56/8/20

Government of Madras.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

G.O., No. 242, 29th July 1910.

INDEXED
N P

Landing and Shipping Fees.

Passing orders on the question of levying fees under the Madras Outports — Act, 1885, on canal-borne cargo, landed or shipped within port limits.

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 of Madras.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

Read. } 1910. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 242, 29th July 1910.

N P

ORIGINAL.

Landing and Shipping Fees.

Passing orders on the question of levying fees under the Madras Outports — Act, 1885, on canal-borne cargo, landed or shipped within port limits.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers :—

I

G.O., No. 90, Marine, dated 4th March 1904.

The Government agree with the Collector of Kistna that landing and shipping fees should be levied at the port of Masulipatam both when goods are brought by canal and landed within port limits and when they are taken from the godowns and placed in the masula boats for shipment.

(True Extract.)

M. Hammick,
Ag. Chief Secretary.

II

G.O., No. 279, Marine, dated 7th September 1909.

The Government see no reason to modify the ruling laid down in G.O., No. 90, Marine, dated 4th March 1904, and are still of opinion that goods landed from or shipped into canal boats within port limits are liable to the payment of fees under the Madras Outports Landing and Shipping Fees Act, 1885, at all places where the Act is in force. It further appears from the last letter of the Presidency Port Officer read above that at Cocanada, as at Masulipatam, some of the goods landed by these boats are not re-exported, but go into the bazaar for internal consumption. In these circumstances the suggestion contained in the first of the Presidency Port Officer's letters read above cannot be accepted

(True Extract.)

A. G. Cardew,
Ag. Chief Secretary.

III

Letter—from the Port Officer, Cocanada.
To—the Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—the 30th November 1909.
No.—246-1.

IV

Memorandum No. 1548-1, Marine, dated 25th January 1910.

V

Letter—from the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Cocanada.
To—the Chief Secretary to Government (through the Collector of Gódávari).
Dated—the 24th February 1910.

VI

Endorsement—of the Collector of Gódávari.
Dated—the 15th March 1910.
No.—N. Dis. Pet. 458-Rev.

VII

Endorsement No. 385-1, Marine, dated 2nd April 1910.

VIII

Letter—from Commander T. A. L. de Berry, R.I.M., Presidency Port Officer, Madras.
To—the Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—the 4th May 1910.
No.—2035/135-G.

With reference to Memorandum of Government No. 1548-1, Marine, dated 25th January 1910, and 2nd April 1910, respectively, I have the honour to state that I have addressed Government in this office letter No. 2035/133-G., dated 4th May 1910, as regards the representation made by the Cocanada Chamber of Commerce that canal-borne cargo landed or shipped within the port limits of Cocanada should be charged per boat load.

The original papers received with the memorandum and endorsement of Government under reference are herewith returned.

IX

Letter—from Commander T. A. L. de Berry, R.I.M., Presidency Port Officer, Madras.
To—the Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—the 4th May 1910.
No.—2035/133-G.

With reference to G.O., No. 279, Marine, dated 7th September 1909, I have the honour to state that at the ports of Vizagapatam, Negapatam, Adirampatnam and Tuticorin, where the Landing and Shipping Fees Act III of 1885 is in force, there is no canal communication. The order of Government cannot, therefore, be held applicable to these ports At the port of Tuticorin, coral is collected from the islands in the vicinity of the port and landed within port limits, and the Landing and Shipping Fees Committee have proposed levy of fees on this commodity and their proposal is dealt with *infra*.

2. Proposals for levy of fees on canal-borne cargo landed or shipped within port limits at the ports of Cocanada, Masulipatam, Cuddalore, Tuticorin, Calicut, Ponnáni, Hangerkotta and Mangalore, where the Landing and Shipping Fees Act III of 1885 is in force, are dealt with below and the correspondence relating thereto are contained in a file herewith submitted for perusal of Government and return.

Cocanada.

Fees.—The Cocanada Port Conservancy Board propose to levy the following rates of fees on canal boats landing and shipping cargo :—

Within port limits, except at the Municipal wharf for each operation	Four annas per boat load.
At the Municipal wharf	Two annas per boat load.
Partly at the Municipal wharf and partly elsewhere within port limits	Four annas per boat load.

Anticipated collections—Rs 2,000 *per annum*.

The Board request the sanction of Government to the levy of the above rates, and point out that the fees are made low, as most of the goods brought by canal boats are intended for reshipment when the usual fee of one pie per cwt. is levied.

The Cocanada Chamber of Commerce protest against the levy of fee on boats arriving from the interior and state that it would likely further handicap the trade of the port, as these boats are already heavily taxed by the Public Works department for navigation in the canal, and any fresh taxation would only further tend to divert the trade elsewhere. If, however, the Government should consider a tax is imperative, they propose it should be a nominal one levied on each boat and not on the weight of its contents.

Masulipatam.

Fees.—Landing and shipping fees are now being charged at this port on canal-borne cargo at the schedule rates for sea-borne cargo.

Draft rules for the levy of fees are submitted by the Port officer after approval by the Landing and Shipping Fees Committee.

Cuddalore.

Fees.—Dues are being collected at this port ever since Act III of 1885 was introduced here (*i.e.*) from 1st April 1905.

Landing and Shipping places.—There being at present no particular place for placing the canal-borne cargo for purposes of assessment, the Committee have selected two places (1) the Customs House jetty for all old town merchants, (2) the Boat Shed in Fort St. David for new town merchants and the local Customs authorities have approved of this arrangement.

Tuticorin.

Fees.—There is no canal boat traffic at this port. Canoes bring in coral collected from the islands in the vicinity, and these boats do not enter or clear at the Customs or Port office. The Committee recommend a levy of 1 anna per ton of 50 cubic feet as on all other goods.

Establishment.—The Committee recommend the entertainment of a clerk and a peon for the purpose and point out that, in some years, it is possible the amount collected may not cover cost of establishment.

Draft rules are submitted.

The Collector of Tinnevelly is of opinion that no charge should be imposed at all, and also that coral stone should be landed only to the north of Puckle's channel.

Ponnáni.

Fees.—Dues are being levied here on canal-borne cargo at the schedule rates in force for the sea-borne cargo under the Landing and Shipping Fees Act III of 1885.

Probable collections Rs. 400 a year.

Landing place.—The Customs wharf to be the place for placing cargo for purposes of assessment or such other place as may be prescribed by the Customs officer who is also the Port Conservator.

Draft rules are submitted.

The Collector suggests that the word "cargo" may be submitted for the term "goods" in the draft rules as the former term denotes trade and the latter includes articles brought in boats for domestic purposes. If this is done there is no serious objection to the rules proposed and that the rules as they now stand will give rise to constant friction and quarrels and will give the subordinates of the Port department abundant chances of bringing false (and true) charges and of extorting money.

Establishment.—It is pointed out by the Port Conservator that three clerks are necessary as there are three entrances to the port limits, and that one man must be stationed at each entrance to check the boats entering and clearing the port.

Calicut.

Fees.—The Landing and Shipping Fees Committee are strongly opposed to the scheme of collecting landing and shipping dues on canal borne traffic, as they consider that the cost of collecting a doubtful revenue, and one which would entail a large amount of supervision, would not be compensated for by the amount of revenue so derived. They consider also that the difficulties of efficient check are so great that the system would only lead to the facilitating of extortion on the part of those whose duty it would be to collect the dues.

If, however, Government should consider, the levy of fees on canal-borne cargo at Calicut imperative they propose the following:—

Fees.—Eight annas per boat load of cargo—

(1) This rate has been fixed with reference to the revised schedule proposed showing an increase of 70 per cent. to effect improvements to ports.

(2) Levy of fee by boat load is recommended as canal boats are of different sizes and it would be difficult to ascertain the amount of cargo without measurement.

(3) Cargo shipped into boats within port limits and again landed in another port within port limits for export by rail should not be required to pay twice over but only once.

(4) Timber and bamboos in bundles floated down the river should not be charged fees as section 4 of Act III of 1885 provides for levy of fees landed or shipped by vessels only. That if a charge is imperative on this commodity, it may be per 50 or 100 square feet.

N.B.—Empty boats, boats carrying passengers with personal luggage only, and boats fishing in the backwaters are exempt.

Collections.—Rs. 4,500, on canal-borne cargo. Rs. 2,500, on tiles, bricks, etc., shipped and landed both within port limits for export by rail. These collections are doubtful, as it is possible that the tax will stop a good deal of the canal traffic and the tile factories may find a cheaper method of getting to the railway than by water in which case Rs. 2,500 will disappear altogether.

Place for landing and shipping.—No particular place or places can be prescribed for the purposes for canal boats. It is proposed to levy fees at the particular places which the boats must pass to get into or to leave the port.

Establishment—

	Rs.	
Eight clerks (2 at each of the four places named) at Rs. 12 each *per mensem*	96	
Four peons (one at each place) at Rs. 8 each	32	
Eighteen boatmen for patrol purposes for three boats (2 sets of crew at 3 per set) at Rs. 8	144	
One Inspector at Rs. 25 *per mensem*	25	
	297 × 12 =	3,564
Contingencies, etc.		136
		3,700

An establishment charge of Rs. 3,700, against an income of Rs. 7,000, which is doubtful.

In addition to the above, three boats at an initial cost of Rs. 150 each will be required.

The Collector of the District supports the recommendation of the Committee and is of opinion, that the cost of collection will however remain always heavy though the receipts may fluctuate, as the figures showing the existing traffic are only approximate and must be accepted with great caution.

Hangerkotta.

Fees.—The rate of fee proposed is As. 1–8 per ton on the tonnage of the boats ($\frac{1}{2}$ ton or less as half a ton and more than $\frac{1}{2}$ ton as one ton).

This rate is proposed as it is not practicable to differentiate the various articles contained in a boat, and as a large number of boats arrive at the port daily during the busy season.

Only boats licensed under the boat rules should be allowed to load or land cargo within port limits after obtaining permission from the officer in charge of the levy of landing and shipping fees.

On fish landed and shipped within port limits the following rates are proposed to be levied :—

	A.	P.	
Fish for consumption	0	1	per cwt.
„ manure	1	8	per ton.
„ curing	0	1	per cwt.

Establishment.—The following additional establishment is proposed for Hangerkotta :—

	Rs.		
One peon	7	*per mensem.*	
Increase of pay to clerk from Rs. 10 to Rs. 15	5	„	
Increase to Superintendent of Customs from Rs. 5 to Rs. 15.	10		
	22×12		264
Add pay of clerk at Rs. 15 *per mensem* for four more months in the year, *i.e.*, for a full year instead of only eight months as at present			60
			324

Landing and shipping places.—Two places have been prescribed for landing and shipping of cargo by canal boats, one for cargo generally and the other for fish only.

Draft rules in connection with the levy of fees in question at Hangerkotta are submitted after approval by the Port officer, Mangalore.

Mangalore.

Fees.—The Landing and Shipping Fees Committee propose levy of fees at annas 1-8 per ton on tonnage of boat irrespective of the nature and amount of cargo.

Landing and shipping places.—The Committee have prescribed places for landing and shipping of canal-borne cargo.

Establishment.—No additional establishment is reported to be necessary.

3. From the replies received from the Port officers, I gather that it is impracticable to charge dues on canal-borne cargo according to the description of the articles inasmuch as a boat may contain different articles to differentiate which will be a tedious task, especially so when there are a large number of boats loading or landing cargo. To give effect to the orders of Government that canal-borne cargo shipped or landed within port limits should be charged landing and shipping fees, it seems to me that it would be necessary to license all such boats plying within the limits of the port or partly within and partly without the port limits under the Boat Rules and to fix a uniform rate, say 8 annas per boat load, whether loaded fully or partly, irrespective of the size of the boat or the description of its contents, as this will be the most practicable and easy means of levying fees and collecting the same. Cargo floated down the river such as bamboos and timber may be exempted.

The Chamber of Commerce at Cocanada and the Collectors of Tinnevelly and Malabar object to the levy of any fee on canal-borne cargo as the boats already pay a tax to the Public Works department, and that any further taxation would be likely to divert the trade elsewhere and that if the levy of a fee is imperative the charge may be for a boat load.

4. On receipt of orders of Government on the proposal now made, the Port officers concerned will be instructed to give effect to the orders with the present staff for the levy of landing and shipping of fees, and to report on same three months after the rules have been in force, and also as to the additional establishment, if any, that may be necessary in connection with the work.

5. Early orders of Government are requested in the matter.

X

Letter—from H. S. Brown, Esq., Officiating Presidency Port Officer.
To—the Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Madras, the 12th July 1910.
No.—2035/192-G.

In continuation of this office letter No. 2035/133-G., dated 4th May 1910, I have the honour to forward herewith letter, in original, from the Collector of Tanjore, D. Dis. No. 2421-Rev., dated 7th July 1910, together with its enclosures, as regards the levy of fees on canal borne cargo landed or shipped within the port limits of Negapatam. The inclusion of the port of Negapatam in paragraph 1 of this office letter referred to is a clerical error.

2. From the correspondence now submitted, it would appear that the Landing and Shipping Fees Committee are willing to charge fees on canal borne cargo at the schedule rates now in force at the port of Negapatam, but for reasons explained in paragraph 3 of this office letter referred to above, a uniform rate of As. 8 per boat load irrespective of the size of the boat may be ordered to be levied, all boats plying within the limits of the port or partly within and partly without port limits being licensed under the boat rules for the purpose. I see no objection to the landing place within port limits for canal borne cargo being defined as proposed by the Tahsildar and approved by the Divisional Officer, Negapatam.

Enclosures.

(*a*)

Letter—from R. F. Austin, Esq., I.C.S., Acting Collector of Tanjore.
To—the Presidency Port Officer, Madras.
Dated—the 7th July 1910.
No.—D. Dis. 2421-Rev.

I have the honour to forward a copy of the Proceedings of the Landing and Shipping Fees Committee, Negapatam, forwarded with the Negapatam Port officer's No. Gl. 427, dated 30th October 1909, with a copy of the Negapatam Divisional Officer's D. Dis. No. 77-Rev., dated 28th January 1910.

(*b*)

Letter—from the Divisional Officer, Negapatam.
To—the Collector of Tanjore.
Dated—the 28th January 1910.
No.—D. Dis. 77-Rev.

In resubmitting herewith your R.C. No. 5971-G.R. of 1909, dated 1st December 1909, I have the honour to enclose herein a copy of the Negapatam Tahsildar's report to D. Dis. No. 92-Rev. of 1910, dated 12th January 1910, and to state that I fully concur with the Tahsildar's views in this matter.

2. I have no more special remarks to offer on the resolutions Nos. 5 and 6 of the Committee.

(*c*)

Letter—from the Tahsildar of Negapatam.
To—the Sub-Collector of Negapatam.
Dated—the 12th January 1910.
No.—D. Dis. 92-Rev.

With reference to your R.C. No. 3599-E.C.R. of 1909, dated 16th December 1909, I beg to report that I consulted Ratnam Pillai, one of the leading owners of canal boats. The others are mostly residents of Topputurai, Kallimodu, Védáranniyam, etc., villages in the limits of Tirutturaippúndi taluk and they could not be consulted in the matter.

2. From enquiries made by me, I understand that landing and shipping fees are not being now levied on goods landed from or shipped into canal boats within the Negapatam port limits and that if, as is now proposed by the Committee, such fees are to be levied hereafter, the practical result will be to diminish the traffic by means of canal boats within port limits. It is to prevent this diminution, however, that the Committee seem to propose that all boats should be made to discharge and take in cargo between the armoury ground on the south and the wharf enclosure to the north, but there may be difficulty in enforcing the rule in practice, as the boat-owners, who are licensed by the Department of Public Works to carry on traffic in the

canal, may take in or land their goods at any place in the canal lower down the ferry, which is situate a few yards to the south of the armoury ground. But it seems to me just and proper that the landing and shipping fees should be levied on goods landed from or shipped into canal boats within port limits, and that the exact place within which they should be so landed or shipped, should be clearly defined. The southern boundary may be put down as "ferry" instead of the "armoury ground", as the armoury ground extends to about a furlong and the expression "between the armoury ground on the south" may not specifically mean whether to the northern or to the southern limit of the armoury ground. The Port officer whom I consulted personally supports my view.

* * * * *

Enclosure.

Proceedings of the Landing and Shipping Fees Committee, Negapatam, dated the 28th October 1909.

* * * * *

Read G.O., No. 279, Marine, dated 7th September 1909, regarding the consideration of assessment of Landing and Shipping Dues on canal-borne produce.

Read again G.O., No. 502, Marine, dated 3rd December 1889, exempting all goods conveyed by canal to the port of Negapatam for export from paying dues under Act III of 1885.

Resolution No. 5.—The Committee agreeing with the views of Government expressed in G.O., No. 279, Marine, dated 7th September 1909, are of opinion that goods landed from or shipped into canal boats within port limits are liable to the payment of fees under the Landing and Shipping Fees Act III of 1885, as it seems to them only fair that, as they enjoy all the facilities of the port, they should be made to pay for same, besides, as pointed out at Cocanada and Masulipatam, there is no guarantee that some portion of the goods so landed are not exported again but go inland or into bazaars where the prices are more favourable for internal consumption. The Committee consider that all boats should discharge and take in cargo between the armoury ground to the south and within the wharf enclosure to the north.

They further consider that the schedule now in force at this port has all the requirements for the proper levy and collection of fees for canal-borne cargo and that the procedure to be adopted is that an application in the prescribed form be put in at the port office by the master or tindal of the boat stating the description and quantity of cargo on board producing his license at the same time and the tonnage therein mentioned be allowed as the carrying capacity of the boat and after having been satisfied that the application is in order, the dues be assessed and collected as usual.

* * * * *

No. G./427.

True copy forwarded to the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, through the Collector of Tanjore, for information.

Negapatam,
30*th October* 1909.

J. H. White,
Port Officer and President, L. & S. Fees Committee.

Order—No. 242, Marine, dated 29th July 1910.

The correspondence read above deals mainly with the question of levying fees under the Madras Outports Landing and Shipping Fees Act, 1885 (III of 1885) on canal-borne cargo landed or shipped within port limits. The Act is at present in force at the ports of Cocanada, Masulipatam, Cuddalore, Negapatam, Calicut, Ponnáni, Hangarkota, Mangalore, Vizagapatam, Adirámpatnam and Tuticorin. There is, however, no canal communication at the last three ports, but in the case of Tuticorin the point is raised whether canoes bringing in coral collected from the islands in the vicinity should be charged fees.

2. The Tuticorin Landing and Shipping Fees Committee recommends the levy of a fee of one anna per ton of 50 cubic feet on such coral, as on all other goods. The Collector of Tinnevelly deprecates the levy of such fees on the ground that the

Government in 1901 decided not to levy seigniorage fees on coral stones collected off the coast, on account of the difficulty of supervision and the likelihood of smuggling, an objection which, he considers, applies also to the levy of landing fees. As he observes, however, the existing practice involves the anomaly of collecting fees in respect of coral imported by vessels arriving with the usual customs papers, while coral landed from canoes is exempt, and there has been a marked increase in the volume of this trade since the Government decided not to levy seigniorage.

The Government therefore agree with the Committee. The proposal to confine the landing of coral to the beach north of Puckle's channel is also approved. Separate proposals should be submitted, with a proposition and reappropriation statement, as to the extra establishment required for the purpose.

3. As regards the imposition of fees on canal-borne traffic, it is observed that this is objected to by the Cocanada Chamber of Commerce and the Landing and Shipping Fees Committee at Calicut. The Government see no reason, however, to modify the decision arrived at in G.Os., No. 90, Marine, dated 4th March 1904, and No. 279, Marine, dated 7th September 1909, that traffic of this description should be brought within the scope of the Landing and Shipping Fees Act.

4. With regard to the rate of fees to be levied in respect of canal-borne articles, the Presidency Port Officer suggests that the principle of charging fees per boat load, irrespective of the kind of cargo, the size of the boat, and the fact whether the boat is fully laden or not, would not only greatly facilitate the levy of fees, but would also do away with the necessity of employing a large staff to collect them. He accordingly proposes the levy of a uniform fee of As. 8 per boat load. The Government are inclined to agree with the Presidency Port Officer, but they desire that the views of the Port Conservancy Board, Cocanada, and the Landing and Shipping Fees Committees of the other ports concerned (except that of Calicut which apparently already approves of this suggestion) should be ascertained. The Presidency Port Officer will submit a further report accordingly.

5. The proposal to confine the landing of canal-borne articles at Negapatam to the area within port limits lying between the ferry to the south and the wharf enclosure to the north is approved

6. There remains the question of exempting certain articles and classes of goods from the operation of the rules—

(1) The Collector of Malabar proposes that the term "goods" should be altered to "cargo" in the draft rules, so as to exclude the personal baggage of persons travelling on the canal and such articles as paddy, straw and cocoanuts brought from the fields on the north side of the canal to the houses of the inhabitants in Ponnáni on the south side.

The Collector's proposal would not be in accord with the wording of section 4 of the Act; but in the case of sea-borne traffic, passengers' personal baggage and bedding have been specially exempted and are free at all ports. This concession will now be extended to cover the case of canal-borne traffic. The Collector will further be requested to submit, through the Presidency Port Officer, proposals for any further local exemptions which he considers necessary to obviate hardship in Ponnáni.

(2) The Landing and Shipping Fees Committee, Calicut, recommends that cargo shipped into boats within port limits for export by rail should not be required to pay twice over. The Act provides for the levy of fees on goods landed or shipped into any vessel within port limits, and it was ruled in G.O., No. 90, Marine, dated 4th March 1904, that when goods were brought into a port by canal and there landed into godowns they should again pay dues when placed in *masula* boats for shipment outside the port. This ruling should be maintained; but double dues need not be charged in respect of what is practically a continuous transaction. Accordingly if cargo landed for export by rail is at once taken to the station only a single payment need be levied. If, however, the goods are kept in depots or godowns, and only sent out by rail subsequently the ruling above quoted will apply.

(3) Timber and bamboos in bundles floated down the rivers do not come within the purview of section 4 of Act III of 1885 and no fees are chargeable on them.

(4) Fishing boats which merely land fish will be exempted from the payment of fees.

7. Along with the information called for in paragraph 4, the Presidency Port Officer will also forward a complete list of landing and shipping fees embodying the present decisions.

(True Extract.)

W. S. Meyer,
Chief Secretary.

To the Presidency Port Officer.
,, Collectors of Maritime districts.
,, Accountant-General.
,, Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Cocanada (Order only).

Marine Department.

NOTES.

[Subject.—*Proposals for the levy of fees on canal borne cargo at ports where Landing and Shipping Fees Act III of* 1885 *is in force.*]

From the Port Officer, Cocanada, dated 30th November 1909, *No.* 246.

Under Secretary—

With the above noted letter, the Port Officer, Cocanada, submits a copy of the minute No. 10, dated 30th November 1909, recorded by the Port Conservancy Board, Cocanada, with the remark that a copy of the same has been forwarded to the Presidency Port Officer for submission to Government with his opinion. This latter has not yet been received. To avoid further loss of time it is submitted that the matter may be referred to the Presidency Port Officer for remarks. A draft endorsement is submitted for approval.

The letter, dated 25th November 1909, from the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Cocanada, is a further appeal against the orders contained in G.O., No. 279, dated 7th September 1909.

M.N.—10-12-09.

The Presidency Port Officer will forward the papers to Government with a report. This may be awaited. It does not seem necessary to refer to the Presidency Port Officer.

C. S. Simpson—11-12-09.

Yes. Remind if we don't get it by 10th January.

A. Galletti—13-12-09.

Under Secretary—

A draft memorandum to the Presidency Port Officer is submitted for approval.

D.V.—12-1-10.
C.S.S.—12-1-10.

The Presidency Port Officer has just gone to Cocanada. Give him till he comes back (15th) and a week more.

A.G.—12-1-10.

Assistant Secretary—

Resubmitted for orders as to issue.

D V.—22-1-10.
C.S.S.—24-1-10.

Issue.

J. W. Bhore—25-1-10.

[Memorandum to the Presidency Port Officer, dated 25th January 1910, No. 1548-1.

From the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Cocanada, dated 24th February 1910.

Endorsement of the Collector of Gódávari, dated 15th March 1910, *Dis. No.* 458/*Rev.*

[Memorandum to the Presidency Port Officer, dated 2nd April 1910, No. 385-1.]

From the Presidency Port Officer, dated 4th May 1910, *No.* 2035-135.

From the Presidency Port Officer, dated 4th May 1910,
No. 2035/133-*G.*

Under Secretary—

On a representation from the Collector of Kistna, Government in G.O., No. 90, Marine, dated 4th March 1904, ruled that landing and shipping fees should be levied at the port of Masulipatam both when goods were brought by canal and landed within port limits and when they were taken from the godowns and placed in the masula boats for shipment. Subsequently in G.O., No. 279, Marine, dated 7th September 1909, Government reiterated the same principle that goods landed from or shipped into canal boats within port limits were liable to the payment of fees under the Madras out-ports Landing and Shipping Fees Act, 1885, at all places where the Act was in force. In accordance with the above orders, the Presidency Port Officer submits proposals for the levy of fees on canal borne cargo at ports where such traffic is carried on.

2. Of the ports at which Landing and Shipping Fees Act III of 1885 is in force, there is, it is stated, no canal communication at the ports of Vizagapatam, Negapatam, Adirampatnam and Tuticorin. At the ports of Masulipatam, Cuddalore and Ponnani, fees are now being charged on canal borne cargo at the scheduled rates sanctioned for sea-borne cargo and consequently no further orders would seem to be required regarding those ports as to the rates of fees to be levied. At the ports of Cocanada, Calicut, Hangerkota and Mangalore different rates of fees are proposed to be levied for the different ports, and at Tuticorin, though there is no canal boat traffic there, the Landing and Shipping Committee propose to levy a fee of one anna per ton of 50 cubic feet on corals collected from the islands in the vicinity. The Collector of Tinnevelly is however of opinion that no charge should be imposed. Draft rules for the levy of fees at some of the ports are submitted, and at some other ports special extra establishment will be required for the collection of the fees though the revenues anticipated is considered doubtful in some cases.

G.O., 81, Marine, 19th March 1910.

3. But to obviate any difficulties in the matter the Presidency Port Officer proposes in paragraph 3 of his letter "to fix a uniform "rate, say 8 annas per boat load, whether loaded fully or partly, "irrespective of the size of the boat or the description of its contents as "this will be the most practicable and easy means of levying fees and "collecting the same." The rates of fees levied will then vary according to the volume of trade at each port. The Presidency Port Officer states that if this is agreed to, he will issue instructions to Port officers to give effect to the orders with the present staff and to report on the same three months after the rules have been in force and also the additional establishment if any that may be necessary in connection with the work. Orders are requested as to whether the proposal of levying fees according to boat loads may be accepted. If so, the Presidency Port Officer may be requested to report the rates of fees to be levied at each port and the sanction of the Government of India obtained if considered necessary to their addition to the scheduled list of rates in G.O., No. 81, Marine, dated 19th March 1910, under section 4 of the Landing and Shipping Fees Act III of 1885.

4. As regards the objections of the Chamber of Commerce, Cocanada, and the Collectors of Tinnevelly and Malabar as to the levy of any fee or canal borne cargo, it is submitted that the question has already been decided in G.Os., No. 90, dated 4th March 1904, and No. 279, dated 7th September 1909, and that it cannot be reopened again in favour of any particular port.

D.V.—4-6-10.

S.P.—4-6-10.

Chief Secretary—

Tuticorin.—The point raised in regard to Tuticorin may be considered first. There is no canal boat traffic at this port, but the question raised is whether canoes bringing in coral collected from the islands in the vicinity should be charged fees. These boats do not enter or clear at the Customs or Port office. The Committee recommend the levy of a fee of 1 anna per ton of 50 cubic feet as on all other goods.

The Collector deprecates the levy of such fees on the following grounds:—

He says that the Government in 1901 decided not to levy seigniorage fees on coral stones collected off the coast on account of the difficulty of supervision and the likelihood of smuggling. He considers that the same objections apply to the levy of landing fees.

I venture to submit that the parellel hardly holds. The Collector admits that the present practice involves the anomaly of collecting dues in respect of coral imported by vessels arriving with the usual customs papers, while coral landed from canoes is exempt, and that there has been a marked increase in the volume of this trade since the Government deprecated the charge of seigniorage. It is submitted that perhaps the Committee's recommendations may be accepted in regard to the levy of fees and that the landing of coral confined to the beach north of Puckle's channel. If experience shows that the cost of the extra staff proposed, viz., one clerk and one peon, is ordinarily greater than the amount of collections, the question of discontinuing the imposition of fees may be considered.

2. The next question is whether the protest entered by some of the authorities and bodies concerned against imposing fees on canal-borne traffic should be allowed to prevail. The Cocanada Chamber of Commerce states that the levy of landing and shipping fees on boats arriving from the interior is likely to further handicap the trade of the port. The Collector of Malabar wishes the substitution of the word "cargo" for "goods" in the case of Ponnáni, but beyond this he has no serious objection to the imposition of fees. The Landing and Shipping Dues Committee at Calicut deprecate the levy of such fees on canal-borne traffic for the following reasons:—

They consider that the cost of collecting a doubtful revenue and ore which would entail a large amount of supervision would not be compensated for by the amount of revenue so derived. They consider also that the difficulties of efficient check are so great that the system would only lead to extortion on the part of those whose duty it would be to collect the dues.

It is submitted that the question of the application of the terms of section 4 of Act III of 1885 to the case of canal boats landing and shipping cargo within the limits of the ports to which this Act applies, has already been considered and decided. There seems to be no reason for modifying the decision arrived at in G.Os., No. 90, Marine, dated 4th March 1904, and No. 279, dated 7th September 1909.

3. *Levy of fees.*—If it is decided to levy landing and shipping fees on canal-borne traffic, the next question is what these fees should be. At Masulipatam, Cuddalore and Ponnáni the same fees are levied on canal-borne cargo as on sea-borne. In regard to the ports of Cocanada, Calicut, Hangerkota and Mangalore, the Landing and Shipping Fees Committees now propose various rates. It is, however, pointed out that any attempt to levy fees according to an elaborate tariff which discriminates between various kinds of merchandise would probably not pay its way. A large staff would be required and the volume of this trade, it is anticipated, would hardly be large enough to bring in sufficient in the way of fees to pay for it. The Presidency Port Officer suggests that, in the case of canal traffic, the principle of charging fees per boat load, irrespective of the kind of cargo, the size of the boat and the fact whether the boat is fully laden or not, would not only greatly facilitate the levy of fees but would also do away with the necessity of employing a large staff to collect them.

For schedule of rates please see G.O., 81, 19th March 1910.

It is submitted that this principle may be adopted. The Presidency Port Officer suggests that the fee should be As. 8 a boat load presumably at all ports. He may perhaps be asked to obtain the views of the Port Conservancy Board, Cocanada, and the Landing and Shipping Dues Committees of other ports concerned with the exception of Calicut which has itself volunteered the same proposal.

4. *Exceptions.*—(1) The Collector of Malabar proposes that the term "goods" should be altered to "cargo" in the draft rules. Cargo he says, implies trade. It would therefore exclude the personal baggage of persons travelling on the canal, boat loads of paddy, straw, cocanuts, etc., brought from the fields on the north side of the canal to the houses of cultivators in Ponnáni on the south side, and various other cases which he quotes in his endorsement, dated the 23rd January 1910. I submit, however, that the original intention of levying fees seems to have been that the facilities afforded for the landing and shipping of goods should be paid for irrespective of what the goods themselves might be. If this intention is to be maintained, then all goods including even personal baggage should pay fees for the facilities afforded. If on the other hand the Collector's argument is to hold good, a more exact definition of the term "cargo" will be necessary. It would perhaps, under these circumstances, be better to maintain the word "goods" and grant exemption certificates as suggested in paragraph 6 of the Collector's endorsement in the case of goods referred to by the Collector in paragraph 3 of his endorsement.

(2) The Landing and Shipping Fees Committee, Calicut, recommend that cargo shipped into boats within port limits and again landed in another part within port limits for export by rail should not be required to pay twice over but only once. In cases where there is no doubt that goods are intended for export by rail, this concession may perhaps be allowed.

(3) Timber and bamboos in bundles floated down the river should not, it is said, be charged fees. This proposal seems to be quite right. Under section 4 of Act III of 1885, only articles landed from or shipped into any vessel within port limit are liable to pay fees. Consequently timber and bamboos floated in bundles down the river would not come within the purview of section 4.

(4) Boats carrying passengers with personal luggage only and boats fishing in the back-waters should be exempt. With regard to baggage, it is to be pointed out that, under section 4, even baggage is liable to pay landing and shipping fees. *Bonâ-fide* fishing boats landing their hauls of fish may perhaps be exempt.

Honourable Member— J.W.B.—18-6-10.

Paragraphs 1—3 *of Mr. Bhore's note.*—I agree.

2. *Paragraph* 4 (1) *ibid.*—Section 4 of the Act provides for the levy of fees on all goods, baggage, etc. It is, as the Collector of Malabar observes, a species of octroi. The proposal to restrict the levy of dues to trade cargo is therefore inadmissible. An octroi should, however, not be oppressive, and the Collector should therefore be asked to submit proposals for exemptions so as to obviate the hardships which he says that the existing rules will impose in Ponnáni.

3. *Paragraph* 4 (2) *ibid.*—The Act provides for the levy of fees on goods landed or shipped into any vessel within port limits, and it was ruled in G.O., No. 90 of 4th March 1904, that where goods were brought into a port by canal and there landed into godowns, they should again pay dues when placed in *masula* boats for shipment outside the port. This ruling should be maintained, but double dues need not be charged in respect of what is practically a continuous transaction. Accordingly, if in the case under reference cargo landed for export by rail is at once taken to the station, only a single payment need be levied. If, however, the goods are kept in depots or godowns, and only sent out by rail subsequently the ruling above quoted will apply.

4. *Paragraph* 4 (3) *ibid.*—I agree.

5. *Paragraph* 4 (4) *ibid.*—As Mr. Bhore says, all baggage is liable but, as above stated, exceptions may be made, at the instance of the local authorities, where this procedure might be oppressive. No dues need be charged on fishing boats landing fish.

W. S. MEYER—22-6-10.

I agree with the Chief Secretary.

V. S. R[ANGA RAO]—28-6-10.

Under Secretary—

A draft order is submitted for approval.

2. With reference to paragraphs 2 and 5 of the Chief Secretary's note above, attention is respectfully solicited to the "explanations (general)" on page 18 of G.O., No. 81, Marine, dated 19th March 1910 In the case of sea-borne traffic "passengers' personal baggage and bedding and provisions and stores for the use of ships" are free at all ports. A somewhat similar concession is allowed by the Port Trust Board at Madras—*vide* foot-note (*g*) on page 4 of G.O., No. 46, Marine, dated 16th February 1910. If canal-borne articles are to be treated in the same way, paragraph 5 (1) of the draft order will require slight modification. Paragraph 5 (4) as drafted is for orders.

The draft as modified is submitted for orders. J.W.B.

3 A sixth paragraph may perhaps be added to the draft asking the Presidency Port Officer for a complete schedule of landing and shipping dues embodying the present proposals.

The draft, as it now stands, meets the point. W.S.M.

K.P.A.—9-7-10.

Chief Secretary— J.W.B—17-7-10.

W.S M.—20-7-10.

From the Presidency Port Officer, dated 12th July 1910, *No.* 2035/192-*G.*

Under Secretary—

Before issuing the order, a further communication from the Presidency Port Officer, which involves some changes in the draft, is submitted. The changes * considered necessary are indicated in the draft which has been typed. Orders are requested whether the draft as modified may issue.

[* Paragraph 1 and end of paragraph 4 of draft.]

K.P.A.—23-7-10.

Chief Secretary— J.W B.—25-7-10.

Yes. W.S.M.—27-7-10.

[G.O., No. 242, Marine, dated 29th July 1910.]

PORT OFFICE, COCANADA.

No. 246 of 09

Dated 30th Novr 1909

Heading.

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE
27 JAN 1910
MADRAS

FROM

H. G. Smith Esq.,
PORT OFFICER,
COCANADA.

REGR. CHIEF SECT.
1-DEC 1909
MADRAS GOVT.

CURRENT NO.
1548
MARINE

1-12-09

3 Hours

To

The Chief Secretary to
the Government of
Madras.

SIR,

Enclosures. 3

Adverting to G. O. No. 279, marine, dated 7th September last, I have the honor to submit herewith, under the instructions of the Port Conservancy Board, Cocanada, a Copy of their minute No. 10, dated 30th Novr 09. together with the enclosures referred to therein and to state that another Copy of the same has been forwarded to the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, for transmission to Government with his opinion.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant

H. G. Smith
Port Officer

To await P.O.'s opinion referred to

1-12-09.

30/11/09

Minutes of the Port Conservancy Board,

Cocanada passed at a meeting held on Tuesday

the 30th November 1909.

PRESIDENCY PORTS OFFICE
27 JAN 1910
MADRAS.

\+ + + + + +

10. Read report of the Sub-Committee, appointed to formulate draft rules for the regulation of the collection of landing and Shipping dues on Canal-borne-Cargo as required in the Presidency Port Officer's Circular No. 48/3406 dated 15th October 1909.

The Sub-Committee's proposals are approved and the Presidency Port officer will be requested to kindly obtain Government Sanction. The fees are made low as most of the goods, brought by canal boats, are intended for reshipment when the usual charge of 1 pie per Cwt. is levied. A Copy will be forwarded to the Chief Secretary to Government as the matter is urgent. A Copy of the letter from the Cocanada Chamber of Commerce on the subject will also be Submitted.

\+ + + + +

(Sd.) E. H. D'Cruz
Vice Chairman

(True Extract)

F. G. Smith
Port Officer

Cocanada
30.11.09

Copy of letter dated 25th November 09
from the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce,
Co Canada to the Chairman, Port Conservancy
Board, Co Canada.

Sir.

I have the honor to Communicate the following resolutions passed at a meeting of the Chamber held this morning:-

"This Chamber is much Concerned to learn that Landing and Shipping fees are now levied from boats arriving from the interior and likely to further handicap the trade of the Port. These are already heavily taxed by the Public Works department for navigation in the Canals and fresh taxation only further tends to divert produce to other markets to the detriment of Co Canada."

"This Canal boat traffic was Considerably larger when the Act No III of 1885 was introduced and up till now no Tax was levied on these boats, it being presumably the intention of Government not to interfere with this traffic".

"The present Charge of 1 pie per cwt. is not only very heavy but impossible in

in many Cases to be fairly and Correctly Collected, owing to the nature of the Articles imported such as fruit, vegetables, Sawed bricks, tiles, timber, firewood &C."

"The Chamber is opposed to any tax being Charged on the Canal boats but if a tax is imperative the Chamber suggests that this should bee a nominal one levied on each boat and not on weight of the Contents".

(Sd) P. J. Rose
Chairman
Chamber of Commerce
Cocanada

(True Copy)

Port officer
30/11/09

Encl 3 to 539 of 10.

Proposals of the Sub Committee appointed at a meeting held on the 5th November 1909 to Suggest fees for Canal Boat traffic.

———"———

1. All canal boats landing or Shipping Cargo within Port limits, except at the Municipal Wharf Wall, to pay a fee of 4 annas for a boat load or part thereof for each operation.

2. All canal boats landing or shipping Cargo at the Municipal Wharf Wall to pay 2 annas for a boat load or part thereof for each operation.

3. Canal boats landing or shipping Cargo partly at the Municipal Wharf Wall and partly elsewhere to pay the full fee of 4 annas per boat for each operation.

4. Dues on Sea-borne Canal boats will be paid at Port office as hitherto. In the case of the inland Canal boats the dues will be Collected at the Municipal Jetty by the additional Clerk to be appointed.

The Canal boat traffic is already in a bad way and any large enhancement of fees is likely to drive the traffic to Rajahmundry and elsewhere in the District to the detriment of the Port of Cocanada.

On the proposed Scale of fees, the income

income by the Canal boat traffic is roughly estimated at Rs 2000/ annually. Owing to the extensive area, over which the operations are spread, it will not be possible to fix places for landing and shipping.

6

The Sub-Committee recommend the entertainment of one clerk on Rs 20/ per mensem and two pensioned Sepoys on Rs 7/ each for the proposed collection of dues.

(Sd.) K. Suryanarayanamurty

(Sd.) E. H. D'Lerwz

(Sd.) P. Chittiah

(True Copy)

F. G. Smith
Port officer.

Encl 4 to 539
J.10.

6/25

7

Marine Depts.

IV

Cur. 1548 / 09

Pro. 1548-1 of 25.1.10

The accompanying letter from the Port Officer Cocanada, No. 246 d 30.11.09, together with its enclosures is forwarded to the Presidency Port Officer, ~~and he~~ he is requested to state when the copy forwarded through him may be expected ~~to reach~~ here.

Sd
12.1.10

Cy
12.1.1910

Int
25.1.10

[illegible]
25/1/10

SC
26.1

DESPATCHED 26 JAN 1910 with Enclos

To
The P.P.O. with current & enclosures in orig. to be retd. with reply

[K. / J]

2,000—25-9-07.

G.146

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE 14 MAR 1910 MADRAS.

8

8

Marine Department.

REMINDER.

REPLY.

No. 85 J, dated the 14th March 1910.

Subject.

Minute No 10 dt 30.11.09 of the Port Conservancy Board, Cocanada

Letter from the Port Officer, Cocanada, received with Memorandum of Government No 1548-1 dated 25th January 1910 is laid over, as it is proposed to submit consolidated schedule and rules for levy of Landing & Shipping fees on Canal borne cargo at all ports when the L & S fees etet III of 1885 is in force. Rules & Schedule for Calicut have not as yet been received from the Collector of Malabar through whom they were submitted by the Port Officer. The Collector was reminded of same on the 4th March 1910. On receipt of the above, the letter from the Port Officer, Cocanada, referred to above, will be disposed of.

THE undersigned is directed to invite attention to the communication noted on the margin and to request that information may be furnished, in the column opposite, of the cause of delay in furnishing a reply and of the approximate date on which a reply may be expected.

No. 1548-1

dated 25. 1. 1910.

It is requested that the reply to this reminder may be sent not later than the 19th March 1910.

J. W. Blee. 12.3.10

Asst ~~Under~~ Secy. to Govt.

FORT ST. GEORGE, ~~OOTACAMUND,~~

12th Mar 1910.

From the A.S.

Subd. for perusal

15.3.10 15.3.10 14.3.10

J. de Berry
Commander R.I.N.
Presidency Port Officer

To Commander T.L. de Berry, R.I.N.
Presidency Port Officer

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Marine Department

J+S 18
14.3.10

14/3.

Stock Form No. 139
0,000—30-12-04

9

Revenue (190 ~~1~~ 10.) Department.

CURRENT No. REVENUE-B 0563

Regd 29.3.10.

CURRENT NO. 0385 MARINE

From

[*Name*] E.B.Elwin,Esq.,I.C.S.,

[*Designation*] Collector, Godavari Dt.,

[*Station*] Cocanada.

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT REVENUE DEPARTMENT 18 MAR 1910

CHIEF SECRETARIAT MADRAS GOVT. M 29 MAR 1910

Marine U.O.
Fi
28.3.

Sd.
23.3.10

DT
AB

Sd.
26.3.10

Rev. U-O. 563B/10-1
29-3

Dis. Pet. *No.* 458 Rev. of 10.
Dated 15--3--1910. ~~*190*~~.
Enclosures Three

Received 18 3 1910.
Registered 19 3 1910.

DESPATCHED 16 MAR 1910

SUBJECT.

Recd 21/3

Forwarding letter from the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce requesting that the merchants may be relieved of the fees -- collected by the Port.

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

To

The Secretary to Government,

Revenue Department.

Sir,

12

VI

9 [illegible]

N Dispet 458/Rw 5/10

Forwarded.

[illegible signature]
Collector

15-3-10

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,

Cocanada, 24th February 1910.

From

P.J. Rose Esq.,

Chairman, Chamber of Commerce,

Cocanada.

To

The Chief Secretary,

to Government of Madras,

MADRAS.

(Through The Collector, Godavari District, Cocanada).

Sir,

By a resolution passed by the Chamber of Commerce -- this day, I have the honour to forward petition received by the Chamber from several merchants of Cocanada, dated 16th February 1910, complaining that the Port Conservancy Department are collecting from them dues on all goods brought into and carried out of Cocanada by the canal, that they also pay a municipal tax -- and that they therefore pay thrice for articles when the shipping dues are collected. They request that they may be relieved of the fees collected by the Port.

2. This Chamber strongly supports the petitioners and -- considers the request is a reasonable one. In the interests of the trade of the Port, the Chamber is of opinion that all inland trade should be exempted from this extra tax as the bulk of the produce is again taxed when exported. If the tax cannot be -- entirely waived, the Chamber suggests that a nominal charge --

Mallidi Appanna	Mallidi Palliah	S.Ramayya
Yennamani Seshayya	Karri Veereddi	K. Chendrayya.
Kovvuri Tatayya	N. Geddayya	
Nallamilli Subbarayadu	P.Subbarayudu	
Kovvuri Ramanna	Karri Veerabhadrudu	
do. Narsireddi	Sathi Surayya	
Sathu Subbarayadu	K.Subbaraju	

per boat may be levied.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

P. M. Chairman

Chamber of Commerce,
Cocanada.

Kovvuri Palliah	Kovvuri Somayya	Sathinarayana
Mallidi Appanna	Mallidi Palliah	S. Sooriah
Yennamani Seshayya	Karri Veereddi	S.Ramayya
Kovvuri Tatayya	N. Geddayya	K. Chendrayya.
Nallamilli Subbarayadu	P.Subbarayudu	
Kovvuri Ramanna	Karri Veerabhadrudu	
do. Narsireddi	Sathi Surayya	
Sathu Subbarayadu	K.Subbaraju	

(Translation).

16th February 1910.

Petition from the merchants of Cocanada, Vedurupaka, Konkuduru, Koppavaram, Mahendrada and Komaripalem.

To

The Chairman,

Chamber of Commerce,

Cocanada.

Sir,

Under Act III of 1885, the Port Officer used to collect dues on Exports & Imports made in boats intended for Steamers - but now they have been collecting dues on goods brought from interior and on those taken to interior such as Kerosine oil, Castor oil, Sugar & Sundries. In those places where these dues are collected, We beg to inform you that the Municipality is charging 1 anna on every 100 Bags and as. 4/- for each Boat - We used to get about 5 or 10 bags for sale, but owing to these dues it has been found that there is much difficulty to make sales of our goods & buy our domestic wantings. We also beg to bring to your notice that it becomes twice charged when it was collected again from shippers.

We beg to request you to be so good as to kindly arrange and see that this collections of Port dues on Exports & Imports is cancelled.

Signed mark of:

Karthi Ramireddi	S. Subbarayadu	K.Subbarayudu
Kovvuri Kristna swami	Kovvuri Ammireddi	S.Ramadass
do. Ramireddi	Karri Venkiah	R.Tulasidass
Karthi Subbayya	Gurumetla Adayya	N.Veerazu
Tadi Atchayya	Manda Venkanna	Sathinarayana
Kovvuri Palliah	Kovvuri Somayya	S. Sooriah
Mallidi Appanna	Mallidi Palliah	S.Ramayya
Yennamani Seshayya	Karri Veereddi	K. Chendrayya.
Kovvuri Tatayya	N. Geddayya	
Nallamilli Subbarayadu	P.Subbarayudu	
Kovvuri Ramanna	Karri Veerabhadrudu	
do. Narsireddi	Sathi Surayya	
Sathu Subbarayadu	K.Subbaraju	

1158

[illegible]

[illegible]

Tulasu...

[illegible]

Encl 8

5539 of 10

Encl 385

16

Marine Dept.

VII

Endt. No $\frac{385-1}{2.4.10}$

Referred to the Presy. Port Officer for favour of remarks.

[initials] 1/4/10.

[initials] 1.4.10

[initials] 2.4.10

Ex 8 [illegible] 2/4

[initials] 4/4/10

To

The P.P.O. (with ct. & enclos: in orig. to be retd. with reply.).

DESPATCHED
2 APR 1910

(abo)

[G. / 6.]

7,900—10-10-06

Passing orders on the question of levying fees under the Madras Outports Landing & Shipping Fees Act, 1885, on canal-borne cargo landed or shipped within port limits.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ

I

G.O.No.90, Marine, dated 4th March 1904. } Order only.
G.O.No.279, Marine, dated 7th September 1909 }

II

C.No.1548, From the Port Officer, Cocanada, No.246, dated 1st December 1909

III

C.No.385, From the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Cocanada, dated 24-2-1910

IV

Endt. of the Collector of Godavari, Dis.No.458/Rev. dated 15-3-1910 (9)

V

C.No.539, From the Presidency Port Officer, No.2035/135, dated 4-5-1910

VI

C.No.541, From the do do , No.2035/135-E, dated 4-5-1910. (a)

VII

" 807 from the do — do No. 2035/192 G dy/12.7.10. (a)

ORDER No....., dated 190 .

P.S.

The correspondence read above deals with the question of levying fees under the Madras Outports Landing and Shipping Fees Act, 1885 (III of 1885) on canal borne cargo landed or shipped within port limits. The Act is at present in force at the ports of Cocanada, Masulipatam, Cuddalore, Calicut, Ponnani, Hangarkotta, Mangalore, Vizagapatam, Negapatam, Adirampatnam and Tuticorin. There is however no canal communication at the last three ports, but in the case of Tuticorin a question is raised whether canoes bringing in coral collected from the

p 5 of notes

the islands in the vicinity should be charged, fees.

2. The Tuticorin Landing and Shipping Fees Committee recommends the levy of a fee of one anna per ton of 50 cubic feet on sand and coral ~~landed from the islands~~, as on all other goods. The Collector of Tinnevelly deprecates the levy of such fees on the ground that the Govt. in 1901 decided not to levy seignorage fees on coral stones collected off the coast, on account of the difficulty of supervision and the likelihood of smuggling, an objection which, he considers, applies also to the levy of landing fees. As he observes however, the existing practice involves the anomaly of collecting fees in respect of coral imported by vessels arriving with the usual customs papers, while coral landed from canoes is exempt, and there has been a marked increase in the volume of this trade since the Govt. decided not to levy of seignorage. The Govt. therefore agree with the Committee, ~~recommendation, is accordingly accepted and~~ The proposal to confine the landing of coral to the beach north of Puckle's channel is also approved. Separate proposals should be submitted, with a proposition and re-appropriation statement,

Act III of 1865 to the case of canal boats landing and shipping goods within the limits of the ports ~~of~~ to which the Act applies and see no reason to modify the decision arrived at in G.O.No.90, Marine, dated 4th March 1904 and No.279, Marine, dated 7th September 1909.

4. With regard to the rate of fees to be levied in respect of canal borne articles, it is pointed out that any attempt to levy fees according to an elaborate tariff which discriminates between various kinds of merchandise would probably not pay its way. A large staff would be required and the volume of this trade, it is anticipated, would hardly be large enough to bring in sufficient income to pay for it. The Presidency Port Officer suggests ~~that in the case of canal traffic~~ the principle of charging fees per boat load, irrespective of the kind of cargo, the size of the boat, and the fact whether the boat is fully laden or not, would not only greatly facilitate the levy of fees, but would also do away with the necessity of employing a large staff to collect them. He accordingly proposes the levy of a uniform fee of 8 annas per boat load. ~~While accepting the principle~~, they desire that the views of the Port Conservancy Board, Cocanada and the L.& S.Fees Committees of the other ports concerned (except

as to the extra establishment required for the purpose.

p6 of notes

3. ~~The next question is as to the~~ beyond the imposition of fees on canal-borne xxx traffic, ~~Some of the authorities and bodies concerned protesting against this extra taxation~~ are opposed to it. The Cocanada Chamber of Commerce states that the levy of landing and shipping fees on boats arriving from the interior is likely to further xxxxxhix handicap the trade of the port. ~~The Collector of Malabar wishes the substitution of the word 'cargo' for 'goods' in the case of Ponnani but beyond this he has no serious objection to the imposition of fees.~~ The Landing and Shipping Fees Committee at Calicut also deprecates the levy of such fees on canal borne traffic for the following reasons:-

It is observed that this is objected to by the Cocanada Chamber of Commerce & the Landing & Shipping Fees Committee at Calicut

(1) ~~That~~ The cost of collecting and ~~a doubtful revenue and one which would entail a large amount of supervision~~ would not be compensated for by the amount of revenue so derived.

(2) ~~That~~ The difficulties of efficient check are so great that the system would only lead to extortion on the part of those whose duty it would be to collect the dues.

The Govt. have again considered the question of the application of the provisions of section 4 of Madras Act

N.P. The proposal to confine the landing of canal borne articles at Negapatam to the areas within port limits between the ferry to the south & within the wharf enclosure to the north is approved.

pp 8-11 of rules

(except that of Calicut which ~~made~~ apparently already approves ~~the same proposal~~ this suggestion) should be ascertained ~~as~~ ~~in regard to this proposal~~ ~~to the rate proposed~~. The P.P.O. will ~~be requested to xxxxxtainx obtain their views and~~ submit a further report accordingly.

5. There remains the question of ~~the exceptions noted~~ exempting certain articles and classes of goods from the operation of the rules.

(1) The Collector of Malabar proposes that the term 'goods' should be altered to 'cargo' in the draft rules, ~~as the former has a wider significance than the latter. Cargo, he says implies trade. It would therefore~~ so as to exclude the personal baggage of persons travelling on the canal, and such articles as paddy, straw and cocanuts brought from the fields on the north side of the canal to the houses of the inhabitants in Ponnani on the south side. ~~The taxation of such articles, he represents, would be~~ involve some hardship. The proposal to ~~xxxx~~ restrict the levy of dues in the manner suggested is however inadmissible with reference to the terms of section 4 of the Act, but the Govt. recognise the force of the Collector's contention and he will be requested to submit, through the P.P.O., proposals for ~~xxxxxx~~ exemptions so as to obviate the hardship which the rules will impose in Ponnani.

The Collr's proposal cd not be accepted with the wording of sec 4(2) of the Act; but,

In the case of sea borne traffic passengers' personal baggage & bedding have been specially exempted and are free at all ports. This concession will be extended to cover the case of canal borne traffic.

The Collr. will further be requested to submit, through the P.P.O., proposals for such further exemptions as he considers necessary to obviate hardship in Ponnani.

(2) The Landing and Shipping Fees Committee, Calicut, recommends that cargo shipped into boats within port limits for export by rail should not be required to pay twice over ~~but only once~~.

The

B

The Act provides for the levy of fees on goods landed or shipped into any vessel within port limits, and it was ruled in G.O.No.90,Marine,dated 4th March 1904 that when goods were brought into a port by canal and there landed into godowns they should again pay dues when placed in ~~m~~sula boats for shipment outside the port. This ruling should be maintained, but double dues need not be charged in respect of what is practically a continuous transaction.Accordingly if cargo landed for export by rail is at once taken to the station only a single payment need be levied. If however the goods are kept in depots or godowns, and only sent out by rail subsequently the ruling above quoted will apply.

(3) ~~l~~ Timber and bamboos in bundles floated down the ~~rivers~~ rivers, ~~should not be charged fees.~~ ~~Timber~~ do not come within the purview of ~~the~~ section 4 of Act III of 1885 and no fees are chargeable on them.

(4) It is ~~recommended~~ proposed that boats carrying passengers with personal luggage only should be exempt and that no fees should be levied on boats fishing in the backwaters and landing fish. The ~~concession in respect of~~ case of passengers' personal luggage has already been dealt with ~~already provided by the existing~~ Rules

G

vide p. 18 of G.O. No. 81 Mar. 8/19.3.10 (Port Manual)

~~was, and a similar concession will be made with regard to their letter~~, and fishing boats ~~landing~~ clearing and fish will ~~also~~ be exempted from the payment of fees.

6 along with the information called for in para 4, the P.P.O will ~~also be requested to~~ forward a complete list of L+S. fees embodying the present ~~proposals~~ decisions

Cal.
17.7.40

Comm

Cal

To

The P.P.O.

Collectors of Maritime districts.

The Accountant General.

" Chairs: of Comm:, Cocanada (order only).
in ms.

Not for E.T.

Abstract.- Passing orders on the question of levying fees under the Madras Outports Act Landing & Shipping Fees Act, 1885 on canal borne cargo landed or shipped within port limits.

[G. / 5]

10,000-17-12-0

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ

I G.O.No.90, Marine, dated 4th March 1904.
II G.O.No.279, Marine, dated 7th September 1909. } Order only.

III C.No.1548, From the Port Officer, Cocanada, No.246, dated 1st December 1909
IV On to the P.P.O. No. 1548-1 d 28-1-10
V C.No.385, From the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Cocanada, dated 24-2-1910
VI Endt. of the Collector of Godavari, Dis.No.458/Rev, dated 15-3-1910
VII On to the P.P.O. No. 385-1 d 2-4-10.
VIII C.No.539, From the Presidency Port Officer, No.2035/135, dated 4-5-1910.
IX C,No.541, From the do do . No.2035/135-G, dated 4-5-1910
X C.No.807, From the do do , No.2035/192-G, dated 12-7-1910.

(q) (a)

To be communicated to the Chairman Chamber of Commerce Cocanada

ORDER No. 242 dated 29. 7. 1910.

P.S.

The correspondence read above deals with mainly with the question of levying fees under the Madras Outports Landing and Shipping Fees Act, 1885 (III of 1885) on canal borne cargo landed or shipped within port limits. The Act is at present in force at the ports of Cocanada, Masulipatam, Cuddalore, Negapatam, Calicut, Ponnani, Hangarkota, Mangalore, Vizagapatam, Adirampatnam and Tuticorin. There is, however, no canal communication at the last three ports; but in the case of Tuticorin the point is raised whether canoes bringing in coral collected from the islands in the vicinity should be charged fees.

altered - vide C.No. 807 on pp 27-33 Pre

2. The Tuticorin Landing and Shipping

Shipping Fees Committee recommends the levy of a fee of one anna per ton of 50 cubic feet on such coral as on all other goods. The Collector of Tinnevelly deprecates the levy of such fees on the ground that the Govt. in 1901 decided not to levy seignorage fees on coral stones collected off the coast, on account of the difficulty of supervision and the likelihood of smuggling, an objection which, he considers, applies also to the levy of landing fees. As he observes, however, the existing practice involves the anomaly of collecting fees in respect of coral imported by vessels arriving with the usual customs papers, while coral landed from canoes is exempt, and there has been a marked increase in the volume of this trade since the Govt. decided not to levy seignorage.

The Govt. therefore agree with the Committee. The proposal to confine the landing of coral to the beach north of Puckle's channel is also approved. Separate proposals should be submitted, with a proposition and reappropriation statement, as to the establishment required for the purpose.

3. As regards the imposition of fees on canal-borne traffic, it is observed that this is objected to by the Cocanada Chamber of Commerce and the

Landing

738

Landing and Shipping Fees Committee at Calicut. The Government see no reason, however, to modify the decision arrived at in G.Os.No.90,Marine,dated 4th March 1904 and No.279,Marine,dated 7th September 1909 that traffic of this description should be brought within the scope of the Landing and Shipping Fees Act.

4. With regard to the rate of fees to be levied in respect of canal borne articles, the Presidency Port Officer suggests that the principle of charging fees per boat load, irrespective of the kind of cargo, the size of the boat, and the fact whether the boat is fully laden or not, would not only greatly facilitate the levy of fees, but would also do away with the necessity of employing a large staff to collect them. He accordingly proposes the levy of a uniform fee of 8 annas per boat load. The Govt.are inclined to agree with the P.P.O., but they desire that the views of the Port Conservancy Board, Cocanada, and the Landing and Shipping Fees Committees of the other ports concerned (except that of Calicut which apparently already approves of this suggestion) should be ascertained. The P.P.O will submit a further report accordingly.

5 The proposal to confine the landing

new addition

vide CNS 807 on
/ M 27-33 File

448

landing of canal borne articles at Negapatam to the area within port limits lying between the ferry to the south ~~xx~~ and ~~within~~ the wharf enclosure to the north is approved.

6 There remains the question of exempting certain articles and classes of goods from the operation of the rules. (1)The Collector of Malabar proposes ~~xx~~ that the term 'goods' should be altered to 'cargo' in the draft rules, so as to exclude the personal baggage of persons travelling on the canal, and such articles ~~xxx~~ as paddy, straw and cocoanuts brought from the fields on the north side of the canal to the houses of the inhabitants in Ponnani on the South side.

The Collector's proposal would not be in accord with the wording of section 4 of the Act; but in the case of sea borne traffic passenger's personal baggage and bedding have been specially exempted and are free at all ports. This concession will now be extended to cover the case of canal borne traffic. The Collector will further be requested to submit, through the P.P.O., proposals for any further local exemptions which he considers necessary to obviate hardship in Ponnani.

(2) The Landing and Shipping Fees Committee, Calicut, recommends that ~~xx~~ cargo shipped into boats within port limits

25P

limits for export by rail should not be required to pay twice over. The Act provides for the levy of fees on goods landed or shipped into any vessel within port limits, and it was ruled in G.O. No.90, Marine, dated 4th March 1904 that when goods were brought into a port by canal and there landed into godowns they should again pay dues when placed in masula boats for shipment outside the port. This ruling should be maintained; but double dues need not be charged in respect of what is practically a continuous transaction. Accordingly if cargo landed for export by rail is at once taken to the station only a single payment need be levied. If however the goods are kept in depots or godowns, and only sent out by rail subsequently the ruling above quoted will apply.

(3) Timber and bamboos in bundles floated down the rivers, do not come within the purview of section 4 of Act III of 1885 and no fees are chargeable on them.

(4) Fishing boats which merely land fish will be exempted from the payment of fees.

7. Along with the information called for in para.4, the P.P.O. will also forward a complete list of L.& S. fees embodying the present decisions.

DESPATCHED with G.O.s
On 24 AUG 1910

Not for E.T.

To
The P.P.O. (with file of orig. pp.)
" Collectors of Maritime districts.
" Accountant General.
" Chairman, Chamber of Commerce Cocanada (O. only) in MSS.

Received from Press 8 8 10
Sent to Mar 8 8 10

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
RECEIVED
13 AUG 1910
MADRAS.

No. 242, MARINE, 29TH JULY 1910.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers :—

I

G.O., No. 90, Marine, dated 4th March 1904.

The Government agree with the Collector of Kistna that landing and shipping fees should be levied at the port of Masulipatam both when goods are brought by canal and landed within port limits and when they are taken from the godowns and placed in the masula boats for shipment.

(True Extract.)

M. HAMMICK,
Ag. Chief Secretary.

II

G.O., No. 279, Marine, dated 7th September 1909.

The Government see no reason to modify the ruling laid down in G.O., No. 90, Marine, dated 4th March 1904, and are still of opinion that goods landed from or shipped into canal boats within port limits are liable to the payment of fees under the Madras Outports Landing and Shipping Fees Act, 1885, at all places where the Act is in force. It further appears from the last letter of the Presidency Port Officer read above that at Cocanada, as at Masulipatam, some of the goods landed by these boats are not re-exported, but go into the bazaar for internal consumption. In these circumstances the suggestion contained in the first of the Presidency Port Officer's letters read above cannot be accepted.

(True Extract.)

A. G. CARDEW,
Ag. Chief Secretary.

III

Letter—from the Port Officer, Cocanada.
To—the Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—the 30th November 1909.
No.—246-1.

IV

~~Official~~ Memorandum No. 1548-1, Marine, dated 25th January 1910.

V

Letter—from the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, Cocanada.
To—the Chief Secretary to Government (through the Collector of Gódávari).
Dated—the 24th February 1910.

Draft rules for the levy of fees are submitted by the Port officer after approval by the Landing and Shipping Fees Committee.

Cuddalore.

Fees.—Dues are being collected at this port ever since Act III of 1885 was introduced here (*i.e.*) from 1st April 1905.

Landing and Shipping places.—There being at present no particular place for placing the canal borne cargo for purposes of assessment, the Committee have selected two places (1) the Customs House jetty for all old town merchants, (2) the Boat Shed in Fort St. David for new town merchants and the local Customs authorities have approved of this arrangement.

Tuticorin.

Fees.—There is no canal boat traffic at this port. Canoes bring in coral collected from the islands in the vicinity, and these boats do not enter or clear at the Customs or Port office. The Committee recommend a levy of 1 anna per ton of 50 cubic feet as on all other goods.

Establishment.—The Committee recommend the entertainment of a clerk and a peon for the purpose and point out that, in some years, it is possible the amount collected may not cover cost of establishment.

Draft rules are submitted.

The Collector of Tinnevelly is of opinion that no charge should be imposed at all, and also that coral stone should be landed only to the north of Puckle's channel.

Ponnani.

Fees.—Dues are being levied here on canal borne cargo at the schedule rates in force for the sea-borne cargo under the Landing and Shipping Fees Act III of 1885.

Probable collections Rs. 400 a year.

Landing place.—The Customs wharf to be the place for placing cargo for purposes of assessment or such other place as may be prescribed by the Customs officer who is also the Port Conservator.

Draft rules are submitted.

The Collector suggests that the word "cargo" may be submitted for the term "goods" in the draft rules as the former term denotes trade and the latter includes articles brought in boats for domestic purposes. If this is done there is no serious objection to the rules proposed and that the rules as they now stand will give rise to constant friction and quarrels and will give the subordinates of the Port department abundant chances of bringing false (and true) charges and of extorting money.

Establishment.—It is pointed out by the Port Conservator that three clerks are necessary as there are three entrances to the port limits, and that one man must be stationed at each entrance to check the boats entering and clearing the port.

Calicut.

Fees.—The Landing and Shipping Fees Committee are strongly opposed to the scheme of collecting landing and shipping dues on canal borne traffic, as they consider that the cost of collecting a doubtful revenue, and one which would entail a large amount of supervision, would not be compensated for by the amount of revenue so derived. They consider also that the difficulties of efficient check are so great that the system would only lead to the facilitating of extortion on the part of those whose duty it would be to collect the dues.

If, however, Government should consider, the levy of fees on canal borne cargo at Calicut imperative they propose the following:—

Fees.—Eight annas per boat load of cargo—

(1) This rate has been fixed with reference to the revised schedule proposed showing an increase of 70 per cent. to effect improvements to ports.

(2) Levy of fee by boat load is recommended as canal boats are of different sizes and it would be difficult to ascertain the amount of cargo without measurement.

(3) Cargo shipped into boats within port limits and again landed in another port within port limits for export by rail should not be required to pay twice over but only once.

(4) Timber and bamboos in bundles floated down the river should not be charged fees as section 4 of Act III of 1885 provides for levy of fees landed or shipped by vessels only. That if a charge is imperative on this commodity, it may be per 50 or 100 square feet.

N.B.—Empty boats, boats carrying passengers with personal luggage only, and boats fishing in the backwaters are exempt.

Collections.—Rs. 4,500, on canal borne cargo. Rs. 2,500, on tiles, bricks, etc., shipped and landed both within port limits for export by rail. These collections are doubtful, as it is possible that the tax will stop a good deal of the canal traffic and the tile factories may find a cheaper method of getting to the railway than by water in which case Rs. 2,500 will disappear altogether.

Place for landing and shipping.—No particular place or places can be prescribed for the purposes for canal boats. It is proposed to levy fees at the particular places which the boats must pass to get into or to leave the port.

Establishment—

	Rs.	
Eight clerks (2 at each of the four places named) at Rs. 12 each *per mensem*	96	
Four peons (one at each place) at Rs. 8 each	32	
Eighteen boatmen for patrol purposes for three boats (2 sets of crew at 3 per set) at Rs. 8	144	
One Inspector at Rs. 25 *per mensem*	25	
	297 × 12 =	3,564
Contingencies, etc.		136
		3,700

An establishment charge of Rs. 3,700, against an income of Rs. 7,000, which is doubtful.

In addition to the above, three boats at an initial cost of Rs. 150 each will be required.

The Collector of the District supports the recommendation of the Committee and is of opinion, that the cost of collection will however remain always heavy though the receipts may fluctuate, as the figures showing the existing traffic are only approximate and must be accepted with great caution.

HANGERKOTTA.

Fees.—The rate of fee proposed is As. 1–8 per ton on the tonnage of the boats ($\frac{1}{2}$ ton or less as half a ton and more than $\frac{1}{2}$ ton as one ton).

This rate is proposed as it is not practicable to differentiate the various articles contained in a boat, and as a large number of boats arrive at the port daily during the busy season.

Only boats licensed under the boat rules should be allowed to load or land cargo within port limits after obtaining permission from the officer in charge of the levy of landing and shipping fees.

No. 242, MARINE, 29TH JULY 1910.

On fish landed and shipped within port limits the following rates are proposed to be levied :—

	A.	P.	
Fish for consumption	0	1	per cwt.
„ manure	1	8	per ton.
„ curing	0	1	per cwt.

Establishment.—The following additional establishment is proposed for Hangerkotta :—

	RS.		
One peon	7	*per mensem.*	
Increase of pay to clerk from Rs. 10 to Rs. 15	5		
Increase to Superintendent of Customs from Rs. 5 to Rs. 15.	10	„	
	22×12		264
Add pay of clerk at Rs. 15 *per mensem* for four more months in the year, *i.e.*, for a full year instead of only eight months as at present			60
			324

Landing and shipping places.—Two places have been prescribed for landing and shipping of cargo by canal boats, one for cargo generally and the other for fish only.

Draft rules in connection with the levy of fees in question at Hangerkotta are submitted after approval by the Port officer, Mangalore.

MANGALORE.

Fees.—The Landing and Shipping Fees Committee propose levy of fees at annas 1-8 per ton on tonnage of boat irrespective of the nature and amount of cargo.

Landing and shipping places.—The Committee have prescribed places for landing and shipping of canal-borne cargo.

Establishment.—No additional establishment is reported to be necessary.

3. From the replies received from the Port officers, I gather that it is impracticable to charge dues on canal-borne cargo according to the description of the articles inasmuch as a boat may contain different articles to differentiate which will be a tedious task, especially so when there are a large number of boats loading or landing cargo. To give effect to the orders of Government that canal-borne cargo shipped or landed within port limits should be charged landing and shipping fees, it seems to me that it would be necessary to license all such boats plying within the limits of the port or partly within and partly without the port limits under the Boat Rules and to fix a uniform rate, say 8 annas per boat load, whether loaded fully or partly, irrespective of the size of the boat or the description of its contents, as this will be the most practicable and easy means of levying fees and collecting the same. Cargo floated down the river such as bamboos and timber may be exempted.

The Chamber of Commerce at Cocanada and the Collectors of Tinnevelly and Malabar object to the levy of any fee on canal-borne cargo as the boats already pay a tax to the Public Works department, and that any further taxation would be likely to divert the trade elsewhere and that if the levy of a fee is imperative the charge may be for a boat load.

4. On receipt of orders of Government on the proposal now made, the Port officers concerned will be instructed to give effect to the orders with the present staff for the levy of landing and shipping of fees, and to report on same three months after the rules have been in force, and also as to the additional establishment, if any, that may be necessary in connection with the work.

5. Early orders of Government are requested in the matter.

6

No. 242, MARINE, 29TH JULY 1910.

X

Letter—from H. S. BROWN, Esq., Officiating Presidency Port Officer.
To—the Chief Secretary to Government.
Dated—Madras, the 12th July 1910.
No.—2035/192-G.

In continuation of this office letter No. 2035/133-G., dated 4th May 1910, I have the honour to forward herewith letter, in original, from the Collector of Tanjore, D. Dis. No. 2421-Rev., dated 7th July 1910, together with its enclosures, as regards the levy of fees on canal borne cargo landed or shipped within the port limits of Negapatam. The inclusion of the port of Negapatam in paragraph 1 of this office letter referred to is a clerical error.

2. From the correspondence now submitted, it would appear that the Landing and Shipping Fees Committee are willing to charge fees on canal borne cargo at the schedule rates now in force at the port of Negapatam, but for reasons explained in paragraph 3 of this office letter referred to above, a uniform rate of As. 8 per boat load irrespective of the size of the boat may be ordered to be levied, all boats plying within the limits of the port or partly within and partly without port limits being licensed under the boat rules for the purpose. I see no objection to the landing place within port limits for canal borne cargo being defined as proposed by the Tahsildar and approved by the Divisional Officer, Negapatam.

ENCLOSURES.

(a)

Letter—from R. F. AUSTIN, Esq., I.C.S., Acting Collector of Tanjore.
To—the Presidency Port Officer, Madras.
Dated—the 7th July 1910.
No.—D. Dis. 2421-Rev.

I have the honour to forward a copy of the Proceedings of the Landing and Shipping Fees Committee, Negapatam, forwarded with the Negapatam Port officer's No. Gl. 427, dated 30th October 1909, with a copy of the Negapatam Divisional Officer's D. Dis. No. 77-Rev., dated 28th January 1910.

(b)

Letter—from the Divisional Officer, Negapatam.
To—the Collector of Tanjore.
Dated—the 28th January 1910.
No.—D. Dis. 77-Rev.

In resubmitting herewith your R.C. No. 5971-G.R. of 1909, dated 1st December 1909, I have the honour to enclose herein a copy of the Negapatam Tahsildar's report to D. Dis. No. 92-Rev. of 1910, dated 12th January 1910, and to state that I fully concur with the Tahsildar's views in this matter.

2. I have no more special remarks to offer on the resolutions Nos. 5 and 6 of the Committee.

(c)

Letter—from the Tahsildar of Negapatam.
To—the Sub-Collector of Negapatam.
Dated—the 12th January 1910.
No.—D. Dis. 92-Rev.

With reference to your R.C. No. 3599-E.C.R. of 1909, dated 16th December 1909, I beg to report that I consulted Ratnam Pillai, one of the leading owners of canal boats. The others are mostly residents of Topputurai, Kallimodu, Védáranniyam, etc., villages in the limits of Tirutturaippúndi taluk and they could not be consulted in the matter.

2. From enquiries made by me, I understand that landing and shipping fees are not being now levied on goods landed from or shipped into canal boats within the Negapatam port limits and that if, as is now proposed by the Committee, such fees are to be levied hereafter, the practical result will be to diminish the traffic by means of canal boats within port limits. It is to prevent this diminution, however, that the Committee seem to propose that all boats should be made to discharge and take in cargo between the armoury ground on the south and the wharf enclosure to the north, but there may be difficulty in enforcing the rule in practice, as the boat-owners, who are licensed by the Department of Public Works to carry on traffic in the

canal, may take in or land their goods at any place in the canal lower down the ferry, which is situate a few yards to the south of the armoury ground. But it seems to me just and proper that the landing and shipping fees should be levied on goods landed from or shipped into canal boats within port limits, and that the exact place within which they should be so landed or shipped, should be clearly defined. The southern boundary may be put down as "ferry" instead of the "armoury ground, as the armoury ground extends to about a furlong and the expression "between the armoury ground on the south" may not specifically mean whether to the northern or to the southern limit of the armoury ground. The Port officer whom I consulted personally supports my view.

* * * * *

Enclosure.

Proceedings of the Landing and Shipping Fees Committee, Negapatam, dated the 28th October 1909.

* * * * *

Read G.O., No. 279, Marine, dated 7th September 1909, regarding the consideration of assessment of Landing and Shipping Dues on canal-borne produce.

Read again G.O., No. 502, Marine, dated 3rd December 1889, exempting all goods conveyed by canal to the port of Negapatam for export from paying dues under Act III of 1885.

Resolution No. 5.—The Committee agreeing with the views of Government expressed in G.O., No 279, Marine, dated 7th September 1909, are of opinion that goods landed from or shipped into canal boats within port limits are liable to the payment of fees under the Landing and Shipping Fees Act III of 1885, as it seems to them only fair that, as they enjoy all the facilities of the port, they should be made to pay for same, besides, as pointed out at Cocanada and Masulipatam, there is no guarantee that some portion of the goods so landed are not exported again but go inland or into bazaars where the prices are more favourable for internal consumption. The Committee consider that all boats should discharge and take in cargo between the armoury ground to the south and within the wharf enclosure to the north.

They further consider that the schedule now in force at this port has all the requirements for the proper levy and collection of fees for canal-borne cargo and that the procedure to be adopted is that an application in the prescribed form be put in at the port office by the master or tindal of the boat stating the description and quantity of cargo on board producing his license at the same time and the tonnage therein mentioned be allowed as the carrying capacity of the boat and after having been satisfied that the application is in order, the dues be assessed and collected as usual.

* * * * *

No. G./427.

True copy forwarded to the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, through the Collector of Tanjore, for information.

Negapatam,
30*th October* 1909.

J. H. White,
Port Officer and President, L. & S. Fees Committee.

Order—No. 242, Marine, dated 29th July 1910.

The correspondence read above deals mainly with the question of levying fees under the Madras Outports Landing and Shipping Fees Act, 1885 (III of 1885) on canal-borne cargo landed or shipped within port limits. The Act is at present in force at the ports of Cocanada, Masulipatam, Cuddalore, Negapatam, Calicut, Ponnáni, Hangarkota, Mangalore, Vizagapatam, Adirámpatnam and Tuticorin. There is, however, no canal communication at the last three ports, but in the case of Tuticorin the point is raised whether canoes bringing in coral collected from the islands in the vicinity should be charged fees.

2. The Tuticorin Landing and Shipping Fees Committee recommends the levy of a fee of one anna per ton of 50 cubic feet on such coral as on all other goods. The Collector of Tinnevelly deprecates the levy of such fees on the ground that the Government in 1901 decided not to levy seigniorage fees on coral stones collected off the coast, on account of the difficulty of supervision and the likelihood of smuggling, an objection which, he considers, applies also to the levy of landing fees. As he observes, however, the existing practice involves the anomaly of collecting fees in respect of coral imported by vessels arriving with the usual customs papers, while coral landed from canoes is exempt, and there has been a marked increase in the volume of this trade since the Government decided not to levy seigniorage.

The Government therefore agree with the Committee. The proposal to confine the landing of coral to the beach north of Puckle's channel is also approved. Separate proposals should be submitted, with a proposition and reappropriation statement, as to the extra establishment required for the purpose.

3. As regards the imposition of fees on canal-borne traffic, it is observed that this is objected to by the Cocanada Chamber of Commerce and the Landing and Shipping Fees Committee at Calicut. The Government see no reason, however, to modify the decision arrived at in G.Os., No. 90, Marine, dated 4th March 1904, and No. 279, Marine, dated 7th September 1909, that traffic of this description should be brought within the scope of the Landing and Shipping Fees Act.

4. With regard to the rate of fees to be levied in respect of canal-borne articles, the Presidency Port Officer suggests that the principle of charging fees per boat load, irrespective of the kind of cargo, the size of the boat, and the fact whether the boat is fully laden or not, would not only greatly facilitate the levy of fees, but would also do away with the necessity of employing a large staff to collect them. He accordingly proposes the levy of a uniform fee of As. 8 per boat load. The Government are inclined to agree with the Presidency Port Officer, but they desire that the views of the Port Conservancy Board, Cocanada, and the Landing and Shipping Fees Committees of the other ports concerned (except that of Calicut which apparently already approves of this suggestion) should be ascertained. The Presidency Port Officer will submit a further report accordingly.

5. The proposal to confine the landing of canal-borne articles at Negapatam to the area within port limits lying between the ferry to the south and the wharf enclosure to the north is approved.

6. There remains the question of exempting certain articles and classes of goods from the operation of the rules—

(1) The Collector of Malabar proposes that the term "goods" should be altered to "cargo" in the draft rules, so as to exclude the personal baggage of persons travelling on the canal and such articles as paddy, straw and cocoanuts brought from the fields on the north side of the canal to the houses of the inhabitants in Ponnáni on the south side.

The Collector's proposal would not be in accord with the wording of section 4 of the Act; but in the case of sea-borne traffic, passengers' personal baggage and bedding have been specially exempted and are free at all ports. This concession will now be extended to cover the case of canal-borne traffic. The Collector will further be requested to submit, through the Presidency Port Officer, proposals for any further local exemptions which he considers necessary to obviate hardship in Ponnáni.

(2) The Landing and Shipping Fees Committee, Calicut, recommends that cargo shipped into boats within port limits for export by rail should not be required to pay twice over. The Act provides for the levy of fees on goods landed or shipped into any vessel within port limits, and it was ruled in G.O., No. 90, Marine, dated 4th March 1904, that when goods were brought into a port by canal and there landed into godowns they should again pay dues when placed in *masula* boats for shipment outside the port. This ruling should be maintained; but double dues need not be charged in respect of what is practically a continuous transaction. Accordingly if cargo landed for export by rail is at once taken to the station only a single payment need be levied. If, however, the goods are kept in depots or godowns, and only sent out by rail subsequently the ruling above quoted will apply.

(3) Timber and bamboos in bundles floated down the rivers do not come within the purview of section 4 of Act III of 1885 and no fees are chargeable on them.

(4) Fishing boats which merely land fish will be exempted from the payment of fees.