M.R.O. 1—20,002—12-65.

(1) Number of Pages 8.

(2) Date of repair 3-3-67

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1369.	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated 26-10-1874.		196

Not to be folded or roughly handled

REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
OOTACAMUND,
26th October 1874.

No. 1,369.

No. 303.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
AGRICULTURE, AND COMMERCE.

SIR,—I am directed, in reply to your letter of the 20th August last, No. 228, to state that, as His Excellency the Governor in Council has decided not to enhance the

Separate Revenue, No. 25.

Salt.

Government selling price of salt in the western coast districts consequent upon the recent change whereby full duty is ch[arged] at Bombay, it is practically immaterial, so far as the consumers of salt are conc[erned], what further restrictions may be placed upon its transport by sea.

2. It appears to His Excellency [in] Council that the Bill will probably fail to check the smuggling which it is its obje[ct] to prevent, while it will seriously interfere with the freedom of traffic.

3. It is a question, indeed, whe[ther] smuggling will not be rather increased than diminished by the provisions of the Bi[ll] where there is no Marine Police, and the smuggler will be able to run his cargo at conv[enient] spots along the coast where there are no preventive establishments. As squ[are]gged vessels of 300 tons and upwards cannot often be found in Goa, and as Goa s[tands] in favor in South Canara, the probabilities are in f[avo]r of smuggling.

4. The west coast trade is main[ly] carried on by Pattamars which used to load salt at Bombay and elsewhere as ballast on the voyage down for a return cargo of country-produce. The Bill will certainly cause this down-voyage to be often performed at a loss.

5. The restriction proposed will injure the trade in salt from the East Coast to Moulmein, etc., for, though the ve[ssels] employed here are generally square rigged, their tonnage is less, as a rule, than t[he] minimum prescribed by Section 2 of the Bill.

6. In regard to Clause (*b*), Se[ction] 3 of the Bill, the Governor in Council is of opinion that the law should require [the] appointment of an Agent at Goa to pass salt for import at the ports of Malabar an[d] Canara and of the Native States of Travancore and Cochin, the duty paid there bein[g] credited to Madras; but it is not clear how such duty can be levied before the salt en[ters] British India.

7. The subject of the last par[agra]ph of your letter has been discussed in the correspondence marginally noted. A further communication will be made so soon as the Sirkars have stated their views on the questions alluded to in [the] latter of these letters.

To Govt. of India, 4th Sept. 1874, No.
From „ „ 22nd „ „ „

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Secretary to Government.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

Vide Ch. 4411 of 1874.

Agriculture 1874 Registered.

From

Government of Fort St. George.

D. 2564/74 No. 1,369. Enclosures. 5 spare copies.

D. No. Progs.

L. No. No.

SUBMITTING opinion of the Government on the provisions of the draft Bill to restrict the transport of salt in British Indian waters; referring to certain correspondence regarding salt imported into Travancore and Cochin; and intimating that a further communication will be made as soon as those States have stated their views on the subject.

Revenue Department

No. 1369 — 26 Oct. 74

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of India
Dept. of Rev. Agri. and Commerce.

Sir,

I am directed in reply to your letter of the 20th August last No. 228 to state that as His Excellency the Governor in Council has decided not to enhance the price of salt in the Western Coast Districts consequent upon the recent change whereby full duty is charged at Bombay it is practically immaterial, so far as salt is concerned, what further restrictions the Govt. of India may be pleased to put upon its transport by sea.

2. It appears to His Excellency in Council that

that the Bill received with your letter is a necessary complement of the fiscal arrangements lately decided upon.

2. The Bill will probably fail to check the smuggling which it is its object to prevent while it will needlessly and grievously interfere with the freedom of traffic.

3. It is a question indeed whether smuggling will not be rather increased than diminished for there is no marine police and the smuggler will be able to run his cargo at convenient spots along the coast where there are no preventive establishments. As square rigged vessels of 300 tons and upwards cannot often be found in Goa, and as Goa salt is in favor in South Canara the probabilities are in favor of smuggling

smuggling. 3/1369

4. The West Coast trade is mainly carried on by Pattamars which used to load salt at Bombay and elsewhere as ballast on the voyage down for a return cargo of country produce. The Bill will certainly cause this down voyage to be often performed at a loss.

5. The restriction proposed will also injure the trade in salt from the East Coast to Mount meru &c. for though the vessels employed here are generally square rigged their tonnage is less, as a rule, than the minimum prescribed by section 2 of the Bill.

6. In regard to clause (b) section 3 of the Bill the Governor in Council is of opinion that the law should require the appointment

appointment of an Agent at Goa to pass salt for import at the ports of Malabar and Canara and of the Native States of Travancore and Cochin the duty paid there being credited to Madras but it is not clear how such duty can be levied before the salt enters British India.

2. The subject of the last paragraph of your letter has been discussed in the correspondence marginally noted. A further communication will be made so soon as the Sir Kars have stated their views on the questions alluded to in the latter of these letters.

* To Govt of India 4 Sept. 1874 No. 135
From do 27 " " 228.

c 19
p 24/10/74 303.