

~~48~~
Audit report of the Revenue
and Portage Accounts of the
Harbour Trust Board for 1894-95

6-10-24 ✓

Dec. 197. 11. 1. 96

Marine (1896) Department.

G.O., No. 22 Mar

DATED 16/1/96

[Despatch Abstract.]

Mr J. H. Baker, Port Office, Inticoni,
does declining to sanction any
increase to the pay and allowance
drawn by—

H.E. 11/1. R 14/1.

Issued
16/1/96

5-10-24 ✓

Mar: 197. 4.1.96

(Marine)

Petition from Mr. T. H. Baker, Port Officer, Tuticorin, dated 15th Octr. 1895

Letter from the Presidency Port Officer, No. 1740/337G.d/13th Decr. 1895.

Mr. Baker will be informed that the Government is not prepared to sanction any increase to the pay and allowances drawn by him.

14/1/56

CHMS
11/9/6

(40-4,000-2-11-95.)

C.S.

5-10-24

Mar: 197. U. I. 96

Ch 1005

RK.

The statement referred to by DW is not in the file?

RS

19 Dec 95

There is a statement of the kind with C.O. 330 Marine, of 10 Sep 92.

Perhaps the P.P.O. pointed out that he had already submitted such a statement?

RS

Capt. The statement called in Marine 821324 of 2-8-93 was submitted by the P.P.O. and disposed of by h46 Marine 14-11-94. This paper, with a big file, is now on W's table with Marine C No 987/95.

It was transferred to the Marine Dept with No 3930C of 11-12-95. (linked)

JP

20-12-95

DW

Please see the above, the statement is said to be with W.

W.

Do not let me hear that with this statement. I should be obliged for this statement. after the W's days will do.

RS

20 Dec 95

P. J. O

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

2 Marine of 16 January 18

No 22 Marine of 16 January 1896

W 17/1

Can

G. O. 80 h46 Marine
dated 14-11-94 with
Statement, now found
and put up - D.P.
6-1-96 -

SW

Submitted.

N.P.

7 Jan 96.

5-10-24

Mar: 197. 11-1-96

CAV.

At 23 93 H.E. is a copy of the
petition called for a comparative
Statement of the pay of
Pat Officers in different parts of
India and expressed an
opinion that if some ^{one}
ever paid the same then
might be reason for a
valid grievance. As far
as I can see from this
correspondence the statement
called for was not
prepared though the
Presidency Pat Officer
was called on to ~~submit~~.

Was any statement
submitted? If so I
should like to see it.
Such a statement should
include pay & allowances
of every kind, as well
as bonus of the
respective parts as
ordered by H.E.

clerk
19/1/96

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

2 Marine of 16 January

Dec: 197. 11-1-96

5-10-24

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

No 22 Marine of 16 January 1896

Read the following:—

Letter from the Presidency Port Officer, No. 1740/337G d/13 Decr. 1895

FOR ORDERS.

Mr. Baker submitted a similar petition before, and it was rejected—vide G.O. 301, Marine, dated 21st August 1893. The claims of other Port Officers to increased pay and other advantages were also fully considered prior to this, as will be seen on reference to G.O. 330, Marine, dated 10th September 1892. The Government then said that the questions brought forward could not be re-opened.

W

COM 7/96

I suppose the fact that the P.O. at Tuticorin receives 300 Rs. a month for his Pearl Fishery duties was taken into account, when the salary was fixed, and as the total emoluments of Mr. Baker now amount to 575 Rs. a month, it may I think be considered that he is fairly paid.

There is however no doubt that if his pay, simply as P.O. is considered, he gets very little for this work, compared with other places - and Tuticorin has of recent years been doing much more business, and it is a question whether the P.O. should not receive some remuneration for the extra work which has undoubtedly grown up. But again if this Ceylon railway comes off - and, from what I hear, it probably will, the trade of Tuticorin will most likely fall back - and the pay of the P.O. will be amply sufficient. On the whole I think the petition should be rejected.

W
10 Jan

R.S.

H.B.

FOR ORDERS.

*Petition from Mr. Baker, Port
officer Tuticorin for an increase
of pay.*

FOR ORDERS.

5-10-24

Dec: 197. 11-1-96

Marine Current No: 1005

Marine (1895) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,
Madras,

To

THE ~~CHIEF~~ SECY. TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
Fort St. George.
Chepuk

No. $\frac{1740}{3374}$

Dated 13

Received

} December 1895.

No.

Subject.

*Forwarding with recommendation
a memorial from Mr. J. H.
Baker, Port officer, Tuticorin
regarding an increase to
his pay.*

Encls 2

Dec: 14-12-95

*No. 316-7 426-8-90 marine ✓
" 330 " 10-9-92 " orig ✓
" 301 " 21-8-93 " ✓
" 302 " 21-8-93 " ✓
" 446 " 14-11-94 " ✓*

H.E. 8/1 R 11/1.

Particulars of the Trade of the Port of Tuticorin during the 77 years 1814-75, 1884-95

Years	Number of Vessels entered	Tonnage	Total Revenue collected from all sources	Passengers	
				Arrived	Total
1874-75	912	166,475½	20,333	102	23,887
1884-85	1,258	251,357½	32,856	132	20,845½
1894-95	1,912	518,978¾	58,218	86	44,178
Tuticorin 15. 10. 95				52,091	96,289
				19,968	43,855
				24,251½	45,097

J. H. Baker
Port Officer

6-10-24

Dec. 197. 11. 1. 96

Tuticorin, 15th October 1895

To

His Excellency The Right Honourable
Sir By Baron "Neville" G. C. I. G.
Governor & President in Council
of Fort Saint George.

The humble petition of J. H. Baker

Port Officer of Tuticorin.

Sheweth,

1. That your Petitioner was first
appointed to the Madras Port Dept in
November 1876 having previously served
Government in the Indian Marine from
June 1873.

2. That at the time of appointment
the post of Deputy Conservator of the Port
of Madras (then termed the Deputy
Master & Attendant, Madras) was open

to

to him but has since been reserved by the Government of India for the Officers of the Royal Indian Marine whereby the only hope of advancement to a lucrative post has been cut off.

3. That the pay of the appointment of Port Officer, Tuticorin, is only Rs 200 per mensem though the trade has increased so largely that it ranks second in importance only to that of the Presidency Port.

4. That your Petitioner is responsible for the collection of dues for passengers and cargo traffic on a Jetty bringing in an average income of Rs 1,500-0-0 per mensem
also

also for those of a Goods shed and on all Port land, duties which require sharp supervision and entails work which frequently must be done out of official office hours, and controls three lighthouses beside the ordinary routine work of a Port Officer.

5. That the Board of Revenue recognising the increase of trade and consequently of work and responsibility have lately recommended the pay of the Superintendent of sea customs being increased from Rs 100 to Rs 150 a mensem thus bringing it to within 50 Rupees of the pay of your Petitioner.

6. In conclusion your Petitioner prays that your Excellency will take into consideration petitioner's faithful service of nearly 19 years.
Confidently

Particulars of the Trade of the Port of Tuticorin during the off years 1874-75, 1884-85

Confidently referring your Excellency to the records of the Port Department as to Petitioners Conduct and ability during that period and grant some increase to his pay as Port Officer.

And your Petitioner as in duty bound with ever pray.

J. H. Baker.
Port Officer

2-6-1
Mar 1005/55

5-10-24

Dec. 197. 11-1-96

No. 1740
337 G.

Heading.

Salary.

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE,
Madras, 13th December 1895.

From
Commander W. J. Powell R.S.M.,
PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,
Madras,

To
THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,

Sir,

Chepak.

I enclose for the favorable consideration of Government, a memorial to His Excellency the Governor from Mr. J. H. Baker, Port Officer of Tuticorin, for an increase to his pay as Port Officer. Tuticorin is a much busier port than Cochin, Calicut or Tellicherry, for instance, in point of trade and passenger traffic. Out-door supervision is also heavier at Tuticorin in connection with the Pier, port lands and the large tract of land that is now being

being reclaimed. There is also the fact that at Tuticorin work goes on uninterruptedly all the year round, whereas on the Western Coast the Officers have comparative rest for a short period of the year when the ports are closed for the S.W. Monsoon. Yet the pay of the Tuticorin Port Officer (as such) is 150 Rupees less than that of the Port Officer of Cochin, Calicut or Tellicherry. I can think of no reason for this except perhaps that the salary of the Tuticorin Port Officer as Superintendent of Pearl Fisheries (viz. Rs. 300/- paid by the Revenue Department) has been taken into consideration. The Revenue Department, I submit, may have some advantage in besting the duties of Pearl Fishery Superintendent on the Port Officer, but I think it is only

only fair that as Port Officer — Mr. Baker, or whoever is in charge of the port, should at least draw the same pay as that of the Port Officer of Cochin, Calicut, or Tellicherry, the work at Tuticorin being heavier and the responsibilities greater. I would strongly recommend, therefore, that the Tuticorin Port Officer's salary, payable from Port-funds, be raised from Rupees 200 to Rupees 300 per mensem.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your obedient servant,

Walter Powell

Commander R.I.M.

Presidency Port-Officer.