

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

M.R.O. 1-32,400-22-11-80

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

20.4.1858.

G.O. No.	<i>741</i>	Press
		Mis.
<i>142-143.</i>		
Dated	<i>20.4.1858</i>	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

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

No. 142. Read the following letter from Major E. LAWFORD, Superintending Engineer Southern Circle, in charge of Central Office of P. W. ; to H. FORBES, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, dated 19th April 1858, No. 9122.

SIR,

In acknowledging the receipt of Extract Minutes Consultation No. 693, dated 15th April 1858, I have the honor to request the attention of Government to the following remarks before I direct the District Engineer to carry on the investigation ordered in Para. 8 of the order quoted above.

2. The Government have evidently misunderstood the case of the Sub Overseer Streenevassa Naick who was stated by the Collector after an investigation by the Tahsildar to have been present in a certain village when a riotous assault was made on that Officer in order to stop a Public Work, and to have abetted the rioters in their opposition to its execution.

3. The District Engineer made no further enquiry into the matter nor did the Chief Engineer consider himself entitled to call in question what was apparently a Magisterial decision, and on such grounds coupled with my knowledge of Streenevassa Naick's indifferent character his dismissal was ordered.

4. Sub Engineer Maitland was never openly accused of any offence except that of addressing a Tahsildar improperly, and was not near the place during the riot, and so far from evincing any sympathy with the Sub Overseer, he had charged him with encouraging the people in opposing the work proposed by himself.

5. The Collector's suspicion of the Sub Engineer was clearly unwarranted by any thing placed on record and though adopted at the time by the District Engineer, was not communicated to Mr. Maitland who remained in perfect ignorance of any charge against himself which Streenevassa Naick certainly could not have done.

6. The Chief Engineer's remarks on the irregularity of the District Engineer in sending up a charge which he had not investigated more such as should have led Major Birdwood, (who had full authority) to make some enquiry if he had still considered the sub Engineer guilty, but it is to be inferred that this was not the case as Mr. Maitland was placed in charge of an executive range in January last.

7. The Government will thus perceive that there is no ground for the reflection they have considered it right to cast on the Head of this Department in the imputation of partiality and it is difficult to see how the Chief Engineer's duties can be properly performed under such a public stigma, and evident want of confidence.

8. The application for Streenevassa Naick's dismissal was based on a judicial enquiry ; the refusal to receive charges against Mr. Maitland while he was ignorant of them was an act of simple justice, and if there is anything in the tone of Colonel Faber's reply to which exception can be taken it must be ascribed to that course so derogatory to him, which the Government thought proper to adopt.

9. That the extraordinary interest shewn in this case has not arisen so much from anything on public record as from private information, tending to disparage Mr. Maitland's character. I cannot doubt, and I think it would be far better that such grounds of suspicion as may exist should be openly stated and investigated than that they should be allowed to prejudice the proceedings of the Chief Engineer.

10. It is impossible to avoid contrasting the dismissal of the Lock Monigar of Permal Coil after fifteen years service for simple neglect of duty, with the difficulties raised to the removal of a Sub Overseer for such conduct as Streenevassa Naick's. In the former case the Collector dismissed an old servant without any intimation to Government, and when the fact became known no defence was admitted, while the Chief Engineer has failed to obtain the power of striking off the list of public servants a man who has long ceased to do duty or draw pay on account of flagrant misconduct judicially investigated.

Extract Minutes Consultation No. 167,
dated 29th January 1858.

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

11. If the Government should still determine on re-opening the subject herein reported on, it will be necessary that the District Engineer should be furnished with the Magistrate's Proceedings on the Tahsildar's enquiry.

No. 143. ORDER THEREON, No. 741; dated 20th April 1858.

Before proceeding to pass orders on the foregoing communication, the Governor in Council resolves to call upon Major Lawford to explain more fully the meaning of the 9th paragraph of his letter in which he informs the Government that he cannot doubt that the extraordinary interest shewn in the case of Sub-Engineer Maitland and Overseer Streenevassa Naick, has not arisen so much from any thing on public record, as from private information tending to disparage Mr. Maitland's character.

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

Central Office of P.W.
Fort St. George 19 April 1858

A. 9/22.

From

The Superintending Engineer & Co.
in charge of Central Office

To H. J. J.
The Secretary to Government P.W.
Sir,

Publ. c.

In acknowledging the receipt of G. M. M. C. No. 693, dated 15th April 1858, I have the honor to request the attention of Government to the following remarks before I direct the District Engineer to carry on the investigation ordered in Para 8 of the order quoted above.

2. The Government have evidently misunderstood the case of the Sub Overseer Streenevassa Naick who was stated by the Collector after an investigation by the Tahsildar to have been present in a certain village when a riotous assault was made on that Officer in order to stop a

a public work, and to have abetted the rioters in their opposition to its execution.

3. The District Engineer made no further enquiry into the matter nor did the Chief Engineer consider himself entitled to call in question what was apparently a Magisterial decision, and on such grounds coupled with my knowledge of Streenewapa's habits in different characters he deemed it was ordered.

4. Sub Engineer Martland was never openly accused of any offence except that of addressing a Tahitian improperly, and was not near the place during the riot, and so far from evincing any sympathy with the Sub Overseer, he had charged him with encouraging the people in opposing the work proposed by himself.

5. The Collector's suspicion of the Sub Engineer was clearly unwaranted by any thing placed on record and though adopted at the time by the District Engineer, was

not communicated to Mr. Martland who remained in perfect ignorance of any charge against himself which Streenewapa's attack certainly could not have done.

6. The Chief Engineer's remarks on the irregularity of the District Engineer in sending up a charge which he had not investigated were such as should have led Major Birdwood, (who had full authority) to make some enquiry if he had still considered the Sub Engineer guilty, but it is to be inferred that this was not the case as Mr. Martland was placed in charge of an Executive Range in January last.

7. The Government will thus perceive that there is no ground for the reflection they have considered it right to cast on the Head of the Department in the imputation of partiality and it is difficult to see how the Chief Engineer's duties can be properly performed under such a public stigma, and evident want of

of confidence.

8. The application for Streener's discharge was based on a judicial enquiry; the refusal to receive charges against Mr. Maithland while he was ignorant of them was an act of simple justice, and if there is anything in the tone of Colonel Galt's reply to which exception can be taken it must be ascribed to that course so derogatory to him which the Government thought proper to adopt.

9. That the extraordinary interest shown in this case has not arisen so much from anything on public record as from private information, tending to disparage Mr. Maithland's character. I cannot doubt, and I think it would be far better that such grounds of suspicion as may exist should be openly stated and investigated than that they should be allowed to prejudice the proceedings of the Chief Engineer.

It

Sr. H. C. Kelly
29 Jan 1873

10. It is impossible to avoid -
Contracting the discharge of the Locks
Manager of Pernal Cais after fifteen
years service for simple neglect of duty
with the difficulties raised to the
removal of a Sub Overseer for such
conduct as Streener's discharge. In
the former case the Collector discharged
an old servant without any intimation
to Government; and when the fact
became known no defence was
admitted, while the Chief Engineer
has failed to obtain the power of
stopping off the back of public
servants a man who has long
ceased to do duty or draw pay
on account of flagrant mis-
conduct judicially investigated

11. If the Government should still determine on re-opening the subject herein reported on, it will be necessary that the District Engineer should be furnished with the Magistrate's
Proceedings

Proceedings on the Tabernacle's inquiry.

To the Genl
19th April 88

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Your much obliged servant

Lawford Esq
Surgeon Genl. & Co. in Ch. of
Aunt's Office 1888

To
The Secretary to Government
P. M. D.

Nov 2

N^o 741

Extract from the minutes of the Under dated the 20th April 1858.

Read the following
letter from the L^{ieut} E.
The S. C. in charge of
the Central Office

Received
19 April 1858
No

[Signature]

Well

Before proceeding
to pass orders on the
communication
frequency letter, the
General in Council
resolved to call upon
Major LaSford to
explain more fully
the meaning of the
9th paragraph of

20 April 1858
Dear Sir
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th inst. in relation to the proposed alteration of the regulations of the S. C. in charge of the Central Office
I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
E. J. LaSford

20 April 1858
No 741

20 April 1858
No 741

Received the letter of the 17th inst. in relation to the proposed alteration of the regulations of the S. C. in charge of the Central Office
I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
E. J. LaSford

20 April 1858

in which he
informs the President
that he cannot doubt
that the extraordinary
interest shown in the
case of Labadie's
Mail and the Pres-
-sen's investigation
which has been
to avoid from any
thing on public re-
-cord, or from pri-
-vate information
leading to disclosure
of Mail and cha-

acter -

of the Chief of the
Post Office

Public Works 1858 Depoarts
Cons: 20th April

N^o 741

Case: 19, 18, 17, 16, 15, 14, 13, 12, 11, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1

Case: 19, 18, 17, 16, 15, 14, 13, 12, 11, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1

Case: 19, 18, 17, 16, 15, 14, 13, 12, 11, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1

Case: 19, 18, 17, 16, 15, 14, 13, 12, 11, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1

Case: 19, 18, 17, 16, 15, 14, 13, 12, 11, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1

Case: 19, 18, 17, 16, 15, 14, 13, 12, 11, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1