

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 730

Press
~~Mis.~~

433 434

Dated 27-4-1918

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th April 1864.*

No. 433. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 20th April 1864,
No. 2,397:—

Read the Government Endorsement, dated 13th April 1864, calling for a report on a Petition from Mr. Barter of Tuticorin, soliciting the remission of a portion of the License Fee paid by him to fish Chanks.

- | | | |
|--|------------|---|
| Nos. 4,456
" 7,113
" 7,367
" 7,556
" 8,032 | } of 1863. | 1. Ordered that copy of the Board's Proceedings noted in the margin be submitted for the information of Government as containing full information on the matter and with the following remarks. |
| Nos. 587
" 935 | | 2. The Government will observe that both the Collector, Mr. Silver, and the Superintendent of Pearl Banks, Captain Phipps, were of opinion, |

That Rupees 650 was a fair fee for the annual license to fish Chanks, required to be taken out for each boat engaged in the Fishery;

That these licenses were granted for the Fusly year;

That Mr. Barter himself estimates the duration of the open season at seven months, the season of course commencing with the close of the South-west monsoon; and

That thus by far the larger proportion of the open season must fall within the six months from 1st January to 30th June.

3. At Mr. Barter's estimate of seven months for the open season, the proportion of the fee for each open month will be Rupees 92½, and the Board consider that *at least* four and a half open months were available from 1st January 1864, for which period at the above proportion, the charge for the period might fairly have been calculated at Rupees 415, if Rupees 650 be a fair fee for the whole year, on which point the Board consider the local Officers to be far more competent judges than the Board can be.

Rs.
92½
4
—
369
46½
—
415-2

4. The licenses for the six months commencing with 1st January, were advertised as obtainable on payment of a fee of Rupees 400, and Mr. Barter took out the number he required with full knowledge of the rate.

5. The Board are unable to see that he has any ground for claiming remission, and they consider that in fairness to the general public at Tuticorin, no grace ought to be shown to him, which will have the effect of enabling him to hold his licenses on more favorable terms than were open to the general public.

No. 434. ORDER THEREON, 27th April 1864, No. 730.

The Government have referred to the advertisement in the District Gazette, and find it distinctly stated that "Licenses to fish Chanks for the remainder of the current Fusly year from 1st January to 30th June 1864," would be granted "on payment of a license fee of Rupees 400 for each boat." Mr. Barter's claim is therefore inadmissible.

(Signed) J. D. SIM,
Secretary to Government.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 20th July 1863.

Read the following letter from J. SILVER, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Tenkasy, 10th July 1863, No. 275 :—

1. The Board of Revenue having, in their Proceedings of the 19th July 1862, sanctioned the continuance of the system of licensing boats for the Chank Fishery for another year, this system having been introduced as an experiment, and having desired to be furnished with a report of the results at the close of the Fasli ending 30th June 1863, I have now the honor to address the Board on the subject.

2. The scheme, which was laid before the Board with my letter of 30th April 1861, and tried as an experiment for the year 1861-62, and again carried on to test the experiment further, for the year 1862-63, and which was expected to result in extensive competition, and a large increase of revenue from the fishery, has proved a total failure, for there has been no competition at all.

3. In the first year, licenses for sixteen boats were taken out at Tuticorin, of which twelve were held by Mr. Barter, and four by Mr. Cocq, the revenue derived being Rupees 6,400. In the second year, just expired, sixteen licenses were in like manner taken out at Tuticorin, all of them by Mr. Barter. I believe that at the rate of six divers to a boat, these sixteen boats take up all the Tuticorin divers, and not a single boat from any one of the out-ports applied for a license. The license fee having been continued for the second year at Rupees 400 a boat, as recommended by Mr. Phipps in his letter of 13th June 1862, copy of which I forwarded to the Board on the 20th June 1862, the revenue derived for the second year, has been the same as for the first, Rupees 6,400.

4. From unofficial information I heard from more than one quarter, within the last six months, there is no doubt that the price of the licenses last year might have been fixed at a considerably higher rate, looking at the profits said to have been made during the first year; and now that fresh arrangements have to be made, it is necessary, if the fishery is again to be rented, that a fair value should be fixed upon it.

5. The experience of two years has shown that there is little or no chance of competition from any of the out-ports. Whether or not the fishery is again carried on under a system of licensing boats, or put up to auction, or carried on under Government management, only the Tuticorin divers are likely to be employed.

6. To form some estimate what the fishery may be worth, I refer to Mr. Cocq's letter of 26th June 1861, reported to the Board by me on the 29th idem, offering that if the fishery was put up to auction, to commence with a bid of Rupees 10,000. That gentleman has now left Tuticorin. Further it is to be remarked, that in Mr. Phipps' original scheme, he estimated that from expected increased competition, parties would have to pay the divers at the rate of Rupees 40 per 1,000 Chanks, double what Messrs. Cocq and Co. used to pay them, when they rented the fishery on a lease, thus involving an outlay of Rupees 600 a boat; whereas from there having been no competition at all, I have reason to believe the divers have only been paid at the old rates, thus diminishing the expense to the speculator, by Rupees 300 a boat; and as the higher estimated outlay of Rupees 600 a boat payment to the divers, was estimated by Mr. Phipps in his scheme, to leave a clear profit to the speculator at the rate of Rupees 500 a boat, the profit under these circumstances, may be more nearly calculated at Rupees 800 a boat.

7. It is well known, that all the Tuticorin divers are under engagements to fish Chanks for Mr. Barter; consequently if the licensing system is continued, he has as much a monopoly, as if the fishery was sold at auction. If sixteen boats took out licenses for this next year, at Rupees 650 for each license, it would give a revenue of Rupees 10,400, and Mr. Phipps recommends that the licensing system be continued with the proviso that not less than sixteen licenses are applied for at the enhanced rates of Rupees 650 each; otherwise that the fishery should be managed by

No. 7,113.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 7th November 1863.

Read the following letter from C. J. BARTER, Esq., to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Tuticorin, 13th October 1863:—

1. I have not yet been favored with any reply to my letter of August, though I have no reason for thinking it miscarried.
2. The Board will be now aware that Mr. Collector Silver failed in obtaining any bid for the Chank Fishery, for the ensuing year, at the upset price of Rupees 10,400, and that he has also been unable to meet with any response in his appeal to the divers to take service under him, partly because, as communicated in my former letter to the Board, the divers are under engagements to me, which they are neither willing nor able to set aside.
3. I did not bid at the auction sale simply because I considered the upset price too high and that I could do better with my funds elsewhere.
4. I do not wish, however, to take advantage of these circumstances; and as prepared to offer before the auction, and in pursuance of the plan of licenses, I am now willing to take out two licences in excess of last year, or to pay Rupees 7,200 as a lump sum, which is the extent of the value of the Fishery at present; and should the Board think fit to accept this offer, I beg that it may be done as early as possible in order to avoid any unnecessary loss of time.
5. I wish to meet the Government in a fair spirit on all such questions, and shall be always ready to forward its interests by giving up the divers for the use of the Pearl Banks. But I may be allowed to express my regret if any personal differences between Mr. Silver and myself are allowed to intervene to the detriment of the public service and its legitimate sources of revenue.

1. The Board did not perceive at the time of receiving Mr. Barter's letter of 23th August last, and do not now on its re-perusal perceive, that it called for any reply.

2. His present offer to take out two more licenses than he obtained in last year will be forwarded to the Collector for disposal. The Board do not desire to rent out the Fishery to a single individual to the exclusion of all others, and prefer the Licensing, or the Amani system, the revenue from this source being a very secondary consideration.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To J. Silver, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely.

Copy to C. J. Barter, Esq., with an original letter returned.

Exd. J. Wright.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

1863.

Department.

No.

Dated 20th July 1863.

Despatched

Received

No. 4,456.

Authorizing the sale of the Chank Farm by
auction for one year.

Government. I am of opinion, however, that the preferable course will be, to put up the fishery to public auction, at the upset price of Rupees 10,400, the amount which sixteen licenses at Rupees 650 would fetch, and allow any one to bid who chooses. This I consider to be the best mode of securing to Government the amount of revenue the fishery will fairly yield, and I request the sanction of the Board to advertise the fishery to be put up to auction accordingly, before the

* For one year.

Deputy Collector at Tinnevely, on the 10th September,* under the usual conditions of not fishing within a mile of any Pearl Bank, payment of Kists, &c., and I solicit the early instructions of the Board on the subject. Copies of the letter I addressed to Mr. Phipps on the 1st instant, and of his reply of the 6th instant with enclosure, are forwarded for the information of the Board.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. SILVER, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely, to G. A. PHIPPS, Esq., Master Attendant, Tuticorin, dated Tenkasy, 1st July 1863, No. 656.

1. The period for which licenses were granted to fish Chanks for the year ending 30th June 1863, having expired yesterday, it is now necessary to decide on the mode in which the fishery is to be conducted in future.

2. The subject having been personally discussed between us lately, I need only here state, that the anticipations expected to result from the scheme of licensing boats, detailed in your letters of 14th March and 20th April 1861, have completely failed, for there has been no competition whatever.

3. It is also undoubted, that in fixing the license fee at 400 Rupees a boat for the second year, as recommended in your letter of 18th June 1862, the same was far too low; and that the profit actually derived might be more nearly calculated at from Rupees 800 to Rupees 900 a boat. Take one item, your scheme supposed the Contractor would have to pay the divers at the rate of Rupees 40 per 1,000 Chanks, double the amount Messrs. Cocq and Co. used to pay, but from want of competition there is good reason to believe, the divers have not been paid more than from 20 to 22 Rupees per 1,000 Chanks.

4. If the right of fishing Chanks is to be in future rented by Government, it must be at such a rate as will ensure a fair return to the State, and leave a good profit to the speculator; otherwise the Chank fishery must be carried on in future under Government management. The first point is to consider what the fishery may be fairly worth. Mr. Cocq, in a letter dated 26th June 1861, offered, if the fishery was again put up to public competition by auction, to commence with a bid of Rupees 10,000; it may, therefore, be fairly inferred, the fishery is worth more than that amount. For the last two years, 16 boats have been licensed each year, at 400 Rupees a boat, giving a revenue of Rupees 6,400. If the license fee was fixed at Rupees 650 instead of Rupees 400, and licenses for 16 boats were taken out, that would give a revenue of Rupees 10,400, and would, I believe, still leave a large profit to the speculator. The opinion you expressed when I saw you lately was, that if a sufficient number of licenses at an increased rate, were applied for, they might be granted, and the fishery conducted as before; if not, that it should be taken into our own hands, and I request you will now give me your views on the subject, and the course you would recommend to be followed. I further request your reply to this letter as soon as possible.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From G. A. PHIPPS, Esq., Superintendent of Pearl Banks, to J. SILVER, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely, dated Tuticorin, 16th July 1863.

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 656, dated 1st instant, requesting my views regarding the future conducting of the Chank Fisheries on this Coast.

2. The licensing scheme, under which it has been conducted during the past two years, has, I regret to say, proved a complete failure, the competition anticipated not having taken place, and the Chemmatties and small native traders residing at the other Ports on the Coast, who I expected to have to become interested in the fishery, have exhibited the utmost indifference; from the want of competition during the last year, the good result expected to accrue to the divers have only been partially obtained, and their number is now nearly the same as it was under the old Contractors.

3. Under these circumstances I would recommend that, in future, the fishery be carried on by Government; but to prevent loss to the parties who have engaged in it during the past two years, and who have godowns built for the purpose of storing the shells, I consider that it should first be advertised in the usual way, and the license fee raised to the sum you mention, viz., Rupees 650 per boat, a stipulation being added that unless sixteen applications are received before the 19th of September next, no licenses will be granted; this will give the Government a certain revenue of Rupees 10,400; should these not be applied for, the fishery can then be carried on under Government management; if this is done for one year, the amount of the profits to be derived from this source of revenue can be determined, and the license fee regulated accordingly; at present it is almost impossible to learn the real value of the Chank shells, as of course information of this sort is kept private.

4. It is a matter which, I think, should be considered, whether the whole amount of license fee should be paid at once, or by two instalments; this is now a considerable sum, and as under the old Contractors, I believe, the rent was paid by quarterly instalments, I do not see any objection to the license fee being paid two-thirds at the time of application, and the remaining one-third on the 5th of January following.

5. Should it be necessary to take the fishery under Government management, a small establishment will be required, consisting of a writer, and two or three Peons and Cavalgars, but it is a matter that can be considered when the applications have been received.

6. I beg to enclose a copy of the usual Advertisement with the required alterations for your approval.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.—Advertisement.

1. Presuming that the maintenance of the Government monopoly of Chanks is still deemed necessary for the due protection of the Pearl Banks, the Board authorize the Collector to sell the farm by auction for one year, viz., the current Fasli 1273 at an upset price of Rupees 10,400 as proposed by him.

2. He will forward copy of his Advertisement for publication in the "Fort Saint George Gazette."

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To J. Silver, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely.

Exd. J. Wright.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 20th November 1863.

Read the following letter from J. SILVER, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 12th November 1863, No. 431 :—

1. I have the honor to forward for the orders of the Board, copy of a letter from Mr. Barter of Tuticorin dated 9th instant, saying that he wishes to submit a Petition to the Board and the Governor in Council, regarding the Chank Fishery, and an offer to construct the proposed Pearl Oyster Nursery, on certain conditions, and therefore he requests access to the correspondence in my Office about the Chank Fishery for the last three years.

2. If any private individual desires to bid for any of the Government farms, he can do so, but it is by no means required to enable him to do this, that official correspondence between the Board of Revenue and the Collector, which relate to matters of general policy and administration of the public revenue, should be laid before him, and I should object to establishing such a precedent as this, precisely as if Mr. Barter had asked for copies of the Board's, and Collector's, proceedings and letters.

3. I may also remark that no one knows the value of the Chank Farm better than Mr. Barter. After the termination of Mr. Cocq's lease in June 1861, Mr. Barter held all the boats under the licensing system, for the first year, except four. It proved a failure to the Government, for there was no competition from the out-ports, and it brought only a revenue of Rupees 6,400. Before it was tried a second year, Mr. Cocq offered, if it was put up to public competition as before, to begin with a bid of Rupees 10,000, in his letter dated 26th June 1861, copy of which was sent to the Board on the 29th idem, but wishing to give it another year's trial, the licensing system was continued, and Mr. Barter had a monopoly of the Fishery that year, having all the boats, and the revenue derived was the same as before, viz, Rupees 6,400.

4. It was then resolved to revert to the former system of public competition, as the fairest means of securing to Government what the Fishery was really worth, and Messrs. Cocq and Co.'s agent Mr. Bowman at once offered to bid on the upset price of Rupees 10,400 in his letter dated 25th August last, copy of which was sent to the Board on the 27th idem, if he could only get the divers, Mr. Barter having it appeared bound over these divers to work for him alone. I am now endeavoring to procure divers from Keelakerry in the Madura District, leaving Mr. Barter to employ and keep together the Tuticorin divers, which is all the Government have in view, and should Mr. Barter cease to employ them, they can always get work from the Government, so that the main object of keeping them together for a Pearl Fishery, is at present fully attained.

5. The above is a brief history of the case, and I do not recommend that Mr. Barter's request to have access to official correspondence between the Board and the Collector, be complied with, as establishing a precedent never before usual, and as unnecessary to enable him to write any petition he desires to do.

6. For Mr. Barter's offer to construct the Pearl Oyster Nursery, I have not myself yet seen the plan and estimate, and any offer of that kind must of course be made to the Public Works Department.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From C. J. BARTER, Esq., to J. SILVER, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely, dated 19th November 1863.

I wish to send in a Petition to the Board of Revenue and the Governor in Council, on the matter of the Chank Fishery on this Coast, as also to submit an offer to construct the proposed Pearl Oyster breeding beds in this harbour, at my own cost, on certain conditions. I therefore beg to request that I may be allowed access to the correspondence in your Office, on the subject of the Chank Fishery over the last three years, so that I may allude with accuracy to such points as seem particularly worthy of their notice, and in a manner allowing of easy reference.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) J. SILVER, Collector.

The Collector will inform Mr. Barter that his request is opposed to established rule, and cannot be complied with. But if he will state the points on which he requires exact information, the Collector will consider how far it is in his power to afford this from the records, and will act accordingly.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,

Secretary.

To J. Silver, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely.

Exd. J. Wright.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

1863. Department.

No.

Dated 7th November 1863.

Despatched

Received

No. 7,113.

Requesting the Collector of Tinnevely to dispose of Mr. Barter's offer to take out two or more licenses in excess of what he obtained last year for the Chank Fishery.

No. 7,556.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 30th November 1863.

Read the following letter from J. SILVER, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely, to W. HUDLE-
STON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 14th November 1863, No. 437:—

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the Board's Proceedings of 7th November 1863, on a letter from Mr. Barter of Tuticorin, dated 13th October, and I beg respectfully to protest against a letter couched in such language as that used by Mr. Barter in the concluding sentence of his communication, being received. All particulars relating to the Chank Fishery having been already laid fully before the Board, I need not recapitulate them here. Mr. Barter having secured a monopoly of the Tuticorin divers to the exclusion of other parties, no one bid at the sale of the Farm, though the Board have learned from the letter of Messrs. Cocq and Co.'s Agent, that he was ready to bid at the sale, if he only could have been sure to get the divers. The Fishery has been advertised to be carried on this year, under Amani, and I have sent a notice inviting divers from Keelakary in Madura, through the Collector of that District; whether any will offer remains to be seen, but if they do not, and the Tuticorin divers continue to be kept together, as they will be, if not by Mr. Barter then by the Government, it is a matter of little importance.

2. Mr. Barter now offers to take out two more licenses than in last year at Rupees 400 each. This seems to be his meaning, as his sixteen boats last year paid Rupees 6,400, at Rupees 400 each, and two more at that rate would give Rupees 7,200. If the licensing system is at any future time reverted to, I consider that the license fee should not be lower than Rupees 650 a boat, and for detailed reasons I beg to refer the Board to my letter of 10th July last, and to the letter addressed to me by the Superintendent Pearl Banks dated 6th July, copy of which was forwarded at the same time.

3. The Fishery having been advertised to be held under Amani this year, I do not recommend that any change be now made, and at the beginning of next season, it can be considered whether the Fishery be rented out either by licenses or sale, or continued to be kept under Amani. With reference to the Board's remark, that they do not desire to rent the Fishery out to a single individual to the exclusion of all others, I would beg to observe, that as the experience of two years has shown that there is no competition from the out-ports, any one party can exclude all others, if he secures a monopoly of the Tuticorin divers.

4. If the licensing system is again tried, I would not, as recommended by Captain Phipps in paragraph 3 of his letter of 6th July last, advise that licenses be refused, unless 16 at Rupees 650 each, were taken out, thus giving a revenue of Rupees 10,400, the sum fixed this year as the upset price at the sale, but I would allow as many or as few at the enhanced rate, to be taken out, as applications were preferred. I beg to request the instructions of the Board on the subject.

1. The Board consider that the main object of the Government in reserving the Chank Fishery should be to conserve the Pearl Banks, and to provide employment for the Divers, whose services are requisite during the Pearl Fisheries, but who in the interval must find other means of livelihood. Revenue from the Chanks should be altogether a secondary consideration, and the Board see no necessity whatever for the Collector to trouble himself to bring Divers for the Chank Fishery from other quarters, if the local Divers do not require the employment afforded by the Chank Fishery.

2. They fail to perceive the objection to Mr. Barter's monopolizing the services of the Divers when they are not required by Government, for they presume that no difficulty has been encountered in obtaining those services for the Pearl Fishery, and for the examination of the banks when needed, no mention of any such difficulty having been made to them.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 30th November 1863.

Despatched

Received

1863.

Department.

No.

Requesting the Collector to inform Mr. Barter that his request to have access to the correspondence on the subject of the Chank Fishery cannot be complied with.

No. 8,032.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 18th December 1863.

Read the following letter from J. SILVER, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely, to W. HUDLESTON, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated 7th December 1863, No. 468:—

1. I have the honor to acknowledge the Board's Proceedings dated 30th November 1863, on the subject of the Chank Fishery.

2. As directed by the Board, I shall take no further steps to procure Divers from other quarters, for the Chank Fishery advertised to be carried on this year under Amani, the local Divers not requiring employment under Government, being as Mr. Barter has informed the Board, under engagements to him. So long as they are kept together, the object of Government is attained.

3. I have no objection to Mr. Barter, or to any other party monopolizing the local Divers, nor to the license system in itself. This scheme was based on an assumption, that there would be great competition from the out-ports, and that parties taking out licenses would have to pay the Divers double what they used to be paid for the Chanks, and after that still leave each speculator a clear profit of Rupees 500 a boat. On these grounds the license fee was at first fixed at Rupees 400. The experience of two years has now proved this to be delusive, there has been no competition, and consequently no such expense entailed on the license holder, therefore the fee could well bear being raised, still leaving the originally estimated profit of Rupees 500 a boat to the speculator, but the Board are evidently under some misapprehension as to how matters stand at present, which I will proceed to explain.

4. In paragraph 4 of their Proceedings under reply, the Board speak of "the license fee fixed at Rupees 650 having been followed by no applications," but such is not the case, no licenses at that rate having been advertised. If the licensing system had been continued for this, the third year, Captain Phipps and I both agreed, that the fee should be fixed at Rupees 650, and Captain Phipps further suggested a stipulation, that unless sixteen licenses at that rate, giving an aggregate revenue of Rupees 10,400, were applied for, the Fishery should be kept under Amani. I considered it would be preferable to put the Fishery up to competition, taking that sum as the upset price, without reference to the number of boats to be employed; and that it was not too high, is proved by the Agent of another Firm having been willing to bid for it, if he could get Divers. Mr. Barter having engaged the Divers to work for him alone, effectually prevented any one else offering for it.

5. He has now in his letter to the Board of 13th October, offered to take out two more licenses at the old rate of Rupees 400 each, which was referred to me for disposal by the Board on the 7th November last. I stated my views to the Board on the 14th November, recommending in paragraph 3 of my letter, that no change should be made in the present season, which has now considerably advanced, and the Board's Proceedings of 30th November, to which I now reply, do not convey to me any Orders, either as to the acceptance or rejection of this offer.

6. My own decided opinion is, that the license fee ought not to be lower than Rupees 650, and when Mr. Barter no longer wishes to keep the Divers employed in other ways, I believe that the licenses will find a ready sale at that rate. I beg therefore to request definite Orders from the Board as early as possible, as to whether they desire any change to be now made, or as recommended by me, to let the subject stand over till next season.

The Board authorize the Collector to notify that licenses to fish Chanks under the prescribed conditions will be granted at the rate of Rupees 650, license fee for each boat. It is for him to consider whether at this late period of the season the fee should be reduced as a special case.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To J. Silver, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely.

Exd. J. Wright.

3. If the license system has not in practice been found incompatible with the proper conservancy of the Pearl Oyster banks, the Board see no reason why it should not be maintained in combination (if necessary) with the Amani system, recourse being had to the latter only when required for the purpose of employing the Divers.

4. Of course if the licensing system is found to be objectionable in practice it should not be allowed, but otherwise the Collector may with advantage consider whether the rate of license fee fixed by him, viz., Rupees 650 per boat, which has been followed by no applications, needs to be maintained at its present amount; and in any case whether licenses may not be issued in combination with the Amani system. The Board agree with the Collector in thinking that if the licensing system is allowed there is no need to restrict the number, or to require a *minimum* number of applications.

5. The phrase in Mr. Barter's letter to which the Collector alludes as objectionable appears to the Board utterly unimportant. The Board do not profess to understand Mr. Barter's meaning, but they have no apprehension that either the public service or the public revenues, will be perceptibly affected by any such circumstances as that gentleman alludes to.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To J. Silver, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely.

Exd. J. Wright.

Passing orders upon the Collector's letter on the subject of issuing licenses for the Chank Fishery.

Dated 30th November 1863
Despatched
Received

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE

No.

1863.

Department.

Ed. Linnéenkatafani
Ch. by L. Linné

No. 587.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 28th January 1864.

Read the following letter from the Collector of Tinnevely, dated 15th January 1864, No. 13 :—

1. Referring to a communication addressed to the Board by Mr. Barter of Tuticorin dated 27th November 1863, and forwarded to me with the Board's Endorsement dated 4th January 1864, to be returned to him, I have the honor to forward for the information of the Board, copies of the only letter I have received from Mr. Barter about the Pearl Oyster Nursery and of my reply. Any information regarding the plans and Estimates must be given by the Professional Department who prepared them. Whether Mr. Barter has applied to the Superintending Engineer 8th Division or not, I do not know. The plans and Estimates are with that Officer.

2. As regards the Chanks, in conformity with the instructions given to me by the Board, in their Proceedings of 18th ultimo, I advertised licenses to be granted for the remaining six months of the Fasli year, from 1st January, at Rupees 400 each, when fifteen licenses were instantly taken up by Mr. Barter at a cost of Rupees 6,000 for only half the year. I leave this fact to speak for itself. With reference to the various communications regarding the alleged over-valuation of the Fishery Mr. Barter has addressed to the Board, and which I need not further notice.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From C. J. BARTER, Esq., to J. SILVER, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely, dated Tuticorin, 8th December 1863.

Before I can make a definite offer to construct the Oyster Nursery in this harbour, it would be advisable that I should be supplied with the Engineer's plan and Estimate of cost, that I may look them over, and have an opportunity of judging of the correctness of the latter, and the terms advisable, under such Estimate.

From J. SILVER, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely, to C. J. BARTER, Esq., dated 10th December 1863, No. 1,308.

In reply to your letter of the 8th instant, I beg to inform you that you should address the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, for any information you require regarding the plans and Estimates for constructing the Pearl Oyster Nursery at Tuticorin.

(True Copies.)

(Signed) J. SILVER, Collector.

The Board agree with the Collector in considering the fact stated to be *prima facie* evidence that the rate of License fee notified for the whole Fasli, viz., Rupees 650, was not excessive.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To J. Silver, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely.

Exd. J. Wright.

1863.

Department

No.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 18th December 1863.

Despatched

Received

No. 8,032.

Authorizing the Collector to notify that
licenses to fish Chanks may be granted at 650
Rupees for each boat.

RECEIVED
TINNEVELLY DISTRICT
JAN 20 1864

No. 935.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 11th February 1864.
Endorsement on Petition No. 307 of 1864 from Mr. C. J. Barter, Tuticorin, Tinnevelly District,
dated 15th January 1864.

1. Mr. Barter appears to be under the impression that the fee for the reduced period should be calculated with reference to the annual rate of Rupees 400.
2. The Board cannot admit this. The annual fee under which the licenses were proposed to be issued was Rupees 650, and if Mr. Barter's Estimate of seven months for the whole fishing season be accepted, the monthly proportion will be Rupees 92½. As the licenses have been granted for six months at the rate of Rupees 400, of which the Board estimate that at least four and half months or till the middle of May will be open for fishing, the proportion of the full rate does not appear excessive.
3. The Board are therefore not prepared to grant the remission sought by Mr. Barter, which could not be conceded without affording good ground of dissatisfaction to some of the general public at the station who might have been able to take out licenses on the same reduced terms, had they then been available.
4. As to Mr. Barter's proposal to tender for the construction of the Pearl Oyster Nursery, the Board cannot interfere with the Executive in the Public Works Department, but they cannot doubt that Captain Moberly, the Superintending Engineer, will consider Mr. Barter's offer if addressed to him.

(A true Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Secretary.

To C. J. Barter, Esq.
Copy to J. Silver, Esq., Collector of Tinnevelly, for information.

Exd. J. Wright.

1864. Department.

No.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

Dated 28th January 1864.

No. 687.

Agreeing with the Collector in considering that
the rate of License fee for Chanks notified for the
whole Fashi was not excessive.

took out the number he required with full knowledge of the rate.

5. The Board are unable to see that he has any ground for claiming remission - and they consider that in fairness to the general public at Inticon, no grace ought to be shown to him which will have the effect of enabling him to hold his licenses on more favorable terms than were open to the general public.
(True Extract)

Anscombe
Secretary.

To J. D. Sim. Esq.
Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
with a Petition returned &
Copies of Correspondence
alluded to in para 1

Edo Chinnakathian
Ch. by E. Chinnakathian

1862. Received by 14th inst
25th March 1864

1864. Department.
No. *Q 1016/1864*

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated 11th February 1864.

Despatched

Received

No. 935.

Passing Endorsement on Petition No. 307 of 1864.

7th April with 9027th March 1864

Revenue Dept.

No 730-

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 27th April 1864

Read the following
Proceedings of the Board
of Revenue.

Submitting Board's
report on the Petition ad-
dressed to Government by
Mr. Barton of Tuticorin
relating the remission of a
portion of the license fee
paid by him to fish chankers

Here enter 20th April 1864

The Government
have referred to the ad-
vertisement in the District
Gazette and find it dis-
tinctly stated that "Li-
censes to fish Chankers for
the remainder of the
current fiscal year from
1st January to 30th June 1864
(contd)

No: 18-2 April 1864 No 655

Rev: 20/4/64 Del: 20/4/64
No: of Govt: 1016

Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue

Dated 20th April 1864
Dec: 20th April 1864
Dec: 21st April 1864
Cm: 21st April 1864

Also see 27th April

Submitting Board's
report on the Petition addressed
to Government by Mr. Barton
of Tuticorin relating the
remission of a portion of the
license fee paid by him to
fish chankers.

I don't think that Mr. Barton is entitled to any remission
as he does not show the conditions upon which he is fishing. It is a
bit - but I do not think the system of giving the price is a good
one. I do not know for certain, but I think it is a bad one.

Mr. Barton claims a re-
mission of license fee on
the ground that he only got his
license on or about 1st Jan 64
the limit was 14th Jan 64.
The license A & B and the
other license in the district
is for the all show that the
licensee here to run from
Jan 7 to 30 June 1864 and
that at 400 Rs was the charge
for that period. The claim
is now for a tenable

AM

AM

AM

AM

AM

AM

would be granted an
payment of a license
fee of Papers 100
for each boat. Mr.
Barker's claim is
therefore inadmissible.

WJ

14 Copies to the P. of Rev. Dr. P. of Rev. Dr.

1 - C. J. Barker Esq.

WJ

2

113

Received 1864 Debit
 No. of Bond for April 1
 216730.
 No. of the Illinois Govt.
 272 April 1864.
 John C. P. Barber Esq.
 24 May 1864 6-71199.

Mr Barber of
 the Court's claim for
 remission of a portion
 of the license fee paid
 by him to said court
 not admitted.

Mite & Carlow for
 information about
 the Chamber R. R.

No 433 4434.