Public Works
~~Marine~~ (1896) Department.

G.O., No. 3521 W

DATED 8th December

[Despatch Abstract.]

Mr W. C. Lewis Ex. Engineer: Stating that, under the circumstances explained, His Excellency in Council is pleased to so far modify G.O. No 3200 W. d/9th November 1896 as to reduce the period of Mr Lewis' being passed over for promotion from two years to eighteen months from 1st October 1895.

T. L.
8/12

INDEXED.

10/12

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date	G.O.	No	Department.	Date.
	3200 W.	P.W.	9-11-96.				
	1214 D.	"	4-9-96.				
	364 D	"	6-6-96.				
	181 D.	"	16-5-96				
	290 W.	"	24-1-96.				

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Mr W. C. Lewis' case

Public Works Department.

No. 3521 W of 8 December 1896

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following

Memorial from Mr W. C. Lewis, Ex Engr, d/ 12.11.96.

His Excy. the Govr. in Council has considered Mr Lewis' memorial and his paper of remarks, & His Excy's opinion as to the blame which attaches to him remains unchanged. But as it now appears that Mr Lewis had permission to remain at Ootacamund for 60 days, the gravity of his dereliction of duty in spending too much of his time at that

[P. W. 45.
2,000—6-6-96]

Station, away from the scene of his more important works, is slightly lessened. H.E. in Council is therefore pleased to so far modify G.O. No. 3200 W dated 9th Nov. 1896, as to reduce the period of Mr Lewis' being passed over for promotion from two years to eighteen months from the 1st Octr 1895

& flagged E

Ex

(Issue) 7/12/96

W

For orders whether with reference to the Hon'ble Mr. Bliss' note, the period may be still further re=duced to one year.

9/12/96

W

I consider the case has been sufficiently met by the reduction of the period of loss of promotion to 18 months.

A.S.H.
4.12.96

Copy/ W. C. Lewis Esqre
(through the S.S. II Circle)

9/12/96

G.O.
E.

H.E. 3/12
R 7/12

H.8/ Case of Mr. W. C. Lewis, Ex. Engr. P. W. DEPARTMENT.

READ the following:—

Memorial from W. C. Lewis, Esq. Executive Engineer, dated 12th November 1896.

FOR ORDERS.

I should be obliged if the Secy. will comment on the passage marked A. in Mr. Lewis' memorial of Nov. 12, 1896. In what way does the punishment involve a fine of Rs. 4,300?

A.S.H.
21-11-96

Mr. W. C. Lewis, Executive Engineer, has handed me two documents one a memorial to His Excellency the Governor and the other notes on G.O. No. 3200 W. of 9th November 1896. As regards the former, I may mention that the letter calling for his second explanation was forwarded to Mr. Lewis on the 4th September 1896 and the reminder was sent to him on 1st October so that he had nearly a month to prepare his explanation and as he was supplied with the records on the Subject I am at a loss to understand how he can say that he received the reminder before he had time to have the

Coimbatore

43—500-27-4-94.

Coimbatore letters copied as no copies were required. The records sent to him were all that were necessary to enable him to submit his explanation and a visit to Coimbatore was not required. The second explanation was only called for in order to give him ~~any~~ every chance of defence and as all papers bearing on the case were sent to him at Guntur I think he is making a somewhat incorrect statement that he was not more favourably situated than in England where he had no records to consult. It would appear as if this act of indulgence in giving him a second chance of explaining were treated by Mr Lewis as a grievance.

2. As regards the second document there are very few points worth ~~noting~~ noticing ~~as they~~ it adds nothing to his previous explanation.

3. It will be noticed that Mr Lewis states in his para 1 that the meagreness of

of

of his reply was due to the certainty in his mind that the excesses were *almost* entirely due to the change of site; if he had this in his mind why did he say in his explanation that the excesses were *entirely* due to change of site.

4. It has been distinctly proved that during the whole of 1894 Mr Lewis only inspected the Kullar bridge 18 times and during the principal working months, January till June only 11 days and yet he excuses his neglect to attend more carefully to the sluices as "he had to inspect the Kullar bridge every few days". This statement is, to use a mild term, an exaggeration and is in itself quite sufficient to justify the punishment Mr Lewis has got.

5. I ~~found~~ find that Mr Lewis did get permission demi officially to stop at Ootacamund for two months instead of taking the 3 months privilege leave due to him, there is nothing

or

on record about this but the Under Secretary tells me that he was allowed to stay at Ootacamund on the distinct understanding that it ~~would~~ should not interfere with the carrying on of his duties

6. It has already been shown that Mr Lewis was 177 days during the year at Ootacamund; deducting the 60 days he had permission to remain there, his ~~stop~~ stay was for 117 days on the Hills during the year which is far more than necessary, even supposing the reasons given for his being there a long period are correct.

7. G.O. No. 3200W. of 9th November 1896 gives full explanation of the charges brought against Mr Lewis and his replies thereto and I cannot see that these last remarks of his alter the situation in any way and he has not ~~done~~ said anything to show that he was not guilty of carelessness and neglect of rules in connection with the execution during the years 1893-95 of the two works

FOR ORDERS.

works Vangal and Nerur head Sluices. He has failed to show that he paid as much attention to the works as was practicable. He has not explained why he neglected to send in a second estimate according to rules and he has given no satisfactory explanation as to the great delay in carrying out the works, or as to why he allowed the accounts to get into confusion.

16/11/96

W.

3/6

H.M.S.

P.W.D.

Current No 102 95.

Note for H.E. the Governor

His Excy's note of 21.11.96, on Mr Lewis' offence.

The "fine" of Rs 4300 mentioned by Mr Lewis is made up as follows:—

Difference of pay between 1st & 2nd Grade Ex. Engrs (Rs 1000 - 850) from 4th Septr 1896 (date of return to duty from furlough, from which date only he would have drawn the full pay of the 1st grade had he been promoted on 1.10.95) to 1st Octr 1895, or nearly 13 months, at Rs. 150 per m. ..	Rs 1,950
Postponement for 2 years of the first increment granted to Ex. Engrs 1st grade, under para 13, Chapter I Vol. I, P.W. Code, at Rs 50 per mensem - - - - - - -	" 1,200
Ditto - ditto of the 2nd increment - ditto - ditto - - - -	1200
Total Rs:	4350

It may be pointed out that the increments granted to 1st grade Ex. Engrs after four & eight years' service in the grade, under the Code rule above quoted, are for approved service, and cannot be claimed as a right.

Supersession can hardly be said to involve

~~[illegible]~~

I have considered ~~his~~ Mr Lewis' Memorial and his paper of remarks, and my opinion as to the ~~degree of~~ blame which attaches to him remains unchanged. But, as it now appears that he had permission to remain at Ootacamund for 60 days, the gravity of the his dereliction of duty in spending too much of his time at Ootacamund, away from a "fine"; if so, Mr Hannan might say he was fined somewhere about Rs 24,000 -

23/11/96

W

Cr

from the scale of his more important works is slightly lessened. I would not object to the period of his being passed over for promotion being reduced from two years to eighteen months.

A.G.H.
26.11.96

Very well

28/11/96

I have no objection at all. It is not, in such a case, so much the amount, as the fact, of punishment for neglect of duty that is important - I should not myself object if the period of ~~[illegible]~~ loss of promotion were reduced to one year or even less -

2/12/96

Circ 27/11 R 2/12
H.E. 23/11 R 27/11.

Public works (1896) department

Current number 10295

Encls 1

Recd: 14.11.96

No. 3200 W d/ 9-11-96. ✓
" 1214 D - 4-9-96. ✓
" 364 D - 6-6-96 ✓
" 181 D - 16-5-96 ✓
" 290 W - 24-1-96 ✓

Memorial of
W. C. Lewis Esq.
M.I.C.E.

to
His Excellency the
Governor of Madras
In Council

With 1 enclosure

Through Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

Nov. 12. 1896.

Other letters are with the file on the "Lewis" case [illegible]

19/11/96

Registered & return S.H.C.

Remarks on G.O. 3200 W of. 9.11.96. 1

The meagreness of my reply was due to the certainty in my mind, that the excesses were almost entirely due to the change of site, the question of the diversion channel depending upon that.

The Overseer, whose explanations the Sup. Eng. quotes, knew nothing of the previous history of the works, having only been in charge of them for that season; I having posted him there partly to get these accounts straight.

With regard to the initial accounts, I may point out that the Dy. Examiner, in inspecting Coimbatore Dt. accounts, animadverts on the number of minor works of which I had had accounts kept by subheads, as being unnecessary; & it was owing to the accounts not being kept by subheads that I believe the excesses were not detected sooner

With regard to the number of days at Kallar during the working season of 1894, I may point out that the Kallar foundation reached water at the end of Aug/93 and that the first cable was hauled over on April 11. 1894. During this period I inspected the work 34 times. There was only one considerable interval when I thought it safe to be out of call of the works; this was from 21st to 22nd. during this interval I took a tour round the works near Hasur, including the two sluices, with a new Sub Dn. officer, who did not remain there long

In April the Sub Dn. officers at Ootacamund & Hocle were both transferred by Mr. Hannain's orders unexpectedly; Supr. Cherry being ordered to N. Arcot from Ooty, urgently, could not hand over to Mr. D. Charal, & I had to wait in Ooty till the latter officer could arrive, to show him the works in the Sub Dn. & inspect some buildings at Gudalur; after the end of May there was no expectation of being able to do anything to the Cauvery sluices. I may also state that though I did not visit the Kallar ~~the~~ bridge often all the time I was at Coimbatore or Ootacamund I could get there in a

few hours, & was receiving daily reports from the work, & was in readiness to proceed immediately when anything went wrong as I did several times

If my journals are read in this light it will be seen that till the end of April 1894 I was for the whole time with the exception of 20 days within easy reach of the work; & considering that the site made it absolutely impossible to camp there (in fact camping there was forbidden by Mr. Lasmini) & that my office was at Coimbatore, I should be considered as having been at or near the work for 70 days out of 91.

As for the time I spent at Ootacamund I had permission to stop at Ootacamund on account of my wife's state of health doing my office work there for two months instead of my applying for three months priv leave which I had due, & during that time I kept the whole of my office work going besides inspecting & looking after a multitude of small questions that always arise at Ootacamund & I read for & passed an examination in Tactics as an Officer of Volunteers an optional examination but which I believe is viewed with favour by Government. Including this period nearly the whole time spent at Ootacamund with the exception of the portion of March when I had a great deal to do with getting buildings ready for Government & April & May when I was detained by change of Sub Dt. officer was during the rains when no work could be done in the Cauvery, & the works could not even be seen because of the same.

Mr. Hannan himself went to look at them & after seeing one covered up with sand he told the Overseer that it was no use taking him to the other.

As regards the accusation of sanctioning separate estes to cover the additional outlay I did not reply in greater detail as it was for alterations in flood banks to take up the altered sites of the sluices, when I was discussing the question with Col Smart. I pointed out that excess that would occur from this, & he said, these must be charged to river bank. As these were only verbal orders I did not quote

them previously but now I am obliged to. These items amount to Rs 824 in Tannagal & Rs 539 in Weeur sluice

I regret that I have made a mistake about the entire excess being due to change of site. My further explanation was hurried by a reminder before I had time to analyse the completion reports.

I do now see that the ^iron^ brickwork was carried out at a high rate of Rs 22. per % cft but this work was in great part executed & I think the accounts entirely submitted after I left the Dt. & part of the excess in this was due to extension of wing wall probably due to change of site

Although His Excellency does not propose to take any further action about the Palli Chinnar Road, I should also like to state that my previous explanation was the same as my latter but not in so much detail, the unhealthiness referred to was the ~~same~~ season then approaching

W. Lewis

12/11/96

an additional Examination but which I

To his Excellency the Governor of Madras

The humble Memorial of W. C. Lewis &c Executive Engineer

Through the Secretary Govt. P.W.D.

Your petitioner has just received a copy of G.O 3200 W of Nov 9. 1896

Your petitioner desires to represent that the accusations as now formulated cover his movements for a long period of time; had he to deal with the whole of his life history & justify all his movements for that period, the explanations would be so voluminous that he doubts whether anyone could follow it, but he is quite able to do so: He would therefore request your Excellency to peruse the accompanying note.

The criticisms on the papers received from Coimbatore, & his further explanation are meagre, in consequence of his having received a reminder from the Sec. to Govt before he had time to have the Coimbatore papers even copied, & as to have thoroughly dealt in detail with them, would have been a work of many hours, perhaps days.

OW2.1
L0295/96

To his Excellency the Governor of Madras
In Council

The humble Memorial of W. C. Lewis &c
Executive Engineer..

Through the Secretary Govt. P.W.D.

Your petitioner has just received a copy of G.O 3200 W of Nov. 9. 1896

Your petitioner desires to represent that the accusations as now formulated cover his movements for a long period of time; had he to deal with the whole of his life history, & justify all his movements for that period, the explanations would be so voluminous that he doubts whether anyone could follow it, but he is quite able to do so: He would therefore request your Excellency to peruse the accompanying note

The criticisms on the papers received from Coimbatore, & his further explanation are meagre, in consequence of his having received a reminder from the Sec. to Govt before he had time to have the Coimbatore papers even copied, & as to have thoroughly dealt in detail with them, would have been a work of many hours, perhaps days, & would require possibly further correspondence with Coimbatore, & he was at the the time taking over charge of a heavy division with a very great number of papers that require much consideration, he hoped that what seemed to him a conclusive explanation; especially as no indication as to in what way his first explanation was deficient, & what points required further elucidation would suffice to procure him justice.

He would further remark, that, to thoroughly avail himself of the opportunities of complete records, would involve a visit to Coimbatore; as at Guntur he was not more favourably situated than in England, except in difference of time by post, which considering that one year was suffered to elapse would not have mattered much, whereas at Guntoor he had the whole of a very heavy correspondence to conduct, and in England perfect leisure

Your petitioner would therefore pray Your Excellency to reopen the subject & to allow him to have a chance of reestablishing himself. The punishment allotted is perhaps more severe than Your Excellency realises. It not only involves a fine of Rs 4,300.

A.

i.e. 13 months pay at Rs 150
2 years increment from Rs 1000 to 1050
& again from Rs 1050 to 1100
which latter depends on length of service
in the grade;

But also the slur cast upon him after so far as he knows an unblemished record since he joined the Presidency

Your petitioner will therefore
ever pray

W Lewis

Nov. 12. 1896

Office slips

I Gunter
Nov. 2. 1896

Jo 3200 W
9-11-96

My dear Col. Campbell

Referring to last weeks Gazette. would you mind letting me know whether my case has been decided or not

Yours sincerely

M Lewis

The [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
Lewis [illegible] [illegible]
5/11/95

SAW

Guntoor
Nov. 9. 1896

My dear Stuart –

Thank you for your letter. I am sorry to trouble you again, but may I assure His Excellency, through you, that to this minute, not only have I never received any intimation in what respect my original explanation of more than a

year ago was deficient; but
even no ~~intimation~~ information except
through the Gazette that it
was not perfectly satisfactory;
& the ~~second~~ explanation was
offered entirely in the dark
as to what further explanation
was necessary. I might
have written a great deal more
but ~~being~~ under those circumstances
I did not know what was
necessary. I am coming to

Madras to night on casual leave
& hope that in the light of the
above remarks His Excellency
may reconsider his determination
not to allow me a further
chance of explaining my
case after seeing Col. Campbell

Believe me

Y. sincerely

McLean

3

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

Public Works Department,
Chepâk, Madras,
12th Nov 189 .

My dear Stuart

Yours of 11th

I have explained matters to Lewis but he is not satisfied & still desires an interview with H.E. I therefore return herewith the file.

Yours sincerely
D. McN. Campbell

4

PRIVATE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNOR · MADRAS

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

13 Nov 1896.

My dear Campbell,

I send you a letter I have received from Lewis, together with a copy of my reply. You will see that His Excellency desires that the representations should be made through you, and

Buckingham Hotel
Nov. 12. 1896

My dear Stuart

I took a further statement enclosed in a petition to his Excellency to Col Campbell this morning who told me I had better present it in person to his Excellency. I must return to Guntoor on Saturday afternoon as my casual leave is up.

2 I shall not have any

b

PRIVATE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNOR · MADRAS ·
GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

13th November 1896.

My dear Lewis,

His Excellency desires that you will make any representations you may wish to put forward to Col Campbell, who will of course place your statements before the Governor together, with his remarks and opinions thereon.

His Excellency does not think any good will be done by a personal interview: he