

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	518	Press
		Mis.
<hr/>		
Dated	1 st	March 1918

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.

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.

on referring to my predecessors on

(Enclosure A)

(Service List of Sivarroya Talley)

18 September 1852 to 31 December 1864 as Layer Recounted at 5. Indian

at Madalapel and Candamungalam

17 October 1853 to 11 July 1853 as Head at Madalapel and Candamungalam 10. 10.

12 July 1853 to 31 December 1863 as Head at Madalapel and Candamungalam 20. 20.

1 January 1864 to 28 February 1868 as Head at Candamungalam 30. 30.

1 March 1868. At Aching at Montand Chandy 40. 40.

Service List of Panthasandy Kuidro. Vide Collection to Government dated 28 March 1864 No. 15 and forming an Enclosure B with present Report.

Charles H. B. Collector

REVENUE.	
THE BOARD OF REVENUE.	
Recd.	Loc.
G. O. No. 180 of 1864, No. 318.	
No. of the Board of Revenue.	
23 March 1864 No. 1959	
MARCH.	
Nos. 1.2.	
Doubtless on 2000 reported by land to Pondicherry. — Summary of the Board of Revenue arrived on Collector's letter of 18 March.	

From J. B. S. Torson Esq
British Consul General
Pondicherry

To
The Queen's Merchant, Chaulm

I will thank you for
the letter of the 11th inst. telling me
that you had sent me the
Bill of Exchange for his
Honour's Office, and
that if it does not do so,
I cannot sign the Drawback
Bill.

Pondicherry
Consul General's Office
24th Feby 1868 } Signed J. B. S. Torson
British Consul General

1 True Copy

Charles Smith
Collector

Encl. A
I enclose
from the Collect
of the 11th inst.
15 Feby 1868
No. 532/69
11th Feby 1868
Dennis Smith
of the 11th inst.
Pondicherry

No 32

From
C. W. Reade Esqre
Collector of South India

I,

A Macpherson Esqre
Asst 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.

*Vide Enclosures
A and B.

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 organised and
sanctioned without consulting
or referring to my predecessors or
to

Encd C.

June 24th 1869
The Collector of South
India 215 Secy 1869
No 9.

220-552/9
Muz. Madras 169 of 11.

Copy of the letter
from the Secretary to
the Revenue at
Madras to the
Collector of South
India.

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.

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 conception,
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 Harford in
his letter to Mr Blair was
really chargeable against
him. In fact I confess my
great astonishment when I
read Mr Harford's letter detailing
the manner in which he had
exercised his important
functions of supervision. Mr
Harford

Horfor does not say in his letter
that he ever verbally or in writing
took exception to the Ameen's
Character, yet surely if he had
seen an ill placed confidence
on my part in that public
servant, it was imperative
on Mr Horfor 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 Horfor, he
has never even hinted that he
suspected Parthasarady Aiyar
or any of the other Ameen's 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 Auditor
and Port House, that I altogether
participated in his (Collector's)
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 Sayer Customs management
whatever the result.

6. In reference to the
Board's Para 10 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 impracti-
cable under the system of
"check" which had been esta-
blished and my firm impression
was that Mr. Horner who had
undertaken the duty examined
all goods for drawback before
signing the Certificate of their
entry, and on which alone draw-
back 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 gross remissness on Mr. Kerfor's part as admitted by that gentleman. Mr. Kerfor 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

87
requiring even the formal production before him of the goods or whatever it was to represent them. By the very appointment of Mr. Kerfor 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.

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 on 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 15 certainly
surprised me, and I should
be glad to have it pointed
out to me how I could find
out or be aware of Mr. Porfirio's
larceny and that frauds were
going on in consequence of it.
Information anonymous,
Pseudonymous, and authenti-
cated reaches me frequently
in connection with different
branches of the administration
of my 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
attempt at fraud and the
whole matter would still have
remained in obscurity.

9. In reference to Para 17
it strikes me as strange that
Mr. Porfirio wrote to the General
and not to me, and if the Carls
were not brought to him he
had simply to withhold his
Counter signature to the Certificate,
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 Mr
Norfor and the Queen on
either side in confirmation
of Mr Norfor's statement with
the exception of one letter of
which I enclose a copy, and
therefore it rests with Mr
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 Mr
Norfor's province to have commu-
nicated to me any dereliction
of duty on the Queen's part,
and that it was an error in
corresponding with those officers
direct, or at all events I should
have been apprised of his
having done so.

x dated
24 Feb/58
Enclosure C.

The

xx
dated
4 March 1858
recorded in 1858
17 March 1858
Encls. B.

10. The Board ask for
Parthasarady Kaidoo's antecedents
as well as those of the present
acting Queen. Every thing I know
of Parthasarady is given in my
letter to government when recom-
mending his appointment as a
Layer 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 Partha-
sarady'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

integrity has ever to my know-
ledge been brought against him.

11. I may add that
Parthasarady Raidoo 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
Ameen officiating for Partha-
sarady Raidoo I know nothing
of him beyond what the records
show. He bears a good cha-
racter and was the oldest
and next in seniority of the
servants of the Survey Department,
and

and therefore I appointed him.
All other particulars as far
as it can 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.

South Arcot
Cott. Ch. Catchery
Chinnampett
in Ch. K. K. K.
Jaghire
9 February 1869

I have
Signed C. H. Reade
Collector

/True Copy/

J. H. Reade
Collector

Revenue 1869 Oct

27-518

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

27-518

MD

1st March / 69

14 copies to the Secy of Revenue Dept
4 " " Collr of South Arcot

for the
Collector's
letter
in duplicate

1030
24

In a letter from
the Collector of South
Arcot dated 15 July / 69
No 9.
Rev. 5354/69
1st March 1869
Copy of a letter
from the Board of Revenue
to the Collector of South Arcot

C N 3964 of 1868.

Not under
attention.

Revenue 1869 @ 1/2

From N. 554.

The Collector of
South India
Secretary
of Government
Rev. Secy.
Madras

15 Feb. 1869

No. 9
Encls. 3.
N. 518. 1st March

Forwarding copy of
letter addressed to the
Board of Revenue, for
certain Encl.
in reference
to Board's Res. of 17th
December last No. 8779
on the subject of
Drawbacks -

1/2 N. 518. 1st March