

4.10.12

Md8

Marine (1896) Department.

G.O., No. 747. *man*

DATED 2nd November 1896

3/11/96

[Despatch Abstract.]

Landing Charges: Letter from the Chairman H.T. Board Submitting with remarks a report from the Board's Traffic Manager on the alleged high rate of — on ^{locomotive} engines at Madras, compared to the Consulting Engineer for Railways.

10/3

T^c 2/11

2/11

[100-25-11-96]

Letter from the Chairman, Harbour Trust Board, submitting, with remarks, a report from the Board's Traffic Manager on the alleged high rate of — on locomotive engines at Madras, communicated to the Consulting Engineer for Railways.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From W. AUSTIN, Esq., I.C.S., Chairman, Harbour Trust Board, Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated 22nd October 1896, No. 3073.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of G.O., No. 662, Marine, dated 28th September 1896, forwarding, for remarks, copies of letters from the Agent and Manager and Locomotive Superintendent of the Madras Railway Company regarding an excess of Rs. 23,861-12-3 over the estimated cost of six new locomotive engines, and I submit, for the information of Government, copy of a letter from the Board's Traffic Manager reporting thereon.

2. In paragraph 4 of his letter, the Locomotive Superintendent states that the excess in the cost of erection is due to a great extent to the very high landing charges on the engines at Madras, amounting to Rs. 5,134, or an average of Rs. 856 for each locomotive, and this appears to be the only point which affects the Harbour Trust Board, although the Traffic Manager has referred to the other remarks made by the Locomotive Superintendent, disparaging to Madras as a port, as compared with Bombay.

3. It would appear that the locomotives in question are much larger than those which were landed at Bombay on a previous occasion, with which comparison is made, and that the cost of conveyance from Raichore to Perambore has not been taken into consideration.

4. The Madras Railway seems to be singularly unfortunate in landing their locomotives at Madras. In December 1894 two were damaged on board the German steamer *Rheinfels* as the tackle used for hoisting out of the ship's hold gave way, and one boiler falling upon another, both were damaged; while a third was lost overboard, inside the harbour, alongside another German steamer. The damage to these two locomotive boilers, and the loss of the other overboard, formed the subject of correspondence between the Agent of the Railway and myself, and I pointed out to him in August 1895 that the two boilers damaged weighed less than 10 tons each, and that during the previous five years 281 boilers, of which some had ranged up to 18 tons weight, had been landed at this port, without accident, by other consignees; 166 more have been safely landed, without difficulty, a total of 347 in 6½ years, nearly all of which came by the Clan line.

5. The actual port charges paid were as follows:—

	RS.	A.	P.
Harbour dues	1,126	7	7
Raft-hire	400	0	0
Total	1,526	7	7

or an average of Rs. 254-6-7 per engine; I am unable to account for the difference between this amount, and the total Rs. 5,134, mentioned by the Locomotive Superintendent.

ENCLOSURE.

From S. HUTCHENCE, Esq., Traffic Manager, Harbour Trust Board, Madras, to the Secretary, Harbour Trust Board, dated 17th October 1896, No. 1487 T.

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your No. 1953 T., forwarding G.O., No. 662, Marine, regarding freight and landing charges on locomotives at this port for report.

2. It is difficult to report on this, as no data or detailed items of charges are given, the item of freight being stated as about Rs. 1,000 more than the freight on locomotives sent to Bombay; but no rate per ton, and the landing charges on six engines are said to be Rs. 5,134, or Rs. 856 per engine; but it is not divided into boat or raft charges, harbour dues, haulage, &c.

3. I will, however, endeavour, paragraph by paragraph, to show that the charges, so far as I can gather from the letter of the Locomotive Superintendent, does not compare unfavourably with those at the Port of Bombay.

4. With reference to the matter of freight (*vide* paragraph 3) said to be about Rs. 1,000 per locomotive over freight to Bombay, I would observe that I have seen the Kitson 2nd-class engines, running on the Madras Railway Company lines, also the six bogie engines now under reference, and am of opinion that the latter are some 10 tons heavier than the Kitson No. 2, and this would appear to be borne out by their relative cost in England. The bogie engines under this would appear to be borne out by the K.A. 2nd-class engines probably weighed about 48 to reference weigh 58 tons as landed, and the K.A. 2nd-class engines probably weighed about 48 to 49 tons, and it would be unreasonable to suppose that 58 tons could be carried 7,300 miles for the same freight that 48 tons could be carried 6,300 miles. The amount of freight paid in either instance is not given, but I should think it would be about £4 to 5 per ton. Taking it at £4 10s. on an excess weight of 9 tons would account for £40 10s. which, at the rate of exchange ruling when these bogie engines were shipped, would give some Rs. 800, while the extra 1,000 miles carried would account for the other Rs. 200. It would therefore appear that in this instance Madras has not compared unfavourably with Bombay, and if the rates of exchange ruling at the time the two lots of locomotives were shipped be taken into account, I think the result will be that Madras in the matter of freight has proved cheaper than Bombay.

5. With reference to the landing charges, at Madras, referred to in paragraph 4 of the Locomotive Superintendent's letter, and said to be Rs. 856 per engine, I am at a loss to know how this figure has been arrived at, although, as Traffic Manager of the Trust, I should be in a position to know. The Board's charges amounted to Rs. 187-8-0 for harbour dues, cranes, portage, loading charges and entry of vehicles. In other words Rs. 187-8-0 took each locomotive, with its tender and fittings complete, from the boats or rafts, loaded it on Madras Railway Company wagons, and delivered it into the Madras Railway Company's lines at Rayapuram. The Deputy Conservator provided rafts for the heavy portions, viz., boiler, engine frame, tender frame, and tank weighing 36 tons, at a cost of Rs. 62-8-0, in all Rs. 250. Boat-hire had to be provided by the railway for the 22 tons of smaller packages, which, at an outside charge of Rs. 1-8-0 per ton, should not have cost more than Rs. 33. These charges in the aggregate gives Rs. 283 as the cost of landing and delivering each complete locomotive into the railway yards at Rayapuram, which, deducted from the total charge of Rs. 856, leaves a sum of Rs. 573 on each locomotive unaccounted for, or a total of Rs. 3,438 on the six engines. This charge of Rs. 283 for a 58-ton engine does not compare unfavourably with the Bombay charge of Rs. 215 each, for much lighter engines, considering that the heavy portions have to be floated ashore on rafts.

6. With reference to paragraph 5, I would observe that the comparison is unfair to this port, seeing that the excess tonnage, rate of exchange on freight, and cost of haulage from Raichore to Perambore have not been taken into account. Were these items fairly compared, it would be to the advantage of Madras; and it seems hard, considering the Madras Harbour has brought so much extra traffic to the Madras Railway, that that Company should make unfavourable comparisons, so as to make it appear desirable for the Company's stores to be landed at other ports. The Locomotive Superintendent states that a K.A. 2nd-class engine (which I estimate to weigh 49 tons as landed at Bombay) cost Rs. 2,405 delivered at Raichore to which should be added cost of haulage to Madras probably Rs. 100 = Rs. 2,505; at this rate a 58-ton engine would have cost Rs. 2,846 + haulage Rs. 120 = Rs. 2,966. The cost of the bogie engines delivered at Madras is said to be Rs. 2,656 each; but as a sum of Rs. 573 each has certainly not been paid as *bonâ fide* landing charges, it should be deducted, which would leave the charges of the engines landed at Madras as Rs. 2,083, against Rs. 2,966 for a similar engine landed at Bombay, which leaves a large balance in favour of Madras, which would be further increased, if the rates of exchange on freight paid be taken into consideration.

7. Referring to paragraph 7, the Locomotive Superintendent has shown that one boiler was dropped overboard, but does not mention the far more serious accident by which two boilers were very much injured, if not rendered unserviceable, viz., the breaking of the ship's sling by which one boiler fell back into the hold, on to the other one at the bottom of the ship, damaging both. Neither of these accidents can be placed to the discredit of the port, as the weather was fine, and the sea quite smooth, at the time the accidents happened, and it would be manifestly unfair to the port, as a port, to charge the consequences of these accidents against the landing charges of

Marine (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 1148

4

No. 747, MARINE, 2ND NOVEMBER 1896.

the six locomotives, to the disparagement of Madras. I do not know that this has been done, but as I am unable to account for a sum of Rs. 3,438, landing charges on the six engines, it may have been done. The more serious accident occurred through the failure of the ship's gear, for which the port is in no way responsible; but, as stated by the Locomotive Superintendent, the service rendered by the ship appears to have been of an inferior description.

ORDER—No. 747, Marine, dated 2nd November 1896.

Communicated to the Consulting Engineer for Railways with reference to G.O., No. 794 R., dated 18th September 1896.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government.

To the Consulting Engineer for Railways.
„ Chairman, Harbour Trust Board.

Ed. A. F. Eccleston.

Order

From

The Chairman,
Harbour Trust Board,
Madras.

No. 3073

Dated 22nd Oct 96

Despatched 23rd —

Received 24.10.96

Enclosures one

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Landing charges on loco-
motives at this port

Replying to G.O. No. 682
Main dated 28th Sept 96
Regarding —

No comment by J. S. seems
called for. The matter is one to
be discussed between the
Railway Company and the
Harbour Trust Board, if
further discussion is neces-
sary.

The moral is? seem to be —
Don't mix goods & found
semen shavers

26/10/96

No. 747 Marine of 2nd November 1896.

Communicated
28/10/96

To the Consulting Engineer for
Railways with reference to G.O.
794 R of 18 Sep 1896

The C. E. Ry. &
Ch. & S. Bd.

26/10/96

28/10/96

W. S.

Order to issue

26/10/96

28/10/96

BACK PAPERS.

G. O.	No.	Department.	Date.
662		marine	28-9-96 ✓
320		"	8-5-96 ✓
211		"	27-3-96 ✓
126		"	28-2-96 ✓
81		"	11-2-96 ✓
39		"	31-1-96 ✓
465		"	5-12-94 ✓
193		"	30-5-94 ✓
287		"	5-8-92 ✓
120		"	21-4-92 ✓

FURTHER PAPERS.

G. O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	826	Marine	27-11-96

Harbour Trust Office,

MADRAS, 22nd October 1896.

No. 323

FROM

Dr. A. Austin Esq. J. L. S. 1/10

CHAIRMAN, HARBOUR TRUST BOARD,

MADRAS.

TO

The Honble Col. D. McNeil Campbell Esq.

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

Marine Department.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of G. O. Marine, dated 28th September, No. 662, forwarding for remarks copies of letters from the Agent & Managers and Loco. Superintendent of the Madras Railway Co., regarding an excess of Rs. 23,861-12-3 over the estimated cost of 6 new Loco engines, and I submit for the information of Government copy of a letter from the Board's Traffic Manager reporting thereon.

In para 4 of his letter the Loco. Superintendent states that the excess in the cost of erection is due to a great extent to the very high landing charges on the engines at Madras, amounting to Rs. 5,134 or an average of Rs. 856 for each

each Locomotive, and this appears to be the only point which affects the Harbour Trust Board, although the Traffic Manager has referred to the other remarks made by the Loco: Superintendent, disparaging to Madras as a Port, as compared with Bombay.

3. It would appear that the Locomotives in question are much larger than those which were landed at Bombay on a previous occasion, with which comparison is made, and that the cost of conveyance from Raichore to Perambore has not been taken into consideration.

4. The Madras Railway seems to be singularly unfortunate in landing their locomotives at Madras. In December 1894 two were damaged on board the German steamer "Rheinfe" as the tackle used for hoisting out of the ship's hold gave way, and one boiler falling upon another both were damaged; while a third was lost over board, inside the Harbour, alongside another German steamer. The damage to these two loco boilers, and the loss of the other over board, formed the subject of correspondence between the Agent of

the Railway and myself, and I pointed out to him in August 1895 that ^{the} two boilers damaged weighed less than ten tons each, and that during the previous five years 281 boilers, of which some had ranged up to 18 tons weight, had been landed at this port without accident, by other consignees; I would now add that during 1895-96, and for the first six months of the current year, 66 more have been safely landed, without difficulty, a total of 347 in 6½ years, nearly all of which came by the Clan line.

5. The actual port charges paid were as follows:-

Harbour dues	- - -	Rs 1126-7-7
Raft hire	- - -	400-0-0
Total		Rs 1526-7-7

or an average of Rs 254-6-7 per engine. I am unable to account for the difference between this amount, and the total Rs 5134, mentioned by the Loco: Superintendent.

I have the honour to be

Sir

Your Obedt. Servant

Secy.

Chairman
Harbour Trust Board

Harbour Trust Board
Traffic Department
Madras 14th October 1896.

N^o 1487 T.

From

The Traffic Manager

Harbour Trust.

Madras.

386

To

The Secretary

Harbour Trust Board.

Madras.

Sir

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your N^o 953 T forwarding G.O. N^o 662 Marine, regarding freight and landing charges on Locomotives at this port for report.—

2. It is difficult to report on this, as no data or detailed items of charges are given, the item of freight being stated as about 1000 Rupees more than the freight on locomotives sent to Bombay; but no rate per ton, and the landing charges on 6 engines are said to be Rupees 5134, or Rupees 856 per engine; but it is not divided into boat or raft charges, Harbour Dues, haulage &c. —

3. I will however endeavour para by para to show that the charges, so far as I can gather from the letter of the Locomotive Superintendent, does not compare unfavorably with those at the Port of Bombay.

4. With reference to the matter of freight (vide Para 3) said to be about Rupees 1000 per locomotive over freight to Bombay, I would observe that I have seen the Kibson 2nd Class Engines, running on the Madras Railway Company lines, also the 6 bogie engines now under reference, and am of opinion that the latter are some 10 tons heavier than the Kibson N^o 2, and this would appear to be borne out by their relative cost in England. The Bogie engines under reference weigh 58 tons as landed, and the K.A 2nd Class engines probably weighed

weighed about 48 to 49 tons, and it would be unreasonable to suppose that 58 tons could be carried 7300 miles for the same freight that 48 tons could be carried 6300 miles. The amount of freight paid in either instance is not given, but I should think it would be about 4 to 5 £ per ton. Taking it at $\frac{5}{4}$ - 10 on an excess weight of 9 tons would account for £ 40/10/- which, at the rate of exchange ruling when these bogie Engines were shipped, would give some 800 Rupees while the extra 1000 miles carried would account for the other 200 Rupees. It would therefore appear that in this instance Madras has not compared unfavorably with Bombay, and if the rates of exchange ruling at the time the two lots of Locomotives were shipped be taken into account, I think the result will be that Madras in the matter of freight has proved cheaper than Bombay.

5. With reference to the landing charges, at Madras referred to in para 4 of Locomotive Superintendent's letter, and said to be Rupees 856 per Engine, I am at a loss to know how this figure has been arrived at, although as Traffic Manager of the Trust, I should be in a position to know. The Board's charges amounted to Rupees 184-8- for Harbour dues, cranaage, portorage, loading charges and entry of vehicles. In other words Rupees 184-8- took each locomotive, with its tender and fittings complete, from the boats or rafts, loaded it on Madras Railway Company's wagons, and delivered it into the Madras Railway Company's lines at Royapuram. The Dy Conservator provided rafts for the heavy portions, viz: boiler, engine frame, tender frame, and tank weighing 36 tons, at a cost of Rupees 62-8- in all Rupees 250. Boat hire, had to be provided by the railway, for the 22 tons of smaller packages, which at an outside charge of Rupees 1-8/- per ton, should not have cost more than Rupees 33. These charges in the aggregate gives Rupees 283 as the cost of landing and delivering each complete Locomotive into the Railway yards at Royapuram, which deducted from the total charge of Rupees 856, leaves a sum of Rupees 573 on each locomotive unaccounted for

for, or a total of Rupees 3438 on the Engines. This charge of Rupees 283 for a 58 ton engine, does not compare unfavorably with the Bombay charge of Rupees 215 each, for much lighter engines, considering that the heavy portions have to be floated ashore on rafts.

6. With reference to para 5, I would observe that the comparison is unfair to this port, seeing that the excess tonnage, rate of exchange on freight, and cost of haulage from Raichoor to Perambore, have not been taken into account. Were these items fairly compared, it would be to the advantage of Madras; and it seems hard, considering the Madras Harbour has brought so much extra traffic to the Madras Railway, that the Company should make unfavorable comparisons, so as to make it appear desirable for the Company's stores to be landed at other ports. The Locomotive Superintendent states that a K. A. 2nd Class engine (which I estimate to weigh 49 tons as landed at Bombay) cost Rupees 2405 delivered at Raichoor to which should be added cost of haulage to Madras probably Rupees 100 = Rupees 2505; at this rate a 58 ton engine would have cost Rupees 2846 + haulage Rupees 120 = Rupees 2966. The cost of the bogie engines delivered at Madras is said to be Rupees 2656 each; but as a sum of Rupees 573 each has certainly not been paid, as bona-fide landing charges, it should be deducted, which would leave the charges of the engines landed at Madras as Rupees 2083, against Rupees 2966 for a similar engine landed at Bombay which leaves a large balance in favour of Madras, which would be further increased, if the rates of exchange on freight paid be taken into consideration.

7. Referring to para 4; the Locomotive Superintendent has shown that one boiler was dropped overboard, but

does

does not mention the far more serious accident by which two
boilers were very much injured, if not rendered unserviceable,
viz the breaking of the ship's sling by which one boiler fell
back into the hold, on to the other one at the bottom of the
ship, damaging both. Neither of these accidents can be
placed to the discredit of the Port, as the weather was fine, and
the sea quite smooth, at the time the accidents happened, and
it would be manifestly unfair to the port, as a port, to charge
the consequences of these accidents against the landing charges
of the 6 locomotives, to the disparagement of Madras. I do
not know that this has been done, but as I am unable to
account for a sum of Rupees 3438, landing charges on the
engines, it may have been done. The more serious accident
occurred through the failure of the ship's gear, for which
the port is in no way responsible; but, as stated by the
Locomotive Superintendent, the service rendered by the ship
appears to have been of an inferior description

I have &c

Sd/ S. Hutchener
Traffic Manager
Harbour Trust

(True Copy)

HARBOUR TRUST

MADRAS 23 OCT. 96

SECRETARY'S OFFICE

S. Hutchener

Secretary
Harbour Trust Board.

Mar
23/10/96