M.R.O. 1—32,400—22-11-30.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Marine DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 393-5 Press ~~Mis.~~

Dated 24th Sept 1857

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 14. From J. J. FRANKLIN, Esq., Secretary Marine Board; to E. MALTBY, Esq. Acting Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 28th July 1857, No. 2555.

SIR,

I have the honor by desire of the Marine Board, to acknowledge receipt of Extract Minutes of Consultation of the 18th Instant, No. 281, forwarding a letter from the Clerk of the Legislative Council of India of the 29th June last, No. 91, covering a Minute from the Honorable Mr. Currie, who took charge of, and introduced the proposed Bill for the levy of Port dues and fees at Ports within this Presidency; and to offer the following remarks on the objections taken to the Bill.

2. The first objection is that it provides an uniform maximum rate for the levy of Dues at those Ports to be subjected to the Act, while no data are furnished to shew what rates may actually be necessary at each Port. It is to be regretted that Mr. Currie was not in possesion of all the papers submitted by this to the Supreme Government on the subject, for to that circumstance alone can the Board attribute the Statement that no data regarding the expenses of the Ports had been furnished. The Board's letters marginally noted supplied full particulars for each of the 15 Ports to which they recommend the Act should be extended. Therein were recorded their limits, with the annual amount of collections and expenses for the last 3 years, and the number and Tonnage of Vessels inwards and outwards.

No. 404, 31*st January* 1857
„ 744, 18*th February do.*
„ 1093, 13*th March do.*
„ 1270, 23*rd do. do.*
„ 1340, 30*th do. do.*
„ 1539, 20*th April do.*
„ 1569, 22*nd do. do.*
„ 1597, 24*th do. do.*
„ 1707, 4*th May do.*

3. The necessary data are therefore before the Supreme Government, and although a maximum rate of (4) four annas a ton was to be imposed by the Act objected to, the Statement for each Port mentions that the Due now levied is one anna a Ton on square rigged Vessels, and six pice on Donies, and that no present increase was contemplated. Improvements in many of these Ports may hereafter take place and expenditure be thereby incurred, to meet which it may be necessary to raise the Due in accordance with the authority vested in the Local Government under Section 42 from one anna to any amount not exceeding the maximum sought to be established.

4. With this explanation the Board doubt not that the Legislative Council will be prepared to pass a Bill of similar purport to that thrown out, so far as it relates to Ports to be at once brought under the provisions of the Act.

5. With regard to the second objection, that the Bill proposes to continue the levy of Dues at a number of small Ports to which it is not intended to extend the provisions of the Act, the Board, without re-submitting their views for consideration, will only explain that in many of the minor Ports mentioned in Schedule B. small outlays are occasionally incurred, and although the amount of Dues at none of them would at present be sufficient to cover the expense of working the Act properly and efficiently, they would enable the Board to bring under favorable notice occasional improvements which might be effected with the Funds so raised. The measure recommended imposed no new Tax on the Shipping, and as the whole aim of the Enactment was the improvement of the Ports, the affording facilities to the Shipping resorting to them, and the expenditure of the Marine Revenue with these views, the Board imagined that the continuation of the Due would have been an advantage to the Public rather than otherwise.

6. Referring now to the order of Government on Mr. Currie's Minute, the Board observe that the data referred to by that gentleman have already been supplied, and that they are prepared to furnish the Honorable Company's Solicitor with such information as he may require.

(Signed) J. J. FRANKLIN,
Secretary.

No. 15. From W. MORGAN, Esq., Clerk of the Legislative Council; to E. MALTBY, Esq., Acting Chief Secretary to the Government of Fort Saint George, dated Fort William, the 30th July 1857, No. 116.

SIR,

With reference to your letter, No. 282, dated the 18th Instant, I have the honor to forward, for the information of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, a copy of the Bill "to au-

thorize the levy of Port Dues and Fees at the present rates for a further period of six months" as passed in Council on the 25th Idem.

The Bill, as originally introduced, proposed to allow a further period of twelve months during which Port Dues and Fees may be levied at existing rates. But the further period has since been restricted to six months in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Committee on the Bill, a copy of whose Report also accompanies.

From this Report, the Right Honorable the Governor in Council will perceive the necessity of expediting the transmission of the information called for in my letter to the address of the Officiating Secretary to the Government of India in the Home Department, No. 196, dated the 3rd December 1855.

(Signed) W. MORGAN,
Clerk of the Council.

To the Honorable the LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, dated 25th July 1857.

We the Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill "to authorize the levy of Port Dues and Fees at the present rates for a further period of twelve months," have the honor to make the following Report.

We have thought it advisable to restrict the further period during which Dues and Fees may be levied at existing rates to six months.

We observe that when this Bill comes into operation two years will have elapsed since the passing of the Harbour Act; and we think that that period was much more than sufficient for supplying the requisite information and preparing and passing the supplemental Acts, which, under the provisions of the Harbour Act, are necessary for each Port at which Dues are levied.

We are strongly of opinion that no further extension of the period, beyond the time which we propose to fix by this Bill, should be allowed.

(Signed) E. CURRIE,
(„) J. P. GRANT,
(„) P. W. LeGEYT.

(True Copy.)
W. MORGAN,
Clerk of the Council.

No. 16. ORDER THEREON, No. 393; dated 24th September 1857.

In Extract Minutes Consultation, No. 281, dated 18th July last, Government passed orders on a letter* from the Clerk of the Legislative Council, enclosing a Minute by the Member for Bengal on the subject of the Bill "for the Levy of Port-dues and Fees at Ports "within the Presidency of Fort Saint George, and to provide against the discharge of Ballast in "certain Ports within the same Presidency," which was transmitted to the Council with the letter of this Government, dated 6th May, No. 181.

* *Dated 29th June* 1857, *No.* 91.

2. The Bill referred to was submitted to Government by the H. C. Solicitor with his letter, No. 217 on the 29th April preceding. It provided for the Levy of Port-dues and Fees, *first*, in certain principal Ports, Fifteen in number, enumerated in Schedule A, and which it was proposed at once to bring under the Harbour Act, (Act XXII of 1855); *Secondly*, in certain, to wit forty other Ports, which were specified in Schedule B, and at all of which it was proposed that the subsisting Dues and Fees should continue to be collected until such Ports respectively shall be made subject to the said Harbour Act; and it provided, *thirdly*, against the improper discharge of Ballast in any of the Ports mentioned in the said Schedule B, or any other Ports not mentioned in either Schedule, which shall at any time hereafter be subject to the provisions contained in certain Sections (8 to 21 inclusive) of the Bill.

3. On this reaching the Council, it was objected,

First, that, while, in the case of those Ports (the Fifteen in Schedule A.) to which the Harbour Act is to be extended, an uniform maximum rate for the Levy of Port dues is provided, no *data* are furnished with the Bill to show what rates are actually necessary.

Secondly, that, while the Bill proposes to continue the Levy of dues (rates not specified) at the forty small Ports, named in Schedule B, to which it is *not* proposed to extend the Harbour Act, the deliberate feeling of the Council is, that, where there is no Harbour Act, there should be no Port dues, though there would be no objection to apply by a separate enactment to such Ports certain Clauses of the Harbour Act, *quoad* the prevention of injury to the anchorage, &c.

And the Honorable Member in charge of the Bill, E. Currie, Esq., concluded his Minute by advising that, for the present Bill, two separate Bills be introduced: *one*, to apply to smaller Ports in the manner suggested; *the other*, fixing rates of Dues for the fifteen Ports to be subjected to the Harbour Act, for the preparation of which the information referred to "in the Chief Secretary's letter to Mr. Eliott, of the 26th March," is absolutely necessary. "When furnished with the requisite "information, I shall be happy" the Honorable Member adds "if the Madras Government desire it, "to prepare and bring in the Bills." Meanwhile the Government learn from the letter of the Clerk to the Council above recorded that an Act has been passed authorising the collection of Port dues at existing rates for six months longer, that is, to the 13th February 1858; and the Select Committee on the Bill were "strongly of opinion that no further extension of the period should be allowed."

Vide Extract Minutes Consultation referred to at Para: 1 *above.*

4. The Marine Board having been requested to expedite the transmission of the *data* referred to by the Honorable Mr. Currie, now state in reply that they have no further information to give beyond what is contained in the various Schedules they have from time to time submitted to Government. These Schedules, the Government remark, were forwarded in original to the Government of India in a letter, No. 139, dated the 8th of April last.

They referred to the (15) Fifteen Ports marginally noted, the same that are specified in Schedule A, of Mr. Boyson's Bill, "and which alone" it was intimated "this Government would for the present wish to have de- "clared subject to the provisions of Act XXII of 1855" or the Harbour Act. As Mr. Currie has complained, not that the *data* are insufficient, but that there are no *data* before the Council at all, it seems probable that the Schedules above mentioned, from some oversight, have not been laid on the table. The Government will enquire of the Clerk whether this surmise is correct; and if it is not, request him to procure from the Honorable Member, as early as practicable, a Statement of the points in regard to which the information supplied falls short of the details required.

Vizagapatam.
Bimlipatam.
Cuddalore.
Tuticorin.
Cochin.
Calicut.
Tellicherry.
Cannanore.
Cocanada with Coringa.
Masulipatam.
Paumben.
Negapatam
Tranquebar.
Mangalore, and Madras.

5. Adverting to the principle stated by Mr. Currie to have been adopted by the Council, *viz.*, that the levy of Port dues should not be authorized at places to which the Harbour Act is not extended, the Government, while they concur with the Board in regretting the measure, will take no steps towards applying the Act, at present, to any other Ports but the fifteen principal ones. They observe from the Enclosure to the Board's letter, dated 4th March last, that, out of an annual total* of Port dues amounting to Rs. 57,264-2-8, the sum collected at the above fifteen Ports alone came to Rupees 47,799-13-0; leaving as Collections at the forty remaining Ports of this Presidency where dues are leviable, the sum of Rupees 8,464-15-8, or an average for each of these lesser Ports of Rupees 200 only, a sum altogether insufficient to work the Machinery of so comprehensive an Enactment, though available as a small Fund for Local improvements.

Vide Extract Minutes Consultation, dated 11th March 1857.

**Exclusive of Pilotage dues*	*Rs.*
Paumben Channel	8,792-6-6.
Paumben and Keelacurry	541-13-6.

Vide Board's letter, dated 12th March 1856, *No.* 718.

6. It is necessary however that these forty subordinate Ports, as well as others still minor ones, should not be allowed to deteriorate, nor the Anchorage they afford be ruined. This much the Council are ready to provide against by extending to such Ports such Sections of Act XXII of 1855 as may be required for the purpose, and Mr. Currie has expressed his readiness to prepare and bring in the Bill. The Board therefore will furnish Government, for transmission to the Honorable Member, with a List of such other Ports, beside the forty specified in Schedule B. of Mr. Boyson's Bill, as it may be desirable to include in the proposed Act.

7. So much of Para: 3, in Extract Minutes of Consultation, No. 281, dated 18th July last, as directed the H. C. Solicitor, to draw up the two fresh Bills suggested by Mr. Currie, in his Minute, is cancelled. The Government overlooked the concluding sentence of the Honorable Member's remarks, offering to prepare and bring in the Bills, himself.

No. 17. To the Clerk of the Legislative Council of India, Calcutta, dated Fort Saint George, 24th September 1857, No. 394.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter, dated 29th June last, No. 91, Minute by the Legislative Member for Bengal, enclosed therein, and my answer under date 18th July, No. 282, I am directed to inform you that the Marine Board, to whom the Honorable Mr. Currie's Minute was communicated, state they are unable to supply any *data* regarding the Ports which it was proposed in the Bill, marginally noted, to bring under the Provisions of the Harbour Act, beyond those contained in the Schedules, they have already submitted. These Schedules, I am to acquaint you, were forwarded in original to the Government of India with the letter of my Predecessor, No. 139, dated the 8th April last, and, as Mr. Currie's complaint is, not that the *data* given are insufficient, but that there are no *data* before the Council at all, it is surmised that, from some oversight, the Schedules referred to have not yet been laid on the table. If the contrary is the fact, then the Governor in Council would request that he may be informed in what particular points, the Statements are considered defective, in order that fresh Schedules may be at once drawn up for transmission to the Honorable Member, whose obliging offer to prepare and bring in the two Bills suggested in his Minute, when I last addressed you, escaped attention.

Bill "from the levy of Port Dues and Fees at "Ports within the Presidency of Fort Saint "George, and to provide against the discharge "of Ballast in certain Ports within the said "Presidency."

2. Copy of the reply of the Marine Board, above referred to, is herewith furnished. I am directed to invite Mr. Currie's attention to Para: 5, and to state that, while the Government concur with the Board, that the Harbour Act could only be worked, even if competent officials could be found, at an expense to the State and, it may be added, without adequate benefit, at the minor Ports specified in Schedule B. of the Bill, they still think the Collection of the existing Dues should not be declared illegal. The sums levied are in no case large, the average being Rupees 200 per annum, and might be allowed to go towards the formation of a Fund for Local improvements.

3. At all events it is necessary they should not be allowed to deteriorate and safe Anchorage should be secured. There would be no objection, Mr. Currie has stated, to provide by a separate Enactment for this. The Government would wish the whole of the Ports specified in Schedule B. to be included in such a Bill, and they have called on the Marine Board to supply a List of any others they may wish to name. A Clause might be added, authorizing the Government to bring under the Act other places which, in the course of a rapidly increasing Coast Trade, may become more frequented by Shipping.

(Signed) E. MALTBY,
Acting Chief Secretary.

No. 18. From E. MALTBY, Esq., Acting Chief Secretary to Government Fort Saint George; to the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, dated the 24th September 1857, No. 395.

Sir,

In Mr. Pycroft's letter, No. 182, dated 6th May last, the Government of India were informed of the transmission to the Legislative Council of a Bill "for the levy of Port Dues and Fees" at Ports within this Presidency.

2. There are fifty-five Ports at Madras, where Port Dues are levied, and in the Bill submitted these were arranged in two Schedules, *viz.*

A. containing (15) fifteen Ports, the principal ones, to which it was proposed to apply the Harbour Act, No. XXII of 1855.

B. containing the remaining forty, the Dues levied at which the Bill proposed should still be levied, pending the gradual extension of the said Act to such Ports respectively.

3. The Honorable Member for Bengal, in a Minute without date, forwarded by the Clerk on the 29th June last, has informed this Government that it is considered by the Council "that "Dues should only be levied at such Ports as may be subjected to the operation of the (Harbour) "Act." The Governor in Council has received this intimation with regret. When it is stated that the total Collections at the fifteen Ports of Schedule *A*, amount to six times the total collected in the forty Ports of Schedule *B*, and that the average sum levied in the latter class is Rupees 200 a year only, it will be readily allowed that the Act could only be worked in these minor Ports at a considerable expense to the State, nor would there be any adequate benefit to the public.

4. These circumstances have now been represented to the Legislative Council, and it is hoped that the existing levy may be permitted on the understanding that the proceeds shall be devoted to the formation of a Fund for the improvement of the Ports respectively.

(Signed) E. MALTBY,
Acting Chief Secretary.

Exd. J. A. Wilson.

2 XXII of 1855); secondly, in certain

Port dues & fees

Marine Dept

No 393

E M C under date 24th Sept/57

Read the following letter from the Secy to the Marine Bd } Here enter No 2555 D/28th July/57.

Read also letter from the Clerk of the Legislative Council. } Here enter No 116 D/30th July/57.

In E. M. C. No 281 D/18th July last, Govt passed orders on a letter from the Clerk of the Legislative Council, enclosing a Minute by the Member for Bengal on the subject of the Bill "for the levy of Port dues "& fees at Ports within the Presidency "of Fort St George, and to provide "against the discharge of Ballast "in certain Ports within the same "Presidency", which was transmitted to the Council with the letter of his Govt dated 6th May, No 181.

+ D/29th June/57 No 91.

2. The Bill referred to was submitted to Govt by the H. C. Solicitor with his letter No 217 on the 29th April preceding. It provided for the levy of Port dues and fees, first, in certain principal ports, fifteen in number, enumerated in Schedule A and which it was proposed at once to bring under the Harbour Act (Act XXII of 1855); secondly, in certain,

to suit for the other ports, which were specified in Schedule B, and at all of which it was proposed that the subsisting dues & fees shd continue to be collected until such ports respectively shall be made subject to the said Harbour act; and it provided, kindly, against the improper discharge of Ballast in any of the ports mentioned in the said Schedule B, or any other ports not mentioned in either Schedule, which shall at any time hereafter be subject to the provisions contained in certain Sections (8 to 21 inclusive) of the Bill.

3. On this reaching the Council, it was objected,

First, that, while, in the case of those ports (the fifteen in Schedule A) to which the Harbour Act is to be extended, an uniform maximum rate for the levy of Port dues is provided, no data are furnished with the Bill to show what rates are actually necessary.

Secondly, that, while the Bill proposes to continue the levy of dues (rates not specified) at the forty small ports, named in Schedule B, to which it is not proposed to extend the Harbour Act, the deliberate feeling of the Council is, that, where there is no Harbour Act there should be no Port dues, though there would be no objection to apply by a separate enactment to such ports certain clauses of the Harbour Act, quoad the prevention of injury to the anchorage &c.

And the humble Member in charge of the Bill, E. Currie Esq., concluded his minute by advising that, for the present Bill, two separate Bills be introduced: one, to apply to smaller ports in the manner suggested; the other, fixing rates of dues for the fifteen ports to be subjected to the Harbour Act, for the preparation of which the information referred to "in the Chief Secy's letter to "Mr. Elliott of the 26th March" is absolutely necessary. "When "furnished with the requisite in-"-formation, I shall be happy" the humble Member adds "if the Ma-"-dras Govt desire it, to prepare & "bring in the Bills." Meanwhile the Govt learn from the letter of their Clerk to the Council above refer-

-ded that an Act has been passed authorising the collection of Port dues at existing rates for six months longer - that is - to the 13th February 1858; and the Select Committee on the Bill were "strongly of opinion "that no further extension of "the period should be allowed."

vide E. M. C. referred to at Para I above.

4. The Marine Bd. having been requested to expedite the transmission of the data referred to by the Hon'ble Mr Currie, now state in reply that they have no further information to give beyond what is contained in the various schedules they have from time to time submitted to Govt. - These Schedules, the Govt. remark, were forwarded in original to the Govt. of India in a letter No 139, dated the 8th of April last. They referred to the (15.) fifteen ports marginally noted, the same that are specified in Schedule A of Mr Boyson's Bill, "and which alone" it was intimated "His Govt. would "for the present wish to have declared "subject to the provisions of Act "XXII of 1855" or the Harbour Act. As Mr Currie has complained, not that the data are insufficient but, that there are no data before the

Vizagapatam
Bimlipatam
Cuddalore
Tuticorin
Cochin
Calicut
Tellicherry.
Cannanore.
Cocanada with Coringa
Masulipatam.
Paumbem.
Negapatam.
Tranquebar
Mangalore, and
Madras.

Council at all, it seems probable that the schedules above mentioned, from some oversight, have not been laid on the table - The Govt. will enquire of the Clerk whether his surmise is correct; and if it is not, request him to procure from the Hon'ble Member, as early as practicable, a statement of the points in regard to which the information supplied falls short of the details required.

5. Adverting to the principle stated by Mr Currie to have been adopted by the Council, viz, that the levy of Port dues shd. not be authorized at places to which the Harbour Act is not extended, the Govt., while they concur with the Bd. in regretting the measure, will take no steps towards applying the Act, at present, to any other ports but the fifteen principal ones. They observe from the enclosure to the Bd's letter dated 4th March last, that, out of an annual total of Port dues amounting to Rs 57,264 " 2 " 8, the sum collected at the above fifteen ports alone came to Rs 47,799 " 13 " 0; leaving as collections at the forty remaining

vide
E. M. C.
D/11th March/57.

exclusive of
lotage dues

	Rs
Paumbem Channel	8792-6-6
...mbem & Keelacurry	541-13-6

...le Bd's letter D/12th March/56
NB 718

ports of his Presidency where dues are leviable, the sum of Rs 8464 " 15 " 8, or an average for each of these lesser ports of Rs 200 only, a sum altogether insufficient to work the machinery of so comprehensive an enactment, though available as a small fund for local improvements.

6. It is necessary however that these forty subordinate ports, as well as others still minor ones, should not be allowed to deteriorate, nor the anchorage they afford be ruined. This much the Council are ready to provide against by extending to such ports such sections of Act XXII of 1855 as may be required for the purpose, and Mr Currie has expressed his readiness to prepare & bring in the Bill. The Bd therefore will furnish Govt, for transmission to the Hon'ble Member, with a list of such other ports, beside the forty specified in Schedule B of Mr Boyson's Bill, as it may be desirable to include in the proposed Act.

7. So much of Para 3 in E. M. G

4

No 281. D/ 18th July last as directed the H. C. Solicitor to draw up the two fresh Bills suggested by Mr Currie in his Minute, is cancelled. The Govt overlooked the concluding sentence of the Hon'ble Member's remarks, offering to prepare & bring in the Bills, himself.

To the Marine Board
" H. C. Solicitor } Dispd 2d

D E C
11-9-57.

(T. E.)
A C S

Ordered that the following letters be despatched.

No 394

Dispd 5th Oct

To the Clerk
of the Legislative Council
of India
Calcutta.

Sir

Adverting to yr letter D/ 29th June last No 91, the Minute by the Legislative Member for Bengal enclosed herein, and my answer under date 18th July No 282, I am directed to inform you that the Marine Bd, to whom the Hon'ble Mr Currie's minute was communicated, state they are unable to supply any data regarding the ports which it was proposed in the Bill marginally noted to bring under the provisions of the Harbour Act, beyond those

Bill "for the levy of Port dues"
"& fees at ports within the Presi-"
"dency of Fort St George, & to pro-"
"vide agt the discharge of Ballast"
"within certain ports within the said Presidency"

contained in the Schedules they have already submitted. These Schedules, I am to acquaint you, were forwarded in original to the Govt. of India with the letter of my predecessor, No 139, of the 8th April last, and, as Mr. Currie's complaint is, not that the data given are insufficient, but that there are no data before the Council at all, it is surmised that, from some oversight, the Schedules referred to have not yet been laid on the table. If the contrary is the fact, then the G. in C. would request that he may be informed in what particular points the statements are considered defective, in order that fresh Schedules may be at once drawn up for transmission to the Hon'ble Member, whose obliging offer to prepare & bring in the two Bills suggested in his minute, had when I last addressed you, escaped attention.

2. Copy of the reply of the Marine Bd. above referred to is herewith furnished. I am directed to invite Mr. Currie's attention to Para 5, and to state that, while the Govt. concur with the Board that the Harbour Act could only be worked, even if competent officials could be found, at an expense to the State and, it may be added, without adequate benefit, at the minor ports specified in Schedule B of the Bill — they still think the collection of the existing dues should not be declared illegal. The sums levied are in no case large — the average being Rs. 200 per annum — and might be allowed to go towards the formation of a fund for local improvements.

3. At all events it is necessary they shd. not be allowed to deteriorate and safe anchorage shd. be secured. There wd. be no objection, Mr. Currie has stated, to provide by a separate enactment for this. The Govt. would wish the whole of the Ports specified in Schedule B to be included in such a Bill, and they have called on the Marine Bd. to supply a list of any others they may wish to name. A clause might be added, authorizing the Govt. to bring under the act other places which, in the course of a rapidly increasing Coast Trade, may become more frequented by shipping. I have &c

Fort St. George,
24th September, 1857.

T. O.

D.A.C. 11-9-57.

Dispd. 5th Oct.

No. 395.

To the Secy. to the Govt. of India.
Home Dept.

Marine Dept.

Sir.

In Mr. Pycroft's letter No 182 Dy 6th May last, the Govt. of India were informed of the transmission to the Legislative Council of a Bill "for the levy of "Port dues & fees" at Ports within this Presidency.

2. There are fifty five ports at Madras, where port dues are levied, and in the Bill submitted these were arranged in two Schedules. viz.

A. containing (15) fifteen Ports, the principal ones, to which it was proposed to apply the Harbour Act. No XXII of 1855.

B. containing the remaining forty, the dues levied at which the Bill proposed should still be levied, pending the gradual extension of the said Act to such Ports respectively.

3. The Hon'ble Member for Bengal, in a Minute without date, forwarded by the Clerk on the 29th June last, has informed this Govt. that it is considered by the Council "that dues shd. "only be levied at such ports as may "be subjected to the operation of the "(Harbour) Act." The [illegible]

received this intimation with ~~much~~ regret. When it is stated that the total collections at the fifteen Ports of Schedule A amount to six times the total collected in the forty Ports of Schedule B, and that the average sum levied in the latter class is Rs 200 a year only, it will be readily allowed that the Act could only be worked in these minor ports at a considerable expense to the State, nor would there be any adequate benefit to the public.

4. These circumstances have now been represented to the Legislative Council, and it is hoped that the existing levy may be permitted on the understanding that the proceeds shall be devoted to the formation of a fund for the improvement of the ports respectively. I have &c.

12 Copies

Fort St. George
24th September, 1857.

D. F. G. 11-9-57.

17-1-12

20/2 [illegible]

14 — 18

C 12 Sep
R 22 "

Intr. to Cons. 29 September

Marine 2857 Depart.

No. 393

Extract Mins: of Cons.

No. 394

To The Clerk of the Legislative Council of India.

No. 395

To The Secy: to the Govt. of India

24 Sept. 57.

Replied from the Secy Govt. of India d/ 19th April 59 No. 179

Further from Marine Board d/ 7th October 57 No. 438