Archives 1—10,000—6-10-76.

(1) Number of pages 16

(2) Date of repair 24.10.84

(3) Initials of the Referencer

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. / B.P. No.	1997	Press. / Mis.
Dated	12.12.1878	197

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

12th December 1878, No. 1,997.

Read the following paper :—

No. 134. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 22nd November 1878, No. 3,120.

Read the following letter from H. W. BLISS, Esq., Commissioner of Salt Revenue, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Madras, 13th November 1878, No. 1,609 :—

REFERRING to that portion of the letter from the Secretary to the Government of India, printed with G.O., 19th October 1878, No. 1,692, Revenue Department, which deals with the question of the price to be charged for salt exported by sea, I have the honor to state that I have ascertained upon inquiry that the rules as to the refund of a portion of the duty on exported salt, copy of which I forwarded to the Board with my letter disposed of in their Proceedings marginally noted, are still in force in Bombay notwithstanding the passing of Act XVIII of 1877, to which I have in my letter in question stated that I think them repugnant.

No. 2,723, dated 5th October 1878.

2. I enclose another copy of the rules in question for ready reference, and request orders as to whether they should or should not be in principle adopted in this Presidency.

3. I still consider them opposed to the existing law. If I am right in so thinking, the allowance of 5 per cent. now made in Bombay should not be continued. If, on the contrary, I am wrong, I think that the export trade in salt from this Presidency should receive the same consideration and assistance as is extended to that from Bombay. Otherwise we are, so to speak, handicapped to the extent of 5 per cent., and a continuance of exports of salt from our depôts is not to be expected.

4. So far as the Imperial revenue is concerned, it matters not at all, in my opinion, whether Madras salt is, or is not, exported to Calcutta. The salt consumption of Bengal and the duty paid on it will not be altered, whether the salt the people there eat comes from Liverpool or from Madras. But the larger the Madras salt sales the more economically of course can the Madras Salt Department be worked, without reference to the duty paid and considering the cost price of 3 Annas per maund only. While, therefore, fully of opinion that not the slightest risk of loss of revenue should be run in order to encourage exports, I think that the conditions of export should not be more onerous here than elsewhere.

5. I observe that the Government of India contemplate the grant of refunds on exports to Burmah and to ports not in British India. The principal demand for salt for export of late has been for Penang, and of course the applicants have refused to buy on the existing terms of prepayment and no refund of the duty. The result, I am informed, is that they have all gone over to Ceylon and taken salt cargoes from thence. Seeing, however, that, so far as I know, there are no proper arrangements in Penang for the accurate in-weighment of salt, I do not feel disposed to regret the loss of this portion of the export salt trade. It might, however, be well to make quite certain of the exact nature of the arrangements in Penang and the Straits Settlements generally, regarding which I may have been misinformed. I venture therefore to suggest that application be made to the Government there for information.

6. As regards exports to Burmah, I submit that the papers printed with G.O., 2nd August 1878, No. 1,211, Revenue Department, show that the arrangements there for in-weighment of salt are not such as to render it advisable for us to offer any encouragement to exports thither by promise of refund of duty or otherwise.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.—Copy of Rules.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. At the close of paragraph 6 of the letter from the Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Revenue, Agriculture and Commerce, printed in G.O., dated 19th October 1878, No. 1,692, it is laid down in regard to exports of salt by sea from the Madras Presidency that "no allowance for wastage should be made, duty being refunded only on the quantity actually landed;" and no provision is made in Act XVIII of 1877 for exemption from duty of any quantity on the ground of wastage. Nevertheless it appears that 5 per cent. is still allowed for wastage in the case of shipments from Bombay under the rules in force in that Presidency, and the Salt Commissioner points out that he must either run counter to what has been declared to be the law, or submit to the unequal competition caused by the Bombay rules.

3. It would seem desirable that a uniform rule should govern both Presidencies in the matter of salt exports, and the question might for this purpose be referred to the Supreme Government. Meanwhile, Mr. Bliss should make no allowance for wastage.

4. It is further desirable that the papers should be referred on account of the want of arrangement for proper in-weighment at Burmah, which might perhaps be remedied, and that the information desired regarding the arrangements in Penang and the Straits Settlements may be obtained.

(True Copy and Extract.)

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

No. 135, ORDER thereon, 13th December 1878, No. 1,997.

Separate Revenue, No. 16.
Salt.

HIS GRACE the Governor in Council agrees with the Board that the Bombay rules referred to must affect prejudicially the salt export trade of this Presidency. The matter will therefore be referred for the consideration and orders of the Government of India; as well as the correspondence recorded in G.O., dated 2nd August 1878, No. 1,211, relative to the defective arrangements for inweighment of salt cargoes in British Burmah.

2. The Government of the Straits Settlements will be asked to state what arrangements are in force there regarding the weighment of salt imported.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) L. A. CAMPBELL,
Under-Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. W. H. French.

5-4-95
31-5-99
24-10-00 D
21-10-19

Govt. of India. 1878. Weekly.

REVENUE.

To the BOARD of REVENUE.

Dated December 1878.

Printed 1879.

Read

Sent

G.O., 13th December 1878, No. 1,997.

DECEMBER.

Nos. 131-185.

Sub-report from the Madras Presidency.

Resolving to refer for the consideration and orders of the Government of India reports relative to the rules under which a rebate or allowance of 5 per cent is allowed on shipments of salt from Bombay presidency to Burmah; and the correspondence relative to the collection arrangements for levy of salt customs in British Burmah.

Revenue Department.

No. 3120

1997/3

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

Dated 22nd November 1878.

Read the following:—

No. 1859.

From,

W. W. Bliss, Esquire,
Commissioner of Salt Revenue.

To,

C. A. Galton Esquire
Acting Secretary to the
Board of Revenue

Sir,

Referring to that portion of the letter from the Secretary to the Government of India printed with G.O. 19th October 1878 No. 1692, R.D., which deals with the question of the price to be charged for salt exported by sea, I have the honor to state that I have ascertained upon enquiry that the Rules as to the refund of a portion of the duty on exported salt, copy of which I forwarded to the Board with No. 2723 dated my letter disposed of in those Proceedings — 5th October 1878 may in all be noted, are still in force in Bombay, notwithstanding the passing of Act XVIII of 1877, to which I have in my

my letter in question stated that I think them refusing.
-ment.

2. I enclose another copy of the Rules in question for ready reference and request orders as to whether they should or should not be in principle adopted in this Presidency.

3. I still consider them opposed to the existing law. If I am right in so thinking, the allowance of 5 per cent now made in Bombay should not be continued. If, on the contrary, I am wrong, I think that the export trade in salt from this Presidency should receive the same consideration and assistance as is extended to that from Bombay. Otherwise we are, so to speak, handicapped to the extent of 5 per cent and a continuance of export of salt from our Depots is not to be expected.

4. So far as the Imperial revenue is concerned it matters not at all, in my opinion, whether Madras Salt is, or is not, exported

1997/4

exported to Calcutta. The salt consumption of Bengal and the duty paid on it would not be altered, whether the salt the people there eat comes from Liverpool or from Madras. But the longer the Madras salt sales the more economically of course can the Madras Salt Department be worked, without reference to the duty paid and considering the cost price of 3 annas per maund only. While, therefore, fully of opinion that not the slightest risk of loss of revenue should be run in order to encourage export, I think that the conditions of export should not be more onerous here than elsewhere.

5.) I observe that the Government of India contemplate the grant of refunds on export to Burmah and to Ports not in British India. The principal demand for salt for export of late has been for Penang, and of course the applicant here refused to buy on the existing terms of pre-payment and no refund of the duty.

The

Present, I am informed, is that they have all gone over to Ceylon and taken salt cargoes from thence. Being, however, that, so far as I know, there are no proper arrangements in Penang for the accurate ascertainment of salt, I do not feel disposed to regret the loss of this portion of the export Salt trade. It might, however, be well to make quite certain of the exact nature of the arrangements in Penang and the Straits Settlement generally, regarding which I may have been misinformed. I venture therefore to suggest that application be made to the Government there for information.

6. As regards exports to Bengal & Rembit that the papers printed with G.O. 2nd August 1878, No. 1211 R.R. show that the arrangements there for ascertainment of salt are not such as to render it advisable for us to offer any encouragement to exports by promise of refund of duty or otherwise.

I have &c.

Office of the Commr of Salt Revenue, Madras, Dated 13th November 1878.

(Sd) A. W. Bliss
Commissioner of Salt Revenue.

1997

Submitted for the orders of Government.

2. At the close of para 6 of the letter from the Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Revenue, Agriculture & Commerce printed in G.O. 19th October 1878 No. 1692, it is laid down in regard to export of salt by sea from the Madras Presidency that "no allowance for wastage should be made, duty being refunded only on the quantity actually landed" and no provision is made in Act XVIII of 1877 for exemption from duty of any quantity on the ground of wastage. Nevertheless it appears that 5 per cent is still allowed for wastage in the case of shipments from Bombay under the Rules in force in that Presidency and the Salt Commissioner points out that he must either grant a like allowance or submit to the unequal competition caused by the Bombay rules.

3. It would seem desirable that a uniform rule

rule should govern both Residencies in the matter of salt exports, and the question might for this purpose be referred to the Supreme Government. Meanwhile Mr Bliss should make no allowance for wastage.

4. It is further desirable that the papers should be returned on account of the want of arrangement for proper inveigilment at Bunnah which might perhaps be remedied, and that the information should regarding the arrangement in Luang and the Straits Settlements may be obtained.

(True Copy and Extract)

A. Clutterbuck
Ag. Secretary.

To
The Secretary to Government P.D.
with one enclosure this ref.
& Copy of Bi Pro. dated 5th October 1876
No. 2723.

E. H. Myrtle
Capt. Asst. Engrs.

Rev. Dept.

1057/7

No 1997.

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

Under date the 12th December 1878

Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue dated 22nd November 1878 No. 3120, regarding refund of duty at 5 per cent allowed in Bombay on exported salt.

His Grace the Governor in Council agrees with the Board that the Bombay rules referred to must affect prejudicially the salt export trade of this Presidency. The matter will therefore be referred for the consideration and orders of the Govt. of India, as well as the correspondence recorded in G.O. dated

Rev. Dept. Proceedings No. 1997 dated 12th December 1878

Read 1 Encl.

Encl. 2. 1 Ord.

Letter to the Collector regarding the refund of 5 per cent duty allowed in Bombay on exported salt.

No 1354 dated 22nd November 1878

dated 2nd August 1878 Pt 1211
relative to the defective ar-
rangements for superveis-
ment of Salt Cargoes in
British Burmah.

2. The Government of
the Straits Settlements write
be asked to state what
arrangements are in force
there regarding the weigh-
ment of Salt imported.

14 Feb 80 Foreign Office
Dec 14 Dec

70/4

5.0

Refund of duty
allowed in Bonds
on Imported Salt.

G.O.no 1997

12.12.1838

134 1937

c.29.Sept/38 R.9.Dec/38