M.R.O. 1—30,000—13-10-29.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 5-18 Press Mis.

1-2

Dated 18th March 1869

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
1st March 1869.

No. 1. Read the following letter from the Collector of South Arcot, to the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort St. George, dated South Arcot, 15th February 1869, No. 9 :—

1. I have the honor to submit copy of a letter* addressed by the Board of Revenue, in acknowledgment of their Proceedings, No. 8,779, of the 17th December last, and which are now under consideration before Government.

2. I have submitted this letter direct, so that it might be read in connection with the Board's Proceedings, and before the final orders of Government are recorded on those Proceedings.

* Dated 9th February 1869, No. ——.

No. 2. ORDER THEREON, 1st March 1869, No. 518.

Miscellaneous.

The Government await the remarks of the Board of Revenue upon the Collector's letter.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
,, the Collector of South Arcot.

Exd. G. A. Turton.

or referring to my predecessors or
to

Board of Revenue.

REVENUE.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

&c, &c., &c.

Dated March, 1st.

Recd. Inst.

G. O., 1st March 1860, No. 318.

Pro. of the Board of Revenue
dy 23 March 1860 No 959

MARCH.

Nos. 1-2.

Drawback on goods re-exported by land to Pondicherry.—Remarks of the Board of Revenue availed on Collector's letter on this subject.

Enclosure C

3

From B. C. Norfor Esqr
British Consular Agent
Pondicherry

To
The Honble Charles Boileau Elliott
Esqr Collector of Customs Salt & Opium
Cuddalore

Sir

I have the honor to forward herewith
a Bill of Exchange No 2 for Rupees
Five hundred & Sixty Nine & Annas
Eight & Pies Nine drawn by
Messrs Mackintosh & Co of Pondicherry
on Messrs Grindlay & Co of London at
Ninety days sight in favor of
Messrs Mackintosh & Co for the
amount of Bill.

Pondicherry
Consular Agents office
24th February 1868

I have &c
B. C. Norfor
British Consular Agent

True Copy

Charles Boileau
Collector

Encl. A.

Invoice
From The Black
Mackintosh & Co
To Sundries
15th February 1868
Rupees

Rupees 569 8 9

Errors Excepted
Pondicherry
15th February 1868
For Mackintosh & Co
Pillay

No 32

From C. H. Reade Esqre
Collector of South Arcot

To,

A. Macpherson Esqre
Offg Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Madras

Sir,

I am in receipt of the Board's Proceedings dated 15 December 1868, No 8779, and beg to submit on separate Papers* the information called for in Para 1.

2. Having done this I can hardly avoid notice of the subject generally of which these Proceedings under acknowledgment treat.

3. The Board are aware that the whole System of land Drawbacks was organized and sanctioned without consulting or referring to any predecessors or

to

*Vide Enclosures A and B.

Encl C.

Letter from
The Collector of South Arcot
dated 15 Decr 1868
No 8779.

Rec'd 22nd Dec 1868
Rev Dept

Reports the Collector of South Arcot has taken over charge of the Collectorate at Cuddalore Limits.

to myself. It was apparently on some direct communication from the French Governor of Pondicherry that the Madras Government granted the indulgence, and this office simply received the orders of the latter to give effect to the arrangement.

4. Also in 1862 the extension of the indulgence was obtained by the then Collector of Sea Customs with the approval of the Board of Revenue, but I was not consulted on the subject, and as with the original concession, so with its extension, I simply received orders to carry it out, and had the Consular Agent who subsequently undertook the

the duty of checking frauds and who was specially nominated for that object been ordinarily careful in doing what was required of him, frauds such as those which are supposed to have been practised could not have been attempted and I do not see that I had any cause, much less right, to suppose that such strange laxity as that admitted by Mr Norfor in his letter to Mr Blair was really chargeable against him. In fact I confess my great astonishment when I read Mr Norfor's letter detailing the manner in which he had exercised his important functions of supervision. Mr Norfor

Norfor does not say in his letter
that he ever verbally or in writing
took exception to the Queen's
Character, yet surely if he had
seen an ill placed confidence
on my part in that public
Servant, it was imperative
on Mr Norfor to have reported
to me his suspicions, and had
I neglected such information
the responsibility would un-
questionably and very properly
have rested entirely with myself,
but notwithstanding the many
Years I have been in constant
intercourse with Mr Norfor, he
has never even hinted that he
suspected Barthasarady, Luidos
or any of the other Queens who
have at different intervals
officiated, and yet in Para 3
of his letter he writes "I cannot

say

say, having myself been many
years in the Sea Customs Cadiz
and Port Rose, that I altogether
participated in his (Collectors)
opinion."

5. I would not condescend
to shrink from any responsibility
much less to throw that respon-
sibility on another, and I
willingly accept it to the fullest
extent as regards all my own
acts and doings in reference
to the Lager Customs management
whatever the result.

6. In reference to the
Board's Para 6 I am not aware
that the subject of Drawbacks
ever came under discussion
except on two occasions. In
March 1864 Mr Blair, referring

to

to a large quantity of Grey Shirting, re-exported into Pondicherry in January and February of that year, wished to know how such large quantities were disposed of at Pondicherry, and whether they were not smuggled into British Territory. This reference never suggested to me, and could not, I submit, possibly suggest to any one that frauds of the kind now brought to light were carried on, and therefore as regards the question of smuggling I simply stated my conviction that smuggling was going on and that we should do our best to check it. The matter never afterwards came under consideration till January 1867, and

and on this, as on the previous occasion, I certainly had no reason to suspect that frauds of the kind had been, or ever could be committed, and I certainly imagined that any things of the kind was impracticable under the system of check which had been established and my firm impression was that the Officer who had undertaken the duty examined all goods for drawback before signing the certificate of their entry, and on which alone drawback was paid, so that it never for a moment occurred to me that such frauds could be attempted, much less practised, and

and thus my attention was never directed to them, and I leave the Board to say how I could possibly have anticipated such grievous remissness on Mr. Horsfall's part as admitted by that Gentleman: Mr. Horsfall was required in every case to certify to the actual arrival of the Goods in Pondicherry, and he did so certify; how then could I have ever dreamt that he was in the habit of signing these important vouchers as a mere form without taking the trouble to satisfy himself that the Goods as declared therein by him had actually reached the French Settlement, and not only so but that he often gave the certificate without requiring

requiring even the formal production before him of the Goods or whatever it was to represent them. By the very appointment of Mr. Horsfall to this duty I conceive that I was relieved of all individual responsibility and it was because of the impossibility of the Collector supervising such matters that a distinct officer resident on the Spot was nominated.

7. The Correspondence of 1867 to which I have alluded will be found recorded in the Board's Proceedings of 13th April 1867 No. 2389, and of 16th January 1868 No. 342, and I do not recollect any previous occasion except that in 1864 already referred to on which the Board or any one else

Else called my attention to the subject and yet in their present proceedings it is stated that my attention was repeatedly called to it.

8. The Remarks of the Board in Para 75 certainly surprise me, and I should be glad to have it pointed out to me how I could find out or be aware of Mr Corfield's incapacity and that frauds were going on in consequence of the Information anonymous, pseudonymous, and authenticated reaches me frequently in connection with different branches of the administration of any district but none has ever come to me relating to frauds connected with the matter of Land Drawbacks, how

how or why this has been I cannot of course pretend to say; probably, however, had it not been for the secret information given to Mr Blair, he and his Department would have been in ignorance of the late detected attempts at fraud and the whole matter would still have remained in obscurity.

9. In reference to Para 9 it strikes me as strange that Mr Corfield wrote to the Secretary and not to me, and if the Certificates were not brought to him he had simply to withhold his Countersignature to the Certificates, and after a while to have reported the fact, when possibly some light might have been thrown on what was going on.

I have been unable to discover any correspondence in the Customs Offices between Sir Norfor and the Queens on either side in confirmation of Sir Norfor's statement with the exception of one letter of which I enclose a copy, and therefore it rests with Sir Norfor to produce it if existing, and I presume, as being an official character, it must be on his own records but I submit that it was Sir Norfor's province to have communicated to me any dereliction of duty on the Queen's part, and that it was an error corresponding with those offic direct, or at all events I should have been apprised of this having done so.

x dated 24 Feby/68 Enclosure C.

10. Sir Board as to Parthasarady Naidoo's antecedents as well as those of the present acting Queen: Every thing I know of Parthasarady is given in my xx letter to Government wherein recommending his appointment as a Lawyer Queen, and I cannot do better than enclose a copy of that letter with the Government order for the Board's information, and in it are also detailed my grounds for the belief in Parthasarady's special fitness and aptitude for the Post. I have seen no reason to alter my opinion despite that of others, and not a single charge affecting his character or integrity

xx dated 4 Dec 1865 recorded in G.O. 15 17th March 1864 No 463 Encl. B.

integrity has ever to my knowledge been brought against him.

11. I may add that Parthasarady Naidoo has been absent on sick leave since upwards of a year, having become paralysed and with very little hope of recovery, and when the leave to which he is entitled has expired his place will be permanently filled up.

12. As regards the Queen officiating for Parthasarady Naidoo I know nothing of him beyond what the records shew. He bears a good character and was the oldest and next in seniority of the Servants of the Lawyer Department, and therefore I appointed him. All other particulars as far as I can will be found in the Separate Papers attached.

13. I have thought it necessary to send a Copy of this letter direct to Government in order that it may be read in connection with the Board's Proceedings. I am now acknowledging as otherwise it might be too late if submitted through the Board after their consultation on it.

I have &c
(Signed) C. H. Reade
Collector

South Arcot
Offi: Ch Cutcherry
Chinnienpett
in Chittoor
Jaghire
9th February 1869

/True Copy/

[illegible]
Dy Collector

Revenue 1869 Vol 2

12

Vol 518.

The Govt await the remarks of the Board of Revenue upon the Collectors letter.

Dick

WD

1st March 69

14 Copies Letter of Rec'd Dec 28 No.
4 " Coll'r of Limerick No 1

WD

1st March 69

I.a. a letter from the Collector of Limerick dated 15th Dec 1868 No 9.

1

Rec'd 5th Jany 1869

Copy of a letter from the Board of Revenue to the Secretary of Treasury

Revenue 1869 Oct.

No. 554.

From The Collector of South Arcot

To Secretary to Government Rev. Dept. Madras

Dated 15th February 69

Rec'd 23rd do

No. 9

Encls. 3.

No. 518. 1st Branch

Forwarding copy of a letter addressed to the Board of Revenue requisitioning certain explanations in reference to Board's Ors. of 17th December last No. 8779 on the subject of Drawbacks.

C No. 3964 of 1868.