

- (1) Number of pages 77
(2) Date of repair 12.5.88
(3) Initials of the Referencer low

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Judicial DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	104	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	22.1.1868	-197-

Not to be folded or roughly handled

52/21

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
22nd January 1868.

No. 166. Read the following letter from W. WILSON, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George; dated Masulipatam, 20th December 1867, No. 41.

In acknowledging the receipt of the Proceedings of Government, No. 1959, dated 2nd current, I have the honor to inform you that they were, as directed, published in the District Gazette of 7th idem; but, with reference to the remark of Government, "that if a proper supervision had been exercised by the Acting Collector of the Kistna District, a notice so liable to misconstruction, and so opposed to the impartial policy of the Government, would not have been allowed to appear in the Gazette of his District," I would respectfully submit whether the censure conveyed is fairly attributable under the circumstances which I beg to lay before you. I write from no personal motive, for I was not in charge when the objectionable notice appeared, but from a sense of justice to my predecessor. The immediate supervision of the District Press lies with the Treasury Deputy Collector, and, as a rule, advertisements in a District Gazette of vacancies in the Public Service are no more submitted to the scrutiny of a Collector than similar notices in the *Fort Saint George Gazette* are to the censorial review of the Chief Secretary. In this particular instance the notice was not submitted to Mr. Leman before publication, and he can scarcely, therefore, be held responsible for its appearance. The censure of Government is confined to the Acting Collector of the Kistna District, who must be, therefore, supposed to have been the only offender. I would, however, beg the attention of Government to page 216 of the *Godavery District Gazette* for June 15th, 1867, where the notice will be found. In the Gazette of Vizagapatam, to which Mr. Bliss belonged, it would, in all probability, have been published; and from Mr. Grigg, when here on his recent tour of inspection, I learned that it had, to the best of his recollection, appeared in the Gazette of Ganjam. The Acting Treasury Deputy Collector, when the advertisement was received, remarked the exception taken to Brahmins, but did not think it necessary to bring it to the notice of the Acting Collector, as, being a Brahmin himself, he might be thought unreasonably prejudiced, and I think his explanation may be accepted when an Officer in so responsible a position as Mr. Bliss thought there was no impropriety in sending for publication a notice that could be objected to as opposed to the impartial policy of Government.

No. 167. ORDER THEREON, 22nd January 1868, No. 104.

With reference to the letter above recorded, the Governor in Council considers that the Collector of a District, while at Head Quarters, and, in his absence, the Civil Officer left in charge, is responsible for all that appears in the District Gazette, of which he should invariably examine the proof before the Gazette is published.

(True Extract).

R. S. ELLIS,
Chief Secretary.

To the Collector of the Kistna District.
" Collector of
" Revenue Department.

Exd. J. H. Burns.

Replied to

2/13/11
Judicial Department.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letter from the
Acting Collector of Krishna District.

(Here enter 20th December 1867 No. 41)

Order No. 104 of 22 January 1868.

With reference to the
letter above recorded, the Governor
in Council considers that the Collec-
tor of a District while at Head
quarters, and in his absence the
Civil Officer left in charge, is
responsible for all that appears
in the District Gazette, of which
he should invariably examine
the proof before the Gazette is
published.

N.P.
M. P.

W.D. W.

To the Collector of the Krishna
District.

Collector of _____
Revenue Department

Dec. 28/11

Memo for order

I do not know whether
it is necessary to take
any notice of this letter

The [Meeting] must be
held as possible for any
thing that appears
in his ^{District} Gazette which
is objectionable - in the

same way that the [Meeting]
then would be as possible
for any thing improper

in the Fort Mifflin
Gazette -

The position of supervisor
of a district Gazette usually
from local arrangements, for
which the Editor of the District
is responsible. The Editor, if
he likes, may make his duty more
inconveniently apparent,
but even then, he will be answerable
for the use of his office
is applied - If Mr. Wilson's
objection is taken in this
District of Districts other than
that specified in the G.O. order,
the remarks of [?] are
applicable also to those
districts. I would so
inform Mr. Wilson whose
letter seems to be rather objectionable
in tone, especially
as he acknowledges that the
matter is not a personal one
W.D.H.

I think that a
[Meeting] can hardly
be held without

for anything published
in a British Gazette
spread in his column
from his own
but when he is at
headquarters the
proof of the Gazette
should necessarily be
examined by him.
It is not alleged that
Mr. Lewis was struck
from his position
when the advertisement
in question was
published.

C. H.

I think with my colleagues
that the letter of the District
Judge is a head receiving much
help. I hope, for what
appears in the District
Gazette & that it is done
I am able to say this day
I think Mr. Nelson was
I think it is a mistake

4/10
Pity for his
deception in the face of
great odds but I do not
think that he intended
to do so. N

C. C. Smith
1877

No. 41.

Richard D. Smith,
Collector of the District of
Columbia,
20 December 1867.

To, W. Wilson Garrison,
Deputy Collector of the District of
Columbia,
Chief Secretary to Government,
No. 104.

Sir,
In acknowledging receipt of the Proceedings of
Government No. 104, dated 22 Current, I have the honor to inform
you that they were not directed, published in the District Gazette
of 7th inst., but with reference to the remarks of Government that
if a proper supervision had been exercised by this Acting Collector
of the District, a notice so liable to misconstruction and so
opposed to the impartial policy of the Government, would not
have been allowed to appear in the Gazette of this District; it
would respectfully submit whether the censure conveyed is fairly
attributable under the circumstances which I beg to lay before you.
I write from no personal motive for I was not in charge when the
objectionable notice appeared, but from a sense of justice to my
predecessor. The immediate supervision of the District Notices
with the necessary Deputy Collector, and as a public advertisement
in a District Gazette of vacancies in the public service are no more
submitted to the scrutiny of a Collector than similar notices in the
Fort and Saint George Gazette are to the censorious review of the Chief
Secretary. In this particular instance the notice was not submitted
to Mr. Simon before publication, and he can scarcely therefore be
held responsible for its appearance. The censure of Government

Dec. 2. 1867. Disposition

No. 104.

PROCEEDINGS OF GOVERNMENT.

Dated 22nd January 1868.

186.107.

is confined to the Acting Collector of the District, who must be
therefore supposed to have been the only offender. I would however
beg the attention of Government to page 248 of the Cochin
District Gazette for June 15th 1867, where the notice will be
found: in the Gazette of Vizagapatam to which Mr. Bliss belonged
it would, in all probability, have been published, and from Mr.
Grigor when here on his recent tour of inspection I learned that it
had to the best of his recollection appeared in the Gazette of Ganjam.
The Acting Treasury Deputy Collector, when the advertisement was
received, remarked the expression taken to Brahmins, but did not
think it necessary to bring it to the notice of the Acting Collector,
as being a Brahmin himself he might be thought unreasonably
prejudiced, and I think his explanation may be accepted when an
officer in so responsible a position as Mr. Bliss thought there was
no impropriety in sending for publication a notice that could be
objected to as opposed to the impartial policy of Government.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,
Your most obed^t servant
W. A. Bliss
Acting Collector.

