7161

INT. C. 1—82,000—13-10-25.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Pol.

Public DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 16 Press ~~Mis.~~

Dated 16 — 1 — 19 1863

20-3

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Government {1863} of Madras.

POLITICAL.

Recd.	} 1899.	*Enclosures*
Regd.		*Spare copies*

G.O., No. 16, 16th January 1863.

JANUARY.

Late Rajah of Tanjore.

Issuing further instructions to the Acting Agent in regard to the disposal of certain property belonging to the —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

Read the following papers :—

No. 19. From G. LEE MORRIS, Esq., Officiating Government Agent, Tanjore; to the Honorable A. J. ARBUTHNOT, Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated Vallam, 8th December 1862, No. 389.

I have the honor to forward the enclosed Memorial from Her Highness Kamakshi Bayi Sahib, senior widow of His Highness the late Rajah, to the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, in which she asks for certain further items of property belonging to the late Rajah. These are—

1st. The deficiency in cloths.
2nd. House property occupied by Government for public purposes.
3rd. The house occupied by the Government School at Combaconum.
4th. Compensation for lands taken up for the Railway.
5th. Premises at Madras and Chingleput, and
6th. The two State Swords.

2. With regard to the first item, I beg to state, that the total value of the cloths which were entered in Schedule O appended to the Government's answer to the suit brought by Kamakshi Bayi Sahib in the Supreme Court, was Rs. 75,082–9; so that after deducting therefrom Rs. 44,433–5, the estimated * value of cloths now made over, as well as Rs. 5,903–4 accruing from portions of cloths otherwise disposed of, there is a net deficiency of Rs. 24,746.

* This is stated in Mr. Phillips' Report to Government, dated the 10th March 1860, No. 870, to be Rs. 43,838–5, but the correct amount according to the contents of the detailed list is Rs. 44,433–5.

3. The late Commissioner Mr. Phillips in paragraph 4 of his letter quoted in the margin above, has already reported that "the value of this item of the late Rajah's property has been diminished by the operation to its detriment of the Supreme Court's injunction, by about one-third or say Rs. 26,000," and it is for the Government therefore to decide whether they are willing or not to make good the real loss, viz., Rs. 24,746.

4. The portions of cloths mentioned in paragraph 2 as having been otherwise disposed of, consist of cloths given by Mr. Phillips for the Princess' marriage, and of certain damaged pieces which were sold by public auction by orders of that gentleman. The value of the former, viz., Rs. 3,485–4, and the latter, viz., Rupees 2,418 † form respectively part of items Nos. 12 and 6 in the list marked A submitted with my letter of the 19th ultimo, No. 343, and these sums being held in deposit as therein stated, can be paid to the Memorialist at once on receipt of orders.

† The amount specified in Mr. Phillips' Report above quoted is Rs. 2,424–4, but the correct amount, exclusive of the charge of the Sale, is only Rs. 2,418.

5. With respect to the 2nd item referred to in the Memorial under consideration, viz., the house property occupied by Government for public purposes, I have already stated in my letter of the 11th ultimo, No. 329 (paragraphs 8 and 9) my views respecting the little Fort in which the first four buildings specified in paragraph 2 of the Memorial are included, and it is therefore unnecessary for me now to offer any further observations regarding them. The other five buildings in the larger Fort as also the Rajah's former Hospital outside the Fort, are occupied by the various Public Offices specified in the same paragraph of the Memorial. These buildings are entered in the several Nos. ‡ marginally noted in the Statement submitted by Mr. Phillips with his letter of the 29th March 1860, No. 940, recorded in the Proceedings of Government, dated the 14th May, No. 312. I beg respectfully to add that I can see nothing in the nature of these buildings which could warrant being deemed as other than the private property of the late Rajah, and I leave it to Government to decide whether the claim of the Memorialist is to be admitted, and if admitted, how it is to be met.

	No.
‡ 1. Somnath Punt's house, now occupied by the Jail	12
2. Venkat Rau's house, now Taluq Katcherri	14
3. Ram's Bungalow, now District Moonsiff's Court	69
4. Kutwal's Choultry	70
5. Barracks do.	10
6. Hospital, now Police Head Quarters.	91

6. The third item set forth in the Memorial is the Bungalow with detached buildings situated on the bank of the Caveri at Combaconum, which is occupied by the Provincial School. These premises, exclusive of the garden and vacant ground thereto attached, were made over by the late Rajah in 1853 for the use of the School, on the express condition that when no longer required for that purpose, they should be restored to him without any demand being made for the cost of repairs which might be executed to the buildings by Government, and I have no doubt whatsoever but that Government have an unquestionable right to retain them accordingly, as long as they may be required for the purpose of the School. Their transfer to Government as above mentioned was made in clear and express terms in a Maratta letter, dated 15th October 1853 from the Sarkil to the then Resident Mr. Forbes, a translation of which, together with a copy of Mr. Forbes' letter to which it was a reply, is herewith enclosed.

7. This letter of the Sarkil the Memorialist endeavours to repudiate, on the assumed plea, that the Rajah did not give his assent to its transmission; but as the Government are aware, all the affairs of the Rajah of whatever importance, were, according to the established usages of the Native Government, conducted by and in the name of his Minister, the Sarkil; and the communications of this Officer have accordingly always been recognized as embodying the orders of the Rajah, and as such binding on him. It is moreover to be observed, that in this instance the Memorialist freely admits that His late Highness saw the house converted into a School, and thus became cognizant of the fact. Under these circumstances I respectfully submit, that because the late Residency Sarishtadar Venkat Row, in urging his claims on Government for a reward for his services, may have dwelt very strongly as he always does on his own alleged exertions in this as in all other matters, it in no way follows that the validity of a transaction concluded in regular course and in express and unmistakable terms, can be at all affected.

8. The next and fourth item of claim refers to compensation due for certain Mirasi land which belonged to the late Rajah in a village called Ramanathpuram and which have been taken up by the Great Southern of India Railway. It is true that the land referred to in the Memorial is at present in the possession of the Railway, and that the Mirasi right to the village in which it is situated belonged to the Rajah by purchase, but it so happens that the former owner of the village (who after the purchase of the village by the Rajah stood in the position of a tenant towards His Highness), in some underhand way or other managed to retain possession of the whole village and ignored the sale altogether. He was accordingly in occupation of the land in question at the time it was taken up for the Railway and claimed for himself

the amount of compensation payable for the same. As the Revenue authorities were, however, not in a position, in a case of disputed right like this, to settle who should receive the money due, its payment has been suspended pending the adjudication by Courts of competent judicature of the right of ownership to the land in question, and the sum is at present in deposit. Under these circumstances it appears to me that the proper course for Her Highness Kamakshi Bayi Sahib to adopt, is to sue in the established Courts for the recovery of the village from the present occupant; and that when her right has been successfully established, the amount of compensation for the land in question can be paid to her.

9. The fifth item of claim refers to a piece of land in Chingleput and to certain premises in the Black Town of Madras. These, I presume, were placed by orders of Government under the management of the Collector of Madras, pending the final settlement of the affairs of the late Rajah, and are still so held, though I have not been able to find on the records of this office any correspondence bearing on the subject. Neither am I aware of the "characteristic duel" fought between Mr. Phillips and the Advocate-General regarding these premises, to which allusion is made in the Memorial, but as they are evidently the private property of the Rajah, I conceive that they ought to be made over to the Memorialist as solicited. Should the Government concur in this view, I would beg to recommend that the necessary orders be issued to the Collector of Madras.

10. The sixth and last item refers to the two State Swords alluded to in paragraph 6 of my letter to Government, dated the 11th ultimo. The Memorialist asserts that these swords are no part of the regalia, but only family heirlooms and objects of Religious worship, and as such regarded by the family with peculiar feelings of veneration.

11. On reference to Schedule I appended to the Government's answer to the suit brought by the Memorialist in the Supreme Court and in which these weapons are entered in Nos. 102 and 103, the Government will find the following description given of them:—

"102 Nagin.
"103 Padmin.

"Two swords so called, said to be very ancient. They could be used and even handled only by the reigning Prince."

There is nothing on record to show the real origin and history of these weapons; but my enquiries on the subject bear out their description above quoted. The value attached to them seems to have arisen, as far as I can learn, in consequence of their being considered to be the weapons of war with which the ancestors of the Maratta family, fought their battles and gained their victories, and this is the reason why they have been preserved through successive generations with so much solicitude and always been the objects of so much veneration to the family. It is, I believe, a fact that these weapons could not be even handled by any other than the Sovereign Prince for the time being, and the Government will observe that this fact is to a certain extent admitted by the Memorialist, for she states in paragraph 18 that the swords were "used in the religious ceremonies of the worship of Arms by the head of the family," that is the Rajah himself.

12. I beg to add, that when in conformity with the instructions contained in paragraph 8 of the Order of Government, dated the 21st August last, No. 336, I desired the Agents of the Memorialist to select such Arms as the family might wish to keep, a person well skilled as to the religious uses of the various Arms was called in, and he selected five swords specially for the purpose of worship in my presence as well as in the presence of the Agents; not one word being said about Nagin and Padmin: it is true that these two swords were not in the room at the time, but it is very curious that no one should have mentioned that they were the particular objects of worship either then or at any other time, for I have often said that I considered them State property, and yet till I read this Memorial, had never heard the fact questioned by any one.

13. If all the foregoing circumstances be not in themselves sufficient to mark these swords as regalia, I do not imagine that any particular enquiries will enable me to obtain any more conclusive evidence in a question like this, in which tradition and rumours constitute the only data available for forming a judgment. The Government may perhaps therefore be inclined to listen to the prayer of the Memorialist, more especially after what she has stated in paragraph 17 of her Memorial.

Enclosure I.

To the Right Honorable Sir WILLIAM DENISON, K.C.B.,
Governor in Council of Fort Saint George.

The respectful Memorial of Her Highness M. KAMATCHI BOYEE SAHIBA.

Sheweth,

That in the delivery of the valuable cloths a deficiency has been found between the Schedule to the East India Company's answer descriptive of those taken possession of and those delivered by the Acting Government Agent to the extent of about Rupees 30,000, she prays therefore that she may be paid this amount.

2. With reference to the house property your Memorialist observes that the following houses have been occupied by Government for public purposes.

In the little Fort:—

1. *The Serjah Mahal*, used as Offices for the Deputy Collector, the Sheristadar's Office, and the English Record Office.
2. *Vaulted buildings on the north side* used for the Treasury, the Vernacular Record Office, the Post Office and the District Post Office.
3. The Animahal used as the Small Cause Court.
4. *The building on the west near the tank*, used as the Government Agent's Office.

In the large Fort the following permises have also been occupied by the Government:—

1. *Somnath Punt's House* with the premises attached to it, used as the Gaol.
2. *Venkata Row's House*, used as the Taluk Cutcherry.
3. *Mr. Ram's Bungalow*, used as the District Moonsiff's Court.
4. *The old Kutwal's Cutcherry*, used as a Police Station.
5. *The Barrack's Choultry*, used as a Police Station.

The Rajah's Hospital outside of the Fort has also been connected into the Police Head Quarters.

3. Your Memorialist is well aware that there is scant accommodation for the Government Offices in Tanjore, and as she is most desirous to meet the convenience of Government, she will be happy to place the abovenamed buildings at the disposal of Your Excellency, such just rent being paid for the same as may be agreed upon by the Government Agent and herself; and she prays that back rent at the rate which may be settled may be paid for each of the aforenamed premises from the date of their respective occupation.

4. There is a house at Combaconum occupied as the Government School. This also she will be happy to see used as at present, such rent being paid for it as may seem just and fair to all parties. She does not ask for back rent for these premises, because she is aware that these premises were used by the Government as a School, if not with the Rajah's express consent, at any rate, with his knowledge; and as the Government might well suppose with his full approbation. But the Rajah was always most averse to permit the use of the Combaconum house as a School, and subsequently refused point blank to give up the surrounding ground, when so requested.

5. The true nature of the transaction is partly disclosed in a statement of services drawn up by the late Residency Seristadar, Vencata Row (page 17), in which he says as follows:—

"In 1853 under instructions from Government, the then Resident requested the Rajah to allow a part of the garden with the Bungalow in it situated on the north bank of the river Cauvery at Combaconum for opening a Government High School there, but the Rajah was quite unwilling to spare them. The Resident having directed me to do all that may be in my power to induce the Rajah to comply with the wishes of Government, I went with the manager of the said garden to Combaconum, inspected the Bungalow and learned from the Tasildar which part of garden is required by Government, with the assistance of the public and private Serkeles, the former being my nearest relative; and the latter my intimate friend. I prevailed upon the Rajah with great difficulty to make over the Bungalow and garden for the use of the Government School, on condition that they should be restored when no longer required. All such important and delicate services rendered by me to the Government may be learned on a reference to the records of the period."

6. The only inaccuracy here is that with reference to the alleged consent of the Rajah. A letter signed by the public Serkeles Vencata Row's "nearest relation" and with the connivance of the private Serkeles his "intimate friend" was no doubt procured and constituted a "difficult and delicate service" on the part of Vencata Row; but your Memorialist has good reason for knowing and affirming that the Rajah did not assent to the transmission of that letter.

7. In the Schedules to the East India Company's answer, your Memorialist observes that this house is spoken of as "*appropriated*" by the Rajah to the use of the Government. She will not reiterate the arguments on this term which she has already submitted to Your Excellency in her Memorial concerning the late Residency, but she craves the benefit of those arguments as strictly applicable to the present case.

8. The Rajah undoubtedly saw the house converted into a School without any protest or ostensible objection; and on this ground your Memorialist does not seek to charge the Government with any back rent; but she submits that this house forming part of the Estate, it is only fitting that such arrangements may be made with respect to the use and occupancy of the premises as may be fair between her and the British Government.

9. A portion of your memorialist's garden at Ramadpoorum has been taken by the Great Southern of India Railway, cutting the premises in two. No compensation has been hitherto made her for this land, nor indeed could there be until the question of the private property between herself and the British Government was settled. She prays, however, that fitting compensation may now be made to her for the deprivation of this land and the damage done to the garden by cutting it in two.

10. Among the property forming the private estate is a piece of land in Chingleput and some premises in the Black Town of Madras.

11. A characteristic duel as your memorialist is informed and believes was fought in the year 1861 between Mr. Phillips then Commissioner at Tanjore and the Advocate-General touching the disposition of these premises. The matter has since been in abeyance, and she now prays that orders may be issued to the Collectors of Madras and Chingleput, respectively, authorizing them to deliver the abovenamed property to such agents as your memorialist may appoint.

12. Lastly she begs to address Your Excellency on a subject that has caused great concern to herself and all the Rajah's family, and which she feels satisfied she has only to explain in order to enlist Your Excellency's sympathy.

13. Among the arms are two swords named "Nagin" and "Padmin." These your memorialist finds the Acting Government Agent has taken into his own custody; and it is believed has recommended the Government to retain, on the ground that they are part of the Regalia.

14. Your memorialist assures Your Excellency that this is a misapprehension. So far as she is aware this is the first time during the whole contention between herself and the British Government at which this idea has been suggested.

15. What information the Government Agent has proceeded on your memorialist has no means of knowing; but it is certainly *ex parte;* and no public inquiry has been held to determine the real character of these swords, as was done when a doubt arose as to the character of certain jewels to ascertain whether or no they were really Regalia.

16. This at least your memorialist submits should be done before any decision is come to, and that the opportunity should be afforded of hearing the evidence of members of the family and disinterested respectable individuals with a competent knowledge of the fact.

17. Your memorialist is well aware of the motives which induce the British Government to retain even the few jewels which form the Regalia. It is not their intrinsic value, but a political object that prompts the action and she trusts that her solemn repudiation of these swords forming part of the Regalia will be accepted by Your Excellency as a sufficient guarantee against any attempt being hereafter made by her or any member of the Rajah's family to make any political capital out of the fact of these swords being left in the family possession.

18. The fact is that these swords are family heirlooms used in the religious ceremonies of the worship of arms by the head of the family. These religious ceremonies cannot be fitly performed without these ancient weapons which are invested with something even superior to the *pretium affections* of ordinary heirlooms in the eyes of your memorialist's family. It would be most painful and hurtful to their feelings were the possession of these two swords to pass from the family into the hands of strangers and those of another religion.

19. Your memorialist feels confident that she need not enlarge upon this topic. And she prays that Your Excellency will authorize the Government Agent to restore these sacred swords to her keeping.

And your memorialist, as in duty bound, shall ever pray, &c.

Tanjore Palace, 1*st December* 1862.

Enclosure II.

From H. FORBES, Esq., Resident; to the Serkil of His Highness the Rajah of Tanjore, dated Tanjore, 7th September 1853, No. 112.

It has been determined to establish in Combaconam the most central and most populous town of Tanjore a branch from the University of Madras, and thus to afford to all the inhabitants of this Province the benefits of a liberal education. Feeling sure that His Highness would be anxious that his name should be connected with so great an undertaking, I have determined to ask his permission for his house at Combaconam on the banks of the Cavery being appropriated to the use of the school.

The ownership of the house will still remain with the Rajah, and it is not desired that the cocoanut and plantain gardens on either side of the building should be interfered with by the school; all that is requested is that the building and out-houses with such ground as may be necessary for communication with the road may be lent for the use of an institution, which will be of essential benefit to all classes of the people, and to connect his name with, which will be creditable to the Rajah of Tanjore.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) G. LEE MORRIS,
Officiating Government Agent.

Enclosure III.

From ANNAJI TIAGARAJ PANDIT, Serkil; to HENRY FORBES, Esq., Conducting the duties of Resident, dated 15th October 1853.

After usual compliments.

I have received your letter of the 7th ultimo, stating that it has been resolved to establish a branch school of the Madras University at Combaconam, and requesting that the two bungalows of the Circar on the north side of the Cavery, as also the

small piece of ground thereto attached, may be given for the purpose of accommodating the schools. The two bungalows covering an area of 209½ gulies and the adjoining ground containing 702 13/16 gulies, together with the trees thereon as marked out by the Residency Sarishtadar, Venkat Ráo, who inspected the place in company with Malhártiágaraj Pandit, the Dimmatdar of M. Avusahib's gardens, &c., have, in compliance with your desire, been made over to the charge of the Tahsildar of Combaconam as a loan, for the use of the aforesaid school. The ground thus made over includes two-thirds of the tank belonging to the garden, but the people of the school should not be allowed to catch the fish in it, which will be done by the people of the Dimmat. The water of the tank can, however, be enjoyed by the school people.

When the bungalows, &c., shall be no longer required for the use of the school, they should be returned to the Circar by the authorities of the school without any demand being made for the cost of the repairs which may have till that time been executed to the buildings. I trust the authorities of the school will have no objection to this.

(True Translation.)

(Signed) G. LEE MORRIS,
Officiating Government Agent.

No. 20. From G. LEE MORRIS, Esq., Officiating Government Agent of Tanjore; to A. J. ARBUTHNOT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, dated Vallam, 11th November 1862.

With reference to the Proceedings of Government, dated 3rd September, No. 333; I have the honour to report, that after having made careful inquiries as to which of the jewels specified by Government, could fairly be termed Regalia and therefore be regarded as State property, I found that, with the exception of the three noted in the margin all the remainder were merely personal ornaments, and that the son-in-law of the late Rajah had duplicates of very nearly all if not of all of them.

Jewels.	No. in the list of State jewels submitted by the late Commissioner.	No. in the General list.
1. Sarphezes	1 to 3	1
2. Jnallam	10	6
3. Bazuchandalya or turban side ornaments.	11	7

Jewels.	No. in the list of State jewels submitted by the late Commissioner.	No. in the General list.
1. Motiache Zanava ..	30	26
2. Turban aigrette ..	4 to 9	2, 3, 4
3. Pearl necklace ..	16	22
4. Pouch and belt ..	17	27
5. Powder flask with a rope of pearls twisted ..	18	28
6. Belt Badge and Scabbard mouth	19	30

2. I have therefore made over to the Senior Widow of His Highness the late Rajah of Tanjore the 11 jewels as per margin, and await the orders of Government as to the disposal of those which I have retained.

3. If I may be permitted to give an opinion, I would respectfully suggest that on no account should any part of these jewels be restored to any of the family of the late Rajah. Notwithstanding every thing which has been written and done by the Government, as well as what I have told the members of the family to the contrary, I have reason for believing that some of them have been persuaded by intriguing Natives that the Raj will eventually be restored if sufficient agitation is made and money expended, and in order therefore to put an end to such ideas, I think that the

Government should for ever retain these jewels just as they are at present; I mean that neither their value nor the precious stones they contain should be presented to any of the family.

* 1. A gold ratham or State carriage drawn by bullocks.
2. Two Ambaries or dome-shaped elephant carriages.
3. Gold net work howdah.
4. An ivory throne.
5. Two State swords.

4. In connection with the subject of State property, I beg to draw the attention of the Government to the list of personal property enumerated in the margin, * and to make the following remarks.

5. The gold carriages marked Nos. 1, 2, 3 form the first three items on the list of the Alayida Mahal submitted by the late Commissioner. They are the articles from which the bulk of the gold was robbed by the sepoys in April 1861: its probable value being no less than Rupees 59,977 out of the total estimated loss by the robbery amounting to Rs. 64,113 as reported by Mr. Cadell. The first of these carriages was exclusively used by the Rajah, and by him only on the occasion of the Dasara feast, when performing the State ceremony of shooting arrows in commemoration of the victory gained by a deity in a mythological war. The two Ambaries or elephant carriages forming the next item and marked No. 2 are very similar in shape to the above though smaller in size, and they have likewise been regarded as the exclusive emblems of royalty. The late Rajah, in his extravagant fondness for favourites, may have occasionally allowed some of them to make use of these carriages, but no one could have made one of the kind for himself or have used the Rajah's Ambari without his special permission, and it is a remarkable fact that the Rajah's son-in-law Sakkaram Sahib, as one of the nearest of his relations and the greatest of his favourites, has no gold Ambari though he has a silver howdah. The same remarks apply to the gold network howdah which forms the third of the items in question and is marked No. 3.

Vide enclosure to Commissioner's letter 29th March 1860, No. 941.

Vide report to Government, 27th May 1861, No. 196.

6. The next two items in the list are an ivory throne and two State swords. The throne was among the various sundries for which no lists were made by either Mr. Forbes or Mr. Phillips, and in point of money is worth but little, its estimated value being only Rs. 55, but it being evidently from its very name an unquestionable mark of royalty, I have at my own discretion retained it. I understand that there is a similar but smaller throne in the private apartments of the ladies, and have called on Her Highness Kamakshi Bayi Sahiba not to allow it to be removed until final orders regarding its disposal shall have been received from Government. The two State swords will be found in Nos. 102 and 103 of the printed list of arms forwarded with Mr. Phillips' letter of the 2nd April 1860, No. 950; and from their description as therein given, the Government will perceive that they likewise unquestionably fall within the category of Regalia. They have accordingly been also retained.

7. All the articles enumerated in the two preceding paragraphs appear to me to be as much State property as the three ornaments called Sarphez, Jallam and Bazuchandalya, and the remarks which I have made in paragraph 3 regarding their absolute retention are, in my opinion, equally as applicable to the one as to the other. For the reasons there stated, I think that they should be neither returned nor should any compensation be made for the gold stolen by the sepoys. If, however, the Government do not agree with me and wish all these articles to be returned to Her Highness Kamakshi Bayi Sahiba and the loss occasioned by the sepoys made good, I beg to be favoured with instructions as to whether Mr. Cadell's estimate of that loss will be sufficient, or whether it will be necessary for me to have the gold remaining on the carriages removed, weighed, and valued, and thus ascertain the exact amount abstracted. I beg to add that I have reason to believe that the Agents of Her Highness Kamakshi Bayi Sahiba are quite willing to abide by Mr. Cadell's estimate.

8. Besides the personal property abovementioned, I have the honour to respectfully submit some remarks respecting the three following subjects of real property, and to request the final orders of Government regarding the disposal of the same. This real property consists of—

The small fort,
The fort walls and ditch, and
The palace; and appears to me to come clearly under the head of State property.

9. The small fort contains within it a palace and garden with detached buildings, all of which are now occupied by the several offices attached to the Collectorate headquarters. Previous to the cession of the district by Rajah Sarfoji, it was garrisoned by the Company's troops, and was evacuated by them under the stipulations contained in Article 10 of the Treaty of 1799.

10. The fort walls consist of an inner and outer wall with a deep ditch running alongside of them. They surround the town of Tanjore and would doubtless prove dangerous in turbulent times if they were not then in the possession of the Government.

11. The palace is a very large upper storied building, extending over many acres of ground; and occupied at present, as the Government are aware, by the different members of the late Rajah's family, amongst whom I regret to say there is much ill-feeling. If the Government would be pleased to consider it as State property and authorize the Agent to arrange how and by whom it should be occupied, many of the present dissensions regarding this point might be put an end to. As things now are, many parts of the palace are rapidly going to ruin, and rumours of scandalous acts being perpetrated within its walls are common. It therefore strikes me that the best plan would be for the Government to settle finally whether the palace is or is not State property, and in the event of their deciding that it is, to direct the Agent to make proper arrangements regarding its occupation, it being a *sine quâ non* that each inmate should keep in proper repair the premises occupied by himself or herself as the case might be. By this means the building would be prevented from becoming dilapidated, and the Agent would be enabled to guard against the concubines, &c., of the late Rajah being placed in rooms so situated as to allow easy access from the outside.

No. 21. From G. LEE MORRIS, Esq., Officiating Government Agent, Tanjore; to A. J. ARBUTHNOT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, dated Vallam, 19th November 1862, No. 343.

I have the honour to lay before Government a memorial addressed by Her Highness Kamakshi Bayi Sahiba to the Right Honorable the Governor in Council concerning several miscellaneous matters connected with the property of His Highness the late Rajah.

2. The subjects referred to by the Memorialist are as follows:—

1st. The personal property of the late Raja sold at Madras.
2nd. The gold, &c., robbed by the Sepoys.
3rd. The bullion removed by Mr. Phillips from the Palace.
4th. The cloths, &c., presented by Mr. Phillips to the Princess and some of the Bayi Sahibas at the time of the former's marriage in 1860.
5th. The cattle, furniture, &c., sold by order of Mr. Phillips at Tanjore.
6th. The Regalia.
7th. The Fort Ditch.
8th. The Records.

* The Regalia.
The Fort Ditch.
The gold, &c., robbed by the Sepoys.
The Palace records.

3. With the exception of the four * items marginally noted (of which the first two were fully described in paragraphs 1 to 3 of my letter, dated 11th instant, No. —, and the last two will be again noticed before the close of this communication), all the remainder can be conveniently

disposed of as a whole, and with this view, I beg to submit two Statements marked A and B showing the several items of personal property which have *not* been made over to the Memorialist. Statement A includes not only all the claims set forth in the Memorial, but also several others, and is furthermore just such an account as the Memorialist asks for in paragraph 8, whilst Statement B is an account particular of the first item in Statement A.

4. This first item in Statement A amounting to Rs. 30,746–1–9 is the value of gold and silver bullion and uncurrent coins made over by the late Commissioner Mr. Phillips to the Collector and transmitted by the latter to Madras. This sum is made up of several minor items entered in the lists of jewels Nos. 3 to 6 submitted to Government with Mr. Phillips' letter marginally noted. All these items are, I presume, included in the two instalments † of bullion and uncurrent coins which were remitted to Madras. I say that I presume they are so included, because I can find nothing on the records of this or the Collector's Office regarding the particulars of these instalments. Again, it appears that besides the articles which make up the sum abovementioned, a further quantity of gold and silver uncurrent coins which were in the Palace Treasury were included in the abovementioned remittances, but as the list of these coins which has been left by Mr. Phillips shows neither weight nor value, I am not able to state what the value thereof may amount to. The sum total of these instalments can, however, be easily ascertained at the Madras Mint, and if it is to be made good, it would, I conceive, be the simplest arrangement to pay it in a lump, instead of entering into details.

31st May 1860, No. 1170.
† *Vide* Commissioner's letter to Government, 25th January 1860, No. 699.
From do. to Collector, 19th April 1860, No. 1014.

5. All the other items contained in the statement consist of sums realised by the sale of property put up to auction, such as animals, conveyances, &c.; it includes also the contents of Schedule R alluded to in paragraph 2 of the Memorial under report, as also the value of cloths, &c., given by Mr. Phillips for the marriage of the Princess. These sums with the exception of the five marked Nos. 5, 7, 9, 14, 19 are held in deposit in the Collectorate Treasury in accordance with the instructions contained in paragraph 7 of the Proceedings of Government, dated 16th January 1860, No. 30, and they can be made over to the Memorialist at once on receipt of orders.

6. The five items abovementioned have, under the instructions of the late Commissioner Mr. Phillips, been carried to the public credit, and the special sanction of Government is therefore necessary for the payment thereof, with the exception of Rupees 20–1–7, forming part of No. 7, which being the sale-proceeds of articles purchased with cash drawn for Palace expenses subsequent to the Raja's death, is from its character an item of public credit, and need not therefore be refunded. The ground on which Mr. Phillips authorized the remaining portion of item No. 7, as also the amount of items 5 and 9 to be credited to public account, was because they were the sale-proceeds of broken muskets and military accoutrements, and as such fell under the category of State property. Items 14 and 19 appear to have been credited to Government from inadvertence. Looking, however, to the spirit of the recent orders of Government and to the fact that they have signified * their intention to make good to the family the value of the arms which, on consideration of public security, it has been deemed advisable to transfer to the Arsenal at Trichinopoly, I do not conceive that it can be the desire of Government to withhold the value of any of the articles included in the accompanying statement.

* *Vide* G.O., 21st August 1862.

7. With regard to paragraph 6 of the Memorial, I beg to observe that the records of my office shew the value of the cloths given by Mr. Phillips on the occasion of the Princess' marriage to be only Rs. 4,488–2–0 as reported by that gentleman in his letter to Government, dated 10th March 1860, No. 870, and not Rs. 10,000 as stated in the Memorial. This sum of Rs. 4,488–2–0, together with the value of certain other sundry articles so appropriated makes up the total amount of item

No. 12. The assertion made in the concluding part of the paragraph alluded to, that some precious stones and cloths were presented to some of the Bayi Sahibs on the occasion of the Princess' marriage is in no way borne out by the records of the Palace.

8. I do not know what good grounds the Memorialist has for the statement she makes in paragraph 9, that the sale was a complete sacrifice; it was at all events a public one, and I find Mr. Phillips in paragraph 6 of the letter to Government marginally noted, mentions "the zealous and efficient superintendence of the local Tahsildar" at one of the sales. It is evident therefore that the Commissioner was satisfied.

10th March 1860, No. 870.

9. I now come to the subject of the gold, &c., robbed by the Sepoys. The statement of the Memorialist in paragraph 2, that I proposed when the rooms were first opened, that the Cars should be taken charge of in their present state, and that Mr. Cadell's estimated valuation of the loss should be accepted as fair and resonable, provided that the Government might feel willing to make good that loss, is quite correct. I did make that proposal at the first moment of seeing the Cars, but very shortly afterwards on thinking over the subject, I told the Agents of Her Highness Kamakshi Bayi Sahiba that I cansidered, on second thoughts, it would be best to refer the whole matter to Government, and consequently no part of the Cars were made over to them, nor have their signatures been taken opposite to these articles in the book of all the property made over which I have had expressly prepared for the purpose of receiving their signatures. My views regarding the disposal of these Cars are fully expressed in paragraphs 4 to 7 of my letter, dated the 11th instant. The total amount of the loss caused by the Sepoy robbery according to Mr. Cadell's valuation was Rs. 64,113, of which Rs. 59,977 appertained to the Cars, and the remainder to other articles. The Government will therefore have to order the payment of Rs. 4,136 if they consider the Cars as State property, and of Rs. 64,113, if they come to a contrary conclusion.

10. With regard to the subject of the Palace records, I beg respectfully to ask the Government to reconsider their Order of the 6th ultimo, No. 404. The accounts and documents connected with the landed property which has been made over to the family, as also the accounts relating to various domestic details of the Raja's household, cannot in my humble opinion, be considered as State property; and it appears to me, that while such records can be of no practical value to Government, the withholding of them will put the family to much inconvenience.

11. I think that all the records of the Palace can be classed under three different heads, viz., first, those relating to matters of State, such as treaties, correspondence between the Raja and the ruling authorities and foreign powers; 2ndly, those connected with the management by Government of the late Raja's affairs generally since his death, including all lists of jewels found in the Palace as well as all accounts of property made out by, or by orders of the Residents; and 3rdly, those referring to domestic matters, as also to the receipt and expenditure of money. The records of the first and second classes, I am of opinion, should be retained by Government, but I see no objection whatever to those of the third class being made over.

Enclosure I.

To the Honorable Sir WILLIAM DENISON, K.C.B.,
Governor in Council of Fort St. George.

The humble Memorial of Her Highness
KAMATCHI BOYEE SAHIBA.

Respectfully Sheweth,

That your Memorialist desires to bring under your favorable consideration several miscellaneous matters on which she requests the orders of your Government.

2. In Schedule R, to the answer filed by the East India Company to your Memorialist's Bill, it is admitted that personal property of the value of Rs. 7,532-1-4, belonging to the estate of the late Raja, was sold at Madras by the defendants. This sum, with interest at 5 per cent., your Memorialist prays, may now be paid to her.

3. Gold to the estimated value of Rs. 64,000 was stolen by the Government Sepoys in charge of the property in the Palace. This gold formed part of the covering of certain Cars. When the Government Agent opened the place in which these Cars were kept, it was at first proposed to strip the Cars of the remaining gold, and by weighing it and comparing it with the accounts, to ascertain the exact deficiency. But so much apprehension was felt lest any further peculation might be committed in this delicate and tempting operation, that your Memorialist at once assented to the reasonable proposition of the Government Agent, to take charge of the Cars in their present state, and accept Mr. Cadell's valuation of the amount of loss. This sum she believes amounts to Rs. 64,000, and this she prays may be also paid over to her.

4. She now approaches three items as to which she requests she may be furnished with specific detailed accounts.

5. Mr. Phillips, the former Government Agent, removed certain bullion from the Palace which your Memorialist is informed, he forwarded either to the Treasury at Negapatam or Madras. The value of this bullion is stated to be about Rs. 30,000.

6. Mr. Phillips also, on the occasion of the marriage of the young Princess, is stated to have given the Princess a portion of the valuable cloths which formed part of the Raja's private Estate. The value of these is estimated at about Rs. 10,000. He is also stated at this time to have presented certain precious stones and cloths to some of the Boyee Sahibas who were at variance with your Memorialist and the other ladies of the family, and who consented to sanction the marriage by their presence. It is presumed that an exact account must have been kept of all the property which was disposed of by Mr. Phillips on that occasion.

7. Mr. Phillips also caused to be sold by public auction at Tanjore, some of the cattles, furniture, &c., forming parts of the Raja's Estate. The proceeds are stated to amount to about Rs. 10,000.

8. These estimated sums your Memorialist regrets that she cannot accept without further information. She submits that the Government is in justice bound to furnish her with an account of all such property as has been disposed of under their orders, since it was taken possession of; just as would happen in the ordinary case of any private individual who had taken charge of the property of another.

9. She has a further objection to urge against accepting the amount in the third item; for the sale was a complete sacrifice; and she will be prepared to shew that property of very considerable value was parted with at less than at tithe of its real value. There was, your Memorialist submits, no necessity for the sale; and at all events she was not a consenting party to it.

10. She trusts therefore that your Excellency will give this matter a liberal consideration, and order to be paid to her the fair value of the cattle, &c., sold, and not only the prices which they fetched.

11. The money which shall be found due on these three last accounts, she prays your Excellency will be pleased to order to be paid to her with interest at 5 per cent.

12. In accordance with the directions of Government, the Government Agent held an enquiry on the subject of the Regalia. Several respectable and trustworthy witnesses were examined; and the general result coincided with the case made and proved by your Memorialist at the hearing of her cause in the Supreme Court; that is to say, that only three jewels, the Surfench, the Lungum and Zellum, form the Regalia. Your Memorialist prays that these jewels which are of considerable value may be broken up and given to her. The only object the Government can have is that the insignia of Sovereignty should not be in the possession of your Memorialist or the Raja's family. Lord Canning has pointed out how impossible it is to *sell* them; and

there is, your Memorialist submits, no objection to the precious stones and gold which form the Regalia being made over to her in such an altered form, that they no longer retain their character of the insignia of royalty, or that their value be paid her.

13. In handing over the lands, a question has arisen respecting the Fort Ditch. The grazing on the slopes affords pasturage for the cattle of the royal family, and also returns a rent of Rs. 700 a year. Your Memorialist prays that this land may be made over to her.

14. There are certain other accounts on which your Memorialist will do herself the honor of addressing your Excellency hereafter, as soon as she is in a position to do so.

15. At present she will only call your Excellency's attention to an order which she understands has been issued with reference to the Palace accounts, records, &c.

16. For these she applied to the Government Agent, who after reference to Government informed her, that her request could not be complied with.

17. No doubt a distinction may be taken as to such records as are in their nature State: as the Treaties, the official correspondence between the Government and the Rajas, and the like.

18. As to these it is not absolutely necessary that your Memorialist should have them in her own possession; though she prays that under any circumstances they may not be destroyed; and she submits that while it will be very inconvenient for the Government Agent to have the charge of these voluminous documents, the Palace is their proper place of custody and your Memorialist their natural custodian, subject of course to the right of Government to have access to the records whenever it may be necessary. She prays therefore that this matter may be reconsidered, and that the records of her family may be committed to her care.

19. But as to the rest of the Palace records, the Dufters connected with the rents of the landed property, the title-deeds thereto, and the lists of the jewels and the like, she respectfully submits that these cannot be considered as public. It being conceded that the lands and jewels are *private* property, it seems difficult to maintain that the accounts of such lands and jewels are not private also: and the greatest public inconvenience must constantly arise in the ordinary management of the Estates and property, if your Memorialist is deprived of the vouchers connected therewith. In every action which she may be forced to bring against her ryots, these accounts may be essential evidence; and to give an instance of the inconvenience likely to arise, she has just been called on to produce certain information connected with some of the villages by the Enam Commissions, to comply with which request correspondence between herself and the Government Agent is inevitably necessary.

20. The lists of jewels made by Mr. Forbes and Mr. Phillips, she asserts no claim to. They no doubt are the property of the Government, and she has no right even to their inspection. But the Palace Dufters connected with the private property she submits necessarily follow the property, and that the one cannot be retained as public, while the other is delivered up as private.

She prays therefore that your Excellency will be pleased to continue to afford her your benevolent protection and to grant her several requests contained in this petition if they shall seem to your Excellency's better judgment, just and reasonable.

And your Memorialist shall ever pray, &c.

Palace, Tanjore, 10*th November* 1862.

Enclosure II.

A.

Statement showing the items of personal property belonging to the late Raja of Tanjore which have not been made over to the Senior widow, Her Highness M. Kamakshi Boyi Sahiba.

	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	
1. Value of gold and silver bullion and uncurrent coins made over to the Collector for transmission to Madras as noted in the lists of jewels	..	..	
List of additional articles in the Dastan Mahal, Nos. 3, 4, 33 to 35, 40, 42, 56, 57 and 75	8,968 15 6		
List of Rajah Mahal, Nos. 57, 60, 69 to 72, 80, 47 and 61	17,204 2 3		
List of Alayida Mahal, No. 16	70 0 0		
List of Avesana Mahal, Nos. 14 and 7 ..	4,503 0 0		
		30,746 1 9	
2. Sale-proceeds of uncurrent copper coins ..	..	39 8 9	Held in deposit—*vide* Collector's letter to Government, 20th February 1860, No. 117.
3. Sale-proceeds of animals and conveyances sold by order of Mr. Forbes	10,139 9 7		
Do. do.	2,639 7 9		
		12,779 1 4	Deposit—*vide* letter from Commissioner to Collector, 21st March, No. 914, paragraphs 1 and 7, and 12th April 1860, No. 985.
4. Sale-proceeds of useless coins, &c., sold at Trichinopoly	..	498 9 0	Deposit—*vide* letter from Commissioner to Collector, 14th February 1860, No. 759.
5. Sale-proceeds of gun carriages as per Commissioner's letter of the 16th March ..	..	790 0 0	Carried to the credit of Government.
6. Sale-proceeds of materials lying in Somanauth Paut's house	1,552 10 9		
Sale proceeds of bulls, heifers, calves, &c...	1,027 8 0		
Do. of cloths, &c.	2,418 0 0		
Do. of fowls, wild animals, &c. ..	225 4 6		
		5,223 7 3	Deposit—*vide* letter from Commissioner to Collector, 5th April 1860, No. 967.
7. Do. of muskets, &c., broken up ..	691 4 9		
Do. of a pony	16 0 0		
Do. of blinds, &c.	4 1 7		
		711 6 4	Carried to the credit of Government—*vide* letter from Commissioner to Collector, 5th April 1860, No. 965.
8. Do. of cows, &c.	..	537 14 0	Deposit—*vide* letter from Commissioner to Collector, 14th April 1860, No 995.
9. Do. of broken up articles of military accoutrements and military stores ..	..	1,239 12 6	Carried to Public account—*vide* letter from Commissioner to Collector, 14th April, No. 995.
10. Price of two Civet cats sold	..	5 0 0	Deposit—*vide* letter from Commissioner to Collector, 19th April 1860, No 1017.
11. Useless military accoutrements	..	83 15 0	Deposit—*vide* letter from Commissioner to Collettor, 21st April 1860, No. 1017.
12. Value of cloths, &c., given for use on the occasion of the Princess' marriage ..	..	4,991 3 0	Deposit—*Vide* letter from Commissioner to Collector, 1st June 1860, No. 1173.
13. Sale-proceeds of a coach, &c., kept in the Residency	..	622 13 6	Deposit.
14. Sale-proceeds of the furniture of the Residency	..	2,142 9 0	Carried to Public account—*vide* letter from Commissioner to Collector, 8th August 1860, No. 1347.
15. Ready money found in Dastan Mahal and which was stated to have been originally brought from Virasimha Sivsudraswamy Pagoda	..	1,959 8 0	Deposit—*vide* letter from Commissioner to Collector, 19th April 1860, No. 1019.
16. Sale-proceeds of the materials of the Nilagiri building	..	224 2 0	Deposit.
17. Sale-proceeds of the bungalow at Point Calamere	..	199 14 0	Do.
18. Sale-proceeds of the articles in the Miniature Fort at Salivanayakam Pattanam ..	..	4,757 6 5	Do.
19. Rents of bungalows let	1,222 8 0		
Deduct cost of repairs ..	193 4 5		
		1,029 3 7	Carried to Public account.
20. Sale-proceeds of materials of certain houses pulled down within the Fort	..	347 2 2	Deposit.
Total ..	..	68,928 9 7	

Vallam,
19*th November* 1862.

(Signed) G. LEE MORRIS,
Acting Government Agent.

Enclosure III.

B.

List showing the value of Gold and Silver Bullion and uncurrent Coins removed from the Palace and made over to the Collector by the late Commissioner Mr. Phillips.

No.	Description.	Number of articles.	Weight.	Value of each article.	Total for each head.
	Additional List.		S. T. M. G.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
3	Miscellaneous pure gold pieces	..	18 9 4 1	6,620 2 6	6,620 2 6
4	Silver pieces too numerous to be counted ..	..	33 22 6 0	814 4 0	814 4 0
	Silver Coins current and otherwise.				
33	Full rupees	375	..	375 0 0	
	Half „	9	..	4 8 0	
	Quarter rupee	3	..	0 12 0	
	Two-anna pieces	34	..	4 4 0	
	Single annas	23	..	1 7 0	
	Five fanam pieces	11	..	4 2 0	
	Single fanams	406	..	31 4 0	
	Double fanams	42	..	6 9 0	
	Spanish dollars	5	..	12 8 0	
	Quarter pagodas	4	..	3 8 0	
	Half Arcot rupees	6	..	3 0 0	
	Poray fanams	10	..	0 10 0	
	Takade sole fanams	1	..	0 1 0	447 9 0
	Gold Coins.				
34	Mohur	1	..	15 0 0	
	One-third Mohur	8	..	40 0 0	
	Moidur cut	1	..	10 8 0	
	Parungipettai Huns	17	..	46 12 0	
	Venetian ducats. Sanar Kas	6	..	60 0 0	
	Serungapatam fanams	235	..	7 7 6	
	Various gold coins	209	2 19 0 1	1,005 2 6	1,184 14 0
35	Silver coins of various nations, value unknown ..	344	10 5 6 $4\frac{3}{4}$	245 0 0	245 0 0
36	Current copper coins	..	..	32 7 0	32 7 0
37	Various uncurrent copper coins	..	26 18 0 0	12 11 0	12 11 0
40	Pieces of gold	..	0 0 8 0	10 0 0	10 0 0
42	Gold dust	..	0 1 1 4	16 14 0	16 14 0
56	Gold pieces	..	0 0 1 6	2 4 0	2 4 0
57	Silver, miscellaneous	..	0 8 3 0	8 4 0	8 4 0
75	A bag said to belong to the pagoda containing rupees	..	..	1,959 8 1	1,959 8 1
	Total ..	..	..	..	11,353 13 7
	Alayida Mahal.				
16	Gold pieces	..	..	70 0 0	70 0 0
	Rajah Mahal.				
57	Venetian Ducats	16	..	160 0 0	
66	Pieces of gold prepared for work	..	9 19 3 $\frac{1}{2}$	3,528 13 3	
69	Gold pieces and bits of kinds	..	4 17 8 3	1,705 7 6	
70	Pure standard gold in strips	..	5 0 0 0	1,800 0 0	
71	Jewellers impure gold	..	0 12 5 3	186 11 6	
72	Gold coins forming the State horse trappings ..	..	21 10 6 0	7,717 8 0	
80	Gold Mohurs	8			
	One-third Mohurs	22			
	2 Pagoda pieces	7			
	One-fourth Gold Mohur	2			
	One pagoda	1			
	Venetian ducat	1	2 3 11 6	779 10 0	
	Star pagodas	44			
	Faringepettai pagodas	2			
	Poray fanams	26			
	Pieces of gold	..			
47	Silver in pieces	..	36 12 0 0	876 0 0	
60	Rupees, current	..	..	1,205 13 0	
61	Coins, silver, various, uncurrent	..	18 18 0 0	450 0 0	
62	Do. copper	..	7 18 0 0	3 14 0	18,413 13 3
	Avesana Mahal.				
14	Gold bullion	..	8 19 6 0	2,820 0 0	
7	Silver do.	..	67 7 6 0	1,683 0 0	4,503 0 0
	Grand Total ..	..	..	..	34,340 10 10
	Deduct silver current coins and copper current and uncurrent coins entered in Nos 33, 36, 37, 75, 60 and 62 and which have been credited in the accounts of the Collector's Treasury ..	..	..	..	3,594 9 1
	Remainder sent to Madras Mint	..	..	..	30,746 1 9

Vallam,
19*th November* 1862.

(Signed) G. LEE MORRIS,
Acting Government Agent.

No. 22. Order thereon, 16th January 1863, No. 16.

In the foregoing letters the Acting Government Agent at Tanjore has applied for the orders of Government on certain points connected with the disposal of the property of the late Raja. Most of the questions raised are mooted in memorials addressed to Government by Her Highness Kamakshi Bhai, and which have been submitted with the Agent's letters of the 19th November and 8th December 1862.

2. His Excellency the Governor in Council has carefully considered the arguments urged in these memorials and the remarks of the Acting Agent; and he will now proceed to record his decision on each point.

1st. The three jewels referred to in paragraph 1 of the Acting Agent's letter of the 11th November and in Her Highness Kamakshi Bhai's memorial of the 1st ultimo.—These jewels it is admitted are State property, being in fact the regalia or insignia of royalty worn by the reigning Prince on State occasions. The Governor cannot comply with Her Highness' application that the stones of which they are composed should be removed from their settings and made over to her. They will be retained by Government in their present form and sent to Madras when an opportunity offers. It will then be determined whether they should be sent to Her Majesty the Queen or retained in Madras.

2nd. The gold carriages, Howdah, Ivory throne and State swords.—These it is clear are also a part of the regalia and as such must be retained by Government. The Agent will arrange for sending them to Madras.

3rd. The small Fort and its buildings.—The walls and ditch round the town of Tanjore and the Palace now occupied by the family of the late Raja.—These are all State property and must be so treated. The town walls will be thrown down and the ditch filled up under orders which will be issued on the subject in the Department of Public Works. The members of the late Raja's family will be permitted to occupy the Palace under such arrangements as the Acting Agent may deem proper in each inmate being required to keep in proper repair the part of the building in his or her immediate occupation.

4th. The property sold by the late Commissioner or by Government including the bullion remitted to Madras.—The value of the bullion, it appears from a memorandum furnished by the Mint Master, is Rs. 34,732-1-3. The Acting Agent will furnish Her Highness Kamakshi Bhai with an account similar to the statement A, enclosed in his letter of the 19th November and will make over to her all the items entered in that account of their value, excepting of course such as it has been determined to retain as regalia.

5th. The alleged deficiency in the value of cloths made over to Kamakshi Bhai as compared with the value entered in the Schedule appended to the answer filed by Government in the Supreme Court.—The cloths in question were injured by being kept locked up in boxes under the operation of the injunction issued by the Supreme Court. The Government cannot undertake to bear the loss. It was the result of Her Highness' own act in suing out the injunction, a proceeding which Her Highness and her advisers must have known was altogether unnecessary, for it could not be supposed that the Government would misappropriate the property pending litigation.

6th. The value of the gold, &c., stolen by the Sepoys.—The greater part of this belonged to the carriages which have been reserved as State property. The rest, amounting to Rs. 4,136, will be paid to Her Highness.

7th. The sum of Rs. 5,903-4-0, the value partly of cloths supplied to the young Princess on her marriage and partly of damaged cloths sold by auction.—This must be paid.

8th. The Palace Records.—Such of these as relate to the domestic accounts of the Palace, will, as recommended in paragraph 11 of the Agent's letter of the 19th November last, be made over to Her Highness.

9th. The houses named in paragraph 2 of Her Highness' memorial of the 1st ultimo.—Four of these are in the little Fort, which with all the buildings it contains, is to be reserved as State property. The other houses are the private property of the

late Raja's family and must be so treated The Acting Agent will accordingly make them over and will arrange for renting or purchasing on behalf of Government such as may be required for public purposes.

10th. The building occupied by the Provincial School at Combaconum.—This building was transferred by the late Raja to Government for educational purposes subject to the condition that when no longer required for such purposes, it should be restored to him. It was a free gift so far as it went and is clearly valid; but the Government do not desire to retain it in opposition to the wishes of the family. The Agent will accordingly arrange in communication with the Director of Public Instruction for renting the building until some other arrangement can be made for the accommodation of the school.

11th. Compensation for Meerassee land at Ramnethpuram taken by Government for Railway purposes.—The title to this land it appears is in dispute. The amount of compensation due on it must therefore as suggested by the Agent be kept in deposit until the right of ownership is settled.

12th. Houses and land in Madras and Chingleput.—The Collector of Madras will make these houses and land over to Her Highness' Agent if they are under his charge.

3. All the payments sanctioned in these proceedings are to be made without interest.

(Signed) A. J. ARBUTHNOT,
Chief Secretary.

Note -

GO No 16 Vol a/16-1-63.

This has been reprinted with Notes in Yellow - 18 copies "For Record Only" and 12 copies plain for filing.

15/4/38

of the late Raja sold at Madras
g to Rs. 7,532–1–4 with interest
ent. may be paid to her.

—That the value of the gold
the sepoys amounting to Rupees
ay be paid to her.

TANJORE RAJ SETTLEMENT.

Notes relating to G.O, No. 16, Political, dated 16th January 1863.

POLITICAL DEPARTMENT.

MEMORANDUM FOR ORDERS.

From the Ag. Govt. Agent, Tanjore, dated 11th Nov. 1862, and 19th Nov. 1862, No. 343.

(Printed at page 8 of the G.O)

In his letter of the 11th ultimo, the Acting Government Agent reports that of the jewels referred to in the Proceedings of Government under date the 3rd September last only three can be treated as Regalia. He requests orders for their disposal, recommending that they should be retained by Government in their present form, and that neither their value nor the stones they contain should be presented to any of the Raja's family.

2. He also applies for orders as to the disposal of certain other articles, viz., three gold carriages, a gold howdah, an ivory throne and two State swords, all of which he considers come under the category of Regalia. The three gold carriages and the gold howdah, he states, have always been considered as emblems of royalty, and the throne and State swords he places under the same category. The swords in question are described in the list appended to Mr. Phillips' letter of the 2nd April 1860 (recorded in Proceedings of 5th May 1860) as "the hereditary possessions of the holder of the Tanjore Raj and (such as) could be used or worn by the Raja only."

3. It was from the gold carriages here referred to that most of the gold stolen by the sepoys in 1861 was taken. The Acting Agent recommends that the small fort, fort wall and ditch and palace should all be treated as State property.

(Printed at page 10 of the G.O.)

4. With his letter of the 19th ultimo, the Acting Government Agent has submitted a memorial from Her Highness Kamakshi Bhai, containing the following requests:—

1*st*.—That the value of the personal property of the late Raja sold at Madras amounting to Rs. 7,532–1–4 with interest at 5 per cent. may be paid to her.

2*nd*.—That the value of the gold stolen by the sepoys amounting to Rupees 64,113 may be paid to her.

Return money without interest.
(Intld.) W. D[ENISON].

Most of this belongs to the carriages which belong to the Raj. The rest may be restored.
(Intld.) W.D.

3rd.—That detailed accounts may be furnished to her with reference to the following items:—	Yes. (Intld.) W.D.
(*a*) The bullion sent by Mr. Phillips to Madras.	Yes. ((Intld.) W.D.
(*b*) The clothes presented by Mr. Phillips to the young princess on her marriage and those alleged to have been presented on the same occasion to certain of the late Raja's widows.	Yes. (Intld.) W.D.
(*c*) Certain cattle, furniture, &c., sold by auction at Tanjore under Mr. Phillips' orders, which the memorialist alleges were sold at a great sacrifice, and the full value of which she claims.	No interest. (Intld.) W.D.
N.B.—She prays that the sums due on these several items may be paid with interest at 5 per cent.	No. Handed to Government as they are. (Intld.) W.D.
4th.—That the three jewels which the memorialist asserts are the only Regalia, be broken up and the stones or their value given to her.	No. (Intld.) W.D.
5th.—That the fort ditch be made over to her.	Yes. (Intld.) W.D.
6th.—That such of the palace records as are connected with the management of the landed property, jewels, &c., be handed over to her.	Should be looked upon as Regalia. (Intld.) W.D.
5. As has been already stated, the Acting Government Agent considers the carriages from which the greater part of the gold plundered by the sepoys was taken to be State property, and he therefore would reject the memorialist's claim to Rs. 59,977 out of Rs. 64,113, the amount of the loss, as estimated by Mr. Cadell.	Should not be given. (Intld.) W.D.
6. He also objects to the jewels which form the Regalia being given to the memorialist in any shape whatever, on the ground that the abandonment of these articles by the Government might tend to encourage hopes of the restoration of the Raj.	These may be paid for. (Intld.) W.D.
7. Mr. Morris states that the value of the clothes presented to the young Princess on her marriage was Rs. 4,488–2–0 and not Rs. 10,000 as alleged in the memorial, and that there is nothing on the records to show that any clothes were presented on that occasion to any of the widows of the late Raja.	Yes and balance should be paid to applicant. (Intld.) W.D.
8. He observes that the sale of the cattle and furniture, which the memorialist describes as a sacrifice, was a perfectly public one, and that the Commissioner was satisfied with the result.	

	Yes. (Intld.) W.D.
	These three jewels should be retained by Government. (Intld.) E. M[ALTBY].
	Yes, and their estimated value should *not* be paid to Kamakshi Bhai Sahiba. The jewels should be sent down to Madras on an opportunity occurring. It can then be decided what should be done with them and whether they are worth sending home to the Queen. (Intld.) J. P[YCROFT].
	Unquestionably. (Intld.) J.P.
	These gold carriages, howdah, ivory throne and two State swords should be retained as Regalia. (Intld.) E.M.
	Yes. They should, I think, be sent down to Madras—the carriages and howdah melted down, and throne and swords put in the Museum or Arsenal. (Intld.) J.P.

* See minute 2nd April 1862, paragraph 14, recorded in Proceedings, 17th May 1862.

9. As regards the palace accounts, he suggests that those relating to domestic matters, as also to the receipt and expenditure of money, should be given to the memorialist.

10. The Agent's letter of the 19th ultimo is accompanied by two statements, in one of which (A) are specified all the articles of personal property which have not been made over to Her Highness Kamakshi Bhai.

11. The orders of Government are required on the following points:—

1st.—Whether the three jewels which are admitted to be State property are to be retained by Government as recommended by the Acting Agent. In Colonel Durand's letter of the 19th February last, which contains the instructions of the Supreme Government as to the disposal of the late Raja's property, no mention is made of the Regalia. The remark made at the end of that letter as to the inexpediency of selling the arms, and the allusion to the effect created in the minds of the native community by the sale of the Nagpore jewels, are referred to by the memorialist in support of her application to which she adverts, and it is possible that among the arms which it was proposed to "deposit in some suitable place of keeping where they can be seen by all," and the value of which was to be paid to the family, the Government of India had in view the two State swords referred to in the Agent's letter of the 11th ultimo. If this was the intention, it would not be unreasonable to apply the same principle to the jewels forming a part of the Regalia; but if any part of the State property be given up, there is no saying where the demands will stop. The application for the small fort and palace would probably follow. In fact, the surrender in any shape of any part of what is determined to be State property would seem to be incompatible with the position which the Government have taken with reference to the resumption of the Raj.

2nd.—Whether the gold carriages, howdah and State swords are to be treated as State property. The Acting Agent considers that they are, and Mr. Phillips, the late Commissioner, is of the same opinion. Mr. Morehead appears * to have considered that everything but the State jewels "which the Rajah or his heir apparent are entitled to wear," should be treated as private property.

3rd.—Whether the small fort, the fort walls, and ditch and the palace should be made over to the memorialist. The Acting Agent treats these also as State property and gives reasons for retaining them.

The small fort and its buildings, the fort walls and ditch round the town of Tanjore and the palace should be retained as State property. The other buildings can be treated as private property.

(Intld.) E.M.

Letter, 11th November 1862, paragraphs 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Yes. The town walls should be thrown down and the ditch filled up and the sooner the better.

(Intld.) J.P.

Yes.

(Intld.) E.M.
(„) J.P.

4th.—Whether an account is to be rendered of the property sold by the Commissioner or the Government, including the bullion remitted to Madras. The value of the bullion it appears from the enclosed memoranda furnished by the Mint Master is Rs. 34,732-1-3. The statement in the memorial that clothes were given to certain of the late Raja's widows on the occasion of the marriage of the princess, Mr. Philliphs states, is altogether unfounded. The Acting Agent might be directed to furnish the memorialist with an account similar to the statement A enclosed in his letter, and to make over to her all the items entered in that account or their value as therein given, with the exception of any articles which it may be determined to retain as Regalia, if any such are included.

I am not clear that the bullion should not be treated as the Supreme Government (letter, dated 19th February 1862, paragraph 20) directed that the presumed amount in the Raja's treasury at the time of his death should be treated, viz., applied to the payment of his debts, but as we are making a final settlement of these questions, I would not except the bullion, but account for it, too, without interest.

(Intld.) J.P.

See accompanying note.

Yes.

(Intld.) E.M.
(„) J.P.

5th.—Whether the recommendation of the Agent in regard to making over to Kamakshi Bhai what he calls the domestic accounts of the palace, is to be sanctioned.

Yes, according to paragraph 11 of letter of 19th November.

(Intld.) E.M.
(„) J.P.

(Intld.) A. J. A[RBUTHNOT].

Since the above was written, another letter under date the 8th instant has been received from the Acting Government Agent at Tanjore forwarding another memorial from Kamakshi Bhai in which she claims certain other property belonging to the late Raja, including the two State swords already referred to.

The items of her present claim are—

1st.—A sum of Rs. 30,000, the alleged amount of deficiency in the value of the cloths made over to the memorialist as compared with the value entered in the schedule appended to the answer filed by Government in the Supreme Court. Mr. Morris shows that the actual deficiency * is Rs. 24,746. The cloths it appears were injured by being kept locked up in cases under the operation of the injunction issued by the Supreme Court. It may be a question whether under these circumstances the Government is bound to make up the loss. Orders are required on this point. Under all the circumstances and with reference to the spirit of the instructions issued by the Supreme Government, it seems advisable that the Government should supply the deficiency.

* See Government note on next page with asterisk.

If the other members of Government take this view,* I do not wish to contest the point. But I do not see why Government should, especially under the circumstances pointed out by Mr. Phillips, pay the sum to Kamakshi Bhai, or the value of the clothes given to the princess on her marriage. These last have not gone out of the family, and were given in accordance with what would have been, it was felt, the Rajah's wishes had he been alive.

(Intld.) E.M.

* I would not make good the damage done to the cloths whilst they were locked up under the injunction. This damage was wholly the result of Kamakshi Bhai's (or her adviser's) own act in suing out the injunction which was altogether an unnecessary proceeding and indeed of the nature of an insult to Government, for it could not seriously be supposed that Government would misappropriate any part of the property pending the litigation. The loss was of her causing and she should stand it.

I think that for the reasons noted by the Hon'ble Mr. Maltby Government would be quite justified in refusing to pay for the clothes issued on the young princess' marriage, but under all the circumstances I would not object to make this payment but without interest.

Yes.

(Intld.) W.D.
(„) J.P.

The sum of Rs. 5,903-1-0, the value partly of cloths supplied to the princess on her marriage, and partly of damaged cloths sold by auction, must, I presume, be paid.

2nd.—The houses named in paragraph 3 of the memorial. Of these four are in the little fort, which the Acting Agent treats as State property. The others he considers as the private property of the family. He should be told, I presume, to make them over and to arrange for renting or purchasing such as are required for public purposes.

See page 4 for my views about the buildings.

(Intld.) E.M.

Yes.

(Intld.) W.D.

Yes.

(Intld.) W.D.

Do. Then do not include the palace in the large fort which should be treated as proposed by Mr. Morris in his letter of 11th November 1862.

3th.—The building occupied by the Provincial school at Kumbakónam. This building was made over by the late Rajah to Government for educational purposes, on the condition that when no longer required for such purposes it should be returned to him. It was a free gift and

I think that the Government will be quite warranted in keeping the premises as for educational purposes according to

is clearly valid; but it may be a question whether now that the Raj has lapsed, the Government ought to retain this gift in opposition to the wishes of the family. It would perhaps be more befitting the dignity of the Government that it should be restored, and that the Agent should arrange for renting it, until a new school-house can be built.

4th.—Compensation for mirassi land at Ramnethpuram taken by Government for railway purposes. The title to this land it appears is in dispute. The Agent recommends that the amount of compensation due on it be kept in deposit until the right of ownership is settled.

5th.—Houses and land in Madras and Chingleput. The Agent suggests that the Collector should be ordered to make them over to the memorialist.

6th.—The two State swords. The memorialist denies that they form part of the Regalia. The Agent considers that they do, and adverts to the admissions in paragraph 18 of the memorial that they were used exclusively by the reigning Rajah. He also alludes to the fact that when a person was deputed by the memorialist to select such arms as the family might wish to keep, he selected five other weapons and made no mention of the two swords in question. They appear to be as much a part of the Regalia as the three jewels mentioned in paragraph 11 of this memorandum.

(Intld.) A.J.A.

TANJORE CASE.

It strikes me that the jewels, &c., forming the Regalia whatsoever they may be should be taken away altogether from Tanjore and dealt with as the property of the Crown. I cannot admit the claim of the widow to have the individual jewels and setting restored to her when the articles themselves are broken up.

I am also of opinion that the three jewels alluded to should be considered as Regalia, also the carriages. It cannot be supposed that these are private articles which will ever be used by the family. I am also of opinion that the two swords should be considered as Regalia.

the Raja's appropriation; but all things considered I would give up the claim to it, and hold it on rent until a noble school-house be provided.

(Intld.) J.P.

Yes.

(Intld.) W.D.
(,,) E.M.
(,,) J.P.

Yes.

(Intld.) W.D.
(,,) E.M.

If he has got them of which I am not very clear.

(Intld.) J.P.

Should be retained by Government as already decided.

(Intld.) J.P.

I concur with the President that it is sufficient to hand over the various sale-proceeds *without interest*. If Rs. 4,136 are paid on account of property stolen this should be done so as not to commit Government into an admission of being *responsible*. I do not object to the payment as a matter of grace and to keep faith with the expectation held out by the Agent. But I am not prepared to admit that Government is bound to make the payment.

(Intld.) E.M.

I concur in the above.

(Intld.) J.P.

With regard to the other matters I think that the value of the cloths should be made good; that the value of the coin, &c., should be paid to the widow; that the value of the articles sold or rather the price which they brought should be paid but without interest.

I have proposed to sanction the payment on account of the deterioration of the cloths. Though as the sale of these was prohibited by the Court upon application by the present applicants, the consequent deterioration would in justice be considered as arising from their own act and deed and therefore not chargeable against the Government.

With regard to the buildings, it is evident that a fort was the property of the Raj, not of the individual, but I do not wish to press this plea beyond its fair limits. The small fort or citadel would then appear to belong to the Raj, but the larger fort may be looked upon as a mere fortified town, of which nothing but the ramparts could be looked upon as public property. It could be wise I think to take steps soon to throw these ramparts into the ditch and to devote the space so gained to the general purposes of the town.

The building at Kumbakónam as being only a contingent gift or rather loan on the part of the Rajah may be handed over to the applicants.

(Intld.) W.D.

For my views on the several matters referred by the Acting Agent I would beg to refer to the notes which I have made on Mr. Arbuthnot's memorandum.

For the reasons therein stated I would not make good the damage done to the cloths whilst locked up under the injunction of the Supreme Court.

I would also retain as State property the large palace in the greater fort. It is surely as much State property as Windsor Castle or the Tuilleries. It should be kept by Government not only on the social considerations adverted to by the Agent, but on political grounds also, for if the family are allowed to have it, they would always refer to it as they would do to the Regalia, swords, &c., if left with them as an evidence in support of their title to the Raj.

(Intld.) J.P.

25-12-62.

18. Dec. 1862.

My dear Arbuthnot -

There was no presentation of stones or prints to the Museum, as Ramatchie Bayee pretends to believe.

In one of the royal workshops, so to designate them, of which I cannot now recollect the name, were found many unselected stones of Ruins and some small pieces which intended for use in letting these stones. The accounts of the royal workshops showed from whom these articles had been received - other data were easily

found Wt indicated clearly that they, Low, Lobey, they had been forwarded to the W: shop - their owners were beyond any doubt or dispute, the sisters young widows of the Raja of Tanjore & were in opposition & mine (one being dead) in union with Ramachee Bayee. These ladies, with a view to the labor of the Raja's salaried goldsmiths, had just before the Raja's demise sent them to the shop to be committed into jewels of Rich, and as the workbench had been put under seal and the laborers had ceased to attend, as Barber remarks, it became my duty to return these articles to their owners. I then proceeded them out into sixteen or fifteen - I can now say with certainty -

search, called up the whole and fairly weighed them and placed them at the disposal of the young ladies. They would not for a time accept them on the altered ground of an unwillingness to compromise their rights to the jewels, but after a period, the six and Ramachee Bayee lost their shares. The nine shares remained for a much longer period in deposit - but these, too, were eventually made over to the nine pro Ramachee Bayee ladies, and R. Bayee knows as much about this arrangement as I do, in returning the said nine shares to assist in paying off the demands made on her

from Madras. Do there such
Namatchi Rayer had no more
right than she would have had
a part of the property of her
of the young widow had not
been minded.
The doubtless there used covered
carriages are part of the
Regalia. They were used only
on those specially grand
occasions when the Rajas
wore the insignia of royalty
attended by the whole of his
Durbar and came to him
from his predecessor -
Believe me
very sincerely Yours
H Dodwell

To
A. J. Arbuthnot Esq
Chief Secretary.

P. S.

In a similar manner
I returned to the Raja's
daughter a large quantity
of gold ware and ready money
which, when the workshop
was closed & sealed up,
had become immoveable
property. No same means
were available for tracing
and establishing the
rights of the Princess; and
to which had there been both
rights of doing the period
of her were dear being tied
up consequent on the Raja's
death - & the measures taken
by Forbes Dawson her property
from depredation, that
a claim was preferred & me

on behalf of the Durbar that the weight of the were restored, was somewhat below that of the bundle forwarded to the workshop. There were then the valuables of sorts in the numerous boxes of the working jadoomkhs for which no owners could be found among the living inmates of the palace, and which under them on his sealed as Raja's perusal. The jewels in a complete form were put away in the Raja's treasury where the bulk of his valuables

had been secured: the bullion was brought to account & forms part of account shown the balance in cash shown & the accounts became seen at the Raja's audit when finished Lang &c.

Letter from
Mrs A. S. Phillips

1880

In

Lawyer case

It strikes me that the
Jewels & forming the
Regalia what ever there
may be should be taken
away altogether from
Lawyer & dealt with
as the property of the
Crown - I cannot admit
Proctarum of the Widow
& have the individual
Jewels & settings restored
& should the articles
themselves be broken
up -
I am also of opinion
that the three jewels
alluded to should
be considered as Regalia
also the Carriages - It
cannot be supposed
that they are private
articles which could
ever be used by the
family - I am also
of opinion that the
two Crowns should be
considered as Regalia

1918
In charge

with regard to the other matters - I think that the value of the Cloths should be made good but the value of the Coin should be paid to the London - But the value of the articles lost or taken the Merchants they brought should be paid but without Interest -

~~As to the Rooms~~ I have proposed to sanction the payment on account of the deliv=ivation of the Cloths. Though as the sale of them was prohibited by the Court upon application by the present applicants the consequent deliv=ivation would in justice be consi=dered as a mercy

from them was act=ded them for unch=argeable against the Govt -

with regard to the buildings - this con=-clude that a Fort was the property of the King not of the individual, but I dont wish to push this point beyond its fair limit - the Land all Fort or Citadel would then appear to belong to the King but the Lease for may be looked upon as a mere petified Tower - prohibit nothing but the Rampart could be looked upon as public property it would be well I think to take a step Room - from them Rampart into the

dated & to devote the
space so pointed to
the general purposes
of the Town -
the building at Cum-
-baconum, as being
only a contingent prop
or rather loan on the
part of the Rajah may
be handed over to the
applicants.

For my views on the several matters referred by the Act^g Agent I would beg to refer to the papers which I have made over to Mr Ashburnham's Memo -
For the reasons there stated I would not make good the damages done to the cloths whilst locked up under the Injunction of the Supr Court -

I would also retain as State property the Rajah Palace with the gardens & tank as much State property as Windsor Castle or the Tuileries. It should be kept by Govt not only on the social considerations adverted to by the Agent, but on Political grounds also, for if the family were allowed to have it, they would always aspire to, as they do the Regalia, swords &c if they ever were - as an evidence that in support of their title to the Raj -

25-12-62

19

Tanjore

Political Department.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letters from the Acting Govt. Agent at Tanjore.

(dt. 11th & 19th Novr. & 8 Decr 1862. Nos 343 & 389)

Order thereon, 16th January 1863. No 16.

In the foregoing letters the Acting Govt. Agent at Tanjore has applied for the orders of Govt. on certain points connected with the disposal of the property of the late Rajah. Most of the questions raised are mooted in Memorials addressed to Govt by Her Highness Ramakshi Bhai, and which have been submitted with the Agent's letters of the 19th Novr and 8th December 1862.

His

2. His Excellency the Governor in Council has carefully considered the arguments urged in these memorials and the remarks of the Acting Agent; and he will now proceed to record his decision on each point.

1st, the three jewels referred to in para 1 of the Acting Agent's letter of the 11th November viz Her Highness Kamakshi Bhai's Memorial of the 1st ultimo. These jewels it is admitted are State property, being in fact the Regalia or insignia of royalty worn by the reigning Prince on State occasions. The Governor cannot comply with Her Highness' application that the Stones of which they are composed should be removed from their settings and made over to her. They will be retained by Govt. in their present form and sent to Madras when an opportunity offers. It will then be determined whether they should be sent to Her Majesty the Queen or retained in Madras.

2d, The gold carriages, Howdah, Ivory throne and State swords. These it is clear are also a part of the Regalia and as such must be retained by Govt. The Agent will arrange for sending them to Madras.

3d, The small Fort and its buildings - The walls and ditch round the town of Tanjore and the Palace now occupied by the family of the late Rajah. These are all State property and must be so treated. The town walls will be thrown down and the ditch filled up under orders

orders which will be issued on the subject in the Deptt of Public Works. The members of the late Rajah's family will be permitted to occupy the Palace under such arrangements as the Acting Agent may deem it proper to make, each inmate being required to keep in proper repair the part of the building in his or her immediate occupation.

4th The property sold by the late Commissioner or by Govt. including the bullion remitted to Madras. The value of the bullion, it appears from a memorandum furnished by the Mint Master is Rs 34,732. 1. 3. The Acting Agent will furnish Her Highness Kamakshi Bhai with an account similar to the Statement A. Enclosed in his letter of the 19th Novr and

and will make over to her all the items entered in that account of their value, excepting of course such as it has been determined to retain as Regalia.—

5th The alleged deficiency in the value of Cloths made over to Kamakshi Bhai as compared with the value entered in the Schedule appended to the answer filed by Govt. in the Supreme Court. The cloths in question were injured by being kept locked up in boxes under the operation of the injunction issued by the Supreme Court. The Govt. cannot undertake to bear the loss. It was the result of Her Highness' own act in suing out the injunction — a proceeding which Her Highness and her Advisers must have known was altogether unnecessary, for it could not be supposed that the Govt. would misappropriate

misappropriate the property pending litigation.—

6th. The value of the gold, etc, stolen by the Sepoys— The greater part of this belonged to the carriages which have been reserved as State property. The rest, amounting to Rs 4136, will be paid to Her Highness.

7th. The sum of Rs 5903. 4; the value partly of cloths supplied to the young Princess on her marriage and partly of damaged cloths sold by auction— This must be paid.

8th— The Palace Records— Such of these as relate to the domestic accounts of the Palace, will, as recommended in para 11 of the Agent's letter of the 19th Novr. last, be made over to Her Highness.

9th. The houses named in para 2 of Her Highness' Memorial of the 1st ultimo— Four of these are in the little Fort, which with all the buildings it contains, is to be reserved as State property. The other houses are the private property of the late Rajah's family and must be so treated. The Acting Agent will accordingly make them over and will arrange for renting or purchasing on behalf of Govt. such as may be required for public purposes.

10th, The building occupied by the Provincial School at Combaconum— This building was transferred by the late Rajah to Govt. for Educational purposes subject to the condition that when no longer required for such purposes, it should be restored to him. It was a free gift so far as it went and

and is clearly valid; but the Govt. do not desire to retain it in opposition to the wishes of the family. The Agent will accordingly arrange in communication with the Director of Public Instruction for renting the building until some other arrangement can be made for the accommodation of the School.

11°. Compensation for Meerassee land at Ramnethpuram taken by Govt for Railway purposes- The title to this land it appears is in dispute. The amount of compensation due on it must therefore as suggested by the Agent be kept in deposit until the right of ownership is settled.-

12°. Houses and land in Madras and Chingleput. The Collector of Madras will

will make these houses and land over to Her Highness' Agent if they are under his charge.

3. All the payments sanctioned in these proceedings are to be made without interest.

Dy. Govt. Agent at Tanjore.
Public Works Deptt.
Director of Public Instn.
Accountant General.
Master of Harbours

3/8/29
B I

Political Department

10P

1/2 Image

1

Memorandum for Orders

From the Actg. Govt. Agent Tanjore. S Dated 11th Nov. 1862

From do do 19th No. 343.

In his letter of the 11th ultimo the Acting Government Agent reports that of the Jewels referred to in the Govt. order date the 3rd September last only three can be treated as Regalia. He requests orders for their disposal, ~~recommending~~ that they should be retained by Government in their present form, and that neither their value nor the stones they contain should be presented to any of the Rajahs family.

He

1863. *Department.*

No.

PROCEEDINGS OF GOVERNMENT,

Dated

9026

2 He also applies for orders as to the disposal of certain other articles viz 3 gold carriages, a gold howdah, an Ivory throne and two State Swords, all of which he considers come under the category of Regalia. The three gold carriages and the gold howdah, he states, have always been considered as emblems of royalty, and the throne and State Swords he places under the same category. The swords in question are described in the list appended to Mr. Phillips' letter of the 2nd April 1860 (recorded in Pros of 5th May 1860) as "the hereditary possessions of the holder of the Tanjore Raj and (such as) could be used or worn by the Rajah only."

3 It was from the gold carriages here referred to that most of the gold stolen by the Sepoys in 1857 was taken. The Acting Agent remarks that the small Fort, Fort Wall and Ditch, and Palace should all be treated as State property.

4 With his letter of the 19th Ultimo the Acting Govt. Agent has submitted a Memorial from Her Highness Kamakshi Bhai, containing the following requests.

1st That the value of the personal property of the late Rajah sold at Madras amounting to Rs 7,532-1-4 with interest at 5 per cent may be paid to her.

2nd That the value of the Gold stolen by the Sepoys amounting to Rs 64,13 may be paid to her.

3rd That detailed accounts may be furnished to her with reference to the following items.

(a) The bullion sent by

by Mr Phillips to Madras
(b) The clothes presented by Mr Phillips to the young Princess on her marriage and those alleged to have been presented on the same occasion to certain of the late Rajah's widows.
(c) certain cattle, furniture &c sold by auction at Tanjore under Mr Phillips's orders, which the Memorialist alleges were sold at a great sacrifice, and the full value of which she claims.

N.B. she prays that the sums due on these several items may be paid with interest at 5 per cent.

4th That the three Jewels which the Memorialist asserts are the only Regalia, be broken up and the stones or their value given to her.

5th That the Fort ditch be made over to her.

That

6th That such of the Palace records as are connected with the management of the landed property, Jewels &c be handed over to her.

5 As has been already stated, the Agent considers the carriages from which the greater part of the gold plundered by the Sepoys was taken to be State property, and he therefore would reject the Memorialist's claim to Rs 59977 out of Rs 64,113, the amount of the loss as estimated by Mr Cadell.

6 He also objects to the Jewels which form the Regalia being given to the Memorialist in any shape whatever, on the ground that the abandonment of these articles by the Government might tend to encourage hopes of the restoration of the Raj.

Mr

7 Mr Morris states that the value of the clothes presented to the young Princess on her marriage was Rs 4,688-2 and not Rs 10,000 as alleged in the memorial, and that there is nothing on the records to shew that any clothes were presented on that occasion to any of the widows of the late Rajah.

8 He observes that the sale of the Cattle and furniture, which the Memorialist describes as a sacrifice, was a perfectly public one, and that the Commissioner was satisfied with the result.

9 As regards the Palace accounts, he suggests that those relating to Domestic matters, as also the receipt and expenditure of money, should be given to the Memorialist.

10 The Agent's letter of the 19th ultimo is accompanied by two statements, in one of which A one specified all the articles of personal property which have not been made over to Her Highness Kamakshi Boyee

11 The orders of Government are required on the following points:

1st Whether the three Jewels which are admitted to be State property are to be retained by Government as recommended by the acting Agent in Colonel Durand's letter of the 19th February last, which contains the instructions of the Supreme Government as to the disposal of the late Rajah's property, no mention is made of the Regalia. The remark made at the end of that letter as to the inexpediency of selling the Arms, and the allusion to the effect created in the minds of the native community by the sale of the Nagpore

These 3 jewels should be returned by Govt —

Ellt

Ger - must Rs in estimated value should not be paid to Kamatchee Boye Sahibah —

The Govt should be consulted as to the manner in which an opportunity of occurring can best be decided as to what should be done with them — and what they can work suitably from the Jewels —

GP

Nagpore Jewels, are referred to by the Memorialist in support of her application to which she adverts, and it is possible that among the arms which it was proposed to "deposit in "some suitable place of "keeping where they can be "seen by all," and the value of which was to be paid to the family, the Govt. of India had in view the two State Swords referred to in the Agents letter of the 11th Ultimo. If this was the intention, it would not be unreasonable to apply the same principle to the Jewels forming a part of the Regalia; but if any part of the State property be given up, there is no saying where the demands will stop. The application for the small Fort and Palace would probably follow. In fact the surrender in any shape of any part of what is determined

14/4 P
1/2 Margin
Unquestionably
JP

These gold carriages, Howdah Ivory throne & 2 State swords should be retained as regalia
Yes. They did & the throne should be sent down to Madras
& carriages & Howdah melted down - and throne & swords put in a Museum or Arsenal -
JP
See minute 2nd April 1862 para 14. recorded in proceedings 17th May 1862.

The small Fort & its buildings, the Fortwalls & ditch round the town of Tanjore & the Palace should be retained as State property. The other buildings can be treated as private property -
Ellis
Letter 11th November 62
Yes. The para 8, 9, 10 & 11
town wall & round & the ditch filled up - & the moat & bastions

determined to be State property would seem to be incompatible with the position which the Government have taken with reference to the resumption of the Raj:

2nd Whether the gold carriages, Howdah and State Swords are to be treated as State property. The Acting Agent considers that they are, and Mr Phillips the late Commissioner, is of the same opinion. Mr Innes appears to have considered that every thing but the State Jewels "which the Rajah or his heir apparent are entitled to wear," should be treated as private property.

3rd Whether the Small Fort, the Fort walls and the Palace should be made over to the Memorialist. The Acting Agent treats these also as State property and gives reasons for retaining them

Whether

10

Yes & Ele
JP

I am not clear that the bullion should not be treated as a Temporary fund / Letter 19 Feby 62 para 20 / directed that the pecuniary account in the Rajahs Treasury at the time of his death should be treated - viz applied to the payment of his debts - but as we are making a final settlement of the question, I would not except the bullion but account for it too - without interest by accompanying note

Yes & Ele
JP

4th Whether an account is to be rendered of the property sold by the Commissioner or the Government including the bullion remitted to Madras. The value of the bullion it appears from the ~~Govt~~ Memorandum from the Mint Master is Rs 34,732-1-3. The statement in the Memorial that clothes were given to certain of the late Rajahs widows on the occasion of the marriage of the Princess, Mr Phillips states, is altogether unfounded. The Acting Agent might be directed to furnish the Memorialist with an account similar to the Statement A enclosed in his letter, and to make over to her all the items entered in that account or their value as therein given, with the exception of any articles which it may be determined to retain as Regalia, if any

Yes - according to P11 of letter of 19 Nov. Ele
JP

any such are included.

5th Whether the recommendation of the Agent in regard to making over to Kamakshi Bhai what he calls the domestic accounts of the Palace, is to be sanctioned.

L/A.

Since the above was written, another letter under date the 8th Instant has been received from the Acting Government Agent at Tanjore forwarding another Memorial from Kamakshi Bhai in which she claims certain other property belonging to the late Rajah, including the two State Swords already referred to.

The items of her present claim are:

1st a sum of Rs 30,000 the alleged amount of deficiency in the value

of

the value partly of clothes supplied to the Princess on her marriage, and partly of damaged clothes sold by auction, must I presume be paid.

2d The houses named in para 3 of the Memorial of these 2, are in the Little Fort, which the Acting Agent treats as State property. The others he considers as the private property of the family. He should be told I presume to make them over and to arrange for pulling or pensioning such as are required for public purposes.

3d The building occupied by the Provincial School at Combaconum. This building was made over by the late Rajah to Govt. for Educational purposes on the condition that when no longer required for such purposes it should be returned to him. It was a free gift and

of the clothes made over to the Memorialist as compared with the value entered in the Schedule appended to the answer filed by Government in the Supreme Court. Mr Morris shews that the actual deficiency is Rs 24,746. The clothes it appears were injured by being kept locked up in cases under the operation of the injunction issued by the Supreme Court.

It may be a question whether under these circumstances the Govt. is bound to make up the loss. Orders are required on this point. Under all the circumstances and with reference to the spirit of the instructions issued by the Supreme Government, it seems advisable that the Govt. should supply the deficiency

The sum of Rs 5903-4 the

14

and is clearly valid; but it may be a question whether now that the Raj has lapsed, the Government ought to retain this Gift in opposition to the wishes of the family. It would perhaps be more befitting the dignity of the Govt: that it should be restored, and that the Agent should arrange for renting it, until a new School house can be built.

4: Compensation for Mecrajee land at Ramnethpuram taken by Government for Railway purposes. The Collector reports this land it appears is in dispute. The Agent recommends that the amount of compensation due on it be kept in deposit until the right of ownership is settled.

5: Houses & land in Madras & Single pint. The Agent suggests that the Collector should be ordered to make them over to the Memorialists.

6th The two State Swords. The Memorialist desires that they form part of the Regalia. The agent considers that they do, and adverts to the admissions in para 18 of the Memorial that they were used exclusively by the reigning Raja. He also alludes to the fact that when a person was deputed by the Memorialist to select such arms as the family might wish to keep, he selected other weapons and made no mention of the two swords in question. They appear to be as much a part of the regalia as the 3 jewels mentioned in para 11 of the memorandum

I think that a portion of the pittance now in keeping up premises for educational purposes according to Rajah's appropriation - but all pittance I commend I would give up & claim it - and hold it on rent until a new School house is provided.

Ord JP

JP

JP

JP

178 1/2 Board's

Should be returned & put on abeyance decided - JP

I concur with the Collector that the Government Bank may be retained, provided the Trustees are willing to pay Rs 4,136 on account of the loan. This should be done to avoid the inconvenience & delay of keeping separate accounts.

I do not agree with the Agent in regard to the Choultry debt due by the Rajah's estate. The Government is bound to admit the claim & pay it.

I concur in the above

JP

178

Memorandum

Political Letter to Eng^d.
12^th Sept^r. N^o. 10 of 1863.

Replied to 16^th March
N^o 4 of 1864.

10|5|99

Pol: 1863. Depart^t.

No 16

Proceedings of Gov^t.

D/ 16 Jany /63

Ft No 122 573 382

19 @ 22

c 16 Dec.
R 18^th Dec.