30—6-3-98.

Revenue (1899) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

G.O., No. 516

DATED 4th February 99

[Despatch Abstract.]

Stating that the Govt sees no reason to interfere in behalf of Ahmed Hussain Korainky, late Sub-Inspector, Salt and Abkari Deptt, in the matter of his removal from Service.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Revenue (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 214

Dt 4/1/99

Rea petition (duplicate) from
A. H. Koraisky d. 11.11.98 (Cus. 7923/98)
" B.P. (Sep. Rev.) Mis No: 58
D. 6.1.99 (Cus. 214/99)

From

The Secretary to the Commissioner of Salt, Abkari and Separate Revenue, Madras.

Order Mis. No 5767 4th Feb 1899

The Govt. sees no reason to interfere on the petitioner's behalf. (from order)

Mis. No. 58.

Dated 6th January 1899.

Received 10

Registered 11

Enclosures 2 49

Spare copies

Mis 8/2/99 Issue

to the petr:, ~~through the~~ Board of Rev., Sep. Rev. with encls. rets.

Sec. 7-2-99

2/2/99

SUBJECT.

Submitting to Government, with remarks, petition from Ahmed Hussain Koraisky, late Sub-Inspector, Salt, Abkari and Customs Department, appealing against the Board's orders declining to interfere with the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Southern Division, dispensing with his services.

rel pe 11/2/99

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

500
6-6-98

REVENUE BOARD OFFICE MADRAS.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

(Separate Revenue),

Dated 6th January 1899.

Mis. No. 58.

-----:0:-----

Read Official Memorandum from Government, Revenue Department, No.318, dated 12th December 1898.

Read also letter from W.A.Fowler Esquire, Deputy Commissioner, Southern Division, No.5379, dated 2nd December 1898, submitting, with remarks, the appeal petition of late Sub-Inspector Ahmed Hussain Koraisky addressed to His Excellency the Governor in Council.

Resolution.

The petition and its enclosures, received with the second of the papers read above, will be submitted to Government.

3. The petitioner states that he was dismissed for a mere technical offence, contrary to the departmental rules, and that he had only two black marks outstanding against him when the order of dismissal was passed. He was as a matter of fact dismissed because he was found incorrigibly lazy and untruthful, and utterly useless. At the time the dismissal order was passed he had six black marks outstanding, as will be seen from the statement enclosed.

(True extract.)

Acting Secretary.
9.1.99.

To the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, with petition and enclosures and one statement.

× It is submitted that the petr. was not dismissed — his services were dispensed with — please see Dy A Comm'rs Proc^s d. 22-7-97 - para 4

Off 7.1.99.

PETITION

0025

To REVENUE DEPT

HIS EXCELLENCY
THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,

FORT St. GEORGE,

MADRAS.

The humble petition of Ahmed Hussain Korishy, Ex
Sub-Inspector of salt and Abkari Departmen
Kayalpatnam Circle, Tinnevelly District

He was not dismissed his services were dispensed with

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH :—

The petitioner respectfully begs to state that he has been unfortunately dismissed for mere technical offence contrary to the departmental rules.

Five Black Marks followed by a warning of dismissal makes an Officer in the Department liable to removal from service.

The petitioner who had had only 2 Black Marks received an order warning him that the petitioner would be *reduced* in case of his earning any *further* punishment (Enclosure No. 3).

It is against this and, order alone that the petitioner preferred an appeal to the Board of Revenue (Enclosure No. 1) which passed the Resolution (Enclosure No. 2) declining to interfere on behalf of the appellant.

Dismissal for two Black Marks or for 5 Assumed Black Marks (there was no such thing in the case of the petitioner) contrary to the *warning order of reduction* is a thing unknown in the Salt Department and is an innovation in the case of this unfortunate petitioner alone.

The petitioner served this Department 6 years and the Judicial Department about 4 years and his dismissal for such mere technical mistakes has ruined him and his large family.

The petitioner does not now wish to dispute the order of his superior, but approaches Your Excellency in Council with a request that Your Excellency's mercy will be graciously pleased to season, the strict justice done to this petitioner by restoring him to his post or at the worst, to reduce him in terms of the order (Enclosure No. 3) to some post in the Department and protect him.

For which act of grace, Your Excellency's petitioner shall feel ever grateful and begs to remain Your Excellency's most humble petitioner.

Dindigul
11th November
98

Ahmedsaheb

ENCLOSURES.

No. 1. Appeal Petition to the Board of Revenue.

No. 2. Resolution of do.

No. 3. A12. Salt Department

To

HIS EXCELLENCY
THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,
FORT ST. GEORGE,
MADRAS.

The humble petition of Ahmed Hussain Korishy, Ex-Sub-Inspector of salt and Abkari Department, Kayalpatnam Circle, Tinnevelly District

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH :—

The petitioner respectfully begs to state that he has been unfortunately dismissed for mere technical offence contrary to the departmental rules.

Five Black Marks followed by a warning of dismissal makes an Officer in the Department liable to removal from service.

The petitioner who had had only 2 Black Marks received an order warning him that the petitioner would be *reduced* in case of his earning any *further* punishment (Enclosure No. 3).

It is against this and, order alone that the petitioner preferred an appeal to the Board of Revenue (Enclosure No. 1) which passed the Resolution (Enclosure No. 2) declining to interfere on behalf of the appellant.

Dismissal for two Black Marks or for 5 Assumed Black Marks (there was no such thing in the case of the petitioner) contrary to the *warning order of reduction* is a thing unknown in the Salt Department and is an innovation in the case of this unfortunate petitioner alone.

The petitioner served this Department 6 years and the Judicial Department about 4 years and his dismissal for such mere technical mistakes has ruined him and his large family.

The petitioner does not now wish to dispute the order of his superior, but approaches Your Excellency in Council with a request that Your Excellency's mercy will be graciously pleased to season, the strict justice done to this petitioner by restoring him to his post or at the worst, to reduce him in terms of the order (Enclosure No. 3) to some post in the Department and protect him.

For which act of grace, Your Excellency's petitioner shall feel ever grateful and begs to remain Your Excellency's most humble petitioner.

Dindigul
11th November
98.

Ahmedsaram

ENCLOSURES.

No. 1. Appeal Petition to the Board of Revenue.

No. 2. Resolution of do.

No. 3. A12.
Salt Department

Punishment awarded	By whom awarded	Date from which to take effect	Reasons for the punishment
1. One blackmark	Assistant Commissioner, Tinnevelly Sub-Division	18th January 1896.	General neglect of duty.
2. One blackmark	— Do —	28th February 1896.	Failure to report to the Inspector the fact that certain bags of salt had not been removed from the platform by 7th ult.
3. One blackmark	Deputy Commissioner, Southern Division	27th July 1896	Notoriously careless estimation of salt scraped in the Neidavasal factory of the Tranquebar Circle during the season of 1895.
4. One blackmark	Assistant Commissioner, Tinnevelly Sub-Division	5th September 1896	Entering a tally incorrectly in the storage book and scratching the same out with a knife.
5. Suspension for 14 days (a blackmark in consequence)	Deputy Commissioner Southern Division	17th November 1896	Not bringing to light certain irregularities in the Vengolam Range of the North Tuticorin Circle.
6 One blackmark	— Do —	30th November 1896	Neglect of duty in not having checked the whole stock of gunnies when he took charge of them in the Tuticorin Circle from his predecessor.
7. One blackmark	— Do —	16th December 1896	High wastage in heap No. 4/231 of 1896 of the Korapad factory.
8. One blackmark	— Do —	31st March 1897	Careless storage.

N.B. Of the above the first was cancelled on 28th May 1896 by uninterrupted good Conduct from 28th February 1896 to 28th May 1896 and the second was cancelled on 16th March 1897 by uninterrupted good Conduct from 16th December 1896 to 16th March 1897.

C.No. 7923. of 98.

O.M., no. 318

The undersigned is directed to enquire whether the original petition of Ahmed Hussain Kerishy, late sub. insp. Saltand abkari Dept. Kayalpatnam Circle, appealing against his dismissal, has been received in the Board's office and if it has to request that its submission to Govt ~~be forwarded to this office~~ may be expedited.

10/12
a.g Undersecy

Fort St. George
12th December 1898.

To
The Board of Rev.
(Sep Rev)

Inst. 13-12-98
*C.No. 7923.

Note.

It is a month since the duplicate petition* was received in the office and the original petition has not yet been received from the Board.

a.a
9/Jan/99.

R 318 dy 12: Decr 98.

2,000—30-3-98.

Revenue (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 7923

From

Ahmed Hussain Koinshy
Ex-Sub Supt: Salt & Sabkari dept—
Kayalpatnam Circle

No.

Order

To await the receipt of the orgl petn. a reminder should be sent after a month.

Pa
21/xi/98.

Dated 11th
Received 19th } November
Registered 21st
Enclosures - not rec'd
Spare copies –

SUBJECT.

Requesting that he may be restored to his post, or at least that he may be reduced to some post in the Dept.

Pa
21/xi

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

PETITION

0660

REVENUE DEPT

Duplicate.

To

HIS EXCELLENCY
THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,
FORT ST. GEORGE,
MADRAS.

CHIEF SECRETARY GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS 17 NOV. 1898

The humble petition of Ahmed Hussain Korishy, Ex-Sub-Inspector of salt and Abkari Department, Kayalpatnam Circle, Tinnevelly District

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH :—

The petitioner respectfully begs to state that he has been unfortunately dismissed for mere technical offence contrary to the departmental rules.

Five Black Marks followed by a warning of dismissal makes an Officer in the Department liable to removal from service.

The petitioner who had had only 2 Black Marks received an order warning him that the petitioner would be *reduced* in case of his earning any *further* punishment (Enclosure No. 3).

It is against this and, order alone that the petitioner preferred an appeal to the Board of Revenue (Enclosure No. 1) which passed the Resolution (Enclosure No. 2) declining to interfere on behalf of the appellant.

Dismissal for two Black Marks or for 5 Assumed Black Marks (there was no such thing in the case of the petitioner) contrary to the *warning order of reduction* is a thing unknown in the Salt Department and is an innovation in the case of this unfortunate petitioner alone.

The petitioner served this Department 6 years and the Judicial Department about 4 years and his dismissal for such mere technical mistakes has ruined him and his large family.

The petitioner does not now wish to dispute the order of his superior, but approaches Your Excellency in Council with a request that Your Excellency's mercy will be graciously pleased to season, the strict justice done to this petitioner by restoring him to his post or at the worst, to reduce him in terms of the order (Enclosure No. 3) to some post in the Department and protect him.

For which act of grace, Your Excellency's petitioner shall feel ever grateful and begs to remain Your Excellency's most humble petitioner.

ENCLOSURES.

No. 1. Appeal Petition to the Board of Revenue.

No. 2. Resolution of do.

No. 3. A12. Salt Department

Received 11th November 98

Ahmedsaib

(1) Petition (duplicate) from Ahmed Hussain Koraishy, late Sub Inspector, Salt and Abkari Deptt. d. 11.11.98 (Cir. 1923/98)
(2) Om. Ltr: 318 d. 12.12.98.
(3) B.P. Mis. Ltr: 58, Sep. Rev. d. 6.1.99. (Cir. 214 of 1899).

To the Under Secretary.

With its Proceedings noted above, the Board submits to Govt. a second appeal from Ahmed Hussain Koraishy, late Sub-Inspector, (fifth grade - monthly pay, Rs. 30) in the Salt and Abkari Department, against the orders of the Deputy Commissioner, Southern Division, dispensing with his services.

The order of the Public Department prohibiting second appeals to Govt. in cases of departmental punishments from officers on a salary not exceeding

A

15.1.99.

wig Rs. 50 a month, has not yet been issued.

As to the facts of the case, attention is solicited to the Deputy Commissioner's Proceedings dated 22.7.97 in which the appellant's services were ordered to be dispensed with. It is submitted that the appellant has not adduced any grounds for disturbing the Deputy Commissioner's order which has been confirmed on appeal by the Board, and that the Govt. may decline to interfere.

P.C. 13.1.99

Secy

In view of the order about to issue the case has not been examined in detail but it is submitted that the Dy Commrs Procs dt 22-7-97 & the present B.P. show prima facie good grounds for the main removal & the petn of appeal in no way meets the facts ~~then~~ set out in their Rs. 16.11.97 (S.R.)

× B.P. 5286 d 30.11.97 (S.R.)

C

A

as the Co. has not issued the case should be examined in detail.

18.1.99.

To Under Secy

Please see further note submitted

A P.C. 23.1.99.

Secy 17-1-99

To Under Secretary.

The facts of the case were as follows:-

In September 1896, the Assistant Commissioner, Dinnevelly Sub-division, recommended the petitioner's reduction to a clerk's post for accumulation of three black marks. (vide rule 4 of the Black mark Rules at p. 1 of Salt Circular Order No I of 1896). The Deputy Commissioner Southern Division, wished to give the petitioner another chance, and merely ordered his transfer at his own expense. The Assistant Commissioner again recommended in November 1896 the petitioner's reduction for accumulation of black marks, but the Deputy Commissioner desired that he should be given one more chance and directed that he be informed of the leniency shown him and warned that he would be

Pages 19 & 21 of file.

Pages 41-42 do-

re reduced if he earned
any further punishments.
(vide the Dy: Comm'r's order
d. 29-1-97 – p. 42 of the file).
Subsequent to the issue of the
Deputy Commissioner's order last
referred to, the petitioner was
in March 1897 awarded a
black mark for "careless
Straggl"; and the Assistant
Commissioner thereupon
reported him for punishment
for accumulation of six
black marks. The Deputy
Commissioner found that
the petitioner had failed
to give satisfaction to his
Superiors ever since his enter-
tainment in the Department
and had never shown any
sign of wishing to work or
improve. The petitioner's
defaulter sheet, the Deputy
Commissioner found, showed
twenty-one entries against
his name in a service of a
little more than six years,
these occurring amongst
them

Page 43 of file.

Page 45 of file.

Please see his Proceg. d 22.7.97,
pp. 56-58 of file (Flagg A).

B.P. No: 5286 Sep. Rev. d 30.11.97
– p. 94 of file (Flagg C).

× p 42 of file

them three instances of sus-
pension. The Deputy Com-
missioner was of opinion
that the appellant had
invariably been treated le-
niently but ~~without~~ to no
effect; and holding that
his retention was highly un
desirable, ordered that his
services should be dispensed
with. On appeal the Board
of Revenue upheld the Deputy
Commissioner's order.

The grounds urged by the
petitioner for interference by
Government in his behalf
are – (i) that there were only two
black marks outstanding
against him at the time of
his removal from service; and
(ii) that in accordance with the
warning conveyed in the Dy.
Commissioner's order× d. 29.1.97
referred to above, he should
only have been reduced and
not removed from service. As
regards the first ground,
it will be seen from the
statement

statement forwarded by the Board (flagged B) that there were six black marks still against the petitioner on the date of his removal. In regard to the other ground, it is a question for consideration whether in the face of the fact noted by the Deputy Commissioner that the petitioner had invariably been treated with leniency but without any good effect, he is deserving of any further lenient treatment.

Orders are requested.

P.C. 23-1-99.

Secy

Submitted that the man had a full trial & failed.

24/1/99

Hon. 27/1/99

To Under Secy.

Please see draft order put up on the docket of Crn. 214 of 1899.

27/1

D. 1899. Rc. 30-1-99

There are no grounds for interference.

A.H. 1.2.99.

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

READ AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
189 ,

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

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

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO

PAPERS 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.

C R 4723/98

1898.

File No. 48 of 1898.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

Serial No. 3.

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE AND AGRICULTURE.

AGRICULTURE.

To

ALL LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIONS.

No. 15—48-3.

Dated Simla, the 31st October 1898.

516 Imp
4-2-99

SUBJECT.

Effect of increasing imports of refined sugar on the market for and the price of Indian sugars.

G. C. Press, Simla.—No. 790 R. & A. D.—2-11-98—890.

No. 15—48-3.

FROM

T. W. HOLDERNESS, Esq., C.S.I.,
Secretary to the Government of India.

TO

Dept. of Rev. & Agri.
Agriculture.

Simla, the 31st October 1898.

SIR,

THE Government of India are anxious to obtain information as to the effect which the increasing imports of refined sugar from Europe and from Mauritius into India have so far exercised, or are tending to exercise, on the market for and the price of Indian sugars, and thereby on the profits of sugarcane cultivation in India. Statements have been made in newspapers and periodicals that this increasing import of sugar at very low prices under the stimulus of the competition between the produce of Mauritius and the bounty-aided sugars of Europe is injuring the sugar industry of India by lessening the internal demand for and reducing the price of Indian sugars; that it will result in sugarcane being less and less grown in India, and in the impoverishment of the agriculturist in many places to the extent that the land revenue assessments and the canal revenues will be endangered.

2. The Government of India have no clear evidence before them that the increasing sugar imports have had, or are tending to, such serious consequences. The area under sugarcane in the different provinces has not declined of late years, nor in recent revenue or settlement reports have any observations regarding the unprofitableness of the industry been noticed. The extent to which the refined sugars from abroad compete in the Indian markets with the coarse sugars ordinarily manufactured by native processes, and tend to supplant the latter, is uncertain. There is probably an increasing demand for sugar in India for domestic consumption and for spirit distilling and sweetmeat making, and as the sugarcane area has not expanded of late years, it may be that the increasing imports have not been in excess of the necessary demand, and that the price of Indian sugars has, notwithstanding these imports, been maintained. Lastly, the question whether sugar prices in India have fallen in recent years is one on which it is difficult on existing materials to pronounce, owing to the many varieties of sugar sold in Indian markets, and the failure of the published price returns to clearly distinguish between them.

3. The subject, connected as it is with the sugar bounty question, appears to the Government of India to be of sufficient importance to be specially investigated and I am to ask that
inquiries may be made as to the effect of the competition of imported sugars on the cultivation of sugarcane in , on the profits of such cultivation, and on those of the sugar-industry; also as to the possibility of any falling off in the land or canal revenues in consequence of the abandonment of sugarcane cultivation. I am to ask that the results of the inquiry may be communicated to the Government of India.

4. A statement showing the imports of sugar into India during the last three years, as given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, is appended. According to the article on sugar in the Dictionary of Economic Products (Volume VI, page 346) the area under sugarcane in India is about 2,500,000 acres, and the outturn, in coarse unrefined sugar, about 2,500,000 tons. The value of this crop at Rs. 100 a ton may approximately be put at Rs. 25,00,00,000. The value of the imports of sugar in 1897-98 is returned at Rs. 4,70,87,904. The imports of sugar thus bear a considerable proportion, as regards value, to the sugar production of the country.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient Servant,

T. W. HOLDERNESS,

Secretary to the Government of India.

APPENDIX.

Imports of sugar into British India:

	QUANTITIES.			VALUE.		
	TWELVE MONTHS, 1ST APRIL TO 31ST MARCH.			TWELVE MONTHS, 1ST APRIL TO 31ST MARCH.		
	1895-96.	1896-97.	1897-98.	1895-96.	1896-97.	1897-98.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Sugar refined or crystalised :—						
From Austria-Hungary,	246	5,775	47,287	63,582	13,13,792	1,04,45,039
„ Germany ...	35,910	37,940	60,165	87,50,225	87,57,394	1,27,88,053
„ Mauritius ...	68,336	74,442	70,302	1,64,55,377	1,71,78,409	1,56,60,098
„ China ...	10,302	6,965	14,558	26,61,905	17,91,512	33,48,381
„ Java ...	5,499	4,872	7,024	13,13,980	9,92,558	17,54,857
„ Straits Settlements,	5,387	3,166	3,717	12,53,962	7,67,904	8,13,005
„ Other countries ...	564	960	8,703	1,50,324	3,17,612	22,78,471
TOTAL ...	126,244	134,120	211,756	3,06,49,355	3,11,19,181	4,70,87,904
Sugar unrefined :—						
Countries unspecified ...	10,299	8,946	18,661	4,18,776	3,99,110	7,56,864
GRAND TOTAL ...	136,543	143,066	230,417	3,10,68,131	3,15,18,291	4,78,44,768

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
DEPARTMENTAL
15 NOV 98

1898.

File No. 48 of 1898.

Serial No. 3.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE AND AGRICULTURE.

AGRICULTURE.

To

ALL LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIONS.

No. 15—48-3.

Dated Simla, the 31st October 1898.

15 - Hr. copies

SUBJECT.

Effect of increasing imports of refined sugar on the market for and the price of Indian sugars.

G. C. Press, Simla.—No. 790 R. & A. D.—2-11-98—890.

15 Hr. copies

No. 15—48-3.

FROM

T. W. HOLDERNESS, ESQ., C.S.I.,
Secretary to the Government of India.

TO

Dept. of Rev. & Agri.
Agriculture.

Simla, the 31st October 1898.

SIR,

THE Government of India are anxious to obtain information as to the effect which the increasing imports of refined sugar from Europe and from Mauritius into India have so far exercised, or are tending to exercise, on the market for and the price of Indian sugars, and thereby on the profits of sugarcane cultivation in India. Statements have been made in newspapers and periodicals that this increasing import of sugar at very low prices under the stimulus of the competition between the produce of Mauritius and the bounty-aided sugars of Europe is injuring the sugar industry of India by lessening the internal demand for and reducing the price of Indian sugars; that it will result in sugarcane being less and less grown in India, and in the impoverishment of the agriculturist in many places to the extent that the land revenue assessments and the canal revenues will be endangered.

2. The Government of India have no clear evidence before them that the increasing sugar imports have had, or are tending to, such serious consequences. The area under sugarcane in the different provinces has not declined of late years, nor in recent revenue or settlement reports have any observations regarding the unprofitableness of the industry been noticed. The extent to which the refined sugars from abroad compete in the Indian markets with the coarse sugars ordinarily manufactured by native processes, and tend to supplant the latter, is uncertain. There is probably an increasing demand for sugar in India for domestic consumption and for spirit distilling and sweetmeat making, and as the sugarcane area has not expanded of late years, it may be that the increasing imports have not been in excess of the necessary demand, and that the price of Indian sugars has, notwithstanding these imports, been maintained. Lastly, the question whether sugar prices in India have fallen in recent years is one on which it is difficult on existing materials to pronounce, owing to the many varieties of sugar sold in Indian markets, and the failure of the published price returns to clearly distinguish between them.

3. The subject, connected as it is with the sugar bounty question, appears to the Government of India to be of sufficient importance to be specially investigated and I am to ask that
inquiries may be made as to the effect of the competition of imported sugars on the cultivation of sugarcane in , on the profits of such cultivation, and on those of the sugar-industry; also as to the possibility of any falling off in the land or canal revenues in consequence of the abandonment of sugarcane cultivation. I am to ask that the results of the inquiry may be communicated to the Government of India.

4. A statement showing the imports of sugar into India during the last three years, as given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, is appended. According to the article on sugar in the Dictionary of Economic Products (Volume VI, page 346) the area under sugarcane in India is about 2,500,000 acres, and the outturn, in coarse unrefined sugar, about 2,500,000 tons. The value of this crop at Rs. 100 a ton may approximately be put at Rs. 25,00,00,000. The value of the imports of sugar in 1897-98 is returned at Rs. 4,70,87,904. The imports of sugar thus bear a considerable proportion, as regards value, to the sugar production of the country.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient Servant,

T. W. HOLDERNESS,

Secretary to the Government of India.

APPENDIX.

Imports of sugar into British India.

	QUANTITIES.			VALUE.		
	TWELVE MONTHS, 1ST APRIL TO 31ST MARCH.			TWELVE MONTHS, 1ST APRIL TO 31ST MARCH.		
	1895-96.	1896-97.	1897-98.	1895-96.	1896-97.	1897-98.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Sugar refined or crystalised :—						
From Austria-Hungary,	246	5,775	47,287	63,582	13,13,792	1,04,45,039
„ Germany ...	35,910	37,940	60,165	87,50,225	87,57,394	1,27,88,053
„ Mauritius ...	68,336	74,442	70,302	1,64,55,377	1,71,78,409	1,56,60,098
„ China ...	10,302	6,965	14,558	26,61,905	17,91,512	33,48,381
„ Java ...	5,499	4,872	7,024	13,13,980	9,92,538	17,54,857
„ Straits Settlements,	5,387	3,166	3,717	12,53,962	7,67,904	8,13,005
„ Other countries ...	564	960	8,703	1,50,324	3,17,612	22,78,471
TOTAL ...	126,244	134,120	211,756	3,06,49,355	3,11,19,181	4,70,87,904
Sugar unrefined :—						
Countries unspecified ...	10,299	8,946	18,661	4,18,776	3,99,110	7,56,864
GRAND TOTAL ...	136,543	143,066	230,417	3,10,68,131	3,15,18,291	4,78,44,768

7723

1898.

File No. 48 of 1898.

Serial No. 3.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE AND AGRICULTURE.

AGRICULTURE.

To

ALL LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIONS.

No. 15—48-3.

Dated Simla, the 31st October 1898.

SUBJECT.

Effect of increasing imports of refined sugar on the market for and the price of Indian sugars.

G. C. Press, Simla.—No. 790 R. & A. D.—2-11-98—890.

No. 15—48-3.

FROM

T. W. HOLDERNESS, ESQ., C.S.I.,
Secretary to the Government of India.

TO

Dept. of Rev. & Agri.
Agriculture.

Simla, the 31st October 1898.

SIR,

THE Government of India are anxious to obtain information as to the effect which the increasing imports of refined sugar from Europe and from Mauritius into India have so far exercised, or are tending to exercise, on the market for and the price of Indian sugars, and thereby on the profits of sugarcane cultivation in India. Statements have been made in newspapers and periodicals that this increasing import of sugar at very low prices under the stimulus of the competition between the produce of Mauritius and the bounty-aided sugars of Europe is injuring the sugar industry of India by lessening the internal demand for and reducing the price of Indian sugars; that it will result in sugarcane being less and less grown in India, and in the impoverishment of the agriculturist in many places to the extent that the land revenue assessments and the canal revenues will be endangered.

2. The Government of India have no clear evidence before them that the increasing sugar imports have had, or are tending to, such serious consequences. The area under sugarcane in the different provinces has not declined of late years, nor in recent revenue or settlement reports have any observations regarding the unprofitableness of the industry been noticed. The extent to which the refined sugars from abroad compete in the Indian markets with the coarse sugars ordinarily manufactured by native processes, and tend to supplant the latter, is uncertain. There is probably an increasing demand for sugar in India for domestic consumption and for spirit distilling and sweetmeat making, and as the sugarcane area has not expanded of late years, it may be that the increasing imports have not been in excess of the necessary demand, and that the price of Indian sugars has, notwithstanding these imports, been maintained. Lastly, the question whether sugar prices in India have fallen in recent years is one on which it is difficult on existing materials to pronounce, owing to the many varieties of sugar sold in Indian markets, and the failure of the published price returns to clearly distinguish between them.

3. The subject, connected as it is with the sugar bounty question, appears to the Government of India to be of sufficient importance to be specially investigated and I am to ask that
inquiries may be made as to the effect of the competition of imported sugars on the cultivation of sugarcane in , on the profits of such cultivation, and on those of the sugar-industry; also as to the possibility of any falling off in the land or canal revenues in consequence of the abandonment of sugarcane cultivation. I am to ask that the results of the inquiry may be communicated to the Government of India.

4. A statement showing the imports of sugar into India during the last three years, as given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, is appended. According to the article on sugar in the Dictionary of Economic Products (Volume VI, page 346) the area under sugarcane in India is about 2,500,000 acres, and the outturn, in coarse unrefined sugar, about 2,500,000 tons. The value of this crop at Rs. 100 a ton may approximately be put at Rs. 25,00,00,000. The value of the imports of sugar in 1897-98 is returned at Rs. 4,70,87,904. The imports of sugar thus bear a considerable proportion, as regards value, to the sugar production of the country.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient Servant,

T. W. HOLDERNESS,

Secretary to the Government of India.

APPENDIX.

Imports of sugar into British India.

	QUANTITIES.			VALUE.		
	TWELVE MONTHS, 1ST APRIL TO 31ST MARCH.			TWELVE MONTHS, 1ST APRIL TO 31ST MARCH.		
	1895-96.	1896-97.	1897-98.	1895-96.	1896-97.	1897-98.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Sugar refined or crystalised :—						
From Austria-Hungary,	246	5,775	47,287	63,582	13,13,792	1,04,45,039
„ Germany ...	35,910	37,940	60,165	87,50,225	87,57,394	1,27,88,053
„ Mauritius ...	68,336	74,442	70,302	1,64,55,377	1,71,78,409	1,56,60,098
„ China ...	10,302	6,965	14,558	26,61,905	17,91,512	33,48,381
„ Java ...	5,499	4,872	7,024	13,13,986	9,92,558	17,54,857
„ Straits Settlements,	5,387	3,166	3,717	12,53,962	7,67,904	8,13,005
„ Other countries ...	564	960	8,703	1,50,324	3,17,612	22,78,471
TOTAL ...	126,244	134,120	211,756	3,06,49,355	3,11,19,181	4,70,87,904
Sugar unrefined :—						
Countries unspecified ...	10,299	8,946	18,661	4,18,776	3,99,110	7,56,864
GRAND TOTAL ...	136,543	143,066	230,417	3,10,68,131	3,15,18,291	4,78,44,768