

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1271	Press ~~Mis.~~
Dated	14-10-1867	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1271

14th October 1867.

Read the following:—

No. 124. Despatch from the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India, to His Excellency the Right Honorable the Governor General of India in Council; dated India Office, London, 9th August 1867, No. 100.

In continuation of my Despatch of the 24th of May last, No. 57, I herewith forward, for the information and guidance

• Letter from the Governor of Mauritius, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 25th March 1867, No. 64, and two enclosures.

Letter from Chairman of the Emigration Board, to the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 20th June 1867.

Despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, to the Governor of Mauritius, dated 6th July 1867.

Letter from the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, to the Emigration Commissioners, dated 13th July 1867.

of your Excellency in Council, a copy of a correspondence* which has taken place between the Colonial Office, the Governor of Mauritius, and the Emigration Commissioners, on the subject of regulations for facilitating the remittance of money

to India by cooly immigrants in the Colonies.

From His Excellency Sir H. BARKLY, K. C. B., Governor of Mauritius, to the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for the Colonies; dated Mauritius, 25th March 1867, No. 64.

Miscellaneous.

I have the honor to state, in reply to your Lordship's Circular Despatch of 4th January, communicating copies of correspondence with the India Office and Emigration Board as to facilitating remittances of their savings by cooly immigrants, that this Government is quite prepared to conform to any uniform system that may be established for the Colonies generally.

2. The rules in force, of which I enclose a copy, were adopted by my direction in November 1865, and, with some unimportant changes of detail, have worked, as will be seen from the accompanying report of the Protector of Immigrants, to the satisfaction of all concerned.

3. The re-payments in India were necessarily left to be effected by the Agents of the Colony at the capitals of the several Presidencies alone, until it could be ascertained that the Indian authorities consented to the discharge of this duty by the Collectors and Sub-Collectors in the country districts.

4. As there has been nothing to prevent coolies about to return home from availing themselves of the advantages of these arrangements, the total sum remitted during the period, some 40,000 Rupees, may appear small in proportion to the immigrant population; but it must be borne in mind that the Indian, as a rule, is fond of carrying his property, in the shape of coin or ornaments, about his own person, or of decorating those of his wife and children therewith, and that there are also numerous Native traders in Port Louis, carrying on extensive pecuniary transactions with their countrymen, besides European Banks having branches both here and in India.

5. It was, indeed, under an impression that greater facilities for the transmission of money were needless, that this experiment was not instituted by Government at a much earlier date.

6. I would suggest that the attention of the Emigration Commissioners should be especially directed to Mr. Beyts' comments on the proposed general regulations, before they are finally decided on.

7. I concur in thinking that limitation of the amount receivable for remittance is hardly worth while, and that the declaration of forfeiture of money orders not presented within 12 months is decidedly inexpedient.

8. That it would be desirable that the notice on the back of the order should be printed in the Indian language best understood by the depositors, as suggested by Mr. Beyts, is beyond doubt; but this would probably be impracticable in most Colonies, though it presents little difficulty in Mauritius, where the type requisite for such purposes is in constant use at the Printing Press of the Police Department.

9. With a view to as little delay as possible in carrying out the views of the Government of India on the matter, the Mauritius Emigration Agents will be forthwith instructed to discontinue making the payments themselves as they have hitherto done, so soon as they learn that the proper

Officers are prepared to disburse the several amounts credited in the lists forwarded by the Protector at the Local Government Treasuries.

Rules for the transmission of money from Mauritius to India on behalf of Immigrants.

1. Immigrants who wish to remit money to India may pay it into the Immigration Office.
2. Every such immigrant shall, in the first instance, address himself to the Chief Clerk, and state the amount he desires to remit, which amount the Chief Clerk shall write on a slip of paper, prepared for that purpose, and forward to the Cashier.
- After counting the money, the Cashier shall put his initials on the slip of paper aforesaid, and return it to the Chief Clerk, who shall file the same. The Cashier shall then give the immigrant a receipt for his money, which receipt shall be countersigned by the Protector of Immigrants.
3. Every sum so paid to the Cashier of the Immigration Office shall be registered by him in a book specially kept for that purpose.
4. All such sums shall be paid into the Treasury at the end of every week.
5. A transcript of the entries made in that book shall be sent by the Protector of Immigrants to the Treasurer at the end of every month.
6. Each of our Emigration Agents shall be apprised by the Protector of Immigrants, at the end of every month, of the various sums received for remittance to his part of India, and full particulars shall be given to him of the destination of each sum.
7. Our Emigration Agents shall be authorized to pay out to the parties to whom they are addressed all such sums received in Mauritius for transmission to India.
8. All such payments shall be made in the Presidency towns of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, in presence of the Mauritius Emigration Agents, and of their Chief Clerks; and in the country districts either by the Mauritius Sub-Agents, or by the Collectors or Sub-Collectors of those districts.
9. An acquittance in triplicate shall be taken from each recipient.
10. One copy of the acquittance shall be numbered and filed in the Agent's Office; another forwarded to the Protector of Immigrants; and the third to the Auditor General.
11. A Quarterly Return shall be regularly sent by each Agent to the Protector of Immigrants, and a copy thereof to the Auditor General, showing the amounts paid out as here-above directed, and all those which may have remained unclaimed.
12. The Protector of Immigrants shall, at the beginning of each year, send to the Treasurer and the Auditor a statement showing the amount received by him during the preceding year, the amount paid in India on account thereof, and the balance unclaimed to the 31st December.

These Rules were approved by His Excellency the Governor on the 29th November 1865.

(Signed) H. N. D. BEYTS,
Protector of Immigrants.

From H. N. D. BEYTS, Esq., Protector of Immigrants, Mauritius, to the Honorable the Colonial Secretary, Mauritius; dated 15th March 1867, No. 54-67A.

Referring to your letter 61D, of the 12th instant, I have the honor to state that the Regulations relative to the remittance of moneys to India on behalf of immigrants were put into operation on the 1st March 1866, and that the sums received for remittance have been as follows:—

From 1st March to 31st December 1866,—

	RS.
For Calcutta...	30,864
„ Madras ..	650
„ Bombay...	500
Total...	32,014

From 1st January to 15th March 1867,—

	RS.
For Calcutta...	8,476
„ Madras ..	100
Total ...	8,576

2. The Regulations first provided that the sums deposited here for remittance would be paid out in India by our Emigration Agents only, as it was not known to what extent the Indian Government would be disposed to assist in carrying out the scheme. It having since been ascertained that the Collectors and other Officers of the Indian Government in the Mofussil were disposed and authorized to receive and pay out the sums remitted, His Excellency ordered the Regulations to be modified on the 30th May last, so as to take advantage of such assistance.

3. Mr. Eales, referring at the end of last year to the operation of these modified Regulations, expressed his approval of them, and suggested only a slight change in the mode of informing our Agents of the reception of deposits for remittance. He recommended that, instead of only sending lists of the deposits at the end of every month to our Emigration Agents, as prescribed by Regulation 5, a list be also sent by each cooly-ship of the sums deposited for remittance up to the date of her departure, in order that there should be no delay in paying out the sums remitted, and that the confidence of coolies in the system adopted might not be shaken by tardy payments. I have taken steps to carry out his recommendation in future.

4. The draft of Regulations enclosed in the Report of the Emigration Commissioners, dated 19th September 1866, has in view the extension to the other Colonies, British and Foreign, of the system already put in practice in this Colony, and the adoption of definite measures for the forwarding of remittances into the Mofussil (the country districts of India).

5. It would, in my opinion, be advisable to contribute as far as possible to the organization of a uniform system, such as is proposed by the Emigration Commissioners, for all the Colonies which import coolies from India, so that the important co-operation of the Indian Government might thereby be facilitated. I therefore think that, although the system already organized by His Excellency in this Colony be working satisfactorily, His Excellency might consent to its being assimilated to that which is proposed for the other Colonies.

6. The chief alteration which would follow would be, that our Agents would have no payments to make themselves, as they have hitherto done, and that all remittances, whether in the Presidency towns or in the Mofussil, would pass through the hands of Officers of the Indian Government. I see no reason why this change should not be assented to by His Excellency.

7. But I should recommend His Excellency's proposing that the Regulations drafted by the Emigration Commissioners be modified as follows:—

- 1.—That the words “not more than \$100 be expunged from Clause 1 of the proposed Regulations, and that no maximum limit be assigned to the deposits. I have received and remitted many sums exceeding \$100: in one case a sum of Rupees 6000 was remitted by a single depositor.
- 2.—That the notice on the back of the money order be printed, if possible, in the Indian language best understood by the depositor, instead of being in English or French.
- 3.—That the words “all claim to the money will be lost,” in Clause 3 of the Rules proposed to be printed on the back of the money order, be struck out, and replaced by the following:—“the money will be returned to the Government of the Colony, to be restored to the remitter, or otherwise disposed of according to law, and the charges attending the return of the remittance will, in such cases, be deducted from its amount.”

8. If the party in favor of whom the money order is made be dead, or cannot be found, it seems to me that the money should return to the remitter, or to the persons who hold his rights. I have already seen remittances made to relatives and friends supposed to be alive. In such cases if the intended payee be dead, or have disappeared from his supposed domicile, it would only be just to let the money come back to the remitter.

9. With the modifications I have taken the liberty of suggesting, I think that the scheme proposed by the Emigration Commissioners would be likely to operate beneficially, and that His Excellency might concur in carrying it into effect.

10. The Emigration Commissioners have, very properly in my opinion, suggested that their scheme be not restricted to the remittance of the savings of coolies remaining in the Colonies, but that coolies returning to India be also permitted to benefit by it. This has already been done

here : coolies returning to India have been allowed, ever since our rules were put in force, to deposit their savings in my Office, and have received money orders entitling them to claim in India the amounts of their deposits.

From T. W. MURDOCH, Esq., Chairman of the Emigration Board, to the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies ; dated Emigration Board, 20th June 1867.

I have to acknowledge your letter of 8th instant, with a Despatch* from the Governor of Mauritius, on the subject of the proposed regulations for facilitating the remittance of money to India by cooly immigrants in the Colonies.

* No. 64, 25th March.

Sir H. Barkly encloses a copy of the Regulations established at the end of 1865 in Mauritius, which he says have worked well, and suggests certain modifications in the Regulations proposed by us.

First, he suggests that there should be no limit to the amount included in a money order. On this I may point out that there is no limit to the number of orders which a cooly may take out, and, therefore, in practice, no limit to the amount he might remit through these orders. But the Regulations are not intended, any more than Post Office orders in the country, for the conduct of transactions which properly fall within the operation of Banks and Commercial Houses, of which Sir H. Barkly states that there are a considerable number in Port Louis having connections in India.

Second, Sir H. Barkly considers that the declaration of forfeiture, if the money order is not presented within 12 months, is decidedly inexpedient. Here again we have followed the Post Office order system. It is clear that some period must be fixed within which the holder of a money order should be bound to present it, both for the convenience of the Office on which it is made payable, and to prevent attempts at fraud. Six months is the time allowed by the Post Office in this country for payment of money orders in the Colonies ; and after 12 months the money is absolutely forfeited. As it is an object to encourage the early presentation of money orders, and as 12 months is ample time to allow of that being done with the proposed cooly orders, I doubt the expediency of extending it further. Mr. Beyts, however, suggests that instead of being forfeited, the money, less the charges incurred, should be returned to the Colony from which it was received, to be restored to the remitter, or otherwise disposed of according to law. Such a system could not be carried out without entailing a great deal of trouble on the Indian Government, and producing probably much confusion, both in India and in the Colonies. It is not likely that any but very small orders would be allowed to lapse, and there is no reason to fear that the Indian Government would be over rigid in enforcing forfeiture where a reasonable explanation of the delay could be given. Upon the whole, it appears to me that it would be best to adhere to the principle which has been found to work satisfactorily in this country and the Colonies, of considering as forfeited orders not presented within a certain time.

Third, Sir H. Barkly suggests that the notice on the back of the order should be printed in the Indian language best understood by the depositors. This is obviously desirable, and, in Mauritius, easily practicable ; but it would be impracticable in the West Indian Colonies, where the type necessary for the purpose does not exist. The best way would be to have the orders printed in India and furnished to the several Colonies as they require them. The only objection is the expense, and the uncertain extent of the demand for such orders. The expense, however, would be small, while the object to be attained is important. For it is hopeless to expect that a cooly in the West Indies, sending a money order to his relations in India, would be able to explain the regulations for obtaining payment of it, or, if he did, that they would understand them. Where, therefore, there was not a British Resident, the recipient of a money order would probably not know what to do with it. If the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos should concur in this view, the Emigration Officers in India would have no difficulty in getting the notices translated into the languages of the emigrants, and printed on the back of the orders. In that case, the English translation of the notices would not be required.

This could be done without any delay ; but if alterations of principle are to be introduced into the Regulations, it would be necessary, before they are adopted, to submit them to the Indian Government and to the Governments of the Colonies which import coolies, a process which must postpone for another 12 months the introduction of the Regulations. Under these circumstances, it appears to me inexpedient to make any further alterations in the Regulations, except for some object of considerable importance, and I should not, therefore, recommend that the alterations suggested by the Governor of Mauritius, except as regards the printing of the notices in the Indian language, should be adopted.

Despatch from the Right Honorable the DUKE of BUCKINGHAM AND CHANDOS, Secretary of State for the Colonies, to His Excellency Sir H. BARKLY, K. C. B., Governor of Mauritius ; dated London, 6th July 1867.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Despatch, No. 64, of the 25th March, on the subject of the proposed Regulations for facilitating the remittance of money to India by cooly immigrants in the Colonies.

You also enclose a copy of the Regulations established in Mauritius in 1865, and suggest certain modifications in those proposed by the Emigration Commissioners in this country.

First.—You suggest that there should be no limit to the amount included in a money order. There is no limit to the number of orders which a cooly may take out, and, therefore, practically there is no limit to the amount he might remit through these orders. But the Regulations are not intended, any more than Post Office orders in this country, for the conduct of transactions which properly fall within the operations of Banks and Commercial Houses, of which you state that there are a considerable number at Port Louis having connections in India.

Second.—You consider that the declaration of forfeiture, if the money order is not presented within twelve months, is decidedly inexpedient. As regards this condition, the Post Office order system has again been followed. It is clear that some period must be fixed within which the holder of a money order should be bound to present it, both for the convenience of the Office on which it is made payable, and to prevent attempts at fraud. Six months is the time allowed by the Post Office in this country for payment of money orders in the Colonies, and after twelve months the money is absolutely forfeited. As it is an object to encourage the early presentation of money orders, and as twelve months is ample time to allow of that being done with the proposed cooly orders, I doubt the expediency of any further extension. Mr. Beyts suggests however that, instead of being forfeited, the money, less the charges incurred, should be returned to the Colony from which it was received, to be restored to the remitter, or otherwise disposed of according to law. Such a system could not be carried out without entailing a great deal of trouble on the Indian Government, and producing probably much confusion both in India and in the Colonies. It is not likely that any but very small orders would be allowed to lapse, and there is no reason to fear that the Indian Government would be over rigid in enforcing forfeiture where a reasonable explanation of the delay could be given. Upon the whole, therefore, it appears to me that it will be best to adhere to the principle which has been found to work satisfactorily in this country and the Colonies, of considering as forfeited orders not presented within a certain time.

Third.—You recommend that the notice on the back of the order should be printed in the Indian language best understood by the depositors, which, in Mauritius, would be easily practicable, but might be more difficult in the West Indies, where probably the necessary type does not exist. I concur in this recommendation ; and to obviate any difficulty in the West Indies, I shall desire the Emigration Commissioners to direct the Emigration Agents at Calcutta to have the orders printed there with the notices on the back in English, and in one or other of the native languages most commonly in use among the emigrants. The Governments of the respective Colonies would then be supplied with forms as required.

Under these circumstances, it will not be necessary for you to have the notices printed in Mauritius.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Department,
14th October 1867.*

From Sir FREDERIC ROGERS, Bart., Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, to the Emigration Commissioners; dated London, 13th July 1867.

I am directed by the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos to acknowledge the receipt of your report of the 20th ultimo, on Sir H. Barkly's Despatch, respecting the proposed regulations for facilitating the remittances of money to India by cooly immigrants in the Colonies.

I enclose a copy of a Despatch which His Grace has addressed to Sir D. Barkly, from which you will see that he concurs generally in your recommendation, but thinks it desirable that the orders should be printed in Calcutta with the notices on the back in English and in one or other of the native languages most commonly in use among the emigrants.

I am to instruct you, therefore, to direct the Emigration Agents at Calcutta to have the orders printed in that form, and to supply the respective Colonies with them as required. This will probably prevent the necessity of having the notices printed in Mauritius.

No. 4795.

Copy forwarded to the Government of Fort Saint George, in continuation of the communication from this office, No. 2123, dated the 10th July last.

HOME DEPARTMENT, SIMLA,
24th September 1867.

(By order, &c.)

(Signed) A. H. HARRINGTON,
Offg. Under Secy. to the Govt. of India.

No. 125.

ORDER THEREON, 14th October 1867, No. 1271.

Communicated to the Protector of Emigrants, in continuation of G. O., dated 29th July last, No. 920.

(True Extract).

A. J. ARBUTHNOT,
Chief Secretary.

To the Protector of Emigrants.

Public.

No. 100.

INDIA OFFICE:

London, the 9th August 1867.

To His Excellency the Right Hon'ble the Governor General of India in Council.

SIR,

IN continuation of my Despatch of the 24th of May last, No. 57, I herewith forward, for the information and guidance of your Excellency in Council, a copy of a correspondence* which has taken place between the Colonial Office, the Governor of Mauritius, and the Emigration Commissioners, on the subject of regulations for facilitating the remittance of money to India by cooly immigrants in the Colonies.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) STAFFORD H. NORTHCOTE.

MISCELLANEOUS.

No. 64.

MAURITIUS,

The 25th March 1867.

To the Right Hon'ble the Earl of Carnarvon, &c., &c., &c.

MY LORD,

I HAVE the honor to state, in reply to your Lordship's Circular Despatch of 4th January, communicating copies of correspondence with the India Office and Emigration Board as to facilitating remittances of their savings by cooly immigrants, that this Government is quite prepared to conform to any uniform system that may be established for the Colonies generally.

2. The rules in force, of which I enclose a copy, were adopted by my direction in November 1865, and with some unimportant changes of detail, have worked, as will be seen from the accompanying Report of the Protector of Immigrants, to the satisfaction of all concerned.

3. The re-payments in India were necessarily left to be effected by the Agents of the Colony at the capitals of the several Presidencies alone, until it could be ascertained that the Indian authorities consented to the discharge of this duty by the Collectors and Sub-Collectors in the country districts.

4. As there has been nothing to prevent coolies about to return home from availing themselves of the advantages of these arrangements, the total sum remitted during the period, some 40,000 Rupees, may appear small in proportion to the immigrant population; but it must be borne in mind that the Indian, as a rule, is fond of carrying his property in the shape of coin or ornaments about his own person, or of decorating those of his wife and children therewith, and that there are also numerous Native traders in Port Louis, carrying on extensive pecuniary transactions with their countrymen, besides European Banks having branches both here and in India.

5. It was, indeed, under an impression that greater facilities for the transmission of money were needless, that this experiment was not instituted by Government at a much earlier date.

6. I would suggest that the attention of the Emigration Commissioners should be specially directed to Mr. Beyts' comments on the proposed general regulations before they are finally decided on.

7. I concur in thinking that limitation of the amount receivable for remittance is hardly worth while, and that the declaration of forfeiture of money orders not presented within 12 months, is decidedly inexpedient.

8. That it would be desirable that the notice on the back of the order should be printed in the Indian language best understood by the depositors, as suggested by Mr. Beyts, is beyond doubt; but this would probably be impracticable in most Colonies, though it presents little difficulty in Mauritius, where the type requisite for such purposes is in constant use at the Printing Press of the Police Department.

9. With a view to as little delay as possible in carrying out the views of the Government of India on the matter, the Mauritius Emigration Agents will be forthwith instructed to discontinue making the payments themselves as they have hitherto done, so soon as they learn that the proper Officers are prepared to disburse the several amounts credited in the lists forwarded by the Protector at the Local Government Treasuries.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) HENRY BARKLY.

Rules for the transmission of money from Mauritius to India on behalf of Immigrants.

1. IMMIGRANTS who wish to remit money to India may pay it into the Immigration Office.

2. Every such immigrant shall, in the first instance, address himself to the Chief Clerk and state the amount he desires to remit, which amount the Chief Clerk shall write on a slip of paper prepared for that purpose, and forward to the Cashier.

After counting the money, the Cashier shall put his initials on the slip of paper aforesaid, and return it to the Chief Clerk who shall file the same. The Cashier shall then give the immigrant a receipt for his money, which receipt shall be countersigned by the Protector of Immigrants.

3. Every sum so paid to the Cashier of the Immigration Office, shall be registered by him in a book specially kept for that purpose.

4. All such sums shall be paid into the Treasury at the end of every week.

5. A transcript of the entries made in that book shall be sent by the Protector of Immigrants to the Treasurer at the end of every month.

6. Each of our Emigration Agents shall be apprised by the Protector of Immigrants, at the end of every month, of the various sums received for remittance to his part of India, and full particulars shall be given to him of the destination of each sum.

7. Our Emigration Agents shall be authorized to pay out to the parties to whom they are addressed, all such sums received in Mauritius for transmission to India.

8. All such payments shall be made in the Presidency towns of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay in presence of the Mauritius Emigration Agents, and of their Chief Clerks; and in the country districts either by the Mauritius Sub-Agents, or by the Collectors or Sub-Collectors of those districts.

9. An acquittance in triplicate shall be taken from each recipient.

10. One copy of the acquittance shall be numbered and filed in the Agent's Office, another forwarded to the Protector of Immigrants, and the third to the Auditor General.

11. A Quarterly Return shall be regularly sent by each Agent to the Protector of Immigrants, and a copy thereof to the Auditor General, shewing

the amounts paid out as here-above directed, and all those which may have remained unclaimed.

12. The Protector of Immigrants shall, at the beginning of each year, send to the Treasurer and the Auditor a Statement shewing the amount received by him during the preceding year, the amount paid in India on account thereof, and the balance unclaimed to the 31st December.

These Rules were approved by His Excellency the Governor on the 29th November 1865.

(Signed) H. N. D. BEYTS,
Protector of Immigrants.

IMMIGRATION OFFICE,
The 15th March 1867.

No. 51
67

To the Honorable the Colonial Secretary, &c., &c., &c.

SIR,

REFERRING to your letter 61D. of the 12th instant, I have the honor to state that the Regulations relative to the remittance of monies to India on behalf of immigrants, were put into operation on the 1st March 1866, and that the sums received for remittance have been as follows:—

From 1st March to 31st December 1866,—

	Rupees.
For Calcutta	30,864
„ Madras	650
„ Bombay	500
Total Rs.	32,014

From 1st January to 15th March 1867,—

	Rupees.
For Calcutta	8,476
„ Madras	100
Total Rs.	8,576

2. The Regulations first provided that the sums deposited here for remittance would be paid out in India by our Emigration Agents only, as it was not known to what extent the Indian Government would be disposed to assist in carrying out the scheme. It having since been ascertained that the Collectors and other Officers of the Indian Government in the Mofussil were disposed and authorized to receive and pay out the sums remitted, His Excellency ordered the Regulations to be modified on the 30th May last, so as to take advantage of such assistance.

3. Mr. Eales, referring at the end of last year to the operation of these modified Regulations, expressed his approval of them, and suggested only a slight change in the mode of informing our Agents of the reception of deposits for remittance. He recommended that, instead of only sending lists of the deposits at the end of every month to our Emigration Agents, as prescribed by Regulation 5, a list be also sent by each cooly-ship of the sums deposited for remittance up to the date of her departure, in order that there should be no delay in paying out the sums remitted, and that the confidence of coolies in the system adopted might not be shaken by tardy payments. I have taken steps to carry out his recommendation in future.

1. The draft of Regulations enclosed in the Report of the Emigration Commissioners, dated 19th September 1866, has in view the extension to the other Colonies, British and Foreign, of the system already put in practice in this Colony, and the adoption of definite measures for the forwarding of remittances into the Mofussil (the country districts of India).

5. It would, in my opinion, be advisable to contribute as far as possible to the organization of a uniform system, such as is proposed by the Emigration Commissioners, for all the Colonies which import coolies from India, so that the important co-operation of the Indian Government might thereby be facilitated. I therefore think that, although the system already organised by His Excellency in this Colony be working satisfactorily, His Excellency might consent to its being assimilated to that which is proposed for the other Colonies.

6. The chief alteration which would follow would be, that our Agents would have no payments to make themselves as they have hitherto done, and that all remittances, whether in the Presidency towns or in the Mofussil, would pass through the hands of Officers of the Indian Government. I see no reason why this change should not be assented to by His Excellency.

7. But I should recommend His Excellency's proposing that the Regulations drafted by the Emigration Commissioners be modified as follows:—

1°.—That the words "not more than \$100 be expunged from Clause 1 of the proposed Regulations, and that no maximum limit be assigned to the deposits. I have received and remitted many sums exceeding \$100; in one case a sum of Rupees 6,000 was remitted by a single depositor.

2°.—That the notice on the back of the money order be printed, if possible, in the Indian language best understood by the depositor, instead of being in English or French.

3°.—That the words "all claim to the money will be lost," in Clause 8 of the Rules proposed to be printed on the back of the money order, be struck out and replaced by the following:—"the money will be returned to the Government of the Colony to be restored to the remitter, or otherwise disposed of according to law, and the charges attending the return of the remittance will, in such cases, be deducted from its amount."

8. If the party in favor of whom the money order is made be dead or cannot be found, it seems to me that the money should return to the remitter, or to the persons who hold his rights. I have already seen remittances made to relatives and friends supposed to be alive. In such cases if the intended payee be dead, or have disappeared from his supposed domicile, it would only be just to let the money come back to the remitter.

9. With the modifications I have taken the liberty of suggesting, I think, that the scheme proposed by the Emigration Commissioners would be likely to operate beneficially, and that His Excellency might concur in carrying it into effect.

10. The Emigration Commissioners have, very properly in my opinion, suggested that their scheme be not restricted to the remittance of the savings of coolies remaining in the Colonies, but that coolies returning to India be also permitted to benefit by it. This has already been done here: coolies returning to India have been allowed, ever since our rules were put in force, to deposit their savings in my Office, and have received money orders entitling them to claim in India the amounts of their deposits.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) H. N. D. BEYTS,
Protector of Immigrants.

EMIGRATION BOARD,
The 20th June 1867.

To Sir Frederic Rogers, Bart., &c., &c., &c.

SIR,

I HAVE to acknowledge your letter of 8th instant, with a Despatch* from the Governor of Mauritius on the subject of the proposed Regulations for facilitating the remittance of money to India by cooly immigrants in the Colonies.

* No. 64, 25th March.

2. Sir H. Barkly encloses a copy of the Regulations established at the end of 1865 in Mauritius, which he says have worked well, and suggests certain modifications in the Regulations proposed by us.

3. First, he suggests that there should be no limit to the amount included in a money order. On this I may point out that there is no limit to the number of order which a cooly may take out, and therefore in practice no limit to the amount he might remit through these orders. But the Regulations are not intended, any more than Post Office orders in the country, for the conduct of transactions which properly fall within the operation of Banks and Commercial Houses, of which Sir H. Barkly states that there are a considerable number in Port Louis having connections in India.

4. Second, Sir H. Barkly considers that the declaration of forfeiture, if the money order is not presented within 12 months, is decidedly inexpedient. Here again we have followed the Post Office order system. It is clear that some period must be fixed within which the holder of a money order should be bound to present it, both for the convenience of the Office on which it is made payable, and to prevent attempts at fraud. Six months is the time allowed by the Post Office in this country for payment of money orders in the Colonies; and after 12 months the money is absolutely forfeited. As it is an object to encourage the early presentation of money orders, and as 12 months is ample time to allow of that being done with the proposed cooly orders, I doubt the expediency of extending it further. Mr. Beyts, however, suggests that instead of being forfeited, the money, less the charges incurred, should be returned to the Colony from which it was received, to be restored to the remitter, or otherwise disposed of according to law. Such a system could not be carried out without entailing a great deal of trouble on the Indian Government, and producing probably much confusion, both in India and in the Colonies. It is not likely that any but very small orders would be allowed to lapse, and there is no reason to fear that the Indian Government would be over-rigid in enforcing forfeiture where a reasonable explanation of the delay could be given. Upon the whole, it appears to me that it would be best to adhere to the principle which has been found to work satisfactorily in this country and the Colonies, of considering as forfeited orders not presented within a certain time.

5. Third, Sir H. Barkly suggests that the notice on the back of the order should be printed in the Indian language best understood by the depositors. This is obviously desirable, and, in Mauritius, easily practicable; but it would be impracticable in the West Indian Colonies, where the type necessary for the purpose does not exist. The best way would be to have the orders printed in India and furnished to the several Colonies as they require them. The only objection is the expense and the uncertain extent of the demand for such orders. The expense, however, would be small, while the object to be attained is important. For it is hopeless to expect that a cooly in the West Indies, sending a money order to his relations in India, would be able to explain the Regulations for obtaining payment of it, or if he did that they would understand them. Where, therefore, there was not a British Resident, the recipient of a money order would probably not know what to do with it. If the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos should concur in this view, the Emigration Officers in India would have no difficulty in getting the notices translated into the languages of the emigrants, and printed on the back of the orders. In that case the English translation of the notices would not be required.

6. This could be done without any delay; but if alterations of principle are to be introduced into the Regulations, it would be necessary, before they are adopted, to submit them to the Indian Government and to the Governments of the Colonies which import coolies, a process which must postpone for another 12 months the introduction of the Regulations. Under these circumstances it appears to me inexpedient to make any further alterations in the Regulations, except for some object of considerable importance, and I should not therefore recommend that the alterations suggested by the Governor of Mauritius, except as regards the printing of the notices in the Indian language, should be adopted.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) T. W. MURDOCH.

DOWNING STREET,
The 6th July 1867.

To Governor SIR H. BARKLY, K. O. B., &c., &c., &c.

SIR,

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Despatch No. 64 of the 25th March, on the subject of the proposed Regulations for facilitating the remittance of money to India by cooly immigrants in the Colonies.

You also enclose a copy of the Regulations established in Mauritius in 1865, and suggest certain modifications in those proposed by the Emigration Commissioners in this country.

First.—You suggest that there should be no limit to the amount included in a money order. There is no limit to the number of orders which a cooly may take out, and therefore practically there is no limit to the amount he might remit through these orders. But the Regulations are not intended, any more than Post Office orders in this country, for the conduct of transactions which properly fall within the operations at Banks and Commercial Houses, of which you state that there are a considerable number at Port Louis having connections in India.

Second.—You consider that the declaration of forfeiture, if the money order is not presented within twelve months, is decidedly inexpedient. As regards this condition the Post Office order system has again been followed. It is clear that some period must be fixed within which the holder of a money order should be bound to present it, both for the convenience of the Office on which it is made payable, and to prevent attempts at fraud. Six months is the time allowed by the Post Office in this country for payment of money orders in the Colonies, and after twelve months the money is absolutely forfeited. As it is an object to encourage the early presentation of money orders, and as twelve months is ample time to allow of that being done with the proposed cooly orders, I doubt the expediency of any further extension. Mr. Beyts suggests however that, instead of being forfeited, the money, less the charges incurred, should be returned to the Colony from which it was received, to be restored to the remitter, or otherwise disposed of according to law. Such a system could not be carried out without entailing a great deal of trouble on the Indian Government, and producing probably much confusion both in India and in the Colonies. It is not likely that any but every small orders would be allowed to lapse, and there is no reason to fear that the Indian Government would be over-rigid in enforcing forfeiture where a reasonable explanation of the delay could be given. Upon the whole, therefore, it appears to me that it will be best to adhere to the principle which has been found to work satisfactorily in this country and the Colonies, of considering as forfeited orders not presented within a certain time.

Third.—You recommend that the notice on the back of the order should be printed in the Indian language best understood by the depositors which,

in Mauritius, would be easily practicable, but might be more difficult in the West Indies where probably the necessary type does not exist. I concur in this recommendation; and to obviate any difficulty in the West Indies, I shall desire the Emigration Commissioners to direct the Emigration Agents at Calcutta to have the orders printed there with the notices on the back in English, and in one or other of the Native languages most commonly in use among the emigrants. The Governments of the respective Colonies would then be supplied with forms as required.

Under these circumstances it will not be necessary for you to have the notices printed in Mauritius.

I have, &c.,
(Signed) BUCKINGHAM & CHANDOS.

DOWNING STREET,
The 13th July 1867.

To the Emigration Commissioners.

GENTLEMEN,

I AM directed by the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos to acknowledge the receipt of your report of the 20th ultimo on Sir H. Barkly's Despatch respecting the proposed Regulations for facilitating the remittances of money to India by cooly immigrants in the Colonies.

I enclose a copy of a Despatch which His Grace has addressed to Sir H. Barkly, from which you will see that he concurs generally in your recommendation, but thinks it desirable that the orders should be printed in Calcutta with the notices on the back in English, and in one or other of the Native languages most commonly in use among the emigrants.

I am to instruct you therefore to direct the Emigration Agents at Calcutta to have the orders printed in that form, and to supply the respective Colonies with them as required. This will probably prevent the necessity of having the notices printed in Mauritius.

I am, &c.,
(Signed) FREDERIC ROGERS.

No. 4795

COPY forwarded to the Government at Port Louis George in continuation of the communication from this Office, No. 2123, dated the 10th July last.

By Order, &c.,

HOME DEPARTMENT:

S I M L A .

The 24th September 1867.

Offg. Under-Secy. to the Govt. of India.

No 16 - August 1894 No 122-123
- 29 July - 29-28

Public 1807 West

From

Under Secretary of War
Order - 1807 West
No 1795

Order
1807 West

1807 West

Office of the

No 16-15

Communications from the
War Department
Respecting the transmission
to the War Department of
Orders in the Colonies -

With an order

14

14. Oct. 1894 No 1291

Communicated.

To the Secretary of War.

Orders, in connection

of 1807 West 29 July

Oct. 1894.

1807 West

1807 West

1807 West

The Sec. of War 1807 West

1807 West

1807 West

122-123