

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1939	Press
4627468		Mis.
Dated	14.5.	1872.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
14th May 1872.*

No. 462. Read the following letter from the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, to the Officiating Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madura, 26th April 1872, No. 330 :—

- 1 Copy of letter from Superintending Engineer, No. 2,077, dated 5th September 1871.
- 1 Do. do., 8th April 1872.
- 1 Letter from Collector of Tinnevely, No. 228, dated 19th October 1871.
- 1 Letter from Rev. J. Kearns, dated 18th October 1871.
- 1 Do. from Collector, No. 272, dated 22nd November 1871, with one enclosure.
- 1 Do. do., No. 110, dated 1st April 1872.
- 1 Do. from Mr. Sage, No. 215, dated 26th December 1871.
- 1 Do. do., No. 217, dated 27th December 1871.
- 1 Do. do., „ 246, „ 10th Jan. 1872.
- 1 Do. do., „ 370, „ 28th Mar. „
- 1 Do. do., „ 28, „ 17th April „

It is with extreme regret that I have the honour to submit the accompanying correspondence for the information, and orders of Government ; but the enclosed letter No. 28, dated 17th instant, from Executive Engineer Mr. G. S. Sage scarcely leaves me any option in the matter.

2. The correspondence, it will be seen, is to a certain extent bound up with Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay's case, which was submitted by me to your

predecessor with my report No. 4,195, dated 30th January 1872 ; and but for that case there can be no doubt that the question now at issue would not have arisen.

3. The facts connected with this case are as follow :—

In the Ottapedarum Taluq of the Tinnevely District, at a place near the site where once stood the fort of Panjalamecoorchy, there are a number of graves of officers and men who fell gloriously in the three separate assaults on that fort in 1799 and 1801—for it was only with the third assault that victory was attained—and that the blood-thirsty Poligar, who held the fort, was driven out of his stronghold, after the loss on our side of the ten officers, nine Non-commissioned officers, and twenty-two privates, who lie buried at this spot, in addition to others buried near Ottapedarum.

4. It appears that in June 1866, Mr. E. Storr, the Acting Head Assistant Collector of the District, reported, in accordance with G. O., in the Ecclesiastical Department, 9th January 1857, No. 11, that these graves were not enclosed by a wall, and that in their present state, situated as they were on an open plain without any protection, they were liable to be damaged by cattle trespassing on them. He also brought to notice that an abortive attempt had been made to plant an aloe hedge round them, but that a good deal of this had disappeared, and that there was little chance of its growing up in the rocky soil of the site in question.

5. An estimate was accordingly prepared in this department by the Range Officer, Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay ; was submitted for sanction in September 1866, and was eventually sanctioned for execution in G. O., 28th July 1869, No. 2,472. And the work was accordingly executed by the Supervisor during the same year.

6. At a late meeting of the Local Fund Board, Tinnevely, it was brought to my notice by the Rev. J. Kearns, who resides within a short distance of Ottapedarum, that the cemetery wall under reference has been built in closer proximity to the tombs than was either necessary or desirable, and that it had been so poorly constructed that a portion of it had been washed away during the monsoon that immediately followed its erection.

7. Accordingly, I referred the matter to Executive Engineer Mr. G. S. Sage for report: as per enclosed memorandum No. 2,077, dated 4th September 1871, and

marked A; and on receipt of the Collector's letter No. 228, dated 19th October 1871 (B), and its enclosure (C) from the Rev. J. Kearns, I at once forwarded these papers to Mr. Sage in continuation of that memorandum.

8. As Mr. Sage's report No. 217, dated 27th December 1871 (D forwarded herewith) differed so entirely from the views expressed by the Rev. Mr. Kearns in this matter, I had no alternative but to await an opportunity of visiting the spot myself before disposing of the subject.

9. I should mention here that the rate allowed in the estimate, and alleged to have been paid, for rough stone-in-mud, of which the wall is built, is Rupees 3 per cubic yard, whereas the ordinary rate of the district for rough stone-in-chunam is Rupees 2-8-0 per cubic yard, and for that rate there is no difficulty whatever in getting a contractor to execute new work of this kind on the spot in question. I say this advisedly, for I hold an agreement with a contractor to this effect.

10. Mr. Sage, it will be seen, does not think the work "is badly built." He attributes its failure to faulty designing, and to the fact that "masons about here do not seem to understand building rubble walls."

11. On the 20th of March last, I made my inspection of the cemetery wall, and I must confess to a feeling of considerable annoyance in regard to the report submitted by Mr. Sage, a report which I felt no hesitation in considering as inconsistent with the real facts of the case, and I accordingly thought it my duty to administer him a very severe rebuke on the subject—see my marginal letter No. 4,915, dated 20th March 1872, upon enclosure D. In confirmation of my views, I would call your special attention here to the enclosed letter from the Collector of Tinnevely, No. 110, dated 1st April 1872, and marked K, wherein that gentleman suggests that, "in consideration of the manifest shortcomings of the Architect Vyapoory Pillay," the repair of the cemetery wall may well be done at the expense of that Supervisor.

12. In his letter No. 370, dated 28th March 1872 (E), Mr. Sage resents my remarks; "is still of opinion that the work is not badly built;" is sorry that what he believes to be true is "in opposition to my wishes," and requests his removal to another division.

13. Before submitting this letter to Government, I addressed the enclosed letter No. 84, dated 8th April 1872 (marked F) to Mr. Sage, with a view of clearing up a misunderstanding that had arisen on two points, and also in order that should he still desire to be removed from this division that wish might be based upon a clear issue.

14. Mr. Sage's reply No. 28, dated 17th April 1872 (G) is forwarded herewith, and as the tone of this letter throughout appears to me exceedingly objectionable, I have no desire to thwart his wishes for his removal from this division.

15. In paragraph 2 of this letter, Mr. Sage states that it was not he who made the inquiry into Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay's case, whereas the Government will see from the original correspondence (enclosure No. 74 of my report No. 4,195, dated 30th January 1872) that Mr. Sage considered it rather a grievance (I quote from memory) that he had not been allowed to be present at

the concluding investigation of the case made by me. Now, if he did not, as he now asserts, make the inquiry, what kind of necessity was there for his being present at the investigations made by me.

16. In the statement which accompanied my report already quoted, I have gone fully into all the details of the case, and I have given my reasons for considering that the Government have not received in this business the assistance which they have a right to expect from an officer of Mr. Sage's standing and experience.

17. There are occasionally to be found in this world, as it is well known, head-strong individuals, whose great aim in life appears to be to prove that every body else is wrong. Men of this stamp habitually make up their minds at once to a strong opinion, and ignore and indeed seem to be totally blind to facts, or occurrences, which appear to others adverse to such an opinion. So long as such a course is confined to mere arguments, or only affects personally the individual that indulges in this peculiar propensity, those who object to the same have no call to mix themselves up in the matter, as they can perfectly pass "on the other side of the way." In public life however this practice has such palpable disadvantages that no public officer can be too careful not to allow himself to be included in this category, and by so doing damage the interests of the Government he serves.

18. Mr. Sage complains, in paragraph 4 of his letter, that I have made a "deliberate charge of falsehood or falsifying" against him, and he asserts that what he writes "is truth however badly expressed." The Government are well aware of what I have written before, and can form their own opinion from what has now passed as to whether I have ever said anything to warrant such a charge against Mr. Sage as that which he alleges as above. I would refer you, in this connection, to paragraph 13 of my report No. 4,195, dated 30th January 1872, where the following passage occurs:—

"The manner in which the preliminary inquiry into the charges against the Supervisor was conducted by Mr. Sage, namely, his not attempting to obtain the evidence of the witnesses in a calm, dignified, and dispassionate manner has resulted in a palpable failure in regard to the whole truth being elicited."

19. In paragraph 5 of his letter it would appear that, as Mr. Sage cannot complain of the course I pursued in regard to my placing Mr. Sub-Engineer McNair under his orders while investigating Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay's case, he must needs fall foul of my motives for doing so. Such an extraordinary proceeding needs no comment on my part, the more especially as I have, in paragraph 14 of my report already quoted, explained my reasons for the course I pursued in this respect. At the end of his paragraph 5, Mr. Sage overtly sneers at Mr. McNair as "a man I had great faith in up to that time at all events." I can only repeat my belief, as stated in my report, that, had Mr. McNair been untrammelled in his investigations, there is every probability that it would have resulted in sufficient evidence being collected as to ensure a magisterial conviction against the Supervisor.

20. I will not trouble the Government with any further comments on Mr. Sage's letter; but I will content myself by asking what subordination can be expected in a department where, if an Executive Officer, on being reprimanded by

his Divisional Officer, at once prefers a request to be removed to another division? This is indeed one way of solving the difficulty, and I would respectfully suggest that, if the request be acceded to, the removal may not be made at the *public expense*.

21. I venture also to point out that there appear no other objections to his removal, but rather the reverse, inasmuch as the services of an officer of Mr. Sage's standing and experience are not actually required in the Northern Range, Tinnevely, whereas it is possible they may be needed by the Government elsewhere. Moreover, as Mr. Sage is not acquainted with Tamil, the language of the district, and has indeed been exempted from passing in it, the services in his place of an officer who has passed in Tamil would manifestly be advantageous. I may here mention that in my letter No. 1,688, dated 15th August 1871, applying for the services of an officer for the range in question, I suggested that an Assistant Engineer of some experience should be detailed for the duty. With the exception of the lighthouse at Tuticorin, which can be perfectly re-transferred to the supervision of the Executive Engineer in charge of the Southern Range, Tinnevely, there are no works whatever of any magnitude in the Northern Range, Tinnevely, which an Assistant Engineer is not perfectly competent to undertake.

22. In addition to the above, I regret to have to state that, in consequence of the dread inspired by Mr. Sage's treatment, as commonly reported, of the subordinates of the range, I find great difficulty in filling the vacancies that occur therein. When a native hears that a Local Fund Overseer, a Christian moreover, has been kept standing in the Range Office from 6 A. M. to 6 P. M. on a Sunday,* he is naturally not very desirous to join that range. But the most

curious thing of all is that Vyapoory Pillay, whom Mr. Sage has expressed his willingness to re-employ as Supervisor, has personally entreated me, should he be reinstated, not to be sent to do duty under Mr. Sage. If gratitude is, as it has been described to be, a keen sense of favours to come, the want of it is explained in this case.

23. At the conclusion of Mr. Sage's letter No. 370 of the 28th March 1872, that gentleman complains of the want of support I have afforded him from his first joining the division. This is the first time that he has brought this to my notice, and though I should indeed much regret that it should be considered that I had made myself obnoxious to this charge, it is impossible for me, in the absence of any specific instance being mentioned, to meet so general and sweeping a statement. The fact is that on Mr. Sage's taking charge of the range almost his first duties were in connection with Vyapoory Pillay's case. In this he appears to have made himself a violent partizan; as lenient, on the one hand, to the Supervisor, as he was harsh to those who gave evidence against that individual. While even in writing to me his language has been so indecorous that I have been compelled to take notice of the same—see Mr. Sage's letter No. 215, dated 26th December 1871, and my marginal reply thereon, No. 3,740, dated 4th January 1872 (marked I), with Mr. Sage's explanation (J).

24. I now leave the matter with confidence in the hands of Government, and I can only regret to have been compelled to trouble them with this additional and disagreeable correspondence.

25. In conclusion, it behoves me to mention one fact while on the subject of Vyapoory Pillay's case, and with a view of the Government having a more thorough insight into the same, and that is that, although he formerly was highly respected, he has fallen much in the estimation of his countrymen by the habit of drinking, which he has acquired of recent years, and under the effects of which habit he has appeared in my presence.

No. 463. ORDER THEREON, 14th May 1872, No. 1,339.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 49.

THE Government remark that this controversy between the Superintending Engineer and Executive Engineer

really arose from the misquotation by the former of a single word in the latter's letter marked D, which cannot be accounted for by any illegibility of the manuscript. They consider therefore that Lieutenant-Colonel Roberts would have adopted the more magnanimous and fair course had he entirely cancelled his memorandum No. 4,195 on that letter written when labouring under a misconception of what Mr. Sage wrote, and they consider that he might have been satisfied with the opinion of so experienced an Executive Officer on so small a matter, and acted upon any repair estimate he might send in. The papers marked I and J certainly should not have been sent up, their subject matter having been allowed to drop.

2. Mr. Sage, on the other hand, however hurt at a censure, the harshness of which was evidently based on the misreading of a single word that he had used, was not justified on such a pretext to request his removal from the 8th Division. It is perfectly evident, as stated by Lieutenant-Colonel Roberts, that ill-feeling had arisen in connection with other matters, and advantage was taken by Mr. Sage of this mistake of his superior officer to demand his removal from under his orders. But Government are not prepared to make transfers simply on account of incompatibility of temper of officers working together in the same division, at least until it suits the public as well as their private convenience. Mr. Sage will accordingly stand fast for the present; and both officers are expected to proceed with their respective duties towards Government and each other without further reference to former misunderstandings, and with a due regard to the deservedly high character they bear.

3. With reference to the charge made in paragraph 22 of the Superintending Engineer's letter, and supported by the documents marked H, the Government do not find that any notice whatever was taken by Lieutenant-Colonel Roberts of Mr. Sage's treatment of the Local Fund Overseer at the time the transaction occurred, namely, in November 1871, which would appear to have been a grave dereliction of duty on his part if he attached any importance to the subject, as he now appears to do. Presuming on the accuracy of the statement made by him, the Superintending Engineer should have called Mr. Sage's attention to the absolute necessity of keeping his temper and refraining from ill-treatment of his subordinates, and have intimated that the severest displeasure of Government would follow upon his having to hand him up for such behaviour in future.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,

Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division.
Exd. E. C. Shunker.

70 1/2

No 330 Superintendent's Office S. D.
Madras 26th April 1872

From,
Lieut. Colonel W. S. Roberts R.E.
Superintending Engineer
S. Division

To,
Colonel C. W. Walker R.E.
Off. Secretary to Government S. D.
Madras

Sir,
It is with extreme regret that
I have the honor to submit the accompanying
selected Correspondence for the information and
orders of Government, but the enclosed
letter No 28 dated 17th Instant, from
Executive Engineer Mr. C. S. Sager
scarcely leaves me any option in the
matter. —

2. The Correspondence, it will be
Yours

being, is to a certain extent, bound up
with ^{the} ~~Supervisor~~ ^{the} ~~Vijayapoor~~ ^{the} ~~Pillayar's~~ ^{the} ~~case~~,
which was submitted by me to your
predecessor with my Report N^o 4195
dated 30th January 1842; and but for
that case there can be no doubt that
the question now at issue would not
have arisen.

3. The facts connected with this
case are as follows: In the Otta-
pedarum Taluk of the Yinnervelly
District, at a place near the site where
once stood the Fort of Panjalamcorchi,
there are a number of graves of Officers
and men who fell gloriously in the
3 separate assaults on that Fort in

1799.

1799 and 1801; for it was only with the
3rd assault that victory was attained, and
that the blood-thirsty ^{sa} ~~Pillayar~~ ^{the} ~~Pillayar~~, who held
the Fort, was driven out of his strong-
hold, after the loss on our side of
the 10 Officers, 9 Non Commissioned
Officers, and 22 Privates, who lie buried
at this spot, in addition to others
buried near Ottapedarum. —

4. It appears that in June 1866,
Mr. C. P. Storr, the Acting Head Assistant
Collector of the District, reported, in
accordance with C. O. in the Ecclesiastical
Department, 9th January 1857, N^o 11, that
these graves were not enclosed by a
wall, and that in their present state,
situated as they were on an open
plain.

plain without any protection; they were
liable to be damaged by cattle trespassing
on them. It was also brought to notice
that an abortive attempt had been made
to plant an aloe hedges round them, but
that a good deal of this had disappeared,
and that there was little chance of
its growing up in the rocky soil of
the site in question.

5. The Estimate was accordingly
prepared in this Department, by the
Range Officer Supervisor Vyapoorji Maharaj,
was submitted for sanction in September
1866, and was eventually sanctioned
for execution in G.O. 28th July 1869,
N^o 2472. - And the work was accordingly
executed by the Supervisor during the same
year

year.

6. At a late meeting of the Local
Fund Board. Annexed, it was
brought to my notice by the Reverend
J. Kearns, who resides within a short
distance of Ottapedarum, that the
Cemetery wall under reference has been
built in closer proximity to the tombs
than was either necessary or desirable,
and that it had been so poorly constructed
that a portion of it had been washed
away during the monsoon that imme-
diately followed its erection.

7. Accordingly I referred the
matter to Executive Engineer Mr. R.
S. Sage for report, as per enclosed Memo
N^o 2077

N^o 2077 dated 4th September 1871 and marked A; and one receipt of the Collector's letter N^o 228, dated 19th October 1871.

(B) and its enclosure (C) from the Reverend J. E. Eames, I at once forwarded these papers to Mr. Sage in continuation of that Memorandum.

8. As Mr. Sage's report N^o 217, dated 27th December 1871 (D forwarded herewith) differed so entirely from the views expressed by the Reverend Mr. Eames in this matter, I had no alternative but to await an opportunity of visiting the spot myself, before disposing of the subject.

9. I should mention here that the

the rate allowed in the Estimate, and alleged to have been paid for rough stones in mud, of which the wall is built, is Rupees 3 per Cubic yard, whereas the ordinary rate of the District for rough stones in Chumam is Rupees 2. 8. per Cubic yard, and for that rate there is no difficulty whatever in getting a Contractor to execute new work of this kind on the spot in question. I say this advisedly, for I hold an agreement with a Contractor to this effect.

10. Mr. Sage, it will be seen, does not think the work "is badly built". He attributes its failure to faulty designing, and to the fact that masons

about

"about here do not seem to understand
"building rubble walls." —

11. On the 20th of March last, I made my inspection of the Cemetery wall, and I must Confess to a feeling of Considerable annoyance in regard to the report submitted by Mr. Sage, a report which I felt no hesitation in considering as inconsistent with the real facts of the Case, and I accordingly thought it my duty to administer him a very severe rebuke on the Subject. See my marginal letter N^o 4915, dated 20th March 1872, upon enclosure D. In confirmation of my views I would call your special attention

attention here to the enclosed letter from
the Collector of Timmerly, No. 110, dated
1st April 1892, and marked K, wherein
that Gentleman suggests that "in consideration
of the manifest shortcomings of the
"Architect Vyasa Rao Pillay" the repair
of the Cemetery wall may well be done
at the expenses of that Supervisor. —

12. In his letter, 1837, dated 28th March 1842. (E) Mr. Sager presents my remarks, "is still of opinion that the work is not badly built," is sorry that what he believes to be true is "in opposition to my wishes," and requests his removal to another Division. —

13. Before submitting this letter,

to Government, I addressed the enclosed letter N^o 84, dated 8th April 1872 (marked F) to Mr Sage with a view of clearing up a misunderstanding that had arisen on two points, and also in order that should he still desire to be removed from this Division that wish might be based upon a clear issue. —

14. Mr Sage's reply N^o 28, dated 17th April 1872 (G) is forwarded herewith and as the tone of this letter throughout appears to me exceedingly objectionable, I have no desire to thwart his wishes for his removal from this Division. —

15. In para 2 of this letter Mr Sage states that it was not he who made

made the enquiry into Supervisor Tappan's case, whereas the Government will see from the original Correspondence Enclosure N^o 44 of my Report N^o 4195, dated 30th January 1872 that Mr Sage considered it rather a grievance (I quote from memory) that he had not been allowed to be present at the concluding investigation of the case made by me. Now, if he did not, as he now asserts, make the enquiry, what kind of necessity was there for his being present at the investigations made by me? —

16. In the statements which accompanied my report already quoted

I have gone fully into all the details of the case, and I have given my reasons for considering that the Government have not received in this business the assistance which they have a right to expect, from an Officer of Mr. Sager's standing and experience.

17. There are occasionally to be found in this world, as it is well known, head-strong individuals whose great aim in life appears to us to prove that every body else is wrong. None of this stamp habitually makes up their minds at once to a strong opinion, and ignore and indeed seems to be totally blind to facts, or occurrences, which appear to others to deserve so such an opinion.

So

So long as such a course is confined to mere arguments, or only affects personally the individual that indulges in this peculiar propensity, those who object to the same have no call to mix themselves up in the matter, as they can perfectly pass over to the other side of the way. In public life, however, this practice has such palpable disadvantages that no public Officer can be too careful not to allow himself to be included in this category - and by so doing damages the interests of the Government he serves.

18. Mr. Sager complains in para 4

para 4. of his letter that I have made a
"deliberate charge of falsehood or falsifying"
against him - and he asserts that what he
writes "is truth however badly expressed."

The Government are well aware of what
I have written before, and can form their
own opinions from what has now passed,
as to whether I have ever said anything
to warrant such a charge against

Mr. Sage as that which he alleges, as
above. I would refer you, in this connection,
to para 13 of my report No 4195 dated
30th January 1872, where the following
passage occurs: -

The manner in which the preliminary
enquiry into the charges against the Superintendent

was

112
"was conducted by Mr. Sage and his not
"attempting to obtain the evidence of the
"witnesses in a calm dignified and
"dispassionate manner - has resulted in a
"palpable failure in regard to the whole
"truth being elicited."

19. In para 5 of his letter it would
appear that as Mr. Sage cannot complain
of the course pursued in regard to
my placing Mr. Sub Engineer McVair
under his orders, while investigating
Superintendent Tillam's case, he
must needs fall foul of my motives for
doing so. Such an extraordinary
proceeding needs no comment on my
part, the more especially as I have
in para 14, of my report already quoted,
explained

explained my reasons for the course I pursued in this respect. At the end of his para 5, Mr. Sage overtly sneers at Mr. McVair as "a man I had great faith in up to that time, at all events", I can only repeat my belief, as stated in my report, that had Mr. McVair been untrammelled in his investigations, there is every probability that it would have resulted in sufficient evidence being collected as to ensure a Marion's conviction against the Supervisor. —

20. I will not trouble the Government with any further comments on Mr. Sage's letter, but I will content myself by asking, what subordination can be expected in a Department where

120
if an Executive Officer, on being reprimanded by his Divisional Officer, at once prefers a request to be removed to another Division? This is indeed one way of solving the difficulty, and I would respectfully suggest that if the request be acceded to, the removal may not be made at the public expense.

21. I venture also to point out that there appears no other objections to his removal, but rather the reverse, in as much as the services of an Officer of Mr. Sage's standing and experience are not actually required in the Northern Range Division, whereas it is possible they may be needed by the Government elsewhere. Moreover as Mr. Sage

is not acquainted with Tamil, the
language of the District, and has
indeed been exempted from passing in it,
the services, in his place of an Officer
who has passed in Tamil, would be
manifestly be advantageous. I may
here mention that in my letter No. 1088,
dated 15th August 1871, applying for the
services of an Officer for the Range
in question, I suggested that an
Assistant Engineer of some experience
should be detailed for the duty. With
the exception of the Light house at
Yuticrin, which can be perfectly re-
transferred to the supervision of the
Executive Engineer in charge of the
Southern Range Tirunelveli, there are

130
no works whatever of any magnitude in
the Northern Range Tirunelveli, which
an Assistant Engineer is not perfectly
competent to undertake. —

22. In addition to the above,
I regret to have to state that in consequence
of the dread inspired by Mr. Sage's
treatment, as commonly reported, of the
subordinates of the Range, I find
great difficulty in filling the vacancies
that occur therein. Where a Native hears
that a Local Fund Overseer, a
Christian moreover, has been kept
standing in the Range Office from 6
A.M. to 6 P.M. on a Sunday, he is
naturally not very desirous to join that
Range. But the most curious thing of
all.

* Enclosed
Correspondence in
forwarded by Collectors
of Tirunelveli with
his letter No. 272
dated 22nd November
1871 - marked
H.

all is that Vyapoor Pillay, whom Mr. Sage has expressed his willingness to re-employ as Supervisor, has personally entreated me, should he be re-instated, not to be gone to do duty under Mr. Sage. His gratitude is, as it has been described to be, a keen sense of favours to come, the want of it is explained in this case. —

23. As to the conclusions of Mr. Sage's letter of 370, of the 28th March 1872, that Gentlemen's complaints of the want of support I have afforded him from his first joining the Division. This is the first time that he has brought this to my notice, and though I should indeed much regret that it should be considered.

14a
Considering that I had made myself obnoxious to this charge, it is impossible for me in the absence of any specific instances being mentioned, to make any general and sweeping statements. The fact is that on Mr. Sage's taking charge of the Ramoia almost his first duties were in connection with Vyapoor Pillay's case. And that he appears to have made himself a violent partizan — as lenient on the one hand, to the Supervisor, as he was harsh to those who gave evidence against that individual. While even in writing to me his language has been so indecorous, that I have been compelled to take notice of the same. See Mr. Sage's letter of 215, dated 26th December

December 1871, and my marginal reply
thereon of 3740, dated 4th January 1872,
(marked I.) with Mr. Sage's explanations
(J). —

24. I now leave the matter with
confidence in the hands of Government,
and I can only regret to have been
compelled to trouble them with this
additional and disagreeable corres-
pondence. —

25. In conclusion it behoves
me to mention one fact, which on the
subject of Yaguchi's case, and
with a view of the Government having
a more thorough insight into the same,
and that is that although he formerly
was highly respected, he has fallen much
in

15a
in the estimation of his Countrymen,
by the habit of drinking which he has
acquired of recent years, and under
the effects of which habit he has appeared
in my presence. —

I have the honor to be

Yours Most Obedient Servant

Richd. Roberts Lieut. Col. R.E.
Superintending Engineer
8th Division

Superint^d Engineer's Office S. S.
Madura 5th September 1871

N^o 2077

166

A complaint having been made to the undersigned regarding work to the compound wall round the Protestant burial ground at Panjalameerochi near Ootapedarum Talook, the Plan, Estimate of Rs 600, and the Bills for the work are herewith forwarded to the Executive Engineer Irrigation Range Tinnevely who is requested to be so good as to ascertain and report, as soon as possible, whether work to the full extent of the Estimate has been executed, and of good materials, and whether the wall in question has been constructed in closer proximity to the tombs than was either necessary or desirable.

Signed R. A. Roberts Lieut. Col. R. E.
Superint^d Engineer S. S. D.

(True Copy)

P. A. R. E. Lieut. Col. R. E.
Superint^d Engineer S. S. Division

Enclosures

1. Plan.
1. Estimate.
2. Bills.

Public Works 1872 Noted
11/11/72
1/1/73

28-2-1875
The S. S. Engineer
S. Division

To the Secy to Govt
P. W.
Madras.

Noted 26/3/72
Recd 26/3/72
1872

Order: 11/7

Submits the accompanying
Correspondence for the information
and Order of Government
and also kind and the
Executive Engineer, S. S. D.

S. S. D.

1872-14th Dec 1872

28-2-1875
1872-14th Dec 1872

№ 2671. 1 Enclosure

Forwarded to Re: Re: Southern Nevada
Industries for report in connection with the Luf.
Re: Memo. No 2077 dated 5. Sept. 1871.
on the same subject.

Camp. Krakow
23rd October 1911.

Richd. B. Roberts
Superintd. - Brynmar 8: 2^o
to be returned

From
The Clerk
to
His Majesty's
Lieut. Governor
of the Province
of New York
October 1790
No 228
Dear Sir,
I have the honor
to acknowledge the
receipt of your
letter of the 10th
inst. in relation
to the petition
of the Trustees
of the African
School, and in
answer to inform
you that the
same has been
forwarded to the
Honorable Board
of Education, for
their consideration.
I am, Sir, very
respectfully,
Your obedient
servant,
Wm. M. Smith

Blue point.

4th The pointing is done, but I consider the

Enc. 2 In a letter
from the Supy Engr & On
to the Secretary to Govt
DRW dated 26 April
1872 No 330.

B

P.W. 2185/72

Collector's letter
No 228 dated 19th
October 1871 forwarding
Rev. Stearns' letter
on the Panjalam
curchi burial
ground -

Bot 26 May 1872 in Bot 26

No. 4915

The undersigned regrets
to be compelled to put on
Record his opinion that he
considers the report to be
highly unsatisfactory. And
in the face of such a report
it is quite impossible for
the Supy. Engineer to place
that confidence in Mr. Sage's
data & rates & reports that
he ought by necessity to have.
2. After a careful inspection
of the wall the undersigned is at
a loss to understand how Mr.
Sage can have submitted these
reports in the ^{question} ~~face~~ of such a
question.
3. As regards the diminution
of the cemetery wall, that is purely
a matter of opinion; ~~also~~ but the
undersigned scarcely thinks that
many persons will be found to concur
in the opinion formed by Mr. Sage
on this point.

No 217 Camp. Shanmoogapooan
December 27. 1871

From
Office in charge
Northern Range
Trincomalee District
The Superintending Engineer
8th Division
Madura

With reference to your in-
structions conveyed in Memo-
rs 2077, 2671, & 3134, I have the
honour to report for your in-
formation, that on evening
of 24th Inst. I inspected the
wall round the European
tombs at Panjalam curchi.
The result was as follows:-
1st The enclosure is 208 ft
by 30 ft inside, instead of 210 x
33, i.e. it is 12 ft short & 3 ft
narrower than is allowed
in estimates, & the wall is
now 6 ft from the nearest
corner.

2nd Regarding the rates,
I am of opinion that the
rates are not too much, & that
I could not get the work done
at the rates proposed by Mr. Sage
in more favorable parts of the
District, let alone on such a
spot as Panjalam curchi.

3rd About 15 ft of wall
is damaged, that is to say
there is a gap, one side of the
work has fallen down consid-
erably.

4th The pointing is badly
done, but I consider the rate

allowed (Rs 1 pnduan) for
little for pointing to rough
stone work in mud.

5th I entirely differ with
Mr Kearns as to the necessity
for a larger space round the
graves, unless it was his in-
tention to use the cemetery
hereafter for native Christians.
All that is required is pro-
tection from desecration,
that is fully attained. I
never saw a handsomer
cemetery wall in my life
in such an out of the way
place. I think it quite un-
necessary.

6th Mr. Kearns plan
is incorrect in dimensions
his estimate totally wrong.

7th Mr. Kearns states
"stone was procurable on the
spot, this is likely to mislead
the stone was brought from
behind a tank about 1/2 a
mile off, as there is no stone
laying about site of cemetery
except those left from the
work."

2. I would now observe
that for a wall of rough stone
5ft high, 1 1/2 ft thickness is
totally insufficient & with
2 feet to build it must be
a certainty be composed
of 2 walls side by side, as
native builders rarely put
any at all except very few
through stones, & this is the

4. But as regards the workmanship,
the rate that has been paid
for this work is more than
ample to insure good work,
& the undersigned, if in charge of
the work at the period in question,
would never have sanctioned so
high a rate? -

5. Where the wall has in part
tumbled down, it would appear that so
far from its having been built in stone
& mud, it has been constructed in
mud with stones stuck in it. The
Coping, which is estimated to be of
brick in Chamam, shows in several
places where it has piled that
the bricks are Sam. burnt bricks.

6. The fate of the fluminate
description, & is already in want of
repair.

7. For Mr. Sage to describe
this tumble-down wall, as he has
done by stating that he never saw
a handsomer cemetery wall in his
life - is simply incomprehensible.

8. To repair such a wall would
be merely to throw bad money after
bad, and there appears no alternative
but to re-build the wall. No doubt
the Govt. will say only against this
additional outlay, but if a wall

is desirable at all, it is clear
that it should be of such a nature as
not to require repair after every
monsoon.

9. The undersigned does not
consider that he has received in
this matter the assistance he has a
right to claim from an Officer of
Mr. Sage's attainments and
experience.

10. The construction of the wall in
question appears to the undersigned
eminently discreditable to his Dept.,
in fact it is in a par with most of the
work performed of late years by
Superior by apooru Sillay, whose
short-comings in this respect,
(which) I have already
palpable and I need not repeat
as they are to be seen by
the undersigned and to the
Public, Mr. Sage does not hesitate to
believe

gives over as matters of no moment.
It is quite beyond the power of the under-
signed to understand how Mr. Sage can
reconcile with his sense of his duty to the

Govt. The course he
has elected to take in
this connection, & it is
with sincere regret
that the undersigned has
to administer this severe rebuke to

cause of the damage above
mentioned, I do not think
the work is badly built, but
masons about here do not
seem to understand building
rubble walls. The wall ought
to have had pillars 1 1/2 ft square
at every 12 or 15 feet.

3. Regarding giving the
Cemetery a better appear-
ance, the rain & grass & weeds
inside, & outside for at least
4 yards all round ought
to be cleared away, a few
Casuarina trees might be
planted all round outside,
& I would recommend the
damaged wall being rebuilt
the whole carefully repaired.

4. When the wall was
originally built there was
a lock & key, the latter having
been given to the Tahsildar.
When I was there the lock
was gone & as Tahsildar
was not in the station I
could not enquire about it.

5. You will see by my
estimate of work done
that the value of work done
differs only Rs 9.7.3 from
Original Estimate, partly
owing to the better masonry
put in shape of Pilasters at
Angles (4) & 2 intermediates
in each long wall (4) I was
deceived by the design faulty.

6. The enclosures remain
with your orders under my
are herewith returned
Share

2- ^{over} both reference to these seminars

I would add what I did not
put before, that the stone used
obtainable is Quartz, which can
not be worked or shaped as
other stone, but must be used
as obtained, & taking all
these matters into consideration
I am still of opinion that the
work is not badly built.

3 — When inspecting the
work I saw an enormous
brick, I did see a few badly
burnt bricks in broken parts
of coping & am sorry I omitted
to mention it. The gate when
I saw it was perfect except
that lock was gone & bolt bent
to keep it closed, but that it
should wear & repair after being
exposed for 4 years (I speak
from recollection having seen
papers by me) to cattle & herd
to go to damage it, in a place
in fact where no one else sees
it is not to be wondered at,
only that the gate was tolerably
good originally, it would have
been destroyed ere this.

4 — In your para 7 you say
that I have stated in my
report "I never saw a hand
"somewhat" walking in my
"life", this is a misquotation
my word is hand & not
hand some, the latter is non-
sense & I am not inspired
at its being incomprehensible
to you.

5 — I again state that the

wall can be properly repaired
& repaired at a comparatively
small cost; it has stood 4 years
without need of repairs except
to the small portion which I
believe was destroyed by
cattle & not by weather.

6 — In your para 9 you
state you have not occurred
in this matter the assistance
you had a right to claim
from me, I do not see in what
I have failed; I have reported
what I believed I still believe
to be true, & am sorry that course
has been in opposition to your
wishes.

7 — In para 10, you state I
have glossed over Supervisor
Tyng's Pilling shortcomings;
this is a most serious charge
to make against the senior
officer of your division, & one
I entirely deny & challenge from
of; I am able to support all
I have said or done in the matter
of the Supervisor, & I consider I
have not failed in my duty
to the Government in any way
or that I had any interest in
doing what you allege I had
given the reverse.

8 — After the statement in
your 10th para above alluded to
& the latter part of your 1st para,
"that it is quite impossible for the
"superintending Engineer to place
that confidence in Mr. Sage's data
& state reports, that he ought by
necessity to have" It appears to
me that it is not to the advantage

stage of government, that I should
remain in this division, I have
therefore the honor to request
that this letter in its entirety,
with your Memo under reply,
my report & the Enclosures may
be sent to the Government for
their decision, & as my request
to be removed to another division
as from my first joining it I am
sorry to say I have experienced
want of support which has
made my duties very unplea-
sant & extremely difficult to
carry out.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Yours obedient Servant
W. H. H. H.
H. H. H.

For forwarding explanation
to the Government of the
enclosed letter to the
Secretary for the
Department for the
Public Works

Subject

Recd 3 Dec 1872

To the Department for the
Public Works

From the Secretary
for the Department for the
Public Works

Enc. 5 In a letter from
from the Suby Engr 820
to Secretary to Govt dated
26 April 1872 No 330 -

E

P.W. 2185/72.

Mr Sages letter
No 370 dated 28
March 1872 furnishing
explanation regarding
Pampalamurchi
Cemetery -

Per 14 May 1872 Lr Bt 462

Page of Government, that I should
remain in this division &c.

Sup^t. Engineer's Office 8th Dr.
Madura 8th April 1872.

N^o 84.
From
Lieut. Colonel R. A. Roberts. R. E.
Sup^t. Engineer 8th Division.

To
G. J. Sage Esq.
Executive Engineer Northern Range
Tinnevely

Sir,
Enclosure 1

In reference to your letter N^o 370,
1. Copy of Collect^r's dated 28th March 1872, forwarding explanation
letter N^o 110 dated : tions on the subject of the Panjalammoorhy
1st April 1872. Cemetery and applying for your removal
from this Division, I have the honor to state
that I have been unable to submit the
matter for the orders of Government, as the
former correspondence on the subject was
with the Collector, to whom it had been
forwarded for information, and for instruc-
tions as to what further funds were avail-
able for the construction of a new wall.

2. The Collector's letter dated 1st Instant
has

has been received this day, and a copy is forwarded for your information, with a request that our Estimate may be submitted by you for repairing the damaged wall, and repointing the remainder of the wall as suggested in your report No. 217, dated 27th December 1871.

3. I regret to find that in common with others who have perused your report above quoted, I misread therein the word "handsome" for "handsomer", that instead of your writing, as I and others read it, that "you had never seen a handsomer Cemetery wall in your life", that you actually wrote was that you had never "seen a handsome cemetery wall in your life". I am always sorry to misquote, however inadvertently, any body, and I need scarcely say that I regret doing so, the more when as in the present case, I make the misquotation a cause of censure.

4. With regard to para 7 of your letter under reply, the whole correspondence

Cont.

Connected with the investigation of Supervisor Tyapoor Pillay's case is now before the Government, and it will be for them to decide whether they consider that they have received from you that assistance in the matter which they have a right to expect.

5. As regards para 8 of your letter and its contained quotation, on which you base your wish to be removed from this Division, I think it right to point out, so that there may be no kind of doubt on the subject, that that quotation is not complete, and is therefore made to express a meaning which it was never intended to bear.

6. What I said then, and what I deliberately say now, is that in the face of such a report, i.e. if reports of the kind were likely to be repeated - it is quite impossible for the Superintending Engineer to place that confidence in Mr. Saigee's data and ratios and reports that he ought

No 28 Lamp Tutuc
April 18

ought by necessity to have. It has appeared to me through-
out all this business in connection with
Supervisor Vyapooray Pillay that having
made up your mind that he was not to
blame, you have considered that when
facts appeared to show otherwise, it was
so much the worse for the facts.

8. It will be a matter of personal
regret to me should the Division lose the
services of an Officer of your ability and
experience, and I write this letter there-
fore in order to clear up the misunder-
standing that has arisen in the two
instances mentioned in this letter, and
with a view that in submitting, should
you still desire to do so, your letter to
Government for your removal from this
Division, that wish may be based on
the clear issue now before us.

I have &c

/Signed/ P. S. Roberts. Lieut Col R.E.

Sup 2 Engineer &c

/True Copy/

P. S. Roberts Lieut Col R.E.

Subaltern Engineer &c Division

Compd

Enc 6 I am a letter
from the Suby Engr^{sr}
to the Secretary to Govt
D P W dated 26 April
1872 No 330.

F

P. W. 2185/72.

Suby Engineer's
letter dated
8 April 1872

Pres. 16 May 1872 L. 401/2

No 28 Camp Tutucorin
April 1872
From the Officer in charge
Northern Camp
Tamilvelly District
To the Superintending Engineer
1st Division
Madura.

Sir,
I have the honor to acknow-
ledge receipt of your letter of
8th Inst., & in reply to inform
you, that although you in first
I parca dispose of the matter
of the misquotation of my report,
the remaining portion of your
letter under reply states (to my
thinking) more emphatically
than before the subject I com-
plained of, & which led me
to apply for my removal.
2— With reference to your
para 4, if it is only the results
of investigation into charges
against Vyapoory Pillay, that
the Government have before
them to decide on, as to whether
I have rendered them the as-
sistance they have a right to
expect or not, they have but
little to guide them, (as I did
not make the enquiry) except
such remarks as you may
have made regarding me &
with a copy of which I think
I ought to have been furnished,
particularly as from your
letter I gather that they have

1. True copy

any answer to
them

been anything but favorable.
3 - I did not base my wish
to leave the Division on the quo-
tation you point out only, & the
two or three words omitted as
far as I see make no alteration
in the subject. I took the whole
para (merely quoting a part to
show the point) & the statement
in your 10th para; & that I was
right is plainly shewn by the
6th para of your letter in dis-
reply, where you explain your
meaning thus "ie, if reports
of the kind were likely to be in-
terpreted" from which I can only
draw the following conclusion
viz. that I have sent you a
report which I consider true
but as it is utterly at variance
with your wishes, very hard
language is used to me, &
which I consider soon but
the Government have a
right to use to me. If I had
the same or a similar report
to send in again I should
do it in the same words & be
convinced am I of the truth
of it.

4 - With reference to your
para 7, I deny that you
have any grounds for, or
right to make the statement
that "having made up your
mind he was not to blame &c"
& I consider the last 4 lines
of this para to convey in a
most offensive manner
a deliberate charge of false-
hood or falsifying against me.

I am not a good hand with
my pen, but I assert that what
I write is truth however badly
expressed.

5 - I will here give a resumé
of how I have been mixed up
in the matter of Vyapooray Pillay
& that you may labor under
no misapprehension as to the
part I have taken in the matter.
In the first place without any
communication with me
on the subject, you intimated
directing Mr. McLean to make
the inquiry, it was pointed
out to you that it would
cause trouble if Mr. McLean
was to be going about my
range calling this man here
& another there without my
knowledge, & that he ought
to be placed under me for the
purpose after consideration
you acted on the suggestion
& received the orders accordingly.
When Mr. McLean joined me,
knowing the great faith you
had in him in investigations
of this sort, I allowed Mr.
McLean to make the whole inquiry
in his own way, merely pointing
out to him where to begin &
ordering his subordinates and
others he wished to examine
or looking up accounts for
him, & but in 2 or 3 instances
not interfering in the matter,
as from my want of know-
ledge of the language I could
not do much to assist him,

Yours Colonel. Rolleston

I was otherwise very busy
taking charge of 2 ranges
working up arrears of
accounts. When the inquiry
was finished Mr W Main
brought me his report &
the depositor is signed
by him to forward, I read
it through & forwarded to
you with a few remarks
agreeing with Mr W Main
as to the results except in
those points on which I
differed; You will see
by this, that I had no objection
to anything to do with the
inquiry, & that it was made
by a man you had great
faith in, up to that time
at all events.

6 - The only real manner
in which I have expressed
any opinions regarding
the Supervisor was in taking
charge of his range, I don't
our survey work in progress
examined it with both
estimate and accounts, &
found nothing wrong
generally, when I did I
reported it, with my transfer
certificate, so that I think
you have no grounds for
stating that I have misused
facts, for remember that
having taken charge from
him, the responsibility falls

on me, so that I had good
reasons for bringing to light
anything wrong that I
might discover.

7 - In conclusion I am
sorry to be obliged to repeat
my request for removal
in so doing I have the honor
to request that this letter
& a copy of yours to which
it is a reply may be added
to the documents mentioned
in my No 370 of 28th Sept to
be forwarded to the proper
authorities.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Yours most obedt Servt
Edw M L
Care: Engineer

No 28 (31)

From
Office in charge
of Northern Range
and Administration
in Division

March 17th } April 1892
Recd.

Subject -

Reopening the West
of the North on report
on timberland in
County the

Enc: 7 Saw a letter
from the Supg Engineer
to the Secretary to
Govt DOW dated 26
April 1872 No 330.

G

P. W. 2185/72.

Mr Sage's letter
to 28 dated 17 April
1872.

Pres. 16 May/72 L. L. L.

No 272 12th Major Catcher
 Tanjore 22 November 1871.

From R. R. Suckle Esq
 President Local Fund Board

To Sir Colonel R. A. Roberts R. E.
 Superintending Engineer 8th Division

Sir, With reference to the enclosed,
 I have the honor to request that you will
 call on your Subordinates to observe Rule III
 of the Local Fund Rules in all appointments
 dismissals & punishments of Local Fund
 Overseers & Masters.

I am quite willing that you or the
 Executive Engineers should take the initia-
 tive in such cases, but I expect any
 changes made in the Establishment to
 be reported to me for sanction.

I have the honor to be
 Your most Obedt Servt
 R. R. Suckle
 President

Comd 208

Enc. 8 In a letter
from the Subg Exp 80
to the Secretary to
Govl DOW dated
26 April 1872 No 331

H

P. W. 2185/72.

Letter from the
President - Local
Fund Board
Trimmelly No 272
dated 22 Nov 1871
with one enclosure.

From 14 May 1872 No 62

as that under notice the
 undersigned will not hesitate
 to bring the matter to the notice
 of the Govt. with a view to
 his being removed from
 the Div.

Mad.
 3.1.72

Madura
 14 January/72

3740 No 215

CAMP *Blapiduram*

From The Executive Engineer
 Irrigation Range
 Northern Tinnevely.

To The Superintendent
 Madurai
 Within

Dated 26 Dec 1871
 Received 14th January 1872
 SUBJECT: *See*

In reply to your order
 number 203668 on my No 180
 of 12th Inst. I have the honor
 to inform you that as
 already reported the man
 was absent from duty on
 11th Inst. on 12 I wrote to him
 at *Hookam*. Copy
 with translation enclosed.
 to which he has now replied
 on 13th Inst. I received the
 enclosed letter dated 10th

from him & as it surely
says he is ill when the
Allah Lingen says he is
fit for duty I took no
notice of it.
2 Septoher's time he has
not returned to duty
but my head accountant
informed me yesterday
(he is in today) that the
man went to him at
Coilpully for his pay on
25th & was away, first
showing him a copy of
an order from you to
Mr. Randall transferring
him to the Southern Range
if it was genuine I said
that considered it a peculiar
transaction my not being
informed of his removal
I have no room to
say
Yours most obedt Servt
Wm. C. D. D.

N^o 3740
The undersigned regrets
to observe that letters addressed
by the Sr. Engineer in charge of
the Northern Range indirectly
to the head of this office are
frequently remarkable for their
want of courtesy - which, coming
emanating from an officer of Mr. Sage's
standing in the Service can scarcely
be considered as unintentional.
2. In his letter, N^o 215, dated
26: Dec 1871, Mr. Sage descends
so far as to the malice another
of his Superior officers as "peculiar."
3. It is impossible for the
undersigned to allow language
of this kind to be addressed to
the Sup. Engr. - and Mr. Sage is
now directly named that on any
repetition on his part of such
expressions & uncalculated remarks

Enc: 9 In a letter from
the Subg Engineer SDW
to the Secretary to Govt
SDW dated 26 April 1872
No 330.

I

P. W. 2185/72.

Mr Sage's letter
No 215 dated 26
December 1871.

Pro 14th May/72 L B 462

3993 No 246

14/1/72

CAMP Vutia Kurrappully
Chettur

From

The Executive Engineer

Northam ~~Inspection~~ Range
Tinnevely.

To

The Superintendent of
Madrass

Dated

10 January 1872

Received

15 Jan 1872

SUBJECT.

Within

Sir, I have the honor to
acknowledge receipt
of your Memo No 3740
of 4th Inst. in para 2
of which you state
"Mr. Sage describes the
as to stigmatize an
order of his superior officer
as "peculiar". I now

beg to assure you that
in no case have I ever
intentionally treated
you with discourtesy
I am a bad letter writer
& thus may have led
you to think anything
you objected to was
done intentionally, in
the particular case under
notice it was quite im-
possible as I had never
heard of the order of
Gore on the subject
nor did I get it till
evening of 28th inst. as
I was writing you on
26th. All I meant by
my letter to convey
was that the writer
had an order & that

3993
I had received no in-
structions; not that
the order you had issued
was peculiar, I trust
you will accept this
explanation.
I have the honor to be
Sir

Yours most obedt. Servt.
Wm. Lloyd Garrison

no
3993 The undersigned
cannot understand how
any other meaning than that
already remarked upon can be
placed upon the expression used
in Mr. Sage's letter under reference.

2. The Capt. Reiner is
 however quite prepared to
 receive this explanation from
 Mr. Sage, & the assurance
 that nothing offensive or
 intentionally used on his part.
 and the undersigned will
 therefore be very happy to
 allow the Capt. to drop.

Rica J. N. Kite

Madison }
 18 June 1872 }
 L. J. N. Kite

To be noted & noted

Notes & returned
 Camp Porter
 22/1/72
 Northern Magazine

Enc. 11 Saw a letter
from the Supy Engineer
to the Secretary to
Govt dated 26
April 1872 No 330.

K 10ⁿ

P. W. 2185/72.
Pres. 14 May 1872 to the
Collector's letter
No 110 dated 1st
April 1872. suggesting
that the wall of the
Pampalommurchi
bemetery may be
repaired at the
expense of Tyapuri
Pileay.

Copy 11/10/72 Lint. Col. R. C.
Superint. Engineer S. Division

Col.

W. 49

P. W. Dept

No 1339.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
(Under date the 14th May 1872)
Read the following

From the Superintending Engr. } H. C. No 330 of 26 April 1872.
& the

The Government
remark that this con-
trovercy between the
Super Engineer, and
Executive Engineer,
really arose from the
misquotation by the

AA.

I. O. S.

I could know the former of a single word
the earliest of the in the latter's letter
line of of transferring marked D; which
has been. Col Robert cannot be accounted for
by the fact that by any illegibility of
him & the general the manuscript. They
are to be taken out consider therefore that
any case of Lieut. Colonel Robert's
already attended to.

would have adopted
the more magnanimous
and fair course had he
entirely cancelled his
Memo. Dec 4 195 on that
letter written when
labouring under a mis-
conception of what
Mr Sage wrote. and they
consider that he might
have been satisfied
with the opinion of so
experienced an Executive
officer on so small a
matter, and acted upon
any Repair Estimate
he might send in.
The papers marked.
I and J certainly should
not have been sent up
their subject matter having
been allowed to drop.

2. Mr Sage ¹²⁰ on the other
hand, however hurt
at a censure the harsh-
ness of which was evi-
dently based on the
misreading of a single
word that he had
used, was not justified
on such a pretext to
request his removal
from the 8th Division.
It is perfectly evident
as stated by Lieutenant
Colonel Roberts, that
ill feeling had arisen
in connection with other
matters, advantage
was taken by Mr Sage
of this mistake of his
superior officer, to demand
his removal from un-
der his orders. But

Government are not pre-
pared to make trans-
fers simply on account
of incompatibility of
temper of officers working
together in the same
Division, at least until
it suits the public as
well as their private
convenience. Mr. Sage
will accordingly stand
fast for the present; and
both officers are expected
to proceed with their
respective duties towards
God and each other with-
out further reference
to former misunderstandings
and with due regard
to the deservedly high
character they bear.

G.M.W.
6.5.72

We must, I think
infer also that
the alleged ill treat-
ment of him by
Mr. Sage. The *in* *the* *case*
Superior 8th Div.

MAJAL AHADOT

With reference to
the change made
~~in para 22 of the~~
in para 22 of the
Superior's letter,
and supported
by the document
numbered II, the
Govt. do not find
that any notice
whatever was
taken by L. J. H.
Roberts of Mr.
Sage's treatment
of the Local Fund
of the Overseas at the
time the Trans-
action occur-
red, viz. in No-
vember 1871;
which would
appear to have
been a grave
dereliction of
his duty, if he at-
tached any
importance to
the subject, as
he now appears

bold - Presuming
on the accuracy
of the statement
made him. The
Sup. has
have called for
Mr. Sage's atten-
tion to the ab-
solute necessi-
ty of keeping
his temper, and
refraining from
ill treatment of
his subordinates.
and ^{have} intimated
that the severest
displeasure of
Govt. would fol-
low upon his
having to be
tried up for such
behaviour in
future -

EW
1875-72

Note. I propose to
move Mr. Sage else-
where, after Capt.
Lis Thompson's
return to duty.

EW

To the Rep. of Eng. 8th Regt
Sept. 6th Dec 1872

No 2185

Govt. of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS. ✓

To the Superintendent
8th Division

Dated

Recd.

Encl. // ✓

G. O. No. 1339-
May 1872.

Nos. 462 & 463

Mr. S. S. Sage.

Regarding orders in cor-
respondence between
the Super. & Mr. S. S.
& Mr. Sage relative to
the repair of the compound
wall round the Protestant
Burial ground at Panja-
lour -