

G.O., No. 338 Marine

DATED 4 May 1898

Tolls : Declining to abolish the — payable by passengers for the use of the pier at Tuticorin and considering that the inconvenience ^{caused} ~~imposed~~ ~~thereby~~ would be minimised, so far as passengers by rail are concerned, if the pier tolls were included by the Railway Company in the through ticket.

Declining to abolish the — payable by passengers for the use of the pier at Tuticorin and considering that the inconvenience caused thereby would be minimised, so far as passengers by rail are concerned, if the pier tolls were included by the Railway Company in the through ticket.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From Commander H. A. STREET, R.I.M., Presidency Port Officer, Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated Madras, 19th April 1898, No. 614/148 G.

With reference to G.O., No. 259, Marine, dated 6th April 1898, I have the honour to acquaint you, for the information of Government, that I am not aware that passengers from Colombo to Tuticorin suffer "great inconvenience and unnecessary expense" in landing at the pier at the latter port. Indeed, Mr. Fowler's complaint is the first that has reached me. I have used the pier personally frequently when embarking and disembarking and have never experienced any worry or inconvenience in doing so. Without a pier, I can quite understand passengers experiencing inconvenience, but as the pier gets rid of all the inconveniences attending landing on a beach, it is only fair, in my opinion, that some charge should be made for the convenience the pier affords, and therefore I am not in favour of abolishing the tolls referred to by Mr. Fowler. I can quite understand a passenger who has not taken the trouble to make himself acquainted with the tolls leviable wishing all tolls abolished, but piers have to be maintained and the slight inconvenience caused by having to pay tolls is sufficiently met by the convenience a pier affords. In October 1896, the Port Officer, Tuticorin, informed me that the Traffic Manager, South Indian Railway, had suggested that pier tolls should be included in the tickets issued by the railway and asked whether I had any objection. I replied that I had none but beyond certain correspondence with the Traffic Manager, South Indian Railway (copies attached); the Railway authorities have not yet made any further proposals in the matter.

2. The passage from the pier to steamer and *vice versa* is conducted by a private company, and it is open to the Railway authorities to run a special boat of their own should they deem the first-class traffic will bear the expense. It is not a matter for the Port authorities to take up, as it would be interfering with private enterprise.

ENCLOSURES.

From Commander H. A. STREET, R.I.M., Presidency Port Officer, to the Traffic Manager, South Indian Railway, dated Madras, 12th December 1896.

The accompanying paper contains the proposals which I understand you made verbally to my Personal Assistant in my absence in regard to passengers and cargo proceeding to or from Colombo by steamer and rail. With respect thereto, I have to observe (a) that I have no objection to the portage and pier due payable by 1st and 2nd class through passengers being included in their tickets, provided that, as at present, the system of each passenger delivering part of his ticket at the pier is continued; (b) as regards 3rd-class passengers, there are a number which do not come to the port by rail, and as these have to pay pier dues, I think that the 3rd-class passengers brought by rail should deliver their pier ticket instead of money. This would enable the Port Officer to exercise a check over the number passing over the pier; (c) if the same arrangement be made in respect of 1st, 2nd and 3rd class tickets issued by Steamer Agents at Colombo, the South Indian Railway to be responsible for the carrying out of the same and the payment of the dues collected; (d) payment of dues collected by the Steamer Agents and Railway authorities to be made to Port Officer, Tuticorin, on receipt of a bill for same from that officer; (e) I have no objection to the weights given by the Railway authorities of contents of trucks containing through cargo being accepted by the Port Officer, Tuticorin, but the Port Officer must retain the right of reweighing should he deem such a proceeding necessary at any time.

South Indian Railway proposals.

(a) That the portage, pier trolley and pier due should be included in the through 1st and 2nd class tickets issued by the Railway authorities. The charge inclusive to be 4 annas per passenger.

(b) That the collection of pier dues on 3rd-class passengers be made also by the Railway authorities and the production of the through ticket to exempt a 3rd-class passenger from charge on the pier itself.

(c) The same arrangement to be made in respect of Steamer Agents through tickets issued at Colombo.

(d) The Steamer Agents and the South Indian Railway Company to furnish the Port Officer, Tuticorin, monthly with a list showing number of passengers booked and also to send cheque or cash for proportion due to the port.

(e) The weight of through goods to Colombo given by the South Indian Railway Company to be accepted by the Port Officer, Tuticorin.

ORDER—No. 338, Marine, dated 4th May 1898.

His Excellency the Governor in Council is not prepared to abolish the tolls payable by passengers for the use of the pier at Tuticorin, but considers that the inconvenience complained of would be minimised, so far as passengers by rail are concerned, if the pier tolls, &c., were included by the Railway Company in the through ticket, as already consented to by the Presidency Port Officer.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) W. B. DEWINTON,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

To the Presidency Port Officer.

" Public Works Department, Railway Branch.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated
Again G.O., dated
Current No. 504

" "
" "

189 , No.

189 , No.

of 1898, dated 25th April '98 from the Presy. Port. Offr

" 189 , " , "

" 189 , " , "

ORDER. No. 338 Mar 24 May '98

His Excellency the Governor in Council is not prepared to abolish the tolls payable by passengers for the use of the pier at Tuticorin, but considers that the inconvenience complained of would be minimised, so far as passengers by rail are concerned, if the pier tolls &c, were included by the Railway Company in the through ticket, as already consented to by the Presidency Port Officer.

ES.

W. S. S. S.
h. r. S. S.

59 23/5/98

To The Presidency Port Officer.
,, P.W. Department, Railway Branch.

C. No. 504 of 1898.

~~HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.~~
~~THE HON'BLE SIR HENRY BLISS, K.C.I.E.~~
~~THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.~~

SUBJECT.
Tuticorin Pier Tolls.

FOR ORDERS.

In para 40 of his inspection
G.O. 259 Marine, dated 6th April '98 notes recorded with G.O. 428 Ry, dated

Flagged B

18th March 1898, the Government In-
specter of Railways proposed the
abolition of tolls on the Tuticorin
Pier, on the ground that they were a
worry to passengers. The Presidency
Port Officer having been asked to
report on the suggestion, states that
he is opposed to the abolition of
tolls, and denies that they can be

regarded in the light of a worry.

It isn't the amount but the fact of having to pay which worries people. However, I don't see how the pier tolls can be dispensed with. The toll might be minimised, as far as regards passengers by rail by the inclusion of pier tolls in the through ticket as already suggested to Capt Street.

I certainly think the tolls are unnecessary & should not be abolished. The rate is of 6 pice for adult & 3 pice for child

2.5.98

3/5/98

Marine (189⁸) Department.

CURRENT No. 504

From

*The Presidency Port. officer,
Madras*

Order

No. $\frac{614}{148}$ 4

Dated 19th April 1898

Received

Registered

Enclosures 2.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

*Stating that the Presidency
Port. officer is not in favor
of abolishing the Tollo levied
for the use of the pier at
Tuticorin*

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

South Indian Railway
-PROPOSALS-

(True Copy)

G. A. Sheet
Commander, R.I.M.,
Presidency Port Officer.

Presidency Port Office,
Madras, 12th December 1896.

Dear Sir,

The accompanying paper contains the proposals which I understand you made verbally to my Personal Assistant in my absence, in regard to passengers and cargo proceeding to or from Colombo by steamer and rail. With respect thereto, I have to observe (a) that I have no objection to the perterage and pier due payable by 1st and 2nd class through passengers being included in their tickets, provided that, as at present, the system of each passenger delivering part of his ticket at the pier is continued; (b) as regards 3rd class passengers ~ there are a number which do not come to the port by rail, and as these have to pay pier dues I think that the 3rd class passengers brought by rail should deliver their pier ticket instead of money. This would enable the Port Officer to exercise a check over the number passing over the pier; (c) if the same arrangement be made in respect of 1st-2nd-3rd class tickets issued by steamer Agents at Colombo, the South Indian ~ Railway to be responsible for the carrying out of the same & the payment of the dues collected; (d) payment of dues collected by the steamer Agents and Railway authorities to be made to Port Officer Tuticorin on receipt of a bill for same from that officer; (e) I have no objection to the weights given by the Railway authorities of contents of trucks containing ~ through cargo being accepted by the Port Officer, Tuticorin, ~ but the Port Officer must retain the right of reweighing ~ should he deem such a proceeding necessary at any time.

I am &c.

(s/d) H.A. STREET

To

The Traffic Manager
South Indian Railway
Trichinopoly

(True Copy)

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

Mar 22
24/98

No. ⁶¹⁴~~148~~ 4

Presidency Port Office,

Heading.....

Madras, 19th April 1898.

From

Commander H.A. Street, R.I.M.,
Presidency Port Officer,
Madras,

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
CHEPAK.

Sir,

With reference to G.O.No.259, Marine, dated 6th April 1898, I have the honor to acquaint you, for the information of Government, that I am not aware that passengers from Colombo to Tuticorin suffer great inconvenience and unnecessary expense in landing at the pier at the latter port. Indeed, Mr: Fowler's complaint is the first that has reached me. I have used the ^{pier} personally ~ frequently when embarking and disembarking and have never experienced any worry or inconvenience ⁱⁿ doing so. Without a pier, I can quite understand passengers experiencing inconvenience, but as the pier gets rid of all the inconveniences attending landing on a beach, it is only fair, in my opinion, that some charge should be made for the convenience the pier affords, and therefore I am not in favor of abolishing the tolls referred to by Mr: Fowler. I can quite understand a passenger who has not taken the trouble to make himself acquainted with the tolls leviable wishing all tolls abolished, but piers have to be maintained and the slight inconvenience caused by having to pay tolls is sufficiently met by the convenience a pier

Ans. 2-1
504/98

pier affairs. In October 1896 the Port Officer, Tuticorin, informed me that the Traffic Manager, South Indian Railway, had suggested that pier tolls should be included in the tickets issued by the Railway and asked whether I had any objection. I replied that I had none but beyond certain correspondence with the Traffic Manager, South Indian Railway (copies attached), the Railway authorities have not yet made any further proposals in the matter.

2. The passage from the pier to steamer and vice versa is conducted by a private Company, and it is open to the Railway authorities to run a special boat of their own should they deem the first class traffic will bear the expense. It is not a matter for the Port authorities to take up, as it would be interfering with ~~the~~ private enterprise.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

H. A. B. B.

Commander, R.I.M.,

Presidency Port Officer.

mut