

1. Number of pages
2. Date of receipt
3. Index of Reference

M.B.O. 1-22,400-22-11-30.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works

DEPARTMENT.

Cons. & S. & L.

G.O. No.	693	Press Mis.
<i>48-49</i>		
Dated	15-4-	1858

Not to be folded or roughly handled

18

Fort Saint George, Public Works Consultation of 20th April 1858.

No. 48. Read the following letter from Colonel C. E. FABER, Chief Engineer ; to H. FORBES, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, dated 22nd March 1858, No. 8318.

SIR,

In reply to Extract Minutes of Consultation No. 493, dated 19th March 1858, I have the honor to inform you that the reason why the Acting Collectors letter of the 27th June 1857, No. 212, to the District Engineer was not forwarded to Government is, as stated in para. 2 of my letter No. 7533, dated 22nd February last, that it had been returned to Major Birdwood.

2. But I cannot admit that the papers now before Government do shew that the charges and the evidence were the same against Mr. Maitland and against Streenavassa Naik and I regret to find myself charged with adopting a difference of treatment under exactly similar circumstances.

3. In Mr. Maitland's case the charges were first of an improper style of writing to the Tahsildar for which he was properly reprimanded and secondly of combining with a Sub Overseer in endeavouring to effect the stoppage of a public work by irregular if not unlawful means for the support of which there was not a little of evidence while the accused party was left in utter ignorance of such a charge having been made.

4. The Collector's enquiry into Streenavassa Naik's conduct having been conducted in the Public Department I could not venture even to comment on the Proceedings which I presumed to be perfectly regular but if the Government are of a different opinion it unhappily is beyond my own power to afford them satisfaction on the point.

No. 49. ORDER THEREON, No. 693 ; dated 15th April 1858.

In a letter dated the 2nd of February 1858, No. 7114, the Chief Engineer reported that, under a misapprehension of the position in the Department of Public Works of a Sub Overseer named Streenavassa Naik, he had, on his own authority, dismissed him from the Department, on his having been charged with implication in an assault on a Tahsildar, so far as to shelter the rioters and write and address for them, and he requested Government to confirm his act of dismissal.

2. The Government in an order of the 16th February, No. 267, declined to accede to this request before they had an opportunity of perusing some correspondence which appeared to have passed between the Acting Collector and the Acting District Engineer upon the subject.

3. In a subsequent letter dated the 22nd of the same month, No. 7533, the Chief Engineer submitted the correspondence referred to, and the Government learned that the Sub Overseer had been dismissed on charges made against him by the Acting Collector in a letter to the Acting District Engineer, the purport of a part of which was to fix on Sub Engineer Maitland complicity with the Sub Overseer, in endeavouring to effect the stoppage of a Public Work by irregular, if not unlawful means, and in the suspicions stated by the Acting Collector, the Acting District Engineer appeared to share.

4. The Government remarked on the dismissal of the Sub Overseer, while the conduct of the Sub Engineer was not adverted to by the Chief Engineer, and they desired to know why the evidence considered sufficient for dismissal in the one case, was held to be so wholly insufficient in the other, as to call for no remark.

5. In his present letter, the Chief Engineer denies that the charge was the same against the two parties. He admits that the Sub Engineer was charged with irregular if not unlawful conduct, in endeavouring to effect the stoppage of a public work, but refers to the Sub Overseer being in addition charged with sheltering Rioters and writing an address for them. Colonel Faber adds that the latter charge was investigated in the Police Department, and he presumes that the proceedings were regular, and adds "but if Government are of a different opinion, it is unhappily beyond my own power to afford them satisfaction."

Extract Minutes Consultation 19th
March 1858, No. 493.

Fort Saint George, Public Works Consultation of 20th April 1858.

6. The Government must remark that the above is not the style or tone in which the Chief Engineer should address the Government, it is he who has asked them to confirm the dismissal of a public servant, and it is his duty therefore to satisfy them of the propriety of the measure he recommends.

7. Of the two charges made, that of endeavouring unlawfully to stop a public work, is by far the more important, and it was particularly incumbent on the Chief Engineer to cause its regular investigation, when both the Acting Collector and the Acting District Engineer had expressed their strong suspicion of its truth.

8. The Government now desire that the District Engineer be directed to investigate the charge both as regards Sub Engineer Maitland, and Sub Overseer Streenavassa Naick, and on the result being communicated a final order will be given.

9. The Government do not consent to the dismissal of the Sub Overseer on the minor charge of giving shelter and writing an address.

(Signed) H. FORBES,
Acting Secretary to Government.

Central Office of P.W. 38
Fort Saint George
22nd March 1858

No 8318

From

The Chief Engineer
To The Secretary to Government P.W.
Sir

In reply to Extract Miss of Court
No 493 dated 19th March 1858 I have the honour to
inform you that the reason why the Acting Collector's
letter of the 27th June 1857 No 212 to the District
Engineer was not forwarded to Government is as
stated in Para 2 of my letter No 533 dated
22nd February last that it had been returned to Major
Birdwood.

2 But I cannot admit that the papers
now before Government do show that the charges
and the evidence were the same against Mr Maitland
and against Streenavassa Naick and I regret to find
myself charged with adopting a difference of treat-
ment under exactly similar circumstances

3 In Mr Maitland's Case the charges
were first of an improper style of writing to the
Tahsildar for which he was properly reprimanded

and secondly of combining with a Sub Overseer in
endeavouring to effect the stoppage of a public work
by irregular if not unlawful means for the support
of which there was not a tittle of evidence while
the accused party was left in utter ignorance of
such a charge having been made;

It The Collector's enquiry into
Mr. Ramkrishna Naik's Conduct having been conducted
in the Pub. Dept. I could not venture even to
comment on the Proceedings, which I presumed to
be perfectly regular but if the Government are of a
different opinion it unhappily is beyond my own
power to afford them satisfaction on the point.

Signed / L. E. Taber Coll.
Chief Engineer

L

The Secretary to Government
P. W. D.

144. London, 22 March 1858.

Central Office of Mr.
Post Office General

1858 22 March 1858.

From Colonel [unclear]

The Chief Engineer

To The Secretary to Government

Sir, In reply to D. & H. Case,

of 1893, dated 19th March 1858, I have

the honor to inform you that the

reason why the Acting Collector

letter of the 27th June 1857, No. 212, is

The District Engineer was not

forwarded to Government is, as

stated in Para. 2 of my letter

No. 7533, dated 22nd February last,

that it had been returned to Major

Birdwood.

2. But I cannot admit that

the papers now before Govern-

ment do show that the charges

and the evidence were the same

against Mr. Maitland and

against Shimeoupa Nait, and

I regret to find myself charged

with.

Public.

Case 20th April 1858

1858 22 March 1858

with adopting a difference of treat-
ment under exactly similar cir-
cumstances.

3. In Mr. Maitland's Case,
the charges were, first of an im-
proper style of writing to the
Tahsilwar, for which he was
properly reprimanded; and
secondly of combining with a
Sub Overseer in endeavouring to
effect the stoppage of a public
work by irregular if not unlaw-
ful means. For the support
of which there was not a tittle
of evidence while the accused
party was left in utter
ignorance of such a charge
having been made!

4. The Collector's enquiry
into Sheenappa Kark's conduct
having been recorded in the Police Depart-
ment, I could not venture even to comment
on the proceedings which I presumed
to be perfectly regular, but if the
Government are of a different opinion it
unhappily is beyond my own power to
afford them satisfaction on the
point

Forth
Fort St George
22 March 1858

L. S.
J. S. Smith

I have the honor to be
Your most obedt Servt
Mr. Major. C. B.
Chief Secy

To The Secretary to Government
P. B. S.

Pub Works Dept.

No 693.

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation
Under date the 15th March 1858.

Read the following
letter from the Chief
Engineers.

There enter 22nd March 1858
CP 8318/

In a letter dated
the 2nd of February 1858
CP 7114, the Chief En-
-gineers reported that,
under a misappre-
-hension of the posi-
-tion in the Depart-
-ment of Public Works
of

Wd

Cons. 19th March 1858 CP 7114
15th March 1858 CP 7445

CP 7114 1858 CP 7114
CP 7445 1858 CP 7445
The Chief Engineer
to the Admiralty
15th March 1858

Under 22nd March 1858
CP 8318/

CP 8318/

CP 8318/

CP 8318/

of a Sub Overseer named
Steenwaggen Chaik,
he had, on his own
authority, dismissed
him from the Depart-
ment, on his having
been charged with
implication in an
assault on a Sahib.
-dar, so far as to shelter
the rioters and write
an address for them,
and he requested
Government to con-
-firm his act of
dismissal.

The ~~Commissioners~~ and
order of the 16th Feb'y 1857, directed to
accede to this request
before they had had

138
an opportunity of per-
-using some
correspondence which
appeared to have
passed between the
Acting Collector
and the Acting
District Engineer
upon the subject.

In a subse-
-quent letter dated
the 22^d of the same
Month 1858, the
Chief Engineer sub-
-mitted the corres-
-pondence referred
to, and the Govern-
-ment learned that
the Sub. Overseer
had been dismissed

on

on charges made against
him by the Acting Col-
lector in a letter to
the Acting District
Engineer, the purport
of a part of which
was to fix on Sub-
Engineer Ottland
complicity with the
Sub Overseer, in en-
deavouring to effect
the stoppage of a
Public work by irreg-
ular, if not unlaw-
ful means, and
in the suspicions
stated by the Acting
Collector, the Acting
District Engineer
appeared to share.

The

Exhibit Contd 19. March
1858. No 493.-

15P

The Govt.

remarked on the
dismissal of the
Sub Overseer, while
the conduct of the
Sub Engineer was
not adverted to by
the Chief Engineer,
and they desired
to know why the
evidence considered
sufficient for dismissal
in the one case, was
~~it~~ held to be so
wholly insufficient
in the other, as to
call for no remark.

In his present
letter the Chief Engi-
neer denies that
the

the charge was the same against the two parties. He admits that the Sub-Engineer, was charged with irregular if not unlawful conduct, in endeavouring to effect the stoppage of a public work, but refers to the Sub-Overseer being in addition charged with sheltering rioters and writing an address for them. Colonel Tabor adds that the latter charge was investigated in the Police Department, and he presumes that the proceedings ^{and adds} were regular, "but if Government

Government are of a different opinion, it is unhappily beyond my own power to afford them satisfaction."

The Government must remark that the above is not the style or tone in which the Chief Engineer should address the Government. it is he who has asked them to confirm the dismissal of a public servant, and it is his duty therefore to satisfy them of the propriety of the measure

measure he recommends.

Of the two charges made, that of endeavouring unlawfully to stop a public work, is by far the more important, and it was particularly incumbent on the Chief Engineer to cause its regular investigation, when both the Acting Collector and the Acting District Engineer had expressed their strong suspicion of its truth.

The Government now desire that the District Engineer

11 F
be directed to investigate the charge both as regards Sub Engineer Maitland, and Sub Overseer Stremanappa Naick, and on the result being communicated a final order will be given.

The Government do not consent to the dismissal of the Sub Overseer in the minor charge of giving shelter and writing an address.

B. L.

9 Copies to the Chief Eng.
Dist. 16.

Cons: 19th March /58 No. 77478
- 16th July - - 74875 -

Public Works 1858 Department
By to Cons: 20th April

C. No. 6903

Extract from Cons.
Dated 15th April /58

Further Cons: 20 April /58
N/142-143

Directing the District
Engineer of Bangalore to investi-
gate the charges both as
regards Sub Engineer Maitland
and Sub Overseer Streenevada
Maitland, and on the results
being communicated to the
Government a final order
will be given.

No. 48049

Cons: 19th March /58