

To

THE MOST NOBLE THE MARQUIS OF

SALISBURY, P.C., M.A., F.R.S., M.R.A.S.

Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India,

LONDON.

*The humble Memorial of T. IVASAWMY MOODELLIAR, late
Manager of the Paper Currency and Paper Stamp-
ing Departments in the Office of the Accountant
General, Fort Saint George.*

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

That after having been uninterruptedly employed in the Public Service for nearly a quar-
ter century, as detailed in the appended Register of Service, during which period Your Memori-
alist filled various posts of trust and responsibility to the entire satisfaction of all his official su-
periors, as abundantly shewn by the accom-
panying testimonials,* he has been summarily

* (Marked A.)

and ignominiously dismissed by Mr. Lodwick, the Accountant General, without so much
as being informed of the precise cause of so
heavy an infliction, and in flagrant violation
of Orders* passed by the Government itself
concerning the removal of subordinate servants
from their appointments.

* Extract from Proceedings of Government, Public De-
partment, 5th May 1854, No. 421.

Para 8. "The Governor in Council considers it but just
"and proper that greater protection should be given to
"old servants, and with this view he directs that the pre-
"vious sanction of the controlling authority should be in-
"dispensable to the dismissal of any servant of 15 years
"standing receiving a certain salary, say 25 Rs. a month."

Para 9. "In every case the specific grounds upon
"which it is proposed to dismiss any servant should be re-
"duced in writing and furnished to him, and the answer
"or defence or explanation of the party taken in writing,
"and the final decision of the superior recorded in writing.
"It will not be absolutely necessary for every head of
"charge to be formally proved by evidence, but when a
"specific fraudulent act is charged, of course it should be
"so proved in the presence of the party accused and sub-
"ject to his cross-examination, and so with other specific
"acts susceptible of proof by the evidence of witnesses
"upon which accusations within the category are built;
"but the charges will often be a matter of inference from
"circumstances not capable of formal proof, but not less
"leading to a moral conviction. The rule, therefore, on
"this head, ought not to be rigorous."

2. That the course of action pursued by
Mr. Lodwick was, further, in direct contraven-
tion of several other repeated orders of Govern-
ment on the subject, in which they ruled that
Heads of Departments should not be at liberty
to institute criminal prosecutions in any case
connected with malversation in their offices
without previously obtaining the sanction of
Government to do so, or, in the first instance,
communicating with and consulting their Law
Officers, prior to bringing the matter before a
Police Magistrate, neither of which was done in
the case of Your Memorialist.

3. That so astounded was Your Memorialist at Mr. Lodwick's extraordinary, impo-
tuous, uncalled for and unprecedented proceedings against him, that he seized the earliest op-
portunity of laying† his most deplorable case

† Vide please, Appeal dated 26th November 1873,
(marked B.)

before the Right Honorable the Governor in
Council, and received in reply this endorse-
ment under date 13th December 1873:—

"The Government await the result of the legal proceedings now pending against Petitioner."

But, though such result was altogether in favor of Memorialist, the Government, instead of acceding to the prayer of his Petition, declined to make even the least concession in the face of their own Order No. 395 of 29th October 1866, Financial Department, which runs thus :—

"The Governor in Council is clearly of opinion that when an officer is acquitted of an offence by a Court of competent Jurisdiction, he is entitled to re-instatement, provided the acquittal is bona fide on the merits of the case, and not in consequence of a mere technicality, a legal flaw in the evidence, collusion with the witnesses or some similar circumstances." * * *

4. Having since appealed twice again in vain to His Excellency the Governor for redress of his grievances, Your Memorialist has now no alternative but to submit his case with all due deference to the highest controlling authority over the affairs of Her Majesty's Indian Empire: feeling well assured that Your Lordship will not fail to accord to this representation a careful and patient perusal; while Memorialist craves permission to state, as briefly as possible, all the facts and circumstances that apparently led, first to his suspension and, subsequently, entire dismissal from his office as follows :—

I. Your Memorialist's proper position in the Office of the Accountant General was that of Manager and Head Accountant of the Paper Currency Department on a monthly salary of 200 Rs., in addition to the duties of which he was also vested with the supervision of the Stamping Department in January 1870, and allowed to draw a further sum of Rs. 50 per month.

II. On taking charge of the Paper Stamping Department Your Memorialist discovered the existence of certain gross irregularities in it (to which he had happily succeeded in applying a remedy before its transfer from the Mint to the Accountant General's Office, as certified* by Dr. Bellow), such as workmen receiving full pay whenever they were absent from duty, notwithstanding that such absence was solely owing to their habits of intemperance, for which they were not unfrequently brought before the Police Magistrate and punished §. This system tended to throw the Stamping work considerably into arrears, and Your Memorialist put a stop to it effectually by causing substitutes to be entertained and paid out of the absentees' salaries; a measure which, in connection with Memorialist's rigid supervision, fines, suspension, dismissal of some hands and consequent reduction of expenditure in the interests of the State, so provoked the enmity and hostility of the operatives towards him as to induce them to prefer constant complaints and anonymous Petitions against him to the Head of the office. Since Your Memorialist's suspension, however, Kissan Sing, native Assistant to the Accountant General, allowed* the workmen full pay during absence, a stroke of

* Vide Pages 5 and 6 of the testimonial Pamphlet marked A. in which is stated as follows :—

"The Assay Master in charge of the Stamp Paper Department, taking this opportunity of standing byway, * * * * * Modallie, the Head Accountant of the Paper Currency, for the seal and case he has shown in * * * the management of the Stamping Department since it was placed under him by the Assay Master on 4th January 1870." * * *

Madras Mem. (Signed) P. P. BELLER, 17th October, 1870. Assay Master in charge of Stamp Paper Department.

"In this Department he has given entire satisfaction and * * * he has been of the greatest assistance to maintain integrity * * * reorganizing the old system of stamping by the introduction of new Dies and Presses." * * *

Madras Mem. (Signed) P. P. BELLER, 14th November 1870. Commissioner of Paper Currency.

† Please see page 4 of 2nd Appeal to the Local Government marked G.

vision, fines, suspension, dismissal of some hands and consequent reduction of expenditure in the interests of the State, so provoked the enmity and hostility of the operatives towards him as to induce them to prefer constant complaints and anonymous Petitions against him to the Head of the office. Since Your Memorialist's suspension, however, Kissan Sing, native Assistant to the Accountant General, allowed* the workmen full pay during absence, a stroke of

* Kissan Sing's evidence before the Magistrate, vide page 19 of the Pamphlet marked B.

"I say since I was dismissed my suspension by the Government * * * * * I have not been supplied with, on the contrary I gave the workmen full pay during their absence. I did so as Head of the Department. I disagreed * * * with the first Defendant's view from being in agreement * * * I was allowed pay to be drawn at a moment's notice from the day mentioned in the Order to 17th." * * *

§ In illustration your Memorialist begs to refer your Lordship to the Madras Athlete and Daily News of 23rd May and 20th September 1874, wherein the evidence of Mr. Lodwick, Pressman Manickum and Examiner Thucavalee were examined and refuted by the Police Magistrate, the former for drunkenness and dishonesty between and the latter for untruthful evidence. Your Memorialist merely begs to request your Lordship's attention to these facts, in order to substantiate the statements to the effect that Memorialist had frequently to find these workmen for being absent without leave on slender grounds to those stated above—and hence their turbulent dislike to him.

"to the time of 1st Defendant's suspension. Since 1st Defendant's suspension I have not done so but allowed the men to draw their full pay. I granted leave indiscriminately to all, not to the witnesses alone. I did not see Mr. Manickum and Chinna Bagavalee at their office work, they came to the office with Mr. Shapson every day."

policy which could have had no other object in view than to afford a premium for statements of all kinds being made against Your Memorialist.

III. Apparently acting upon the anonymous accusations thus brought against Your Memorialist, Mr. Lodwick held a private enquiry in his own Office room, with closed doors, on 30th October 1873, at which his Assistant Kissan Sing was present, and having taken down the depositions of two men of the Stamping Department who were specially referred to in the anonymous letter, proceeded, in company with

† Counter Narrainsawmy, Examiner Thucavalee.

Kissan Sing to that Department, obtained the key of a desk from the Superintendent in immediate charge and took out 9 blank rolls of water-marked paper. Your Memorialist was then sent for from the Currency Department and was asked why these blank rolls were there, to which he replied that they must have been in excess of the number sent from time to time to be stamped and ought to have been returned to the General Stamp Office whence they were received, but that as they were all torn right across, soiled and therefore quite unfit for use, they had most probably been hung into the desk by the workmen—a circumstance of which Memorialist was not at all aware, else he would certainly have sent them back to the General Stamp Office. In short, Mr. Lodwick's further interrogatories regarding the 9 blank rolls clearly implied that they might have been stamped and surreptitiously sold in the market to one's own private advantage in defiance of Government; but this was simply impossible except in collusion with the Superintendent of Stamps, Deputy Collector of Madras and the Government licensed Stamp Vender. A Stamp paper to be marketable must be complete. In the Stamping Department attached to the Accountant General's Office only the value is stamped on it. It is then despatched to the Superintendent of Stamps, who, after putting his own stamp thereon, forwards it to the Deputy Collector of Madras. The Deputy Collector in his turn puts his stamp on the paper and hands it over to the Stamp Vender, by whom the sale of each paper is endorsed on the back with his signature. Unless, therefore, there were a gigantic conspiracy in all these departments, no fraud could possibly be perpetrated against the Government: a fact which did not at all seemingly occur to Mr. Lodwick, and this charge thus at once fell to the ground from its own inherent impossibility.

IV. The private investigation was then followed up by Mr. Lodwick's calling for the four Pressmen of the Department and, after addressing them to the effect that they had nothing to fear and that he was the head of the Office, minutely questioned one of them, named Manickum, on the subject of stamping excess papers, and his answers not squaring with Mr. Lodwick's views he was dismissed then and there from the service, a step that would naturally strike terror at once into the minds of the other workmen in the Department. Manickum was, however, re-instated next day (31st October 1873) on his coming forward to make a statement in support of the charges trumped up by his fellow workmen: hence it will be seen that it was not for any delinquency whatever urged against your Memorialist in connection with the management of his own proper department (Paper Currency) but in the Paper Stamping Department alone, in which, as mentioned before, he had excited a great deal of animosity on the part of the inferior employes, through his endeavours to correct the abuses prevailing therein.

* Manickum. Annamalai Jayaram. Narrainsawmy.

Vide evidence before the Police Magistrate, page 4 of Pamphlet marked B, wherein Mr. Lodwick stated :— "Manickum may have persisted in his reply. I ordered him to be dismissed then and there. Next day I enquired for Manickum. From information given by Kissan Sing, I had Manickum brought upstairs. I asked Manickum a great many questions. I think he was restored after he made statement."

Kissan Sing stated :—Vide pages 15 and 16 do. do. "Manickum still persisted in saying that he did not know any thing about excess papers. It was upon this Mr. Lodwick dismissed him. This caused terror in the Department. About 12 o'clock on the 31st October I saw him at the Office, he said he had something to say about yesterday's affair. I took to the Accountant General. I said here Sir, Manickum wants to say something about what took place yesterday. Mr. Lodwick said ask him what he has to say. Manickum then made a statement. After the statement was taken down from Manickum Mr. Lodwick ordered me to re-instate him."

connection with the management of his own proper department (Paper Currency) but in the Paper Stamping Department alone, in which, as mentioned before, he had excited a great deal of animosity on the part of the inferior employes, through his endeavours to correct the abuses prevailing therein.

V. After Manickum's criminary statement and consequent restoration to his situa-

tion, your Memorialist was abruptly suspended from Office by Mr. Lodwick who, on the evening of the same day (31st October 1873) had him arrested upon a Warrant issued by one of the Police Magistrates and confined all night in Her Majesty's Justice's Jail, wherefrom he was released on the ensuing day, 1st November 1873, on bail: your Memorialist's garden house having at the same time been thoroughly searched by Police Officers on four different occasions and certain articles ordinarily used in all houses with garden compounds,—such as Crowbars, Manicotties, Garden-knife, Zinc horse bucket, &c,—were seized and carried away on the alleged plea of their being the property of Government, although some of them were afterwards clearly proved to be of English manufacture by the marks stamped on them.

VI. On the same day (1st November 1873) your Memorialist was taken before the Magistrate, but Mr. Lodwick, on seeing the things brought away from your Memorialist's dwelling-house, asked for an adjournment of the case for a fortnight, saying he was unprepared to proceed with it. At the lapse however of that interval, the prosecution, on the ground of still being unprepared, requested a remand of another fortnight, which after some demur was granted by the Magistrate. Such was the disgrace and humiliation your Memorialist had to en-

* Marked B.

should have needed so much time as one month for preparation on the part of the prosecution, seeing more especially that Mr. Lodwick's witnesses were all men employed in the Stamping Department and under his immediate influence; but your Memorialist would here beg leave respectfully to observe, at the risk of incurring the imputation of presumptuousness, that the real cause of the adjournments was to afford Mr. Police Inspector Simpson the amplest opportunity for tutoring the witnesses,—the expression is a strong one, but Memorialist

as more fully detailed in his first Appeal* to the Madras Government; whilst it is very remarkable that a matter so manifestly trivial

respectfully submits that the witness' own deposition* given in the margin justifies it—, whom this Officer used to detain at his house till midnight or 1 o'clock in the morning, and further, that Mr. Lodwick's hasty and unwarranted proceedings against your Memorialist had for their sole object the procuring of evidence in extenuation of his own conduct, firstly, in suspending Memorialist from employment and get-

* Vide Mr. Police Inspector Simpson's evidence before the Magistrate, pages 57 and 58 of the Pamphlet marked B.

"Since 2nd November I have very often been to the Accountant General's Office nearly every day, when I go there I used to stay sometimes the whole day, sometimes an hour, sometimes three hours, it depends upon circumstances. I have kept that up for about 25 days. For the last 5 or 10 days I have been doing official work till 9 or 10 o'clock at night in writing in my house. I keep wires in my house till 8 or 10 o'clock at night; some times later than that, sometimes half past 12 or 1 o'clock in the morning, not till 2 o'clock."

ting him dragged away at night from his family and incarcerated and, secondly, in dismissing him from the service altogether upon his own responsibility, as he did on the 21st November 1873, or about two months before the case was heard and disposed of by the Magistrate: this latter step having been adopted with the view of emboldening the whole of the Press workmen to dispose to whatever they liked to your Memorialist's disparagement, as may be fairly inferred from the fact of Mr. Lodwick's sending for them to his Office-room and haranguing them to the effect that *he was the head of the Department and could retain or dismiss whom he pleased, that it rested with him to increase the pay of all of them, that he had sent Lysacomy (Memorialist) away who had now no authority whatever and that there was no need to fear him.*

VII. Not content with thus encouraging the Pressmen, Mr. Lodwick entered the apartment occupied by the mechanics and, addressing them to the same effect, enquired if they had ever done any work in brass or iron for your Memorialist, and upon their answering in the negative Mr. Lodwick became so enraged as to threaten them with instant removal from their employment, and then questioned† them as to whether they did

† Mr. Lodwick's evidence before the Magistrate, pages 4 and 5 of the Pamphlet marked B.

"I did go to the Filer and Blacksmith's room. I said to the men I had suspended 1st defendant (Memorialist), 'not to be afraid to speak the truth. The workmen' I don't know any work in brass and iron for 1st defendant. I don't think I was angry at one of them. I don't recollect saying I would dismiss them or send them to jail. I never had any to do, I have put the questions to the workmen if they had ever done any bit of work for

not at any time do any bit of work, such as even a nail or any trifle of that kind for your Memorialist, to which they gave a distinct denial. He thereupon called for Pressman Maniekum (whom, as already mentioned, he had discharged but replaced in his post the next day, and

"1st defendant in brass or iron, such as a nail or any trifle of that kind, they denied this also. * * * I sent for Maniekum, he came up, and from my very feet produced two brass moulds. This was done, when a man whom I was examining denied that he had done any work. Soondra Chary was the man whom I was examining, on his denying that he did any work for any body except for Office, and on Maniekum producing two moulds, I squeezed him by the throat."

Kissun Sing stated, Vide pages 16 and 17 do. do. "Mr. Lodwick then went to the Filer's and Blacksmith's rooms. I recollect Mr. Lodwick telling the workmen they need not fear 1st defendant. I don't think he said he was the head of the Office. He did say that 1st defendant was sent away. Mr. Lodwick first asked if they have ever done any work for any body except for Office. I think he also asked them whether they have done any work for 1st defendant in brass or iron, they all said they had never done any work for 1st defendant in brass or iron. Upon Soondra Chary denying having made any thing Mr. Lodwick seized him by the throat, he did not cry out but moved back: he might have been so squeezed as he could not cry out. I advised Mr. Lodwick not to touch him. Although our object in going down was to enquire whether any work was done for 1st defendant, yet we did not put that question. I cannot account for Soondra Chary in answer to a general question, referring to work done for 1st defendant alone."

VIII. Such were the very questionable means Mr. Lodwick had recourse to in order to effect the utter ruin of your Memorialist, who would beg to submit that, so far from evidencing any desire to further the interests of the State, Mr. Lodwick's whole proceedings from first to last were not only extremely unbecoming his high and influential position as Accountant General, but that they unmistakably indicate the prejudice and ill-will he had personally conceived against Your Memorialist, at the instigation of his Native Assistant Kissun Sing, whom your Memorialist had unwittingly offended through his instrumentality in the dismissal, transfer, and reduction in salary of certain of his favourites, who were amongst the subordinates, whose enmity Memorialist had aroused, as aforementioned, by his efforts in the performance of his duty to rectify existing abuses and to introduce order and efficiency in the working of the Departments under his charge.

5. That indeed Kissun Sing's bitter animosity towards your Memorialist is placed beyond all question as well by the circumstances particularized in pages 4, 5 and 6 of Your Memorialist's

* Marked C.

† See please the Pamphlet marked B, Pages 17 and 18 wherein Kissun Sing said as follows:—

"I may have spoken to 1st defendant on behalf of Ramanada Pillay for reducing his pay. This document, marked No. 21, bears the signature of Mr. Taylor and the Accountant General recommending reduction. It was in October or November 1872, I was in charge up to 25th or 29th Oct. 1872, 1st defendant must have spoken to me about the reduction. I must have spoken to 1st defendant not to reduce the pay of Ramanada Pillay for nothing else, but for his efficiency in the office, I should say that 1st defendant is a better judge than I am as regards judging the efficiency of his subordinates. I don't think I brought the fact of 1st defendant recommending reduction of the establishment to the notice of the Accountant General. I have no doubt that it was Mr. Donald who brought it to the notice of the Accountant General. I did not bring it to his notice, because I went up-country on Government business either in Oct. or November 1872. 1st defendant might have shown me the statement before he took it to Mr. Donald, because I think I was just then relinquishing charge of the department. I might have spoken to him. I don't think I was angry with him; I was neither pleased nor displeased with him."

"I know a man named Mooregum, he has been Cashier in the Exchange Department since December 1872. I was away for about three weeks, and came back. He is my family doctor, I spoke to Mr. Biggs and got him transferred on the same pay to the Paper Currency Department, having been found incompetent. This Document, No. 22, is the

from whom he had extorted a statement inculcating Memorialist), and asked him what work had ever been executed for Memorialist by the artizans, he then and there picked up a brass mould which he said was one of the things made for Memorialist, but which one of the men, Filer Soondra Chary, instantly pointed out had been manufactured under orders from Mr. Donald† for a railing on account of Saint George's Cathedral and not for your Memorialist. Hereupon Mr. Lodwick seized Soondra Chary by the throat and squeezed it so violently as to cause him grievous hurt. For this assault the man took out a summons at the Police Court against Mr. Lodwick, which resulted in the latter being fined in a sum of Rupees 100 with Court costs Rupees 200.

second Appeal* to the Local Government, as by Kissun Sing's own admission† in his deposition before the Magistrate: while so determined was Mr. Lodwick in combination with Kissun Sing to crush your Memorialist, that he did not scruple to bring forward as witnesses for the Prosecution the very men who had been from time to time variously punished by Memorialist for their misconduct, and a list of whose names will be found in the Appendix to the second Appeal to the Local Government.

6. That by the reduction of the Establishment of the Stamping Department consequent upon a diminution of the work therein performed, and in opposition to Kissun Sing's wishes as respects more particularly the curtailment of his favorite Ramanada Pillay's salary, your Memorialist effected a saving to Government of

* Vide page 5 of the defence portion of Pamphlet marked B, in which Mr. Donald stated thus:—
"I got the brass work No. 8 made for the Cathedral. This is muster * * * Eight like this (No. 8) and 4 pillars twisted thick like this wooden master, were made."

"order transferring Moorogassam dated 10th December 1872. I find by this order that I did not recommend him; this is the order now marked No. 28, fixing him 2 Rupees for carelessness. I don't think I interfered at all on behalf of Moorogassam. I spoke to Mr. Biggs on another occasion. I spoke to Mr. Biggs for his promotion and transfer in the same department. Mr. Biggs said he could not comply with my request as I gave security for Moorogassam for 500 Rs. for his post in the Exchange Department. I was neither pleased nor displeased with 1st defendant for what he had done. Moorogassam's pay was 20 Rupees. In the arrangement consequent on 1st defendant's suspension I increased his salary. I recommended increasing of his pay from 20 to 30 Rupees, and it was done. His duties are just the same now as before in the Exchange Department; there is a Matriculated Student who is drawing 35 Rupees a month. I put Moorogassam over him. I don't see any order regarding the Matriculated Student that he is unfit for work."

"I know a man named Moothosawmy, he was a peon in the Money Order Department: part of this man's duty is to purchase articles for domestic purposes out of office hours at my house, for which I paid him. I believe he was transferred to the Paper Currency Department, but not at my instance. I increased his pay from 7 to 10 Rupees. 1st defendant sent him back to the Money Order Office, saying he would not have him. He was then getting 7 Rupees. I had no pleasure or displeasure with 1st defendant for treating him in this way. Since 1st defendant's suspension Moothosawmy's pay has been increased to 10 Rupees. I dismissed him three months ago from attending to my domestic calls because he was impertinent to my house people. I recommended him because he was all right in the office work. Moothosawmy is acting for gollah Khatnah Pillay who was suspended in connexion with this case. I believe he gets 10 Rupees a month on my recommendation. I am not aware of the order of Government directing that the gollah's pay should be reduced from 10 to 8 Rupees."

"Appiah is my private servant; he was brought into office by me last year while I was in charge of the Stamp Department; he was sent away by 1st defendant with others. I believe he was getting certain acting allowances; I was not in Madras when he was sent away. On my return I heard of it. I did not blame 1st defendant because the man was sent away by the Assistant in charge; at present he is acting for a peon on 7 Rupees under my recommendation; he comes to my house whenever I want to do my private work."

proceedings in the Police Court, namely, firstly, the misappropriation of two fines, one of one Rupee and the other of Eight Annas instead of both being credited to Government; and, secondly, the distribution of Mysore Counters' pay among three instead of two men. The first of these charges was so manifestly absurd as to carry with it its own refutation, since no sane man could for a moment suppose that one in Memorialist's official position of 24 years' standing with a salary of Rs. 250 a month attached thereto, would hazard all his reasonable prospects of advancement and pension for the sake of a paltry Rupee and a half; the simple truth being that this sum, as well as stoppages from the pay of absentees, was paid away as remuneration to volunteers employed in the Office according to a custom long prevalent therein, as was well known to both Mr. Donald and Kissun Sing who were bound to abolish the practice if they considered it objectionable. Mr. Lodwick himself admitted before the Magistrate that the division of fines amongst volunteers appeared in the acquittance roll passed by the Assistant Kissun Sing, and yet he sought to build up a criminal accusation against Memorialist on this very point. In respect of the other charge, to wit, the division by Memorialist, without orders, of the Mysore Counters' pay among three instead of two men, it may suffice to state that such division was owing to the Mysore Government decreasing the allowance they originally granted on account of the stamping work done for them, and that it was made with the cognizance and express sanction of Mr. Donald; the money being regularly paid month after month in the presence of Kissun Sing, and the acquittance rolls duly signed by the Counters for more than two years. The following Extracts from the depositions before the Police Court of Messrs. Lodwick, Kissun Sing, Donald, and VanDerwart, will clearly show that your Memorialist's conduct in connection with the above affair was well known to them and therefore strictly honest and straightforward:—

238 Rs. a month in 1872-73 which will show with what zeal and earnestness he worked in the interests of the State while it raised up for him no end of enmity in the Office, and how ruthlessly he has nevertheless been persecuted: it being note-worthy that the manner in which Ramanada Pillay was employed after your Memorialist's suspension was explained by his patron Kissun Sing in his deposition before the Police Magistrate wherein he stated as follows:—

"Ramanada Pillay's appointment is in the Paper Currency Department. Vide page 14 of Pamphlet marked E. "on 60 Rs. Since 1st defendant's suspension he has not done a

"day's work, but was specially deputed to the Stamp Department—this was at my suggestion to the Accountant General. He is now doing the Mysore work. I cannot account why Ramanada Pillay was put in for the supervision of the Stamping Department when Mr. VanDerwart could have done it. Ramanada Pillay puts his initials in the book as attending the Paper Currency Department. Such is the state of things. Ramanada Pillay has his own work in the Paper Currency Department which he is not performing. He has no special business except the supervision of the Stamping Department and assisting this prosecution."

7. That your Memorialist would now advert to the only two specific charges whereupon he was avowedly dismissed by Mr. Lodwick before even the commencement of Pro-

Mr. Lodwick says:—"I dismissed the 1st defendant on 21st November 1873, I dismissed him for matters unconnected with this prosecution. I dismissed him because he divided the pay of two men amongst three. He gave Rs. 3-5-4 to each of the

Vide pages 5 & 6 of the Pamphlet marked E.

"three men instead of giving 5 Rs. to each of the two men. Kissun Sing brought this to my notice. The first defendant also divided certain fines amongst Volunteers which ought to go to the credit of Government. It was 1 Rupee, 8 Annas. These were the two grounds upon which he was dismissed; he was dismissed on those and not on the other grounds because he was under trial upon the other charges. I did not give him any opportunity of knowing what the charges were against him. There is acquittance roll month after month. This is for extra work done out of Office hours. Before my dismissal of 1st defendant, and before this prosecution, I had no complaints of these men. Kissun Sing brought the matter to my notice about fines. The division of fines amongst the Volunteers appeared in the acquittance roll, passed by the Assistant Kissun Sing. I have found fault with Kissun Sing. I don't think he deserves dismissal."

Kissun Sing says:—"I did some special work for Mysore and special allowance allowed by Mysore Government. Prior to January 1872, they allowed

Vide page 13 of the Pamphlet marked E.

"40 Rs., after that Rs. 30 was allowed. Prior to January 1872, there were three Counters and one Accountant for this work, the work was just the same all along, even after the reduction, the same three men were employed on the reduced salary as were employed before January 1872. The Mysore Government got the service of the very same men on the reduced salary which they proposed for two men. Neither the Mysore Government nor this Government was defrauded of any money, and in fact the Mysore Government got the same work done by the three men which they wished to get done by two. I passed these payments when I was acting, but unknowingly. Mr. VanDerwart made these payments in my presence, not 1st defendant. No objection was ever raised by these workmen till after this prosecution."

Mr. Donald says:—"It is quite immaterial for the Mysore Government whether the work was done by three or two. I have never received any complaint from Counters that they were paid Rs. 3-5-4

Vide page 5 of the defence portion in the Pamphlet marked E.

"instead of Rs. 5. The first time I heard about it was

"when this charge was prepared against the 1st defendant."

Mr. VanDerwart says:—"No complaint was ever made to me while I was Manager of 3 Counters receiving Rs. 3-5-4 each instead of 2 Counters receiving 5 Rs. each per month. Three men were

Vide page 3 of the defence portion in the Pamphlet marked E.

"first employed on Rs. 5 each, but the Mysore Government reduced the amount from Rs. 15 to 10 which

"was divided amongst three instead of two; first defendant told me that he had orders to do so from the Assistant Accountant General who was Mr. Donald and always paid the Counters in the presence of the Assistant."

8. That so great, however, was Mr. Lodwick's anxiety to obtain a conviction that he attempted to fix a fresh criminal charge on your Memorialist, namely, that of tampering with what is called the Mysore Court Fees Labels, and went so far as to telegraph to Calcutta for Mr. Biggs (formerly his Assistant in charge of the Paper Currency and Stamping Departments) to come down under the hope and belief that something would be elicited from him in support of the charge, but like the rest it had to be completely abandoned by the Counsel for the prosecution as the charge was utterly without foundation: so that Mr. Lodwick had nothing to rely upon but the wild statements of two common workmen whom your Memorialist had fined and suspended. So precipitate and ill-advised was the action taken by the Accountant General in reference to this matter, that he not only needlessly put the Government to considerable inconvenience and expense in having to pay for Mr. Biggs' passage to and from Bengal but, heedless of all consequences, put himself in instant communication with the Mysore authorities, the result of which was that the confidence reposed by them in the work so long and well executed for them in Madras has been completely destroyed, and the work of stamping on their account has been put an end to.

9. That after all these futile attempts against your Memorialist, he would now beg to notice the significant fact that the charges actually proceeded with against him at the Police Court dwindled down to his having caused certain of the articles removed from his house, (such as door brass knobs, pillar rings, 1 brass door handle, iron bars, mamutees, and crowbars, &c.) to be made for him by the mechanics in the Office out of Government materials; an allegation of which, though having no foundation in fact, so far as it concerned your Memorialist, Mr.

*Vide deposition pages 9 and 10 of the Pamphlet marked E in which Mr. Lodwick stated as follows:—

"I don't recollect of a key having been put by men in the Office to a bureau in my house. I may have done it, but I don't recollect. * * I had some small repairs made to my Portmanteau. * * It may have been done by Office people. * * I had a key put to it. I had a piece of wood put on two other pieces as a stand for my house. The piece of wood was Government property. I have a right to use it. It is in the Office. I never took it * * I know Damodara Pillay employed in the Office, he is the head of the Audit Department. I bought one Arcu-nut cane from him. I don't know what I paid for it. I did not ask him to get silver rings put to it. I have not got it. I gave it away in England. I did not receive any diamond studs from Damodara Pillay. I got some silver tops made through him for which I paid. I got a *goulet* stand made in the Office during the time I lived there; I paid for it. It was made of teakwood, we have no teakwood in the Office. I took it home and brought it back to the Office since this prosecution and presented at the Office. I got four pegs for a list stand made by some body. I paid 3 Annas for it. I never took it to my house. When I went to England I gave it to a peon. I have since ordered it to be brought and presented at the Office on *pro-posing to give the peon the value of it*; I did so, because people would say that I got things made at the Office and not paid for them."

Judge sitting in his turn at the Quarter Sessions, viz., Mr. Justice Innes. The Advocate General assisted by the Government Solicitor conducted the prosecution, but after examining 4 or 5 witnesses, he informed the Court that he would not take up any more of its time by proceeding any further, as the witnesses had broken down in their statements, and that he could not ask the jury to convict your Memorialist upon such evidence as that tendered; whereupon His Lordship the Chief Justice observed that the learned Advocate of the Crown was exercising a wise discretion and directed the jury to return a verdict of *not guilty*, which they unhesitatingly did. Thus it will be seen that the prosecution collapsed entirely, notwithstanding the long time Mr. Lodwick had been allowed for his preparations, and that your Memorialist was fully and honorably acquitted.

10. That as affording a striking contrast with the case of your Memorialist he may here be permitted not inappropriately to cite that of Mr. Chadwick, a subordinate of the Medical Establishment, who as a British-born subject was committed by the Sessions Judge of Negapatam to the Madras Quarterly Sessions Court on the charge of "issuing and signing a false Certificate, forgery, intentionally giving false evidence, &c." and whose trial came on the day after your Memorialist's; that whereas the Apothecary who was also honorably acquitted of the offences he was accused of, was re-instated in the service by Government and paid all arrears of salary as well as Court costs, Your Memorialist has not had the smallest consideration vouchsafed to him, but has been throughout treated as a common convicted felon; and this, too, although Mr. Chadwick had the advantage of getting all the witnesses for the prosecution examined, while there was no prosecution at all in the instance of your Memorialist, it having been, as before stated, entirely relinquished by the Advocate General, almost at the very outset, as the excerpts herewith appended from the Honorable Mr. Cunningham's Report to Government, taken from the *Madras Athenaeum and Daily News*, dated 18th and 30th July 1874, further show:—

"The enquiry started with the dismissal of a workman named Manickum in consequence of his replies while under interrogation. The dismissal had apparently the desired effect, for the next day he came back with a statement and was thereupon re-instated. No more distinct witness could of course be held out to a set of ignorant mechanics and coolies than such a proceeding and a jury might reasonably refuse to put any confidence in statements so elicited."

3 Particularly that of Office Moulder Ganesappa Chetty (which may serve as a type of all the other witnesses) who under the threats and tutorage of the Police Officers, of whom Mr. Inspector Simpson was the Chief stated at first something before the Magistrate but on cross-examination veered round and made a statement diametrically opposed to his previous one as to making certain articles for Memorialist in the Office.
Vide pages 26 and 27 of the Depositions contained in the Pamphlet marked E.

Lodwick confessedly declared* the applicability to himself; but notwithstanding the evidence,|| such as it was, adduced by the prosecution to substantiate these charges, the Magistrate deemed it necessary to send up the case to the Sessions, saying in substance that he did not wish to take upon himself the responsibility of disposing of a matter put forward by an Officer so high in the service of Government as the Accountant General, and that he therefore thought it best to commit the case to the High Court for trial by jury under the guidance of a learned Judge. Accordingly it came on for trial on the 4th February 1874 before, strange to say, a *Special Court* presided over by the Chief Justice himself Sir Walter Morgan, all the other cases, of which there were only 9, being tried by the

"But this was not all, during the prolonged interrogatories to which the workmen were subjected and which began with an absolute denial on the part of all save Manickum, that any work had been improperly done, it came out that on one occasion the Accountant General, enraged at what he considered the falsity of one of the men examined, had seized him by the throat. The man explained afterwards that he had misunderstood the question, which, as it had to be interpreted, is likely enough to have been the case. But, however that may be, the effect of the Head of a Department treating subordinates who are before him under interrogation with violence of this description was obviously calculated to drive ignorant and frightened Natives, some of them mere boys, into saying whatever they thought would be safest to say. In fact as one of our witnesses said, the proceedings of the Accountant General struck terror into the whole Office."

"Another circumstance which here most unfavorably against the prosecution was the summary dismissal of Iyasawmy during the preliminary investigations on grounds which certainly appeared so glaringly insufficient as to give the proceeding an aspect of oppression and vindictiveness, besides of course, encouraging the witnesses to treat the dismissed official as a fallen man, whom, it was certainly safe and probably advisable to assail with accusations."

"These observations will, I believe, satisfy Government that the case when I abandoned it, was not only desperate, but so transparently desperate, that had I persisted in it any longer it would have been only to invite an inevitable hostile verdict, coupled, probably, with some severe observations from the Court on the unsound character of the prosecution and the unwise precipitancy with which it was set on foot."

The same Journal in its issue of 30th July 1874, published the following extract from the Advocate General's report:—

"Upon the whole, the Defence would have urged, and in my opinion, have urged with justice, that the evidence was got out of the witnesses by means which robbed it of all pretensions to trustworthiness."

11. Judging from the above quotations, your Memorialist may reasonably infer that the Advocate General's entire report must have been not only wholly condemnatory of the Prosecution but strongly in favor of your Memorialist, who would fain hope, it will be submitted to your Lordship by the Local Government as being a document of the greatest importance to him, written as it is, by the highest legal adviser of the Crown in this Presidency who had the best means of judging of all the merits of the case, and was at the same time a thoroughly impartial but able recorder of all what had transpired. Your Memorialist would therefore, respectfully request Your Lordship to call for the Honble Mr. Cunningham's report, as he feels certain it will give Your Lordship a clear insight into the whole of the Proceedings of the Prosecution.

12. That after passing unscathed through the ordeal of a trial both before the Police and Sessions Courts on the 4th February 1874,

* 2nd Appeal marked C.

Your Memorialist addressed* the Government on 13th idem, soliciting restoration to his ap-

pointment in the Paper Currency and Paper Stamping Departments, payment of the arrears of salary and re-imbursement of the Law Costs, to which he had been compulsorily put in his own vindication through the well-known impulsiveness of Mr. Lodwick and the cruel and unprecedented measures adopted by that gentleman against Your Memorialist; but, to Your Memorialist's surprise, instead of a compliance with

* BOARD OF REVENUE, 13th May 1874.

Under instructions from Government the undersigned hereby requires the attendance of E. Iyasawmy Moodelly, late Manager Stamping Department in the Accountant General's Office at the said Accountant General's Office on Friday the 15th May at 12 o'clock (noon).

(Signed) G. THORNHILL.

First Member Board of Revenue.

his reasonable request, he received an intimation* as per margin dated 13th May 1874, or at the lapse of three months from the date of his appeal, from Mr. Thornhill, first Member of the Revenue Board of his (Memorialist's) attend-

ance being required at the Accountant General's Office on 15th idem, when he found that this Gentleman had been deputed by Government to make a Departmental enquiry into certain fresh charges brought against him by Mr. Lodwick, whose strong feeling in the case is thus clearly demonstrated beyond all doubt.

13. The gist of Mr. Lodwick's supplemental charges was Your Memorialist's most unfairly assumed responsibility for:—

1st. Two Mysore Plate Dies for Receipt Labels alleged to have been lost while in the hands of the workmen.

2nd. One Mysore master Die of Rupees 1,000 missing and,

3rd. One small round blank Die, for Madras Stamp, found in Your Memorialist's Office desk, as contained in the only two paragraphs of Mr. Lodwick's letter to Government that were supplied to Your Memorialist by the Commissioner Mr. Thornhill, and which are given below:—

25th. "When we began to examine the Almira's of Dies, two plates containing 30 dies each, and one 1,000 Rupees master stamp were found missing. It appeared that these were given out of stock to be used as masters by the workmen and were never returned. While in the hands of the workmen Iyasawmy as Manager was responsible for the safe custody of these important articles, and should certainly have reported their loss when he found them not forthcoming for return—(Vide accompaniment marked C). This he did not do, and nothing was known of their being lost till the examination which I ordered to be instituted revealed the fact."

26th. "Again, it was found that he must have been in the habit of causing brass dies to be made, without orders, one such die already made, and only requiring to be engraved was found by myself in his desk, and my Assistant Kisan Sing, as will be seen by the document marked U, besides having given any orders for the formation of this die."

14. Instead of here entering variation upon the above groundless accusations, Your Memorialist respectfully begs leave to refer Your Lordship to his hurriedly drawn up defence in which he has dilated at some length on these fresh charges, shewing as that document does that Mr. Lodwick could not possibly have had any object in putting them forward at the eleventh hour, as it were, save that of creating a belief that there was really something to support his former proceedings which the result of the cases already alluded to clearly proved to have arisen from malicious and vindictive information furnished by his Native Assistant Kisan Sing, whose implacable hatred Your Memorialist had aroused, as aforementioned, by the punitive measures he adopted, in the conscientious discharge of his public duty against Ramnada Pillay and certain other workmen of the Stamping Department, and thus compassing Your Memorialist's ruin through the ignorance of those very men whose testimony had been pronounced to be utterly unworthy of credit by both the Police and Sessions Courts, and whose asseverations on the present occasion were, in all probability, as much prompted by the terror they had been inspired with, as by a desire to ingratiate themselves with the head of the Department, Kisan Sing, who was actually responsible for all, if any of the losses, &c. And Memorialist would further respectfully remark that the enquiry was not conducted in that impartial and open manner your Memorialist had every right to expect, as will hereafter be shewn. The Commissioner absolutely refused to allow Memorialist any legal aid towards rebutting the charges and thus although he himself—most irregularly your Memorialist submits—forwarded a long string of leading questions to Mr. Donald then on leave on the Neilgherry Hills. Memorialist was merely asked to put in any questions he chose for transmission simultaneously with the Commissioner's note, and Mr. Lodwick's; and upon your Memorialist's expressing his inability to do so without first knowing the nature of the interrogatories by the Court or at least Mr. Donald's replies thereto, he was informed that he would not be permitted hereafter to put any questions whatever. Your Memorialist has taken upon himself to apply the term "leading" to those questions put by Messrs. Thornhill and Lodwick because, that they must have been so, is fairly deducible from the nature of the answers returned and which are given below:—

1. I do consider Iyasawmy responsible for the loss of Mysore Dies taken out as master.
2. No. Iyasawmy never reported their return to the Almira to me.
3. Yes. I did report the loss of two Mysore Die-plates to the Accountant General.
4. Yes. I was present when all the Court Fees Dies were put into the Almira. I always open the Almira myself.
5. I cannot say whether Iyasawmy was present as I am unable to recall the particulars attending the placing of Mysore Court Fees Plates in the Almira.

6. For the above reason I cannot say who were present.

7 & 8. I do not recollect of Iyasawmy having reported to me any thing about the loss of the two Mysore Die-plates.

9. Iyasawmy never reported the absence of the two Plates.

10. Yes. I reported to the Accountant General of the discovery of the loss of master Die.

11. No. Master Die was never returned to my custody—never destroyed by Iyasawmy in my presence or under my orders nor the loss was reported to me.

12. Certainly on the understanding that the brass issued should be used for the particular purpose entered in the book, there was no strict order on the subject.

13. Iyasawmy had no authority to give orders to make new Dies or keep spare ones and give them to the workmen without my orders, when I was in charge there was no written requisition in use.

14. No. I was not present. I came after the unfinished Die was found on Mr. Lodwick sending for me.

15. I did hear the Accountant General asking how that Die came to be where it is found.

16. I received no satisfactory answer from any one.

17. I don't know whether the key of the Desk was taken from Mr. VanDerwart.

18. Yes. The Engraver did say that he would engrave any value if ordered by Iyasawmy.

19. I consider myself that Iyasawmy was too hard upon the men in the Stamping Department.

20. Yes. I did occasionally refuse to punish the men because I consider Iyasawmy too severe.

21. It was Iyasawmy's duty to Superintend the work of the Stamping Department by frequently visiting the rooms, but his work in the Currency Department was such that he was unable to go continually.

22. He frequently went into the different rooms.

23. While I was in charge, Iyasawmy as Manager saw all the letters received and written by me regarding Plates, Dies, &c.

15. The above answers were noted down by your Memorialist as fast as they were read out to him by Mr. Thornhill in the presence of Mr. Lodwick, at the Revenue Board Office, where Memorialist attended in obedience to

* B. Iyasawmy is informed that Mr. Donald's answers to questions have been received, and Mr. Thornhill will be ready to read them to him at the Office of the Board of Revenue, at 12 o'clock on Tuesday 26th May.

Mr. Thornhill's 2nd note*, dated 25th May last. Your Lordship will thus see that your Memorialist was never furnished with authenticated copies either of the questions or replies,

and that he has therefore reason to characterise the Departmental enquiry as a partial one and not conducted in the open and regular manner he had every reason to expect it would have been.

16. Further more, the injustice of holding Memorialist accountable for the alleged loss of Dies, &c., six months after his removal from office, is so very transparent as to need no comment on his part, as is likewise the fact with reference to all the charges, none of them having a tittle of

evidence to sustain them, whilst the hardship of making Memorialist suffer for the remissness of others, is equally manifest from the Native Assistant Kissun Sing's own admissions before Mr. Thornhill in these words :—

Kissun Sing deposed :—“I cannot say positively that Ramanada takes out the required dies or more. I cannot say positively that they are correctly returned in the evening. It is my duty to see it all and I did so whenever I went. Whenever I had pressure of work I don't see. In November or December last Mr. Donald took me to the almirah, I had the key, we both opened the almirah, and examined the dies with the list, and found two plates of 30 dies each missing and reported the same to the Accountant General. Mr. Donald did not say any thing about the information. All the almirahs containing the dies were in my charge. The Assistant in charge opens the die almirah and gives out the dies to the Accountant that requires them. Since of late a record is kept of the dies given out, previously no record was kept. There is a particular man for the Mysore work, paid a small remuneration by the Mysore Government. No Mysore dies were given to any one except Mr. VanDerwart and Ramanada Pillay. When I took charge of the Office I did not examine the dies. We never checked the dies taken out in the morning when returned in the evening. Since the discovery of the loss, a register is kept, that is since 17th December 1873. At the time of Iyasawmy's suspension the dies were in Mr. Donald's room; they were removed to my room in the latter end of January. Sometimes I go with Ramanada to take out dies, sometimes when I am engaged I give the keys to Ramanada and he goes and opens the almirah. The almirahs were in Mr. Donald's room for about three months from the date of Iyasawmy's suspension. Iyasawmy Moodelliar never came for the key. I heard of the two missing dies given out as musters in 1871 in November or December 1873. I consider Iyasawmy Modelhar responsible for the missing two plates, because as head of the department, it was his duty to see that they were put back in the almirah. Vydelinga Chary the Engraver, Narayanasawmy, Countery, Jayaram and Menickum Pressmen said that the missing two plates were brought down in 1871 when the Court fees new dies were made. They are of no use now. Vydelinga Chary Engraver said that three and four annas value plates were brought down as a muster. It was in Mr. Donald's time that the plates came down. I don't know, they may have been put back into the almirah, or may not.”

17. From Kissun Sing's own statement, therefore, Your Lordship will observe that Your Memorialist had nothing whatever to do with the Dies, the keys of the Die Almirahs as clearly admitted by Mr. Donald* and Kissun Sing were always held by themselves. The latter plainly stated that when he took charge of the Office he did not examine the Dies, neither did he check them when taken out in the morning and returned in the evening. Since Your Memorialist's removal from Office, Kissun Sing put Ramanada Pillay in charge of Mysore Dies and allowed him to open and shut the Almirah which contained them, there was no

check over him. The loss of the 2 plates said to have been missing must clearly therefore be chargeable to Kissun Sing and Ramanada Pillay and yet Mr. Lodwick has thrown the entire responsibility on Your Memorialist, notwithstanding the fact that Kissun Sing and Mr. VanDerwart had both clearly deposed that your Memorialist never went up for the keys of the Die almirah. Moreover the said 2 plates were of no earthly use whatever to any body, seeing they were last used in 1865 while at the Mint and superseded by the Mysore Court Fees Labels in 1871. Every witness for the prosecution, moreover, Your Lordship will remark, had a direct interest in your Memorialist's dismissal, or strong grounds for having a grudge against him. Your Lordship will also perceive that Kissun Sing having got your Memorialist dismissed admits himself that it was for an act he himself was responsible, and which he himself had passed.

18. Your Memorialist now begs to refer Your Lordship to certain evidence which clearly contradicts the statement made by Kissun Sing. Vydelinga Chary deposed :—

“I know nothing of the loss of the two dies. I never told Kissun Sing that 3 and 4 annas plates were brought as musters.” Mr. VanDerwart deposed as follows :—“Messrs. Donald, Biggs, and Kissun Sing were in charge of the department. Whenever work is received from the Mysore Government, I go to the Assistant in charge ask for the required dies, he hands me the key of the almirah, and I take the required dies. Kissun Sing never went with me, he used to seal his own. For about a year Kissun Sing was in charge of the department, and I don't remember of any single instance in which Kissun Sing came to the almirah. After I take the dies from almirah I take them downstairs. Never in any instance do I remember taking dies to Kissun Sing after they had been taken out from the almirah. Mr. Donald and Mr. Biggs sat in the same room as the dies were. When the dies are taken back in the evening, the Assistant in charge does not see them.

“No check over my opening and shutting, and I don't remember Iyasawmy Moodelliar going up himself for the Mysore plates at any time. I was not aware of the loss of the two dies for the two years I was in charge of the Mysore works.”

19. It is evident however to your Memorialist that either the evidence of the Prosecution witnesses has been believed, while that of Mr. VanDerwart, has been set aside by Mr. Thornhill as untrustworthy, or that Memorialist has been found guilty of faults he has never been charged with, and which in that case he has had no opportunity given him of rebutting or proving his innocence of same in any way :—In fact, as before remarked, Memorialist is still in the dark, as to the nature of the offence he stands convicted of having committed, and which has necessitated the Local Government passing the fearful sentence on him they have.

20. Your Memorialist would, however, respectfully beg to request Your Lordship's attention to the fact that Mr. VanDerwart has been fifteen years in the service, and was appointed to act for your Memorialist on his dismissal from his post of Manager of the Paper Currency Department. Mr. VanDerwart must have aspired to this post as the eventual reward in the shape of official promotion of long and faithful service to the Government. If ever therefore, Your Lordship must admit, there was a deep and strong motive for the action of self-interest above all other considerations, it is to be found in Mr. VanDerwart, the Deputy Officiating in your Memorialist's late post, and looking forward to eventually becoming its permanent incumbent.

It was to Mr. VanDerwart's interest surely to give such evidence, as while inculpating your Memorialist would immeasurably strengthen his claims to be your Memorialist's successor. Such being Mr. VanDerwart's position with respect to your Memorialist, your Memorialist would respectfully ask Your Lordship, whether Mr. VanDerwart's evidence is not to be accepted in preference to any evidence that has been adduced against your Memorialist. Are his position and standing in the office, and as such, his trustworthiness as a witness not to be estimated far above the character and official position of the four chief witnesses who have been brought against your Memorialist? Your Memorialist respectfully submits that the evidence in his favour altogether preponderates over that which has been adduced against him: in fact the latter is utterly unworthy of credit, when the character and motives of the witnesses are taken into consideration. The witnesses for the Prosecution at the Departmental enquiry had previously been all examined at the Police Court trial, and at the Sessions, and your Memorialist would here again respectfully request Your Lordship's earnest and particular attention to the results of these trials, the remarks that fell from the bench, and the comments of the Advocate General in his report on this case to Government.

21. One other incident as indicative of the irregular—and your Memorialist would almost be thinks he justified in saying—on fair way the enquiry was conducted, is so remarkable that he cannot omit mention of it. He alludes to the singular fact that before the close of the enquiry into

* E. Iyasawmy Moodelliar is requested to attend at the Accountant General's Office to-morrow Friday 5th, at 11-30 A. M.

(Signed) G. THORNHILL.

June 4th, Thursday.

† To

G. THORNHILL, Esq.
&c. &c. &c.

Sir,—I shall feel much obliged by your furnishing me with a copy of the two charges now brought against me by Mr. Lodwick and which you have been deputed by Government to enquire into. This I require to enable me to draw up my defence. In the last enquiry you were pleased to favor me with copy of the charges then brought and I trust therefore that you will do the same in the present instance. I beg to remain, &c.,

(Signed) E. IYASAWMY.

MADRAS, 6th June 1874.

‡ Marked H. See page 3, paragraph 11.

the foregoing three charges, Memorialist discovered on his attendance again at the Accountant General's Office on 5th June 1874, in pursuance of a note* from Mr. Thornhill, that a still further charge had been put forward by Mr. Lodwick involving the insinuation that Memorialist had over-charged the Mysore Government with 35 Rs. for some work done by contractors for them in 1871, which sum it was said he had appropriated to his own use. This supplemental charge is contained in the appended Memorandum which was sent by Mr. Thornhill to your Memorialist at his request† in writing and has been, your Memorialist respectfully submits, so thoroughly met in his second defence‡ as to require no further notice here.

"The additional charge, and there is only one, in regard to which E. Iyasawmy is now called on for explanation is comprised in the following extract from a letter addressed by the Accountant General to Government under date 23rd May 1874:—

"In May 1871 certain engravers signed the document, copy of which accompanies this letter marked A, by which it will be seen they were to receive Rs. 300 for making 20 plates of 30 dies each from the master given them or at the rate of 8 Annas a die. On the 13th February 1872 a document appears to have been laid before Mr. Donald with Iyasawmy's initials attached in proof of its correctness in which Rs. 350 were charged for payment to the engravers for engraving 21 plates or 35 Rupees more than should have been charged to the Mysore Government."

"This document, copy of which marked B is sent, was signed by Mr. Donald as the Assistant in charge and the amount was recovered from the Mysore Government."

(True Extract)

(Signed) G. THORNHILL,

First Member Board of Revenue.

5th June, 1874.

22. On the subject of this particular charge Mr. Thornhill, before he could have received the sanction of Government to its entertainment and before your Memorialist knew any thing at all about it, had already obtained the following answers from Mr. Donald who was at the time on the Neilgherry Hills, thus clearly establishing the fact, your Memorialist submits, that evidence was being taken in a most irregular manner. Mr. Donald's answers to obviously leading questions, as read out to Memorialist by the Commissioner, were as follows:—

"I was not aware till now any such charge was made for engraving Mysore Die Plates. To the best of my recollection the accounts were passed by me without examining the individual items, because it bore the initial of Iyasawmy and it did never occur to me to check the engraving charge with the agreement. I held Iyasawmy responsible for its correctness."

23. Your Memorialist cannot but feel that he has fallen a victim to the machinations of Kissun Sing and to the only too ready ear lent to his false representations by Mr. Lodwick as the two defences* abundantly testify, and Memorialist can only trust that the Madras Government may see fit to transmit to your Lordship the Depositions taken down by the Commissioner, Mr. Thornhill, along with his Report on the result of the Departmental enquiry.

* Marked G. and H.

24. That after patiently enduring all the troubles and privations incidental to the proceedings at the Police, High Court and Commissioner's Court, and after the establishment of his innocence of the several accusations that had been brought against him, your Memorialist naturally looked forward to the redress prayed for in his Appeal* to Government, dated 13th February 1874, but to his extreme surprise he received the following endorsement on 13th July or exactly 5 months from the date of the Appeal:—

* Marked C.

"REVENUE DEPARTMENT."

"Read Petition from E. Iyasawmy Moodelhar, late Manager of the Paper Currency and Paper Stamping Departments, Accountant General's Office, praying to be restored to Office from which he has been removed by the Accountant General."

"(H. E. 13th February 1874.)"

"The Government decline to restore Petitioner to the appointments from which he has been dismissed by the Accountant General, or to entertain his request for payment of the expenses to which he has been put in defending himself."

(By Order)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,

Acting Secretary to Government.

Ootacamund, 13th July 1874.

To E. IYASAWMY MOODELLAR.

* Marked D.

25. On the receipt of this order your Memorialist appealed* again to Government under date the 17th July 1874, soliciting a re-consideration of his whole case with reference to the Advocate General's report and respectfully begging to be informed whether in the event of their not being disposed to re-instate him in his appointments, he should consider himself debarred from all further employment in the Public Service with or without the loss of his past services of upwards of 24 years; but such appeal was curtly disposed of as follows:—

"GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS."

"Petition Department."

"Endorsement on No. 2,139 of 1874."

"The Government decline to re-consider the Order referred to which carries with it the usual consequences as to past service."

"Should any Officer apply for his services the Governor in Council will be prepared to consider the question of permitting Petitioner's re-employment."

(By Order)

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,

Acting Secretary to Government.

Ootacamund, 17th August 1874.

26. Your Memorialist would respectfully beg to request your Lordship's particular attention to the above order. The local Government seemed to hesitate to say that your Memorialist shall hereafter be held unfit to hold any office under Government, but pass an order, which so far as your Memorialist is concerned, is tantamount to an order of utter unfitness for Government employ having been issued against him. And were he guilty of any offence requiring the terrible punishment, the Madras Government have thought proper to inflict on him, your Memorialist humbly submits, that the Government would have been more than justified in passing such an order, but they do not, and say "should any Officer apply for his (Memorialist's) services the Governor in Council will be prepared to consider the question of permitting Petitioner's re-employment?"

* Marked E.

27. As a last resource your Memorialist applied* for transcripts of the Advocate General's report as well as Mr. Thornhill's, to enable him to submit his whole case in a complete form to the Home Government; but this request, like his two previous Petitions, was equally summarily disposed of.

"GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS."

"Petition Department."

"Endorsement on Petition from E. Iyasawmy, late Manager Paper Currency and Paper Stamping Departments, applying for copies of certain papers connected with his case, dated 29th August 1874."

"The Petitioner's request is inadmissible."

(By Order)

(Signed) L. CAMPBELL,

Acting Under Secretary to Government.

Ootacamund, 7th September 1874.

28. That while his own conscience acquits him of any misconduct whatsoever deserving the fearful and unrestricted punishment with which he has been visited, your Memorialist would urge on Your Lordship's special attention the following Extracts from the depositions of three chief witnesses at the Police Court, together with the accompanying pamphlet of testimonials* from all the Gentlemen under whom he has had the honor to serve:—

* Marked A.

Mr. Donald deposed :—" I have known 1st defendant 2 or 3 years before he came to the Fort. I was his immediate superior. I always entertained a very high opinion of 1st defendant. That was the opinion he brought with him from his previous employers. 1st defendant kept his subordinates well up to their work."

Mr. Biggs deposed :—" I was Asst. Acct. Genl. from the 24th October 1872 to 1st May 1873. 1st defendant was employed under me in the Stamping Department. During the time he was under me I was satisfied with his duties. He used to make his subordinates work well. He was rather strict with the subordinates and kept them up to their work."

Kissun Sing deposed :—" I have known the 1st defendant for the last 7 or 8 years when the Currency Department was first established. He gets 200 Rupees in the Currency Department and 50 Rupees in the Stamping Department. * * As far as my knowledge goes, he is a man of respectable character. From 1861 or 1862, 1st defendant has been Manager in the Paper Currency Department. During this time some lac and crores of Rupees must have passed through his hands. From the time the Paper Currency Department came to our office, I never found fault with him. No complaint has ever been made by any of the Paper Currency men against the 1st defendant."

* Vide page 7 of the Pamphlet marked A.

" I hereby certify that E. Iyasawmy served under me during the year I acted as Currency Commissioner of Madras, and that I had every reason to be satisfied with the way in which he conducted the responsible duties entrusted to his charge. He bore a high character as an intelligent, industrious and trustworthy official when he came under my superintendence, and I have much pleasure in stating that I have every reason to confirm the opinion held of him by his former superiors."

(Signed) R. W. LODWICK,

Acting Currency Commissioner, Madras.

ACCOUNTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
MADRAS, 28th March 1872.

" This is to certify that the bearer Iyasawmy, served under me in the Currency Department when I acted as Accountant General of Madras for 1 year, and always proved himself a most valuable Government servant. His duties are onerous, and he performs them with great zeal and ability, and has obtained the approval and confidence of the Assistant in charge of the Currency Department and of his former superiors in consequence."

(Signed) R. W. LODWICK,

Acting Accountant General.

MADRAS,
3rd April 1872.

29. Notwithstanding, however, the good opinion Mr. Lodwick had formed of Memorialist only two years ago, he completely altered such opinion last year by having your Memorialist arraigned as a felon before the highest Judicial tribunal in this country, charged with such

* See page 4, Clause VI of para. 1 of this Memorial.

grave offences as those already noticed, and in redemption of the promise* the Accountant General had made to the workmen of the Stamping Department he immediately on receipt of the Order of Government confirming Memorialist's dismissal actually did promote them or enhanced their pay and dismissed all the hands who gave evidence in Memorialist's behalf, amongst whom was his Deputy Mr. VanDerwart, who was degraded in his official rank and pay and all your Memorialist fears, because he declined to speak or give evidence against Memorialist, at either of the trials or at the Departmental enquiry, while witnesses who have shamefully perjured themselves at your Memorialist's heavy expense and suffering, have on the other hand, as Your Lordship will have perceived from what has gone before, been promoted. Your Memorialist humbly urges that these facts speak for themselves, and speak volumes on his behalf.

30. Your Memorialist would also further most respectfully submit that from what has gone before, he has clearly shewn that the inclination of the Madras Government was (as was but natural) to support—probably on public policy to a great extent—the action taken by a head of a large and important Department and a high Covenanted Officer, against a native subordinate in the Uncovenanted ranks. That the Madras Government's position was a difficult one, your Memorialist readily admits, but, at the same time, he respectfully submits that the head of a Department should not be supported—when such an act necessitates a cruel injustice being committed on a subordinate of a lower service. And that in such a case, justice should be meted out impartially—no matter how unfortunate on public grounds the results of such impartial act may be—to both parties concerned. It is for Your Lordship to decide after a perusal of these papers whether Memorialist has been sacrificed to save a head of a Department from censure or not—or whether he has met with a punishment only adequate to the offences the Madras Government may allege he has committed.

31. Your Memorialist is apprehensive of his having trespassed too much on Your Lordship's valuable time, for which he humbly trusts his anxiety to put Your Lordship in possession of all the merits and demerits of his case may plead in his excuse and he would now, in conclusion, most respectfully beg, that Your Lordship, on a patient and dispassionate review of all the foregoing details, and taking into consideration his long, zealous and faithful service, embracing a period of nearly 25 years with a reputation heretofore unimpeached, and the termination in his complete vindication of the trials which he has been made to undergo upon mere surmises inferentially based upon the misrepresentations of a low set of men, may be graciously pleased to direct that he be re-instated in the appointments from which he humbly submits he has been undeservedly—may cruelly and harshly—removed, and be paid up all arrears of salary from November 1873; pardoning Memorialist for all expressions in the language he has employed that may appear to Your Lordship unnecessarily strong, humbly begging Your Lordship to bear in mind that he feels himself a grossly injured man, that he has suffered shame and humiliation under numerous indignities causelessly heaped upon him—his hitherto good name assailed—the privacy of his house invaded—his goods ransacked and taken away—his family frightened and plunged into the deepest sorrow—and he himself cast into prison for one night—deprived of every source of income for his own and household's maintenance, and compelled to contract debts to the extent of Rupees 6,000 wherewith to meet the demands of Counsel and Attorneys whom he was obliged to engage for his defence in consequence of the hasty, indiscreet and cruel action of Mr. Lodwick—an act of impartial and considerate justice for which your Memorialist as in duty bound,

WILL EVER PRAY,

E. Iyasawmy

Late Manager of the Paper Currency and

Paper Stamping Departments.

MADRAS,

23rd October 1874.

Register of E. Iyasawmy Modelliar's Services.

Establishment.	Appointment.	From	To	Salary.	Period of service in each appointment.				Total period of service in each Department.			Remarks.
					Years.	Months.	Days.		Years.	Months.	Days.	
Clothing Board Office	Writer	1st Sept. 1849 ..	31st May 1850 ..	Rs. 10	0	9	0					
Do.	Do.	1st June 1850 ..	31st Dec. 1851 ..	13	1	7	0		4	10	0	
Do.	Do.	1st Jan'y. 1852 ..	30th June 1854 ..	16	2	6	0					
Eastern Coast Canal Department	Do.	1st July 1854 ..	31st Jan. 1855 ..	35	0	7	0		2	1	0	
Do.	Head Writer	1st Feby. 1855 ..	31st July 1856 ..	50	1	6	0					
Revenue and P. W. Dept., Govt. Office	Clerk	1st Aug. 1856 ..	23rd May 1858 ..	50	1	9	26					
Do.	Acting Indorer	27th May 1858 ..	31st Oct. 1858 ..	60	0	5	5					
Do.	Indorer	1st Nov. 1858 ..	10th Aug. 1859 ..	60	0	9	10		5	6	17	
Do.	Superintendent of Reference	11th Aug. 1859 ..	5th Mar. 1861 ..	70	1	6	26					
Do.	Acting Examiner	6th Mar. 1861 ..	23rd do ..	85	0	0	23					
Do.	Superintendent of Reference	29th do ..	14th Feb. 1862 ..	70	0	10	17					
Paper Currency Department, Madras.	Accountant	15th Feb. 1862 ..	31st Aug. 1867 ..	100	5	6	15					
Do.	Do.	1st Sept. 1867 ..	4th Feby. 1870 ..	200	2	5	4		11	9	13	
Do.	Manager & Hd. Accountant	5th Feb. 1870 ..	31st Oct. 1873 ..	200	3	8	24					
Paper Stamping Department, Madras.	Manager*	1st Mar. do		50								
Total...					24	2	0		24	2	0	

* Put in charge on 4th January 1870, but without pay till 1st March following.

11
I think that Para 21
of Mr Robert's letter
maybe generally agreed
in and I would remit
Para 22 with the general
approval of government
to the Board of Revenue
& Director of Public Instruction
for reconsideration in
communication with
Mr Robert & with directing
to submit a detailed plan
to settle the matter
treated of therein with
as little delay as possible
- keeping in mind the
more extended Educational
Vaidya (if adopted) of
Government

As regards the
future I append a short
sketch of what I think
should be aimed at and
I fully agree with Mr Robert
that

that the men who are
required to give effect
to a general scheme
of Agricultural Education
can neither be found
nor produced for the
present in this country.
I would therefore make
arrangements for bringing
out, as proposed by
Mr. Linn, three or four
more Educated and
Scientific agriculturists
& Teachers from Europe.

I would obtain these
from Germany. Our
recent applications
to the Secretary of State
shows how serious is
the difficulty of procuring
such persons from
England & that the
expense is considerable.
In the meantime I
believe that Germany
affords

and that this effect upon the
Agriculture of the country is ^{far as}
~~time to time~~ ^{as far as possible}
is ascertained. I fear that the
tangible results are hitherto
entirely inconsiderable.

As regards Corniculture: I should
greatly be disposed to have selected
the establishment of the Paris meeting
that of Sydenham is ⁱⁿ a more
satisfactory condition, & would
we are better able to test the
results. It is however a part of

of the general scheme adopted last
in 1871: and I should be reluctant
to oppose the measure. If ^{it is} ~~it is~~ to
be established, I think that the
Hon. Mr. Sewin has indicated the
course which it is most desirable
to pursue.

Robert
Aug 2/74

Minute by
H. C. the Governor
dated August 1874.

Statement of Agricultural Colleges and Schools Ranges

Provincial District	Districts	Name	Area	Population	Experimental Station	Remarks
Central Division	Tamil Nadu	Chingleput	2753	940,744	Cuddalore	Cuddalore school and college
		North Arcot	7139	2,007,667	Vellore	
		South Arcot	4,873	1,762,525	Cuddalore	
		Vellore	8,462	1,375,349	Vellore	
Southern Division	Tamil Nadu	Tirunelveli	5,176	1,689,421	Palanesthah	Trichinopoly
		Madurai	9,502	2,259,263	Madurai	
		Trichinopoly	3,515	1,197,936	Trichinopoly	
		Coimbatore	3,654	1,975,042	Coimbatore	
Western Coast	Malabar	Malabar	6,002	2,274,466	Tellicherry	Tellicherry
		Canara and Konkan	3,902	9,18,870	Mangalore	
West Centre	Kilbary	Kilbary	749	50,194	Poly	Salem
		Coimbatore	7432	1,756,705	Coimbatore	
Central District	Salem	Salem	7483	1,963,243	Salem	Cuddalore
		Bellary	11,007	1,653,154	Bellary	
		Cuddalore	9,367	1,343,762	Cuddalore	
		Quator	8,036	1,429,252	Quator	
Northern Coast	Rajahmundry	Rajahmundry	6,224	1,584,179	Rajahmundry	Rajahmundry
		Vizagapatnam	18,344	2,284,254	Vizagapatnam	
		Barkham pore	8,313	1,487,227	Barkham pore	
		Barkham pore	8,313	1,487,227	Barkham pore	

Cramp 1978

18
Soli with Moh

I want to think
that the requirements
of the country are:-
I A chair of Agriculture
attached to the University
II A central Agricultural
College at Madras in
connection with the
Lydelpet farms.
III Four or five Provincial
Schools with superintendents
and Educational farms
of 40 to 50 acres attached
to each of them, in the
more important Districts
of the Presidency.
IV Sixteen or eighteen
Schools in Districts not
otherwise provided for.
V Elementary Agricultural
instruction in the various
literary

literary schools of the
country.

I The first of these
regiments may stand
out for a while, though
probably few things would
lead more strongly to
develop this important
branch of practical
Education and stimulate
Agricultural & Economic
Science in the country,
than the institution of
such a chair in connection
with the Madras University.

If the Lyceum Institution
should at once be put
on the footing of a College,
for we have the means
of making a creditable
beginning.

As regards the 3rd & 4th
heads, I have endeavoured
to make out the country
so as to show where
Provincial

Provincial & District
Schools should
be established as the
means of so doing
can be provided.

I have arranged the
Districts of the Presidency
into what I would call
Provinces, within each
of which there should be
a central Provincial
Agricultural School
under Scientific European
Management for the
advancement of Agricul-
tural Education
and practice amongst
Students from the
Provincial classes of
promising recruits
from District Schools
and the sons of landed
proprietors.

District schools might
be placed under District
Management.

Manufactured and
probably should be
supplied to as the
Provincial schools should
be contributed to by
local funds & fees.

The Order of the
Government of India
dated 14 March 1875
contemplates something
of the Irish system of
imparting elementary
instruction in agriculture
in the Literary Schools
of the Country - and I
would call on the
Educational Department
to report what may be
done in this direction
and ask Mr. Robinson
whether he would undertake
to prepare a series of
elementary books for
such use. A liberal
honorarium might be
offered.

Note by
The Hon. Mr. Robinson
Agricultural College

GO 19 March 75 No 446

My first book at many, I believe,
be carried out in the most ad-
-vantageous way, at least for
two years, when we shall be
able to judge - by actual ex-
-perience - whether it has for
the Experiment is likely to be
successful.

The plan I now include Rs
400 for the first year -
120 for the second - This would
be sufficient for 20 students @ 20 Rs

Rank which seems to
run from 1 to 100. A class
of 12 might be admitted in
the first year - and one of
the like number in the
second - in the third I should
hope that the stipendiary system
might be established - or at least
be introduced. The cause of boys
helpful for learning agriculture
though to be sure helped not the
encouragement given to a limited

extent at the school. A know-
ledge of agriculture will be va-
luable & useful in itself &
if united with the ^{other} acquirements
educational attainments, will
add to a man's qualifications
for employment in the West.
Debt - the Salt Commission - &
the branches of the Public Service
and increase his chances of
getting rich - I would not then
forehold out any hope of
a continuation of the Salt
Commission system to grow the first

two or three years. Private students
will of course be admitted to
any extent not beyond the teach-
ing power. Mr. Robertson contemplates
a class of students to attend
lectures only. I have no faith in
this system of Education but see
no objection to its being tried. Pro-
bably the College would be a better
place than the Farm for such
a purpose.

We have now Mr. Robertson
in his lecture at the Farm &

Searchly, more than a year ago the
Soc^y decided (7 April/13) that it
"is not necessary at present to discuss
"the large question raised by Mr. Robertson,
"whether it is expedient that the
"Soc^y should send delegates to
"general & conference in relation to
"the agricultural education of the
"people of this Province." It is now
proposed (as I understand) that we
should reconsider that decision.

in what powers I am available
to discuss. In my own part,
I remain of the opinion which led
me to suggest that portion of the
order. As to such place, I have
complete faith in the general
principles which require that
any exceptional aspect and
exceptional reasons should
be shown for any imposition
of taxes for the purpose of
contributing to the taxpayers.

instruction in the various kinds
of industry by which they have
~~for their~~ subsistence, a right to
wealth, and of which it is their
proper business to learn for themselves.
As a rule (I repeat) however, ~~except~~
large sacrifices may be made of this
is in the long run most conducive
to the interests of the poor, and
to the welfare (of which independence
is ~~an~~ essential part) of the people
themselves. This time but then
are not wanting grounds for treating
Indian agriculture as one

unapt to the task: The people of
India in ~~fact~~ ^{are} a people long
habitrated to despotism, and
can only be ~~forced~~ ^{unconsciously} produced
proofs of education, poor conditions
which makes "paternal government"
^{for the present} in some degree a necessity. And, further,
Indian Agriculture, being ~~from~~ that poor,
which nearly half the Indian revenue
is derived, is a matter of peculiar
interest to the Govt. And as the
Govt. would the people of India, ~~being~~ ^{and being}
(so to speak) at the mercy of its

Government - ~~being~~ ^{and} wholly destitute
of the privilege enjoyed by the people of
more advanced countries of protecting
itself par ~~tantum~~ - it is ~~very~~ ^{essential}
important that ~~it~~ ^{the Govt} should abstain
from inflicting it upon them without
the most anxious consideration,
and should resist the strong
temptation to create, at the expense ^{of the people}
institutions of easy, popu-
lar "for their own benefit." And I say
that it does not appear to me that

[illegible]

so as to effect them on a plate
^{over} ~~is~~ ^{subject,} ~~is~~ ^{and} ~~is~~ ^{is}
 done to satisfy itself that the work
 about ~~the~~ when expected, is really
 useful to the country. The measure
 was, comparatively, unopposed; at
 some experience left: and it can be
 easily abandoned if unsuccessful.
 In undertaking upon such subjects as
 that of an Agricultural College, at
 great expense, & for which it will
 be difficult to ^{with} draw, we can
 not all reason to be made out. We
 need that our Agriculture is ~~in~~

defective: but all that needs to be
known about it (even Mr. Robertson
himself) is that, on the basis of a census,
it feeds 80 millions of people, yields
"a considerable surplus of rice for"
"exportation, besides a great bulk of"
"cotton, sugar, ~~and~~ oil-seeds, and"
"indigo, and pays 4 1/2 millions sterling"
"of land Revenue". At first sight,
this is not an agricultural ~~condition~~ in a
condition so deplorable as to require
that the ~~present~~ ^{existing} ~~condition~~ ^{should}
principles of administration ~~be~~ ^{be}

abandoned for the purpose of
improving it. And if our supposition
were correct - we are unable to
divine what ~~any~~ ^{any} ~~facts~~ ^{facts} are
established ascertain with ~~any~~ ^{any} ~~certainty~~
any confidence that this present
state of affairs ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~case~~ ^{case}
is inconsistent with the facts.
^{for instance}
I ~~am~~ ^{am} ~~desire~~ ^{desire} to know from the Revenue
of Revenue (from which there can
hardly be a better ~~authority~~ ^{authority} ~~of~~ ^{of} ~~what~~ ^{what}
is the real condition of our agriculture,
we find that they are satisfied that

no European Officer is at present
"thoroughly competent to pronounce an
"opinion upon this point." The
specimens which are requested upon
it (see Halcott's & others), are
probably based upon European
appreciation. But as replaced ^{at least}
the high farming, ~~which it appears~~
~~that the absence of which~~
in Southern India is apparent to
be brought so lamentably, in the
product of the an unclimatic
climate & ^{an} obstructed soil. ~~There~~

~~whereas~~
Is it evident that what we are
proposing is not the application of a
violent remedy where there is no
disease?
Is the introduction ^{of the common} ~~that~~ of any person
they take a republican for a more
scholar of collegiate education in
agriculture. I am altogether opposed.
But as we have initiated, representing
a world farm, I would indeed to
effort what may be possible with
a view to make it thoroughly efficient

Two Polystra. who ~~for~~ ^{for} ~~it~~ ^{it} appear
in his brilliant release of ~~an~~ ^{an} ~~admission~~
tation, has overlooked the ~~care~~ ^{care} ~~which~~
enter which develop upon ^{him} ~~it~~ ^{it} ~~should~~
be required to give to his apprentices
the "regular instruction" which he
has denied to them. And for ^{to} ~~any~~
~~present~~ ^{with} ~~considered~~ ^{practical}
improvements now required to by defect
I am I sh^d be prepared to assist.
But I sh^d be aware it is a purely
technical institution: and I think
that its proceedings sh^d be kept
under careful ^{watch} ~~board~~ ^{board} ~~provision~~ ^{provision},

12
affords a specially suitable
field for recruiting in
this direction. In the
the gentleman who has
already joined us from
there is an instance
of the comparative facility
and cheapness with
which a supply may
be obtained from that
source. I attach special
value to this source of
supply. Technical Education
has been carried to
peculiar prominence
in that country & we
shall be able to obtain
thence not only highly
scientificable men
but men who have
~~been~~ ^{been} trained
in, and perhaps become
taught to manage industry
of the kind which we
seek to establish

in this country.

I would also request Mr. Robertson to devote himself to the preparation of a series of Educational books for the purpose in hand and give him such assistance & honorarium as he may require.

As regards the financial bearing of this most important matter, we have an Imperial grant of Rs. 25,000 for agricultural purposes in general, and I think that the Government of India may be asked to raise it to Rs. 50,000 or more for an object of such acknowledged importance. Then the whole Surplus Cattle Pound Fund is properly available

available for the purpose of promoting agricultural & Veterinary Education & improvement & of providing the means of further development of these objects - one half of the income is carried to general purposes of local funds. The income under this head is somewhat fluctuating and a slight continuous decline is difficult to account for - but expenditure on Repairs has been on the increase & that of 1873/74 is evidently abnormal, but I am informed that the Board of Revenue think that an annual surplus of Rs. 1,20,000 may safely be contemplated in view of the considerable improvement

Surplus Ponds Fund

1869-70	—	1,19,470
1870-71	—	1,32,970
1871-72	—	1,30,058
1872-73	—	1,29,300
1873-74	—	1,08,820

Expenditure on Repairs

1869-70	—	8,139
1870-71	—	7,771
1871-72	—	8,996
1872-73	—	11,105
1873-74	—	24,160

by the local administration
in the Districts and
close looking after
when the Masters and
public men see a beneficial
application of the fund.

With these amounts
faithfully husbanded
& specially applied to
a good deal more being
done & doubtless

Local Boards will see
their way under judicious
guidance to supplement
the fund.

2577 Robinson

I have little to
add to my former
minutes on this
subject. I entirely
agree as has been
in my last College

proposal to call
for a committee
scheme of ^{the} ~~the~~
details & esti-
mates of an Edu-
cational College
at Hyderabad.
No one can ab-
solutely make the
roughly the same & do
the best advantage
of a thing. The hope
of to have by an ap-
propriate committee on
S. India, the means
of acquiring sound
agricultural Edu-
cation - theoretical -
scientific & practical

The only difference of
opinion between Mr.
Robinson & my self
lies in this - that
it is in his scheme too
far in advance of
the people. As I be-
lieve we need Model
Farms & schools - the
former to prove to the
satisfaction of the light
by the evidence of his
eyes that what the
latter teach is worth
learning - Colleges &
Chairs of Agriculture
are, in my judgment,
the want of a still
more useful & distant
future.

J. D. Lee 29.7.
N. 247

Minute by
The Hon. W. Robinson
dated 25th July 1874
G.O. 19 March 75 No. 246

P.S. &
note on Mr. Robinson's Minute
With reference to
my Honorable Colleague
Mr. Lee's minute, I am
able (from intimate and
constant personal observation)
to assure the Government
that Mr. Robinson has
endeavored to give
effect to the order of
Government in regard
to the instruction of
apprentices with a fidelity
and anxiety which are
the offspring of his own
deep conviction of the
requirements of the Country
in this respect. But political
failure has been inevitable
under the circumstances.
The Gov. were directed
to send down suitable
men to be trained as apprentices

and responded to the
Call as best they could
and left their other
avocations. But this
class of men (in some
cases Penn's Sons, some who
seeking a livelihood and
the like) deputized by them
were, with two or three
exceptions, unamiable to
the purposes in hand
and the excellent practical
instructions given by
Mr Robertson to such
as remained has not
succeeded in fitting
any one of them to be
more than a good Overseer
under an Experienced
J Farmer. Not one has
become or ever could be
made an efficient
Superintendent of any
Example Farm. The
failure is in no way
blamable attributable
to want of painstaking

on Mr Robertson's part,
but to circumstances
over which neither he
nor the Government have
had any real control
under the conditions of
the Country and the Course
prescribed. On the
contrary I am satisfied
that Mr Robertson has
done more than justice
to the man provided for
him, for the instruction
given has been quite
equal to, if not better
than that given to many
of the class of Overseers
on English Model Farms,
and I doubt not that
what Mr Robertson
meant by the expression
used in his letter which
is noticed by Mr Lewis
is that these Apprentices
are not rising (indeed
they are wholly incapable
of

of free riding) such
systematic scientific
instruction & training
as are given elsewhere
and the Agricultural
Schools & Colleges where
scientific agriculturists
are educated in the
many branches of science
which belong to any
agricultural education.
In this respect no doubt
Mr. Robertson considers
— and I heartily agree
with him — that the govern-
ment plan is defective
and destined to fail.

I. J. Stockbridge
Honble Mr. Robinson
dated 27 July 74

QD 19 March 75 W 446

277. W. Robertson