

(1) Number of pages 6
 (2) Date of repair _____
 (3) Initials of the Referencer _____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	3375	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	14-12-1977	197

Not to be folded or roughly handled

REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
FORT ST. GEORGE,
11th December 1877.

No. 83.

No. 3,375.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
REVENUE, &c., DEPARTMENTS.

Separate Revenue, No. 6.

Salt.

*Recorded in G.O., dated 11th Dec. 1877, No. 3374.

SIR,—Referring to paragraphs 4 and 5 of your letter, dated 15th June 1877, No. 125, (Salt), I am directed to forward copy of report* from the Resident in Travancore and Cochin showing (1) that the prices at which salt is sold in those States already approximate to the rates in force in the adjoining British districts, and (2) that the arrangements connected with the purchase of salt at Bombay prevent the contractors making away with the salt *en route*, full duty being levied on any deficiencies at the place of import. The explanation on these points seems to His Grace the Governor in Council to be quite satisfactory.

2. As regards paragraph 6 it will be observed that no allowance is now made for wastage with reference to the instructions contained in Mr. Under Secretary Barbour's letter, dated 19th July 1876, No. 1,652, Financial Department.

3. The last paragraph of the Resident's letter refers to the deficiency up to 10 per cent. for which compensation was claimed on account of the years 1874-75 and 1875-76, and which is alluded to in paragraph 4 of the Proceedings accompanying Mr. Carmichael's letter, dated 30th August 1876, No. 1,192, to which I am desired to ask for an early reply.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Secretary to Government.

Exd. T. D. Ryan.

Rebriue (1877) Department

Government of Port St. George

Dated 11th Dec. 1877. } No. 3,375.
Received } Enclosures.
D. No. } Progs.
L. No. } No.

Forwarding copy of a report from the
Agent in Travancore and Cochin furnishing in-
formation with reference to the sale of salt in those
and any arrangements connected with the pur-
chase of salt at Bombay.



Rev. Sept.

No. 3375

21/11 Decr 1877

Note with reference to the
Honble Mr. Hurdlestone's remarks
on draft letter B.P. 11.

The G. of I. have
not replied to our
letter d/30 Aug 1876
but in their letter
recorded in G.O. 31
July 1877 No 2409
they have declined
to accept the propo-
sals made in our
letter d/26 Feb 1875
and as the proposals
in letter of 30 Aug
1876 were based
on the same prin-
ciple (with addi-
tional items on
account of interest
and increase of freight
etc etc)

not an allowance for
the proposed notes with the purchase
of the same then in draft of the same

it was assumed
in para 2 G.O. 31
July 1877 No 2409
that the G. of J's letter
now under reply
disposed of the
whole question.

The suggestion
in the draft that
a small conces-
sion of Rs 18,970
might be made
was put in because
apparently all
other compensa-
tion had been
refused.

It is the case

Revenue (1877) Department

Rev. Dept.

No. 2375

27th Dec 1877

that a small ab-
lowance for waste
agg was included
in the calculation
of Rs 12-8-3 per
100 maunds of
which the lump
sum of Rs 80,000
(letter of 30 Aug 1876)
was based.

The Board were
asked to report on
paras 4 & 5 of S. 17.
letter of 15 June 77
No 125 (vide para
3 G.O. 31 July 1877 No
2409) but it does
not seem necessary

cost an allowance for
the proposed matter with the purchase
of a large quantity of the same

Revenue (1877) Department

it was assumed
to wait for their
reply before ad-
dressing the Govt.

No. 4718

From

M. E.

Recd by A. 10/12/77

800
Said to be
before 1880

Have the drafts in this
to be kept as proposed
by M. E. but I do not
know in each up to now
whether it is to be 70 or 75

3325
4

Recorded in G.O. of

M. E. 20/10

Not seen
4/12

Have got replies to
our letter of 30 Sept. 77
and find nothing
is not important
the present letter
does not allow for
the proposed notes
to be issued

Rev. Dept.

No. 3376

27/11 Decr 1877

The Secretary to the Govt. of India
Revenue & Finance Dept.

Sir,

1. Referring to paras. 4
and 5 of your letter dated 15
June 1877 H. 125 /Salt/ I am
directed to forward copy of
report from the Resident in
Tavancore and Cochin showing
(1) that the prices at which
salt is sold in those States
already
approximate to the rates
in force in the adjoining
British Districts and (2)
the arrangements connected
with the purchase of

at Bombay prevent the contractors making away with the salt enroute, full duty being levied on any deficiencies at the place of import. The explanation on these points seems to His Grace the Governor in Council to be quite satisfactory.

2. As regards para. b it will be observed that no allowance is now made for wastage with reference to the instructions contained in Mr. Under Secretary's letter dated 19th July

in adjustment of demands? It seems to me if any further allowance is to be made it should be in addition to the amount already allowed in P.W. So long as due I swear - but that cannot include the allowance for waste the item being included in P.W. R. 12.8.3 - per is the allowance. (A ^{loose} copy of this should have been put in in convenient to have a copy backwards & forwards in handy file.)



July 1876 No 1652 Financial Department.

3. The last paragraph of the Resident's letter refers to the deficiency up to 10% for which compensation was claimed on account of the years 1874-75 and 1875-76, and which is alluded to in paragraph 4 of the Proceedings accompanying Mr. Carmichael's letter dated 30 August 1876 No 1192. It was there stated that the amount asked for need not be allowed as under the bagging system was

2. I am directed to ask for an answer to the reply herewith. This time better. I am fine now in the job. I shall make all after this. 4/12

is reduced to a minimum.
 The bagging system came into
 force on 1st October 1874, and
 it is observed from para 132
 of the Travancore Adminis-
 tration Report for 1875-76 (No.
 C. 1051) that the wastage on
 Bombay salt during that
 year (August 1875 to August
 1876) was reduced from an
 average of 10 per cent. to an
 average of 2 1/2. Under the
 circumstances of the case
 allowance
 and as the ~~allowance~~ ^{allowance}
 was always previously
 made by the Government
 given
 for ~~compensation~~ ^{compensation} to the
~~holders~~ ^{holders} have been ~~neglected~~ ^{neglected},
 perhaps

I am rather doubtful
 about this para No.
 am willing to retain
 The reply will be that the
 probability is that at
 least 8 out of the 10%
 were landed wrong
 titling & revenue
 lost on the coast &
 that amount & that
 the demand & make
 the deficiency good
 entails a doubt
 loss. 2707

3325
 8

perhaps the Government of
 India will have no objection
 to the refund of this compa-

Let this intended to be a rather small sum (Rs 18970)
 in add. to the sum more especially as no allow-
 ance of 80000 Rs. pro- ^{ance} whatever is proposed
 should be allowed to be made on this account
 the Rs. of 30 Aug 76 hereafter.

Or of the amt. of Rs. 66,891
 from Cal. as our inspectors
 of factories.

The total will be in the
 one case Rs. 98970
 & in the other Rs. 87861.

It seems that factories
 be included in the sum
 sum of Rs. 80000 -

Yes I think so
 4/12

Estt

To The Govt of

Salt supply to
various & Coast
Bombay.

Cro

18/10/11

Recd from R. 10/11/11
27/10/11 R. 4/11/11