

(1) Number of Pages..... 26
(2) Date of repair..... 30.3.68
(3) Initials of the Referencer..... *SV*

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.
B.P. No.

1710

Press
Mis.

Dated

29. 11. 1875 196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
29th November 1875.*

Read the following papers:—

No. 327. From Messrs. LECOT AND CO. and P. GOUGH, Esq., Attorney to S. SARAVANAMUTTU PILLAY, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, dated Pothanore, 4th November 1875.

We have the honor, in enclosing copies of the marginally noted correspondence between the Collector of Coimbatore and ourselves, to request that you will submit to the Government this our appeal against the decision of the Board of Revenue (Proceedings of which are also enclosed) on the subject of our petition.

1. Copy of our letter to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated 10th August 1875.
2. Original letter from Collector of Coimbatore to us, dated 16th August 1875.
3. Copy of our letter to the Collector of Coimbatore, dated 16th October 1875.
4. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 28th October 1875.

2. The Board have expressed their opinion that the contractors have no valid grievance on the ground of what has been done in regard to licensing toddy shops; but we venture to hope that this view of the matter may not be final, and that, when all the circumstances of the case have been considered by the Government, it may be found that our complaint is not groundless or the result of any shortcomings on our part.

3. We have laid stress upon the fact that, when the Board advertised for tenders for the arrack monopoly, no intimation was given of any contemplated changes affecting the demand, save the separation of the toddy from the arrack contract.

4. It was generally believed that the number of shops for either traffic had been fixed by the Collectors of districts after careful inquiry and consideration, not of the number which the contractor might make use of, but the number which would suffice for the legitimate wants of the people; and this conclusion may be drawn from the fact that the sanctioned number of shops was about double the number actually opened when both contracts were in one hand.

5. It was well known that late contractors did not avail themselves of the sanctioned number of toddy shops, because this traffic was suppressed by them in order to develop the arrack trade; and we should have had no excuse for supposing that the separation of the contracts would result otherwise than in considerably increased sales of toddy and a proportionate decrease in the demand for arrack.

6. We cannot, therefore, complain that our sales of arrack are less than they were under the old system, but we do most respectfully submit that, in the absence of any intimation that our guarantee would be affected by subsequent concessions in favor of a rival traffic, we have ground for complaint that a very considerable increase has lately been allowed in the number of sanctioned shops for the sale of toddy.

7. When we first addressed the Collector on the 10th of August (copy of our letter being herein enclosed) the number of toddy shops had been increased, we believe, from 494 to 881. This increase was, however, afterwards reduced to 754, and we trust we are not asking too much when we beg that the original number of 494 may be again fixed as the limit.

8. If this petition is granted, there will be a restoration of the same circumstances regarding facilities of traffic as existed when we guaranteed the minimum annual revenue of Rupees 2,70,000, and which guarantee we are still prepared to

fulfil. We would here call attention to the large difference between the above sum and the total revenue from toddy of this district which is only Rs. 90,900,—a point worthy of consideration in determining the facilities to be granted to either traffic.

9. The Board, it will be observed, do not attribute the low sales of arrack in this district solely to the competition of the toddy, and allude to the probability of illicit manufacture and sale of arrack.

10. We admit that, in spite of all our efforts (in which expense and pains have certainly not been spared) to put a stop to illicit manufacture and sale, there is reason to fear the existence, to some small extent, of such offences (which, in a district where most shop-keepers formerly distilled their own arrack, it is difficult completely to prevent except gradually); but we are, nevertheless, able to state, after some practical experience, that the present supply of toddy is, in our humble opinion, quite sufficient to account for the deficiency between our actual sales and a fair estimate of what they would be if the toddy traffic had not been unduly stimulated.

11. The result of our experience and observation is that amongst the poorer classes the preference is generally given to the toddy shop for the simple reason that at the latter they can indulge in intoxication at the cost of one Anna, whilst at the arrack shop they could not do so under four Annas. Hence, it is that the toddy shop-keeper almost invariably places his shop along side of the arrack shop, whilst the dealer in arrack fears competition instead of courting it.

12. We have mentioned the above fact in support of our statement that the number of toddy shops previously sanctioned met all legitimate requirements, and that the late increase is such as to develop the toddy traffic at the expense of the arrack trade to an extent which we cannot think was ever intended on the acknowledged principle of getting the maximum of revenue from the minimum of consumption.

13. A reference to our letter to the Collector, dated 16th ultimo, will show that our sales during September amounted to only 7,600 gallons, and this figure is about the average of our monthly sales since the 1st of July, including October.

The above issue represents a monthly revenue of Rs. 12,635, whilst our guarantee is Rs. 22,500 per mensem, and our principal petition is that we may be allowed to carry out our agreement under the same circumstances as existed at the time our tender was accepted.

14. We have also asked that the toddy-producing trees (both Cocconut and Palmyra) required by the contractors may be stamped or marked, with the view of regulating supplies and checking illicit sales, which, in the absence of the restrictions placed upon the arrack traffic, are too easily carried on. This system has been adopted in the Town of Madras, and though the Board have pronounced it impracticable in a large district like this, we venture to hope that, as we are ready to prove our appreciation of its good result, by paying a reasonable sum for the employment of Gumastahs on the work, the Government may think fit to give their consideration to this matter also.

We beg that we may be excused for the length of this petition, and have the honor to be, &c.

No. 328. From Messrs. LECOT AND CO. and P. GOUGH, Esq., Attorney to S. SARAVANAMUTTU PILLAY, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort St. George, dated Pothanore, 24th November 1875.

We have the honor, in continuation of our appeal, dated the 4th instant, against the decision of the Board of Revenue regarding the increased number of toddy shops, to bring forward, for submission to the Government, the following fact in support of our petition, especially with reference to paragraph 4.

2. That when the taluqwar toddy auctions were held in this district in the month of April, all the conditions of the transaction were publicly read out in the vernacular to intending bidders, who were also clearly informed, at the same time, of the number of sanctioned shops.

3. That no official intimation was given of any intention to sanction new shops, and that bids were, therefore, made without any hopes being held out of increased facilities to the toddy traffic.

4. The above being the case, we respectfully submit that the toddy contractors could have no right to complain if they were limited to the number of shops sanctioned at the time the taluq was knocked down to them, as that number admitted of their opening very many more than then existed, and was generally understood to be finally fixed.

No. 329. ORDER THEREON, 29th November 1875, No. 1,710.

Separate Revenue, No. 34.
Abkari.

REFERRED to the Board of Revenue for a full report, which should be accompanied by all such papers relating to the invitation of tenders and the con-

clusion of the contract with the memorialists as are not already before Government.

2. Detailed information as to the toddy contract and the conditions on which it was accepted should also be submitted, and, pending orders of Government, further additions to the number of shops should not be made. The Board should call on the Collector for report on the statement that the toddy is sold in a fermented state.

3. There can be no doubt that the tenders for the arrack contract were calculated with reference to the probable consumption not only of this but also of other liquor, and the question to be considered is how far reasonable calculations may have been affected by material changes of system as regards other liquor. It would be well for the Board to ascertain the position of affairs in the other districts worked on the same system of Abkari.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. F. R. Bantlemau.

3
Pothanore, 4th November 1875

To

The Chief Secretary
to the Government.
Madras.

Sir,

We have the honor, in enclosing
Copies of the marginally noted corres-
pondence between the Collector of
Coimbatore and ourselves, to request
that you will submit to the Govern-
ment this our appeal against the
decision of the Board of Revenue
(proceedings of which are also enclosed)
on the subject of our petition.

2. The Board have expressed their
opinion that the Contractors have no
valid grievance on the ground of what
has been done in regard to licensing
toddy shops, but we venture to hope
that this view of the matter may
not be final, and that when all the
circumstances of the case have been
considered by the Government it may
be

30
Govt. of 1875
REVENUE.
Madras.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE

Coimbatore, 29th

Nov

G. O., 28th November 1875, No. 1,710.

NOVEMBER
Nos. 327-328

Increased number of Toddy Shops in Coimbatore District. - Referring to the Board of Revenue for report letter from Messrs. Leach and Co. and Mr. T. Gough, Attorney to S. Sureswami Pillay, appealing against the decision of the Board in the matter of the grievance done to them in regard to licensing an

100/100-08/76
- 08/76

he found that our complaint is not groundless, or the result of any shortcomings on our part.

3. We have laid stress upon the fact that when the Board advertised for tenders for the Arrack monopoly, no intimation was given of any contemplated changes affecting the demand, save the separation of the toddy from the Arrack contract.

4. It was generally believed that the number of shops for either traffic had been fixed by the Collectors of Districts after careful enquiry, and consideration, not of the number which the contractor might make use of, but the number which would suffice for the legitimate wants of the people, and this conclusion may be drawn from the fact that the sanctioned number of shops was about double the number actually opened when both contracts were in one hand.

5. It was well known that late
contractors

contractors did not avail themselves of the sanctioned number of toddy shops because this traffic was suppressed by them in order to develop the Arrack trade, and we should have had no excuse for supposing that the separation of the contracts would result otherwise than in considerably increased sales of toddy, and a proportionate decrease in the demand for Arrack.

6. We cannot therefore complain that our sales of Arrack are less than they were under the old system, but we do most respectfully submit that, in the absence of any intimation that our guarantee would be affected by subsequent concessions in favor of a rival traffic, we have ground for complaint that a very considerable increase has lately been allowed in the number of sanctioned shops for the sale of toddy.

7. When we first addressed the Collector on the 10th of August (copy of our letter being herein enclosed)

the

the number of toddy shops had been increased, we believe, from 494 to 881.

This increase was however afterwards reduced to 754, and we trust we are not asking too much, when we beg that the original number of 494 may be again fixed as the limit.

8. If this petition is granted there will be a restoration of the same circumstances regarding facilities of traffic, as existed when we guaranteed the minimum annual revenue of Rs. 2,70,000 and which guarantee we are still prepared to fulfil. We would here call attention to the large difference between the above sum and the total revenue from toddy of this district which is only Rs. 90,900 a point worthy of consideration in determining the facilities to be granted to either traffic.

9. The Board, it will be observed, do not attribute the low sales of arrack in this district solely to the competition of the toddy, and allude to the probability of illicit manufacture and sale of Arrack.

10. We admit that in spite of all our efforts (in which expense and pains have certainly not been spared) to put a stop to illicit manufacture and sale, there is reason to fear the existence to some small extent of such offences, (which, in a district where most shopkeepers formerly distilled their own arrack, it is difficult completely to prevent except gradually); but we are, nevertheless, able to state, after some practical experience, that the present supply of toddy is, in our humble opinion, quite sufficient to account for the deficiency between our actual sales and a fair estimate of what they would be if the toddy traffic had not been unduly stimulated.

11. The result of our experience and observation is that amongst the poorer classes the preference is generally given to the toddy shop for the simple reason that at the latter

they can indulge in intoxication at the cost of one Anna, whilst at the Arrack shop they could not do so, under four Annas. Hence it is that the toddy shop keeper almost invariably places his shop along side of the Arrack shop, whilst the dealer in Arrack fears competition instead of courting it.

12. We have mentioned the above fact in support of our statement that the number of toddy shops previously sanctioned met all legitimate requirements, and that the late increase is such as to develop the toddy traffic at the expense of the Arrack trade to an extent which we cannot think was ever intended on the acknowledged principle of getting the maximum of revenue from the minimum of consumption.

13. A reference to our letter to the Collector dated 16th Ultimo will

show that our sales during September amounted to only 7600 gallons and this figure is about the average of our monthly sales since the 1st of July including October.

The above issue represents a monthly revenue of Rs. 12,635. whilst our guarantee is Rs. 22,500. per mensem, and our principal petition is that we may be allowed to carry out our agreement under the same circumstances as existed at the time our tender was accepted.

14. We have also asked that the toddy producing trees (both Coconut and Palmyra) required by the Contractors may be stamped or marked, with the view of regulating supplies and checking illicit sales, which, in the absence of the restrictions placed upon the Arrack traffic, are too easily carried on. This system has been adopted in the town of Madras, and though the Board have pronounced

pronounced it impracticable in a large district like this, we venture to hope that, as we are ready to prove our appreciation of its good result, by paying a reasonable sum for the employment of Gomastaks on the work, the Government may think fit to give their consideration to this matter also.

We beg that we may be excused for the length of this petition and have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient servants

Meerab

Piercy Joseph.

Attorney to S. Saravanan Muller Pillay

Pothanore, 24th November 1875

To

The Chief Secretary to Government.

Fort St. George.

Sir,

We have the honor, in continuation of our appeal dated the 4th Instant against the decision of the Board of Revenue regarding the increased number of Toddy Shops, to bring forward for submission to the Government the following fact in support of our petition. Especially with reference to para IV.

2. That when the talook was Toddy auctions were held in this district in the month of April, all the conditions of the transaction were publicly read out in the vernacular to intending bidders, who were also clearly informed at the same time of the number of sanctioned shops.

3. That no official intimation was given of any intention to sanction new shops and that bids were therefore made without any hopes being held out of increased facilities to the toddy traffic.

4. The above being the case, we respectfully submit that the toddy contractors could have no right to complain if they were limited to the number of shops sanctioned at the time the talook was increased down to them, as that number admitted of their opening very many more than then existed, and was generally understood to be finally fixed.

We have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servants.

Respectfully

Very respectfully,

Attorney to S. Saravanan Muttoswamy

session of 1880.

In witness whereof

Revenue 1875 Depts
No 4591

from

Super. Inst. H. O.

and

Mr. P. Gough

Attorney to J. S. S. S. S.

Mutual Policy

Pothamood

Dated 24th 3 Nov-75
Recd 29.

Bringing to notice
certain facts in continuation of their appeal
of 4: Nov, against the decision of the
Board of Rev: regarding the increased number
of toddy shops, and in support of their appeal

SC No 1710. 29 October 1875

N^o 328

Mr. S. S. S. S. S.
Kau. The

Cin. S. S. S. S. S.
Contract.

The report must be called
for, from the Board -
There seems a substantial
grievance if as is stated
by the Contractors - the
toddy sold, is not fresh
but fermented - for this
would be to go beyond
the intention of Govt &

9
This must go to the
B. S. S. S. S. S. S.
to call for
tenders & concluding
the contract. After
that those who have
in Govt Office S. S.
S. S. S. S. S. S.
S. S. S. S. S. S. S.
S. S. S. S. S. S. S.

At the same time
be to be fully
in formed as to

the Lody contracts

then they will result in a loss of
included. Then Revenue without any
in that terms under corresponding advantage
from calculation for I think the Board should
on that conditions call on the Collector
for report on this point
accepted.

I have no doubt
that under for the
arrack contract from
calculated with respect
to probable consumption
of this. to this liquor

are reasonable

calculations of
of material change
of system as regards
this liquor?

(B)

Concur - to the
mean time said
subd as more
are a number
of 500. I do not know
has become of the
Bills to stop currency
14/11

Arrack contractors
Combination Book

No 1710

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 29th November 1875

Read the following
letters from Messrs Leach & Co.
& Mr P. Joseph Attorney to S.
Saravaniammallu Pillay.

Appealing against the
decision of the Board of Rev
in the matter of the grievance
done to them in regard to licen-
sing toddy shops. &c.

(H.E. 4: Nov 1875)

Bringing to notice certain fact in continua-
tion of their appeal of 4: Nov, against the decision of the Board
of Rev. regarding the increased no of toddy shops, and in support
of that appeal

" 24th "

Referred to the
Board of Rev. for a full report,
which should be accompanied
by all such papers relating
to the invitation of tenders
and the conclusion of the
Contract with the Memorialists
as are not already before
Govt

LB

A loan can
get drawn on
H.M. for 10000
while it's held. 4
Mines with 10
Mach. & 1000
the whole effect
this is to be used
for the purpose.

Rev: 15/25: 20/21

10/4/31

Ann

Chap. 2nd to

and

Mr. P. Joseph

Attorney to S. Saravaniammallu Pillay
No 1710-29 Nov 1875

Dec 4th 1875

Rev 5th 1875

for 10000

9.11.02

Applying against

the decision of the Board of Revenue

in the matter of the grievance done

to them in regard to licensing toddy

shops & 10000

been increased for 496

to 754. They agree with the

increased but they mean

increased in proportion as

8:327-

21/11/75 10/2 26/11/75
2/12/75 12/12/75

217 Nov 25 1875
218 Nov 25 1875

Goat -

2. Detailed information
as to the loan contract
and the conditions on which
it was accepted should also
be submitted.

3. This Exec. in Comm.

~~shows that~~ there can be
no doubt that the tenders for
the Arrack contract were
calculated with reference
to the probable consumption
not only of this, but also of
other liquor, and the question
to be considered is how far
reasonable calculations may
have been affected by material
changes of system as regards
other liquor.

of the further address
of the number of bottles
sold to the public

The Bd. should
take care the public for
supplies the statement
that the duty is sold in
a fermented state

It will be well for the Bd. to ascertain
the position of affairs in the
other districts worked on the
same system of Arrack.

14 To the Board of Revenue
D. Scott Secy 29 Nov

L. W. Abbott

8-0

Memorial from Super. Leitch H. A. L.
Samoa - letter Pella regarding
Alkan contract in Com
Lalio St

Am. L. K. H. L. H.

7

Dr. J. A. L.

Re: L. K. H. L. H.
L. K. H. L. H.
L. K. H. L. H.

L. K. H. L. H.