0/9 6. 5-8-98.

Revenue (1898) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 3089

DATED 22nd July 98

Pol

[Despatch Abstract.]

Copy to the Board of Revenue
decision of the Govt of India in re
the exemption from import-duty
of the component parts of a railway
carriage

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O. C.No.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
4835 99							

4,000—19-7-97.

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 4974

and then print
SAL 26/7/98.

Order Mis. No. 3087 dt 12th July 98. 4

H.M. to Sec

19/7/98

From The Govt of India Finance & Commerce Dept

No. 3000 dt 8.7.98

communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O No 491 dt 25-7-95.

KO 19/7/98

19/7/98

Dated 8 July

Received 14/7/98

Registered 14/7/98

Enclosures

Spare copies.

I/c to Board SR. 25/7

Resdt in Travancore & Cochin
Thro' the Pol. Secy

Draft 26.7.98

SUBJECT.

Forwarding to the Govt of Madras &c for information copy of a letter addressed to the Govt of Bombay re: the treatment in respect of assessment to import duty of articles entered as component parts of Railway carriages but which are capable of being used for other purposes.

SA 19/7/98.

cd 19/7/98

14/7/98

6-10

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O. C. No.	No.	Department.	Date.
4835/99			

No. 3000 F.C.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

FINANCE AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENT.

Simla, the 8th July 1899.



[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] that
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] military commissions
[illegible] [illegible] exception is questioned
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] to the [illegible] and quality
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] at its import

[illegible] [illegible] required to inform [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] should be [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] with these [illegible]

I have the honour to be,
Your most obedient servant,
(Sd) J. A. Robertson
Offg. Assistant Secy. to the [illegible]

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Bombay, for information in continuation of the letter in this Department No. 2276 [illegible] dated the 12th July 1875.

J. A. Robertson
Offg. Assistant Secy. to the Govt. of [illegible]

No. 90 $\frac{1171}{2557-9}$

Government {1898} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. } 1898. *Enclosures*

Regd. } *Spare copies*

G.O., Mis. No. 3087, 22nd July 1898.

JULY.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue decision of the Government of India *in re* the exemption from import duty of the component parts of a railway carriage.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following letter from J. A. ROBERTSON, Esq., Officiating Assistant Secretary to the Government of India (Finance and Commerce Department), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, dated Simla, the 8th July 1898, No. 3000-S.R. :—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 440, dated the 19th January 1898, regarding the treatment, in respect of assessment to import duty, of articles entered as component parts of railway carriages, but which are capable of being used for other purposes.

2. In paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, the Government of Bombay were informed, in answer to their question whether the component parts of articles specified as "railway material" are to be charged with duty on the analogy of component parts of machinery though capable of being used for other purposes, that the limitation applied to component parts of machinery by the second proviso to No. 14 of the Indian Tariff Act should be held to apply equally to component parts of railway material.

Subsequently the Advocate-General, Bombay, held, in an opinion, dated the 16th November 1897, that duty had been improperly levied in a certain case, because the articles had been, as he understood, admitted to be component parts of railway carriages and were, as such, free from duty under No. 93 of schedule IV of the Tariff Act; that the proviso to No. 14 of the same schedule which has the effect of not rendering exempt from duty component parts of machinery which can be adapted for any other purpose refers only to the articles specified in that number, and cannot be used for the purpose of construing No. 93; and that all that is necessary to secure exemption under No. 93 is that the articles should be component parts of railway carriages.

The Government of Bombay now enquire whether the Government of India accept the opinion quoted above and if so whether the instruction in paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, is to be regarded as cancelled.

3. I am to say that, on full consideration of this question, the Government of India have decided to cancel paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department of the 10th July 1895, and to substitute therefor the following :—

"2 (3)—In the same way the question whether any article in respect of which exemption from import duty is claimed on the ground that it is a component part of a railway carriage shall be admitted to such exemption is a question of fact which must be decided by the customs officials with reference to the shape and quality of the article, and the circumstances of its importation."

4. The claim referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply should be dealt with in accordance with these instructions.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Burma, for information, in continuation of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895.

(Signed) J. A. ROBERTSON,
Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Order—Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, dated 22nd July 1898.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O., No. 491, dated 25th July 1895.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, through the Political Department.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

25 Copies.

given for copying ——
copied ——
examined ——
signed ——
} 189 .

GAIN G.O., No. DATED
189 ,

NT No.

URES TO C. No.

OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .. A A A A A A A

OF GOVERNMENT.

SENT WITH DITTO

IS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.

19-8-10

Government {1898} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. } 1898. Enclosures
Regd. } Spare copies

G.O., Mis. No. 3087, 22nd July 1898.

JULY.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue decision of the Government of India *in re* the exemption from import duty of the component parts of a railway carriage.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following letter from J. A. ROBERTSON, Esq., Officiating Assistant Secretary to the Government of India (Finance and Commerce Department), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, dated Simla, the 8th July 1898, No. 3000-S.R. :—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 440, dated the 19th January 1898, regarding the treatment, in respect of assessment to import duty, of articles entered as component parts of railway carriages, but which are capable of being used for other purposes.

2. In paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, the Government of Bombay were informed, in answer to their question whether the component parts of articles specified as "railway material" are to be charged with duty on the analogy of component parts of machinery though capable of being used for other purposes, that the limitation applied to component parts of machinery by the second proviso to No. 14 of the Indian Tariff Act should be held to apply equally to component parts of railway material.

Subsequently the Advocate-General, Bombay, held, in an opinion, dated the 16th November 1897, that duty had been improperly levied in a certain case, because the articles had been, as he understood, admitted to be component parts of railway carriages and were, as such, free from duty under No. 93 of schedule IV of the Tariff Act; that the proviso to No. 14 of the same schedule which has the effect of not rendering exempt from duty component parts of machinery which can be adapted for any other purpose refers only to the articles specified in that number, and cannot be used for the purpose of construing No. 93; and that all that is necessary to secure exemption under No. 93 is that the articles should be component parts of railway carriages.

The Government of Bombay now enquire whether the Government of India accept the opinion quoted above and if so whether the instruction in paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, is to be regarded as cancelled.

3. I am to say that, on full consideration of this question, the Government of India have decided to cancel paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department of the 10th July 1895, and to substitute therefor the following :—

"2 (3)—In the same way the question whether any article in respect of which exemption from import duty is claimed on the ground that it is a component part of a railway carriage shall be admitted to such exemption is a question of fact which must be decided by the customs officials with reference to the shape and quality of the article, and the circumstances of its importation."

4. The claim referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply should be dealt with in accordance with these instructions.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Burma, for information, in continuation of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895.

(Signed) J. A. ROBERTSON,
Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Order—Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, dated 22nd July 1898.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O., No. 491, dated 25th July 1895.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, through the Political Department.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

25 Copies.

Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, 22nd July 1895.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Burma, for information, in continuation of the letter in this department, No. 3270-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895.

(Signed) J. A. ROBERTSON,
Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Order—Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, dated 22nd July 1895.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O., No. 491, dated 25th July 1895.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
" the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, through the Political Department.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

25 Copies.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Burma, for information, in continuation of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895.

(Signed) J. A. ROBERTSON,
Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Order—Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, dated 22nd July 1898.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O., No. 491, dated 25th July 1895.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, through the Political Department.

Ed. Shaik Karim.

25 Copies.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Burma, for information, in continuation of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895.

(Signed) J. A. ROBERTSON,
Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Order—Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, dated 22nd July 1898.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O., No. 491, dated 25th July 1895.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
" the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, through the Political Department.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

25 Copies.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Burma, for information, in continuation of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895.

(Signed) J. A. ROBERTSON,
Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Order—Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, dated 22nd July 1898.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O., No. 491, dated 25th July 1895.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, through the Political Department.

Ex1. Shaik Karim.

25 Copies.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Burma, for information, in continuation of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895.

(Signed) J. A. ROBERTSON,
Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Order—Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, dated 22nd July 1898.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O., No. 491, dated 25th July 1895.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, through the Political Department.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

25 Copies.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Burma, for information, in continuation of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895.

(Signed) J. A. ROBERTSON,
Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Order—Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, dated 22nd July 1898.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O., No. 491, dated 25th July 1895.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, through the Political Department.

Ex.I. Shaik Karim,

25 Copies.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Burma, for information, in continuation of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895.

(Signed) J. A. ROBERTSON,
Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Order—Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, dated 22nd July 1898.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O., No. 491, dated 25th July 1895.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, through the Political Department.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

25 Copies.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Burma, for information, in continuation of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895.

(Signed) J. A. ROBERTSON,
Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Order—Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, dated 22nd July 1898.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O., No. 491, dated 25th July 1895.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
" the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, through the
Political Department.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

25 Copies.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Burma, for information, in continuation of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895.

(Signed) J. A. ROBERTSON,
Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Order—Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, dated 22nd July 1898.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O., No. 491, dated 25th July 1895.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, through the Political Department.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

25 Copies.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Burma, for information, in continuation of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895.

(Signed) J. A. ROBERTSON,
Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Order—Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, dated 22nd July 1898.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O., No. 491, dated 25th July 1895.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, through the Political Department.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

25 Copies.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Burma, for information, in continuation of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895.

(Signed) J. A. ROBERTSON,
Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Order—Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, dated 22nd July 1898.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O., No. 491, dated 25th July 1895.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. S. FORBES,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, through the Political Department.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

25 Copies.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Burma, for information, in continuation of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895.

(Signed) J. A. ROBERTSON,
Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Order—Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, dated 22nd July 1898.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O., No. 491, dated 25th July 1895.

(True Extract.)

Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, through the Political Department.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

25 Copies.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Burma, for information, in continuation of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895.

(Signed) J. A. ROBERTSON,
Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Order—Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, dated 22nd July 1898.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O., No. 491, dated 25th July 1895.

(True Extract.)

Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, through the Political Department.

Ex1. Shaik Karim.

25 Copies.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following letter from J. A. ROBERTSON, Esq., Officiating Assistant Secretary to the Government of India (Finance and Commerce Department), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, dated Simla, the 8th July 1898, No. 3000-S.R. :—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 440, dated the 19th January 1898, regarding the treatment, in respect of assessment to import duty, of articles entered as component parts of railway carriages, but which are capable of being used for other purposes.

2. In paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, the Government of Bombay were informed, in answer to their question whether the component parts of articles specified as "railway material" are to be charged with duty on the analogy of component parts of machinery though capable of being used for other purposes, that the limitation applied to component parts of machinery by the second proviso to No. 14 of the Indian Tariff Act should be held to apply equally to component parts of railway material.

Subsequently the Advocate-General, Bombay, held, in an opinion, dated the 16th November 1897, that duty had been improperly levied in a certain case, because the articles had been, as he understood, admitted to be component parts of railway carriages and were, as such, free from duty under No. 93 of schedule IV of the Tariff Act; that the proviso to No. 14 of the same schedule which has the effect of not rendering exempt from duty component parts of machinery which can be adapted for any other purpose refers only to the articles specified in that number, and cannot be used for the purpose of construing No. 93; and that all that is necessary to secure exemption under No. 93 is that the articles should be component parts of railway carriages.

The Government of Bombay now enquire whether the Government of India accept the opinion quoted above and if so whether the instruction in paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, is to be regarded as cancelled.

3. I am to say that, on full consideration of this question, the Government of India have decided to cancel paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department of the 10th July 1895, and to substitute therefor the following :—

"2 (3)—In the same way the question whether any article in respect of which exemption from import duty is claimed on the ground that it is a component part of a railway carriage shall be admitted to such exemption is a question of fact which must be decided by the customs officials with reference to the shape and quality of the article, and the circumstances of its importation."

4. The claim referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply should be dealt with in accordance with these instructions.

Ordered, that copy be forwarded to the Governments of Madras, Bengal and Burma, for information, in continuation of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895.

(Signed) J. A. ROBERTSON,
Offg. Asst. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Order—Mis. No. 3087, Revenue, dated 22nd July 1898.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue with reference to G.O., No. 491, dated 25th July 1895.

(True Extract.)

Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue).
„ the Resident in Travancore and Cochin, through the Political Department.

Ex1. Shaik Karim.

25 Copies.

Government {1898} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. }
} 1898. *Enclosures*
Regd. }
Spare copies

G.O., Mis. No. 3087, 22nd July 1898.

JULY.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue decision of the Government of India *in re* the exemption from import duty of the component parts of a railway carriage.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following letter from J. A. ROBERTSON, Esq., Officiating Assistant Secretary to the Government of India (Finance and Commerce Department), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, dated Simla, the 8th July 1898, No. 3000-S.R. :—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 440, dated the 19th January 1898, regarding the treatment, in respect of assessment to import duty, of articles entered as component parts of railway carriages, but which are capable of being used for other purposes.

2. In paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, the Government of Bombay were informed, in answer to their question whether the component parts of articles specified as "railway material" are to be charged with duty on the analogy of component parts of machinery though capable of being used for other purposes, that the limitation applied to component parts of machinery by the second proviso to No. 14 of the Indian Tariff Act should be held to apply equally to component parts of railway material.

Subsequently the Advocate-General, Bombay, held, in an opinion, dated the 16th November 1897, that duty had been improperly levied in a certain case, because the articles had been, as he understood, admitted to be component parts of railway carriages and were, as such, free from duty under No. 93 of schedule IV of the Tariff Act; that the proviso to No. 14 of the same schedule which has the effect of not rendering exempt from duty component parts of machinery which can be adapted for any other purpose refers only to the articles specified in that number, and cannot be used for the purpose of construing No. 93; and that all that is necessary to secure exemption under No. 93 is that the articles should be component parts of railway carriages.

The Government of Bombay now enquire whether the Government of India accept the opinion quoted above and if so whether the instruction in paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, is to be regarded as cancelled.

3. I am to say that, on full consideration of this question, the Government of India have decided to cancel paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department of the 10th July 1895, and to substitute therefor the following :—

"2 (3)—In the same way the question whether any article in respect of which exemption from import duty is claimed on the ground that it is a component part of a railway carriage shall be admitted to such exemption is a question of fact which must be decided by the customs officials with reference to the shape and quality of the article, and the circumstances of its importation."

4. The claim referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply should be dealt with in accordance with these instructions.

Government {1898} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. }
} 1898.
Regd. }

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., Mis. No. 3087, 22nd July 1898.

JULY.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue decision of the Government of India *in re* the exemption from import duty of the component parts of a railway carriage.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following letter from J. A. ROBERTSON, Esq., Officiating Assistant Secretary to the Government of India (Finance and Commerce Department), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, dated Simla, the 8th July 1898, No. 3000-S.R. :—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 440, dated the 19th January 1898, regarding the treatment, in respect of assessment to import duty, of articles entered as component parts of railway carriages, but which are capable of being used for other purposes.

2. In paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, the Government of Bombay were informed, in answer to their question whether the component parts of articles specified as "railway material" are to be charged with duty on the analogy of component parts of machinery though capable of being used for other purposes, that the limitation applied to component parts of machinery by the second proviso to No. 14 of the Indian Tariff Act should be held to apply equally to component parts of railway material.

Subsequently the Advocate-General, Bombay, held, in an opinion, dated the 16th November 1897, that duty had been improperly levied in a certain case, because the articles had been, as he understood, admitted to be component parts of railway carriages and were, as such, free from duty under No. 93 of schedule IV of the Tariff Act; that the proviso to No. 14 of the same schedule which has the effect of not rendering exempt from duty component parts of machinery which can be adapted for any other purpose refers only to the articles specified in that number, and cannot be used for the purpose of construing No. 93; and that all that is necessary to secure exemption under No. 93 is that the articles should be component parts of railway carriages.

The Government of Bombay now enquire whether the Government of India accept the opinion quoted above and if so whether the instruction in paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, is to be regarded as cancelled.

3. I am to say that, on full consideration of this question, the Government of India have decided to cancel paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department of the 10th July 1895, and to substitute therefor the following :—

"2 (3)—In the same way the question whether any article in respect of which exemption from import duty is claimed on the ground that it is a component part of a railway carriage shall be admitted to such exemption is a question of fact which must be decided by the customs officials with reference to the shape and quality of the article, and the circumstances of its importation."

4. The claim referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply should be dealt with in accordance with these instructions.

Government (1898) of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd.
Regd.
} 1898.
Enclosures
Spare copies

G.O., Mis. No. 3087, 22nd July 1898.

JULY.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue decision of the Government of India in re the exemption from import duty of the component parts of a railway carriage.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following letter from J. A. ROBERTSON, Esq., Officiating Assistant Secretary to the Government of India (Finance and Commerce Department), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, dated Simla, the 8th July 1898, No. 3000-S.R. :—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 440, dated the 19th January 1898, regarding the treatment, in respect of assessment to import duty, of articles entered as component parts of railway carriages, but which are capable of being used for other purposes.

2. In paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, the Government of Bombay were informed, in answer to their question whether the component parts of articles specified as "railway material" are to be charged with duty on the analogy of component parts of machinery though capable of being used for other purposes, that the limitation applied to component parts of machinery by the second proviso to No. 14 of the Indian Tariff Act should be held to apply equally to component parts of railway material.

Subsequently the Advocate-General, Bombay, held, in an opinion, dated the 16th November 1897, that duty had been improperly levied in a certain case, because the articles had been, as he understood, admitted to be component parts of railway carriages and were, as such, free from duty under No. 93 of schedule IV of the Tariff Act; that the proviso to No. 14 of the same schedule which has the effect of not rendering exempt from duty component parts of machinery which can be adapted for any other purpose refers only to the articles specified in that number, and cannot be used for the purpose of construing No. 93; and that all that is necessary to secure exemption under No. 93 is that the articles should be component parts of railway carriages.

The Government of Bombay now enquire whether the Government of India accept the opinion quoted above and if so whether the instruction in paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, is to be regarded as cancelled.

3. I am to say that, on full consideration of this question, the Government of India have decided to cancel paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department of the 10th July 1895, and to substitute therefor the following :—

"2 (3)—In the same way the question whether any article in respect of which exemption from import duty is claimed on the ground that it is a component part of a railway carriage shall be admitted to such exemption is a question of fact which must be decided by the customs officials with reference to the shape and quality of the article, and the circumstances of its importation."

4. The claim referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply should be dealt with in accordance with these instructions.

Government (1898) of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. } 1898. *Enclosures*

Regd. } *Spare copies*

G.O., Mis. No. 3087, 22nd July 1898.

JULY.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue decision of the Government of India in re the exemption from import duty of the component parts of a railway carriage.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following letter from J. A. ROBERTSON, Esq., Officiating Assistant Secretary to the Government of India (Finance and Commerce Department), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, dated Simla, the 8th July 1898, No. 3000-S.R. :—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 440, dated the 19th January 1898, regarding the treatment, in respect of assessment to import duty, of articles entered as component parts of railway carriages, but which are capable of being used for other purposes.

2. In paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, the Government of Bombay were informed, in answer to their question whether the component parts of articles specified as "railway material" are to be charged with duty on the analogy of component parts of machinery though capable of being used for other purposes, that the limitation applied to component parts of machinery by the second proviso to No. 14 of the Indian Tariff Act should be held to apply equally to component parts of railway material.

Subsequently the Advocate-General, Bombay, held, in an opinion, dated the 16th November 1897, that duty had been improperly levied in a certain case, because the articles had been, as he understood, admitted to be component parts of railway carriages and were, as such, free from duty under No. 93 of schedule IV of the Tariff Act; that the proviso to No. 14 of the same schedule which has the effect of not rendering exempt from duty component parts of machinery which can be adapted for any other purpose refers only to the articles specified in that number, and cannot be used for the purpose of construing No. 93; and that all that is necessary to secure exemption under No. 93 is that the articles should be component parts of railway carriages.

The Government of Bombay now enquire whether the Government of India accept the opinion quoted above and if so whether the instruction in paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, is to be regarded as cancelled.

3. I am to say that, on full consideration of this question, the Government of India have decided to cancel paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department of the 10th July 1895, and to substitute therefor the following :—

"2 (3)—In the same way the question whether any article in respect of which exemption from import duty is claimed on the ground that it is a component part of a railway carriage shall be admitted to such exemption is a question of fact which must be decided by the customs officials with reference to the shape and quality of the article, and the circumstances of its importation."

4. The claim referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply should be dealt with in accordance with these instructions.

Government (1898) of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. } 1898. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., Mis. No. 3087, 22nd July 1898.

JULY.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue decision of the Government of India in exemption from import duty of the component parts of a railway carriage.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following letter from J. A. ROBERTSON, Esq., Officiating Assistant Secretary to the Government of India (Finance and Commerce Department), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, dated Simla, the 8th July 1898, No. 3000-S.R. :—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 440, dated the 19th January 1898, regarding the treatment, in respect of assessment to import duty, of articles entered as component parts of railway carriages, but which are capable of being used for other purposes.

2. In paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, the Government of Bombay were informed, in answer to their question whether the component parts of articles specified as "railway material" are to be charged with duty on the analogy of component parts of machinery though capable of being used for other purposes, that the limitation applied to component parts of machinery by the second proviso to No. 14 of the Indian Tariff Act should be held to apply equally to component parts of railway material.

Subsequently the Advocate-General, Bombay, held, in an opinion, dated the 16th November 1897, that duty had been improperly levied in a certain case, because the articles had been, as he understood, admitted to be component parts of railway carriages and were, as such, free from duty under No. 93 of schedule IV of the Tariff Act; that the proviso to No. 14 of the same schedule which has the effect of not rendering exempt from duty component parts of machinery which can be adapted for any other purpose refers only to the articles specified in that number, and cannot be used for the purpose of construing No. 93; and that all that is necessary to secure exemption under No. 93 is that the articles should be component parts of railway carriages.

The Government of Bombay now enquire whether the Government of India accept the opinion quoted above and if so whether the instruction in paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, is to be regarded as cancelled.

3. I am to say that, on full consideration of this question, the Government of India have decided to cancel paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department of the 10th July 1895, and to substitute therefor the following :—

"2 (3)—In the same way the question whether any article in respect of which exemption from import duty is claimed on the ground that it is a component part of a railway carriage shall be admitted to such exemption is a question of fact which must be decided by the customs officials with reference to the shape and quality of the article, and the circumstances of its importation."

4. The claim referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply should be dealt with in accordance with these instructions.

deali

Government {1898} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. }
} 1898.
Regd. }

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., Mis. No. 3087, 22nd July 1898.

JULY.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue decision of the Government of India *in re* the exemption from import duty of the component parts of a railway carriage.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following letter from J. A. ROBERTSON, Esq., Officiating Assistant Secretary to the Government of India (Finance and Commerce Department), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, dated Simla, the 8th July 1898, No. 3000-S.R. :—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 440, dated the 19th January 1898, regarding the treatment, in respect of assessment to import duty, of articles entered as component parts of railway carriages, but which are capable of being used for other purposes.

2. In paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, the Government of Bombay were informed, in answer to their question whether the component parts of articles specified as "railway material" are to be charged with duty on the analogy of component parts of machinery though capable of being used for other purposes, that the limitation applied to component parts of machinery by the second proviso to No. 14 of the Indian Tariff Act should be held to apply equally to component parts of railway material.

Subsequently the Advocate-General, Bombay, held, in an opinion, dated the 16th November 1897, that duty had been improperly levied in a certain case, because the articles had been, as he understood, admitted to be component parts of railway carriages and were, as such, free from duty under No. 93 of schedule IV of the Tariff Act; that the proviso to No. 14 of the same schedule which has the effect of not rendering exempt from duty component parts of machinery which can be adapted for any other purpose refers only to the articles specified in that number, and cannot be used for the purpose of construing No. 93; and that all that is necessary to secure exemption under No. 93 is that the articles should be component parts of railway carriages.

The Government of Bombay now enquire whether the Government of India accept the opinion quoted above and if so whether the instruction in paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, is to be regarded as cancelled.

3. I am to say that, on full consideration of this question, the Government of India have decided to cancel paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department of the 10th July 1895, and to substitute therefor the following :—

"2 (3)—In the same way the question whether any article in respect of which exemption from import duty is claimed on the ground that it is a component part of a railway carriage shall be admitted to such exemption is a question of fact which must be decided by the customs officials with reference to the shape and quality of the article, and the circumstances of its importation."

4. The claim referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply should be dealt with in accordance with these instructions.

Government (1898) of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. } 1898. *Enclosures*

Regd. } *Spare copies*

G.O., Mis. No. 3087, 22nd July 1898.

JULY.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue decision of the Government of India in re the exemption from import duty of the component parts of a railway carriage.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following letter from J. A. ROBERTSON, Esq., Officiating Assistant Secretary to the Government of India (Finance and Commerce Department), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, dated Simla, the 8th July 1898, No. 3000-S.R. :—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 440, dated the 19th January 1898, regarding the treatment, in respect of assessment to import duty, of articles entered as component parts of railway carriages, but which are capable of being used for other purposes.

2. In paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, the Government of Bombay were informed, in answer to their question whether the component parts of articles specified as "railway material" are to be charged with duty on the analogy of component parts of machinery though capable of being used for other purposes, that the limitation applied to component parts of machinery by the second proviso to No. 14 of the Indian Tariff Act should be held to apply equally to component parts of railway material.

Subsequently the Advocate-General, Bombay, held, in an opinion, dated the 16th November 1897, that duty had been improperly levied in a certain case, because the articles had been, as he understood, admitted to be component parts of railway carriages and were, as such, free from duty under No. 93 of schedule IV of the Tariff Act; that the proviso to No. 14 of the same schedule which has the effect of not rendering exempt from duty component parts of machinery which can be adapted for any other purpose refers only to the articles specified in that number, and cannot be used for the purpose of construing No. 93; and that all that is necessary to secure exemption under No. 93 is that the articles should be component parts of railway carriages.

The Government of Bombay now enquire whether the Government of India accept the opinion quoted above and if so whether the instruction in paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, is to be regarded as cancelled.

3. I am to say that, on full consideration of this question, the Government of India have decided to cancel paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department of the 10th July 1895, and to substitute therefor the following :—

"2 (3)—In the same way the question whether any article in respect of which exemption from import duty is claimed on the ground that it is a component part of a railway carriage shall be admitted to such exemption is a question of fact which must be decided by the customs officials with reference to the shape and quality of the article, and the circumstances of its importation."

4. The claim referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply should be dealt with in accordance with these instructions.

Government [1898] of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. } 1898. *Enclosures*

Regd. } *Spare copies*

G.O., Mis. No. 3087, 22nd July 1898.

JULY.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue decision of the Government of India in re the exemption from import duty of the component parts of a railway carriage.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following letter from J. A. ROBERTSON, Esq., Officiating Assistant Secretary to the Government of India (Finance and Commerce Department), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, dated Simla, the 8th July 1898, No. 3000-S.R. :—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 440, dated the 19th January 1898, regarding the treatment, in respect of assessment to import duty, of articles entered as component parts of railway carriages, but which are capable of being used for other purposes.

2. In paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, the Government of Bombay were informed, in answer to their question whether the component parts of articles specified as "railway material" are to be charged with duty on the analogy of component parts of machinery though capable of being used for other purposes, that the limitation applied to component parts of machinery by the second proviso to No. 14 of the Indian Tariff Act should be held to apply equally to component parts of railway material.

Subsequently the Advocate-General, Bombay, held, in an opinion, dated the 16th November 1897, that duty had been improperly levied in a certain case, because the articles had been, as he understood, admitted to be component parts of railway carriages and were, as such, free from duty under No. 93 of schedule IV of the Tariff Act; that the proviso to No. 14 of the same schedule which has the effect of not rendering exempt from duty component parts of machinery which can be adapted for any other purpose refers only to the articles specified in that number, and cannot be used for the purpose of construing No. 93; and that all that is necessary to secure exemption under No. 93 is that the articles should be component parts of railway carriages.

The Government of Bombay now enquire whether the Government of India accept the opinion quoted above and if so whether the instruction in paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, is to be regarded as cancelled.

3. I am to say that, on full consideration of this question, the Government of India have decided to cancel paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department of the 10th July 1895, and to substitute therefor the following :—

"2 (3)—In the same way the question whether any article in respect of which exemption from import duty is claimed on the ground that it is a component part of a railway carriage shall be admitted to such exemption is a question of fact which must be decided by the customs officials with reference to the shape and quality of the article, and the circumstances of its importation."

4. The claim referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply should be dealt with in accordance with these instructions.

Government (1898) of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. } 1898. *Enclosures*

Regd. } *Spare copies*

G.O., Mis. No. 3087, 22nd July 1898.

JULY.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue decision of the Government of India in re the exemption from import duty of the component parts of a railway carriage.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following letter from J. A. ROBERTSON, Esq., Officiating Assistant Secretary to the Government of India (Finance and Commerce Department), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, dated Simla, the 8th July 1898, No. 3000-S.R. :—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 440, dated the 19th January 1898, regarding the treatment, in respect of assessment to import duty, of articles entered as component parts of railway carriages, but which are capable of being used for other purposes.

2. In paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, the Government of Bombay were informed, in answer to their question whether the component parts of articles specified as "railway material" are to be charged with duty on the analogy of component parts of machinery though capable of being used for other purposes, that the limitation applied to component parts of machinery by the second proviso to No. 14 of the Indian Tariff Act should be held to apply equally to component parts of railway material.

Subsequently the Advocate-General, Bombay, held, in an opinion, dated the 16th November 1897, that duty had been improperly levied in a certain case, because the articles had been, as he understood, admitted to be component parts of railway carriages and were, as such, free from duty under No. 93 of schedule IV of the Tariff Act; that the proviso to No. 14 of the same schedule which has the effect of not rendering exempt from duty component parts of machinery which can be adapted for any other purpose refers only to the articles specified in that number, and cannot be used for the purpose of construing No. 93; and that all that is necessary to secure exemption under No. 93 is that the articles should be component parts of railway carriages.

The Government of Bombay now enquire whether the Government of India accept the opinion quoted above and if so whether the instruction in paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, is to be regarded as cancelled.

3. I am to say that, on full consideration of this question, the Government of India have decided to cancel paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department of the 10th July 1895, and to substitute therefor the following :—

"2 (3)—In the same way the question whether any article in respect of which exemption from import duty is claimed on the ground that it is a component part of a railway carriage shall be admitted to such exemption is a question of fact which must be decided by the customs officials with reference to the shape and quality of the article, and the circumstances of its importation."

4. The claim referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply should be dealt with in accordance with these instructions.

Government (1898) of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. } 1898. *Enclosures*

Regd. } *Spare copies*

G.O., Mis. No. 3087, 22nd July 1898.

JULY.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue decision of the Government of India *in re* the exemption from import duty of the component parts of a railway carriage.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following letter from J. A. ROBERTSON, Esq., Officiating Assistant Secretary to the Government of India (Finance and Commerce Department), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, dated Simla, the 8th July 1898, No. 3000-S.R. :—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 440, dated the 19th January 1898, regarding the treatment, in respect of assessment to import duty, of articles entered as component parts of railway carriages, but which are capable of being used for other purposes.

2. In paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, the Government of Bombay were informed, in answer to their question whether the component parts of articles specified as "railway material" are to be charged with duty on the analogy of component parts of machinery though capable of being used for other purposes, that the limitation applied to component parts of machinery by the second proviso to No. 14 of the Indian Tariff Act should be held to apply equally to component parts of railway material.

Subsequently the Advocate-General, Bombay, held, in an opinion, dated the 16th November 1897, that duty had been improperly levied in a certain case, because the articles had been, as he understood, admitted to be component parts of railway carriages and were, as such, free from duty under No. 93 of schedule IV of the Tariff Act; that the proviso to No. 14 of the same schedule which has the effect of not rendering exempt from duty component parts of machinery which can be adapted for any other purpose refers only to the articles specified in that number, and cannot be used for the purpose of construing No. 93; and that all that is necessary to secure exemption under No. 93 is that the articles should be component parts of railway carriages.

The Government of Bombay now enquire whether the Government of India accept the opinion quoted above and if so whether the instruction in para- 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1[illegible] to be regarded as cancelled.

3. I am to say that, on full consideration of this question, the Government of India have decided to cancel paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department of the 10th July 1895, and to substitute therefor the following :—

"2 (3)—In the same way the question whether any article in respect of which exemption from import duty is claimed on the ground that it is a component part of a railway carriage shall be admitted to such exemption is a question of fact which must be decided by the customs officials with reference to the shape and quality of the article, and the circumstances of its importation."

4. The claim referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply should be dealt with in accordance with these instructions.

Government {1898} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. }
Regd. } 1898.

Enclosures

Spare copies

G.O., Mis. No. 3087, 22nd July 1898.

JULY.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue decision of the Government of India in re the exemption from import duty of the component parts of a railway carriage.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following letter from J. A. ROBERTSON, Esq., Officiating Assistant Secretary to the Government of India (Finance and Commerce Department), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, dated Simla, the 8th July 1898, No. 3000-S.R. :—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 440, dated the 19th January 1898, regarding the treatment, in respect of assessment to import duty, of articles entered as component parts of railway carriages, but which are capable of being used for other purposes.

2. In paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, the Government of Bombay were informed, in answer to their question whether the component parts of articles specified as "railway material" are to be charged with duty on the analogy of component parts of machinery though capable of being used for other purposes, that the limitation applied to component parts of machinery by the second proviso to No. 14 of the Indian Tariff Act should be held to apply equally to component parts of railway material.

Subsequently the Advocate-General, Bombay, held, in an opinion, dated the 16th November 1897, that duty had been improperly levied in a certain case, because the articles had been, as he understood, admitted to be component parts of railway carriages and were, as such, free from duty under No. 93 of schedule IV of the Tariff Act; that the proviso to No. 14 of the same schedule which has the effect of not rendering exempt from duty component parts of machinery which can be adapted for any other purpose refers only to the articles specified in that number, and cannot be used for the purpose of construing No. 93; and that all that is necessary to secure exemption under No. 93 is that the articles should be component parts of railway carriages.

The Government of Bombay now enquire whether the Government of India accept the opinion quoted above and if so whether the instruction in paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, is to be regarded as cancelled.

3. I am to say that, on full consideration of this question, the Government of India have decided to cancel paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department of the 10th July 1895, and to substitute therefor the following :—

"2 (3)—In the same way the question whether any article in respect of which exemption from import duty is claimed on the ground that it is a component part of a railway carriage shall be admitted to such exemption is a question of fact which must be decided by the customs officials with reference to the shape and quality of the article, and the circumstances of its importation."

4. The claim referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply should be dealt with in accordance with these instructions.

Government (1898) of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. } 1898. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., Mis. No. 3087, 22nd July 1898.

JULY.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue decision of the Government of India in re the exemption from import duty of the component parts of a railway carriage.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following letter from J. A. ROBERTSON, Esq., Officiating Assistant Secretary to the Government of India (Finance and Commerce Department), to the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Revenue Department, dated Simla, the 8th July 1898, No. 3000-S.R. :—

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 440, dated the 19th January 1898, regarding the treatment, in respect of assessment to import duty, of articles entered as component parts of railway carriages, but which are capable of being used for other purposes.

2. In paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, the Government of Bombay were informed, in answer to their question whether the component parts of articles specified as "railway material" are to be charged with duty on the analogy of component parts of machinery though capable of being used for other purposes, that the limitation applied to component parts of machinery by the second proviso to No. 14 of the Indian Tariff Act should be held to apply equally to component parts of railway material.

Subsequently the Advocate-General, Bombay, held, in an opinion, dated the 16th November 1897, that duty had been improperly levied in a certain case, because the articles had been, as he understood, admitted to be component parts of railway carriages and were, as such, free from duty under No. 93 of schedule IV of the Tariff Act; that the proviso to No. 14 of the same schedule which has the effect of not rendering exempt from duty component parts of machinery which can be adapted for any other purpose refers only to the articles specified in that number, and cannot be used for the purpose of construing No. 93; and that all that is necessary to secure exemption under No. 93, is that the articles should be component parts of railway carriages.

The Government of Bombay now enquire whether the Government of India accept the opinion quoted above and if so whether the instruction in paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department, No. 3276-S.R., dated the 10th July 1895, is to be regarded as cancelled.

3. I am to say that, on full consideration of this question, the Government of India have decided to cancel paragraph 2 (3) of the letter in this department of the 10th July 1895, and to substitute therefor the following :—

"2 (3)—In the same way the question whether any article in respect of which exemption from import duty is claimed on the ground that it is a component part of a railway carriage shall be admitted to such exemption is a question of fact which must be decided by the customs officials with reference to the shape and quality of the article, and the circumstances of its importation."

4. The claim referred to in paragraph 2 of your letter under reply should be dealt with in accordance with these instructions.

Government {1898} of Madras.

REVENUE.

Recd. } 1898. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., Mis. No. 3087, 22nd July 1898.

JULY.

Communicating to the Board of Revenue decision of the Government of India in re the exemption from import duty of the component parts of a railway carriage.