(1) Number of pages 2
(2) Date of repair 19 12
(3) Initials of the Referencer
(4) [illegible]

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. / B.P. No. 2072 — Press. / Mis.

Dated 31. 12. 1878 197 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

2072
1

31st December 1878, No. 2,072.

Read the following paper:—

No. 280. Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department, dated 1st March 1877, No. 552.

Read the following letter from WHITLEY STOKES, Esq., C.S.I., Secretary to the Government of India, Legislative Department, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort William, 23rd February 1877, No. 371.

I AM directed to forward, herewith, three copies of the Bill noted on the margin, and to request that His Grace the Governor in Council will favor the Government of India in this department at an early date with an expression of his opinion on the provisions of the Bill in its second stage.

Bill to restrict the transport of Salt by Sea.

2. I am also to request that the Bill be published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* in English and in such other languages as His Grace may think fit, and that the dates of such publication may be communicated in your reply.

REFERRED to the Revenue Department for the issue of the necessary instructions preparatory to report.

2. The Bill to restrict the transport of Salt by Sea in its second stage will be published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* in English and in the Tamil, Telugu, Malayalum, and Canarese languages, and the dates of such publication will be reported to the Government of India, in replying to this reference.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. HUDLESTON,
Chief Secretary.

No. 281. ORDER THEREON, 31st December 1878, No. 2,072.

Separate Revenue, No. 35.
Salt.

THE Government of India will be informed that the time that has passed since expression was last given to the views of this Government in regard to the Salt Transport Bill leaves their objections to the measure still undiminished on the grounds that have from time been fully set out.

2. His Grace the Governor in Council believes that any restriction on the transport of Salt will enhance its cost to the injury of the consumer without any commensurate advantage to Government and, with an efficient shore preventive service, is in no way needed for the protection of the revenue. Indeed, the obstruction caused thereby to licit trade, especially in supply of small places, is likely to encourage the smuggling of foreign sat.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) H. S. THOMAS,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Judicial Department, with draft memorandum and notes of Members, and eso Nos. 2,802, 1877, and 1,891, 1878.

Exd. W. H. French.

Govt. of [1878] Madras.

REVENUE.

To

THE JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

Dated December 31st.

Printed January 7th, 1879.

Read.

Ditto.

G.O., 31*st December* 1878, *No.* 2,072.

DECEMBER.

Nos. 280-281.

Salt Transport Bill.—Stating that the Government of India will be informed in the Judicial Department that the time that has passed since expression was last given to the views of this Government in regard to the —leaves their objections to the measure still undiminished; believing that any restriction on the transport of Salt will enhance its cost to the injury of the consumer without any commensurate advantage to Government; and observing that the obstruction caused thereby to licit trade is likely to encourage the smuggling of foreign Salt.

Bills introduced into the Council of the Governor-General for making Laws and Regulations, or published under Rule 22.

The following Report of a Select Committee, together with the Bill as settled by them, was presented to the Council of the Governor-General of India for the purpose of making Law and Regulations on the 28th February 1877 :—

We, the undersigned Members of the Select Committee to which the Bill to restrict the transport of Salt by Sea was referred, have the honor to report that we have considered the Bill and the papers noted in the margin.

From Department of Revenue, Agriculture, and Commerce, No. 201-C. S., dated 24th July 1874.

From Department of Revenue, Agriculture, and Commerce, No. 232-C. S., dated 7th July 1875, and enclosures.

From Department of Revenue, Agriculture, and Commerce, No. 320-C. S., dated 23rd November 1876, and enclosures.

From Department of Revenue, Agriculture, and Commerce, No. 365, dated 23rd December 1876.

Suggestions by G. H. M. Batten, Esq., dated 8th February 1877.

2. We think that the proposed Act should come into force on the West Coast of India at once, and elsewhere on such day as the Government of India directs.

3. We have saved from the operation of Section 2 salt covered by rawánas granted under Madras Regulation I of 1805, Section 11, Clause 3.

4. We think that the power to stop, search, and arrest, given by Section 4, should be exercised only by officers who have reason to believe from personal knowledge or from information taken down in writing that salt is being, or has within twenty-four hours been, illegally carried. We have empowered such officers to seize vessels which they have reason to believe to be liable to confiscation under the proposed Act, and cause them to be brought into any British Indian port. We have limited their power to arrest persons without warrant to cases in which salt is actually found on board. We have provided that all salt in respect of which an offence has been committed under the proposed Act shall be liable to confiscation.

5. We have omitted as useless the section as to the summary punishment of offences against the proposed Act.

6. We have transferred the powers given to the Government of India by Section 3, Clauses (*b*) and (*c*), and Section 4, to the Governments of Madras and Bombay, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, and the Chief Commissioner of British Burma.

7. We recommend that the Bill thus amended be passed. But we think that it has been so altered as to require republication.

T. C. HOPE.
A. HOBHOUSE.
A. J. ARBUTHNOT.
J. R. BULLEN SMITH.
F. R. COCKERELL.
R. A. DALYELL.

I dissent from the first paragraph of Section 7 of this Report.

R. A. DALYELL.

Calcutta, 19th February 1877.

No. II.

A Bill to restrict the transport of Salt by Sea.

WHEREAS it is expedient to restrict the transport of salt by sea in manner hereinafter appearing; It is hereby enacted as follows:—

Preamble.

Short title. 1. This Act may be called "The Transport of Salt Act, 1877:"

Extent. It extends to the whole of British India and, further, applies—

(*a*) to all European British subjects of Her Majesty within the territorial jurisdiction of Princes and States in India in alliance with Her Majesty;

(*b*) to all Native Indian subjects of Her Majesty, wherever they may be;

Commencement. And it shall come into force on the West Coast of India at once, and elsewhere on such day as the Governor-General in Council may, by notification in the *Gazette of India*, direct in this behalf.

Penalty for carrying salt in certain vessels. 2. When any salt is carried by sea in any vessel other than a vessel of the burden of three hundred tons and upwards, the owner and master of such vessel shall each be liable to a fine not exceeding one thousand Rupees, or to imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months, or to both.

Exceptions.

3. Nothing in Section two applies to—

(*a*) salt covered by a permit granted under Section twenty-eight or Section thirty-one of the Act of the Governor of Bombay in Council No. VII of 1873, or by a rawána granted under Madras Regulation I of 1805, Section eleven, Clause third;

(*b*) salt covered by a pass granted by any officer whom the Government may appoint in this behalf;

(*c*) such amount of salt carried on board any vessel for consumption by her crew or by the passengers or animals (if any) on board as the Government may from time to time exempt from the operation of Section two.

Power of stoppage, search, and arrest.

4. When any officer of Government empowered by the Government, whether by name or office, to act under this section, has reason to believe from personal knowledge or from information taken down in writing that any salt is being carried, or has within the twenty-four hours next before the requirement first hereinafter mentioned been carried, in any vessel so as to render the owner or master of such vessel liable to the penalties prescribed by Section two, he may require such vessel to be brought to, and thereupon may—

(*a*) enter and search the same;

(*b*) require the master of such vessel to produce any documents in his possession relating to such vessel or the cargo thereof;

(*c*) seize such vessel if the said officer has reason to believe it liable to confiscation under this Act, and cause it to be brought with its crew and cargo into any port in British India; and

(*d*) where salt is found on board such vessel, search and arrest without a warrant any person on board the same who such officer has reason to believe is punishable under Section two.

Penalties for resisting officer.

5. Any master of a vessel refusing or neglecting to bring to or to produce his papers when required to do so by an officer acting under Section four,

and any person obstructing any such officer in the performance of his duty,

may be arrested by such officer without a warrant, and shall be liable to a fine not exceeding one thousand Rupees, or to imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months, or to both.

Confiscation of vessel and cargo.

6. Every vessel in which salt is carried in contravention of this Act, the cargo on board such vessel, and all salt in respect of which an offence under this Act has been committed, shall be liable to confiscation.

The confiscation of any vessel under this section shall include her tackle, apparel, and furniture.

Confiscations under this section may be adjudged (*a*) by a Chief Customs authority, or (*b*) by such other officer as the local Government may from time to time appoint in this behalf.

Whenever any Customs officer is satisfied that any article is liable to confiscation under this section, he may seize such article, and shall at once report the seizure to his superior officer for the information of the Chief Customs authority, or such other officer as aforesaid, who may, if satisfied on such report, or after making such inquiry as he thinks fit, that the article so seized is liable to confiscation, either declare it to be confiscated or impose a fine in lieu thereof not exceeding the value of the article.

Jurisdiction.

7. For the purpose of the adjudication of penalties under Section two or Section five, every offence thereunder may be deemed to have been committed within the limits of the jurisdiction of the Magistrate of any place where the offender is found, or to which, if arrested under Section four or Section five, he may be brought.

"Government" defined.

8. In this Act "the Government" means the Governor of Madras in Council, the Governor of Bombay in Council, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, or the Chief Commissioner of British Burma.

WHITLEY STOKES,
Secretary to the Government, of India.

(Republished by order of His Grace the Governor in Council.)

W. HUDLESTON,
Chief Secretary.

MADRAS: PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY E. KEYS, AT THE GOVERNMENT PRESS, FORT ST. GEORGE.

2072/3

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

1st March 1877, No. 552.

Bills—Legislative.

Read the following paper:—

No. 1. *From WHITLEY STOKES, Esq., C.S.I., Secretary to the Government of India, Legislative Department, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Fort William, 23rd February* 1877, *No.* 371.

I am directed to forward, herewith, three copies of the Bill noted on the margin, and to request that His Grace the Governor in Council will favor the Government of India in this department at an early date with an expression of his opinion on the provisions of the Bill in its second stage.

Bill to restrict the transport of Salt by Sea.

2. I am also to request that the Bill be published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* in English and in such other languages as His Grace may think fit, and that the dates of such publication may be communicated in your reply.

No. 2. ORDER THEREON, 1st March 1877, No. 552.

Referred to the Revenue Department for the issue of the necessary instructions preparatory to report.

2. The Bill to restrict the transport of Salt by Sea in its second stage will be published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* in English and in the Tamil, Telugu, Malayalum, and Canarese languages, and the dates of such publication will be reported to the Government of India, in replying to this reference.

(True Extract.)

Chief Secretary.

To the Revenue Department.
„ Superintendent, Government Press, with Bill.
„ Tamil Translator to Government.
„ Telugu do.
„ Malayalum do.
„ Canarese do.

Exd. A. S. Rodgers.

065

Revenue Secretariat, Madras,
Nov 8th 1878.

Dear Roberts,

His Grace has just sent me some notes on the Salt Transport Bill but to enable a draft to be prepared it is essential that the previous original papers & notes by members of Govt which are doubtless

Dear Friend—

I hope this is what you want—

Yours truly

B Stoddart

9. Nov

[illegible]

in a bundle & one-
piece—tied together
shd be forwarded
direct. Will you
obtain His Excel
directions for a
bundle?

Yours sincerely

Eliza Cass

Dear Abbott,

There are several other papers on the subject of this Bill which have not been returned the most important being the one named on the accompanying slip. I should be glad if these could be forwarded.

Yours sincerely

C Hurst Esq

Dear Hamilton

I send you a memorandum which I have received from a member of the Select Committee & hope you will endeavour to attend

Tom. Erskine 9 Nov.

Office

March 8/77

My dear Erskine

2072/6

Enclosing yr letter of this date, for facility of reference — I beg to point out that there is a misapprehension on yr part.

You say "Further, the Bill does not allude "to the prepayment of duty in Bombay; it seems "to be strongly urged in the draft".

See Section 2. This distinctly states that all skippers of small craft carrying salt will be severely dealt with (Sect 6 further confiscating the vessels & cargo) — unless (Sect 3) they have a Bombay permit or (b) a permit from some Govt Officer — i.e. at Goa, Damaun &c —

And if you will look at the Bombay act quoted, you will see that a Bombay permit is given only — as I explained in my Memo — after payment of duty —

Perhaps you will decide to bring the papers up at the next Council —

Yours

A Hamilton

From the Inclosed
it will be observed
that Mr. Carmichael
Asks whether that the Df.
might stand — I am
satisfied with it my
self. I endeavored to
bring out the objection
which Mr Pinckney
the argument advanced
successfully availed. I
therefore conclude the
Df. will be Considered
913

2072
8

I am not myself Reposed
to Approving of Section
2 the proposed Finance
measures in the first &
this second telegram.
The immediate effect
them must be to depress
which is a degree the
financial pressure.
& the embarrassment
promote. The abolition
of the custom line will
be an enormous public
benefit - the great
Economy. Some deduction
of the Public debt will
can scarcely be made

in Spain. It is now
3.4 - now 2.4
Sterling - or 2.8
per cent.

I cannot therefore
see any ground to anticipate
this modification. for
if the duty increases the
burden is as. they
be a financial benefit
in combination with the
abolition of the customs
line. the present Bengal
salt Revenue fluctuating
diminished duties
by the reduction & increase

2077/9

of salt tax is that the
burden falls on the
consumer in proportion
as the Agric: class is
from hereby Liquor
than any in India
Shillong. but these
grounds of objection
are not insuperable by
the present Lieutenant.
I am for Lattimer
Council at any time
Reading address

[illegible]

26/12. 1.45.

Sir W. Rob
Hon W Wedderburn

With copy enclosing 2072/10

Annexed despatch
just-deciphered

It is now announced
that Madras is to
be taxed 8 pence
in Bengal —
But was not the
question just-
answered by us
I am dis[illegible]

Sentiments agree with
His Grace and W.
adopt the telegram
Sketched out or the
a Stronger one
24/12 W.P.

Bray —

I do accepted

decision Brennan.

In Jurgens v

Jennings dispensing

~~of~~ caused by pennies

Lopes —

I do consider any

Juvenile taxation

of Madras ~~etc~~

~~Bray~~

In any other Jurisdiction

I do give due

serious and well

grounded feeling

of diminution Justice

and dissent —

That is my first

suspicion — I

circulate that the

Matter may be

promptly resolved

2072/11

R. 2

D/o letter from Mr Dalyell regarding the "Salt transport" Bill.

d/24-2-77.

Submitted that the strong remonstrance of the Govt agst passing the Bill be telegraphed to him.

We lay ago sent Mr Dalyell all the papers to be telegraphed for them — which leads to the belief — that remonstrance not to be entertained — but in an important case of this kind, the Govt of India keep the Legislative Council in ignorance of the views of local Govts, whose views are opposed to their own.

2. I have marked with a note of interrogation a passage in Mr D's note which I do not understand. In regard to this statement that the prepayment of duty at Bombay is not touched on in the Bill — it seems on the contrary that the Bill expressly enacts prepayment — as Salt leaving Bombay for the coast must have a Bombay passport, to save it from confiscation — & such passport is only given — see Bombay Act — after payment of duty.

H.S. March 5

I think that this last remonstrance should go — and if necessary till then that we shall appeal to the Sec: of State

5/3

I don't think the Bill will pass this Session but we shd remonstrate most strongly BH

Mr Cunliffe to prepare telegraphic & written protest above

2. Latham best also, as Mr D. is going home, we shd wire Govt India to place all the correspondence before the Legl Council.

23.

2072/13

Selb Transport Bill
non-Repeal Legislature
Council of Governor
Speculative

2072/14

No. 158.

From Madras. | ,, Calcutta.

,, Rev. Secy. to Govt. | To Govt. of India,

MADRAS Government learns with regret that Government India is proceeding with Salt Transport Bill notwithstanding earnest and continued remonstrances addressed from Madras. It seems doubtful from debates reported in Gazette, 10th February, whether all correspondence has been laid before Legislative Council. Proposal impossible to carry out with regard to Madras ports, shipping, and trade. Suggested that in view of strong feeling of Madras Government, further action be postponed. Letter follows:—

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

FORT ST. GEORGE,
6th March 1877.

N° 158

R. D 2072/15

Ordered that the following telegram be despatched to the Govt India Dept of Revenue &c -

"Madras Govt learns with ~~much~~ regret that Govt India is proceeding into the Salt transport Bill ~~in the face~~ notwithstanding the earnest and continued remonstrances addressed from Madras. It ~~even appears~~ seems doubtful from debates of 31st January reported in Gazette of 10th February ~~that~~ whether the correspondence has not been laid before Legislative Council. Suggested that in view of strong feeling of Madras Govt, further action ~~should~~ be postponed pending reference to Secretary of State.] ~~xx~~ Letter follows";

Proposal impossible to carry out with Govt of Madras Ports, Shipping & Trade

6-3-77.

D.F. Finch 6/3

Bal 6/3

R.D.

2972/17

To,

The Secy. to the Govt. of India

Rev: & Agl. Dept.to

Sir,

1. I am directed by

His Grace the Governor in

Council to reply to Mr.

Lyall's letter dated 25th

May last No. 107 (Salt-)

The Govt. of India

ask for the letter promised

in the telegram which was

despatched from Madras

on 6th March last, in which

regret-

The Bill imposes heavy penalties on the carriage of salt as cargo in any but square rigged vessels of 300 Tons burden upwards unless it has paid duty at

regret was expressed that notwithstanding earnest and continued remonstrances the Salt Transport Bill was being pushed on, and a suggestion made that in view of the strong feeling of this Govt. & of the impossibility of carrying out the measure with regard to Madras ports, shipping, & trade further action should be postponed.

2. Mr Ross laid before them the Telegram from the Govt. of India in their Resolution of the 16th March last No. 49 determined, on a review of the correspondence which has been going on since August 1874, to adhere to the conclusion originally arrived at & pass this Law to restrict the transport of Salt in British waters.

3. The request made in Mr Carmichael's letter dated 9th May last No. 1678 and reiterated in my telegram of the 5th instant that the Secretary of

Bombay or is exempted by a G.I. pass. That is intended the arrangt as regards this presidency I cannot discover from the papers. But I presume it contemplates the trade from Calcutta & Rangoon.

It has been requested that Salt port at the Bombay warehouses shall be established. But I presume this is for Salt from Goa or Kathiawar or the Arabian Gulf. or for cargoes in bonded vessels from ports other than Bombay (e.g. England) as I cannot find any suggestion that Salt under any circt. shall be exported from Bombay without passing the port.

This practically excludes all our small native coasters - & this is doubtless the object.

But it is a great hardship on the honest trader

[illegible] means. Shows the glad [illegible] but however entails the liability of being hauled [illegible] by the preventive [illegible] whenever the Revenue Officer chooses & think that he has reason to suspect that any vessel in is carrying or is about to carry - or has recently carried - Salt otherwise than as provided in the act.

The main object of the Bill is only to facilitate the passing system at Bombay.

But it is very hard that a fair trader this ship to load his patimar of (say) 100 tons burden with Salt should be obliged to pay Rs. 5075 duty on a cargo costing say Rs. 525 (at 3 as) a maund before he can carry his cargo from one G.I. port to another - and all to give Bombay a monopoly from Madras consumption of a necessary of life.

The [illegible]

of State might be asked
to decide on the question
appears to have been
anticipated by the Govt.
of India per your tele:
:gram of the 7th instant
informs His Grace that
the matter has been re:
:ferred & that the Right
Honorable the Secy. of State
approved of proceeding with
the Bill so far back
as 25th January last.
The Madras Govt. regret
that they have had no
opportunity of perusing
the

a smuggled cargo from
Goa will be very great
it is not fair & impose
such disabilities on the
wayfaring trade. While the
precaution is early not
necessary if the boundary
passport is not
enforced.

I think all this might
be stated somewhat more
plainly & succinctly than
it is in the draft. &
I do not like the allusion
to the "suitable temperament"
of our Interoceanic traders
but before reading this
reply, I think it would be
well to ascertain precisely
by Telegr. from Govt. whether
they entirely disapprove of
passes at Bombay
& are prepared to
be authorised
by them, even taken
of coast trade by small
native vessels in salt
under bond: if so -
I presume it is not
as this Govt. neutralises the
Bombay act. But I do not
find it has ever been
expressly stated to
either the G.I. Govt or
finally opposed the

proposed system. & I
think we should know
the entire views before
we make our
final protest.

I
Sd.
S. B. 27.

2277/19

the correspondence on a matter
so intimately connected with
the welfare of this Presi:
:dency.

4 The measure is
intended to prevent the
smuggling which is expected
to follow the operation of
the rule (in which this Govt.
have unwillingly acquiesced)
that duty must be prepaid
on all salt exported from
Bombay. This Govt have
already pointed out that
the serious interference with
freedom of traffic entailed
thereby while necessitating
large

large preventive establishments
will probably fail to
check the smuggling it is
intended to prevent if
it does not act as an
incentive to a breach
of the new law.

5. Some idea of
the work which will be
cut out for the sea-going
preventive establish-
ment settled upon by
the Govt. of India will
be found in the
statement accompanying
Mr Carmichael's letter
of

of 26th August last
upwards of 17000 country
vessels frequent the
ports in Malabar and
Canara and these
will have to be
overhauled to discover
if they carry contraband
goods. apart from the
physical difficulty
of the operation and
possible conflicts with
superior numbers
the very knowledge
of the liability
will

will interfere with
bonâ fide trading
and prevent honest-
shippers from
exposing themselves
to treatment so
obstructive to their
dealings and so open
to the grossest abuse.

16. Interference which
is avowedly to protect
the interests not
only of

Govt

Govt but also of salt-
workers in British Territory
should not, I am to submit,
take a form so oppressive
and hateful in the eyes of
a large sea-going population
who have as good a claim
to the protection of the British
Government as their fellow-
countrymen in Bombay.
If the trade of the latter
is valuable so is that of
the former and the working
of a Govt monopoly should
not be so outsided as to
inflict the maximum of
harm on one body, while
the interests of the others,
because

because identical with those of Govt., are to be so well protected.

7. It is assumed by the Govt of India that the legitimate sea-borne trade in salt between the foreign ports, which this Bill will principally affect, is insignificant. allowing, for the sake of argument, that this is the case, the tendency of the new law will be in reference to an article of

2072
22

of universal consumption like salt to give an impetus to an illicit traffic which it will be difficult to cope with however much the preventive service is on the alert, more especially as the price of salt to the consumer must inevitably be increased by the pre-payment of duty.

8. It has been pointed out more than once that salt is the main article used as ballast by the native

Native vessels on the
West Coast and the pro-
=hibition to carry it must
infallibly lead to loss
and discontent. These
small traders cannot
afford to prepay the duty,
and this will prevent
their taking advantage
of the proviso in the
Bill which is nominally
intended to give them the
opportunity of loading
with salt at Bombay.
It must not be over-
=looked that salt is
also

207/23

imported from
Arabia and a serious
loss will be inflicted
on this traffic as well
as on Goa and other
nearer foreign territories
by the action proposed.
The Portuguese Govt
will have good ground
for complaint at the
destruction of their
legitimate salt trade
with our Western ports
in coasters, and it is
not likely that they
would

would consent to a licensing officer being stationed in their ports.

9. The Govt of India are not unaware of the excitable temperament of the population of the Districts mostly af= =fected by the recent changes in the law and as the radius of interference is very much extended by the proposed Bill it is not in the opinion of His Grace the

the Governor in Council at all advisable to push to extremes so radical a measure. He observes with regret that the Salt Commission would enlarge the powers con= =ferred by the Bill in authorizing the confiscation of vessels conveying salt contrary to its provisions.

End 8

Govt of India.

Rev: & Agr: Dept.

Salt Transport Bill.

Abstracts of references in Circulation about Salt Transport Bill. 20 72/77

C. No.	From whom	Date	Subject	Remarks.
D.O.	The Hon: Mr. Dalyell.	21st Feby/77	Salt Transport Bill.	With Order and Draft Letter to G. of I. Honorable Sir W. Robinson 8th March 1877.
1627.	Rev: Judl. Dept.	1st March.	Requesting opinion on the provisions of the Bill to restrict the transport of salt by sea.	For Orders 6th May/78.
2738.	G of I. Rev: & Agr: Dept.	25th May.	Bill to restrict transport of salt by sea.	With Draft Letter to G. of I.
2802.	Sel: ——do——	7th June.	Salt Transport Bill.	To His Grace the Govr. 19th June 77.
5136.	Chief Secretary	11th Dec.	Requesting letter from G of I. Sec: Dept: requesting that the opinions called for on the provisions of the bill to restrict the transport of salt by sea may be communicated without delay.	With Draft and Note from Secy. To His Grace the Govr. 14th Dec. 77.
669.	——do——	13th Feby 78.	Referring letter from G of I. Sec: Dept: requesting early reply to letter calling for an opinion on provisions of Bill to restrict the transport of salt by sea.	Circulated to His Grace the Govr. 15th Feby 78.
1891.	G of I. Rev & Agr: Depts	16th April 78.	Forwarding copy of despatch from Secy of State making observations relative to the substitution of a system of Salt excise for the Govt. monopoly in the Distts of Malabar and South Canara and to the Salt Transport Bill.	For Orders 6th May 78.

R. 13: Nov 78.

C. 16th June 1877 R. 19 June 77. R.C. 19 June 77.

salt will enhance its cost to the injury of the consumer without any commensurate advantage to Govt. and with an efficient preventive service, is in no way needed for the protection of the revenue. Indeed the obstruction caused thereby to licit trade is likely to encourage the smuggling of foreign salt.

3. If the Bill is to become law it should in the opinion of His Grace in Council be followed by the appointment of an agent at Goa to pass salt as has already been recommended.* For though this precaution

* Vide letter to Govt. of India 26 Oct/74 para 6

precaution may not be of much advantage to Govt., if as seems probable the prepayment of duty cannot be required, still, it will tend to lessen the interference with trade which will admittedly be caused

In S. of S. Judicial Dep.: Dec. 31-12-78
with draft forms and notes of members.
and also in 2802/77 and 1891/78.

31st December 1878.

Encl. to Bombay Cipher Dec. 8 Jan.

Gl

Salt Taxation Bill

G.O.M. 2072 Rec'd 31-12-1878

His Grace

2804-291

Circ. 26 Dec/78: R'd Dec/78