

(1) Number of pages 14

(2) Date of repair 7. 8. 38

(3) Initials of the Referencer 4

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	568	Press Mis.
Dated	1-6-	1882.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

CONFIDENTIAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following letter from R. CROSS, Esq., to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Madras, dated No. 3, Wardie Cottages, Granton, Edinburgh, 14th April 1882 :—

I take the liberty to inform you that I have duly received, through the India Office, the order of Government, of 28th February 1882, No. 625, sanctioning my claim for return-travelling expenses, for which I beg to express my obligations and thanks.

Perhaps I may be excused for making a few remarks regarding the *true Chinchona Succirubra*, concerning which a pronouncement was made by Dr. Bidie contrary to what I had stated before leaving India.

Just on arrival here, I set to work in order to fully re-assure and satisfy myself on the matter. I have now examined various collections, including those of the University and Museums, which I have compared with some specimens I possess. I obtained access also to a superb collection of South American barks, about thirty years old, presented by a gentleman to the Museum here, though not as yet exhibited to the public. This collection contained all the fine sorts now growing in India. The entire evidence has convinced me, in the strongest possible manner, that the facts I have already stated on the subject are most true, certain, and positive facts, and are briefly thus :—

First.—That the true *Chinchona Succirubra* includes two varieties,—one the *Pata*, being nearly smooth-leaved, while the other the *Teja*, or tile variety, has the under side of the leaves more hairy. Both varieties grow on the slopes of Chimborazo,—the *Pata* at the higher elevations,—and both are put up and packed together in commerce; therefore both may be regarded in a broad sense as being the true *Succirubra*.

Second.—That the *Succirubra* at present grown in the Indian Plantations is not the true *Succirubra*, but is just the “Fluanuco” “Grey Bark” or “Mossy Lima” of Commerce. This tree inhabits the Eastern Andes of Peru, more than three hundred miles south of the mountain, Chimborazo.

Great confusion has arisen from the descriptive details of printed documents, &c., about *Chinchona* by botanists and others, who were really unable to distinguish the various commercial barks or the species whence these barks were derived.

P.S.—It appears that some persons who attend the bark sales at Mincing Lane “were well aware, for some time past,” that the Red Bark from the East sold there was not the “Fine Red” or “South American Red,” but was derived from a different tree.

True “Red Bark” generally fetches a high price in the market, and it is purchased by both manufacturers and chemists. The tree is comparatively hardy and very prolific, and my own conviction is that on the Nilgiris, if properly wrought, it

will yield a far higher return per acre than the most immaculate sort of *Ledgeriana*. At the same time, I consider that the cultivation of the other hardy sorts, such as Crown, Pitayo, and Santa Fé, if well grown and carefully wrought, will yield very valuable results.

ORDER—dated 1st June 1882, No. 568, Revenue.

Miscellaneous.

Communicated to Dr. Bidie.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) E. F. WEBSTER,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To G. Bidie, Esq., M.B.

11-5-92
22-7-92

Further C. No. 6803/82

Original

Govt. of 1882 Madras.
REVENUE.

Order, dated 1st June 1882, No. 568.

Chinchona succirubra.—Mr. Cross's remarks
communicated to Dr. Bidie.

No 3 Wardie Cottages
Granton 30
Edinburgh
April 14th 1882.

C. J. Masters Esq.
Secretary to Government.
Revenue Department
Madras.

Sir, I take the liberty to inform you
that I have duly received through the
India Office the Order of Government
of 28th February 1882 No. 623 sanctioning
my claim for return travelling expenses
for which I beg to express my obligations
and thanks.

Perhaps I may be excused
for making a few remarks regarding
the true Chinchona succirubra concerning
which a pronouncement was made by
Dr. Bidie contrary to what I had stated
before leaving India.

Just on arrival here I set to work in
order to fully reassure and satisfy myself
on the matter. I have now examined
various collections including those of the
University and Museum which I
have compared with some specimens
I possess. I obtained access also
to a superb collection of South American
barks about 30 years old presented by
a gentleman to the Museum here though
not as yet exhibited to the public.

This collection contained all the

Sorts now growing in India. The entire evidence has convinced me in the strongest possible manner that the facts I have already stated on the subject are most true certain and positive facts and are briefly the

1st That the true Cinchona Succirubra includes two varieties - one the Pata being nearly smooth leaved while the other the Veja or tile variety has the under side of the leaves more hairy. Both varieties grow on the slopes of Chimborazo - the Pata at the higher elevations - and both are put up and packed together in commerce therefore both may be regarded in a broad sense as being the true Succirubra.

2^d That the Succirubra at present grown in the Indian Plantations is not the true Succirubra but is just the Huanuco "grey bark" or "mossy Lima" of Commerce. This tree inhabits the Eastern Andes of Peru more than three hundred miles south of the mountain Chimborazo.

Great confusion has arisen from the descriptive details of printed documents about Cinchona by botanists and others who were really unable to distinguish the various commercial barks or the species whence these barks were derived.

I am Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant.
R. Cross

It appears that some persons who the bark sales at Mincing Lane well aware for some time past "the Red Bark from the East sold there at the "fine Red" or South American but was derived from a different

True Red Bark generally fetches a price in the market and it chased by both Manufacturers Chemists. The tree is comparably hardy and very prolific and in conviction is that on the Nilgiris properly wrought it will yield a higher return per acre than most immaculate sort of Ledgeriana. The same time I consider that cultivation of the other hardy such as Croton, Pitaya and Santal &c grown and carefully wrought will - very valuable results.

R. Cross

60

REVENUE (1882) DEPARTMENT.

No.

2554

From

Robert Cross Esq

Chas. Bidie Esq. 2nd. 1/6/82

Dated

14 April.

Recd.

12 May.

No.

Printed 1/6/82

SUBJECT.

Expressing obligation
I thank for the cancellation
of his claim for return
traveling expenses &
making a few remarks
regarding the true China
Succinbra.

Ques.

G. C. 10088

Communicated to Dr Bidie.

J. W.

List from order.

1 Jan 1882

19. Bidie 1078 M.B. Dec 21-6-82

No. 2554

From

Mr Robert Cross

Dated 14th April

1882

FOR ORDERS.

Mr. Cross maintains
that subsequent enquiries
have only tended to confirm
his views regarding the
tree Succinbra plant.

Dr Bidie's report
on Mr. Cross' allegations
was sent to the Secretary
of State in March last
and the specimens collected
by Dr Bidie were despatched
to England
on the 19th Instant

Orders solicited as
to whether Mr. Cross' present
letter should be com-
municated to Dr Bidie
and the Secretary of
State or the result

There is no reason why
the letter should not be
shown to Dr Bidie but I see
no reason why he should
state his views on the
subject in his report.

MSD
May 20/82

of the analysis of the
specimens awaited.

It is presumed that
it is not necessary to
acknowledge the receipt
of Mr. Cross' letter.

~~275~~
~~275~~
275

FOR ORDERS.

Mr. Cross on the Chinchona
Plantations at Antioquia

March 21st 1882

Thos. H. Hunt
The Secretary