

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Prinial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	<i>201</i>	Press
	<i>55-56</i>	Mis.
Dated	<i>1-7-</i>	<i>1859</i>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

201

1

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
from 25th June to 1st July 1859.*

No. 55. Read the following letter from THOS. SYDNEY SMYTH, Esq., Advocate General ;
to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 21st June 1859.

I have the honor to request that you will bring under the consideration of the Honorable the Governor in Council, with reference to the approaching Criminal Sessions of the Supreme Court, a subject which appears to have already excited the attention of Government, with reference to criminal trials before the Mofussil Courts.

2. I see by the *Spectator* of Monday the 20th Instant, that Lord Stanley has expressed his approval of Government having acceded to the proposition of the Sudr Judges to appoint a Vakeel to conduct the prosecution in such cases, wherever Counsel was retained for the defence. It is also there stated that this step was recommended by the Sudr Court *in lieu* of the appointment of a public prosecutor, suggested by the Government, but which the Sudr Court is stated to have considered impracticable for the present.

3. The Judges of Her Majesty's Supreme Court of Judicature have repeatedly and strongly felt and expressed (and I believe no one has felt it more strongly than the present Chief Justice) the great impropriety of their being left to conduct criminal prosecutions, more especially when Counsel was engaged for the defence. The late Chief Justice indeed at last refused to do so, and in all such cases directed the Clerk of the Crown to instruct Counsel to conduct the prosecution, the expense being defrayed from the "Fines Fund" deposited in the General Treasury under the provisions of 9 Geo. 4, C. 74, Section 52.

4. The impropriety of a Judge being as it were pitted against a Counsel must strike every one on the least consideration, but even where no Counsel appears for the defence, there are, especially in this country, very serious objections it appears to me, to obliging the presiding Judge to act as public prosecutor.

5. In cases of life and death this objection was so strongly felt that in the time of my predecessor the Judges expressed themselves very strongly indeed on the subject, which resulted in the Advocate General's saying that he felt the force of their objections so much that, though no part of his official duty, he should always be happy to place his services at the disposal of the Court in capital cases. I have continued to act upon this understanding, and always conduct the prosecutions in cases of this nature.

6. In Bengal, as I have understood, in consequence of official correspondence that took place upon this subject about the time I refer to, Lord Dalhousie decided that the Company's standing Counsel should always conduct the prosecution in cases of life and death, unless where the Advocate General might consider the case to be of such a nature as to call for his intervention.

7. I believe, but have no certain information, that the intervention of the standing Counsel was confined to capital cases. I am not aware that any general arrangement has been made any where in India, for relieving Her Majesty's Judges from the unbecoming position of appearing as the prosecutor of prisoners, while in the eye of the Law he is considered their Counsel.

8. I said that the state of things appeared to me more objectionable here than in England, and for the following reasons. The position, the perfect impartiality and independence of Her Majesty's Judges, is I believe more thoroughly felt and understood in England than in India, especially by the lower and poorer classes. I think it must often be difficult for poor and undefended criminals of this class in this country and for their relations, when they see the presiding Judge acting as their prosecutor, to believe in his perfect and entire impartiality, still less to believe that he is discharging the duty which the Law considers to belong to him, of being Counsel for them—difficult in fact for them to regard him otherwise than as forming just as much as the Police and the Committing Magistrate, part and parcel of the Government machinery employed to ensure his conviction and punishment.

9. This, *per se*, if my remarks be at all well founded, must be admitted to be a grave evil, of no small magnitude ; but it appears to me to be materially aggravated by two other considerations—Istly, by the much more defective manner in which depositions, and generally speaking the case for the prosecution, are got up here than in England unless where, which very seldom

727
27-5-59
27-28
15-7-58
No 1328/60
1949/59

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
from 25th June to 1st July 1859.*

happens, the prosecutor himself retains the professional assistance of Attorney and Counsel;—
2ndly, by the lamentable prevalence of perjury in almost all Native evidence.

10. It will be obvious that the first of these considerations must impose additional labor on the Judge, and by making an increased demand upon his attention to supply these deficiencies, divert it *pro tanto* from that calm and impartial consideration of the whole case which is as much his primary duty, as it is the prisoner's undoubted due and right.

11. The second consideration obviously shews that a greater necessity exists here than in England for the closest and most undivided attention on the part of the Judge to every word uttered by, and to the manner and demeanour of every single witness, on both sides, while, for the reasons already given, he is perhaps less able to give such attention here than he would be if conducting a prosecution in England.

12. Under these circumstances, I would request the Honorable the Governor in Council to take into his early consideration the question of either appointing at once a public prosecutor, the necessity of which has of late been so generally and publicly recognized almost everywhere—or, at least, as a temporary measure, to authorize the Clerk of the Crown to instruct Counsel for the prosecution in all cases where none have been retained, and moreover, wherever he shall consider the case to require it, to employ an Attorney also, at the public expense. It would probably be found less expensive to make an arrangement each Sessions with some one Counsel to act as Crown prosecutor—as they are called in Ireland—for that Sessions, than to deliver briefs in each case.

13. It appears to me out of the question that the Government Solicitor could possibly discharge this duty, in addition to the numerous onerous and pressing duties already devolved on him.

No. 56.

ORDER THEREON, 1st July 1859, No. 901.

The Government observe that the propositions contained in the above letter from the Advocate General, involve a change of system, which they cannot think it right to make, without further inquiry and deliberation. They resolve therefore to refer Mr. T. S. Smyth's letter to the Judicial Commission for their consideration.

2. Meanwhile they are not prepared to authorize any deviation from the course hitherto followed.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

27
Has anything
been done in the matter
of appointing a Public Prosecutor
or any similar arrangement
for the next Sessions?
The C.J. is really anxious
to work, but from his looks, &
from what Dr. Paterson says,

I am almost sure he will
break down at the Session

I cannot understand
how Pitt Rivers could think
of going back again, after
seeing the state his colleague
is in. It is not doing
justice to the Public, or
discharging the duties for
which he is so well paid.

The main reason for having
a second Judge is that if one
is ill, there may always

be another in the spot ready
to do the duty.

37
H. J. 12/10/73
H. J. 12/10/73

27th

Early orders are
requested on the
Advocate General's
letter relative to the
appointment of
a Public Prosecutor,
which was sent

in his valuation soon
days ago.

27/6/59 JH 4/10/59

June 21/59

47

My dear Percott

I have written this
letter by the express desire
of the Chief Justice - tho' I've
not mentioned his name.
He wants it answered, if
possible, before next Session -
i.e. 5th July.

Yours truly
J. H. 4/10/59

My dear friend is much interested
that a Public Prosecutor, in
decisions, is urgently called for
seems to be admitted by all. The
Judges have been very pressing
for it. And some of opinion that
it is right. That the Govt should
now assent to the request -
I have thought over the subject,
the simplest, easiest, & cheapest
plan seems to me, to be, to add
to the duties of the Clerk of the
Court those of Public Prosecutor

The Machinery is ready & we
have an experienced person
at once available for that
important duty - a duty
which if not well perform-
ed would cause much harm.
The scheme is supported in part
12 of the ~~Advocate~~ Advocate & let
etc do not seem to pass as
the one I have above advised.
It might not be possible, when
the occasion occurred to get

an eligible Garrison to act as
a Public Prosecutor -
The salary of the Clerk of the Crown
would require to be increased
and even if it were raised to
say 6000 ^{per annum} it
would be less than the
present rate. I am inclined
to think that the cost to the
State would be less than if
Garrison were to be
to act in cash case - & certainly
the work would be done & all
satisfied.

letter done -

The Advocate General would
you are state act in Capital
& Political cases - on a scale
of salaries - the P. P. would
be his junior -

This seems to me to be
the most satisfactory mode
of dealing with the matter as now
submitted to you

W. H.

27

I have read Mr Morehead's Mi-
note. The Advocate General's proposition
involves a change of system, which
I cannot think it right that we
should make without further
giving and deliberation. Meanwhile
the duties of the Court can be
conducted as they always have been.

It seems a proper point
for the consideration of our Judicial
Commission.

W. H. Munby

20 June 59

I believe the appointment
of Public Prosecutors to be essential
to the right despatch of criminal
justice both here & in the most useful
I think Mr Morehead's suggestion would

Sailed to meet the ~~express~~ ^{arcum}

of the Supreme Court -

28- June

157

[illegible]

From the Advocate-General 21 June 1859.

Order thereon 1st July 1859. No 901.

The Government observe that the propositions contained in the above letter from the Advocate General, involve a change of system, which they cannot think it right to make, without further inquiry and deliberation. They resolve therefore to refer Mr J. S. Smyth's letter to the Judicial Commission for their consideration -

W. J. P.

2. Meanwhile they are not prepared to authorize any

~~2. Meanwhile, the session now approaching, the Govt~~

called to meet the ~~proposed~~ arcum
of the Supreme Court
28th June 1859
interposed several doubts
which might be regarded as
not being in the least
intended to be taken
into consideration. The
Government are however
not prepared to refer the
matter to the Judicial
Commission for their
consideration. They
resolve therefore to refer
Mr J. S. Smyth's letter
to the Judicial Commission
for their consideration -

deviation from the
course hitherto
followed -

authorizes the Clerk of
the Crown to act as
suggested in the
concluding part of

para 12 of the Advoc.

- call - journals letter -
at his discretion
arranging with some

one Counsel for the

whole business, or

devising briefs

in each case - except

capital cases the prom.

- cution of which will

as hitherto be conducted

by the Advocate General

JP

Advocate General
Clerk of the Crown

to the Commission
enquiring into the judicial system
of the Straits Settlements

} Disposed by the
M.S.