

(1) Number of Pages.....10
(2) Date of repair.....27 7 1968
(3) Initials of the Referencer.....31.18

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.
B.P. No.

1846

Press
Mis.

Dated

1-9-1875 196

[Handwritten signature]

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1875
1

Read the following letters:—

No. 76. From Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. M. SHAW-STEWART, R.E., Consulting Engineer for Railways, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. MULLINS, R.E., Officiating Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 22nd June 1875, No. 358.

At the request of the Agent of the South Indian Railway, I have the honor to lay before Government, his letter, dated the 9th instant, No. 654, giving cover to a letter from the Chief Engineer, in which exception is taken to certain proceedings of the

* No. 341, 19th June 1875.

Revenue Authorities in the Chingleput District. A letter* from the Collector

of that District, bearing upon the same subject, is also submitted for consideration. The circumstances to which these letters relate may be briefly described as follows.

2. Towards the close of the year 1874, several complaints were made by Mr. Nicholls, the Engineer in charge of No. 4 District, Northern Extension, of difficulties thrown in the way of his work in consequence of the interference and opposition of certain of the Revenue Authorities. These complaints had reference chiefly to three points.

3. The first subject of complaint was the issue of a proclamation by the Sub-Collector of the district, prohibiting the quarrying of stone without license. It afterwards appeared that this proclamation was based upon G. O., No. 80, dated the 14th November 1873; and that a notice upon the subject had been published by the Collector in the District Gazette on the 7th February 1874. By an oversight in this office, the Government Order in question was not communicated at the time to the Railway Authorities; and the notice in the District Gazette seems also to have escaped their attention. The result was that the Sub-Collector's proclamation was looked upon as an order interfering with the quarrying operations of the Company. The complaint was of course withdrawn by the Railway Authorities when the circumstances became known.

4. The second subject of complaint was connected with the removal of stone from the old fort at Karanguly. The railway line passes through this old fort; and in August 1874, at the instance of the Company's officials, the Collector of Chingleput gave permission for the stones being used in the construction of the large bridge over the Karanguly river, upon condition that the Company should agree to pay for the stones, if required by Government to do so. Mr. Nicholls brought to notice that the Revenue officials were not only taking the best stones from the fort for Local Fund works, but were also removing some of the stones from within the Company's lockspitting. The complaint seems to have originated from a misunderstanding on the part of the Railway Engineer, and after some correspondence and explanation it was also withdrawn.

5. The third and principal subject of complaint was the alleged impressment of labor by the Revenue officials, and its withdrawal from the Company's Contractors. Several alleged instances of this were brought to notice by Mr. Nicholls; but, upon being referred to the Sub-Collector, their accuracy was directly denied by Mr Croie, after inquiry made by him. Subsequently the Company's Chief Engineer made a personal investigation into the grounds of the complaints brought forward under this

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th August 1875.*

head by Mr. Nicholls; and the result was that he was satisfied as to their being valid and substantially correct. Mr. Logan accordingly requested that the matter might be re-investigated by the Collector. Upon this the Collector referred the matter to the Sub-Collector, and requested him to hold a formal inquiry into it: but the Railway Authorities protested against the investigation being conducted by that officer, and the inquiry was accordingly adjourned. Subsequently the Railway officials withdrew their protest, and the inquiry was opened upon the 17th May and lasted during eight days. The result is detailed at length in the letters herewith submitted.

6. It will be seen that Mr. Logan protests against the result of that inquiry, and requests that the matter may be laid before Government with a view to its re-investigation. He writes as follows:—

"It appears to me that a searching inquiry into the real state of affairs is urgently required. The feeling of many of the people in the localities under reference is that it is dangerous for them to come forward and state their grievances unless some person of standing, unconnected with the sub-division, is deputed to conduct the inquiry."

7. In order to enable the Government to deal conclusively with the matter, it seems necessary to lay before them the whole of the correspondence which has passed; and it is therefore sent with this letter, accompanied by a précis.

8. During the period covered by these complaints and the inquiries into them, there has been a great press of work upon this department, caused especially by the condition of the North-west Line of the Madras Railway, and the recent Traffic Inquiry Commission. Owing to this cause, I regret that this department has not been able to do much more in the matter of these complaints than act as a channel of communication. Captain Thompson, when inspecting the Northern Extension of the

South Indian Railway in January 1875, mentioned* that the delay in the progress of work was attributed by the Railway

officials to the impressment of labor by the Revenue Authorities; and he was afterwards present at Karanguly from the 24th to the 26th of February, when evidence was taken by Mr. Logan. Lieutenant Coaker was also present at Chingleput upon the 10th May, the day fixed for the inquiry by the Sub-Collector; but the inquiry was adjourned on account of the protest lodged by the Company; and on the 17th May, when it took place, it was out of his power to attend.

From R. J. MELVILLE, Esq., Acting Collector, Chingleput District, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. M. SHAW-STEWART, R.E., Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Saidapet, 19th June 1875, No. 341.

I HAVE the honor to address you on the subject of the inquiry recently held at the instance of the officials, South Indian Railway. The inquiry was conducted by the Acting Sub-Collector in the presence of an officer of your department and of the Railway officials, and lasted eight days. In your letter, 1st May, No. 653, you took exception to my stating that the inquiry was to be held at the special request of the Railway officials; but as in your No. 329, dated March 1875, the following appears in paragraph 4:—"the Agent requests that a further inquiry may be held, at which the Railway Authorities may be allowed a hearing. I have the honor to request, therefore, that you will institute a full inquiry, &c., &c." It is quite clear that my statement of the case is correct. There is nothing to show that Mr. Barlow was asked to hold the inquiry in

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th August 1875.*

person, and in any case it did not rest with the Railway Company's officials to prescribe by whom the inquiry was to be held. As the events complained of occurred in the Sub-Collector's division, he was naturally deputed to hold the inquiry.

2. Although the inquiry was principally confined to the alleged impressment of labor, and that of the two earlier complaints that as to quarrying had been grudgingly withdrawn, I think it best to notice the complaints seriatim.

3. QUARRYING.—The first complaint appears in an enclosure forwarded with your letter No. 1,124, dated 27th November 1874, and is to the following effect:—"A proclamation has just been issued by the Sub-Collector prohibiting quarrying of stone, &c. &c." Subsequent complaints to a similar effect were afterwards received; anybody reading the wording of these letters would be led to believe that the Sub-Collector, of his own accord, had issued an entirely new order, interfering with the quarrying operations of the Railway Company; the fact being that he was simply, as in duty bound, giving effect to a notice by the Collector of the district, published in the District Gazette as far back as 7th February 1874, a notice which the Railway Authorities should have made themselves acquainted with and conformed to. I observe in your letter, No. 1,201, dated 16th December 1874, that you excuse the irregular action of the Railway officials by stating that through an oversight in your office the order of Government prohibiting the quarrying of stones without a license had not been communicated to the Agent, South Indian Railway. I would observe that the way in which blame is imputed to the Sub-Collector in this complaint is entirely unjustified by the facts of the case. The order was a general one, issued by the Head of the District, giving effect to orders passed by Government, and the Railway Company officials have only themselves to blame if their work was hindered by their own non-compliance with an order which they should have known. Under all the circumstances, I am unable to understand what is meant by the expression in your letter, which is apparently a quotation from a letter of the Agent, South Indian Railway, "that the Railway Authorities did not take exception to his proclamation, but only to the manner in which it was brought to bear on them." An order prohibiting quarrying, except under certain conditions, can only be enforced by stopping those quarrying who fail to comply with those conditions. There is no other way of enforcing it. It would have been well if the Railway Company had frankly withdrawn this complaint and admitted that they were in fault in making it.

4. REMOVING STONES FROM KARANGULY FORT.—This complaint first appears in a letter from Mr. Nicholls, enclosed in your No. 14, dated January 1875. The complaint is to the effect, "that since permission has been granted by Government to this Company to use stone from Karanguly Fort, a large body of men had been employed by the Sub-Collector to select and remove the best." It was further complained that stone was taken from within the Company's lockspitting.

As to the latter complaint, it appears from the Sub-Collector's letter, dated 17th January 1875, that "some stone was actually taken by the wudders through ignorance, from within the limits alleged, but that it was prohibited and stopped as soon as discovered. It would further appear that it had actually been stopped some time before the 20th December, the date of the Agent's letter. I must also bring to notice that the Department of Public Works

sinned in exactly the same way, and also wholly unintentionally. Apparently the Sub-Collector was mistaken in supposing that this practice stopped as early as stated; but orders had been issued by competent authority to stop it, and if those orders had not been complied with, the obvious course was to bring the matter to the notice of the officer who had issued the orders. I would also remark that no particular part of the Karanguly Fort, or the stone in it, belonged to the Company, who had only permission to quarry in it in common with other departments. It was no doubt more convenient that stone within the Company's lockspittings should be left to them, but that this was not done at first affords no grounds for imputing special malice to the Revenue officials in the neighbourhood. When brought to notice orders were promptly issued to stop the practice. The Railway Engineer on the spot wrote as if the stone in the fort had been made over exclusively to the Company. In Mr. Smith's report to Assistant

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th August 1875.*

Engineer Nicholls, enclosure to your letter, No. 39, dated 14th January 1875, which was forwarded through Mr. Nicholls to the Agent, and sent on to you by the Agent without remark, Mr. Smith made use of the following expression:—"There are from fifty to sixty carts a day removing stone from the fort, (I do not mean that all the number are removing within the railway boundary,) and we shall be without stones for the bridge at forty-ninth mile stone." Mr. Smith seems clearly of opinion that any one, except the Railway Contractors, taking stone from the fort were trespassers. Similar expression occurs in a letter from the Agent to your office, dated 28th December 1874, and in No. 342, dated 14th January 1875; and more particularly in letter dated 5th November, (evidently a slip of the pen for March 1875,) from the Chief Engineer to the Agent, in which one of the complaints of the Railway Company is stated as follows:—"2nd, that a large body of men has been employed by the Sub-Collector to select and remove the best of the stones for the purpose of making drains in the neighbourhood." In the same letter it is stated that the charge of removing the best stones is an exaggeration, the writer being evidently under the impression that if it were true that the best stone had been taken by another department, the Company would have had just cause of complaint. I need hardly point out that the Company have no preferential right to the best or any other stone; they have simply a right in common with the Local Fund Board and the Department of Public Works to quarry in the fort. This is admitted in letter dated November* 1875, from the Chief Engineer to the Agent; but it is difficult to reconcile his assertion, "I never at any time considered that we had a preferential right to any portion of the stone in the Karanguly Fort," with the expressions above quoted.

In this complaint again, the Sub-Collector's name was unjustifiably dragged in, and things done in the ordinary course of business so represented as to appear as though specially done to annoy the Railway. I need scarcely point out that the Sub-Collector is not the President of the Local Fund Board, under whose sanction these works were carried out. From the above it is clear that the first part of the complaint was made under a misapprehension of the Railway Company's limits was the result of an error which was rectified as soon as pointed out. In this case I think the Chief Engineer should have admitted that he had made a complaint which was not justified by the facts of the case; but I am not aware that anything of this sort has been done.

5. I now come to the third and most important complaint, viz., that of impressing laborers employed by one of the Company's Contractors; this would appear to have taken place early in December. This first appears in letter No. 334, dated 12th January 1875, enclosed in your No. 39, dated 14th idem.

In No. 352 from the Agent to your department, referring to this alleged impressment of labor, it is stated, "under existing circumstances it is impossible to carry on work in this section." In the report of the Assistant Engineer, Mr. Nicholls, it is stated that the alleged impressment, "together with prohibition to quarrying stone, or to remove that already quarried from any of the hills, has caused an entire stoppage to the works in this section of the district." Here I would wish you to note the fact that the alleged prohibition to quarry stone, a matter already disposed of, is again raked up and made a subject of complaint. I would now draw attention to Mr. Nicholls' statement at the recent inquiry. In the third sheet of his statement the following appears. "I send three Progress Reports per mensem; I sent such reports in November and December. I do not think there is anything unusual in the reports for these months." So that it appears that either an entire stoppage of work in a section of the line is nothing unusual or that such an event was not thought of sufficient importance to deserve mention in the Progress Reports furnished to the Chief Engineer, presumably with the intention of keeping him informed as to the progress of work in Mr. Nicholls' section. No inquiry was made except from the Inspector, Mr. Smith. Mr. Nicholls confined himself to reporting the matter just as it came from the Contractor to the Chief Engineer. These facts are admitted by Mr. Nicholls in his statement. I shall have to return to this subject later on.

Vide Mr. Nicholls' statement:—

"Before writing my report I made inquiries of the Inspector."

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th August 1875.*

6. The complaint sent with your No. 39 was referred to the Sub-Collector. Previous to this a complaint had reached the Sub-Collector and he had called on the Tahsildar for a report, which was made on 24th December 1874. The Tahsildar therewith forwarded a statement taken from the Contractor, in which he in a categorical manner withdraws his complaint both as to quarrying as well as to impressment of labor; he states that some of his men had gone to work in Karanguly with his brother's consent. The statement given by the Contractor before the Tahsildar was received and abstracted in the Sub-Collector's Office, and was forwarded in original with the Tahsildar's arzi to the Collector with the Sub-Collector's letter, No. 13, dated 7th January 1875. The Sub-Collector in his letter, as well as the Tahsildar in his arzi, both of them at the time forwarding the Contractor's statement, refer to its contents. Mr. Barlow in his letter, No. 26, dated 29th January, Karanguly, in answering your previous letters, refers to an extract from the Contractor's deposition, the original being then before him. I must beg that this may be borne in mind as its importance will appear further on.

7. At the date of writing this letter, and for nearly three weeks at about this time, Mr. Barlow was encamped at Karanguly engaged in the settlement of the taluq. Nothing was said to him about the matter. The complaints might now have been supposed to have been disposed of; but the Railway Authorities were not of that opinion, and Mr. Logan, just as Mr. Barlow was leaving Karanguly after a stay of three weeks, wished to have all the matters re-opened. Mr. Barlow naturally declined to do this. Mr. Logan's reason for wishing a further inquiry seems to have been to enable the Railway Company to be represented at the inquiry. I would here point out that each and every complaint originated with Kistnama Charri, the Contractor. This is evident throughout the correspondence. The extent to which the Chief Engineer identifies himself with his Contractor is shown by the following extract from his statement:—"every witness brought has been produced by Kistnama Charri. I proceeded on information produced by Kistnama Charri through Mr. Nicholls. It is not my duty to say whether I am responsible for this case, or whether Kistnama Charri is responsible for the statements made in this case; it is left for the other side to find that out. I will not state who has engaged the Barrister in this case." The Contractor had before the Tahsildar withdrawn all his complaints. As the Contractor was the sole source from whom the Company's officials received their information there was apparently nothing left to inquire into.

8. On Mr. Barlow refusing to re-open the matter, Mr. Logan himself proceeded to hold an inquiry. He admits in his statement that he confined himself to examining the witnesses produced by the Contractor. It never seems to have occurred to him to examine any of the other Contractors, or to have struck him as strange that when such wholesale impressment was going on, Kistnama Charri should be the only Contractor to suffer.

It was during this inquiry that mention is first made of triangles being set up in Karanguly Fort and village. No previous mention had been made of the matter. Mr. Smith, the Inspector, who states that he saw them, considered it to be a matter of such every-day occurrence as not to be worthy of mention even to his immediate superior, and this when he was in constant communication with him on matters connected with the works. Mention was also made by some of the witnesses that people were flogged. I would now refer to the result of the inquiry in which the Chief Engineer of South Indian Railway was assisted by Counsel. The fact of the impressment; of the setting up of the triangles; the flogging of some person or persons, names unknown, for no witness is able to give the name of any one flogged, or to state that he himself saw any one flogged is testified to by witnesses—coolies mostly in the pay of the Contractor, most of them at the time of giving their evidence under advances from him.

Mr. Smith also deposes to having recognised 150 men at work in Karanguly as having been employed on the work; he subsequently modifies this statement, but still asserts that he recognised from 50 to 60 by sight.

This witness, as before stated, saw the triangles frequently, but was not impressed by such an ordinary sight.

Against this evidence, first, as to the triangle, there is the evidence of Mr. Nicholls, constantly on the spot, who admits that he must have seen the triangles had they been in the place

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th August 1875.

mentioned, by the witnesses who assert that they saw them; second, the evidence of the Special Deputy Collector, who was at Karanguly at the time when it is alleged they were at that place, who was, moreover, in constant communication with Railway Authorities about accommodation works. He states that he neither saw nor heard anything of the matter.

Similar evidence is given by the Inspector of Schools, an entirely independent witness, and the Inspector of Police. That the whole story is an invention is further shown by the fact that nothing was said to Mr. Barlow during his three weeks' stay at Karanguly, within six weeks of the alleged occurrence, although he was in daily communication with the ryots of the taluq, many of whom were employed in the neighbouring works, as is proved by the statement of several of the witnesses produced by the Railway Company that the Jummahbundy put a slight stop to their working on the line.

Anybody at all acquainted with the people of this district is aware that it is not their wont to suffer in silence, and will be slow to believe that people could be flogged in an illegal manner and nothing heard of it except through a Contractor a month after the event. Finally, there is official documentary evidence, evidently genuine, produced by the Tahsildar, to show that the triangles could not have been at Karanguly as they were at a village some miles off, and had been there for some time. I can come to no other conclusion than that the statements as to the triangles and flogging are entirely false.

9. As to the alleged impressment, we have the Contractor's statement, given shortly after the alleged occurrence, to the effect that the few men employed on the Railway who went to work on the Local Fund Works went with his brother's consent.

At the inquiry, part of the deposition referring to impressment was found to have been interpolated, and the inference intended to be drawn was that the word read *செல்லம்* had originally been *செல்லம்*, and that the *அ* negative had been elided presumably by the Tahsildar.

I have already drawn attention to the fact that this statement of the Contractor was forwarded in original to the Sub-Collector, was abstracted in his office, and was sent in original to the Collector's office, there read to him and referred to, and an extract of it given by him in a letter to you. Had the deposition been then as it now appears, it could not have escaped notice; the words *அவர்கள் செல்லம்* are not idiomatic. They are not the words that any one would use in giving, or a Gumastah write down in recording, a deposition; it is as though one should say in English "they went on his dissent." One is as much English as the other is Tamil. It is clear that the document has been tampered with, and tampered with since the inquiry held by Mr. Logan. This is shown by the evidence and conduct of the Contractor. He gave his statement before the Tahsildar on 24th December 1875. The effect of his deposition was made known to the Railway Authorities early in January, and that it had been so made known was no doubt known to the Contractor in that month. In February Mr. Logan, the Chief Engineer, taxed him with having given such a deposition, but it is not till the recent inquiry, which was held in May, had been proceeding several days, that the Contractor for the first time mentions the fact of his deposition having been tampered with.

10. It is easy to account for the way in which the sense of the sentence tampered with has been perverted. Without a great deal of erasure and fresh writing, it would have been impossible to have perverted the sentence in an idiomatic way; the only resource of the tamperer was to add an *அ* and then elide it. Unfortunately for him the whole statement is written in the form of question and answer, and all but one of the answers remain in their unaltered form, and so contradict the perverted sentence. There is besides the evidence of competent witnesses that the *அ* and elision was written with the same ink and at a different time to that of the body of the deposition. This is plain to any one who examines the document in question. I therefore came to the unhesitating conclusion that the document has been tampered with in the interests of the Contractor who had every motive to do so. At Mr. Logan's inquiry, Mr. Logan taxed him with having deposed as he did before the Tahsildar. The deposition in its unaltered state was a conclusive answer to the complaint as to impressment which owed its origin to this Contractor, as did each of the other complaints. The Railway Authorities would not be likely to forgive him for misleading them.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th August 1875.

11. As to the difficulty of getting at the records so as to have the opportunity of tampering with them, I need only remark that it is notorious that the expenditure of a few rupees have given access to documents of a far more important and secret nature than any in a Taluq Cutcherry, and that in the Presidency town with all possible precautions taken to prevent such access.

I will now proceed to notice the other evidence brought by the Contractor in support of the charge of impressment. He professes to give the names of maistries whose gangs had been impressed. These names he derives from entries taken from another book subsequently produced. The accounts produced by him are unintelligible and incomplete, and the entries mostly undated; but he states that they are the only accounts he keeps. It is clear that no one having dealings with coolies in the number, and making advances on the scale, this Contractor alleges that he does, could carry in his head numerous transactions of all sorts, extending over considerable periods of time. I can therefore come but to one conclusion, viz., that the accounts produced are not this witnesses' real accounts, and that he has motives for the non-production of such accounts. To sum up, I can come to no other decision than that this complaint is as groundless as the other two. The small substratum of fact which has been used as a foundation for this complaint is pretty clear from the evidence given by the Contractor. He admits that when the work is stopped by rain he gives advances to the coolies in his employ to keep them together. It is proved by his own evidence and that of some of his witnesses, that rain sufficiently heavy to put a stop to the works he was carrying out occurred about the time of the alleged impressment of coolies. It is probable that his brother was only too glad to have his coolies kept together free of expense by their being sub-employed on other work in the immediate neighbourhood for which he had not to pay. Subsequently, when taxed with being backward in the performance of his contract, the Contractor accounts for it to his employers by stating that the men had been impressed. I may add that the works then being carried out by the Local Fund Board were not liable to be affected by the rain.

12. The expenditure of much time and paper would have been saved if Mr. Nicholls instead of sending every complaint, just as received from the Contractor without any inquiry deserving of the name, to his official superior, had communicated direct with the Government officials

Vide statement: "I made inquiries of the Inspector. I made no reference to the Tahsildar about Kistnama Charri's complaint."

on the spot. This Mr. Logan evidently agrees with me in thinking to be the usual course, as in his deposition he states, "I did consider it singular that none of the Railway Authorities said a word about the irregularities stated to have been committed either to the Acting Sub-Collector or Collector who were at Karanguly," but the Chief Engineer does not seem to have pointed out to his subordinate the expediency of so acting in future. In order to enable us to render effectual assistance, assistance which I shall always be ready to afford and to insist on my subordinates affording, I hope that this course may be adopted henceforth. Much time and unnecessary correspondence will thus be saved.

13. To conclude, I would remark that though there are railway works in other parts of the district, and there are other Engineers and Contractors, this is the only instance, as far as I am aware, in which similar complaints have been brought forward, a circumstance which, I think, should have led the higher officials of the Company to receive such complaints with caution, and should have prevented them endorsing, without due consideration, sweeping assertions and imputations couched in terms which are happily not frequently met with in official correspondence.

No. 76-A. From R. J. MELVILLE, Esq., Acting Collector of the Chingleput District, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. MULLINS, R.E., Officiating Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Saidapet, 20th July 1875, No. 65.

With reference to your official memorandum, No. 547, dated 9th instant, I have the honor to forward the record of the inquiry, held by Mr. Crole into the case of

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
5th August 1875.*

alleged impressment of Railway workmen, together with the appeal of Kistnama Charri against the sentence of two months imprisonment and the decision thereon.

2. I have called for the record of the criminal charge brought against Kistnama Charri, and will forward it as soon as received.

No. 76-B. From the same Officer, dated Saidapet, 26th July 1875, No. 69.

REFERRING to paragraph 2 of my letter of the 20th instant, No. 65, I have the honor to forward the record of the criminal charge brought against Kistnama Charri.

No. 77. ORDER THEREON, 5th August 1875, No. 2,260.

RAILWAY, No. 11-A.

AFTER a careful inquiry into the charges brought against the Revenue and Magisterial Authorities of the Chingleput

District, the Honorable the Governor in Council is of opinion that these charges have been shown to be unfounded, and he considers it has been satisfactorily shown that no blame attaches to the Tahsildar.

2. It is observed that the Collector's letter, which is a very correct resumé of the whole matter, shows very clearly that all this trouble and ill-feeling between departments, culminating in tampering with an official record, and a criminal prosecution, might have been avoided if either Mr. Nicholls or Mr. Logan had adopted the usual and reasonable course of referring to the official authorities of the district, who were at hand and perfectly willing to render assistance to the Railway Authorities.

(True Extract.)

 Major-General, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Consulting Engineer for Railways.
„ Revenue Department.

Exd. S. T. Austin.

20 Spare Copies

Rev: 1875: D. H. L.
No. 3337

No 1074
Govt. of [1875] Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

THE CONSULTING ENGINEER

FOR RAILWAYS.

&c., &c., &c.

Dated August 5th.

Issued

Recd.

25th

Encl. 71

Returned to
C. H. D. 4/10/75

G. O., 5th August 1875, No. 2,260.

* Retained for copy from a copy
of the

St. M. AUGUST.

Nos. 76-77

Charges brought against the Revenue and
Magisterial Authorities of the Chingleput Dis-
trict by the Chief Engineer, South Indian
Railway.—Passing orders on correspondence
relating to certain — No 1846

Communicated to the Chief Engineer

1 September 1875

14. To the Rev. D. H. L. 3. 1875