

Marine (1896)

DEPARTMENT.

Recd 13.6.9

From

THE PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,

Madras,

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

PUBLIC WORKS (MARINE) DEPARTMENT,

Madras.

No. $\frac{956}{196}$ 4

Dated 11th

Received

} June 1896.

No.

21.7.98. 250. 20.
7.7.94. 269 20.
6.12.95. 39 memo
12.1.96. 186 20.

Subject.

Stating that the proposed rent of Rs 12/ per acre for lands within port limits at Mangalore was the highest rate of assessment in the district for building sites &c

The result of the inquiry will be awaited. The Collector will be requested to expedite the matter.

13/6/96

R.S.

The P.P.O

.. Rev. Dept.

ASA 15.6.96

The Secretary to Govt. Rev. Dept. for favour of counter initials

DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS
24 JUL 96

26/6

26/6

26/6

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Marine Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following

From the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, No. 942/161 G d/6th May 1896.

No. 434 Mar 8/16 June 1896

His Excellency the Governor in Council considers that the inclusion of the port of Madras in the Eastern group for the purpose of -- levying port dues would be inexpedient even if the Act admitted of such an arrangement, which is, however, by no means clear.

16/6/96



The Presidency Port Officer.

II Schedule I of the Act. If, as -- assumed by the Presidency Port officer, it can be grouped with the Eastern Ports for the levy of dues then why not with the Western ports also?

There is no more authority in the Act for the one than there is for the other.

3. It is submitted that the Presidency Port Officer's interpretation of the Act cannot be sustained.

28/5/96

W.

Cive

Interpretation of the Indian Ports Act of 1879

The Hon. Mr. Bhai C. B.

The Hon. Mr. G. B.

Marine
P.W. DEPARTMENT.

G.O. 434 Mar
16-6-96

Read the following:—

Letter from the Presidency Port Officer, No. 942/161 G., d/6th May 1896

FOR ORDERS.

Even assuming that the Port Officer of
the inclusion of Madras in the Eastern
group, ~~and~~ I think such inclusion
would be inexpedient.

A.17.

9.6.96

11/6/96

89

15-16/96

The Presidency Port Officer --
raises the question whether the --
Port of Madras shall be included in
the Eastern Group in respect to the
levy of Port dues. He points out --
that though Madras is, under section
37 of the Indian Ports Act, treated
as a separate port for the purpo-
ses of accounts, there is no provi-
sion in the Act that Madras should
not be treated as a port of the --
Eastern Group for the levy of dues.
2. It may be observed that the con-
verse of this proposition is equal-
ly true, viz, that there is no provi-
sion in the Act that Madras shall
be included in the Eastern Group.
The inference, ~~is~~ however, is distinctly
the other way. Madras is shown by --
itself and not with the Eastern --
Group for the levy of dues in Part

Marine (1896) DEPARTMENT.

No. 520

Rev. 9.5.96

From

THE PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,

Madras,

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

PUBLIC WORKS (MARINE) DEPARTMENT,

Madras.

No. 942
161 G

Dated 6 } May 1896.
Received }

No.

Subject.

Enquiring whether the
ruling contained in G.O.
Marine No 395 d/6 September
1889 applies also to the Eastern
Group, as Madras is not
included in that group.

Instructions for Port Officer (Marine)
Indian Ports Act 1889
395 Marine d/6-9-89.

of 1889, Madras is treated as separate from the ports of the Eastern Group for the purposes of Accounts, but there is no provision in the Act that Madras should not be treated as a port of the Eastern Group in respect to the levy of Dues at other ports in the same Group. I think that a vessel calling at Madras under the circumstances specified in the case of the "Aurora" should have the benefit of the remission of Dues allowed to vessels calling at ports other than Madras in the Eastern Group, and that the Dues levied a second time on the "Aurora" at Coconada should be refunded.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Obedient Servant,

H. A. Street
Commr. R.I.M.,
Presidency Port Officer.

The Congress is also true - There is no provision in the Act that Madras should not be treated as a port of the Eastern Group in respect to the levy of Dues at other ports in the same Group. The inference is that it shall be kept distinct - Madras cannot be grouped with any other ports under Section 37 (1) A.S.

Be