

Marine (1898) Department.

G.O., No. 732.3 Mar

DATED 30 Aug 98

[Despatch Abstract.]

Additional lights on the Madras Coast

Ordered that the Govt of India be informed that, on receipt of the requisite information, formal proposals for levying light dues for providing will be laid before that Govt in view to legislation and that an application be made for a loan from Imperial funds for the prosecution of lighthouse works in the next financial year.

Additional lights on the Madras Coast

Informing the Govt of India that, on receipt of the requisite information, formal proposals for levying light dues for providing will be laid before that Govt in view to legislation, & requesting that a loan may be granted from Imperial funds for the prosecution of lighthouse works in the next financial year.

Satisfying that the Govt of India
 is not disposed to give a grant
 from Imperial Revenue
 to meet the Expenditure to
 be incurred in the construction
 of — & suggesting the
 imposition of light dues.

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
401207287	1898
26-1-8	
2588	6-7-98
462	1-6-98
384	14-5-98
316-17	29-4-98
980	3-12-97
253	23-4-97
253	8-4-96
245	8-4-96

FURTHER PAPERS.

10th - March 1898.

LIGHTING ON FOREIGN COASTS.

Sir CHARLES CAYZER: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Governments of France, Russia, Germany, Italy, and Portugal maintain the lighting of their respective coasts out of the Imperial funds; and if he can state what European countries make a charge on merchant shipping for lights, with the amount of charge in each case?

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE: The Board of Trade have no recent information as to the funds out of which the cost of the lighting of the coasts of European countries is defrayed. From a Report of the United States Commissioners for the year 1885 it appeared that at that time tonnage dues were levied in nearly all countries, and that these dues, though not called light dues, were applied to the maintenance of lights as well as to other purposes. The Board of Trade have no information as to the amount of charges made by particular countries.

(True Copy.)

W. Bechtelme

Registrar, Finance & Commerce Department.

non.

No. 3285-S.R.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

FINANCE AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENT.

Simla, the 27th July 1898.

To

The SECRETARY to the GOVERNMENT of MADRAS,

Marine Department.

Sir,

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 317 Marine, dated the 29th April 1898, and subsequent reminder No. 589 Marine, dated the 6th instant, asking for a grant from Imperial funds of Rupees 6,68,000 in 1899-1900 and Rupees 1,45,000 in 1900-1901 in aid of the lighthouses and port improvements contemplated in the Madras Presidency.

2. It ^Xappears from the proceedings of the Government of Madras No. 316-Marine, dated the 29th April 1898, that the cost of the lighthouse scheme taken by itself is Rupees 8,30,000, and the Government of India agree with the Government of Madras in considering that this scheme should be kept separate from that of Port improvements which is a purely local matter. It is understood that the lights on which this expenditure is to be incurred are coast lights, and apart from the question of the legality, or propriety of applying the balances of port funds to expenditure of this nature the Government of Madras have now set aside the proposal so to apply them owing to the urgent necessity for many port improvements which would have had to be postponed indefinitely if the available balances of the port funds had been devoted to the lighthouse scheme.

X Appendix C

Mar ^{Encl} 989/98

Before

3. Before making the present application for a grant from Imperial revenues, the Government of Madras have considered the alternatives of applying to the Government of India for a loan to supplement the Port Funds or of legislating either to raise the Port dues ^{or for the imposition of light dues} on vessels passing up and down the West coast of the Bay of Bengal; but His Excellency in Council has arrived at the conclusion that neither of these alternatives should be adopted because, as far as the first alternative is concerned ^{it is considered} that the Port funds are not in a position to pay the interest charges on a loan and provide a sinking fund for its extinction, while the raising of the Port dues would, they consider, occasion an undue burden on trade and a proposal to levy light dues would, it is anticipated, meet with so much opposition from the shipping interests that it would not be advisable to make it.

4. The Government of India however regret that they are not disposed to give a grant from Imperial Revenues to meet the whole or a portion of the expenditure to be incurred in providing additional lights on the Madras Coast. It is argued indeed that Imperial funds might equitably be given for such a purpose in view of the protection afforded by such lights to trade and navigation generally, and it is stated that England is the only important maritime power which does not act on this principle, but requires lighthouses to be maintained from the proceeds of light dues. But in reply to this I am to say that in the opinion of the Government of India whatever may be the practice of Continental countries in Europe, the principle adopted in this respect in England is that which they ought to follow.

5. The Government of India indeed are not aware of the information on which the Government of Madras base their statements regarding the practice in other European countries. But the enclosed copy of a question asked in the British Parliament on the 10th March and of the answer given thereto shows that there are reasons for believing that England is not singular in this respect, and throws doubts on the information received by the Governor in Council as to the practice followed in other countries. See also paragraph 28 of Mr. Ashpitels report.

6. In view then of the English practice and of the precedents afforded in this country by Act IX of 1879 under which light dues are levied on vessels passing up and down the East coast of the Bay of Bengal and by the levy of the Besses light dues under the authority of the Board of Trade, the Government of India consider that trade and shipping, and not the country generally, should bear the burden of the cost of erecting light-houses on the coast of India. Nor would the Government of India be disposed to attach much weight to the argument that this view will meet with opposition from shipping interests for the principle that the portion of the community specially interested should bear the cost of the lights seems in itself equitable; though it is only natural that such opposition would arise, if the special interests concerned thought that there was any reasonable prospect of having the cost of the lights provided for in any other way.

7. The Governor General in Council therefore considers that any fresh expenditure to be incurred for erecting lights on the Madras coast should be provided for by means of light dues. Some expenditure has already been incurred in the past in the erection of light houses on that coast and is still incurred in their maintenance; and the Government of India have no objection to the Government of Madras continuing to bear such expenditure to the same extent as before, though it is not clear how much that is. But as regards any future expenditure on this object, the Government of India are of opinion that the expected capital outlay and the additional maintenance charges over and above past standards cannot be met from Imperial revenues, but should be provided for under some scheme which should be forthwith formulated on the basis that both the interest on the new capital outlay and the additional maintenance charges will be covered together with a small sinking fund charge by light dues to be now imposed.

8. I am therefore to request that, with the permission of His Excellency

Excellency the Governor in Council, the Government of Madras will reconsider the case in the light of the above remarks and formulate a scheme based on the analogy of Act IX of 1879 for the levy of light dues on vessels passing up and down the West coast of the Bay of Bengal, sufficient to cover the expenditure required for the purpose in view.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

Stephen Jacob

Offg. Secy. to the Govt. of India.

Marine (1897) Department.

CURRENT No.

Order

From

The Chairman,
Harbour Trust Board,
Madras.

No. 1328.

Dated 18th June 1897.

Despatched 23rd

Received

Enclosures—

Spare copies three.

SUBJECT.

DEBENTURE LOAN.

Replying to G. O., Financial No. 398, dated 12th May 1897, requesting that the Government of India may be asked to allow the sanction to the issue of the proposed Debenture Loan of Rs. 50,00,000 to stand.

[illegible]

G. O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FROM

ACTING CHAIRMAN, HARBUR TRUST BOARD,
MADRAS

Tc

Secretary to Government,

SIR,

2. A resumé of the circumstances leading up to the sanction granted by the Government of India to the issue of this loan was given in the Administration Report of the Trustees for the year 1896-97, paras. 4 to 11, copies of which I submit herewith for ready reference.

3. With regard to para. 3 of the letter from the Government of India, Finance and Commerce Department, dated Simla, 27th April, No. 1889-A, the Trustees would invite attention to para. 11 of their Administration Report, which points out that the opportunity of successfully floating the loan, when proposed, was lost between that time and the receipt of the necessary sanction from H. E. the Governor-General in Council, under Section 34, Madras Act II. of 1896, the money market having in the interval become so unfavourable that it was impossible to offer the loan for public subscription in India with any prospect of success.

4. The money market has remained in the same state up to now, and there is not at the present moment any prospect of an immediate change. It is, however, impossible to predict when a favourable opportunity may occur, or for how long a period it might last; and it is very necessary that the Trustees should be in a position to seize any favourable turn of the money market which may present itself, and be able to act promptly.

5. The Board would, therefore, request that the Government of India may be asked to allow the sanction to the issue of the proposed loan to stand, as if it is necessary to refer for sanction again when a favourable market occurs, the opportunity may again be lost, as was the case before, owing to the unavoidable delay in obtaining sanction; after which it must be remembered notice inviting tenders must for some little time be advertised, which again would mean further delay, during which time the market might change.

6. With regard to the terms of repayment of the existing loan from Government, which now stands at Rs. 48,79,227, the Trustees would, of course, be prepared to abide by any reasonable terms which the Government of India might see fit to impose.

I have the honor to be,

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

J. N. ATKINSON,

Chairman.

*Extract from the Administration Report of the Trustees of the Harbour of Madras
for the year 1896-97 regarding the issue of a Debenture Loan.*

Debenture loan.

4. The proposal to issue a debenture loan was brought forward by the Hon. Mr. G. L. Chambers, at the meeting of the Board held on the 8th day of November 1895, when a memorandum was read proposing, with reference to the notice given by him at the immediately preceding meeting, that, subject to the consent of H. E. the Governor in Council under section 34, Act II. of 1886, the Trustees should issue a debenture loan under section 36, to repay to the Secretary of State for India the sum due on account of advances made by Government for Harbour construction, and to provide funds for Harbour improvements.

Reduction in
rate of interest.

5. It was resolved to address Government, with a view to obtaining a reduction in the interest payable under section 30, from $4\frac{1}{2}$ to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and to solicit the favour of early orders to enable the Trustees to take advantage of the then favourable position of the money market for the issue of a loan, should Government decline to reduce the rate of interest.

Refund of
capital
advances.

6. In addressing Government upon the subject on the 18th November 1894, Mr. LeFanu pointed out that the Madras Trust was heavily handicapped with its comparatively small income, in having to pay such large sums annually by way of interest and refund of capital advances, which had amounted for the preceding five years to Rs. 19,50,860, including a voluntary extra refund of Rs. 5,00,000 in August 1894, when it was anticipated that the Harbour would then be shortly completed, without the necessity of borrowing any further advance to finish it; but unexpected delay in completing the work had occurred, the Board had been compelled to apply for an additional loan and the Trustees were advised that a protective groyne to the south of the Harbour, and other works, were absolutely necessary, which it was estimated would add a still further expenditure on capital account of Rs. 16,50,000.

Outstanding
liabilities
1894-95.

7. The position of the Board at that time was as follows:—

Capital debt at the end of 1894-95	Rs. 47,24,242
Completion Estimate	3,69,122

Total Debt... 50,93,364

Contemplated expenditure upon Har- bour improvements	Rs. 16,50,000
---	---------------

Total to be provided for out of loan and invested funds	Rs. 67,43,364
--	---------------

It was, therefore, proposed to issue a loan of Rs. 60,00,000.

8. The Board had in cash and investments Rs. 9,50,000, total Rs. 69,50,000, which would it was estimated have left an available Surplus balance of about two lakhs of rupees, over and above the sum to be repaid to Government and the contemplated expenditure upon protective works and Harbour improvements. The issue of the proposed loan would have substituted for the outstanding balance due to Government a debt to the public of Rs. 60,00,000, upon which it was shown interest could be paid at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per annum, and a sinking fund provided sufficient to extinguish the loan in thirty years.

9. In its order upon the Board's proposal, Government declined to reduce the rate of interest, and favoured the Trust with a memorandum from the Financial Department revising the forecast which had accompanied the Board's proposals.

Revised
proposals.

This revised forecast calculated that the Board could reckon upon receiving only 3 per cent. per annum upon investments, instead of $3\frac{1}{2}$ as anticipated by the Trustees, and provided for interest upon the debenture loan at the rate of 4% instead of at $3\frac{1}{2}$.

The result, however, arrived at by Government satisfactorily showed that the Trust could, even under these circumstances, repay the proposed debenture loan of Rs. 60,00,000 in full at the end of a period of thirty years.

10. The matter was in July 1896 referred to the Government of India, the sanction of H. E. The Governor-General in Council being required to the issue of the loan under section, 34 Act II. of 1886, and under date Simla 10th September 1896, sanction was accorded under that section to the issue of a debenture loan of Rs. 50,00,000 bearing interest at either $3\frac{1}{2}$ or $3\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. per annum; and it was stipulated that three months' notice should be given by the Trust before repayment, during the course of the year 1896-97, of the outstanding balance due to Government.

Sanction to
issue Debenture
loan received
from
Government of
India.

11. During the interval which had elapsed between the time that the Board proposed the issue of the loan, and sanction being accorded, the money market became unfavourable, and the Trustees have, since September 1896, deemed it unwise to make the offer to the public, as in the state of the money market during the past six months there appeared little prospect of floating such a loan successfully.

Unfavourable
condition of the
money market.

The Trustees have therefore addressed Government, requesting that the matter may be allowed to remain in abeyance, for the present.

(True Extract.)

C. PINSENT,
Secretary.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

again
READ the following

G.O. 2560 W, dated 2nd September 1904.

Order No. 3655 W, dated 22nd ~~September~~ ^{December} 1904.

In supersession of G.O. 2560 W, dated 2nd September 1902, the entertainment for a period of six months of the undermentioned establishment for regrading the Channels in the Godavari Eastern Dyke, and for making tracings of each channel with the proposed positions of the pipes allowed and the Ayacut of each pipe is sanctioned:-

	Cost Rs
2 overseers on Rs 60 each - - -	120
10 Surveyors on Rs 50 and 60 (55) - - -	550
1 Zaeer on Rs 25 - - -	25
1 Draftsman on Rs 45 - - -	45
1 Clerk on Rs 20 - - -	20
1 Peon on Rs 8 (for Mr. Mullings) - - -	8
68 Lascars on Rs 7 each - - -	476
Total per mensem	1244
Total for 6 months	7464

2. Mr. C.T. Mullings, who will be placed in charge of the work early in January next will be given two Selected overseers 1st grade and the two temporary overseers now sanctioned will be appointed in

their

their places. Of the 68 Lascars sanctioned bare for each surveyor, 2 for each overseer and the remainder for the officer in charge. The superintending Engineer will scrutinise the establishment now sanctioned carefully and only appoint such as he considers absolutely necessary for the work to be done. The Government trust that the work will be done before the next irrigation season.

3. The sanction accorded in para 1 has been registered as Provincial No. 52 W of 1904-05 and Classified as Establishment Temporary.

(True Extract)

(Sd) S.B. Murray.

Under Secretary to Govt. P.W.D.

(True Copy)

P. Vaidyanathan
18.3.105
Head Clerk, P.W. Secretariat.

Rf

Operations in the Negapatnam Port

P.W. No R 551

12.5.05

Erro 5264. From S.E. V No 357W of 29.5.0.

W

There seems to be a certain amount of misunderstanding here. The Ex. Engr is not apparently aware that he is in charge of the dredging operations, which appear to be supervised by the Port officer.

2. If the dredging returns are calculated on a boat load of 16 tons, when the boat can only hold 10.8 tons, then the returns are false.

(Sd) 8Bm

8.6.05.

The dredging operations here, as elsewhere, should be in charge of the Port officer who is always on the spot, whereas the Ex. Engr may be absent for 2/3 of each month. With marine knowledge have orders passed on this matter.

Meaning

(Sd) W.D. Dew

876

Coimbatore Port.

This port was declared open to trade in about the year 1864 and since then carried on a small trade. A Port Conservator and a Signalling establishment looked after the requirements of the Port. In 1883 the trade of the Port had so much declined that the Ports Act was withdrawn and the Port abolished (See G. O. Rev: No 1074 of 15th November 1887 and G. O. Marine No 356 dated 10th August 1889). Existing establishments were also dispensed with. In 1892 in order to facilitate the landing of Railway Materials for the East Coast Railway, the Port was again declared open under the Ports Act and temporary establishment sanctioned for customs purposes (See G. O. Marine, No 410 of 5th November 1892) the Conservancy affairs

affairs of the Port being supervised by the Port Officer of Gopalpore by occasional visits. In 1896, the Collector reported that the attempt to land Railway material at Ganjam was not successful and that practically no exports or imports had taken place for the previous three years, and in view of this fact and of the improbability of Ganjam being ever used as a Port for private trading recommended the Port being again abolished which was accordingly done (See G. O. Marine No. 41, of 14th January 1897, and Revenue No. 232 of 1st April 1897).

2. In May 1897 Mr. Spring, Ag. Consulting Engineer for Railways, submitted a note to Government with reference to the relative advisability of connecting the Port of Ganjam or that of Gopalpore with the East

East Coast Railway and remarked that Ganjam is far better potentially than Gopalpore (See Marine Department Endorsement No. 3448, dated 19th May 1897). The Presidency Port Officer in reporting on a Reference made to him on the Subject remarked that the usual advantages offered by the Port of Ganjam for Landing and Shipping operations have long been known and that the only reason that could be assigned for Gopalpore having been selected as a Port in preference by the Mercantile Community was probably the reputation Ganjam had for unhealthiness since 1815 when there was a very great mortality from fever among the inhabitants. No such severe mortality has been heard of in recent years; this perhaps is due to the fact that very few people are now

2
4
now living in the place. Should
the Port be connected by Railway
with Gopalpore the great advantages
it offers over the Port of Gopalpore
ought to cause the Mercantile com-
munity to use it, but it will de-
pend on the place being sufficiently
healthy to induce traders to bring
themselves there (G.O. No. 954 Marine
dated 23rd November 1897)

H. D. Bannister
For Presy. Port Officer

marine u.o. D. 26
20-1-05



P.W.U.O. R. No 66
21-1-05

2
Draft is forwarded to P.W.D. up for
acceptance

ayll
20-1-05

P.W.D.

Submitted

P.K.S.
21-1-05

I think, before these letters issue,
inquiries should be made as to
what the "Kasabek" has done at
Negapatam, from Port Officer & Cee.
Eng. - I am inclined to think the
harbour is much worse. If the
Kasabek dredger is found unsuitable
for the purpose, the "Priestman" dredger must
be at Kichicorin, which will be available
when the "Manser" starts work, which
also, but only, will be, and no new craft
is required.

The statement at A in para 3 of letter
to Director R.I. is of course, wrong.
The P.O. was intended to say that there is
not Engineer at Cuddalore - & even in
this it is possible he is wrong, as perhaps
they also have a man who
could supervise repair work.

marine (u.o.) -



Draft O.M. to P. O. on the lines of
the above work.

ayll
28.1.05

For the U.S.

A draft memo is submitted

Marine: u.o.D. 36 T.H.A 30.1.05
1-2-05.

P.W.D. use for acceptance

P.W.UO RNO106
2.2.05

ayll
31.1.05



P.W.D

ds

The draft may be accepted?

P.H.S
2.2.05

1. As I was not satisfied that the
proposed disposal would send no
any further change this rather sudden
need, I decided to withdraw to
Cuddalore, & see things for myself.
This I did on 17th inst.
2. I found that a dredger is urgently
needed, boats being unable to lie
up alongside the wharf except during
high tide & having to make a
detour of a mile to get to the

for 28/2/05

has for the day, & often, cranked
with much reduced back -

3. I have shown in the ^{blue pencil} sketch the tracing of Chart 1400 to the Channel which will dredge my most urgent. They aggregate 5610 R⁹ feet, & calculate that 50,000 tons of silt has to be removed from there to make them suitable for ^{pulling} junks laden boats. There are also other places which will dredge between Wharf & North bar, & the above are most urgent. The stuff to be dredged varies from pure sand, to sand & clay mixed, & pure clay. Neither of them is hard, & I could drive a pointed bamboo down 6 feet. The stuff can be removed either by buckets or suction pump. Personally I am inclined to agree with the Presy. Port Office that a bucket dredger would be most suitable.

4. Taking 50,000 tons as the quantity to be removed at once, & assuming that the dredger can lift 100 tons per hour, & works 8 hours a day, & 20 days per month, this means $3\frac{1}{2}$ months work -

I think that any dredges which
to keep the Cuddalore lock in
in an efficient state (the naviga-
y heavy laden boats, should be
Capable of doing this amount of
work, and I would fix 100 tons
in hours or less capability. More is
intercepted.

5. I have ascertained that the Vasebeck
lifts about 125 tons per day according
to the record kept. It according to
the lift logs I think there is very
little supervision over the operation
& he doubts if more than 1/2 ton
is really dredged. I think the
to P.O.O. should be asked to inquire
into the matter.

6. The bucket dredges in use in Surlingham
skirting Cuddalore which cost £2000, &
lift 200 tons a day -
Therefore neither the Vasebeck nor with
the Delta Dredges are sufficiently
powerful for Cuddalore -

7. With regard to the disposal of the
spoil it can be shown that in the back entrance
into the Channel A B (see chart)
will have to be conveyed to a
in front of the entrance.

8. I think therefore, that a dredge
of the following description is well
for Cuddalore.

1. Self-propelling, because the
water is deep, & it will have to
move sand in. Speed need not
exceed 4 or 5 knots.

2. Draft not to exceed $2\frac{1}{2}'$

3. To dredge 100 fms. or more of
fairly soft sand, sand & clay.
Clay.

4. To be fitted with bucket.

Note. Cuddalore merchants wish for
a bucket dredge. These gentlemen
reference of their work that I cannot
say whether we would answer the
purpose as well as a bucket dredge.

5. Should take (1) that will work at
a distance not exceeding 100'

(2) deliveral in parts or hoppers &
convey to shore.

6. Cost deliveral at Cuddalore not to
exceed \$5000.

Note. Skilled superintendence can be
had there, with the fitting of
together, & for upkeep maintenance.

9. The C.O. think that such a craft

Can be named in the Fort dock
 yard. Calcutta, by all means let
 the reference be made - Personally, I
 am inclined to think it might be
 best to obtain her from England.

L. L. L.
 25. 2. 11.

Waring 100



Prober type
 the 10/10 8/4
 note 8/4

One of the most famous of the South Sea
Islands. Celebrated for its
beauty and its people are
very friendly to the white man.

Visagapatom

to the private Secy
13 H. 2. the Govt



from the dues fund for
tarpaullins & plankings
to protect jaggery lying
within port limits.
The Govt. presumed
that rent for storage
was charged.

The Comtee were unani-
mously of opinion that
rent should not be
charged as the tarpau-
lins were bought from
landing & shipping fees.

The Govt. held, however,
that rent should be
charged for the use of
ground within port
limits whether the
goods stored thereon
were under tarpaulins
or not. The rates were
eventually sanctioned
and published in the
Gazette.

The Vizag. L. & S. dues
fund opened '94/95 with
nearly Rs. 8,000
balance in hand.

G.O. dt 10.3.94, No 82.A.

G.O. dt 21.4.94,
No 138, para 1.

G.O. dt 7.7.94, No 273.

~~G.O. dt 10.3.94, No 82.A.~~

353.
4/9

579/54

Marine Dept
Vizag. Landing and
Shipping Dues.

The P. P. O. has the
power to sanction from
the Dues Fund estimates
for works up to a limit
of Rs. 500/- in each case.
Above that amount
estimates must be
sanctioned by Govt.

In March last the
Vizag. Comtee desired
that a sum of Rs. 5000
from the Dues Fund
might be placed at
the Collector's disposal
for port improvements.

The proposal was dis-
allowed with the re-
mark that an estimate
for each work should be
sub^d for sanction in
the usual course.

The Committee appealed
but the decision was
upheld.

In March '94 the
Govt. sanctioned an
expenditure of Rs. 1500
from

cleared twice, say at Vizag: a Tuticorin
for vessels using the light. 7/10th
from, Tuticorin being included in
the Western port for purposes of
light dues -

G.O. 980 Mar. 4/3rd Dec. '97
+ p. 21. Flag. M

fine statistics in which more
accurate data can be framed.

his total, as there is no informa-
tion in his report, or in any
other document before Govern-
ment, as to the number of
ships of each kind that would
pay the dues. The information
given in the administration
Reports as to number of ships
and tonnage does not enable
one to judge of the number
of ships that has to be dealt
with, as the same ships and
tonnage are counted several
times in one year, i.e., whenever
the ships enter ports.

6. If it is decided to pro-
ceed with the levy of a light
due, the Presidency Port officer
might be asked to report on
the proposed rates, and to
verify Mr. Ashpitel's calcula-
tion as to the expected proceeds.

7. As regards para 5 of
India's letter, it is submitted
that there is nothing in the
copy of answer in the House
of Commons which controverts
the statement made by the
Madras

Madras Government. The President of the Board of Trade merely says that nearly all European countries levy tonnage dues which are applied not only to the maintenance of lights but to other purposes. This is exactly what is done in the Madras Presidency. There is thus no separate light due in any of those countries. The information in para 28 of Mr. Ashpitel's report is inaccurate, as he admits in his letter recorded with Co. R. 384 Marine dated 14 May '98.

Flag E

W. H. L.
6-7-98

The light dues now levied in Indian ports will be found in Table X of R.O. 245 Marine of 4 April 96.

Flag H

Amount of loan required for 1899-00 to admit of the proposed programme being carried out -

A

11-12-13-14-15-16-17-18-19-20-21-22-23-24-25-26-27-28-29-30-31-32-33-34-35-36-37-38-39-40-41-42-43-44-45-46-47-48-49-50-51-52-53-54-55-56-57-58-59-60-61-62-63-64-65-66-67-68-69-70-71-72-73-74-75-76-77-78-79-80-81-82-83-84-85-86-87-88-89-90-91-92-93-94-95-96-97-98-99-100-101-102-103-104-105-106-107-108-109-110-111-112-113-114-115-116-117-118-119-120-121-122-123-124-125-126-127-128-129-130-131-132-133-134-135-136-137-138-139-140-141-142-143-144-145-146-147-148-149-150-151-152-153-154-155-156-157-158-159-160-161-162-163-164-165-166-167-168-169-170-171-172-173-174-175-176-177-178-179-180-181-182-183-184-185-186-187-188-189-190-191-192-193-194-195-196-197-198-199-200-201-202-203-204-205-206-207-208-209-210-211-212-213-214-215-216-217-218-219-220-221-222-223-224-225-226-227-228-229-230-231-232-233-234-235-236-237-238-239-240-241-242-243-244-245-246-247-248-249-250-251-252-253-254-255-256-257-258-259-260-261-262-263-264-265-266-267-268-269-270-271-272-273-274-275-276-277-278-279-280-281-282-283-284-285-286-287-288-289-290-291-292-293-294-295-296-297-298-299-300-301-302-303-304-305-306-307-308-309-310-311-312-313-314-315-316-317-318-319-320-321-322-323-324-325-326-327-328-329-330-331-332-333-334-335-336-337-338-339-340-341-342-343-344-345-346-347-348-349-350-351-352-353-354-355-356-357-358-359-360-361-362-363-364-365-366-367-368-369-370-371-372-373-374-375-376-377-378-379-380-381-382-383-384-385-386-387-388-389-390-391-392-393-394-395-396-397-398-399-400-401-402-403-404-405-406-407-408-409-410-411-412-413-414-415-416-417-418-419-420-421-422-423-424-425-426-427-428-429-430-431-432-433-434-435-436-437-438-439-440-441-442-443-444-445-446-447-448-449-450-451-452-453-454-455-456-457-458-459-460-461-462-463-464-465-466-467-468-469-470-471-472-473-474-475-476-477-478-479-480-481-482-483-484-485-486-487-488-489-490-491-492-493-494-495-496-497-498-499-500-501-502-503-504-505-506-507-508-509-510-511-512-513-514-515-516-517-518-519-520-521-522-523-524-525-526-527-528-529-530-531-532-533-534-535-536-537-538-539-540-541-542-543-544-545-546-547-548-549-550-551-552-553-554-555-556-557-558-559-560-561-562-563-564-565-566-567-568-569-570-571-572-573-574-575-576-577-578-579-580-581-582-583-584-585-586-587-588-589-590-591-592-593-594-595-596-597-598-599-600-601-602-603-604-605-606-607-608-609-610-611-612-613-614-615-616-617-618-619-620-621-622-623-624-625-626-627-628-629-630-631-632-633-634-635-636-637-638-639-640-641-642-643-644-645-646-647-648-649-650-651-652-653-654-655-656-657-658-659-660-661-662-663-664-665-666-667-668-669-670-671-672-673-674-675-676-677-678-679-680-681-682-683-684-685-686-687-688-689-690-691-692-693-694-695-696-697-698-699-700-701-702-703-704-705-706-707-708-709-710-711-712-713-714-715-716-717-718-719-720-721-722-723-724-725-726-727-728-729-730-731-732-733-734-735-736-737-738-739-740-741-742-743-744-745-746-747-748-749-750-751-752-753-754-755-756-757-758-759-760-761-762-763-764-765-766-767-768-769-770-771-772-773-774-775-776-777-778-779-780-781-782-783-784-785-786-787-788-789-790-791-792-793-794-795-796-797-798-799-800-801-802-803-804-805-806-807-808-809-810-811-812-813-814-815-816-817-818-819-820-821-822-823-824-825-826-827-828-829-830-831-832-833-834-835-836-837-838-839-840-841-842-843-844-845-846-847-848-849-850-851-852-853-854-855-856-857-858-859-860-861-862-863-864-865-866-867-868-869-870-871-872-873-874-875-876-877-878-879-880-881-882-883-884-885-886-887-888-889-890-891-892-893-894-895-896-897-898-899-900-901-902-903-904-905-906-907-908-909-910-911-912-913-914-915-916-917-918-919-920-921-922-923-924-925-926-927-928-929-930-931-932-933-934-935-936-937-938-939-940-941-942-943-944-945-946-947-948-949-950-951-952-953-954-955-956-957-958-959-960-961-962-963-964-965-966-967-968-969-970-971-972-973-974-975-976-977-978-979-980-981-982-983-984-985-986-987-988-989-990-991-992-993-994-995-996-997-998-999-1000-1001-1002-1003-1004-1005-1006-1007-1008-1009-1010-1011-1012-1013-1014-1015-1016-1017-1018-1019-1020-1021-1022-1023-1024-1025-1026-1027-1028-1029-1030-1031-1032-1033-1034-1035-1036-1037-1038-1039-1040-1041-1042-1043-1044-10

Total

50 ————— 6, 7, 8 & 9 ————— from columns, 6,

Figures in column 14 have been arrived at by reckoning at

— 20 — 16 — from Appendix

R.P.
11 Aug. 98

hands

2:15

19.

All the Lighthouse works and Port improvements proposed in the forecast for execution during 1898-99 have been provided with funds in the current year's budget.

78 & 9 of the appendices printed on page 11 of L. Q. 316 Marine of 29 April 1878.

80

printed on page 10 of S. O. No. 316 Marine of 29 April 1898.

10

Marine Dept

Marine DEPARTMENT.

A Application to India for
a loan for light house works.
Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

urgent

Again G.O., dated

189 No.

Again G.O., dated

189 , No.

Current No.

of 189 , dated , from

" "

" 189 , "

" 989

" 189 8, " 2nd August , , the Govt. of India,
Finance & Commerce Dept

ORDER.

732 dated 30th August 1898

The Hon Sir Henry Blundell K.C.S.E
Hon Mr. Arundel
His Excellency the Governor

Ordered that the following --
reply be sent.

(H.E.No. 733 Mar.d/30th August 98).

TO
The Secretary to the
Government of India,
Finance & Commerce Dept.

Sir,
I am directed to acknowledge --
the receipt of your letter, No. 3285
S.R. dated 27th July, 1898, in which
the regret of the Government of --
India is expressed at not being --
able to make a grant from Imperial
Revenues in aid of the expenditure
to be incurred in providing addi-
tional lights on the Madras coast,
and suggesting the imposition of --
light dues to meet the cost in-
volved.

2. In reply I am to say that His
Excellency the Governor in Council
is now causing inquiry to be made as
to

Pres
only the
notes should be
presented to
the order of letter

B

I don't follow the figures below. In
para 3 of our letter of April 29 we
said that we wanted a grant of 6.68
in '99-'00. ^{it is stated} ~~Others~~ in the table appended
here, ~~showing~~ that a loan of 4.61 will
be needed, while in the body of the draft
only 2.15 is asked for and remaining
requirements are proposed to be met
from current receipts supplemented by
existing receipts - I don't see how.

BO
20/8/98

Col
Para 18 of A says a loan
of 4.61 is wanted. Col. 15 gives
2.15 for light house works nothing
for fund works. Why not ask
a loan of 4.61 that is wanted. How
are we to meet the deficit. We
are bankrupt now. Shall we
be solvent then?

P. W. 4.
500-24-3-98.

18th. 8. 98

14th. 8. 98

14th. 8. 98

to the estimated receipts from such dues and that when this and other requisite information has been obtained, formal proposals will be laid before the Government of India in view to legislation. So far as can be at present seen, the legislative enactment will have to be an imperial measure, and to be introduced into the Governor General's Council. This procedure will take time. Meanwhile, arrangements have to be made for the continuance of the operations for which the special light house establishment has been organised. Should the proposed programme be adhered to both as regards lighthouse and other port works, there will be a ^{large} ~~small~~ deficit in 1899-1900. ~~minimum~~. His Excellency the Governor in Council trusts, under these circumstances, that the Government of India will be pleased to come to the aid of the Madras Government to the extent of giving a loan from Imperial Funds for the prosecution of lighthouse works in next official year, the total cost of which, including apparatus, is estimated at Rs. 2,15,000. Should this loan be sanctioned, His Excellency the Governor in Council will arrange to provide for lighthouse maintenance and port works generally from current receipts supplemented by existing balances, and to carry out such other new port fund works.

3. In para 3 of my letter no. 317 marine dated 29th April 1898 the amount asked for from Imperial Funds for next year is given as Rs. 6,68,000, but this included works other than lighthouses, and ~~was estimated before the framing of the current year's budget which alters to some extent the original~~ ^{wholly} ~~forecast~~. The present application, ~~it will be seen, is confined to the amount required next year for new lighthouse works and apparatus, leaving all other charges to be met from available Port Funds, which, after providing for maintenance, will probably amount to Rs. 3,98,000.~~

* Letter recorded with L.O.
384 Mar 9 14 May 1898. 745-2

works as may be possible.

4. With reference to para 5 of your letter under reply, I am to say that so far as His Excellency in Council can judge, there is nothing in the answer of the President of the Board of Trade, in the House of Commons, to controvert the statement made by the Madras Government to the effect that England is the only important maritime power that requires its lighthouses to be wholly maintained from the proceeds of light dues. The President of the Board of Trade says that tonnage dues were levied in nearly all countries, and that these dues were applied not merely to the maintenance of lights but to "other purposes" also. It would thus appear that in none of these countries is there a special due imposed exclusively for the construction and maintenance of lighthouses.

5. The information given in para 28 of Mr. Ashpitel's report, to which attention is invited by the Government of India, has since been modified by that officer, who reported on the 10th May 1898 that his previous statement was not strictly accurate, as in many countries what is levied is a general tonnage rate, which is credited to the general revenue.

revenue, and to which the cost of construction and maintenance of lights is debited without reference to the amount collected. This arrangement seems to be precisely similar to that which is now followed by the Madras Presidency, and which the Government of India proposes to alter.

RS.

APR 16-8-98.

I have etc.,

M. 18.8.98

13/9/98

x No. I hope to spend much of it in clearing up the light house works.

W both submitted for approval with reference to the figure of 46,000. The figure is an uncertain quantity and depends on the estimate of expenditure which will be much below 46,000. 30.8.98

Loan for light house works.

The Hon. Mr. H. H. Arnold.

Flag A.

Very good - But I think this should be explained in some detail, as India will fail to follow the plan as laid.

RS 26/8/98

28.8.98

An amended draft order is now submitted with reference to Mr. H. H. Arnold's suggestion on 22-8-98. It is submitted that if we can get a loan for light house works we can finance the work without difficulty. This is the light house which I have been working on.

25.8.98 29.8.98

732 733 30

Marine Department.

C.No.989.

Note for the Honourable Members

With reference to the Hon. Member's remarks on the draft --- order, the following explanation is submitted:-

(1) In Appendix A printed on page 8 of G.O.No.316, Marine, dated 29th April 1898, a provision of Rs. 2,00,000 was made for expenditure during 1898-99 on item 11, viz, "Dredger and improvements to the bar at Cocanada"; but with reference to note 2 in the same Appendix, a sum of Rs. 50,000 only has been provided in the current year's budget estimate. This difference between the forecast and the budget estimate has increased the closing balance in the budget estimate by Rs.1,50,000, or Rs. 1,87,000 inclusive of Establishment and Tools and Plant charges.

There is also a difference of about Rs.20,000 due to minor alterations in details between the forecast and the budget estimate. This difference has also correspondingly increased

30.8.98

increased the closing balance
on the 1st April 1899.

The above modifications, which
amount to RS. 2,07,000, (1,87,000 +
20,000), account for the difference
between 6.68 shown in para 3 of
the letter to the Government of
India dated 29th April 1898 and
4.61 shown in the statement A
now appended.

6.68
4.61
1.87

(2) The Statement shows that a loan
of 4.61 would be necessary if all
works (lighthouse & others) were
carried out from the proceeds, but
in the present draft letter it is
proposed to restrict the amount
of the loan to requirements on ac-
count of lighthouse works alone,
leaving maintenance charges and
other new works to be provided
for from available Port Funds,
which will amount to RS. 3.98 in
1899-1900, after providing for all
maintenance charges, i.e. this amount
will be available for new Port Fund works
other than Lighthouses.

x vide col. 12 of statement.

M. 25.8.98

10

(1) The amounts required
in the two following years
are shown on the attached
slip

(2) The Govt of India
are aware that the
expenditure goes beyond
next year, and the present
application is only a
small shift, pending the
elaboration of the scheme
suggested by the Govt.
of India. It would
perhaps therefore, be
well to confine the
application to next year's
needs.

It is perhaps not
necessary to reiterate the
papers. Mr. Grundell's
letter of 22-8-98 has
already been answered
by your letter of 25-8-98
and the Hon. Member
seems satisfied. He
counter-indicates in Henry
Bliss' letter of 26-8-98.

Very well. Sent 30 Aug 98
with India
M. 25.8.98