(1) Number of pages 10 Sheets

(2) Date of repair 13.7.84

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. / B.P. No: 1367	Press. / Mis.
Dated 28.8.1878	197 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Archives I—5,806—24-2-78.

1367
1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

28th August 1878, No. 1,367.

Read the following papers :—

No. 313. Endorsement of the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Ootacamund, 6th June 1878, No. 982.

Read the following letter from E. J. SINKINSON, Esq., Officiating Under-Secretary to the Government of India, Financial Department, to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, dated Simla, 27th May 1878, No. 569.

Referring to the Proceedings of the Government of Madras, in the Revenue Department, No. 337, dated the 4th March 1878, I am directed to request that you will be good enough to state the reasons which led the Government of Madras to rule that the cost of the combined Customs and Salt Establishments in Malabar and South Canara should be debited proportionately to "Customs" and "Salt," instead of wholly to "Customs" as proposed by the Comptroller-General.

2. It will be seen that under the orders contained in paragraph 12 of Financial Resolution, No. 2,778, dated 6th October 1865, the Comptroller-General has authority to deal with all ordinary questions relating to the public accounts, such as classification of receipts and payments, &c., and that, in the present case, his proposal to debit the entire cost to "Customs" is also in accordance with the orders of the Government of India, as contained in paragraph 10 (Clause III) of Financial Resolution, No. 2,189, dated 26th October 1865.

Transferred to the Revenue Department.

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Chief Secretary.

No. 314. Telegram from Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Ootacamund, to Secretary to the Government of India, Financial Department, Simla, dated 11th July 1878, No. 72.

Your letter, 569, 27th May. Resolution 26th October 1865, 2,189, not traceable Government or Accounts Offices; please send.

No. 314-A. From E. J. SINKINSON, Esq., Officiating Under-Secretary to the Government of India, Financial Department, to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras, dated Simla, 27th July 1878, No. 1,678.

In continuation of my letter, No. 569, dated the 27th May 1878, and with reference to your telegram of the 11th July 1878, I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the Resolution in this Department, No. 2,189, dated 20th April 1865.

No. 315. ORDER THEREON, 28th August 1878, No. 1,367.

Separate Revenue, No. 40.
Customs and Salt.

THE Government were of opinion that "Sea Customs" should be charged only with the cost of the establishment as it existed before the amalgamation; the difference between that sum and the combined charge being debited to "Salt," (1) because the additional establishment sanctioned in the Government of India letter, dated 13th October 1877, No. 3,641, Financial Department, was solely in the interests of the Salt Revenue, viz., for the purpose of weighing Salt, collecting duty, and supervising bonded warehouses at the ports, &c.; and (2) because the import duty on Salt is credited to Salt Revenue.

2. With reference, however, to paragraph 10, (Clause III), of the Financial Resolution of the Government of India, No. 2,189, dated 20th April 1865 (not G.O., 14th June 1865, No. 1,303, R.D. 26th October 1865, as quoted in the first letter read above), the Governor in Council considers that the debit of the whole to "Customs" is the more correct course. The Board's attention will be specially drawn to this Resolution, as they have apparently overlooked it in submitting their Proceedings, dated 26th February 1878, No. 519.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Board of Revenue.
" the Accountant-General.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

1367/2

C. D. 2417 of 1878.

1367

Revenue Department

Memo for orders.

Letter from the Government of Cochin
dated 27th May 1878 No. 569 F. D.

The Government of Cochin
request to be informed, with
reference to G.O 4th March 1878
No. 383 R.D, of the reasons
which led this Government to
order that the cost of the Combined
Customs and Salt Establishments
in Malabar and South Canara
should be debited proportionately
to "Customs" and "Salt" instead
of wholly to "Customs" as decided
by the Comptroller General under
authority vested in him by para-
graph 12 of Financial Resolution
No. 2778 dated 6th October 1865;

G.O 6th Nov. 1865 No. 2700 R.D.

Cost. of [1878] Works.

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated August 28th.

Printed September 7th.

Recd.

Encl.

AUGUST.
Nos. 313—315.

Customs and Salt Establishments on Malabar and South Canara.—Directing remarks on papers relative to the ruling that the cost of the combined establishment should be debited proportionately to "Customs" and "Salt" instead of wholly to Customs

and point out that the decision of the Comptroller General is in accordance with the orders of that Government as contained in para: 10 (clause III) of Financial Resolution No. 2189 dated 26th October 1865.

The last quoted Resolution does not appear to have been communicated to the Government, nor is it available in the Accountant General's Office.

The reasons which led to the decision of the Government as contained in G.O. of 4th March 1878, are contained in the Board's Proceedings wherein recorded -viz-

"The increase of establishment having for the Collection of the duty on Salt, it must be debited to Salt to which the duty is credited.

The Board accordingly adhere to the recommendation made by them in paragraphs 24 and 31 of their Proceedings, dated 13th December 1877, No 5237, to the effect that the Sea Customs should be charged with the cost of the establishment as it existed before the amalgamation, the difference between it and the combined charge being debited to Salt. Government have approved of the proposal in paragraph 11 of G.O. dated 16th January 1878, No 79."

G.O. 16th January 1878 No. 79
paras 11 & 15 R.D.

In reviewing the Revenue Budget of charges for 1878-79, the above question was fully considered by Government, and the Board's view as above explained was deliberately adopted. Vide paras 19 and 22 of the "Memo for Orders" put up with G.O of 16th January 1878.

The additional Establishment sanctioned in G.O. 23rd August 1877 no. 2562 was solely in the interest of the Salt Revenue viz for the purpose of receiving Salt, collecting duty and supervising bonded warehouses at the ports &c; As the imported duty on Salt is credited to Salt in the Financial accounts, all the cost incurred on account of the collection of Salt duty has also been debited to Salt.

The decision of the Comptroller General was based on the assumption that the greater part of the charge of the combined Salt and Customs Establishment is on account of "Customs". How far this assumption is correct will be seen from the following figures, quoted from paragraph

Vide the Correspondence recorded in G.O. 1878 no. 337

31 of the Board's Proceedings recorded in G.O. 18th January 1878 no. 79.

		Establishment existing prior to the Amalgamation.	Revised Establishment
Customs			
Division Establishment	South Canara	6972	6972
	Malabar	17412	17412
Deputy Collector's Establishment	Malabar	"	"
		24,384	24,384
Salt			
Division Establishment	South Canara	12132	14148
	Malabar	5856	7200
Deputy Collector's Establishment	South Canara	1200	1620
	Malabar	1560	1560
		20748	24528

The Cost of the increased Establishment is Rs 3780 which is added to Salt for reasons given above, The existing Salt and Customs Establishments being retained as usual. As it will be seen from the foregoing table, the

entire Salt charge of the revised Establishment exceeds that of the Customs' and following the Comptroller General's argument, the charge of the Combined Establishment would have been shewn under "Salt." But there can be no object in relieving either the Customs or the Salt Revenue of a charge which is legitimately debitable to it. Perhaps it would be undesirable to do so in an administrative point of view, however convenient it may be in an Accountant's point of view.

Under these circumstances will the Government reconsider their order dated 4th March 1878 No. 337 R.D.?

The last Resolution referred to by the Govt of India (26 Oct 1865) not being available it cannot be ascertained what bearing it has on the case. The other requirements is — as the Comptroller General can do as he likes what do you mean by differing from him?

No doubt in one sense the duty levied on salt at the ports is Customs duty & not Salt duty but it is said the credited to Salt in the finance accounts

The reasons which the Govt are asked to state are apparent on the face of the Proceedings referred to ~~and~~ all of which were available. The enquiry therefore is not really intended to elicit information—

Submitted that the simple facts may be reported without any further expression of opinion—

[illegible initials]

I agree
20/6 [illegible]

Prop. [illegible] on the point [illegible] adopted by the C. Gen. the decision of this Govt. seems to be correct. [illegible initials]

17-6-78. Rec. 28-6-78
R. 25-6-78. [illegible] 11-7-78
Rec. 10-8-78 [illegible]

C. N. 2417 of 1878

Memo. for orders.

Regarding the head to which the Cost of the Customs and Salt Establishments in Malabar and S. Canara are to be debited.

C.S.

For the resolution 1879 of Oct 26th saying [illegible] not been received [illegible] of Act. Govr [illegible]

The Govt of India have now with letter d/ 27 July 1878 No 1678 forwarded copy of their Resolution d/ 20 April 1865 No 2189. Clause III of paragraph 10 of which directs that

[illegible] April 65. [illegible]

[illegible]

Pro. debit to Customs as the more correct course under the G.O. order

12/8 [illegible]

"The cost of any Establishment under Civil Administration which can be distinctly referred to any branch of Revenue is to appear under the head of that branch ...... The cost of establishment in the Bombay Presidency which are common to both Customs and Salt including the charge for the Commissioner of Customs Salt & Opium should be shown under Customs. In the N.W.P. and C.P. the cost of the customs line which principally collects the Salt Revenue, should be shown under Salt" &c.

The present pro-

1367/8

Jrnal of the Comptroller General, with reference to the combined Establishments in Malabar & Canara, is strictly in accordance with the Bombay precedent, but as a matter of fact the chief item collected by Salt Revenue the N.W.P. & C.P. dosage is perhaps more applicable.

[illegible]

Memo for Order

Management of
that the customs
salaries should be
managed by Customs
and by Salt —

The explanation to be
sent for why the state the
facts — that the
Collector of Salt is
not known —

No 2417

1st Mail
see Govt Madras
Correspondence

This was Copied by
Mr Grant pencilled
Copy sent to Govt of India, but the only
Govt of India, I can not write letter
Circ) about this copy in words
formed part of
Was Copied to the Board

C 19-8-78
R 14-8-78
R 14-8-78
R 27-8-78

Madras
Confidential

Official Note
Order Letter to be
sender not enclosure

No 1367

4
Rev: Dept.
136/9

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 28 August 1878

Read the following papers —

Letter from the Govt of India
dated 27th May 1878 No 569 Finan-
cial Department.

Telegram to — do — dated
11th July 1878 No 72.

Letter from Govt of India dated
27th July 1878 No 1678 Financial
Department.

The Government were
of opinion that "Sea Customs"
should be charged only with
the cost of the establishment as
it existed before the amalgama-
tion the difference between that
sum and the combined charge
being debited to "Salt", (1) because
the additional establishment
sanctioned

sanctioned in the Govt. of India
letter dated 13th October 1877 No 3644
Financial Department was solely
in the interests of the Salt revenue,
viz for the purpose of weighing salt,
collecting duty and supervising
bonded warehouses at the ports
&c, and (2) because the import
duty on salt is credited to Salt
Revenue.

2. With reference however
to paragraph 10 (clause III) of
the Financial Resolution of the
Govt of India No 2189 dated
20th April 1865, (not 26th October
1865 as quoted in the first
letter read above) the Governor
in Council considers that the
debit of the whole to "Customs"
is the more correct course. The
Board's attention will be specially
drawn to this Resolution as they
have

G.O. 14th June 1865 No 1303 R.D.

have apparently overlooked it
in submitting their Proceedings
dated 26th February 1878 No 519.

13c

14. F. to the Board of Revenue & c. 9 Sept
b. Re Accounts and Finance

40
4

No. 2.

Coast of the Carolinas
Salt Establishments
Montalan & South Coast

Desk Cab

Sir W. Rodney's

London

C 24-8-78.
E 27-8-78