

Public (1899) Department.

ORDINARY M.S.

G.O., No. 433

Dated 15-4-99

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Passing orders on letter
from the Malayalam Translator to put
submitting, with remarks, a memorial
from C.P. Sankaran ^{Memorandum} clerk in his
office, making certain representations
against him.

4
15-4-99

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

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Cuo	1685/99	(Ment. Trans?)					
Cuo	1599/99	(")					

CHIEF SECRETARY
20 MAR. 1899
DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

No. 66

Received }
Registered } 23.3.99

Spare copies

Submitting ^{with remarks.} a memorial ~~together~~
~~with explanation.~~ from
C. P. Sankaranarayanan, a Clerk in
his office, making certain
representations against him.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

To

**His Excellency the Governor of
FORT ST. GEORGE IN COUNCIL.**

[Through the Malayalam Translator to Government.]

*The humble Memorial of C. P. Sankunni
Menon, Acting Munshi in the Gov-
ernment Malayalam Translator's
office, (now on leave).*

RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH :—

That Your Excellency's memorialist has a service of over 16 years in this office, 7 years of which being under Mr. W. Dumergue and 5 years each under Mr. L. Garthwaite and Mr. M. Krishnan, the Acting Translator.

2. That for the past 11 months the permanent Munshi of the office has been absent on furlough and the memorialist had to do the Munshi's work in addition to his own: that owing to heavy work the memorialist lately fell ill and applied for 2 months' privilege leave for which he was eligible; that privilege leave was refused; that, on his producing a medical certificate to prove the necessity for the leave, leave on medical certificate alone was granted, thus allowing the memorialist only half pay or Rs. 17½ per mensem as leave allowance instead of full salary, Rs. 50 per mensem, which he would have got if he had been granted privilege leave: that this is a source of great grievance to the memorialist because (a) it cuts short his emoluments at a time when he has need of as much money as he can possibly get, for medical treatment, (b) it creates a break in his service, and (c) it entails forfeiture of lien on his acting appointment;

that under article 367 of the Civil Service Regulations, leave on medical certificate should have been granted only if the memorialist had not been eligible for privilege leave;

that the memorialist's claim for privilege leave deserves some consideration as he has not had any leave (not even the Christmas and Easter holidays) during the past 27 months; that all the other members of this office have been granted, one time or other, privilege leave for 2 months and 3 months; that none of them has ever been compelled to take any leave other than privilege leave with full pay when he was eligible therefor;

that if contrary to custom it were necessary to appoint a substitute for memorialist while he was on privilege leave, he would, in order to prevent a break in his service, have willingly foregone

2

a portion of his leave allowance, although no one during the past 16 years of memorialist's service in this office has ever had to make such a sacrifice.

3. That Your Excellency's memorialist craves permission to submit that the peculiarly harsh treatment to which he has been subjected by the Translator is the result of spite and malice entertained by him towards the memorialist for reasons set forth below:—

(a) The *Kerala Sanchari*, a leading Malayalam newspaper, published in its issue of the 26th January 1898, a leader containing unfavourable comments on the work of the Malayalam Translator to Government and recommending the appointment of full time Translators. This article was translated in full by the memorialist for inclusion in the report to Government, but the Translator omitted it from the report. The memorialist thereupon remonstrated with him on the unadvisability of suppressing the article, but as there was a strong rumour at the time that the question of the appointment of Native Translators was engaging the attention of Government, he considered it unsafe for him to bring the said article to the notice of Government, and he was displeased with the memorialist for having pressed the point. Ever since, the Translator's treatment of the memorialist has been harsh, insulting and annoying. The attention of Government is respectfully invited to the article referred to above and to the fact that it was omitted from the newspaper report for the 2nd fortnight of January 1898.

(b) As matters which it is the Translator's interest that the Government should know nothing of are suppressed, so unimportant articles which from interested motives he wishes that the Government should know more fully are enlarged and written at length. Reports of an Ex-Deputy Collector Mr. C. Kunhikannan's memorial to the Secretary of State are instances in point (*Vide* fortnightly reports on Native newspapers for the second fortnight of August and first fortnight of September 1897). This Mr. Kunhikannan is the husband of the Translator's niece. Unfortunately for the memorialist, he happened to express his disapproval of the Translator's procedure in this matter.

3

(c) The Translator does absolutely no original translation work; when the post of Munshi on Rs. 155 was abolished and a Native Translator appointed, the office expected that the Translator would relieve the office of some portion of the translation work; not only was this expectation never realised, but the responsibility of the office clerks was immensely added to, inasmuch as the Native Translator would not do even what the European Translators were doing; that is, the European Translators considered themselves responsible for the correct rendering of English passages and followed the original closely while the translation was read out to them by the Munshi, whereas the present Native Translator does not examine the translation made in the office before it is sent to Press, and when proof is received the Translator reads out the vernacular version and the person who translated it, or, worse still, some other clerk who has never seen it before is supposed to follow the English original; and thus there is no chance of any mistake in the construction put upon English passages by the clerks being detected or corrected. Again, the newspaper report is written by the least paid clerk in the office who sometimes omits articles or portions of them which he finds it difficult to understand or translate; the Translator invariably affixes his signature to translations which he has never read and sends them to the Press for being printed; and there are instances in which translations which the Translator has never read have been issued and those in which translations correctly made by the Munshi or clerk have been altered by the Translator into a wrong form, which in some cases has since been found out and corrected while in others it remains so to this day; it would look hardly credible, but it is none the less true, that the Translator, anxious to show something in his own handwriting, would sometimes offer to write down translation to the dictation of his subordinates. Thus the work and responsibility of the clerks increased a good deal under the *regime* of the present Translator while the abolition of the post of Munshi on Rs. 155 deprived them of a decent reward for their hard work. And to his misfortune, the memorialist

had at times to grumble at his lot being cast in such an office.

(d) The accommodation provided for office is a room in the Translator's own family house which adjoins the market and the bazaar street; there is neither latrine accommodation provided nor is there an office servant to open and close the office when the members of the establishment come and go; the disturbances by children from within the house and the noise and confusion from the adjoining market and bazaar street are so great that the place is hardly fitted for one to read and clearly understand legislative enactments; the members of the establishment have to go and be knocking at the door of the private house while the Translator is away in his College, to get the office opened. The memorialist was unfortunate in having represented these inconveniences to the Translator.

4. That the memorialist begs leave to submit that the Translator having been displeased with the memorialist for the above reasons has unjustly refused to grant him privilege leave, and that he is therefore obliged to appeal to Your Excellency in Council for justice being done to him, and to request that Your Excellency will be graciously pleased, on a consideration of the circumstances set forth in para 2 *supra*, to order that the leave on medical certificate granted to the memorialist be converted into privilege leave.

5. That, in conclusion, the memorialist begs permission to submit that the present Translator who, after graduating in Arts, became Malayalam Munshi of the Presidency College in 1877 on a pay of Rs. 50 per mensem and after 22 years' service was able to rise to a pay of Rs 80 per mensem only, has now a Munshi on Rs. 75 and 2 clerks under him; that while he gets monthly Rs. 80 for the whole day's work he draws a local allowance of Rs. 250 per mensem for work supposed to be done out of office hours; and that the destinies of the members of the Malayalam Translator's establishment which were before in better and nobler hands can never be safe in his hands, especially when it is remembered that, as is clear from the instances mentioned in para 3 *supra*, he is not very scrupulous in the performance of his official duties.

EGMORE, MADRAS. }
13th March 1899. }

C. P. Sankunni Menon.

Recd 15 March 99
Mk

MEMORIAL OF C. P. SANKUNI MENON, Acting
Munshi, Government Malayalam Translator's
office (on leave).

TO
HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR
OF FORT ST. GEORGE IN COUNCIL.

DATED 15TH }
RECD 1 } MARCH 1899.

Submitting certain representations against
the acting Malayalam Translator to Government.

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PRINTERS, ESPLANADE, MADRAS.

2146

Madras, 22nd March 1899.

From

M. R. Ry

M. Krishnan Averghal B. A. B. L.,

Acting Malayalam Translator to Government.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,

Fort Saint George,

MADRAS.

Sir,

I have the honour to forward a memorial addressed to Govern-
ment by C. P. Sankuni Menon, a clerk of this office, appealing
against my order declining to grant him privilege leave on full
pay.

2. A copy of the order appealed against is not produced,
nor is any order produced to show that I refused to grant the
memorialist privilege leave on the terms mentioned in the last
two lines of para 4 of his memorial. On the subject of his princi-
pal grievance it is enough to draw attention to article 100 of the
C. S. R. under which a Government servant drawing less than Rs 100
is not entitled to the grant of privilege leave on full pay for
more than one month if it should be inconvenient for the head of
the office to spare his services. At the time when the memorialist
applied for leave, the Munshi on Rs 75 was ^{away} on furlough for a year
and the memorialist was acting for him and drawing an acting allow-
ance of Rs 15 per mensem. The remaining permanent establishment
consisted of the memorialist and a clerk on Rs 30 and if the memo-
rialist had been granted privilege ^{leave} on full pay, the establishment
would have been reduced for the time being to the clerk on
Rs 30 and a substitute (entertained for the Munshi absent on
furlough) on Rs 20. In these circumstances I declined

* Art 367 of the C. S. Regulations which is quoted by the
memorialist is not in his favour as his pay is less than
Rs 100 per mensem.

declined to grant ^{him} leave unless a medical certificate was produced. The memorialist being subject to chronic asthma and the object of his leave being to undergo treatment, I considered that on this account also leave on medical certificate was appropriate in his case. However, I had no objection to grant him privilege leave after the return of the Munshi who is due on the 31st, instant and I informed him accordingly; but he would not wait. Nor would I have had any objection to convert the leave on medical certificate actually granted into privilege leave, provided that the memorialist was prepared to forego ^{part} of his allowance so as to enable me to entertain a substitute but he did not apply to me on the subject either in person or in writing and this is the first time such a request is preferred by him. Accordingly the request at the conclusion of para 4 of his memorial is liable to be summarily rejected under para II of the memorial rules prescribed by Government.

3. ^{of the memorial} Paras 3 and 5 contain a virulent personal attack upon me in the course of which the memorialist takes upon himself to pass judgment on my fitness for the work which Government has been pleased to entrust to me; and asserts in general terms as well as in circumstantial detail that I systematically neglect all branches of my work as Malayalam Translator.

4. I beg to draw attention in particular to the following extracts from the memorial:-

1. "The Translator does absolutely no original work."
2. "The Native Translator would not even do what the European Translators were doing."
3. "The newspaper report is written by the least paid clerk in the office who sometimes omits articles or portions of them which he finds difficult to understand or translate."
4. "The Translator invariably affixes his signature to translations which he has never read and sends them to the Press for being printed."

- 5 " There are instances in which ~~the~~ translations which
 " the Translator has never read have been issued.
- 6 " It would look hardly credible, but ^{it is} none the less
 " true that the Translator sometimes offer^s to write
 " down translations to the dictation of his subordi-
 " nates."

These statements contain the gravest allegations and insinuations which it is possible to make against a Translator to Government. Even if the memorialist had a foundation for his accusations against me, the tone of his memorial would be highly reprehensible; but as the charges against me are a mere tissue of mis-representation and wilful falsehood as I shall presently show, I submit that he merits ^candign punishment at the hands of Government for this impertinent and insolent communication.

5. As regards statements 1 to 3 above, I do not propose to enter upon a formal defence of my procedure as a Translator, but I may claim credit for doing more original work than my predecessors did. I make it a rule to read myself the whole of every Malayalam Newspaper which is sent to me for report. I then mark out every passage to be translated in full or in abstract. When the translation is ready I compare diligently the original and the translations and execute myself the translations of ~~the~~ passages ^{to} for which the clerk in charge of that work may be unequal. All this may be verified by means of the Malayalam Newspapers in my office as well as the original newspaper reports in the Government Press. Government is therefore in no danger of being misled or kept in the dark owing to the failure of a low paid clerk to understand or adequately translate a newspaper article.

6. As regards the memorialist's allegations numbered 4, 5, and 6, it is a fact that in many cases I execute the translations of Acts and notifications myself from first manuscript

to the correction of the last proof and to get ~~this~~ urgent work ~~done~~ quickly. I occasionally require the clerk to bring the papers to me and read aloud the original while I write down the translation. This is a very different thing from what the memorialist wishes to convey by his statement that I "sometimes offer to write down translations to the dictation of my subordinates."

7. Again I generally send to the Press the manuscript translations executed by clerks as their manuscript is often either illegible or not convenient for the purpose of extensive correction or revision. I reserve this work for the proof stage and I have in my possession heaps of proofs which will show how minutely I scrutinize the translations of the Munshi and clerks. For the same reason I prefer to hold the translation in my own hand, while correcting the proof instead of handing it over to a clerk as the memorialist would have ^{me do} made in para 3 (c) of his memorial. I need hardly remark that mine is obviously the better method.

In the 5th allegation which I have extracted above the memorialist no doubt wishes to insinuate that translations of acts are published without ever being read by me either in manuscript or in proof. If questioned I dare say he will maintain that he did ^{not} mean this, but only that I am in the habit of calling for proof in respect of manuscripts which I have not read. I leave it to Government to judge whether such a deliberate mis-representation is permissible in a memorial professing to bring grave departmental irregularities to the notice of Government.

8. I next turn to the instances referred to in the 5th allegation as those in which "translations which the Translator has never read have been issued". I believe that this is an allusion to certain cases in which verbal changes to be made in notifications ^{are} communicated by Government to the Superintendent, Government Press by means of the telephone, and as such communications were received by the Superintendent while my

or clerk
 Munshi¹ was already in attendance at the Press for passing urgent proofs the latter's services were utilized for translating the altered wording. Such urgent matter² of course could not be seen by me before issue but on the other hand it could only relate to a few words or at most a short passage and would always come immediately after under my review so that if a correction was necessary it could always be notified in a subsequent issue of the Gazette.

9. Passing to less important parts of the memorial, I observe that in para 2 the memorialist seems to complain that he was not allowed to avail himself of Easter and Christmas vacations during the past 27 months. I was perfectly willing to let the memorialist go to Malabar or anywhere else at his pleasure on such occasions but he used to spend the vacations at Madras on the pretext of being too poor to afford a holiday excursion. Moreover just before the 27 months in question the memorialist had enjoyed a year's furlough.

10. In para 3 (a) the memorialist draws attention to an article in the "Kerala Sanchari" of the 26th, January 1898 regarding Government Translators in general and the Malayalam Translator in particular. I passed over the article because in the first place it was a mere réchauffé of articles on the same subject which had appeared in the English Newspapers published at Madras and in the second place I suspected that the article had been contributed by a discontented clerk of my own office. The clerk who was told to translate the marked articles undertook however to write out a full translation of this particular article, *although I had not marked it. So made*
 I omitted the translation from my report because I looked upon it as a piece of impertinence. I may add that the translation was furnished not by the memorialist as alleged by him but ^{by} a clerk on Rs 30 who in this instance seems to have colluded with the memorialist. Nor did the memorialist remonstrate with me that it was unadvisable to suppress it. Seeing that I did not include the article in my report, the memorialist or some one inspired by him sent a similar communication

communication to the "Hindu" which published it on the 1st, March 1898. This shows the attitude taken by the memorialist in this affair.

II. As regards para 3 (b) of the memorial I reported Mr. Kunhi Kannan's case because it was a general subject of comment in all the Malayalam papers and the journalists endeavoured to make much of the supposed discovery of new evidence in favour of the ex-Deputy Collector. I never supposed that Government would rehabilitate him or do him any other favour merely because I reported that the Malayalam papers ^{has taken} took up his cause.

I2. In para 5 of his memorial the memorialist complains of the inadequate accommodation afforded by me ^{to} for the clerks of my office. I can only say that no complaint has been made to me on the subject. The office room in my house is quite distinct from and does not communicate directly with the inhabited portion of the house. It is spacious and well ventilated and quite adapted to the purposes for which it is being used. In fact in selecting Egmore as my residence I was partly influenced by the consideration that the Munshi and clerks lived in the same quarter of the town and I have never had reason to suspect that even the memorialist was dissatisfied with the office accommodation provided by me.

I3. Lastly in para 5 of the memorial the memorialist passes my career in review and considers it a misfortune that I should have charge of the Malayalam Translator's Office. My post as Malayalam Master in the ^{Presidency} College is humble enough but ambition has not been my foible. I am a graduate in law as well as in arts and might if I chose, earn a competence as a Vakil, but I decided to adopt the teaching of Malayalam as a profession. I have cultivated the language with special care and have published no less than 15 works in that language which have been adopted as Text Books in schools. Moreover I

I am a frequent contributor to the magazine literature in Malayalam and my literary earnings ^{together} with my pay in the Presidency College sufficed for my wants until Government was pleased to recognize my services to Malayalam Literature by conferring upon me the post of which the memorialist wishes to prove me to be eminently unworthy. I differ from his opinion and presume to think that Government will do so. // I am inclined to think that the principal reason of the dis-satisfaction expressed by the memorialist is the stringency with which the work is now being exacted from all the clerks of the office. The office of the Malayalam Translator was, when I took charge of it, considered the most backward in regard to punctuality in the submission of reports and translations. By enforcing punctual attendance as well as regular office hours and exacting a fair measure of work from the establishment without sparing my own exertions, I have succeeded in keeping work current and up to time. The memorialist has always been striving to return to the easy ways to which he was formerly accustomed and his memorial shows that he would rather have the head of the office do the whole work than that he himself should do a part of it. I have had repeated cause to be dis-satisfied with him for his insolence and unwillingness to carry out orders, but his present outburst is an open attempt to subvert discipline in the office and deserves, as I have already remarked, severe punishment.

Para 14

I have the honour to be ,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

M. Krishnan
of Malayalam Translator to Govt.

U

Public DEPARTMENT.
...
...
...
...
...

C. No. 935 From the ap. Malayalam Translation No. 48 dated 23.2.1899.

" " " " " " 1899
" " " " " " 1899
" " " " " " 1899

For orders.

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

certificates instead of privilege
leave are given in para 2
of the translator's letter. The
munshi was away on furlough
& if the petition was granted
privilege leave the estate

would have been reduced to
the clerk on Rs 30 and a substitute
on Rs 20.

Article 100 of the C.A.R. quoted
by the petitioner translator has
nothing to do with the subject
on hand & apparently he
misunderstood the note to Art. 102 which
says that privilege leave ^{beyond no much should}
is not granted. S. J. Wilson

assuming leave Rs 100
if any extra expense is thereby
incurred on the estate.

Article 94 of the C.A.R. also
says the same thing.

Art 867 quoted by the petitioner
is also not to the point as
it says less than Rs 100.

The translator says that
he explained the state of
things to the petitioner and allowed
him the option of waiting
till the munshi who had

gone on furlough returned,
but the petitioner would not wait.
The translator subsequently
told him the petitioner that
he would convert the leave
on medical certificate
into a privilege leave provided
he was prepared to forego
a part of his allowance.
But the petitioner did not, the
translator says, apply
to him on the subject
either in person or in
writing.

The petitioner, it is submitted,
liable to be rejected under
para II C. Petn rules;
but besides the request
to have the leave converted
into privilege leave the
petitioner makes several
accusations against
the translator.

Very truly yours,
9/1/99
The petition was
rejected, as the
petitioner has no claim
to privilege leave, the
grant of which is always

Сн
10/4/57

When given for copying 117/4
 When copied 1874 } 189
 When examined
 When signed

READ AGAIN G.O., No. , DATED
 189

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING WANT FOR DESPATCH
 IN ORIGINAL.

N.B. -

- A = Copy in full.
- B = Not to be copied.
- P = Copy abstract only.
- Q = Copy heading only.