

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Marine DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	389	Press Mis.
Dated	2. 11.	1860.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

14. 1. 32

15

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Marine Department;
2nd November 1860.*

No. 8. Read the following letter from J. J. FRANKLIN, Esq., Superintendent of Marine, to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated 24th October 1860, No. 4,561.

No. 360, dated 16th October 1860. I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of the Proceedings of Government, marginally noted, forwarding draft Bill for the levy of Port Dues at Calingapatam and Munsoorcottah, for such observations as I might wish to offer.

2. The Bill seems to provide for all that is necessary, but I do not see any reason why Section 4 should be introduced. It exempts a vessel from the due if driven by distress into one of the Ports after having left the other. Act II of 1858, from which it has been taken, constitutes all the Balasore Ports as one Port, and the due (6 Annas per 100 Indian maunds of tonnage) paid at one exempts a vessel from the charge at the other. Calingapatam and Munsoorcottah are, however, perfectly distinct, and the funds will be kept separate. I think therefore that this Section should be omitted.

3. I would moreover suggest that the Act should come in force from the 1st January next, in lieu of the 1st March. No Port Dues are now levied and consequently there are no funds for improvements.

No. 9. ORDER THEREON, 2nd November 1860, No. 389.

The Government resolve to forward copy of this letter to the Member for Madras. They concur in the remarks of the Superintendent of Marine on Section IV of the Bill. There is no such provision in Act VII, 1858, or the Act by which the levy of Port Dues at the other Madras Ports, is regulated.

2. The Government are not aware whether the Bill can be passed in such time as to admit of its being brought into operation on the 1st January, but they will inform Mr. Forbes, that for the reason given by Mr. Franklin, it is desirable that early effect should be given to it.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

No. 10. To the Member for Madras of the Legislative Council of India, dated Fort Saint George, 2nd November 1860, No. 390.

Referring to the Bill for the levy of Port Dues at Calingapatam and Munsoorcottah, I am directed to forward to you copy of a letter, 24th ultimo, No. 4,561, from the Superintendent of Marine, and to state that the Government concur in his remarks on Section IV of the Bill. You will observe that there is no such provision in Act VII, 1858, or the Act by which the levy of Port Dues at the other Madras Ports is regulated.

2. The Government are not aware whether the Bill can be passed in such time as to admit of its being brought into operation on the 1st January, but for the reason given by Mr. Franklin, it is desirable that early effect should be given to it.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. F. Cartledge.

effect

N^o 389 - 2^d November 1860 -

The Govt. resolve to forward
copy of this letter to the
Member for Madras, & they
concur in the remarks of
the Superintendent of Ma-
rine on Section IV of the Bill.
There is no such provision in
Act VII, 1858, or the Act by
which the levy of Port dues at
the other Madras Ports, is
regulated.

2. The Govt. are not aware
whether the Bill can be
passed in such time as to
admit of its being brought
into operation on the 1st Jan-
uary - but for the reason
given by Mr. Franklin, it is
desirable that early effect should
be given to it.

The Suptt. of Marine. *W. M.*

given in Act VII. 1858 or the
Act by which the levy of port
dues at the other Madras Ports
is regulated.

2. The Government are
not aware whether the bill
can be passed in such time
as to admit of its being brought
into operation on the 1st
January - but for the reason
given by Mr. Franklin
it is desirable that early
effect

Marine Dept.

No. 390.

To
The Member for Madras of the
Legislative Council of India.

Sir,

Referring to the Bill for the
levy of port dues at Calcutta,
Bombay and Munsoorcottah, I am
directed to forward to you copy of
a letter, 24th ^{Sept} 1858, from
the Superintendent of Marine,
and to state that the Govt concur
in his remarks on Section IV
of the Bill. You will observe
that there is no such provi-
sion in Act VII. 1858 or the
Act by which the levy of port
dues at the other Madras Ports
is regulated. —

2. The Government are
not aware whether the bill
can be passed in such time
as to admit of its being brought
into operation on the 1st
January - but for the reason
given by Mr. Franklin
it is desirable that early
effect

effect should be given to it.

Fort George?
2^d November 1860

I have the



will be
followed

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

(5)
 Levy of Post dues at Cuba
 - superannuation of Henderson collector

10. November 1860

Marine 1860 Dep't of the

42.390.

To the Member for Hudson
 of the Legislative Coun-
 cil of India at Simla 1860.

Received of 11th Feb 1861
 1861 Rs. 57.

8010.

C24 Oct
 B1 Nov