

(1) Number of pages 26
(2) Date of repair 14 11 86
(3) Initials of the Referencer long

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	2613 W	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	18. 10. 1879	197

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Alam

2613

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

18th October 1879, No. 2,613 W.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

Read the following papers:—

No. 39. Endorsement of the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated Ootacamund, 4th October 1879.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 29th September 1879, No. 2,728.

From H. W. BLISS, Esq., Commissioner of Salt Revenue, to C. A. GALTON, Esq., Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Madras, 13th September 1879, No. 7,256.

The rules recently sanctioned in G.O., 8th July, 1879, No. 1,801-A W, and published in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, for the regulation of the navigation of the Buckingham Canal considerably affect the working of this department. I have the honor therefore to submit the following remarks on them for the consideration of the Board.

2. By the rules all vessels plying on the canals are to be licensed and to be charged with an annual license fee as well as with a toll on passing from one section of the canal to another. This department has about 25 or 30 boats of different sorts in use on the canal, which have hitherto been subject to no charge whatever. I request that I may be informed if they are to be paid for in future. I am not quite sure about it, but I rather think that such a payment from Imperial to Provincial Funds is contrary to the orders of the Government of India.

3. The sections into which the canal has been divided, and on passage from each one to the next of which a toll has to be paid, are so arranged that all the salt boats, both from the north and from the south of Madras, will in future have to pay both license fee and tolls, whereas they have hitherto paid either one or the other, but not both. If this had come about in the natural course of events I should not have felt inclined to complain, seeing that the canal must be kept up somehow, and that it is fair enough that the salt traffic should contribute to its upkeep to the same extent as traffic of other descriptions. The sections, however, into which the canal has been divided have been arranged apparently with the express purpose of catching the salt traffic. Every other section is over 40 miles in length. That at Madras is only 12. Other sections end at what I may call more or less natural *termini*. The Madras section does not terminate at Madras itself, which I should call a natural *terminus*, but begins and ends outside it. What is the object of this? Obviously, I should say, to catch the salt traffic. I do not consider that this is fair treatment of the only certain customer (this department) which the canal has. It will certainly cause the Imperial Government a considerable increase of expense without any corresponding additional advantage. I request therefore that Government will take into consideration the advisability of relieving the salt traffic from at least a portion of the additional charge proposed to be imposed. Considering the shortness of the lead and the large amount of the traffic, I think that if all salt brought into Madras paid half tolls this department would be making as large an additional contribution to the upkeep of

a canal of which for many years past it has been the chief supporter as any one can reasonably desire or expect.

4. Another great objection, to my mind, to the new rules is that they provide for the charge of the same tolls on empty as on full boats. Hitherto empty boats have paid no toll at all. I cannot pretend to be a prophet, but I shall be very much surprised if this heavy impost does not go a long way altogether to destroy the traffic on the canal which is now rapidly increasing. It will, in my opinion, be a case of killing the goose which lays the golden eggs. When the traffic on the canal is more developed it may be possible to make boats pay whether empty or laden. Just now the object should be to develop traffic. I cannot think that these heavy charges are the best way to do so, especially considering that as there are now next to no outward cargoes from Madras, so that the boatmen are already under the great disadvantage of having to make two journeys for single hire. I think therefore that for the present empty boats ought not to be charged more than quarter tolls at most, if anything.

5. Rule II includes in the "Canal" all navigable estuaries, backwaters, rivers and channels, whether salt or fresh, connected with it.

6. Every branch channel, therefore, in 17 or 18 salt factories is a part of the canal. I presume therefore that the intention is that the Canal Department should keep them all in repair out of Canal Funds, and I request orders as to whether I am to provide or not in future for their repair as hitherto. If this is not the intention I do not understand why these channels have been included in the Buckingham Canal. The inclusion is most inconvenient and will be a practical obstruction to the working of the department for the following reasons:—

1st. (Bye-law No. III).—Because written permission must be obtained every time I want to repair a boat;

2ndly. (Bye-law No. V).—All my boats when moored must have their masts down; they must be made fast stem and stern to the banks in single tier, and there must be a person always in charge of each vessel (for which purpose I must employ probably nearly a hundred additional hands); and when moored they must, between sunset and sunrise, show a clear bright light, not less than 4 feet above the water level and visible all round.

3rdly. (Bye-law No. X).—Police patrol boats, which to be of any use should be able to move about at night unobserved, must carry a light; and, whether he likes it or not, every officer travelling on the canal must burn a night-light in his cabin all night; and,

4thly. (Bye-law No. XII).—Every boat must have its license always on board. I do not know how this is possible with open boats. Wind and rain will soon make an end of all the licenses.

7. It may be replied that strict compliance with the rules will not be expected of small boats. There however the rules are, and I do not see how, while they exist, one class of boats is to be exempted from their operation while another is not.

8. If, therefore, Government do not think fit to exempt entirely from these rules, boats which are their own property and which are in use by this department, I would at least request that additional rules may be passed excluding from the rules all channels, backwaters, &c., in the possession of this department and empowering the Executive Engineer to exempt Government boats from the operation of such of the rule as he may think fit. The latter proposed new rule, if judiciously worked, as no doubt it would be, would meet my difficulties.

9. And there is, I think, another class of boats to which the power of exemption should be extended. I am, as a member of the Madras Boat Club, a proprietor of pleasure boats plying on the canal. As such I object most strongly to the requirement that pleasure boats shall be disfigured by having their number, tonnage, &c., painted on them. I have used pleasure boats often enough on canals, and never heard even of a license fee being exacted for their use, much less that their owners should consent to their being disfigured before they are allowed to use them. All the

sailing boats at Ennore have fixed masts which it would be difficult to get out without the use of shearlegs. By these rules these boats must be unrigged and dismasted every night to be remasted and re-rigged the next morning—a task in each case involving probably two or three days' hardwork by skilled hands as well as considerable expense! They must lie also, though far away from the line of navigation and anchored in the Ennore backwater opposite their owner's bungalows, moored head and stern, with a crew always on board and a light burning all night! Of course such a result can never have been intended by these rules, but there the rules are, and so long as they continue every owner of a pleasure boat will be liable to interference and annoyance on the part of subordinates of the Public Works Department more zealous than discreet.

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. The division of the canal into sections, each constituting a distinct line of navigation under the Canal and Ferries Act, and the levy of a toll on passage from one section to another was obviously dictated by the necessity for raising sufficient funds for the maintenance of the canal. From the first it was apparent that tolls must be levied on all traffic entering Madras from the south as well as from the north—vide Board's Proceedings, dated 14th March 1878, No. 695, embodied in the Government Order quoted. A short section of only 12 miles was clearly a necessity, the object being to catch all traffic and not merely the salt traffic.

There is nothing unfair to the Salt Department in this arrangement; the chief customers naturally contribute most, and the Executive Engineer's note shows that half the entire traffic consists of salt. The Salt Department must make payments adequate to the benefits derived from the existence of the work, and the Board are not aware of any orders of the Government of India prohibiting such payments; it would be absurd to expect any such exemption from charge for advantages provided by expenditure from Provincial Funds. Paragraphs 17 and 18 of the Executive Engineer's Note show that the salt traffic was duly considered, and that the incidence of the burden, which has hitherto pressed more heavily on salt than on other traffic owing to the shortness of the lead, will be more equally distributed in future.

3. As to the policy of charging the same tolls on empty as on full boats, Mr. O'Shaughnessy's calculations go to show that the boat-owners can well afford to bear the burden. The working of the rule will no doubt be closely watched by the officer in charge and the rate reduced if necessary.

4. With regard to Rule II, the terms of which certainly include every branch channel in the salt factories, it could not have been the intention to keep them in repair out of Canal Funds, and the Commissioner must provide for them as usual. The Board think that such channels and backwaters should be expressly excluded from the operation of the rules, and that the officer in charge of the canal should be empowered to relax any particular rule in favor of Government boats as, for instance, Bye-law No. X in the case of Police patrol boats. The Executive Engineer should have similar authority in respect of pleasure boats; there is no reason why they should not pay the regulated fees; but they might be exempted from the provisions adverted to by Mr. Bliss.

(A true Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Acting Secretary.

TRANSFERRED to the Public Works Department.

(By Order.)

(Signed) J. H. GARSTIN,
Acting Secretary to Government.

No. 40. ORDER THEREON, 18th October 1879, No. 2,613 W.

THE Government concur in the opinions of the Board as expressed in paragraph 1 to 3 of their Proceedings quoted above.

2. The Superintending Engineer will submit for the approval of Government an amendment to Rule II in accordance with the suggestion made in paragraph 4 of the Proceedings under consideration.

3. The Government are not prepared to make any exception from Rule X in favor of Police patrol or pleasure boats.

4. The marking of pleasure boats has been already provided for in Rule V of the rules republished in the *Port St. George Gazette* of the 22nd September 1879.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. H. SANKEY, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, Third Circle.
„ Revenue Department.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

2612
3

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of {1879} Madras

PUBLIC WORKS.

To
The SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
THIRD CIRCLE.

Dated October 1879.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 18th October 1879, No. 2,613 W.

OCTOBER.

Nos. 39-40.

Rules for the regulation of the navigation
of the Buckingham Canal.—Orders on Board.
Proceedings submitting the remarks of the
Commissioner of Salt Revenue on the —.

Correspondence Dept.

No. 7256.

Office of the Commr. of Salt
Revenue, Madras

Dated September 13, 1879

From

M. W. Bliss Esq.

Commissioner of Salt Revenue

To

C. A. Galton Esq.

Ag. Secretary to the Board of Revenue

Sir,

The Rules recently sanctioned
in G. O. 8th July, 1879 No. 1801 A-W and
published in the Fort St. George Gazette
for the Regulation of the navigation of
the Buckingham Canal considerably
affect the working of this Department.
I have the honor therefore to submit
the following remarks on them for the
consideration of the Board.

2. By the Rules all vessels plying on
the Canals are to be licensed and to
be charged with an annual License

Free as well as with a toll on passing
from one section of the Canal to
another. This Department has about
25 or 30 boats of different sorts in use
on the Canal, which have hitherto—
been subject to no charge whatever.
I request that I may be informed
if they are to be paid for in future.
I am not quite sure about it but
I rather think that such a payment
from Imperial to Provincial Funds
is contrary to the orders of the Govern-
ment of India.

3. The sections into which the Canal
has been divided, and on passage
from each ~~one~~ ^{one} to the next of which
a toll has to be paid, are so arranged
that all the salt boats, both from
the North and from the South of
Madras, will in future have to pay
both license fee and tolls, whereas they
have hitherto paid either one or the
other

26/3/55
other but not both. If this had come
about in the natural course of events
I should not have felt inclined to
complain seeing that the Canal must
be kept up somehow and that it is fair
enough that the salt traffic should
contribute to its upkeep to the same
extent as traffic of other descriptions.
The sections, however, into which the
Canal has been divided have been
arranged apparently with the express
purpose of catching the salt traffic.
Every other section is over 40 miles in
length. That at Madras is only 12.
Other sections end at what I may call
more or less natural termini. The
Madras section does not terminate
at Madras itself, which I should call
a natural terminus, but begins and
ends outside it. What is the object
of this? Obviously, I should

to catch the Salt Traffic. I do not consider that this is fair treatment of the only certain customer (this Department) which the Canal has. It will certainly cause the Imperial Government a considerable increase of expense without any corresponding additional advantage. I request - therefore that Government will take into consideration the advisability of relieving the Salt Traffic from at least a portion of the additional charge proposed to be imposed. Considering the shortness of the lead and the large amount of the traffic I think that if all Salt brought into Madras paid half tolls this Department would be making as large an additional contribution to the upkeep of a Canal which for many years past it has been the chief supporter as any one can desire or expect.

2613
4. Another great objection, to my mind, to the new Rules is that they provide for the charge of the same tolls on empty as on full boats. Hitherto empty boats have paid no toll at all. I cannot pretend to be a prophet, but I shall be very much surprised if this heavy impost does not go a long way altogether to destroy the traffic on the Canal which is now rapidly increasing. It will in my opinion be a case of killing the goose which lays the golden eggs. When the traffic on the Canal is more developed it may be possible to make boats pay whether empty or laden. Just now the object should be to develop traffic. I cannot think that these heavy charges are the best way to do so, especially considering that as there are now next to no outward cargoes from Madras so that the

the Boatmen are already under the great disadvantage of having to make two journeys for single hire. I think therefore that for the present empty boats ought not to be charged more than quarter tolls at most, if anything.

5. Rule II includes in the "canal" all navigable estuaries, back waters, rivers and channels, whether Salt or fresh, connected with it.

6. Every branch channel, therefore, in 17 or 18 Salt Factories is a part of the Canal. I presume therefore that the intention is that the Canal Department should keep them all in repair out of Canal Funds, and I request orders as to whether I am to provide or not in future for their repair as hitherto. If this is not the intention I do not understand why these channels have been included in the Dockingham Canal. The inclusion

inclusion is most inconvenient and will be a practical obstruction to the working of the Department for the following reasons:-

1st (Bye Law ch. III) Because written permission must be obtained every time I want to repair a boat;

2^{ndly} (Bye Law ch. IV) All my boats when moored must have their masts down; they must be made fast stem and stern to the banks in single tier, and there must be a person always in charge of each vessel (for which purpose I must employ probably nearly a hundred additional hands); and when moored they must, between sunset and sunrise, show a clear bright light, not less than 4 feet above the water level and visible all round.

3^{rdly} (Bye Law ch. V) Police Patrol Boats which, to be of any use, should be able to move about at night unobserved must carry a light; and who likes it or not

not, every Officer travelling on the Canal must burn a night-light in his cabin all night; and,

4th (Bye law No. III) Every boat must have its licence always on board. I do not know how this is possible with open boats. Wind and rain will soon make an end of all the licences.

7. It may be replied that strict compliance with the Rules will not be expected of small boats. There, however, the Rules are, and I do not see how, while they exist, one class of boats is to be exempted from their operation while another is not.

8. If, therefore Government do not think fit to exempt entirely from these Rules boats which are their own property and which are in use by this Department, I would at least request that additional Rules may be passed excluding from the Rules all channels, back-water in the possession of this Department

26/3/88
Department and empowering the Executive Engineer to exempt Government boats from the operation of such of the Rules as he may think fit. The latter proposed new Rule if judiciously worked, as no doubt it would be, would meet my difficulties.

9. And there is, I think, another class of boats to which the power of exemption should be extended. I am, as a member of the Madras Boat Club, a proprietor of pleasure boats plying on the Canal. As such I object most strongly to the requirement that pleasure boats shall be disfigured by having their number, tonnage &c. painted on them. I have used pleasure boats often enough on Canals and never heard even of a license-fee being exacted for their use much less that their owners should consent to their being disfigured before they are

are allowed to use them. All the
Sailing boats at Ennore have fixed
masts which it would be difficult
to get out without the use of Shear-
legs. By these Rules these boats
must be unrigged and dismasted
every night to be remasted and
re-rigged the next morning - a
task in each case involving pro-
bably 2 or 3 days hard work by
skilled hands, as well as considera-
ble expense! They must lie also,
though far away from the line of
navigation and anchored in the
Ennore Backwater opposite their
owners' Bungalows, moored head
and Stern, with a crew always on
board and a light burning all
night! Of course such a result
can never have been intended by
these Rules, but there the Rules are
and

2613 409
and, so long as they continue, every
owner of a pleasure boat will be
liable to interference and annoyance
on the part of Subordinates of the
Public Works Department more
zealous than discreet.

I have &c.
(Signed) D. B. W. Bliss
Commissioner of Satt Rev.

(True Copy)

W. C. M.
Ag Secretary

G.O. 18-10-79-26132

Enclosure in Board's
Proceedings to the
Secy to Govt. &c.
of 29th Sept. 1879
No. 2728

Revenue Department
26/3/79

No. 2728

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue.

Dated 29th September 1879.

Read letter from the Commissioners of Salt
Revenue dated 13th September 1879 No. 7256.

Submitted for the orders of Government.

2. The division of the Canal into sections
each constituting a distinct line of Navigation
under the Canal and Ferries Act and the
levy of a toll on passage from one section
to another was obviously dictated by the necessity
for raising sufficient funds for the maintenance
of the Canal. From the first it was apparent
that toll must be levied on all traffic
entering Madras from the South as well as
from the North vide Board's Proceedings dated
14th March 1878 No. 695 embodied in the
G.O. quoted. A short section of only 12 miles
was clearly a necessity, the object being to cut
all traffic and not merely the Salt trade.

There is nothing unfair to the Salt Department in this arrangement; the chief ^{customers} ~~customers~~ naturally contribute most and the Executive Engineer's Note shows that half the entire traffic consists of salt. The Salt Department must make payments adequate to the benefits derived from the existence of the work and the Board are not aware of any order of the Govt. of India prohibiting such payments; it would be absurd to expect any such exemption from charge for advantages provided by expenditure from Provincial Funds. Paras 17 & 18 of the Executive Engineer's Note show that the salt traffic was duly considered and that the incidence of the burden, which has hitherto pressed more heavily on Salt than on other traffic owing to the nature of the trade, will be more equally distributed in future.

3. As to the policy of charging the same tolls on empty as on full boats Mr. O'Shaughnessy's calculations go to show that the boatowners will afford to bear the burden. The execution of the rule will no doubt be closely watched.

watched by the Officer in charge and the rate reduced if necessary.

4. With regard to Rule II, the terms of which certainly include every branch channel in the Salt factories, it could not have been the intention to keep them in repair out of Canal Funds & the Commissioners must provide for them as usual. The Board think that such channels & boatmasters should be expressly excluded from the operation of the Rules & that the Officer in charge of the Canal should be empowered to relax any particular rule in favor of Govt. boats as for instance Bye law No. 4 in the case of Police patrol boats. The Executive Engineer should have similar authority in respect of pleasure boats; there is no reason why they should not pay the regulated fees; but they might be exempted from the provisions admitted to by Mr. Bliss.

(True Extract)

[Signature]
The Ag. Secretary to Government
with copy of letter from Commr. of Salt Res.
R.D.

Cir 10.10.79. Plot 7b. 10.79.
to Oct 5 10

26/3
1871
B & B
C. W. Department.

No. 2613 W

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 18th Oct^r 1779.

READ the following

Endorsement in the Revenue
Dept. on Board's Pro: } H. E. R. . d/4 Oct. 1/79.
N^o. 2728 d/29 September 1879.

The Govt. concurs
in the opinions of the
Board as expressed in
para 1 to 3 of their Pro:
quoted above.

2. The Supg Engineer
will submit for the
approval of Govt. an
amendment to Rule II
in accordance with the

Suggestion made in
para 4 of ^{to}pro: under
Consideration

Superintending Engineer *3 Circle*
 Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
 Consulting Engineer for Railways.
 Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
 „ Railway Accounts.
 Consulting Architect.
 Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works.
 General Superintendent, P. W. Stores and Workshops.
 Do. do. P. W. Stores Department.
 Chief Engineer and Manager, Madras Irrigation and Canal Company's Accounts.
 Examiner Irrigation and Canal Company's Accounts.

Revenue Dept. X
Desked
29-10-79

3. The Govt are not prepared to make any exception from Rule X in favor of Police patrol or pleasure boats.

4. The marking of pleasure boats has been already provided for in Rule I of the rules republished in the Fort St. George Gazette of the 22nd Sept^r 1879.

L
8.10

Att

10/10/79

h
Cci 70-10/79
L 10/10-10-
10/10-10-79

Cir 7168

Gobt. of 1879 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. 18 Oct, 1879, No. 2634

Nos. 39-40

Rules for the regulation
of the navigation of the
Buckingham Canal
Orders or Board's Resolutions
submitting the remarks
of the Commissioner of Public
Revenue on the

B-4-11