

A1

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
27th March 1873.*

No. 252. Read the following letter from the Director of Revenue Settlement, to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Fort St. George, dated Madras, 18th March 1873, No. 542-22 :—

THE Government of India in their Resolution of 12th February last, No. 544, communicated in G. O., 4th instant, No. 10, prescribe that “ No officer shall act as an arbitrator in any case which is likely to come before him in any shape in virtue of any judicial or executive office which he may be holding.”

2. But Act XXVIII. of 1860, Section 23, declares that the Settlement or other officer acting under that Act is not to be considered “ incompetent by virtue of his office to undertake the duty of an arbitrator in cases in which the conflicting parties may be desirous to nominate him as such.”

3. I presume that the Government order is to be read in subordination to and as qualified by the statute, and that Settlement officers are still competent to act as arbitrators in matters relating to boundary disputes ; but to prevent any question being hereafter raised on this point I have the honour to submit it for the decision of Government. An appeal from the decision of arbitrators appointed under the Act lies to the Civil Court by regular suit.

No. 253. ORDER THEREON, 27th March 1873, No. 367.

Miscellaneous.

THE G. O. in question evidently does not bar the operation of the Act.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Chief Secretary.

To the Director of Revenue Settlement.
„ the Board of Revenue.
„ the Superintendent of Revenue Survey.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
17th March 1873.*

No. 185. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 5th March 1873, No. 318A:—

Read the following letters:—

From H. E. SULLIVAN, Esq., Acting Collector of South Arcot, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Tindivanam, 25th January 1873, No. 16.

I HAVE the honour, with reference to paragraph 1 of the Board's Proceedings dated 14th November last, No. 2,204, to forward for their information copies of correspondence* which has passed between the French Government and myself on the subject of the delivery of salt by weight instead of by measure.

* From Collector to French Government, dated 11th December 1872, No. 175.
From French Government to Collector, dated 20th December 1872, No. 117.
From French Government to Collector, dated 30th December 1872, No. 121.
From Collector to French Government, dated 21st January 1873, No. 15.

From this it will be seen that they do object (as is not unnatural) to the proposed change, and for the manner in which I have met the objections raised I beg to refer the Board to my letter to the Governor at Pondicherry, dated 21st instant, No. 15. It remains to be seen whether the French Government will adopt my suggestion, or whether they will refer the matter for the consideration of the Government of Fort St. George. In the latter case the Board, with the correspondence now forwarded in their possession, will be in a position to reply to any reference which may be made to them on the subject.

2. Adverting to paragraph 3 of the Proceedings under reply I have the honour to enclose copy of a letter dated 19th ultimo, No. 116, from the Government at Pondicherry, stating that the price of salt at the principal dépôt at Pondicherry is Rupees 243½ per garce and at other dépôts Rupees 250½. As this is in excess of our price at the platforms, my impression that a portion of it was smuggled back into English territory must be erroneous.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Correspondence.

From the same Officer, dated Gingee, 12th February 1873, No. 20.

ADVERTING to paragraph 3 of the Board's Proceedings dated 14th November 1872, No. 2,204, and in continuation of my letter dated 25th ultimo, No. 16, I have the honour to submit a statement showing the number of cases of salt smuggling detected and the quantity and value of the article confiscated in 1867, 1868, 1869, as compared with 1870, 1871, 1872. It will be seen that, although during the latter period there were a few more cases detected, the quantity of the commodity confiscated was very slightly in excess of the seizures of the three years preceding.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Statement.

FROM the correspondence submitted with the foregoing letter, in reply to Board's Proceedings dated 14th November 1872, No. 2,204, it appears that the authorities at Pondicherry object to the substitution of weight for measure in the delivery of salt, unless the equivalent of a garce be taken as 10,720½ French lbs. or kilos 5,360.333.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
17th March 1873.

2. This is the equivalent for 424 mercals which it appears was arrived at, after experiments in 1864, by a Commission at Pondicherry, and which was entered in a Convention ratified by the Collector Mr. Reade. By further experiments made in December last the equivalent of 120 Indian Maunds was found to be kilos 4,487.16.

3. It is clear that in executing the Convention of 1864 Mr. Reade exceeded his powers. The kilogramme being 2.2,046 lbs. English, the equivalent of 120 Indian Maunds, or 9,874.2857 lbs., is kilos 4,478.947. That demanded by the French is 5,360.300 kilos, or 11,816.3174 lbs., an excess of lbs. 1,942.0317, or 19.7 per cent.

4. The order of Government dated 25th September 1865, No. 2,301, paragraph 34, is distinct; and under it the salt should be delivered to the French Government, by weight, at the rate of 120 Maunds, or 4,478.947 kilos per garce. The order should have been enforced before, but probably the local officers finding that its execution is surrounded with some difficulty and complication have refrained from giving peremptory effect to it until now. Eight years having elapsed since the order was issued the Board deem it right to place the matter before Government with an expression of their present opinion that it will be better to leave things as they are.

5. The prices at which salt is sold at the French depôts is Rupees 243½ and Rupees 250 per garce. The Board presume that this is garce measure of 424 mercals; and if the Merkanam salt tested on the 20th December, is so sold, it would be equal to about 147 maunds of similar salt sold from the British stores, which would cost Rupees 294, and would thus be under-sold. The Cuddalore salt tested would be slightly dearer than similar salt from the British depôt.

6. From the Collector's letter of 12th February the quantity of salt smuggled does not seem to be increasing. Copies of the papers noted in the margin are submitted for the information of Government.

No. 186.

ORDER THEREON, 17th March 1873, No. 332.

Separate Revenue, No. 14.
Salt.

THE Governor in Council concurs in the opinion of the Board of Revenue (paragraph 4), who will issue orders accordingly to the Collector of South Arcot.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

We have been delivering
salt by measure since
1865 - we have both
a canary - and as
the French are likely
to desire this system to
end at once, I would yield
the point - the in case
- previous to our coming to
any part.
I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Yours, W. D. L. D. S.
W. D. L. D. S.
W. D. L. D. S.

Revenue 1873 - Draft

7-6-11

Proceedings of the
Board of Revenue

Dated 5th March 1873

Despatch 5 - " - "

Recd. 6th

in 18. Recd. 16. 1873

Submitting to Govt.
with observations, letters
from the Collector of
South Arcot, regarding
the objections to the
the French Government
at Pondicherry to the
substitution of weight
for measure in the
delivery of salt.
No 202 of March 1873

W. D. L. D. S.

332.

The Govt. concurs in the opinion
of the Bd of Rev (para 4) who will
issue orders accordingly to the Collector
Arcot.

15/3-73

17th March 1873

To the Board of Revenue

18th March 1873, R. 15, 1873

Revenue Settlement Office,
Madras,
18th March 1873.

From, Geo. Banbury Esq^r
Director of Rev. Settlement.
To, W. H. Carmichael Esq^r
Secretary to Government
Revenue Department

Sir,
The Government of India
in their Resolution of 12th
February last N^o 544, com-
municated in G. O. 4th Instant
N^o 10, prescribe that "No
officer shall act as an
arbitrator in any case which
is likely to come before him
in any shape in virtue of
any judicial or executive office
which he may be holding."

2. But Act XXVIII of 1860

See

23-11-90
27-6-93

7/9/1045/75

Govt. of 1873 Madras

To
REVENUE.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated March 17th.

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 17th March 1873, No. 332.

MARCH.

Nos. 185-186.

Substitution of Weight for Measure in
delivery of Salt to French Government.
Proposal of the Board of Revenue to allow the
present system to continue, approved.



section 23 declares that
the Settlement or other officer
acting under that Act
is not to be considered
"incompetent by virtue of
his office to undertake the
duty of an arbitrator in
cases in which the conflicting
parties may be desirous
to nominate him as such."

3. I presume that the Go-
vernment Order is to be read
in subordination to, and
as qualified by, the Statute
and that Settlement Officers
are still competent to act
as arbitrators in matters
relating to boundary disputes;
but to prevent any question
being

AS
being hereafter raised
on this point, I have the
honor to submit it for the
decision of Government.
~~The~~ Appeal from the deci-
sion of Arbitrators appoint-
ed under the Act lies to the
Civil Court by regular suit.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obed^t Serv^t

Geo Baubury.

Director of Rev Settlement

Ln 252-253

77-813

Heine

Redeemed
Revelation

2

Seeley to son

Rebeck

Oct 1803
Dec 1803

20542

22

Encouraging with
Glosses to Counters
of United States Wholes
Retailers Office
May not as Cash
Held in matters
Relating to business
Deposits.

W. H. D. P.
A. 307-27-a-a-a-a-173

PR 26: Prunus

Institution

193-11

✓
27. March / 73
13. Brief Besichtigung
14. 73. Brief
13. Brief Besichtigung