Government of Madras.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

SINCE PRINTED.

G.O., No. 471, 31st May 1899.

INDEXED.

NOTES PRINTED.

Coast Light dues.

Requesting the representatives of mercantile and shipping interests in the Madras Presidency to favour the Government with their views both as to the necessity for the proposed improvements to lighthouses and as to the ability of the trade to bear the proposed imposition of —, and referring, for opinion, the draft Bill on the subject to certain officers, mercantile bodies and agents.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Number of copies { Order.
Letter.

Government {1899} of Madras.

MARINE.

Recd. } 1899. *Enclosures*
Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 471, 31st May 1899.

NP

MAY.

Coast Light Dues.

Requesting the representatives of mercantile and shipping interests in the Madras Presidency to favour the Government with their views both as to the necessity for the proposed improvements to lighthouses and as to the ability of the trade to bear the proposed imposition of —, and referring, for opinion, the draft Bill on the subject, to certain officers, mercantile bodies and agents.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

Read—again the following papers :—

G.O., No. 268, Marine, dated 18th June 1889.

Abstract.—Communicating to the Presidency Port Officer, for information and guidance, Government of India Resolution appointing Mr. W. T. Douglass on the special duty of inspecting lighthouses on the Indian coasts.

G.O., Nos. 25, 26, Marine, dated 22nd January 1891.

Abstract.—Passing orders on Mr. W. T. Douglass' report of his inspection of the lighthouses in Madras Presidency and on the Presidency Port Officer's remarks thereon, and directing that the proceedings be communicated to the Secretary of State and the Government of India.

G.O., No. 230, Marine, dated 26th May 1891.

Abstract.—Directing that the Secretary of State be addressed in view to Mr. F. W. Ashpitel, Assistant Engineer, First grade, at present in England on furlough, being permitted to undertake the study of lighthouse buildings and apparatus in use in England and France.

G.O., No. 438, Marine, dated 8th October 1891.

Abstract.—Informing the Presidency Port Officer that at present and until the new provincial contract is settled the Government cannot entertain the proposals made for reorganizing the lights on the East coast.

G.O., No. 23, Marine, dated 19th January 1892.

Abstract.—Recording resolution of the Government of India passing orders on the correspondence regarding the action taken by local Governments on the suggestions and recommendations made by Mr. Douglass in connection with lighthouses on the coasts of India.

G.O., No. 107, Marine, dated 20th March 1893.

Abstract.—Authorizing the Accountant-General to pay Rs. 1,000 to Mr. Ashpitel as a bonus and directing that the report and plans be forwarded to the Superintendent, Revenue Survey, for report regarding reproduction of the illustrations.

G.O., No. 431, Marine, dated 6th December 1893.

Abstract.—Stating that Government is unable to pass any general order regarding Mr. F. W. Ashpitel accompanying the Presidency Port Officer on his annual inspection of lighthouses, but that the Presidency Port Officer should apply for his services on such occasions as they may seem requisite, that Mr. Ashpitel cannot be made available to accompany him on his approaching visit to Pámban and agreeing with the views of the Presidency Port Officer as to the respective duties of himself and Mr. Ashpitel in regard to lighthouses.

G.O., No. 80, Marine, dated 8th March 1894.

Abstract.—Modifying paragraph 3 of G.O., No. 431, Marine, dated 6th December 1893, as to the respective duties of Mr. Ashpitel and the Presidency Port Officer in regard to lighthouses.

G.O., No. 213, Marine, dated 8th June 1894.

Abstract.—Inquiring of the Presidency Port Officer for what period the services of Mr. Ashpitel are required for inspecting the coast-lights, stating that Mr. Ashpitel's remarks on the suitability of the old Madras light for Point Divi will be awaited and that his opinion should also be taken on the Presidency Port Officer's proposals regarding the lights at certain other places and requesting the Public Works department to furnish plans and estimates for certain improvements to the lighthouse at Point Divi.

G.O., No. 318, Marine, dated 10th August 1894.

Abstract.—Calling for proposals in regard to the removal of the Hope Island light to a spot whence it would completely guard vessels from the Sacramento Shoal and directing that Mr. Ashpitel be deputed on special duty to inspect and report on all the lights along the coast.

G.O., Nos. 245, 246, Marine, dated 8th April 1896.

Abstract.—Reviewing a report by Mr. F. W. Ashpitel on the lighthouses in the Madras Presidency.

G.O., No. 562, Marine, dated 19th August 1896.

Abstract.—Communicating to the Presidency Port Officer Public Works Department proceedings No. 2156 W., dated 27th July 1896, directing that Mr. F. W. Ashpitel be placed on special duty on relief of the charge of the Coimbatore division, in view to the details being worked out and a separate division organized for giving effect to the scheme of lighthouse improvement already approved, and requesting the Financial department to settle the question of raising the requisite funds for carrying out the scheme as soon as possible.

G.O., No. 513, Marine, dated 4th June 1897.

Abstract.—Recording letter from the Presidency Port Officer submitting a report of inspection of certain ports and lighthouses.

G.O., Nos. 316, 317, Marine, dated 29th April 1898.

Abstract.—Orders directing that the Government of India be appealed to for a grant from Imperial funds to admit of the proposed schemes of lighthouse and port improvements being carried out within the period contemplated.

G.O., No. 442, Marine, dated 1st June 1898.

Abstract.—Despatch from the Secretary of State forwarding copy of a letter containing the observations of the Elder Brethren of Trinity House on Mr. Ashpitel's report on lighthouses in Madras, communicated to Mr. Ashpitel and the Presidency Port Officer with instructions to the former to consider and report on the suggestions made by that body.

G.O., No. 587, Marine, dated 6th July 1898.

Abstract.—Stating that, pending reply from the Government of India, it does not seem desirable to forward to the India Office the indent for apparatus for lighthouses to be constructed in the Madras Presidency, and ordering that the Government of India be requested to pass early orders on the application for aid from Imperial funds.

Memorandum No. 416-E., dated 11th August 1898.

The Government of India has now replied * to the application of this Government for a grant from Imperial funds in aid of the provision of lights for shipping on the coasts of this Presidency. It is not prepared to make any grant from Imperial funds, but considers that trade and shipping, and not the country generally, should bear the burden, and suggests legislation for the imposition of light dues.

* Finance and Commerce Department letter, No. 3285-S.R., dated 27th July 1898.

2. Mr. Ashpitel proposed † the imposition of light dues at the following rates :—

† Page 11 of G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, and table X of the same Government Order.

On each coasting steamer	12 pies	per ton	per month
On each native craft	6 pies	do.	do.
On each foreign steamer	7 pies	do.	per voyage

and estimated that the proceeds would amount to about Rs. 1,30,000 per annum.

3. It is not known how Mr. Ashpitel arrived at his total, as no information is given as to the number of ships of each kind that would pay the dues. The Presidency Port Officer is requested to be so good as to verify Mr. Ashpitel's calculation as to the expected proceeds, or to give statistics on which accurate data can be framed.

4. Mr. Ashpitel's method for coasting vessels, though easy of collection, would not, it is thought, be equitable, because vessels would pay the same dues however much or little they used the lights. The proper course seems to be to charge per voyage and to make a distinction between vessels using the lights of the whole coast, *e.g.*, British India and Asiatic steamers, and those using only a portion of them, *i.e.*, the dues might be identical for the Eastern and Western groups of ports and levied twice, say at Vizagapatam and Tuticorin for vessels using the lights of both groups, Tuticorin being included in the Western group for purposes of collection.

5. But besides the coasting trade and foreign steamers, we should levy dues on the whole of the shipping which passes between—

(1) Bombay and Colombo and the far east, and
(2) Calcutta and Colombo.

This trade will be properly charged at a lower rate, say a quarter of the rate charged on the coasting trade. The Presidency Port Officer is also requested to be so good as to calculate the income from light dues levied in this manner and state how best it may be collected.

W. B. deWINTON,
Secretary to Govt., Marine Dept.

To the Presidency Port Officer.

G.O., No. 732, Marine, dated 30th August 1898.

Abstract.—Ordered that the Government of India be informed that, on receipt of the requisite information, formal proposals for levying light dues for providing additional lights on the Madras Coast will be laid before that Government 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 official year.

G.O., No. 736, Marine, dated 31st August 1898.

Abstract.—Recording letter from the Superintendent of Works, Lighthouse division, replying to the observations of the Elder Brethren of Trinity House on his report on lighthouses in the Madras Presidency.

Read—also the following papers :—

From Commander W. AVES, R.I.M., Acting Presidency Port Officer, to the Secretary to Government, Marine department, dated Madras, 1st September 1898, No. 1271/299 G.

With reference to Government memorandum (Marine department), No. 416-E., dated 11th August 1898, I have the honour to state, for the information of Government, that the sum of Rs. 1,30,000 estimated by Mr. Ashpitel as receipts from light dues was based on information obtained demi-officially from this office. The details of his calculation are —

Tonnage, 130,000 tons, coasting traffic ;
,, 240,000 ,, foreign and semi-coasting ;
,, 40,000 ,, native craft ;
Coasting steamers and native craft to pay 12 and 6 pies per ton per month respectively ;
Foreign and semi-coasting, 7 pies per ton per month respectively ;

These figures as regards coasting, semi-coasting and foreign steamers represent, respectively, 130 foreign and semi-coasting steamers ranging from 1,000 to 3,500 tons, net register, and 80 * coasting steamers ranging from 160 to 3,200 tons, net register, which make from 1 to 10 voyages per annum. The receipts from native craft are apparently roughly estimated from the total tonnage of such craft as shewn in the administration report of the Port department, and the amount thus calculated is, as stated by Mr. Ashpitel, Rs. 1,30,000.

* This figure represents coasters at all ports of the Eastern group.

2. I now submit lists showing the vessels which arrived at the Port of Madras during the year 1897–98. Lists for West coast ports, including native craft, have been called for, but it will be near enough to base the estimate of dues recoverable from native craft on the total tonnage dues paid by those vessels in one particular year. The year selected is 1896–97. It will be a long and tedious process to ascertain the name of each native craft and the number of times in the year she would be liable to pay dues.

3. The tonnage of direct steamers to Madras in the year 1897–98 aggregated 256,800 tons, and of these one-third are regular traders making at least three visits annually to the port. To avoid any chance of over-estimating receipts, I have selected, from the 117 vessels representing this tonnage, 40 vessels about which there can be little doubt as to their liability to payment of the dues at least three times during the year. These are marked thus ** in the list. It is extremely probable that many of the others will pay more than once. To these have been added 44,441 tons of semi-coasting steamers.

4. The coasting vessels may be safely assumed to be liable at least eight times in the year. The Port officer of Bombay has been asked to give an estimate of the tonnage, from Bombay to Colombo direct, likely to be liable to Western group dues. No direct vessels from Calcutta to Colombo will ever benefit by any of the Eastern group lights, and they cannot equitably be asked to pay for such lights.

5. I attach a draft notification showing roughly the manner in which I think the vessels should be classified, and the rates of dues leviable on each class; also a statement showing the amount that we may reasonably reckon upon as receipts. (See paragraph 9 *infra.*)

6. I think that Mr. Ashpitel has slightly over-estimated receipts, as I notice that he refers to a monthly payment of 12 pies per ton (paragraph 31 of his report, G.O., No. 245, Marine of 8th April 1896). The coasting dues should be calculated on the assumption that dues on the whole tonnage will be paid only eight times a year. Foreign and semi-coasting steamers would not visit the coast every month.

7. Details of the calculations by which the total collections are estimated are given in the lists accompanying this letter.

8. In actual working, the collections will be much larger, as there must be, among the vessels named, many which will pay dues several times during the year; but all doubtful cases have been omitted.

9. The following is a summary of the receipts from vessels according to classification:—

	RS.			RS.	
Class I *	47,810	at 9 pies for each group.	or	95,620	at As. 1–6 for each group.
„ II	15,079	at 6 pies	or	30,158	„ A. 1
„ III	4,000	„ 8 „	or	8,000	„ As. 1–4.
„ IV	7,657	„ 4 „	or	15,314	„ 8 pies.
„ V	291	„ 2 „	or	582	„ 4 „
„ VI	3,587	„ 7 „	or	7,174	„ As. 1–2.
Total ..	78,424	Total ..		1,56,848	

* One anna per ton per group will perhaps be a fairer charge; in this case, the total of the higher rates will be then Rs. 1,24,875; of the lower, Rs. 94,311.

The lesser sum will, according to the proposed scale of establishment, be insufficient to pay fully for the maintenance of the lights, and if it is intended that the whole cost of lights, and the provision of a Sinking fund is to be debited to light dues, the rates proposed will have to be doubled. This will give a revenue of Rs. (1,56,848) one lakh fifty-six thousand eight hundred and forty eight. I have therefore, in the draft of rates of light dues, provided alternative rates. It is believed that the actuals will considerably exceed the estimate, but it will be safer to levy the higher rate to commence with, as it is more convenient to reduce than to enhance dues.

10. Taking the average net register tonnage of a coaster at 1,600 and of a direct steamer at 2,500 tons, the incidence of the dues per steamer at the higher rate will be, in the case of coasting steamers about Rs. 300 per voyage; in that of direct steamers, about Rs. 160 per voyage. As the coasters derive more benefit from the lights than the direct steamers, any reduction in the higher rate might preferably be given to the latter. It must be noted, however, that many direct steamers belonging to regular lines, will benefit on two voyages for one payment, *e.g.*, the steamers belonging to the British India Steam Navigation Company's Home Line.

11. A copy of this letter has been sent to Commander Street, Presidency Port Officer, now on privilege leave; and it has been suggested to him that he should address you demi-officially on any points on which he disagrees.

ENCLOSURES.

Draft Notification.

Vessels arriving at or departing from ports in the Madras Presidency, or which in the ordinary course of any voyage shall pass within range of, or derive benefit from, the sea lights of that Presidency, are liable to be charged with light dues according to the class in which such vessels may be placed, as specified below, viz.:—

Class I.—Any vessel which in the ordinary course of a voyage would pass or derive benefit from more than 5 sea lights in the Eastern group, or more than 3 sea lights in the Western group.	* 9 pies (or As. 1–6) per ton per voyage for each group. One payment in a group to exempt from further payment in that group for 30 days.
Class II.—All vessels, British and Foreign, to or from Europe, the Australian, African and other British Colonies, including the Straits Settlements and Ceylon, and vessels from Indian ports and ports in Burma which in the ordinary course of a voyage will pass or derive benefit from any of the sea-lights in the Madras Presidency, and vessels alling at more than one port in the group, and which do not come under the conditions of class I.	* 6 pies (or 12 pies) peo ton per voyage per group. One payment to exempt from further payment for 30 days (payable on arrival at a port in the Madras Presidency).
Class III.—All vessels from Bombay or ports in the Bombay Presidency bound direct for Colombo, and from Colombo direct to ports in the Bombay Presidency.	* 8 pies (or 16 pies) per ton per voyage; payable on arrival at or departure from Bombay.
Class. IV.—All sailing vessels (of 15 tons and upwards) coasting or otherwise.	* 4 pies (or 8 pies) per ton per voyage per group; one payment to exempt from further payment for 30 days.
Class V.—Vessels performing the daily service between Tuticorin and Colombo, and steamers from Bombay bound for the minor ports of South Canara, whose voyage terminates at Mangalore.	* 2 pies (or 4 pies) per ton every 30 days.
Class VI.—Steamers plying direct between Madras and Rangoon.	* 7 pies (or 14 pies) per ton every 30 days.

* *Vide* summary in paragraph 9 of letter accompanying.

NOTE.—The term "Sea Lights" to apply to the following, viz., Calingapatam, Santapilli, Vakalapudi, Sacramento (new light to be put up) Hope Island, Kistna (new light to be put up) Armeghon, Pulicat, Madras, Seven Pagodas, Negapatam, Tuticorin, Manapad, Muttam, Tangacherri (new light to be put up) Sacrifice Rock or Tellicherry (as the light may eventually be named) Cochin, Calicut and Moolki (new light to be put up).

LIST of arrivals at Madras of coasting steamers in 1897–98.

CLASS I.

		TONS.			TONS.
S.S.	"Chyebassa"	1,688	S S.	"Nairung"	2,862
"	"Kasara"	505	„	"Bhundara"	2,215
"	"Camorta"	1,351	„	"Kohinur"	1,935
	"Ellora"	1,494	„	"Merkara"	1,949
„	"Huzara"	1,336	„	"Nevasa"	1,945
„	"Maharani"	1,647	„	"Nizam"	2,041
„	"Khandalla"	1,318	„	"Rajpootana"	1,312
„	"Chanda"	1,305	„	"Pemba"	987
„	"Nerbudda"	1,961	„	"Java"	920
„	"Henzada"	1,341	„	"Kilwa"	993
„	"Nawab"	2,041	„	"Landaura"	2,157
„	"Byculla"	1,095	„	"Nadir"	2,041
„	"Goalpara"	1,359	„	"Cocanada"	547
„	"Bancoora"	2,197	„	"Kerbela"	1,458
„	"Karagola"	622	„	"Nuddea"	1,944
„	"Kangra"	1,478	„	"Bezwada"	3,270
„	"Nurani"	2,870	„	"Purulia"	993
„	"Shabjehan"	1,065	„	"Megna"	772
„	"Patna"	1,164	„	"Pundua"	2,126
„	"Sirdhana"	2,074			
„	"M. Meanatchy"	1,368		Total ..	63,746

Calculation.

It is estimated that each of these steamers or their substitutes will make use of the group lights on each coast not less than eight times a year.

$$\text{Therefore } \overset{\text{Tons.}}{63{,}746} \times \overset{\text{Pies.}}{9} \times 8 = \frac{45{,}89{,}712}{12} = \frac{3{,}82{,}476}{16} = \text{Rs. } 23{,}905$$

Annual receipts Rs. 23,905 for each group
or at $1\frac{1}{2}$ annas Rs. 47,810 do.

Total receipts both groups, Rs. 47,810 or Rs. 95,620

LIST of arrivals at Madras of Foreign steamers in 1897-98.

CLASS II (A).

		TONS.
S.S.	“Badonin”	2,245
,,	“Oceanie”	1,863
,,	“Bombay”	2,049
,,	“Polluce”	1,286
,,	“Ceres”	2,318
,,	“Benvortich”	2,164
,,	“Gorsedd	2,451
,,	“City of Everett”	1,858
,,	“Kirkdale”	1,853
,,	“Federation”	1,570
,,	“Deepdale”	1,650
,,	“Haxley”	2,252
,,	“Olivemoor”	1,970
,,	“Orion”	1,762
,,	“Knight Templar”	2,704
,,	“Baron Androssan”	1,825
,,	“Baron Cawder”	2,053
,,	“Aglaia”	1,173 **
,,	“Sirsa”	1,675 **
,,	“Nevasa”	1,945 **
,,	“Bangalore”	3,268
,,	“Clan Matheson”	2,521 **
,,	“Eridan”	927 **
,,	“Oriental”	3,085
,,	“Goldenfels”	2,269 **
,,	“Matiana”	3,413 **
,,	“Calliope”	1,927
,,	“Rewa”	2,519 **
,,	“Clan Grant”	2,306 **
,,	“Larnaca”	1,492
,,	“Secundra”	1,675 **
,,	“Amigo”	822
,,	“Rheinfels”	1,773 **
,,	“Elax”	2,612
,,	“Clan Macintosh”	2,591 **
,,	“Simla”	3,805
,,	“Warora”	2,565 **
,,	“Clan Macpherson”	2,559 **
,,	“Maggie Macnair”	2,078
,,	“Ameer”	2,682
,,	“Pongola”	934 **
,,	“Trym”	710
,,	“Palawan”	2,996
,,	“Manora”	2,995 **
,,	“Ockenfels”	2,314
,,	“Goorkha”	2,617 **
,,	“Bullionist”	2,196 **
,,	“Gulf of Louis”	1,672
,,	“Baron Glamis”	1,556
,,	“Volute”	2,599 **
,,	“Merkara”	1,949
,,	“Kentigeru”	1,585
,,	“Steinberger”	2,313 **
,,	“Lawada”	2,124
,,	“Picciola”	875
,,	“Mombassa”	3,039 **
,,	“Worsley Hall”	2,238
,,	“Clan Macdonald”	3,113 **
,,	“Scharlachberger”	1,810 **
,,	“Mulazi”	1,133 **
,,	“India”	2,591
,,	“Muzinto”	1,160 **
,,	“Bullivant”	2,607
,,	“Golconda”	3,761 **
,,	“Skidley”	2,241
,,	“Argus”	1,822
,,	“Hochheimer”	1,892 **
,,	“Musician”	3,047
,,	“Neidenfels”	3,478 **
,,	“Aurora”	1,836

		TONS.
S.S.	“Bramfels”	1,888 **
,,	“Lindenfels”	1,862 **
,,	“Loodiana”	2,124 **
,,	“Rothenfels”	1,864 **
,,	“Craignair”	601
,,	“Aries”	1,968
,,	“Foreland”	2,8[illegible]2
,,	“Nord”	768
,,	“Imperialist”	2,177
,,	“Rudesheimer”	1,795
,,	“Darius”	2,130
,,	“Planet Mercury”	2,092
,,	“Clan Monroe”	3,121 **
,,	“Pindari”	3,686
,,	“Borneo”	2,914
,,	“Orissa”	3,525 **
,,	“Clan Macarthur”	2,584 **
,,	“Chusan”	2,852
,,	“Okara”	3,439
,,	“Turbo”	2,659
,,	“Osborne”	2,033
,,	“Couch”	2,314
,,	“Malta”	3,900
,,	“Bhundara”	2,215 **
,,	“Brand”	1,520
,,	“Massilia”	2,909
,,	“Baghdad”	820
,,	“Viraiva”	2.158
,,	“Coromandel”	2,783
,,	“Clan Murray”	3,107 **
,,	“Lalpoora”	2,124
,,	“Dupliex”	1,264 **
,,	“Paramatta”	2,854
,,	“Trocas”	2,657
,,	“Bengal”	2,752
,,	“City of Dublin”	2,155
,,	“Euplectela”	2,507
,,	“Jupiter”	2,199
,,	“Wave”	1,450
,,	“Roma”	1,743
,,	“Maltby”	1,808
,,	“Siegfried”	909
,,	“Queen Louise”	2,170
,,	“Congella”	1,022 **
,,	“Oransay”	1,350
,,	“Telena”	3,124
,,	“Clan Robertson”	3,104 **
	Total ..	256,800

NOTE.—The vessels marked ** are those which may be expected to render themselves liable to payment of dues at least three times during the year. Their tonnage is as follows :—

1,173	934	1,888
1,675	2,995	1,862
1,945	2,617	2,124
2,521	2,196	1,864
927	2,599	3,121
2,269	2,313	3,525
3,413	3,039	2,584
2,519	3,113	2,215
2,306	1,810	3,107
1,675	1,133	1,264
1,773	1,160	1,022
2,591	3,761	3,104
2,565	1,892	
2,559	3,478	90,631

Calculation—

Tons.
256,800 of which
— 90,631 may be expected to pay three times a year.

leaving 166,169 which will pay once in the year for eastern group
+ 44,441 semi-coasting traffic (see list class II B)

210,610 paying six pies per ton once during the year

$$= \frac{2,10,610 \times 6}{12} = \frac{1,05,305}{16} = \text{Rs. } 6,582.$$

$$+ \frac{90,631 \times 6 \times 3}{12} = \frac{1,35,947}{16} = \text{Rs. } 8,497.$$

Rs. 15,079
or Rs. 30,158 at one anna.

Receipts under class II (*a*) and II (*b*) Rs. 15,079.

Owing to the Peninsula and Oriental steamers being withdrawn from this line receipts may be slightly less, but other tonnage is increasing.

LIST of arrivals at Madras of semi-coasting vessels in 1897–98.

CLASS II (B).

		Tons.
S.S.	“Clan Chisholm”	1,630
,,	“Clan Ranald”	1,339
,,	“Clan Macalister”	1,436
,,	“Clan Alpine”	1,349
,,	“Clan Menzies”	1,704
,,	“Clan Macgregor”	1,921
,,	“Clan Buchanan”	1,931
,,	“Clan Ogilvie”	1,691
,,	“Clan Macnab”	1,591
,,	“Clan Sinclair”	1,908
,,	“Clan Fraser”	1,371
,,	“Clan Macrae”	1,664
,,	“Clan Campbell”	1,662
,,	“Clan Graham”	1,878
,,	“Clan Drummond”	1,870
,,	“Clan Mackenzie”	1,932
,,	“Clan Cameron”	1,548
,,	“Clan Forbes”	1,561
,,	“Clan Macintyre”	1,590
,,	“Clan Ross”	1,664
,,	“Clan Maclean”	1,486
,,	“Clan Macneil”	1,591
,,	“Clan Lindsay”	1,705
,,	“Clan Sutherland”	1,810
,,	“Clan Macleod”	1,589
,,	“Clan Mackay”	1,665
,,	“Clan Stuart”	1,355
		44,441

Vide class II (*a*) for calculations.

CLASS III.

In this class the receipts are based on the number of Peninsula and Oriental Steamers on the China Line of which there are two fortnightly one up and one down. The tonnage of these vessels may be taken as 2,000 each net register. There will be of course vessels of other lines also liable; but to avoid delay this tonnage is taken as a basis in calculating probable receipts on account of light dues. As these vessels will derive benefit from all the lights of the Western group except Manapad $\frac{8}{\text{or } 16}$ pies is proposed as the due to be levied per ton.

Calculation.

$2{,}000\times 4=\overset{\text{Tons.}}{8{,}000}$ per mensem or $\overset{\text{Tons.}}{96{,}000}$ per annum at 8 pies per ton.

$\overset{\text{Pies.}}{\frac{96{,}000\times 8}{12}}=\overset{\text{As.}}{\frac{64{,}000}{16}}=$ Rs. 4,000 or Rs. 8,000 at 16 pies per ton.

CLASS IV.

The aggregate tonnage of native sailing craft for the year 1896–97 was 713,000 tons being 20,500 voyages making the average tonnage of a native craft 34 tons. This shipping paid in port dues Rs. 22,971 at the rate of 1 anna per ton for every 60 days.

The due proposed to be levied on account of lights for this class of vessel is $\frac{4}{\text{or } 8}$ pies per ton every 30 days, and it is considered that the amount levied as port dues will form a fair basis of calculation for the light dues. The light dues receipts will thus be $\frac{\frac{1}{3}}{\text{or } \frac{2}{3}}$ of the port dues.

$\frac{22{,}971\times 1}{3}=$ Rs. 7,657 or Rs. 15,314 at 8 pies.

The light due payable by a native craft of 100 tons will thus be $\frac{\text{Rs. 2-1-4}}{\text{or Rs. 4-2-8}}$ per mensem.

As large sailing vessels from the United Kingdom very seldom visit this coast, it is unnecessary to make any special rate for them; it is proposed to charge them the same as native sailing craft.

CLASS V.

In this class there are—

(*a*) Five steamers aggregating 2,650 tons performing the service between Bombay and Mangalore. As these will only benefit by one of the sea lights in the group, it is proposed that they shall only pay $\frac{2}{\text{or } 4}$ pies per ton.

Owing to closing of ports for the South West monsoon it is estimated that they will pay dues 6 times each in the course of the year.

Calculation.

$\overset{\text{Tons.}}{\frac{2{,}650\times 2\times 6}{12}}=\overset{\text{As.}}{2{,}650}=\overset{\text{Rs.}}{166}.$

(*b*) Three steamers aggregating 1,000 tons performing the daily service between Tuticorin and Colombo benefiting by only two lights of the group will pay dues 12 times a year.

Calculation.

$\frac{1{,}000\times 2\times 12}{12}=\overset{\text{As.}}{2{,}000}=\overset{\text{Rs.}}{125}.$

Total Rs. 291.
or
Rs. 582 at 4 pies.

LIST of Direct Steamers running between Madras and Rangoon in 1897–98.

CLASS VI.

	Tons.
S.S. "Putiala"	1,929
" "Palitana"	1,934
" "Purnea"	2,127
" "Pentacottah"	2,209
	8,199

Calculation.

It is estimated that each vessel of this class will make not less than 12 trips per annum and at 7 pies per ton they will pay—

$\frac{8{,}199\times 12\times 7}{12}=\overset{\text{As.}}{\frac{57{,}393}{16}}=\overset{\text{Rs.}}{3{,}587}.$

or

Rs. 7,174 at 14 pies per ton.

Telegram from the Secretary to Government, Marine department, to the Presidency Port Officer, dated 27th September 1898.

What is the average duration of a voyage from Calcutta to Bombay by British Indian coaster.

Telegram from the Presidency Port Officer, to the Secretary to Government, Marine department, dated Madras, 27th September 1898, No. 1271-299, G.

Your telegram to-day. Average duration 24 days.

Official memorandum from W. B. DEWINTON, Esq., Secretary to Government, Marine department, to the Presidency Port Officer, dated Madras, 29th September 1898, No. 496-E.

It is necessary that further information in regard to the proposed classes and rates of light dues should be furnished to admit of this matter being laid before Government, *e.g.*—

(1) *Class I.*—(*a*) Why are five and three sea lights chosen for the two groups as the number in excess of which vessels will have to pay dues if they benefit thereby.

(*b*) Why is the limit of 30 days entered, within which vessels will be exempted from paying light dues a second time for the same group. If it is imposed, the receipts will not apparently be so great as the Presidency Port Officer estimates. It is reported that the average duration of a voyage from Calcutta to Bombay by a British India coaster is 24 days. Allowing three days for loading and unloading at terminal ports a vessel performs one voyage a month. Now say she leaves Calcutta on 1st January, March, May, &c., and Bombay 1st February, April, June, &c., she would under the thirty days' limit only pay light dues once on each voyage except the first, thus:—

Month.	Eastern group.	Western group.	Remarks.
January	1	1	The vessel leaves Calcutta January 1, arrives at Tuticorin, say, January 15. She will be back at Tuticorin by February 14, and so will not have to pay Western group light dues. In the same way if she leaves Calcutta again on or about March 1, she will not have to pay Eastern group light dues on her third voyage, so that in the year she will only have to pay dues 13 times instead of 16 8 times for each group) as estimated by the Presidency Port Officer.
February	1	..	
March	..	1	
April	1	..	
May	..	1	
June	1	..	
July	..	1	
August	1	..	
September	..	1	
October	1	..	
November	..	1	
December	1	..	

Unless the Presidency Port Officer can prove that this is a wrong forecast it would be better to expunge the thirty days limit for coasters.

(*c*) Is class I intended to include vessels plying from Madras to Rangoon *viâ* Coast ports?

It is believed that they go as far north as Bimlipatam before crossing, so that they would make use of more than five sea lights. The limit of thirty days might be imposed for them because the round trip takes, it is believed, about that time, and the dues would be levied once for the double voyage which would probably be sufficient.

(2) *Class V.*—The rate proposed is so small that it is hardly worth collecting, but the receipts do not seem to have been properly calculated. There are believed to be two steamers now plying between Tuticorin and Colombo, of 1,200 tons each; at 4 pies per ton, each of these vessels would pay Rs. 25 per month or the two together Rs. 600 a year. It is true that they only use one light, but they use it about 15 times a month, and I think the higher rate for this class should be raised to 6 pies at least which would bring in for—

	RS.
(*a*) the Tuticorin steamers 2,400 tons at 6 pies per ton per month ..	900
(*b*) the Mangalore steamers 2,640 tons at 6 pies per ton, 6 times ..	500
Total ..	1,400

From Commander W. AVES, R.IM., Acting Presidency Port Officer, to the Secretary to Government, Marine department, dated Madras, 8th October 1898, No. 1271/347-G.

Query (1) (*a*).—In the Eastern group (if Tuticorin is selected as the commencement of the Western group) there will be eleven sea lights as against eight in the Western group. The object in restricting the levy of dues to vessels benefiting by more than five and three respectively was to avoid unduly taxing semi-coasting traffic, *i.e.*, vessels loading for home ports at two or more ports of a group. If some distinction of this sort is not made vessels other than coasters might have to pay the dues. It will perhaps simplify matters to draft the notification thus:—"All vessels under a general pass engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta and Bombay, and between Rangoon and Madras *viâ* ports north of Madras; provided that, if no port in the Eastern group be touched at, the due for that group shall not be levied."

NOTE.—A vessel bound from Calcutta to Bombay, unless she called at a port in the Eastern group, would not sight any of the lights of this Presidency until she arrived on the West Coast, and West Coast dues would be justly leviable whether the vessel touched at any port or not.

Query (1) (*b*).—I think you have under-estimated the period occupied in loading and unloading at Bombay and Calcutta which, as steamers are yearly increasing in tonnage, may be taken as a week at each end. However, on consideration, I think for the present it will be better to omit the thirty days' limit in this class.

Query (1) (*c*).—Class I was intended to include the Rangoon steamers calling at Northern ports. I have, in the amended draft herewith put up, included them specially. I would omit the thirty days' limit here also.

Query (2).—The steamers now performing the daily service between Tuticorin and Colombo are only about 750 tons net register, the tonnage on which the dues will be paid, so the result at 6 pies a ton would be—

	RS.
Tuticorin steamers, 1,500 tons at 6 pies per month	563
Mangalore steamers, 2,640 tons at 6 pies per ton, 6 times	500
Total ..	1,063

ENCLOSURE.

Revised draft notification.

Vessels arriving at or departing from ports in the Madras Presidency, or which in the ordinary course of any voyage shall pass within range of, or derive benefit from, the sea lights of that Presidency, are liable to be charged with light dues according to the class in which such vessels may be placed, as specified below, viz.—

CLASS I.

All vessels under a general pass engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta and Bombay and between Rangoon and Madras *viâ* ports North of Madras.	9 pies (or 1½ annas) per ton per voyage for each group provided that if no port in the Eastern group be touched at, the due for that group shall not be levied.

CLASSES II, III AND IV—*as per previous draft.*

CLASS V.

Vessels performing the daily service between Tuticorin and Colombo, and steamers from Bombay bound for the minor ports of South Canara, whose voyage terminates at Mangalore.	3 pies—or 6 pies) per ton every 30 days.

CLASS VI, NOTE, &C.—*as per previous draft.*

Official memorandum from the Secretary to Government, Marine department, to the Presidency Port Officer, dated 17th November 1898, No. 586-E.

In his report printed with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, table I, Mr. Ashpitel proposes to place sixteen lights in the "sea" group, while the Presidency Port Officer in his letter No. 1271/299-G., dated 1st September 1898, allocates nineteen lights to this group. The following comparative statement shows the proposals in each case:—

As given by Mr. Ashpitel.	*As given by the Presidency Port Officer.*
1. Calingapatam.	1. Calingapatam.
2. Santapilli.	2. Santapilli.
3. Vakalapudi.	3. Vakalapudi.
4. Sacramento.	4. Sacramento.
5. Armeghon.	5. Armeghon.
6. Pulicat.	6. Pulicat.
7. Madras	7. Madras.
8. Seven Pagodas.	8. Seven Pagodas.
9. Manapad.	9. Manapad.
10. Muttum.	10. Muttum.
11. Tangacherri.	11. Tangacherri.
12. Sacrifice Rock.	12. Sacrifice Rock.
13. Mulki.	13. Mulki.
14. Alleppi.	14. Hope Island.
15. Point Calimere.	15. Kistna.
16. Point Divi.	16. Negapatam.
(Hope Island to be abandoned.)	17. Tuticorin.
	18. Cochin.
	19. Calicut.

2. The discrepancies should be further considered by the Presidency Port Officer in communication with Mr. Ashpitel. The matter now becomes of importance in view of the proposal to levy light dues for the use of the "sea" lights.

3. It is requested that this reference be treated as one of urgency.

From Commander H. A. STREET, R.I.M., Presidency Port Officer, to the Secretary to Government, Marine department, dated 18th November 1898, No. 1271/402-G.

The discrepancies referred to in paragraph 2 above have been considered as requested, and the marginal list of lights represents what may be now considered as fulfilling the conditions of sea lights of the coast as laid down in paragraph 6, page 3 of Mr. Ashpitel's report printed with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896.

2. It will be seen that the light at Alleppi (which appears in Mr. Ashpitel's list) has not been included, and the reason for this is, that this light is maintained by the Travancore Government.

3. The lights at Cochin and Calicut appear to have been included through some misapprehension by the Acting Presidency Port Officer in the list under reference. It is unnecessary, in my opinion, to treat either of these lights at present as sea lights.

1. Calingapatam.	East Coast.
2. Santapalli.	
3. Vakalapudi.	
*4. Sacramento.	
*5 Kistna.	
6. Armeghon.	
7. Pulicat.	
8. Madras.	
9. Seven Pagodas.	
10. Negapatam.	
11. Tuticorin.	
12. Manapad.	
13. Muttum.	West Coast.
*14. Tangacherri.	
*15. Tellicherri.	
*16. Mulki.	

---

* Lighthouses not yet constructed.

G.O., Nos. 29, 30, Marine, dated 10th January 1899.

Abstract.—Directing that the Government of India be requested to make a grant from Imperial funds of Rs. 2,58,850 for the prosecution of Lighthouse works in 1899–1900.

Official memorandum from W. B. deWINTON, Esq., Secretary, Marine Department, to the Presidency Port Officer, dated Madras, 20th January 1899, No. 41-E.

Under the Burma Coast Lights Act, all vessels of 50 tons and upwards are liable to the payment of coast light dues. The Presidency Port Officer is requested to state whether the same limit of tonnage for the levy of light dues should be adopted in the Madras Presidency, and if so, how his forecast of receipts will be affected. The limit for port dues is, as he is aware, 15 tons.

2. Under the proposed Madras scheme, Rangoon-Madras steamers, *viâ* coast ports north of Madras, are put * into class I, and pay the same rates as coasters between Calcutta and Bombay. Seeing that the former have already to pay under the Burma Act, and do not profit by Madras lights to the same extent as the latter, they should perhaps be assessed at a lower rate. If the Presidency Port Officer agrees he is requested to suggest the amount of such lower rate.

* *Vide* your 1271/347-G., dated 8th October 1898.

Official memorandum from W. B deWINTON, Esq., Secretary, Marine Department, to the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, dated 20th January 1899, No. 44-E.

In continuation of memorandum No. 41-E., dated 20th January 1899, it is observed that vessels performing the daily service between Tuticorin and Colombo are put under class V, paying 3 or 6 pies per ton every 30 days according as the higher or lower rate is charged. They only use one Madras light, *i.e.*, about the same as a Foreign steamer calling at Madras, and should perhaps pay the same light dues, *i.e.*, 6 or 12 pies once in 30 days. They would then come under class II. The Presidency Port Officer is requested to report whether there is any objection to this.

It should also be stated whether the descriptive words † at end of class II "and vessels calling at . . . . . class I" cannot be omitted—they seem unnecessary. If the Presidency Port Officer wishes to retain them, give an instance of such a vessel.

* *Vide* draft notification appended to Presidency Port Officer's letter No. 1271/299 G., dated 1st September 1898, reproduced below for ready reference :—

" *Class II.*

" All vessels, British and Foreign, to or from " Europe the Australian, African and other " British Colonies, including the Straits " Settlements and Ceylon and vessels from " Indian ports and ports in Burma which in " the ordinary course of a voyage will pass " or derive benefit from any of the sea lights in " the Madras Presidency, and vessels calling " at more than one port in the group and " which do not come under the conditions of " Class I."

From Commander H. A. STREET, R.I.M., Presidency Port Officer, to the Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated Madras, 24th January 1899, No. 1271/36-G.

Native Craft.—It is believed that the number of vessels of under 50 tons which navigate the coast of Burma is small, whereas on the west coast of this Presidency there are between 300 and 400. All these vessels make frequent voyages and benefit by the lights, and I see no reason for exempting them from payment. The reduction in receipts if this exemption be allowed will about one-third.

2. *Rangoon-Madras steamers viâ Coast.*—I see no reason for assessing these vessels at a lower rate. With the exception of Seven Pagodas and Negapatam they will benefit by all the sea lights of the group, and in case of overrunning their distance and passing Madras they would also benefit by Seven Pagodas Light. The distinction between these vessels and others coming under class I is so very trifling that I see no necessity for creating a separate class for them, as they ought not to be included in class II.

3. *Daily service steamers between Tuticorin and Colombo.*—I see no objection to these vessels being included in class II, and consider it will be better to do so.

4. As regards the words at the end of class II, I am of opinion that these should be retained. The provision is intended to meet the case of semi-coasters which sometimes visit a number of ports in a group picking up cargo at each. In this way these vessels might be held to bring themselves under class I through deriving benefit from the prescribed number of lights in that class, whereas it is only intended that the rate of dues in that class shall be levied on vessels which in the *ordinary course* of a voyage pass a certain number of lights. The case of a semi-coaster visiting a number of ports is not the *ordinary course* of a voyage. The descriptive words are not absolutely necessary, but may serve to prevent misunderstanding.

G.O., No. 439, Marine, dated 19th May 1899.

Abstract.—Communicating to the Presidency Port Officer, Financial Department Procedings Nos. 579–580, dated 8th May 1899, on letter from the Government of India passing orders on the budget estimates of this Presidency for 1899–1900, and making certain allotments from the undistributed provision of 8·73 lakhs placed by that Government in the estimates under 45. *Civil Works.* Copy to the Government of India.

Order—No. 471, Marine, dated 31st May 1899.

In 1890, Mr. W. T. Douglass, Lighthouse Engineer, was sent out from England at the request of the Government of India to report on the lighthouses on the coasts of India. His report on the Madras lighthouses is contained in G.O., No. 25, Marine, dated 22nd January 1891. He suggested the introduction of the most modern appliances for illumination and the adoption of occulting and flashing lights, and pointed out the importance of making the lights distinctive in character. He also recommended the construction of new buildings at various places, *e.g.*, Pigeon Island, Cape Comorin, Divi, Masulipatam, on the Sacramento Shoal, Vizagapatam and Bimlipatam.

2. Since this period, the question of the improvement of these lights has received the almost continuous consideration of Government, and in 1894 Mr. Ashpitel was deputed to visit localities and report on lighthouse requirements generally. The results of this inspection are recorded with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, a copy of which is attached to these Proceedings. His report covered a wide field and included proposals under the following heads :—

(1) The building of new lighthouses.
(2) The introduction of improved light apparatus.
(3) The improvement of existing lights.
(4) The complete reorganisation of the lighthouse establishments.
(5) The levy of light dues on shipping to meet the cost of his proposals.

It also embraced various other minor matters connected with internal administration.

3. His programme of lighthouse improvement involved an expenditure of Rs. 8,80,000. Of this sum, Rs 8,00,000 were for "coast" lights or those intended for general navigation. The latter amount included Rs. 2,80,000 for eight new sets of apparatus, Rs. 4,55,000 for improvements to existing towers and for new constructions, and the balance was for contingencies and Public Works supervision. The

"port" lights or those intended for the navigation of ports and harbours, were to cost Rs. 80,000. To meet the capital cost of the "coast" lights, he proposed to raise a loan of Rs. 8,00,000. The interest and sinking fund for which and its ultimate extinction, were to be provided by the levy of light dues. The proposal to raise a loan in the open market and the levy of light dues did not then commend itself to Government, who considered that the scheme could be started from the accumulated balances of Port funds.

4. In order to give effect to the scheme of lighthouse improvement suggested by Mr. Ashpitel and approved generally in G O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, a special Lighthouse division, under Mr. Ashpitel, was formed under the authority of G.O., No. 2156 W., dated 27th July 1896, Mr. Ashpitel being called upon to frame a financial forecast of the amount required for expenditure. His financial forecast is printed with G.O., No. 316, Marine, dated 29th April 1898. These proceedings also contain a complete forecast of Port fund works other than lighthouses. The Government observed that the outlay involved could not be met from local resources alone, within a reasonable time, and decided that the Government of India should be appealed to for assistance. That Government was accordingly asked in letter No. 317, Marine, dated 29th April 1898, for a *grant* from Imperial funds of Rs. 6,68,000 in 1899–1900 and Rs. 1,45,000 in 1900–1901. The Government of India refused * to entertain the application, and pointed out that trade and shipping, and not the country generally, should bear the cost of erecting lighthouses. They considered that any fresh expenditure to be incurred in erecting lighthouses on the Madras coast should be provided for by the levy of light dues. They further observed as follows:—

* Finance and Commerce Department letter, No. 3285-S.R., dated 27th July 1898.

> "Some expenditure has already been incurred in the past in the erection of lighthouses 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 additional maintenance charges will be covered, together with a small sinking fund charge, by light dues to be now imposed."

5. The Madras Government, seeing that a free grant had been refused, asked † for a *loan*, from Imperial funds, of Rs. 2,15,000, and promised that, should this loan be sanctioned, His Excellency the Governor in Council would arrange for the maintenance of lighthouses and port works generally from current receipts, supplemented by existing balances, and to carry out such other new Port fund works as may be possible. It was explained that the grant of Rs. 6,68,000 previously asked for included works other than lighthouses, whereas the smaller sum of Rs. 2,15,000 was confined to the amount required, for the coming year, for new lighthouse works and apparatus alone.

† Letter No. 733, Marine, dated 30th August 1898.

6. The Government of India, in reply, pointed out that if the lights to be constructed are of the nature of coast lights, the expenditure on them of Port funds is inadmissible, such expenditure as regards *lights* being limited by sub-section 5 of section 36 of the Indian Ports Act to "lights maintained chiefly for the benefit of vessels being in, or entering, or leaving, the port or passing through the rivers or channels leading thereto;" while if they are "port" lights, they cannot properly be charged against capital outlay which is intended to be liquidated hereafter by general light dues. They accordingly requested fuller explanation of the conditions on which the proposed loan was asked for, and in what way the Government proposed to close the transaction.

7. In letter No. 30, Marine, dated 10th January 1899, the Madras Government reiterated its request for a loan from Imperial funds, to the amount of Rs. 2,58,850, the amount to be refunded when the proposed light dues became available.

8. The final result of the application is contained in letter from the Finance and Commerce Department to the Chief Secretary to Government, No. A-1429-L., dated 29th March 1899, in which a special addition of Rs. 8,73,000 is authorised to be made to the Provincial expenditure from the existing balance, and from which the Madras Government is at liberty to reappropriate money for expenditure on lighthouse construction, provided that it recovers it by the imposition of light dues.

9. This latter course therefore seems the only one open, if any improvement is to be effected in the lighting of the Madras coast, and a scheme, detailed below, has been prepared with that object. But before proceeding further in the matter, His Excellency the Governor in Council desires to be favoured with the views of the representatives of mercantile and shipping interests in this Presidency, both as to the necessity for the proposed improvements, and as to the ability of the trade to bear the proposed imposition of light dues.

10. The programme of lighthouse improvement as regards "coast" lights includes the following:—

Coast lights.	Estimated cost. RS.
1. Calingapatam	5,000
2. Santapili	1,00,000
3. Vakalapudi	18,000
4. Sacramento	1,00,000
5. Havelock Point	1,18,620
6. Armeghon	37,390
7. Pulicat	27,300
8. Madras	1,000
9. Seven Pagodas	49,920
10. Negapatam	5,000
11. Turicorin	13,000
12. Manapad	51,230
13. Muttam	10,450
14. Tangasséri	88,000
15. Sacrifice Rock	96,000
16. Mulki	68,600
Total	7,89,510
or in round figures	8,00,000

NOTE.—Of these, the estimates for Nos. 4, 5, 9, 12, 14, 15 and 16 provide for new lighthouses; the remaining estimates provide for improvements to existing lighthouses.

NOTE.—The estimates for some of the above are only approximate. Of the above the improvements at Havelock Point, Seven Pagodas, Manapad, Muttam and Mulki are already in hand.

11. The question as to the classes of vessels that should be taxed to meet the expenditure on "coast" lights and the rates to be imposed will now be considered. It may be perhaps assumed that all vessels which derive benefit from the "coast" lights should contribute, and that the rate should be determined by the amount or frequency of the benefit.

12. Mr. Ashpitel proposed in his report embodied with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, the imposition of a light due on the following classes of vessels at the rate specified against each class:—

On each coasting vessel	12 pies per ton per month.
On each Native craft	6 pies per ton per month.
On each Foreign steamer	7 pies per ton per voyage.

This method, though simple and easy of collection in regard to coasting vessels, would not be equitable for the reason that the incidence of the tax would weigh equally heavily on *all* coasting vessels, however much or little they used the lights. A better method would perhaps be to charge per voyage, to make a distinction between vessels using the lights of the whole coast, *e.g.*, British Indian and Asiatic Steamers, and those using only a portion of them, to render the dues identical for both the eastern and western group of ports, and make them leviable once per voyage on vessels using the lights of each group.

13. The Presidency Port Officer has proposed the following classification of vessels and rates of dues:—

Classes of vessels.

Rate of due proposed and how often leviable.

Class I.

All steam vessels engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta and Bombay, and between Rangoon and Madras *viâ* ports north of Madras.

Nine pies or As. 1-6 per ton per voyage for each group, provided that if no port in the eastern group be touched at, the due for that group shall not be levied.

Note.—A vessel bound from Calcutta to Bombay unless she called at a port in the eastern group would not sight any of the lights until she arrived on the West coast and only West coast dues would be leviable.

$$\frac{{}^{*}63{,}746 \times 9 \times 8}{12 \times 16} = \text{Rs. } 23{,}905.$$

The tonnage of arrivals under this class at Madras during 1897–98 is reported to have been 63,746 tons. Each vessel or its substitute is estimated to make use of the lights on each coast not less than eight times a year. On this basis, and at 9 pies per ton the annual receipts for each group will be Rs. 23,905 *. For both the groups, the receipts will be doubled, *i.e.*, 47,810. At the higher rate of As. 1-6 per ton, the receipts will be twice 47,810 or Rs. 95,620.

Class II.

All steam vessels, British and Foreign, to or from Europe, the Australian, African and other British Colonies including the Straits Settlements and Ceylon and vessels from Indian ports and ports in Burma which, in the oridinary course of a voyage, will pass or derive benefit from any of the coast lights in the Madras Presidency, and vessels calling at not more than one port in a group, but which do not come under the conditions of Class I.

The Presidency Port Officer estimates receipts under this class from three sources :—

First.—From vessels which may be expected to pay dues to the eastern group *once* during the year; the tonnage of these vessels during 1897–98 is stated to be 166,169 tons;

Secondly.—From what the Presidency Port Officer calls "Semi-coasting" vessels, whose tonnage during the same period amounted to 44,441 tons; and

Thirdly.—From vessels which may be expected to render themselves liable to payment of dues to the eastern group, at least three times during the year; their tonnage for 1897–98 is reported to have been 90,631 tons. At the lower rate of 6 pies per ton the receipts from this class will amount to Rs. 15,079†. At one anna, the receipts will be doubled, *i.e.*, Rupees 30,158.

Six pies or 12 pies per ton per voyage per group. One payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days; payable on arrival at a port in the Madras Presidency.

To this class must be added the steamers plying between Colombo and Tuticorin, originally included in class V, but now entered, in class II. The dues derivable will be Rs. 376 per annum at the lower rate, and Rs. 752 at the higher rate.

	RS.
† Tonnage of vessels liable *once* during the year 166,169+44,441 = 210,610 tons.	
At 6 pies per ton, the receipts $= \frac{210{,}610 \times 6}{12 \times 16}$ ..	6,582
Tonnage of vessels liable *thrice* during the year = 90,631 tons.	
At 6 pies per ton, the receipts will be $\frac{90{,}631 \times 6 \times 3}{12 \times 16}$	8,497
Total ..	15,079

Classes of vessels.

Rate of due proposed and how often leviable.

All steam vessels from Bombay or ports in the Bombay Presidency, bound direct for Colombo and from Colombo direct for ports in the Bombay Presidency.

The Presidency Port Officer bases his estimate of receipts from this class from the number of P. and O. steamers on the China line of which there are two fortnightly—one up and one down. While vessels of other lines will also be liable, this basis is apparently adopted as a safe one. The tonnage of these vessels may be taken as 2,000 each. For one month, the tonnage liable to dues will be 8,000, and for one year 96,000 tons. At 8 pies per ton the receipts will be $\frac{96{,}000 \times 8}{12 \times 16} =$ Rs. 4,000. At 16 pies, the receipts will be Rs. 8,000.

Eight pies or 19 pies per ton per voyage payable on arrival at or departure from *Bombay*.

Class IV.

All sailing vessels of 15 tons and upwards coasting or otherwise.

Four pies or 8 pies per ton per voyage per group; one payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days.

Large sailing vessels from the United Kingdom very seldom visit this coast and the Presidency Port Officer considers it unnecessary to make any special rate for them. The aggregate tonnage of native sailing craft during 1896–97 was 713,000 tons. This shipping paid in port dues Rs. 22,971 at one anna per ton for every 60 days. Upon this basis, the Presidency Port Officer estimates receipts from light dues (leviable at 4 or 8 pies per ton) at $\frac{1}{3}$ or $\frac{2}{3}$ of the port dues, *i.e.*, at $\frac{22{,}971 \times 1}{3}$ or $\frac{22{,}971 \times 2}{3} =$ Rs. 7,657 or Rs. 15,314.

Class V.

Steamers from Bombay bound for the minor ports of South Canara whose voyage terminates at Mangalore.

Three pies or 6 pies per ton every thirty days.

These vessels will benefit by one or two lights only and hence the lower rate proposed. It is reported that there are eight steamers aggregating 2,650 tons performing the service between Bombay and Mangalore. Owing to the closing of the ports for the south-west monsoon, it is estimated that they will pay dues six times each year. The receipts will then be $\frac{2{,}650 \times 3 \times 6}{12 \times 16} =$ Rs. 248 or Rs. 496 at the higher rate.

Class VI.

Steamers plying between Madras and Rangoon.

Seven pies or 14 pies per ton every thirty days.

The aggregate tonnage of vessels under this class for 1897–98 was 8,199 tons. It is estimated that each vessel of this class will make not less than twelve trips per annum; at 7 pies per ton they will pay $\frac{8{,}199 \times 12 \times 7}{12 \times 16} =$ Rs. 3,587 or Rs. 7,174 at the higher rate.

Receipts.	Lower rate.	Higher rate.
	Rs.	Rs.
*Class I	47,810	95,620
„ II	15,455	30,910
„ III	4,000	8 000
„ IV	7,657	15,314
„ V	248	496
„ VI	3,587	7,174
Total ..	78,569	1,57,138

14. The total approximate receipts from the proposed levy of light dues as estimated by the Presidency Port Officer will thus come to Rs. 78,569 * at the lower, or Rs. 1,57,138 * at the higher rate. This will be the amount available for (1) maintenance of coast lights, (2) payment of interest on capital outlay, and (3) provision of a Sinking fund for the extinction of the loan.

15. No precise information is at present available as to the amount that will have to be set apart for maintenance; some of the lighthouses not having yet been built, and their improved illuminating apparatus brought into use. A rough forecast is, therefore, all that is possible. The following figures given in Mr. Ashpitel's report recorded with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, may, perhaps, be adopted :—

Coast Lights.	Maintenance charges.
	Rs.
1. Calingapatam	3,900
2. Santapilli	5,500
3. Vakalapudi	3,800
4. Sacramento	5,300
5. Havelock Point	5,100
6. Armeghon	3,800
7. Pulicat	3,800
8. Madras	4.600
9. Seven Pagodas	4,800
10. Negapatam	1,200
11. Tuticorin	1,150
12. Manapad	5,000
13. Muttam	5,300
14. Tangasséri	4,000
15. Sacrifice Rock	7,200
16. Mulki	5,100
Total ..	70,150

On this basis, the lower rates of light dues, calculated to yield Rs. 78,569, will be insufficient to pay for maintenance † and interest ‡ charges. So these rates are out of the question. On the other hand, the higher rates will, as will be seen from the accompanying statement A, liquidate a loan of Rs. 8,00,000 in 12 years after paying interest at 3½ per cent. on capital outlay and meeting maintenance charges. They therefore seem to be unnecessarily high and a statement (B attached) has been prepared showing two rates intermediate between those proposed by the Presidency Port Officer which will liquidate the loan in 21 and 49 years, respectively. Under the proposed draft Bill, referred to *infra*, the Government is empowered, subject to a maximum, to raise or lower the rates. There seems, therefore, no objection to the higher rates being entered in the schedule and such rates, not exceeding them, levied as may, from time to time, be found necessary. With the double object of imposing as light a due as possible and of obviating any considerable reduction of the dues when the loan is liquidated—only maintenance charges having then to be met from light dues—the lower rate as entered in column 4 of statement B has been calculated. This will extinguish the loan in 49 years. The proposed loan of Rs. 8,00 000 will cover all capital charges on account of coast lights and admit of the expenditure already incurred this year and debited to Port funds being refunded.

† 70,150.
‡ 28,000 for 1st year on a loan of Rs. 8,00,000 at 3½ per cent.

98,150

16. The framing of the legislative enactment has now to be considered. Attached is a rough draft of the proposed Bill. It is an adaptation of the Burma Coast Lights Act IX of 1879, and comparatively few deviations from that Act have been made in the draft. The Burma Act is an Imperial enactment and the proposed enactment for this Presidency should also, it is thought, be an Imperial measure as it extends to territories outside the limits of the Presidency of Fort St. George. Under rule 3 of the précis of Legislative standing orders "no provision should be made in any Bill to be introduced into any Legislative Council in India for the creation of such * a fund, until the expediency of the measure has been specially considered in the Finance Department of the Government of India." The proposed Bill aims at creating such a special fund, and it will thus have also to be laid before the Government of India in the Financial Department before it can be introduced into the Legislative Council.

* *i.e.*, appropriations from which are restricted to defined purposes.

17. The views of the mercantile bodies and agents are also invited on the draft Bill, which will also be referred to the Presidency Port Officer and the Advocate-General, for remarks.

(True Extract.)

W. B. deWINTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Presidency Port Officer.
„ the Government Solicitor.
„ Messrs. Arbuthnot & Co., Madras.
„ „ Binny & Co., Madras.
„ „ Wilson & Co., Madras.
„ „ Gordon, Woodroffe & Co., Madras.
„ „ Best & Co., Madras.
„ „ Parry & Co., Madras.
„ the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Madras.
„ the „ Madras Trades Association.
„ the „ European Chamber of Commerce, Cocanada.
„ the „ Native „ „ „
„ the „ Cochin Chamber of Commerce.
„ Messrs. Adamson, Mactaggart & Co., Negapatam.
„ „ Burnett & Son, Tellicherry.
„ „ Peirce, Leslie & Co., Calicut.
„ „ Stuart, Hall & Co., Vizagapatam.
„ the Financial Department.
„ the Superintendent of Works, Lighthouse Division.

[Annexure.

ANNEXURE.

Accompaniments to G.O., No. 471, *Marine, dated* 31st *May* 1899.

A. Light Dues—Financial Forecast.

Year.	Loan at beginning of the year.	Annual receipts from light dues at maximum rates.	Maintenance charges.	Interest on loan at 3½ per cent. on amount in column 2.	Total of columns 4 and 5.	Balance available for extinction of loan (column 3 — column 6).	Loan outstanding at close of the year (column 2—column 7).
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
1st ..	8,00,000	1,57,138	70,150	28,000	98,150	58,988	7,41,012
2nd ..	7,41,012	1,57,138	70,150	25,935	96,085	61,053	6,79,959
3rd ..	6,79,959	1,57,138	70,150	23,799	93,949	63,189	6,16,770
4th ..	6,16,770	1,57,138	70,150	21,587	91,737	65,401	5,51,369
5th ..	5,51,369	1,57,138	70,150	19,298	89,448	67,690	4,83,679
6th ..	4,83,679	1,57,138	70,150	16,929	87,079	70,059	4,13,620
7th ..	4,13,620	1,57,138	70,150	14,477	84,627	72,511	3,41,109
8th ..	3,41,109	1,57,138	70,150	11,939	82,089	75,049	2,66,060
9th ..	2,66,060	1,57,138	70,150	9,312	79,462	77,676	1,88,384
10th ..	1,88,384	1,57,138	70,150	6,593	76,743	80,395	1,07,989
11th ..	1,07,989	1,57,138	70,150	3,780	73,930	83,208	24,781
12th ..	24,781	1,57,138	70,150	867	71,017	86,121	A surplus of Rs. 61,340 after extinction of the loan.

B.

Class.	Tonnage.	Alternative rate. (*a*)	Alternative rate. (*b*)	Receipts calculated at the rate entered in column 3.	Receipts calculated at the rate entered in column 4.
1	2	3	4	5	6
				RS.	RS.
I.	63,746 tons	15 pies	12 pies	79,683	63,746
II.	210.610 (leviable once) .. .. 90,631 (leviable three times) .. 1,000 (leviable twelve times) ..	9 „	9 „	23,180	23,180
III.	96,000 tons	10 „	10 „	5,000	5,000
IV.	Based on the port dues which amounted to Rs. 22,971 at 1 anna per ton	6 „	4 „	11,486	7,657
V.	2,650 tons (leviable six times) ..	6 „	6 „	497	497
VI.	8,199 tons (leviable twelve times) ..	10 „	9 „	5,124	4,612
	Total ..	..	..	(*a*) 1,24,970	(*b*) 1,04,692

(*a*) This will liquidate the loan in 21 years. (*b*) The loan will run for 49 years.

C.

Draft Bill to provide for the levy of dues for the use of Coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George.

Preamble.

Whereas it is expedient for the maintenance of coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George to levy dues on vessels passing or deriving benefit from such lights; It is hereby enacted as follows:—

Preliminary.

Short title.
Commencement.
Local extent.

1. This Act may be called "The Madras Coast Light Dues Act, 1899." It shall come into force on the . . . . and it shall extend to the territories respectively administered by the Governors of Fort St. George and Bombay in Council and the Lieutenant-Governors of Bengal and Burma.

Saving.

But nothing herein contained shall apply to any vessel belonging to or in the service of Her Majesty or the Government of India or to any vessel of war belonging to any Foreign Prince or State.

Interpretation clause.

2. In this Act unless there is something repugnant in the subject or context—

" Customs Collector."

"Customs Collector" means a Customs Collector appointed under the Sea Customs Act, 1878, and includes any person appointed by the Local Government by name or in virtue of his office to discharge the functions of a Customs Collector under this Act at any port.

" Vessel."

"Vessel" includes any thing made for the conveyance by water of human beings or of property.

" Master."

"Master" when used in relation to any vessel means any person (except a Pilot or Harbour Master) having for the time being the charge or control of such vessel.

" Voyage."

"Voyage" means the whole distance between a vessel's place of departure and her final place of arrival; but the return of a vessel from any place shall, notwithstanding the terms of any charter party, be deemed a distinct voyage.

Coast Light Dues.

Coast light dues payable in respect of vessels of 15 tons.

3. For the purpose of maintaining coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George, a toll, hereinafter called "Coast light dues" shall be paid in respect of every vessel of the burden of 15 tons and upwards making any voyage mentioned in the schedule hereto annexed of the rate specified in column 2 thereof.

Dues when payable.

4. The said coast light dues shall become due and payable—

(*a*) In the case of a vessel clearing out of a port in British India upon any such voyage previous to the grant of any port clearance;

(*b*) in the case of a vessel entering a port in British India in the course or at the termination of any such voyage—immediately upon her entering such port: provided that the said dues shall not be levied more than once in the same port or groups fo ports on anydvessel in the course of the same voyage and that for the purposes of this Act, the port of Madras shall be reckoned as belonging to the eastern group of ports in the Presidency of Fort St. George any provisions to the contrary in any other enactment notwithstanding.

Power to vary rates of dues.

5. With the prior sanction of the Governor-General in Council, the Governor in Council of Fort St. George may from time to time, by notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, reduce or raise the rate of coast light dues in respect of all vessels or any particular class of vessels.

Provided that such rate shall not in any case exceed the rate fixed by section 3.

Collection of dues.

Voucher to be given.

6. The Customs Collector shall collect the coast light dues, and shall grant to the person paying the same a voucher in writing under his hand setting forth the name of his office, the port at which the coast light dues are paid, the amount so paid, the name, tonnage and other proper description of the vessel in respect of which such payment is made, and the voyage on which she is or has been bound.

Master to report arrival.

7. Within 24 hours after the arrival within a port of any vessel chargeable with coast light dues, the master of such vessel shall give notice of such arrival to the Customs Collector.

Tonnage of vessel chargeable with coast light dues how ascertained.

8. In order to ascertain the tonnage of any vessel chargeable with coast light dues, the following rules shall be observed :—

If registered.

(*a*) If such vessel be a British registered vessel or a vessel registered under Act No. X of 1841 or Act No. XI of 1850, or under any other law for the time being in force for the registration of vessels in India, the Customs Collector may require the owner or master of such vessel, or any other person having possession of her register to produce such register for inspection. If any such owner, master or other person neglects or refuses to produce such register or otherwise to satisfy the Customs Collector as to what is the true tonnage of the vessel in respect of which such coast light dues are payable, he shall be punished with fine which may extend to one hundred rupees, and the Customs Collector may cause such vessel to be measured and the tonnage thereof to be ascertained; and in such case, the owner or master of such vessel shall also be liable to pay the expenses of such measurement.

If not registered.

(*b*) If such vessel be not a British registered vessel or a vessel registered under Act No. X of 1841 or Act No. XI of 1850 or under any other law for the time being in force for the registration of vessels in India, and the owner or master thereof fails to satisfy the Customs Collector as to what is her true tonnage according to the mode of measurement prescribed by the law in force for the time being for regulating the measurement of British registered vessels, the Customs Collector shall cause such vessel to be measured and the tonnage thereof, according to the mode aforesaid, to be ascertained; and in such case the owner or master of such vessel shall be liable to pay the expenses of such measurement.

On refusal to pay dues or expenses, the Collector may distrain and sell.

9. If the master of any vessel refuses or neglects to pay to the Customs Collector on demand by him the amount of any dues or expenses payable in respect of such vessel under this Act, the Customs Collector may distrain or arrest such vessel and the tackle, apparel and furniture belonging thereto, or any part thereof, and detain the same until the amount of such dues or expenses is paid; and in case any part of such dues or expenses, or of the costs of the distress or arrest, or of the keeping of the same, remains unpaid for the space of five days next after any such distress or arrest so made, the Customs Collector may cause the vessel or other thing so distrained or arrested to be sold, and with the proceeds of such sale may satisfy such dues, expenses and costs (including the costs of sale) remaining unpaid, and shall render the surplus (if any) to the master of such vessel upon demand.

No port clearance to be granted until dues, &c., are paid.

10. The officer of Government whose duty it is to grant a port clearance for any vessel shall not grant such port clearance until her master or some other person has paid, or secured to the satisfaction of such officer, the amount of all dues, expenses and costs with which such vessel is chargeable under this Act, and of any fine to which any person is liable for anything done by him in contravention of this Act.

Master to specify on demand voyage on which vessel is bound.

11. The master of any vessel departing from or entering any port in British India upon, or in the course of, or at the termination of, any voyage, shall, upon the demand of the Customs Collector, specify upon what voyage she is or has been bound.

Penalty for evading payment of dues, &c.

12. If the master of any vessel evades, or attempts to evade, the payment of any coast light dues, expenses or costs payable in respect of such vessel under this Act, he shall be punished with fine which may extend to two hundred rupees.

Determination of disputes under Act.

13. If any dispute arises as to whether any vessel is chargeable with any coast light dues, expenses or costs under this Act, or as to the amount of such dues, expenses or costs, such dispute shall upon application made in that behalf by either of the disputing parties, be heard and determined in the towns of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay by a Presidency Magistrate and elsewhere by any Magistrate exercising at the place where the dispute arises powers under the Code of Criminal Procedure not less than those of a Magistrate of the second class. All decisions under this section shall be final.

Prosecutions under other Laws.

Saving of prosecutions under other laws.

14. Nothing herein contained shall prevent any person from being prosecuted under any other law for any act or omission which constitutes an offence against this Act: provided that no person shall be punished twice for the same act or omission.

Statement of Receipts and Expenditure.

Statement of receipts and expenditure to be published.

15. The Governor in Council of Fort St. George shall on or before the first day of October in each year publish in the *Fort St. George Gazette* a statement showing the amount received on account of coast light dues during the year ending on the thirty-first day of March last preceding, and the amount expended during the same period on the maintenance of coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George.

SCHEDULE.

VESSELS chargeable with Light dues, rate of Light dues and frequency of payment.

Vessels chargeable.	Rate of light dues.	How often chargeable.
CLASS I.		
All steam vessels engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta and Bombay and between Rangoon and Madras *viâ* ports north of Madras.	1½ annas per ton.	Once during a voyage for each group, provided that it no port in the eastern group be touched at, the due for that group shall not be paid.
CLASS II.		
All steam vessels, British and Foreign, to or from Europe, the Australian, African and other British Colonies, including the Straits Settlements and Ceylon and vessels from Indian ports and ports in Burma which in the ordinary course of a voyage will pass or derive benefit from any of the coast lights in the Madras Presidency and vessels calling at more than one port in the group, and which do not come under the conditions of Class I.	12 pies per ton ..	Once per voyage per group; one payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days; payable on arrival at a port in the Presidency of Fort St. George.
CLASS III.		
All steam vessels from Bombay or ports in the Bombay Presidency bound direct for Colombo and from Colombo direct to ports in the Bombay Presidency.	16 pies per ton ..	Once during a voyage payable on arrival at or departure from Bombay.
CLASS IV.		
All sailing vessels of 15 tons and upwards, coasting or otherwise.	8 pies per ton ..	Once during a voyage for each group. One payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days.
CLASS V.		
All steam vessels from Bombay bound for the minor ports of South Canara whose voyage terminates at Mangalore.	6 pies per ton ..	Once for every thirty days.
CLASS VI.		
All steam vessels plying direct between Madras and Rangoon.	14 pies per ton ..	Once for every thirty days.

STATEMENT OF OBJECTS AND REASONS.

Whereas the Government of Fort St. George has undertaken an extensive and costly scheme of lighthouse construction and illumination on the coasts of the Madras Presidency, and whereas it is necessary to raise funds in the open market for the capital outlay thereon, it is proposed in the accompanying Bill to levy a coast light due on vessels deriving benefit from the lights in question; the proceeds of the due being applied to payment of—

(1) the interest on the loan; (2) a sinking fund for its final extinction; and (3) the maintenance of the lights.

D

G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 471, MARINE, DATED 31st MAY 1899.

Marine Department.

[Subject.—*Lighthouse programme and levy of light dues.*]

Back papers.

G.O.,	*Nos.*	25–26,	*Marine,*	*dated*	*22nd Jan.*	1891.
„	*No.*	230	„	„	*26th May*	„
„	„	438	„	„	*8th Oct.*	„
„	„	23	„	„	*19th Jan.*	1892.
„	„	157	„	„	*15th May*	1893.
„	„	431	„	„	*6th Dec.*	„
„	„	80	„	„	*8th Mar.*	1894.
„	„	216	„	„	*11th June*	„
„	„	318	„	„	*10th Aug.*	„
„	*Nos.*	245–46	„	„	*8th April*	1896.
„	*No.*	562	„	„	*19th Aug.*	„
„	*Nos.*	316–17	„	„	*29th April*	1898.
„	*No.*	574	„	„	*4th July*	„
„	„	732	„	„	*30th Aug.*	„
Letter	„	733	„	„	*30th* „	„
G.O.,	„	29	„	„	*10th Jan.*	1899.
Letter	„	30	„	„	*10th* „	„
G.O.,	*Nos.*	579, 80	*Financial*	„	*8th May*	„

Memorandum to the Presidency Port Officer, No. 416 *E., dated* 11*th August* 1898.

From the Presidency Port Officer, No. 1271/299 *G., dated* 1*st Sept.* 1898.

Telegram to the Presidency Port Officer, dated 27*th Sept.* 1898.

„ *from the Presidency Port Officer, No.* 1271/299 *G., dated* 27*th Sept.* 1898.

Memorandum to the Presidency Port Officer, No. 496 *E., dated* 29*th Sept.* 1898.

From the Presidency Port Officer, No. 1271/347 *G., dated* 8*th October* 1898.

For the Secretary—

Before proceeding with the question of legislation for the levy of light dues, it seems necessary that a decision should be come to in regard to the classification of lights under the two main heads, viz., "Port" and "Coast" lights. At present such a division is not recognized, and all expenditure is charged to Port funds. For the future the Government of India has stated in paragraph 7 of its letter No. 3285-S. R., dated 27th July 1898, that any fresh expenditure to be incurred for erecting and maintaining lights on the Madras Coast, over and above past standards, should be provided for by means of light dues.

G.O., No. 732, Marine, dated 30th August 1898.

It is doubtful, however, whether this ruling is in strict accordance with law. It will be seen from section 36 (3) (*b*) of the Indian Ports Act, 1889 (X of 1889), that Port funds cannot be spent on lights other than those "maintained chiefly for the benefit of vessels *being in* or *entering* or *leaving* the ports or passing through the rivers or channels *leading* thereto". "Coast" lights, therefore, or those intended for the use of vessels passing along the coast, would have to be erected and maintained from some other source—presumably *Imperial funds*, in the absence, or pending the levy, of special light dues for the purpose.

G.O., No. 29, Marine, dated 10th January 1899.

In its subsequent letter No. 4778 S R, dated 2nd November 1898, the Government of India raises purely technical objections to the grant of a loan, quoting sub-section (3) of section 36 of the Ports Act as a bar to a loan to *Port funds* on account of "Coast" lights, and the general provincial contract arrangements as militating against any loan to *provincial*. But as pointed out above, it may be contended by the Madras Government that the expenditure on "Coast" lights is a direct imperial charge. It may further be contended that imperial is also liable to Port funds for all past outlay on this class of lights wrongly and illegally charged to Port funds. It should not for a moment be admitted that the expenditure in question falls against *provincial*, no allowance for it having been made in the provincial contract arrangements.

This being the position, the Madras Government might waive its claim to a refund of past expenditure, on condition that the Government of India now makes a temporary grant from Imperial revenues for the erection and immediate maintenance of "Coast" lights, repayable on the introduction and collection of light dues.

Mr. Ashpitel places sixteen lights in the "Coast" group (including Alleppi) while the Presidency Port Officer in his letter No. 1271/299-G., dated 1st September 1898, allocates nineteen lights (excluding Alleppi) to that group. It seems necessary that this discrepancy should be reconciled before again approaching the Government of India on the subject of the contribution from Imperial funds, the amount of which will depend on the number of lights classed under the "Coast" group.

Yes. Please have this definitely settled first.

W. B. DEWINTON—14-11-98.

G.O., No. 29, Marine, dated 10th January 1899.

Meanwhile, the following information is submitted with reference to India's letter No. 4778-S.R., dated 2nd November 1898:—

Letter No. 733, Marine, dated 30th August 1898.

Paragraph 3.—The lights for the construction of which the loan of Rs. 2,15,000 was applied for include "Coast"* and "Port"* lights (Rs. 2,06,000† for coast lights and Rs. 9,000† for port lights). The total cost of the lighthouse scheme is Rs. 8,80,000, of which Rs. 8,00,000‡ is for "Coast" lights and Rs. 80,000§ for port lights. It will thus be seen that the major portion of the loan required is for "Coast" lights.

		RS.
Sacramento Coast light	..	1 00,000
Vakalapudi "	...	18,000
Tangasséri "	...	88,000
		2,06,000
Cochin Port light	...	9,000
		2,15,000

Paragraph 4.—In this paragraph, the Government of India points out that lighthouse construction is not a productive work on which Government can spend money and charge it otherwise than against the revenues of the year in which it is spent. The meaning of this seems to be that the expenditure in each year on lighthouse construction should be restricted to the receipts in that year from light dues. If this be so, the works cannot be carried out within the next two years by raising a loan in the open market to be liquidated hereafter by light dues, as contemplated by this Government. As pointed out above, however, the whole circumstances seem now to be changed. "Port" lights will probably have to be carried out from Port funds, and "Coast" lights, on which the expenditure is much larger, will perhaps be started by an imperial contribution which will be repaid in due course from the proceeds of light dues.

R. PARSONS—11-11-98.

---

* These are the terms used by the Government of India.

† For these details, please see page 10 of G.O., No. 316, Marine, dated 29th April 1898.

‡ *Vide* total in column 16 of the statement on page 17 of G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896.

§ *Vide* total in column 17 of the statement on page 17 of G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896.

Memorandum to the Presidency Port Officer, No. 586 *E., dated* 17*th Nov.* 1898.
From the Presidency Port Officer, No. 1271/40[illegible] *G., dated* 18*th November* 1898.
Memorandum to the Presidency Port Officer, No. 41 *E., dated* 20*th Jan.* 1899.
" " " *No.* 44 *E., dated* 20*th* " "
From the Presidency Port Officer, No. 1271/36 *G., dated* 24*th January* 1899.

G.O., No. 732, Marine, dated 30th August 1898.

B

The Government having undertaken an extensive and costly scheme of lighthouse construction and illumination on the coasts of the Madras Presidency, and the appeal to the Government of India for a free grant from Imperial funds having failed, the question of raising the requisite funds by a loan in the open market and of the imposition of light dues to liquidate it remains to be considered.

G.O., No. 732, Marine, dated 30th August 1898.

2. In their letter, No. 3285-S.R., dated 27th July 1898, the Government of India suggested that some scheme "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". Some expenditure from Port funds having already been incurred in the erection of lighthouses on the coasts of this Presidency, and maintenance charges being still provided from this source, the Government of India intimated that they had no objection to the Government of Madras continuing to bear such expenditure to the same extent as before, leaving the balance of the requisite outlay for the completion of the lighthouse scheme, under both construction and maintenance, to be met from the proceeds of the proposed loan.

3. Further investigation has, however, disclosed the fact that Port funds are not legally applicable to lighthouses of all classes, but must, under sub-section 5 of section 36 of the Indian Ports Act X of 1889, be limited to "lights maintained chiefly for the benefit of vessels being in or entering or leaving the port or passing through the rivers or channels leading thereto," *i.e.*, to lights of the class now technically called "Port" lights. It would, therefore, be illegal and inadmissible to continue as suggested by the Government of India, expenditure on all lights indiscriminately "to the same extent as before."

4. To obviate this difficulty, the lights of this Presidency must, in future, be arranged under two distinct groups, viz. :—

(1) Port lights and
(2) Coast lights;

and Port funds be spent on the former only. Class (1) includes lights of local utility, and class (2) those which serve the purposes of general navigation beyond port limits.

5. The following have been classified as "Coast lights," the estimated expenditure on which amounts to Rs. 6,73,000 as shown below :—

Coast lights.	Estimated cost.*
	RS.
1. Calingapatam	5,000
2. Santapilli	1,00,000
3. Vakalapudi	18,000
4. Sacramento	1,00,000
5. Kistna	91,000
6. Arméghon	18,000
7. Pulicat	23,000
8. Madras	1,000
9. Seven Pagodas	53,000
10. Negapatam	5,000
11. Tuticorin	13,000
12. Manapad	47,000
13. Muttum	12,000
14. Tangasséri	88,000
15. Tellicherry	3,000
16. Mulki	96,000
Total ...	6,73,000

* These figures have been taken from statement on page 10 of G.O., No. 316, Marine, dated 29th April 1898. The coast lights are those last selected by the Presidency Port Officer in consultation with Mr. Ashpitel.

6. The question as to the classes of vessels that should be taxed to meet the expenditure on "Coast lights" and the rates to be imposed will now be considered. It may be perhaps assumed that all vessels which derive benefit from the "Coast lights" should contribute, and that the rate should be determined by the amount or frequency of the benefit.

7. Mr. Ashpitel proposed in his report embodied with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, the imposition of a light due on the following classes of vessels at the rates specified against each class :—

On each coasting vessel—12 pies per ton per month.
On each Native craft—6 pies per ton per month.
On each Foreign steamer—7 pies per ton per voyage.

This method, though simple and easy of collection in regard to coasting vessels, would not be equitable for the reason that the incidence of the tax would weigh equally heavily on *all* coasting vessels, however much or little they used the lights. A better method would perhaps be to charge per voyage, to make a distinction between vessels using the lights of the whole coast, *e.g.*, British Indian and Asiatic steamers, and those using only a portion of them, to render the dues identical for both the eastern and western group of ports, and make them leviable once per voyage on vessels using the lights of each group.

8. The Presidency Port Officer has, on these and other suggestions which are contained in memorandum No. 416 E., dated 11th August 1898, and after discussion with the undersigned as to certain classes and rates, proposed the following classification of vessels and rates of dues :—

Rate of due proposed and how often leviable.

Classes of vessels—Class I.—All steam vessels engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta and Bombay, and between Rangoon and Madras, *viâ* ports north of Madras. Nine pies or As. 1–6 per ton per voyage for each group, provided that if no port in the eastern group be touched at, the due for that group shall not be levied.

NOTE.—A vessel bound from Calcutta to Bombay unless she called at a port in the eastern group would not sight any of the light until she arrived on the West Coast and only West Coast dues would be leviable.

The tonnage of arrivals under this class at Madras during 1897–98 is reported to have been 63,746 tons. Each vessel or its substitute is estimated to make use of the lights on each coast not less than eight times a year. On this basis, and at 9 pies per ton, the annual receipts for each group will be Rs. 23,905 *. For both the groups, the receipts will be doubled, *i.e.*, 47,810. At the higher rate of As. 1–6 per ton, the receipts will be twice Rs. 47,810 or Rs. 95,620.

Class II.—All steam vessels, British and Foreign, to or from Europe, the Australian, African and other British Colonies

$$* \ \frac{63{,}746 \times 9 \times 8}{12 \times 16} = \text{Rs. } 23{,}905.$$

including the Straits Settlements and Ceylon and vessels from Indian ports and ports in Burma which, in the ordinary course of a voyage, will pass or derive benefit from any of the coast lights in the Madras Presidency, and vessels calling at more than one port in a group, but which do not come under the conditions of Class I. Six pies or 12 pies per ton per voyage per group. One payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days; payable on arrival at a port in the Madras Presidency.

The Presidency Port Officer estimates receipts under this class from three sources:—

Firstly.—From vessels which may be expected to pay dues to the eastern group *once* during the year; the tonnage of these vessels during 1897–98 is stated to be 166,169 tons;

Secondly.—From what the Presidency Port Officer calls "Semi-coasting" vessels, whose tonnage during the same period amounted to 44,441 tons;

To this class must be added the steamers plying between Colombo and Tuticorin, originally included in class V, but now entered, in class II. The dues derivable will be Rs. 376 per annum at the lower rate, and Rs. 752 at the higher rate.

Thirdly.—From vessels which may be expected to render themselves liable to payment of dues to the eastern group, at least three times during the year; their tonnage for 1897–98 is reported to have been 90,631 tons. At the lower rate of 6 pies per ton the receipts from this class will amount to Rs. 15,079.* At one anna, the receipts will be doubled, *i.e.*, Rupees 30,158.

Class III.—All steam vessels from Bombay or ports in the Bombay Presidency, bound direct for Colombo and from Colombo direct for ports in the Bombay Presidency. Eight pies or 16 pies per ton per voyage payable on arrival at or departure from *Bombay*.

The Presidency Port Officer bases his estimate of receipts from this class from the number of P. and O. steamers on the China line of which there are two fortnightly—one up and one down. While vessels of other lines will also be liable,

this basis is apparently adopted as a safe one. The tonnage of these vessels may be taken as 2,000 each. For one month, the tonnage liable to dues will be 8,000, and for one year 96,000 tons. At 8 pies per ton the receipts will be $\frac{96,000 \times 8}{12 \times 16} =$ Rs. 4,000. At 16 pies, the receipts will be Rs. 8,000.

Class IV.—All sailing vessels of 15 tons and upwards coasting or otherwise. Four pies or 8 pies per ton per voyage per group; one payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days.

Large sailing vessels from the United Kingdom very seldom visit this coast and the Presidency Port Officer considers it unnecessary to make any special rate for them. The aggregate tonnage of native sailing craft during 1896–97 was 713,000 tons. This shipping paid in port dues Rs. 22,971 at one anna per ton for every 60 days. Upon this basis, the Presidency Port Officer estimates receipts from light dues (leviable at 4 or 8 pies per ton) at $\frac{1}{3}$ or $\frac{2}{3}$ of the port dues, *i.e.*, at $\frac{22,971 \times 1}{3}$ or $\frac{22,971 \times 2}{3} =$ Rs. 7,657 or Rs. 15,314.

Class V.—Steamers from Bombay bound for the minor ports of South Canara whose voyage terminates at Mangalore. Three pies or 6 pies per ton every thirty days.

These vessels will benefit by one or two lights only and hence the lower rate proposed. It is reported that there are eight steamers aggregating 2,650 tons performing the service between Bombay and Mangalore. Owing to the closing of the ports for the south-west monsoon, it is estimated that they will pay dues six times each year. The receipts will then be $\frac{2,650 \times 3 \times 6}{12 \times 16} =$ Rs. 248 or Rs. 496 at the higher rate.

Class VI.—Steamers plying between Madras and Rangoon. Seven pies or 14 pies per ton every thirty days.

The aggregate tonnage of vessels under this class for 1897–98 was 8,199 tons. It is estimated that each vessel of this class will make not less than twelve trips per annum; at 7 pies per ton they will pay $\frac{8,199 \times 12 \times 7}{12 \times 16} =$ Rs. 3,587 or Rs. 7,174 at the higher rate.

	RS.
* Tonnage of vessels liable *once* during the year $166,169 + 44,441 = 210,610$ tons.	
At 6 pies per ton, the receipts $= \frac{210,610 \times 6}{12 \times 16}$ ..	6,582
Tonnage of vessels liable *thrice* during the year $= 90,631$ tons.	
At 6 pies per ton, the receipts will be $\frac{90,631 \times 6 \times 3}{12 \times 16}$	8,497
Total ..	15,079

9. The total approximate receipts from the proposed levy of light dues as estimated by the Presidency Port Officer will thus come to Rs. 78,569 * at the lower, or Rs. 1,57,138 * at the higher, rate. This will be the amount available for (1) maintenance of coast lights, (2) payment of interest on capital outlay, and (3) provision of a sinking fund for the extinction of the loan.

Receipts.

	Lower rate.	Higher rate.
	RS.	RS.
* Class I	47,810	95,620
,, II	15,455	30.910
,, III	4,000	8,000
,, IV	7,657	15,314
,, V	248	496
,, VI	3,587	7,174
Total ...	78,569	1,57,138

Note.—[The above] alterations [of 15,455 and 248 for 15,079 and 436 under 'lower rate' and of 30,910 and 496 for 30,158 and 872 under 'higher rate' respectively] have been made because of the inclusion of Tuticorin-Colombo steamers in Class II instead of in Class V. As the difference is not much the totals have not been altered.

W.B.deW.

10. No precise information is at present available as to the amount that will have to be set apart for maintenance; some of the lighthouses not having yet been built, and their improved illuminating apparatus brought into use. A rough forecast is, therefore, all that is possible. The following figures given in Mr. Ashpitel's report recorded with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, may, perhaps, be adopted :—

Coast lights.	Maintenance charges.
	RS.
1. Calingapatam	3,900
2. Santapilli	5,500
3. Vakalapudi	3,800
4. Sacramento	5,300
5. Kistna	5,100
6. Arméghon	3,800
7. Pulicat	3,800
8. Madras	4,600
9. Seven Pagodas	4,800
10. Negapatam	1,200
11. Tuticorin	1,150
12. Manapad	5,000
13. Muttum	5,300
14. Tangasséri	4,600
15. Tellicherry	540
16. Mulki	5,100
Total ...	63,490

On this basis, the lower rates of light dues, calculated to yield Rs. 78,569, will be insufficient to pay for maintenance † and interest ‡ charges. So these rates are out of the question. On the other hand, the higher rates will, as will be seen from the following statement, liquidate a loan of Rs. 6,73,000 in nine years after paying interest at 3½ per cent. on capital outlay and meeting maintenance charges :—

† 63,490.
‡ 23,555 for 1st year on a loan of Rs. 6,73,000 at 3½ per cent.
87,045

Light Dues—Financial Forecast.

Year.	Loan at beginning of the year.	Annual receipts from light dues.	Maintenance charges.	Interest on loan at 3½ per cent. on amount in column 2.	Total of columns 4 and 5.	Balance available for extinction of loan (column 3 — column 6).	Loan outstanding at close of the year (column 2—column 7).
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
1st ..	6,73,000	1,57,138	63,490	23,555	87,045	70,093	6,02,907
2nd ..	6,02,907	1,57,138	63,490	21,102	84,592	72,546	5,30,361
3rd ..	5,30,361	1,57,138	63,490	18,563	82,053	75.085	4,55,276
4th ..	4,55,276	1,57,138	63,490	15,935	79,425	77,713	3,77,563
5th ..	3,77,563	1,57,138	63,490	13,215	76,705	80,433	2,97,130
6th ..	2,97,130	1,57,138	63,490	10,400	73,890	83,248	2,13,882
7th ..	2,13,882	1,57,138	63,490	7,486	70,976	86,162	1,27,720
8th ..	1,27,720	1,57,138	63,490	4,470	67,960	89,178	38,542
9th ..	38,542	1,57,138	63,490	1,349	64,839	92,299	A surplus of 53,757 after extinction of the loan.

They therefore seem to be unnecessarily high and the following statement has been prepared showing two rates intermediate between those proposed by the Presidency Port Officer which will liquidate the loan in 15 and 25 years, respectively :—

Class.	Tonnage.	Rate fixed by the Secretary.	Rate now proposed.	Receipts calculated at the rate entered in column 3.	Receipts calculated at the rate entered in column 4.
1	2	3	4	5	6
				RS.	RS.
I	63,746 tons	15 pies	12 pies	79,683	63,746
II	210,610 (leviable once) .. .. 90,631 (leviable three times) .. 1,000 (leviable twelve times) ..	9 ,,	9 ,,	23,180	23,180
III	96,000 tons	16 ,,	10 ,,	5,000	5,000
IV	Based on the port dues which amounted to Rs. 22,971 at 1 anna per ton.	6 ,,	4 ,,	11,486	7,657
V	2,650 tons (leviable six times) ..	6 ,,	6 ,,	497	497
VI	8,199 tons (leviable twelve times)..	10 ,,	9 ,,	5,124	4,612
	Total ..	..	..	(a) 1,24,970	(b) 1,04,692

(a) This will liquidate the loan in 15 years.

(b) The loan will run for 25 years.

Under the proposed draft Bill, referred to *infra*, the Government is empowered, subject to a maximum, to raise or lower the rates. There seems, therefore, no objection to the higher rates being entered in the schedule and such rates, not exceeding them, levied as may, from time to time, be found necessary. With the double object of imposing as light a due as possible and of obviating any considerable reduction of the dues when the loan is liquidated—only maintenance charges having then to be met from light dues—the lower rate entered in column 4 of second statement above will extinguish the loan in 25 years. The proposed loan of Rs. 6,73,000 will cover all capital charges on account of coast lights and admit of the expenditure already incurred this year and debited to Port funds being refunded.

11. The framing of the legislative enactment has now to be considered. Attached is a rough draft of the proposed Bill. It is an adaptation of the Burma Coast Lights Act IX of 1879, and comparatively few deviations from that Act have been made in the draft. The Burma Act is an Imperial enactment and the proposed enactment for this Presidency should also, it is thought, be an Imperial measure as it extends to territories outside the limits of the Presidency of Fort St. George. Under rule 3 of the précis of Legislative standing orders "no provision should be made in any Bill to be introduced into any Legislative Council in India for the creation of such* a fund, until the expediency of the measure has been specially considered in the Finance Department of the Government of India." The proposed Bill aims at creating such a special fund, and it will thus have also to be laid before the Government of India in the Financial Department before it can be introduced into the Legislative Council.

12. The following seem the only points in the draft Bill which call for special remark:—

Section 2 defines the terms "Customs Collector", "Vessel", "Master" and "Voyage" in the terms of the Burma Coast Lights Act.

Section 3 levies coast light dues on vessels of the burden of 15 tons and upwards. This limit in the Burma Act is 50 tons, but the Presidency Port Officer has explained that, if this limit is adopted in Madras, a large number of vessels in the West Coast will escape the dues. The limit proposed is therefore the same as for port dues, viz., 15 tons.

Section 4 shows when the dues become payable. A clause has been added to this section making the port of Madras a part of the eastern group. This seems necessary with reference to section 37 (1) of the Indian Ports Act, which declares that Madras shall *not* be grouped with any other port for the purposes of maintenance of its Port fund accounts.

---

* *i.e.*, appropriations from which are restricted to defined purposes.

Section 5.—The power to vary rates is given to the Governor in Council, subject to the prior sanction of the Governor-General in Council. This is in accordance with local usage in similar cases.

Section 16 of the Burma Act has been so far modified (*vide* section 15 of the draft) as to place the duty of publishing accounts on the Government of Madras instead of on the Government of India.

The schedule attached to the draft Bill shows the rates and mode of collection of the light dues.

A 13. The draft Bill might be referred to the Presidency Port Officer and the Advocate-General for remarks and then forwarded to the Government of India, Financial Department, for approval, prior to its introduction into the Supreme Legislative Council. The last step should, perhaps, be taken in the Legislative Department of the Madras Government.

Draft Bill to provide for the levy of dues for the use of Coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George.

Preamble.

Whereas it is expedient for the maintenance of coast lights in the Presidency of Forst St. George to levy dues on vessels passing or deriving benefit from such lights; It is hereby enacted as follows:—

Preliminary.

Short title.

1. This Act may be called "The Madras Coast Light Dues Act, 1899".

Commencement.

It shall come into force on the . . . .

Local extent.

and it shall extend to the territories respectively administered by the Governors of Fort St. George and Bombay in Council and the Lieutenant-Governors of Bengal and Burma.

Saving.

But nothing herein contained shall apply to any vessel belonging to or in the service of Her Majesty or the Government of India or to any vessel of war belonging to any Foreign Prince or State.

Interpretation clause.

2. In this Act unless there is something repugnant in the subject or context—

"Customs Collector."

"Customs Collector" means a Customs Collector appointed under the Sea Customs Act, 1878, and includes any person appointed by the Local Government by name or in virtue of his office to discharge the functions of a Customs Collector under this Act at any port.

"Vessel."

"Vessel" includes any thing made for the conveyance by water of human beings or of property.

"Master."

"Master" when used in relation to any vessel means any person (except a Pilot or Harbour Master) having for the time being the charge or control of such vessel.

"Voyage."

"Voyage" means the whole distance between a vessel's place of departure and her final place of arrival; but the return of a vessel from any place shall, notwithstanding the terms of any charter party, be deemed a distinct voyage.

Coast Light Dues.

Coast light dues payable in respect of vessels of 15 tons.

3. For the purpose of maintaining coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George, a toll, hereinafter called "Coast light dues" shall be paid in respect of every vessel of the burden of 15 tons and upwards making any voyage mentioned in thes chedule hereto annexed of the rate specified in column 2 thereof.

Dues when payable.

4. The said coast light dues shall become due and payable—

(*a*) in the case of a vessel clearing out of a port in British India upon any such voyage previous to the grant of any port clearance;

(*b*) In the case of a vessel entering a port in British India in the course or at the termination of any such voyage—immediately upon her entering such port: provided that the said dues shall not be levied more than once in the same port or group of ports on any vessel in the course of the same voyage and that for the purposes of this Act, the port of Madras shall be reckoned as belonging to the eastern group of ports in the Presidency of Fort St. George any provisions to the contrary in any other enactment notwithstanding.

Power to vary rates of dues.

5. With the prior sanction of the Governor-General in Council, the Governor in Council of Fort St. George may from time to time, by notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, reduce or raise the rate of coast light dues in respect of all vessels or any particular class of vessels.

Provided that such rate shall not in any case exceed the rate fixed by section 3.

Collection of dues.

6. The Customs Collector shall collect the coast light dues,

Voucher to be given.

and shall grant to the person paying the same a voucher in writing under his hand setting forth the name of his office, the port at which the coast light dues are paid, the amount so paid, the name, tonnage and other proper description of the vessel in respect of which such payment is made, and the voyage on which she is or has been bound.

Master to report arrival.

7. Within 24 hours after the arrival within a port of any vessel chargeable with coast light dues, the master of such vessel shall give notice of such arrival to the Customs Collector.

Tonnage of vessel chargeable with coast light dues how ascertained.

8. In order to ascertain the tonnage of any vessel chargeable with coast light dues, the following rules shall be observed:—

If registered.

(*a*) If such vessel be a British registered vessel or a vessel registered under Act No. X of 1841 or Act No. XI of 1850, or under any other law for the time being in force for the registration of vessels in India, the Customs Collector may require the owner or master of such vessel, or any other person having possession of her register to produce such register for inspection. If any such owner, master or other person neglects or refuses to produce such register or otherwise to satisfy the Customs Collector as to what is the true tonnage of the vessel in respect of which such coast light dues are payable, he shall be punished with fine which may extend to one hundred rupees, and the Customs Collector may cause such vessel to be measured and the tonnage thereof to be ascertained; and in such case, the owner or master of such vessel shall also be liable to pay the expenses of such measurement.

If not registered.

(*b*) If such vessel be not a British registered vessel or a vessel registered under Act No. X of 1841 or Act No. XI of 1850 or under any other law for the time being in force for the registration of vessels in India, and the owner or master thereof fails to satisfy the Customs Collector as to what is her true tonnage according to the mode of measurement prescribed by the law in force for the time being for regulating the measurement of British registered vessels, the Customs Collector shall cause such vessel to be measured and the tonnage thereof, according to the mode aforesaid, to be ascertained; and in such case the owner or master of such vessel shall be liable to pay the expenses of such measurement.

On refusal to pay dues or expenses, the Collector may distrain and sell.

9. If the master of any vessel refuses or neglects to pay to the Customs Collector on demand by him the amount of any dues or expenses payable in respect of such vessel under this Act, the Customs Collector may distrain or arrest such vessel and the tackle, apparel and furniture belonging thereto, or any part thereof, and detail the same until the amount of such dues or expenses is paid; and in case any part of such dues or expenses, or of the costs of the distress or arrest, or of the keeping of the same, remains unpaid for the space of five days next after any such distress or arrest so made, the Customs Collector may cause the vessel or other thing so distrained or arrested to be sold, and with the proceeds of such sale may satisfy such dues, expenses and costs (including the costs of sale) remaining unpaid, and shall render the surplus (if any) to the master of such vessel upon demand.

No port clearance to be granted until dues, etc., are paid.

10. The officer of Government whose duty it is to grant a port clearance for any vessel shall not grant such port clearance until her master or some other person has paid, or secured to the satisfaction of such officer, the amount of all dues, expenses and costs with which such vessel is chargeable under this Act, and of any fine to which any person is liable for anything done by him in contravention of this Act.

Master to specify on demand voyage on which vessel is bound.

11. The master of any vessel departing from or entering any port in British India upon or in the course of, or at the termination of, any voyage, shall, upon the demand of the Customs Collector, specify upon what voyage she is or has been bound.

Penalty for evading payment of dues, etc.

12. If the master of any vessel evades, or attempts to evade, the payment of any coast light dues, expenses or costs payable in respect of such vessel under this Act, he shall be punished with fine which may extend to two hundred rupees.

Determination of disputes under Act.

13. If any dispute arises as to whether any vessel is chargeable with any coast light dues, expenses or costs under this Act, or as to the amount of such dues, expenses or costs, such dispute shall, upon application made in that behalf by either of the disputing parties, be heard and determined in the towns of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay by a Presidency Magistrate and elsewhere by any Magistrate exercising at the place where the dispute arises powers under the Code of Criminal Procedure not less than those of a Magistrate of the second class. All decisions under this section shall be final.

Prosecutions under other Laws.

Saving of prosecutions under other laws.

14. Nothing herein contained shall prevent any person from being prosecuted under any other law for any act or omission which constitutes an offence against this Act: provided that no person shall be punished twice for the same act or omission.

Statement of Receipts and Expenditure.

Statement of receipts and expenditure to be published.

15. The Governor in Council of Fort St. George shall on or before the first day of October in each year publish in the *Fort St. George Gazette* a statement showing the amount received on account of coast light dues during the year ending on the thirty-first day of March last preceding, and the amount expended during the same period on the maintenance of coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George.

SCHEDULE.

Vessels chargeable with Light dues, rate of Light dues and frequency of payment.

Vessels chargeable.	Rate of light dues.	How often chargeable.
Class I.		
All steam vessels engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta and Bombay and between Rangoon and Madras *viâ* ports north of Madras.	1½ annas per ton.	Once during a voyage for each group, provided that if no port in the eastern group be touched at, the due for that group shall not be paid.
Class II.		
All steam vessels, British and Foreign, to or from Europe, the Australian, African and other British Colonies, including the Straits Settlements and Ceylon and vessels from Indian ports and ports in Burma which in the ordinary course of a voyage will pass or derive benefit from any of the coast lights in the Madras Presidency and vessels calling at more than one port in the group, and which do not come under the conditions of Class I.	12 pies per ton ..	Once per voyage per group; one payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days; payable on arrival at a port in the Presidency of Fort St. George.
Class III.		
All steam vessels from Bombay or ports in the Bombay Presidency bound direct for Colombo and from Colombo direct to ports in the Bombay Presidency.	16 pies per ton ..	Once during a voyage payable on arrival at or departure from Bombay.
Class IV.		
All sailing vessels of 15 tons and upwards, coasting or otherwise.	8 pies per ton ..	Once during a voyage for each group; one payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days.
Class V.		
All steam vessels from Bombay bound for the minor ports of South Canara whose voyage terminates at Mangalore.	6 pies per ton ..	Once for every thirty days.
Class VI.		
All steam vessels plying direct between Madras and Rangoon.	14 pies per ton ..	Once for every thirty days.

STATEMENT OF OBJECTS AND REASONS.

Whereas the Government of Fort Saint George has undertaken an extensive and costly scheme of lighthouse construction and illumination on the coasts of the Madras Presidency, and whereas it is necessary to raise funds in the open market for the capital outlay thereon, it is proposed in the accompanying Bill to levy a coast light due on vessels deriving benefit from the lights in question; the proceeds of the due being applied to payment of—

(1) the interest on the loan; (2) a sinking fund for its final extinction; and (3) the maintenance of the lights.

R. Parsons.

W. B. de Winton—31-1-99.

A I think that before this is done, our Financial Branch should see the papers and report upon the proposals therein made.

A. E. H[avelock]—3-2-99.

B But the matter is still under correspondence. A letter from the Secretary, Marine, to India, dated 10th January 1899, is still pending unanswered.

As to the proposal that this Government should raise a loan in the open market, I take it that this Government has no power to do such a thing and that the Government of India would peremptorily negative such a proposal, for the obvious reason that pledging the credit of the Madras Government in support of a loan is the same thing as pledging the credit of the Government of India—a thing that could on no account be permitted.

But as His Excellency has noted the whole question should be considered by Financial which will have further to consider it when the reply of India is received to the letter of January 10th.

A. T. A[rundel]—13-2-99.

H. W[interbotham]—14- -99.

Transferred to the Financial Department.

(Signed) A. W. SMART, Col., R.E.,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

16th February 1899.

Financial Department.

For the Chief Secretary—

As pointed out by the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel, c.s.i., in his note, dated 13th February 1899, there is no rule under which this Government can raise a loan in the open market. Even if it were possible for Government to borrow on the security of Port funds, the objection raised by the Government of India in paragraph 3 of its letter, No. 4778-S.R., dated 2nd November 1898, to a loan from *Imperial* would seem to apply equally to a loan in the open market. The money thus borrowed, which would be an addition to the Port fund receipts, could not be utilized on expenditure on *coast* lights, since the provisions of section 36, sub-section (5) of the Indian Ports Act, 1889, restrict the application of Port funds to the class of lights defined in that section, *i.e.*, to *port* lights. It is submitted, therefore, that the reply of the Government of India to letter, No. 30, Marine, dated 10th January last, may be awaited.

G.O., No. 29, Marine, dated 10th January 1899.

F. A. D'Cruz—6-3-99. C. M. Schmidt—6-3-99.

Hold the papers till the answer is received

G. Stokes—7-3-99.

For the Chief Secretary—

In the note of the Marine department, dated 31st January 1899, the question of raising funds for the scheme of lighthouse construction and illumination on the coasts of this Presidency by a loan in the open market and of the imposition of light dues to liquidate it was considered. The Hon'ble Mr. Arundel, c.s.i., pointed out in his note, dated 13th February 1899, that the matter was still under correspondence with the Government of India, and that letter, No. 30, Marine, dated 10th January last, in which that Government was requested to make a grant from Imperial funds of Rs. 2,58,850 for the prosecution of lighthouse works in the current year, still remained unanswered. The Honourable Member also considered that this Government had no power to raise a loan in the open market, and that the Government of India would peremptorily negative such a proposal for the obvious reason that pledging the credit of the Madras Government in support of a loan was the same thing as pledging the credit of the Government of India—a thing that could on no account be permitted. The papers having been referred to the Financial department, it was remarked that there was no rule under which this Government could raise a loan in the open market; that even if it were possible for the Government to borrow on the security of Port funds, the objection raised by the Government of India in paragraph 3 of its letter, No. 4778-S.R., dated 2nd November 1898, to a loan from Imperial would seem to apply equally to a loan in the open market, and that the money thus borrowed, which would be an addition to the Port

G.O., No. 29, Marine, dated 10th January 1899.

fund receipts, could not be utilized on expenditure on coast lights, since the provisions of section 36, sub-section (5) of the Indian Ports Act, 1889, restrict the application of Port funds to the class of lights defined in that section, *i.e.*, to Port lights. It was submitted, therefore, that the reply of the Government of India to letter, No. 30, Marine, dated 10th January last, might be awaited. In the meantime the notes, etc., of the Marine department have, as directed, been put in type.

G.O., No. 579-80, Finl., dated 8th May 1899.

G.O., No. 732, Marine, dated 30th August 1898.

2. The reply of the Government of India is contained in the orders of that Government passed on the budget. The Government of India states that the money required for the construction of the lighthouses should, as already stated in its letter, No. 3285 S.R., dated 27th July 1898, be ultimately provided for by the levy of light dues, but that, if the expenditure is charged to Government, it must be charged as ordinary expenditure under the head 45. CIVIL WORKS which is wholly Provincial in accordance with the terms of the current Provincial settlement, as there is no authority for charging such expenditure to Loan funds. The Government of India accordingly adds that the special grants to Provincial revenue mentioned in its letter will enable the Government of Madras to pursue, without interruption, their policy in the matter of the construction of lighthouses, but that it is to be understood that if any expenditure is incurred out of Government funds, it will be ultimately recovered from light dues.

3. The only source from which a grant can now be made from Provincial funds for the construction of lighthouses in the current year is the unallotted sum of 8·73 lakhs entered in the budget under 45. CIVIL WORKS; and as it is a condition that whatever expenditure is incurred out of Government funds should be ultimately recovered from light dues, there will be no objection to the sum of 2·59 lakhs required by the Marine department for expenditure in the current year being allotted from this source. From the remark made by the Government of India that the special grants to Provincial revenues will enable this Government to pursue without interruption its policy in the matter of the construction of lighthouses, it is evidently contemplated that the whole of the estimated expenditure on coast lights, viz., 6·73 lakhs,* should be met from time to time from Provincial funds. It will be necessary therefore to make further grants of about 2 lakhs in each of the next two years. Although this will to a certain extent limit the spending power of this Government on other objects for a few years, the grants made are virtually investments, which would be available for expenditure on repayment in future years. The Public Works department may be requested to include in its budget under 45. CIVIL WORKS the necessary provision for lighthouse construction that may be required in the next two years.

* *Vide* paragraph 5 of Marine department note, dated 31st January 1899.

Vide paragraph 10 of Marine department note and statements therein.

Paragraph 10 of Marine department note.

4. The question as to the manner in which these grants should be recovered remains now to be considered. In the Marine department note, dated 31st January 1899, the question of the imposition of light dues to liquidate a loan of 6·73 lakhs, which it was proposed to borrow in the open market, is discussed, and certain rates are proposed which, if levied, would liquidate such a loan in 9, 15 and 25 years, respectively. With the double object of imposing as light a due as possible and of obviating any considerable reduction of the dues when the loan is liquidated—only maintenance charges having then to be met from light dues—the lower rate entered in column 4 of the second statement in paragraph 10 of the Marine department note, which was calculated to extinguish the loan in twenty-five years, is recommended by the Marine department for adoption. The receipts at this rate are estimated to amount to 1·05 lakh a year. The maintenance charges being set down at ·63, the amount remaining for refund of the Provincial expenditure to be incurred and the expenditure already incurred from Port funds on these lights is only ·42. The adoption of the intermediate rate entered in column 3 of the same statement, which was intended to liquidate the loan in fifteen years would give an annual income of 1·25 lakhs and would leave ·62 for refund to Provincial and Port funds. At this rate it would take about eleven years for the recovery from light dues of the total amount (6·73) estimated to be spent on coast lights.

5. The question of a loan from the open market having fallen through, the necessary alteration should be made in the draft "Statement of Objects and Reasons" as regards the application of the proceeds of light dues which should now go towards—

(1) the refund of the expenditure incurred from Port and Provincial funds, and
(2) the maintenance of the lights.

F.A.D'C.—15-4-99.

G.O., No. 579, Financial, dated 8th May 1899.

It is clear from paragraph 7 of the Government of India, Finance and Commerce department, No. A.1429 L., dated 29th March 1899, that the Government of India will not involve Imperial funds in any way in the matter of the scheme of lighthouse improvements. India insists that if any expenditure is to be charged to Government in the first instance, it must be found from *Provincial* funds.

As stated in the note above, although funds may perhaps be made available in 1899–1900, the question of the future has to be considered, and for these coast lights Provincial funds will, if the local Government commits itself to this scheme any further at present, have to find a grant of about 2 lakhs in each of the next two years in addition to the 2·59 to be found in the current year. Provincial funds are comparatively well off only in consequence of the special grants made by the Government of India, but it has to be remembered that these grants are distinctly labelled "Special" by India and by the Finance Minister in his statement in the Supreme Legislative Council. In this year's budget several schemes have been provided for, such as the Railway Police Scheme, Taluk Gumastahs, Additional Munsif's Court, etc., some of these have already been introduced, and the taluk gumastah's scheme will apparently be introduced during the year. Funds for meeting the recurring expenditure in connection with the additional establishments entertained by the introduction of these schemes will swell the Provincial expenditure in future years, and the actual result of giving large grants to Port funds, to be recovered in instalments of about half a lakh *per annum*, will be that the grant for CIVIL WORKS—PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT will have to be curtailed in future years. Until therefore the question of the financial position of this Government is on a more certain basis, and until that position is not solely dependent on the good will and the benevolences of the Government of India, it seems, it is submitted, to be a questionable policy for the local Government to commit itself further to the scheme of lighthouse improvements.

It is to be noted that the light dues, which are to form the source of revenue from which the advances now made to Port funds are to be ultimately liquidated, are not at present legally leviable; that before they can be so leviable an Act will apparently have to be passed by the Imperial Legislative Council; and that therefore the recoveries belong to the remote future.

It is acknowledged in paragraph 2 of letter No. 30, Marine, dated 10th January 1899, that this scheme of lighthouse improvements was started and the special lighthouse division (which so far as can be seen has been paid up to this from Provincial funds) was created under the erroneous impression that the cost could be defrayed from Port funds. This impression has not only turned out to be erroneous, but the Government of India has declined to have anything to do with the scheme or to finance it in any way. The position has therefore altered considerably and the matter is now one for consideration from the point of view of Provincial funds alone.

From paragraph 3 of the Marine notes attached to G.O., No. 316, Marine, dated 29th April 1898, it will be seen that there is scope for reduction in the Presidency Port Officer's programme of Port fund works. The Chief Engineer himself considers that the programme needs "considerable revision" (*vide* paragraph 4 of the same note). It is respectfully submitted that the matter is proceeding too quickly. Port funds should, it is thought, be made to wait for their schemes of improvement until " ways and means " are more certain. In any case it is submitted that if a grant is to be made in the current year from the unallotted sum of 8·73 placed by the Government of India in the budget, this grant should be sanctioned on the clear understanding that it does not necessarily involve Provincial funds in any grants for the future and that such grants will depend entirely on the state of Provincial finances.

C. M. Schmidt—24-4-99.

For the Chief Secretary—

It has been decided to make a grant of 1 lakh during the current year for lighthouse improvements and order to that effect is issuing. Submitted that file may be returned to Marine.

Vide K.W. 579, Financial, dated 8th May 1899.

C.M.S.—29-4-99.

No. I want to examine this matter.

G. Stokes.—30-4-99.

Honourable Member

His Excellency the Governor

There has been a very great mistake made in dealing with this matter. It was at first thought that the expenditure for the " Lighthouse scheme " could be met from Port funds, but this has been found to be a mistake. Port funds can only be expended on port lights. So far as the scheme involves these lights and improvements there is no difficulty. But the matter is otherwise with the " Coast lights."

2. Mr. Ashpitel's scheme involved an outlay of —

	RS.
Port lights	80,000
Coast „	8,00,000

It appears, however, that some of the expenditure on the scheme has already been met from Port funds, and I gather that, apart from what is wanted to repay Port funds, the capital sum now required to complete the scheme is Rs. 6,73,000. The Government of India have distinctly laid down that if any money is to be spent on the lighthouse scheme, it must come out of 45. Civil Works, *i.e.*, it must be Provincial; hence Provincial must advance this Rs. 6,73,000. The Government of India in their last letter, * *i.e.*, in their reply to the letter of this Government of 10th January 1899, when read with their letter recorded in G.O., No. 732, Marine, of 30th August 1898, make it quite plain that all expenditure on this scheme is to be Provincial. In the latter letter, paragraph 7, the Government of India say :

* Finance and Commerce department letter No. A. 1429 L., dated 29th March 1899.

[G.O., No. 579, Financial, dated 8th May 1899.]

> " 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."

3. It is assumed in the correspondence that the money is to be found by the imposition of light dues, but I note that both His Excellency and Sir Henry Bliss and Mr. Grose have already expressed an unanimous opinion against the imposition of light dues (*vide* notes † of March 1898), and I think that some reasons can be given against having recourse to that measure. The trade of the Madras Presidency is not large or of an increasing volume. Shipping, *i.e.*, coasting vessels, have now to compete against railways and can less than before bear any burdens. Competition is so keen that any even the smallest burden will drive ships away. The imposition is certain to be met by strong opposition on behalf of the ship owners. It is proposed to impose the dues on vessels sailing from Bombay to Colombo and from Calcutta to Colombo which will never sight one of our coast lights. Coasting steamers, of which there are only two lines, and sailing dhonies which do not want the lights, will all have to pay. The sum which will have to be collected will nearly double the present collection of dues which amounts to Rupees 2,32,696 on 6,087,882 tons on the average of the years 1894—1897. Commander Aves proposes to raise Rs. 1,56,848 by light dues.

†K.W. 316-17, Marine, dated 29th April 1898.

4. Supposing that matters have now gone so far that money must be got and that there is no alternative but to impose light dues, the next question is what are the charges which have to be met. As above pointed out, the cost of the scheme is Rs. 8,00,000, but the latest figure which has been taken is Rs. 6,73,000. I apprehend that a considerable portion of the difference has come out of Port funds. In fact I think there is little doubt that Port funds are being applied to " lighthouse " purposes with very questionable legality. Where then is Rs. 6,73,000 to come from? Under the orders Government of India it must be from Provincial funds. It cannot be a loan, so no question * of interest or sinking fund arises, and if Provincial advances the money it must be content to get it back in lump payments. I think the period for repayment ought not to be allowed to exceed ten years. Hence the annual payment to be recovered is Rs. 67,300 on Capital account.

* But see India's letter above quoted. It will make little difference in the sum to be raised by light dues whether interest and Sinking fund or lump annual repayments to reimburse Provincial in a moderate number of years are imposed.

G.S.—3-5-99.

5. Supposing that the whole of the lights are at once carried out and put in working order, then the cost of maintenance is, as stated in the Marine note, Rupees 63,490, but to this must be added cost of inspection Rs. 3,000, pay of relief Rs. 1,920, and contribution to pension Rs. 4,500 = Rs. 9,420. These items have, I believe, been omitted as paid from Port funds which seems to me wrong. Hence the total sum to be provided annually is Rs. 1,40,210, to meet which the sum † yielded by the maximum dues is only sufficient.

† Commander Aves' estimate, Rs. 1,56,848.

6. It is stated that for the year 1899–1900 Rs. 2,58,850 is required. Of this Rs. 2,16,000 is for work and Rs. 42,850 for maintenance. Rs. 1,00,000 has been allotted out of the Rs. 8,73,000 given by the Government of India and there is a reserve of Rs. 1,13,000 roundly, or, say, Rs. 1,00,000 as some of the balance is sure to be wanted for some small items. The balance of Rs. 58,850 must be found if wanted from Public Works department works by retrenchment.

7. From a financial point of view the strongest objection to the continuance of the scheme is to be found in the fact that the Act for the imposition of light dues (which too must be an Imperial Act) is not yet in existence. A draft Act is submitted which should be pushed through as rapidly as possible if light dues are to be imposed.

8. Looking at the whole matter I think that all works which can be postponed should be so, and that only those works should be put in hand which are really necessary. A number of the works on the West Coast are of little use. If it be decided to go on with the work, then the requisite Act to enable the levy of light dues should be passed without any delay as every day means loss. I think that in any event the cost of the scheme should be kept down to the lowest possible figure so as to keep the scale of light dues chargeable as low as possible and that, if possible, it should be introduced piece-meal and not as now *en bloc*. The only sound way to carry on the scheme is from the accumulations of light dues.

G. Stokes—3-5-99.

This great lighthouse scheme estimated to cost Rs. 8,00,000 has been initiated without making sure that funds are available for it. So long ago as March last year

K. W. 316-17, dated 29th April 1898.

Sir H. Bliss realized the difficulty and discussed the alternatives "(1) stop lighthouse construction when we have spent our balances . . . . ; or (2) we must get a grant from the Government of India, a loan being of no use; or (3) we must take legislative authority to increase the rate of port dues. I don't like (3) at all."

Sir H. Bliss again repeated his objection to an increase of dues, and His Excellency and Mr. Grose agreed with him. So do I entirely, as the Chief Secretary suggests such a measure would tend to destroy the sea-borne trade.

Alternative (3) is thus rejected.

Alternative (2) must also be rejected for the Government of India flatly declines to give us a rupee for the work.

Alternative (1) now also put forward by the Chief Secretary remains, namely, to stop lighthouse building.

Such work as has actually been begun must, I suppose, be completed: but charity begins at home, and it is somewhat quixotic for this Government to spend its Provincial assignments on lighthouses for the benefit of trade that goes elsewhere, when we have unlimited demands for money for various necessary purposes within the Presidency.

The Public Works department can no doubt ascertain what work *must* go on and be paid for out of Provincial, and what works can be indefinitely postponed, presuming that His Excellency thinks this the wisest course we can take.

If there has been, or if there is in contemplation, any modification of lighthouse establishments connected with this scheme, it will presumably require reconsideration.

A. T. A[RUNDEL].—4-5-99.

I should like to discuss this matter in Council.

A. E. H[AVELOCK].—8-5-99.

Submitted very urgently to the Hon'ble Mr. Winterbotham in view to the matter being brought before the next meeting of Council.

G. STOKES.—9-5-99.

Seen.

H. M. W[INTERBOTHAM]—9-5-99.

The file is forwarded to the Marine department with the request that the information called for in Council to-day (12th May 1899) may be supplied.

G.S.—12-5-99.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

His Excellency the Governor—

The Hon'ble Mr. A. T. Arundel, C.S.I.—

The Hon'ble Mr. H. M. Winterbotham—

In 1840 Mr. W. T. Douglass, the eminent Lighthouse Engineer, was sent out from England at the request (apparently) of the Government of India to report on the lighthouses on the coasts of India. His report on the Madras lighthouses is contained in G.O., No. 25, Marine, dated 22nd January 1891. He suggested the introduction of the most modern appliances for illumination in various existing lighthouses of this Presidency and the adoption of occulting and flashing lights, and pointed out the importance of making the lights distinctive in character. He also recommended the construction of new buildings at various places; *e.g.*, Pigeon Island, Cape Comorin, Divi, Masulipatam, on the Sacramento Shoal, Vizagapatam and Bimlipatam.

2. Mr. Douglass' report was referred to the Presidency Port Officer, Commander Street, who was inclined to be satisfied with the existing fixed lights which he said were sufficiently distinctive in character for the purposes of the coasting vessels for whose use they were provided, and was not prepared to agree with Mr. Douglass as to the necessity for so many new lights. The Government agreed generally with Commander Street and considered that it would be desirable to offer a young Engineer officer of a mechanical turn some inducement to make a study of lighthouse buildings and apparatus in use in England and France during his absence from duty on furlough. Mr. Ashpitel was accordingly selected * and facilities were afforded to him while on leave in Europe to study lighthouse construction and illumination.

* G.O., No. 230, Marine, dated 2nd May 1891.

3. Meanwhile, in 1891, Commander Bean, who was acting for Commander Street, submitted proposals for the construction of lighthouses at the following places:—

Gódávari Point.	Masulipatam.
Sacramento Shoal.	Bimlipatam
Point Divi.	Vizagapatam.

But the Government deferred, † on financial grounds, sanction to the proposal.

† G.O., No. 438, Marine, dated 8th October 1891.

4. During the years 1892 to 1894, Commanders Street and Powell came up with proposals for the construction of lighthouses at Madras, Point Divi, Manapaud and Coondapoor, and for improvements to those at Calingapatam, Pámban, Tellicherry, etc., and Mr. Ashpitel was taken into consultation. He was subsequently deputed ‡ to visit localities and report on lighthouse requirements generally. The results of this inspection are recorded with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896. His report covered a wide field and included proposals under the following heads:—

‡ G.O., No. 318, Marine, dated 10th August 1894.

(1) The building of new lighthouses.

(2) The introduction of improved light apparatus.

(3) The improvement of existing lights.

(4) The complete reorganization of the lighthouse establishments.

(5) The levy of light dues on shipping to meet the cost of his proposals.

It also embraced various other minor matters connected with internal administration.

5. His programme of lighthouse improvement involved an expenditure of Rupees 8,80,000. Of this sum, Rs. 8,00,000 were for "Sea" lights or those intended for general navigation. The latter amount included Rs. 2,80,000 for eight new sets of apparatus, Rs. 4,55,000 for improvements to existing towers and for new constructions, and the balance was for contingencies and Public Works supervision. The "Port" lights, or those intended for the navigation of ports and harbours, were to cost Rupees 80,000. To meet the capital cost of the "Sea" lights he proposed to raise a loan of Rs. 8,00,000. The interest and Sinking fund for which, and its ultimate extinction, were to be provided by the levy of light dues. The proposal to raise a loan in the open market and the levy of light dues did not then commend itself to Government, who considered that the scheme could be started from the accumulated balances of Port funds.

6. In order to give effect to the scheme of lighthouse improvement suggested by Mr. Ashpitel and approved generally in G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, a special Lighthouse division, under Mr. Ashpitel, was formed under the authority of G.O., No. 2156-W., dated 27th July 1896; Mr. Ashpitel being called upon to frame a financial forecast of the amount required for expenditure. His financial forecast is printed with G.O., No. 316, Marine, dated 29th April 1898—These proceedings also contain a complete forecast of Port fund works other than lighthouses. The Government observed that the outlay involved could not be met from local resources alone within a reasonable time, and decided that the Government of India should be appealed to for assistance. That Government was accordingly asked in letter No. 317,

Marine, dated 29th April 1898, for a *grant* from Imperial funds of Rs. 6,68,000 in 1899–1900 and Rs. 1,45,000 in 1900–1901. The Government of India* refused to entertain the application, and pointed out that trade and shipping and not the country generally should bear the cost of erecting lighthouses. They considered that any fresh expenditure to be incurred in erecting lighthouses on the Madras coast should be provided for by the levy of light dues. They further observed as follows:—

* G.O., No. 732, Marine, dated 30th Aug. 1898.

> "Some expenditure has already been incurred in the past in the erection of lighthouses 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 additional maintenance charges will be covered together with a small sinking fund charge by light dues to be now imposed."

7. The Madras Government, seeing that a free grant had been refused, † asked for a *loan* from Imperial funds of Rupees 2,15,000, and promised that, should this loan be sanctioned, His Excellency the Governor in Council would arrange for the maintenance of lighthouses and port works generally from current receipts, supplemented by existing balances, and to carry out such other new Port fund works as may be possible. It was explained that the grant of Rs. 6,68,000 previously asked for included works other than lighthouses, whereas the smaller sum of Rs. 2,15,000 was confined to the amount required for the coming year for new lighthouse works and apparatus alone.

† Letter No. 733, Marine, dated 30th August 1898.

8. The Government of India in reply ‡ pointed out that if the lights to be constructed are of the nature of coast lights, the expenditure on them of Port funds is inadmissible, such expenditure as regards *lights* being limited by sub-section 5 of section 36 of the Indian Ports Act to "lights maintained chiefly for the benefit of vessels being in, or entering, or leaving, the port, or passing through the rivers or channels leading thereto"; while if they are "port" lights, they cannot properly be charged against capital outlay, which is intended to be liquidated hereafter by general light dues. They accordingly requested fuller explanation of the conditions on which the proposed loan was asked for, and in what way the Government proposed to close the transaction.

‡ G.O., No. 29, Marine, dated 10th January 1899.

9. In letter No. 30, Marine, dated 10th January 1899, the Madras Government reiterated its request for a loan from Imperial funds to the amount of Rs. 2,58,850, the amount to be refunded when the proposed light dues became available.

10. The final result of the application is contained in letter from the Finance and Commerce department to the Chief Secretary to Government, No. A. 1429 L., dated 29th March 1899, in which a special addition of Rs. 8,73,000 is authorised to be made to the Provincial expenditure from the existing balance, and from which the Madras Government is at liberty to reappropriate money for expenditure on lighthouse construction, provided that it recovers it by the imposition of light dues.

G.O., No. 579, Financial, dated 8th May 1899.

R.P.—15-5-99.

11. The above note on the history of the lighthouse programme has been compiled from information available at Ootacamund. The opening portions may need amendment on receipt of earlier papers from Madras, but I submit it without waiting for them because the matter is urgent.

12. I beg to point out that the statement that the sea-going trade of Madras cannot bear the impositions of light dues rests at present on the assertion of the Chief Secretary, unsupported by facts. I

Sir H. Bliss was opposed to it.

A. T. A[RUNDEL].

trust that before it is decided to abandon or postpone this important lighthouse programme, the views of the Presidency Port Officer, the Collectors of Maritime districts, the Chamber of Commerce, and the principal firms engaged in shipping operations may be obtained.

To abandon the programme now would mean that Mr. Ashpitel and his staff, now specially qualified for lighthouse construction, would be scattered about the Presidency on other work, and it would be difficult to make them available for a piece-meal programme. I have already called on Mr. Ashpitel to report progress up to date, and at what stage work in progress can be stopped without financial loss to Government, and I beg that his report on the subject may be awaited.

A. T. A[RUNDEL].

13. I would also point out that the Government of India has laid down that the only proper method of obtaining funds for the construction of lighthouses is the imposition of light dues, and that if this method is rejected, no further improvement in the lighting of the coast, except with regard to port lights as distinguished from coast lights, is possible.

W. B. DEWINTON—16-5-99.

It appears from this note that our present lighthouse scheme owes its origin to the report on the imperfect condition of the lighthouses, which was made by Mr. Douglass, an expert, in 1890. There is nothing here to show that the mercantile and shipping bodies moved in the matter, or were consulted. Perhaps it would be well now to ask the mercantile and shipping interests whether they would recommend the improvement of the lighthouses, on the proposed scheme, the cost to be met by increased light dues. The augmented rates, which would be necessary, should of course be stated.

A. E. H[AVELOCK]—17-5-99.

I agree with His Excellency.

A. T. A[RUNDEL]—18-5-99.
H. W[INTERBOTHAM]—19-5-99.

Papers submitted in continuation of note for orders on the above subject, dated 16th instant.

It will be observed that the Government of India took the initiative in this matter.

Vide G.O., No. 268, Marine, dated 18th June 1899.

W.B.DEW.—17-5-99.

Seen.

A. E. H[AVELOCK]—18-5-99.
A. T. A[RUNDEL]—19-5-99.
H. W[INTERBOTHAM]—19-5-99.

His Excellency the Governor—
The Hon'ble Mr. A. T. Arundel, C.S.I.—
The Hon'ble Mr. H. M. Winterbotham—

[A draft order is submitted.]

R.P.—23-5-99.

Paragraph 10.—If the coast lights estimates for Nos. 4, 5, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16 provide for new lighthouses, the remaining estimates provide for improvements to existing lighthouses.

W.B.DEW.—24-5-99.
A. E. H[AVELOCK]—26-5-99.
A. T. A[RUNDEL]—29-5-99.
H. W[INTERBOTHAM]—30-5-99.

[G. O., No. 471, Marine, dated 31st May 1899.]

[9/4]
6,000—6-3-97

DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT FILE.

CONTENTS.

From	Number.	Date.	Pages.

Go. 471 Mas

31-5-99

portion

To be printed up

[P. T. O. FOR PUT UP PAPERS.

PAPERS PUT UP WITH CURRENT No.

Papers of the department to which the current belongs.

Number.	Date.	Original (=O) or spare copy (=S. C.).	Remarks. (In this column such of the papers have been removed for copying, printing, &c., should be marked with a cross.)	Initials of Referencer with date in token of return to Reference department.

Papers of other departments.

Department.	Number.	Date.	Original (=O) or spare copy (=S. C.).	Initials with date of (1) Referencer of the Chief Secretariat department acknowledging return of the paper concerned or (2) Despatcher to denote the return of the papers to departments outside the Chief Secretariat.

Urgent

1

16a

Marine Department.

No. 416 E, 11' August 1898

Memorandum.

The Government of India has now replied to the application of this Government for a grant from Imperial Funds in aid of the provision of lights for shipping on the coasts of this Presidency. It is not prepared to make any grant from Imperial Funds, but considers that trade and shipping, and not the -- country generally, should bear the burden, and suggests legislation for the imposition of light dues.

x Page 11 of G.O. 245 Marine dated 8th April 1896, and Table X of the same G.O.

2. Mr. Ashpitel proposed[x] the imposition of light dues at the following rates:-

On each coasting steamer----	12 pies	per ton	per month.
On each native craft--------	6 pies	-do-	-do-.
On each foreign steamer-----	7 pies	-do-	per voyage,

and estimated that the proceeds -- would amount to about Rs. 1,30,000 per annum.

3. It is not known how Mr. Ashpitel arrived at his total, as no information is given as to the number of ships of each kind that would pay the dues. The Presidency Port Officer is requested to be so good as to verify Mr. Ashpitel's calculation as to the expected proceeds, or to give statistics on which accurate data can be framed.

Issue and send to C.a.W.

4.

2

4. Mr. Ashpitel's method for coasting vessels, though easy of collection, would not, it is thought, be equitable, because vessels would pay the same dues however much or little they used the lights. The proper course seems to be to charge per voyage and to make a distinction between vessels using the lights of the whole coast, e.g. B.I. & Asiatic steamers, and those using only a portion of them, i.e. the dues might be identical for the Easterm and Western groups of ports and levied twice, say at Vizagapatam and Tuticorin for vessels using the lights of both groups; Tuticorin being included in the Western group for purposes of collection.

5. But besides the coasting trade, and foreign steamers, we should levy dues on the whole of the shipping which passes between

(1) Bombay and Colombo and the far east, and

(2) Calcutta and Colombo.

This trade will be properly charged at a lower rate, say a quarter of the rate charged on the coasting trade. The Presidency Port Officer is also ~~requested~~ requested to be so good as to calculate the income from light dues levied in this manner, & state how best it may be collected

C.S.

M.

10.8.98

The Presidency Port Officer

3

87/1

Marine (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 1136

3 clean book form proofs called for

27/3/99

(11)

From

The Presidency Port Officer, Madras

Order

No. 1271/2999

Dated 1st September 1898

Received 3 6-9-98

Registered 3

Enclosures 2

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Forwarding draft notification for imposition Light Dues

BACK PAPERS.

9D

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date
7126	9/98

~~12~~ No 491 E of 27 Septr 98

B 4

~~K.C.~~

Print

forward to Secy to Govt of Marine Deptt

~~Please send following telegram to B.O.~~

urgent 27-9-98

10

What is the average duration of a voyage from Calcutta to Bombay by B.I. Steamer.

27-9-98

Tel. despatched 27/9/98

9

5

Marine (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 1213

Telegram

Order

1 (a)

From

The Presidency Port Officer

No. –

Dated 27-9-98

Received 27-9-98

Enclosures –

Spare copies –

SUBJECT.

Stating that the average duration of a voyage from Calcutta to Bombay by B. I. Coaster is twenty four days

W/

M. 4.
500—14-4-97.

126

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PA RS.

No.	

---

6 ~~127~~

Marine

~~Public Works~~ (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 1269

(2)

From

The Presidency Port Officer

Order

No. $\frac{1271}{347}$ G.

Dated 8-10-98

Received } 10.10.98
Registered }

Enclosures 1/3

Spare copies -

SUBJECT.

Light Dues

Forwarding a revised d
draft notification
for the imposition of —

CNM
Madras

R.W. 8853

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
4968 G	29-9-98
4918 G	7-9-98
8073 2-39	30-8-98
5885 G	6-7-98
5746 G	4-7-98
3846 G	14-5-98
3167 G	9-4-98

Removed from file for [illegible] 8553
20/10/98

FURTHER PA S.

No.	D

PRESIDENCY
3 OCT 98
PORT OFFICE

7 ~~96~~ ~~126~~ 128 128

Marine Department.

Letter from the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, No. 1271/299 G, dated 1st September 1898.

Telegram from the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, dated 27th September 1898.

No 4968 E., d/ 29 September 1898
O. M.

G723

Print

To

The Presidency Port Officer.

~~(Unofficially).~~

It is necessary that further information in regard to the proposed classes and rates of light dues should be furnished to admit of this matter being laid before Government. e.g:-

(1) Class. I

(a) Why are 5 and 3 sea lights chosen for the 2 groups as the number in excess of which --- vessels will have to pay dues if they benefit thereby.

(b) Why is the limit of 30 days entered, within which vessels will be exempted from paying - light dues a second time for -- the same group. If it is imposed, the receipts will not apparently be so great as the Presidency Port officer estimates. It is reported that the average duration of a voyage from Calcutta to Bombay by a B.I. coaster is 24 days. Allowing 3 days for loading and unloading at

terminal

19

terminal ports a vessel performs one voyage a month. Now say she leaves Calcutta on 1st January, March, May &c. and Bombay 1st February, April, June &c., She would -- under the 30 days' limit only pay light dues once on each -- voyage except the first thus:-

Month.	Eastern Group.	Western Group.	Remarks.
January.......	/	/	The vessel leaves Calcutta January 1, arrives at Tuticorin say Jan. 15. She will be back at Tuticorin by Feb. 14 and so will not have to pay Western group light dues. In the same way if she --- leaves Calcutta again ~~in~~ on or about March 1 she will not have to pay Eastern group light dues on her 3rd voyage, so that in the year she will only have to pay dues 13 times instead of 16 (8 times for each group) as estimated by the Presidency Port Officer.
February......	/	u	
March.........	u	/	
April.........	/	u	
May...........	u	/	
June..........	/	u	
July..........	u	/	
August........	/	u	
September.....	-	/	
October.......	/	u	
November......	u	/	
December......	/	u	

Unless the Presidency Port Officer can prove that this is a wrong forecast it would be better to expunge the 30 days limit for coasters.

(c) Is Class I intended to include vessels plying from Madras to Rangoon via Coast ports?

It is believed that they go as far North as Bimilipatam before crossing, so that they would make use of more than 5 sea lights. The limit of 30 days might be imposed for them because the -- round trip takes, it is believed, about

---

about that time, and the dues would be levied once for the double voyage which would --- probably be sufficient.

(2) Class V.

The rate proposed is so small that it is hardly worth collecting, but the receipts do not -- seem to have been properly calculated. There are believed to be 2 steamers now plying between Tuticorin and Colombo, of 1200 tons each, at 4 pies per ton, each of these vessels --- would pay Rs. 25 per month or -- the two together Rs. 600 a year. It is true that they only use one light, but they use it about 15 times a month and I think the higher rate for this class should be raised to 6 pies at least which would bring in for

(a) the Tuticorin steamers 2,400 tons at 6 pies per ton per month.........Rs. 900

(b) the Mangalore steamers 2,640 tons at 6 pies per ton, 6 times.......... ,, 500

1,400

Secretary to Government,
Marine Dept.

CNo. 1269 From ~~the~~ P. P. O. No. 1271/347 4 & 8-10-98

With Current No. 1136
to be returned.

Query (1) (a)--In the Eastern Group (if Tuticorin is selected as the commencement of the Western Group) there will be 11 sea lights as against

8 in the Western Group. The object in restricting the levy of dues to vessels benefiting by more than 5 & 3 respectively was to avoid unduly taxing semi-coasting traffic, i.e., vessels loading for home ports at two or more ports of a group. If some distinction of this sort is not made vessels other than coasters might have to pay the dues. It will perhaps simplify matters to draft the Notification thus:--"All vessels under a General Pass engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta and Bombay, & between Rangoon and Madras via ports North of Madras," provided that, if no port in the Eastern Group be touched at, the due for that Group shall not be levied."

Note.-A vessel bound from Calcutta to Bombay, unless she called at a port in the Eastern Group, would not sight any of the lights of this Presidency until she arrived on the West Coast, and West Coast dues would be justly leviable whether the vessel touched at any port or not.

Query (1) (b)--I think you have under-estimated the period occupied in loading and unloading at Bombay and Calcutta which, as steamers are yearly increasing in tonnage, may be taken as a week at each end. However, on consideration, I think for the present it will be better to omit the 30 days limit in this class.

Query (1) (c)--Class I was intended to include the Rangoon Steamers calling at Northern ports. I have, in the amended draft herewith

put up, included them specially. I would omit the 30 days limit here also.

Query (2)---The steamers now performing the daily service between Tuticorin and Colombo are only about 750 tons net register, the tonnage on which the dues will be paid, so the result at 6 pies a ton would be,--

Tuticorin Steamers

1,500 tons at 6 pies per month.. ..Rs.563

Mangalore Steamers

2,640 tons at 6 pies per ton, 6times .. Rs.500

Commdr., R.I.M.,

Ag. Presy. Port Officer.

Madras, 8-10-98.

To

The Secy. to Govt., Mar.Dept.,

(unofficially)

With revised draft Notification & Current No. 1136.

21

mm7

8

PRESIDENCY
17 NO/98
PORT OFFICE

12 ~~147~~ G. 863

No. 586 E.

Urgent

Government of Madras ~~138~~ 158

MARINE **DEPARTMENT.**

Print

Madras, 17th November 1898.

OFFICE NOTE.

O.M.

From

The Secretary to Government,
Marine Dept.

To

The Presidency Port Officer.

In his report printed with G.O. 245 Marine dated 8th April 1896, Table I, Mr. Ashpitel proposes to place 16 lights in the "sea" group, while the Presidency Port Officer in his letter No. 1271/299 G. dated 1st September 1898 allocates 19 lights to this group. The following comparative statement shows the proposals in each case

126

[P. W. 48. / 500 24-3-98.]

As given by Mr. Ashpitel.	As given by the Presidency Port Officer.
1. Calingapatam. ✓	1. Calingapatam. ✓
2. Santapilli.	2. Santapilli. ✓
3. Vakalapudi.	3. Vakalapudi. ✓
4. Sacramento. ✓	4. Sacramento. ✓
5. Armeghon. ✓	5. Armeghon. ✓
6. Pulicat. ✓	6. Pulicat. ✓
7. Madras. ✓	7. Madras. ✓
8. Seven Pagodas. ✓	8. Seven Pagodas. ✓
9. Manapad. ✓	9. Manapad. ✓
10. Muttum. ✓	10. Muttum. ✓
11. Tangacherri. ✓	11. Tangacherri. ✓
12. Sacrifice Rock. ✗	12. Sacrifice Rock. (~~Tellicherry~~)
13. Mulki. ✓	13. Mulki. ✓
14. Aleppi. ✗	~~14. Hope Island.~~ ✗
15. Pt. Calimere. ✗	15. Kistna. ✓
16. Pt. Divi.	16. Negapatam. ✓
(Hope Island to be abandoned).	17. Tuticorin. ✓
	~~18. Cochin.~~ Stet
	~~19. Calicut.~~ Stet

2. The discrepancies should be further considered by the Presidency Port Officer in communication with Mr. Ashpitel. The matter now becomes of importance in view of the proposal to levy light dues for the use of the "sea" lights.

3. It is requested that this reference be treated as one of urgency.

R.S.

A Knall.

For Secretary to Government.

~~Reply d/18th november 1898~~ From P.P.O. No. 1271/402 G 18/11/98

Commdr. H A Street to Secy. of Govt. Marine Dept.

The discrepancies referred to in para 2 above have been considered as requested

requested, and the marginal list of lights represents what may be now considered as fulfilling the conditions of sea lights of the coast as laid down in para 6, page 3, of Mr. Ashpitel's Report printed with G.O. No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April, 1896.

East Coast.

1. Calingapatam
2. Santapalli
3. Vakalapudi
※ 4. Sacramento
※ 5. Kistna
6. Armeghon
7. Pulicat
8. Madras
9. Seven Pagodas
10. Negapatam
11. Tuticorin
12. Manapad

West Coast.

13. Muttam
※ 14. Tangacherri
※ 15. Tellicherri
※ 16. Mulki

※ Lighthouses not yet constructed.

2. It will be seen that the light at Alleppi (which appears in Mr. Ashpitel's list) has not been included, and the reason for this is, that this light is maintained by the Travancore Government.

3. The lights at Cochin and Calicut appear to have been included thro' some misapprehension by the Acting Presidency Port Officer in the list under reference. It is unnecessary, in my opinion, to treat either of these lights at present as sea lights.

H A Street

Commdr., R.I.M.,
Presidency Port Officer.

Madras,
18th November, 1898.

No. 1271/402 G

To
The Secy. to Government,
Marine Department,
Chepak.

~~18~~

15 ~~16~~

Marine (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 1456

(3)

From

The Presidency Port Officer
Madras

No. 1271/402 G/

Dated 18-11-98
Received
Registered 3/19-11-98
Enclosures —
Spare copies —

SUBJECT

Sea Light

Stating what, he considers, may be regarded as —— for purposes of levying light dues.

ue 19/11/98

[P. W. 20. / 1,000—5-9-98.]

requested

G.O. 293 M., d/ 20.1.99 &c. ✓
5866, 17.11.98 — removed
732-33 M., 30.8.98
574 M., 4.7.98 &c.
382 M., 16.5.98
316-17 M. 19.4.98
The Hospital's estimates
243 M., 31.3.98 &c.
980 M., 3.12.97 &c.
351 M., 12.4.97 &c.
245 M., 8.4.96 &c.
318 M., d/ 10.8.94 &c.
The Indian Ports Act 1889 ✓
Act No. IX of 1879. ✓
The Indian Councils Act.

BACK PAPE

G.O.	No.	Department.	D

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

requested

16

21 JAN 99

No. 41E.

~~1~~ G 68

18

Government of Madras.

Marine DEPARTMENT.

Madras, 20th Jany. 1899.

Print

OFFICE NOTE.

~~D.M.~~

O.M.

From ~~Secretary~~ Marine Deptt.

To the Presidency Port Officer ~~(confidential)~~

Under the Burma Coast Lights Act, all vessels of 50 tons and upwards are liable to the payment of Coast Light dues. Please say whether the same limit of tonnage for the levy of light dues should be adopted in the Madras Presidency, and if so, how ~~your~~ his forecast of receipts will be affected. The limit for port dues is, as he is ~~you are~~ aware, 15 tons.

The P.O. is requested to state

2. Under the proposed Madras scheme, Rangoon-Madras

[P. W. 48. / 50, 24.3-98.]

~~154~~ 17

Steamers, via Coast ports North of Madras,* are put into Class I, and pay the same rates as Coasters between Calcutta and Bombay. Seeing that the former have already to pay under the Burma act, and do not profit by ~~our~~ Madras lights to the same extent as the latter, they should perhaps be assessed at a lower rate.

If ~~you~~ the P.P.O. agrees, ~~please~~ suggest he is requested to the amount of such lower rate.

R.J.

Secretary

* Vide your U.O. Note 1271 G / 3(7) d 8. Oct. 98. (Notified)

18

G 472

Print

No. 44 E.

~~155~~ ~~168~~ 188/19

Government of Madras

Marine DEPARTMENT.

Madras, 20th Jany. 1899.

~~OFFICE NOTE.~~

O.M.

From The Secretary Marine Dept.

To The Presidency Port Officer ~~(unofficially)~~

In Continuation of Office Note No. 41 E d 20. January 1899 it is observed that vessels performing the daily service between Tuticorin and Colombo are put under class V, paying 3 or 6 pies per ton every 30 days according as the higher or lower rate is charged. They only use 1 Madras light, i.e. about the same as a foreign steamer calling at Madras, and should perhaps pay the same light dues, i.e. 6 or 12 pies once in 30 days.

F. W. 49.
50} 24.3-98.

19

PRESIDENCY
23 JAN 99
PORT OFFICE

~~They~~ would then come under Class II. Please let ~~me know~~ whether there is any objection to this.

The P.P.O. is requested to report

C.S.

Secretary

~~It should also be stated whether~~
~~Please also say~~ if the descriptive words at end of Class II " and vessels calling at × × × × Class I " cannot be omitted - they seem unnecessary. If ~~you wishes~~ the P.P.O. wishes to retain them, ~~please~~ he will give an instance of such a vessel.

P.P.O.

Vide draft Notification appended to your letter No 1271/299 G of 1. Sept. 98 reproduced below for ready reference:—

"Class II

"All vessels British & foreign, to or from "Europe the Australian, African and "other British Colonies, including the "Straits Settlements and Ceylon and "vessels from Indian ports and ports "in Burma which in the ordinary course "of a voyage will pass or derive bene-"fit from any of the sealights in the "Madras Presidency, and vessels call-"ing at more than one port in the Presy "and which do not come under the Con-"ditions of Class I."

Lr 52/1-2-99

Marine Light 20 ~~84~~

W&Rs
~~Public~~ (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 129

Order

From The Presidency Port Officer

No. 1271/36 G

Dated 24-1-99

Received 27

Registered

Enclosures 2

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Stating that he sees no reason to exempt vessels from payment of light dues

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	
D-44	E9	20-1-98	
46	E9	20-1-98	
	Drafts		

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

21

Marine DEPARTMENT.

Omit

C. No. 1136 of 1898.

(3) HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

(1) THE HON'BLE SIR HENRY BLISS, K.C.I.E.
(2) The Hon'ble Mr. Arundel
~~THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.~~

SUBJECT.

Light Dues - Forecast.

FOR ORDERS.

x Flag U. G.O. 732 Marine d/ 30th August 1898.

In compliance with Memo No. 416 E dated 11th August 1898,[x] the Presidency Port Officer submits a schedule of rates for the levy of light dues on vessels benefited by the -- Madras coast lights.

2. Para 9 of this letter contains a summary of the receipts from the six classes into which the vessels have been divided. The total amounts to 1,56,848 per annum at the higher rates proposed. The amount of capital required to carry out the programme of lighthouse construction is Rs.8,00,000.[@] The interest on this ~~sum~~ sum at $3\frac{1}{2}$ % is Rs. 28,000. Adding the additional annual maintenance charge of Rs. 17,000,[$] the total expenditure in the first year will be Rs.45,000[a] and the balance available for the extinction of the loan, Rs.1,11,848.[b]

3. The second year will thus commence with an outstanding liability of

@ This is the amount required for "sea" lights, as distinguished from minor or port lights. vide page 17 of G.O. 245 Mar of 8th April 1898 Flag J.

$

Eastern group...	30,000	Flag B.
Western ,,	20,000	
Madras	12,000	
	62,000	
Deduct present standard maintenance charges	45,000	Flag A.
	17,000	

a Col.6 of statement A. } Flag C
b Col.7 ,, ,, A. }

[P. W. 45. / 500-27-1-98.]

of Rs. 6,88,152, and at the end of the seventh year the loan will be wholly extinguished, and a balance of Rs. 70,111 carried to credit.

4. It would thus appear that according to the Presidency Port Officer's forecast of light dues collections there will be no difficulty in meeting the expenditure on lighthouse construction in a comparatively short period of time. Should this forecast turn out to be correct, it may be possible hereafter to reduce the rates and spread the debt over a longer period.

A.S.
20-9-98.

M.

Omit

A

Light Dues Financial Forecast

Year 1	Loan at the beginning of the year 2	Annual Receipts from Light dues 3	Additional maintenance charges 4	Interest on loan at 3½ per cent on amount in Col: 2. 5	Total of Columns 4 and 5 6	Balance available for extinction of loan (Col 3 – Col 6) 7	Loan outstanding at the close of the year (Col 2 – Col 7) 8	Remarks 9
1st	8,00,000	156,848	17,000	28,000	45,000	1,11,848	6,88,152	
2nd	6,88,152	1,56,848	17,000	24,085	41,085	1,15,763	5,72,389	
3rd	5,72,389	1,56,848	17,000	20,034	37,034	1,19,814	4,52,575	
4th	4,52,575	1,56,848	17,000	15,840	32,840	1,24,008	3,28,567	
5th	3,28,567	1,56,848	17,000	11,500	28,500	1,28,348	2,00,219	
6th	2,00,219	1,56,848	17,000	7,008	24,008	1,32,840	67,379	
7th	67,379	1,56,848	17,000	2,358	19,358	1,37,490		There will be a surplus of Rs 70,111 at the close of the year.

C.S.
20 Sep. 98

Omit

Light Dues — B — Financial Forecast 73

Year	Loan at the beginning of the year	Annual Receipts from Light Dues	Additional maintenance charges	Interest on loan at 3½ per cent on amount in col. 2	Total of columns 4 and 5	Balance available for extinction of loan (col. 3 – col. 6)	Loan outstanding at the end of the year (col. 2 – col. 7)	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1st	8,00,000	78,424	17,000	28,000	45,000	33,424	7,66,576	
2nd	7,66,576	78,424	17,000	26,830	43,830	34,594	7,31,982	
3rd	7,31,982	78,424	17,000	25,619	42,619	35,805	6,96,177	
4th	6,96,177	78,424	17,000	24,366	41,366	37,058	6,59,119	
5th	6,59,119	78,424	17,000	23,069	40,069	38,355	6,20,764	
6th	6,20,764	78,424	17,000	21,727	38,727	39,697	5,81,067	
7th	5,81,067	78,424	17,000	20,337	37,337	41,087	5,39,980	
8th	5,39,980	78,424	17,000	18,899	35,899	42,525	4,97,455	
9th	4,97,455	78,424	17,000	17,411	34,411	44,013	4,53,442	
10th	4,53,442	78,424	17,000	15,870	32,870	45,554	4,07,888	
11th	4,07,888	78,424	17,000	14,276	31,276	47,148	3,60,740	
12th	3,60,740	78,424	17,000	12,626	29,626	48,798	3,11,942	
13th	3,11,942	78,424	17,000	10,918	27,918	50,506	2,61,436	
14th	2,61,436	78,424	17,000	9,150	26,150	52,274	2,09,162	
15th	2,09,162	78,424	17,000	7,321	24,321	54,103	1,55,059	
16th	1,55,059	78,424	17,000	5,427	22,427	55,997	99,062	
17th	99,062	78,424	17,000	3,467	20,467	57,957	41,105	
18th	41,105	78424	17000	1,439	18,439	59,985		There will be a surplus of 18880 at the closing this year

N.S.
22 Sept 98

F

14

HM
22 Sept 98

C/

Light Dues - Financial Forecast

15

Draft #

Year	Loan at the beginning of the year	Annual receipts from Light Dues	Maintenance charges	Interest on loan at 3½ per cent on amount in Col. 2	Total of columns 4+5	Balance available for extinction of loan (Col. 3 – Col. 6)	Loan outstanding at the close of the year (Col. 2 – Col. 7)	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1st	8,80,000	1,56,848	66,000	30,800	96,800	60,048	8,19,952	
2nd	8,19,952	1,56,848	66,000	28,698	94,698	62,150	7,57,802	
3rd	7,57,802	156848	66,000	26523	92523	64,325	6,93,477	
4th	6,93,477	1,56,848	66,000	24,272	90272	66,576	6,26,901	
5th	6,26,901	1,56,848	66,000	21,942	87,942	68,906	5,57,995	
6th	5,57,995	1,56,848	66,000	19,530	85,530	71,318	4,86,677	
7th	4,86,677	1,56,848	66,000	17,034	83,034	73,814	4,12,863	
8th	4,12,863	1,56,848	66,000	14,452	80,450	76,398	3,36,465	
9th	3,36,465	1,56,848	66,000	11,776	77,776	79,072	2,57,393	
10th	2,57,393	1,56,848	66,000	9,009	75,009	81,839	1,75,554	
11th	1,75,554	1,56,848	66,000	6,144	72,144	84,704	90,850	
12th	90,850	1,56,848	66,000	3,180	69,180	87,668	3,182	
13th	3182	1,56,848	66,000	111	66,111	90,737		There will be a surplus of Rs. 87555 at the close of the year.

C.S. 28 Sep 98.

HN
28 Sep 98.

26

27

16

D

Light Dues — Financial Forecast 17

Year	Loan at the beginning of ~~the~~ year	Annual receipts from Light Dues	Maintenance charges	Interest on loan at 3½ per cent on amount in col. 2	Total of columns 4 and 5	Balance available for extinction of loan. (Col. 3 — Col. 6)	Loan outstanding at the close of the year (Col. 2 – Col. 7)	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1st	8,80,000	1,17,636	66,000	30,800	96,800	20,836	8,59,164	
2nd	8,59,164	1,17,636	66,000	30,071	96,071	21,565	8,37,599	
3rd	8,37,599	1,17,636	66,000	29,316	95,316	22,320	8,15,279	
4th	8,15,279	1,17,636	66,000	28,535	94,535	23,101	7,92,178	
5th	7,92,178	1,17,636	66,000	27,726	93,726	23,910	7,68,268	
6th	7,68,268	1,17,636	66,000	26,889	92,889	24,747	7,43,521	
7th	7,43,521	1,17,636	66,000	26,023	92023	25,613	7,17,908	
8th	7,17,908	1,17,636	66,000	25,127	91,127	26,509	6,91,399	
9th	6,91,399	1,17,636	66,000	24,199	90,199	27,437	6,63,962	
10th	6,63,962	1,17,636	66,000	23,239	89,239	28,397	6,35,565	
11th	6,35,565	1,17,636	66,000	22,245	88245	29,391	6,06,174	
12th	6,06,174	1,17,636	66,000	21,216	87,216	30,420	5,75,754	
13th	5,75,754	1,17,636	66,000	20,151	86,151	31,485	5,44,269	
14th	5,44,269	1,17,636	66,000	19,049	85,049	32,587	5,11,682	
15th	5,11,682	1,17,636	66,000	17,909	83909	33,727	4,77,955	
16th	4,77,955	1,17,636	66,000	16,728	82,728	34,908	4,43,047	
17th	4,43,047	1,17,636	66,000	15,507	81,507	36,129	4,06,918	
18th	4,06,918	1,17,636	66,000	14,242	80,242	37,394	3,69,524	
19th	3,69,524	1,17,636	66,000	12,933	78,933	38,703	3,30,821	
20th	3,30,821	1,17,636	66,000	11,579	77,579	40,057	2,90,764	
21st	2,90,764	1,17,636	66,000	10,177	76,177	41,459	2,49,305	
22nd	2,49,305	1,17,636	66,000	8,726	74,726	42,910	2,06,395	
23rd	2,06,395	1,17,636	66,000	7,224	73,224	44,412	1,61,983	
24th	1,61,983	1,17,636	66,000	5,669	71,669	45,967	1,16,016	
25th	1,16,016	1,17,636	66,000	4,061	70,061	47,575	68,441	
26th	68,441	1,17,636	66,000	2,395	68,395	49,241	19200	
27th	19200	1,17,636	66,000	672	66,672	50,964		There will be a surplus of Rs. 31,764 at the close of this year

29

28 Sep. 98

H.N.
28 Sep. 98

Marine Department.

C. Nos. 1269 & 1136/1406

Financing the scheme of Lighthouse constructions

G.O. 471 Marine 31-5-99

Flag Y

Note for M.

Before proceeding with the question of legislation for the levy of light dues, it seems necessary that a decision should be come to in regard to the classification of lights under the two main heads-viz. "Port" and "Coast " lights. At present such a ~~decision~~ division is not recognized, and all expenditure is charged to Port Funds. For the future, the Government of India has stated in para 7 of its letter No. 3285 S.R. dated 27" July 1898, that any fresh expenditure to be incurred for erecting and maintaining lights on the Madras coast, over and above past standards, should be provided for by means of light dues.

It is doubtful, however, whether this ruling is in strict accordance with law. It will be seen from Section 36(3) (b) that Port Funds cannot be spent on lights other than those --- "maintained chiefly for the benefit of vessels being in, or entering or leaving the Port, or passing through the rivers or channels leading thereto". "Coast" lights, therefore, or

those

23

W 11 Nov 98

Caw

those intended for the use of vessels passing along the coast, would have to be erected and maintained from some other source-presumably Imperial Funds, in the absence, or pending the levy, of special light dues for the purpose.

In its subsequent letter No. 4778-S.R. dated 2"November 1898, the Government of India raises purely technical objections to the grant of a loan, quoting subsection (3) of section 36 of the ~~Ports~~ Ports Act as a bar to a loan to Port Funds on account of "Coast" lights, and the general Provincial Contract arrangements as militating against any loan to Provincial. But as pointed out above, it may be contended by the Madras Government that the expenditure on "Coast" lights is a direct Imperial charge. It may further be contended that Imperial is also liable to Port Funds for all past outlay on this class of lights wrongly and illegally charged to Port Funds. It should not for a moment be admitted that the expenditure in question falls against Provincial, no allowance for its having been made in the Provincial Contract arrangements.

This

x Flag T

x Flag V

Ex - please have this definitely settled first x

14. 11. 98

x as quickly as possible

x Flag T.

This being the position, the Madras Government might waive its claim to a refund of past expenditure, on condition that the Government of India now makes a temporary grant from Imperial Revenues for the erection and immediate maintenance of "Coast" lights, repayable on the introduction and collection of light dues.

Mr. Ashpitel places 16 lights in the "Coast" group (including Alleppi) while the Presidency Port Officer in his letter No. 1271/299 G dated 1" September 1898, allocates 19 lights (excluding Alleppi) to that group. It seems necessary that this discrepancy should be reconciled before again approaching the Government of India on the subject of the contribution from Imperial Funds, the --- amount of which will depend on the Number of lights classed under the "coast" group.

Meanwhile, the following information is submitted with reference to India's letter No. 4778 S.R. dated 2"November 1898, (c. No-1406.).

Para 3. The lights for the construction of which, the loan of Rs. 2.15.000 was

was applied for include ×"Coast" and ×"Port" Lights (Rs.2,06,000 θ for Coast Lights and Rs.9000 θ for Port Lights). The total cost of the Light House Scheme is Rs.8,80,000 of which --- Rs.8,00,000 ✻ is for "Coast" Lights and Rs.80,000 + for Port Lights. It will thus be seen that the major portion of the loan required is for "Coast" lights.

Para 4. In this para. the Government of India points out that light house construction is not a productive work on which Government can spend money and charge it otherwise than against the revenues of the year in which it is spent. The meaning of this seems to be that the expenditure in each year on Light House Construction should be restricted to the receipts in that year from Light Dues. If this be so, the works cannot be carried out -- within the next 2 years by raising a loan in the open market to be liquidated hereafter by Light Dues, as contemplated by this Government. As pointed out above, however, the whole circumstances seem now to be changed. "Port" Lights will probably have to be carried out from Port Funds, and "Coast" lights, on which the expenditure is much larger, will perhaps be started by an Imperial contribution which will be repaid in due course from the proceeds of light dues.

11 Nov 98

× These are the terms used by the Government of India.

θ For these details, please see ~~Lag~~ page 10 of G.O.316 d/ 29th April 1898. (Fl

Sacramento--Coast light-	Rs.	1,00,000
Vakalapudi-- Do -----	"	18,000
Tangacherri-- Do-----	"	88,000
		2,06,000
Cochin -- Port Light		9,000
		2,15,000

✻ Vide total in column 16 of the statement on page 17 of G.O. 245 d/8th April 1896. (Flag J)

+ Vide total in column 17 of---Do-

351

~~Marine~~ DEPARTMENT.

1a/

READ the following :--

Letter from the Presidency Port Officer No $\frac{1271}{299}$ G of 1st Septr 1898.
Telegram — do — do — dated 27th Septr 1898.
From the — do — do — No $\frac{1271}{347}$ G of 8th Octr 1898
— do — do — do — No $\frac{1271}{402}$ G of 18th Novr 1898.
Do — Do — Do — " $\frac{1271}{36}$ G d/ 24. Jany 99.

Levy of light dues.

Circulated to

H. E. the Governor
The Hon Mr A. T. Arundel C.S.I.
The Hon Mr H. M. Winterbotham

FOR ORDERS.

(1)

But the matter is still under correspondence. A letter from the Secy. Marine to India d/ 10th Jany 1899 is still pending unanswered.

As to the proposal that this Govt. should raise a ^ and of the imposition of light dues to liquidate it loan in the open market, I take it that this Govt. has no power to do such a thing & that the Govt. of India would peremptorily negative such a proposal, for the obvious

Flag U

The Government having undertaken an extensive and costly scheme of lighthouse construction and illumination on the coasts of the Madras Presidency, and the appeal to the Government of India for a free grant ~~[illegible]~~ from Imperial Funds having, ~~so far~~ failed, the question of raising the requisite funds by a loan in the open market ^ culty remains to be considered.

2. In their letter No 3285 S.R. dated 27th July 1898 the Government of India suggested that some scheme "should be "forthwith formulated on the "basis that both the interest "on the new capital outlay an

1a

P. W. 43
500—14-11-98.

12.1.2.99
4.2.99
15.2.99

"and the additional maintenance charges will be covered, "together with a small sinking "fund charge, by light dues "to be now imposed". Some expenditure from Port Funds having already been incurred ~~in this respect~~ in the erection of lighthouses on the coasts of this ~~Madras~~ Presidency, and maintenance charges being still provided from this source, the Government of India intimated that they had no objection to the "Government of Madras continuing to bear such expenditure to the same extent as before", leaving the balance of the requisite outlay for the completion of the lighthouse scheme, under both construction and maintenance, to be met from the proceeds of the proposed loan.

3. Further investigation has, however, disclosed the fact that Port Funds are not legally applicable to lighthouses of all class, but must, under Sub section 5 of Section 36 of the Indian Ports Act X of 1889, be limited to "lights maintained "chiefly for the benefit of "vessels being in or entering "or leaving the port or passing "through the rivers or channels "leading thereto", i.e. to lights of the class now technically called "Port" lights. It would, therefore, be illegal and inadmissible to continue as suggested by the Government of India, expenditure on all lights indiscriminately "to the same extent as before".

4. To obviate this difficulty, the lights of this Presidency must, in future, be arranged under two distinct groups viz:—

(1) Port Lights and

(2) Coast Lights,

~~the former only of which~~ ~~can~~ and Port Funds be spent in the former only class

CHIEF SECY
16 FEB 1899
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

reason that ~~the~~ pledging the credit of the Madras Govt ~~has~~ in support of a loan is the same thing as pledging the credit of the Govt. of India — a thing that could on no account be permitted.

But as H.E. has noted the whole question should be considered by Financial wh. will have further to consider it, when the reply of India is received to the letter of Jany 10th.

NA 13. 2. 99

KS
14-2 99

CURRENT No. 698

No: 86E. d/ 16th Feb: 1899

Recd 16/2/99 [illegible] file

Transferred to the Financial Department

[illegible]
Col. R.E.
Ag: Secy to Govt.

R.S.
To
The Finl. Deptt with papers in original and connd. file

2a

Class (1) includes lights of local utility, and class (2) those which serve the purposes of general navigation beyond port limits.

5. The following have been classified as^x^ "Coast Lights", the estimated expenditure on which amounts to Rs 6,73,000 as shown below:—

x G.O. 2930 Marine d/ 10 January 1897 Flag P.

Coast Lights	Estimated cost x Rs.
1. Calingapatam	5,000.
2. Santapalli	1,00,000.
3. Vakalapudi	18,000.
4. Sacramento	1,00,000.
5. Kistna	91,000.
6. Armeghon	18,000.
7. Pulicat	23,000.
8. Madras	1,000.
9. Seven Pagodas	53,000.
10. Negapatam	5,000.
11. Tuticorin	13,000.
12. Manapad	47,000.
13. Muttum	12,000.
14. Tangachari	88,000.
15. Tellicheri (Santapalli)	3,000.
16. Mulki	96,000
Total	6,73,000

x These figures have been taken from Statement (flagged K) on page 10 of G.O. 316 Mar dy 29. april 98. The Coast lights are those last selected ~~[illegible]~~ by the P.P. officer in Consultation with Mr Ashpitel - Vide Flag R.

6. The

[illegible] The file. Refer [illegible] and connect to file

6. The question as to the classes of vessels that should be taxed to meet the expenditure on "Coast lights" and the rates to be imposed will now be considered. It may be perhaps assumed that all vessels which derive benefit from the "Coast lights" should contribute, and that the rate should be determined by the amount or frequency of the benefit.

x vide para 31 of his report flagged H.

7. Mr. Ashpitel proposed^x^ in his report embodied in the G.O. 245 Marine dated 8th April 1896, the imposition of a light due on the following classes of vessels, at the rates specified against each class:—

on each Coasting vessel — 12 Pies per ton per month
on each Native craft — 6 pies — do —
on each foreign steamer — 7 pies per ton per voyage

This method though simple and easy of collection in regard to Coasting vessels would not be equitable

3a

For

for the reason that the^x incidence of the tax would weigh equally heavily on all coasting vessels, however much or little they used the lights. A better method would be to charge per voyage, to make a distinction between vessels using the lights of the whole coast, e.g. B. I. and Asiatic Steamers, and those using only a portion of them, to render the dues identical for both the Eastern and Western group of ports, and make them leviable once per voyage on vessels using the lights of each group.

8. The Presidency Port officer has, on these and other suggestions which are contained in Memo. No. 416E^& dated 11th August 1898, and after discussion with the undersigned as to certain classes and rates, proposed the following classification of vessels and rates of dues

Rate

x vide para 4 of Note for orders flagged Y with G.O. 732–3 Mar./30-8-98

& Flag W

Classes of vessels

Class I

All steam vessels ~~under a general~~ ~~pass~~ engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta & Bombay, and between Rangoon and Madras via Ports north of Madras.

^x Flag E

Rate of due proposed and how often leviable

9 Pies or 1½ annas per ton per voyage for each group, provided that if no port in the Eastern group be touched at, the due for that group shall not be levied.

Note. A vessel bound from Calcutta to Bombay unless she called at a port in the Eastern ~~port~~ group would not sight any of the lights until she arrived on the West Coast and only West Coast dues would be leviable.

The tonnage of arrivals under this class at Madras during 1897-98 is reported to have been 63746 tons. Each vessel or its substitute is estimated to make use of the lights on each coast not less than 8 times a year. On this basis, and at 9 pies per ton the annual receipts for each group will be

Rupees

40a

Rupees 23905. For both the groups, the receipts will be doubled i.e. 47,810. At the higher rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ annas per ton, the receipts will be twice 47810 or Rs 95,620.

Class II

All steam vessels, British and Foreign, to or from Europe, the Australian, African and other British Colonies including the Straits Settlements and Ceylon and vessels from Indian ports and ports in Burma which in the ordinary course of a voyage will pass or derive benefit from any of the Coast ~~Sea (Coast?)~~ lights in the Madras Presidency
and vessels calling at more than one
~~and vessels calling at more~~
port in a group, but which do not
~~than one port in the group~~
come under the conditions of Class I
~~but which do not come under~~
~~the conditions of class I.~~

The Presidency Port officer estimates receipts under this class from three sources: —

1st

$$\frac{63746 \times 9 \times 8}{12 \times 16} = 23905.$$

6 Pies or 12 pies per ton per voyage per group. One payment to exempt from further payment for 30 days; payable on arrival at a port in the Madras Presidency.

9

Flag E

To this Class must be added the steamers plying between Colombo & Tuticorin, originally included in Class V, but now entered, at the suggestion of the undersigned, in Class II. The dues leviable will be Rs 376 per annum at the lower rate, & Rs 752 at the higher rate.

Tonnage of vessels liable:
once during the year 166169 + 44441 = 210610 tons

At 6 pies per ton, the receipts = $\frac{210610 \times 6}{12 \times 16}$ = Rs 6582

Tonnage of vessels liable thrice during the year = 90631 tons
At 6 pies per ton the receipts will be $\frac{90631 \times 6 \times 3}{12 \times 16}$ = 8497

Total Rs 15,079

Class III

All steam vessels from Bombay or ports in the Bombay Presidency, bound direct for Colombo and from Colombo direct for ports in the Bombay Presidency.

~~166~~ 5a b

1st From vessels which may be expected to pay dues to the Eastern group once during the year; the tonnage of these vessels during 1897-98 is stated to be 166169 tons;

2nd From what the Presidency Port officer calls "Semi coasting" vessels, whose tonnage during the same period amounted to 44441 tons; and

3rd From vessels which may be expected to render themselves liable to payment of dues to the Eastern group, at least 3 times during the year; their tonnage for 1897-98 is reported to have been 90,631 tons. At the lower rate of 6 pies per ton the receipts from this class will amount to Rs 15079. At 1 anna the receipts will be doubled i.e. Rs 30158.

8 pies or 16 pies per ton per voyage payable on arrival at or departure from Bombay.

5a

The Presidency Port officer bases his estimate of receipts from this class from the number of P. and O. Steamers on the China line of which there are two fortnightly, one up and one down. While vessels of other lines will also be liable, this basis is apparently adopted as a safe one. The tonnage of these vessels may be taken as 2000 each. For 1 month, the tonnage liable to dues will be 8000, and for 1 year 96,000 tons. At 8 pies per ton the receipts will be $\frac{96000 \times 8}{12 \times 16}$ = 4000 Rs. At 16 pies, the receipts will be Rs 8000.

Class IV

All sailing vessels of 15 tons & upwards coasting or otherwise

4 pies or 8 pies per ton per voyage per group; one payment to exempt from further payment for 30 days.

Large sailing vessels from the United Kingdom very seldom visit this coast and the Presidency Port Officer considers it unnecessary to make any special

rate for them. The aggregate tonnage of Native Sailing Craft during 1896-97 was 713,000 tons. This shipping paid in port dues Rs 22971 at 1 anna per ton for every 60 days. Upon this basis, the Presidency Port Officer estimates receipts from light dues (leviable at 4 or 8 pies per ton) at $\frac{1}{3}$rd or $\frac{2}{3}$rd of the port dues i.e. at $\frac{22971 \times 1}{3}$ or $\frac{22971 \times 2}{3}$ = Rs 7657 or 15314.

Class V

~~Vessels performing the daily service between T[illegible] and [illegible]~~ steamers from Bombay bound for the minor ports of South Canara whose voyage terminates at Mangalore

3 pies or 6 pies per ton every 30 days.

These vessels will benefit by one or two lights only and hence the lower rate proposed. It is reported that there are 8 steamers aggregating 2650 tons performing the service between Bombay and

and Mangalore. owing to the closing of the ports for the S. W. monsoon, it is estimated that they will pay dues 6 times each year. The receipts will then be $\frac{2650 \times 3 \times 6}{12 \times 16}$ = Rs 248 or Rs 496 at the higher rate.

~~Between Tuticorin and Colombo, there are 3 steamers plying, with an aggregate tonnage of 1000 tons which will pay dues 12 times a year. The receipts will then be $\frac{1000 \times 3 \times 12}{12 \times 16} = \frac{3000}{16}$ = Rs 188 or Rs 376 at the higher rate. The total receipts under this class will then be Rs 436 at the lower, and Rs 872 at the higher rate per annum.~~

Class VI
Steamers plying between Madras and Rangoon.

7 or 14 pies per ton every 30 days.

The aggregate tonnage of vessels under this class for 1897-98 was 8199 tons. It is

B

is estimated that each vessel of this class will make not less than 12 trips per annum; at 7 pies per ton they will pay $\frac{8199 \times 12 \times 7}{12 \times 16}$ = Rs 3587 or Rupees 7174 at the higher rate.

9. The total approximate receipts from the proposed levy of light dues as estimated by the Presidency Port Officer will thus come to Rs 78,569 at the lower, ~~and~~ or Rs 157,138 at the higher rate. This will be the amount available for (1) maintenance of Coast lights (2) payment of interest on Capital outlay and (3) provision of a sinking fund for the extinction of the loan.

10. No precise information is at present available as to the amount that will have to be set apart for maintenance, some of the lighthouses not having yet been built, and their improved illuminating apparatus brought into use.

Receipts

	Lower rate	Higher rate
Class I	47,810	95,620
Class II	15,~~079~~ 455	30,~~168~~ 910
Class III	4,000	8,000
Class IV	7,657	15,314
Class V	~~436~~ 248	~~872~~ 496
Class VI	3587	7,174
Total	78569	157,138

Note. The above alterations have been made because of the inclusion of Tuticorin-Colombo steamers in Class II instead of in Class V. As the difference is small the totals have not been altered.

7a

A rough forecast is, therefore, all that is possible. The following figures given in Mr. Ashpitel's report recorded with G.O. 245,+ Marine, dated 8th April 1896 may, perhaps, be adopted:-

Coast Lights	Maintenance charges Rs
1. Calingapatam —	3,900
2. Santapilli —	5,500
3. Vakalapudi —	3,800
4. Sacramento —	5,300
5. Kistna —	5,100
6. Armeghon —	3,800
7. Pulicat —	3,800
8. Madras —	4,600
9. Seven Pagodas —	4,800
10. Negapatam —	1,200
11. Tuticorin —	1,150
12. Manapad —	5,000
13. Muttum —	5,300
14. Tangacherri —	4,600
15. Tellicherri —	540
16. Mulki —	5100
	63,490

On this basis, the lower rates of light dues, calculated to yeild Rs78,569, will be insufficient to

+Flag L.

× 63490
※ 23555 for 1st year on a loan of Rs 6,73 000 at 3½ per cent.
87,045

& This is the rate of interest proposed by Mr Ashpitel in para 27 of his report - Flag H.

H.E. Statement A

H.E. Statement B

to pay for maintenance× and interest※ charges. So these rates are out of the question. On the other hand the higher rates will, as will be seen from the ~~accompanying~~ following Statement A, liquidate a loan of Rs 6,73,000 in 9 years after paying interest at 3½& per cent on Capital outlay and meeting maintenance charges. They therefore seem to be unnecessarily high and ~~a~~ the adjoined Statement (B. ~~attached~~) has been prepared shewing two rates intermediate between those proposed by the Presidency Port Officer which will liquidate the loan in 15 and 25 years respectively. Under the proposed draft bill, referred to infra, the Government is empowered, subject to a maximum, to raise or lower the rates. There seems, therefore, no objection to the higher rates being entered in the Schedule

8a

Schedule and such rates, not exceeding them, levied as may, from time to time, be found necessary. With the double object of imposing as light a due as possible and of obviating any considerable reduction of the dues when the loan is liquidated – ~~[illegible]~~ only maintenance charges having then to be met from light-dues, – the lower rate entered in Column 4 of Statement B is recommended for adoption, which will extinguish the loan in 25 years. The proposed loan of Rs 6,73,000 will cover all Capital charges on account of Coast lights and admit of the expenditure already incurred this year and debited to Port Funds

being refunded.

11. The framing of the legislative Enactment has now to be considered. Attached to this note is a rough draft of the proposed bill. It is an adaptation of the Burma coast light Act IX of 1879, and comparatively few deviations from that Act have been made in the draft. The Burma Act is an Imperial enactment and the proposed enactment for this Presidency should also, it is thought, be an imperial measure as it extends to territories outside the limits of the Presidency of Fort St George.

× Vide page 45 of the Indian Councils Act with Rules

Under Rule 3 of the "precis of Legislative standing Orders" no provision should be be made in any Bill to be introduced into any Legislative Council in India for the creation of such[6] a fund, until the expediency of the measure has been specially considered in the Finance Department of the Government of India". The proposed bill aims at creating such a special Fund, and it will thus

---

[6] i.e. Appropriations from which are restricted to defined purposes.

---

thus have also to be laid before the Government of India in the Financial Department before it can be introduced into the Legislative Council.

12. The following seem the only points in the draft bill which call for special remark.

Section 2 defines the terms "Customs Collector" "Vessel" "Master" and "Voyage" in the terms of the Burma Coast lights act.

+ Section 3 levies coast light dues on vessels of the burden of ~~50~~ 15 tons and upwards. This limit ~~is taken from~~ in the Burma Act is 50 tons. ~~Whether~~ in Madras that limit is suitable and sufficient is a matter for consideration. The Presidency Port Officer might be asked to advise.

Section 4 shows when the dues become payable - A clause has been added to

+ It has since stated that the limit fixed for port dues - viz 15 tons and upwards should be adopted - The draft Act has been amended accordingly

+ But the P.O.O. has explained that if this limit is adopted in Madras, a large number of the West Coast vessels will escape the dues. The limit proposed is therefore, the same as for port dues, viz 15 tons

10a

to this section making the ~~Government~~ port of Madras a part of the Eastern group. This seems necessary with reference to Section 37 (1) of the Indian Ports Act, which declares that Madras shall not be grouped with any other port for the purposes of maintenance of its Port fund accounts.

Section 5. The power to vary rates is given to the Governor in Council, subject to the prior sanction of the Governor General in Council. This is in accordance with local usage in similar cases.

Section 16 of the Burma Act has been so far modified (*vide* Section 15 of the draft) as to place the duty of publishing accounts on the Government of Madras instead of on the Government of India.

The Schedule attached to the draft bill shows the rates and mode of collection of the light dues.

13. The draft bill might be referred to the Presidency Port Officer and the Advocate General for remarks and then forwarded to the Government of India Financial Department, for approval, prior to its introduction into the Supreme Legislative Council. The last step should, perhaps, be taken in the Legislative Department of the Madras Government.

C.S.

31-1-99

I think that before this is done, our Financial Branch should see the papers and report upon the proposals therein made.

A.S.H.
3.2.99

110

Engd

~~23~~ 56

A

Light Dues - Financial Forecast.

year	Loan at beginning of the year	Annual receipts from Light Dues	Maintenance charges	Interest on loan at 3½ per cent on amount in Col. 2	Total of columns 4 & 5	Balance available for extinction of loan (Col. 3 - Col. 6)	Loan outstanding at close of the year (Col. 2 - Col. 7)	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1st	6,73,000	1,57,138	63,490	23,555	87,045	70,093	6,02,907	
2nd	6,02,907	1,57,138	63,490	21,102	84,592	72,546	5,30,361	
3rd	5,30,361	1,57,138	63,490	18,563.	82,053	75,085	4,55,276	
4th	4,55,276	1,57,138	63,490	15,935	79,425	77,713	3,77,563	
5th	3,77,563	1,57,138	63,490	13,215	76,705	80,433	2,97,130	
6th	2,97,130	1,57,138	63,490	10,400	73,890	83,248	2,13,882	
7th	2,13,882	1,57,138	63,490	7,486	70,976	86,162	1,27,720	
8th	1,27,720	1,57,138	63,490	4,470	67,960	89,178	38,542	
9th	38,542	1,57,138	63,490	1,349	64,839	92,299	A surplus of 53,757 after extinction of the loan.	

C.S. 15 Jan 99

12a

Print on schedule

12 Dec

57 **B** ~~25~~

~~=~~ Print on separate sheet

Class	Tonnage	Rate fixed by the Secy	Rate now proposed	Receipts calculated at the rate entered in col: 3	Receipts calculated at the rate entered in col: 4	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
				Rs	Rs	
I	63.746 tons	15 pies	12 pies	79.683	63.746	
II	2.10.610 (leviable once) 90.631 (leviable 3 times) 1.000 (leviable 12 times)	9 pies	9 pies	23.180	23.180	
III	96.000 tons	10 pies	10 pies	5.000	5.000	
IV	Based on the port dues which amounted to Rs 22.971 at 1 anna per ton	6 pies	4 pies	11.486	7.657	
V	2.650 tons (leviable [illegible] times)	6 pies	6 pies	497	497	
VI	8.199 tons (leviable 12 times)	10 pies	9 pies	5.124	4.612	(a) This will liquidate the loan in 15 years.
	Total			(a) 1.24.970	(b) 1.04.692	(b) The loan will run for 25 years.

31-1-99

31 Jan 99

13a

Draft bill to provide for the levy ~~of~~ dues for the use ~~of establishment and maintenance~~ of Coast lights in the Presidency of Fort Saint George.

Preamble.

Whereas it is expedient for the Maintenance of Coast lights in the Presidency of Fort Saint George to levy dues on vessels passing or deriving benefit from such lights; it is hereby enacted as follows:—

Preliminary.

Short title.

1. This act may be called "The Madras Coast light Dues act 1899".

Commencement
1st April 1900?
Local Extent

It shall come into force on the ____ and it shall extend to the territories respectively administered by the Governors of Fort Saint George and Bombay in Council and the Lieutenant Governors of Bengal & Burma.

Saving

But nothing herein contained shall apply to any vessel belonging to or in the service of Her Majesty or the Government of India or to any vessel of war belonging to any Foreign Prince or

State.

Interpretation Clause

2. In this act unless there is something repugnant in the subject or Context, —

"Customs Collector"

"Customs Collector" means a Customs Collector appointed under the Sea Customs Act 1878 and includes any person appointed by the Local Government by name or in virtue of his Office to discharge the functions of a Customs Collector under this act at any port.

"Vessel"

"Vessel" includes anything made for the Conveyance by water of human beings or of property

"Master"

"Master" when used in relation to any vessel means any person (except a Pilot or Harbour Master) having for the time being the charge or Control of such vessel.

"Voyage"

"Voyage" means the whole distance between a vessel's place of departure and her final place of arrival; but the return of a vessel from any place shall, notwithstanding the terms of any Charter party, be deemed a distinct voyage.

Coast Light Dues

Coast light dues payable in respect of Vessels of $\overset{15}{50}$ tons.

3. For the purpose of ~~establishing~~ and maintaining Coast lights in the Presidency of Fort Saint George, a toll, hereinafter called "Coast light dues" shall be paid in respect of every vessel of the burden of $\overset{15}{\textcircled{50}}$ tons and upwards making any voyage mentioned in the schedule hereto annexed of the rate specified in Column 2 thereof.

Dues when payable

4. The said Coast Light dues shall become due and payable

(a) in the case of a vessel clearing out of a port in British India upon any such voyage - previous to the grant of any port Clearance;

(b) in the case of a vessel entering a port in British India in the Course or at the termination of any such voyage - immediately upon her entering such port - provided that the said dues shall not be levied more than once in the same port or group of

61

of ports on any vessel in the course of the same voyage and that for the purposes of this act, the port of Madras shall be reckoned as belonging to the eastern group of ports in the Presidency of Fort Saint George any provisions to the Contrary in any other enactment notwithstanding.

Power to vary rates of dues.

5. ~~The Governor General in Council~~ The Govt in Council of Fort St George with the prior sanction of the Governor General in Council may from time to time, by notification in the Fort St George Gazette ~~of India~~ reduce or raise the rate of Coast light dues in respect of all vessels or any particular class of vessels:

Provided that such rate shall not in any case exceed the rate fixed by Section 3.

Collection of dues

6. The Customs Collector shall collect the Coast light dues,

Voucher to be given

and shall grant to the person paying the same a voucher in writing under his hand setting forth the name of his office, the port at which the coast light dues are paid, the amount so paid, the name, tonnage and other

62 ~~53~~

178 ~~90~~

other proper description of the vessel in respect of which such payment is made, and the voyage on which she is or has been bound.

Master to report arrival

7. Within 24 hours after the arrival within a port of any vessel chargeable with Coast light dues, the master of such vessel shall give notice of such arrival to the Customs Collector.

Tonnage of vessel chargeable with Coast-light dues how ascertained.

8. In order to ascertain the tonnage of any vessel chargeable with Coast-light dues, the following rules shall be observed:—

If registered

(a) If such vessel be a British registered vessel or a vessel registered under Act No. X of 1841 or Act No. XI of 1850, or under any other law for the time being in force for the registration of vessels in India, the Customs Collector may require the owner or master of such vessel, or any other person having possession of her register, to produce such register for inspection. If any such owner, master or other

17a

other person neglects or refuses to produce such register or otherwise to satisfy the Customs Collector as to what is the true tonnage of the vessel in respect of which such Coast-light-dues are payable, he shall be punished with fine which may extend to one hundred rupees, and the Customs Collector may cause such vessel to be measured and the tonnage thereof to be ascertained; and in such case, the owner or master of such vessel shall also be liable to pay the expenses of such measurement.

If not registered

(b) If such vessel be not a British registered vessel or a vessel registered under Act No. X of 1841 or Act No. XI of 1850 or under any other law for the time being in force for the registration of Vessels in India, and the owner or master thereof fails to satisfy the Customs Collector as to what is her true tonnage according to the mode of measurement

measurement prescribed by the law in force for the time being for regulating the measurement of British registered vessels, the Customs Collector shall cause such vessel to be measured and the tonnage thereof, according to the mode aforesaid to be ascertained; and in such case the owner or master of such vessel shall be liable to pay the expenses of such measurement.

On refusal to pay dues or expenses, the Collector may distrain and sell.

9. If the master of any vessel refuses or neglects to pay to the Customs Collector on demand by him the amount of any dues or expenses payable in respect of such vessel under this Act, the Customs Collector may distrain or arrest such vessel and the tackle, apparel and furniture belonging thereto, or any part thereof, and detain the same until the amount of such dues or expenses is paid;

18a and

and in case any part of such dues or expenses, or of the costs of the distress or arrest, or of the keeping of the same, remains unpaid for the space of five days next after any such distress or arrest so made, the Customs Collector may cause the vessel or other thing so distrained or arrested to be sold, and with the proceeds of such sale may satisfy such dues, expenses and costs (including the costs of sale) remaining unpaid, and shall render the surplus (if any) to the master of such vessel upon demand.

No Port clearance to be granted until dues &c are paid.

10. The Officer of Government whose duty it is to grant a port clearance for any vessel shall not grant such port clearance until her master or some other person has paid, or secured to the satisfaction of such officer, the amount of all dues expenses and costs

with

with which such vessel is chargeable under this Act, and of any fine to which any person is liable for anything done by him in contravention of this Act.

Master to specify on demand voyage on which vessel is bound.

11. The master of any vessel departing from or entering any port in British India upon, or in the course of, or at the termination of, any voyage, shall, upon the demand of the Customs Collector, specify upon what voyage she is or has been bound.

Penalty for evading payment of dues &c.

12. If the master of any vessel evades, or attempts to evade, the payment of any Coast light dues, expenses or costs payable in respect of such vessel under this Act he shall be punished with fine which may extend to two hundred rupees.

Determination of disputes under Act.

13. If any dispute arises as to whether any vessel is chargeable with any Coast

light

any

light dues, expenses or costs under this Act, or as to the amount of such dues, expenses or costs, such dispute shall upon application made in that behalf by either of the disputing parties, be heard and determined in the towns of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay by a Presidency Magistrate and elsewhere by any Magistrate exercising at the place where the dispute arises powers under the Code of Criminal Procedure not less than those of a magistrate of the second class. All decisions under this section shall be final.

Prosecutions under other Laws

Saving of prosecutions under other laws.

14. Nothing herein contained shall prevent any person from being prosecuted under any other law for any act or omission which constitutes an offence against this Act: provided that

that no person shall be punished twice for the same act or omission.

Statement of Receipts and Expenditure

Statement of receipts and expenditure to be published.

15. The Governor in Council of Fort St. George shall on or before the first day of October in each year publish in the Fort St. George Gazette, a statement showing the amount received on account of coast light dues during the year ending on the thirty first day of March last preceding, and the amount expended during the same period on the ~~establishment and~~ maintenance of coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George.

Schedule

Vessels chargeable with Light Dues, rate of light dues and frequency of payment.

Vessels chargeable	Rate of Light dues	How often chargeable
Class I All steam vessels ~~under a General Pass~~ engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta & Bombay and between Rangoon and Madras *via* Ports north of Madras.	1½ annas per ton	once during a voyage for each group provided that if no port in the eastern group be touched at, the due for that group shall not be paid.
Class II All steam vessels, British and Foreign to or from Europe, the Australian African & other British Colonies including the Straits Settlements and Ceylon and vessels from Indian ports and ports in Burma which in the ordinary course of a voyage will pass or derive benefit from any of the coastlights in the Madras Presidency and vessels calling at more than one port in the group, and which do not come under the conditions of Class I	12 pies per ton	once per voyage per group; one payment to exempt from further payment for 30 days; payable on arrival at a port in the Presidency of Fort St. George.
Class III All steam vessels from Bombay or ports in the Bombay Presidency bound direct for Colombo and from Colombo direct to ports in the Bombay Presidency.	16 pies per ton	once during a voyage payable on arrival at or departure from Bombay.

70

Vessels chargeable	Rate of Light dues	How often chargeable
Class IV All sailing vessels of 15 tons & upwards coasting or otherwise	8 pies per ton	once during a voyage for each group. one payment to exempt from further payment for 30 days.
Class V ~~Vessels performing the daily service between Tuticorin and Colombo and~~; All Steam~~ers~~ vessels from Bombay bound for the minor ports of South Canara whose voyage terminates at Mangalore	6 pies per ton	once for every 30 days.
Class VI All Steam~~ers~~ vessels plying direct between Madras and Rangoon	14 pies per ton	once for every 30 days.

R.S. 18 Jan 99

21.1.99

71

14

Madras Coast Light Dues Act 1899

Statement of Objects & Reasons.

Whereas the Government of Fort Saint George has undertaken an extensive and costly scheme of Light house construction and illumination on the Coasts of the Madras Presidency, and whereas it is necessary to raise funds in the open market for the capital outlay thereon, it is proposed in the accompanying bill to levy a Coast light due on vessels deriving benefit from the lights in question; the proceeds of the due being applied to payment of

(1) the interest on the loan

(2) a sinking fund for its final extinction and

(3) the maintenance of the lights.

R.S.

14a

72

C.H.W.

I have written to P.S. to say that earlier records have to be examined in Madras, which will take time.

Meanwhile, please have the history prepared from 1882 to date. I notice that the Madras Govt. proposed to take very little action on Mr Douglass' report

13.5.99

M

Draft submitted. The opening portion may on receipt of papers from Madras, require amendment.

15 May 99

Circ

16.5.99

Papers submitted in continuation of the note on lighthouse improvement, now in circulation. It will be observed that the Govt. of India took the initiative in this matter, and that Mr. Douglass, who is responsible for the subsequent action, was brought out on the suggestion of that Govt.

17 May 99

H.E. 16.5.99

75

C. Adm

I think we must give the merchants little more information than is contained in the draft. I have shown in pencil how I think it should run, & would add all that portion of the note now under marked in blue pencil

22.5.99

M

Draft revised accordingly N.S.

23 May 99.

74 ~~[illegible]~~

C.Entry

Please note that a copy of G.O. No. 5 Marine 16.5.99 should be attached to the present proceedings so that the trade may have full information of the effect of the lighthouse improvement.

24.5.99

Noted
25 May 99

Note connected with G.O. No. 471 Marine, d/ 31st May 1899.

76

C. No. 696

Financial Department.

18

NOTE for the CS

As pointed out by the Honourable Mr. Arundel, C.S.I., there is no rule under which this Govt. can raise a loan in the open market. Even if it were possible for Govt. to borrow on the security of Port funds the objection raised by the Govt. of India in para. 5 of its letter No. 4778 S.R., dated 2nd November 1898, to a loan from Imperial, would seems to apply equally to a loan in the open market. ~~as~~ The money thus borrowed, which would be an addition to the Port Fund receipts, could not be utilized on expenditure on coast lights, since the provisions of section 36 sub section (5) of the Indian Ports Act, 1889, restrict the application of Port funds to the class of lights defined in that section i.e., to port lights. It is submitted therefore that the reply of the Govt. of India to letter No. 30, Marine, dated 10th January last, may be awaited. Meanwhile it might be suggested to ~~Dept~~ Marine to print up all notes &c in their file.

80. 29 Mar
10.1.98

5/3/99

Circd
6/3/99

Get the notes printed up & hold the papers till the answer is recd. The

uildings ?

~~28~~ 77

papers is now in Finl.

---

78 Light house Improvements ~~2~~

Financial Department. 3

2

Note

In the note of the Marine Dept. below the question of raising funds for the scheme of light house construction and illumination on the coasts of this Presidency by a loan in the open market and of the imposition of light dues to liquidate it was considered. The Hon'ble Mr.Arundel C.S.I., pointed out that the matter was still under correspondence with the Govt.of India and that letter No.30 Marine, dated 10th January last, in which that Govt.was requested to make a grant from Imperial funds of ₨.2,56,850 for the prosecution of light house works in the current year, still remained unanswered. The Hon'ble Member also considered that this Govt.had no power to raise a loan in the open market and that the Govt.of India would peremptorily negative such a proposal for the obvious reason that pledging the credit of the Madras Govt. in support of a loan was the same thing as pledging the credit of the Govt.of India - a thing that could on no account be permitted. The papers having been referred to the Financial Dept. it was remarked that there was no rule under which this Govt. could raise a loan in the open market; that even if it were possible for the Govt.to borrow on the security of Port funds the objection raised by the Govt.of India in para 3

Z

A

of

uildings

H.E. 16.5.99

of its letter No.4778 S.R.,d/2nd Novr. 1898,to a loan from Imperial would seem to apply equally to a loan in the open market and that the money thus borrowed,which would be an addition to the Port fund receipts could not be utilized on expenditure on coast lights,since the provisions of section 36 sub: section (5) of the Indian Ports Act 1889,restrict the application of Port funds to the class of lights defined in that section,i.e.to Port lights. It was submitted therefore that the reply of the Govt.of India to letter No.30 Marine,dated 10th January last, might be awaited. In the meantime the notes &c of the Marine Department have, as directed,been put in type.

G.O.No.29 Marine d/10-1-98. P

Z

The printed papers are tagged together in the file below marked ⊗

2. The reply of the Govt.of India is contained in the orders of that Govt. passed on the budget (G.O. No. 1407× ~~in the linked file~~). The Govt.of India states that the money required for the construction of the light houses should,as already stated in its letter No.3285 S.R.,d/ 27th July 1898, be ultimately provided for by the levy of light dues,but that if the expenditure is charged to Govt. it must be charged as ordinary expenditure under the head 45 CIVIL WORKS which is wholly Provincial in accordance with the terms of the current Provincial settlement,as there is no authority for charging such expenditure to Loan funds. The Govt.of India accordingly adds that the special grants

× Vide para 7.

G.O. No. 732 Marine, d. 30 Augt. /98. U

grants

grants to Provincial Revenues mentioned in its letter will enable ~~to~~ the Govt.of Madras to pursue,without interruption, their policy in the matter of the construction of light houses,but that it is to be understood that if any expenditure is incurred out of Govt.funds,it will be ultimately recovered from light dues.

3. The only source from which a grant can now be made from Provincial funds for the construction of light houses in the current year is the unallotted sum of 8.73 lakhs entered in the budget under 45 CIVIL WORKS; and as it is a condition that whatever expenditure is incurred out of Govt.funds should be ultimately recovered from light dues there will be no objection to the sum of 2.59 lakhs required by the Marine Dept. for expenditure in the current year being allotted from this source. From the remark made by the Govt.of India that the special grants to Provincial Revenues ~~[illegible]~~ will enable this Govt.to pursue without interruption its policy in the matter of the construction of light houses, it is evidently contemplated that the whole of the estimated expenditure on coast lights, viz. 6.73× lakhs,should be met from time to time from Provincial funds. It will be necessary therefore to make further grants of about 2 lakhs in each of the next 2 years. Although this will to a certain extent limit the spending power of this Govt. on other objects for a few years the grants made are virtually investments,

Vide para: 3 of G.O. No. 1407 in linked file.

× Vide page 2 of Marine Dt. note

which would be available for expenditure on repayment in future years. The P.W.Department may be requested to include in its budget under 45 CIVIL WORKS the necessary provision for light house construction that may be required in the next two years.

4. The question as to the manner in which these grants should be recovered remains now to be considered. In the Marine Department Note below the question of the imposition of light dues to liquidate a loan of 6.73 lakhs, which it was proposed to borrow in the open market, is discussed, and certain rates are proposed which if levied would liquidate such a loan in 9, 15 and 25 years respectively. With the double object of imposing as light a due as possible and of obviating any considerable reduction of the dues when the loan is liquidated - only maintenance charges having then to be met from light dues - the lower rate entered in Col.4 of Statement B attached to the Marine Dept. note, which was calculated to extinguish the loan in 25 years, is recommended by the Marine Dept for adoption. The receipts at this rate are estimated to amount to 1.05 lakh a year. The maintenance charges being set down at .63 the amount remaining for refund of the Provincial expenditure to be incurred and the expenditure already incurred from Port funds on these lights is only .42. The adoption of the intermediate rate entered in Col.3 of the same statement which

Vide para 10 of Marine Dt. Note & statements A & B attached to it.

Para: 10 of Marine Dt. Note.

which was intended to liquidate the loan in 15 years would give an annual income of 1.25 lakhs and would leave .62 for refund to Provincial and Port funds. At this rate it would take about 11 years for the recovery from light dues of the total amount (6.73) estimated to be spent on coast lights.

5. The question of a loan from the open market having fallen through the necessary alteration should be made in the draft "Statement of Objects and Reasons" as regards the application of the proceeds of light dues which should not go towards

(1) the refund of the expenditure incurred from Port and Provincial funds, and

(2) the maintenance of the lights.

15/4/99

F O R the C. S.

C.No.1407 in the linked file XXIII

It is clear from paragraph 7 of the Govt. of India Fin. & Com: Dept. No.A-1429 L., d/29th March 1899 that the Govt. of India will not involve Imperial funds in any way in the matter of the scheme of light house improvements. India insists ~~It is pointed out~~ that if any expendit ure is to be charged to Govt. in the first instance it must be found from Provl. funds.

~~and~~

~~and~~, As stated in the note above, although funds may perhaps be made available in 1899-1900, the questionn of the future has to be considered and for these coast lights Provl. funds will, if the local Govt. commits itself to this scheme any further at present, have to find a grant of about 2 lakhs in each of the next two years in addition to the 2.59 to be found in the current year. Provl. funds are comparatively well off only in consequence of the special grants made by the Govt. of India but it has to be remembered that these grants are distinctly labelled "special" by India and by the Finance Minister in his statement in the Supreme Legive. Council. In this year's budget several schemes have been provided for - such as the Ry. Police Scheme, Taluk gumastas, Additional Munsifs courts etc. Some of these have already been introduced and the Taluk gumasta scheme will apparently be introduced during the year. Funds for meeting the recurring expenditure in connection with the additional establishments entertained by the introduction of these schemes will swell the Provl. expenditure in future years, and the actual result of giving large grants to Port funds, to be recovered in instalments of about half a lakh per annum, will be that the grant for Civil Works P.W.D. will have to be curtailed in future years. Until therefore the question of the financial position of this Gov t

is

is on a more certain basis and until that position is not solely dependent on the good will and the benevolences of the Govt. of India it seems, it is submitted, to be a questionable [redacted] policy for the local Govt. to commit itself further to the scheme of light house improvements.

It is to be noted that the light dues, which are to form the source of revenue from which the advances now made to Port Funds are to be ultimately liquidated, are not at present legally leviable; that before they can be so leviable an Act will apparently have to be passed by the Imperial Legve. Council; and that therefore the recoveries belong to the remote future.

It is acknowledged in para 2 of letter No.30 Marine d/10th Jan. '99 that this scheme of light house improvements was started and the ~~creation of the~~ special ~~several~~ light house divisions (which so far as can be seen has been paid up to this from Provl. funds) was created ~~were started~~ under the erroneous impression that the cost could be defrayed from Port Funds. This impression has not only turned out to be erroneous, but the Govt of India has declined to have anything to do with the scheme or to finance it in any way. The position has therefore altered considerably and the matter is now one for consideration from the point of view of Provl. funds alone.

From paragraph 3 (page 6) of the

uildings

Marine 85

~~2~~ XXI

Marine notes attached to G.O.No.316 dated 29th April 1898, it will be seen that there is scope for reduction in the Presy. Port Officer's programme of port fund works. The Chief Engineer himself considers that the programme needs "considerable revision" (vide para 4 of the same note). ~~and~~ It is respectfully submitted that the matter is proceeding too quickly. Port funds should, it is thought, be made to wait for their schemes of improvement until "ways and means" are more certain. In any case it ~~appears~~ is to subd. that if a grant is to be made in the current year from the unallotted sum of 8.73 placed by the Govt. of India in the budget, this grant should be sanctioned on the clear understanding that it does not necessarily involve Provl. funds in any ~~amount~~ grants for the future and that such grants will depend entirely on the state of Provl. finances

C. No 65 Fin

24.4.99

For the C.S.

It has been decided to make a grant of 1 lakh during the current year for Lighthouse improvements & order to that effect is issuing. Subd. that this file may be returned to Marine. I want to examine this matter.

28.4.99

30/4/99

See note below.

3/5/99

financial position of this Govt

is

---

86 C4.5.99 R4.5.99 C6.5.99 R9.5.99

68 10

H. M.

H. E. The Govr.

This great lighthouse scheme estimated to cost Rs 800 000 has been initiated without making sure that funds are available for it. So long ago as March last year Sir H. Bliss realized the difficulty & discussed the alternatives "(1) stop light-house construction when we have spent our balances . . . ; or (2) we must get a grant from the Govt. of India, a loan being of no use; or (3) we must take legislative authority to increase the rate of port dues. I don't like (3) at all." p. 3 of printed notes – yellow. On p.p. 8 & 9 Sir H. Bliss repeated his objection to an increase of dues, and H. E. & Mr Grose agreed with him. So do I entirely. As the C.S. suggests such a measure wd. tend to destroy the seaborne trade.

Fin. Dept.

Note

There has been a very great mistake made in dealing with this matter. It was at first thought that the expenditure for the "Light House Scheme" could be met from Port Funds but this has been found to be a mistake. Port Funds can only be expended on Port Lights. So far as the scheme involves these Lights and Improvements there is no difficulty. But the matter is otherwise with the "Coast Lights"

2. Mr. Ashpitel's scheme involved an outlay of

Port Lights... ... 80,000 Rs.

Coast Lights.. ... 8,00,000 Rs.

It appears however that some of the expenditure on the scheme has already been met from Port Funds and I gather that apart from what is wanted to repay Port Funds the capital sum now required to complete the scheme is Rs. 6,73,000. The Govt. of India have distinctly laid down that if any money is to be spent on the Lighthouse scheme it must come out of 45 Civil Works i.e. it must be Provincial. Hence Provincial must advance this Rs. 6,73,000. The Govt. of India in their last letter i.e. in their reply to the letter of this Govt. of 10th January 1899 when read with their letter recorded in G.O.No. 733, Marine of 30th August 1898 make it quite plain that all

uildings

M1.16.5.99

all expenditure on this scheme is to be Provincial. In the latter latter para. 7 the Govt. of India say:-

"But as regards any future expenditure "on this object, the Govt. 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 for-"mulated 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."

3. It is assumed in the correspondence that the money is to be found by the imposition of light dues but I note that both His Excellency and Sir Henry Bliss and Mr. Grose have already expressed an unanimous opinion against the imposition of light dues (vide notes of March 1896) and I think that some reasons can be given against having recourse to that measure. The trade of the Madras Presidency is ~~but~~ not large or of an increasing volume. Shipping i.e. coasting vessels have now to compete against railways and can less than before bear any burdens. Competition is now so keen that any even the smallest burden will drive ships away. The imposition is certain to be met by strong opposition on behalf of the ship owners. It is proposed to impose the

is

Alternative (3) is thus rejected.

Alternative (2) must also be rejected for the Govt. of India flatly declines to give us a rupee for the work.

Alternative (1) now also put forward by the C.S. remains; namely, to stop light-house building.

Such work as has actually been begun must I suppose be completed: but charity begins at home, and it is somewhat Quixotic for this Govt. to spend its Provincial assignments on lighthouses for the benefit of trade that goes elsewhere, when we have unlimited demands for money for various necessary purposes within the Presidency.

The D.P.W. can no doubt ascertain what work must go on & be paid for out of Provincial, and what works can be indefinitely postponed – presuming that H.E. thinks this the wisest course we can take.

If there has been, or if there is in contemplation, any modification of light-house establishments connected with this scheme, it will presumably require ~~modification~~ reconsideration.

A.T.A. 4.5.99.

Intended also to discuss this matter in Council

A.H.

5.5.99

Seen H.W. 9-5-99

the dues on vessels sailing from Bombay to Colombo and from Calcutta to Colombo which will never sight one of our Coast Lights. Coasting Steamers of which there are only two lines and sailing Dhonies which do not want the lights will all have to pay. The sum which will have to be collected will nearly double the present collection of dues which amounts to Rs. 3,33,696 on 6,087,882 tons on the average of the years 94-97. Commander Aves proposes to raise Rs. 1,56,348 by Light dues.

4. Supposing that matters have now gone so far that money must be got and that there is no alternative but to impose Light dues the next question is what are the charges which have to be met. As above pointed out the cost of the scheme is Rs. 8,00,000 but the latest figure which has been taken is 6,73,000. I apprehend that a considerable portion of the difference has come out of Port Funds In fact I think there is little doubt the Port Funds are being applied to Light house purposes with very questionable legality. Where then is Rs. 6,73,000 to come from. Under the Govt. of India it must be from Provincial Funds. It can not be a loan so no question+ of interest or Sinking Fund arises and if Provincial advances the money it must be content to get it back in lump payments. I think the period for repayment ought not to be allowed to

+ But see India's letter above quoted. It will make little difference in the sum to be raised by light dues whether Int. & Sinking Fund or lump annual repayments to reimburse Provincial in a moderate number of years are imposed. H. 2/5/99.

H.E. 16.5-99

exceed 10 years. Hence the annual payment to be recovered is Rs.67,300 on capital account.

5. Supposing that the whole of the lights are at once carried out and put in working order then the cost of maintenance is as stated in the Marine note 63,490 but to this must be added cost of Inspection 3,000 Rs. Pay of relief 1920 and contribution to pension 4,500 = 9,420. These items have I believe been omitted as paid from Port Funds which seems to me wrong. Hence the total sum to be provided annually is 1,40,310 to meet which the + sum yielded by the maximum dues is only sufficient.

Comr. Asst's Estimate Rs. 1,56,848

6. It is stated that for the years 1899-1900 3,58,850 is required. Of this 3,10,000 is for work and 48,850 for maintenance, Rs.1,00,000 has been allotted out of the 8,73,000 given by the Govt of India and there is a reserve of 1,13,000 roundly or say 1,00,000 as some of the balance is sure to be wanted for some small items. The balance of 58,850 must be found if wanted from D.P.W. works by retrenchment.

7. From a financial point of view the strongest objection to the ~~existence~~ continuance of the scheme is to be found in the fact that the Act for the imposition of Light dues (which too must be an Imperial Act) is not yet in existence. A draft Act is submitted which should be pushed through as rapidly as possible if light dues are to be imposed.

Looking

---

8. Looking at the whole matter I think that all works which can be postponed should be so, and that only those works should be put in hand which are really necessary. A number of the works on the West Coast are of little use. If it be decided to go on with the work then the requisite Act to enable the levy of light dues should be passed without any delay as every day means loss. I think that in any event the cost of the scheme should be kept down to the lowest possible figure so as to keep the scale of light dues changeable as low as possible and that if possible it should be introduced piece meal and not as now en bloc. The only sound way to carry on the scheme is from the accumulations of light-dues.

3/5

c.g. 5-99
Rko. 5-99

91

~~Financial~~ DEPARTMENT. ~~24~~ 8

[G./124]

500—25-11-98.

98

C. No 698 From the Marine Department No. 862, dated 16. 2. 1899.

" ,, ,, , ,, , ,, 189 .

" ,, ,, , ,, , ,, 189 .

" ,, ,, , ,, , ,, 189 .

Hon Mr. [illegible].

Seen H.S. 9-5-99

Submitted very urgently to the Hon'ble Mr. [illegible] in view to the matter being brought before the next meeting of Council.

9.5-9.

7D

No 1275/12.5.99.

The file is forwarded to the Marine Department with the request that the information called for in Council today (~~11th~~ 12th May 1899) may be supplied

G. [illegible]
Chief Secretary

CWS
12.5.99

x Please file in [illegible]

Office
Take C No. from the Annexe list.
B.C. has originals of above which should be returned to Marine.
CWS
12/5/99

B.C. written
x [illegible] 12/5

2 two origls of Mar. C.S. notes returned to Marine today
G.S.S.
16/5/99.

To The Marine Dept

ildings

Recd [illegible] 17/5/99

H.E. 16.5.99 [illegible] No. 18

Light House Programme 92 ~~219~~ 10 8

471 Urgent

His Excellency the Governor
Hon'ble Mr A. T. Arundel C.S.I.
Hon'ble Mr H. M. Winterbotham

Marine Department.

(10

Note.

In 1890 Mr.W.T.Douglass, the eminent Lighthouse Engineer, was sent out from England ^ to report on the lighthouses on the coasts of India. His report on the Madras lighthouses is contained in G.O.1/25 Marine, dated 22nd January 1891. He suggested the introduction of the most modern appliances for illumination in various existing lighthouses of this Presidency and the adoption of occulting and flashing lights, and pointed out the importance of making the lights distinctive in character. He also recommended the construction of new buildings at various places; e.g Pigeon Island, Cape Comorin, Divi, Masulipatam, on the Sacramento Shoal, Vizagapatam and Bimilipatam.

2. Mr.Douglass' report was referred to the Presidency Port Officer, Commander Street, who was inclined to be satisfied with the existing fixed lights which he said were sufficiently distinctive in character for the purposes of the coasting vessels for whose use they were provided, and was not prepared to agree with Mr.Douglass as to the necessity for so many new lights. The Government agreed generally with Commander Street and considered that it would be desirable to offer a young Engineer Officer of a mechanical turn some inducement to make a study of lighthouse buildings

^ at the request (apparently) of the Govt. of India

1. Flag - A

It appears from this Note that our present light-house scheme owes its origin to the report on the imperfect condition of the light-houses, which was made by Mr. Douglass, an expert, in 1890. There is nothing here to show that the mercantile and shipping bodies moved in the matter, or were consulted. Perhaps it would be well now to ask the mercantile and shipping interests whether they would recommend the improvement of the light-houses, on the proposed scheme, the cost to be met by increased light Dues. The augmented rates, which would be necessary, should of course, be stated.

A. E. H.
17.5.99

I agree with H.E.
A.A. 18.5.99

HW 19-5-99

H.E. 16.5.99 R. 18.5.99. Hon. 18.5.99. R 19-5.99

buildings and apparatus in use in England and France during his absence from duty on furlough. Mr. Ashpitel was accordingly (2) selected and facilities were afforded to him while on leave in Europe to study lighthouse construction and illumination.

(2) Go. 230 Mar. d/ 27 May 1891
Flag-B

3. Meanwhile, in ~~in~~ 1891, Commander Bean, who was acting for Commander Street, submitted proposals for the construction of lighthouses at the following places:-

Godavari Point.
Sacramento Shoal.
Point Divi.
Masulipatam.
Bimilipatam.
and Vizagapatam.

But the Government deferred, on financial grounds, (3) sanction to the proposal.

(3) Flag-C (Go. 438 Mar.
d/ 8 Oct. 1891)

4. During the years 1892 to 1894, Commanders Street and Powell came up with proposals for the construction of lighthouses at Madras, Point Divi, Manapaud and Kundapur, and for improvements to those at Calingapatam, Pamban, Tellicherry &c., and Mr. Ashpitel was taken into consultation. He was subsequently (4) deputed to visit ~~the~~ localities and report on lighthouse requirements generally. The results of this inspection are recorded with (5) G.O. 245 Marine, dated 8th April 1896. His report covered a wide field and included proposals under the following heads:-

(4) Go. 318 Mar. d/ 10 Aug '94
Flag-D

(5) Flag-E

(I)

(I) the building of new lighthouses.
(2) the introduction of improved light apparatus.
(3) the improvement of existing lights.
(4) the complete reorganisation of the lighthouse establishments.
(5) the levy of light dues on shipping to meet the cost of his proposals.

It also embraced ~~and~~ various other minor matters connected with internal administration.

5. His programme of lighthouse improvement involved an expenditure of Rs.8,80,000. Of this sum Rs.8,00,000 were for "Sea" lights or those intended for general navigation. The latter amount included Rs.2,80,000 for eight new sets of apparatus, Rs.4,55,000 for improvements to existing towers and for new constructions, and the balance was for contingencies and Public Works supervision. The "Port" lights, or those intended for the navigation of ports and harbours, were to cost Rs.80,000. To meet the capital cost of the "sea lights" he proposed to raise a loan of Rs. 8,00,000, the interest and sinking fund for which, and its ultimate extinction, were to be provided by the levy of light dues. The proposal to raise a loan in the open market and the levy of light dues did not then commend itself to Government, who considered that the scheme could be started from the accumulated balances of Port Funds.

6. In order to give effect to the scheme of lighthouse improvement suggested

suggested

gested by Mr.Ashpitel and approved generally in G.O.245 Marine, dated 8th April 1896, a special Lighthouse Division, under Mr.Ashpitel, was formed under the authority of G.O.2156 W., dated 27th July 1896;(6) Mr.Ashpitel being called upon to frame a financial forecast of the amount required for expenditure. His financial forecast is printed with G.O.316 Marine,(7) dated 29th April 1898.-vide Appendix C., page 10. These proceedings also contain a complete forecast of Port Fund works other than lighthouses. The Government observed that the outlay involved could not be met from local resources alone within a reasonable time, and decided that the Government of India should be appealed to for assistance. That Government was accordingly asked in letter No.317 Mar.,(8) dated 29th April 1898 for a grant from Imperial Funds of Rs.6,68,000 in 1899-1900 and Rs.1,45,000 in 1900-1901. The Government of India refused(9) to entertain the application, and pointed out that trade and shipping and not the country generally should bear the cost of erecting lighthouses. They considered that any fresh expenditure to be incurred in erecting lighthouses on the Madras coast should be provided for by the levy of light dues. They further observed as follows:-

(6) Flag-Z

(7) Flag-X

(8) Flag-R

(9) G.O. 732 Mar of 30 Aug 98 Flag-U

"Some expenditure has already been incurred in the past in the erection of lighthouses on that coast and is

still

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 additional maintenance charges will be covered together with a small sinking fund charge by light dues to be now imposed."

7. The Madras Government, seeing that a free grant had been refused, asked(10) for a loan from Imperial Funds of Rs. 2,15,000, and promised that, should this loan be sanctioned, His Excellency the Governor in Council would arrange for the maintenance of lighthouses and port works generally from current receipts, supplemented by existing balances, and to carry out such other new Port Fund works as may be possible. It was explained that the grant of Rs. 6,68,000 previously asked for ~~involved~~ included works other than lighthouses, whereas the smaller sum of Rs.2,15,000 was confined to the amount required for the

(10) Letter 733 Mar of 30 Aug 98 Flag-Y

coming

~~2/54~~

97

coming year for new lighthouse works and apparatus alone. (11)

8. The Government of India in reply pointed out that if the lights to be constructed are of the nature of coast lights, the expenditure on them of Port Funds is inadmissible, such expenditure as regards lights, being limited by sub-section 5 of section 36 of the Indian Ports Act to "lights maintained chiefly for the benefit of vessels being in, or entering, or leaving, the port, or passing through the rivers or channels leading thereto"; while if they are "port" lights, they cannot properly be charged against capital outlay, which is intended to be liquidated hereafter by general light dues. They accordingly requested fuller ~~xxxxxxxxxxx~~ explanation of the conditions on which the proposed loan was asked for, and in what way the Government proposed to close the transaction.

(11) Ex 29 Mar & 10 Jan 99 Flag - P

9. In letter No.30 (12) Marine, dated 10th January 1899, the Madras Government reiterated its request for a ~~xxxxx~~ loan from Imperial Funds to the amount of Rs.2,58,~~650~~ 850, the amount to be refunded when the proposed light dues became available.

(12) Flag - L

10. The final result of the application (13) is contained in letter from the Finance and Commerce Department to the Chief Secretary to Government No.A.1429 L., dated 29th March 1899, in

(13) Flag - S

98

13B 13

in which a special addition of Rs. 8,73,000 is authorised to be made to the Provincial expenditure from the existing balance, and from which the Madras Government is at liberty to reappropriate money for expenditure on lighthouse construction, provided that R, G. it recovers it by the imposition of light dues./–

11. This latter course, therefore, seems to be the [illegible]. If any improvement is to be effected in the lighting of the Madras Coast, a scheme, detailed below, has been prepared with that object – but before proceeding further &c.

11. The above note on the history of the lighthouse programme has been compiled from information available at only ~~ahe~~. The opening portion may need amendment on receipt of earlier papers from Madras, but I submit it without waiting for them because the matter is urgent.

12. I beg to point out that the statement that the sea-going trade of Madras cannot bear the imposition at present of light dues rests, so, on the assertion of the Chief Secretary, unsupported

Sir H. Bliss was opposed to it.
AA

by facts. I trust that before it is decided to abandon or postpone this important lighthouse programme, the views of the Presidency Port Officer, the Collectors of maritime Districts, the Chamber of Commerce, & the principal firms engaged in shipping operations may be obtained.

To abandon the programme now would mean that Mr Ashpitel & his staff, now specially qualified for lighthouse construction, would be scattered about the Presidency on other work, & it would be difficult to make them available for a piece meal programme.

As will be seen from the linked file I have already called on Mr Ashpitel to report progress up to date, & at what stage work

---

.... DEPARTMENT.

READ the following :— 100

148

Circulated to

~~FOR ORDERS~~

in progress can be stopped without financial loss to Govt., & I beg that his report on the subject may be awaited.

13. I would also point out that the Govt. of India has laid down that the only proper method of obtaining funds for the construction of lighthouses is the imposition of light dues, & that if this method is adopted no further improvement in the lighting of the Coast, except with regard to port lights as distinguished from coast lights, is possible.

W Bell

16.5.21

Urgent

~~2~~ Marine .... DEPARTMENT. 13

READ the following :— 101

158

Lighthouse Programme

Circulated to H. E. The Governor
Hon'ble Mr G. T. Arundel CSI.
Hon'ble Mr H. M. Winterbotham

FOR ORDERS

Submitted in continuation of Note for orders on the above subject dated 16th inst.

It will be observed that the Govt. of India took the initiative in this matter

L Bell
17.5.99

[illegible] A.H. 18.5.99

AT 19.5.99

vide G.O. [illegible] of 18th June 1889 (Leg

HW 19-5-99

[43. / [illegible] 49.]

H. E. 25/5 R

18.5.99 [illegible] 19.5.99 R 19.5.99

G.O 59-60 Mar dy 19-2-90
G.O 268 Mar dy 18-6-89

102

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

again

READ the following :—

G.O.268 Marine, dated 18th June 1889.

G.O.25 Marine, dated 22nd January 1891.

G.O.245 Marine, dated 8th April 1896.

Read also

Letter from the Presidency Port Offr., No.1271/299G, d/1st September 1898.
Telegram from " " dated 27th September 1898.
From the Presy. Port Officer, No.1271/347G, d/8th October 1898.
" " " No.1271/402G, d/ 18th November 1898.
" " " No.1271/36G, dated 24th January 1899.

Lighthouse Programme & the Levy of light dues.

Circulated to

His Excellency the Governor
The Hon'ble Mr. A.T. Arundel C.S.I.
The Hon'ble Mr. H.M. Winterbotham

G.O. N-471 Mar dy 31 May '99

ORDER.

1.P.

A.G.H. 26.5.99

Flag A

A.H. 29.5.99

H.S. 30-5-99

In 1890, Mr. W.T. Douglass, Light-House Engineer was sent out from England at the request of the Government of India to report on the light houses on the coasts of India. His report on the Madras Light houses is contained in G.O 25 Marine, dated 22nd January 1891. He suggested the introduction of the most modern appliances for illumination and the adoption of occulting and flashing lights, and pointed out the importance of making the lights distinctive in character. He also recommended the construction of new buildings at various places, e.g. Pigeon Island, Cape Comorin, Divi, Masulipatam, on the Sacramento Shoal, Vizagapatam and Bimilipatam.

2. Since this period., the question of the improvement of these lights has received the almost continuous consideration of Government, and in 1894 Mr. Ashpitel was deputed to visit

Flag D

P. W. 42-A.
1,000—2-3-99.

H.G. 25/5 R 27/5 A.H. 29/5. R 30/5.

visit localities and report on lighthouse requirements generally. The results of this inspection are recorded with G.O.245 Mar dated 8th April 1896. His report covered a wide field and included proposals under the following heads:-

× Flag E

^ a copy of which is attached to these Proceedings.

(1) the building of new lighthouses.

(2) the introduction of improved light apparatus.

(3) the improvement of existing lights.

(4) the complete reorganisation of the lighthouse establishments.

(5) the levy of light dues on shipping to meet the cost of his proposals.

It also embraced various other minor matters connected with internal administration.

3. His programme of lighthouse improvement involved an expenditure of Rs.880000. Of this sum Rs.8,00,000 were for "coast" lights or those intended for general navigation. The latter amount included Rs. 2,80,000 for eight new sets of apparatus, Rs.4,55,000 for improvements to existing towers and for new constructions, and the balance was for contingencies and Public Works supervision. The "port" lights or those intended for the navigation of ports and harbours, were to cost Rs.80,000. To xx meet the capital cost of the "coast" lights, he proposed to raise a loan of Rs. 8,00,000. The interest and sinking fund for which and its ultimate extinction, were to be provided by the levy of light dues. The proposal to raise a loan in the open market and the levy of light dues did not then commend

commend itself to Government, who considered that the scheme could be started from the accumulated balances of Port Funds.

4. In order to give effect to the scheme of lighthouse improvement suggested by Mr. Ashpitel and approved generally in G.O. 245 Marine, dated 8th April 1896, a special Lighthouse Division, under Mr. Ashpitel, was formed under the authority of G.O. 2156 W. dated 27th July, 1896; Mr. Ashpitel being called upon to frame a financial forecast of the amount required for expenditure. His financial forecast is printed with G.O. 316 Marine, dated 29th April, 1898-vide Appendix C, page 10. These proceedings also contain a complete forecast of Port Fund works other than lighthouses. The Government observed that the outlay involved could not be met from local resources xxx alone, within a reasonable time, and decided that the Government of India should be appealed to, for assistance. That Government was accordingly asked in letter No. 317 Marine, dated 29th April 1898 for a grant from Imperial funds, of Rs.6,68,000 in 1899-1900 and Rs.1,45,000 in 1900-1901. The Government of India refused to entertain the application, and pointed out that trade and shipping, and not the country generally, should bear the cost of erecting lighthouses. They considered that any fresh expenditure to be incurred in erecting lighthouses on the Madras coast should be provided for by the levy of light dues. They further observed as follows:-

2 P

θ Flag F

× Flag K

⊗ Flag R

+ G.O. 732 Marine 30 Aug 98 Flag U

"Some expenditure has already been incurred

105

4 incurred in the past in the erection of lighthouses 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 additional maintenance charges will be covered, together with a small sinking fund charge, by light dues to be now imposed."

5. The Madras Government, seeing that a free grant had been refused, asked for a loan, from Imperial funds, of Rs.215000, and promised that, should this loan be sanctioned, His Excellency the Governor in Council would arrange for the maintenance of lighthouses and port works generally from current receipts, supplemented by existing balances, and to carry out such other new port fund works as may be possible. It was explained that the grant of Rs.6,68,000 previously asked for included works other than lighthouses, whereas the smaller sum of Rs.2,15,000, was confined to the amount required, for the coming year, for new lighthouse works and apparatus alone.

× Letter No. 733 Marine, 30 Aug 98.
Flag J.

6. The Government of India, in reply, pointed

[illegible] 24 Mar [illegible] 10 Jan 99

106

3

pointed out, that if the lights to be constructed are of the nature of coast lights, the expenditure on them of Port Funds is inadmissible, such expenditure as regards lights being limited by sub-section 5 of section 36 of the Indian Ports Act to "lights maintained chiefly for the benefit of vessels being in, or entering, or leaving, the port or passing through the rivers or channels leading thereto"; while if they are "port" lights, they cannot properly be charged against capital outlay which is intended to be liquidated hereafter by general light dues. They accordingly requested fuller explanation of the conditions on which the proposed loan was asked for, and in what way the Government proposed to close the transaction.

Flag R

7. In letter No.30 Marine, dated 10th January, 1899, the Madras Government reiterated its request for a loan, from Imperial Funds, to the amount of Rs. 2,58,850, the amount to be refunded when the proposed light dues became available.

+ Flag S

8. The final result of the application is contained in letter from the Finance and Commerce Department to the Chief Secretary to Government, No.A1429L dated 29th March, 1899 in which a special addition of Rs.8,73,000 is authorised to be made to the Provincial expenditure from the existing balance, and from which the Madras Government is at liberty to reappropriate money for expenditure on

lighthouse

~~8~~ 107

lighthouse construction, provided that it recovers it by the imposition of light dues.

9. This latter course therefore seems the only one open, if any improvement is to be effected in the lighting of the Madras coast, and a scheme, detailed below, has been prepared with that object. But before proceeding furtherin the matter, His Excellency the Governor in Council desires to be favoured with the views of the representatives of mercantile and shipping interests in this Presidency, both as to the necessity for the proposed improvements, & as to the ability of the trade to bear the proposed imposition of light dues.

---

108 48 7

~~India is not prepared to make any grant from Imperial Funds. If, therefore, the scheme of lighthouse improvement is to be carried on, the requisite funds must be raised by means of a loan in the open market, which will have to be served by the levy of light dues on shipping. This seems the only course open, but before proceeding further in the matter, His Excellency the Governor in Council desires to be favoured with the views of the representatives of mercantile and shipping interests in this Presidency.~~

10. The programme of lighthouse improvement as regards "coast" lights includes the following:-

	Coast Lights.	Estimated cost.
1.	Calingapatam.	5,000.
2.	Santapilli.	I,00,000.
3.	Vakalapudi.	I8,000.
4.	Sacramento.	I,00,000.
5.	Havelock Point.	I,18,620.
6.	Armeghon.	37,390.
7.	Pulicat.	27,300.
8.	Madras.	I,000.
9	Seven Pagodas.	49,920.
10	Negapatam.	5,000.
11	Tuticorin.	I3,000.
12	Manapad.	5I,230.
13	Muttam.	I0,450.
14	Tangasseri.	88,000.
15	Sacrifice Rock.	96,000.
16	Mulki.	68,600.
	Total.	7,89,5I0.
	or in round figures	8,00,000.

Note. Of these, the estimates for Nos 4, 5, 9, 12, 14, 15 & 16 provide for new lighthouses; the remaining estimates provide for improvements to existing lighthouses

Note. The estimates for some of the above are only approximate. Of the above the improvements at Havelock Point, Seven Pag Manapad, Muttum and Mulki are already in hand.

11.

5 P

11. The question as to the classes of vessels that should be taxed to meet the expenditure on "Coast lights" and the rates to be imposed will now be considered. It may be perhaps assumed that all vessels which derive benefit from the "Coast lights" should contribute, and that the rate should be determined by the amount or frequency of the benefit.

12. Mr. Ashpitel proposed in his report embodied with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, the imposition of a light due on the following classes of vessels at the rates specified against each class :—

On each coasting vessel—12 pies per ton per month.

On each Native craft—6 pies per ton per month.

On each Foreign steamer—7 pies per ton per voyage.

---

6 P

This method, though simple and easy of collection in regard to coasting vessels, would not be equitable for the reason that the incidence of the tax would weigh equally heavily on *all* coasting vessels, however much or little they used the lights. A better method would perhaps be to charge per voyage, to make a distinction between vessels using the lights of the whole coast, *e.g.*, British Indian and Asiatic Steamers, and those using only a portion of them, to render the dues identical for both the eastern and western group of ports, and make them leviable once per voyage on vessels using the lights of each group.

13. The Presidency Port Officer has, ~~on these and other suggestions which are contained in memorandum No. 416 E., dated 11th August 1898, and after discussion with the undersigned as to certain classes and rates,~~ proposed the following classification of vessels and rates of dues :—

Classes of vessels.	*Rate of due proposed and how often leviable.*
Class I. All steam vessels engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta and Bombay, and between Rangoon and Madras, *viâ* ports north of Madras.	Nine pies or As. 1–6 per ton per voyage for each group, provided that if no port in the eastern group be touched at, the due for that group shall not be levied. *Note.*—A vessel bound from Calcutta to Bombay unless she called at a port in the eastern group would not sight any of the lights until she arrived on the West coast and only West coast dues would be leviable.
$$\frac{*\,63{,}746\times 9\times 8}{12\times 16}=\text{Rs. } 23{,}905.$$	The tonnage of arrivals under this class at Madras during 1897–98 is reported to have been 63,746 tons. Each vessel or its substitute is estimated to make use of the lights on each coast not less than eight times a year. On this basis, and at 9 pies per ton the annual receipts for each group will be Rs. 23,905 *. For both the groups, the receipts will be doubled, *i.e.*, 47,810. At the higher rate of As. 1–6 per ton, the receipts will be twice 47,810 or Rs. 95,620.
Class II. All steam vessels, British and Foreign, to or from Europe, the Australian, African and other British Colonies including the Straits Settlements and Ceylon and vessels from Indian ports and ports in	Six pies or 12 pies per ton per voyage per group. One payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days; payable on arrival at a port in the Madras Presidency.

Burma which, in the ordinary course of a voyage, will pass or derive benefit from any of the coast lights in the Madras Presidency, and vessels calling at not more than one port in a group, but which do not come under the conditions of Class I.

The Presidency Port Officer estimates receipts under this class from three sources:—

First.—From vessels which may be expected to pay dues to the eastern group *once* during the year; the tonnage of these vessels during 1897–98 is stated to be 166,169 tons;

Secondly.—From what the Presidency Port Officer calls "Semi-coasting" vessels, whose tonnage during the same period amounted to 44,441 tons; and

Thirdly.—From vessels which may be expected to render themselves liable to payment of dues to the eastern group, at least three times during the year; their tonnage for 1897–98 is reported to have been 90,631 tons. At the lower rate of 6 pies per ton the receipts from this class will amount to Rs. 15,079.* At one anna, the receipts will be doubled, *i.e.*, Rupees 30,158.

To this class must be added the steamers plying between Colombo and Tuticorin, originally included in class V, but now entered, ~~at the suggestion of the undersigned,~~ in class II. The dues derivable will be Rs. 376 per annum at the lower rate, and Rs. 752 at the higher rate.

(Intld.) ~~W.B.deW.~~

	RS.
* Tonnage of vessels liable *once* during the year 166,169 + 44,441 = 210,610 tons.	
At 6 pies per ton, the receipts = $\frac{210,610 \times 6}{12 \times 16}$ ..	6,582
Tonnage of vessels liable *thrice* during the year = 90,631 tons.	
At 6 pies per ton, the receipts will be $\frac{90,631 \times 6 \times 3}{12 \times 16}$	8,497
Total ..	15,079

Class III.

All steam vessels from Bombay or ports in the Bombay Presidency, bound direct for Colombo and from Colombo direct for ports in the Bombay Presidency.

Eight pies or 16 pies per ton per voyage payable on arrival at or departure from *Bombay*.

The Presidency Port Officer bases his estimate of receipts from this class from the number of P. and O. steamers on the China line of which there are two fortnightly—one up and one down. While vessels of other lines will also be liable, this basis is apparently adopted as a safe one. The tonnage of these vessels may be taken as 2,000 each. For one month, the tonnage liable to dues will be 8,000, and for one year 96,000 tons. At 8 pies per ton the receipts will be $\frac{96,000 \times 8}{12 \times 16}$ = Rs. 4,000. At 16 pies, the receipts will be Rs. 8,000.

70

Class IV.

All sailing vessels of 15 tons and upwards coasting or otherwise.

Four pies or 8 pies per ton per voyage per group; one payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days.

Large sailing vessels from the United Kingdom very seldom visit this coast and the Presidency Port Officer considers it unnecessary to make any special rate for them. The aggregate tonnage of native sailing craft during 1896–97 was 713,000 tons. This shipping paid in port dues Rs. 22,971 at one anna per ton for every 60 days. Upon this basis, the Presidency Port Officer estimates receipts from light dues (leviable at 4 or 8 pies per ton) at $\frac{1}{3}$ or $\frac{2}{3}$ of the port dues, *i.e.*, at $\frac{22,971 \times 1}{3}$ or $\frac{22,971 \times 2}{3}$ = Rs. 7,657 or Rs. 15,314.

Class V.

Steamers from Bombay bound for the minor ports of South Canara whose voyage terminates at Mangalore.

Three pies or 6 pies per ton every thirty days.

These vessels will benefit by one or two lights only and hence the lower rate proposed. It is reported that there are eight steamers aggregating 2,650 tons performing the service between Bombay and Mangalore. Owing to the closing of the ports for the south-west monsoon, it is estimated that they will pay dues six times each year. The receipts will then be $\frac{2,650 \times 3 \times 6}{12 \times 16}$ = Rs. 248 or Rs. 496 at the higher rate.

Class VI.

Steamers plying between Madras and Rangoon.

Seven pies or 14 pies per ton every thirty days.

The aggregate tonnage of vessels under this class for 1897–98 was 8,199 tons. It is estimated that each vessel of this class will make not less than twelve trips per annum; at 7 pies per ton they will pay $\frac{8,199 \times 12 \times 7}{12 \times 16}$ = Rs. 3,587 or Rs. 7,174 at the higher rate.

14. ~~9~~. The total approximate receipts from the proposed levy of light dues as estimated by the Presidency Port Officer will thus come to Rs. 78,569 * at the lower, or Rs. 1,57,138* at the higher, rate. This will be the amount available for (1) maintenance of coast lights, (2) payment of interest on capital outlay, and (3) provision of a Sinking fund for the extinction of the loan.

15. ~~10~~. No precise information is at present available as to the amount that will have to be set apart for maintenance; some of the lighthouses not having yet been built, and their improved illuminating apparatus brought into use. A rough forecast is, therefore, all that is possible. The following figures given in Mr. Ashpitel's report recorded with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, may, perhaps, be adopted :—

Coast Lights.	Maintenance charges.
	RS.
1. Calingapatam	3,900
2. Santapilli	5,500
3. Vakalapudi	3,800
4. Sacramento	5,300
5. ~~Kistna~~ Havelock Point	5,100
6. Armeghon	3,800
7. Pulicat	3,800
8. Madras	4,600
9. Seven Pagodas	4,800
10. Negapatam	1,200
11. Tuticorin	1,150
12. Manapad	5,000
13. Muttum	5,300
14. Tangasséri	4,600
15. ~~Tellicherry~~ Sacrifice Rock	540 1200
16. Mulki	5,100
Total ..	~~63,490~~ 70,150

On this basis, the lower rates of light dues, calculated to yield Rs. 78,569, will be insufficient to pay for maintenance † and interest ‡ charges. So these rates are out of the question. On the other hand, the higher rates will, as will be seen from the accompanying statement A, liquidate a loan of Rs. ~~6,73,000~~ 8,00,000 in ~~9~~ 12 years after paying interest at 3½ per cent. on capital outlay and meeting maintenance charges. They therefore seem to be unnecessarily high and a statement (B attached) has been prepared showing two rates intermediate between those proposed by the Presidency Port Officer which will liquidate the loan

† ~~63,490~~. 70,150

‡ ~~23,555~~ 28,000 for 1st year on a loan of Rs. ~~6,73,000~~ at 3½ per cent.

~~87,045~~ [illegible]

8º

Receipts.

	Lower rate.	Higher rate.
	RS.	RS.
*Class I	47,810	95,620
" II	15,455	30,910
" III	4,000	8,000
" IV	7,657	15,314
" V	248	496
" VI	3,587	7,174
Total ..	78,569	1,57,138

NOTE.—[The above] alterations [of 15,455 and 248 for 15,079 and 436 under 'lower rate' and of 30,910 and 496 for 30,158 and 872 under 'higher rate' respectively] have been made because of the inclusion of Tuticorin-Colombo steamers in Class II instead of in Class V. As the difference is not much the totals have not been altered.

~~(Intld.) W.B. deW.~~

9º

in ~~15~~ 21 and ~~25~~ 49 years, respectively. Under the proposed draft Bill, referred to *infra*, the Government is empowered, subject to a maximum, to raise or lower the rates. There seems, therefore, no objection to the higher rates being entered in the schedule and such rates, not exceeding them, levied as may, from time to time, be found necessary. With the double object of imposing as light a due as possible and of obviating any considerable reduction of the dues when the loan is liquidated—only maintenance charges having then to be met from light dues—the lower rate as entered in column 4 of statement B has been calculated ~~is recommended for adoption, which~~ will extinguish the loan in ~~25~~ 49 years. The proposed loan of Rs. ~~6,73,000~~ 8,00,000 will cover all capital charges on account of coast lights and admit of the expenditure already incurred this year and debited to Port funds being refunded.

This

16. ~~11~~. The framing of the legislative enactment has now to be considered. Attached ~~to this note~~ is a rough draft of the proposed Bill. It is an adaptation of the Burma Coast Lights Act IX of 1879, and comparatively few deviations from that Act have been made in the draft. The Burma Act is an Imperial enactment and the proposed enactment for this Presidency should also, it is thought, be an Imperial measure as it extends to territories outside the limits of the Presidency of Fort St. George. Under Rule 3 of the précis of Legislative standing orders "no provision should be made in any Bill to be introduced into any Legislative Council in India for the creation of such * a fund, until the expediency of the measure has been specially considered in the Finance Department of the Government of India." The proposed Bill aims at creating such a special fund, and it will thus have also to be laid before the Government of India in the Financial Department before it can be introduced into the Legislative Council.

* i.e., appropriations from which are restricted to defined purposes.

17. ~~10~~. The views of the mercantile bodies and agents are also invited on the draft Bill, which will also be referred to the Presidency Port Officer and the Advocate General, for remarks.

To
The Presidency Port Officer 3
" Government Solicitor 3
Messrs. Arbuthnot & Co. Madras 3
" Binny & Co. Madras 3
" Wilson & Co. Madras 3
" Gordon Woodroffe & Co. Madras 3
" Best & Co. Madras 3
" Parry & Co., Madras. 3
The Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Madras 3
" Chairman, Madras Trades Assocn. 3
" " European Chamber of Commerce, Cocanada 3
" " Native — do — do 3
" " Cochin Chamber of Commerce 3
Messrs. Adamson, MacTaggart & Co., Negapatam 3
" Burnett & Son, Tellicherry 3
" Peirce, Leslie & Co., Calicut 3
" Stuart Hall & Co. Vizagapatam. 3

24.5.98

Financial Dept.

Lighthouse Division

tons, but the Presidency Port Officer has explained that if this limit is adopted in Madras, a large number of vessels in the West Coast will escape the dues. The limit proposed is therefore the same as for port dues, viz., 15 tons.

Section 4 shows when the dues become payable. A clause has been added to this section making the port of Madras a part of the eastern group. This seems necessary with reference to section 37 (1) of the Indian Ports Act, which declares that Madras shall *not* be grouped with any other port for the purposes of maintenance of its Port fund accounts.

Section 5.—The power to vary rates is given to the Governor in Council, subject to the prior sanction of the Governor-General in Council. This is in accordance with local usage in similar cases.

Section 16 of the Burma Act has been so far modified-(*vide* section 15 of the draft) as to place the duty of publishing accounts on the Government of Madras instead of on the Government of India.

The schedule attached to the draft Bill shows the rates and mode of collection of the light dues.

13. The draft Bill might be referred to the Presidency Port Officer and the Advocate-General for remarks and then forwarded to the Government of India, Financial Department, for approval, prior to its introduction into the Supreme Legislative Council. The last step should, perhaps, be taken in the Legislative Department of the Madras Government.

(Intld.) R.P.

(Intld.) W.B.deW.
31-1-99.

I think that before this is done, our Financial Branch should see the papers and report upon the proposals therein made.

(Intld.) A.E.H.
3-2-99.

---

10 Nov

A. Light dues – Financial forecast. (Revised)

Year	Loan at beginning of the year	Annual receipts from light dues at maximum rates –	Maintenance Charges	Interest on loan at 3½ per cent on amount in Column 2	Total of Columns 4 and 5	Balance available for extinction of loan, (Column 3 – Column 6)	Loan outstanding at Close of the year (Column 2 – Column 7)	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	Rs	Rs	Rs	Rs	Rs	Rs	Rs	
1st	8,00,000	1,57,138	70,150	28,000	98,150	58,988	7,41,012	
2nd	7,41,012	1,57,138	70,150	25,935	96,085	61,053	6,79,959	
3rd	6,79,959	1,57,138	70,150	23,799	93,949	63,189	6,16,770	
4th	6,16,770	1,57,138	70,150	21,587	91,737	65,401	5,51,369	
5th	5,51,369	1,57,138	70,150	19,298	89,448	67,690	4,83,679	
6th	4,83,679	1,57,138	70,150	16,929	87,079	70,059	4,13,620.	
7th	4,13,620	1,57,138	70150	14,477	84,627	72,511	3,41,109	
8th	3,41,109	1,57,138	70150	11,939	82,089	75,049	2,66,060	
9th	2,66,060	1,57,138	70150	9,312	79,462	77,676	1,88,384	
10th	1,88,384	1,57,138	70150	6,593	76,743	80,395	1,07,989	
11th	1,07,989	1,57,138	70150	3,780	73,930	83,208	24,781	
12th	24,781	1,57,138	70150	867	71,017	86,121	a surplus of Rs 61340 after extinction of the loan	

P.K.S. 22-5-99

R.P. 22 May 99.

11 Bm

A. LIGHT DUES—Financial Forecast.

Year.	Loan at beginning of the year.	Annual receipts from light dues.	Maintenance charges.	Interest on loan at 3½ per cent. on amount in column 2.	Total of columns 4 and 5.	Balance available for extinction of loan (column 3 — column 6).	Loan outstanding at close of the year (column 2—column 7).
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
1st ..	6,73,000	1,57,138	63,490	23,555	87,045	70,093	6,02,907
2nd ..	6,02,907	1,57,138	63,490	21,102	84,592	72,546	5,30,361
3rd ..	5,30,361	1,57,138	63,490	18,563	82,053	75,085	4,55,276
4th ..	4,55,276	1,57,138	63,490	15,935	79,425	77,713	3,77,563
5th ..	3,77,563	1,57,138	63,490	13,215	76,705	80,433	2,97,13
6th ..	2,97,130	1,57,138	63,490	10,400	73,890	83,248	2,13,882
7th ..	2,13,882	1,57,138	63,490	7,486	70,976	86,162	1,27,720
8th ..	1,27,720	1,57,138	63,490	4,470	67,960	89,178	38,542
9th ..	38,542	1,57,138	63,490	1,349	64,839	92,299	A surplus of 53,757 after extinction of the loan.

(Intld) R.P.
18-1-99.

Has been revised so as to provide for a loan of 8 lakhs which will probably be necessary as shown by later figures.
[illegible]
22·[illegible]

B.

Class.	Tonnage.	Rate fixed by the Secretary.	Rate now proposed.	Receipts calculated at the rate entered in column 3.	Receipts calculated at the rate entered in column 4.
1	2	3	4	5	6
				RS.	RS.
I.	63,746 tons	15 pies	12 pies	79,683	63,746
II.	210,610 (leviable once) .. .. 90,631 (leviable three times) .. 1,000 (leviable twelve times) ..	9 ,,	9 ,,	23,180	23,180
III.	96,000 tons	10 ,,	10 ,,	5,000	5,000
IV.	Based on the port dues which amounted to Rs. 22,971 at 1 anna per ton.	6 ,,	4 ,,	11,486	7,657
V.	2,650 tons (leviable six times) ..	6 ,,	6 ,,	497	497
VI.	8,199 tons (leviable twelve times) ..	10 ,,	9 ,,	5,124	4,612
	Total ..	..	..	(a) 1,24,970	(b) 1,04,692

(a) This will liquidate the loan in 15 years. (b) The loan will run for 25 years.

21 49

(Intld.) R.P.
31-1-99.

(Intld.) W.B.DEW.
31-1-99.

No. 86-E.

Transferred to the Financial Department.

16th February 1899.

(Signed) A. W. SMART, Col., R.E.,
Ag. Secretary to Government.

Draft Bill to provide for the levy of dues for the use of Coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George.

Preamble.

Whereas it is expedient for the maintenance of coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George to levy dues on vessels passing or deriving benefit from such lights; It is hereby enacted as follows:—

Preliminary.

Short title.

1. This Act may be called "The Madras Coast Light Dues Act, 1899."

Commencement.

It shall come into force on the . . . . and it shall extend

Local Extent.

to the territories respectively administered by the Governors of Fort St. George and Bombay in Council and the Lieutenant-Governors of Bengal and Burma.

Saving.

But nothing herein contained shall apply to any vessel belonging to or in the service of Her Majesty or the Government of India or to any vessel of war belonging to any Foreign Prince or State.

Interpretation clause.

2. In this Act ~~unes~~ is there is something repugnant in the subject or context—

unless/

"Customs Collector."

"Customs Collector" means a Customs Collector appointed under the Sea Customs Act, 1878, and includes any person appointed by the Local Government by name or in virtue of his office to discharge the functions of a Customs Collector under this Act at any port.

"Vessel."

"Vessel" includes any thing made for the conveyance by water of human beings or of property.

"Master."

"Master" when used in relation to any vessel means any person (except a Pilot or Harbour Master) having for the time being the charge or control of such vessel.

On refusal to pay dues or expenses, the Collector may distrain and sell.

9. If the master of any vessel refuses or neglects to pay to the Customs Collector on demand by him the amount of any dues or expenses payable in respect of such vessel under this Act, the Customs Collector may distrain or arrest such vessel and the tackle, apparel and furniture belonging thereto, or any part thereof, and detain the same until the amount of such dues or expenses is paid; and in case any part of such dues or expenses, or of the costs of the distress or arrest, or of the keeping of the same, remains unpaid for the space of five days next after any such distress or arrest so made, the Customs Collector may cause the vessel or other thing so distrained or arrested to be sold, and with the proceeds of such sale may satisfy such dues, expenses and costs (including the costs of sale) remaining unpaid, and shall render the surplus (if any) to the master of such vessel upon demand.

No port clearance to be granted until dues, &c., are paid.

10. The officer of Government whose duty it is to grant a port clearance for any vessel shall not grant such port clearance until her master or some other person has paid, or secured to the satisfaction of such officer, the amount of all dues, expenses and costs with which such vessel is chargeable under this Act, and of any fine to which any person is liable for anything done by him in contravention of this Act.

Master to specify on demand voyage on which vessel is bound.

11. The master of any vessel departing from or entering any port in British India upon, or in the course of, or at the termination of, any voyage, shall, upon the demand of the Customs Collector, specify upon what voyage she is or has been bound.

Penalty for evading payment of dues, &c.

12. If the master of any vessel evades, or attempts to evade, the payment of any coast light dues, expenses or costs payable in respect of such vessel under this Act he shall be punished with fine which may extend to two hundred rupees.

Determination of disputes under Act.

13. If any dispute arises as to whether any vessel is chargeable with any coast light dues, expenses or costs under this Act, or as to the amount of such dues, expenses or costs, such dispute shall upon application made in that behalf by either of the disputing parties, be heard and determined in the towns of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay by a Presidency Magistrate and elsewhere by any Magistrate exercising at the place where the dispute arises powers under the Code of Criminal Procedure not less than those of a Magistrate of the second class. All decisions under this section shall be final.

Prosecutions under other Laws.

Saving of prosecutions under other laws.

14. Nothing herein contained shall prevent any person from being prosecuted under any other law for any act or ommission which constitutes an offence against this Act: provided that no person shall be punished twice for the same act or omission.

Statement of Receipts and Expenditure.

Statement of receipts and expenditure to be published.

15. The Governor in Council of Fort St. George shall on or before the first day of October in each year publish in the *Fort St. George Gazette* a statement showing the amount received on account of coast light dues during the year ending on the thirty-first day of March last preceding, and the amount expended during the same period on the maintenance of coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George.

"Voyage"

"Voyage" means the whole distance between a vessel's place of departure and her final place of arrival; but the return of a vessel from any place shall, notwithstanding the terms of any charter party, be deemed a distinct voyage.

Coast Light Dues.

Coast light dues payable in respect of vessels of 15 tons.

3. For the purpose of maintaining coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George, a toll, hereinafter called "Coast light dues" shall be paid in respect of every vessel of the burden of 15 tons and upwards making any voyage mentioned in the schedule hereto annexed of the rate specified in column 2 thereof.

Dues when payable.

4. The said coast light dues shall become due and payable—

(*a*) in the case of a vessel clearing out of a port in British India upon any such voyage previous to the grant of any port clearance;

(*b*) In the case of a vessel entering a port in British India in the course or at the termination of any such voyage—immediately upon her entering such port: provided that the said dues shall not be levied more than once in the same port or group of ports on any vessel in the course of the same voyage and that for the purposes of this Act, the port of Madras shall be reckoned as belonging to the eastern group of ports in the Presidency of Fort St. George any provisions to the contrary in any other enactment notwithstanding.

Power to vary rates of dues.

5. With the prior sanction of the Governor-General in Council, the Governor in Council of Fort St. George may from time to time, by notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, reduce or raise the rate of coast light dues in respect of all vessels or any particular class of vessels.

Provided that such rate shall not in any case exceed the rate fixed by section 3.

Collection of dues.

6. The Customs Collector shall collect the coast light dues,

Voucher to be given.

and shall grant to the person paying the same a voucher in writing under his hand setting forth the name of his office, the port at which the coast light dues are paid, the amount so paid, the name, tonnage and other proper description of the vessel in respect of which such payment is made, and the voyage on which she is or has been bound.

Master to report arrival.

7. Within 24 hours after the arrival within a port of any vessel chargeable with coast light dues, the master of such vessel shall give notice of such arrival to the Customs Collector.

Tonnage of vessel chargeable with coast light dues how ascertained.

8. In order to ascertain the tonnage of any vessel chargeable with coast light dues, the following rules shall be observed:—

If registered.

(*a*) If such vessel be a British registered vessel or a vessel registered under Act No. X of 1841 or Act No. XI of 1850, or under any other law for the time being in force for the registration of vessels in India, the Customs Collector may require the owner or master of such vessel, or any other person having possession of her register to produce such register for inspection. If any such owner, master or other person neglects or refuses to produce such register or otherwise to satisfy the Customs Collector as to what is the true tonnage of the vessel in respect of which such coast light dues are payable, he shall be punished with fine which may extend to one hundred rupees, and the Customs Collector may cause such vessel to be measured and the tonnage thereof to be ascertained; and in such case, the owner or master of such vessel shall also be liable to pay the expenses of such measurement.

If not registered.

(*b*) If such vessel be not a British registered vessel or a vessel registered under Act No. X of 1841 or Act No. XI of 1850 or under any other law for the time being in force for the registration of vessels in India, and the owner or master thereof fails to satisfy the Customs Collector as to what is her true tonnage according to the mode of measurement prescribed by the law in force for the time being for regulating the measurement of British registered vessels, the Customs Collector shall cause such vessel to be measured and the tonnage thereof, according to the mode aforesaid, to be ascertained; and in such case the owner or master of such vessel shall be liable to pay the expenses of such measurement.

SCHEDULE.

Vessels chargeable with Light dues, rate of Light dues and frequency of payment.

Vessels chargeable.	Rate of Light dues.	How often chargeable.
CLASS I.		
All steam vessels engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta and Bombay and between Rangoon and Madras *viâ* ports north of Madras.	1½ annas per ton.	Once during a voyage for each group, provided that if no port in the eastern group be touched at, the due for that group shall not be paid.
CLASS II.		
All steam vessels, British and Foreign, to or from Europe, the Australian, African and other British Colonies, including the Straits Settlements and Ceylon and vessels from Indian ports and ports in Burma which in the ordinary course of a voyage will pass or derive benefit from any of the coast lights in the Madras Presidency and vessels calling at more than one port in the group, and which do not come under the conditions of Class I.	12 pies per ton ..	Once per voyage per group; one payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days; payable on arrival at a port in the Presidency of Fort St. George.
CLASS III.		
All steam vessels from Bombay or ports in the Bombay Presidency bound direct for Colombo and from Colombo direct to ports in the Bombay Presidency.	16 pies per ton ..	Once during a voyage payable on arriva at or departure from Bombay.
CLASS IV.		
All sailing vessels of 15 tons and upwards, coasting or otherwise.	8 pies per ton ..	Once during a voyage for each group. One payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days.
CLASS V.		
All steam vessels from Bombay bound for the minor ports of South Canara whose voyage terminates at Mangalore.	6 pies per ton ..	Once for every thirty days.
CLASS VI.		
All steam vessels plying direct between Madras and Rangoon.	14 pies per ton ..	Once for every thirty days.

STATEMENT OF OBJECTS AND REASONS.

WHEREAS the Government of Fort Saint George has undertaken an extensive and costly scheme of lighthouse construction and illumination on the coasts of the Madras Presidency, and whereas it is necessary to raise funds in the open market for the capital outlay thereon, it is proposed in the accompanying Bill to levy a coast light due on vessels deriving benefit from the lights in question; the proceeds of the due being applied to payment of—

(1) the interest on the loan; (2) a sinking fund for its final extinction; and (3) the maintenance of the lights.

(Intld.) R. P.

7.6
Marine 7.6.

6/6

No. 471, MARINE, 31ST MAY 1899.

Proof for approval.

28.6.05

28/6/05

Press

T.H.D 28/6/05

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following papers:—

G.O., No. 268, Marine, dated 18th June 1889.

ABSTRACT.—Communicating to the Presidency Port Officer, for information and guidance, Government of India Resolution appointing Mr. W. T. Douglass on the special duty of inspecting lighthouses on the Indian coasts.

G.O., Nos. 25, 26, Marine, dated 22nd January 1891.

ABSTRACT.—Passing orders on Mr. W. T. Douglass' report of his inspection of the lighthouses in Madras Presidency and on the Presidency Port Officer's remarks thereon, and directing that the proceedings be communicated to the Secretary of State and the Government of India.

G.O., No. 230, Marine, dated 26th May 1891.

ABSTRACT.—Directing that the Secretary of State be addressed in view to Mr. F. W. Ashpitel, Assistant Engineer, First grade, at present in England on furlough, being permitted to undertake the study of lighthouse buildings and apparatus in use in England and France.

G.O., No. 438, Marine, dated 8th October 1891.

ABSTRACT.—Informing the Presidency Port Officer that at present and until the new provincial contract is settled the Government cannot entertain the proposals made for reorganizing the lights on the East coast.

G.O., No. 23, Marine, dated 19th January 1892.

ABSTRACT.—Recording resolution of the Government of India passing orders on the correspondence regarding the action taken by local Governments on the suggestions and recommendations made by Mr. Douglass in connection with lighthouses on the coasts of India.

G.O., No. 107, Marine, dated 20th March 1893.

ABSTRACT.—Authorizing the Accountant-General to pay Rs. 1,000 to Mr. Ashpitel as a bonus and directing that the report and plans be forwarded to the Superintendent, Revenue Survey, for report regarding reproduction of the illustrations.

G.O., No. 431, Marine, dated 6th December 1893.

ABSTRACT.—Stating that Government is unable to pass any general order regarding Mr. F. W. Ashpitel accompanying the Presidency Port officer on his annual inspection of lighthouses, but that the Presidency Port Officer should apply for his services on such occasions as they may seem requisite that Mr. Ashpitel cannot be made available to accompany him on his approaching visit to Pámban and agreeing with the views of the Presidency Port Officer as to the respective duties of himself and Mr. Ashpitel in regard to lighthouses.

G.O., No. 80, Marine, dated 8th March 1894.

Abstract.—Modifying paragraph 3 of G.O., No. 431, Marine, dated 6th December 1893, as to the respective duties of Mr. Ashpitel and the Presidency Port Officer in regard to lighthouses.

G.O., No. 213, Marine, dated 8th June 1894.

Abstract.—Inquiring of the Presidency Port Officer for what period the services of Mr. Ashpitel are required for inspecting the coast-lights stating that Mr. Ashpitel's remarks on the suitability of the old Madras light for Point Divi will be awaited and that his opinion should also be taken on the Presidency Port Officer's proposals regarding the lights at certain other places and requesting the Public Works department to furnish plans and estimates for certain improvements to the lighthouse at Point Divi.

G.O., No. 318, Marine, dated 10th August 1894.

Abstract.—Calling for proposals in regard to the removal of the Hope Island light to a spot whence it would completely guard vessels from the Sacramento Shoal and directing that Mr. Ashpitel be deputed on special duty to inspect and report on all the lights along the coast.

---

communicating to the P.P.O. P.W.D. proceedings No. 2156 W. dated 27-7-96

G.O., Nos. 245, 246, Marine, dated 8th April 1896.

Abstract.—Forwarding copy of proceedings reviewing a report by Mr. F. W. Ashpitel on the lighthouses in the Madras Presidency.

---

l.c

G.O., No. 562, Marine, dated 19th August 1896.

Abstract.—Directing that Mr. F. W. Ashpitel be placed on special duty on relief of the charge of the Coimbatore division, in view to the details being worked out and a separate division organized for giving effect to the scheme of lighthouse improvement already approved, and requesting the Financial department to settle the question of raising the requisite funds for carrying out the scheme as soon as possible.

Recording

G.O., No. 513, Marine, dated 4th June 1897.

Abstract.—Letter from the Presidency Port Officer submitting a report of inspection of certain ports and lighthouses ~~recorded with remarks.~~

317

G.O., No. 316, Marine, dated 29th April 1898.

Abstract.—Orders directing that the Government of India be appealed to for a grant from Imperial funds to admit of the proposed schemes of lighthouse and port improvements being carried out within the period contemplated.

G.O., No. 442, Marine, dated 1st June 1898.

Abstract.—Despatch from the Secretary of State forwarding copy of a letter containing the observations of the Elder Brethren of Trinity House on Mr. Ashpitel's report on lighthouses in Madras, communicated to Mr. Ashpitel and the Presidency Port Officer with instructions to the former to consider and report on the suggestions made by that body.

S. Ramaiya

3

G.O., No. 587, Marine, dated 6th July 1898.

Abstract.—Stating that, pending reply from the Government of India, it does not seem desirable to forward to the India Office the indent for apparatus for lighthouses to be constructed in the Madras Presidency, and ordering that the Government of India be requested to pass early orders on the application for aid from Imperial funds.

Memorandum No. 416-E., dated 11th August 1898.

Finance &
Commerce
Deptl letter
No 3235 F.R
D 27-7-98

The Government of India has now replied to the application of this Government for a grant from Imperial funds in aid of the provision of lights for shipping on the coasts of this Presidency. It is not prepared to make any grant from Imperial funds, but considers that trade and shipping, and not the country generally, should bear the burden, and suggests legislation for the imposition of light dues.

2. Mr. Ashpitel proposed* the imposition of light dues at the following rates:—

On each coasting steamer	..	..	..	12 pies per ton per month
On each native craft	..	..	..	6 pies do. do.
On each foreign steamer	..	..	..	7 pies do. per voyage

and estimated that the proceeds would amount to about Rs. 1,30,000 per annum.

3. It is not known how Mr. Ashpitel arrived at his total, as no information is given as to the number of ships of each kind that would pay the dues. The Presidency Port Officer is requested to be so good as to verify Mr. Ashpitel's calculation as to the expected proceeds, or to give statistics on which accurate data can be framed.

4. Mr. Ashpitel's method for coasting vessels, though easy of collection, would not, it is thought, be equitable, because vessels would pay the same dues however much or little they used the lights. The proper course seems to be to charge per voyage and to make a distinction between vessels using the lights of the whole coast, *e.g.*, British India and Asiatic steamers, and those using only a portion of them, *i.e.*, the dues might be identical for the Eastern and Western groups of ports and levied twice, say at Vizagapatam and Tuticorin for vessels using the lights of both groups, Tuticorin being included in the Western group for purposes of collection.

5. But besides the coasting trade and foreign steamers, we should levy dues on the whole of the shipping which passes between—

(1) Bombay and Colombo and the far east, and
(2) Calcutta and Colombo.

This trade will be properly charged at a lower rate, say a quarter of the rate charged on the coasting trade. The Presidency Port Officer is also requested to be so good as to calculate the income from light dues levied in this manner and state how best it may be collected.

W. B. deWINTON,
Secretary to Govt., ~~*P.W. Dept.*~~ Marine

To the Presidency Port Officer.

* Page 11 of G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, and table X of the same Government Order.

G.O., No. 732, Marine, dated 30th August 1898.

Abstract.—Ordered that the Government of India be informed that, on receipt of the requisite information, formal proposals for levying light dues for providing additional lights on the Madras Coast will be laid before that Government 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 official year.

G.O., No. 736, Marine, dated 31st August 1898.

Abstract.—~~A~~ Recording Letter from the Superintendent of Works, Lighthouse division, replying to the observations of the Elder Brethren of Trinity House on his report on lighthouses in the Madras Presidency, ~~recorded with remark~~.

6 3

G.O., No. 29, Marine, dated 10th January 1899.

ABSTRACT.—Directing that the Government of India be requested to make a grant from Imperial funds of Rs. 2,58,850 for the prosecution of light house works in 1899–1900.

G.O., No. 439, Marine, dated 19th May 1899.

ABSTRACT.— communicating to the Presidency Port officer financial dept proceedings

---

G.O., Nos. 579, 580, Financial, dated 8th May 1899.

ABSTRACT.—Communicating to the departments of the Secretariat letter from the Government of India passing orders on the budget estimates of this Presidency for 1899–1900, and making certain allotments from the undistributed provision of 8·73 lakhs placed by that Government in the estimates under *45. Civil Works.* Copy to the Government of India.

READ—also the following papers :—

From Commander W. AVES, R.I.M., Acting Presidency Port Officer, to the Secretary to Government, Marine department, dated Madras, 1st September 1898, No. 1271/299 G.

With reference to Government memorandum (Marine department), No. 416/E., dated 11th August 1898, I have the honour to state, for the information of Government, that the sum of Rs. 1,30,000 estimated by Mr. Ashpitel as receipts from light dues was based on information obtained demi-officially from this office. The details of his calculation are —

Tonnage, 130,000 tons, coasting traffic ;
,, 240,000 ,, foreign and semi-coasting ;
,, 40,000 ,, native craft ;
Coasting steamers and native craft to pay 12 and 6 pies per ton per month respectively ;
Foreign and semi-coasting, 7 pies per ton per month respectively ;

These figures as regards coasting, semi-coasting and foreign steamers represent, respectively, 130 foreign and semi-coasting steamers ranging from 1,000 to 3,500 tons, net register, and 80 * coasting steamers ranging from 160 to 3,200 tons, net register, which make from 1 to 10 voyages per annum. The receipts from native craft are apparently roughly estimated from the total tonnage of such craft as shewn in the administration report of the Port department, and the amount thus calculated is, as stated by Mr. Ashpitel, Rs. 1,30,000.

* This figure represents coasters at all ports of the Eastern group.

2. I now submit lists showing the vessels which arrived at the Port of Madras during the year 1897–98. Lists for West coast ports, including native craft, have been called for, but it will be near enough to base the estimate of dues recoverable from native craft on the total tonnage dues paid by those vessels in one particular year. The year selected is 1896–97. It will be a long and tedious process to ascertain the name of each native craft and the number of times in the year she would be liable to pay dues.

3. The tonnage of direct steamers to Madras in the year 1897–98 aggregated 256,800 tons, and of these one-third are regular traders making at least three visits annually to the port. To avoid any chance of over-estimating receipts, I have selected, from the 117 vessels representing this tonnage, 40 vessels about which there can be little doubt as to their liability to payment of the dues at least three times during the year. These are marked thus ** in the list. It is extremely probable that many of the others will pay more than once. To these have been added 44,441 tons of semi-coasting steamers.

For P. R.
6. P.

4. The coasting vessels may be safely assumed to be liable at least eight times in the year. The Port officer of Bombay has been asked to give an estimate of the tonnage, from Bombay to Colombo direct, likely to be liable to Western group dues. No direct vessels from Calcutta to Colombo will ever benefit by any of the Eastern group lights, and they cannot equitably be asked to pay for such lights.

5. I attach a draft notification showing roughly the manner in which I think the vessels should be classified, and the rates of dues leviable on each class; also a statement showing the amount that we may reasonably reckon upon as receipts. (See paragraph 9 *infra.*)

6. I think that Mr. Ashpitel has slightly over-estimated receipts, as I notice that he refers to a monthly payment of 12 pies per ton (paragraph 31 of his report, G.O., No. 245, Marine of 8th April 1896). The coasting dues should be calculated on the assumption that dues on the whole tonnage will be paid only eight times a year. Foreign and semi-coasting steamers would not visit the coast every month.

7. Details of the calculations by which the total collections are estimated are given in the lists accompanying this letter.

8. In actual working, the collections will be much larger, as there must be, among the vessels named, many which will pay dues several times during the year; but all doubtful cases have been omitted.

9. The following is a summary of the receipts from vessels according to classification :—

	RS.			RS.	
Class I *	47,810	at 9 pies for each group.	or	95,620	at As. 1–6 for each group.
,, II	15,079	at 6 pies	or	30,158	,, A. 1
,, III	4,000	,, 8 ,,	or	8,000	,, As. 1–4.
,, IV	7,657	,, 4 ,,	or	15,314	,, 8 pies.
,, V	291	,, 2 ,,	or	582	,, 4 ,,
,, VI	3,587	,, 7 ,,	or	7,174	,, As. 1–2.
Total ..	78,424	Total ..		1,56,848	

The lesser sum will, according to the proposed scale of establishment, be insufficient to pay fully for the maintenance of the lights, and if it is intended that the whole cost of lights, and the provision of a Sinking fund is to be debited to light dues, the rates proposed will have to be doubled. This will give a revenue of Rs. (1,56,848) one lakh fifty-six thousand eight hundred and forty eight. I have therefore, in the draft of rates of light dues, provided alternative rates. It is believed that the actuals will considerably exceed the estimate, but it will be safer to levy the higher rate to commence with, as it is more convenient to reduce than to enhance dues.

10. Taking the average net register tonnage of a coaster at 1,600 and of a direct steamer at 2,500 tons, the incidence of the dues per steamer at the higher rate will be, in the case of coasting steamers about Rs. 300 per voyage; in that of direct steamers, about Rs. 160 per voyage. As the coasters derive more benefit from the lights than the direct steamers, any reduction in the higher rate might preferably be given to the latter. It must be noted, however, that many direct steamers belonging to regular lines, will benefit on two voyages for one payment, *e.g.*, the steamers belonging to the British India Steam Navigation Company's Home Line.

11. A copy of this letter has been sent to Commander Street, Presidency Port Officer, now on privilege leave; and it has been suggested to him that he should address you demi-officially on any points on which he disagrees.

ENCLOSURES.

DRAFT NOTIFICATION.

Vessels arriving at or departing from ports in the Madras Presidency, or which in the ordinary course of any voyage shall pass within range of, or derive benefit from, the Sea Lights of that Presidency, are liable to be charged with light dues according to the class in which such vessels may be placed, as specified below, viz.:—

---

* One anna per ton per group will perhaps be a fairer charge; in this case, the total of the higher rates will be then Rs. 1,24,875; of the lower, Rs. 94,311.

Class I.—Any vessel which in the ordinary course of a voyage would pass or derive benefit from more than 5 sea lights in the Eastern group, or more than 3 sea lights in the Western group.	* 9 pies (or As. 1–6) per ton per voyage for each group. One payment in a group to exempt from further payment in that group for 30 days.
Class II.—All vessels, British and Foreign, to or from Europe, the Australian, African and other British Colonies, including the Straits Settlements and Ceylon, and vessels from Indian ports and ports in Burma which in the ordinary course of a voyage will pass or derive benefit from any of the sea-lights in the Madras Presidency, and vessels alling at more than one port in the group, and which do not come under the conditions of class I.	* 6 pies (or 12 pies) per ton per voyage per group. One payment to exempt from further payment for 30 days (payable on arrival at a port in the Madras Presidency).
Class III.—All vessels from Bombay or ports in the Bombay Presidency bound direct for Colombo, and from Colombo direct to ports in the Bombay Presidency.	* 8 pies (or 16 pies) per ton per voyage; payable on arrival at or departure from Bombay.
Class IV.—All sailing vessels (of 15 tons and upwards) coasting or otherwise.	* 4 pies (or 8 pies) per ton per voyage per group; one payment to exempt from further payment for 30 days.
Class V.—Vessels performing the daily service between Tuticorin and Colombo, and steamers from Bombay bound for the minor ports of South Canara, whose voyage terminates at Mangalore.	* 2 pies (or 4 pies) per ton every 30 days.
Class VI.—Steamers plying direct between Madras and Rangoon.	* 7 pies (or 14 pies) per ton every 30 days.

---

* *Vide* summary in paragraph 9 of letter accompanying.

NOTE.—The term "Sea Lights" to apply to the following, viz., Calingapatam, Santapilli, Vakalapudi, Sacramento (new light to be put up) Hope Island, Kistna (new light to be put up) Armeghon, Pulicat, Madras, Seven Pagodas, Negapatam, Tuticorin, Manapad, Muttam, Tangacherri (new light to be put up) Sacrifice Rock or Tellicherry (as the light may eventually be named) Cochin, Calicut and Moolki (new light to be put up).

LIST of arrivals at Madras of coasting steamers in 1897–98.

CLASS I.

		TONS.			TONS.
..	"Chyebassa"	1,688	S S.	"Nairung"	2,862
"	"Kasara"	505	"	"Bhundara"	2,215
"	"Camorta"	1,351	"	"Kohinur"	1,935
"	"Ellora"	1,494	"	"Merkara"	1,949
"	"Huzara"	1,336	"	"Nevasa"	1,945
"	"Maharani"	1,647	"	"Nizam"	2,041
"	"Khandalla"	1,318	"	"Rajpootana"	1,312
"	"Chanda"	1,305	"	"Pemba"	987
"	"Nerbudda"	1,961	"	"Java"	920
"	"Henzada"	1,341	"	"Kilwa"	855
"	"Nawab"	2,041	"	"Landaura"	2,437
"	"Byculla"	1,095	"	"Nadir"	257,4
"	"Goalpara"	1,359	"	"Cocanada"	801
"	"Bancoora"	2,197	"	"Kerbela"	1,449
"	"Karagola"	622	"	"Nuddea"	1,914
"	"Kangra"	1,478	"	"Bezwada"	3,270
"	"Nurani"	2,870	"	"Purulia"	993
"	"Shahjehan"	1,065	"	"Megna"	772
"	"Patna"	1,164	"	"Pundua"	2,126
"	"Sirdhana"	2,074			
"	"M. Meanatchy"	1,368		Total ..	63,746

Calculation—

It is estimated that each of these steamers or their substitutes will make use of the group lights on each coast not less than eight times a year.

$$\text{Therefore } \overset{\text{Tons.}}{63{,}746} \times \overset{\text{Pies.}}{9} \times 8 = \frac{45{,}89{,}712}{12} = \frac{3{,}82{,}476}{16} = \text{Rs. } 23{,}905$$

Annual receipts Rs. 23,905 for each group
or at 1½ annas Rs. 47,810 do.

Total receipts both groups, Rs. 47,810 or Rs. 95,620

LIST of arrivals at Madras of Foreign steamers in 1897-98.

CLASS II (A).

	TONS.
S.S. "Bedouin"	2,245
,, "Oceanie"	1,863
,, "Bombay"	2,049
,, "Polluce"	1,286
,, "Ceres"	2,318
,, "Benvortich"	2,164
,, "Gorsedd"	2,451
,, "City of Everett"	1,858
,, "Kirkdale"	1,853
,, "Federation"	1,570
,, "Deepdale"	1,650
,, "Haxley"	2,252
,, "Olivemoor"	1,970
,, "Orion"	1,762
,, "Knight Templar"	2,704
,, "Baron Androssan"	1,825
,, "Baron Cawder"	2,053
,, "Aglaia"	1,173 **
,, "Sirsa"	1,675 **
,, "Nevasa"	1,945 **
,, "Bangalore"	3,268
,, "Clan Matheson"	2,521 **
,, "Eridan"	927 **
,, "Oriental"	3,085
,, "Goldenfels"	2,269 **
,, "Matiana"	3,413 **
,, "Calliope"	1,927
,, "Rewa"	2,519 **
,, "Clan Grant"	2,306 **
,, "Larnaca"	1,492
,, "Secundra"	1,675 **
,, "Amigo"	822
,, "Rheinfels"	1,773 **
,, "Elax"	2,612
,, "Clan Macintosh"	2,591 **
,, "Simla"	3,805
,, "Warora"	2,565 **
,, "Clan Macpherson"	2,559 **
,, "Maggie Macnair"	2,078
,, "Ameer"	2,682
,, "Pongola"	934 **
,, "Trym"	710
,, "Palawan"	2,996
,, "Manora"	2,995 **
,, "Ockenfels"	2,314
,, "Goorkha"	2,617 **
,, "Bullionist"	2,196 **
,, "Gulf of Louis"	1,672
,, "Baron Glamis"	1,556
,, "Volute"	2,599 **
,, "Merkara"	1,949
,, "Kentigeru"	1,585
,, "Steinberger"	2,313 **
,, "Lawada"	2,124
,, "Picciola"	875
,, "Mombassa"	3,039 **
,, "Worsley Hall"	2,238
,, "Clan Macdonald"	3,113 **
,, "Scharlachberger"	1,810 **
,, "Mulazi"	1,133 **
,, "India"	2,591
,, "Muzinto"	1,160 **
,, "Bullivant"	2,607
,, "Golconda"	3,761 **
,, "Skidley"	2,241
,, "Argus"	1,822
,, "Hochheimer"	1,892 **
,, "Musician"	3,047
,, "Neidenfels"	3,478 **
,, "Aurora"	1,836
S.S. "Bramfels"	1,888 **
,, "Lindenfels"	1,862 **
,, "Loodiana"	2,124 **
,, "Rothenfels"	1,864 **
,, "Craignair"	601
,, "Aries"	1,968
,, "Foreland"	2,8 2
,, "Nord"	768
,, "Imperialist"	2,177
,, "Rudesheimer"	1,795
,, "Darius"	2,130
,, "Planet Mercury"	2,092
,, "Clan Monroe"	3,121 **
,, "Pindari"	3,686
,, "Borneo"	2,944
,, "Orissa"	3,525 **
,, "Clan Macarthur"	2,584 **
,, "Chusan"	2,852
,, "Okara"	3,439
,, "Turbo"	2,659
,, "Osborne"	2,033
,, "Couch"	2,314
,, "Malta"	3,900
,, "Bhundara"	2,215 **
,, "Brand"	1,520
,, "Massilia"	2,909
,, "Baghdad"	820
,, "Viraiva"	2 158
,, "Coromandel"	2 783
,, "Clan Murray"	3,107 **
,, "Lalpoora"	2,124
,, "Dupliex"	1,264 **
,, "Paramatta"	2,854
,, "Trocas"	2,657
,, "Bengal"	2,752
,, "City of Dublin"	2,155
,, "Euplectela"	2,507
,, "Jupiter"	2,199
,, "Wave"	1,450
,, "Roma"	1,743
,, "Maltby"	1,808
,, "Siegfried"	909
,, "Queen Louise"	2,170
,, "Congella"	1,022 **
,, "Oransay"	1,350
,, "Telena"	3,124
,, "Clan Robertson"	3,104 **
Total ..	256,800

NOTE.—The vessels marked ** are those which may be expected to render themselves liable to payment of dues at least three times during the year. Their tonnage is as follows:—

1,173	934	1,888
1,675	2,995	1,862
1,945	2,617	2,124
2,521	2,196	1,864
927	2,599	3,121
2,269	2,313	3,525
3,413	3,039	2,584
2,519	3,113	2,215
2,306	1,810	3,107
1,675	1,133	1,264
1,773	1,160	1,022
2,591	3,761	3,104
2,565	1,892	
2,559	3,478	90,631

②

S-99-6

8

No. 471, MARINE, 31ST MAY 1899.

Calculation—

Tons.
253,800 of which
— 90,631 may be expected to pay three times a year.

leaving 166,169 which will pay once in the year for eastern group
+ 44,441 semi-coasting traffic (see list class II B)

210,610 paying six pies per ton once during the year

$$= \frac{2,10,610 \times 6}{12} = \frac{1,05,305}{16} = \text{Rs. } 6,582.$$

$$+ \frac{90,631 \times 6 \times 3}{12} = \frac{1,35,947}{16} = \text{Rs. } 8,497.$$

Rs. 15,079
or Rs. 30,158 at one anna.

Receipts under class II (*a*) and II (*b*) Rs. 15,079.

Owing to the Peninsula and Oriental steamers being withdrawn from this line receipts may be slightly less, but other tonnage is increasing.

LIST of arrivals at Madras of semi-coasting vessels in 1897-98.

CLASS II (B).

		Tons.
S.S.	"Clan Chisholm"	1,630
,,	"Clan Ranald"	1,339
,,	"Clan Macalister"	1,436
,,	"Clan Alpine"	1,349
,,	"Clan Menzies"	1,704
,,	"Clan Macgregor"	1,921
,,	"Clan Buchanan"	1,931
,,	"Clan Ogilvie"	1,691
,,	"Clan Macnab"	1,591
,,	"Clan Sinclair"	1,908
,,	"Clan Fraser"	1,371
,,	"Clan Macrae"	1,664
,,	"Clan Campbell"	1,662
,,	"Clan Graham"	1,878
,,	"Clan Drummond"	1,870
,,	"Clan Mackenzie"	1,932
,,	"Clan Cameron"	1,548
,,	"Clan Forbes"	1,561
,,	"Clan Macintyre"	1,590
,,	"Clan Ross"	1,664
,,	"Clan Maclean"	1,486
,,	"Clan Macneil"	1,591
,,	"Clan Lindsay"	1,705
,,	"Clan Sutherland"	1,810
,,	"Clan Macleod"	1,589
,,	"Clan Mackay"	1,665
,,	"Clan Stuart"	1,355
		44,441

Vide class II (*a*) for calculations.

CLASS III.

In this class the receipts are based on the number of Peninsula and Otiental Steamers on the China Line of which there are two fortnightly one up and one down. The tonnage of these vessels may be taken as 2,000 each net register. There will be of course vessels of other lines also liable; but to avoid delay this tonnage is taken as a basis in calculating probable receipts on account of light dues. As these vessels will derive benefit from all the lights of the Western group except Manapad $\frac{8}{\text{or } 16}$ pies is proposed as the due to be levied per ton.

No. 471, MARINE, 31ST MAY 1899.

Calculation.

$2{,}000 \times 4 = \overset{\text{Tons.}}{8{,}000}$ per mensem or $\overset{\text{Tons.}}{96{,}000}$ per annum at 8 pies per ton.

$\frac{\overset{\text{Pies.}}{96{,}000 \times 8}}{12} = \frac{\overset{\text{As.}}{64{,}000}}{16}$ = Rs. 4,000 or Rs. 8,000 at 16 pies per ton.

CLASS IV.

The aggregate tonnage of native sailing craft for the year 1896–97 was 713,000 tons being 20,500 voyages making the average tonnage of a native craft 34 tons. This shipping paid in port dues Rs. 22,971 at the rate of 1 anna per ton for every 60 days.

The due proposed to be levied on account of lights for this class of vessel is $\frac{4}{\text{or } 8}$ pies per ton every 30 days, and it is considered that the amount levied as port dues will form a fair basis of calculation for the light dues. The light dues receipts will thus be $\frac{\frac{1}{3}}{\text{or } \frac{2}{3}}$ of the port dues.

$\frac{22{,}971 \times 1}{3}$ = Rs. 7,657 or Rs. 15,314 at 8 pies.

The light due payable by a native craft of 100 tons will thus be $\frac{\text{Rs. 2-1-4}}{\text{or Rs. 4-2-8}}$ per mensem.

As large sailing vessels from the United Kingdom very seldom visit this coast, it is unnecessary to make any special rate for them; it is proposed to charge them the same as native sailing craft.

CLASS V.

In this class there are—

(*a*) Five steamers aggregating 2,650 tons performing the service between Bombay and Mangalore. As these will only benefit by one of the sea lights in the group, it is proposed that they shall only pay $\frac{2}{\text{or } 4}$ pies per ton.

Owing to closing of ports for the South West monsoon it is estimated that they will pay dues 6 times each in the course of the year.

Calculation.

$\frac{\overset{\text{Tons.}}{2{,}650 \times 2 \times 6}}{12} = \overset{\text{As.}}{2{,}650} = \overset{\text{Rs.}}{166}.$

(*b*) Three steamers aggregating 1,000 tons performing the daily service between Tuticorin and Colombo benefiting by only two lights of the group will pay dues 12 times a year.

Calculation.

$\frac{1{,}000 \times 2 \times 12}{12} = \overset{\text{As.}}{2{,}000} = \overset{\text{Rs.}}{125}.$

Total Rs. 291.
or
Rs. 582 at 4 pies.

LIST of Direct Steamers running between Madras and Rangoon in 1897–98.

CLASS VI.

	Tons.
S.S. "Putiala"	1,929
" "Palitana"	1,934
" "Purnea"	2,127
" "Pentacottah"	2,209
	8,199

Calculation.

It is estimated that each vessel of this class will make not less than 12 trips per annum and at 7 pies per ton they will pay—

$\frac{8{,}199 \times 12 \times 7}{12} = \frac{\overset{\text{As.}}{57{,}393}}{16} = \overset{\text{Rs.}}{3{,}587}.$

or

Rs. 7,174 at 14 pies per ton.

Telegram from the Secretary to Government, Marine department, to the Presidency Port Officer, dated 27th September 1898.

What is the average duration of a voyage from Calcutta to Bombay by British Indian coaster.

Telegram from the Presidency Port Officer, to the Secretary to Government, Marine department, dated Madras, 27th September 1898, No. 1271-299, G.

Your telegram to-day. Average duration 24 days.

Mar. 471

No. 471, MARINE, 31ST MAY 1899.

Official memorandum from W. B. DEWINTON, Esq., Secretary to Government, Marine department, to the Presidency Port Officer, dated Madras, 29th September 1898, No. 496-E.

Memorandum No 496 E, 29-9-98

It is necessary that further information in regard to the proposed classes and rates of light dues should be furnished to admit of this matter being laid before Government, *e.g.*—

(1) *Class I.*—(*a*) Why are five and three sea lights chosen for the two groups as the number in excess of which vessels will have to pay dues if they benefit thereby.

(*b*) Why is the limit of 30 days entered, within which vessels will be exempted from paying light dues a second time for the same group. If it is imposed, the receipts will not apparently be so great as the Presidency Port Officer estimates. It is reported that the average duration of a voyage from Calcutta to Bombay by a British India coaster is 24 days. Allowing three days for loading and unloading at terminal ports a vessel performs one voyage a month. Now say she leaves Calcutta on 1st January, March, May, &c., and Bombay 1st February, April, June, &c., she would under the thirty days' limit only pay light dues once on each voyage except the first, thus :—

Month.	Eastern group.	Western group.	Remarks.
January	1	1	The vessel leaves Calcutta January 1, arrives at Tuticorin, say, January 15. She will be back at Tuticorin by February 14, and so will not have to pay Western group light dues. In the same way if she leaves Calcutta again on or about March 1, she will not have to pay Eastern group light dues on her third voyage, so that in the year she will only have to pay dues 13 times instead of 16·8 times for each group) as estimated by the Presidency Port Officer.
February	1	..	
March	..	1	
April	1	..	
May	..	1	
June	1	..	
July	..	1	
August	1	..	
September	..	1	
October	1	..	
November	..	1	
December	1	..	

Unless the Presidency Port Officer can prove that this is a wrong forecast it would be better to expunge the thirty days limit for coasters.

(*c*) Is class I intended to include vessels plying from Madras to Rangoon *viâ* Coast ports?

It is believed that they go as far north as Bimlipatam before crossing, so that they would make use of more than five sea lights. The limit of thirty days might be imposed for them because the round trip takes, it is believed, about that time, and the dues would be levied once for the double voyage which would probably be sufficient.

(2) *Class V.*—The rate proposed is so small that it is hardly worth collecting, but the receipts do not seem to have been properly calculated. There are believed to be two steamers now plying between Tuticorin and Colombo, of 1,200 tons each; at 4 pies per ton, each of these vessels would pay Rs. 25 per month or the two together Rs. 600 a year. It is true that they only use one light, but they use it about 15 times a month, and I think the higher rate for this class should be raised to 6 pies at least which would bring in for—

	RS.
(*a*) the Tuticorin steamers 2,400 tons at 6 pies per ton per month ..	900
(*b*) the Mangalore steamers 2,640 tons at 6 pies per ton, 6 times ..	500
Total ..	1,400

To the Presidency Port Officer

(Sd) W. B. deWinton
Secretary to Govt.
Marine dept.

From Commander W. AVES, R.IM., Acting Presidency Port Officer, to the Secretary to Government, Marine department, dated Madras, 8th October 1898, No. 1271/347-G.

Query (1) (*a*).—In the Eastern group (if Tuticorin is selected as the commencement of the Western group) there will be eleven sea lights as against eight in the Western group. The object in restricting the levy of dues to vessels benefiting by more than five and three respectively was to avoid unduly taxing semi-coasting traffic, *i.e.*, vessels loading for home ports at two or more ports of a group. If some distinction of this sort is not made vessels other than coasters might have to pay the dues. It will perhaps simplify matters to draft the notification thus :—" All vessels under a general pass engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta and Bombay, and between Rangoon and Madras *viâ* ports north of Madras; provided that, if no port in the Eastern group be touched at, the due for that group shall not be levied."

NOTE.—A vessel bound from Calcutta to Bombay, unless she called at a port in the Eastern group, would not sight any of the lights of this Presidency until she arrived on the West Coast, and West Coast dues would be justly leviable whether the vessel touched at any port or not.

Query (1) (*b*).—I think you have under-estimated the period occupied in loading and unloading at Bombay and Calcutta which, as steamers are yearly increasing in tonnage, may be taken as a week at each end. However, on consideration, I think for the present it will be better to omit the thirty days' limit in this class.

Query (1) (*c*).—Class I was intended to include the Rangoon steamers calling at Northern ports. I have, in the amended draft herewith put up, included them specially. I would omit the thirty days' limit here also.

Query (2).—The steamers now performing the daily service between Tuticorin and Colombo are only about 750 tons net register, the tonnage on which the dues will be paid, so the result at 6 pies a ton would be—

	RS.
Tuticorin steamers, 1,500 tons at 6 pies per month	563
Mangalore steamers, 2,640 tons at 6 pies per ton, 6 times	500
Total ..	1,063

ENCLOSURE.

REVISED DRAFT NOTIFICATION.

Vessels arriving at or departing from ports in the Madras Presidency, or which in the ordinary course of any voyage shall pass within range of, or derive benefit from, the sea lights of that Presidency, are liable to be charged with light dues according to the class in which such vessels may be placed, as specified below, viz.—

CLASS I.

All vessels under a general pass engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta and Bombay and between Rangoon and Madras *viâ* ports North of Madras.	9 pies (or 1½ annas) per ton per voyage for each group provided that if no port in the Eastern group be touched at, the due for that group shall not be levied.

CLASSES II, III AND IV—*as per previous draft.*

CLASS V.

Vessels performing the daily service between Tuticorin and Colombo, and steamers from Bombay bound for the minor ports of South Canara, whose voyage terminates at Mangalore.	3 pies—or 6 pies) per ton every 30 days.

CLASS VI, NOTE &c—*as per previous draft.*

9—12

(3)

13

12

No. 471, Marine, 31st May 1899.

Official memorandum from the Secretary to Government, Marine department, to the Presidency Port Officer, dated 17th November 1898, No. 586-E.

In his report printed with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, table I, Mr. Ashpitel proposes to place sixteen lights in the "sea" group, while the Presidency Port Officer in his letter No. 1271/299-G., dated 1st September 1898, allocates nineteen lights to this group. The following comparative statement shows the proposals in each case:—

As given by Mr. Ashpitel.	*As given by the Presidency Port Officer.*
1. Calingapatam.	1. Calingapatam.
2. Santapilli.	2. Santapilli.
3. Vakalapudi.	3. Vakalapudi.
4. Sacramento.	4. Sacramento.
5. Armeghon.	5. Armeghon.
6. Pulicat.	6. Pulicat.
7. Madras.	7. Madras.
8. Seven Pagodas.	8. Seven Pagodas.
9. Manapad.	9. Manapad.
10. Muttum.	10. Muttum.
11. Tangacherri.	11. Tangacherri.
12. Sacrifice Rock.	12. Sacrifice Rock.
13. Mulki.	13. Mulki.
14. Alleppi.	14. Hope Island.
15. Point Calimere.	15. Kistna.
16. Point Divi.	16. Negapatam.
(Hope Island to be abandoned.)	17. Tuticorin.
	18. Cochin.
	19. Calicut.

2. The discrepancies should be further considered by the Presidency Port Officer in communication with Mr. Ashpitel. The matter now becomes of importance in view of the proposal to levy light dues for the use of the "sea" lights.

3. It is requested that this reference be treated as one of urgency.

From Commander H. A. STREET, R.I.M., Presidency Port Officer, to the Secretary to Government, Marine department, dated 18th November 1898, No. 1271/402-G.

1. Calingapatam.	East Coast.
2. Santapalli.	
3. Vakalapudi.	
*4. Sacramento.	
*5. Kistna.	
6. Armeghon.	
7. Pulicat.	
8. Madras.	
9. Seven Pagodas.	
10. Negapatam.	
11. Tuticorin.	
12. Manapad.	
13. Muttum.	West Coast.
*14. Tangacherri.	
*15. Tellicherri.	
*16. Mulki.	

The discrepancies referred to in paragraph 2 above have been considered as requested, and the marginal list of lights represents what may be now considered as fulfilling the conditions of sea lights of the coast as laid down in paragraph 6, page 3 of Mr. Ashpitel's report printed with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896.

2. It will be seen that the light at Alleppi (which appears in Mr. Ashpitel's list) has not been included, and the reason for this is, that this light is maintained by the Travancore Government.

3. The lights at Cochin and Calicut appear to have been included through some misapprehension by the Acting Presidency Port Officer in the list under reference. It is unnecessary, in my opinion, to treat either of these lights at present as sea lights.

---

* Lighthouses not yet constructed.

M. M 12t

G.O., Nos. 29, 30, Marine, dated 10th January 1889.

Abstract.—Directing that the Government of India be requested to make a grant from Imperial funds of Rs. 2,58,850 for the prosecution of Light house works in 1899–1900.

[illegible] has already been read again [illegible] supra.

Official memorandum from W. B. deWINTON, Esq., Secretary, Marine Department, to the Presidency Port Officer, dated Madras, 20th January 1899, No. 41-E.

Under the Burma Coast Lights Act, all vessels of 50 tons and upwards are liable to the payment of coast light dues. The Presidency Port Officer is requested to state whether the same limit of tonnage for the levy of light dues should be adopted in the Madras Presidency, and if so, how his forecast of receipts will be affected. The limit for port dues is, as he is aware, 15 tons.

2. Under the proposed Madras scheme, Rangoon-Madras steamers, *via* coast ports north of Madras, are put * into class I, and pay the same rates as coasters between Calcutta and Bombay. Seeing that the former have already to pay under the Burma Act, and do not profit by Madras lights to the same extent as the latter, they should perhaps be assessed at a lower rate. If the Presidency Port Officer agrees he is requested to suggest the amount of such lower rate.

* *Vide* your 1271/347-G, dated 8th October 1898.

Official memorandum from W. B. deWINTON, Esq., Secretary, Marine Department, to the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, dated 20th January 1899, No. 44-E.

In continuation of memorandum No. 41-E, dated 20th January 1899, it is observed that vessels performing the daily service between Tuticorin and Colombo are put under class V, paying 3 or 6 pies per ton every 30 days according as the higher or lower rate is charged. They only use one Madras light, *i.e.*, about the same as a Foreign steamer calling at Madras, and should perhaps pay the same light dues, *i.e.*, 6 or 12 pies once in 30 days. They would then come under class II. The Presidency Port Officer is requested to report whether there is any objection to this.

It should also be stated whether the descriptive words * at end of class II "and vessels calling at . . . . . class I" cannot be omitted—they seem unnecessary. If the Presidency Port Officer wishes to retain them, give an instance of such a vessel.

* *Vide* draft notification appended to Presidency Port Officer's letter No. 1271/299 G., dated 1st September 1898, reproduced below for ready reference :—

"*Class II.*

"All vessels, British and Foreign, to or from "Europe the Australian, African and other "British Colonies, including the Straits "Settlements and Ceylon and vessels from "Indian ports and ports in Burmah which in "the ordinary course of a voyage will pass "or derive benefit from any of the sealights in "the Madras Presidency, and vessels calling "at more than one port in the group and "which do not come under the conditions of "Class I."

Street

From Commander H. A. ~~SHEET~~, R.I.M., Presidency Port Officer, to the Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated Madras, 24th January 1899, No. 1271/36-G.

Native Craft.—It is believed that the number of vessels of under 50 tons which navigate the coast of Burma is small, whereas on the west coast of this Presidency there are between 300 and 400. All these vessels make frequent voyages and benefit by the lights, and I see no reason for exempting them from payment. The reduction in receipts if this exemption be allowed will about one-third.

15

14

2. *Rangoon-Madras Steamers via Coast.*—I see no reason for assessing these vessels at a lower rate. With the exception of Seven Pagodas and Negapatam they will benefit by all the sea lights of the group, and in case of overrunning their distance and passing Madras they would also benefit by Seven Pagodas Light. The distinction between these vessels and others coming under class I is so very triffling that I see no necessity for creating a separate class for them, as they ought not to be included in class II.

3. *Daily service steamers between Tuticorin and Colombo.*—I see no objection to these vessels being included in class II, and consider it will be better to do so.

4. As regards the words at the end of class II, I am of opinion that these should be retained. The provision is intended to meet the case of semi-coasters which sometimes visit a number of ports in a group picking up cargo at each. In this way these vessels might be held to bring themselves under class I through deriving benefit from the prescribed number of lights in that class, whereas it is only intended that the rate of dues in that class shall be levied on vessels which in the *ordinary course* of a voyage pass a certain number of lights. The case of a semi-coaster visiting a number of ports is not the *ordinary course* of a voyage. The descriptive words are not absolutely necessary, but may serve to prevent misunderstanding.

439 Marine 19-5-99

G.O., Nos. 579, 580, Financial, dated 8th May 1899.

Abstract.—Communicating to the departments of the Secretariat letter from the Government of India passing orders on the budget estimates of this Presidency for 1899–1900, and making certain allotments from the undistributed provision of 8·73 lakhs placed by that Government in the estimates under 45. *Civil Works.* Copy to the Government of India.

2/C ~~G.O., No. 439, Marine, dated 29th May 1899.~~

Order—No. 471, Marine, dated 31st May 1899.

In 1890, Mr. W. T. Douglass, Lighthouse Engineer, was sent out from England at the request of the Government of India to report on the lighthouses on the coasts of India. His report on the Madras lighthouses is contained in G.O., No. 25, Marine, dated 22nd January 1891. He suggested the introduction of the most modern appliances for illumination and the adoption of occulting and flashing lights, and pointed out the importance of making the lights distinctive in character. He also recommended the construction of new buildings at various places, *e.g.*, Pigeon Island, Cape Comorin, Divi, Masulipatam, on the Sacramento Shoal, Vizagapatam and Bimlipatam.

2. Since this period, the question of the improvement of these lights has received the almost continuous consideration of Government, and in 1894 Mr. Ashpitel was deputed to visit localities and report on lighthouse requirements generally. The results of this inspection are recorded with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, a copy of which is attached to these Proceedings. His report covered a wide field and included proposals under the following heads:—

(1) The building of new lighthouses.
(2) The introduction of improved light apparatus.
(3) The improvement of existing lights.
(4) The complete reorganisation of the lighthouse establishments.
(5) The levy of light dues on shipping to meet the cost of his proposals.

It also embraced various other minor matters connected with internal administration.

3. His programme of lighthouse improvement involved an expenditure of Rs. 8,80,000. Of this sum, Rs. 8,00,000 were for "coast" lights or those intended for general navigation. The latter amount included Rs. 2,80,000 for eight new sets of apparatus, Rs. 4,55,000 for improvements to existing towers and for new constructions, and the balance was for contingencies and Public Works supervision. The

for P.R
D.P.

"port" lights or those intended for the navigation of ports and harbours, were to cost Rs. 80,000. To meet the capital cost of the "coast" lights, he proposed to raise a loan of Rs. 8,00,000. The interest and sinking fund for which and its ultimate extinction, were to be provided by the levy of light dues. The proposal to raise a loan in the open market and the levy of light dues did not then commend itself to Government, who considered that the scheme could be started from the accumulated balances of Port funds.

4. In order to give effect to the scheme of lighthouse improvement suggested by Mr. Ashpitel and approved generally in G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, a special Lighthouse division, under Mr. Ashpitel, was formed under the authority of G.O., No. 2156 W., dated 27th July 1896, Mr. Ashpitel being called upon to frame a financial forecast of the amount required for expenditure. His financial forecast is printed with G.O., No. 316, Marine, dated 29th April 1898. These proceedings also contain a complete forecast of Port fund works other than lighthouses. The Government observed that the outlay involved could not be met from local resources alone, within a reasonable time, and decided that the Government of India should be appealed to for assistance. That Government was accordingly asked in letter No. 317, Marine, dated 29th April 1898, for a *grant* from Imperial funds of Rs. 6,68,000 in 1899–1900, and Rs. 1,45,000 in 1900–1901. The Government of India refused * to entertain the application, and pointed out that tradeand shipping, and not the country generally, should bear the cost of erecting lighthouses. They considered that any fresh expenditure to be incurred in erecting lighthouses on the Madras coast should be provided for by the levy of light dues. They further observed as follows:—

> "Some expenditure has already been incurred in the past in the erection of lighthouses 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 additional maintenance charges will be covered, together with a small sinking fund charge, by light dues to be now imposed."

5. The Madras Government, seeing that a free grant had been refused, asked † for a *loan*, from Imperial funds, of Rs. 2,15,000, and promised that, should this loan be sanctioned, His Excellency the Governor in Council would arrange for the maintenance of lighthouses and port works generally from current receipts, supplemented by existing balances, and to carry out such other new Port fund works as may be possible. It was explained that the grant of Rs. 6,68,000 previously asked for included works other than lighthouses, whereas the smaller sum of Rs. 2,15,000 was confined to the amount required, for the coming year, for new lighthouse works and apparatus alone.

6. The Government of India, in reply, pointed out that if the lights to be constructed are of the nature of coast lights, the expenditure on them of Port funds is inadmissible, such expenditure as regards *lights* being limited by sub-section 5 of section 36 of the Indian Ports Act to "lights maintained chiefly for the benefit of vessels being in, or entering, or leaving, the port or passing through the rivers or channels leading thereto;" while if they are "port" lights, they cannot properly be charged against capital outlay which is intended to be liquidated hereafter by general light dues. They accordingly requested fuller explanation of the conditions on which the proposed loan was asked for, and in what way the Government proposed to close the transaction.

7. In letter No. 30, Marine, dated 10th January 1899, the Madras Government reiterated its request for a loan from Imperial funds, to the amount of Rs. 2,58,850, the amount to be refunded when the proposed light dues became available.

8. The final result of the application is contained in letter from the Finance and Commerce Department to the Chief Secretary to Government, No. A-1429-L., dated 29th March 1899, in which a special addition of Rs. 8,73,000 is authorised to be

---

* Finance and Commerce Department letter, No. 3284 S.R dated 27th July 1898.

† Letter No. 733, Marine, dated 30th August 1898.

13—16

4

made to the Provincial expenditure from the existing balance, and from which the Madras Government is at liberty to reappropriate money for expenditure on lighthouse construction, provided that it recovers it by the imposition of light dues.

9. This latter course therefore seems the only one open, if any improvement is to be effected in the lighting of the Madras coast, and a scheme, detailed below, has been prepared with that object. But before proceeding further in the matter, His Excellency the Governor in Council desires to be favoured with the views of the representatives of mercantile and shipping interests in this Presidency, both as to the necessity for the proposed improvements, and as to the ability of the trade to bear the proposed imposition of light dues.

10. The programme of lighthouse improvement as regards "coast" lights includes the following:—

Coast lights.	Estimated cost RS.
1. Calingapatam	5,000
2. Santapili	1,00,000
3. Vakalapudi	18,000
4. Sacramento	1,00,000
5. Havelock Point	1,18,620
6. Armeghon	37,390
7. Pulicat	27,300
8. Madras	1,000
9. Seven Pagodas	49,920
10. Negapatam	5,000
11. Turicorin	13,000
12. Manapad	51,230
13. Muttam	10,450
14. Tangasséri	88,000
15. Sacrifice Rock	96,000
16. Mulki	68,600
Total ..	7,89,510
or in round figures ..	8,00,000

NOTE.—Of these, the estimates for Nos. 4, 5, 9, 12, 14, 15 and 16 provide for new lighthouses; the remaining estimates provide for improvements to existing lighthouses.

NOTE.—The estimates for some of the above are only approximate. Of the above the improvements at Havelock Point, Seven Pagodas, Manapad, Muttam and Mulki are already in hand.

11. The question as to the classes of vessels that should be taxed to meet the expenditure on "coast" lights and the rates to be imposed will now be considered. It may be perhaps assumed that all vessels which derive benefit from the "coast" lights should contribute, and that the rate should be determined by the amount or frequency of the benefit.

12. Mr. Ashpitel proposed in his report embodied with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, the imposition of a light due on the following classes of vessels at the rate specified against each class:—

On each coasting vessel	12 pies per ton per month.
On each Native craft	6 pies per ton per month.
On each Foreign steamer	7 pies per ton per voyage.

This method, though simple and easy of collection in regard to coasting vessels, would not be equitable for the reason that the incidence of the tax would weigh equally heavily on *all* coasting vessels, however much or little they used the lights. A better method would perhaps be to charge per voyage, to make a distinction between vessels using the lights of the whole cost, *e.g.*, British Indian and Asiatic Steamers, and those using only a portion of them, to render the dues identical for both the eastern and western group of ports, and make them leviable once per voyage on vessels using the lights of each group.

13. The Presidency Port Officer has proposed the following classification of vessels and rates of dues:—

Classes of vessels.	*Rate of due proposed and how often leviable.*
Class I. All steam vessels engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta and Bombay, and between Rangoon and Madras *viâ* ports north of Madras. * $\frac{63,746 \times 9 \times 8}{12 \times 16}$ = Rs. 23,905.	Nine pies or As. 1-6 per ton per voyage for each group, provided that if no port in the eastern group be touched at, the due for that group shall not be levied. *Note.*—A vessel bound from Calcutta to Bombay unless she called at a port in the eastern group would not sight any of the lights until she arrived on the West coast and only West coast dues would be leviable. The tonnage of arrivals under this class at Madras during 1897-98 is reported to have been 63,746 tons. Each vessel or its substitute is estimated to make use of the lights on each coast not less than eight times a year. On this basis, and at 9 pies per ton the annual receipts for each group will be Rs. 23,905*. For both the groups, the receipts will be doubled, *i.e.*, 47,810. At the higher rate of As. 1-6 per ton, the receipts will be twice 47,810 or Rs. 95,620.
Class II. All steam vessels, British and Foreign, to or from Europe, the Australian, African and other British Colonies including the Straits Settlements and Ceylon and vessels from Indian ports and ports in Burma which, in the oridinary course of a voyage, will pass or derive benefit from any of the coast lights in the Madras Presidency, and vessels calling at not more than one port in a group, but which do not come under the conditions of Class I. The Presidency Port Officer estimates receipts under this class from three sources :— *First.*—From vessels which may be expected to pay dues to the eastern group *once* during the year; the tonnage of these vessels during 1897-98 is stated to be 166,169 tons ; *Secondly.*—From what the Presidency Port Officer calls "Semi-coasting" vessels, whose tonnage during the same period amounted to 44,441 tons ; and *Thirdly.*—From vessels which may be expected to render themselves liable to payment of dues to the eastern group, at least three times during the year; their tonnage for 1897-98 is reported to have been 90,631 tons. At the lower rate of 6 pies per ton the receipts from this class will amount to Rs. 15,079.* At one anna, the receipts will be doubled, *i.e.*, Rupees 30,158.	Six pies or 12 pies per ton per voyage per group. One payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days ; payable on arrival at a port in the Madras Presidency. To this class must be added the steamer plying between Colombo and Tuticorin, originally included in class V, but now entered, in class II. The dues derivable will be Rs. 376 per annum at the lower rate, and Rs. 752 at the higher rate.

	Rs.
* Tonnage of vessels liable *once* during the year 166,169+44,441 = 210,610 tons.	
At 6 pies per ton, the receipts = $\frac{210,610 \times 6}{12 \times 16}$ ..	6,582
Tonnage of vessels liable *thrice* during the year = 90,631 tons.	
At 6 pies per ton, the receipts will be $\frac{90,631 \times 6 \times 3}{12 \times 16}$	8,497
Total ..	15,079

Class III. All steam vessels from Bombay or ports in the Bombay Presidency, bound direct for Colombo and from Colombo direct for ports in the Bombay Presidency.	Eight pies or 19 pies per ton per voyage payable on arrival at or departure from *Bombay*.
The Presidency Port Officer bases his estimate of receipts from this class from the number of P. and O. steamers on the China line of which there are two fortnightly—one up and one down. While vessels of other lines will also be liable, this basis is apparently adopted as a safe one. The tonnage of these vessels may be taken as 2,000 each For one month, the tonnage liable to dues will be 8,000, and for one year 96,000 tons. At 8 pies per ton the receipts will be $\frac{96,000 \times 8}{12 \times 16} =$ Rs. 4,000. At 16 pies, the receipts will be Rs. 8,000.	
Class IV. All sailing vessels of 15 tons and upwards coasting or otherwise.	Four pies or 8 pies per ton per voyage per group; one payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days. Large sailing vessels from the United Kingdom very seldom visit this coast and the Presidency Port Officer considers it unnecessary to make any special rate for them. The aggregate tonnage of native sailing craft during 1896-97 was 713,000 tons. This shipping paid in port dues Rs. 22,971 at one anna per ton for every 60 days. Upon this basis, the Presidency Port Officer estimates receipts from light dues (leviable at 4 or 8 pies per ton) at $\frac{1}{3}$ or $\frac{2}{3}$ of the port dues, *i.e.*, at $\frac{22,971 \times 1}{3}$ or $\frac{22,971 \times 2}{3} =$ Rs. 7,657 or Rs 15,314.
Class V. Steamears from Bombay bound for the minor ports of South Canara whose voyage terminates at Mangalore.	Three pies or 6 pies per ton every thirty days. These vessels will benefit by one or two lights only and hence the lower rate proposed. It is reported that there are eight steamers aggregating 2,650 tons performing the service between Bombay and Mangalore. Owing to the closing of the ports for the south-west monsoon, it is estimated that they will pay dues six times each year. The receipts will then be $\frac{2,650 \times 3 \times 6}{12 \times 16} =$ Rs. 248 or Rs. 496 at the higher rate.
Class VI. Steamers plying between Madras and Rangoon	Seven pies or 14 pies per ton every thirty days. The aggregate tonnage of vessels under this class for 1897-98 was 8,199 tons. It is estimated that each vessel of this class will make not less than twelve trips per annum; at 7 pies per ton they will pay $\frac{8,199 \times 12 \times 7}{12 \times 16} =$ Rs. 3,587 or Rs. 7,174 at the higher rate.

14. The total approximate receipts from the proposed levy of light dues as estimated by the Presidency Port Officer will thus come to Rs. 78,569 * at the lower, or Rs. 1,57,138 * at the higher rate. This will be the amount available for (1) maintenance of coast lights, (2) payment of interest on capital outlay, and (3) provision of a Sinking fund for the extinction of the loan.

Receipts.

	Lower rate.	Higher rate.
	RS.	RS.
* Class I	47,810	95,620
" II	15,455	30,910
" III	4,000	8,000
" IV	7,657	15,314
" V	248	496
" VI	3,587	7,174
Total ..	78,569	1,57,138

15. No precise information is at present available as to the amount that will have to be set apart for maintenance; some of the lighthouses not having yet been built, and their improved illuminating apparatus brought into use. A rough forecast is, therefore, all that is possible. The following figures given in Mr. Ashpitel's report recorded with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, may, perhaps, be adopted :—

Coast Lights.	Maintenance charges.
	RS.
1. Calingapatam	3,900
2. Santapilli	5,500
3. Vakalapudi	3,800
4. Sacramento	5,000
5. Havelock Point	5,130
6. Armeghon	3,800
7. Pulicat	3,800
8. Madras	4,600
9. Seven Pagodas	4,800
10. Negapatam	1,200
11. Tuticorin	1,150
12. Manapad	5,000
13. Muttam	5,300
14. Tangasséri	4,600
15. Sacrifice Rock	7,200
16. Mulki	5,100
Total ..	70,150

On this basis, the lower rates of light dues, calculated to yield Rs. 78,569, will be insufficient to pay for maintenance † and interest ‡ charges. So these rates are out of the question. On the other hand, the higher rates will, as will be seen from the accompanying statement A, liquidate a loan of Rs. 8,00,000 in 12 years after paying interest at 3½ per cent. on capital outlay and meeting maintenance charges. They therefore seem to be unnecessarily high and a statement (B attached) has been prepared showing two rates intermediate between those proposed by the Presidency Port Officer which will liquidate the loan in 21 and 49 years, respectively. Under the proposed draft Bill, referred to *infra*, the Government is empowered, subject to a maximum, to raise or lower the rates. There seems, therefore, no objection to the higher rates being entered in the schedule and such rates, not exceeding them, levied as may, from time to time, be found necessary. With the double object of imposing as light a due as possible and of obviating any considerable reduction of the dues when the loan is liquidated—only maintenance charges having then to be met from light dues—the lower rate as entered in column 4 of statement B has been calculated. This will extinguish the loan in 49 years. The proposed loan of Rs. 8,00,000 will cover all capital charges on account of coast lights and admit of the expenditure already incurred this year and debited to Port funds being refunded.

† 70,150.	
‡ 28,000	for 1st year on a loan of Rs. 8,00,000 at 3½ per cent.
98,150	

17–20

5

S R

No. 471, Marine, 31st May 1899.

16. The framing of the legislative enactment has now to be considered. Attached is a rough draft of the proposed Bill. It is an adaptation of the Burma Coast Lights Act IX of 1879, and comparatively few deviations from that Act have been made in the draft. The Burma Act is an Imperial enactment and the proposed enactment for this Presidency should also, it is thought, be an Imperial measure as it extends to territories outside the limits of the Presidency of Fort St. George. Under rule 3 of the précis of Legislative standing orders "no provision should be made in any Bill to be introduced into any Legislative Council in India for the creation of such * a fund, until the expediency of the measure has been specially considered in the Finance Department of the Government of India." The proposed Bill aims at creating such a special fund, and it will thus have also to be laid before the Government of India in the Financial Department before it can be introduced into the Legislative Council.

17. The views of the mercantile bodies and agents are also invited on the draft Bill, which will also be referred to the Presidency Port Officer and the Advocate-General, for remarks.

(True Extract.)

W. B. deWINTON,
Secretary to Government.

To the Presidency Port Officer.
,, the Government Solicitor.
,, Messrs. Arbuthnot & Co., Madras.
,, ,, Binny & Co., Madras.
,, ,, Wilson & Co., Madras.
,, ,, Gordon, Woodroffe & Co., Madras.
,, ,, Best & Co., Madras.
,, ,, Parry & Co., Madras.
,, the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Madras.
,, the ,, Madras Trades Association.
,, the ,, European Chamber of Commerce, Cocanada.
,, the ,, Native ,, ,, ,,
,, the ,, Cochin Chamber of Commerce.
,, Messrs. Adamson, Mactaggart & Co., Negapatam.
,, ,, Burnett & Son, Tellicherry.
,, ,, Peirce, Leslie & Co., Calicut.
,, ,, Stuart, Hall & Co., Vizagapatam.
,, the Financial Department.
,, the Superintendent of Works, Lighthouse Division.

G.O., No. 471, 31st May 1899.

MAY.

Coast Light Dues.

a/

Requesting the representatives of mercantile and shipping interests in the Madras Presidency to favour the Government with their views both as to the necessity for the proposed improvements to lighthouses and as to the ability of the trade to bear the proposed imposition of —, and referring, for opinion, the draft Bill on the subject, to certain officers, mercantile bodies and agents.

Annexure

---

* i.e., appropriations from which are restricted to defined purposes.

Mar. 471

22

21

~~Annexure~~

Accompaniments to G.O., No. 471, *Marine, dated* 31st *May* 1899.

A. LIGHT DUES—Financial Forecast.

Year.	Loan at beginning of the year.	Annual receipts from light dues at maximum rates.	Maintenance charges.	Interest on loan at 3½ per cent. on amount in column 2.	Total of columns 4 and 5.	Balance available for extinction of loan (column 3 — column 6).	Loan outstanding at close of the year (column 2—column 7).
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
1st ..	8,00,000	1,57,138	70,150	28,000	98,150	58,988	7,41,012
2nd ..	7,41,012	1,57,138	70,150	25,935	96,085	61,053	6,79,959
3rd ..	6,79,959	1,57,138	70,150	23,799	93,949	63,189	6,16,770
4th ..	6,16,770	1,57,138	70,150	21,587	91,737	65,401	5,51,369
5th ..	5,51,369	1,57,138	70,150	19,298	89,448	67,690	4,83,679
6th ..	4,83,679	1,57,138	70,150	16,929	87,079	70,059	4,13,620
7th ..	4,13,620	1,57,138	70,150	14,477	84,627	72,511	3,41,109
8th ..	3,41,109	1,57,138	70,150	11,939	82,089	75,049	2,66,060
9th ..	2,66,060	1,57,138	70,150	9,312	79,462	77,676	1,88,384
10th ..	1,88,384	1,57,138	70,150	6,593	76,743	80,395	1,07,989
11th ..	1,07,989	1,57,138	70,150	3,780	73,930	83,208	24,781
12th ..	24,781	1,57,138	70,150	867	71,017	86,121	A surplus of Rs. 61,340 after extinction of the loan.

rule

B.

Class.	Tonnage.	Alternative rate. (*a*)	Alternative rate. (*b*)	Receipts calculated at the rate entered in column 3.	Receipts calculated at the rate entered in column 4.
1	2	3	4	5	6
				RS.	RS.
I.	63,746 tons	15 pies	12 pies	79,683	63,746
II.	210,610 (leviable once) .. . 90,631 (leaviable three times) .. 1,000 (leaviable twelve times) ..	9 ,,	9 ,,	23,180	23,180
III.	96,000 tons	10 ,,	10 ,,	5,000	5,000
IV.	Based on the port dues which amounted to Rs. 22,971 at 1 anna per ton	6 ,,	4 ,,	11,486	7,657
V.	2,650 tons (leviable six times) ..	6 ,,	6 ,,	497	497
VI.	8,199 tons (leviable twelve times) ..	10 ,,	9 ,,	5,124	4,612
	Total ..	..	..	(*a*) 1,24,970	(*b*) 1,04,692

(*a*) This will liquidate the loan in 21 years. (*b*) The loan will run for 49 years.

S. R

21 — 22

6

P. Venkatachalam

C.

Draft Bill to provide for the levy of dues for the use of Coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George.

Preamble.

WHEREAS it is expedient for the maintenance of coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George to levy dues on vessels passing or deriving benefit from such lights; It is hereby enacted as follows :—

Preliminary.

Short title. Commencement. Local extent.

1. This Act may be called "The Madras Coast Light Dues Act, 1899." It shall come into force on the . . . . and it shall extend to the territories respectively administered by the Governors of Fort St. George and Bombay in Council and the Lieutenant-Governors of Bengal and Burma.

Saving.

But nothing herein contained shall apply to any vessel belonging to or in the service of Her Majesty or the Government of India or to any vessel of war belonging to any Foreign Prince or State.

Interpretation clause.

2. In this Act unless there is something repugnant in the subject or context—

"Customs Collector."

"Customs Collector" means a Customs Collector appointed under the Sea Customs Act, 1878, and includes any person appointed by the Local Government by name or in virtue of his office to discharge the functions of a Customs Collector under this Act at any port.

"Vessel."

"Vessel" includes any thing made for the conveyance by water of human beings or of property.

"Master."

"Master" when used in relation to any vessel means any person (except a Pilot or Harbour Master) having for the time being the charge or control of such vessel.

"Voyage."

"Voyage" means the whole distance between a vessel's place of departure and her final place of arrival; but the return of a vessel from any place shall, notwithstanding the terms of any charter party, be deemed a distinct voyage.

Coast Light Dues.

Coast light dues payable in respect of vessels of 15 tons.

3. For the purpose of maintaining coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George, a toll, hereinafter called "Coast light dues" shall be paid in respect of every vessel of the burden of 15 tons and upwards making any voyage mentioned in the schedule hereto annexed of the rate specified in column 2 thereof.

Dues when payable.

4. The said coast light dues shall become due and payable—

(*a*) In the case of a vessel clearing out of a port in British India upon any such voyage previous to the grant of any port clearance;

(*b*) in the case of a vessel entering a port in British India in the course or at the hat thio of any such voyage—immediately upon her entering such port: provi of porte saiudues shall not be levied more than once in the same port or groups Acts on anydvessel in the course of the same voyage and that for the purposes of this in the port of Madras shall be reckoned as belonging to the eastern group of port the Presidency of Fort St. George any provisions to the contrary in any other enactment notwithstanding.

471-Marine

P. Venkatakrishnan

Jan: 471

Power to vary rates of dues.

5. With the prior sanction of the Governor-General in Council, the Governor in Council of Fort St. George may from time to time, by notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, reduce or raise the rate of coast light dues in respect of all vessels or any particular class of vessels.

Provided that such rate shall not in any case exceed the rate fixed by section 3.

Collection of dues.

Voucher to be given.

6. The Customs Collector shall collect the coast light dues, and shall grant to the person paying the same a voucher in writing under his hand setting forth the name of his office, the port at which the coast light dues are paid, the amount so paid, the name, tonnage and other proper description of the vessel in respect of which such payment is made, and the voyage on which she is or has been bound.

Master to report arrival.

7. Within 24 hours after the arrival within a port of any vessel chargeable with coast light dues, the master of such vessel shall give notice of such arrival to the Customs Collector.

Tonnage of vessel chargeable with coast light dues how ascertained.

8. In order to ascertain the tonnage of any vessel chargeable with coast light dues, the following rules shall be observed :—

If registered.

(*a*) If such vessel be a British registered vessel or a vessel registered under Act No. X of 1841 or Act No. XI of 1850, or under any other law for the time being in force for the registration of vessels in India, the Customs Collector may require the owner or master of such vessel, or any other person having possession of her register to produce such register for inspection. If any such owner, master or other person neglects or refuses to produce such register or otherwise to satisfy the Customs Collector as to what is the true tonnage of the vessel in respect of which such coast light dues are payable, he shall be punished with fine which may extend to one hundred rupees, and the Customs Collector may cause such vessel to be measured and the tonnage thereof to be ascertained; and in such case, the owner or master of such vessel shall also be liable to pay the expenses of such measurement.

If not registered.

(*b*) If such vessel be not a British registered vessel or a vessel registered under Act No. X of 1841 or Act No. XI of 1850 or under any other law for the time being in force for the registration of vessels in India, and the owner or master thereof fails to satisfy the Customs Collector as to what is her true tonnage according to the mode of measurement prescribed by the law in force for the time being for regulating the measurement of British registered vessels, the Customs Collector shall cause such vessel to be measured and the tonnage thereof, according to the mode aforesaid, to be ascertained; and in such case the owner or master of such vessel shall be liable to pay the expenses of such measurement.

On refusal to pay dues or expenses, the Collector may distrain and sell.

9. If the master of any vessel refuses or neglects to pay to the Customs Collector on demand by him the amount of any dues or expenses payable in respect of such vessel under this Act, the Customs Collector may distrain or arrest such vessel and the tackle, apparel and furniture belonging thereto, or any part thereof, and detain the same until the amount of such dues or expenses is paid; and in case any part of such dues or expenses, or of the costs of the distress or arrest, or of the keeping of the same, remains unpaid for the space of five days next after any such distress or arrest so made, the Customs Collector may cause the vessel or other thing so distrained or arrested to be sold, and with the proceeds of such sale may satisfy such dues, expenses and costs (including the costs of sale) remaining unpaid, and shall render the surplus (if any) to the master of such vessel upon demand.

No port clearance to be granted until dues, &c., are paid.

10. The officer of Government whose duty it is to grant a port clearance for any vessel shall not grant such port clearance until her master or some other person has paid, or secured to the satisfaction of such officer, the amount of all dues, expenses and costs with which such vessel is chargeable under this Act, and of any fine to which any person is liable for anything done by him in contravention of this Act.

Master to specify on demand voyage on which vessel is bound.

11. The master of any vessel departing from or entering any port in British India upon, or in the course of, or at the termination of, any voyage, shall, upon the demand of the Customs Collector, specify upon what voyage she is or has been bound.

Penalty for evading payment of dues, &c.

12. If the master of any vessel evades, or attempts to evade, the payment of any coast light dues, expenses or costs payable in respect of such vessel under this Act, he shall be punished with fine which may extend to two hundred rupees.

Determination of disputes under Act.

13. If any dispute arises as to whether any vessel is chargeable with any coast light dues, expenses or costs under this Act, or as to the amount of such dues, expenses or costs, such dispute shall upon application made in that behalf by either of the disputing parties, be heard and determined in the towns of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay by a Presidency Magistrate and elsewhere by any Magistrate exercising at the place where the dispute arises powers under the Code of Criminal Procedure not less than those of a Magistrate of the second class. All decisions under this section shall be final.

Prosecutions under other Laws.

Saving of prosecutions under other laws.

14. Nothing herein contained shall prevent any person from being prosecuted under any other law for any act or omission which constitutes an offence against this Act: provided that no person shall be punished twice for the same act or omission.

Statement of Receipts and Expenditure.

Statement of receipts and expenditure to be published.

15. The Governor in Council of Fort St. George shall on or before the first day of October in each year publish in the *Fort St. George Gazette* a statement showing the amount received on account of coast light dues during the year ending on the thirty-first day of March last preceding, and the amount expended during the same period on the maintenance of coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George.

SCHEDULE.

VESSELS chargeable with Light dues, rate of Light dues and frequency of payment.

Vessels chargeable.	Rate of light dues.	How often chargeable.
CLASS I. All steam vessels engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta and Bombay and between Rangoon and Madras *via* ports north of Madras.	1½ annas per ton.	Once during a voyage for each group, provided that it no port in the eastern group be touched at, the due for that group shall not be paid.
CLASS II. All steam vessels, British and Foreign, to or from Europe, the Australian, African and other British Colonies, including the Straits Settlements and Ceylon and vessels from Indian ports and ports in Burma which in the ordinary course of a voyage will pass or derive benefit from any of the coast lights in the Madras Presidency and vessels calling at more than one port in the group, and which do not come under the conditions of Class I.	12 pies per ton ..	Once per voyage per group; one payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days; payable on arrival at a port in the Presidency of Fort St. George.
CLASS III. All steam vessels from Bombay or ports in the Bombay Presidency bound direct for Colombo and from Colombo direct to ports in the Bombay Presidency.	16 pies per ton ..	Once during a voyage payable on arrival at or departure from Bombay.
CLASS IV. All sailing vessels of 15 tons and upwards, coasting or otherwise.	8 pies per ton ..	Once during a voyage for each group. One payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days.
CLASS V. All steam vessels from Bombay bound for the minor ports of South Canara whose voyage terminates at Mangalore.	6 pies per ton ..	Once for every thirty days.
CLASS VI. All steam vessels plying direct between Madras and Rangoon.	14 pies per ton ..	Once for every thirty days.

D

G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896.

STATEMENT OF OBJECTS AND REASONS.

WHEREAS the Government of Fort St. George has undertaken an extensive and costly scheme of lighthouse construction and illumination on the coasts of the Madras Presidency, and whereas it is necessary to raise funds in the open market for the capital outlay thereon, it is proposed in the accompanying Bill to levy a coast light due on vessels deriving benefit from the lights in question; the proceeds of the due being applied to payment of—

(1) the interest on the loan; (2) a sinking fund for its final extinction; and (3) the maintenance of the lights.

471-Marine

Marine 12.6 5 12.6 5 12/6/05

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O., No. 471, MARINE, DATED 31st MAY 1899.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

20C 29/7

[SUBJECT.—*Lighthouse programme and levy of light dues.*]

Press. Please strike copies nw.

27.7.05

Back papers.

G.O.,	*Nos.* 25–26,	*Marine,*	*dated*	*22nd Jan.*	1891.
„	*No.* 230	„	„	*26th May*	„
„	„ 438	„	„	*8th Oct.*	„
„	„ 23	„	„	*19th Jan.*	1892.
„	„ 157	„	„	*15th May*	1893.
„	„ 431	„	„	*6th Dec.*	„
„	„ 80	„	„	*8th Mar.*	1894.
„	„ 216	„	„	*11th June*	„
„	„ 318	„	„	*10th Aug.*	„
„	*Nos.* 245–46	„	„	*8th April*	1896.
„	*No.* 562	„	„	*19th Aug.*	„
„	*Nos.* 316–17	„	„	*29th April*	1898.
„	*No.* 574	„	„	*4th July*	„
„	„ 732	„	„	*30th Aug.*	„
Letter	„ 733	„	„	*30th* „	„
G.O.,	„ 29	„	„	*10th Jan*	1899.
Letter	„ 30	„	„	*10th* „	„
G.O. Nos	579-80 Marine		„	8th May	1899.

~~*Marine C. No. 1136 of 1898 with draft order.*~~
~~*Govt. of India No. 1429-E., dated 29th March 1899.*~~
~~*The Indian Ports Act (Act X of 1889) and Amending Acts.*~~

Memorandum to the Presidency Port Officer, No. 416 E., dated 11th August 1898.
From the Presidency Port Officer, No. 1271/299 *G., dated 1st Sept.* 1898.
Telegram to the Presidency Port Officer, dated 27th Sept. 1898.
„ *from the Presidency Port Officer,* ~~*No.* 1271/299 *G., dated 27th Sept.* 1898.~~
~~*Official*~~ *memorandum to the Presidency Port Officer, No. 496 E., dated 29th Sept.* 1898.
From the Presidency Port Officer, No. 1271/342 *G., dated 8th October* 1898.

For the Secretary—

Before proceeding with the question of legislation for the levy of light dues, it seems necessary that a decision should be come to in regard to the classification of lights under the two main heads, viz., "Port" and "Coast" lights. At present such a division is not recognized, and all expenditure is charged to Port funds. For the future the Government of India has stated in paragraph 7 of its letter No. 3285-S. R., dated 27th July 1898, that any fresh expenditure to be incurred for erecting and maintaining lights on the Madras Coast, over and above past standards, should be provided for by means of light dues.

G.O., No. 732, Marine, dated 30th August 1898.

It is doubtful, however, whether this ruling is in strict accordance with law. It will be seen from section 36 (3) (*b*) of the Indian Ports Act, 1889 (X of 1889), that Port funds cannot be spent on lights other than those "maintained chiefly for the benefit of vessels *being in* or *entering* or *leaving* the ports or passing through the rivers or channels *leading* thereto". "Coast" lights, therefore, or those intended for the use of vessels passing along the coast, would have to be erected and maintained from some other source—presumably *Imperial funds*, in the absence, or pending the levy, of special light dues for the purpose.

2

G.O., No. 29, Marine dated 10th January 1899.

In its subsequent letter No. 4778 S.R., dated 2nd November 1898, the Government of India raises purely technical objections to the grant of a loan, quoting sub-section (3) of section 36 of the Ports Act as a bar to a loan to *Port funds* on account of "Coast" lights, and the general provincial contract arrangements as militating against any loan to *provincial*. But as pointed out above, it may be contended by the Madras Government that the expenditure on "Coast" lights is a direct imperial charge. It may further be contended that imperial is also liable to Port funds for all past outlay on this class of lights wrongly and illegally charged to Port funds. It should not for a moment be admitted that the expenditure in question falls against *provincial*, no allowance for it having been made in the provincial contract arrangements.

This being the position, the Madras Government might waive its claim to a refund of past expenditure, on condition that the Government of India now makes a temporary grant from Imperial revenues for the erection and immediate maintenance of "Coast" lights, repayable on the introduction and collection of light dues.

Mr. Ashpitel places sixteen lights in the "Coast" group (including Alleppi) while the Presidency Port Officer in his letter No. 1271/299-G., dated 1st September 1898, allocates nineteen lights (excluding Alleppi) to that group. It seems necessary that this discrepancy should be reconciled before again approaching the Government of India on the subject of the contribution from Imperial funds, the amount of which will depend on the number of lights classed under the "Coast" group.

Yes. Please have this definitely settled ‡ first.
W. B. de Winton—14-11-98.

~~‡ As quickly as possible.~~

G.O., No. 29, Marine, dated 10th January 1899.

Meanwhile, the following information is submitted with reference to India's letter No. 4778-S.R., dated 2nd November 1898:—

Paragraph 3.—The lights for the construction of which the loan of Rs. 2,15,000 was applied for include "Coast" * and "Port" * lights (Rs. 2,06,000 † for coast lights and Rs. 9,000 † for port lights). The total cost of the lighthouse scheme is Rs. 8,80,000, of which Rs. 8,00,000 ‡ is for "Coast" lights and Rs. 80,000 § for port lights. It will thus be seen that the major portion of the loan required is for "Coast" lights.

Letter No. 733, Marine, dated 30th August 1898.

Paragraph 4.—In this paragraph, the Government of India points out that lighthouse construction is not a productive work on which Government can spend money and charge it otherwise than against the revenues of the year in which it is spent. The meaning of this seems to be that the expenditure in each year on lighthouse construction should be restricted to the receipts in that year from light dues. If this be so, the works cannot be carried out within the next two years by raising a loan in the open market to be liquidated hereafter by light dues, as contemplated by this Government. As pointed out above, however, the whole circumstances seem now to be changed. "Port" lights will probably have to be carried out from Port funds, and "Coast" lights, on which the expenditure is much larger, will perhaps be started by an imperial contribution which will be repaid in due course from the proceeds of light dues.

R. Parsons—11-11-98.

---

* These are the terms used by the Government of India.

† For these details, please see page 10 of G.O., No. 316, Marine, dated 29th April 1898.

	RS.
Sacramento Coast light ...	1,00,000
Vakalapudi " ...	18,000
Tangasséri " ...	88,000
	2,06,000
Cochin Port light ...	9,000
	2,15,000

‡ *Vide* total in column 16 of the statement on page 17 of G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896.

§ *Vide* total in column 17 of the statement on page 17 of G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896.

2

~~Official~~ memorandum to the Presidency Port Officer, No. 586 E., dated 17th Nov. 1898.
From the Presidency Port Officer, No. 1271/40½ G., dated 18th November 1898.
~~Official~~ memorandum to the Presidency Port Officer, No. 41 E., dated 20th Jan. 1899.
" " No. 44 E., dated 20th "
From the Presidency Port Officer, No. 1271/36 G., dated 24th January 1899.

B The Government having undertaken an extensive and costly scheme of lighthouse construction and illumination on the coasts of the Madras Presidency, and the appeal to the Government of India for a free grant from Imperial funds having failed, the question of raising the requisite funds by a loan in the open market and of the imposition of light dues to liquidate it remains to be considered.

G.O., No. 732, Marine, dated 30th August 1898.

2. In their letter, No. 3285-S R., dated 27th July 1898, the Government of India suggested that some scheme "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". Some expenditure from Port funds having already been incurred in the erection of lighthouses on the coasts of this Presidency, and maintenance charges being still provided from this source, the Government of India intimated that they had no objection to the Government of Madras continuing to bear such expenditure to the same extent as before, leaving the balance of the requisite outlay for the completion of the lighthouse scheme, under both construction and maintenance, to be met from the proceeds of the proposed loan.

G.O., No. 732, Marine, dated 30th August 1898.

3. Further investigation has, however, disclosed the fact that Port funds are not legally applicable to lighthouses of all classes, but must, under sub-section 5 of section 36 of the Indian Ports Act X of 1889, be limited to "lights maintained chiefly for the benefit of vessels being in or entering or leaving the port or passing through the rivers or channels leading thereto," *i.e.*, to lights of the class now technically called "Port" lights. It would, therefore, be illegal and inadmissible to continue as suggested by the Government of India, expenditure on all lights indiscriminately "to the same extent as before."

4. To obviate this difficulty, the lights of this Presidency must, in future, be arranged under two distinct groups, viz. :—

(1) Port lights and
(2) Coast lights;

and Port funds be spent on the former only. Class (1) includes lights of local utility, and class (2) those which serve the purposes of general navigation beyond port limits.

5. The following have been classified as "Coast lights," the estimated expenditure on which amounts to Rs. 6,73,000 as shown below :—

Coast lights.	Estimated cost.*
	RS.
1. Calingapatam	5,000
2. Santapilli	1,00,000
3. Vakalapudi	18,000
4. Sacramento	1,00,000
5. Kistna	91,000
6. Arméghon	18,000
7. Pulicat	23,000
8. Madras	1,000
9. Seven Pagodas	53,000
10. Negapatam	5,000
11. Tuticorin	13,000
12. Manapad	47,000
13. Muttum	12,000
14. Tangasséri	88,000
15. Tellicherry	3,000
16. Mulki	96,000
Total ...	6,73,000

6. The question as to the classes of vessels that should be taxed to meet the expenditure on "Coast lights" and the rates to be imposed will now be considered. It may be perhaps assumed that all vessels which derive benefit from the "Coast lights" should contribute, and that the rate should be determined by the amount or frequency of the benefit.

7. Mr. Ashpitel proposed in his report embodied with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, the imposition of a light due on the following classes of vessels at the rates specified against each class :—

On each coasting vessel—12 pies per ton per month.

On each Native craft—6 pies per ton per month.

On each Foreign steamer—7 pies per ton per voyage.

This method, though simple and easy of collection in regard to coasting vessels, would not be equitable for the reason that the incidence of the tax would weigh equally heavily on *all* coasting vessels, however much or little they used the lights. A better method would perhaps be to charge per voyage, to make a distinction between vessels using the lights of the whole coast, *e.g.*, British Indian and

---

* These figures have been taken from statement on page 10 of G.O., No. 316, Marine, dated 29th April 1898. The coast lights are those last selected by the Presidency Port Officer in consultation with Mr. Ashpitel.

Asiatic steamers, and those using only a portion of them, to render the dues identical for both the eastern and western group of ports, and make them leviable once per voyage on vessels using the lights of each group.

8. The Presidency Port Officer has, on these and other suggestions which are contained in memorandum No. 416 E., dated 11th August 1898, and after discussion with the undersigned as to certain classes and rates, proposed the following classification of vessels and rates of dues:—

Rate of due proposed and how often leviable.

Classes of vessels—Class I.—All steam vessels engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta and Bombay, and between Rangoon and Madras, *vid* ports north of Madras. Nine pies or As. 1-6 per ton per voyage for each group, provided that if no port in the eastern group be touched at, the due for that group shall not be levied.

NOTE.—A vessel bound from Calcutta to Bombay unless she called at a port in the eastern group would not sight any of the light until she arrived on the West Coast and only West Coast dues would be leviable.

The tonnage of arrivals under this class at Madras during 1897-98 is reported to have been 63,746 tons. Each vessel or its substitute is estimated to make use of the lights on each coast not less than eight times a year. On this basis, and at 9 pies per ton, the annual receipts for each group will be Rs. 23,905*. For both the groups, the receipts will be doubled, *i.e.*, 47,810. At the higher rate of As. 1-6 per ton, the receipts will be twice Rs. 47,810 or Rs. 95,620.

$$*\frac{63,746 \times 9 \times 8}{12 \times 16} = \text{Rs. } 23,905.$$

Class II.—All steam vessels, British and Foreign, to or from Europe, the Australian, African and other British Colonies including the Straits Settlements and Ceylon and vessels from Indian ports and ports in Burma which, in the ordinary course of a voyage, will pass or derive benefit from any of the coast lights in the Madras Presidency, and vessels calling at more than one port in a group, but which do not come under the conditions of Class I. Six pies or 12 pies per ton per voyage per group. One payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days; payable on arrival at a port in the Madras Presidency.

V. Cundaswamy

X

The Presidency Port Officer estimates receipts under this class from three sources :—

Firstly.—From vessels which may be expected to pay dues to the eastern group *once* during the year; the tonnage of these vessels during 1897–98 is stated to be 166,169 tons;

Secondly.—From what the Presidency Port Officer calls "Semi-coasting" vessels, whose tonnage during the same period amounted to 44,441 tons; ~~and~~ 8

To this class must be added the steamers plying between Colombo and Tuticorin, originally included in class V, but now entered, in class II. The dues derivable will be Rs. 376 per annum at the lower rate, and Rs. 752 at the higher rate.

Thirdly.—From vessels which may be expected to render themselves liable to payment of dues to the eastern group, at least three times during the year; their tonnage for 1897–98 is reported to have been 90,631 tons. At the lower rate of 6 pies per ton the receipts from this class will amount to Rs. 15,079.* At one anna, the receipts will be doubled, *i.e.*, Rupees 30,158.

An

	RS.
* Tonnage of vessels liable *once* during the year $166,169 + 44,441 = 210,610$ tons.	
At 6 pies per ton, the receipts $= \frac{210,610 \times 6}{12 \times 16}$ ..	6,582
Tonnage of vessels liable *thrice* during the year $= 90,631$ tons.	
At 6 pies per ton, the receipts will be $\frac{90,631 \times 6 \times 3}{12 \times 16}$	8,497
Total ..	15,079

Class III.—All steam vessels from Bombay or ports in the Bombay Presidency, bound direct for Colombo and from Colombo direct for ports in the Bombay Presidency. Eight pies or 16 pies per ton per voyage payable on arrival at or departure from *Bombay*.

The Presidency Port Officer bases his estimate of receipts from this class from the number of P. and O. steamers on the China line of which there are two fortnightly—one up and one down. While vessels of other lines will also be liable, this basis is apparently adopted as a safe one. The tonnage of these vessels may be taken as 2,000 each. For one month, the tonnage liable to dues will be 8,000,

V. Candaswamy

7

K.V.

7

and for one year 96,000 tons. At 8 pies per ton the receipts will be $\frac{96,000 \times 8}{12 \times 16} =$ Rs. 4,000. At 16 pies, the receipts will be Rs. 8,000.

Class IV.—All sailing vessels of 15 tons and upwards coasting or otherwise. Four pies or 8 pies per ton per voyage per group; one payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days.

Large sailing vessels from the United Kingdom very seldom visit this coast and the Presidency Port Officer considers it unnecessary to make any special rate for them. The aggregate tonnage of native sailing craft during 1896–97 was 713,000 tons. This shipping paid in port dues Rs. 22,971 at one anna per ton for every 60 days. Upon this basis, the Presidency Port Officer estimates receipts from light dues (leviable at 4 or 8 pies per ton) at $\frac{1}{3}$ or $\frac{2}{3}$ of the port dues, *i.e.*, at $\frac{22,971 \times 1}{3}$ or $\frac{22,971 \times 2}{3} =$ Rs. 7,657 or Rs. 15,314.

Class V.—Steamers from Bombay bound for the minor ports of South Canara whose voyage terminates at Mangalore. Three pies or 6 pies per ton every thirty days.

These vessels will benefit by one or two lights only and hence the lower rate proposed. It is reported that there are eight steamers aggregating 2,650 tons performing the service between Bombay and Mangalore. Owing to the closing of the ports for the south-west monsoon, it is estimated that they will pay dues six times each year. The receipts will then be $\frac{2,650 \times 3 \times 6}{12 \times 16} =$ Rs. 248 or Rs. 496 at the higher rate.

Class VI.—Steamers plying between Madras and Rangoon. Seven pies or 14 pies per ton every thirty days.

The aggregate tonnage of vessels under this class for 1897–98 was 8,199 tons. It is estimated that each vessel of this class will make not less than twelve trips per annum; at 7 pies per ton they will pay $\frac{8,199 \times 12 \times 7}{12 \times 16} =$ Rs. 3,587 or Rs. 7,174 at the higher rate.

7

9. The total approximate receipts from the proposed levy of light dues as estimated by the Presidency Port Officer will thus come to Rs. 78,569 * at the lower, or Rs. 1,57,138 * at the higher, rate. This will be the amount available for (1) maintenance of coast lights, (2) payment of interest on capital outlay, and (3) provision of a sinking fund for the extinction of the loan.

10. No precise information is at present available as to the amount that will have to be set apart for maintenance; some of the lighthouses not having yet been built, and their improved illuminating apparatus brought into use. A rough forecast is, therefore, all that is possible. The following figures given in Mr. Ashpitel's report recorded with G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, may, perhaps, be adopted :—

Coast lights.	Maintenance charges.
	RS.
1. Calingapatam	3,900
2. Santapilli	5,500
3. Vakalapudi	3,800
4. Sacramento	5,300
5. Kistna	5,100
6. Arméghon	3,800
7. Pulicat	3,800
8. Madras	4,600
9. Seven Pagodas	4,800
10. Negapatam	1,200
11. Tuticorin	1,150
12. Manapad	5,000
13. Muttum	5,300
14. Tangasséri	4,600
15. Tellicherry	540
16. Mulki	5,100
Total ...	63,490

On this basis, the lower rates of light dues, calculated to yield Rs. 78,569, will be insufficient to pay for maintenance † and interest ‡ charges. So these rates are out of the question. On the other hand, the higher rates will, as will be seen from the following statement, liquidate a loan of Rs. 6,73,000 in nine years after paying interest at 3½ per cent. on capital outlay and meeting maintenance charges :—

† 63,490.

‡ 23,555 for 1st year on a loan of Rs. 6,73,000 at 3½ per cent.

87,045

Receipts.

	Lower rate.	Higher rate.
	RS.	RS.
* Class I	47,810	95,620
„ II	15,455	30,910
„ III	4,000	8,000
„ IV	7,657	15,314
„ V	248	496
„ VI	3,587	7,174
Total ...	78,569	1,57,138

NOTE.—[The above] alterations [of 15,455 and 248 for 15,079 and 436 under 'lower rate' and of 30,910 and 496 for 30,158 and 872 under 'higher rate' respectively] have been made because of the inclusion of Tuticorin-Colombo steamers in Class II instead of in Class V. As the difference is not much the totals have not been altered.

W.B. DEW.

LIGHT DUES—Financial Forecast.

Year.	Loan at beginning of the year.	Annual receipts from light dues.	Maintenance charges.	Interest on loan at 3½ per cent. on amount in column 2.	Total of columns 4 and 5.	Balance available for extinction of loan (column 3 — column 6).	Loan outstanding at close of the year (column 2—column 7).
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
1st ..	6,73,000	1,57,138	63,490	23,555	87,045	70,093	6,02,907
2nd ..	6,02,907	1,57,138	63,490	21,102	84,592	72,546	5,30,361
3rd ..	5,30,361	1,57,138	63,490	18,563	82,053	75,085	4,55,276
4th ..	4,55,276	1,57,138	63,490	15,935	79,425	77,713	3,77,563
5th ..	3,77,563	1,57,138	63,490	13,215	76,705	80,433	2,97,130
6th ..	2,97,130	1,57,138	63,490	10,400	73,890	83,248	2,13,882
7th ..	2,13,882	1,57,138	63,490	7,486	70,976	86,162	1,27,720
8th ..	1,27,720	1,57,138	63,490	4,470	67,960	89,178	38,542
9th ..	38,542	1,57,138	63,490	1,349	64,839	92,299	A surplus of 53,757 after extinction of the loan.

They therefore seem to be unnecessarily high and the following statement has been prepared showing two rates intermediate between those proposed by the Presidency Port Officer which will liquidate the loan in 15 and 25 years, respectively:—

Class.	Tonnage.	Rate fixed by the Secretary.	Rate now proposed.	Receipts calculated at the rate entered in column 3.	Receipts calculated at the rate entered in column 4.
1	2	3	4	5	6
				RS.	RS.
I	63,746 tons	15 pies	12 pies	79,683	63,746
II	210,610 (leviable once) .. .. 90,631 (leviable three times) .. 1,000 (leviable twelve times) ..	9 ,,	9 ,,	23,180	23,180
III	96,000 tons	16 ,,	10 ,,	5,000	5,000
IV	Based on the port dues which amounted to Rs. 22,971 at 1 anna per ton.	6 ,,	4 ,,	11,486	7,657
V	2,650 tons (leviable six times) ..	6 ,,	6 ,,	497	497
VI	8,199 tons (leviable twelve times)..	10 ,,	9 ,,	5,124	4,612
	Total ..	..	..	(a) 1,24,970	(b) 1,04,692

(a) This will liquidate the loan in 15 years.

(b) The loan will run for 25 years.

B. Govinda

Under the proposed draft Bill, referred to *infra*, the Government is empowered, subject to a maximum, to raise or lower the rates. There seems, therefore, no objection to the higher rates being entered in the schedule and such rates, not exceeding them, levied as may, from time to time, be found necessary. With the double object of imposing as light a due as possible and of obviating any considerable reduction of the dues when the loan is liquidated—only maintenance charges having then to be met from light dues—the lower rate entered in column 4 of second statement above will extinguish the loan in 25 years. The proposed loan of Rs. 6,73,000 will cover all capital charges on account of coast lights and admit of the expenditure already incurred this year and debited to Port funds being refunded.

11. The framing of the legislative enactment has now to be considered. Attached is a rough draft of the proposed Bill. It is an adaptation of the Burma Coast Lights Act IX of 1879, and comparatively few deviations from that Act have been made in the draft. The Burma Act is an Imperial enactment and the proposed enactment for this Presidency should also, it is thought, be an Imperial measure as it extends to territories outside the limits of the Presidency of Fort St. George. Under rule 3 of the précis of Legislative standing orders "no provision should be made in any Bill to be introduced into any Legislative Council in India for the creation of such * a fund, until the expediency of the measure has been specially considered in the Finance Department of the Government of India." The proposed Bill aims at creating such a special fund, and it will thus have also to be laid before the Government of India in the Financial Department before it can be introduced into the Legislative Council.

12. The following seem the only points in the draft Bill which call for special remark :—

Section 2 defines the terms "Customs Collector", "Vessel", "Master" and "Voyage" in the terms of the Burma Coast Lights Act.

---

* i.e., appropriations from which are restricted to defined purposes.

Section 3 levies coast light dues on vessels of the burden of 15 tons and upwards. This limit in the Burma Act is 50 tons, but the Presidency Port Officer has explained that, if this limit is adopted in Madras, a large number of vessels in the West Coast will escape the dues. The limit proposed is therefore the same as for port dues, viz., 15 tons.

Section 4 shows when the dues become payable. A clause has been added to this section making the port of Madras a part of the eastern group. This seems necessary with reference to section 37 (1) of the Indian Ports Act, which declares that Madras shall *not* be grouped with any other port for the purposes of maintenance of its Port fund accounts.

Section 5.—The power to vary rates is given to the Governor in Council, subject to the prior sanction of the Governor-General in Council. This is in accordance with local usage in similar cases.

Section 16 of the Burma Act has been so far modified (*vide* section 15 of the draft) as to place the duty of publishing accounts on the Government of Madras instead of on the Government of India.

The schedule attached to the draft Bill shows the rates and mode of collection of the light dues.

A 13. The draft Bill might be referred to the Presidency Port Officer and the Advocate-General for remarks and then forwarded to the Government of India, Financial Department, for approval, prior to its introduction into the Supreme Legislative Council. The last step should, perhaps, be taken in the Legislative Department of the Madras Government.

V. Thiruvengadam

Draft Bill to provide for the levy of dues for the use of Coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George.

Preamble.

WHEREAS it is expedient for the maintenance of coast lights in the Presidency of Forst St. George to levy dues on vessels passing or deriving benefit from such lights; It is hereby enacted as follows:—

Preliminary.

Short title.

1. This Act may be called "The Madras Coast Light Dues Act, 1899".

Commencement.

It shall come into force on the . . . . and it shall extend

Local extent.

to the territories respectively administered by the Governors of Fort St. George and Bombay in Council and the Lieutenant-Governors of Bengal and Burma.

Saving.

But nothing herein contained shall apply to any vessel belonging to or in the service of Her Majesty or the Government of India or to any vessel of war belonging to any Foreign Prince or State. +

Interpretation clause.

+ **2.** In this Act unless there is something repugnant in the subject or context—

"Customs Collector."

"Customs Collector" means a Customs Collector appointed under the Sea Customs Act, 1878, and includes any person appointed by the Local Government by name or in virtue of his office to discharge the functions of a Customs Collector under this Act at any port.

"Vessel."

"Vessel" includes any thing made for the conveyance by water of human beings or of property.

"Master."

"Master" when used in relation to any vessel means any person (except a Pilot or Harbour Master) having for the time being the charge or control of such vessel.

"Voyage."

"Voyage" means the whole distance between a vessel's place of departure and her final place of arrival; but the return of a vessel from any place shall, notwithstanding the terms of any charter party, be deemed a distinct voyage.

Coast Light Dues.

Coast light dues payable in respect of vessels of 15 tons.

3. For the purpose of maintaining coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George, a toll, hereinafter called "Coast light dues" shall be paid in respect of every vessel of the burden of 15 tons and upwards making any voyage mentioned in thes chedule hereto annexed of the rate specified in column 2 thereof.

Dues when payable.

4. The said coast light dues shall become due and payable—(*a*) in the case of a vessel clearing out of a port in British India upon any such voyage previous to the grant of any port clearance;

(*b*) In the case of a vessel entering a port in British India in the course or at the termination of any such voyage—immediately upon her entering such port: provided that the said dues shall not be levied more than once in the same port or group of ports on any vessel in the course of the same voyage and that for the purposes of this Act, the port of Madras shall be reckoned as belonging to the eastern group of ports in the Presidency of Fort St. George any provisions to the contrary in any other enactment notwithstanding.

Power to vary rates of dues.

5. With the prior sanction of the Governor-General in Council, the Governor in Council of Fort St. George may from time to time, by notification in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, reduce or raise the rate of coast light dues in respect of all vessels or any particular class of vessels.

Provided that such rate shall not in any case exceed the rate fixed by section 3.

Collection of dues.

6. The Customs Collector shall collect the coast light dues,

Voucher to be given.

and shall grant to the person paying the same a voucher in writing under his hand setting forth the name of his office, the port at which the coast light dues are paid, the amount so paid, the name, tonnage and other proper description of the vessel in respect of which such payment is made, and the voyage on which she is or has been bound.

Master to report arrival.

7. Within 24 hours after the arrival within a port of any vessel chargeable with coast light dues, the master of such vessel shall give notice of such arrival to the Customs Collector.

Tonnage of vessel chargeable with coast light dues how ascertained.

8. In order to ascertain the tonnage of any vessel chargeable with coast light dues, the following rules shall be observed:—

If registered.

(*a*) If such vessel be a British registered vessel or a vessel registered under Act No. X of 1841 or Act No. XI of 1850, or under any other law for the time being in force for the registration of vessels in India, the Customs Collector may require the owner or master of such vessel, or any other person having possession of her register to produce such register for inspection. If any such owner, master or other person neglects or refuses to produce such register or otherwise to satisfy the Customs Collector as to what is the true tonnage of the vessel in respect of which such coast light dues are payable, he shall be punished with fine which may extend to one hundred rupees, and the Customs Collector may cause such vessel to be measured and the tonnage thereof to be ascertained; and in such case, the owner or master of such vessel shall also be liable to pay the expenses of such measurement.

If not registered.

(*b*) If such vessel be not a British registered vessel or a vessel registered under Act No. X of 1841 or Act No. XI of 1850 or under any other law for the time being in force for the registration of vessels in India, and the owner or master thereof fails to satisfy the Customs Collector as to what is her true tonnage according to the mode of measurement prescribed by the law in force for the time being for regulating the measurement of British registered vessels, the Customs Collector shall cause such vessel to be measured and the tonnage thereof, according to the mode aforesaid, to be ascertained; and in such case the owner or master of such vessel shall be liable to pay the expenses of such measurement.

On refusal to pay dues or expenses, the Collector may distrain and sell.

9. If the master of any vessel refuses or neglects to pay to the Customs Collector on demand by him the amount of any dues or expenses payable in respect of such vessel under this Act, the Customs Collector may distrain or arrest such vessel and the tackle, apparel and furniture belonging thereto, or any part thereof, and detail the same until the amount of such dues or expenses is paid; and in case any part of such dues or expenses, or of the costs of the distress or arrest, or of the keeping of the same, remains unpaid for the space of five days next after any such distress or arrest so made, the Customs Collector may cause the vessel or other thing so distrained or arrested to be sold, and with the proceeds of such sale may satisfy such dues, expenses and costs (including the costs of sale) remaining unpaid, and shall render the surplus (if any) to the master of such vessel upon demand.

No port clearance to be granted until dues, etc., are paid.

10. The officer of Government whose duty it is to grant a port clearance for any vessel shall not grant such port clearance until her master or some other person has paid, or secured to the satisfaction of such officer, the amount of all dues, expenses and costs with which such vessel is chargeable under this Act, and of any fine to which any person is liable for anything done by him in contravention of this Act.

Master to specify on demand voyage on which vessel is bound.

11. The master of any vessel departing from or entering any port in British India upon or in the course of, or at the termination of, any voyage, shall, upon the demand of the Customs Collector, specify upon what voyage she is or has been bound.

Penalty for evading payment of dues, etc.

12. If the master of any vessel evades, or attempts to evade, the payment of any coast light dues, expenses or costs payable in respect of such vessel under this Act, he shall be punished with fine which may extend to two hundred rupees.

Determination of disputes under Act.

13. If any dispute arises as to whether any vessel is chargeable with any coast light dues, expenses or costs under this Act, or as to the amount of such dues, expenses or costs, such dispute shall, upon application made in that behalf by either of the disputing parties, be heard and determined in the towns of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay by a Presidency Magistrate and elsewhere by any Magistrate exercising at the place where the dispute arises powers under the Code of Criminal Procedure not less than those of a Magistrate of the second class. All decisions under this section shall be final.

Prosecutions under other Laws.

Saving of prosecutions under other laws.

14. Nothing herein contained shall prevent any person from being prosecuted under any other law for any act or omission which constitutes an offence against this Act: provided that no person shall be punished twice for the same act or omission.

Statement of Receipts and Expenditure.

Statement of receipts and expenditure to be published.

15. The Governor in Council of Fort St. George shall on or before the first day of October in each year publish in the *Fort St. George Gazette* a statement showing the amount received on account of coast light dues during the year ending on the thirty-first day of March last preceding, and the amount expended during the same period on the maintenance of coast lights in the Presidency of Fort St. George.

RV

SCHEDULE.

Vessels chargeable with Light dues, rate of Light dues and frequency of payment.

Vessels chargeable.	Rate of light dues.	How often chargeable.
Class I.		
All steam vessels engaged on coasting voyages between Calcutta and Bombay and between Rangoon and Madras *viâ* ports north of Madras.	1½ annas per ton.	Once during a voyage for each group, provided that if no port in the eastern group be touched at, the due for that group shall not be paid.
Class II.		
All steam vessels, British and Foreign, to or from Europe, the Australian, African and other British Colonies, including the Straits Settlements and Ceylon and vessels from Indian ports and ports in Burma which in the ordinary course of a voyage will pass or derive benefit from any of the coast lights in the Madras Presidency and vessels calling at more than one port in the group, and which do not come under the conditions of Class I.	12 pies per ton ..	Once per voyage per group; one payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days; payable on arrival at a port in the Presidency of Fort St. George.
Class III.		
All steam vessels from Bombay or ports in the Bombay Presidency bound direct for Colombo and from Colombo direct to ports in the Bombay Presidency.	16 pies per ton ..	Once during a voyage payable on arrival at or departure from Bombay.
Class IV.		
All sailing vessels of 15 tons and upwards, coasting or otherwise.	8 pies per ton ..	Once during a voyage for each group; one payment to exempt from further payment for thirty days.
Class V.		
All steam vessels from Bombay bound for the minor ports of South Canara whose voyage terminates at Mangalore.	6 pies per ton ..	Once for every thirty days.
Class VI.		
All steam vessels plying direct between Madras and Rangoon.	14 pies per ton ..	Once for every thirty days.

STATEMENT OF OBJECTS AND REASONS.

WHEREAS the Government of Fort Saint George has undertaken an extensive and costly scheme of lighthouse construction and illumination on the coasts of the Madras Presidency, and whereas it is necessary to raise funds in the open market for the capital outlay thereon, it is proposed in the accompanying Bill to levy a coast light due on vessels deriving benefit from the lights in question; the proceeds of the due being applied to payment of—

(1) the interest on the loan; (2) a sinking fund for its final extinction; and (3) the maintenance of the lights.

W. B. DE WINTON—31-1-99.

R. Parsons

A I think that before this is done, our Financial Branch should see the papers and report upon the proposals therein made.

A. E. H[AVELOCK].—3-2-99.

B But the matter is still under correspondence. A letter from the Secretary, Marine, to India, dated 10th January 1899, is still pending unanswered.

As to the proposal that this Government should raise a loan in the open market, I take it that this Government has no power to do such a thing and that the Government of India would peremptorily negative such a proposal, for the obvious reason that pledging the credit of the Madras Government in support of a loan is the same thing as pledging the credit of the Government of India—a thing that could on no account be permitted.

But as His Excellency has noted the whole question should be considered by Financial which will have further to considered it when the reply of India is received to the letter of January 10th.

A. T. A[RUNDEL].—13-2-99.
H. W[INTERBOTHAM].—14-2-99.

Transferred to the Financial Department.

(Signed) A. W. SMART, Col., R. E.
Ag. Secretary to Government.

16th February 1899.

For the Chief Secretary—

As pointed out by the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel, C.S.I., in his note, dated 13th February 1899, there is no rule under which this Government can raise a loan in the open market. Even if it were possible for Government to borrow on the security of Port funds, the objection raised by the Government of India in paragraph 3 of its letter, No. 4778-S.R., dated 2nd November 1898, to a loan from *Imperial* would seem to apply equally to a loan in the open market. The money thus borrowed, which would be an addition to the Port fund receipts, could not be utilized on expenditure on *coast* lights, since the provisions of section 36, sub-section (5) of the Indian Ports Act, 1889, restrict the application of Port funds to the class of lights defined in that section, *i.e.*, to *port* lights. It is submitted, therefore, that the reply of the Government of India to letter, No. 30, Marine, dated 10th January last, may be awaited.

G.O., No. 29, Marine, dated 10th January 1899.

F. A. D'CRUZ—6-3-99. C. M. SCHMIDT—6-3-99.

Hold the papers till the answer is received.

G. STOKES—7-3-99.

For the Chief Secretary—

In the note of the Marine department, dated 31st January 1899, the question of raising funds for the scheme of lighthouse construction and illumination on the coasts of this Presidency by a loan in the open market and of the imposition of light dues to liquidate it was considered. The Hon'ble Mr. Arundel, C.S.I., pointed out in his note, dated 13th February 1899, that the matter was still under correspondence with the Government of India, and that letter, No. 30, Marine, dated 10th January last, in which that Government was requested to make a grant from Imperial funds of Rs. 2,58,850 for the prosecution of lighthouse works in the current year, still remained unanswered. The Honourable Member also considered that this Government had no power to raise a loan in the open market, and that the Government of India would peremptorily negative such a proposal for the obvious reason that pledging the credit of the Madras Government in support of a loan was the same thing as pledging the credit of the Government of India—a thing that could on no account be permitted. The papers having been referred to the Financial department, it was remarked that there was no rule under which this Government could raise a loan in the open market; that even if it were possible for the Government to borrow on the security of Port funds, the objection raised by the Government of India in paragraph 3 of its letter, No. 4778-S.R., dated 2nd November 1898, to a loan from Imperial would seem to apply equally to a loan in the open market, and that the money thus borrowed, which would be an addition to the Port fund receipts, could not be utilized on expenditure on coast lights, since the provisions of section 36, sub-section (5) of the Indian Ports Act, 1889, restrict the application of Port funds to the class of lights defined in that section, *i.e.*, to Port lights. It was submitted, therefore, that the reply of the Government of India to letter, No. 30, Marine, dated 10th January last, might be awaited. In the meantime the notes, etc., of the Marine department have, as directed, been put in type.

G.O., No. 29, Marine, dated 10th January 1899.

2. The reply of the Government of India is contained in the orders of that Government passed on the budget. The Government of India states that the money required for the construction of the lighthouses should, as already stated in its letter, No. 3285 S.R., dated 27th July 1898, be ultimately provided for by the levy of light dues, but that, if the expenditure is charged to Government, it must be charged as ordinary expenditure under the head

G.O. 579-80 Fin. d/ 8-5-99

G.O., No. 732, Marine, dated 30th August 1898.

45. Civil Works which is wholly Provincial in accordance with the terms of the current Provincial settlement, as there is no authority for charging such expenditure to Loan funds. The Government of India accordingly adds that the special grants to Provincial revenue mentioned in its letter will enable the Government of Madras to pursue, without interruption, their policy in the matter of the construction of lighthouses, but that it is to be understood that if any expenditure is incurred out of Government funds, it will be ultimately recovered from light dues.

3. The only source from which a grant can now be made from Provincial funds for the construction of lighthouses in the current year is the unallotted sum of 8·73 lakhs entered in the budget under 45. Civil Works; and as it is a condition that whatever expenditure is incurred out of Government funds should be ultimately recovered from light dues, there will be no objection to the sum of 2·59 lakhs required by the Marine department for expenditure in the current year being allotted from this source. From the remark made by the Government of India that the special grants to Provincial revenues will enable this Government to pursue without interruption its policy in the matter of the construction of lighthouses, it is evidently contemplated that the whole of the estimated expenditure on coast lights, viz., 6·73 lakhs,* should be met from time to time from Provincial funds. It will be necessary therefore to make further grants of about 2 lakhs in each of the next two years. Although this will to a certain extent limit the spending power of this Government on other objects for a few years, the grants made are virtually investments, which would be available for expenditure on repayment in future years. The Public Works department may be requested to include in its budget under 45. Civil Works the necessary provision for lighthouse construction that may be required in the next two years.

Vide paragraph 10 of Marine department note and statements therein.

4. The question as to the manner in which these grants should be recovered remains now to be considered. In the Marine department note ~~below~~ dated 31st January 1899 the question of the imposition of light dues to liquidate a loan of 6·73 lakhs, which it was proposed to borrow in the open market, is discussed, and certain rates are proposed which, if levied, would liquidate such a loan in 9, 15 and 25 years, respectively. With the double object of imposing as light a due as possible and of obviating any considerable reduction of the dues when the loan is liquidated—only maintenance charges having then to be met from light dues—the lower rate entered in column 4 of the second statement in paragraph 10 of the Marine department note, which was calculated to extinguish the loan in twenty-five years, is recommended by the Marine department for adoption. The receipts at this rate are estimated to amount to 1·05 lakh a year. The maintenance charges being set down at ·63, the amount remaining for refund of the Provincial expenditure to be incurred and the expenditure already incurred from Port funds on these lights is only ·42. The adoption of the intermediate rate entered in column 3 of the same statement, which was intended to liquidate the loan in fifteen years would give an annual income of 1·25 lakhs and would leave ·62 for refund to Provincial and Port funds. At this rate it would take about eleven years for the recovery from light dues of the total amount (6·73) estimated to be spent on coast lights.

Paragraph 10 of Marine department note.

5. The question of a loan from the open market having fallen through, the necessary alteration should be made in the draft "Statement of Objects and Reasons" as regards the application of the proceeds of light dues which should now go towards—

(1) the refund of the expenditure incurred from Port and Provincial funds, and
(2) the maintenance of the lights.

F.A.D'C.—15-4-99.

G.O., No. 579, Financial, dated 8th May 1899.

It is clear from paragraph 7 of the Government of India, Finance and Commerce department, No. A.1429 L., dated 29th March 1899, that the Government of India will not involve Imperial funds in any way in the matter of the scheme of lighthouse improvements. India insists that if any expenditure is to be charged to Government in the first instance, it must be found from *Provincial* funds.

---

* *Vide* paragraph 5 of Marine department note, dated 31st January 1899.

As stated in the note above, although funds may perhaps be made available in 1899–1900, the question of the future has to be considered, and for these coast lights Provincial funds will, if the local Government commits itself to this scheme any further at present, have to find a grant of about 2 lakhs in each of the next two years in addition to the 2·59 to be found in the current year. Provincial funds are comparatively well off only in consequence of the special grants made by the Government of India, but it has to be remembered that these grants are distinctly labelled "Special" by India and by the Finance Minister in his statement in the Supreme Legislative Council. In this year's budget several schemes have been provided for; such as the Railway Police Scheme, Taluk Gumastahs, Additional Munsif's Court, etc., some of these have already been introduced, and the taluk gumastah's scheme will apparently be introduced during the year. Funds for meeting the recurring expenditure in connection with the additional establishments entertained by the introduction of these schemes will swell the Provincial expenditure in future years, and the actual result of giving large grants to Port funds, to be recovered in instalments of about half a lakh *per annum*, will be that the grant for CIVIL WORKS—PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT will have to be curtailed in future years. Until therefore the question of the financial position of this Government is on a more certain basis, and until that position is not solely dependent on the good will and the benevolences of the Government of India, it seems, it is submitted, to be a questionable policy for the local Government to commit itself further to the scheme of lighthouse improvements.

It is to be noted that the light dues, which are to form the source of revenue from which the advances now made to Port funds are to be ultimately liquidated, are not at present legally leviable; that before they can be so leviable an Act will apparently have to be passed by the Imperial Legislative Council; and that therefore the recoveries belong to the remote future.

It is acknowledged in paragraph 2 of letter No. 30, Marine, dated 10th January 1899, that this scheme of lighthouse improvements was started and the special lighthouse division (which so far as can be seen has been paid up to this from Provincial funds) was created under the erroneous impression that the cost could be defrayed from Port funds. This impression has not only turned out to be erroneous, but the Government of India has declined to have anything to do with the scheme or to finance it in any way. The position has therefore altered considerably and the matter is now one for consideration from the point of view of Provincial funds alone.

From paragraph 3 of the Marine notes attached to G.O., No. 316, Marine, dated 29th April 1898, it will be seen that there is scope for reduction in the Presidency Port Officer's programme of Port fund works. The Chief Engineer himself considers that the programme needs "considerable revision" (*vide* paragraph 4 of the same note). It is respectfully submitted that the matter is proceeding too quickly. Port funds should, it is thought, be made to wait for their schemes of improvement until "ways and means" are more certain. In any case it is submitted that if a grant is to be made in the current year from the unallotted sum of 8·73 placed by the Government of India in the budget, this grant should be sanctioned on the clear understanding that it does not necessarily involve Provincial funds in any grants for the future and that such grants will depend entirely on the state of Provincial finances.

C.M.SCHMIDT—24-4-99.

For the Chief Secretary—

It has been decided to make a grant of 1 lakh during the current year for lighthouse improvements and order to that effect is issuing. Submitted that file may be returned to Marine.

Vide K.W. 579, Financial, dated 8th May 1899.

C.M.S.—29-4-99.

No. I want to examine this matter.

G. S.—30-4-99.

Honourable Member

His Excellency the Governor

There has been a very great mistake made in dealing with this matter. It was at first thought that the expenditure for the "Lighthouse scheme" could be met from Port funds, but this has been found to be a mistake. Port funds can only be expended on port lights. So far as the scheme involves these lights and improvements there is no difficulty. But the matter is otherwise with the "Coast lights."

2. Mr. Ashpitel's scheme involved an outlay of—

	RS.
Port lights	80,000
Coast „	8,00,000

It appears, however, that some of the expenditure on the scheme has already been met from Port funds, and I gather that, apart from what is wanted to repay Port funds, the capital sum now required to complete the scheme is Rs. 6,73,000. The Government of India have distinctly laid down that if any money is to be spent on the lighthouse scheme, it must come out of 45. CIVIL WORKS, *i.e.*, it must be Provincial; hence Provincial must advance this Rs. 6,73,000. The Government of India in their last letter, * *i.e.*, in their reply to the letter of this Government of 10th January 1899, when read with their letter recorded in G.O., No. 732, Marine, of 30th August 1898, make it quite plain that all expenditure on this scheme is to be Provincial. In the latter letter, paragraph 7, the Government of India say:

* Finance and Commerce department letter No. A. 1429 L., dated 29th March 1899.
[G.O., No. 579, Financial, dated 8th May 1899.]

> "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."

3. It is assumed in the correspondence that the money is to be found by the imposition of light dues, but I note that both His Excellency and Sir Henry Bliss and Mr. Grose have already expressed an unanimous opinion against the imposition of light dues (*vide* notes † of March 1898), and I think that some reasons can be given against having recourse to that measure. The trade of the Madras Presidency is not large or of an increasing volume. Shipping, *i.e.*, coasting vessels, have now to compete against railways and can less than before bear any burdens. Competition is so keen that any even the smallest burden will drive ships away. The imposition is certain to be met by strong opposition on behalf of the ship owners. It is proposed to impose the dues on vessels sailing from Bombay to Colombo and from Calcutta to Colombo which will never sight one of our coast lights. Coasting steamers, of which there are only two lines, and sailing dhonies which do not want the lights, will all have to pay. The sum which will have to be collected will nearly double the present collection of dues which amounts to Rupees 2,32,696 on 6,087,882 tons on the average of the years 1894—1897. Commander Aves proposes to raise Rs. 1,56,848 by light dues.

† K.W. 316-17, ~~department~~ marine dated 29th April 1898.

4. Supposing that matters have now gone so far that money must be got and that there is no alternative but to impose light dues, the next question is what are the charges which have to be met. As above pointed out, the cost of the scheme is Rs. 8,00,000, but the latest figure which has been taken is Rs. 6,73,000. I apprehend that a considerable portion of the difference has come out of Port funds. In fact I think there is little doubt that Port funds are being applied to "lighthouse" purposes with very questionable legality. Where then is Rs. 6,73,000 to come from? Under the orders Government of India it must be from Provincial funds. It cannot be a loan, so no question ‡ of interest or Sinking fund arises, and if Provincial advances the money it must be content to get it back in lump payments. I think the period for repayment ought not to be allowed to exceed ten years. Hence the annual payment to be recovered is Rs. 67,300 on Capital account.

l.c.

‡ But see India's letter above quoted. It will make little difference in the sum to be raised by light dues whether interest and Sinking fund or lump annual repayments to reimburse Provincial in a moderate number of years are imposed.

G.S.—3-5-99.

5. Supposing that the whole of the lights are at once carried out and put in working order, then the cost of maintenance is, as stated in the Marine note, Rupees 63,490, but to this must be added cost of inspection Rs. 3,000, pay of relief Rs. 1,920, and contribution to pension Rs. 4,500 = Rs. 9,420. These items have, I believe, been omitted as paid from Port funds which seems to me wrong. Hence the total sum to be provided annually is Rs. 1,40,210, to meet which the sum § yielded by the maximum dues is only sufficient.

§ Commander Aves' estimate, Rs. 1,56,848.

6. It is stated that for the year 1899–1900 Rs. 2,58,850 is required. Of this Rs. 2,16,000 is for work and Rs. 42,850 for maintenance. Rs. 1,00,000 has been allotted out of the Rs. 8,73,000 given by the Government of India and there is a

reserve of Rs. 1,13,000 roundly, or, say, Rs. 1,00,000 as some of the balance is sure to be wanted for some small items. The balance of Rs. 58,850 must be found if wanted from Public Works department works by retrenchment.

7. From a financial point of view the strongest objection to the continuance of the scheme is to be found in the fact that the Act for the imposition of light dues (which too must be an Imperial Act) is not yet in existence. A draft Act is submitted which should be pushed through as rapidly as possible if light dues are to be imposed.

8. Looking at the whole matter I think that all works which can be postponed should be so, and that only those works should be put in hand which are really necessary. A number of the works on the West Coast are of little use. If it be decided to go on with the work, then the requisite Act to enable the levy of light dues should be passed without any delay as every day means loss. I think that in any event the cost of the scheme should be kept down to the lowest possible figure so as to keep the scale of light dues chargeable as low as possible and that, if possible, it should be introduced piece-meal and not as now *en bloc*. The only sound way to carry on the scheme is from the accumulations of light dues.

G. Stokes—3-5-99.

K. W. 316-17, dated 29th April 1898.

This great lighthouse scheme estimated to cost Rs. 8,00,000 has been initiated without making sure that funds are available for it. So long ago as March last year Sir H. Bliss realized the difficulty and discussed the alternatives "(1) stop lighthouse construction when we have spent our balances . . . . ; or (2) we must get a grant from the Government of India, a loan being of no use; or (3) we must take legislative authority to increase the rate of port dues. I don't like (3) at all." ~~On pages 8 and 9~~ Sir H. Bliss repeated his objection to an increase of dues, and His Excellency and Mr. Grose agreed with him. So do I entirely. As the Chief Secretary suggests such a measure would tend to destroy the sea-borne trade.

again

a/

Alternative (3) is thus rejected.

Alternative (2) must also be rejected for the Government of India flatly declines to give us a rupee for the work.

Alternative (1) now also put forward by the Chief Secretary remains, namely, to stop lighthouse building.

Such work as has actually been begun must, I suppose, be completed: but charity begins at home, and it is somewhat quixotic for this Government to spend its Provincial assignments on lighthouses for the benefit of trade that goes elsewhere, when we have unlimited demands for money for various necessary purposes within the Presidency.

The Public Works department can no doubt ascertain what work *must* go on and be paid for out of Provincial, and what works can be indefinitely postponed, presuming that His Excellency thinks this the wisest course we can take.

If there has been, or if there is in contemplation, any modification of lighthouse establishments connected with this scheme, it will presumably require reconsideration.

A.T.A[rundel].—4-5-99.

I should like to discuss this matter in Council.

A. E. H[avelock].—8-5-99.

Submitted very urgently to the Hon'ble Mr. Winterbotham in view to the matter being brought before the next meeting of Council.

G.S.—9-5-99.

Seen.

H. M. W[INTERBOTHAM]—9-5-99.

The file is forwarded to the Marine department with the request that the information called for in Council to-day (12th May 1899) may be supplied.

G.S.—12-5-99.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

His Excellency the Governor—

The Hon'ble Mr. A. T. Arundel, C.S.I.—

The Hon'ble Mr. H. M. Winterbotham—

In 1840 Mr. W. T. Douglass, the eminent Lighthouse Engineer, was sent out from England at the request (apparently) of the Government of India to report on the lighthouses on the coasts of India. His report on the Madras lighthouses is contained in G.O., No. 25, Marine, dated 22nd January 1891. He suggested the introduction of the most modern appliances for illumination in various existing lighthouses of this Presidency and the adoption of occulting and flashing lights, and pointed out the importance of making the lights distinctive in character. He also recommended the construction of new buildings at various places; *e.g.*, Pigeon Island, Cape Comorin, Divi, Masulipatam, on the Sacramento Shoal, Vizagapatam and Bimlipatam.

2. Mr. Douglass' report was referred to the Presidency Port Officer, Commander Street, who was inclined to be satisfied with the existing fixed lights which he said were sufficiently distinctive in character for the purposes of the coasting vessels for whose use they were provided, and was not prepared to agree with Mr. Douglass as to the necessity for so many new lights. The Government agreed generally with Commander Street and considered that it would be desirable to offer a young Engineer officer of a mechanical turn some inducement to make a study of lighthouse buildings and apparatus in use in England and France during his absence from duty on furlough. Mr. Ashpitel was accordingly selected * and facilities were afforded to him while on leave in Europe to study lighthouse construction and illumination.

3. Meanwhile, in 1891, Commander Bean, who was acting for Commander Street, submitted proposals for the construction of lighthouses at the following places:—

Gódávari Point.
Sacramento Shoal.
Point Divi.
Masulipatam.
Bimlipatam
Vizagapatam.

But the Government deferred, † on financial grounds, sanction to the proposal.

4. During the years 1892 to 1894, Commanders Street and Powell came up with proposals for the construction of lighthouses at Madras, Point Divi, Manapaud and Coondapoor, and for improvements to those at Calingapatam, Pámban, Tellicherry, etc., and Mr. Ashpitel was taken into consultation. He was subsequently deputed ‡ to visit localities and report on lighthouse requirements generally. The results of this inspection are recorded with G.O.,

---

* G.O., No. 230, Marine, dated 2nd May 1891.

† G.O., No. 438, Marine, dated 8th October 1891.

‡ G.O., No. 318, Marine, dated 10th August 1894.

No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896. His report covered a wide field and included proposals under the following heads:—

(1) The building of new lighthouses.
(2) The introduction of improved light apparatus.
(3) The improvement of existing lights.
(4) The complete reorganization of the lighthouse establishments.
(5) The levy of light dues on shipping to meet the cost of his proposals.

It also embraced various other minor matters connected with internal administration.

5. His programme of lighthouse improvement involved an expenditure of Rupees 8,80,000. Of this sum, Rs. 8,00,000 were for "Sea" lights or those intended for general navigation. The latter amount included Rs. 2,80,000 for eight new sets of apparatus, Rs. 4,55,000 for improvements to existing towers and for new constructions, and the balance was for contingencies and Public Works supervision. The "Port" lights, or those intended for the navigation of ports and harbours, were to cost Rupees 80,000. To meet the capital cost of the "Sea" lights he proposed to raise a loan of Rs. 8,00,000. The interest and Sinking fund for which, and its ultimate extinction, were to be provided by the levy of light dues. The proposal to raise a loan in the open market and the levy of light dues did not then commend itself to Government, who considered that the scheme could be started from the accumulated balances of Port funds.

6. In order to give effect to the scheme of lighthouse improvement suggested by Mr. Ashpitel and approved generally in G.O., No. 245, Marine, dated 8th April 1896, a special Lighthouse division, under Mr. Ashpitel, was formed under the authority of G.O., No. 2156-W., dated 27th July 1896; Mr. Ashpitel being called upon to frame a financial forecast of the amount required for expenditure. His financial forecast is printed with G.O., No. 316, Marine, dated 29th April 1898—~~vide Appendix C, page 10.~~ These proceedings also contain a complete forecast of Port fund works other than lighthouses. The Government observed that the outlay involved could not be met from local resources alone within a reasonable time, and decided that the Government of India should be appealed to for assistance. That Government was accordingly asked in letter No. 317, Marine, dated 29th April 1898, for a *grant* from Imperial funds of Rs. 6,68,000 in 1899–1900 and Rs. 1,45,000 in 1900–1901. The Government of India * refused to entertain the application, and pointed out that trade and shipping and not the country generally should bear the cost of erecting lighthouses. They considered that any fresh expenditure to be incurred in erecting lighthouses on the Madras coast should be provided for by the levy of light dues. They further observed as follows:—

* G.O., No. 732, Marine, dated 30th Aug. 1898.

> "Some expenditure has already been incurred in the past in the erection of lighthouses 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 additional maintenance charges will be covered together with a small sinking fund charge by light dues to be now imposed."

7. The Madras Government, seeing that a free grant had been refused, † asked for a *loan* from Imperial funds of Rupees 2,15,000, and promised that, should this loan be sanctioned, His Excellency the Governor in Council would arrange for the maintenance of lighthouses and port works generally from current receipts, supplemented by existing balances, and to carry out such other new Port fund works as may be possible. It was explained that the grant of Rs. 6,68,000 previously asked for included works other than lighthouses, whereas the smaller sum of Rs. 2,15,000 was confined to the amount required for the coming year for new lighthouse works and apparatus alone.

† Letter No. 733, Marine, dated 30th August 1898.

8. The Government of India in reply* pointed out that if the lights to be constructed are of the nature of coast lights, the expenditure on them of Port funds is inadmissible, such expenditure as regards *lights* being limited by sub-section 5 of section 36 of the Indian Ports Act to "lights maintained chiefly for the benefit of vessels being in, or entering, or leaving, the port, or passing through the rivers or channels leading thereto"; while if they are "port" lights, they cannot properly be charged against capital outlay, which is intended to be liquidated hereafter by general light dues. They accordingly requested fuller explanation of the conditions on which the proposed loan was asked for, and in what way the Government proposed to close the transaction.

* G.O., 29, Marine, 10th January 1899.

9. In letter No. 30, Marine, dated 10th January 1899, the Madras Government reiterated its request for a loan from Imperial funds to the amount of Rs. 2,58,850, the amount to be refunded when the proposed light dues became available.

10. The final result of the application is contained in letter from the Finance and Commerce department to the Chief Secretary to Government, No. A. 1429 L., dated 29th March 1899, in which a special addition of Rs. 8,73,000 is authorised to be made to the Provincial expenditure from the existing balance, and from which the Madras Government is at liberty to reappropriate money for expenditure on lighthouse construction, provided that it recovers it by the imposition of light dues.

G.O., No. 579, Financial, dated 8th May 1899.

R. P.—15-5-99.

11. The above note on the history of the lighthouse programme has been compiled from information available at Ootacamund. The opening portions may need amendment on receipt of earlier papers from Madras, but I submit it without waiting for them because the matter is urgent.

12. I beg to point out that the statement that the sea-going trade of Madras cannot bear the impositions of light dues rests at present on the assertion of the Chief Secretary, unsupported by facts. I trust that before it is decided to abandon or postpone this important lighthouse programme, the views of the Presidency Port Officer, the Collectors of Maritime districts, the Chamber of Commerce, and the principal firms engaged in shipping operations may be obtained.

Sir H. Bliss was opposed to it.
A. T. A[RUNDEL].

To abandon the programme now would mean that Mr. Ashpitel and his staff, now specially qualified for lighthouse construction, would be scattered about the Presidency on other work, and it would be difficult to make them available for a piece-meal programme. I have already called on Mr. Ashpitel to report progress up to date, and at what stage work in progress can be stopped without financial loss to Government, and I beg that his report on the subject may be awaited.

A. T. A[RUNDEL].

13. I would also point out that the Government of India has laid down that the only proper method of obtaining funds for the construction of lighthouses is the imposition of light dues, and that if this method is rejected, no further improvement in the lighting of the coast, except with regard to port lights as distinguished from coast lights, is possible.

W. B. DE W.—16-5-99.

It appears from this note that our present lighthouse scheme owes its origin to the report on the imperfect condition of the lighthouses, which was made by Mr. Douglass, an expert, in 1890. There is nothing here to show that the mercantile and shipping bodies moved in the matter, or were consulted. Perhaps it would be well now to ask the mercantile and shipping interests whether they would recommend the improvement of the lighthouses, on the proposed scheme, the cost to be met by increased light dues. The augmented rates, which would be necessary, should of course be stated.

A. E. H[AVELOCK]—17-5-99.

I agree with His Excellency.

A. T. A[RUNDEL]—18-5-99.
H. W[INTERBOTHAM]—19-5-99.

Papers submitted in continuation of note for orders on the above subject, dated 16th instant.

Vide G.O., No. 268, Marine, dated 18th June 1899.

It will be observed that the Government of India took the initiative in this matter.

W. B. DEW.—17-5-99.

Seen.

A. E. H[AVELOCK]—18-5-99.
A. T. A[RUNDEL]—19-5-99.
H. W.[INTERBOTHAM]—19-5-99.

His Excellency the Governor—
The Hon'ble Mr. A. T. Arundel, C.S.I.—
The Hon'ble Mr. H. M. Winterbotham—

[A draft order is submitted.]

R.P.—23-5-99.

Paragraph 10.—If the coast lights estimates for Nos. 4, 5, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16 provide for new lighthouses, the remaining estimates provide for improvements to existing lighthouses.

m/

W. B. DEW.—24-5-99.
A. E. H[AVELOCK]—26-5-99.
A. T. A[RUNDEL]—29-5-99.
H. W[INTERBOTHAM]—30-5-99.

[G. O., No. 471, Marine, dated 31st May 1899.]