

(1) Number of Pages 26
(2) Date of repair 16-2-68
(3) Initials of the Referencer 26.4.68

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.

~~B.P. No.~~

1539

Press

~~Mis.~~

Dated 28-10-1875 196 .

[Handwritten signature]

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1539
1

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
28th October 1875.*

No. 182. Read the following letter from the Acting Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, to the Secretary to the Government of Fort St. George, Revenue Department, dated Bombay Castle, 12th June 1875, No. 3,333 :—

WITH reference to the Government of India's letter, No. 799, dated 18th ultimo, to your address, regarding the adjustment of duty paid in Bombay on salt exported to the Madras Presidency and to Cochin and Travancore under contract, I am directed to forward the accompanying copy of a letter* from the Collector of Salt Revenue; and to request that you will be so good as to favor this Government with the views of the Government of Fort St. George on the points therein mooted.

* No. 3,360, dated 1st June 1875.

2. I am directed to state that copies of the documents referred to in the 3rd paragraph of Mr. Pritchard's letter were forwarded to you with this Government's letter, No. 89, dated 8th January last.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From C. PRITCHARD, Esq., Collector of Salt Revenue, to the Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, dated 1st June 1875, No. 3,360.

To enable me to carry out the orders conveyed in Government Resolution, No. 3,053, dated the 28th ultimo, I have the honor to request that, as soon as contracts are given out by the Collectors of South Canara and Malabar and by the Cochin and Travancore Sirkars, I may be informed of the names of the contractors and the quantities of salt each has engaged to supply.

2. Salt is sometimes removed for export both to Madras and Travancore ports on private account. A trader clears a cargo for Mangalore for example. If the Collector of South Canara wants salt, he will purchase it; if not, the trader will offer the cargo to the Collector of Malabar, and, if it be refused at Calicut, will carry it on to Cochin or Allepey. It, also, sometimes happens that salt taken by the Madras Government contractors is rejected by the Collectors of South Canara and Malabar. The contractors then send it on to Cochin or Travancore, and sell it to one of the Sirkars at a reduced rate. I solicit instructions whether such transactions are to be noted in the accounts of this office, or whether the requisite adjustments will be made in Madras. If adjustments are to be made in this office, it will be necessary that the salt officers at the different ports on the Malabar Coast keep me informed of the actual disposal of each cargo shipped from Bombay. I would respectfully suggest that confusion will probably be avoided if I submit monthly statements showing separately the duty levied and quantities of salt shipped for Madras ports and for ports in Cochin and Travancore, leaving all adjustments to be made in Madras.

3. I have further the honor to solicit instructions whether I am to allow salt to be exported on private account to ports on the Malabar Coast, or whether the exportation is to be confined to the contractors; and, lastly, whether any limit is to be placed on the shipments for Cochin and Travancore. On this last point reference is solicited to paragraphs 50 and 51 of my Administration Report for 1873-74 and to paragraphs 4 and 5 of my No. 6,560, dated the 3rd December 1874.

No. 183. ORDER THEREON, 28th October 1875, No. 1,539.

Separate Revenue, No. 29.

Salt.

COMMUNICATED to the Board of Revenue and Resident in Travancore and Cochin, who will arrange for the Collector of Salt Revenue in Bombay being furnished with the information required by him as to the contractors.

2. It will be intimated to the Government of Bombay that, in view of the early introduction of the Salt Excise Act into Malabar and Canara, which has been decided on, it seems unnecessary to disturb any of the existing arrangements having reference to the present mode of supplying salt to those districts, and that the arrangement approved by the Government of India in paragraph 3 of their letter, No. 799, dated 18th May 1875, for the payment of the duty refunded to the Sirkars seems proper and suitable.

3. They will, also, be informed that it is not intended to place any restriction on the quantity of salt imported to the States.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) L. A. CAMPBELL,
Under-Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin.

No. 3333 of 1875. 1539

Revenue Department
Bombay Castle 12 June 1875.

To

The Secretary to the Government of
Fort Saint George

Sir,

With reference to the Government of India's letter No. 799 dated 18th ultimo, to your address regarding the adjustment of duty paid in Bombay on salt exported to the Madras Presidency and to Cochin and Travancore, under contract, I am directed to forward the accompanying copy of a letter from the Collector of Salt Revenue, 1st June 1875, and to request that you will be so good as to favor this Government with the views of the Government of Fort Saint George on the points therein mooted.

2. I am directed to state that copies of the documents referred to in the 3rd para. of Mr. Pritchard's letter were forwarded to you with this Government letter No. 89 dated 8th January last.

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Your most obedient servant

For Acting Secretary to Govt.

Aug 11/6

Govt. of Madras.

REVENUE.

To

The BOARD OF REVENUE,

Ac,

Ac,

Ac

Dated October, 28th.

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. 28th October 1875, No. 1,639.

OCTOBER

No. 189-188

Salt for South Canara, Malabar, Travancore, and Cochin.—Communicating to the Board of Revenue and Resident of Travancore and Cochin letter from the Government of Bombay requesting to inform the Collector of Salt Revenue of the names of the contractors engaged to supply.— Resolving to inform the Government of Bombay that it is unnecessary to disturb the existing arrangements for the supply of salt in view of the early introduction of the Salt Excise Act in those districts, and intimating that it is not intended to place any restriction on the quantity of salt imported to the States.



1539
4

N^o 3360 of 1875
Revenue Department

To
The Secretary to Government
Bombay
Bombay 1st June 1875.

Sir,

To enable me to carry out the orders conveyed in Government Resolution N^o 3053, dated the 28th ultimo, I have the honor to request that as soon as contracts are given out by the collectors of South Canara and Malabar, and by the Cochin and Travancore Sirkars, I may be informed of the manner of the Contractors and the quantity of salt each has engaged to supply.

2. Salt is sometimes removed for export both to Madras and Travancore ports on private account. A trader clears a cargo for Mangalore for example. If the collector of South Canara wants salt he will purchase it. If not the trader will offer the cargo to the collector of Malabar, and if it be refused at Calicut will carry it on to Cochin or Allepey. It also sometimes happens that salt taken by the Madras Government Contractors is rejected by the collector of South Canara and Malabar. The Contractors then send it on to Cochin or Travancore and sell it to one of the Sirkars at a reduced rate.

to D. S. Clerk / 15th May 1875 Revenue 1875 Dept^o

To
The Secy to the Govt of Bombay

Salt 12 June 1875.
Rec^d 7th July 1875

N^o 3333 E-1

Forward copy of
letter from the Collector of
Salt Revenue & request to be
furnished with the views of the
Madras Govt on certain points
subject of adjustment of duty
levied in Bombay on salt
to the Madras Govt & to Cochin
& Travancore under contract.

DDN^o 1539-28 Cochin, 1875

1872
C. 23 Salt N^o 250075
C. 29 Salt 11 May 1875

rate. I solicit instructions whether such transactions are to be noted in the accounts of this office, or whether the requisite adjustments will be made in Madras. If adjustments are to be made in this office, it will be necessary that the Salt Officers at the different Ports on the Malabar Coast keep me informed of the actual disposal of each cargo shipped from Bombay. I would respectfully suggest that confusion will probably be avoided if I submit monthly statements showing separately the duty levied and quantities of salt shipped for Madras ports and for Ports in Cochin and Travancore, leaving all adjustments to be made in Madras.

3. I have further the honor to solicit instructions whether I am to allow salt to be exported on private account to ports on the Malabar Coast, or whether the exportation is to be confined to the Contractors, and lastly whether any limit is to be placed on the shipments for Cochin and Travancore. On this last point reference is solicited to paras: 50 and 51 of my Administration Report for 1873/74 and to paras: 4 and 5 of my No 6560 dated the 3rd December 1874.

I have the honor to be &c
(Signed) C. Pritchard
Collector of Salt Revenue

(True Copy)

Yours
Ag. Under Secy to Govt
P.S.

recd p. 52 of letter
sent of memo 26 Feb 75
1875 No. 327

1. To what limits is salt to be exported?
2. Arrangements of duty on salt imported to Madras & the Cochin ports.
3. Whether private traders are to be allowed to export.
4. Arrangements under Revenue & Cochin.

1538

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 1st Aug 75

Read the following letter
from the As. Secretary to the
Govt of Bombay.

Forw. copy of a letter from
the Coll. of Salt Revenue
and requesting to be favored
with the views of the Madras
Govt. on certain points touching
the subject of adjustment of
duty paid in Bombay on salt
exported to the Madras Pres. &
the Cochin & Travancore under
Contract.

(H.C. 12 June 1875. No. 3333)

Communicated to the
Board of Revenue and Resident
in Travancore & Cochin who
will arrange for the Collection
of Salt Revenue in Bombay
being furnished with the
information required by
him as to the Contractors.
The arrangements
sanctioned

[Signature]

I think the credit
by Bombay Govt is
proper & necessary
but that we
have no precedent
for intention of giving

2.

Rev 2603/75

sanctioned in G.O. 20 May
1875. No. 775 will be
submitted to the Govt. of
India & it will be pointed
out that the transfer
of funds provided in
para 4 of the letter
from the Financial
Secretary dated 18 May
1875. No. 799 seems now
unnecessary.

3. The arrangement for
the payment of the duty
refunded to the Sikans
seems the only one feasible
at present. This will
be explained to the Govt.
of Bombay. It should be
be informed that it is
not intended to place any
restriction on the quantity
of salt imported to Travancore
or Cochin or to interfere
with

it.

In my remarks on
the note. I don't understand
Mr. Macgregor's sharing part
this draft. as it is opposed
to his ed pencil note on the
draft. in L.B. he apparently con- and with me

⊕ 20/9th July 75
1881

T vide para 3 of the
same letter

2 + D. M. he
he intended to
be in- value of salt
has been determined
not to be placed
been determined
seems unnecessary
and of the

to this note
wanting amount
reference to the present
those
arranging amount
of the salt
Sikans seems
one feasible
3 May will also be
that the salt
any restriction
Sikans seems
be in order

with private traders.
J. A.

Q. O.
Salt supplied by Contractor
from Bombay to Trichinopoly
& Cochin.

Receipt

Revenue Dept.
of

8th

This question of duty on
Govt. imports of salt from
Bombay is most mysteriously
complicated.

Bombay apparently insists
on levy of duty on all salt
exported thence. But will
allow time for payt. on
seawater.

But the Ld. (acting through
this Govt.) has expressed the
wishes & desires of the
claim & credit for this
duty / has directed that
the levy of duty on salt

When, in October
of last year, the pre-
-payment of duty on all
salt exported from Bombay
was made compulsory, it
became necessary to decide
how this payment should
be arranged in the case of
the contractors who supplied
Bombay salt to

- (a) this Government, and
- (b) the European & Cochin States.

with

2. (a) With reference to their contractors, the Govt. have, at different times, decided as follows:—

(1) That they would not ask to have the duty levied on their contractors' salt credited to them.

(2) That they would ask that the duty might be adjusted by an account payment.

(b) as to the Sirkars, the Government have

(1) authorized the refund of the duty (Rs. 1-130 per annum) actually paid by them, and

(2) stated to the J. & J. of India that they wish no restrictions to be placed on the quantity of salt imported by the States.

3. With reference to

Expenditure & no provision on behalf of Govt. shall be credited to the Govt. Thus A. contracts to supply with Bombay salt. & gives Bombay security for the duty. & has long it from him. a credit

para 9. G. O. 17th Oct/74 No. 1338

Bombay. & 2 credits Indras. as being revenue from our consumption.

para 10. G. O. ————

Bombay certainly has no right to it. but have we? as we long it again in the salt price.

Yes we have. because we really pay it to the contractor in the contract price. so that practically we pay the contractor. & have paid Bombay. But what is the use of paying them if we

Vide letters of the 26th Feb 75 No 327 & 2nd March 75 No 337.

They repay us?

to the duty being adjusted by an account payment, the Bombay Government, who had "already given permission to allow salt merchants a month's credit on their Promissory Notes," have stated that salt can be given equally well on the production of the necessary documents from a Marine Treasury.

On this, our Accountants General and the Board have arranged, and the Govt. have approved of the arrangement, that, "provided the contractor deposits security sufficient to prevent all loss to Govt., credit may be afforded for the duty chargeable

Vide G.O. 21st May 75 No 775

chargeable on salt supplied from Bombay for the use of the West Coast Districts, the duty being credited to the fr. of Bombay and a receipt for the amount printed to the Contractor by the Collector. In case of short delivery, the Contractor should make good the amount of duty on the quantity deficient."

The Contractor is to produce a Certificate from the Bombay Authorities showing the quantity shipped, and is to get credit for that amount only.

4. Subsequently, the fr. of India, in sanctioning the refund of duty to the States, have stated that it will be covered by a transfer of funds from the fr. of Bombay, and that a similar transfer is

& see letter in f.O.
19th July 75 No 1081.

I think the order is correct because the contractor is to get credit for amount from salt in Bombay. But the point is how far the fr. of India is correct. It is a most ambiguous answer.

He says in Madras & the sum is added to Bombay. The order for refunding to Madras is correct. This Govt. would say they would not make an application, I suppose because the Revenue Department is not to elect when the Revenue should be credited.

10
is to be made to Madras on account of the analogous duty to be refunded to their own Contractors.
5. These orders are obviously correct, as far as the States' salt is concerned, as Madras should not have anything debited against her on its account, but should she have the duty on the salt supplied to her own contractors repaid, when she has distinctly refused to have it credited to her, and when, as a matter of fact, the Contractor does not pay anything in Bombay?
Moreover, it would appear that, if the duty is credited to her in Bombay, it will appear in

in the accounts twice
over as she will levy and
credit it herself when she
sells the salt.

6. With reference
to these orders of the Gov. of
Lusia, the Bombay Gov. has
a letter from their Collector of Salt
Revenue, pointing out various
inconveniences that will
arise if the adjustments are
made in Bombay.

e.g. the actual disposal
of each cargo shipped from
Bombay will have to be
reported to him.

7. It therefore
seems necessary to inform
the Gov. of Lusia of the arrange-
ments under which the Salt
is now supplied to the
Contractors

Contractors and recommend
the adjustments being made
in Madras.

8. As to the amount
that are to be paid to
Madras on account of the
refund to the States, it seems
only necessary that the
duly levied should, as
directed by the Gov. of Lusia,
be held in deposit as
repayable in Madras until
informed by the Madras
Accountant General of
the amount of the refund
to the States.

Yours
J. A.

J. A.

Note
Duty on Salt exported
Bombay -

Recy
draft

80
2/10



N^o 1539

Revenue Dept^l

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 28th October 1875

Read the following letter
from the A^d Sec^y to the
Gov^t of Bombay.

Forw^d copy of a letter
from the Coll^r of Salt Rev^y &
requesting to be favored with the views
of the Madras Gov^t on certain points
touching the subject of adjustment
of duty paid in Bombay on Salt
exported to the Madras Pres^d & to
Cochin & Travancore under contract

G. E. 12 June 1875 N^o 3333

LA

Communicated to
the Board of Revenue and
Resident in Travancore and
Cochin who will arrange for
the Collector of Salt Revenue
in Bombay being furnished

with

with the information required
by him as to the Contractors.

2. It will be intimated

to the Govt of Bombay that,
in view of the early intro-
duction of the Salt Excise

Act into Malabar and
Canara ^{which} having been decided

on, it seems unnecessary
to disturb any of the
existing arrangements

having reference to the
present mode of supplying
salt to those Districts,

+ that the arrangement
approved by the S. G. in para 3. of their
letter No. 799 of 18th May 75
for the payment of the

duty

duty refunded to the
Sirkars seems ^{superior} the only one
feasible. 13

3. They will also
be informed that it is not
intended to place any
restriction on the quantity
of Salt imported to the

States -

44. To the Board of Revenue 29 Oct
44. The Resident in Travancore & Cochin. S

404
H. H. H.

G.O.

Bombay Salt Supply
by Contract to the
Revenue of the Government