

CONFIDENTIAL - GO

Spec. I (1)-10,000-7-10-70.

- (1) Number of pages 14
(2) Date of repair _____
(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

JUDL DEPARTMENT

CONFIDENTIAL - GO

G.O. No.	17	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	8-9-1887	197

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Question in House of Commons on
Monday 12th September 1887.

Mr. J. D. O'Brien asked the Under Secretary of State for India, with reference to the affidavit filed on the 12th ultimo in the High Court of Judicature, Madras, by Mr. William Francis Grahame, Madras Covenanted Civil Service, Sessions Judge of Tinnevely, to the effect that, in June 1884, he heard it publicly stated by a Native landowner of good position to Mr. Edward Turner, that his (Mr. Edward Turner's) immediate predecessor, as Chief Magistrate and Principal Collector of the Madura District, had been in the habit of taking bribes, and whether he could explain why Messieurs Turner and Grahame, above referred to, for three years permitted such very serious allegations to go unnoticed.

Sir J. Fergusson: The Secretary of State for India has no knowledge of the Affidavit referred to by the Hon.

Member

Member except from the newspapers.
He will, however, call the attention
of the Government of Madras
to the question in the paper.

No 3

Copy of Question put in
the House of Commons
on the 12th Sep: 1887 and
Answer.

Referred to in Public Letter to
Madras, No 21, dated 29th Sep. 1887

Pub 4492 of 87

1544.

Public.

No 21.

Question has
been sent to
the Secy of State
in order to answer
this question. It is
put next session.

C

India Office.
London. 29th September 1887.

My Lord,

I transmit for your
information copy of a
Question put and of the
Answer made in the
House of Commons on
the 12th instant with
reference to an Affidavit
filed in the Madras
High Court by Mr
William Francis Grahame
of the Madras Civil
Service.

I have the honor to be,
My Lord,

Your Lordship's most obedient
humble servant,

Cross.

His Excellency,
The Right Honorable,
The Governor in Council,
Fort St George.

No. 20241 35.8.87

CURRENT NO. 4492

N^o 2

Public

29th September 1887

For orders:—

The facts are now as stated in the question. The statement by Kotaisami was not made publicly, nor in the presence of Mr. Turner. The affidavit as reported in the newspapers and up to which is probably the basis of the question is worded so as to make it seem that Turner was present, but Mr. Graham's letter to Mr. Morgan dated 16 Jan 1887, shows clearly that this was not so, but that Mr. C. & Kotaisami were alone.

I submit that no obligation to make what he had heard known attached to Mr. Graham, either as a private man or a public servant. It was two separate affidavits given to be made the basis of a charge against Mr. C. G. [Turner at once repudiated as soon as it was made known. It would have been very much better if Mr. Graham had kept it to himself altogether.]

If G. G. had sent these views a despatch (stating the circumstances) into his drafts.

W. L.

28/10

Quite right except that of the two clauses at B. I have put into brackets the former hardly affects the question while the latter is irrelevant & that he mentioned it.

26 Oct.

26/10

The Letter to Lord S^t George

N^o 21

Dr. 29th Sep.
Recd. 19 Oct. N^o 21.

From Camp 24/10

Forwarding for information copy of a question and an answer in the House of Commons regarding an affidavit filed in the High Court by Mr. Graham.

A letter was rejected by the Court as irrelevant to the subject matter of the suit.

Judicial Department

N^o 17

To The Right Hon^{ble} the Secy of State for India

My Lord.

We have the honour to reply to your lordship's despatch 29 Sep. 1887 N^o 21 Public, on the subject of a question put in the House of Commons ^{regarding} an affidavit ~~filed in the~~ by Mr. W. F. Graham ^{of the Madras Civil Service} filed in the High Court of Judicature at Madras.

3. The affidavit in question was put in for the defendant, a minor under the charge of the Court of Wards, in an action for defamation brought by Kotaisami Tevar a zamindar of the Madras District. The question in the House of Commons was apparently based on the newspaper reports of the proceedings. The statements by Kotaisami to which Mr. Graham referred

were not made publicly
nor in the presence of Mr.
Turner but to Mr. Frahm
alone. We did not consider
that any obligation to ^{report} ~~make~~
what he had heard known
attached to Mr. Frahm
either in his private capacity
or as a public servant, as
the statements were altogether
too vague & unsupported
to be made the basis of a charge
against Mr. Crole, who is the
predecessor of Mr. Turner
referred to in the question;
and being of this opinion
we have not called on
Mr. Frahm for any expla-
nation in the matter.

M.S.

Wm.

Post Office

8 November 1887

Copy despatch sent to Genl. Secy

I
10/11

7^c

ORDINARY, PRINTED.

Individual DEPARTMENT.
Despatch
D.O. DATED 8 November 1887
No. 7.

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print. 8-11-87.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Replying to the despatch for
warding a question put in
the House of Commons re-
garding Mr. Graham's
affidavit filed in the
High Court.

14.16.87