's Court, Tirukkóyilúr, and he is one of the two gentlemen who signed a notice for convening the public meeting.

M.R.Ry. Ratnasabapathi Mudaliyar says that the apothecary has been uniformly kind and courteous to him, that on some occasions, when he happened to go to the hospital at about 7 A.M., the apothecary was not present, but that he is unable to give the dates, and that he made no enquiries as to the whereabouts of the officer at the time.

One Marimuthu Naik, who is stigmatized by the medical officer as an ex-convict says that he went to the hospital on one occasion at 7 A.M., and again the next day, that on the first day he was told that the apothecary had gone to the missionary's bungalow, that the apothecary was not seen the next day, but that he cannot mention the exact dates of his visit. This man seems to have uttered a deliberate falsehood by saying that he signed the memorial at the public meeting, while as a matter of fact it was drafted subsequently, and to have acted under the influence of one Govinda Udayar, who figures very prominently as will be seen from the sequel.

6. The next complaint is that of one David Carpenter, a Christian of the Local Danish Mission, and he was examined by the Tahsildar (*vide* page 15 of his report, dated 15th September 1896). In this case, the charge is that the apothecary refused to attend at the house of David Carpenter on a certain day in the first week of May 1896 for the treatment of his baby, five months old, though the child was then in precarious state. It is however admitted by the complainant that the baby was daily taken to the hospital and placed under the treatment of the apothecary for about ten days prior to its death, and that even on the last day when the medical officer's services could not be procured at his quarters, that officer was solicitous about the state of the child, in having deputed two or three persons to go and ascertain why the child was not brought to the hospital, and that the apothecary eventually turned up, in his own carriage, after 9 A.M. The apothecary's explanation is that he had paid due attention to the treatment of the baby, which was suffering from high fever coupled with lung complications, that on the last day when he had a call from David Carpenter during hospital hours, he explained to him the advantages of treatment in the hospital, and asked him to bring the child as usual, that David Carpenter consented to do so and returned home, that as the child was not brought up as agreed to, he (apothecary) ascertained through a servant of the hospital the state of the child and proceeded thereafter to the house of David Carpenter. It is also stated by the apothecary that he had attended at his quarters and treated gratuitously his other children in two severe cases of illness, and that this will be amply testified to by his own wife and other Christians. The apothecary has sent up a copy of a letter from the European Danish Missionary to the District Surgeon, which amply testifies to the good work of the medical officer done to the poor Christians without any charge and most willingly. It appears from the Tahsildar's report that David Carpenter was set up to prefer his complaint some six weeks after the death of his baby by a private vakil named Sadasiva Pillai, who owes a grudge to the apothecary in his capacity as union Chairman (*vide* correspondence ending with your letter, No. 166-D.B., dated 11th May 1896, in the Local Fund Branch). I need hardly say that the complaint of David Carpenter is quite unfounded as aptly remarked by the Rev. S. Berg. It is very strange that the fact of the previous treatment of the very baby by the apothecary has been suppressed from the memorial.

7. The next complainant is one Devarajaya, a girls' school teacher, Tirukkóyilúr, whose grievance is set out in paragraph 7 of the memorial. It is stated there that while Devarajaya's wife was in acute stage of labour, the apothecary declined to attend without *previous* payment of Rs. 15. The word "previous" is italicized in the memorial with a view to draw the attention of the authorities. But Devarajaya himself has on being cross-examined by the apothecary denied that the latter had refused to attend without *previous* payment. It is admitted by this teacher that the

apothecary sent the midwife to attend on the labour case in his house, and that on being told by the apothecary that the woman would have to be relieved by the application of instruments, Devarajaya hesitated, and that he proposed to consult elderly people. The apothecary is said to have demanded a fee of Rs. 15, and asked Devarajaya to make arrangements sharp. In this case there seems to have been a misconception of facts. Devarajaya says that when the prescribed amount of fee was mentioned to him, he did not offer anything less in consideration of his impoverished circumstances, and he understood the words of the apothecary "arrangements should be made soon" to mean steps to procure the fee required. But according to the apothecary's explanation, he wished to hurry his visit and to ask Devarajaya to decide once for all whether he had no objection to handling the case himself. Devarajaya was apparently in a fix when he was suddenly told that the woman in his house would have to be delivered by a male member of the medical profession at a time when he (Devarajaya) had gone to the apothecary's quarters simply to bring back the midwife. Hence it will be seen that no great weight can be attached to this complaint based on a misconception of facts. I have also heard of several instances of gratuitous treatment of labour cases by Mr. John Pillai, and there is no reason to suppose that in this particular instance he was unusually hard.

8. In paragraphs 8 to 10 of the memorial, Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar, B.A., B.L., first grade pleader, and his father Arunachala Aiyar figure as complainants, and the former has made his statement before me both for himself and his father, a retired revenue inspector. As regards the absence of the apothecary from the hospital between 4 and 5–30 P.M., Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar says that he does not remember the exact day when he took his step sister to the hospital who had thrust a tamarind seed in her nostril, that the apothecary was not then at his quarters, that no enquiry was made as to the whereabouts of the apothecary, and that the apothecary turned up after 5–30 P.M. and relieved the child. The vakil does not remember if the apothecary accounted for his absence by saying that he had been to the Sub-Magistrate's Court as a witness. The date is approximately fixed as one between the 10th May and 22nd June 1896, and the apothecary says that on that particular day he was absent in the Sub-Magistrate's Court which is corroborated by the compounder. Thus it will be seen that the complaint is not worth the paper in which it is set forth, and that it was apparently intended to swell the number of charges against the apothecary.

The next complaint embodied in paragraph 9 of the memorial is even according to the complainant's own showing a total misrepresentation of facts. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar admits that the hospital midwife did attend on his step mother in labour from 10 P.M. of the 13th May 1895 till 5 A.M. the next day, that finding the case too difficult for her she left his house at 5 A.M., saying she would go and consult the apothecary, that subsequently the midwife did not turn up, that his (Jayaramachandraiyar's) cousin Ramanadaiyar misunderstood what was wanted and went to call the apothecary instead of the midwife, that at about 10 A.M., Ramanadaiyar was again sent to the hospital to bring the midwife, and that he returned without the midwife and said that she had gone out to attend on some other case of labour. Mr. Arunachalaiyar was averse to allowing the apothecary to handle the case, though he had volunteered his services as admitted by Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar himself, and the hospital midwife had already expressed her inability to treat the case. I do not see how the apothecary or the midwife can be blamed in the circumstances. The apothecary says that as the midwife was unable to cope with the labour case, he sent her to attend on another labour case at Keelur, and I find from the birth register of Keelur village that on 14th May 1895 one Kaluvarayan had a son born dead. This goes to support the statement of the apothecary, and the information furnished by Ramanadan to Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar seems however to urge that his step mother's case should have been given preference. This is absurd on the fact of it inasmuch as the midwife was not quite equal to the task, and her services could be better utilized in the other case at Keelur. The midwife nevertheless turned up in Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar's house at 2 P.M. on 14th May 1895. The language in the memorial in regard to this complaint that the apothecary could not be *moved* is quite meaningless, if not malicious, and yet the very same Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar was one of the members of the sub-committee who drafted the memorial. It should be here noted that this complaint was thirteen months old at the date of the meeting.

The next complaint set forth in paragraph 10 of the memorial refers to the treatment of a baby eleven days old born to Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar's step mother spoken of in the labour case just disposed of. The apothecary opened a boil on the back of the baby at Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar's quarters some ten days after delivery, and on this occasion there was admittedly no delay in attendance on the part of the apothecary. The next morning when the apothecary passed along the street, without the necessary dressing materials and on some unknown business, he did not enter the house to see how the child was getting on (and it is not known to Mr. Ramachandraiyar if the apothecary then enquired Ramanadan about the child), nor was he invited by Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar to attend on the baby. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar was admittedly inside his house at the time. Immediately after Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar says he sent his cousin, Ramanadan, with a carriage to hospital to bring the apothecary, and Ramanadan returned without the apothecary, and explained that he was then very busy in the hospital. It was not then expressly given out by Ramanadan that the apothecary demanded fees, and that his failure to attend was attributable to it, though it was understood from Ramanadan's conversation with Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar that that might be the case. Ramanadan was again sent to the apothecary with an assurance as to the payment of any fee that might be demanded. At about 10 A.M., apparently after the hospital work was over, the apothecary went to Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar's and dressed the boil but refused to receive a sum of Rs. 5 though offered by Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar, explaining that he would receive the fee only after the child was cured. The apothecary attended at Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar's quarters more than twelve days, and cured the baby completely. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar never noticed any indifference in his treatment during the time the apothecary attended on the baby, and eventually sent of his accord Rs. 20 to the apothecary as his remuneration. Now I would ask would any same man, who cannot bring himself to stoop to foul means and misrepresent indubitable facts so much in favour of the apothecary, think of complaining against that very officer, and express his imaginary grievance in such strong language as to induce the authorities to believe that the medical officer was devoid of even the rudimentary principles of humanity, and heartless in exacting money, without regard to the sufferings of the patients. In fact, Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar has practically withdrawn all his complaints, and on being questioned as to the wording of paragraph 10 of the memorial purporting to have been drafted by himself and his comrades, members of the sub-committee. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar says that the words in paragraph 10 are not his own, and that his father Arunachalaiyar does not know English. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar candidly admitted before me, when questioned as to why the good services of Mr. John Pillai were not represented at the public meeting, that the meeting was convened to condemn and not to applaud the action of the medical officer. I may, however, observe here that the candour and outspoken manner in which as a gentleman Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar has made his statement before me regardless of the dire consequences of incurring the wrath of the district munsif, and his friends, which seem to have threatened other members of the local bar, deserve consideration.

9. Paragraph 11 of the memorial deals with the grievance of Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar, Local Fund Assistant Engineer, who was not present at the meeting, and who seem to have signed the memorial under pressure from the Sub-Registrar Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar. It is said in the memorial that the apothecary, when sent for, *refused* to call on Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar when the latter was suffering one day from *high fever*. In his statement before me, Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar says that on 11th February 1896 he had fever (not high fever) that that day between 6 and 8 A.M. (hospital hours) he sent word to the apothecary asking him to attend at his quarters—two furlongs from the hospital—that he was informed that as the apothecary was then busy at the hospital, he had expressed his inability to comply with the request, that the compounder was however sent to him with the required medicines from the hospital, and that the fever subsided that night. Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar adds that the apothecary went to him the next morning and enquired about his health, and on being questioned as to the health of my child he (apothecary) gave out that it was in a critical state the previous day, that he (Pranathathihara Aiyar) knew that the apothecary had also to attend on my baby the previous day,

that before seeing the memorial in print, he had no serious attention of complaining against the apothecary, that he never desired any one to represent his grievance to the authorities or at the public meeting, that as the memorial in print did not fairly set out the whole facts of his case, he added a note in pencil at the close of paragraph 11 that the apothecary attended the next day when his services were not in need, but that as the sub-registrar objected to the appearance of such a record (favourable to the apothecary) in the body of the memorial itself, the pencil entry was scored out, and the same note repeated in ink just above his (Pranatharthihara Aiyar's) signature. The complaint is in itself shown to be frivolous, to say the least of it, inasmuch as the medical officer could not, in justice to his duties, be present in the hospital and at the same time in Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar's house to attend to an ordinary case of fever, but the highly reprehensible conduct of the officers in intentionally suppressing a salient fact from the body of the memorial, and transferring a note of it to an unnoticeable portion of the memorial amidst a number of signatures deserves comment. I shall, however, deal with the action of the officials in a separate section as premised. In his explanation in regard to this complaint, the apothecary rightly points out that the wording in the memorial is not justified by the facts deposed to by Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar himself, which do not refer to "high fever" and "refusal to attend" and that being unaware of the strained relations between himself (apothecary) and the Sub-Registrar, Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar, allowed himself to be carried away by the pressure of the sub-registrar, who had throughout acted with a sinister motive.

10. The next complainant, whose grievances are embodied in paragraphs 12, 13 and 14 of the memorial, is M.R.Ry. T. Varatharajulu Naidu Garu, B.A., B.L., District Munsif of Tirukkóyilúr. He wished to avoid his personal attendance before me for open enquiry on the score of his official position and the unpleasant idea of meeting the apothecary, and sent me a written statement of the facts of his complaint. But as his complaints had no reference to his official capacity, and as the apothecary stoutly protested against admitting on record any statement of the district munsif made behind his back and untested by cross-examination, the district munsif after much hesitation consented to depose before me. He pressed his charges most vehimently, added to a new charge which does not find place in the memorial, apparently because the three complaints in the memorial were all no less than ten months old on the date of the public meeting which he attended, and made an elaborate statement which I had to record on two days successively for full twelve hours.

The first complaint in chronological order is set forth in paragraph 13 of the memorial. The district munsif says that he had an abscess near one of his knees, and he sent word to the apothecary at about 7 P.M. on 28th July 1895 for dressing the abscess. The apothecary sent word in reply that he was much tired and could not therefore call over. A message was again sent to the apothecary asking him to send the compounder at least, but even this requisition was not complied with. The compounder was then sent for independently of the apothecary, and he (compounder) turned up at 8 P.M., and did the needful. The apothecary had already commenced the treatment and was asked by the district munsif either to attend himself, or to depute his compounder. On the morning of the *29th July 1895*, the apothecary attended on the district munsif at his quarters and continued to do so for about two days from that date. There was no need to cut open the abscess. On the night of the 28th July 1895 when the compounder turned up he bandaged the abscess in such a manner that it might not fall away during sleeping hours, applying to the abscess what the apothecary had previously prescribed. It is admitted by the district munsif that he might himself have bandaged it. In connection with this complaint, the apothecary says that if there was any real requisition for his attendance, he would certainly have attended on the district munsif as he had done before and after that date, that it is impossible for him to remember, after the lapse of nearly a year, the minute details of every individual case treated by him, and that it was usual with the district munsif and his people to apply for his services even in trivial cases. I would request a reference to the apothecary's explanation with regard to this and other complaints against him.

As regards paragraph 12 of the memorial, the district munsif's complaint refers to the treatment of another abscess near his anus, and in connection with this he *wrote* to the apothecary asking him to attend at his quarters on the *10th August 1895* to which he received a reply that, as it was a meeting day of the panchayat, and as he might be fully occupied with the hospital work, the apothecary could not call over *in the morning* and that he would attend later on. The district munsif waited till 12 noon without going to court, but the medical officer did not turn up. The apothecary's note, dated 10th August 1895, on a scrap of paper was preserved for full one year, and produced by the district munsif on *16th August 1896*. The district munsif admits that the apothecary turned up the next day (11th August), and that on the 12th August he opened the abscess as he had undertaken to do the previous day. The apothecary says that, to the best of his recollection, he went to the house of the district munsif in the afternoon of the 10th August 1895, and learnt that he had left his court which he would not have done if the disease was a serious one. But the district munsif refuses to believe it, and his contention is that had the medical officer appeared after his going to court, his servants would have given information of it. It is really very strange that the district munsif preferred to rely on his servants as to what happened a year ago, and would not believe the apothecary, though the district munsif's absence from his house could be ascertained without directly enquiring his own servants. I may also observe here that I find from an extract from the hospital visitors' book that it was on the 10th August 1895 that Mr. Roberts, the Assistant Collector, visited the hospital, and recorded his notes in the book.

The next paragraph (14) deals with the complaint of the district munsif in regard to the treatment of his daughter. He says that on the *22nd August 1895* at about 1 A.M., his daughter was seriously ill, and that he sent a lantern with two servants to the apothecary with an urgent request that he should come over to see the patient. The men returned with a medicine and said that the apothecary could not be induced to come at that hour. The medicine was not however administered as the apothecary had not seen the patient. In this instance there was no written communication between the district munsif and the apothecary. The apothecary says that he had seen the girl the previous evening at his quarters, and given the necessary medicines to be taken at stated hours for the night, that to the best of his recollection on that very night at about 9 o'clock a servant of the district munsif sent by his wife orally reported the state of the child, and asked for certain instructions as to the administration of medicine and diet for the night, that he forthwith gave the required instructions, and attended on the child the next morning, and that the allegation that the child which was stated to be very seriously ill at 2 A.M., was all right the next morning is enough to indicate the simple nature of the disease.

The fourth complaint of the district munsif which, for the first time, was brought to notice in his written statement sent to me on 16th August 1896, *i.e.*, seven weeks after the public meeting, refers to the apothecary's failure to attend on him in the early part of March 1896, when he (district munsif) had slight fever, and when a female member of his household had sent word to the apothecary in his name. It is however admitted by the district munsif at the close of sheet No. 6 of his statement made before me that the apothecary attended on him when he had slight fever. It is not clear whether this was not the occasion spoken of as referring to March 1896. The apothecary says in his explanation that to the best of his recollection, he saw the district munsif at his quarters and prescribed medicines on 5th March 1896.

As for remuneration * to the apothecary, the district munsif has attempted to show by a peculiar classification of the medical officer's visits, into official and friendly, and visits entitling him to remuneration and no fees, that the visits for which any fee was due were not more than the value (Rs. 5) of a tennis bat, which he had given him in the middle of 1895, and Rs. 3 which he has sent in cash on two different occasions after January 1896. The apothecary denies having received more than Rs. 2 in cash and says that, on receipt of this amount on 18th February 1896, he sent him a note thanking him and pointing out this payment as a new departure in his case, that the bat was merely given as a loan, and that the district munsif had

* *Vide* apothecary's separate list enclosed of medical attendance and quality of medicines supplied.

refused to accept Rs. 5 offered as its price. The bat was returned to the district munsif immediately after the meeting and that very day, and it was accepted by him. The district munsif wants me to believe that as the scale of fees for private attendance of the medical officer had not been fixed, there was no payment throughout the year 1895, except by way of the tennis bat, which he says, he intended to serve as remuneration, though he had not openly expressed it. But the district munsif did not care to know what was the fee due, apparently because he never meant to pay, and does not remember to have maintained a record of the number of official visits at his quarters and is unable to produce that officer's letter written to him so recently as 18th February 1896, while he has carefully preserved notes as to the dates of all his complaints against the apothecary, though nearly a year and old, and the scrap of paper written to him by that officer so far back as 10th August 1895. A careful perusal of the district munsif's statement made before me will convince the reader that he has strenuously and by a sustained effort tried his utmost to withhold or deny every information which may be construed favourable to the apothecary, that he has exerted to fill up all possible loopholes where the medical officer can be expected to afford reasonable explanation, and that he has positively asserted everything unfavourable to that officer even though the events referred to happened some months ago, and he based his assertions on the oral informations given him by his servants, who acted the part of messengers between himself and the apothecary. In this aspect, the district munsif's statement is a striking contrast to that of his Pleader Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar, which is marked for candour and fairness. It is to be regretted that the district munsif's memory fails just where what may be elicited from him is likely to favour the contention of the apothecary even in regard to recent events, but his memory is very strong and probabilities rush in where an assertion touching incidents many months old is likely to bring home a charge to the medical officer. It seems as if the district munsif has carried a little too far his judicial acuman, and allowed his sense of fair dealing as a judicial officer to be overpowered by predominant self-interest. I shall however return to this subject in another portion of this report where it will be shown how much he has worked to bring about the memorial under report. His complaints are mainly based on what he was told by his servants, and the information was with reference to what happened some ten months ago. In the light of the explanation furnished by the apothecary, I cannot attach any weight to the charges, and the tennis bat incident will suffice to show at once whether it was becoming on an officer in the position of the district munsif to have treated the bat as a remuneration for the professional visits of the apothecary, while it was originally given him as a loan, and subsequently as a present when its price was offered by the apothecary. I may also observe here that the exact dates of the several complaints now given out by the district munsif do not find place in the memorial, that he has purposely omitted to sign the memorial, and that in a portion of his statement before me he says he is not responsible for the wording in the memorial.

11. The next gentleman who appears on the stage is Mr. Gopala Row, Inspector of the Salt and Abkári Department, Tirukkóyilúr circle, who had the honour of presiding at the public meeting held on 24th June 1896. He appears to have been smarting under some imaginary grievance against the apothecary in that he was not courteously received at the hospital on the occasion of his first visit without previous intimation, and that the apothecary had refused to give him a medical certificate to enable him to apply for sick leave. These two personal grievances all shown to be quite unfounded by the Tahsildar in his accompanying report, dated 15th September 1896, inasmuch as the apothecary was not to blame for omitting to do what he was not competent to do in the matter of sick certificate to be granted to a gazetted officer, and that Mr. Gopala Row should have previously announced his position when he first visited the hospital.

It is stated in paragraph 15 of the memorial that the apothecary did not attend, on being sent for by Mr. Gopala Row, when he was suffering from ear-ache and he had to seek the aid of the compounder who had the kindness to do the needful. Mr. Gopala Row evaded open enquiry in the presence of the apothecary, and he has sent me a written statement wherein he has improved his complaint by adding throat-ache to ear-ache. It appears from the explanation of the apothecary and his compounder's statement that Mr. Gopala Row never applied for medical aid for ear-ache, that

when Mr. Gopala Row wanted some medicine to apply to his throat, it was sent to him through the compounder, that there was no requisition from him for the services of the apothecary, that the disease, throat-ache, was introduced in Mr. Gopala Row's written statement after the apothecary recorded the statement of his compounder in regard to it, and that the accusation is quite unfounded and malicious. Mr. Gopala Row says in his written statement, dated 5th August 1896, that the apothecary was highly unpopular, and that a majority of the people have lost their confidence in him, while as a matter of fact several members of his own family are shown by the hospital records to have received in full confidence medical aid at the very same hospital managed by Mr. John Pillai. Mr. Gopala Row has purposely omitted to sign the memorial, though he was the president of the meeting. As he was subsequently transferred to Nandyal he could not be cross-examined by the apothecary. His unwarranted aspersions, out of interested motive, on the popularity of the apothecary, deserve severe notice.

12. The next complainant is one Rangasami Pillai, a peon of the local *District Munsif's Court*. His complaint as set forth in 16 of the memorial is that his boy with a cancerous ulcer in one of his jaws was placed under the treatment of the apothecary, that as the ulcer was emitting foul smell the apothecary kept him at a distance, and had the ulcer dressed by a ward cooly, and that the boy was under indifferent treatment. There is a marginal note in manuscript in the handwriting of the sub-registrar that the boy died since the date of the memorial, as if the death was due to indifferent treatment. But Rangasami Pillai, who does not know English, has in his statement before me distinctly stated that he noticed no sort of indifference in the treatment of the boy, that the apothecary regretted the result of the quack treatment in the interval and even apprized him of the dangerous consequences of it, but never ordered the boy to be kept aloof, that the boy's mother used to keep him at some distance because of the bad smell, that the apothecary examined the boy on the first day, and prescribed medicines, and that the boy was given the same kind of treatment as was given to the other patients in the hospital. It is also evident from this peon's statement that on the day of the public meeting he was sent for through another peon of the district munsif, and asked by the sub-registrar, Mr. Sreenivasa Row, and the retired district munsif to make a statement of his boy's case, that the sub-registrar and the district munsif are friends and that the former evinced special interest in enquiring about the death of the boy in the house of the district munsif. The only complaint of this peon is that the apothecary did not go near the boy after the first day, though the boy was every day taken in his presence and given prescription. It was the compounder who gave medicines to the boy as prescribed by the medical officer and the ulcer was washed by the ward cooly as is generally done in the case of other patients. There is virtually no valid ground of complaint against the apothecary. Facts have been distorted and misrepresented with unworthy motives for which the Sub-Registrar, Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar, was one of the few responsible. The language in the memorial is greatly misleading, and the sub-registrar who drafted it had an ulterior object which will be dwelt upon later on. This complaint having completely fallen to the ground the apothecary says that there is no need for him to offer his explanation in regard to it. This is one of a series of unsuccessful attempts at multiplying the charges against the apothecary, and the peon being a subordinate of the district munsif seems to have been induced to say something against the medical officer at the public meeting, apparently because he was encouraged by the presence of his master there with a number of complaints of his own against the same officer.

13. The next grievance embodied in paragraph 17 of the memorial is that of M.R.Ry. S. Sundraiyar, Tahsildar of Tirukkóyilúr. It was represented at the public meeting by the Sub-Registrar, M.R.Ry. Masilamani Mudaliyar, though the latter was not desired to do so. The tahsildar was not one of the members of the public meeting, nor has he affixed his signature to the memorial. The sub-registrar says that when he happened to meet the tahsildar on two occasions, he (sub-registrar) voluntarily mentioned to him that the apothecary had not been kind enough to attend on him forthwith, that the tahsildar did not contradict, and that in the course of his conversation with the tahsildar it was clear that he preferred native treatment to that

of the apothecary. It was therefore inferred by the sub-registrar that the tahsildar had a complaint against Mr. John Pillai, and he discharged the self-imposed duty of giving utterance to it by representing it to the chairman of the public meeting. The report of the tahsildar, dated 21st September 1896, which I have obtained regarding the allegations in paragraphs 17 and 21 of the memorial will go to show that he had not a shadow of grievance against the apothecary, that that officer did comply with his request and attend on him (tahsildar) as early as possible, that he (tahsildar) had a fall from horseback on 18th June 1895 at a place 9 miles from Tirukkóyilúr, and not from a carriage at a village 6 miles from the town as stated in the memorial, that his case was not one of grave urgency as stated in the memorial, that there was no *urgent request* for the attendance of the apothecary, that the expression "a conveyance drawn by a pony" was inserted in paragraph 17 of the memorial with a view to induce a belief that it was a swift conveyance, while, as a matter of fact, the pony which was the property of the sub-registrar himself was well known to be the slowest creature unable to walk even 2 miles an hour, and that he (tahsildar) had recourse to native treatment in September 1895 because of the simple nature of the disease he was then suffering from, and of his having, on a previous occasion, when he had an injury in his forearm by a fall, treated with indifference the instructions given him by the apothecary. The words of the tahsildar in the concluding paragraph of his report under reference may be quoted here for facility of reference—

"I beg to observe that I was neither present at the meeting, nor have I signed the memorial, nor have I asked any of those present at the meeting to represent my grievances, if any. The sub-registrar has nevertheless, to show himself in his true colours, discharged his self-imposed duty of representing me as one of the complainants, and in doing so, he has, as shown above, acquitted himself in a way most unbecoming, to say the least of it, an officer of his position, inasmuch as he has freely indulged himself in reprehensible distortion and suppression of facts with an ulterior object which pervades the memorial."

In this connection, I may also bring to notice that the tahsildar visited the hospital on 7th June 1896, *i.e.*, seventeen days before the date of the public meeting of which nothing was then known, and noted in the visitors' book that the institution was very popular, and that great credit was due to Mr. John Pillai for the interest he took in his work. It is absurd to say in the face of these remarks recorded so recently, that the tahsildar had really any grievance against the Apothecary, Mr. John Pillai. At page 26 of his report, dated 25th August 1896, Mr. John Pillai has, in view of the various false charges maliciously urged against him in the memorial, applied for permission to prosecute some of the leading men for defamation and damages if not also for false information; and this is a matter for the consideration of the authorities.

14. The next complaint set out in paragraph 18 of the memorial is represented as one which proceeded from myself, and this was, as admitted by the Sub-Registrar, Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar, ventilated by him at the public meeting. Here again there is a culpable suppression of facts. A few days after I joined this division, a ryot from a distant village represented to me in the office that he was unable to pay the high fee demanded by the apothecary for attendance in his village on a labour case. As I was informed that the scale of fees and the distance limit had not been fixed by this taluk board, I could not satisfactorily settle the matter. Subsequently, the subject came up for decision at a meeting of the taluk board, and I was for fixing the lower scale of fees referred to in the Government Order in consideration of the poverty of the masses in this division, and in support of my view I referred to the particular incident as admitted by the sub-registrar, who, as vice-president of the taluk board, was present at the meeting. The lower of the two scales was adopted, and a distance limit of 12 miles was fixed in a resolution of the taluk board at the meeting. This does not show in the least that Mr. John Pillai was unreasonable in his demands, or that he was unduly cruel in the particular case. The sub-registrar has apparently availed himself of his connection with the taluk board and misused the information he had obtained as a member and vice-president of the board to serve his end. The apothecary says that the distance he was desired to travel by the ryot in the case under reference was about 15 miles, that he had brought no conveyance, and that he was not prepared to pay any fee. I may say that if I had thought that Mr. John

Pillai was in any way to blame in the matter, I would certainly have called for his explanation, and settled the matter. But I had no just cause of complaint in the absence of definite rules on the subject, and the matter was therefore dropped at the time.

In paragraph 21 of the memorial, a reference is made to my having sent for medical aid from a distant station at a considerable cost as if I had no confidence in the medical treatment of Mr. John Pillai. This is another instance of exaggeration and misstatement of facts. In the course of twenty days from the close of January 1896, three children in my family died one after another, and they were not exclusively under the treatment of Mr. John Pillai. The first child had an attack of dysentery when I was absent in camp 40 miles off. It was for some days under the treatment of a native physician in my absence, and when Mr. John Pillai took up the case he found it almost hopeless. The child died immediately after my return to Tirukkóyilúr. Mr. John Pillai tried his best and devoted great attention to the treatment of the other two children, who were also occasionally under the treatment of others, but his labours proved fruitless. A woman from a village 5 or 6 miles from Tirukkóyilúr was sent for at the instance of the female inmates of my house for the treatment of the last baby, simply as a last chance, but after some days she gave up the baby as hopeless of cure. The woman was thereafter sent back with a remuneration of a few rupees. This course was adopted not because of want of confidence in the apothecary, but because we had to try the last chance as is occasionally done even by professional medical officers. It is very strange that so much has been made of this incident to condemn the apothecary as a medical officer who does not command confidence of the public. Even a few months ago, the apothecary has successfully treated my surviving children when they were suffering from fever. The Tahsildar, Mr. Sundara Iyer, says that on many occasions after he had a fall from his horse, he had recourse to the treatment of Mr. John Pillai for himself, his wife and children. It will thus be seen that the allegation in paragraph 21 of the memorial rests on very shaby foundation, and that it is calculated by the authors of the memorial, of whom the sub-registrar is one, to unfairly represent Mr. John Pillai as an unworthy member of the medical profession. I shall return to this subject when dealing with his general popularity.

15. The last specific charge against the apothecary is recorded in paragraph 19 of the memorial, and the officer who took upon himself the responsibility of representing it at the public meeting was Mr. Narasimma Chariar, the Inspector of Police, Tirukkóyilúr Division. This officer attended the meeting on 24th June 1896, and he has signed the memorial on 2nd July 1896, in his capacity as inspector of police. He says that he has made a report in his diary to the Superintendent of the convening of the public meeting, and of its object. It is not known if he has made his official superior understand that he figured as one of the complainants against the apothecary. He says distinctly that he had no grievance of his own against Mr. John Pillai, that on the other hand he was very much thankful to him for his having taken special care of his brother and treated him for a month for lunacy, that his requisition for the medical services of Mr. John Pillai was always readily complied with, that for all such services no remuneration was at any time demanded or paid, that even when a remuneration was offered, Mr. John Pillai declined to receive it, and that so far as medical treatment is concerned, he (police inspector) had no complaint against the apothecary. The police inspector had however official complaints against the Apothecary Mr. John Pillai in his capacity as a medical officer and union chairman. This is the very inspector of police who is responsible for the scandalous insinuation in paragraph 19 of the memorial that Mr. John Pillai is indirectly responsible for the death of a Pariah from Adichanallur, who had sustained injuries by a fall from a piccotah, and who, according to the memorial, died some two days after he was refused admission as an in-patient in the hospital in February or March 1896. In his statement before me, the inspector says that he had the information from an unknown female relation of the deceased Pariah, that when the latter was taken to the hospital, he was not taken as an in-patient, and that the medical officer had not taken sufficient pains to treat the patient. The inspector says that he got this information some ten days after the death of the injured Pariah, that the Pariah was not sent to the hospital by the police, and that no enquiry was made if the Pariah offered to be taken as an in-patient, and if he had not already been under the treatment of a native quack. There is

nothing said in the memorial itself of the indifferent treatment now spoken of by the inspector, and this was apparently a subsequent improvement to aggravate the charge against Mr. John Pillai. On referring to the records of inquest in this case, I find that the police reported the case as one of accidental death, that in reply to a reference from the sub-magistrate, the apothecary stated that, according to the information of the Pariah, he had sustained the injury by a beating, and that, after some correspondence on the subject between the magistrate and the police, the sub-magistrate examined certain blood relations of the deceased and others and found that the case to be one of accidental death. The police did not relish the idea of the apothecary furnishing certain information contrary to the line of their action. If there was any real ground of complaint against the apothecary, the blood relations of the deceased being the aggrieved parties would certainly have mentioned it when they were examined by the sub-magistrate in about five days after the death; but, as a matter of fact, I find no such thing in the records of the sub-magistrate's enquiry. The fact seems to be that the inspector had for about a year been cherishing strong official grudge against the apothecary, and he availed himself of the opportunity of a public meeting countenanced by officials and vakils to defame Mr. John Pillai by representing the imaginary grievance of an unknown person. It will be seen from what follows that the inspector is one of the worst offenders without a particle of gratitude for the gratuitous medical aid which he had so often received from Mr. John Pillai. The object in recording this unfounded complaint in paragraph 19 against Mr. John Pillai and in referring to his antecedents in a parallel case some years ago in the next following paragraph 20, needs hardly any comment, and the authors of the memorial, of whom the sub-registrar was certainly one, seem to have ingeniously exercised their powers of exposition by such an arrangement and sequence of allegations to improperly influence the authorities against Mr. John Pillai. The apothecary says that his suspension referred to in paragraph 20 of the memorial was some fifteen years ago, and that it was cancelled on his appeal. The records in the Surgeon-General's office may, if necessary, be referred to on the subject.

16. This memorial as its predecessor, the manuscript memorial already reported on by me, closes with a prayer not for the investigation of the various charges against the apothecary, but for his immediate transfer from the place. I have shown above in detail that the charges are utterly unfounded and imaginary, and it will be apparent from the sequel that in some instances they are malicious, and that the memorial was got up simply to pander to the wishes of a few discontended influential men in the town.

17. *Section II.*—On a perusal of the records of my enquiry and of the reports of the Tahsildar of Tirukkóyilúr, dated 15th and 21st September 1896, coupled with a consideration of the facts brought to notice by the apothecary in his report, dated 25th August 1896, I am led to conclude that the chief instigators of the public meeting and the subsequent printed memorial under report were the gentlemen named below, and that but for the district munsif such a well-attended public meeting would not have been possible:—

(1) M.R.Ry. J. Varatharajulu Naidu Garu, B.A., B.L., District Munsif, Tirukkóyilúr.
(2) M.R.Ry. V. Masilamani Mudaliyar Avargal, late Sub-Registrar and Vice-President, Taluk Board.
(3) M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal, 1st Grade Pleader and a Member of the District and Taluk Boards.
(4) M.R.Ry. C. Narasimma Chariar Avargal, Inspector of Police, Tirukkóyilúr Division.
(5) M.R.Ry. Govinda Udayan, Landholder and Member of the Union Panchayat.
(6) M.R.Ry. Sadasiva Pillai, Private Vakil, Tirukkóyilúr.

The first named gentleman felt aggrieved because, according to the information given him by his servants, the apothecary had refused to attend at his quarters on the 28th July 1895, and on the 10th and 22nd August 1895. In regard to these complaints, I may state here briefly that it was only on one occasion (10th August 1895), there was communication in writing between the two officers, and there was

then a satisfactory reply from Mr. John Pillai. The district munsif says that for the attendance of the apothecary on his son for a sham head-ache, he sent through his peon one rupee to Mr. John Pillai, the receipt of which is denied by the latter. It cannot be said in regard to this paltry sum either of the officers is uttering falsehood. Again the district munsif says that in March 1896 when his aunt sent word to the apothecary to attend on the district munsif for slight fever, Mr. John Pillai sent an hospital servant to the district munsif's house to ascertain how the sick child was getting on. In fairness to both the officers, the reasonable inference is that, in the first instance, the money was misappropriated by the peon, and that, in the second instance, some wrong information was given to Mr. John Pillai. These instances spoken to by the district munsif himself are sufficient to show what amount of confidence can be placed on his servants, and how far they can be relied on for accurate information. Whatever it may be, it was and it still continues to be the impression of the district munsif that the apothecary is to blame for not responding to his calls. In September 1895 when he (district munsif) went to see the tahsildar then on sick bed accompained by his friend, the sub-registrar, he was observed by the tahsildar to welcome every information against Mr. John Pillai. The district munsif had not the moral courage to represent his complaints in writing to the authorities, and he sought for a device of mentioning them in his private conversation with my predecessor Mr. Rajaratna Mudaliar, who left the district on transfer in the middle of October 1895, and then abandoned the idea of putting in a written complaint, though he seems to have cherished a plan of getting rid of Mr. John Pillai. The sub-registrar being his close friend and vice-president of the taluk board seems to have come in for aid. At the meeting of the taluk board held on 13th November 1895 at which Mr. Raghaviah presided, the sub-registrar moved a resolution on the pretext of economy to replace the two apothecaries in the division by second-class hospital assistants, as if lives of men are not so precious as the maintenance of roads, and the motion was seconded by his comrade Mr. Sreenivasa Row. A resolution was accordingly passed by a majority of the board, the dissenting members being the tahsildar and a vakil by name Mr. Parthasarathi Aiyangar. But even this attempt to replace Mr. John Pillai proved unsuccessful, inasmuch as the resolution of the taluk board was, on mature consideration, vetoed by the district board in spite of vehement support by Mr. Sreenivasa Row in the district board. I joined the division in the middle of December 1895, and the district munsif says that, on the very day of my assumption of charge, he made me understand that the apothecary was an indifferent medical officer. I do not remember to have heard of it. But it goes to show that the district munsif wished to influence me at the very outset against Mr. John Pillai, and eventually to secure his transfer. This was certainly not a commendable course. I subsequently noticed in the sub-registrar a spirit of opposition to Mr. John Pillai chiefly in his capacity as Chairman of the Tirukkóyilúr Union. I had then, however, no knowledge of the details of the past events. In February 1896, the sub-registrar and Mr. Sreenivasa Row, who as members of the taluk board had been requested to report on house-tax appeals, complained to me that the Union Chairman, Mr. John Pillai, had refused to lend one of the union servants to help them in inspecting the houses in the union and I pacified them and gave them the required aid. In April 1896, there was a report from Mr. Holman, Inspector of the Salt and Abkári Department, complaining of the action taken by Mr. John Pillai on sanitary grounds and bringing to notice his unpopularity. The report was referred to me, and I have in my endorsement on the tahsildar's report, Dis. No. 392, dated 24th May 1896, in the Local Fund branch, represented to you that the sub-registrar was lightly suspected of having set up Mr. Holman against Mr. John Pillai, and that the latter was not to blame in the matter. Again, on 7th May 1896, there were two petitions purporting to have been signed by seven union servants and complaining against Mr. John Pillai for exacting from them his private work. One of these petitions was addressed to you as President, district board (*vide* endorsement, dated 12th May 1896), and the other to the District Surgeon, and they were referred to me for disposal. The petitions were referred to the Stationary Sub-Magistrate for inquiry, and his report, dated 22nd June 1896, shows that the petitions were pseudonymous, that they were believed to have been got up by some of the enemies of Mr. John Pillai and that the union servants examined had no complaint against that officer—*vide* file enclosed.

Again, there was a manuscript memorial, dated May 1896, and addressed to the Surgeon-General. This contained a number of charges against the apothecary and union chairman, and it was, as admitted by Mr. Sreenivasa Row, drafted by himself. I have already reported on the memorial in my confidential No. 9 of 1896 and shown what action was taken in regard to it by Mr. Sreenivasa Row. Most of the allegations in the manuscript memorial against Mr. John Pillai in his capacity as apothecary are repeated in the printed memorial. On the very day (23rd June 1896) on which I received the manuscript memorial for report as to the genuineness of the signatures in it, a notice was issued for convening a public meeting the next morning (24th June 1896) which resulted in the printed memorial under report. The notice of the meeting was signed by Mr. Sreenivasa Row and another vakil, Mr. Sreenivasa Chariar.

In his statement before me, the district munsif says that he was not aware of the public meeting till he got the notice on the night of the 23rd June 1896, that he cannot say that it struck him at the time that he would be called upon to state what he had to say against the apothecary, that it was not mentioned in the notice that people should be ready with their complaints when they go to the meeting, and that nevertheless on the morning of the meeting day he took with him the apothecary's letter, dated 10th August 1895. He adds that he might have casually mentioned to some of his vakils his complaints against the apothecary. I may also observe here that nine out of the eleven vakils practising in his court have taken part in the public meeting, affixed their signatures to the printed memorial, while only one of them had specific complaints againt Mr. John Pillai, that five out of the eighteen signatories to the manuscript memorial in which his complaints are referred to are his vakils, and that, while I was recording his statement on 18th August 1896 after 5 P.M. to suit his convenience, four of his vakils headed by Mr. Sreenivasa Row who are all signatories to the printed memorial just like a number of others, sent a letter to me requesting to be present at the enquiry and put some questions to him, which, however, was not complied with inasmuch as the district munsif did not require their presence. It appears further from the tahsildar's report, dated 15th September 1896, that it was at the instance of the district munsif that Mr. Ramalinga Aiyar, M.A., who was put as a member of the meeting, was sent for and that it was the wish of the district munsif that his vakils should not expose his friend, the sub-registrar. Mr. Sreenivasa Row, who signed the meeting notice, says that he does *not like to give out the names of the persons* from whom there was a requisition for convening *the public meeting*. Similarly, Mr. Sreenivasa Chariar, who was a joint signatory to the meeting notice, has declined to answer the apothecary's query as to who took part in drafting the notice. Further, it is distinctly stated by Mr. Jaga Ramachandraiyar, B.A., B.L., another vakil of the same Court, but with quite different turn of mind as stated already, that the sub-registrar and the police inspector took the meeting notice to him and told him that he should attend the meeting and represent his grievances. This fact is, of course, denied by these two officers. It appears also from what is stated by Mr. Murugasa Pillai (the sub-magistrate) that the police inspector went to him on the morning of the meeting day and made him understand that he should also attend the meeting, when the Salt Inspector's carriage was kept waiting for him. This is further supported by other statements recorded by the tahsildar. There is also a statement taken from the Forest Range officer to the effect that he was invited by the sub-registrar to attend the meeting. Now I would ask whether the impression produced on reading together the various statements with due regard to the probabilities of the case is not such as to lead one to the conclusion that the meeting was pre-arranged among the district munsif, the sub-registrar, the inspector of police and Mr. Sreenivasa Row, and that there was a strong combination among them to press the charges as best as they could and to make the meeting a thorough success? Mr. Sreenivasa Row is unable to account satisfactorily for having resorted to memorials and a public meeting against the apothecary, a public servant under the control of the local board, in preference to representing, as he had a right to do, the charges or grievances at the taluk or district board of which he is a member, and his conduct deserves notice. I have no hesitation in concluding that the vakils joined together to support the district munsif, the sub-registrar whose recent departure on transfer he seems to have regretted very much, was ready to lend his helping hand, that the inspector of police smarting under some official

grievance against Mr. John Pillai, which will be detailed below, was of some use in arranging for the meeting and securing the attendance of members, and that Mr. Gopala Row, who had some unfounded complaints against Mr. John Pillai, was induced to preside at the meeting and invite complaints from the members present.

The inspector of police mentioned to me, after I closed his statement, that the misunderstanding between him and the apothecary arose from the date of the Tirukkóyilúr murder case disposed of a year ago, and on this information I referred to the records. In register case No. 3 of 1895, disposed of by the then Sub-Magistrate Mr. Krishnasamy Aiyar, on 10th June 1895, Mr. John Pillai gave evidence which went to show that it was a real case of murder, and the Sub-Magistrate has passed very severe strictures on the reprehensible and suspicious conduct of the police including the inspector (*vide* preliminary register enclosed for reference). In this case it does not appear that any notice was taken of the conduct of the inspector, and he having escaped unscathed seems to have worked in a revengeful spirit against the apothecary, by causing a charge sheet to be put in on 18th October 1895 against the apothecary's private servant and one of his union servants, charging them with theft of a bark of a tree worth *a pie* (*vide* calendar No. 36 of 1895 on the file of the Sub-Magistrate of Tirukkóyilúr). This case, however, ended in acquittal, and on a representation from the apothecary, the inspector seems to have been severely scolded by the Superintendent of Police. There was subsequently some correspondence between the apothecary and the Superintendent of Police through the District Magistrate in respect of gambling countenanced by the police here. These are the real official grievances which apparently set up the inspector to join the opposition, and represent at the public meeting the imaginary grievance of an unknown person against Mr. John Pillai. The inspector of police had to appear before me on the day of the meeting in my camp at Manalurput eight miles from Tirukkóyilúr in connection with a criminal case. He did not appear there before 2 P.M. He cared more for the success of the meeting, and he would not quit the meeting hall even though he was desired to return home by a Vakil Mr. R. Srinivasa Aiyangar of Cuddalore, who had also business in my court the same day at Manalurput. With these facts, I would request you to decide whether an officer, whose duty it is to preserve peace and order, can be let off with impunity, when he is shown to have stimulated an agitation in the town under cloak of his authority, which even a station-house officer of ordinary common sense would not have ventured to do.

As for Govinda Udayan No. 4, Union Panchayat member, he became very obnoxious and refractory in the matter of revision of house-tax, encroachments on public streets, and sanitation of the town. He was chiefly instrumental in retarding the work of the panchayat in these important branches of panchayat work. At a time when cholera was raging around Tirukkóyilúr, Govinda Udayan was reported by Mr. John Pillai in his letter, dated 14th August 1895, to have requested him very much to slacken the rule as to giving effect to the speedy removal of rubbish from the backyards of houses in the limits of the union, and it was ordered in your endorsement, dated 19th August 1895, that he should not again be nominated as a panchayatdar. But on a further representation from my predecessor, you intimated in your endorsement, Cur. No. 1140-D.B., dated 25th September 1895, that you had no objection to the re-appointment of Govinda Udayan provided no better man is availabe when he retires.

Again, it was reported to me by the Chairman Mr. John Pillai in his letter, dated 23rd March 1896, that the very same Govinda Udayan had refused to report on encroachments as desired by the panchayat with the assistance of two other members, and that he returned the list of encroachments twice.

It appears further from the panchayat resolution, No. 13, dated 20th March 1896, on this subject that Govinda Udayan was unguarded in his expression and mannerless.

There was subsequently another occasion when this Govinda Udayan had refused, on the pretext of caste prejudices, to do the work allotted to him of revising the house-tax for the current year by entering the Parachari included in his ward, and he expressed his sympathy with the tax-payers. This was reported to me by the chairman in his letter, dated 17th April 1896.

This Govinda Udayan, being a native physician and a channel monegar having control over the regulation of water-supply, commands some influence especially among the masses, and he is shown by the Tahsildar to have taken an active part in getting signatures to the memorial on various false pretexts. As he is reported to have refused to act on three different occasions, he has rendered himself liable to be removed from the panchayat under section 126 of the Local Boards' Act and Local and Municipal Notification No. 326, dated 17th May 1894. This Govinda Udayan was the neighbour of the late Sub-Registrar Mr. Masilamani Mudaliar and a relation of the owner of the house in which the latter was living, and he seems to have served as a useful weapon in the hands of the sub-registrar.

The next person to be noticed is one Sadasiva Pillai, a private vakil, and he owes a grudge to the apothecary, inasmuch as the latter pressed hard for prosecuting him for an offence under section 504, Indian Penal Code. The prosecution was not however sanctioned (*vide* your letter, Ref. No. 166-D.B., dated 11th May 1896). Hence it was that this Sadasiva Pillai worked against the apothecary jointly with Govinda Udayan in multiplying the number of signatures in the memorial under report, and this Sadasiva Pillai appears from the Tahsildar's report to have set up David, carpenter, on false pretexts to complain against Mr. John Pillai at the public meeting.

18. I now turn to the next subject of the steps taken to draft the memorial, and the special interest evinced in doing it by the Sub-Registrar Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar. According to the proceedings of the public meeting, a sub-committee consisting of the five gentlemen named in the margin with *power to add* was entrusted with the duty of drafting the memorial, and *do the needful* with specific reference to the complaints made at the meeting. Though the sub-registrar's name is entered last in the list, he was the very officer who took a prominent part in drawing up and completing the memorial. Nos. 2 and 4 were not heard of after the meeting, nor was it considered necessary by the remaining members to avail themselves of the power given them to add to their number. No. 2 Mr. Ramalinga Aiyar was merely a name-lender, and he left the district for Rajahmundry the day after the meeting. No. 4 Mr. Narayana Rao is the retired District Munsif who has settled himself at Tirukkóyilúr. He remained here on the 24th and 25th June 1896, but was not consulted by the other members. As for Mr. Jaya Ramachandra Aiyar, he admits having taken part in drafting the memorial, but this allegation is made apparently because he cannot well extricate himself from the other members of the sub-committee. His allegation will be found meaningless, when it is remembered that he has disowned the language in the memorial even in regard to one of his own complaints, and that he does not know who made certain alterations and interlineations in the printed memorial in manuscript, though the sub-registrar wants me to believe that he made them with the approval of the other two members Messrs. Jaya Ramachandra Aiyar and Sreenivasa Rao. It will thus be seen that truth groaning under the weight of a mass of glossy exaggerations and tissue of falsehood has at least come out in bold relief by pointing to the sub-registrar and his associate Mr. Sreenivasa Rao as the real authors of the memorial responsible for its wording. It should now be remembered that these were the identical gentlemen who, as members of the taluk board at its meeting held on 13th November 1895, succeeded in securing a resolution for replacing the apothecary by a second-class hospital assistant. It may even be said that of these two gentlemen, it was the sub-registrar who evinced greater interest and took more active part, backed up perhaps by a gentleman of better attainments, inasmuch as Mr. Sreenivasa Rao says that the manuscript interlineations and alterations are not in his handwriting and as the sub-registrar admits them to be his own, and states that he got the memorial printed at Vellore, his native place, though there is a printing press at Cuddalore. Further it has been elicited in the enquiry that it was the sub-registrar's acting peon (a Brahmin), who is also the son of an amin of the District Munsif's Court here, that took round the meeting notice to several residents of the town, and subsequently went round with the memorial and obtained signatures in it. The sub-registrar says that he had personal grievance against the apothecary, and yet he did not choose to

(1) M.R.Ry. L. A. Jaya Ramachandra Aiyar Avargal, B.A., B.L.
(2) A. Ramalinga Aiyar Avargal, M.A.
(3) V. Sreenivasa Rao Garu.
(4) V. Narayana Rao Pantulu Garu.
(5) V. Masilamani Mudaliyar Avargal.

represent it at the meeting, though complaints were then invited by the chairman and the members asked by him to come forward *boldly* and represent their grievances. He thought it safter to represent there the imaginary grievance of the Tahsildar. He had special interest, while sitting in the house of his friend the District Munsif, to enquire about the health of the son of a peon of the District Munsif, and the audacity to make a side note "since died" in manuscript to paragraph 16 of the memorial with the apparent object of aggravating the charge against Mr. John Pillai. He has studiedly introduced by manuscript interlineations the words "often" and "not unfrequently" in paragraph 3 of the memorial. Again, he is said to have induced the Assistant Engineer (L. F.) with an unworthy motive to transfer the manuscript note which he wished to note in favour of the apothecary from the body of the memorial to the signature portion of it, where it is almost sure to escape notice. Perhaps these are his special functions intended to be covered by the expression "*and do the needful*" in resolution No. 3 of the proceedings of the public meeting. What he wanted as the arch conspirator was an authority to draft a memorial, which was not to be submitted for the approval of a second meeting, and this he has succeeded by his stratagem in securing. When he made his statement before me, he refused to subject himself to cross examination by the apothecary, on the pretext that the latter had recently insulted him without any cause for provocation, and ordered him to be pushed out of the hospital by certain hospital servants, and when I asked him if he would answer the apothecary's queries, he refused to do even this. Hence the apothecary had not the advantage of eliciting from him facts which may tend to better strengthen his case. The subsequent conduct of the sub-registrar disclosed by the following two episodes will go to show that he was the chief instigator of the agitation in the town, whether for his own benefit or for the advantage of others. Having submitted the printed memorial on or about the 8th July 1896 (received by the Collector on 9th July 1896), the sub-registrar seems to have been brooding over the question of securing documentary evidence of Mr. John Pillai's late attendance and other irregularities in the hospital. On the morning of the 16th July 1896 (the date of receipt of the memorial by me was 14th July 1896) when I was at head-quarters, the sub-registrar visited the hospital without my knowledge and, in his capacity as vice-president of the taluk board, noted his remarks in the visitors' book. He remarked that the apothecary appeared at the hospital at 7–45 A.M. according to railway time, and 7–30 A.M. according to the hospital time, while several patients had been waiting for him, and that the in-patient register and the diet register had not been correctly written up. A copy of his remarks and the explanation of the apothecary accompany this report. The sub-registrar (vice-president) had never before visited the hospital, and recorded his remarks in the book. Again, on the same day at 11 A.M., the sub-registrar (vice-president) seems to have written to the apothecary for a copy of his remarks without reference to me. Finding this attempt fruitless, Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar wrote to me two days after, asking me for a copy of his remarks and of the apothecary's explanation to enable him to submit a report to me. As I was not in need of his report at that stage, the request was not complied with. There was subsequently another incident between Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar and the apothecary, and this I have designated "the carriage incident" for the sake of brevity.

On the morning of the 28th July 1896, Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar seems to have driven into the compound of the Police hospital in charge of the apothecary in his double bullock cart, in spite of the protest of the sweeper in attendance, and left there the cart and the bullocks. An altercation ensued between the two officers. Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar refused to take out the cart as desired, and it had eventually to be taken out forcibly by the hospital servants and left on the side of the road close by. The apothecary says he has orders not to allow carts inside the compound, which is kept scrupulously clean. Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar metamorphosed himself for the occasion into vice-president, and in exercise of that authority he seems to have insulted the apothecary by uttering the expression "you do not understand your position," sat opposite to the apothecary in the hospital dispensing room, and demanded paper, &c., to enable him to report him to me. The request was not of course complied with, and as Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar refused to quit the room as desired by the apothecary, the latter asked his compounder to lead him out of it,

because it was hospital time when patients had to be attended to. Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar went to me forthwith and asked me to enquire into his complaint. I did so accordingly, and the records of enquiry, together with an endorsement from the District Surgeon, dated 30th July 1896, are herewith submitted. In this case, there can be no doubt that Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar was the aggressor, and he cannot be exonerated from blame. The apothecary was threatened with a report, and he was asked to supply paper and pen for the purpose. This was certainly an unreasonable requisition with which Mr. John Pillai could not be expected to comply at the spur of the moment. But Mr. John Pillai would be considered to have acted more prudently, if he had kept down his temper and shown some consideration to the exasperated vice-president. I can, however, find nothing very serious to blame Mr. John Pillai in the special circumstances of the case and the strained relations between him and Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar, whom he looks upon as his arch enemy. This seems to be a disturbance created more with a view to its being taken as a pretext for avoiding cross examination in the enquiry which, the sub-registrar knows, I was about to convene, than for the purpose of asserting the authority of the one over the other. This incident happened on 28th July 1896, and I examined Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar on 4th August 1896.

19. In the meeting proceedings prefixed to the memorial will be found the names of the three gentlemen named in the margin, who have no local interest and who had nothing to do with the agitation against the medical officer. The first-named gentleman is a native of a village called Agaram some four miles from Tirukkóyilúr, and employed as a lecturer in the Rajahmundry College. He is a Master of Arts, and he had come to his village during the summer recess. He seems to have been specially sent for without previous notice of the public meeting, presumably because the authors of the memorial wished to have among them a gentleman with high university honours. He was put as a member of the sub-committee, while as a matter of fact he is ascertained to have left the district the day after the meeting. He took no part in the deliberations of the sub-committee.

M.R.Ry. A. Ramalinga Aiyar, M.A., of Rajahmundry.
" R. Sreenivasa Aiyangar, B.A., of Cuddalore.
" I. Madava Row of Cuddalore.

The next gentleman is Mr. R. Sreenivasa Aiyangar, B.A., of Cuddalore. The place of his residence is not noted in the proceedings, and the omission cannot but be intentional. He says that he stepped into the meeting hall simply to take home the inspector of police and remained there for half an hour as a spectator witnessing the *fun* of the meeting, that he had known the apothecary only by sight, and that the Chairman Mr. Gopala Row asked the members to come *boldly* forward to represent their grievances, if any.

Mr. I. Madava Row is the prosecuting Inspector of Police, Cuddalore. He says he went to the meeting hall to speak to the District Munsif in connection with a case sent by him, that he remained there only three or four minutes, that he had nothing to do with the meeting, and that he is very sorry to find his name in the proceedings of the meeting.

The two second-grade pleaders of the local District Munsif's Court named in the margin say that personally they have no complaint against Mr. John Pillai, but that they have signed the memorial believing the complaints of others and without caring to verify if they were well founded.

(1) M.R.Ry. Krishnasawmy Aiyar.
(2) " Ragunatha Row.

I have also examined the two other individuals named in the margin, and they say that personally they have no grievances against the apothecary, that nevertheless they attended the meeting in persuance of a notice and signed the memorial being heard of the complaints of others.

(1) M.R.Ry. Narayana Row Avargal, retired District Munsif.
(2) M.R.Ry. Rungasawmy Naidu, Private Vakil.

It will also be evident from the report of the Tahsildar, dated 15th September 1896, who submitted it after examining 20 out of the 166 Tamil signataries in the memorial, that in some instances the same signatures appear twice with seeming difference;

that even taking the number to be correct, it represents but 5 per cent. of the male population of the town; that in a number of instances signatures were obtained on blank sheets and by deceitful means by Govinda Udayan and Sadasiva Pillai already referred to above; that though the signatories have no real ground of complaint against the apothecary, they were induced to sign because of the influence of Govinda Udayan and of his misrepresentation of facts; that the two leading officers, the District Munsif and the Salt Inspector, as well as several others who were present at the meeting have not signed the memorial; that a number of persons who had no personal knowledge of the proceedings in the meeting or of the contents of the memorial have blindly signed the memorial; that the object of the authors of the memorial was to deceive the authorities by showing to them that it was countenanced by a good number of local residents and by officers of position and vakils, while the number of complainants among the signatures was less than half a dozen; that the District Munsif was the officer most interested in the transfer of the apothecary; that in his attempts to gain his object he was supported by nine out of the eleven pleaders of his Court, notably by his leading pleader Mr. Sreenivasa Row, as also by his intimate friend the Sub-Registrar Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar; that these two agents, aided by the Police Inspector Mr. Narasimmachari, were in their turn able to secure two unscrupulous sub-agent in the person of Govinda Udayan and Sadasiva Pillai; that these agents and sub-agents aided by sympathizers, friends and persons under their influence succeeded in getting up a mass meeting headed by the principal local officials and vakils, and a memorial signed by a number of local residents who had really nothing to complain of; that but for the presence and encouragement of the District Munsif, a public meeting of the kind could not have been possible; that at the time of the enquiry regarding the memorial there were frequent conferences among the officials and vakils at the quarters of the District Munsif, the sub-registrar, the inspector of police, the salt inspector and the leading pleader Mr. Sreenivasa Row; that there were sustained efforts at the time to throw obstacles in the way of getting at the truth; that ignorant signatories to the memorial were threatened with unpleasant consequences, should they, having once signed the memorial, omit to say something against the apothecary; and that though the Land Revenue department was not represented at the meeting in spite of strenuous efforts to secure at least the presence of the local Sub-Magistrate, that even the village officers of kusbah Tirukkóyilúr were so much in the hands of the authors of the memorial that they proved traitors to the Tahsildar in having suppressed certain facts within their knowledge and withdrawn their oral representations to the Tahsildar.

20. It will be seen from the above that the public servants who took part in the public meeting attended by about seventy persons, or in its creature, the printed memorial, are those named in the margin. Though the mass meeting may not be looked upon as a quasi-political gathering referred to in the Public Servants' Manual, there can be no doubt that such a collection for condemning the action of a public servant on unfounded allegations is certainly against the spirit of the rules, and it is not such as will be countenanced by Government.

(1) M.R.Ry. I. Varatharajulu Naidu Garu, B.A., B.L., District Munsif, Tirukkóyilúr.
(2) M.R.Ry. V. Masilamani Mudaliyar Avargal, late Sub-Registrar and Vice-President of the Taluk Board.
(3) M.R.Ry. Narasimmachariar, Inspector of Police.
(4) M.R.Ry. Gopala Row Avargal, Inspector of Salt and Abkári Revenue.
(5) Pranatharthihara Aiyar, B.C.E., Local Fund Assistant Engineer.

As for the District Munsif, he seems to have acted much behind the scene, and his connection with the whole affair has been traced by strong inferences from the statements of others. In his own interest it is desirable that he should at least have a transfer from the district.

As for Nos. 2 and 3, I have shown by a line of convincing arguments based upon patent facts that they have acted maliciously against the apothecary, and that there can be no doubt that they deserve suitable punishment in the hands of their departmental superiors.

Mr. Gopala Row (No. 4) has already left the district, and I do not think that any further action is needed in his case except perhaps a censure.

As for Pranatharthihara Aiyar (No. 5), I think he deserves censure for having allowed himself to be lead away by the representations of the sub-registrar. In this connection, I would invite your kind attention to the concluding paragraph of the enclosed apothecary's report, dated 25th August 1896.

21. *Section III.*—I now turn to the state of the medical institution at Tirukkóyilúr under the management of the Apothecary Mr. John Pillai. He took charge of the hospital in May 1894. It appears from the notes of visitors recorded in the Hospital Visitors' Book from time to time, that Mr. John Pillai has been successfully managing the institution, and that it is gradually rising in popularity. It will also be seen from the figures obtained from the hospital records and noted below that there has been increase from year to year in the number of in and out patients *admitted* for treatment, as also in the number of major and minor operations, and that therefore they go to show beyond doubt the growing popularity of the institution under Mr. John Pillai and the absurdity of the remarks in the memorial that he is highly unpopular and inaccessible to patients seeking medical aid:—

Particulars.	1893–94.	1894–95.	1895–96.
(1) In-patients	127	159	168
(2) Out-patients	9,072	10,025	10,542
(3) Major and minor operations	235	331	393

The total number of in and out patients *treated* during the first five months of the current official year was 12,542 against 10,738 for the corresponding period of the past official year, in spite of the memorial in June 1896 and the agitation created thereby in the town. This is an unmistakable proof on record of the facilities afforded to patients by Mr. John Pillai and of his popularity, and it will thus be seen that the sweeping allegations in the memorial by a few discontented resident officials and vakils condemning him for want of popularity and sympathy for the sufferings of the poor are wholly unfounded. I may also observe here that the Tahsildar, who has frequent opportunities of coming in contact with the residents of outlying villages in his division, has reported from informations he had from several villages that the services of the apothecary are duly appreciated by those who had occasion to resort to him for treatment, and that he has very often found him overzealous and earnest in the discharge of his duties, and I have no doubt that the Tahsildar's representations are well founded. In conclusion, I beg to state that there are no grounds whatever to justify the transfer of the apothecary, and that facts and figures point most eloquently to the desirability of his continuance at this station where he has gained popularity and the confidence of the public in general even at the sacrifice of remuneration to which he is entitled.

From M.R.Ry. R. SUNDARASA MUDALIYAR Avargal, Deputy Collector and President, Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr, to the Collector and President, District Board, South Arcot, dated 29th September 1896, No. 9.

With reference to your endorsement, dated 10th July 1896, on a manuscript memorial addressed to the Surgeon-General to the Government of Madras, I have the honour to report as follows.

2. The memorial sets out a number of allegations against Mr. John Pillai, Civil Apothecary and Union Chairman, Tirukkóyilúr. It is dated May 1896 and signed by eighteen persons, of whom five are vakils practising in the local District Munsif's Court including M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal, a member of the Taluk and District Board, and Ramachandra Aiyar Avargal, a member of the Tirukkóyilúr union panchayat presided over by Mr. John Pillai. Among the rest is a resident ryot named Govinda Udayan, also a member of the same panchayat, whose conduct is specially noted in my report on the subsequent printed memorial. There are no specific charges against Mr. John Pillai in his capacity as medical officer, except that he had ill-treated his compounder and omitted to attend at the private residence of some leading officials and vakils and that he used to parade himself on his bycicle on the streets during hospital hours. The memorialists make certain allegations against Mr. John Pillai as

chairman of the union, and I shall deal with them seriatim. One noteworthy fact about the memorial is that not one of the signatories to it has ventilated in it any of his grievances imaginary or real, and there is therefore virtually no one who can be called upon to substantiate any of the charges except Hanumanta Rao, whose specific allegation has reference to a resolution of the taluk board. As for the charges bearing on the working of the union under its present chairman, these are records sufficient to disprove them, and to show that some of them at least are malicious. It will be evident from my report on the subsequent printed memorial that the real wire-pullers worked behind the scene, and that they have, through their sympathizers and others, submitted the manuscript memorial to prejudice the minds of the authorities and prepare them without demur to receive as true all their allegations *en masse* against Mr. John Pillai in his capacity as medical officer. This manuscript memorial was received by me on the 23rd June 1896 for report as to the genuineness of the signatures, and that was the very day when a notice was sent out for convening a meeting against the apothecary. The meeting was held on the morning of the ensuing day, which resulted in the printed memorial containing specific charges against the medical officer. That meeting was headed by most of the leading officials and the local vakils, and as I have dwelt at length in my report on that memorial with my remarks, it will be superfluous to recapitulate them here. In view of the facts set forth above, it will be seen that there is scarcely any need to examine the signatories to the manuscript memorial under report. I have, however, examined two of the vakil signatories M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal and Krishnasamy Aiyar Avargal and four others * being among the signatories to the printed memorial are included in the list of those examined by the Tahsildar of Tirukkóyilúr in connection with that memorial.

* (1) Govinda Udayan.
(2) Rangasami Pillai.
(3) Rathnasabapathi Pillai.
(4) Bawani Sing.

3. The manuscript memorial, with a view apparently to bias the head of the medical department, starts with a narration of the antecedents of the apothecary that some years ago he was suspended, and transferred for neglect of duty, and the same is reproduced in paragraph 20 of the printed memorial with the modification, that the suspension was only a few years ago. Mr. John Pillai has in his explanation, with reference to the later printed memorial, stated that some fifteen years ago he was suspended under a misconception of facts, but that he was restored on appeal. It is not understood why the memorialists have thought fit to introduce this event, and suppress what followed unless it be with a motive to induce the authorities to attach undue weight to their unfounded allegations nor can the object of such a mention at the very outset, in the absence of a sinister motive, be perceived when it is remembered that the apothecary Mr. John Pillai was in charge of the same hospital here for full two years up to the date of the memorial. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal, first grade pleader and a member of the district and taluk board, admits having drafted the manuscript memorial, and states that he had not seen the records of suspension; that he is unable to mention the names of persons from whom he got the information; and that he does not know how the order of suspension was eventually disposed of. It is very strange that Mr. Sreenivasa Row is not aware of the name of the person who wrote the memorial.

4. The first charge against Mr. John Pillai mentioned in paragraph 4 of the memorial is that he whipped the hospital compounder some months ago, and that in spite of the representations of the latter to the then President, Taluk Board, that officer merely transferred the compounder. In this instance, the aggrieved party was the compounder according to the memorialist's own showing, and he is not one of the signatories. This is another instance in which the memorialists have sought to represent the medical officer as an unworthy specimen of humanity, though they were apparently not aware of the whole case as disclosed by the records. It was so far back as 5th September 1895 that the then compounder, Narayanasamy, submitted a petition to the District Medical Officer through the apothecary charging his official superior with assult and insult, and the complaint was forthwith sent up to the District Medical Officer with a covering letter bringing to notice the gross misconduct of the compounder and his culpable neglect of duty. The papers were received by

my predecessor with a demi-official letter dated 6th September 1895, from the District Medical Officer, and the compounder put in a petition to the President on the 11th idem withdrawing his complaint. The papers were recorded with a (confidential) note by my predecessor. It appears that in consideration of the strained relations between the compounder and the apothecary, the former was transfered * to the Kallakurichi hospital on or before the date of his complaint. It will thus be seen that the memorialists had taken upon themselves the onus of representing the supposed grievances of an hospital servant who had withdrawn his complaint. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal who drafted the memorial states † that the compounder complained of his having been beaten, but that he does not know what was done with the complaint to the District Magistrate.

* *Vide* copy of a letter from the President, Taluk Board, to the District Surgeon, dated 5th September 1895, with reference to an endorsement from the latter, dated 26th August 1895. The transfer had no reference to the compounder's complaint.

† Deposition accompanies the report on the printed memorial.

5. As for the charges of indifference to the sufferings of patients and of omission to attend in cases of grave urgency at the quarters of some of the leading officials including the District Munsif, the Tahsildar and the Local Fund Assistant Engineer directed against Mr. John Pillai in his capacity as a medical officer; it is enough to observe here that they appear in an undeveloped form in the manuscript memorial; that they have been subsequently amplified and formulated in the printed memorial dated June 1896, in drafting which the Sub-Registrar and vice-President of the taluk board is found to have taken a prominent part; and that I have this day separately reported on them in detail with the explanation of the apothecary. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal referred to in the last two paragraphs states that he had not heard of the Tahsildar's complaint himself; that it is not possible to give out the names of persons who made mention of that complaint; that the Local Fund Assistant Engineer had told him one or two weeks before the date of the memorial that the apothecary had failed to attend on him when he was suffering from fever; that he had not heard from the District Munsif of his complaint against the apothecary; and that he is not *inclined* to give the names of persons from whom he had heard of it. This vakil, in spite of his connection with the taluk and district boards, has admittedly taken a part in drafting the memorial without caring to verify its contents, as if that was the most appropriate course for him to reach the authorities for punishing a public servant under the control of the local boards, and he has flatly refused, for reasons best known, to mention the names of persons from whom he had heard of the complaints of the District Munsif. He admits that he has not at any time brought to the notice of the taluk or district board any of the complaints against the apothecary embodied in the two memorials. These are, however, matters which I have commented upon in my report on the printed memorial.

6. I shall now deal with the several charges against Mr. John Pillai as chairman of the Tirukkóyilúr union panchayat. He joined the hospital here as the medical officer in charge in May 1894, and in April 1895 he was appointed chairman of the union. It cannot be said that he was more greedy of powers than his predecessor Mr. Krishnaiyar, a local pleader, who it appears was a member of the panchayat as also of the taluk and district boards, and I fail to see how M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal is justified in having introduced paragraph 8 in the manuscript memorial, while he had not grudged the love of power in one of his colleagues. In his statement before me M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal says that he had heard of the apothecary's greediness for power from one of his friends, but that he is not prepared to give out the name of his friend who put him in possession of this information. This shows that there was a deep plot among the enemies of the apothecary and that there was a conspiracy to shoot him in the dark. In this connection I may observe that the District Medical Officer has once expressed it as his opinion that the local medical officer should have a seat in the taluk board as in the case of Mr. D'Sylva of Tindivanam.

7. In paragraph 9 of the memorial, reference is made to the chairman's unauthorized entry in private dwelling houses, and the case of one Sadasiva Pillai, a private

vakil, is quoted as an instance. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal on being questioned on the subject says that it is not possible for him to name the persons who complained of it. As for Sadasiva Pillai himself, he is not one of the signatories to the memorial under report, and yet his supposed grievance seems to have been represented by proxy. In this case, it was Mr. John Pillai who pressed for criminal prosecution against Sadasiva Pillai for the latter having insulted him openly, but in consideration of the special circumstances of the case, it was held that Mr. John Pillai would best assort his dignity by treating Sadasiva Pillai's conduct with silent contempt (*vide* District Board President's letter Ref. on Cur. No. 166-D.B. of 1896, dated 11th May 1896).

8. As regards the alleged unauthorized removal of lanterns referred to in paragraph 10 of the memorial, I have as yet received only one complaint against the action of the chairman Mr. John Pillai, and that was from a contractor named Mr. Hanumantha Row, who figures as one of the signatories to the memorial. The complaint was enquired into, and placed before the taluk board at a meeting held on 29th May 1896 and presided over by the vice-President M.R.Ry. Masilamani Mudaliyar. The matter was disposed of in resolution No. 10, dated 29th May 1896. But in view of the comments made in the resolution on the action of the union chairman and of doubtful ownership of the lantern, there has been some further correspondence from the chairman and the matter has not been finally disposed of by the taluk board. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal, seems to have made use of the information obtained by him as a member of the taluk board, and regardless of the interest of the board embodied it in the memorial and affixed his signature to it underneath that of the complainant Mr. Hanumantha Row himself. The threatened civil action against the taluk board will be awaited.

9. As regards the allegation in para. 11 of the memorial, I find on a reference to the records that the six persons named in the margin were appointed as members of the union panchayat after Mr. John Pillai had his appointment as chairman in April 1895, and that except in two cases Mr. John Pillai did not object to the re-appointment of the out-going members. It does not appear that he had any thing to do with the appointment of M.R.Ry. Ramachandraiyar Avargal, a pleader of the Local District Munsiff's Court. As for (*b*) Muthusawmy Pillai he was recommended by the Tahsildar in place of one Adinarayana Naidu whose re-appointment was righlty objected to by the chairman because of his old age. I recommended Muthialu Chetty (*c*) in place of Arunachala Aiyar, who had resigned his membership, and the chairman had no objection to the appointment. Sadagopa Naidu (*e*), a vakil, was recommended by the chairman in place of one Subbaramanier deceased. As for Govinda Udayan (*f*), he was an out-going member, and his re-appointment was recommended by the chairman himself. It was only in the case of Ramasamy Pillai (*d*) that he was put in place of the out-going member Sama Row (a vakil) at the instance of the chairman, inasmuch as the re-appointment of Sama Row was objected to on the score of his indifference and apathy to union work. This Sama Row, while his re-appointment was under consideration, and some two days after the vice-President had sent me a note suggesting the desirability of enquiring him as to his consent to continue in office, put in a petition to me on 21st January 1896 volunteering his services; but I did not accept his offer as it was thought undesirable to throw obstacles and impede the progress of union work by the addition of a useless member, and as there was already a member in the Panchayat reported against for presistent apposition to progress of work in the person of Govinda Udayan (*f*). The petitioner, Sama Row, who has apparently been backed up by the taluk board members Mr. Sreenivasa Row has affixed his signature to the memorial, and this is another instance of the want of interest of the latter in the proper and efficient management of union affairs. I need hardly observe here that facts have been exaggerated and misrepresented for which Mr. Sreenivasa Row is one of the individuals responsible. It is absurd to suppose that the chairman has almost succeeded in having in the union men of his own liking in the face of the fact that three out of the six new members have signed

(*a*) M.R.Ry. Ramachandraiyar Avargal,	December 1895.	
(*b*) M.R.Ry. Muthusamy Pillai	March 1896.	
(*c*) „ Muthialu Chetti		
(*d*) „ Ramasamy Pillai		
(*e*) Sadagopa Naidu.		
(*f*) Govinda Udayan.		

the printed memorial against Mr. John Pillai—(*a*), (*e*) and (*f*) and that one of them (*f*) has taken a most active part in getting up the memorial as will be seen from the Tahsildar's report on the printed memorial.

10. Referring to paragraph 12 of the memorial, I have to state here that there was no budget provision for any expenditure for making sanitary arrangements at the Keelur festival in February 1896; but a small amount of Rs. 10 was sanctioned as a special case at the request of the chairman. The money was not, however, spent, as it was reported later on that special coolies were not procurable for the purpose, but that the necessary sanitary arrangements were made with the ordinary union staff. The chairman being also the medical officer has done the needful, and there were no complaints when I inspected the locality in the course of the festival. It is very strange that Mr. Sreenivasa Row, who is also a trustee of the temple and who cannot be relieved of his responsiblity for the contents of the memorial, has thought it fit to note this item as one of the complaints against the chairman, while he had admittedly not referred to the correspondence on the subject nor complained to me on the occasion when I was on the spot.

11. The complaint in paragraph 13 of the memorial, regarding the chairman's refusal to carry out the diversion of the water course in the Pennar for drinking purposes is purely imaginary. A small amount of Rs. 25 was sanctioned for the purpose, and the chairman expressed his inability to carry out the work with such a small amount, and suggested the need for professional help. The work was then entrusted to the Tahsildar, who, with aid of village labour and collection of materials for putting up an embankment, did the needful within the sanctioned allotment. The work was also supervised by me personally, and this was certainly not a matter in which the chairman could be taken to task. Mr. Sreenivasa Row pleads ignorance of the agency through which the Tahsildar executed the work and of the details of the actual expenditure, while it is a well-known fact in the town that the Tahsildar collected a number of coolies for the purpose from different villages as also materials; and the records were accessible to have (Mr. Sreenivasa Raw) as a member of the taluk board.

12. The union sweepers and scavengers have not complained against the chairman in the way they are represented to have done in paragraph 14 of the memorial. There was a petition purporting to have been written by the union servants, and containing similar allegations and it was referred to the Stationary Sub-Magistrate for enquiry and report. I found from the report of that officer that the complaint was frivolous, that it was got up for the occasion, and that the petition itself was pseudonymous. This reminds me of a curious incident mentioned to me in the course of conversation by one of the official signatories to the printed memorial. In that case I was given to understand that the Sub-Registrar and vice-President of the taluk board attempted in a scheming manner to secure evidence to prove a charge of the same kind against the chairman, Mr. John Pillai, but that the proposal was subsequently given up. As, however, the information was not communicated to me officially, I am precluded from entering into the details of the case. It is a point worthy of consideration that Mr. Sreenivasa Row, who has drafted the memorial, has recorded such frivolous complaints in the memorial which will serve to stir up the union servants against the chairman, and this is certainly not what is expected of a member of the taluk and district boards. I may also draw your kind attention to the palpably inaugrous statements in paragraphs 14 and 15 of the memorial. When the memorialists or rather the authors of the memorial wanted to represent the imaginary shortcomings of the chairman, they complained in paragraph 14 of his having reflected the sanitary condition of the town by executing private work from the union servants. Again, when they wished to hand him up for neglect of his duty as a medical officer by frequent absence from the hospital during the hospital hours, they have very reluctantly given him a certificate for his good work (*vide* paragraph 15) as chairman of the union by way of inspection of houses for a general revision of house-tax, and of encroachments and close supervision of the work of union servants. The use of a bycicle on occasions in a town like Tirukkóyilúr, which comprises three detached portions in distant parts is certain to result in advantage to the public inasmuch as it facilitates speedy trips from one corner to another. The memorialists could not, however, bear to see the chairman using it at times, and they have taken

him to task as if his object is to parade on public streets. From what has come to my notice, I may say that Mr. John Pillai deserves credit for his earnest and zealous discharge of his duties as chairman, and that if he has erred at all, it was by excessive zeal and warm interest in improving the condition of the union.

13. The memorial closes with a prayer, not for an investigation of the charges set out therein, but for the transfer of Mr. John Pillai, on the allegation that he has proved a failure as a medical officer and chairman of the union. Mr. S. Krishnasamy Aiyar who has signed both the memorials states that he has personally no complaint against Mr. John Pillai; that on the other hand whenever he had occasion to seek his medical aid there was ready compliance with his request; that he knows nothing personally of the complaints in either of the memorials, but that he signed them both because he had understood from some of the respectable vakils and others that Mr. John Pillai was unpopular. This is simply rediculous on the face of it.

14. In conclusion, I beg to state that the charges complained of are purely imaginary, and that the memorial appears to have been got up by a few interested persons as a prelude to the later printed memorial which serves to expose on the stage the real actors, but which will be found destined to share the same fate, in spite of considerable official and vakil influence brought to bear, as will be seen from my report on that memorial.

15. The connected papers as per separate list are enclosed.

Enclosure.

Extract of Remarks from the Visitors' Book of the Local Fund Hospital, Tirukkóyilúr, by the President, District Board, South Arcot.

Inspected the hospital this morning. Found six in-patients (male) in the male ward and two male in-patients in the contageous disease shed, one female patient in the female ward. The wards, compound, out-houses including latrines, kitchen, dead-house were all clean and in good order. Similar remarks apply to the internal arrangements of the hospital. The medicines and instruments were neatly arranged and the latter were clean. The following figures show that this institution is doing good work under civil apothecary Mr. John Pillai who joined on 10th May 1894.

The number of *in-patients* treated in 1894–95 was 159. During the corresponding period in 1895–96, the number was 168. The number of *out-patients* treated in 1894–95 was 10,025 whilst the number treated during the corresponding period in 1895–96 was 10,542.

The following figures show the total number of all patients treated in his hospital during the last five months of 1896, compared with the total number treated in the corresponding month of 1895 :—

	1896.	1895.
April	1,745	1,703
May	2,151	2,021
June	3,383	2,166
July	2,951	2,387
August	2,312	2,467
Total ..	12,542	10,738

The following figures show the number of operations (major and minor) performed by the apothecary during the first two quarters of 1895 and 1896, respectively :—

1st quarter, 1895	65
2nd „ „	132
Total ..	197
1st quarter, 1896	91
2nd „ „	146
Total ..	237

These figures eloquently disprove the allegations recently made by a few local residents that the civil apothecary is unpopular. On the contrary, they conclusively establish the fact that he is doing excellent work and that the popularity of the institution is rapidly increasing under his management.

I find that the number of midwifery cases from 1st January to 31st August 1895 was 28, whilst the total number of these cases for the corresponding period in 1896 was 31. There is evidently room for improvement in this direction.

I find that medicines are given to the public gratis. This seems quite unnecessary in all cases where patients can afford to pay for medicines. The attention of the taluk board president should be drawn to this fact.

Three screens are required for the use of the hospital, and they should be provided by the taluk board at an early date.

(Signed) A. E. CASTLESTUART STUART,
President, District Board.

6th September 1896.

Submitted to the President, District Board, South Arcot, through the President, Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr.

(Signed) D. JOHN PILLAI,
Apothecary.

Tirukkoyilur,
7th September 1896.

Submitted to the President, District Board, South Arcot.

2. It appears from a comparative statement obtained from the apothecary Mr. John Pillai on 29th July 1896 that the popularity of the institution under his management is on the increase. The figures are noted below for reference :—

	1893–94.	1894–95.	1895–96.
In-patients	127	159	168
Out-patients	9,072	10,025	10,542

There can be no doubt that the public in general who resort to him for treatment appreciate his valuable services, and have full confidence in him. His sphere of duty as a medical officer is not confined to the town of Tirukkóyilúr, and it will be seen from my report on the memorial to be shortly submitted that the allegations against the apothecary of some discontented residents of the town, who appear to have been brought together under questionable influence and interested motives are unfounded and mostly malicious.

3. I am waiting for the Tahsildar's report as to the result of his enquiry which I expect to have in a day or two, and shall shortly submit my final report on the memorial against the apothecary.

4. Action will be taken on the last two paragraphs of the enclosed notes.

(Signed) R. SUNDARASA MUDALIAR,
President, Taluk Board.

Tirukkóyilúr,
13th September 1896.

From the President, District Board, South Arcot, dated 25th November 1896, Dis. No. 15-Tour.

Enclosures.

Petition from certain inhabitants of Tirukkóyilúr, South Arcot district, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 8th January 1897.

Most respectfully showeth,—That the petitioners and certain others sent up a memorial to the Surgeon-General in May 1896 and another in July 1896 to the Surgeon-General, the President, District Board, and the District Surgeon embodying their complaints against the then Local Fund Apothecary of the station Mr. D. John Pillai and requesting his transfer from that place.

2. That the said apothecary who had recently been sent out of the station to make room for the permanent incumbent is giving out that he expects soon to be posted back to the station permanently.

3. That the petitioners believe that expectation aforesaid of the apothecary is based upon the reports of the Acting Deputy Collector and the Collector, which, the petitioners respectfully submit, were prepared upon an incomplete and one-sided enquiry held by the Acting Deputy Collector and the Tahsildar.

4. That at the time of the enquiries some of the petitioners requested the Deputy Collector and the Collector (the former in writing also) to permit them to be present at the enquiries, which request was not complied with, though the apothecary had been given the fullest scope to cross-examine the signatories to the memorials and others.

5. That as the Tahsildar was an important witness in the matter, and as he had, subsequent to the first memorial dated May 1896, committed himself to certain statements in the hospital visitors' book very favourable to the apothecary, the petitioners requested that the Tahsildar should not be permitted to conduct any portion of the enquiry; but this request was also not complied with.

6. That the petitioners in their telegram dated 20th September 1896 have also represented to the Surgeon-General about the irregularities of the enquiries.

7. That the enquiries were generally conducted at unusual hours during nights at the houses of the Deputy Collector and the Tahsildar.

8. That the petitioners learn and believe that the said apothecary was suspended several times at different stations, and has been unpopular at various places for which he had to be transferred, which will be evident from a perusal of his service book and the papers connected with his antecedents.

9. The petitioners humbly pray that the threatened retransfer of the said apothecary may not be effected, and before allowing him to come back to the station, they may be allowed the opportunity of being heard by an independent European officer.

10. A copy of the memorial dated July 1396 is herewith submitted.

For this act of kindness the petitioners shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

Petition from certain inhabitants of Tirukkóyilúr Town, to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated July 1896.

Respectfully showeth,—That the civil apothecary Mr. D. John Pillai has been for nearly two years now presiding over the local hospital.

2. That ever since he assumed charge of his office at this station, he has continued to make himself unpopular in a variety of ways and has been unmindful of the medical needs of the people.

3. That he has been for a long time past irregular in his attendance at the hospital, often discourteous in his behaviour towards people anxious to avail themselves of his medical skill, and not unfrequently callous to the sufferings of the unfortunate patients resorting to him for medical aid.

4. That a public meeting was consequently held in this town on the morning of the 24th instant at which several persons came forward with specific complaints against the apothecary, which were noted down by the Chairman for being embodied in this memorial.

5. That on certain occasions, when Messrs. Streenivasachariyar and Naravanaswamy Iyer, Pleaders, and Messrs. Arunachella Naicker, Maurimuthu Naicker, Devanayaga Pillay and Krishnasawmy Udayan, local residents of the town, had to go to the hospital for medical aid, they found the apothecary to be very irregular in his attendance, and some of them had consequently to return home without receiving that aid which they had a right to expect,

6. That according to one David Asary of the Danish Mission he went to the apothecary with a decent conveyance and requested him to call over to his house to see his child, which was then in a dangerous condition, and the apothecary, who was then conversing with a Brahmin vakil, refused to go over to see the patient though the prescribed fee had been offered him, but directed the applicant to bring the child to the dispensary which he could not have done in the state in which the child then was; and when the apothecary actually came over to the applicant's house three hours later, his services proved to be of no avail and the child expired within two minutes after the medicine prescribed by the apothecary had been administered. The petition which the said David Asary meant to present to the District Surgeon on the subject is at his request submitted herewith.

7. That the apothecary declined to attend on the wife of Devarajiah, Headmaster of the local girls' school, when she was in an acute stage of labour about a fortnight ago, without a *previous* payment of a fee of Rs. 15 and he had not even the kindness to pay an ordinary visit.

8. That when Mr. Jayaramchendra Iyer, B.A. and B.L., First-grade Pleader, went to the dispensary at 4 P.M. about twenty days ago taking with him a child which had thrust into one of its nostrils a tamarind seed, the apothecary was not to be found at the dispensary, and that he had to patiently wait until 5–30 P.M. when the apothecary was fetched from his house by the hospital compounder.

9. That on the 2nd of Vyasi of Manmatha (14th May 1895) when the wife of Mr. Arunachella Iyer, a retired Revenue Inspector, was in labour, the apothecary refused to lend the services of the midwife, who had attended on her the previous night, on the plea that she had other engagements; although an earnest request was made to him at 7 A.M. which was repeated at 11 A.M. and the apothecary could not be moved though it was represented to him that the patient was hopelessly bad.

10. That a child of the said Mr. Arunachella Iyer, eleven days old, had a boil on its back which was opened by the apothecary one day; but he flatly declined to attend on it the next day until he was assured of sufficient remuneration; though a respectable request with a carriage was made to him and that before the promise of payment was made, the apothecary passed by the house of the said gentleman that day, but he had not the heart to call over and see how the child was doing.

11. The apothecary, when sent for, refused to call on Mr. Pranatharthyhara Iyer, B.A., B.C.E., Local Fund Assistant Engineer, when he was suffering one day from high fever.

12. That when the attendance of the apothecary was sought for by Mr. T. Varadarajulu Nayadu, E.A., B.L., District Munsif, when he had an abscess, he wrote to him that he had panchayat and hospital work to attend to, and that he would call later on, which he did not do, and that he did not turn up till he was again sent for the next day.

13. That when the said gentleman requested the apothecary's attendance at his house in connection with another abscess at about 7 P.M. one day, he sent word that he was too much tired to call over, and that when, in consequence, he was requested to lend the services of his compounder at least, he refused to comply with this request also on the ground that it was a late hour; and the compounder had therefore to be directly sent for who had the kindness to attend and do the needful.

14. That on another occasion when the daughter of the said gentleman was taken seriously ill at about 1 or 2 A.M. in the night, a lantern and two men were sent to the apothecary with a request for his attendance; but the apothecary refused to call over at that hour although his residence was within a hundred yards of the house of the District Munsif and it was considered unsafe to administer the medicine then sent as the patient had not been seen by him; and he appeared the next day at 7 A.M. when his services were not much needed.

15. That the apothecary did not attend when sent for by Mr. Gopal Row, Inspector of Salt, when he was suffering from ear-ache and he had to seek the aid of the compounder who had the kindness to do the needful.

16. That one Rungasawmi Pillai had his son treated for a fortnight in the dispensary for fever with no effect and when he changed the treatment a cankerous ulcer was formed in one of his jaws for which he has again been placed under hospital treatment and as it emits foul smell, the apothecary does not approach the boy but keeps him at a distance and directs a ward cooly to dress it and the boy is still under such indifferent treatment.

17. That when the Tahsildar Mr. Sundara Iyer had a fall from his carriage at a village six miles from this town, a conveyance drawn by a pony was sent to the apothecary at about 5 P.M., with an urgent request to go over to the place where the Tahsildar was, but he did not choose to comply with the request though the case was one of grave urgency.

18. That the Deputy Collector Mr. Sunderasa Mudaliar once expressed at a meeting of the Taluk Board that a certain person from a village in this taluk had complained to him with tears in his eyes and in a manner which moved him much that the apothecary had refused to go to his village to see his wife who was then in labour and in a dangerous stage, unless the whole of the fee demanded was paid to him at once, though he had been offered a portion of the fees then and there and promised the rest in the village.

19. That although a man from the village of Adichanellore who had fallen from a picota and received severe injuries was brought to the hospital, he was merely admitted as an out-patient and he died within two days after his admission as such.

20. That the apothecary had been at this very station a few years ago and he had to be suspended and transferred for having neglected an in-patient, who, in despair, committed suicide by drowning himself in a well adjoining the hospital.

21. That the apothecary does not command the confidence of the public in his medical treatment so much so, that several, notably the Deputy Collector and the Tahsildar, had on certain occasions to send for medical aid from distant stations at a considerable cost.

22. That the unsympathetic and indifferent nature of the apothecary, as evidenced by the facts above narrated, has rendered him so very unpopular that several leading men of the locality were put to the painful necessity of convening a meeting and making a public representation of their grievances in spite of the risk which they thereby run of precluding themselves from approaching the Apothecary any more for medical aid with any degree of confidence.

In conclusion the memorialists humbly pray that their grievances may be redressed at an early date by the removal of the present apothecary from this station and the appointment of a humane and large-hearted medical officer in his stead. For which act of kindness and generosity the memorialists shall as in duty bound ever pray.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 29th January 1897, No. C.—9.

With reference to my confidential letter No. C.—84, dated 26th November 1896, submitting papers in the case of Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai, I have the honour to state, for the information of Government, that this apothecary has since been suspended by me for three months for surreptitiously removing or causing to be removed from his service book certain pages containing entries regarding his previous suspension on two occasions.

Memorandum No. 378.

The Surgeon-General is requested to submit a copy of his proceedings suspending the apothecary.

12*th February* 1897. (Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 16th February 1897, No. 66.

With reference to your memorandum, No. 378, Public, dated 12th February 1897, I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of my Proceedings, No. 429, dated 29th January 1897, suspending Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai.

2. I also attach, for the information of Government, copies of the Proceedings* of my predecessors regarding this apothecary in 1882, 1885 and 1886.

* Surgeon-General Cornish's Proceedings, No. 4266, dated 15th August 1882.
Surgeon-General Furnell's Proceedings, No. 3251, dated 26th June 1885.
Surgeon-General Bidie's Proceedings, No. O—228, dated 6th June 1886.

Enclosures.

Proceedings of the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, No. 4266, dated 15th August 1882.

Read—letter No. 501 from the Acting Zillah Surgeon, Cuddalore, with enclosures, regarding the conduct of Civil Apothecary John Pillai in charge of the Local Fund dispensary, Tirukkóyilúr, in neglecting to relieve a mendicant, who applied for medical aid on the 12th July last.

Order—No. 4266, dated 15th August 1882.

The Surgeon-General considers that, unless all the witnesses in the case have perjured themselves, the charge of neglect against Civil Apothecary John Pillai is borne out. It is shown by the witnesses that a poor wayfarer in pain and suffering applied at the dispensary, and after waiting for some time, without securing any help, left the place and subsequently fell into a well receiving injuries from which he died.

2. The Civil Apothecary John Pillai denies any knowledge of the man's presence at the dispensary in the afternoon, but if the compounder's evidence is trustworthy, he was duly informed of the presence of a patient seeking relief, and the evidence of the man Babu Singh, shows that he saw the apothecary speaking to the patient, and that he took a message from the apothecary to the compounder requesting him to come to the hospital, which the compounder did.

3. Under these circumstances the Surgeon-General has no doubt that the Civil Apothecary John Pillai did see and converse with the man, but that he was too proud or too lazy to administer a dose of medicine, or to take measures for the relief of the patient in the absence of the compounder, and that owing to the delay in administration of medical relief the man wandered away and met with his death. The Surgeon-General in a circular No. 48 of 21st December 1880 informed medical subordinates that the delegation of their own proper duties to hospital servants would not be permitted and that some punishment would follow breach of rules.

4. Conduct, such as is described in the depositions of witnesses, is simply disgraceful to all concerned. John Pillai has shown himself to be unfit for his position, and will not be again employed in an independent charge until he has shown himself to be more trustworthy.

5. For this act of gross inhumanity and neglect of duty the Surgeon-General directs that John Pillai be suspended from rank, pay and allowances for a period of two months. At the end of the period of suspension he will be posted to some subordinate situation, where he will be under the supervision of a superior officer.

6. The Zillah Surgeon will be so good as to make arrangements in communication with the President for the immediate relief of John Pillai, and to report if any of the district subordinates are fit for the permanent charge at Tirukkóiyilúr.

7. The Civil Surgeon will also communicate with the President, Local Fund Board, in regard to the conduct of the hospital servants at Tirukkóyilúr. So far as the depositions go, the Surgeon-General thinks they are all unfitted for their positions and that it would be advisable to make a clean sweep of the establishment, but this is a matter entirely in the hands of the President of the Local Fund Board.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) A. J. STURMER, Surgeon,
Secy., Surgn.-Genl. with the Govt. of Madras.

Proceedings of the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, No. 3251, dated 26th June 1885.

Read—letter from the District Surgeon, Cuddalore, dated 15th June 1885, No. 23 and enclosures.

Order—No. 3251, dated 26th June 1885.

The correspondence shows that if the charges of neglect of duty and extorting fees from patients are not conclusively proved against Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai in charge of the Local Fund dispensary at Tiruvannámalai, he is eminently wanting in tact and conciliation. and is not fulfilling the purpose for which he has been placed in medical charge of Tiruvannámalai. His antecedent history at Tirukkóyilúr is also against him, where in 1882 he so far neglected his duty towards a sick mendicant who applied for relief, as to have led to his death. On that occasion he was suspended from rank, pay and allowances for two months and removed from independent charge. John Pillai does not appear to have profited by that lesson, and within a year of being re-employed in independent charge, has given occasion for dissatisfaction in the district, and for a request for his removal.

While holding with the District Surgeon that the charges of neglect of duty have not been established, it is very evident from the correspondence that, as medical officer of Tiruvannámalai, John Pillai has not earned the confidence and good will of the people from want of tact and judgment, and is not furthering the object of the Local Fund Board in providing medical relief for the Circle. The District Surgeon will therefore submit the whole correspondence (herewith forwarded) to the President for expression of his views as to whether it would not be desirable to replace John Pillai by a Civil Apothecary who would co-operate with the District authorities in the interests of the tax-payers. In that case John Pillai will be withdrawn to a subordinate charge, where he may be induced to qualify for an independent charge at some future time.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. ELCUM, Surgeon,
Secy., Surgn.-Genl. with the Govt. of Madras.

Proceedings of the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, No. O-228, dated 6th July 1886.

Read—the following papers:—

From the Superintendent, Lying-in-Hospital, Nos. 166 and 170, dated 18th and 20th June 1886, respectively.

From Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai, dated 28th June 1886.

Order—No. O-228, dated 6th July 1886.

The Surgeon-General regrets to receive such frequent complaints against Civil Apothecary John Pillai. In 1882 when attached to the Civil dispensary, Tirukkóyilúr, he so far neglected his duty towards a sick mendicant who applied for relief, as to have presumably led to his death, and was suspended on that occasion from rank, pay and allowances for two months and removed from independent charge.

On restoration to an independent post, charges were brought against him of neglect of duty and extorting fees from patients applying for aid at the Civil dispensary, Tiruvannámalai, and of want of tact and conciliation, and he was again removed from an independent to a subordinate charge.

The present correspondence shows still further neglect of duty on the part of the Civil Apothecary even in a subordinate position. An infant in the Lying-in hospital was found on the 17th June covered with acute scabies. No notice had been taken of the case by John Pillai, no attempt to apply a remedy, no report made to the Medical officer, or to his representative—the Senior Apothecary—on visiting the hospital, nor did the Civil Apothecary know the nature of the ailment. The fact of the admission and neglect were discovered by the Medical officer on the following day—not on the report of the Civil Apothecary, but by an accident.

When spoken to by the Medical officer regarding his neglect of duty and professional ignorance, he "became most insubordinate in manner and bearing," manifesting much contumacy when verbally ordered by the Medical officer to consider himself under suspension from duty.

According to his own showing John Pillai signally failed in his duty, for although the Senior Apothecary, in the absence of the Medical officer, went round the wards after the admission of the infant, John Pillai did not report the admission to him, but "thought best to show the infant the next day to the Doctor on his morning visit" and in that he failed also. In the meantime nothing was done to alleviate the sufferings of an infant covered with acute scabies.

Under all the circumstances of the case, and his previous misconduct coupled with his comparative ignorance of his profession, the Surgeon-General questions the advantage of retaining such a man in the public service; but requests that he may be warned that on the next occasion of misconduct he will not fail to move the Government for his dismissal from the service.

For his present offence the Surgeon-General sentences him to be suspended from duty and pay for one month, with effect from date of suspension by Surgeon-Major Branfoot.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. BIDIE, M.B., C.I.E.,
Surgeon-General with the Govt. of Madras.

Proceedings of the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, No. 429, dated 29th January 1897.

Read—the following papers:—

From the Superintendent, Government Maternity Hospital, No. 831, dated 1st December 1896, reporting that the service book of Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai sent to him for verification by the District Medical and Sanitary Officer, South Arcot, does not contain the pages bearing the entries regarding the Apothecary's suspension.

From the District Medical and Sanitary Officer, Minute No. 193, dated 16th December 1896, and No. D-C., dated 21st January 1897, forwarding the Apothecary's explanations.

Order—No. 429, dated 29th January 1897.

It is observed from the above correspondence that a new service book having been opened for Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai, doing duty Cuddalore, on the plea that the old one was in an unserviceable condition, it was sent by the District Medical and Sanitary officer, South Arcot, to the Superintendent, Government Maternity Hospital, Madras, for verification of the period during which the Apothecary was attached to his hospital.

2. While verifying the entries in the book with the records in the hospital, the Superintendent found that the new book contained no entries regarding the suspensions of the Apothecary, and on examining the old service book he discovered that the pages which contained such entries were missing from it.

3. The matter having been reported to this office, the Apothecary was called upon for explanation. He states that he is unable to account for the missing pages and that he only copied in the new service book such entries as were to be found in the old one.

4. The Apothecary's explanation is most unsatisfactory. He knew perfectly well that he was suspended more than once in his service and that the entries of such suspensions were made in his service book—so that if he had no connection with the surreptitious removal of the missing pages from the old book, he ought to have reported the fact to his medical officer when, in the course of preparing his new book, he found that the old one did not contain the missing pages.

5. His neglect to do so and his attempt to get the new book—without the entries of his punishments—passed through point to the fact that the pages from the old book were removed either by himself or at his instance or with his cognizance.

6. The presumption, supported as it is by very clear circumstantial evidence, is so strong that the Surgeon-General does not consider that the Apothecary can be given the benefit of doubt.

7. Such dishonest conduct on the part of an official calls for his summary dismissal, but in the present case, in the absence of direct evidence, the Surgeon-General considers that the ends of justice can be met by a lighter punishment. He accordingly directs that Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai be suspended for three months from his duty, pay and allowances from date of receipt by him of this order.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. SIMPSON, M.B., Surgn.-Captain,
Secy., Surgn.-Genl. with the Govt. of Madras.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 3rd March 1897, No. C.—20.

With reference to your memorandum, No. 513, dated 1st March 1897, I have the honour to forward Civil Apothecary John Pillai's letter of explanation, dated the 25th August 1896.

2. I also enclose, as requested, his appeal against his suspension in 1882 together with the District Medical and Sanitary officer's report thereon. His statement that the appeal resulted in his being restored to his office is wrong. The only effect of the appeal was that his suspension was reduced from two months to one month, but the order about his removal from independent charge stood fast, as will be seen from Surgeon-General Cornishe's remarks in pencil on the back of the report of the District Medical and Sanitary officer, South Arcot. I would also draw your attention to the proceedings of my predecessors in 1885 and 1886, copies of which were sent with my letter, No. 66, dated the 16th February 1897, and which will show that his punishment in 1882 was not cancelled.

From Apothecary D. JOHN PILLAI, dated 11th March 1897.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 13th March 1897, No. C.—25.

In continuation of my letters quoted in the margin, I have the honour to forward herewith an appeal submitted by Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai against his suspension as ordered in my proceedings No. 429, dated 29th January 1897, a copy of which has already been forwarded to Government, with my letter No. 66, dated 16th February 1897.

No. C.—9, dated 29th January 1897.
" 66, dated 16th February "
" C.—20, dated 3rd March "

2. According to G.O., No. 788, Public, dated 23rd October 1894, punishments by one of medical subordinates other than dismissal are not appealable, but as the Apothecary insists on his appeal being sent to Government in spite of this order, I consider it best to do so, and to lay the whole facts before Government.

3. On the 1st December 1896, I received an official letter from the Superintendent, Government Maternity Hospital, which I reproduce below for ready reference:—

I have the honour to forward, herewith, correspondence regarding the verification of entries in a new service book for Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai (with the old service book and a new one). I observe that the papers on which references were made to his suspension from duty in 1886 when posted to this hospital are missing, and I have reason to believe that entries referring to a former suspension (1882) are also missing from the book. A great deal of valuable time and trouble has been expended in verifying these entries, and if I had signed the new book as requested by the District Medical and Sanitary officer, South Arcot, no mention would have been made of suspension from duty when the Apothecary was at this hospital. I forward the books now, as I think that some explanation should be given by the Civil Apothecary regarding the torn and partially-destroyed record of service and the attempt made to obtain my signature to what would have been a false record.

* * * * *

4. This was no doubt a very serious matter and the Apothecary was called upon for an explanation. His reply was not only unsatisfactory but evasive, as discussed in my proceedings quoted above.

5. His present appeal is chiefly based on his presumption that he explained to my satisfaction at a personal interview that the original service book had never been mutilated. On the other hand I was never before more convinced of the service book having been tampered with as I was when I closely inspected it. I send it herewith for the inspection of Government. It will be seen that the pages not being numbered in print, there is no difficulty whatever in some of them being removed or replaced by new ones and the fact that in the present instance all sheets are separate and joined together by a thread considerably confirms this suspicion. Above all, it will be noticed that the entries in the book from 1881 to 1889 (the period which comprised the two occasions the Apothecary was suspended) are all in the Apothecary's own handwriting instead of in the handwriting of the medical officers under whom he was employed or of their clerks, as is the case in all the subsequent entries. Moreover not a single entry from 1881 to 1889 has been attested by any medical officer as provided for in column 12 of the book, as is the case in all other entries, and the sheets containing entries from 1881 to 1889 are in a better and more serviceable condition than the latter portion of the book which was used much after them. All these facts coupled with Brigade-Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel Branfoot's evidence of having seen and remembered the entries of suspension in the book, conclusively prove that the book was tampered with, and the handwriting of the Apothecary is a sufficient proof of his complicity and guilt.

6. His other statements call for no remarks—suffice it to say that there was not the least prejudice against him in this office as will be seen from my letter No. C.—84, dated 26th November 1896.

7. I would request the attention of Government to the intemperate nature of the language in the appeal as it originally stood and which has been slightly modified on the Apothecary's attention being drawn to it.

Order—No. 793, Public, dated 25th June 1897.

His Excellency the Governor in Council is of opinion that the suspension of three months inflicted on Civil Apothecary John Pillai for failure to bring to notice the omission from his service book of the entries relating to his previous punishments was well merited, and his petition will accordingly be dismissed. A perusal of the later correspondence read above shows the Apothecary in a most unfavourable light, and the Government therefore directs that he be severely censured and that such censure be recorded against him. The allegation in John Pillai's petition that the signature of a public servant in his service book does not entail on him responsibility for the entries therein cannot be accepted; a public servant is responsible for everything that he signs. The Surgeon-General should take due notice of the discreditable way in which the Apothecary's service book has been kept.

2. With regard to the public meeting held at Tirukkóyilúr, the Government observes with surprise that among the individuals who took a prominent part were several officers of Government, certain retired public servants, and two members of local boards. That these persons should have assisted at a public meeting held for the purpose of attacking the official character of a public servant, was most improper, and they are deserving of severe censure for what, as they must have been aware, was a gross breach of decorum.

3. These proceedings will be communicated to all departments of the Secretariat for communication, in view to officers in the public service being warned to abstain from action of the nature of that commented on above.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Surgeon-General.
„ the Revenue Department.
„ the Local and Municipal Department.
„ the Judicial Department.
„ other Departments of the Secretariat.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyengar,

Marine Department

Government {1897} of Madras.

PUBLIC.

Recd.	1897.	*Enclosures*
Regd.		*Spare copies*

G.O., No. 793, 25th June 1897.

No 612 Mar dy 9 July 97
Communicates the

JUNE. P. P. officer.

Rgd Dec

To The P.P.O.

Civil Apothecary John Pillai.

Dismissing, with remarks, petition from — appealing against the order of the Surgeon-General suspending him for three months for failure to bring to notice the omission of certain entries from his service book; commenting on the conduct of certain officers of Government, &c., who have assisted at a public meeting held for the purpose of attacking the official character of —, a public servant; and communicating the proceedings to all departments of the Secretariat in view to its communication to officers in the public service.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers :—

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), Mis. No. 3210, dated 31st July 1896.

Read—the following letter from M.R.Ry. M. GOPALA ROW, Inspector of Salt, Abkári and Customs Revenue, Tirukkóyilúr Circle, to the Secretary to the Commissioner of Salt, Abkári and Separate Revenue, dated 24th July 1896, No. C. :—

With reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, Routine No. 2160, dated the 16th instant, calling on me to report if the facts mentioned in a letter published in the *Hindu* of the 27th ultimo are true, I beg to state that the contents of the said letter are true. The following Government servants were present at the meeting referred to :—

M.R.Ry. T. Varadarajulu Naidu, B.A., B.L., District Munsif, Tirukkóyilúr.
" A. Ramalinga Iyer, M.A., Lecturer, Rajahmundry College.
" C. Narasimha Charri, Inspector of Police, Tirukkóyilúr.
" V. Masilamony Mudaliar, Sub-Registrar, Tirukkóyilúr.
" M. Gopala Row, Inspector of Salt, Abkári and Customs Revenue.
" T. Mathava Row, Prosecuting Inspector of Police, Cuddalore.
" V. Narayana Row, Retired District Munsif.
" L. Arunachala Iyer, Retired Revenue Inspector.
" A. Nadamuny Naidu, Retired Taluk Clerk.

Resolution—Mis. No. 3210, dated 31st July 1896.

Submitted to Government with reference to its official memorandum, No. 101, Revenue, dated 13th July 1896.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) EDMUND MILLETT,
Assistant Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Endt. No. 1547-R.

Transferred to the Public Department, with reference to office-note, No. 135-A, dated the 9th ultimo.

Ootacamund,
10*th August* 1896.

(Signed) A. T. ARUNDEL,
Secy. to Govt., Revenue Dept.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 2nd September 1896, No. 401.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 17th September 1896, No. 434.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 25th September 1896, No. 447.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 16th October 1896, No. 481.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 23rd October 1896, No. 489.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated 11th November 1896, No. 522.

From the President, District Board, South Arcot, dated 25th November 1896.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 26th November 1896, No. C.-84.

With reference to your memorandum, No. 1355, Public, dated the 9th July 1896, and this office letter ending with No. 522, dated the 11th November 1896, I have the honour to state that the report in the case of Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai of Tirukkóyilúr has just been received from the Collector of South Arcot and is herewith forwarded for the information of Government.

2. The report consists of letter No. C, dated the 18th November, from the Collector and two letters from the Deputy Collector and President of the Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr, who conducted the inquiry, together with a copy of the covering memorandum, No. 2-C, dated the 20th November 1896, from the District Medical and Sanitary Officer. I have kept back the voluminous enclosures to the Deputy Collector's reports as the facts are very clearly and lucidly discussed in the reports themselves, thereby doing away with the necessity of reading through them.

3. It will be seen from these reports and the Collector's letters that the apothecary has been made the subject of a base conspiracy on the part of the Brahmanical and other officials and vakils of the place, simply because he was not subservient to them and did his work honestly. He has been fully acquitted of the charges and allegations contained in the memorials submitted by the conspirators which have been proved to be malicious and entirely devoid of foundation.

4. Civil Apothecary John Pillai has since been relieved of his acting appointment at Tirukkóyilúr by the permanent incumbent in the ordinary course; the Collector however considers it desirable that he should be re-appointed to the station so that the public may be convinced that such machinations as have been brought to light will not be allowed to succeed. I agree in this view, but as at present there is no other appointment available for the permanent incumbent, I have posted John Pillai to do duty at Cuddalore until arrangements can be made for retransferring him to Tirukkóyilúr. I however await the instructions of Government regarding the Collector's proposal.

5. I fully concur with the Collector that the conduct of the accusers calls for exemplary punishment, and I trust that they will be dealt with in such a way as to protect medical subordinates from such base and malicious public charges in future.

Enclosures.

From Surgeon-Major J. C. MARSDEN, District Medical and Sanitary Officer, South Arcot, to the Secretary to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated Cuddalore, 20th November 1896, No. 2-C.

The papers in question are submitted herewith, together with confidential letter, No. C, dated 18th November 1896, from the President, District Board, South Arcot, which reviews the whole case.

2. There are two sets of papers from the President, Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr, consisting of reports, with enclosures, concerning (*a*) the manuscript memorial and (*b*) the printed memorial against the apothecary.

3. I have already, in my No. 135, dated 19th September 1896, submitted some remarks on the case, noting that my predecessors had reported favourably on this apothecary. He is also held in good repute by all the European officers in the district who are acquainted with him.

4. During my recent inspection of Tirukkóyilúr, I was quite satisfied with his work and he appeared popular with all except the memorialists. I took the opportunity of meeting the leading petitioners (those who were present in the station), and I heard their complaints, as well as the apothecary's explanations.

The complaints are all detailed in the accompanying file of correspondence.

The explanations I considered satisfactory. The apothecary is of a nervous disposition and he was disposed to be too verbose and, perhaps, not sufficiently alive to the fact that the district munsif was his official superior. He had, however, received great provocation and a little advice on this point seemed to be all that was needed.

5. In my opinion, the apothecary has cleared himself of the grave charges brought against him and he is most painstaking and diligent.

6. But it seems very evident that his position as union chairman has interfered with his other duties and has led to friction. I think that post should not be held by the medical officer.

7. It is also very evident that several of the memorialists have a strong grudge against him and they have, accordingly, raked up old stories, though they made no complaint at the time of the alleged occurrences.

Nothing can justify their conduct in this case.

From A. E. CASTLESTUART STUART, Esq., President, District Board, South Arcot, to the District Medical and Sanitary Officer, Cuddalore, dated Cuddalore, 18th November 1896, No. C.

I have the honour to forward, for your information and transmission to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, the confidential reports Nos. 9 and 10 of 1896, dated 29th September 1896, of the Deputy Collector, Tirukkóyilúr, and President of the Tirukkóyilúr Taluk Board, on (1) the manuscript and (2) the printed memorials submitted against Mr. John Pillai, late Civil Apothecary and Union Chairman of Tirukkóyilúr, in original, together with their respective enclosures.

2. The Deputy Collector and Taluk Board President has made a most thorough and exhaustive inquiry. His reports are so complete and the records are already so voluminous that I shall do as little as possible to swell the literature of the subject. I may state that whilst at Tirukkóyilúr lately I made personal inquiries which satisfy me that the Deputy Collector's conclusions are correct and his lucid exposition of what was a base conspiracy organized by a few officials of the place to ruin a brother official leaves little room for further comment. It was my intention to have addressed the heads of the various departments to which the implicated officials belong on the subject of the gross misconduct of their subordinates, but this would involve considerable delay in making several copies of the records, and this I desire to avoid having regard to the reminders received for these reports.

3. The inquiry has disclosed that the late Civil Apothecary, Mr. John Pillai, is entitled to be fully acquitted of the malicious charges recklessly brought against him by a few public servants and others whose animosity he appears to have incurred on account of his zealous performance of public duties, both as a medical officer and as chairman of the union at Tirukkóyilúr, and his personal independence of character. Had he been subservient to the district munsif in particular, it is improbable that this spurious agitation would have been manufactured in the manner disclosed by the Deputy Collector's reports. Mr. John Pillai has abundant material for both civil and criminal action against his traducers, but his reputation is in the hands of Government, to whom I request that the Surgeon-General will be so good as to forward these papers for orders—so far as the implicated officials are concerned. I am of opinion that, in the public interests, exemplary punishment should be meted out to the ringleaders.

4. The inquiry proves that the ringleaders were the following :—

(1) M.R.Ry. T. Varadarajulu Naidu Garu, District Munsif of Tirukkóyilúr,
(2) „ V. Masilamony Mudaliar Avargal, late Sub-Registrar of Tirukkóyilúr and Vice-President of the Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr,
(3) „ Srinivasa Row Avargal, First-grade Pleader of Tirukkóyilúr and Member of the District Board, as also of the Tirukkóyilúr Taluk Board,
(4) „ C. Narasimha Chariar Avargal, Inspector of Police, Tirukkóyilúr,
(5) „ Gopala Row Avargal, Inspector of Salt and Abkári Revenue,
(6) „ Govinda Odayar Avargal, Member of the Tirukkóyilúr Union Panchayat, and
(7) „ Sadasiva Pillai Avargal, a private Vakil of Tirukkóyilúr.

5. The records prove that the principal offender was the District Munsif of Tirukkóyilúr. It is astonishing that an officer in his position should, to gratify personal spite for imagined slight which, if it occurred at all, occurred some twelve months previously, have taken so prominent a part in the public meeting convened to condemn a brother officer in another department. That nine of the eleven pleaders of his court should have supported him is not surprising having regard to native character—or the absence thereof. He was ably seconded by the leading local vakil M.R.Ry. Srinivasa Row Avargal who did not consider it improper, though a member of a district board and also of the taluk board, to which the civil apothecary was directly subordinate both as the local medical officer and the chairman of the local union, to take a most prominent part in these scandalous proceedings. He admittedly drafted the manuscript memorial and was one of the five persons selected as a sub-committee of the public meeting to draw up the printed memorial, both of which may be characterized as a concatenation of misrepresentations. The Sub-Registrar M.R.Ry. Masilamony Mudaliar Avargal also took a very prominent part in the matter and attempted to induce the forest ranger to join the conspirators. This sub-registrar was reported to me to be endeavouring to tamper with the witnesses. He was accordingly transferred at my request by the Inspector-General of Registration, and, I believe, he is now in the Salem district. The Police Inspector M.R.Ry. Narasimha Charriar Avargal signed the memorial and took part in the meeting and attempted to induce the local sub-magistrate to join in the nefarious plot. The inspector of salt and abkári referred to has since been transferred; but his transfer had no connection with his part in this agitation. Govinda Odayar, a member of the union, was intriguing against his own chairman, the apothecary. The private vakil not being an official, may well be treated with contempt.

6. If the public servants who are implicated in this conspiracy had any valid grievances against the civil apothecary either in his capacity as a medical officer or as chairman of the union, they could easily and, of course, should have made their complaints against him to the proper authorities in the proper way. But for them to have banded together to get up a public meeting, touting for signatures and declaiming against a brother public servant, signing mahazars against him containing the most reckless and false charges, was an intolerable breach of the public rules and subversive of all discipline. No public officer can be expected to do his duty fearlessly if at any moment he is liable to find himself the object of hostile declamation in the streets at a public meeting deliberately convened by and presided over and attended by brother officers whose malevolent eloquence is in inverse ratio to the

truth of their utterances. The license of the native press of this country is such that ample scope is afforded for anonymous libellers to defame public servants with practical impunity; but this press has established for itself such a reputation for deliberate misrepresentation that its malicious vapourings can best be treated with merited contempt; but where, as in this case, public servants have not hesitated to conspire together publicly to attack a brother public servant, condign punishment is, in my opinion, imperatively necessary in the interests of public administration. Such agitation is expressly prohibited by rule 68 of the "Rules regulating the personal conduct of public servants."

7. As agitators of this kind are dangerous to the public peace and order, I venture to make the following recommendations for such consideration as they may be considered to merit by His Excellency the Governor in Council:—

(*a*) That the misconduct of the district munsif be brought to the notice of the High Court in view to his prompt transfer after such reduction, suspension or other punishment as may be deemed proper.

(*b*) That the sub-registrar referred to be suspended and reduced.

(*c*) That similar punishment be awarded to the inspectors of the police and of the salt and abkári, the latter to be subsequently transferred.

(*d*) That M.R Ry. Srinivasa Row Avargal, the district and taluk board member, be removed from the local boards under section 24 (1) (iii) of Act V of 1884, and his re-appointment or re-election be prohibited for a period of three years.

(*e*) That M.R.Ry. Govinda Odayar Avargal be similarly dealt with in respect of his appointment in the union panchayat.

8. In conclusion, as I understand, that Mr. John Pillai has lately, in the ordinary course, been relieved of his appointment at Tirukkóyilúr by the reversion of the permanent incumbent. I am of opinion that as this is just what the conspirators have been working for, it is desirable, if not absolutely necessary, that he should be re-appointed to Tirukkóyilúr at a very early date, so that the public may be convinced that such machinations as have been brought to light will not be allowed to succeed. In the public interests such a course seems expedient, for otherwise the transfer of this apothecary at this juncture must give rise to deplorable misconstruction. He has done excellent work at Tirukkóyilúr and the hospital figures afford the best evidence of his popularity. I append copy of my inspection notes passed on the 6th September 1896 which also bears the remarks of the Deputy Collector, and Taluk Board President. I am confident that the Surgeon-General will not for a moment tolerate such intrigues as have been laid bare by the Deputy Collector and the retention of this medical subordinate at Tirukkóyilúr for some months at least to come together with the punishment of his traducers would, I think, be the best possible answer to the mahazars under reference.

From M.R.Ry. R. SUNDARASA MUDALIYAR Avargal, Deputy Collector on General Duties and President, Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr, to the Collector of South Arcot, dated Tirukkóyilúr, 29th September 1896, No. 10.

Adverting to your endorsement, dated 10th July 1896, on a printed memorial against Mr. John Pillai, Civil Apothecary, Tirukkóyilúr, I have the honour to submit his explanation with all the connected records as per enclosed list, and to report as follows.

2. The memorial was the outcome of a public meeting convened at Tirukkóyilúr on the morning of the 24th June 1896. Among the members present were the leading officials of the Judicial, Registration, Police and Abkári departments, as also most of the vakils of the local bar. The president of the meeting was Mr. Gopala Row, Inspector of the Salt and Abkári department, and he is stated to have taken notes of the several complaints made by some of the members present against the civil apothecary. It was resolved that as the local Apothecary Mr. John Pillai had been for a long time inattentive to his duties and had become highly unpopular and inaccessible to the public on occasions of urgent nature, a memorial should be submitted to the Surgeon-General, the Collector and the District Surgeon praying for

his removal from this station, and that a sub-committee of five gentlemen should draft the memorial and do the needful with special reference to the complaints made at the meeting.

3. According to the memorial itself the individuals who are stated to have represented at the meeting the complaints against the apothecary of their own or of others numbered only sixteen, while the signatures affixed to the memorial exceed 180. It was not possible to trace out all the signatories, nor could it be conceived how so many could have had any grievance in the absence of specific mention of it in the memorial itself. I therefore apportioned the work of examining the Tamil signatories to the Tahsildar, and requested him to submit a report detailing the circumstances which brought about the public meeting. His elaborate report which speaks volumes against the memorialists themselves is herewith submitted. He has examined some twenty persons, and I have recorded the statements of seventeen others, most of whom are officials and vakils.

4. It is necessary for a correct understanding of the whole facts of the case to deal with the subject in different sections, and I therefore propose to divide it into three sections as detailed below:—

I. The specific grievances embodied in the manual.

II. How, by whom, and with what motive a public meeting was arranged for, and the memorial drawn up with special reference to the action of public servant, members of the local board and of the union panchayat.

III. The popularity of the medical institution at Tirukkóyilúr.

5. *Section I.*—Of the sixteen persons who complained against the apothecary at the public meeting, six individuals are confined to a vague complaint of irregular attendance at the hospital referred to in paragraph 5 of the memorial, three gentlemen who had either no complaints to make or who had no desire to press their grievance are shown to have given utterance to the supposed grievances of four others who were not present at the meeting, and of whom only one was made to sign the memorial, and two persons—father and son—who are living together are shown in paragraphs 8 to 10 as two different complainants. Hence the actual number of individuals with specific complaints has to be taken as only seven.

As for the first charge of irregular attendance specified in paragraph 5 of the memorial, I examined the three persons named in the margin. The Tahsildar has examined a few others whose names do not appear in the body of the memorial. No one is able to specify the exact date and hour when they found the apothecary absent from the hospital, nor has any person who happened to go to the hospital cared to inquire if the medical officer had gone elsewhere on duty. This is an accusation, which it is easy to make, but not possible to bring home to the person charged, in the absence of particulars as to dates and hours. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Chari, who admits his obligation to the apothecary for gratuitous treatment, speaks of the absence of that officer from the hospital on some occasions, probably in November 1895. He cannot, however, specify the days and he has admittedly made no inquiry as to the cause of late attendance. He admits, however, having received medicines at the hospital about that time almost continuously for fifteen days. This vakil has, in the course of his examination before me, added a fresh count of charge—indifferent treatment—which does not find place in the memorial. On being questioned on this point, the vakil says that he considered his treatment indifferent, because he thought that the apothecary had been engrossed with other thoughts when he (vakil) narrated his case, but that he is unable to state definitely his reasons for calling the treatment an indifferent one. The vakil states that some two or three months after November 1895, he sent to the apothecary, without any demand, Rs. 4 with a letter thanking him for his services, and stating that the amount was not an adequate remuneration for his services; but that the money was returned by the apothecary with a note expressing that he valued friendship more than money. It may well be concluded how far the

(1) M.R Ry. Sreenivasa Charriar, Second-grade Pleader, Tirukkóyilúr.
(2) Ratnasabapatti Mudaliar, Head Clerk, Stationary Sub-Magistrate's Office.
(3) Marimuthu Naik, a ryot.

charge of indifferent treatment can be believed. In explanation of the omission of this new count of charge from the memorial, the vakil contents himself by attributing it to those who drafted the memorial, while he has affixed his signature to the memorial in English with a long title as Pleader, District Munsif's Court, Tirukkóyilúr, and he is one of the two gentlemen who signed a notice for convening the public meeting.

M.R.Ry. Ratnasabapathi Mudaliyar says that the apothecary has been uniformly kind and courteous to him, that on some occasions, when he happened to go to the hospital at about 7 A.M., the apothecary was not present, but that he is unable to give the dates, and that he made no enquiries as to the whereabouts of the officer at the time.

One Marimuthu Naik, who is stigmatized by the medical officer as an ex-convict says that he went to the hospital on one occasion at 7 A.M., and again the next day, that on the first day he was told that the apothecary had gone to the missionary's bungalow, that the apothecary was not seen the next day, but that he cannot mention the exact dates of his visit. This man seems to have uttered a deliberate falsehood by saying that he signed the memorial at the public meeting, while as a matter of fact it was drafted subsequently, and to have acted under the influence of one Govinda Udayar, who figures very prominently as will be seen from the sequel.

6. The next complaint is that of one David Carpenter, a Christian of the Local Danish Mission, and he was examined by the Tahsildar (*vide* page 15 of his report, dated 15th September 1896). In this case, the charge is that the apothecary refused to attend at the house of David Carpenter on a certain day in the first week of May 1896 for the treatment of his baby, five months old, though the child was then in precarious state. It is however admitted by the complainant that the baby was daily taken to the hospital and placed under the treatment of the apothecary for about ten days prior to its death, and that even on the last day when the medical officer's services could not be procured at his quarters, that officer was solicitous about the state of the child, in having deputed two or three persons to go and ascertain why the child was not brought to the hospital, and that the apothecary eventually turned up, in his own carriage, after 9 A.M. The apothecary's explanation is that he had paid due attention to the treatment of the baby, which was suffering from high fever coupled with lung complications, that on the last day when he had a call from David Carpenter during hospital hours, he explained to him the advantages of treatment in the hospital, and asked him to bring the child as usual, that David Carpenter consented to do so and returned home, that as the child was not brought up as agreed to, he (apothecary) ascertained through a servant of the hospital the state of the child and proceeded thereafter to the house of David Carpenter. It is also stated by the apothecary that he had attended at his quarters and treated gratuitously his other children in two severe cases of illness, and that this will be amply testified to by his own wife and other Christians. The apothecary has sent up a copy of a letter from the European Danish Missionary to the District Surgeon, which amply testifies to the good work of the medical officer done to the poor Christians without any charge and most willingly. It appears from the Tahsildar's report that David Carpenter was set up to prefer his complaint some six weeks after the death of his baby by a private vakil named Sadasiva Pillai, who owes a grudge to the apothecary in his capacity as union Chairman (*vide* correspondence ending with your letter, No. 166-D.B., dated 11th May 1896, in the Local Fund Branch). I need hardly say that the complaint of David Carpenter is quite unfounded as aptly remarked by the Rev. S. Berg. It is very strange that the fact of the previous treatment of the very baby by the apothecary has been suppressed from the memorial.

7. The next complainant is one Devarajaya, a girls' school teacher, Tirukkóyilúr, whose grievance is set out in paragraph 7 of the memorial. It is stated there that while Devarajaya's wife was in acute stage of labour, the apothecary declined to attend without *previous* payment of Rs. 15. The word "previous" is italicized in the memorial with a view to draw the attention of the authorities. But Devarajaya himself has on being cross-examined by the apothecary denied that the latter had refused to attend without *previous* payment. It is admitted by this teacher that the

apothecary sent the midwife to attend on the labour case in his house, and that on being told by the apothecary that the woman would have to be relieved by the application of instruments, Devarajaya hesitated, and that he proposed to consult elderly people. The apothecary is said to have demanded a fee of Rs. 15, and asked Devarajaya to make arrangements sharp. In this case there seems to have been a misconception of facts. Devarajaya says that when the prescribed amount of fee was mentioned to him, he did not offer anything less in consideration of his impoverished circumstances, and he understood the words of the apothecary "arrangements should be made soon" to mean steps to procure the fee required. But according to the apothecary's explanation, he wished to hurry his visit and to ask Devarajaya to decide once for all whether he had no objection to handling the case himself. Devarajaya was apparently in a fix when he was suddenly told that the woman in his house would have to be delivered by a male member of the medical profession at a time when he (Devarajaya) had gone to the apothecary's quarters simply to bring back the midwife. Hence it will be seen that no great weight can be attached to this complaint based on a misconception of facts. I have also heard of several instances of gratuitous treatment of labour cases by Mr. John Pillai, and there is no reason to suppose that in this particular instance he was unusually hard.

8. In paragraphs 8 to 10 of the memorial, Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar, B.A., B.L., first grade pleader, and his father Arunachala Aiyar figure as complainants, and the former has made his statement before me both for himself and his father, a retired revenue inspector. As regards the absence of the apothecary from the hospital between 4 and 5–30 P.M., Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar says that he does not remember the exact day when he took his step sister to the hospital who had thrust a tamarind seed in her nostril, that the apothecary was not then at his quarters, that no enquiry was made as to the whereabouts of the apothecary, and that the apothecary turned up after 5–30 P.M. and relieved the child. The vakil does not remember if the apothecary accounted for his absence by saying that he had been to the Sub-Magistrate's Court as a witness. The date is approximately fixed as one between the 10th May and 22nd June 1896, and the apothecary says that on that particular day he was absent in the Sub-Magistrate's Court which is corroborated by the compounder. Thus it will be seen that the complaint is not worth the paper in which it is set forth, and that it was apparently intended to swell the number of charges against the apothecary.

The next complaint embodied in paragraph 9 of the memorial is even according to the complainant's own showing a total misrepresentation of facts. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar admits that the hospital midwife did attend on his step mother in labour from 10 P.M. of the 13th May 1895 till 5 A.M. the next day, that finding the case too difficult for her she left his house at 5 A.M., saying she would go and consult the apothecary, that subsequently the midwife did not turn up, that his (Jayaramachandraiyar's) cousin Ramanadaiyar misunderstood what was wanted and went to call the apothecary instead of the midwife, that at about 10 A.M., Ramanadaiyar was again sent to the hospital to bring the midwife, and that he returned without the midwife and said that she had gone out to attend on some other case of labour. Mr. Arunachalaiyar was averse to allowing the apothecary to handle the case, though he had volunteered his services as admitted by Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar himself, and the hospital midwife had already expressed her inability to treat the case. I do not see how the apothecary or the midwife can be blamed in the circumstances. The apothecary says that as the midwife was unable to cope with the labour case, he sent her to attend on another labour case at Keelur, and I find from the birth register of Keelur village that on 14th May 1895 one Kaluvarayan had a son born dead. This goes to support the statement of the apothecary, and the information furnished by Ramanadan to Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar seems however to urge that his step mother's case should have been given preference. This is absurd on the fact of it inasmuch as the midwife was not quite equal to the task, and her services could he better utilized in the other case at Keelur. The midwife nevertheless turned up in Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar's house at 2 P.M. on 14th May 1895. The language in the memorial in regard to this complaint that the apothecary could not be *moved* is quite meaningless, if not malicious, and yet the very same Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar was one of the members of the sub-committee who drafted the memorial. It should be here noted that this complaint was thirteen months old at the date of the meeting.

The next complaint set forth in paragraph 10 of the memorial refers to the treatment of a baby eleven days old born to Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar's step mother spoken of in the labour case just disposed of. The apothecary opened a boil on the back of the baby at Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar's quarters some ten days after delivery, and on this occasion there was admittedly no delay in attendance on the part of the apothecary. The next morning when the apothecary passed along the street, without the necessary dressing materials and on some unknown business, he did not enter the house to see how the child was getting on (and it is not known to Mr. Ramachandraiyar if the apothecary then enquired Ramanadan about the child), nor was he invited by Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar to attend on the baby. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar was admittedly inside his house at the time. Immediately after Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar says he sent his cousin, Ramanadan, with a carriage to hospital to bring the apothecary, and Ramanadan returned without the apothecary, and explained that he was then very busy in the hospital. It was not then expressly given out by Ramanadan that the apothecary demanded fees, and that his failure to attend was attributable to it, though it was understood from Ramanadan's conversation with Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar that that might be the case. Ramanadan was again sent to the apothecary with an assurance as to the payment of any fee that might be demanded. At about 10 A.M., apparently after the hospital work was over, the apothecary went to Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar's and dressed the boil but refused to receive a sum of Rs. 5 though offered by Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar, explaining that he would receive the fee only after the child was cured. The apothecary attended at Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar's quarters more than twelve days, and cured the baby completely. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar never noticed any indifference in his treatment during the time the apothecary attended on the baby, and eventually sent of his accord Rs. 20 to the apothecary as his remuneration. Now I would ask would any same man, who cannot bring himself to stoop to foul means and misrepresent indubitable facts so much in favour of the apothecary, think of complaining against that very officer, and express his imaginary grievance in such strong language as to induce the authorities to believe that the medical officer was devoid of even the rudimentary principles of humanity, and heartless in exacting money, without regard to the sufferings of the patients. In fact, Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar has practically withdrawn all his complaints, and on being questioned as to the wording of paragraph 10 of the memorial purporting to have been drafted by himself and his comrades, members of the sub-committee. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar says that the words in paragraph 10 are not his own, and that his father Arunachalaiyar does not know English. Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar candidly admitted before me, when questioned as to why the good services of Mr. John Pillai were not represented at the public meeting, that the meeting was convened to condemn and not to applaud the action of the medical officer. I may, however, observe here that the candour and outspoken manner in which as a gentleman Mr. Jayaramachandraiyar has made his statement before me regardless of the dire consequences of incurring the wrath of the district munsif, and his friends, which seem to have threatened other members of the local bar, deserve consideration.

9. Paragraph 11 of the memorial deals with the grievance of Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar, Local Fund Assistant Engineer, who was not present at the meeting, and who seem to have signed the memorial under pressure from the Sub-Registrar Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar. It is said in the memorial that the apothecary, when sent for, *refused* to call on Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar when the latter was suffering one day from *high fever*. In his statement before me, Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar says that on 11th February 1896 he had fever (not high fever) that that day between 6 and 8 A.M. (hospital hours) he sent word to the apothecary asking him to attend at his quarters—two furlongs from the hospital—that he was informed that as the apothecary was then busy at the hospital, he had expressed his inability to comply with the request, that the compounder was however sent to him with the required medicines from the hospital, and that the fever subsided that night. Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar adds that the apothecary went to him the next morning and enquired about his health, and on being questioned as to the health of my child he (apothecary) gave out that it was in a critical state the previous day, that he (Pranathathihara Aiyar) knew that the apothecary had also to attend on my baby the previous day,

that before seeing the memorial in print, he had no serious attention of complaining against the apothecary, that he never desired any one to represent his grievance to the authorities or at the public meeting, that as the memorial in print did not fairly set out the whole facts of his case, he added a note in pencil at the close of paragraph 11 that the apothecary attended the next day when his services were not in need, but that as the sub-registrar objected to the appearance of such a record (favourable to the apothecary) in the body of the memorial itself, the pencil entry was scored out, and the same note repeated in ink just above his (Pranatharthihara Aiyar's) signature. The complaint is in itself shown to be frivolous, to say the least of it, inasmuch as the medical officer could not, in justice to his duties, be present in the hospital and at the same time in Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar's house to attend to an ordinary case of fever, but the highly reprehensible conduct of the officers in intentionally suppressing a salient fact from the body of the memorial, and transferring a note of it to an unnoticeable portion of the memorial amidst a number of signatures deserves comment. I shall, however, deal with the action of the officials in a separate section as premised. In his explanation in regard to this complaint, the apothecary rightly points out that the wording in the memorial is not justified by the facts deposed to by Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar himself, which do not refer to "high fever" and "refusal to attend" and that being unaware of the strained relations between himself (apothecary) and the Sub-Registrar, Mr. Pranatharthihara Aiyar, allowed himself to be carried away by the pressure of the sub-registrar, who had throughout acted with a sinister motive.

10. The next complainant, whose grievances are embodied in paragraphs 12, 13 and 14 of the memorial, is M.R.Ry. T. Varatharajulu Naidu Garu, B.A., B.L., District Munsif of Tirukkóyilúr. He wished to avoid his personal attendance before me for open enquiry on the score of his official position and the unpleasant idea of meeting the apothecary, and sent me a written statement of the facts of his complaint. But as his complaints had no reference to his official capacity, and as the apothecary stoutly protested against admitting on record any statement of the district munsif made behind his back and untested by cross-examination, the district munsif after much hesitation consented to depose before me. He pressed his charges most vehimently, added to a new charge which does not find place in the memorial, apparently because the three complaints in the memorial were all no less than ten months old on the date of the public meeting which he attended, and made an elaborate statement which I had to record on two days successively for full twelve hours.

The first complaint in chronological order is set forth in paragraph 13 of the memorial. The district munsif says that he had an abscess near one of his knees, and he sent word to the apothecary at about 7 P.M. on 28th July 1895 for dressing the abscess. The apothecary sent word in reply that he was much tired and could not therefore call over. A message was again sent to the apothecary asking him to send the compounder at least, but even this requisition was not complied with. The compounder was then sent for independently of the apothecary, and he (compounder) turned up at 8 P.M., and did the needful. The apothecary had already commenced the treatment and was asked by the district munsif either to attend himself, or to depute his compounder. On the morning of the *29th July 1895*, the apothecary attended on the district munsif at his quarters and continued to do so for about two days from that date. There was no need to cut open the abscess. On the night of the 28th July 1895 when the compounder turned up he bandaged the abscess in such a manner that it might not fall away during sleeping hours, applying to the abscess what the apothecary had previously prescribed. It is admitted by the district munsif that he might himself have bandaged it. In connection with this complaint, the apothecary says that if there was any real requisition for his attendance, he would certainly have attended on the district munsif as he had done before and after that date, that it is impossible for him to remember, after the lapse of nearly a year, the minute details of every individual case treated by him, and that it was usual with the district munsif and his people to apply for his services even in trivial cases. I would request a reference to the apothecary's explanation with regard to this and other complaints against him.

As regards paragraph 12 of the memorial, the district munsif's complaint refers to the treatment of another abscess near his anus, and in connection with this he *wrote* to the apothecary asking him to attend at his quarters on the *10th August 1895* to which he received a reply that, as it was a meeting day of the panchayat, and as he might be fully occupied with the hospital work, the apothecary could not call over *in the morning* and that he would attend later on. The district munsif waited till 12 noon without going to court, but the medical officer did not turn up. The apothecary's note, dated 10th August 1895, on a scrap of paper was preserved for full one year, and produced by the district munsif on *16th August 1896*. The district munsif admits that the apothecary turned up the next day (11th August), and that on the 12th August he opened the abscess as he had undertaken to do the previous day. The apothecary says that, to the best of his recollection, he went to the house of the district munsif in the afternoon of the 10th August 1895, and learnt that he had left his court which he would not have done if the disease was a serious one. But the district munsif refuses to believe it, and his contention is that had the medical officer appeared after his going to court, his servants would have given information of it. It is really very strange that the district munsif preferred to rely on his servants as to what happened a year ago, and would not believe the apothecary, though the district munsif's absence from his house could be ascertained without directly enquiring his own servants. I may also observe here that I find from an extract from the hospital visitors' book that it was on the 10th August 1895 that Mr. Roberts, the Assistant Collector, visited the hospital, and recorded his notes in the book.

The next paragraph (14) deals with the complaint of the district munsif in regard to the treatment of his daughter. He says that on the *22nd August 1895* at about 1 A.M., his daughter was seriously ill, and that he sent a lantern with two servants to the apothecary with an urgent request that he should come over to see the patient. The men returned with a medicine and said that the apothecary could not be induced to come at that hour. The medicine was not however administered as the apothecary had not seen the patient. In this instance there was no written communication between the district munsif and the apothecary. The apothecary says that he had seen the girl the previous evening at his quarters, and given the necessary medicines to be taken at stated hours for the night, that to the best of his recollection on that very night at about 9 o'clock a servant of the district munsif sent by his wife orally reported the state of the child, and asked for certain instructions as to the administration of medicine and diet for the night, that he forthwith gave the required instructions, and attended on the child the next morning, and that the allegation that the child which was stated to be very seriously ill at 2 A.M., was all right the next morning is enough to indicate the simple nature of the disease.

The fourth complaint of the district munsif which, for the first time, was brought to notice in his written statement sent to me on 16th August 1896, *i.e.*, seven weeks after the public meeting, refers to the apothecary's failure to attend on him in the early part of March 1896, when he (district munsif) had slight fever, and when a female member of his household had sent word to the apothecary in his name. It is however admitted by the district munsif at the close of sheet No. 6 of his statement made before me that the apothecary attended on him when he had slight fever. It is not clear whether this was not the occasion spoken of as referring to March 1896. The apothecary says in his explanation that to the best of his recollection, he saw the district munsif at his quarters and prescribed medicines on 5th March 1896.

As for remuneration * to the apothecary, the district munsif has attempted to show by a peculiar classification of the medical officer's visits, into official and friendly, and visits entitling him to remuneration and no fees, that the visits for which any fee was due were not more than the value (Rs. 5) of a tennis bat, which he had given him in the middle of 1895, and Rs. 3 which he has sent in cash on two different occasions after January 1896. The apothecary denies having received more than Rs. 2 in cash and says that, on receipt of this amount on 18th February 1896, he sent him a note thanking him and pointing out this payment as a new departure in his case, that the bat was merely given as a loan, and that the district munsif had

* *Vide* apothecary's separate list enclosed of medical attendance and quality of medicines supplied.

refused to accept Rs. 5 offered as its price. The bat was returned to the district munsif immediately after the meeting and that very day, and it was accepted by him. The district munsif wants me to believe that as the scale of fees for private attendance of the medical officer had not been fixed, there was no payment throughout the year 1895, except by way of the tennis bat, which he says, he intended to serve as remuneration, though he had not openly expressed it. But the district munsif did not care to know what was the fee due, apparently because he never meant to pay, and does not remember to have maintained a record of the number of official visits at his quarters and is unable to produce that officer's letter written to him so recently as 18th February 1896, while he has carefully preserved notes as to the dates of all his complaints against the apothecary, though nearly a year and old, and the scrap of paper written to him by that officer so far back as 10th August 1895. A careful perusal of the district munsif's statement made before me will convince the reader that he has strenuously and by a sustained effort tried his utmost to withhold or deny every information which may be construed favourable to the apothecary, that he has exerted to fill up all possible loopholes where the medical officer can be expected to afford reasonable explanation, and that he has positively asserted everything unfavourable to that officer even though the events referred to happened some months ago, and he based his assertions on the oral informations given him by his servants, who acted the part of messengers between himself and the apothecary. In this aspect, the district munsif's statement is a striking contrast to that of his Pleader Mr. Jayaramachandra-iyar, which is marked for candour and fairness. It is to be regretted that the district munsif's memory fails just where what may be elicited from him is likely to favour the contention of the apothecary even in regard to recent events, but his memory is very strong and probabilities rush in where an assertion touching incidents many months old is likely to bring home a charge to the medical officer. It seems as if the district munsif has carried a little too far his judicial acuman, and allowed his sense of fair dealing as a judicial officer to be overpowered by predominant self-interest. I shall however return to this subject in another portion of this report where it will be shown how much he has worked to bring about the memorial under report. His complaints are mainly based on what he was told by his servants, and the information was with reference to what happened some ten months ago. In the light of the explanation furnished by the apothecary, I cannot attach any weight to the charges, and the tennis bat incident will suffice to show at once whether it was becoming on an officer in the position of the district munsif to have treated the bat as a remuneration for the professional visits of the apothecary, while it was originally given him as a loan, and subsequently as a present when its price was offered by the apothecary. I may also observe here that the exact dates of the several complaints now given out by the district munsif do not find place in the memorial, that he has purposely omitted to sign the memorial, and that in a portion of his statement before me he says he is not responsible for the wording in the memorial.

11. The next gentleman who appears on the stage is Mr. Gopala Row, Inspector of the Salt and Abkári Department, Tirukkóyilúr circle, who had the honour of presiding at the public meeting held on 24th June 1896. He appears to have been smarting under some imaginary grievance against the apothecary in that he was not courteously received at the hospital on the occasion of his first visit without previous intimation, and that the apothecary had refused to give him a medical certificate to enable him to apply for sick leave. These two personal grievances all shown to be quite unfounded by the Tahsildar in his accompanying report, dated 15th September 1896, inasmuch as the apothecary was not to blame for omitting to do what he was not competent to do in the matter of sick certificate to be granted to a gazetted officer, and that Mr. Gopala Row should have previously announced his position when he first visited the hospital.

It is stated in paragraph 15 of the memorial that the apothecary did not attend, on being sent for by Mr. Gopala Row, when he was suffering from ear-ache and he had to seek the aid of the compounder who had the kindness to do the needful. Mr. Gopala Row evaded open enquiry in the presence of the apothecary, and he has sent me a written statement wherein he has improved his complaint by adding throat-ache to ear-ache. It appears from the explanation of the apothecary and his compounder's statement that Mr. Gopala Row never applied for medical aid for ear-ache, that

when Mr. Gopala Row wanted some medicine to apply to his throat, it was sent to him through the compounder, that there was no requisition from him for the services of the apothecary, that the disease, throat-ache, was introduced in Mr. Gopala Row's written statement after the apothecary recorded the statement of his compounder in regard to it, and that the accusation is quite unfounded and malicious. Mr. Gopala Row says in his written statement, dated 5th August 1896, that the apothecary was highly unpopular, and that a majority of the people have lost their confidence in him, while as a matter of fact several members of his own family are shown by the hospital records to have received in full confidence medical aid at the very same hospital managed by Mr. John Pillai. Mr. Gopala Row has purposely omitted to sign the memorial, though he was the president of the meeting. As he was subsequently transferred to Nandyal he could not be cross-examined by the apothecary. His unwarranted aspersions, out of interested motive, on the popularity of the apothecary, deserve severe notice.

12. The next complainant is one Rangasami Pillai, a peon of the local *District Munsif's Court*. His complaint as set forth in 16 of the memorial is that his boy with a cancerous ulcer in one of his jaws was placed under the treatment of the apothecary, that as the ulcer was emitting foul smell the apothecary kept him at a distance, and had the ulcer dressed by a ward cooly, and that the boy was under indifferent treatment. There is a marginal note in manuscript in the handwriting of the sub-registrar that the boy died since the date of the memorial, as if the death was due to indifferent treatment. But Rangasami Pillai, who does not know English, has in his statement before me distinctly stated that he noticed no sort of indifference in the treatment of the boy, that the apothecary regretted the result of the quack treatment in the interval and even apprized him of the dangerous consequences of it, but never ordered the boy to be kept aloof, that the boy's mother used to keep him at some distance because of the bad smell, that the apothecary examined the boy on the first day, and prescribed medicines, and that the boy was given the same kind of treatment as was given to the other patients in the hospital. It is also evident from this peon's statement that on the day of the public meeting he was sent for through another peon of the district munsif, and asked by the sub-registrar, Mr. Sreenivasa Row, and the retired district munsif to make a statement of his boy's case, that the sub-registrar and the district munsif are friends and that the former evinced special interest in enquiring about the death of the boy in the house of the district munsif. The only complaint of this peon is that the apothecary did not go near the boy after the first day, though the boy was every day taken in his presence and given prescription. It was the compounder who gave medicines to the boy as prescribed by the medical officer and the ulcer was washed by the ward cooly as is generally done in the case of other patients. There is virtually no valid ground of complaint against the apothecary. Facts have been distorted and misrepresented with unworthy motives for which the Sub-Registrar, Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar, was one of the few responsible. The language in the memorial is greatly misleading, and the sub-registrar who drafted it had an ulterior object which will be dwelt upon later on. This complaint having completely fallen to the ground the apothecary says that there is no need for him to offer his explanation in regard to it. This is one of a series of unsuccessful attempts at multiplying the charges against the apothecary, and the peon being a subordinate of the district munsif seems to have been induced to say something against the medical officer at the public meeting, apparently because he was encouraged by the presence of his master there with a number of complaints of his own against the same officer.

13. The next grievance embodied in paragraph 17 of the memorial is that of M.R.Ry. S. Sundraiyar, Tahsildar of Tirukkóyilúr. It was represented at the public meeting by the Sub-Registrar, M.R.Ry. Masilamani Mudaliyar, though the latter was not desired to do so. The tahsildar was not one of the members of the public meeting, nor has he affixed his signature to the memorial. The sub-registrar says that when he happened to meet the tahsildar on two occasions, he (sub-registrar) voluntarily mentioned to him that the apothecary had not been kind enough to attend on him forthwith, that the tahsildar did not contradict, and that in the course of his conversation with the tahsildar it was clear that he preferred native treatment to that

of the apothecary. It was therefore inferred by the sub-registrar that the tahsildar had a complaint against Mr. John Pillai, and he discharged the self-imposed duty of giving utterance to it by representing it to the chairman of the public meeting. The report of the tahsildar, dated 21st September 1896, which I have obtained regarding the allegations in paragraphs 17 and 21 of the memorial will go to show that he had not a shadow of grievance against the apothecary, that that officer did comply with his request and attend on him (tahsildar) as early as possible, that he (tahsildar) had a fall from horseback on 18th June 1895 at a place 9 miles from Tirukkóyilúr, and not from a carriage at a village 6 miles from the town as stated in the memorial, that his case was not one of grave urgency as stated in the memorial, that there was no *urgent request* for the attendance of the apothecary, that the expression "a conveyance drawn by a pony" was inserted in paragraph 17 of the memorial with a view to induce a belief that it was a swift conveyance, while, as a matter of fact, the pony which was the property of the sub-registrar himself was well known to be the slowest creature unable to walk even 2 miles an hour, and that he (tahsildar) had recourse to native treatment in September 1895 because of the simple nature of the disease he was then suffering from, and of his having, on a previous occasion, when he had an injury in his forearm by a fall, treated with indifference the instructions given him by the apothecary. The words of the tahsildar in the concluding paragraph of his report under reference may be quoted here for facility of reference—

"I beg to observe that I was neither present at the meeting, nor have I signed the memorial, nor have I asked any of those present at the meeting to represent my grievances, if any. The sub-registrar has nevertheless, to show himself in his true colours, discharged his self-imposed duty of representing me as one of the complainants, and in doing so, he has, as shown above, acquitted himself in a way most unbecoming, to say the least of it, an officer of his position, inasmuch as he has freely indulged himself in reprehensible distortion and suppression of facts with an ulterior object which pervades the memorial."

In this connection, I may also bring to notice that the tahsildar visited the hospital on 7th June 1896, *i.e.*, seventeen days before the date of the public meeting of which nothing was then known, and noted in the visitors' book that the institution was very popular, and that great credit was due to Mr. John Pillai for the interest he took in his work. It is absurd to say in the face of these remarks recorded so recently, that the tahsildar had really any grievance against the Apothecary, Mr. John Pillai. At page 26 of his report, dated 25th August 1896, Mr. John Pillai has, in view of the various false charges maliciously urged against him in the memorial, applied for permission to prosecute some of the leading men for defamation and damages if not also for false information; and this is a matter for the consideration of the authorities.

14. The next complaint set out in paragraph 18 of the memorial is represented as one which proceeded from myself, and this was, as admitted by the Sub-Registrar, Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar, ventilated by him at the public meeting. Here again there is a culpable suppression of facts. A few days after I joined this division, a ryot from a distant village represented to me in the office that he was unable to pay the high fee demanded by the apothecary for attendance in his village on a labour case. As I was informed that the scale of fees and the distance limit had not been fixed by this taluk board, I could not satisfactorily settle the matter. Subsequently, the subject came up for decision at a meeting of the taluk board, and I was for fixing the lower scale of fees referred to in the Government Order in consideration of the poverty of the masses in this division, and in support of my view I referred to the particular incident as admitted by the sub-registrar, who, as vice-president of the taluk board, was present at the meeting. The lower of the two scales was adopted, and a distance limit of 12 miles was fixed in a resolution of the taluk board at the meeting. This does not show in the least that Mr. John Pillai was unreasonable in his demands, or that he was unduly cruel in the particular case. The sub-registrar has apparently availed himself of his connection with the taluk board and misused the information he had obtained as a member and vice-president of the board to serve his end. The apothecary says that the distance he was desired to travel by the ryot in the case under reference was about 15 miles, that he had brought no conveyance, and that he was not prepared to pay any fee. I may say that if I had thought that Mr. John

Pillai was in any way to blame in the matter, I would certainly have called for his explanation, and settled the matter. But I had no just cause of complaint in the absence of definite rules on the subject, and the matter was therefore dropped at the time.

In paragraph 21 of the memorial, a reference is made to my having sent for medical aid from a distant station at a considerable cost as if I had no confidence in the medical treatment of Mr. John Pillai. This is another instance of exaggeration and misstatement of facts. In the course of twenty days from the close of January 1896, three children in my family died one after another, and they were not exclusively under the treatment of Mr. John Pillai. The first child had an attack of dysentery when I was absent in camp 40 miles off. It was for some days under the treatment of a native physician in my absence, and when Mr. John Pillai took up the case he found it almost hopeless. The child died immediately after my return to Tirukkóyilúr. Mr. John Pillai tried his best and devoted great attention to the treatment of the other two children, who were also occasionally under the treatment of others, but his labours proved fruitless. A woman from a village 5 or 6 miles from Tirukkóyilúr was sent for at the instance of the female inmates of my house for the treatment of the last baby, simply as a last chance, but after some days she gave up the baby as hopeless of cure. The woman was thereafter sent back with a remuneration of a few rupees. This course was adopted not because of want of confidence in the apothecary, but because we had to try the last chance as is occasionally done even by professional medical officers. It is very strange that so much has been made of this incident to condemn the apothecary as a medical officer who does not command confidence of the public. Even a few months ago, the apothecary has successfully treated my surviving children when they were suffering from fever. The Tahsildar, Mr. Sundara Iyer, says that on many occasions after he had a fall from his horse, he had recourse to the treatment of Mr. John Pillai for himself, his wife and children. It will thus be seen that the allegation in paragraph 21 of the memorial rests on very shaby foundation, and that it is calculated by the authors of the memorial, of whom the sub-registrar is one, to unfairly represent Mr. John Pillai as an unworthy member of the medical profession. I shall return to this subject when dealing with his general popularity.

15. The last specific charge against the apothecary is recorded in paragraph 19 of the memorial, and the officer who took upon himself the responsibility of representing it at the public meeting was Mr. Narasimma Chariar, the Inspector of Police, Tirukkóyilúr Division. This officer attended the meeting on 24th June 1896, and he has signed the memorial on 2nd July 1896, in his capacity as inspector of police. He says that he has made a report in his diary to the Superintendent of the convening of the public meeting, and of its object. It is not known if he has made his official superior understand that he figured as one of the complainants against the apothecary. He says distinctly that he had no grievance of his own against Mr. John Pillai, that on the other hand he was very much thankful to him for his having taken special care of his brother and treated him for a month for lunacy, that his requisition for the medical services of Mr. John Pillai was always readily complied with, that for all such services no remuneration was at any time demanded or paid, that even when a remuneration was offered, Mr. John Pillai declined to receive it, and that so far as medical treatment is concerned, he (police inspector) had no complaint against the apothecary. The police inspector had however official complaints against the Apothecary Mr. John Pillai in his capacity as a medical officer and union chairman. This is the very inspector of police who is responsible for the scandalous insinuation in paragraph 19 of the memorial that Mr. John Pillai is indirectly responsible for the death of a Pariah from Adichanallur, who had sustained injuries by a fall from a piccotah, and who, according to the memorial, died some two days after he was refused admission as an in-patient in the hospital in February or March 1896. In his statement before me, the inspector says that he had the information from an unknown female relation of the deceased Pariah, that when the latter was taken to the hospital, he was not taken as an in-patient, and that the medical officer had not taken sufficient pains to treat the patient. The inspector says that he got this information some ten days after the death of the injured Pariah, that the Pariah was not sent to the hospital by the police, and that no enquiry was made if the Pariah offered to be taken as an in-patient, and if he had not already been under the treatment of a native quack. There is

nothing said in the memorial itself of the indifferent treatment now spoken of by the inspector, and this was apparently a subsequent improvement to aggravate the charge against Mr. John Pillai. On referring to the records of inquest in this case, I find that the police reported the case as one of accidental death, that in reply to a reference from the sub-magistrate, the apothecary stated that, according to the information of the Pariah, he had sustained the injury by a beating, and that, after some correspondence on the subject between the magistrate and the police, the sub-magistrate examined certain blood relations of the deceased and others and found that the case to be one of accidental death. The police did not relish the idea of the apothecary furnishing certain information contrary to the line of their action. If there was any real ground of complaint against the apothecary, the blood relations of the deceased being the aggrieved parties would certainly have mentioned it when they were examined by the sub-magistrate in about five days after the death; but, as a matter of fact, I find no such thing in the records of the sub-magistrate's enquiry. The fact seems to be that the inspector had for about a year been cherishing strong official grudge against the apothecary, and he availed himself of the opportunity of a public meeting countenanced by officials and vakils to defame Mr. John Pillai by representing the imaginary grievance of an unknown person. It will be seen from what follows that the inspector is one of the worst offenders without a particle of gratitude for the gratuitous medical aid which he had so often received from Mr. John Pillai. The object in recording this unfounded complaint in paragraph 19 against Mr. John Pillai and in referring to his antecedents in a parallel case some years ago in the next following paragraph 20, needs hardly any comment, and the authors of the memorial, of whom the sub-registrar was certainly one, seem to have ingeniously exercised their powers of exposition by such an arrangement and sequence of allegations to improperly influence the authorities against Mr. John Pillai. The apothecary says that his suspension referred to in paragraph 20 of the memorial was some fifteen years ago, and that it was cancelled on his appeal. The records in the Surgeon-General's office may, if necessary, be referred to on the subject.

16. This memorial as its predecessor, the manuscript memorial already reported on by me, closes with a prayer not for the investigation of the various charges against the apothecary, but for his immediate transfer from the place. I have shown above in detail that the charges are utterly unfounded and imaginary, and it will be apparent from the sequel that in some instances they are malicious, and that the memorial was got up simply to pander to the wishes of a few discontended influential men in the town.

17. *Section II.*—On a perusal of the records of my enquiry and of the reports of the Tahsildar of Tirukkóyilúr, dated 15th and 21st September 1896, coupled with a consideration of the facts brought to notice by the apothecary in his report, dated 25th August 1896, I am led to conclude that the chief instigators of the public meeting and the subsequent printed memorial under report were the gentlemen named below, and that but for the district munsif such a well-attended public meeting would not have been possible:—

(1) M.R.Ry. J. Varatharajulu Naidu Garu, B.A., B.L., District Munsif, Tirukkóyilúr.
(2) M.R.Ry. V. Masilamani Mudaliyar Avargal, late Sub-Registrar and Vice-President, Taluk Board.
(3) M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal, 1st Grade Pleader and a Member of the District and Taluk Boards.
(4) M.R.Ry. C. Narasimma Chariar Avargal, Inspector of Police, Tirukkóyilúr Division.
(5) M.R.Ry. Govinda Udayan, Landholder and Member of the Union Panchayat.
(6) M.R.Ry. Sadasiva Pillai, Private Vakil, Tirukkóyilúr.

The first named gentleman felt aggrieved because, according to the information given him by his servants, the apothecary had refused to attend at his quarters on the 28th July 1895, and on the 10th and 22nd August 1895. In regard to these complaints, I may state here briefly that it was only on one occasion (10th August 1895), there was communication in writing between the two officers, and there was

then a satisfactory reply from Mr. John Pillai. The district munsif says that for the attendance of the apothecary on his son for a sham head-ache, he sent through his peon one rupee to Mr. John Pillai, the receipt of which is denied by the latter. It cannot be said in regard to this paltry sum either of the officers is uttering falsehood. Again the district munsif says that in March 1896 when his aunt sent word to the apothecary to attend on the district munsif for slight fever, Mr. John Pillai sent an hospital servant to the district munsif's house to ascertain how the sick child was getting on. In fairness to both the officers, the reasonable inference is that, in the first instance, the money was misappropriated by the peon, and that, in the second instance, some wrong information was given to Mr. John Pillai. These instances spoken to by the district munsif himself are sufficient to show what amount of confidence can be placed on his servants, and how far they can be relied on for accurate information. Whatever it may be, it was and it still continues to be the impression of the district munsif that the apothecary is to blame for not responding to his calls. In September 1895 when he (district munsif) went to see the tahsildar then on sick bed accompained by his friend, the sub-registrar, he was observed by the tahsildar to welcome every information against Mr. John Pillai. The district munsif had not the moral courage to represent his complaints in writing to the authorities, and he sought for a device of mentioning them in his private conversation with my predecessor Mr. Rajaratna Mudaliar, who left the district on transfer in the middle of October 1895, and then abandoned the idea of putting in a written complaint, though he seems to have cherished a plan of getting rid of Mr. John Pillai. The sub-registrar being his close friend and vice-president of the taluk board seems to have come in for aid. At the meeting of the taluk board held on 13th November 1895 at which Mr. Raghaviah presided, the sub-registrar moved a resolution on the pretext of economy to replace the two apothecaries in the division by second-class hospital assistants, as if lives of men are not so precious as the maintenance of roads, and the motion was seconded by his comrade Mr. Sreenivasa Row. A resolution was accordingly passed by a majority of the board, the dissenting members being the tahsildar and a vakil by name Mr. Parthasarathi Aiyangar. But even this attempt to replace Mr. John Pillai proved unsuccessful, inasmuch as the resolution of the taluk board was, on mature consideration, vetoed by the district board in spite of vehement support by Mr. Sreenivasa Row in the district board. I joined the division in the middle of December 1895, and the district munsif says that, on the very day of my assumption of charge, he made me understand that the apothecary was an indifferent medical officer. I do not remember to have heard of it. But it goes to show that the district munsif wished to influence me at the very outset against Mr. John Pillai, and eventually to secure his transfer. This was certainly not a commendable course. I subsequently noticed in the sub-registrar a spirit of opposition to Mr. John Pillai chiefly in his capacity as Chairman of the Tirukkóyilúr Union. I had then, however, no knowledge of the details of the past events. In February 1896, the sub-registrar and Mr. Sreenivasa Row, who as members of the taluk board had been requested to report on house-tax appeals, complained to me that the Union Chairman, Mr. John Pillai, had refused to lend one of the union servants to help them in inspecting the houses in the union and I pacified them and gave them the required aid. In April 1896, there was a report from Mr. Holman, Inspector of the Salt and Abkári Department, complaining of the action taken by Mr. John Pillai on sanitary grounds and bringing to notice his unpopularity. The report was referred to me, and I have in my endorsement on the tahsildar's report, Dis. No. 392, dated 24th May 1896, in the Local Fund branch, represented to you that the sub-registrar was lightly suspected of having set up Mr. Holman against Mr. John Pillai, and that the latter was not to blame in the matter. Again, on 7th May 1896, there were two petitions purporting to have been signed by seven union servants and complaining against Mr. John Pillai for exacting from them his private work. One of these petitions was addressed to you as President, district board (*vide* endorsement, dated 12th May 1896), and the other to the District Surgeon, and they were referred to me for disposal. The petitions were referred to the Stationary Sub-Magistrate for inquiry, and his report, dated 22nd June 1896, shows that the petitions were pseudonymous, that they were believed to have been got up by some of the enemies of Mr. John Pillai and that the union servants examined had no complaint against that officer—*vide* file enclosed.

Again, there was a manuscript memorial, dated May 1896, and addressed to the Surgeon-General. This contained a number of charges against the apothecary and union chairman, and it was, as admitted by Mr. Sreenivasa Row, drafted by himself. I have already reported on the memorial in my confidential No. 9 of 1896 and shown what action was taken in regard to it by Mr. Sreenivasa Row. Most of the allegations in the manuscript memorial against Mr. John Pillai in his capacity as apothecary are repeated in the printed memorial. On the very day (23rd June 1896) on which I received the manuscript memorial for report as to the genuineness of the signatures in it, a notice was issued for convening a public meeting the next morning (24th June 1896) which resulted in the printed memorial under report. The notice of the meeting was signed by Mr. Sreenivasa Row and another vakil, Mr. Sreenivasa Chariar.

In his statement before me, the district munsif says that he was not aware of the public meeting till he got the notice on the night of the 23rd June 1896, that he cannot say that it struck him at the time that he would be called upon to state what he had to say against the apothecary, that it was not mentioned in the notice that people should be ready with their complaints when they go to the meeting, and that nevertheless on the morning of the meeting day he took with him the apothecary's letter, dated 10th August 1895. He adds that he might have casually mentioned to some of his vakils his complaints against the apothecary. I may also observe here that nine out of the eleven vakils practising in his court have taken part in the public meeting, affixed their signatures to the printed memorial, while only one of them had specific complaints against Mr. John Pillai, that five out of the eighteen signatories to the manuscript memorial in which his complaints are referred to are his vakils, and that, while I was recording his statement on 18th August 1896 after 5 P.M. to suit his convenience, four of his vakils headed by Mr. Sreenivasa Row who are all signatories to the printed memorial just like a number of others, sent a letter to me requesting to be present at the enquiry and put some questions to him, which, however, was not complied with inasmuch as the district munsif did not require their presence. It appears further from the tahsildar's report, dated 15th September 1896, that it was at the instance of the district munsif that Mr. Ramalinga Aiyar, M.A., who was put as a member of the meeting, was sent for and that it was the wish of the district munsif that his vakils should not expose his friend, the sub-registrar. Mr. Sreenivasa Row, who signed the meeting notice, says that he does *not like to give out the names of the persons* from whom there was a requisition for convening *the public meeting*. Similarly, Mr. Sreenivasa Chariar, who was a joint signatory to the meeting notice, has declined to answer the apothecary's query as to who took part in drafting the notice. Further, it is distinctly stated by Mr. Jaga Ramachandraiyar, B.A., B.L., another vakil of the same Court, but with quite different turn of mind as stated already, that the sub-registrar and the police inspector took the meeting notice to him and told him that he should attend the meeting and represent his grievances. This fact is, of course, denied by these two officers. It appears also from what is stated by Mr. Murugasa Pillai (the sub-magistrate) that the police inspector went to him on the morning of the meeting day and made him understand that he should also attend the meeting, when the Salt Inspector's carriage was kept waiting for him. This is further supported by other statements recorded by the tahsildar. There is also a statement taken from the Forest Range officer to the effect that he was invited by the sub-registrar to attend the meeting. Now I would ask whether the impression produced on reading together the various statements with due regard to the probabilities of the case is not such as to lead one to the conclusion that the meeting was pre-arranged among the district munsif, the sub-registrar, the inspector of police and Mr. Sreenivasa Row, and that there was a strong combination among them to press the charges as best as they could and to make the meeting a thorough success? Mr. Sreenivasa Row is unable to account satisfactorily for having resorted to memorials and a public meeting against the apothecary, a public servant under the control of the local board, in preference to representing, as he had a right to do, the charges or grievances at the taluk or district board of which he is a member, and his conduct deserves notice. I have no hesitation in concluding that the vakils joined together to support the district munsif, the sub-registrar whose recent departure on transfer he seems to have regretted very much, was ready to lend his helping hand, that the inspector of police smarting under some official

grievance against Mr. John Pillai, which will be detailed below, was of some use in arranging for the meeting and securing the attendance of members, and that Mr. Gopala Row, who had some unfounded complaints against Mr. John Pillai, was induced to preside at the meeting and invite complaints from the members present.

The inspector of police mentioned to me, after I closed his statement, that the misunderstanding between him and the apothecary arose from the date of the Tirukkóyilúr murder case disposed of a year ago, and on this information I referred to the records. In register case No. 3 of 1895, disposed of by the then Sub-Magistrate Mr. Krishnasamy Aiyar, on 10th June 1895, Mr. John Pillai gave evidence which went to show that it was a real case of murder, and the Sub-Magistrate has passed very severe strictures on the reprehensible and suspicious conduct of the police including the inspector (*vide* preliminary register enclosed for reference). In this case it does not appear that any notice was taken of the conduct of the inspector, and he having escaped unscathed seems to have worked in a revengeful spirit against the apothecary, by causing a charge sheet to be put in on 18th October 1895 against the apothecary's private servant and one of his union servants, charging them with theft of a bark of a tree worth *a pie* (*vide* calendar No. 36 of 1895 on the file of the Sub-Magistrate of Tirukkóyilúr). This case, however, ended in acquittal, and on a representation from the apothecary, the inspector seems to have been severely scolded by the Superintendent of Police. There was subsequently some correspondence between the apothecary and the Superintendent of Police through the District Magistrate in respect of gambling countenanced by the police here. These are the real official grievances which apparently set up the inspector to join the opposition, and represent at the public meeting the imaginary grievance of an unknown person against Mr. John Pillai. The inspector of police had to appear before me on the day of the meeting in my camp at Manalurput eight miles from Tirukkóyilúr in connection with a criminal case. He did not appear there before 2 P.M. He cared more for the success of the meeting, and he would not quit the meeting hall even though he was desired to return home by a Vakil Mr. R. Srinivasa Aiyangar of Cuddalore, who had also business in my court the same day at Manalurput. With these facts, I would request you to decide whether an officer, whose duty it is to preserve peace and order, can be let off with impunity, when he is shown to have stimulated an agitation in the town under cloak of his authority, which even a station-house officer of ordinary common sense would not have ventured to do.

As for Govinda Udayan No. 4, Union Panchayat member, he became very obnoxious and refractory in the matter of revision of house-tax, encroachments on public streets, and sanitation of the town. He was chiefly instrumental in retarding the work of the panchayat in these important branches of panchayat work. At a time when cholera was raging around Tirukkóyilúr, Govinda Udayan was reported by Mr. John Pillai in his letter, dated 14th August 1895, to have requested him very much to slacken the rule as to giving effect to the speedy removal of rubbish from the backyards of houses in the limits of the union, and it was ordered in your endorsement, dated 19th August 1895, that he should not again be nominated as a panchayatdar. But on a further representation from my predecessor, you intimated in your endorsement, Cur. No. 1140-D.B., dated 25th September 1895, that you had no objection to the re-appointment of Govinda Udayan provided no better man is availabe when he retires.

Again, it was reported to me by the Chairman Mr. John Pillai in his letter, dated 23rd March 1896, that the very same Govinda Udayan had refused to report on encroachments as desired by the panchayat with the assistance of two other members, and that he returned the list of encroachments twice.

It appears further from the panchayat resolution, No. 13, dated 20th March 1896, on this subject that Govinda Udayan was unguarded in his expression and mannerless.

There was subsequently another occasion when this Govinda Udayan had refused, on the pretext of caste prejudices, to do the work allotted to him of revising the house-tax for the current year by entering the Parachari included in his ward, and he expressed his sympathy with the tax-payers. This was reported to me by the chairman in his letter, dated 17th April 1896.

This Govinda Udayan, being a native physician and a channel monegar having control over the regulation of water-supply, commands some influence especially among the masses, and he is shown by the Tahsildar to have taken an active part in getting signatures to the memorial on various false pretexts. As he is reported to have refused to act on three different occasions, he has rendered himself liable to be removed from the panchayat under section 126 of the Local Boards' Act and Local and Municipal Notification No. 326, dated 17th May 1894. This Govinda Udayan was the neighbour of the late Sub-Registrar Mr. Masilamani Mudaliar and a relation of the owner of the house in which the latter was living, and he seems to have served as a useful weapon in the hands of the sub-registrar.

The next person to be noticed is one Sadasiva Pillai, a private vakil, and he owes a grudge to the apothecary, inasmuch as the latter pressed hard for prosecuting him for an offence under section 504, Indian Penal Code. The prosecution was not however sanctioned (*vide* your letter, Ref. No. 166-D.B., dated 11th May 1896). Hence it was that this Sadasiva Pillai worked against the apothecary jointly with Govinda Udayan in multiplying the number of signatures in the memorial under report, and this Sadasiva Pillai appears from the Tahsildar's report to have set up David, carpenter, on false pretexts to complain against Mr. John Pillai at the public meeting.

18. I now turn to the next subject of the steps taken to draft the memorial, and the special interest evinced in doing it by the Sub-Registrar Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar. According to the proceedings of the public meeting, a sub-committee consisting of the five gentlemen named in the margin with *power to add* was entrusted with the duty of drafting the memorial, and *do the needful* with specific reference to the complaints made at the meeting. Though the sub-registrar's name is entered last in the list, he was the very officer who took a prominent part in drawing up and completing the memorial. Nos. 2 and 4 were not heard of after the meeting, nor was it considered necessary by the remaining members to avail themselves of the power given them to add to their number. No. 2 Mr. Ramalinga Aiyar was merely a name-lender, and he left the district for Rajahmundry the day after the meeting. No. 4 Mr. Narayana Rao is the retired District Munsif who has settled himself at Tirukkóyilúr. He remained here on the 24th and 25th June 1896, but was not consulted by the other members. As for Mr. Jaya Ramachandra Aiyar, he admits having taken part in drafting the memorial, but this allegation is made apparently because he cannot well extricate himself from the other members of the sub-committee. His allegation will be found meaningless, when it is remembered that he has disowned the language in the memorial even in regard to one of his own complaints, and that he does not know who made certain alterations and interlineations in the printed memorial in manuscript, though the sub-registrar wants me to believe that he made them with the approval of the other two members Messrs. Jaya Ramachandra Aiyar and Sreenivasa Rao. It will thus be seen that truth groaning under the weight of a mass of glossy exaggerations and tissue of falsehood has at least come out in bold relief by pointing to the sub-registrar and his associate Mr. Sreenivasa Rao as the real authors of the memorial responsible for its wording. It should now be remembered that these were the identical gentlemen who, as members of the taluk board at its meeting held on 13th November 1895, succeeded in securing a resolution for replacing the apothecary by a second-class hospital assistant. It may even be said that of these two gentlemen, it was the sub-registrar who evinced greater interest and took more active part, backed up perhaps by a gentleman of better attainments, inasmuch as Mr. Sreenivasa Rao says that the manuscript interlineations and alterations are not in his handwriting and as the sub-registrar admits them to be his own, and states that he got the memorial printed at Vellore, his native place, though there is a printing press at Cuddalore. Further it has been elicited in the enquiry that it was the sub-registrar's acting peon (a Brahmin), who is also the son of an amin of the District Munsif's Court here, that took round the meeting notice to several residents of the town, and subsequently went round with the memorial and obtained signatures in it. The sub-registrar says that he had personal grievance against the apothecary, and yet he did not choose to

(1) M.R.Ry. L. A. Jaya Ramachandra Aiyar Avargal, B.A., B.L.
(2) A. Ramalinga Aiyar Avargal, M.A.
(3) V. Sreenivasa Rao Garu.
(4) V. Narayana Rao Pantulu Garu.
(5) V. Masilamani Mudaliyar Avargal.

represent it at the meeting, though complaints were then invited by the chairman and the members asked by him to come forward *boldly* and represent their grievances. He thought it safter to represent there the imaginary grievance of the Tahsildar. He had special interest, while sitting in the house of his friend the District Munsif, to enquire about the health of the son of a peon of the District Munsif, and the audacity to make a side note "since died" in manuscript to paragraph 16 of the memorial with the apparent object of aggravating the charge against Mr. John Pillai. He has studiedly introduced by manuscript interlineations the words "often" and "not unfrequently" in paragraph 3 of the memorial. Again, he is said to have induced the Assistant Engineer (L. F.) with an unworthy motive to transfer the manuscript note which he wished to note in favour of the apothecary from the body of the memorial to the signature portion of it, where it is almost sure to escape notice. Perhaps these are his special functions intended to be covered by the expression "*and do the needful*" in resolution No. 3 of the proceedings of the public meeting. What he wanted as the arch conspirator was an authority to draft a memorial, which was not to be submitted for the approval of a second meeting, and this he has succeeded by his stratagem in securing. When he made his statement before me, he refused to subject himself to cross examination by the apothecary, on the pretext that the latter had recently insulted him without any cause for provocation, and ordered him to be pushed out of the hospital by certain hospital servants, and when I asked him if he would answer the apothecary's queries, he refused to do even this. Hence the apothecary had not the advantage of eliciting from him facts which may tend to better strengthen his case. The subsequent conduct of the sub-registrar disclosed by the following two episodes will go to show that he was the chief instigator of the agitation in the town, whether for his own benefit or for the advantage of others. Having submitted the printed memorial on or about the 8th July 1896 (received by the Collector on 9th July 1896), the sub-registrar seems to have been brooding over the question of securing documentary evidence of Mr. John Pillai's late attendance and other irregularities in the hospital. On the morning of the 16th July 1896 (the date of receipt of the memorial by me was 14th July 1896) when I was at head-quarters, the sub-registrar visited the hospital without my knowledge and, in his capacity as vice-president of the taluk board, noted his remarks in the visitors' book. He remarked that the apothecary appeared at the hospital at 7–45 A.M. according to railway time, and 7–30 A.M. according to the hospital time, while several patients had been waiting for him, and that the in-patient register and the diet register had not been correctly written up. A copy of his remarks and the explanation of the apothecary accompany this report. The sub-registrar (vice-president) had never before visited the hospital, and recorded his remarks in the book. Again, on the same day at 11 A.M., the sub-registrar (vice-president) seems to have written to the apothecary for a copy of his remarks without reference to me. Finding this attempt fruitless, Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar wrote to me two days after, asking me for a copy of his remarks and of the apothecary's explanation to enable him to submit a report to me. As I was not in need of his report at that stage, the request was not complied with. There was subsequently another incident between Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar and the apothecary, and this I have designated "the carriage incident" for the sake of brevity.

On the morning of the 28th July 1896, Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar seems to have driven into the compound of the Police hospital in charge of the apothecary in his double bullock cart, in spite of the protest of the sweeper in attendance, and left there the cart and the bullocks. An altercation ensued between the two officers. Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar refused to take out the cart as desired, and it had eventually to be taken out forcibly by the hospital servants and left on the side of the road close by. The apothecary says he has orders not to allow carts inside the compound, which is kept scrupulously clean. Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar metamorphosed himself for the occasion into vice-president, and in exercise of that authority he seems to have insulted the apothecary by uttering the expression "you do not understand your position," sat opposite to the apothecary in the hospital dispensing room, and demanded paper, &c., to enable him to report him to me. The request was not of course complied with, and as Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar refused to quit the room as desired by the apothecary, the latter asked his compounder to lead him out of it,

because it was hospital time when patients had to be attended to. Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar went to me forthwith and asked me to enquire into his complaint. I did so accordingly, and the records of enquiry, together with an endorsement from the District Surgeon, dated 30th July 1896, are herewith submitted. In this case, there can be no doubt that Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar was the aggressor, and he cannot be exonerated from blame. The apothecary was threatened with a report, and he was asked to supply paper and pen for the purpose. This was certainly an unreasonable requisition with which Mr. John Pillai could not be expected to comply at the spur of the moment. But Mr. John Pillai would be considered to have acted more prudently, if he had kept down his temper and shown some consideration to the exasperated vice-president. I can, however, find nothing very serious to blame Mr. John Pillai in the special circumstances of the case and the strained relations between him and Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar, whom he looks upon as his arch enemy. This seems to be a disturbance created more with a view to its being taken as a pretext for avoiding cross examination in the enquiry which, the sub-registrar knows, I was about to convene, than for the purpose of asserting the authority of the one over the other. This incident happened on 28th July 1896, and I examined Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar on 4th August 1896.

19. In the meeting proceedings prefixed to the memorial will be found the names of the three gentlemen named in the margin, who have no local interest and who had nothing to do with the agitation against the medical officer. The first-named gentleman is a native of a village called Agaram some four miles from Tirukkóyilúr, and employed as a lecturer in the Rajahmundry College. He is a Master of Arts, and he had come to his village during the summer recess. He seems to have been specially sent for without previous notice of the public meeting, presumably because the authors of the memorial wished to have among them a gentleman with high university honours. He was put as a member of the sub-committee, while as a matter of fact he is ascertained to have left the district the day after the meeting. He took no part in the deliberations of the sub-committee.

M.R.Ry. A. Ramalinga Aiyar, M.A., of Rajahmundry.
" R. Sreenivasa Aiyangar, B.A., of Cuddalore.
" I. Madava Row of Cuddalore.

The next gentleman is Mr. R. Sreenivasa Aiyangar, B.A., of Cuddalore. The place of his residence is not noted in the proceedings, and the omission cannot but be intentional. He says that he stepped into the meeting hall simply to take home the inspector of police and remained there for half an hour as a spectator witnessing the *fun* of the meeting, that he had known the apothecary only by sight, and that the Chairman Mr. Gopala Row asked the members to come *boldly* forward to represent their grievances, if any.

Mr. I. Madava Row is the prosecuting Inspector of Police, Cuddalore. He says he went to the meeting hall to speak to the District Munsif in connection with a case sent by him, that he remained there only three or four minutes, that he had nothing to do with the meeting, and that he is very sorry to find his name in the proceedings of the meeting.

The two second-grade pleaders of the local District Munsif's Court named in the margin say that personally they have no complaint against Mr. John Pillai, but that they have signed the memorial believing the complaints of others and without caring to verify if they were well founded.

(1) M.R.Ry. Krishnasawmy Aiyar.
(2) " Ragunatha Row.

I have also examined the two other individuals named in the margin, and they say that personally they have no grievances against the apothecary, that nevertheless they attended the meeting in persuance of a notice and signed the memorial being heard of the complaints of others.

(1) M.R.Ry. Narayana Row Avargal, retired District Munsif.
(2) M.R.Ry. Rungasawmy Naidu, Private Vakil.

It will also be evident from the report of the Tahsildar, dated 15th September 1896, who submitted it after examining 20 out of the 166 Tamil signataries in the memorial, that in some instances the same signatures appear twice with seeming difference;

that even taking the number to be correct, it represents but 5 per cent. of the male population of the town; that in a number of instances signatures were obtained on blank sheets and by deceitful means by Govinda Udayan and Sadasiva Pillai already referred to above; that though the signatories have no real ground of complaint against the apothecary, they were induced to sign because of the influence of Govinda Udayan and of his misrepresentation of facts; that the two leading officers, the District Munsif and the Salt Inspector, as well as several others who were present at the meeting have not signed the memorial; that a number of persons who had no personal knowledge of the proceedings in the meeting or of the contents of the memorial have blindly signed the memorial; that the object of the authors of the memorial was to deceive the authorities by showing to them that it was countenanced by a good number of local residents and by officers of position and vakils, while the number of complainants among the signatures was less than half a dozen; that the District Munsif was the officer most interested in the transfer of the apothecary; that in his attempts to gain his object he was supported by nine out of the eleven pleaders of his Court, notably by his leading pleader Mr. Sreenivasa Row, as also by his intimate friend the Sub-Registrar Mr. Masilamani Mudaliyar; that these two agents, aided by the Police Inspector Mr. Narasimmachari, were in their turn able to secure two unscrupulous sub-agent in the person of Govinda Udayan and Sadasiva Pillai; that these agents and sub-agents aided by sympathizers, friends and persons under their influence succeeded in getting up a mass meeting headed by the principal local officials and vakils, and a memorial signed by a number of local residents who had really nothing to complain of; that but for the presence and encouragement of the District Munsif, a public meeting of the kind could not have been possible; that at the time of the enquiry regarding the memorial there were frequent conferences among the officials and vakils at the quarters of the District Munsif, the sub-registrar, the inspector of police, the salt inspector and the leading pleader Mr. Sreenivasa Row; that there were sustained efforts at the time to throw obstacles in the way of getting at the truth; that ignorant signatories to the memorial were threatened with unpleasant consequences, should they, having once signed the memorial, omit to say something against the apothecary; and that though the Land Revenue department was not represented at the meeting in spite of strenuous efforts to secure at least the presence of the local Sub-Magistrate, that even the village officers of kusbah Tirukkóyilúr were so much in the hands of the authors of the memorial that they proved traitors to the Tahsildar in having suppressed certain facts within their knowledge and withdrawn their oral representations to the Tahsildar.

20. It will be seen from the above that the public servants who took part in the public meeting attended by about seventy persons, or in its creature, the printed memorial, are those named in the margin. Though the mass meeting may not be looked upon as a quasi-political gathering referred to in the Public Servants' Manual, there can be no doubt that such a collection for condemning the action of a public servant on unfounded allegations is certainly against the spirit of the rules, and it is not such as will be countenanced by Government.

(1) M.R.Ry. I. Varatharajulu Naidu Garu, B.A., B.L., District Munsif, Tirukkóyilúr.
(2) M.R.Ry. V. Masilamani Mudaliyar Avargal, late Sub-Registrar and Vice-President of the Taluk Board.
(3) M.R.Ry. Narasimmachariar, Inspector of Police.
(4) M.R.Ry. Gopala Row Avargal, Inspector of Salt and Abkári Revenue.
(5) Pranatharthihara Aiyar, B.C.E., Local Fund Assistant Engineer.

As for the District Munsif, he seems to have acted much behind the scene, and his connection with the whole affair has been traced by strong inferences from the statements of others. In his own interest it is desirable that he should at least have a transfer from the district.

As for Nos. 2 and 3, I have shown by a line of convincing arguments based upon patent facts that they have acted maliciously against the apothecary, and that there can be no doubt that they deserve suitable punishment in the hands of their departmental superiors.

Mr. Gopala Row (No. 4) has already left the district, and I do not think that any further action is needed in his case except perhaps a censure.

As for Pranatharthihara Aiyar (No. 5), I think he deserves censure for having allowed himself to be lead away by the representations of the sub-registrar. In this connection, I would invite your kind attention to the concluding paragraph of the enclosed apothecary's report, dated 25th August 1896.

21. *Section III.*—I now turn to the state of the medical institution at Tirukkóyilúr under the management of the Apothecary Mr. John Pillai. He took charge of the hospital in May 1894. It appears from the notes of visitors recorded in the Hospital Visitors' Book from time to time, that Mr. John Pillai has been successfully managing the institution, and that it is gradually rising in popularity. It will also be seen from the figures obtained from the hospital records and noted below that there has been increase from year to year in the number of in and out patients *admitted* for treatment, as also in the number of major and minor operations, and that therefore they go to show beyond doubt the growing popularity of the institution under Mr. John Pillai and the absurdity of the remarks in the memorial that he is highly unpopular and inaccessible to patients seeking medical aid:—

Particulars.	1893-94.	1894-95.	1895-96.
(1) In-patients	127	159	168
(2) Out-patients	9,072	10,025	10,542
(3) Major and minor operations	235	331	393

The total number of in and out patients *treated* during the first five months of the current official year was 12,542 against 10,738 for the corresponding period of the past official year, in spite of the memorial in June 1896 and the agitation created thereby in the town. This is an unmistakable proof on record of the facilities afforded to patients by Mr. John Pillai and of his popularity, and it will thus be seen that the sweeping allegations in the memorial by a few discontented resident officials and vakils condemning him for want of popularity and sympathy for the sufferings of the poor are wholly unfounded. I may also observe here that the Tahsildar, who has frequent opportunities of coming in contact with the residents of outlying villages in his division, has reported from informations he had from several villages that the services of the apothecary are duly appreciated by those who had occasion to resort to him for treatment, and that he has very often found him overzealous and earnest in the discharge of his duties, and I have no doubt that the Tahsildar's representations are well founded. In conclusion, I beg to state that there are no grounds whatever to justify the transfer of the apothecary, and that facts and figures point most eloquently to the desirability of his continuance at this station where he has gained popularity and the confidence of the public in general even at the sacrifice of remuneration to which he is entitled.

From M.R.Ry. R. SUNDARASA MUDALIYAR Avargal, Deputy Collector and President, Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr, to the Collector and President, District Board, South Arcot, dated 29th September 1896, No. 9.

With reference to your endorsement, dated 10th July 1896, on a manuscript memorial addressed to the Surgeon-General to the Government of Madras, I have the honour to report as follows.

2. The memorial sets out a number of allegations against Mr. John Pillai, Civil Apothecary and Union Chairman, Tirukkóyilúr. It is dated May 1896 and signed by eighteen persons, of whom five are vakils practising in the local District Munsif's Court including M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal, a member of the Taluk and District Board, and Ramachandra Aiyar Avargal, a member of the Tirukkóyilúr union panchayat presided over by Mr. John Pillai. Among the rest is a resident ryot named Govinda Udayan, also a member of the same panchayat, whose conduct is specially noted in my report on the subsequent printed memorial. There are no specific charges against Mr. John Pillai in his capacity as medical officer, except that he had ill-treated his compounder and omitted to attend at the private residence of some leading officials and vakils and that he used to parade himself on his bycicle on the streets during hospital hours. The memorialists make certain allegations against Mr. John Pillai as

chairman of the union, and I shall deal with them seriatim. One noteworthy fact about the memorial is that not one of the signatories to it has ventilated in it any of his grievances imaginary or real, and there is therefore virtually no one who can be called upon to substantiate any of the charges except Hanumanta Rao, whose specific allegation has reference to a resolution of the taluk board. As for the charges bearing on the working of the union under its present chairman, these are records sufficient to disprove them, and to show that some of them at least are malicious. It will be evident from my report on the subsequent printed memorial that the real wire-pullers worked behind the scene, and that they have, through their sympathizers and others, submitted the manuscript memorial to prejudice the minds of the authorities and prepare them without demur to receive as true all their allegations *en masse* against Mr. John Pillai in his capacity as medical officer. This manuscript memorial was received by me on the 23rd June 1896 for report as to the genuineness of the signatures, and that was the very day when a notice was sent out for convening a meeting against the apothecary. The meeting was held on the morning of the ensuing day, which resulted in the printed memorial containing specific charges against the medical officer. That meeting was headed by most of the leading officials and the local vakils, and as I have dwelt at length in my report on that memorial with my remarks, it will be superfluous to recapitulate them here. In view of the facts set forth above, it will be seen that there is scarcely any need to examine the signatories to the manuscript memorial under report. I have, however, examined two of the vakil signatories M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal and Krishnasamy Aiyar Avargal and four others * being among the signatories to the printed memorial are included in the list of those examined by the Tahsildar of Tirukkóyilúr in connection with that memorial.

* (1) Govinda Udayan.
(2) Rangasami Pillai.
(3) Rathnasabapathi Pillai.
(4) Bawani Sing.

3. The manuscript memorial, with a view apparently to bias the head of the medical department, starts with a narration of the antecedents of the apothecary that some years ago he was suspended, and transferred for neglect of duty, and the same is reproduced in paragraph 20 of the printed memorial with the modification, that the suspension was only a few years ago. Mr. John Pillai has in his explanation, with reference to the later printed memorial, stated that some fifteen years ago he was suspended under a misconception of facts, but that he was restored on appeal. It is not understood why the memorialists have thought fit to introduce this event, and suppress what followed unless it be with a motive to induce the authorities to attach undue weight to their unfounded allegations nor can the object of such a mention at the very outset, in the absence of a sinister motive, be perceived when it is remembered that the apothecary Mr. John Pillai was in charge of the same hospital here for full two years up to the date of the memorial. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal, first grade pleader and a member of the district and taluk board, admits having drafted the manuscript memorial, and states that he had not seen the records of suspension; that he is unable to mention the names of persons from whom he got the information; and that he does not know how the order of suspension was eventually disposed of. It is very strange that Mr. Sreenivasa Row is not aware of the name of the person who wrote the memorial.

4. The first charge against Mr. John Pillai mentioned in paragraph 4 of the memorial is that he whipped the hospital compounder some months ago, and that in spite of the representations of the latter to the then President, Taluk Board, that officer merely transferred the compounder. In this instance, the aggrieved party was the compounder according to the memorialist's own showing, and he is not one of the signatories. This is another instance in which the memorialists have sought to represent the medical officer as an unworthy specimen of humanity, though they were apparently not aware of the whole case as disclosed by the records. It was so far back as 5th September 1895 that the then compounder, Narayanasamy, submitted a petition to the District Medical Officer through the apothecary charging his official superior with assult and insult, and the complaint was forthwith sent up to the District Medical Officer with a covering letter bringing to notice the gross misconduct of the compounder and his culpable neglect of duty. The papers were received by

my predecessor with a demi-official letter dated 6th September 1895, from the District Medical Officer, and the compounder put in a petition to the President on the 11th idem withdrawing his complaint. The papers were recorded with a (confidential) note by my predecessor. It appears that in consideration of the strained relations between the compounder and the apothecary, the former was transfered * to the Kallakurichi hospital on or before the date of his complaint. It will thus be seen that the memorialists had taken upon themselves the onus of representing the supposed grievances of an hospital servant who had withdrawn his complaint. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal who drafted the memorial states † that the compounder complained of his having been beaten, but that he does not know what was done with the complaint to the District Magistrate.

* *Vide* copy of a letter from the President, Taluk Board, to the District Surgeon, dated 5th September 1895, with reference to an endorsement from the latter, dated 26th August 1895. The transfer had no reference to the compounder's complaint.

† Deposition accompanies the report on the printed memorial.

5. As for the charges of indifference to the sufferings of patients and of omission to attend in cases of grave urgency at the quarters of some of the leading officials including the District Munsif, the Tahsildar and the Local Fund Assistant Engineer directed against Mr. John Pillai in his capacity as a medical officer; it is enough to observe here that they appear in an undeveloped form in the manuscript memorial; that they have been subsequently amplified and formulated in the printed memorial dated June 1896, in drafting which the Sub-Registrar and vice-President of the taluk board is found to have taken a prominent part; and that I have this day separately reported on them in detail with the explanation of the apothecary. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal referred to in the last two paragraphs states that he had not heard of the Tahsildar's complaint himself; that it is not possible to give out the names of persons who made mention of that complaint; that the Local Fund Assistant Engineer had told him one or two weeks before the date of the memorial that the apothecary had failed to attend on him when he was suffering from fever; that he had not heard from the District Munsif of his complaint against the apothecary; and that he is not *inclined* to give the names of persons from whom he had heard of it. This vakil, in spite of his connection with the taluk and district boards, has admittedly taken a part in drafting the memorial without caring to verify its contents, as if that was the most appropriate course for him to reach the authorities for punishing a public servant under the control of the local boards, and he has flatly refused, for reasons best known, to mention the names of persons from whom he had heard of the complaints of the District Munsif. He admits that he has not at any time brought to the notice of the taluk or district board any of the complaints against the apothecary embodied in the two memorials. These are, however, matters which I have commented upon in my report on the printed memorial.

6. I shall now deal with the several charges against Mr. John Pillai as chairman of the Tirukkóyilúr union panchayat. He joined the hospital here as the medical officer in charge in May 1894, and in April 1895 he was appointed chairman of the union. It cannot be said that he was more greedy of powers than his predecessor Mr. Krishnaiyar, a local pleader, who it appears was a member of the panchayat as also of the taluk and district boards, and I fail to see how M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal is justified in having introduced paragraph 8 in the manuscript memorial, while he had not grudged the love of power in one of his colleagues. In his statement before me M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal says that he had heard of the apothecary's greediness for power from one of his friends, but that he is not prepared to give out the name of his friend who put him in possession of this information. This shows that there was a deep plot among the enemies of the apothecary and that there was a conspiracy to shoot him in the dark. In this connection I may observe that the District Medical Officer has once expressed it as his opinion that the local medical officer should have a seat in the taluk board as in the case of Mr. D'Sylva of Tindivanam.

7. In paragraph 9 of the memorial, reference is made to the chairman's unauthorized entry in private dwelling houses, and the case of one Sadasiva Pillai, a private

vakil, is quoted as an instance. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal on being questioned on the subject says that it is not possible for him to name the persons who complained of it. As for Sadasiva Pillai himself, he is not one of the signatories to the memorial under report, and yet his supposed grievance seems to have been represented by proxy. In this case, it was Mr. John Pillai who pressed for criminal prosecution against Sadasiva Pillai for the latter having insulted him openly, but in consideration of the special circumstances of the case, it was held that Mr. John Pillai would best assort his dignity by treating Sadasiva Pillai's conduct with silent contempt (*vide* District Board President's letter Ref. on Cur. No. 166-D.B. of 1896, dated 11th May 1896).

8. As regards the alleged unauthorized removal of lanterns referred to in paragraph 10 of the memorial, I have as yet received only one complaint against the action of the chairman Mr. John Pillai, and that was from a contractor named Mr. Hanumantha Row, who figures as one of the signatories to the memorial. The complaint was enquired into, and placed before the taluk board at a meeting held on 29th May 1896 and presided over by the vice-President M.R.Ry. Masilamani Mudaliyar. The matter was disposed of in resolution No. 10, dated 29th May 1896. But in view of the comments made in the resolution on the action of the union chairman and of doubtful ownership of the lantern, there has been some further correspondence from the chairman and the matter has not been finally disposed of by the taluk board. M.R.Ry. Sreenivasa Row Avargal, seems to have made use of the information obtained by him as a member of the taluk board, and regardless of the interest of the board embodied it in the memorial and affixed his signature to it underneath that of the complainant Mr. Hanumantha Row himself. The threatened civil action against the taluk board will be awaited.

9. As regards the allegation in para. 11 of the memorial, I find on a reference to the records that the six persons named in the margin were appointed as members of the union panchayat after Mr. John Pillai had his appointment as chairman in April 1895, and that except in two cases Mr. John Pillai did not object to the re-appointment of the out-going members. It does not appear that he had any thing to do with the appointment of M.R.Ry. Ramachandraiyar Avargal, a pleader of the Local District Munsiff's Court. As for (*b*) Muthusawmy Pillai he was recommended by the Tahsildar in place of one Adinarayana Naidu whose re-appointment was righlty objected to by the chairman because of his old age. I recommended Muthialu Chetty (*c*) in place of Arunachala Aiyar, who had resigned his membership, and the chairman had no objection to the appointment. Sadagopa Naidu (*e*), a vakil, was recommended by the chairman in place of one Subbaramanier deceased. As for Govinda Udayan (*f*), he was an out-going member, and his re-appointment was recommended by the chairman himself. It was only in the case of Ramasamy Pillai (*d*) that he was put in place of the out-going member Sama Row (a vakil) at the instance of the chairman, inasmuch as the re-appointment of Sama Row was objected to on the score of his indifference and apathy to union work. This Sama Row, while his re-appointment was under consideration, and some two days after the vice-President had sent me a note suggesting the desirability of enquiring him as to his consent to continue in office, put in a petition to me on 21st January 1896 volunteering his services; but I did not accept his offer as it was thought undesirable to throw obstacles and impede the progress of union work by the addition of a useless member, and as there was already a member in the Panchayat reported against for presistent apposition to progress of work in the person of Govinda Udayan (*f*). The petitioner, Sama Row, who has apparently been backed up by the taluk board members Mr. Sreenivasa Row has affixed his signature to the memorial, and this is another instance of the want of interest of the latter in the proper and efficient management of union affairs. I need hardly observe here that facts have been exaggerated and misrepresented for which Mr. Sreenivasa Row is one of the individuals responsible. It is absurd to suppose that the chairman has almost succeeded in having in the union men of his own liking in the face of the fact that three out of the six new members have signed

(*a*) M.R.Ry. Ramachandraiyar Avargal, December 1895.		
(*b*) M.R.Ry. Muthusamy Pillai	March 1896.	
(*c*) „ Muthialu Chetti		
(*d*) „ Ramasamy Pillai		
(*e*) Sadagopa Naidu.		
(*f*) Govinda Udayan.		

the printed memorial against Mr. John Pillai—(*a*), (*e*) and (*f*) and that one of them (*f*) has taken a most active part in getting up the memorial as will be seen from the Tahsildar's report on the printed memorial.

10. Referring to paragraph 12 of the memorial, I have to state here that there was no budget provision for any expenditure for making sanitary arrangements at the Keelur festival in February 1896; but a small amount of Rs. 10 was sanctioned as a special case at the request of the chairman. The money was not, however, spent, as it was reported later on that special coolies were not procurable for the purpose, but that the necessary sanitary arrangements were made with the ordinary union staff. The chairman being also the medical officer has done the needful, and there were no complaints when I inspected the locality in the course of the festival. It is very strange that Mr. Sreenivasa Row, who is also a trustee of the temple and who cannot be relieved of his responsiblity for the contents of the memorial, has thought it fit to note this item as one of the complaints against the chairman, while he had admittedly not referred to the correspondence on the subject nor complained to me on the occasion when I was on the spot.

11. The complaint in paragraph 13 of the memorial, regarding the chairman's refusal to carry out the diversion of the water course in the Pennar for drinking purposes is purely imaginary. A small amount of Rs. 25 was sanctioned for the purpose, and the chairman expressed his inability to carry out the work with such a small amount, and suggested the need for professional help. The work was then entrusted to the Tahsildar, who, with aid of village labour and collection of materials for putting up an embankment, did the needful within the sanctioned allotment. The work was also supervised by me personally, and this was certainly not a matter in which the chairman could be taken to task. Mr. Sreenivasa Row pleads ignorance of the agency through which the Tahsildar executed the work and of the details of the actual expenditure, while it is a well-known fact in the town that the Tahsildar collected a number of coolies for the purpose from different villages as also materials; and the records were accessible to have (Mr. Sreenivasa Raw) as a member of the taluk board.

12. The union sweepers and scavengers have not complained against the chairman in the way they are represented to have done in paragraph 14 of the memorial. There was a petition purporting to have been written by the union servants, and containing similar allegations and it was referred to the Stationary Sub-Magistrate for enquiry and report. I found from the report of that officer that the complaint was frivolous, that it was got up for the occasion, and that the petition itself was pseudonymous. This reminds me of a curious incident mentioned to me in the course of conversation by one of the official signatories to the printed memorial. In that case I was given to understand that the Sub-Registrar and vice-President of the taluk board attempted in a scheming manner to secure evidence to prove a charge of the same kind against the chairman, Mr. John Pillai, but that the proposal was subsequently given up. As, however, the information was not communicated to me officially, I am precluded from entering into the details of the case. It is a point worthy of consideration that Mr. Sreenivasa Row, who has drafted the memorial, has recorded such frivolous complaints in the memorial which will serve to stir up the union servants against the chairman, and this is certainly not what is expected of a member of the taluk and district boards. I may also draw your kind attention to the palpably inaugrous statements in paragraphs 14 and 15 of the memorial. When the memorialists or rather the authors of the memorial wanted to represent the imaginary shortcomings of the chairman, they complained in paragraph 14 of his having reflected the sanitary condition of the town by executing private work from the union servants. Again, when they wished to hand him up for neglect of his duty as a medical officer by frequent absence from the hospital during the hospital hours, they have very reluctantly given him a certificate for his good work (*vide* paragraph 15) as chairman of the union by way of inspection of houses for a general revision of house-tax, and of encroachments and close supervision of the work of union servants. The use of a bycicle on occasions in a town like Tirukkóyilúr, which comprises three detached portions in distant parts is certain to result in advantage to the public inasmuch as it facilitates speedy trips from one corner to another. The memorialists could not, however, bear to see the chairman using it at times, and they have taken

him to task as if his object is to parade on public streets. From what has come to my notice, I may say that Mr. John Pillai deserves credit for his earnest and zealous discharge of his duties as chairman, and that if he has erred at all, it was by excessive zeal and warm interest in improving the condition of the union.

13. The memorial closes with a prayer, not for an investigation of the charges set out therein, but for the transfer of Mr. John Pillai, on the allegation that he has proved a failure as a medical officer and chairman of the union. Mr. S. Krishnasamy Aiyar who has signed both the memorials states that he has personally no complaint against Mr. John Pillai; that on the other hand whenever he had occasion to seek his medical aid there was ready compliance with his request; that he knows nothing personally of the complaints in either of the memorials, but that he signed them both because he had understood from some of the respectable vakils and others that Mr. John Pillai was unpopular. This is simply rediculous on the face of it.

14. In conclusion, I beg to state that the charges complained of are purely imaginary, and that the memorial appears to have been got up by a few interested persons as a prelude to the later printed memorial which serves to expose on the stage the real actors, but which will be found destined to share the same fate, in spite of considerable official and vakil influence brought to bear, as will be seen from my report on that memorial.

15. The connected papers as per separate list are enclosed.

Enclosure.

Extract of Remarks from the Visitors' Book of the Local Fund Hospital, Tirukkóyilúr, by the President, District Board, South Arcot.

Inspected the hospital this morning. Found six in-patients (male) in the male ward and two male in-patients in the contageous disease shed, one female patient in the female ward. The wards, compound, out-houses including latrines, kitchen, dead-house were all clean and in good order. Similar remarks apply to the internal arrangements of the hospital. The medicines and instruments were neatly arranged and the latter were clean. The following figures show that this institution is doing good work under civil apothecary Mr. John Pillai who joined on 10th May 1894.

The number of *in-patients* treated in 1894–95 was 159. During the corresponding period in 1895–96, the number was 168. The number of *out-patients* treated in 1894–95 was 10,025 whilst the number treated during the corresponding period in 1895–96 was 10,542.

The following figures show the total number of all patients treated in his hospital during the last five months of 1896, compared with the total number treated in the corresponding month of 1895 :—

	1896.	1895.
April	1,745	1,703
May	2,151	2,021
June	3,383	2,166
July	2,951	2,387
August	2,312	2,467
Total ..	12,542	10,738

The following figures show the number of operations (major and minor) performed by the apothecary during the first two quarters of 1895 and 1896, respectively :—

1st quarter, 1895	65
2nd „ „	132
Total ..	197
1st quarter, 1896	91
2nd „ „	146
Total ..	237

These figures eloquently disprove the allegations recently made by a few local residents that the civil apothecary is unpopular. On the contrary, they conclusively establish the fact that he is doing excellent work and that the popularity of the institution is rapidly increasing under his management.

I find that the number of midwifery cases from 1st January to 31st August 1895 was 28, whilst the total number of these cases for the corresponding period in 1896 was 31. There is evidently room for improvement in this direction.

I find that medicines are given to the public gratis. This seems quite unnecessary in all cases where patients can afford to pay for medicines. The attention of the taluk board president should be drawn to this fact.

Three screens are required for the use of the hospital, and they should be provided by the taluk board at an early date.

(Signed) A. E. CASTLESTUART STUART,
President, District Board.

6th September 1896.

Submitted to the President, District Board, South Arcot, through the President, Taluk Board, Tirukkóyilúr.

(Signed) D. JOHN PILLAI,
Apothecary.

Tirukkoyilur,
7th September 1896.

Submitted to the President, District Board, South Arcot.

2. It appears from a comparative statement obtained from the apothecary Mr. John Pillai on 29th July 1896 that the popularity of the institution under his management is on the increase. The figures are noted below for reference :—

	1893–94.	1894–95.	1895–96.
In-patients	127	159	168
Out-patients	9,072	10,025	10,542

There can be no doubt that the public in general who resort to him for treatment appreciate his valuable services, and have full confidence in him. His sphere of duty as a medical officer is not confined to the town of Tirukkóyilúr, and it will be seen from my report on the memorial to be shortly submitted that the allegations against the apothecary of some discontented residents of the town, who appear to have been brought together under questionable influence and interested motives are unfounded and mostly malicious.

3. I am waiting for the Tahsildar's report as to the result of his enquiry which I expect to have in a day or two, and shall shortly submit my final report on the memorial against the apothecary.

4. Action will be taken on the last two paragraphs of the enclosed notes.

Tirukkóyilúr, (Signed) R. SUNDARASA MUDALIAR,
13th September 1896. *President, Taluk Board.*

From the President, District Board, South Arcot, dated 25th November 1896, Dis. No. 15-Tour.

Enclosures.

Petition from certain inhabitants of Tirukkóyilúr, South Arcot district, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 8th January 1897.

Most respectfully sheweth,—That the petitioners and certain others sent up a memorial to the Surgeon-General in May 1896 and another in July 1896 to the Surgeon-General, the President, District Board, and the District Surgeon embodying their complaints against the then Local Fund Apothecary of the station Mr. D. John Pillai and requesting his transfer from that place.

2. That the said apothecary who had recently been sent out of the station to make room for the permanent incumbent is giving out that he expects soon to be posted back to the station permanently.

3. That the petitioners believe that expectation aforesaid of the apothecary is based upon the reports of the Acting Deputy Collector and the Collector, which, the petitioners respectfully submit, were prepared upon an incomplete and one-sided enquiry held by the Acting Deputy Collector and the Tahsildar.

4. That at the time of the enquiries some of the petitioners requested the Deputy Collector and the Collector (the former in writing also) to permit them to be present at the enquiries, which request was not complied with, though the apothecary had been given the fullest scope to cross-examine the signatories to the memorials and others.

5. That as the Tahsildar was an important witness in the matter, and as he had, subsequent to the first memorial dated May 1896, committed himself to certain statements in the hospital visitors' book very favourable to the apothecary, the petitioners requested that the Tahsildar should not be permitted to conduct any portion of the enquiry; but this request was also not complied with.

6. That the petitioners in their telegram dated 20th September 1896 have also represented to the Surgeon-General about the irregularities of the enquiries.

7. That the enquiries were generally conducted at unusual hours during nights at the houses of the Deputy Collector and the Tahsildar.

8. That the petitioners learn and believe that the said apothecary was suspended several times at different stations, and has been unpopular at various places for which he had to be transferred, which will be evident from a perusal of his service book and the papers connected with his antecedents.

9. The petitioners humbly pray that the threatened retransfer of the said apothecary may not be effected, and before allowing him to come back to the station, they may be allowed the opportunity of being heard by an independent European officer.

10. A copy of the memorial dated July 1896 is herewith submitted.

For this act of kindness the petitioners shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

Petition from certain inhabitants of Tirukkóyilúr Town, to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated July 1896.

Respectfully showeth,—That the civil apothecary Mr. D. John Pillai has been for nearly two years now presiding over the local hospital.

2. That ever since he assumed charge of his office at this station, he has continued to make himself unpopular in a variety of ways and has been unmindful of the medical needs of the people.

3. That he has been for a long time past irregular in his attendance at the hospital, often discourteous in his behaviour towards people anxious to avail themselves of his medical skill, and not unfrequently callous to the sufferings of the unfortunate patients resorting to him for medical aid.

4. That a public meeting was consequently held in this town on the morning of the 24th instant at which several persons came forward with specific complaints against the apothecary, which were noted down by the Chairman for being embodied in this memorial.

5. That on certain occasions, when Messrs. Streenivasachariyar and Narayanaswamy Iyer, Pleaders, and Messrs. Arunachella Naicker, Maurimuthu Naicker, Devanayaga Pillay and Krishnasawmy Udayan, local residents of the town, had to go to the hospital for medical aid, they found the apothecary to be very irregular in his attendance, and some of them had consequently to return home without receiving that aid which they had a right to expect.

6. That according to one David Asary of the Danish Mission he went to the apothecary with a decent conveyance and requested him to call over to his house to see his child, which was then in a dangerous condition, and the apothecary, who was then conversing with a Brahmin vakil, refused to go over to see the patient though the prescribed fee had been offered him, but directed the applicant to bring the child to the dispensary which he could not have done in the state in which the child then was; and when the apothecary actually came over to the applicant's house three hours later, his services proved to be of no avail and the child expired within two minutes after the medicine prescribed by the apothecary had been administered. The petition which the said David Asary meant to present to the District Surgeon on the subject is at his request submitted herewith.

7. That the apothecary declined to attend on the wife of Devarajiah, Headmaster of the local girls' school, when she was in an acute stage of labour about a fortnight ago, without a *previous* payment of a fee of Rs. 15 and he had not even the kindness to pay an ordinary visit.

8. That when Mr. Jayaramchendra Iyer, B.A. and B.L., First-grade Pleader, went to the dispensary at 4 P.M. about twenty days ago taking with him a child which had thrust into one of its nostrils a tamarind seed, the apothecary was not to be found at the dispensary, and that he had to patiently wait until 5–30 P.M. when the apothecary was fetched from his house by the hospital compounder.

9. That on the 2nd of Vyasi of Manmatha (14th May 1895) when the wife of Mr. Arunachella Iyer, a retired Revenue Inspector, was in labour, the apothecary refused to lend the services of the midwife, who had attended on her the previous night, on the plea that she had other engagements; although an earnest request was made to him at 7 A.M. which was repeated at 11 A.M. and the apothecary could not be moved though it was represented to him that the patient was hopelessly bad.

10. That a child of the said Mr. Arunachella Iyer, eleven days old, had a boil on its back which was opened by the apothecary one day; but he flatly declined to attend on it the next day until he was assured of sufficient remuneration; though a respectable request with a carriage was made to him and that before the promise of payment was made, the apothecary passed by the house of the said gentleman that day, but he had not the heart to call over and see how the child was doing.

11. The apothecary, when sent for, refused to call on Mr. Pranatharthyhara Iyer, B.A., B.C.E., Local Fund Assistant Engineer, when he was suffering one day from high fever.

12. That when the attendance of the apothecary was sought for by Mr. T. Varadarajulu Nayadu, B.A., B.L., District Munsif, when he had an abscess, he wrote to him that he had panchayat and hospital work to attend to, and that he would call later on, which he did not do, and that he did not turn up till he was again sent for the next day.

13. That when the said gentleman requested the apothecary's attendance at his house in connection with another abscess at about 7 P.M. one day, he sent word that he was too much tired to call over, and that when, in consequence, he was requested to lend the services of his compounder at least, he refused to comply with this request also on the ground that it was a late hour; and the compounder had therefore to be directly sent for who had the kindness to attend and do the needful.

14. That on another occasion when the daughter of the said gentleman was taken seriously ill at about 1 or 2 A.M. in the night, a lantern and two men were sent to the apothecary with a request for his attendance; but the apothecary refused to call over at that hour although his residence was within a hundred yards of the house of the District Munsif and it was considered unsafe to administer the medicine then sent as the patient had not been seen by him; and he appeared the next day at 7 A.M. when his services were not much needed.

15. That the apothecary did not attend when sent for by Mr. Gopal Row, Inspector of Salt, when he was suffering from ear-ache and he had to seek the aid of the compounder who had the kindness to do the needful.

16. That one Rungasawmi Pillai had his son treated for a fortnight in the dispensary for fever with no effect and when he changed the treatment a cankerous ulcer was formed in one of his jaws for which he has again been placed under hospital treatment and as it emits foul smell, the apothecary does not approach the boy but keeps him at a distance and directs a ward cooly to dress it and the boy is still under such indifferent treatment.

17. That when the Tahsildar Mr. Sundara Iyer had a fall from his carriage at a village six miles from this town, a conveyance drawn by a pony was sent to the apothecary at about 5 P.M., with an urgent request to go over to the place where the Tahsildar was, but he did not choose to comply with the request though the case was one of grave urgency.

18. That the Deputy Collector Mr. Sunderasa Mudaliar once expressed at a meeting of the Taluk Board that a certain person from a village in this taluk had complained to him with tears in his eyes and in a manner which moved him much that the apothecary had refused to go to his village to see his wife who was then in labour and in a dangerous stage, unless the whole of the fee demanded was paid to him at once, though he had been offered a portion of the fees then and there and promised the rest in the village.

19. That although a man from the village of Adichanellore who had fallen from a picota and received severe injuries was brought to the hospital, he was merely admitted as an out-patient and he died within two days after his admission as such.

20. That the apothecary had been at this very station a few years ago and he had to be suspended and transferred for having neglected an in-patient, who, in despair, committed suicide by drowning himself in a well adjoining the hospital.

21. That the apothecary does not command the confidence of the public in his medical treatment so much so, that several, notably the Deputy Collector and the Tahsildar, had on certain occasions to send for medical aid from distant stations at a considerable cost.

22. That the unsympathetic and indifferent nature of the apothecary, as evidenced by the facts above narrated, has rendered him so very unpopular that several leading men of the locality were put to the painful necessity of convening a meeting and making a public representation of their grievances in spite of the risk which they thereby run of precluding themselves from approaching the Apothecary any more for medical aid with any degree of confidence.

In conclusion the memorialists humbly pray that their grievances may be redressed at an early date by the removal of the present apothecary from this station and the appointment of a humane and large-hearted medical officer in his stead. For which act of kindness and generosity the memorialists shall as in duty bound ever pray.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 29th January 1897, No. C.—9.

With reference to my confidential letter No. C.—84, dated 26th November 1896, submitting papers in the case of Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai, I have the honour to state, for the information of Government, that this apothecary has since been suspended by me for three months for surreptitiously removing or causing to be removed from his service book certain pages containing entries regarding his previous suspension on two occasions.

Memorandum No. 378.

The Surgeon-General is requested to submit a copy of his proceedings suspending the apothecary.

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

12*th February* 1897.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 16th February 1897, No. 66.

With reference to your memorandum, No. 378, Public, dated 12th February 1897, I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of my Proceedings, No. 429, dated 29th January 1897, suspending Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai.

2. I also attach, for the information of Government, copies of the Proceedings* of my predecessors regarding this apothecary in 1882, 1885 and 1886.

* Surgeon-General Cornish's Proceedings, No. 4266, dated 15th August 1882.
Surgeon-General Furnell's Proceedings, No. 3251, dated 26th June 1885.
Surgeon-General Bidie's Proceedings, No. O—228, dated 6th June 1886.

Enclosures.

Proceedings of the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, No. 4266, dated 15th August 1882.

Read—letter No. 501 from the Acting Zillah Surgeon, Cuddalore, with enclosures, regarding the conduct of Civil Apothecary John Pillai in charge of the Local Fund dispensary, Tirukkóyilúr, in neglecting to relieve a mendicant, who applied for medical aid on the 12th July last.

Order—No. 4266, dated 15th August 1882.

The Surgeon-General considers that, unless all the witnesses in the case have perjured themselves, the charge of neglect against Civil Apothecary John Pillai is borne out. It is shown by the witnesses that a poor wayfarer in pain and suffering applied at the dispensary, and after waiting for some time, without securing any help, left the place and subsequently fell into a well receiving injuries from which he died.

2. The Civil Apothecary John Pillai denies any knowledge of the man's presence at the dispensary in the afternoon, but if the compounder's evidence is trustworthy, he was duly informed of the presence of a patient seeking relief, and the evidence of the man Babu Singh, shows that he saw the apothecary speaking to the patient, and that he took a message from the apothecary to the compounder requesting him to come to the hospital, which the compounder did.

3. Under these circumstances the Surgeon-General has no doubt that the Civil Apothecary John Pillai did see and converse with the man, but that he was too proud or too lazy to administer a dose of medicine, or to take measures for the relief of the patient in the absence of the compounder, and that owing to the delay in administration of medical relief the man wandered away and met with his death. The Surgeon-General in a circular No. 48 of 21st December 1880 informed medical subordinates that the delegation of their own proper duties to hospital servants would not be permitted and that some punishment would follow breach of rules.

4. Conduct, such as is described in the depositions of witnesses, is simply disgraceful to all concerned. John Pillai has shown himself to be unfit for his position, and will not be again employed in an independent charge until he has shown himself to be more trustworthy.

5. For this act of gross inhumanity and neglect of duty the Surgeon-General directs that John Pillai be suspended from rank, pay and allowances for a period of two months. At the end of the period of suspension he will be posted to some subordinate situation, where he will be under the supervision of a superior officer.

6. The Zillah Surgeon will be so good as to make arrangements in communication with the President for the immediate relief of John Pillai, and to report if any of the district subordinates are fit for the permanent charge at Tirukkóiyilúr.

7. The Civil Surgeon will also communicate with the President, Local Fund Board, in regard to the conduct of the hospital servants at Tirukkóyilúr. So far as the depositions go, the Surgeon-General thinks they are all unfitted for their positions and that it would be advisable to make a clean sweep of the establishment, but this is a matter entirely in the hands of the President of the Local Fund Board.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) A. J. STURMER, Surgeon,
Secy., Surgn.-Genl. with the Govt. of Madras.

Proceedings of the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, No. 3251, dated 26th June 1885.

Read—letter from the District Surgeon, Cuddalore, dated 15th June 1885, No. 23 and enclosures.

Order—No. 3251, dated 26th June 1885.

The correspondence shows that if the charges of neglect of duty and extorting fees from patients are not conclusively proved against Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai in charge of the Local Fund dispensary at Tiruvannámalai, he is eminently wanting in tact and conciliation, and is not fulfilling the purpose for which he has been placed in medical charge of Tiruvannámalai. His antecedent history at Tirukkóyilúr is also against him, where in 1882 he so far neglected his duty towards a sick mendicant who applied for relief, as to have led to his death. On that occasion he was suspended from rank, pay and allowances for two months and removed from independent charge. John Pillai does not appear to have profited by that lesson, and within a year of being re-employed in independent charge, has given occasion for dissatisfaction in the district, and for a request for his removal.

While holding with the District Surgeon that the charges of neglect of duty have not been established, it is very evident from the correspondence that, as medical officer of Tiruvannámalai, John Pillai has not earned the confidence and good will of the people from want of tact and judgment, and is not furthering the object of the Local Fund Board in providing medical relief for the Circle. The District Surgeon will therefore submit the whole correspondence (herewith forwarded) to the President for expression of his views as to whether it would not be desirable to replace John Pillai by a Civil Apothecary who would co-operate with the District authorities in the interests of the tax-payers. In that case John Pillai will be withdrawn to a subordinate charge, where he may be induced to qualify for an independent charge at some future time.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. ELCUM, Surgeon,
Secy., Surgn.-Genl. with the Govt. of Madras.

Proceedings of the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, No. O–228, dated 6th July 1886.

Read—the following papers:—

From the Superintendent, Lying-in-Hospital, Nos. 166 and 170, dated 18th and 20th June 1886, respectively.

From Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai, dated 28th June 1886.

Order—No. O–228, dated 6th July 1886.

The Surgeon-General regrets to receive such frequent complaints against Civil Apothecary John Pillai. In 1882 when attached to the Civil dispensary, Tirukkóyilúr, he so far neglected his duty towards a sick mendicant who applied for relief, as to have presumably led to his death, and was suspended on that occasion from rank, pay and allowances for two months and removed from independent charge.

On restoration to an independent post, charges were brought against him of neglect of duty and extorting fees from patients applying for aid at the Civil dispensary, Tiruvannámalai, and of want of tact and conciliation, and he was again removed from an independent to a subordinate charge.

The present correspondence shows still further neglect of duty on the part of the Civil Apothecary even in a subordinate position. An infant in the Lying-in hospital was found on the 17th June covered with acute scabies. No notice had been taken of the case by John Pillai, no attempt to apply a remedy, no report made to the Medical officer, or to his representative—the Senior Apothecary—on visiting the hospital, nor did the Civil Apothecary know the nature of the ailment. The fact of the admission and neglect were discovered by the Medical officer on the following day—not on the report of the Civil Apothecary, but by an accident.

When spoken to by the Medical officer regarding his neglect of duty and professional ignorance, he "became most insubordinate in manner and bearing," manifesting much contumacy when verbally ordered by the Medical officer to consider himself under suspension from duty.

According to his own showing John Pillai signally failed in his duty, for although the Senior Apothecary, in the absence of the Medical officer, went round the wards after the admission of the infant, John Pillai did not report the admission to him, but "thought best to show the infant the next day to the Doctor on his morning visit" and in that he failed also. In the meantime nothing was done to alleviate the sufferings of an infant covered with acute scabies.

Under all the circumstances of the case, and his previous misconduct coupled with his comparative ignorance of his profession, the Surgeon-General questions the advantage of retaining such a man in the public service; but requests that he may be warned that on the next occasion of misconduct he will not fail to move the Government for his dismissal from the service.

For his present offence the Surgeon-General sentences him to be suspended from duty and pay for one month, with effect from date of suspension by Surgeon-Major Branfoot.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. BIDIE, M.B., C.I.E.,
Surgeon-General with the Govt. of Madras.

Proceedings of the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, No. 429, dated 29th January 1897.

Read—the following papers:—

From the Superintendent, Government Maternity Hospital, No. 831, dated 1st December 1896, reporting that the service book of Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai sent to him for verification by the District Medical and Sanitary Officer, South Arcot, does not contain the pages bearing the entries regarding the Apothecary's suspension.

From the District Medical and Sanitary Officer, Minute No. 193, dated 16th December 1896, and No. D-C., dated 21st January 1897, forwarding the Apothecary's explanations.

Order—No. 429, dated 29th January 1897.

It is observed from the above correspondence that a new service book having been opened for Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai, doing duty Cuddalore, on the plea that the old one was in an unserviceable condition, it was sent by the District Medical and Sanitary officer, South Arcot, to the Superintendent, Government Maternity Hospital, Madras, for verification of the period during which the Apothecary was attached to his hospital.

2. While verifying the entries in the book with the records in the hospital, the Superintendent found that the new book contained no entries regarding the suspensions of the Apothecary, and on examining the old service book he discovered that the pages which contained such entries were missing from it.

3. The matter having been reported to this office, the Apothecary was called upon for explanation. He states that he is unable to account for the missing pages and that he only copied in the new service book such entries as were to be found in the old one.

4. The Apothecary's explanation is most unsatisfactory. He knew perfectly well that he was suspended more than once in his service and that the entries of such suspensions were made in his service book—so that if he had no connection with the surreptitious removal of the missing pages from the old book, he ought to have reported the fact to his medical officer when, in the course of preparing his new book, he found that the old one did not contain the missing pages.

5. His neglect to do so and his attempt to get the new book—without the entries of his punishments—passed through point to the fact that the pages from the old book were removed either by himself or at his instance or with his cognizance.

6. The presumption, supported as it is by very clear circumstantial evidence, is so strong that the Surgeon-General does not consider that the Apothecary can be given the benefit of doubt.

7. Such dishonest conduct on the part of an official calls for his summary dismissal, but in the present case, in the absence of direct evidence, the Surgeon-General considers that the ends of justice can be met by a lighter punishment. He accordingly directs that Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai be suspended for three months from his duty, pay and allowances from date of receipt by him of this order.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. SIMPSON, M.B., Surgn.-Captain,
Secy., Surgn.-Genl. with the Govt. of Madras.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 3rd March 1897, No. C.—20.

With reference to your memorandum, No. 513, dated 1st March 1897, I have the honour to forward Civil Apothecary John Pillai's letter of explanation, dated the 25th August 1896.

2. I also enclose, as requested, his appeal against his suspension in 1882 together with the District Medical and Sanitary officer's report thereon. His statement that the appeal resulted in his being restored to his office is wrong. The only effect of the appeal was that his suspension was reduced from two months to one month, but the order about his removal from independent charge stood fast, as will be seen from Surgeon-General Cornishe's remarks in pencil on the back of the report of the District Medical and Sanitary officer, South Arcot. I would also draw your attention to the proceedings of my predecessors in 1885 and 1886, copies of which were sent with my letter, No. 66, dated the 16th February 1897, and which will show that his punishment in 1882 was not cancelled.

From Apothecary D. JOHN PILLAI, dated 11th March 1897.

From Surgeon-Major-General C. SIBTHORPE, F.R.C.P.I., Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 13th March 1897, No. C.—25.

In continuation of my letters quoted in the margin, I have the honour to forward herewith an appeal submitted by Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai against his suspension as ordered in my proceedings No. 429, dated 29th January 1897, a copy of which has already been forwarded to Government, with my letter No. 66, dated 16th February 1897.

No. C.—9, dated 29th January 1897.
" 66, dated 16th February "
" C.—20, dated 3rd March "

2. According to G.O., No. 788, Public, dated 23rd October 1894, punishments by one of medical subordinates other than dismissal are not appealable, but as the Apothecary insists on his appeal being sent to Government in spite of this order, I consider it best to do so, and to lay the whole facts before Government.

3. On the 1st December 1896, I received an official letter from the Superintendent, Government Maternity Hospital, which I reproduce below for ready reference:—

I have the honour to forward, herewith, correspondence regarding the verification of entries in a new service book for Civil Apothecary D. John Pillai (with the old service book and a new one). I observe that the papers on which references were made to his suspension from duty in 1886 when posted to this hospital are missing, and I have reason to believe that entries referring to a former suspension (1882) are also missing from the book. A great deal of valuable time and trouble has been expended in verifying these entries, and if I had signed the new book as requested by the District Medical and Sanitary officer, South Arcot, no mention would have been made of suspension from duty when the Apothecary was at this hospital. I forward the books now, as I think that some explanation should be given by the Civil Apothecary regarding the torn and partially-destroyed record of service and the attempt made to obtain my signature to what would have been a false record.

* * * * *

4. This was no doubt a very serious matter and the Apothecary was called upon for an explanation. His reply was not only unsatisfactory but evasive, as discussed in my proceedings quoted above.

5. His present appeal is chiefly based on his presumption that he explained to my satisfaction at a personal interview that the original service book had never been mutilated. On the other hand I was never before more convinced of the service book having been tampered with as I was when I closely inspected it. I send it herewith for the inspection of Government. It will be seen that the pages not being numbered in print, there is no difficulty whatever in some of them being removed or replaced by new ones and the fact that in the present instance all sheets are separate and joined together by a thread considerably confirms this suspicion. Above all, it will be noticed that the entries in the book from 1881 to 1889 (the period which comprised the two occasions the Apothecary was suspended) are all in the Apothecary's own handwriting instead of in the handwriting of the medical officers under whom he was employed or of their clerks, as is the case in all the subsequent entries. Moreover not a single entry from 1881 to 1889 has been attested by any medical officer as provided for in column 12 of the book, as is the case in all other entries, and the sheets containing entries from 1881 to 1889 are in a better and more serviceable condition than the latter portion of the book which was used much after them. All these facts coupled with Brigade-Surgeon-Lieutenant-Colonel Branfoot's evidence of having seen and remembered the entries of suspension in the book, conclusively prove that the book was tampered with, and the handwriting of the Apothecary is a sufficient proof of his complicity and guilt.

6. His other statements call for no remarks—suffice it to say that there was not the least prejudice against him in this office as will be seen from my letter No. C.—84, dated 26th November 1896.

7. I would request the attention of Government to the intemperate nature of the language in the appeal as it originally stood and which has been slightly modified on the Apothecary's attention being drawn to it.

Order—No. 793, Public, dated 25th June 1897.

His Excellency the Governor in Council is of opinion that the suspension of three months inflicted on Civil Apothecary John Pillai for failure to bring to notice the omission from his service book of the entries relating to his previous punishments was well merited, and his petition will accordingly be dismissed. A perusal of the later correspondence read above shows the Apothecary in a most unfavourable light, and the Government therefore directs that he be severely censured and that such censure be recorded against him. The allegation in John Pillai's petition that the signature of a public servant in his service book does not entail on him responsibility for the entries therein cannot be accepted; a public servant is responsible for everything that he signs. The Surgeon-General should take due notice of the discreditable way in which the Apothecary's service book has been kept.

2. With regard to the public meeting held at Tirukkóyilúr, the Government observes with surprise that among the individuals who took a prominent part were several officers of Government, certain retired public servants, and two members of local boards. That these persons should have assisted at a public meeting held for the purpose of attacking the official character of a public servant, was most improper, and they are deserving of severe censure for what, as they must have been aware, was a gross breach of decorum.

3. These proceedings will be communicated to all departments of the Secretariat for communication, in view to officers in the public service being warned to abstain from action of the nature of that commented on above.

(True Extract.)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To the Surgeon-General.
„ the Revenue Department.
„ the Local and Municipal Department.
„ the Judicial Department.
„ other Departments of the Secretariat.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyengar.

Marine (1897) Department.