(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 72

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் மே 1988

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

பொதுப்பணி துறை

அரசாணை எண். 216 (ய) அச்சகம்

~~மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.~~ ~~புலவகை~~

நாள் : 24.1.1888 ~~19~~.

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

B

ஆவண. கா-1—18,006—15-6-87.

24th January 1888, No. 286 W., Public Works.

286/1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

Read—the following papers :—

From Mr. J. W. Laskey, Pensioned Sub-Engineer, Public Works Department, Madras, to the Right Honorable Lord Connemara, Governor of Madras, forwarding a Memorial, dated 12th November 1887, for transmission to the Secretary of State.

Endorsement thereon by the Private Secretary to the Right Honorable the Governor, dated 22nd November 1887.

Order—dated 24th January 1888, No. 286 W., Public Works.

Ordered that the memorial be transmitted to the Secretary of State for India.

(Here enter No. $\frac{1}{286\text{ W.}}$, dated 24th January 1888.)

(True Extract.)

(Signed) H. R. MEAD, Colonel, R.E.,
Joint Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

To Mr. J. W. Laskey, Pensioned Sub-Engineer,
Public Works Department.

Exd. J. Moses.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Govt. of (1888) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated January, 24th.

Recd. *Enc.*

G.O., 24th Jan. 1888, No. 286 W.

JANUARY.

Mr. J. W. Laskey, Pensioned Sub-Engineer, Public Works Department

Memorial from — praying for redress and pecuniary compensation for alleged unjust punishments inflicted on him, ordered to be forwarded to the Home Government.

286/2

W.M. 17.1.88

To
Captain W. L. C. Baddeley R.E.
Under Secretary to Govt
P.W. Dept
Madras

Sir

With reference to your Memorandum No 4574 C dated 10th Ultimo I have the honor to advise you of the despatch of my Memorial &c by Parcel Post of this date, and in compliance with your request I now forward 25 copies of my Memorial.

I would be thankful to you to favour me with a reply to state that the Memorial had reached you.

[illegible]

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obdt Servt
J W Laskey
P. Sub Engr

Vizagapatam
8th January
1888.

Ry 13.1.88

E. 7/5

(2 S.C. [illegible]

28/3

pensioned

P. W. Departmen

1. Mr. J. W. Laske originally appointed to the Government service as a Sub Assistant Surveyor, on the 9th July 1855, and was made Assistant Overseer in the P. W. Department, on the 1st January 1857.

2. His subsequent promotions and reductions are given below:-

Promoted to Overseer — 11. XII. 1859.
Supr. 2nd class — 13. VIII. 1863.
Ag Supr. 1st Grade — 16. IX. 1865.
Supr. 1st grade — 7. III. 1866.
Reduced to bottom of the list of Supervisors 1st grade. — XII. 1873.
Promoted to Sub Engr. 3rd grade — 1. IV. 1880.
Sub Engr. 2nd " — 1. X. 1881.
Reduced to Sub Engr. IIIrd grade — 1. IV. 1882.
Promoted to Sub Engr. 2nd grade — 20. I. 1884 Substanti pro tempore
Reduced to Sub Engr. 3rd grade — 24. III. 1885
Pensioned — 10. XII. 1885

3. The first notice of Mr. Laskey

and in
the District
North Canara, —
G. W. Walker R.E.
No. 138, dated 15th Nov:
1860, from which the following extract is made. "In my late inspection of Supa Range in September and October last, I was utterly dissatisfied with every particular of Mr. Laskey's & his subordinates work, as reported in my notes on his Inspection Lists, in my list of examination of cash chests for September and in letter No 122, of 20th October. Roused by my reproaches, Mr. Laskey seems to have thought of checking his subordinates proceedings, and in two letters dated 17th & 20th October, reported to me his having inspected his roasters

several of which he enclo in proof of "disgraceful attempts to defraud the work people".

× × × × × × ×

"I must own that I share Mr. Laskey's opinion × × × that the Sub-Overseers' procedure altogether "gives the matter a strange tinge". But I cannot agree with him, × × that he could not have ridden over to Supa (21 miles only by my new trace via Oosoday, the general line of which he might at least have had the curiosity to to inspect) and there made all square himself. He has been for months making abortive attempts at contracts for bricks and chunam, ingeniously detailed in [illegible] on fools' errands, (vide Inspection List for 22nd Octr), by erroneous traces as reported in my communication, quoted in paragraph 2, he has thrown away Rs 720 of Government money, to which this sum of Rs 158 odd is now added, and, in fact, has shown his utter incompetence for charge of a North Canara Range".

4- In the order thereon, No 2597, dated 18th Dec 1860, the Government remarked as follows:-

"It seems from Capt: Walker's letter, that Mr Fernandez will shortly have the Range, but nothing is said of Mr Laskey's future destination. It

286/2

is desirable that the Department should now be systematically cleared of all the inefficient agents, whose employment at the outset was almost a necessity. The Chief Engineer should give his attention to the matter."

5 In his letter No 906/7 dated 21st January 1861, the Chief Engineer Lt: Col: ~~Houseley~~ Horsley: R.E; reported as follows on the transaction referred to above:-

"With respect to the loss sustained by the reputed robbery, I am, of opinion, that Overseer Laskey should be held responsible for the amount. It was clearly his duty to have made the payments to the work people himself, and not to [illegible] on fool's errands, (vide Inspection List for 22nd Octr). By erroneous traces as reported in my communication, quoted in paragraph 2, he has thrown away Rs 720 of Government money, to which this sum of Rs 158 odd is now added, and, in fact, has shown his utter incompetence for charge of a North Canara Range".

4. In the order thereon, No. 2597, dated 18th Dec 1860, the Government remarked, as follows:—

"It seems from Capt: Walker's letter, that Mr Fernandez will shortly have the Range, but nothing is said of Mr Laskey's future destination. It is desirable that the Department should now be systematically cleared of all the inefficient agents, whose employment at the outset was almost a necessity. The Chief Engineer should give his attention to the matter."

5. In his letter No. 90 6/11 dated 21st January 1861, the Chief Engineer Lt: Col: ~~Houseley~~ Horsley: R.E., reported as follows on the transaction referred to above:—

"With respect to the loss sustained by the reported robbery, I am of opinion, that Overseer Laskey should be held responsible for the amount. It was clearly his duty to have made the payments to the work people himself, and not to have entrusted it to his Accountant. The District Engineer's Memo of 25th October 1860, may not have been received by Mr. Laskey when he sent the Accountant to Supa, but his experience in the Department, and knowledge of its rules, should have prevented his entrusting public money, to an office subordinate for the payment of contractors or workpeople, and I therefore recommend that his salary be subjected to a monthly reduction of Rs 10/-, until the sum lost, Rs 156-7-3, shall have been made good.

"With regard to the last para of Captn. Walker's

Walker's letter, of the 21st December 1860, No. 161, I have the honor to explain, that it was at first ordered that Mr. Laskey should be transferred to Vizagapatam for employment at Waltair barracks, but that, subsequently he was transferred to Cuddapah, where his services are more urgently required, as reported in my letter of the 16th Jany: 1861, No. 8897.

"I have now requested the District Engineer of North Canara to relieve Mr. Laskey as early as possible of the charge of the Supa range, and acquaint him of the course which I have now recommended to Government should be followed to make good the money lost"

The

6- The Government approved and sanctioned the course proposed by the Chief Engineer, for recovering from Asst: Overseer Laskey the money lost through his neglect of duty.

G. O. No 225 d/ 2nd Feby

7- On a further review of the transaction, which gave rise to the proceedings quoted above, the Government, in para 11 of their proceedings No 257, dated 7th February 1861, make the foll: remarks:-

½

"The last of these points on which explanation was called for, is Mr. Overseer Laskey's alleged unfitness for the post of Overseer. The Chief Engineer advances nothing to meet Captn Walker's allegation of the man's unfitness; he merely states the grounds on

8/

8/7

June 22nd 1859

on which he was made an Overseer. It appears that he was promoted to this rank from that of Asst: Overseer, in consequence of a letter from Lieut Hunter, then Acting District Engineer, reporting on a petition from him, and a memo from Captn Goddard which accompanied it. He was a Revenue Surveyor in the old P. W. D, and Lieut: Hunter describes him, as highly qualified as a Surveyor and Draftsman. But he says nothing as to his qualifications for the duties of an Overseer, that is, as a Superintendent of work, in which capacity Captn Walker has now found him wanting, nor could an opinion, so expressed before hand, however favorable,

favourable, be properly opposed under any circum=
=stances, to the deliberate statement by an officer of what he has actually found on trial. The Governor-in-Council desires that Mr Laskey may be distinctly warned through the District Engineer of his new district (Cuddapah), that unless he gives satisfaction to Captn Hemery, he will be degraded or dismissed."

8. The next notice of Mr Laskey, which is one of a favorable character, occurs in a letter from Lt. Col: Hemery: R.E. Superintending Engineer 3rd Division, No 125, dated 17th August 1863, in para 4 of which he speaks as follows:-

~~"4. Mr Howell's conduct was on two occasions un=
=favorably brought to the notice of the late Chief~~

Engineer,

~~Engineer, once in connection with the new School House at Cuddapah, and again with reference to the Anan=
=tarazpett tank, and although he has lately con=
=ducted his duties in a satisfactory manner, I do not consider him so deserving of promotion as the four men~~ who stand before him in my statement of the 31st ultimo, and I would re=
=spectfully beg to recommend for promotion, Mr J. W. Laskey, who, whilst in charge of the Royachoti Range, from January to April 1863, during Mr George's absence on leave, performed his duties much to my satisfaction."

9. The order of Gov=
=ernment thereon No 2418, dated 25th August 1863, is in the following terms:-

"Under the circumstances stated in this letter, Mr Howell's promotion x x x will be considered cancelled, and Mr Overseer Laskey will act as Supervisor 2nd class x x x and be posted to the Tanjore District."

10- In March 1870, Major Fischer R.E., Superintending Engineer I Division, forwarded "for the consideration and orders of Government" copy of a letter received from Mr Laskey, advocating his own claims for promotion.

11- The order of Government thereon, No 151, dated 26th March 1870, was as follows:-

"The claims of Supervisor Laskey to promotion will receive due consideration on the occurrence of a vacancy".

12 In 1872, Lt. Col. Fischer R.E., Superintending Engineer I Division, writes as follows in regard to Mr Laskey, in his letter of the 18th Jany of that year, No 3179:-

"When the late Major Ryves gave over the charge of this Division to me, he informed me he had been obliged to take away the Trunk road work from Mr Laskey, and give it to Captn Beatty, and advised me to continue the arrangement. This will shew that I have not been singular in finding fault with Mr Laskey's conduct and proceedings. That these have now been submitted to Government, is his own seeking. I have avoided, I fear, far more than I should have done, complaining of them."

13- G.O. 449, dated 16th February 1872, is the next paper on record regarding Mr Laskey. It is as follows:-

"In his letter of the 14th March 1871, No C.C, the

8/p

the Superintending Engineer of the 1st Division, in reporting on the fitness of Mr. Supervisor Hamnett for the charge of a range, remarked that he was not quite satisfied with the state of affairs in No 1 Range of the Vizagapatam District, and that he had warned Mr. Laskey the Supervisor in charge.

"No specific grounds of complaint were then urged, but having by some means not stated, perused not only Lt Col: Fischer's letter quoted above, but the one which gave cover to the Supervisor's remonstrance, Mr Laskey submits detailed explanations.

". Lt Col: Fischer had doubtless some reason for being dissatisfied with Mr. Laskey's conduct, but as

286/10

8/p he observes in paragraph 6 of his letter of the 7th Dec last, No. 2106, that the matters to which Mr. Laskey adverts "have long since been forgotten" [illegible] rious, it [illegible] did not notice the [illegible] spirit [illegible] recorded.

" Mr. Laskey's addressing Government direct, instead of through the Superintending Engineer was improper."

p 14. In proceedings of Government, No. 2066, of 27 August 1872, the following remarks occur:-

8/p "The Supervisor in charge of No 1 Range, does not appear to have shewn much alacrity in responding to the call made on him for a proper trace of the Toonee, and Pentacotah road. Wet, and showery weather, is alleged by him as sufficient reason for delaying

S/p

delaying nearly two months to attend to a work, the first and second traces of which had been pronounced unsuitable, and the rectification of which, the Government had desired might be "taken in hand at once", as it was desirable to give employment there, and to facilitate the salt trade. It might be a desirable step to supersede Mr. Laskey in charge of the range by any other competent person, such as Assistant Engineer Brickwell, or Supervisor T. Ramiah Naidoo, who appear to be available".

15. In November* 1872 Lt: Col Fischer, again reported Mr. Laskey. He complained that Mr. Laskey had overcharged for rubble masonry work, and in reply to Mr. Laskey's plea of inexperience as the cause of the overcharge, remarks as follows:–

* Letter No. 2970 d/ 19th Nov/1872

28/11

S/p "This plea should not hold good when I mention, that I had personally instructed Mr. Laskey to get his rough stone, by opening a quarry on the hill side close by, which instructions, he has set aside, or did not give effect to, from a spirit of obstinacy, and by which the cost of the buildings would be greater than otherwise. Rs 3000, instead of Rs 1750."

16. It also appeared that in the construction of the cutcherry at Yellamunchelly "Mr. Laskey would insist on using brick of the worst quality, when splendid stone at far cheaper rates was available at hand."

17. The Government upon consideration of this report, and Mr. Laskey's explanation, passed the following order:–

S/p "The unfitness of Mr. Laskey

for change of a range having been already noted in Lt Col: Fischer's letters, of 14th March & 21st Decr 1871, and in G O 2206, of 20th August 1872, his name will be placed at the bottom of the list of Supervisors of the 1st Grade, and he will be warned that further bad report on him, will lead to his reduction to the rank of Overseer".

~~18~~ In 1878, or six years after the issue of these orders, Mr Laskey appealed[x] against them. The following order was passed on his petition:-

"The Government decline to reconsider a decision passed more than six years ago. Mr Laskey's petition should have been submitted to Government, through the District and Chief Engineers.

"His future promotion must depend on his conduct"

19 In 1878, Mr Laskey was employed in the Chingleput district, where his irregular proceedings formed the subject of much correspondence.

20 Col E. A. Foord R.E., who was then Chief Engineer,[x] recorded the following remarks on the case:

"From these papers it would appear, after careful inquiry, that the charges preferred by the Divisional officer against Mr Supervisor Laskey, are fully borne out and are by no means satisfactorily explained by Mr Supervisor Laskey, whose irregularity and general carelessness have nearly resulted in his removal from the Public Works Department. He has now been removed to the Vellor District, and the Chief Engineer

[x] G.O. 1503 W d/ 25th March 1878

[x] Mems. No 3142 d/ 13th July 1878

8/p

9 8c/12

Engineer takes this opportunity of warning Mr. Laskey, that unless better reports are received from his new district, of the mode of his conducting his duties, his reduction in the Department will surely follow.

" The Chief Engineer presumes that the Rs 40/- retained in deposit by Mr. Laskey, have been duly recovered and brought to account. As Mr. Laskey can produce no proof of having paid the Contractor the Rs 40/- in question, the irregularity, of which transaction from beginning to end reflects most reprehensibly on Mr. Laskey's conduct as a Subdivisional officer, the Chief Engineer directs that this amount be recovered from Mr. Laskey in two monthly instalments

---

286/13

and reconsideration of the case.

22. In the Nellore District to which Mr. Laskey had been removed as stated above, he again gave cause of complaint. The Executive Engineer considered him inefficient and untrustworthy, and he supported this opinion, by specific charges which Mr. Laskey was allowed ample opportunity of rebutting. The circumstances were carefully and impartially inquired into by the Superintending Engineer, and the following ※ are some of the conclusions at which he arrived, given as far as possible in his own words.

"I

※ Letter No. 420 NL dated 16th March 1882 ems, and to inspect work i the Nellore division proper"

"It is clear that Mr Laskey could not have ntelligently carried out transfer of tools to the ocal Fund Boards, and ieut Henderson's opinion, s to the condition of the achinery when he relieved Mr Laskey, must be ccepted as showing that t had not been properly ooked after.

"The temporary cut left pen in the left bank (of the Pennar), above the aniant, as undoubtedly dangerous October though permissible During the working Season. But the breach had been left open the previous Season, and

286/14

Constantly travelling in Nellore taluq (near head quarters), does show neglect of duty.

"There was undoubtedly a failure on Mr Laskey's part to check-measure un-adjusted works.

"Mr Laskey did forward numerous "emergent estimates", but very few for the complete repairs of tanks in the manner now required

"As regards the buildings at Ongole, Mr Laskey admits having sent in an inaccurate plan.

"I consider that Mr Laskey disobeyed a standing rule, in allowing the Accountant to write out the Cheques, and evinced great want of care in standing rule, - viz that men employed on general duties shall not be charged to estimates. During Mr. Laskey's incumbency, Rs 180 were thus spent in the Vellore division.

"The above all relate to Mr Laskey's work while in charge of the Vellore Division, and show in my opinion, that Mr. Laskey is in many instances deserving of blame. He was, however, in a charge he was not equal to, and that very few subordinates would have been equal to.

"A capable man, knowing what he had

286/15

to do, and how to set about it, would certainly have been able to complete this revised estimate, (for the Sarvepalli Project) in 7 or 8 months. This Mr. Laskey has failed to do, primarily, I believe, because he was not equal to the task. × × × × × Mr. Laskey made many mistakes.

"It remains to be proved whether the field work is reliable. Lieut: Henderson asserts that Mr. Laskey has not himself checked any of the levels. This charge Mr Laskey does not deny, and he has certainly omitted one of the most important of his duties.

"On the whole therefore, I think, that Lt. Henderson has not proved untrustworthiness against Mr Laskey, but has proved some instances of neglect and incapacity.

Judging

8/-

judging by other subordinates of Mr. Laskey's rank and standing, I should say, he had been promoted beyond his merits and capacity"

23. The Chief Engineer was of × opinion, on a broad view of the case, that "many of the faults brought home to Mr. Laskey should not have been committed by any earnest or energetic man having the high position of a Sub Engineer in the Department." He also concurred in the Superintending Engineer's opinion, that Mr. Laskey had been promoted beyond his merits. With every desire to make allowances for the difficulties of his position, and other extenuating circumstances, the Chief Engineer considered that the case would be sufficiently met by (1) reducing Mr. Laskey from 2nd to 3rd grade Sub Engineer, and (2), and transferring him from the 2nd Circle.

× No 750 C d/ 30th March 1882

286/16

24. Mr. Laskey appealed against these orders in a Memorial which he addressed direct to Government, and in terms disrespectful to his superior officers.

25. The Government thereupon passed the following order:- "It appears from the papers connected with this case, that Mr. Laskey has on more than one occasion failed to give satisfaction in the discharge of his duties, and that it has twice been found necessary to degrade him. His case appears to have received the fullest consideration at the hands of the Chief Engineer, who had actually made arrangements for Mr. Laskey's being reinstated in

G.O. 1925 W d/ 10th July 1883

in his former Grade this year, provided that in the interim he conducted himself to the satisfaction of the Superintending Engineer, to whose circle he had been transferred. Without waiting until his application to the Chief Engineer for reinstatement had been disposed of, Mr. Laskey took the irregular and insubordinate step of addressing the Government direct on the subject of his alleged grievances, an irregularity, of which he was guilty on a previous occasion, and which was noticed with displeasure in G.O. dated 16th February 1872. In consequence of this breach of rules, and of the disrespectful remarks regarding his superior officers, which find expression in the Memorial, the Govt: are precluded from taking

Mr

Mr. Laskey's representation into consideration, and he will be informed accordingly."

26. In April 1884,* the Chief Engineer passed the following order:- "Mr. Laskey having expressed contrition for his breach of rule, in addressing Government direct, and for the disrespectful remarks upon his superior officers contained in his Memorial of the 13th June 1883, the Chief Engineer considering that Mr. Laskey's punishment has now lasted sufficiently long, has obtained the sanction of Government to reinstate him in the 2nd Grade of Sub Engineers when opportunity offers." Mr. Laskey was accordingly made Sub Engineer 2nd Grade, substantive, pro tem on the 20th May 1884.

27. He had not been long in

* No. 836 C d/ 7th April 1884

in this position before his proceedings were again the cause of much trouble and annoyance to his Departmental superiors. In April 1885, the circumstances were reported to Government through the Chief Engineer, and as the Superintending Engineer's letter No 3 G.W., dated 2nd April 1885, summarises in as few words as possible, the facts of the case, around which a voluminous correspondence has collected, it is here reproduced for reference:-

"I have the honor to submit for your perusal and orders, three files of correspondence, as per accompanying list received from the Executive Engineer Ganjam division, regarding the conduct and behaviour of Mr Laskey, Sub Engineer while in charge of the Chicacole Sub Division.

2. "These documents were received at different dates, but I have endeavoured to arrange them according to the several charges which the Executive Engineer brings against Mr Laskey, and which may be formulated as follows:-

1st — Carrying out all masonry works in his Sub Division, without exception, by Contractors, and placing himself entirely in the hands of his Contractors

2nd — Carrying out earthworks, such as the clearing of channel beds, during the wet season, when the proper measurement and check of the work is an absolute impossibility, and paying for a large amount of earthwork which had not been done.

3rd.——— By making provisional payments to Contractors, on ir=regular measurements, or rather, on no measure=ment at all.

4th.— Disobedience of orders, and prevarication.

3.. " To the 1st. charge Mr. Laskey replies, that it had been the custom in the Sub Division to carry out all work by Contractors. But the opposition and obstruction, which the Sub Engineer is evidently placing in the way of the introduction of a whole=some, and much needed reform, viz. the execution of masonry works as far as possible by Departmental labor, shows the spirit by

which he is actuated.

" With regard to the 2nd. charge, viz: the carrying out of channel clearings during the wet season, and the measuring of work under water, Mr. Laskey writes as follows:-

"I explained the circum=
=stances that urged
"me to do so, and showed
"him (Captain Langley)
"his predecessor's remarks,
"that steady monthly
"progress on works
"must be shown, and
"that the rainy season
"will not be received
"as an excuse, otherwise
"arrangements will
"be made to replace me".

" Mr. Laskey was trans=ferred from the Western Delta Godaveri to Chicacole in November 1883 and there was no necessity whatever, for his postponing the clearing of his channels until the wet season. The impossibility of checking the measurements of work, carried out under such circumstances, prevents the complete substantiation of the very serious charge, which the Divisional officer has brought against Mr. Laskey viz: "Having paid for a "large amount of earthwork "which had not been done". Had this charge been substantiated, I would have had no alternative but to recommend Mr. Laskey's criminal prosecution. As it is the very circumstances which have made such a presumption possible, viz: the systematic clearing of channels during the wet

786/20

wet season, when it is impossible to check the work done, clearly shows, that Mr. Laskey, is no longer fitted to hold a responsible position in the Public Works Department.

" As regards the 3rd. charge, the manner in which Mr. Laskey, in para 9 of his letter No. 425, dated 30th. December 1884, endeavours to justify his provisional payments to Contractors, clearly shows, that his moral obliquity renders his further employment as a disbursing officer, hazardous, to say the least of it.

" The 4th. charge viz: disobedience of orders, Mr. Laskey endeavours to dispose of by a series of lengthy prevarications which are self evident.

4" Besides these, I would bring to your notice the highly disrespectful manner in which Mr. Laskey refers to his superior officers throughout the whole of the voluminous correspondence now before you.

5" In the 3rd file of documents herewith submitted, are some of Mr. Laskey's previous testimonials which he submits for favorable consideration; but these, together with the very excellent character with which Mr. Laskey provides himself, must be taken for what they are worth.

6" It is not possible in this office to draw up a complete departmental history of Mr. Laskey, as this subordinate's service register appears to have been twice lost, or done away

away with. But from the remarks made by the Examiner of Public Works Accounts in the accompanying register, the following incidents which have occurred since 9th July 1855, should be placed in evidence against the high opinion which Mr. Laskey forms of himself:-

Absence without leave for six days in September 1860.

Three days full pay at Rs 90/- per month = Rs 8-11-4, and two days full pay at Rs 90/- per month = Rs 5"12"11 in March 1861, stopped; reasons not known.

Half a day's pay at Rs 100/- per month, fined in March 1861.

G O No. 2964 dated 14th December 1872 pronounced

Mr. Laskey unfit for the charge of a Range, and placed him at the bottom of the list of Supervisors 1st grade, and he was warned, "that further bad report of him will lead to his reduction to Overseer."

Absent without leave from 25th May to 8th June 1878.

Chief Engineer's Memo, No. 760 C, dated 31st March 1882, reduced from 2nd to 3rd Sub-Engineer

" All the papers connected with this last reduction, together with Mr. Laskey's reinstatement in 1884 to the 2nd grade Sub Engineer, are, it is understood, in the Chief Engineer's office.

M.

7. "In the latter part of his letter of the 6th February 1885, Mr. Laskey tenders his resignation, and taking into consideration his previous long service, together with the fact of his twice having been sent up to the out of the way Northern Districts, (where unfortunately until lately a proper supervision has not always been available) I would recommend, that his resignation be accepted, after a sufficient punishment to mark your disapproval of his highly irregular conduct and insolent behaviour while in charge of the Chicacole Sub Division, has been inflicted on him. Such as, I would venture to suggest, the cancelment of his reinstatement to 2nd grade Sub Engineer".

28. If the above should

be added extract para 3 of a subsequent letter from the Superintending Engineer, No. 4 G.N, dated 4th April 1885.

3 – "In my report of the "2nd instant, I stated that "Mr. Laskey had been "transferred from the Western "Delta Godavari, to Chicacole, "in November 1883. I ought "to have said, transferred "to the Ganjam District, "for he does not appear "to have joined the Chicacole "Sub Division until June "following: This fact may "furnish extenuating "circumstances for carrying "out some of his channel "clearings during the wet "season, in order to meet "the wishes of his then "Executive Engineer to show "steady monthly progress "on works. But I still "maintain, that it is any "thing but creditable for any "any subordinate to have made "a practice of channel clearing "during the wet season, as "Mr. Laskey has done".

No/23

29 – The papers on the case received the most careful scrutiny in the Secretariat, and were finally disposed of on the 7th May 1885, by the following order of Government No. 1067 W.

" After careful consideration of the voluminous correspondence submitted in connection with the complaints preferred against Mr. Laskey, Sub Engineer 2nd Grade, substantive *pro tem*, including the explanations offered by him, the Government are of opinion that, though some of the charges have not been fully substantiated, and others are of a nature which should have been dealt with by the Superintending Engineer himself, there is sufficient evidence to prove, disregard of departmental rules, neglect of duty, want of judgement, and generally bad management. It is moreover clear to the Government that Mr. Laskey is unfitted for the charge of a Sub Division, which, by his position in the Department, he should be competent to hold.

" The Government accordingly direct, that he be again relegated to the position of Sub Engineer 3rd Grade, to which he was reduced in 1882, the reduction to have effect from the date of his suspension.

" Mr. Laskey will also be called upon to retire from the Service, from such date as he may become eligible for pension.

" It will be pointed out to

288/29

to Mr. Laskey, that, in addressing the Chief Engineer direct in his letter of the 26th March 1885, he acted contrary to rule - vide P. W. Code para 1042."

30 - In accordance with these orders, Mr. Laskey on the 10th December 1885 retired from the Service of Government, on the full pension, allowed by the rules, viz Rs 127-8-0 per mensem.

Jol.
14/11/87

Mr. J. W. Laskey.

Appointed Sub Apt. Surveyor. 9th July 185
Apt. Overseer. 1 Jany 185
Promoted to Supy. Overseer. 11th Decr 185
Supervisor 2d class. 13th Augt 18
Ag. Supervisor 1 grade. 16th Novr 18
Supervisor 1st grade. 7 March 18

286/25

Reduced to the bottom of list of
Supervisor 1 grade - Decr: 18

Promoted to Sub Engineer 3d grade. 1 April 18
Sub Engineer 2d grade. 1 Octr: 18

Reduced to Sub Engineer 3d grade - 1 April 1

Promoted to Sub Engineer 2d grade
sub pro tem. 20th May

Reduced to Sub Engineer 3d grade - 24th March

Pensioned 10th December 1885

a.a.
16/12

S of W

C. No: 9540

This is an appeal to the Secretary of State from Mr. Lashley, pensioned Sub Engineer. It covers almost the whole of his service of 30 years in the Dept. To write the merest outline of the case for the Secretary of State would, with the reading of the voluminous correspondence, take perhaps two or three days. The time for this would be taken from current duties which are heavy enough. I therefore propose, with your approval, to allow the papers to lie over till the holidays, when I shall have the requisite leisure to deal with them.

R. S.

7-XII-87

approved

Jos

7/12/87

I have since been able to complete the case. If the form of disposal is approved, the "note", which is necessarily rather lengthy might be put into type, half margin, prior to circulation.

A.S.
13-XII-87

It has since been found necessary to return the Memorial to Mr Laskey with a view to signature on each page, as required by rule. Its return must be awaited, but the "note" can meanwhile be put into type if thought necessary.

A.S.

The note is very clear, & as CAH suggests it might with advantage be printed for circulation, as a printed copy will be required for the Secy of State.

WCS
13.12.87

Yes.

Jm
14/12/87

AC

The "note" marked A to be put into type — half margin — for ultimate despatch to the Secretary of State.

"Proof" to be sent to me.

The other papers can lie over pending return of the Memorial which has gone back to Mr Laskey for signature.

A.S.
14-XII-87

× Sent to Press 15/12/87

⊕ No 4574 [illegible] of 16/12/87

A.C.

2 Spare copies
to be kept out of the
file in circulation,
but they will be required
by the Despatcher
hereafter –

C.S.
13.1.88

286/28

PETITION from Mr. J. W. Laskey

Dated 12th Novr. 1887.

286/30

TRANSFERRED to the ~~Chief~~ Secretary to Government P.W. Department for disposal.

(By Order.)

Jones

Private Secretary.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
18th Novr. 1887.

458 W d/ 23.2.86
18 C d/ 5.1.86
2134 C d/ 12.12.85
2080 C d/ 4.12.85
192 W d/ 23.1.86.
2074 C d/ 30.11.85
1894 W d/ 15.8.85
2066 d/ 29.8.72
2577 d/ 2.11.72
457 d/ 17.2.72
1267 d/ 19.4.69
419 d/ 6.4.69
2483 d/ 12.8.63
2349 d/ 18.8.63
5 d/ 6.1.58
74 d/ 15.7.56

836 C d/ 7.4.84

1067 W d/ 7.5.85.
622 d/ 11.2.79
1503 W d/ 25.3.78
2964 d/ 14.12.72
2066 d/ 29.8.72
449 d/ 16.2.72
151 d/ 26.3.70
2418 d/ 25.8.63
257 d/ 7.2.61
225 d/ 2.2.61
2597 d/ 18.12.60

(183) DEPAR

From

THE PRIVATE SECRETARY

TO THE RIGHT HON. THE G

To

THE ~~Chief~~ SECRETARY TO GOVERN

P. Work

23 NOV

Dated 23rd } November
Recd. 24 }

No. 4574 C of

ENCLOSURES 5

Subject.

Transfers a petition from Mr. J.W. Laskey, pensioned Su Engineer, D.P.W. Madr praying that the encl petition to the Secretar of State may be dul transmitted.

:- Mr. J.W. Laskey with Memorial & Enclosures.

No. 4574C of 10th Decr P.W.D
(88)

Memo 286/31

Returned with a request that ~~view to~~ the memorial, with all accompanying documents, may be ~~being~~ properly authenticated by the signature of the memorialist on each sheet, in accordance with the memorial rules.

It is requested that two spare copies of the memorial, which is in print, be furnished.

9.12.87

A-4574ca(10

~~Circ~~

Genl Estabt

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No. 286 W

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 24 Janry

READ the following

Letter from Mr. J. W. Laskey pensioned Sub Engineer D.P.W. Madras to the Rt. Hon: Lord Connemara Governor of Madras forwarding a memorial d/12 Nov - 87 for transmission to the Secy of State } dated 12th November 1887

Endt: thereon by the P. S. to the Rt. Hon: the Governor } dated 22nd Nov 1887

Ordered that the memorial be transmitted to the Secy of State for India.

No $\frac{1}{286}$ W d/ 24th January 88

To:-
Mr. J. W. Laskey
Pensd. Sub Engr. P. W. D.

16 Jany

To:-
The Rt. Hon: the Secy of State for India.

My Lord.

We have the honor to forward herewith a memorial from Mr. J. W. Laskey a pensioned Sub Engineer of the P. W. Department in which he reviews his career of thirty years service in the Department, and seeks redress and pecuniary compensation for what he considers the unjust punishments inflicted on him during that period. These punishments emanated, in his opinion, from feelings of resentment on the part of his superior officers, whose reports were, he states, "wilfully constructed with the determined object to injure him". He adds that his remonstrances to Govt: brought him no redress, but on the contrary caused his ultimate ruin.

2 — It will probably be more convenient to notice Mr. Laskey's career in a separate paper, and this has been done in the enclosure to this despatch marked A. There are, however, a few misrepresentations as to facts in Mr. Laskey's memorial which may perhaps be more fittingly here referred to. ~~in this place.~~ 2Dc/33

3 — In para 2 Mr. Laskey says — "I was thus deprived of the promotion to Sub-Engineer 3rd Grade that I was promised in G.O. 151 d/ 26th March 1870". We may remark that no such promise was made to Mr. Laskey in the order in question, which is in these terms — "The claim of Supervisor Laskey to promotion will receive due consideration on the occurrence of a vacancy." — He was no more promised promotion on this occasion than were other members of the Department all of whom equally with Mr. Laskey ~~all of whom~~ had claims to be considered.

4 — In the same para Mr. Laskey says "a subordinate has to be furnished with

copy of remarks made by his superior, prejudicial to him, to enable him to clear away things misrepresented" — Mr. Laskey is in error here. It is not usual, neither is it desirable, to furnish subordinates with copies of confidential reports sent to higher authority in regard to their work and conduct.

5 — In para 7 in connection with his punishment of 1861, Mr. Laskey says "I was under Col. Walker in Canara, when he was Captain and District Engineer in 1860. I received harsh treatment from his hands — I appealed to the Chief Engineer, and asked to be removed from his district. This was granted by the Chief Engineer." — The probable inference from these statements would be that the Chief Engineer, considering Mr. Laskey to have been ill used, transferred him, at his own request, to another district. The record of the case contained in paras 567 of Enclosure A shows that such an assumption is unwarranted.

6 — In para 16 the following statements are made — "His Excellency Sir Grant Duff received my memorial favorably and I was informed through the Private Secretary that His Excellency had sent the Memorial to the Chief Secretary for disposal. The Governor immediately after left Madras on a tour × × × × and in His Excellency's absence from Council, the case

was disposed of very adversely in the Dept. of Public Works" — There is nothing to support the statement that H. E. the Governor received the Memorial "favorably". In regard to this, we may remark that it is not usual for the head of the Government to express any opinion on Memorials before the facts are departmentally laid before him. The statement that the case was disposed of by the Council, without reference to the Governor, is wholly unfounded. The papers were laid before His Excellency, who approved of the order issued - viz G.O. 1915 d/ 10th July 1883, the draft of which, before His

7 — The charge which Mr. Lastley brings against his superior officers of feelings of personal resentment against him is not borne out by the record of his case. The frequent reprimands and punishments which he received during his long, but by no means uniformly good, service were unquestionably due to his own shortcomings; and that the Govt: were ultimately compelled to cut short his career in their service is a circumstance of which he has no valid ground to complain, seeing what an unsatisfactory servant he proved himself to be. It was only in consideration of his long service, during a portion of which he did good

Mr Laskey

work that the Government allowed him to retire on the pension of his rank. Had he not possessed these claims on their consideration Mr Laskey would undoubtedly have been removed from the Dept. without the liberal ~~usual~~ pension of Rs 127-8-0 per mensem of which he is now in the enjoyment ~~of~~.

8 — We have thus no recommendation to make on behalf of the Memorialist

13.12.87

17.1.

14/12/87

25/1/88

Note

These papers had to be returned to the Memorialist

J. M. / B

Govt. of 1888 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Urgent —

18/1/88

Dated

Recd. 3

G.O. 21 Jany. 88 No. 286

Mr. J. W. Laskey,

Pensioned Exe. Engr.,

P.W. Dept.

Memorial from — praying for a reopening of his case, or pecuniary compensation for ~~alleged~~ alleged unmerited punishments inflicted on him", ordered to be forwarded to the Home Govt.

For Home Govt.

Forwarding Memorial from Mr. J.W. Laskey, pensioned Ex. Engr., P.W. Dept., praying for redress & pecuniary compensation for alleged unmerited punish[illegible]

[illegible]

Ev 17/1