

(1) Number of pages 6
(2) Date of repair 9-4-1984
(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

REVENUE DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1168	Press.
B.P. No:		Mis.
Dated	25-7-1878	197

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Archives 1-5,806-24-2-78.

1168
1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

25th July 1878, No. 1,168.

Read the following paper :—

No. 333. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 2nd July 1878, No. 1,823.

Read the following letters :—

From A. CRUICKSHANK, Esq., Acting Collector of South Arcot, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cuddalore, 10th May 1878, No. 220 :—

With reference to the Board's Proceedings of the 16th March 1878, No. 715, I have the honor to report that the explanation given by the French authorities as to the remark "the vessels for which the duty is not entered are those whereof the Ravanahs have been delivered at the ports of exportation and presented at the time of shipping of paddy and rice at the Port office" is as follows: when a vessel with grain arrives at Pondicherry and it is the intention of those concerned to re-export the whole or part of it afterwards, a declaration to this effect is made and the quantities landed are examined. At the time of re-exportation the account of the quantities examined together with proof that the duty was paid at the port of exportation is produced, and no export duty is claimed at Pondicherry. The explanation as to why no duty was collected on the quantities transhipped is that the operations were not under their control. I do not understand this, and have again asked the French authorities to explain how the operations were not under their control. On receipt of their reply I shall communicate it to the Board.

From the same Officer, dated Cuddalore, 23rd May 1878, No. 240 :—

With reference to my letter of the 10th instant, No. 220, I have the honor to state that the further explanation given by the French authorities as to why no duty was collected on the quantities of paddy and rice transhipped is that as there are no duties except on tobacco and spirits imported into Pondicherry, they had not to exercise any control over grain; that duty is levied on grain exported and they therefore confined themselves to levying the duty when the cargo was cleared from the beach, but during the prevalence of famine and when the duty was suspended on grain exported from British Ports into Pondicherry and Karikal they, at the request of the Viceroy, had the quantities landed in these ports compared with the manifests exhibiting the quantities shipped at the port of exportation, and when there existed any discrepancy they immediately reported the matter to the Collector of Customs where grain was shipped, so that cases of transhipment or re-exportation could be easily ascertained; that there was one transhipment only from the *Edwards* to the *Rozelle*; and that every explanation had been furnished on the subject to the Government of Calcutta.

From E. F. WEBSTER, Esq., Collector of Tanjore, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Point Calimere, 5th June 1878, No. 1,741.

With reference to paragraph 4 of the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 16th March 1878, No. 715, I have the honor to state that the information therein called for was given in the remark column of the statement showing the

quantity of the several descriptions of grains exported, submitted with this office letter of 14th November 1877, No. 3,887; I, however, beg to state that duty was duly collected on the exports of grain from Karikal, and the total remittance made to the British Government from January to 31st July 1877 amounted to Rupees 19,266-15-1.

SUBMITTED to Government with reference to G.O., 3rd May 1878, No. 651.

2. From the further explanation furnished by the Collector of South Arcot, it appears that the French authorities at Pondicherry have been levying on behalf of the British Government duty on grain *re-exported* at Pondicherry, but not on grain *transhipped*; that there was only one case of such transhipment, and that due intimation of the fact was given to the Government of India.

3. The Collector of Tanjore states that duty was duly collected at Karikal by the French authorities on grain re-exported, and that the amount was remitted to him.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Acting Secretary.

No. 334.

ORDER THEREON, 25th July 1878, No. 1,168.

Separate Revenue, No. 33.

Customs.

ORDERED to be forwarded, together with a copy of G.O., 3rd May 1878, No. 651, Revenue Department, to the Government of India with reference to their letter, dated 12th February 1878, Customs (Statistical Branch—

No. 25, Department of Revenue, Agriculture, and Commerce (Statistical Branch—Customs).

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. A. S. Rodgers.

1168
2

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 2nd July 1878.

Read the following letters:—

From A. CRUICKSHANK, Esq., Acting Collector of South Arcot, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Cuddalore, 10th May 1878, No. 220:—

With reference to the Board's Proceedings of the 16th March 1878, No. 715, I have the honor to report that the explanation given by the French authorities as to the remark "the vessels for which the duty is not entered are those whereof the Ravanahs have been delivered at the ports of exportation and presented at the time of shipping of paddy and rice at the Port office" is as follows: when a vessel with grain arrives at Pondicherry and it is the intention of those concerned to re-export the whole or part of it afterwards, a declaration to this effect is made and the quantities landed are examined. At the time of re-exportation the account of the quantities examined together with proof that the duty was paid at the port of exportation is produced, and no export duty is claimed at Pondicherry. The explanation as to why no duty was collected on the quantities transhipped is that the operations were not under their control. I do not understand this, and have again asked the French authorities to explain how the operations were not under their control. On receipt of their reply I shall communicate it to the Board.

From the same Officer, dated Cuddalore, 23rd May 1878, No. 240:—

With reference to my letter of the 10th instant, No. 220, I have the honor to state that the further explanation given by the French authorities as to why no duty was collected on the quantities of paddy and rice transhipped is that as there are no duties except on tobacco and spirits imported into Pondicherry, they had not to exercise any control over grain; that duty is levied on grain exported and they therefore confined themselves to levying the duty when the cargo was cleared from the beach, but during the prevalence of famine and when the duty was suspended on grain exported from British Ports into Pondicherry and Karikal they, at the request of the Viceroy, had the quantities landed in these ports compared with the manifests exhibiting the quantities shipped at the port of exportation, and when there existed any discrepancy they immediately reported the matter to the Collector of Customs where grain was shipped, so that cases of transhipment or re-exportation could be easily ascertained; that there was one transhipment only from the *Edwards* to the *Rozelle*; and that every explanation had been furnished on the subject to the Government of Calcutta.

From E. F. WEBSTER, Esq., Collector of Tanjore, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Po. at Calimere, 5th June 1878, No. 1,741.

With reference to paragraph 4 of the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 16th March 1878, No. 715, I have the honor to state that the information therein called for was given in the remark column of the statement showing the quantity of the several descriptions of grains exported, submitted with this office letter of 14th November 1877, No. 3,887; I, however, beg to state that duty was duly collected on the exports of grain from Karikal, and the total remittance made to the British Government from January to 31st July 1877 amounted to Rupees 10,266-15-1.

SUBMITTED to Government with reference to G.O., 3rd May 1878, No. 651.

2. From the further explanation furnished by the Collector of South Arcot, it appears that the French authorities at Pondicherry have been levying on behalf of the British Government duty on grain *re-exported* at Pondicherry, but not on grain *transhipped*; that there was only one case of such transhipment, and that due intimation of the fact was given to the Government of India.

3. The Collector of Tanjore states that duty was duly collected at Karikal by the French authorities on grain *re-exported*, and that the amount was remitted to him.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Acting Secretary.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Copy to the Collector of South Arcot.

" " of Tanjore.

Exd. W. H. French.

REVENUE.

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

GOVT. OF INDIA: BOMBAY.

Dated July 25th.

G.O. 25th July 1878, No. 1,185.

JULY.

Nos. 220-240.

Report of French grain from Karikal and Pondicherry. Order to be forwarded to the Government of India. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue furnishing information regarding the collection of duty on.

No. 3025

1878.

Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS, 2ND JULY 1878, No. 1,823.

Enkel

Receiver

13.12.1978

JULY,
No. 1, 823.

Reports of Food-grains—from Karikal and Pondicherry.—Submitting to Government letters from Collectors of South Arcot and Tanjore furnishing information called for as to collection of duty on—

Dr. M. G. - 25 July 1873

14. Lake Ontario (Des Moines) 1874

(Mammals - Insects)

ordered to be forwarded, together with a copy of
 Ep. 3rd May 1898 & 10651 R.D. to the Government of India
 with reference to our letter dated 12 February 1898
 up to 25th of advancement of Revenue Agreement & Commence

Call 7-1811
1234-7-78