

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	<i>449</i>	Press Mis.
Dated	<i>6-4-</i>	<i>1958</i>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following :—

No. 174. 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, 31st January 1868, No. 24.

In continuation of my Despatch of the 14th of September last, No. 135, I forward, herewith, for the information and guidance of your Excellency in Council, a copy of a letter, dated the 14th instant, with its enclosures, which has been received from the Colonial Office, relating to the form of Money Orders to be issued to coolies for the remittance of their savings to India.

From Sir F. ROGERS, Bart., &c., &c., &c., to the Under Secretary of State for India; dated Downing Street, 14th January 1868.

I am directed by the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos to transmit to you, for the information of the Secretary of State for India, in connection with my letter of the 13th July last, a

copy of a Despatch* from the Governor of Mauritius, on the subject of the form of Money Orders to be issued to coolies for the remittance of their savings to India. I am also to enclose a report by the Emigration Commissioners upon that subject, and am to state that the suggestions which it embodies have been adopted by the Duke of Buckingham.

From Sir H. BARKLEY, Governor of Mauritius, to His Grace the DUKE of BUCKINGHAM and CHANDOS, &c., &c., &c.; dated 25th October 1867, No. 272, Miscellaneous.

With reference to your Grace's Despatch, No. 86, of 6th July, replying to mine of 25th March, No. 64, on the subject of the proposed regulations for facilitating the remittance of money to India by cooly immigrants, I have the honor to enclose some further explanations on the subject from Mr. Beyts, the Protector of Immigrants.

2. As regards the limitation of each Money Order to 100 Dollars, the alteration suggested by me in my Despatch abovementioned is, as pointed out by your Grace, clearly unnecessary, as this limitation forms no part of the "Notice," and it will, of course, rest with the Governments of Mauritius and India to issue and pay larger sums by one or more orders, as may, in practice, prove most convenient.

3. With reference, however, to the *forfeiture* of money deposited, if the order be not presented within twelve months, I scarcely think that the remote analogy to the Post Office system in England can be safely relied on to outweigh actual experience as to the ideas and habits of Indian immigrants in this Colony; and I venture respectfully to state that I should still prefer to see Rule No. 3 modified by the addition at the end of the words "in India."

4. I am, however, perfectly ready to acquiesce in the Regulations as they at present stand, since an appeal is allowed in this case to the Government of India.

5. In conclusion, I beg to state that I should be glad to receive a supply, as promised in your Grace's Despatch, of the orders, with Notices printed upon them in English and the Native languages spoken in each of the three Presidencies of India.

From H. N. D. BEYTS, Esq., Protector of Immigrants, to the Honorable F. BEDINGFELD, Colonial Secretary to the Government of Mauritius; dated 23rd October 1867, No. 158-67A.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 235D, dated 10th ultimo, giving cover to a copy of a Despatch from the Secretary of State (No. 86 of 6th July 1867), on the subject of remittances of money to India by Indian immigrants.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Department,
6th April 1868.*

2. With reference to the limit assigned to the amount of each remittance (\$ 100), I beg to state that hitherto the majority of the remittances made through my Office have exceeded that limit, and that, therefore, it would simplify matters to remove the limit altogether.

Vide Enclosure No. 1.

3. With regard to the period fixed as that within which the Money Order should be presented, I take leave to mention that, although I think it perfectly right that, "for the convenience of the Office on which it is made payable," the Money Order should be held to be cancelled after a certain period. I do not see how it follows that the money should be forfeited by the remitter. Many circumstances may occur rendering the Money Order cancellable after its issue without the fault either of the remitter or the person to whom the money is remitted; the party to whom it is addressed may die, or have gone away from his supposed domicile; the remitter, intending to receive the money himself in India, may, after the despatch of the remittance, be hindered from leaving the Colony, or induced to prolong his stay here. Under such circumstances, and indeed under all circumstances, I think that, if the Money Order be not presented within the prescribed period, the order should be cancelled, and payment in India refused; but that the amount should be returned to this Colony, to be given over to the remitter, or those who hold his rights.

4. Under present arrangements, it is quite easy to obtain the return of any amount remitted at any time; and this, I think, has greatly contributed to the confidence which our Regulations have inspired, and to the success which has hitherto attended their operation.

Vide Enclosure No. 2.

5. Several cases have already occurred in which it has been found requisite to cancel remittances and claim back the sums remitted.

ENCLOSURE, No. 1.

Remittances made by Immigrants to the several Presidencies of India, from the 1st February 1866 to the 23rd October 1867.

Presidency to which remitted.	Sums exceeding \$ 100.	Sums of \$ 100 or less.	Total number of remittances.	Total amount of remittances.
Calcutta	111	75	186	RS. 50,612
Madras	...	15	15	1,140
Bombay	4	...	4	2,900
Total.....	115	90	205	54,652

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

Sums remitted to India which have subsequently been returned to Mauritius and refunded to the Remitters.

Date of remittance.	By whom remitted.	Presidency to which remitted.	Amount.
29th October 1866...	Chooliah...	Calcutta ..	RS. 25
5th September 1867	Tusrut...	" ..	70
4th March 1867...	Ramdhony...	" ..	400
Do. ...	Bhawonah...	" ..	400
		Total.....	895

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Department,
6th April 1868.*

From T. W. C. MURDOCH, Esq., to Sir F. ROGERS, Bart, &c., &c., &c.; dated Emigration Board, 4th January 1868.

I have to acknowledge your letter of 29th ultimo, with a further Despatch* from the Governor of Mauritius, on the subject of the form of the Money Orders to be issued to coolies for the remittance of their savings to India.

* No. 272, dated 25th October.

2. Two objections were raised by the Government of Mauritius to the form proposed by us :—

1st.—It was objected that the limit of 100 Dollars for each order was too low. It was answered that there was no limit to the number of orders a cooly might take out; and practically, therefore, no limit to the amount he might remit. Sir H. Barkley expresses himself satisfied with this explanation, and withdraws the objection.

2nd.—It was objected that the forfeiture of the order, if not presented within 12 months, was unnecessarily harsh, and that the money ought, instead, to be returned to the Colony for re-payment to the remitter. It was answered that it was necessary, both for the convenience of the Office on which the order was made payable, and to prevent frauds, to require its presentation within a limited time; that this could only be done by attaching a penalty to its non-presentation; that to lay down a rule that lapsed orders should be re-paid to the Remitter would involve much trouble, both to the Indian Government and the Colony; and that there was 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. Sir H. Barkley says he should still prefer that the lapsed orders should be re-payable in the Colony, but that he is perfectly ready to acquiesce in the Regulations, since an appeal is allowed in these cases to the Government of India.

3. To prevent delay, we were directed, by your letter of 13th July last, to instruct the Emigration Agents in India to have the orders printed at once in the form and with the endorsements proposed. The necessary instructions were sent to them by the mail of 26th July, and have no doubt been acted on, although no copies of the orders have been sent to this country. I would submit, therefore, that, in answer to Sir H. Barkley's application for a supply of these orders, he should be directed to apply to Mr. Eales, to whom, as well as to the Agents for the West Indian Colonies, the instructions of 26th July were sent.

4. I would also submit that the result of the correspondence should be communicated to the Secretary of State for India.

No. 1308.

Copy forwarded to the Government of Madras, in continuation of Endorsement No. 5863, dated the 26th October 1867.

HOME DEPARTMENT,
FORT WILLIAM,
12th March 1868.

(By Order),
(Signed) J. GEOGHEGAN,
Under Secy. to the Govt. of India.

No. 75. ORDER THEREON, 6th April 1868, No. 449.

Communicated to the Protector of Emigrants, and to the Accountant General, in continuation of G. O., dated the 19th November 1867, No. 1446.
(True Extract).

To the Protector of Emigrants.
" Accountant General.

Edw. F. R. Bantleman.

Chief Secretary.

54

India Office;
London, 31st January 1868.

Public,
No. 24.

To His Excellency the Right Honorable the GOVERNOR GENERAL of India in Council.

SIR,

IN continuation of my Despatch of the 14th of September last, No. 135, I forward herewith, for the information and guidance of your Excellency in Council, a copy of a letter dated the 14th instant, with its enclosures, which has been received from the Colonial Office, relating to the form of Money Orders to be issued to coolies for the remittance of their savings to India.

I have, &c.,
STAFFORD H. NORTHCOTE.

From Sir F. ROGERS, Bart., &c., &c., &c., to the Under Secretary of State for India,—Dated Downing Street, the 14th January 1868.

I AM directed by the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos to transmit to you, for the information of the Secretary of State for India, in connection with my letter of the 13th July last, a copy of a Despatch* from the Governor of Mauritius, on the subject of the form of Money Orders to be issued to coolies for the remittance of their savings to India. I am also to enclose a Report by the Emigration Commissioners upon that subject, and am to state that the suggestions which it embodies adopted by the Duke of Buckingham.

From Sir H. BARKLEY, Governor of Mauritius, to His Grace the DUKE of BUCKINGHAM and CHANDOS, &c., &c., &c.,—No. 272, (Miscellaneous,) dated the 25th October 1867.

WITH reference to your Grace's Despatch No. 86 of 6th July, replying to mine of 25th March, No. 64, on the subject of the proposed Regulations for facilitating the remittance of money to India by

Protector of Immigrant's letter No. 138A of 23rd October 1867. coolly immigrants, I have the honor to enclose some further explanations on the subject from Mr.

Beyts, the Protector of Immigrants.

2. As regards the limitation of each Money Order to 100 dollars, the alteration suggested by me in my Despatch above mentioned is, as pointed out by your Grace, clearly unnecessary, as this limitation forms no part of the "Notice," and it will, of course, rest with the Governments of Mauritius and India to issue and pay larger sums by one or more orders, as may, in practice, prove most convenient.

3. With reference, however, to the forfeiture of money deposited, if the order be not presented within twelve months, I scarcely think that the remote analogy to the Post Office system in England can be safely relied on to outweigh actual experience as to the ideas and habits of Indian immigrants in this Colony; and I venture respectfully to state that I should still prefer to see Rule No. 8 modified by the addition at the end of the words "in India."

4. I am, however, perfectly ready to acquiesce in the Regulations as they at present stand, since an appeal is allowed in this case to the Government of India.

5. In conclusion, I beg to state that I should be glad to receive a supply, as promised in your Grace's Despatch, of the orders, with Notices printed upon them in English and the Native languages spoken in each of the three Presidencies of India.

From H. N. D. BEYTS, Esquire, Protector of Immigrants, to the Hon'ble F. BEDINGFIELD, Colonial Secretary to the Government, Mauritius,—No. 158-67A, dated the 23rd October 1867.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 235D, dated 10th ultimo, giving cover to a copy of a Despatch from the Secretary of

State (No. 86 of 6th July 1867), on the subject of remittances of money to India by Indian immigrants.

2. With reference to the limit assigned to the amount of each remittance (\$ 100), I beg to state that hitherto the majority of the remittances made through my Office have exceeded that limit, and that, therefore, it would simplify matters to remove the limit altogether.

3. With regard to the period fixed as that within which the Money Order should be presented, I take leave to mention that, although I think it perfectly right that, "for the convenience of the Office on which it is made payable," the Money Order should be held to be cancelled after a certain period. I do not see how it follows that the money should be forfeited by the remitter. Many circumstances may occur rendering the Money Order cancellable after its issue without the fault either of the remitter or the person to whom the money is remitted; the party to whom it is addressed may die, or have gone away from his supposed domicile; the remitter, intending to receive the money himself in India, may, after the despatch of the remittance, be hindered from leaving the Colony, or induced to prolong his stay here. Under such circumstances, and indeed under all circumstances, I think that, if the Money Order be not presented within the prescribed period, the order should be cancelled, and payment in India refused; but that the amount should be returned to this Colony, to be given over to the remitter or those who hold his rights.

4. Under present arrangements, it is quite easy to obtain the return of any amount remitted at any time; and this, I think, has greatly contributed to the confidence which our Regulations have inspired, and to the success which has hitherto attended their operation.

5. Several cases have already occurred in which it has been found requisite to cancel remittances and claim back the sums remitted.

Enclosure. No. 1.

Remittances made by Immigrants to the several Presidencies of India, from the 1st February 1866 to the 23rd October 1867.

Presidency to which remitted.	Sums exceeding \$100.	Sums of \$100 or less.	Total number of remittances.	Total amount of remittances.
Calcutta	111	75	186	Rupees. 50,612
Madras	...	15	15	1,140
Bombay	4	...	4	2,900
Total	115	90	205	54,652

Enclosure. No. 2.

Sums remitted to India which have subsequently been returned to Mauritius, and refunded to the Remitters.

Date of remittance.	By whom remitted.	Presidency to which remitted.	Amount.
29th October 1866 ...	Chooliah ...	Calcutta ...	Rupees. 25
5th September 1867 ...	Tusrut ...	" ...	70
4th March 1867 ...	Ramdhony ...	" ...	400
" ...	Bhawonah ...	" ...	400
	Total ...		895

From T. W. C. MURDOCH, Esquire, to Sir F. ROGERS, Bart., &c., &c., &c.,—Dated Emigration Board, the 4th January 1868.

I HAVE to acknowledge your letter of 29th ultimo, with a further Despatch* from the Governor of Mauritius, on the subject of the form of the Money Orders to be issued to coolies for the remittance of their savings to India.

2. Two objections were raised by the Government of Mauritius to the form proposed by us:—

1st.—It was objected that the limit of 100 dollars for each order was too low. It was answered that there was no limit to the number of orders a coolie might take out; and practically, therefore, no limit to the amount he might remit. Sir H. Barkley expresses himself satisfied with this explanation, and withdraws the objection.

2nd.—It was objected that the forfeiture of the order, if not presented within 12 months, was unnecessarily harsh, and that the money ought, instead, to be returned to the Colony for re-payment to the remitter. It was answered that it was necessary, both for the convenience of the Office on which the order was made payable, and to prevent frauds, to require its presentation within a limited time; that this could only be done by attaching a penalty to its non-presentation; that to lay down a rule that lapsed orders should be re-paid to the remitter would involve much trouble, both to the Indian Government and the Colony; and that there was 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. Sir H. Barkley says he should still prefer that the lapsed orders should be re-payable in the Colony, but that he is perfectly ready to acquiesce in the Regulations, since an appeal is allowed in these cases to the Government of India.

3. To prevent delay, we were directed, by your letter of 13th July last, to instruct the Emigration Agents in India to have the orders printed at once in the form and with the endorsements proposed. The necessary instructions were sent to them by the mail of 26th July, and have no doubt been acted on, although no copies of the orders have been sent to this country. I would submit, therefore, that, in answer to Sir H. Barkley's application for a supply of these orders, he should be directed to apply to Mr. Eales, to whom, as well as to the Agents for the West Indian Colonies, the instructions of 26th July were sent.

communicated to the Secretary of State for India.

No. 1300

Copy forwarded to the Government of Madras in continuation of Endorsement No. 5263 dated the 26th October 1867.

HOME DEPARTMENT,
FORT WILLIAM;
PUBLIC,
The 12th March 1868.

By Order,

[Signature]

Under Secy. to the Govt. of India.

8/11/1868

Dec 19 - Nov 18 1874

Vol. 1, 1874

Nov 19 1874

W. H. C. 1874
Nov 19 1874

W. H. C. 1874

W. H. C. 1874

W. H. C. 1874

W. H. C. 1874
Nov 19 1874

W. H. C. 1874

W. H. C. 1874

Dec 19 1874

Communicated to the
to the Secretary, and
in connection with
about the 19th November
1874. No. 1446.

W. H. C. 1874
Nov 19 1874