

Public (1895) Department.

ORDINARY PRINTED.

G.O., No. 701-702

DATED 26 Aug. 1895

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

PILGRIM SHIPS BILL.

Furnishing the Government of India, by telegram, with the opinions of this Government and of certain officers on the provisions of the---, confirming the above telegram, and forwarding to that Government copies of replies received by this Government on the subject.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

26TH AUGUST 1895, No. 701, PUBLIC.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS. PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

READ—again G. O., 19th August 1895, No. 692, Public.

READ—the following paper:—

From J. M. MACPHERSON, Esq., Officiating Secretary to the Government of India, Legislative Department, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Simla, the 11th July 1895, No. 1254.

ABSTRACT.—Inviting opinions on the provisions of the Bill to make better provision for the regulation of Pilgrim Ships.

ORDER—dated 19th August 1895, No. 692, Public.

The foregoing letter from the Government of India has inadvertently been overlooked in consequence of its having been placed in a bundle of spare copies of the Bill. It will now be communicated with copies of the Bill and the Statement of Objects and Reasons, to the Hon'ble the Judges of the High Court, the Hon'ble the Advocate General, the Chamber of Commerce, Madras, the Presidency Port Officer and the Protector of Emigrants, with the request that the Government may be favoured with their opinions on the Bill *with the least possible delay*.

2. The Bill and Statement of Objects and Reasons have already been re-published in English in the Fort St. George Gazette. They will now be published in Hindustani and Malayalam. The Superintendent, Government Press, should report without delay the dates of the publication.

(True Extract)

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

To
The Hon'ble the Chief Justice of the High Court with C. L.
" Government Solicitor.
" Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Madras.
" Presidency Port Officer.
" Protector of Emigrants.
" Hindustani and Malayalam Translators to Government.
" Superintendent, Government Press.

READ—also the following papers:—

From the Protector of Emigrants, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Public Department, Fort St. George, dated Madras, 21st August 1895, No. 363.

With reference to Government Order, dated 19th August 1895, No. 692, I have the honor to state that so long as passengers on Pilgrim Ships who are not

pilgrims do not violate the rules of decency or sanitation, they may be treated as passengers on board other steamers are.

2. My remarks on the Pilgrim Ships Act were sent to Government through the Presidency Port Officer on the 1st instant.

From the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Public Department, Ootacamund, dated Madras, 21st August 1895.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the Order of the Madras Government, dated the 19th instant, No. 692, forwarding for an early expression of the Chamber's opinion the draft Pilgrim Ships Bill, together with the Government of India's letter of the 11th ultimo.

As pilgrim ships do not leave the Ports of Madras, the Chamber has no experience to guide it as to what may or may not conduce to making better provision for the regulation of such ships, and it is, therefore, not prepared to offer any opinion in regard to the Bill.

From the Government Solicitor, Madras, dated 23rd August 1895, No. 456.

ABSTRACT.—Forwarding the following opinion of the Advocate General, dated 22nd August 1895, on the Pilgrim Ships Bill.

OPINION.

I think that the Bill should make provision for the treatment of passengers on Pilgrim Ships who are not pilgrims, as the health of the pilgrim may be affected by that of such passengers.

(Signed) J. H. SPRING BRANSON,
Advocate General.

From the Acting Registrar of the High Court of Judicature, Appellate Side, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, dated Madras, 22nd August 1895, No. 2307.

With reference to G.O., dated the 19th instant, No. 692, Public, forwarding, for opinion, a Bill to make better provision for the regulation of Pilgrim Ships, I am directed to state that the Honorable the Chief Justice and Judges have no remarks to make on the subject.

From the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Marine Department, Fort St. George, dated Madras, 23rd August 1895, No. 1678-229-G.

In reply to G.O., No. 692, dated 19th August 1895, I have the honor to state that the "Pilgrim Ships Bill" appears to provide for all that is necessary. Of late years, I have had no opportunity of seeing much of pilgrim ships. To the best of my recollection the better class of accommodation used to be taken up by the more well to do pilgrims. I think it should be ruled that no passengers other than those proceeding on pilgrimage should be carried in "Pilgrim Ships."

ORDER—dated 26th August 1895, No. 701.

The following telegram will be despatched to the Secretary to the Government of India, Legislative Department:—

517. Pilgrim Ships Bill. High Court and Chamber of Commerce no remarks. Advocate General considers provision necessary for treatment passengers other than pilgrims on grounds health. Protector Emigrants thinks if passengers do not violate rules decency or sanitation no special provision necessary. Presidency Port Officer considers no non-pilgrim passengers should be carried pilgrim ships. This Government opinion provisions bill suitable and agree with Presidency Port Officer. Dates publication in Hindustani and Malayalam will follow. X

(True Extract)

J. F. PRICE,
Chief Secretary.

*This has been
been done
then...*

Govt. of {1895} Madras.

PUBLIC.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 26th August 1895, No. 701.

AUGUST.

Pilgrim Ships Bill.

Furnishing Government of India with the opinions of this Government and of certain officers on the provisions of the—.

1895.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

From the Government of
Fort St. George.

Issued

P. d.

Encl.

Letter, 26th August 1895, No. 702.

AUGUST.

Pilgrim Ships Bill.

Confirming the telegram despatched to the Government of India communicating opinions on the provisions of the—and forwarding copies of replies received by this Government on the subject.

26TH AUGUST 1895, No. 702, PUPLIC.

PUBLIC DEPARTMENT.

LETTER—from

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF

FORT ST. GEORGE,

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

I am directed to confirm the telegram No. 517 despatched to you this day and to forward herewith copies of the replies received by this Government in regard to the Pilgrim Ships Bill.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

J. F. PRICE,

Chief Secretary.

OOTACAMUND,
26th August 1895.

CURRENT No. 2735

Pelagic sept

From the Chairman Chamber of Commerce -
Massachusetts

Rece 21
Rece 22 } August 20-
Rece 23

subject
Submitting that the Chamber is not
prepared to offer any opinion in regard to
the Pelagic Ship Bill as pelagic ships do not
leave the Ports of Massachusetts.

25

C. D. Smith

CURRENT No. 2735

The Madras Chamber of Commerce,

Madras, 21st Aug 1895.

FROM

The Honble W. G. L. Chambers
CHAIRMAN, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
MADRAS.

CHIEF SECRETARY
22 AUG. 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

TO

The Chief Secretary to Government
Public Department
Pottamunth

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge
the receipt of the Order of the Madras
Government, dated the 19th instant,
No 692, forwarding for an early
expression of the Chamber's opinion
the Draft Pilgrim Ships Bill, together
with the Government of India's letter
of the 11th ultimo.

As pilgrim ships do not leave
the Ports of Madras, the Chamber has
no experience to guide it as to what
may

may or may not conduce to making
better provision for the regulation
of such ships, and it is therefore, not
prepared to offer any opinion in
regard to the Bill.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedt servant,

W. K. Chambers

Chairman.

CURRENT NO.
Public Dept
Public (1895) Department.

(EMIGRATION.)

From
THE PROTECTOR OF EMIGRANTS,
Madras,
To
THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
PUBLIC DEPARTMENT,
Fort St. George.

CHIEF SECRETARY
23 AUG 1895
No. 363
DEPARTMENT OF EMIGRATION

Dated 21st
Despatched - do } August 1895
Received 23rd

ENCLOSURES.

No.
Subject.

Submitting his opinion on
the treatment of passengers
who are not pilgrims, on
board pilgrim ships

P.S.

No. 363

2754
OFFICE OF THE PROTECTOR OF EMIGRANTS,
Madras, 21st August 1895.

From

W. J. H. de laune Esq. J. & C.

PROTECTOR OF EMIGRANTS,
Madras,

To

The Honble W. J. F. Price Esq.

CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
PUBLIC DEPARTMENT,
Fort St. George.

SIR,

With reference to Government Order dated 19th August 1895 No. 692 I have the honor to state that so long as passengers on Pilgrim Ships who are not pilgrims do not violate the rules of decency or sanitation, they may be treated as passengers on board other Steamers -

2. My remarks on the Pilgrim Ships Act were sent to Government through the Presidency Port Officer on the 1st instant.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most obedt Servant

W. J. H. de laune
Protector of Emigrants

*
"Open to no
objection"

Public Dept
Judicial {189 5} Department.

No.

FROM

By
The Registrar of the High Court
of Judicature, Appellate Side,
Madras.

Dated 22nd August } 1895.

Received
1895



No. 2307
Enc .

Stating that the High Court
has no remarks to make
on the Bill to make better
provision for the regulation
of Pilgrim ships.

No. 2307.

High Court of Judicature,
Madras, 22nd August 1895.

From D. W. G. Bowie Esquire,
Ag. Registrar of the High Court
of Judicature, Appellate side,
Madras.

To

The Honorable J. F. Price, C.S.I.,
Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort Saint George.

Honorable Sir,

With reference to G. O. dated the
19th instant, No. 692, Public, forwarding,
for opinion, a Bill to make better provision
for the regulation of Pilgrim ships, I am
directed to state that the Honorable the
Chief Justice and Judges have no remarks
to make on the subject.

I have the honor to be,
Honorable Sir,

Your most obedient servant,
D. W. G. Bowie

Ag. Registrar.

Every letter, whether printed or in manuscript, should be do-
cketed and abstracted on the back ;
and the abstract should state clearly the purport of the letter and
not merely its title subject.

Enclosures and statements also, whether sent with letters, or
merely under cover, should be numbered, docketed and abstracted.
The headings of statements should be written in full to prevent
mistakes, (G. O., 8th April 1893, No. 239, Public.)

Urgent

Public (1895) Department

From

Ernest Barclay
Government Solicitor
Madras

To

Mr Chief Secretary to
Government
Cotacamund

N^o 456

Dated 23 August 1895
recd 24
24

Forwarded with reference
to the Order of Government
dated 14 August 1895.

N^o 692. Public Department

Ernest Barclay
Government Solicitor

Re the Bill to make better provision for the
regulation of Pilgrim Ships.

Opinion

I think that the Bill should make provision
for the treatment of passengers on Pilgrim Ships
who are not pilgrims - as the health of the
pilgrim may be affected by that of such
passengers

J. H. Spring Brouson
Advocate General

Madras

22nd Augt.
1895

(True copy)

Ernst Baer

Government Solicitor

Madras 189) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,
Madras,

To

THE CHIEF SECY. TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
Fort St. George.

No. *1678*
2294

Dated *23* } *August* 189*5*.
Received *24* }
40670

No.



Subject.

*Submitting remarks on
the Pilgrim Ships Bill.*

Heading.

No. *1678*
2294

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE,
Madras, *23rd August* 1895.

From

Commander W. Powell B. I. M.

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,

Madras,

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

MARINE DEPARTMENT,

Fort Saint George.

SIR,

In reply to G. O. Memoirs No 692, dated
19th August 1895, I have the honor to state
that the "Pilgrim Ships Bill" appears to
provide for all that is necessary. Of late
years I have had no opportunity of seeing
much of pilgrim ships. To the best of my
recollection the better class of accommo-
dation used to be taken up by the men well
to do pilgrims. I think it should be ruled
that no passengers other than those proceeding
on pilgrimage should be carried in
"Pilgrim Ships."

I have the honor to be

Sir,
Your most obedient servant
Walter Powell

Commander B. I. M.

Presidency Port Officer

I perceive that India letter of July 11
was taken as entire quintal receipt of
letter on the 15th inst. It was then
forwarded, apparently, of course on the
17th; but it was not until the 19th a
delay of 2 days, that any thing was done.
It thus took 3 days to pass the purely
formal S.O. of Aug 19th, No 692, which
might almost have been passed in
as many minutes. For the delay no ca-
use is attempted. For the delay of
about a month which occurred after the
receipt of the India letter of July 11 the
excuse put forward is that the
letter was hidden in the bundle of other
copies of the Bill & was not found. If
it were the custom for India to send
down copies of bills without covering
letters, I could admit that this should
have some force. But I cannot remem-
ber any copies of bills ever being sent
down. I believe there is always a
covering letter. I shall be glad to hear
if that is the case. I have not notice the
of this disgraceful ~~the~~ case of July 11.

26 August 1895
No 701.
The following telegram will
be despatched to the Secy to the
Govt of India. Leg^{re} Dept:-

517x "Pilgrim Ships Bill".
High Court and Chamber of
Commerce no remarks. Advocate
General considers provision
necessary for treatment passengers
other than pilgrims on grounds
health. Protector Emigrants
thinks if passengers do not
violate rules decency or
sanitation no special provision
necessary. Presidency Port
Officer considers no non pil-
grim passengers should be
carried pilgrim ships. This
Govt opinion provisions Bill
suitable and agree with
Advocate General. Dates
publication in Hindustani
and Malayalam will follow.

I don't agree with the Adv. Genl. I
agree with the Presy Port officer that
Pilgrim ships should not carry non-pilgrim
passengers.
26/8/95
So do I
W
26 Aug

JOB.
24/8/95.
25/8/95

Public Dept

Letter, dated 26th Aug 1895, No 702.

To
The Secy to the Govt of India
Legislative Dept.

Sir,

I am directed to
confirm the telegram
^{No 517}
~~originally reported~~
despd. to you this day
and to forward herewith
copies of the replies
recd. by this Govt. in
regard to the Pilgrim
Ships Bill.

Sd/ J. H. Price
Ct.

Ct.

This will be printed here
and despd. without further
delay. The Secy. will then be
informed as requested.

J. H. P.

26.8.95

(Here enter the tel)

note

The referencer stated that the letter to which India wanted a reply was in the file regarding proposed rules under the Pilgrimage Act. Accordingly, telephoned to Mr Forbes at Govt House that the matter was urgent. Immediately the file came back from Mr Forbes. I found that the Refr's statement was incorrect and had a search made for the missing letter with the result stated.

C.S.

On receipt of C. 2679 inquiries were made but no trace of the letter No. 1254 could be found. Yesterday evening the letter was found embedded in a bundle of spare copies of the Bill. The outer spare copy bore the C.S. stamp of the 16th July but the letter had not been discovered by anybody. On enquiry I find that the spare copies were kept by the registering clerk awaiting a covering letter: that a few days after India sent a copy of rules framed under the Pilgrimage Act for opinion and a copy of the ~~Bill~~ Bill was in the file for reference. Clerk Narayana treated the copies of the Bill he had with him as spare copies and passed them into the records, and it was not until yesterday that the letter was discovered. It was quite fresh and unopened.

ness, and I will call upon
him for his explanation.
He has been absent from
office on acct of illness the
past two days. The despatch in
the Simla Sect. is certainly
guilty of contributory neg-
ligence in having concealed
the letter among the spare
copies, but that does not
absolve our responsibility.
The matter should
have been brought to my
notice at once as these
despatches from India
are always urgent. Please
pass the accq draft
and send it to the Head
Clerk who will arrange
to issue the G.O. today.

I am sorry to have to
trouble you on Sunday
but it is necessary.

Please see proposed
telegrams to India.

J.S.B.
18/8/95.

NOTE FOR THE Ball Club.

- (2) Public Registry
Solent
- (3) Public Refus.
- (4) Ramanujachari

I am directed by the B.A.
to obtain explanations from you
in this case and submit them to
him. Therefore, please send them
soon to me.

1169
19/8/95.

Note for the C.A.

I beg most respectfully to submit as follows :-

The bill which bears the C.A. stamp & 16 only was received in office, as usual, on the following day the 17th idem when it was handed over to me by Cell clerk Venkataramanayya with the remark that it was a bundle of spare copies which should await the covering letter. As it is the usual practice with India to send covering letter quite separately from the ~~spare~~ spare copies I had nothing to make me doubt the accuracy of the statement and so allowed the bundle to lie on my table for a time. Subsequently the clerk Phaniappa also told me to keep the spare copies for a day or two to see whether any covering letter was forthcoming. These circumstances strongly confirmed my belief that it was nothing but a bundle of spare copies. It did not therefore strike me that in this case the covering letter might be concealed within the bundle as it was subsequently discovered.

In the meanwhile the Cell clerk after consultation with the Public Defender Sekhara Menon came and told me that the covering letter had already been received & printed and asked me to mark the bundle as spare copies of P.W. No 2270. In this connection I beg most respectfully to submit that it is often the case that the covering letters are received first and the spare copies come by packet post afterwards. I had not therefore the least idea that the present would be an exception to the rule.

As the said current No 2270 (which was not then with me) related to Pilgrim Ships the statement did not appear to be incorrect especially after referring the matter myself to the Public Defender, he also corroborated that statement. The spare copies were accordingly marked. I am extremely sorry for having taken the word of my subordinate on trust as I had exceptionally strong grounds for believing them and as they never went wrong till now.

Under these most peculiar circumstances connected with this very regrettable mistake I beg most respectfully to request that the C.A. may be so kind as to view the matter with leniency and to grant me pardon in this case.

Mm.
20/8

With reference to the explanation called for in connection with the Pilgrim Ships Bill I beg to submit that about the 17th or 18th of last month the Cell clerk and the Registering clerk told me that a bundle of spare copies of the Bill in question was lying on the table without a covering letter and asked me whether any advice of their despatch from the Govt. ^{of India} was received by me. I replied that no such letter had been seen by me.

In the meantime, on the 19th idem another current, No 2270, was received from India relating to Pilgrim Ships and the above clerks asked me ~~again~~ whether the Bill was ^{not} an enclosure to it. I then pointed out that there was nothing in the letter to show that the Bill was an enclosure to it and that if no letter from the Govt of India had been received to which the Bill in question was an enclosure, then it was just possible that it might be an enclosure to C No 2270. Thus I left it to the clerks concerned, whose duty it was to ^{have} ascertained whether there was a covering letter, to satisfy themselves that there was no such letter. I am not aware if this has been done though the current (No 2270) was subsequently taken away.

33

33

and the Bill marked as an
enclosure to it.

V. S. Kharan
Public Reference

20 - 8 - 95

for

Note for the C.A.

During Venkatarama Ayyah's absence on sick leave I was merely attending, in addition to my own work, to the distribution of the Tappal papers to the Registering Clerk, (on H.C.'s order without making any attempt at noting Calls &c, as I was quite ignorant of that work.) On the Evening of the 16th July^{last}, just the day before V's return, the papers bundles of bills in question were received, and thinking that the papers might be a Leg. Current I sent the bundles

33

33

on to Shaligram Rao.
He returned them that
evening at about 6
or half past six
saying that it was
neither a jud. nor
a legislative paper.
I then left the bundle
to the best of my
recollection on his
table in the rattan tray.
The next morning I
saw them on Karay-
nar's table & thought
they were taken proper
care of. I know
absolutely nothing
about the subsequent
history of the Current.

A.T.R.
20/VIII

(1) On the day the paper
was received in the
office I was sick at
home and consequently
it was not distributed
by me for registry.

19.8.95.

DUR

Call Clerk.

Mr H.

When did you return to office
after your illness? Did send the
registering. letter or the Defer. consult.
you as regards the covering
letter after your return to office.
Please reply soon. 1.10.1905

(1)

I returned to office on the 17th of July from my sick leave and when I distributed papers for registry that morning I found some 3 or 4 bundles of blue paper already lying on Narayan the Public Registering clerk's table. After some time at about 2 or 2.30 in the day he asked me whether any covering letter was with me about those bundles. I replied that I never had a look into the bundle, that they were not distributed by me & consequently I knew nothing about them. Soon after I went to the Reference Dept. to distribute some registered papers I had on hand & casually repeated the question put to me by Narayan to Askharan the Public Reference. Askharan replied me that he had not seen any paper of the kind referred to or some such thing. In proof of my statement that the paper was not distributed by me I beg to say that clerk Ramannja Chavry has said before 2 or 3 fellow clerks on the evening of the 17th instant ^{afterwards} & repeated the same that he first sent the papers to the legislative registering clerk under the

(2)

impression that the paper belonged to that department but when he (the legislative registering clerk) returned them to him as being Public he kept them on the Public Registering clerk's table. ~~Remember~~ please see the letter "Publ" at the top of the spare copy filed with the G.O. in Ramannja Chavry's handwriting & from the above I think it is evident that the papers in question were received in the office for registry on the 16th & enquiries made regarding them on that same day - the day on which I was sick & at home.

On the 19th of July a further paper was received from the Govt. of India on the Pilgrimage Ship Rules & this I passed on for registry. On the 22nd of the same month 7 spare copies of the above ^{were} ~~was~~ received. These spare copies also I passed on to the Public Registering clerk & it must have been regarding these that I might have told something to him and not about papers which

(3)

are received in the office during my absence & about which I knew nothing. In this connection I beg to point out that when spare copies are received for the forwarding of them or for the current requires, when being required they are returned to me directly or through the Head clerk & according to the instructions I received from the Head clerk I make enquiries in the several departments of the Secretariat or write to Madras office also for information if necessary. If the particular paper in question had passed through me for registry or had been returned to me forward of the covering letter I would not have deviated from the usual rule of practice. When signed copies of printed letters are received sometimes they (the signed copies) are placed in the beginning & some time in the end of the file of spare copies. It is the registering clerk who goes through the papers, picks

(P.T.O.)

Assistant.
NOTE FOR THE CHIEF SECRETARY.

The explanations of all the clerks concerned in this case are submitted. The bundles of spare copies of bills were received in the office and seem to have been distributed for registry together with other papers by Ramaniyachari on the 16th July ^(by Venkatarawayya) and not on the 17th July, as stated by Narayanan, Public Dept. registering clerk. Please see serial entry "Public" in Ramaniyachari's hand writing on the spare copy of the bill filed with the G.O. submitted with this. Venkatarawayya returned to duty after recovery from illness on the 17th - vide medical certificate in this file. It is clear that Narayanan did not examine C.N. 2270 in order to satisfy himself whether the spare copies in question really belonged to that current or not, and made the entry on ~~one~~ the topmost copy of one of the bundles - "40 spare copies of C.N. 2270". He might have in all probability consulted me as regards the covering letter

out the signed copy & registers that copy. He does not register at random the first copy that he chances to pick up. In the same way it is he - the registering clerk who goes over the file & examines whether signed copy of printed copies or covering letter of spare copies have been received.

I respectfully beg to be excused for this long and detailed explanation & my only excuse is that I have thought it necessary under the present circumstances.

D.V.R.

clerk

21/8/95

128

I deny his statement in toto, but as it will be seen from his explanation, I never told him to pass the spare copies on to records without satisfying himself as regards the whereabouts of the missing covering letter.

The Refee Dept. was not up to this time in the habit of examining bundles of spare copies with a view to see whether any current has been mixed up with them. I understood from the Referees and also attended that they return to the registering clerk concerned only in cases where the current number or numbers to which the spare copies belong are not marked. All the attenders have been warned to show in future the spare copies to the referees concerned before they are put away in proper places.

33

It is no doubt very regrettable that this careless and stupid mistake should have occurred in the office, but under the peculiar circumstances of the case and on the face of the fact that 4 of 1. letters are always received separately either before or after the receipts of the spare copies and that India's letter was

NOTE FOR THE CHIEF SECRETARY.

in question marked "urgent" in
red ink was despatched at
Simla mixed up in one of the
packets of a large number of
spare copies of bills enclosed in
8 separate covers (Please see pencil
note on the 1st page of the letter
C.N. 2689 - 35 A.C.'s were enclosed
in 7 separate covers; the 5 remaining copies
together with the letter were en-
closed in another cover, because the
L.S.'s date stamp has been
impressed on 8 spare copies, one
of each contained in each cover).
it is, I respectfully beg to submit,
for the kind consideration of the
C.B.A. and the L.S. whether the
mistake committed in the office
should not be condoned as a
special case. These last lines are
not, I beg to add, intended
to deny the fact that the
mistake committed was a careless one.

179
21/3/15

C.S.

With ref: to the Hui's
note of 26.8.95 in this file
attention is invited to
the note attached to this
which was written on the
18th ult. Clerk Narayan
passed the spare copies of
the Bill into the records
as spare copies of a spare
copy, wh. happened to
form the enclosure to
another letter from India
regarding rules under
the Bill when it becomes
law. He had no warrant
for doing this. Clerk Sakhar
Menon was aware of the
circumstances under
wh. the spare copies were
passed to his care in the
Records. He shd. have exer-
cised more care. The
lengthy explan^g subd:
offer no valid excuse as
both clerks have been
in the office for sometime
and must be aware of
the object of a number of
S.C. of a Bill being sent
down by India. The clerks
work very hard here and
are not to be blamed.

do not often occur. It is
seldom a clerk gets
away before 7 p.m. and the
office is generally open
until 8 p.m.

The delay from the
17th to the 19th observed by
the H.M. is explained in
the margin of the attached
note. Clerk K. Sekhara
Memon took the telegram
to refer to the letter re
rules under the Act. and
I accordingly telephoned to
Mr. Forbes asking him to
expedite that file as he
was dealing with it. It was
only on receipt of the file
that I found the telegram
referred to a different
letter. I then had a search
made & the letter found.
Up to that time I was
not aware of the receipt
of the S.C. of the Bill.

Submitted to H.M.

These copies from India
are marked in pencil
on the outside. When stamping
the papers I must take
care and stamp the outside
copy & not the inside

Note

The papers have only just
been recd. from the H.M.

one. I have never before known a case
where the copies of the letter were sent inside
these copies; the letters are always stamped
which the C.A. says is correct, both
men are very well behaved and
hard working and they have
their hands full from morning

C. No.

FOR ORDERS.

tell him at night. They have never
been brought up before me before
and my practice for a first offence
is to give a warning. I have therefore
had them both before me and given them
a severe reprimand which I trust
that H.M. will consider sufficient.
I do not think that a thing of this
kind is likely to occur again as the
men have hitherto been careful
& attentive to their duties.

R

3/9/95

FOR ORDERS.

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for signature.

Despatched in print.

READ AGAIN G O., No.
189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPER NOT FILED UP. BEING MEANT FOR DISPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

- A—Print in full.
- B—Not to be printed.
- P—Print abstract only.
- Q—Print heading only.

NUMBER OF COPIES
REQUIRED.

Order complete. 105
Letter only. 105
Order complete with Letter 10