

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

DEPARTMENT.

Financial

G.O. No. *549*

Press
Mis.

Dated

26.9.1889

B no. 13-15

10/11

Not to be folded or roughly handled

24/9/89

x/

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Financial Department,
from 24th September to 4th October 1859.*

Read the following Papers :—

No. 13. From GOVINDEN and SEETARAMEN, Shroffs in the General Treasury; to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 3rd September 1859.

We the undermentioned beg leave to bring for the information of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council the following circumstances.

We are employed in the General Treasury several years since, as Shroffs, and conducted our duties with fidelity and integrity to the entire satisfaction of our several employers. While such is the case, a bag of 500 Star Pagodas and odd contained in a Box is not found in it, when it was opened by the Head Shroff, who has not opened the Box, as he ought to do, in the presence of the Sub-Treasurer. The Head Shroff reporting this circumstance to us, directed us to attend to his house in the evening where he shewed a Memorandum with a treatment that unless we make good the sum of 2,000 and odd Rupees equal to the lost amount, we shall be discharged by the Sub-Treasurer. Accordingly we paid the sum both with a view of securing our bread and our honesty during a long service in the Government. We beg to assure you that we have paid the sum imposed on us with great difficult and reluctance.

Whether the Memorandum in question is written by the Sub-Treasurer or by the Head Shroff himself, we are not aware; the Box in which the bag of Star Pagodas containing should have been opened in the presence of the Sub-Treasurer, on the contrary it was not done so. This the Sub-Treasurer himself will acknowledge.

Whether the sum was purloined by the Head Shroff himself, when he opened the Box or the Sub-Treasurer directed him to open it in his absence, is a questionable subject; under these circumstances, why cannot the sum be deducted from the money deposited by the Head Shroff in the Treasury or the case be subjected to the formal investigation of the Chief Magistrate to detect the theft.

Suppose another bag containing a larger sum was found lost (when a Box was opened) or taken by the Head Shroff himself as was done now, are Shroffs to pay the amount to make good the same to the Government.

The Head Shroff Ramakistna Chetty is too young to hold so responsible duty, and if he remain any longer in the post, there will be a great loss to the Government.

We therefore request that the Right Honorable the Governor in Council will be pleased to cast his merciful eyes on us and to take our deplorable case into his serious consideration and to direct the Sub-Treasurer to deduct the amount in question from the money deposited by the Head Shroff, and to return to us the sum extorted from us unjustly.

No. 14. From W. WATERFIELD, Esq., Acting Sub-Treasurer; to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 9th September 1859, No. 600.

With reference to the Proceedings of Government, No. 496 of the 5th Instan^t, in the Financial Department, I have the honor to report that the Gold Coins mentioned by Mr. Birch in his 5th paragraph were under the Orders of Government made over to the Mint Master for disposal on the 25th June last, by Mr. Balmain.

2. I have personally examined the various Deposits in the course of framing my report to Government, and can confidently state that the missing Pagodas are not among them.

No. 15. ORDER THEREON, 26th September 1859, No. 549.

From the letters as per margin,* it seems that on the 4th June, that is before Mr. Birch

* From Mr. Balmain to the Accountant General, 11th July 1859. From Mr. Waterfield, 25th July 1859. From Mr. Birch, 15th August 1859.	made over charge of the Treasury to Mr. Balmain, the Box which should have contained the missing Pagodas was delivered to the Cash-keeper at his own request, and was removed by him to the weighing Room of which he keeps the key, in order to be remitted to the Mint
---	---

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Financial Department,
from 24th September to 4th October 1859.

with various uncurrent Coins, the lid of the box being then as all seem to agree quite loose. It was not then examined but remained under the Cash-keeper's keys in charge of one of the Shroffs, Balagooroonathum. This box, states Mr. Waterfield (the last made over to the Weighing man) was not, he says, opened until the 11th, on which evening, and the morning of the 13th, (the 12th was a Sunday,) he examined it in the presence of another Shroff and a Clerk. On the Monday the deficiency was reported to Mr. Balmain.

2. Before deciding as to the party on whom the loss of the Pagodas should fall, the Government desire to have before them the statement in writing of the Cash-keeper respecting the transaction. Mr. Waterfield will obtain from him and submit to Government his explanation as to what became of the box from the time of its being made over to him on the 4th June to that on which the deficiency was discovered, why he was not present when the box was examined, and why he should not be held responsible for the loss that has occurred.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Financial Department

Memorandum.

From Govindan and Veetharaman - (Dated 3rd September 1859.)
Shroffs in the General Treasury -
From the Acting Sub Treasurer. (--- 9th --- " --- " --- 1859.)

5 Sept 59

25 July 1859

This letter of the 9th instant the Acting Sub Treasurer Mr. Waterfield reports in advertence to a suggestion from Mr. Birch referred to him by Government - that he personally examined the various Deposits in the course of framing his report to Government, and can confidently state that the missing Pagodas are not among them. -

2. - The question now is, on whom the loss should fall. - The Shroffs have made good the money which is now in deposit. -

3. - From Mr. Waterfield's report 25 July last, it seems that the latest date at which the missing coins can be traced is in October

1854 when Mr. Birch addressed the Accountant General on the subject of the deposits, recommending that they should be sold or melted down. Mr. Birch writes that great pains were then taken to verify the correctness of Mr. Lherrie's list and that every item was checked by himself. It was then removed from the Centre or Grand Magazine to the Inner Current Cash Godown. Mr. Birch asserts most positively that the coins could not possibly have been abstracted, whilst in ^{his} custody, whether during the time they were in the Grand Magazine, or, as is supposed, in the Inner Current Cash Godown; no one could have had access to them, except, not only in ^{his} own presence, but in that of two or three other persons. He does not believe that the box was secured at all, nor under the circumstances he had stated, could there be more necessity for securing

securing these items, than there was for securing the 3 or 4 lac of Rupees which were generally placed, in the outer Godown, in Bags. The lock was not wrapped in cloth and sealed up, because it belonged to an inner door, the outer door of communication being sealed up by the Cash-keeper.

4. - As a reason for his not having made over the box to the Mint in 1858, Mr. Birch says that the resolution of Government does not direct the transmission of these coins, but grants the authority for its being done. As no gold coin had however for some years been melted up at the Mint, it would have been but little use to have sent them there at that time. This is not much of a reason. Mr. Birch asked permission to make over the coins to the Mint and he was authorized to do so. It was to be presumed that he would do it. It should be remarked however that owing to delay in the

A J's office a long time
intervened between his
appointment to A J. on 5/54
and its submission to
the A J. on 1st Feb/58

The Jewels in the box were
taken out at two different
times. 26 April & 7 Oct 1858
to be sent for sale by auction.
It does not appear that the
remaining packets were
examined on these occa-
sions -

From Mr. Balmain's
11 July 1859, No 323

+++ in the aforesaid Bal-
main's letter 11 July

in Proc: 23 do

5.- On the 14 June - that
is before Mr. Birch made
over ^{charge} to Mr. Balmain - the
box was delivered to the
Cash-keeper at his own
request and was removed
by him to the Weighing
Room of which he keeps the
key, in order to be remitted
to the Mint with various
uncurrent coin - the lid
of the box being then, as
all seem to agree quite loose.
It was not then examined
but remained under the
Cash-keeper's keys in charge
of one of the Shroffs - Bal-
gooroonathum. This box
states Mr. Waterfield (the
last made over to the weigh-
ing man) was not he says
opened until the 11th, on
which evening, and the
morning of the 13th; (the 13th
was a Sunday) he examined
it in the presence of another
Shroff and a Clerk. On the
Monday, the deficiency was
reported to Mr. Balmain.
This was the first intimi-
-tion that Gentlemen received

of its existence in the
office Records, for never
having been entered in the
Public Accounts as a re-
-gular deposit, and having
been given out by Mr. Birch,
for remittance to the Mint,
it was not included in the
list of deposits made
over with the Treasury.

6.- The Accountant Gene-
-ral has ruled that as
neither the Sub-Treasurer
nor the Cash-keeper was
present when the box was
opened, the Shroffs must
be held responsible.

7.- The Acting Sub-Treasurer
does not think that at
present any suspicion
attaches to their characters.
Most of them have served
from 15 to 30 years, during
which they have been
greatly trusted, while he
believes this is the first
occasion on which any
property has been missed
from the Treasury.

8.- In his minute 22^d
July 1859 the Honorable the
President

President has stated that if the money cannot be recovered, it must be made good by the Cash-keeper under his general obligation. Two Shroffs Govindan and Seetharaman have presented a petition in which they state that the amount missing has been recovered from them. Whereas the box was opened by the Head Shroff Ramachristna Chetty but not in the presence of the Sub Treasurer as it ought to have been. — Why then man should have been held responsible does not appear. The man first mentioned by Mr. Dal-
-main was Anle-gooroo-
-nathian & Venkata-soboo

JV

Besides the general responsibility of the Cash Keeper for the safe custody of all the money in the Treasury ^{this} deposit was removed at his own request to the Weighing Room of which he keeps the key. I therefore continue to think that the Cash Keeper ought to make the sum good. ^{19 Sep 67}
This is my opinion likewise J. J. [Signature]

The Cash Keeper is clearly the person who must be held responsible. He is not however forced any State member upon the record. I think he should be called on for one.

The box was in the possession of the Cash-keeper on the Monday when the deficiency was discovered - where was the Cash-keeper he is entitled not to have been put to test where he

not received

8

not

List
Council
23 - 9 - 59

Proceedings of the Madras Gov^{ty}

Sept. Depart^{mt}

Read the following papers

From Govindan and Sektaram
Shroff in the Gen^l Treasury

Here enter 3 Sept^r 1839 No 420

From the Act^g Sub. Treasurer

9th de. de. No 429

Minute by the Hon the President

19 - do -

Order thereon dated 26th September 1839 No 549.

From the letters

From Mr. Bahurain to the
Act^g Gen^l 11th July 1839

as per margin it seems
that on the 4th June

From Mr. Waterfield
25th July 1839 -

that is before Mr. Birch
made over charge of the

From Mr. Birch - 15th Aug^t
1839 -

Treasury to Mr. Bal.
main - the box which

should have contained
the missing Pagodas
was delivered to the

Cashkeeper

Cashkeeper at his own request, and was removed by him to the weighing Room of which he keeps the key, in order to be remitted to the Mint with various uncurrent coins - the lid of the box being then as all seem to agree quite loose. It was not there examined but remained under the Cashkeeper's keys in charge of one of the Shroffs - Balagaceros. This box states Mr. Waterfield (the last made over to the weighing man) was not he says opened until the 11th, on which evening, and the morning of the 13th. (the 12th was a Sunday) he examined

From Mr. Balmain
11 July 1859 No 323

Remate 10000.
Mr Balmain's letter
11 July 59
2. ~~to state~~ ^{appear} before deciding as to the party on whom the loss of the Pagoda should fall, the fact being that an error in writing of the Cashkeeper - the water field with ^{from him} ^{in writing} ^{respecting the transaction} ^{submit to him} ^{his} ^{for the} explanation as to what became of the box from the time of its being made over to him on the 11th June to that on which the deficiency was discovered - why he was not present

examined it in the presence of another Shroff and a Clerk. On the Monday the deficiency was reported to Mr. Balmain and this was the first intimation that gentleman received of its existence in the Office Records, for never having been entered in the Public Accounts as a regular deposit, and having been given out by Mr. Birch for remittance to the Mint, it was not included in the list of deposits made over with the Treasury. The Accountant General has ruled that as neither the Sub. Treasurer nor the Cashkeeper was present when the box was opened, the Shroffs must be

When the box was
examined - &
why he should not
be held responsible
for the loss that has
occurred

JP

The Sub Treasurer - Dispt. 1st Oct 18

be held responsible -
The Acting Sub-Treasurer
does not think that at
present any suspicion
attaches to their charac-
ters. Most of them
have served from 15
to 30 years, during
which they have been
greatly trusted, while
he believes this is the
first occasion on
which any property
has been misused from
the Treasury.

In the opinion
of Gov^{rs} therefore it
is clear that if the
money cannot be
recovered it must
be made good by
the Cashkeeper under
his general obligati-
on, and further as
it

it was removed at
his own request to
the Weighing Room
of which he keeps the
key.

The box was opened
it is said by Head Sheriff
Rammachistua Chetty, but
not in the presence
of the Sub-Treasurer
as it ought to have
been, and the Gov^{rs}
in Council does not
see why Sheriff Govin-
den, and Seethara-
men should have been
held responsible. The
men first mentioned
by Mr. Balmain
were Balagoroonathu
and Vencatasooboo.

Defalcation of
- current Gold Coin
in the Treasury

list of 14 coins

To Hon. A. Cohn.
Financial 1859 Dec 11

18549

Proceedings of Court

21/26 Dec 1859

Before