M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Political DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 230 (69-75) Press / ~~Mis.~~
69-75

Dated 31-5- 1873.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following papers:—

No. 69. Despatch from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India.

INDIA OFFICE, LONDON,
23rd January 1873.

Political.
No. 4.

MY LORD,—I transmit, herewith, copy of a correspondence* with Messrs. Smith, Fleming, and Co., East India Merchants in London, and desire to be favoured with any information which your Excellency's Government may have to afford respecting the commercial clauses of the treaty of 1802 with the Government of His Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad, with especial reference to the commercial facilities afforded by that treaty to subjects of His Highness the Nizam at Masulipatam.

* Letter from Messrs. Smith, Fleming, and Co., dated 7th January 1873.
Letter to Messrs. Smith, Fleming, and Co., dated 17th January 1873.

I have, &c.,
ARGYLL.

His Excellency the Right Honourable
The Governor-General of India in Council.

From Messrs. SMITH, FLEMING, and Co., to T. L. SECCOMBE, Esq., C.B., Assistant Under Secretary of State, dated 17 and 18, Leadenhall Street, London, 7th January 1873.

Our friends in Bombay, Messrs. Collilier and Co., who have recently opened an Agency for the sale and purchase of goods in Hyderabad in the Deccan, inform us that a treaty between the Nizam's Government and the Honourable East India Company, called the Commercial Treaty of 1802, No. XI. of Aitchison's Treaties, Volume V., which has never been repealed, expressly makes Masulipatam a free port for all goods intended for consumption in the Nizam's dominions, and they have instructed us to ship goods to Masulipatam for transmission to Hyderabad.

2. As the treaty in question, though unrepealed, has been many years in abeyance, we conceive it to be our duty to bring the fact of the existence to your knowledge, and to inquire whether the treaty will be respected, as we should not like to be the means of raising any difficulty between the Government and that of the Nizam.

From H. MERIVALE, Esq., C.B., Under Secretary of State for India, to Messrs. SMITH, FLEMING, and Co., 17 and 18, Leadenhall Street, dated India Office, 17th January 1873.

I am directed by the Duke of Argyll to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 7th instant, addressed to the Assistant Under Secretary of State, and to inform you, in reply, that the treaty of 1802 with the Government of His Highness the Nizam of the Deccan has not, so far as concerns the point to which your inquiry relates, been in any way modified, but whether its commercial provisions are still in operation can only be ascertained by reference to the Government of India, to whom a copy of this correspondence has been sent.

No. 429-P.

Copy of the above forwarded to the Government of Fort St. George, with a request that the Government of India may be furnished with a report on the matter.

(By order, &c.)
(Signed) C. E. BUCKLAND,
for *Offg. Under Secy. to the Govt. of India.*

FOREIGN DEPARTMENT (POLITICAL),
FORT WILLIAM, *5th March* 1873.

Referred to the Acting Collector of the Kistna District for report through the Board of Revenue.

FORT ST. GEORGE,
11*th March* 1873.

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Chief Secretary.

No. 70. From D. BARBOUR, Esq., Officiating Under Secretary to the Government of India, Financial Department, to the Hon. W. HUDLESTON, Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, dated Fort William, 3rd April 1873, No. 2232.

I am directed to forward a copy of the papers noted on the margin, and to request that, with the permission of His Excellency the Governor in Council, you will be good enough to submit a report as to whether any special commercial privileges are at present afforded to subjects of His Highness the Nizam at Masulipatam, under the provisions of the treaty of 1802.

Despatch from Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India (Political), No. 4, dated 23rd January 1873, and enclosures.
Endorsement (Foreign Department), No. 431-P., dated 5th March 1873, to the address of the Department of Agriculture, Revenue, and Commerce.

Referred to the Collector of the Kistna District for report.

OOTACAMUND,
2*nd May* 1873.

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Chief Secretary.

No. 71. From G. D. LEMAN, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, to the Hon. W. HUDLESTON, Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, dated Masulipatam, 9th May 1873, No. 741.

I have the honour to return the enclosure, and to reply that no special commercial privileges are or ever have been accorded to the subjects of His Highness the Nizam at Masulipatam.

2. The previous reference on the same subject was answered according to the instructions endorsed on it through the Board of Revenue, and I have the honour to enclose a copy.

No. 72. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 21st May 1873, No. 848.

From G. D. LEMAN, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Masulipatam, 30th April 1873, No. 671.

IN accordance with the Chief Secretary's endorsement, dated 11th March 1873, I have the honour to return the accompanying correspondence through the Board to Government.

2. Board's Proceedings, No. 502, dated 1st April 1873, are on the same subject. I have looked into the matter further since writing my letter published with the above Board's Proceedings, and I think the Proceedings of the Board dated 8th July 1844 render it quite clear that Masulipatam was never considered a free port for goods imported for Hyderabad.

Secretary of State's despatch, dated 23rd January 1873, No. 4, Political Department.
Letter from Messrs. Smith, Fleming, and Co., to Assistant Under Secretary of State, dated 7th January 1873.
Letter to do., dated 17th January 1873.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
31*st May* 1873.

3. I have but the Order as published at page 360 of the old Circular Order Book of the Board of Revenue to refer to, but it would seem that, when considering the terms of the treaty of 1802 with reference to Act VI.* of 1844, the only question was about the amount of frontier duty to be charged, and that the Sea Custom duty was passed over altogether as a matter about which there could be no question. Up to that time goods imported in certain vessels, and, among them, those of His Highness the Nizam, were not chargeable with duty, as by Regulation, XI. of 1803 they were considered to be in British bottoms and so exempt from import duty.

* An Act for the abolition of Inland Customs.

4. It does not seem to me that there are any words in the treaty of 1802 that justify Messrs. Smith, Fleming, and Co.'s statement in their letter to Mr. Seccombe that the treaty "expressly makes Masulipatam a free port for all goods intended for consumption in Hyderabad." The free use of the port given in Article 1 cannot be taken to mean more than a permission to His Highness to make use of the port without let or hindrance—a permission which is extended in Article 2 to all ships carrying His Highness' flag.

5. A similar concession is given in Section 2, Regulation IV. of 1812, to all European ships.

6. Also while Article 8 of the treaty of 1802 lays down that no more than five per cent. is to be charged by His Highness the Nizam on exports the treaty is silent as to what may be charged by the Honourable East India Company.

7. My records do not show that any application to pass goods free has ever been made before this, and it is certain that there has never been in the district any such preventive service as would have been necessary to stop smuggling and prevent the sale in the district of goods imported nominally for Hyderabad had the port ever been made use of as proposed.

SUBMITTED to Government with reference to the Chief Secretary's endorsement on a letter from the Government of India inquiring whether Masulipatam is a free port for goods destined for the Nizam's dominions under the Commercial Treaty of 1802.

2. The same point raised by Messrs. Nichol and Co. of Hyderabad was dealt with in Board's Proceedings, dated 1st April 1873, No. 502, a copy of which is forwarded.

3. The "free use of the seaport" is granted to the Nizam by Article 1 of the treaty, but this did not make it a *free port*. In Article 3 a "free transit" of goods across the frontier line is provided for, but Article 5 shows that duty was levied on the goods that had the free transit. Similarly duty has always been levied on goods landed at Masulipatam for the Nizam's dominions in spite of his having the free use of the port.

4. The treaty has never been understood to bear the sense attributed to it by Messrs. Smith, Fleming, and Co., nor is it susceptible of that construction, nor has the Nizam's Government ever made the claim.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) J. GROSE,
Secretary.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Political Department,
31*st May* 1873.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 1st April 1873, No. 502.

Read the following letters :—

From G. D. LEMAN, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Masulipatam, 6th January 1873, No. 35.

I have the honour to forward, for the consideration and orders of the Board, an original letter from the Agent to Messrs. Nicol and Co. at Hyderabad, inquiring whether, under the Commercial Treaty of 1802,* goods from England will be allowed to be imported at Masulipatam free of duty.

* *Vide* pages 83 and 84 of Volume V. of Mr. Aitchison's Treaties, &c., 1864.

2. I am not aware that the treaty quoted has become obsolete.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Letter from the Agent to Messrs. Nicol and Co.

From the same Officer, dated Repalli, 19th March 1873, No. 408.

ABSTRACT.—Requesting early reply to his letter, No. 35, dated 6th January 1873.

The Board cannot find that, during the seventy years which have elapsed since the treaty, it has been thought to bear the sense now sought to be attached to it ; nor does the wording, in their opinion, warrant such a construction.

2. The Collector should levy duty, as usual, on goods imported at Masulipatam without taking heed of their destination.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) H. E. STOKES,
Acting Sub-Secretary.

No. 73. ORDER THEREON, 31st May 1873, No. 230.

Ordered that the above report of the Collector, and Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, be forwarded for submission to the Government of India, with reference to the communications in the Foreign and Financial Departments, dated 5th March and 3rd April 1873, Nos. 429-P.-and 2232, respectively, and with the remark of this Government that neither the terms of the Commercial Treaty of 1802 with His Highness the Nizam, nor the practice under it for the past seventy years, afford any grounds for the assumption in Messrs. Smith, Fleming, and Co.'s letter, that Masulipatam was by that treaty made a free port for goods intended for consumption in the Hyderabad State.

(True Extract.)

Acting Under Secretary,
for *Chief Secretary.*

To the Board of Revenue.
,, Collector of the Kistna District.

Exd. J. Wright.

Govt. of India.

POLITICAL.

To

The Board of Revenue,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated May, 31st.

Recd.

G. O., 31st May 1873, No. 230.

MAY.
Nos. 69–75.

Directing that certain papers bearing on the question of Masulipatam being a free port for goods intended for consumption in the Hyderabad State be forwarded to the Government of India.

(Copy.)

Political
No 4.

India Office, London
23rd January 1873.

His Excellency The Right Honble
The Governor General of India
in Council.

My Lord,

I transmit herewith Copy of
a correspondence* with Messrs Smith, Fleming
and Co, East India Merchants in London,
and desire to be favoured with any information
which your Excellency's Government may have
to afford respecting the Commercial clauses of the
Treaty of 1802 with the Government of His
Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad, with especial
reference to the Commercial facilities afforded
by that Treaty to subjects of His Highness
the Nizam at Masulipatam.

I have the honor to be &c.

(Sd) Argyll.

* Letter from Messrs Smith, Fleming & Co 8th January 1873. to Do 14th Do

17 & 18 Leadenhall Street
London, 4th Jany 1873.

To

J. L. Vecombe, Esquire C.B.
Assistant Under Secy of State.

Sir,

We Friends in Bombay

Collins & Co, who have recently opened an Agency for the Sale and purchase of Goods in Hyderabad in the Deccan, inform us that a Treaty between the Nizam's Government and the Honorable East India Company, called the Commercial Treaty of 1802 & XI of Aitchison's Treaties Vol: 5 which has never been repealed, expressly makes Masulipatam a free port for all goods intended for consumption in the Nizam's dominions and they have instructed us to ship goods to Masulipatam for transmission to Hyderabad.

As the Treaty in question, though unrepealed, has been many years in abeyance, we conceive it to be our duty to bring the fact of the existence to your knowledge, and to inquire whether the Treaty will be respected, as we should not like to be the means of raising any difficulty between the Government and that of the Nizam.

We are &c.

Messrs Smith, Fleming & Co.

India Office, 17th January 1873.

Messrs Smith, Fleming & Co.
17 & 18. Leadenhall Street.

Gentlemen,

I am directed by the Duke of Argyll to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 7th instant, addressed to the Assistant Under Secy of State, and to inform you in reply that the Treaty of 1802 with the Government of His Highness the Nizam of the Deccan has not, so far as concerns the point to which your enquiry relates, been in any way modified, but whether its Commercial provisions are still in operation can only be ascertained by reference to the Government of India, to whom a Copy of this Correspondence has been sent.

I am &c.

(Sgd) Herman Merivale

No 4291.

Copy of the above forwarded to the Government of Fort Saint George, with a request that the Government of India may be furnished with a report on the matter.

Foreign Department,
Political
Fort William, the 5th March 1873.

By Order &c.

C. Buckland
For Offg Under Secy to the Govt of India

№ 2232

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras

Financial Deptt

I am directed to forward a co[py] of the papers noted on the margin, and to request that, with the permission of His Excellency the Governor in Council, you will be good enough to submit a report as to whether any special commercial facilities are at present afforded to subjects of His Highness the Nizam at Masulipatam, under the provisions of the Treaty of 1802.

Dest Letter from Hon'ble Secretary of State for India (Political) № 4 dated 23d January 1873 8 enclosures

Endt Foreign Deptt (P) № 1318 dated 5th March 1873 to the address of the Department of Agriculture, Revenue and Commerce.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedt Servt

C Bernard

Offg Under Secy to the Govt of India

Fort William
The 3d April 1873

Recd 18th April 1873
from the Govt of Madras
Receipt Mem. No 429

50 no 230

Secretariat
Letter 28th April
30 April 1873 from
the Secretary Govt
Revenue Department
to the Secretary Govt
Central Board
Revenue Madras

Extract from the Resolutions of Govt
of India
Financial Department
dated the 3d April 1873

Read the following Despatch from the Secretary of State for India (Political) № 4 dated 23d January 1873 8 enclosures

Read also the following Despatch from the Government of Madras (Financial Department) № 1318 dated 5th March 1873 8 enclosures

Ordered that a copy of the Despatch from the Secretary of State be forwarded to the Government of Madras (Financial Department) with a request that they will be good enough to submit a report as to whether any special commercial facilities are at present afforded to subjects of His Highness the Nizam at Masulipatam, under the provisions of the Treaty of 1802.

Ordered also that a copy of the Despatch from the Government of Madras be forwarded to the Secretary of State for India (Political) for information.

Extract from the Resolutions of Govt of India
Financial Department
dated the 3d April 1873

C Bernard
Offg Under Secy to the Govt of India

Approved

No 14 of 1873

5

7. 5. 73.

Referred to the Collector of the Kistna District for report.

Cotacamund
2d May 1873.

E Stuart Hyde
Asst Secretary

To the Collector of the Kistna District with an enclo.

Pol Dep 1873 Sept 8

S.O. nos 230 to 232
7/31 1044 1873.

Pol Dep
Sept 8 1873
No 2232

Pol Dep
Sept 3 1873.
No 181.

Rec'd.

Forwarding certain papers and representations relative to the Customs Tariff and to the Privileges enjoyed by Commercial Travellers &c &c

Referred.

(Copy)

13

Political
No 4

India Office, London
28th January 1873

His Excellency The Right Honorable the
Governor General of India in Council

My Lord,

I transmit herewith copy of a correspondence* with Messrs Smith Fleming and Co East India Merchants in London, and desire to be favored with any information which Your Excellency's Government may have to afford respecting the Commercial clauses of the Treaty of 1802, with the Government of His Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad, with especial reference to the commercial facilities afforded by that Treaty to subjects of His Highness the Nizam at Masulipatam.

I have &c
(Signed) Argyll

* Letters from Messrs Smith Fleming & Co
Dy 7th January 1873
Dys to Dy & 17th Dy

---

17 & 18 Leaden hall Street
London 7th January 1873

To
The Right Honble
H. L. Secombe Esquire C. B.
&c &c &c
Under Secretary of State

Sir,

Our friends in Bombay Messrs Collier & Company who have recently opened an Agency for

for the sale and purchase of Goods in Hyderabad in the Deccan, inform us that a Treaty between the Nizam's Government and the Honorable East India Company called the Commercial Treaty of 1802 Art XI of Aitchison's Treaties Vol 5 which has never been repealed, expressly makes Masulipatam a free port for all goods intended for consumption in the Nizam's dominions, and they have instructed us to ship goods to Masulipatam for transmission to Hyderabad.

As the Treaty in question though un-repealed has been many years in abeyance, we conceive it to be our duty to bring the fact of the existence to your knowledge and to enquire whether the Treaty will be respected, as we should not like to be the means of raising any difficulty between the Government and that of the Nizam.

We are &c.
D) Smith Fleming & Co

India Office 17th January 1873

Messrs Smith Fleming & Co
17 & 18 Leaden hall Street

Gentlemen,

I am directed by the Duke of Argyll to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 7th instant

15

instant, addressed to the Assistant Under Secretary of State, and to inform you in reply that the Treaty of 1802 with the Government of His Highness the Nizam of the Deccan has not, so far as concerns the point to which your enquiry relates, been in any way modified, but whether its Commercial provisions are still in operation can only be ascertained by reference to the Government of India, to whom a copy of this correspondence has been sent.

I am &c.
D) Herman Merivale

No 4810

Copy of the above forwarded to the Department of Agriculture, Revenue and Commerce for an expression of opinion as to the facilities afforded to subjects of His Highness the Nizam at Masulipatam, under the commercial clauses of the Treaty of 1802.

By Order &c.
D) C.E. Buckland
For Offg Under Secy to the Govt of India

Foreign Department
Political
Fort William the 5th March 1873

(True Copies)

J. Walling
Registrar Fin. Dept

2252

Pub 1873

Part 2 Sec 1-2
Go 31 May/73 No 230

1741

Kistna District Collectors
Office Masulipatam 9th May 1873

From

G. D. Keenan. Esqre,
Acting Collector
Kistna District.

To

The Honorable W. Hudleston
Chief Secretary to Government
Fort Saint George

Sir,

I have the honor to return the Enclosure and to reply that no special Commercial previlejes are or ever have been accorded to the subjects of His Highness the Nizam at Masulipatam

2 The previous reference on the same subject was answered according to the instructions endorsed on it through the Board of Revenue & I have the honor to enclose a copy.

I have the honor &c
Sir
Your most Obd Servt
G D Keenan
Acting Collector

Received
9th
Ramnad

Thenbooffallein Dist.y 19 & 10

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 21st May 1873. No 619

Read the following

No 671

From

G. D. Leman Esqre,
Acting Collector, Kistna District

To

J. Grose Esqre,
Secretary to the Board of Revenue
Madras

SIR,

Secretary of States despatch 23d Jany 1873 No 4 Political Despth.
Letter from Messrs Smith Fleming & Co to Asstt Under Secy of State dated 7th Jany 1873 –
Letter to Do dated 17th January 1873.

1. In accordance with the Chief Secretary's Endorsement dated 11th March 1873, I have the honor to return the accompanying correspondence through the Board to Government.

2. Board's Proceedings No 502 April 1st 1873 are on the same subject, I have looked into the matter further since writing my letter published with the above Board's Proceedings and I think the Proceedings of the Board dated 8th July 1844, render it quite clear that Bandar Masulipatam was never considered a free Port for goods imported for Hyderbad.

I

3. I have but the order as published at page 360 of the old circular Order Book of the Board of Revenue to refer to; but it would seem that when considering the terms of the treaty of 1802 with reference to Act VI of 1844 × the only question was about the amount of frontier duty to be charged and that the Sea custom duty was passed over altogether as a matter about which there could be no question. Up to that time goods imported in certain vessels and among them those of His Highness the Nizam were not chargeable with duty as by Regulation XI of 1803 they were considered to be in British bottoms and so exempt from Import duty.

× An act for the abolition of Inland Customs

4. It does not seem to me that there are any words in the Treaty of 1802 that justify Messrs Smith Fleming & Co's statement in their letter to Mr Leccombe that the Treaty "expressly makes Masulipatam a Free Port for

"for all goods intended for consumption in "Hyderabad" the free use of the Port given in Article 1, cannot be taken to mean more than a permission to His Highness to make use of the Port without let or hindrance – a permission which is extended in Article 2 to all Ships carrying His Highness' Flag.

5. A similar concession is given in Section 2 Regulation IV of 1812 to all European Ships.

6. Also while Article 8 of the treaty of 1802 says down that no more than 5 per cent is to be charged by His Highness the Nizam on exports, the Treaty is silent as to what may be charged by the Honorable East India Company.

7. My records do not show that any application to pass goods free has ever been made before this and it is certain that there has never been, in the District any

any such preventive service as would have been necessary to stop smuggling & prevent the sale, in the District of goods imported nominally for Hyderabad; had the Port ever been made use of as proposed.

Kistna District
Collectors Office,
Masulipatam,
30th April 1873

I have &c
(signed) G. D. Lennon
Ag Collector.

Submitted to Government with reference to the Chief Secretary's Endorsement on a letter from the Government of India enquiring whether Masulipatam is a free port for goods destined for the Nizam's dominions under the Commercial Treaty of 1802.

The same point raised by Messrs Nichol & Co of Hyderabad was dealt with in Board's Proceedings 1st April 1873 No 502

a

23 12

a copy of which is forwarded.

The "free use of the sea port" is granted to the Nizam by article I of the Treaty but this did not make it a free port. In article 3 a "free transit" of goods across the frontier line is provided for but article 5 shows that duty was levied on the goods that had the free transit. Similarly duty has always been levied on goods landed at Masulipatam for the Nizam's dominions in spite of his having the free use of the port.

The Treaty has never been understood to bear the sense attributed to it by Messrs Smith Fleming & Co, nor is it susceptible of that construction nor has the Nizam's Government ever made the claim.

(True Copy & Extract)

J Grote.
Secretary

To, The Chief Secretary to Government
Public Department
with Board's Pro: 1st April 73 No 502 & original
End^t of Govt returned -

B Menghuffe
C B/12

V5 13

D 671

Kistna District Collectors Office

Masulipatam 30 April 1873

From G. D. Leman. Esquire,
Acting Collector Kistna District

To J. Grose. Esquire,
Secretary to the Board of Revenue
Madras

Sir,

In accordance with the Chief Secretary's Endorsement dated 11 March 1873, I have the honor to return the accompanying correspondence through the Board of Government.

2 Boards Proceedings D502 April 1st. 1873 are on the same subject. I have looked into the matter further since writing my letter published with the above Boards Proceedings and I think the Proceedings of the Board dated 8 July 1844. render it quite clear that Masulipatam was never considered a free Port for goods imported for Hyderabad.

3 I have but the order as published at page 360 of the old Circular order Book of the Board of Revenue to refer to but it would seem that when considering the terms of the treaty of 1802 with reference to Art VI of 1844

Secretary of States dispatch 28 Jany 1873. No 24 Political Department

Letter from Messrs Smith Fleming & Co to Asst Under Secretary of State dated 7 Jany 1873.

Letter to do dated 17 Jany 1873.

× On Acct for the abolition of Inland Customs

Pol 1873 Deptt

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

No 256

Dated the 1st April 1873.

Read - 21 " " "

Ans 26 " " "

S.O. No. 230 - 2

Submitting Copy of Despatch from Govt of India dt 28th Jany 1873 with its enclosure:
"Reference to enquiry of Govt of Madras whether Masulipatam is a Free Port for the purposes of Inland Customs duty."
Dr 1602.

the only question was about the amount of frontier duty to be charged & that the Sea Custom duty was passed over altogether as a matter about which there could be no question. Up to that time goods imported in certain Vessels and among them those of His Highness the Nizam were not chargeable with duty as by Regulation XI of 1803, they were considered to be in British bottoms and to exempt from Import duty.

4 It does not seem to me that there are any words in the Treaty of 1802 that justify Messrs Smith Fleming & Co's statement in their letter to Mr Decombe that the Treaty "expressly makes Masulipatam a free Port for all goods intended for Consumption in Hyderabad" the free use of the Port given in Article 1, cannot be taken to mean more than a permission to His Highness to make use of the Port without let or hindrance - a permission which is extended in Article 2 to all Ships carrying His Highness' Flag

5 A similar Concession is given in Section 2 Regulation IV of 1812 to all European Ships.

6 Also while Article 8 of the Treaty of 1802 lays down that no more than 5 per Cent is to be charged by His Highness the Nizam on Exports; the Treaty is silent as to what may be charged by the Honorable East India Company.

7 My records do not show that any application to pass goods free has ever been made before this. Yet it is certain that there has never been in the District any such preventive service as would have been necessary to stop smuggling and prevent the sale, in the District, of goods imported nominally for Hyderabad, had the Port ever been made use of as proposed.

I have the honorable
Sir
Your most obed. Servt
(Sd) G. D. Lewin
Acting Collector

(True Copy)
G. D. Lewin
Acting Collector.

Mogannah
Asst. G.

27 14

Political Department. 29 16 H

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letter & from

the Govt of India, Foreign Dept. dd 5th March 1873, No 429 P

— do — Finl — do — do 3rd April 1873. No 2232

— Collector of the Kistna D.t — 9th May 1873 No 741

Proc. Bd. of Revenue — — — 21st — —

Order thereon - Ordered 31st May 1873. No 230.

Ordered that the above report of the Collector and Proceedings of the Board of Revenue be forwarded for submission to the Govt of India with reference to the communications in the Foreign and Financial Depts dated 5th March and 3rd

Enclosure in letter
to 741 dated 9th May 73
from the Collector of Kistna
to the Chief
Secretary to Govt. Pol.
Dept &c -

Pol 234 1/73

3rd April 1873, Nos.
429 P. and 2232, re-
spectively, and with the
remark of this Govt.
that neither the terms
of the Commercial Treaty
of 1802 with H. H. the
Nizam, nor the practice
under it for the past
70 years afford any
grounds for the assump-
tion in Messrs. Smith,
Fleming and Co's letter,
that Masulipatam
was by that treaty
made a free port for
goods intended for
consumption

39 12

consumption in the
Hyderabad State.

The Collr. of the Kistna D. 3
Board of Revenue. } dated 14/6

15- 6861-

19-12-30 I
16-4-32 B

Govt. of {1873} Madras.

Political

To

The Collector of the Kistna District
& 20

Dated 31st Dec 73
Recd. 7th

1873, No. 230.

Nos. 69-75.

Directing that certain papers bearing on the question of Masulipatam being a free port for goods intended for consumption in the Hyderabad State be forwarded to the Govt. of India