

Marine (1897) Department.

G.O., No. 642 Mar

DATED 9 July 1897

Railway Siding near at the port of Tuticorin. Passing
across in regard to the incidence of the cost
the — and directing that an estimate of
cost of maintaining the outwall of the Reclama
be called for in the P.W.D.

Dr
yes
w. 7. 97

21/7/97

Passing orders in regard to the incidence of the cost of the — and directing that an estimate of the cost of maintaining the out wall of the reclamation be called for in the Public Works Department.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers:—

From Commander H. A. STREET, R.I.M., Presidency Port Officer, to the Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated Madras, 9th January 1897, No. 163/8 G.

In G.O., Public Works, No. 2327 W. of 13th September 1894, the sum of Rs. (37,500) thirty-seven thousand and five hundred was sanctioned in connection with the Tuticorin reclamation scheme. As the cost of the "turn-table" and of the laying down of the "permanent siding" from the main line of the South Indian Railway to the shore end of the new pier referred to in the enclosure from the Agent, South Indian Railway, which accompanied the letter from the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, printed with the Government Order above quoted, seems to have been included in the sum of Rs. 37,500, I submit that, as the Railway Company will probably benefit largely by the establishment of through communication to the pier, the cost of the "permanent siding" and of the "turn-table" should be met by the Company. The expenditure of Port Funds on these works would appear to be contrary to the instructions contained in sub-section 5 (b) of section 36 of the Indian Ports Act, as only works maintained chiefly for the benefit of vessels entering or leaving the port can be charged to Port Funds, and the works in question apparently will chiefly benefit the Railway Company. The "line" has been laid down, but the "turn-table" has not yet been placed in position; as the line is being used daily its upkeep and maintenance should be met by the Railway Company for the reasons already given for debiting the Company with the original cost of the work; and I also consider that, for the use of the ground, a small rent, say Rs. (12) twelve yearly, might be charged, and a rate of 1 anna per ton of goods carried by each railway vehicle passing within port limits should be levied. The levy of this fee could be legalised under Madras Act III of 1885.

From Commander H. A. STREET, R.I.M., Presidency Port Officer, to the Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated Madras, 18th February 1897, No. 163/47 G.

In continuation of this office letter No. 163/8 G., dated 9th January 1897, I have the honour to state with reference to the provision in G.O. (Public Works), No. 2327 W., dated 13th September 1894, of Rs. (2,500) two thousand and five hundred for a turn-table and of Rs. (9,30) nine thousand three hundred and thirty for a permanent siding from the main line to the shore end of the new pier at Tuticorin, that the Executive Engineer, Tinnevely division, reports that no expenditure has yet been incurred on these two items.

Office-note from the Officiating Joint Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, Railway Branch, dated 14th May 1897, No. 217 D.

With reference to Marine Department, No. 61 E. of 28th January 1897, forwarding letter from Presidency Port Officer, Madras, the undersigned has the honour to forward copy of a letter, No. 494, dated 7th May 1897, from the Agent, South Indian Railway, and to recommend that the proposals therein contained may be accepted.

ENCLOSURE.

From the Agent, South Indian Railway, to the Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 7th May 1897, No. 494.

With reference to your endorsement, No. 442, dated 5th February 1897, I have the honour to offer the following remarks. The siding will undoubtedly be of benefit to both the port and the railway and should, therefore, in my opinion, be constructed and worked at the expense of both departments. The port department having paid for the reclamation of the land on which the siding is laid, this Company should, I think, bear the cost of the permanent-way and of the turn-table. If this be agreed to I do not think the railway should be called upon to pay rent or any further charges, and I think it should be allowed to retain possession of the land on which the siding is laid subject to rendition when required and after receipt of six months' prior notice.

2. As regards working charges, it must be remembered that most of the export grain traffic can bear no addition to freight without being seriously affected. We are endeavouring to divert to Tuticorin the rice which now finds its way from the small ports in the Tanjore district to Colombo and the Tinnevely district by British India steamers and country craft. To do this it has been necessary to quote rates that are barely remunerative, and if the route is blocked by port charges at Tuticorin, the railway will not be the only loser. Passenger traffic can bear enhancement of rates, and I see no objection to both the port department, and the railway making a small charge for the use of the siding. I am willing for the siding to be maintained at the expense of the Company, provided the port department undertake to maintain the permanency of the reclaimed land on which it is laid, I ask for this as we have already incurred expense in replacing the sand which has escaped through the interstices of the coral retaining wall. As this Company bears all the expense of haulage from the station to the pier and will make no charge for the goods service, I hope the Presidency Port Officer will waive his suggestion for the tonnage charge mentioned in his letter, No. 163/8 G., dated 9th January 1897.

From Commander H. A. STREET, R.I.M., Presidency Port Officer, to the Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated Madras, 12th June 1897, No. 163/220 G.

With reference to Marine Department memorandum, No. 360 E., dated 27th May 1897 (enclosures herewith returned), I have the honour to state that, after a careful perusal of the letter of the Agent, South Indian Railway, No. 494, dated 7th May 1897, to the Consulting Engineer for Railways, I regret that I am unable to meet his views on the questions referred to therein, for I find nothing put forward which in any way causes me to change the opinion expressed in my letter, No. 163/8 G., dated 9th January 1897, and which is also that of the Collector of Tinnevely—vide paragraph 7 of Proceedings of Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), dated 7th November 1896, Mis. No. 4662—in respect to the railway extension.

2. The siding referred to by the Agent, South Indian Railway, up to the present has not benefited the port in a pecuniary way. Since its opening, about seven months ago, some 600 passengers and 2 cargoes of salt have passed over it, but it is the Railway Company that has benefited and not the port. Judging from the small number of passengers which have used the siding since its opening, I consider that a charge for the same would bring in no appreciable increase of income unless the passenger traffic largely increases.

3. Should the cargo traffic by the siding increase, it is the Railway Company that will largely benefit thereby, and I therefore strongly protest against any part of the cost of the siding or of the upkeep of the permanent way being debited to Port Funds. As pointed out in my letter, No. 163/8 G., of 9th January 1897, Port Funds cannot be expended on purposes which do not benefit the shipping visiting a port. It may be said that the siding will benefit the shipping by affording facilities for passengers and cargo, but it would not have been made had not the railway authorities perceived that it was likely to largely increase their revenue in the future, and I do not think that it will bring any increase to Port Fund.

No. 642, MARINE, 19TH JULY 1897.

ORDER—No. 642, Marine, dated 19th July 1897.

In G.O., No. 2327 W., dated 13th September 1894, an estimate amounting to Rs. 37,500 for reclaiming the foreshore at Tuticorin near the Government pier, was sanctioned. This estimate includes the following items:—

(a) Permanent railway siding	...	...	...	...	...	Rs.
(b) Turn-table	...	...	...	...	...	9,330
						2,500
Total	...	...	...	...	...	11,830

2. The Presidency Port Officer contends that the original cost of these items as well as their future upkeep should be borne exclusively by the South Indian Railway. In this view His Excellency the Governor in Council concurs. The works form part of the railway system, and there is no reason why Port Funds should bear any portion of their cost. The maintenance of the land occupied by the railway works is also a legitimate charge against the Company, but the upkeep of the outer wall of the reclamation will devolve on Port Funds on the understanding, however, that the Marine Department will not be responsible for damage or interruption of traffic caused by storms. There will be no objection to the railway undertaking, as a matter of convenience, and at the request of the port authorities, any repairs to the sea wall which may be urgently required. The cost would in this case be repaid by Port Funds.

3. The proposals that the traffic of the railway should be tolled by the port department, and that the railway shall pay rent for the use of the land which has been reclaimed and will be maintained so far as the outer wall goes at the cost of Port Funds, may stand over. For the meantime, an estimate of the cost of maintaining the outer wall will be called for in the Public Works Department.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government.

To the Presidency Port Officer.
 " Public Works Department.
 " " Railway Branch.

Exd. P. Seetharam.

Marine (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 41

Encl.

Order Referred to the Rail-
 way Branch for such remarks
 as the South of India Rail-
 way authorities may wish
 to make.

From,
The Presidency Port Officer,
MadrasNo. 163
8/9

27/1/97

Dated 9 January 1897

Received 11.1.97

Enclosures "

Spare copies

The Railway Branch
 with a/c No. 2327 W
 C.S. d/13 Sep 1894. 2/97.

Reminders issued 17.3.97

SUBJECT.

Tuticorin reclamation
scheme:—

Informing that the
 cost of the "turn table"
 and of the laying down
 of the "permanent siding"
 should be met by the
 South Indian Railway
 Company.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
<i>Guano</i>	24	Marine	23-11-95
"	20	— <i>Dr.</i>	19-11-95
"	13	— <i>Dr.</i>	15-11-95
"	4	— <i>Dr.</i>	7-11-95
<i>Gr.</i>	382	— <i>Dr.</i>	24-9-94
"	27	— <i>Dr.</i>	19-1-94
"	409	— <i>Dr.</i>	22-11-93
"	375	— <i>Dr.</i>	20-10-93
"	308	— <i>Dr.</i>	24-8-93

FURTHER PAPERS.

Heading.

No. 163 *g*

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE,
Madras, 9th January 1897.

From

Commander A. A. Street, R. I. M.,

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,

Madras.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

MARINE DEPARTMENT,

Chepak.

SIR,

SIR,
In G.O. Public Works, No. 2327 of
13th September 1894, the sum of Rs (37,500)
Thirty seven thousand and five hundred
was sanctioned in connection with the
Tuticorin Reclamation Scheme. As the
cost of the "turn table" and of the laying
down of the "permanent siding" from the
main line of the South Indian Railway
to the shore end of the new pier referred
to in the enclosure from the Agents,
S. I. Railway, which accompanied the
letter from the Superintending Engineer,
VIth Circle, printed with the G.O. above
quoted, ~~seems~~ to have been included
in the sum of Rs 37,500. I submit that

382 Mar
24-9-94
May H.

as the Railway Company will probably benefit largely by the establishment of through communication to the pier, the cost of the "permanent siding" and of the "turn table" should be met by the Company. The expenditure of Port Funds on these works would appear to be contrary to the instructions contained in sub section 5(b) of section 36 of the Indian Ports Act, as only works maintained chiefly for the benefit of vessels entering or leaving the port can be charged to Port Funds, and the works in question apparently will chiefly benefit the Railway Company. The "line" has been laid down, but the "turn table" has not yet been placed in position; as the line is being used daily its upkeep and maintenance should be met by the Railway Company for the reasons already given for debiting the Company with the original cost of the work, and I also consider that for the use of the ground a small rent - say Rupees (12) twelve yearly - might be charged, and a rate of one anna per ton of goods carried by each railway vehicle passing within port limits should be

^{Dec 2}
levied. The levy of this fee could be legalised under Madras Act III of 1885.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your obedt. servant
H. A. Theet
Commander, R. I. M.
Perry: Port Office

mmte

Enc. No. 1 TO P. O. No. 2075 OF 1897
 Letter No. 510 OF 8.5.97
 From A

Marine (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 214

From

The Presidency Fort Office,
 Madras.

No. $\frac{163}{47}$ G

Dated 18 February 1897.

Received 19.2.97

Registered

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Informing that, with reference to G.O. No. 2327W dated 13 September 1894, the Executive Engineer, Tinnevely Division, reports that no expenditure has yet been incurred on the works mentioned thereon.

3138 9957
Don't reply to G.O. No. 61 ad/RS. 97 - 4 no 360 ad/27 May 97
Reply sent to 220023/2/97
For remarks with of to him 16/3/97

P.W. 2-2 1083/97

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
10030.	9.2.97
I the papers marked	
on G.O. 52 Mar. 8, 1897	

FURTHER PAPERS

No.	Date.	Heading.

No. 163 G.
47

10030

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE,

Madras, 18th February 1897.

From

Commander H. A. Street, R. I. M.,

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,

Madras,

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

MARINE DEPARTMENT,

Chepak.

SIR,

In continuation of this office letter No. 163/G, dated 9th January 1897, I have the honor to state with reference to the provision in G.O. (Public Works) No. 2327/M, dated 13th September 1894, of Rs (2,500) two thousand and five hundred for a turn table and of Rs (9,330) nine thousand three hundred and thirty for a permanent siding from the main line to the shore end of the New Pier at Tuticorin, that the Executive Engineer, Tinnevely Division, reports that no expenditure has yet been incurred on these two items.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your obedt. servant,

H. D. Bannister
for Pres. Port Officer

612
28-1-97.
O.P. 382 Mar
24-9-94
lay. D
Hay A.

1005

Letter from the Agent, S. S. Ry to
the Cons. Eng. for Ry, Madras, No. 494
dated 7th May 1897.

With reference to your endorsement
No. 442 dated 5th Feb. 1897, I have the honour
to offer the following remarks. The siding
will undoubtedly be of benefit to both
the port and the railway and should
therefore in my opinion be constructed
and worked at the expense of both
Departments. The Port Dept. having paid
for the reclamation of the land on which
the siding is laid, this Company should
I think bear the cost of the Permanent
way and of the turn-table. If this be
agreed to I do not think the railway
should be called upon to pay rent
or any further charges, and I think
it should be allowed to retain posses-
sion of the land on which the siding
is laid subject to rendition when
required and after receipt of six
months' prior notice.

2. As regards working charges, it
must be remembered that most of
the export grain traffic can bear no
addition to freight without being
seriously

seriously affected. We are endeavouring to divert to Tuticorin the rice which now finds its way from the small port in the Tanjore District to Colombo and the Linnelly District by British India Steamers and Country craft. To do this it has been necessary to quote rates that are barely remunerative, and if the route is blocked by port charges at Tuticorin, the railway will not be the only loser. Passenger traffic can bear enhancement of rates and I see no objection to both the Port Dept and the Railway making a small charge for the use of the siding. I am willing for the siding to be maintained at the expense of the Company, provided the Port Dept undertake to maintain the permanency of the reclaimed land on which it is laid. I ask for this as we have already incurred expense in replacing the sand which has escaped through the interstices of the Coral retaining wall. As this Company bears all the expense of haulage from the station to the pier and will make no charge for the goods service, I hope the Presidency Port officer will advise his suggestion for the tonnage charge mentioned in his letter No 163 dated 9th Jan'y 1897

8

Mar 20/97

100 18-1-97

Doc 4

PUBLIC WORKS SECRETARIAT,
RAILWAY BRANCH.

No 217 D

Station Tuticorin date 14th May 1897.

OFFICE NOTE.

From R

To W

May D.

With reference to Marine Dept. No 61 E of 28th January 1897, forwarding letter from Presidency Port officer, Madras, the undersigned has the honour to forward copy of a letter No 494 dated 7th February 1897 from the Agent, S. S. Ry. and to recommend that the proposals therein contained may be accepted.

13/5/97

Marine (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 850

Order 214. looked

642 m

From

*The Presidency Port offices,
Madras*

No. $\frac{163}{220} 4$.

Dated 12 June 1897.

Received

Registered

Enclosures 1.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

*Replying to Marine Department
Memorandum No. 360 E of 27 May 97
regarding the siding arrange-
ments at the Tuticorin Pier.*

der

Encl
Mar 850/57

[illegible]

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE,
Madras, 12th June 1897.

Commander H. A. Street, R.N.
PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,
Madras,

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
Chepak.

SIR, With reference to Marine Department, memorandum, No 360 C, dated 27th May 1897 (enclosures herewith returned) I have the honor to state that, after a careful perusal of the letter of the Agent, South Indian Railway, No 494, dated 7th May 1897 to the Consulting Engineer for Railways, I regret that I am unable to meet his views on the question I referred to therein, for I find nothing put forward which in any way causes me to change the opinion expressed in my letter, No 163/8, G, dated 9th January 1897 and which is also that of the Collector of Tirunelveli - vide para 7 of Proceedings of Board of Revenue, Separate Revenue, dated 7th November 1896, No 4662, Mis, in respect

respect to the Railway Extension.

2. The Siding referred to by the Agent, South Indian Railway, up to the present has not benefited the port in a pecuniary way. Since its opening - about 4 months ago - some 600 passengers and 2 cargoes of salt have passed over it, but it is the Railway Company that has benefited and not the Port. Judging from the small number of passengers which have used the siding since its opening, I consider that a charge for the same would bring in no appreciable increase of income unless the passenger traffic largely increases.

3. Should the cargo traffic by the siding increase, it is the Railway Company that will largely benefit thereby, and I therefore strongly protest against any part of the cost of the siding or of the upkeep of the permanent way being debited to Port Funds. As pointed out in my letter, No. 163/84 of 9th January 1897, Port Funds cannot be expended on purposes which do not benefit the shipping visiting a port. It may be said

Said that the siding will benefit the shipping by affording facilities for passengers and cargo, but it would not have been made had not the Railway Authorities perceived that it was likely to largely increase their revenue in the future and I do not think that it will bring any increase to Port Fund.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your obedient servant,
H. A. T. T. T.
Commander R. D. M.
Deputy Port Officer

Ina **P. W.** DEPARTMENT.

S. W.

R. argues that the
 retention is for the benefit
 of the firm & is a
 mortgage of the realty
 that the firm has
 in the latter case
 can free the firm
 from the burden of
 the mortgage in case
 of the firm's failure.
 The question is whether
 the firm is bound for the cost of
 the mortgage in case the mortgage
 is not paid.
 By opinion the firm is bound
 for the cost of the mortgage
 in case the mortgage is not paid.
 The firm is bound for the cost of
 the mortgage in case the mortgage
 is not paid.

~~Int.~~ Φ Ashlands at Sulicormi, re.

READ the following:—

Am Sin Hing Chin. A.C.S.E

FOR ORDERS.

Flag A.

Railway should certainly pay
the riding & turn-table - It should
maintain the land occupied by
the maintenance of the outer wall
& reclamation being left to Port Road,
understanding, however, that
Funds will not be responsible for
a interruption of traffic caused
there. There wd. of course be no
tion of the Railway undertaking,
inconvenience save at the request of
it officer, any repairs urgently
needed.

As to the proposal that the traffic
on Railway should be tolled by the
Dept. I am not opinion to it in

Flag M. Linked file.

iple, but think that the weather
better ~~had~~ left to stand over until we
and the traffic develops.

and the traffic service.
The Railway should certainly pay a form
for the land occupied by it. But there
I find me how to fix the rate and should
has some sort of an idea how much
annual cost of the upkeep of the should
- wall of the reclamation is likely cost.
me to. Can an estimate of that be procured?
might say it might be - It might not
is not necessarily to be very accurate, but
24-6-0 - it should do as a basis for

cost. The reclaimed land on which the
land? permanent

24-6-97 It should
24-6-97

Draft S.O. Marine Dept. on Current
703 Marine Dept.

The order contemplates the levy of a toll at some future time on the traffic of the Railway and also a charge for reat-former of the land which has been retained at the expense of Port Funds.

In P.W.D (R^y) Memo. 2982 d. 15/10/95
it was requested that such portion
of the land as is required for the
Railway may be transferred to the
R^y Dept.

Order in P.W.D No. 266W d 28/1/96
shows that Island was taken
possession of by the R^y on 9th Sept^r 1876.
There was no mention previous to that
date of any charge for rent or toll
on railway traffic.

Under the terms of the contract paras
11. 27. 39. land is provided free of cost
to the railway and I can find no clause
under which the Govt. can exact
a toll of any kind on their traffic.
The Port Department can if they wish
regain possession of the land and buy
the R. way material & turn-table and
work it themselves but as they ~~could~~
~~do not want the S.R. to use the~~ would
in that case have to supply their own
rolling stock such a course would
probably not be remunerative.

Had stipulations such as are now pro-
posed been made before the railway
took over the land and laid their
sidings arrangements could have
been made. Similar actions in the
case of the proposed railways on Port
Land in Madras this has been done.
The railway have as explained by the

Hay N

Yes, at the cost
of the Port of

Why not? In Act III of 88 (M). Under
the Part is to the R^y Compt^y in the election gave
private person to another. This not bound to
allow entrance upon it - land may charge for
things so -
thereafter

Railway siding at Tuticorin

Marine DEPARTMENT.

~~John O'Donnell~~
~~Arthur in Henry Chris R.D.E.~~

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following

From the Presidency Post Office, Madras, No. 163/86, dated 9th January 1897.

do do No. 163/476, dated 18th February 1897.

Endorsement in the P.W.D. Railway Branch No. 217 D, dated 14th May 1897.

From the Presidency Post Office, Madras, No. 163/2206, dated 12th June 1897.

No. 642 Marine d/19th July 1897
In G.O. 2327 W, dated 13th September

1897 an estimate amounting to Rs 37,500 for reclaiming the foreshore at Tuticorin near the Government Pier was sanctioned.

This estimate includes the following items:-

(a) Permanent railway siding - Rs 9,330

(b) Twin-table " 2,500

Total " 11,830.

2. The Presidency Post Office contends that the original cost of these items as well as their future upkeep should be borne exclusively by the South Indian Railway. In this view His Excellency the Governor in Council concurs. The works form part of the Railway system, and there is no reason why Port Funds should bear any portion of their cost. The maintenance of the occupied by the railway works is

Issue as amended
by Mr. H. M. Member
19/7/97
W
J.P.

a legitimate charge against the Company, but the upkeep of the outer wall of the reclamation will devolve on Port Funds on the understanding, however, that the Marine Department will not be responsible for damage or interruption of traffic caused by storms. There will be no objection to the Railway undertaking, as a matter of convenience, and at the request of the port authorities, any repairs to the seawall which may be urgently required. The cost would in this case be repaid by Port Funds.

3. The proposals that the traffic of the Railway should be tolled by the Port Department may stand over, until it is seen how the traffic develops. The Railway should, however, pay a rent for the use of the land which has been reclaimed, and will be maintained, at the expense of Port Funds. The amount of this rent will be fixed after it has been ascertained what the annual cost of the upkeep of the seawall is likely to come to. An estimate ^{maintaining the outer wall} of the cost of this work will be called for in the Public Works Department.

and that the R.R. shall pay rent for the use of the land which has been reclaimed, at the cost of Port Funds.

(20) Joint Committee to Gov.
P.W. Railway Branch
for favour of Committee

To The Presidency Port Office.
" P.W. Department
" do Railway Branch

29/6/97