Archives I 10,006—16-8 77.

(1) Number of pages 54

(2) Date of repair 4.87

(3) Initials of the Referencer lent

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

PUBLIC WORKS. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. / B.P. No.	2241 - W	Press. / Mis.
Dated	31 - 8 - 1882	197 .

My.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1/2241

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

No. 192.

Read—the following papers:—

G.O., dated 7th August 1882, No. 677, Marine.

Read—the following letter from J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieut., R.N.R., Master Attendant, Administrative Department, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated Madras, 5th August 1882, No. 6684:—

I have the honor to report, for the information of Government, that I have been in consultation with the Advocate-General on the subject of the short Bill for levying tolls in the Madras Harbour, and have also had communications with the Chamber of Commerce on the subject. The last letter from that body is forwarded with this, and it will be seen from it that the Chamber is of opinion that the Government in taking the whole charge of the Harbour might lay itself open to a great deal of inconvenience and difficulty, and even, as they allege, pecuniary loss. I am not aware that any of the test cases submitted by the Chamber have ever arisen or are likely to arise, but I have no doubt a great deal of obstruction and annoyance to Government might be caused by parties, who, for purposes of their own, might choose to distort and exaggerate even the most insignificant circumstances into complaint calling for redress and remedy. The letter from the Chamber may be considered to represent their views that as far as possible Government action should be restricted to collecting the toll, with the expenses of establishment and upkeep. And the language of the letter seems to support the idea that the arrangement will be satisfactory to the trade. Now, as any present arrangement must be of a temporary character, lasting only until the completion of the Harbour, its final cost, and the development of its capacity for shelter and its general facilities for trade, I beg respectfully to represent that it may perhaps seem to Government to be advisable to meet the Chamber on this basis, and change the character of the Bill into one simply dealing with the Harbour in much the same terms now used in the Pier Act.

2. The Advocate-General entirely concurs in this, and points out that a very short Bill would alone be necessary, and nothing in it would then interfere with the Pier Act, the Boat Act, and the Marine Police Act, all of which would retain their present positions.

3. The Pier Act simply states, clause 1, that tolls according to such rates as shall from time to time be settled and approved by the Governor of Madras in Council shall be levied, &c., but if it is considered necessary or advisable to name in the Bill a rate which will be sufficient for all purposes, then I would respectfully suggest the levy of one rupee (for the interest of money spent up to this time upon the Harbour, and four annas for all other purposes required for the performance of duties connected with the Port) upon every [illegible] of goods entering or leaving the Port;

this would be collected on the pier and on the beach, and the mercantile public would be free to take their goods, and in all respects exercise their present freedom, which the Chamber declares to be their desire.

4. As the boat-hire has already been reduced one rupee a trip, or about 10 annas a ton, owing to the facilities offered by the Harbour, this arrangement ought to recommend itself as a very satisfactory one.

5. The simplicity of this method has much to recommend it, but the use of the Custom-house sheds is an imperative necessity for the Port until private accommodation of sufficient capacity is provided, which even then will never be so convenient as the present site into which the pier railway discharges all goods in security. How to provide for this shelter and the charges connected with it and the delivery of goods has to be considered; perhaps the Collector could give advice upon this point. The dues paid for warehousing would go some way towards expenses, if indeed they did not suffice entirely, but as the receipt and delivery of goods have always been an extra charge on the public, perhaps a somewhat similar arrangement to the one previously existing, under a responsible contractor, would meet the difficulty.

6. The incomplete condition of the Harbour is without doubt a grave consideration, when taking absolute charge over its working is contemplated, and though all parties agree that the facilities offered by it justify a levy of money to recoup the Government for its construction, yet the many accidents to which it may yet be subject might interfere with harmonious working under any department or body, if the present arrangements, which are considered vested interests by the parties concerned, are entirely set aside.

7 A very short notice would be all that was necessary to set the proposal in this letter in action, and only the small extension of staff mentioned in my letter recorded in G.O., Public Works Department, No. 1382 W., dated 5th June 1882. The Bill would require to provide for lien on goods until the tolls were paid, and penalties against any infringement of the law and order in the Harbour. The palisades and sheds would be a convenience to all parties, for business on the hot sand could not be safely conducted by unsheltered Europeans, and more protection to property would be a great desideratum.

Enclosure.

From CLEMENT SIMPSON, Esq., Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, to the Master Attendant, dated Madras, 10th July 1882.

The Chamber have had your letter of the 26th ultimo under consideration, and while thanking you for the details you have been good enough to furnish on various matters connected with the proposed future management of the Harbour, they desire me to state that your explanation does not afford them all the information sought for in my letter of the 21st ultimo.

The Chamber do not understand how the hire of boats is to be arranged for. Boat-hire is included in your consolidated rate, and it is therefore to be presumed that boats will be provided by you, but you state that this is not intended to interfere with the selection of boats by the parties directly interested any more than is done now.

You refer to boat-hire as an invariable item, for you recognise only the legal rate, but you must be aware that a hard and fast tariff is not suited to the exigencies of trade, and that as a matter of fact the legal rate of boat-hire is not recognised and that rates vary if circumstances warrant their doing so, and in the opinion of the Chamber it is perfectly fair and reasonable that emergent rates should be paid for emergent work.

Do you mean when you refer to a shipper's power of selection that he is to engage his own boats in any way he chooses, refer the boats to you for their legal hire and then pay them himself any extra hire that may have been agreed upon? Is he to take charge of his goods and ship them on his own responsibility in the boats he has selected? If so, it appears to the Chamber that although you nominally undertake the responsibility of shipment, and seek in your scheme as a consequence of such responsibility to make a profit for Government on shipping, you really contemplate that your department shall be relieved of responsibility at the point when shipment commences.

To enable you clearly to appreciate the difficulties which occur to the Chamber in the working of the scheme you have proposed to Government, assuming that it involves the shipping and landing of goods by your department and not by those interested, I am desired to submit, for your consideration, the following cases which, it is believed, would be common enough in practice, and to request that you will be good enough to explain in what way the department which is to have charge of the shipping and landing arrangements of the Port would deal with them:—

(1) What, for example, will be the effect of the new arrangement when a merchant has a chartered ship or steamer whose lay-days are just expiring, so that it is imperative to ship cargo as rapidly as possible to avoid going on demurrage? Under present arrangements the merchant would probably pay extra boat-hire to secure as many boats as possible and get the ship loaded before the lay-days run out. If he were compelled to get shipment effected through the proposed special department, he would probably be told that he could not have more than a fair proportion of the Port accommodation. He would be unable to offer any inducement to the boat-men and others concerned to exercise greater despatch, and he would be unable to prevent the ship going on demurrage. Here is a case where possibly the merchant could not establish a claim against the Government Department, but where undoubtedly he would incur loss which he could have avoided had trade been left to itself.

(2.) Or, again, take the case of a merchant who has sold produce in London for shipment by a certain date. The time is nearly run out before his ship comes in. Were it open to him to make his own arrangements he could probably get his produce shipped within the contract date. If he were only one of many shippers whose produce had been handed over to the special department proposed, very probably he could not complete shipment in time, and he might lose his market, or even have claims for damages brought against him.

(3.) Again, take the case of a merchant who has sold document bills for a certain mail date. His ship or steamer possibly arrives on the morning of the mail day. Were he left to himself he could most probably get his produce shipped and his documents ready in time, but a special department must follow its routine regulations, which means delay, or at least a want of special expedition, and it is just as likely as not that he would miss his mail which, with a rising exchange, means lose money. At any rate, he cannot by special personal exertion save his mail as he might under present circumstances.

Many similar cases of emergency could be cited to you, but the foregoing will suffice to show you the practical difficulties that occur to the Chamber, and in reference to shipping, I am only further to add that the Chamber will be much obliged if you will state in the closest detail the exact procedure, step by step, that will be followed from the time goods enter the gates of your palisade to the moment in which Mate's receipts are handed to the owner, and with whom the responsibilities attaching in the charge of goods during that period and their proper shipment in proper time will rest?

So far as landing is concerned, the Chamber feel that similar queries must be put to you. Will the power of selecting boats rest with steamer Agents? If so will not the discharge of the steamer and the landing of her cargo virtually rest with them as at present? In what way will your department interfere with the landing, and if not at all, on what grounds do you propose to make a profit for Government out of it?

If it is really your intention to relieve the Agents of ships and steamers from all the work and responsibility of landing, what assurance can you give the Chamber that the work will be more expeditiously done than is now the case with Government cargo, the discharge of which already rests with your department?

The Chamber approve of the arrangements you propose to make on the beach and the Custom-house buildings for the enclosure and protection of goods in course of shipment or landing, and they fully recognize the necessity of proper means of levying the Harbour dues on goods, but they so far fail to see the necessity for Government interference beyond the beach. I am desired by the Chamber to state that, in their opinion, it would be better to make your consolidated rate exclude the cost of boat-hire, the existing arrangements for the provision of which should not be interfered with.

Order—dated 7th August 1882, No. 677, Marine.

Transferred to the Public Works Department, with reference to G.O., No. 1382 W., dated 5th June 1882.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Chief Secretary.

No. 192-A.

From R. J. MELVILLE, Esq., Collector of Sea Customs, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 16th August 1882, No. 2048.

I have the honor to reply to No. 563 E., dated 10th August 1882, Public Works Department, referring to me for an expression of my opinion a letter No. 6684, dated August 5th, from the Master Attendant, Administrative Department, together with a file of papers * connected with the subject under discussion, viz, the scheme for landing and shipping and levying dues for the Madras Harbour.

* Herewith returned.

2. In the letter of the Master Attendant a scheme is proposed in which, in deference to the rooted objections of the Chamber of Commerce to the whole business connected with the landing and shipping of goods being taken out of their hands, the action of Government is confined to providing shelter and guard for goods before being shipped and after being landed, and in the Act proposed to be passed to legalize the levy of a due for such service, the Master Attendant proposes to name a rate of one rupee. I would propose that as in the Pier Act no rate should be named, but that it should be left open to Government to fix the rate from time to time.

3. In paragraph 5 it is stated that the use of the Custom-house sheds is an "imperative necessity" "until private accommodation of sufficient capacity is provided." I have already in my letter No. 1212, dated May 11th, 1882, pointed out that half the sheds of the Custom-house could be spared for the shelter of free goods, but that the sheds must first be effectively separated from that part of the yard still required for dutiable goods.

4. The fees at present levied for godown rent, which I presume are those referred to by the Master Attendant as warehousing fees, vary in respect of different articles as shown in the accompanying list. These rates are not leviable for the first four days. The revenue derived from this source is shown under the head of Customs, and would not be available for any of the purposes suggested by the Master Attendant.

5. Whatever rate it may eventually be decided to levy in the proposed enclosure and sheds should be levied on goods in the Custom-house whether dutiable or free. The rate is a Harbour due and has nothing to do with Customs.

Enclosure.

RENTS FOR GODOWN RENT.

	Per Month. Rs.	A.	P.
Beer, whole pipes, butt, or puncheon	0	12	0
Do. half pipe or hogshead	0	6	0
Do. quarter pipe	0	3	0
Large casks containing glass or earthen-ware	1	0	0
Tierce, do. do. or provisions	0	12	0
Large crates, 12 dozen bottles	0	6	0
Small do. 6 or 8 dozen, more or less.	0	4	0
Wines, butt or pipe	2	0	0
Do. half pipe or hogshead	1	0	0
Do. quarter pipe	0	8	0
Do. chests above 12 dozen size	0	8	0
Do. do. of 12 dozen or above 6 dozen.	0	6	0
Do. do. of 6 do. or 3 do.	0	3	0
Wines, quarter chest or 3 dozen	0	2	0
Do. all boxes under 3 dozen and above 1 dozen.	0	1	0
Do. one dozen boxes	0	0	9
Spirits, per pipe	2	0	0
Do. hogshead	1	0	0
Do. in bottle case of 1 dozen	0	1	0
Do. above 1 and under 3 dozen	0	1	6
Do. 3 dozen	0	2	0
Do about 3 and under 6 dozen	0	3	0
Do. 6 dozen	0	4	0
Do. for every dozen in excess of 6 dozen size	0	0	9

	Per Month. Rs.	A	P.
British piece goods, per case above 12 dozen	0	8	0
Do. do. per case of 12 dozen or above 6 dozen	0	6	0
Do. do. per case of dozen or above 3 dozen	0	3	0
Do. do. 3 do. or less	0	2	0
Do. do. per bale of size of bale of Twist of 4 to 500 lbs.	0	6	0
Do. do. per bale of smaller size	0	4	0
Twist of all sorts, per bale of 4 or 500 lbs.	0	6	0
Do. do. do. of smaller size	0	4	0
Metals, per bazaar maund	0	0	6
Canvas, per bale	0	3	0
Silk, per bale	0	6	0
Silk piece goods, per case	0	6	0
Indigo, per chest	0	6	0
Opium	0	6	0
Cotton, Hemp, Jute and Safflower, per bale of 300 lbs.	0	4	0
Sugar, Rice, and Seeds, per 100 bazaar maunds	2	8	0
Cutch, per 100 bazaar maunds	2	0	0
Shell lac and lac dye, per chest	0	4	0
Vermillion, per box	0	2	0
Arsenic, do.	0	3	0
Brass leaf, per box	0	2	0
China paper, per case	0	2	0
China cases of Nankin, Cassia, Camphor, Silk, Aniseed, &c., per case	0	3	0
Ginger or Turmeric, per 100 bazaar maunds	3	0	0
Betelnut, per bazaar maund	0	0	6
Cloves, do. do.	0	1	0
Coffee, Pepper, Cardamom, Cuminseed, Aniseed, in bags or bales, per bazaar maund	0	1	0
Sugar, spices or any other similar articles, per hogshead	0	8	0
Do. do. do. do. per tierce	0	4	0
Sugar candy, per tub	0	0	6
Tea, per whole chest	0	2	0
Do. per smaller box	0	1	0
Paint, per keg of 56 lbs.	0	0	6
Salmon, Herrings, or other Fishes per keg	0	0	6
Turpentine, Linseed, or other vegetable oil, per jar.	0	2	0
All cordage, per cwt	0	1	0
Rosin or Dammer, per bazaar maund.	0	1	0
Tobacco, unmanufactured, per 1 maund bale	0	2	0
Gunnies, per large bale	0	8	0
Gunnies, per smaller bale	0	6	0
Cow Hides, per large bale	0	12	0
Do. do. per smaller bale	0	8	0
Goat skins, per bale	0	8	0
Quicksilver, per bazaar maund	0	2	0
Tin plates, per box	0	0	6
Bricks, per 1,000	1	0	0

No. 192-B.

From the Collector of Sea Customs, Madras, dated 17th August 1882, No. 2050.

No. 193.

Order—dated 31st August 1882, No. 2241 W., Public Works.

In G.O., No. 1382 W., dated 5th June 1882, the preparation of a short Bill was directed to enable a consolidated charge of Rs. 2-2-0 per ton to be levied on all goods landed and shipped in the Madras Harbour.

2. The Master Attendant has now, after communication with the Advocate-General and the Chamber of Commerce, submitted proposals in modification of his original scheme, which contemplated the lading and landing of goods through the

No. 192-A.

From R. J. MELVILLE, Esq., Collector of Sea Customs, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 16th August 1882, No. 2048.

I have the honor to reply to No. 563 E., dated 10th August 1882, Public Works Department, referring to me for an expression of my opinion a letter No. 6684, dated August 5th, from the Master Attendant, Administrative Department, together with a file of papers * connected with the subject under discussion, viz, the scheme for landing and shipping and levying dues for the Madras Harbour.

* Herewith returned.

2. In the letter of the Master Attendant a scheme is proposed in which, in deference to the rooted objections of the Chamber of Commerce to the whole business connected with the landing and shipping of goods being taken out of their hands, the action of Government is confined to providing shelter and guard for goods before being shipped and after being landed, and in the Act proposed to be passed to legalize the levy of a due for such service, the Master Attendant proposes to name a rate of one rupee. I would propose that as in the Pier Act no rate should be named, but that it should be left open to Government to fix the rate from time to time.

3. In paragraph 5 it is stated that the use of the Custom-house sheds is an "imperative necessity" "until private accommodation of sufficient capacity is provided." I have already in my letter No. 1212, dated May 11th, 1882, pointed out that half the sheds of the Custom-house could be spared for the shelter of free goods, but that the sheds must first be effectively separated from that part of the yard still required for dutiable goods.

4. The fees at present levied for godown rent, which I presume are those referred to by the Master Attendant as warehousing fees, vary in respect of different articles as shown in the accompanying list. These rates are not leviable for the first four days. The revenue derived from this source is shown under the head of Customs, and would not be available for any of the purposes suggested by the Master Attendant.

5. Whatever rate it may eventually be decided to levy in the proposed enclosure and sheds should be levied on goods in the Custom-house whether dutiable or free. The rate is a Harbour due and has nothing to do with Customs.

Enclosure.

RENTS FOR GODOWN RENT.

	Per Month. Rs.	A.	P.
Beer, whole pipes, butt, or puncheon	0	12	0
Do. half pipe or hogshead.	0	6	0
Do. quarter pipe	0	3	0
Large casks containing glass or earthen-ware	1	0	0
Tierce, do. do. or provisions	0	12	0
Large crates, 12 dozen bottles	0	6	0
Small do. 6 or 8 dozen, more or less.	0	4	0
Wines, butt or pipe	2	0	0
Do. half pipe or hogshead	1	0	0
Do. quarter pipe	0	8	0
Do. chests above 12 dozen size	0	8	0
Do. do. of 12 dozen or above 6 dozen.	0	6	0
Do. do. of 6 do. or 3 do.	0	3	0
Wines, quarter chest or 3 dozen	0	2	0
Do. all boxes under 3 dozen and above 1 dozen.	0	1	0
Do. one dozen boxes	0	0	9
Spirits, per pipe	2	0	0
Do. hogshead	1	0	0
Do. in bottle case of 1 dozen	0	1	0
Do. above 1 and under 3 dozen	0	1	6
Do. 3 dozen	0	2	0
Do about 3 and under 6 dozen	0	3	0
Do. 6 dozen	0	4	0
Do. for every dozen in excess of 6 dozen size	0	0	9

	Per Month. Rs.	A.	P.
British piece goods, per case above 12 dozen	0	8	0
Do. do. per case of 12 dozen or above 6 dozen	0	6	0
Do. do. per case of dozen or above 3 dozen	0	3	0
Do. do. 3 do. or less	0	2	0
Do. do. per bale of size of bale of Twist of 4 to 500 lbs.	0	6	0
Do. do. per bale of smaller size	0	4	0
Twist of all sorts, per bale of 4 or 500 lbs.	0	6	0
Do. do. do. of smaller size	0	4	0
Metals, per bazaar maund	0	0	6
Canvas, per bale	0	3	0
Silk, per bale	0	6	0
Silk piece goods, per case	0	6	0
Indigo, per chest	0	6	0
Opium	0	6	0
Cotton, Hemp, Jute and Safflower, per bale of 300 lbs.	0	4	0
Sugar, Rice, and Seeds, per 100 bazaar maunds	2	8	0
Cutch, per 100 bazaar maunds	2	0	0
Shell lac and lac dye, per chest	0	4	0
Vermillion, per box	0	2	0
Arsenic, do.	0	3	0
Brass leaf, per box	0	2	0
China paper, per case	0	2	0
China cases of Nankin, Cassia, Camphor, Silk, Aniseed, &c., per case	0	3	0
Ginger or Turmeric, per 100 bazaar maunds	3	0	0
Betelnut, per bazaar maund	0	0	6
Cloves, do. do.	0	1	0
Coffee, Pepper, Cardamom, Cuminseed, Aniseed, in bags or bales, per bazaar maund	0	1	0
Sugar, spices or any other similar articles, per hogshead	0	8	0
Do. do. do. do. do. per tierce	0	4	0
Sugar candy, per tub	0	0	6
Tea, per whole chest	0	2	0
Do. per smaller box	0	1	0
Paint, per keg of 56 lbs.	0	0	6
Salmon, Herrings, or other Fishes per keg	0	0	6
Turpentine, Linseed, or other vegetable oil, per jar.	0	2	0
All cordage, per cwt	0	1	0
Rosin or Dammer, per bazaar maund.	0	1	0
Tobacco, unmanufactured, per 1 maund bale	0	2	0
Gunnies, per large bale	0	8	0
Gunnies, per smaller bale	0	6	0
Cow Hides, per large bale	0	12	0
Do. do. per smaller bale	0	8	0
Goat skins, per bale	0	8	0
Quicksilver, per bazaar maund	0	2	0
Tin plates, per box	0	0	6
Bricks, per 1,000	1	0	0

No. 192-B.

From the Collector of Sea Customs, Madras, dated 17th August 1882, No. 2050.

No. 193.

Order—dated 31st August 1882, No. 2241 W., Public Works.

In G.O., No. 1382 W., dated 5th June 1882, the preparation of a short Bill was directed to enable a consolidated charge of Rs. 2-2-0 per ton to be levied on all goods landed and shipped in the Madras Harbour.

2. The Master Attendant has now, after communication with the Advocate-General and the Chamber of Commerce, submitted proposals in modification of his original scheme, which contemplated the lading and landing of goods through the

agency of the Marine Department. It is now suggested, and in this the Chamber of Commerce are understood to concur, that the action of Government should be restricted to collecting the toll. A short Bill framed on this basis may now be drawn up for submission to the Legislative Council. No change would, it is stated, be needed in the Pier, Boat, and Marine Police Acts.

3. The suggestion of the Collector of Sea Customs, that the rate to be levied should not be specified in the Act, is approved, it being left open to Government to fix it from time to time as circumstances may require.

4. The arrangements in regard to the warehousing of goods at the Custom-house, the rate to be levied for such shelter, and the appropriation of the proceeds, have not been made clear to Government. Further information on these subjects should be submitted by the Collector of Sea Customs.

(True Extract.)

Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.,
Irrigation Branch.

To the Advocate-General.
" Master Attendant, Madras.
" Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce, Madras.
" Collector of Sea Customs, Madras.
" Chairman, Trades Association, Madras.
" Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works.
" Superintending Engineer, Fifth Circle,
" Marine, Revenue and Legislative Departments.

4/2241

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of [1882] Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated August, 31st.

Read. *Encl.*

G.O., 31st Aug. 1882, No. 2241 W.

AUGUST.

Nos. 192-193.

Bill for the levy of Harbour Dues.

Directing the framing of a short — on the basis suggested by the Master Attendant, and calling for further information in connection with the arrangements in regard to the warehousing of goods at the Custom-house.

E/324

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General Establishment.

No. 21.

READ—the following letter from the Harbour Committee, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated Madras, 5th April 1882:—

We have the honor to report that, acting under the instructions contained in G.O., 14th October 1881, No. 2512 W., we have reassembled to consider the points named by Government for our opinion. We would have sent in our report at a much earlier date, but we were under the impression that the damage caused to the Harbour by the cyclone of the 12th November last rendered it unnecessary to consider for the present the question of levying fresh dues. In obedience, however, to the expressed wish of Government, we have the honor to advise that we have considered what would be the best "arrangements for managing the Harbour and levying dues for its use, and for landing and shipping goods under the improved facilities afforded."

We have had the advantage of having before us a letter, dated December 1881, written to our President by Captain J. H. Taylor, and a copy of which is submitted for the information of Government. We have also ascertained from the principal trading and commercial firms what their landing and shipping goods costs them now that the shelter of the Harbour is partially available. The conclusion at which we have unanimously arrived is that it would be undesirable to have two rates for goods as suggested by Captain Taylor, and that if all goods pay Rs. 2-2-0 per ton (computed according to the Madras Chamber of Commerce tonnage scale) this would not be unduly burdensome on the trade, while it would give fully one rupee per ton to go towards the revenue of the Harbour. For the charge of Rs. 2-2-0 per ton the goods would be taken charge of, landed or shipped, as the case may be, a police guard provided, and the porterage to and from the Custom House or Beach defrayed.

Government will no doubt observe that, in recommending a consolidated rate for landing and shipping, it is contemplated that the whole control of the trade of the port should be undertaken by some department. Hitherto the various firms engaged in trade have made their own arrangements for landing and shipping, and we are not unaware of the objections that may be raised to the proposal we have indicated. But in our opinion the best arrangement for levying dues for the Harbour must include a consolidated rate for which everything will be done.

Captain Taylor, it will be seen, proposes that the work connected with the landing and shipping be undertaken by his department, and he estimates that for an extra Rs. (260) two hundred and sixty per mensem he could provide all the additional establishment required. We simply call attention to his figures, without assuming any responsibility for them. But it is our duty to point out to Government that if one of their departments is made to undertake the whole landing and shipping of the port, and to charge a consolidated rate for so doing, then of course Government is responsible for all loss and damage to goods while under their charge. It may be

that this is not a very serious responsibility, but it is one that Government will have to incur.

(Signed) P. MACFADYEN.
(,,) R. J. MELVILLE.
(,,) R. C. WALKER.
(,,) R. G. ORR.
(,,) J. H. TAYLOR.
(,,) A. M. SAUNDERS.
(,,) N. Sr. B. BEARDMORE.
(,,) H. L. PRENDERGAST, Col., R.E.

It has to be noticed that the Hon. Mr. Coleman's signature is wanting to the report, owing to that gentleman having left for England before the report was ready, but it may be mentioned that he fully concurred in Captain Taylor's views.

(Signed) J. H. TAYLOR,
Secretary.

ENCLOSURES.

From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieutenant, R.N.R., Master Attendant, Madras, to the President, Harbour Committee, dated December 1881.

I have now the honor to advance my opinion that the injury to the Harbour walls, though necessitating considerable delay in the completion of the work, does not and should not interfere with a thorough re-organisation of the Harbour arrangements and the levy of a sufficient annual sum to justify the Government in prosecuting this important work. With this view I have drawn out a scheme which will provide for revenue, establishment, order and discipline; and, while removing many disabilities under which the port now labors, will not increase the burden now placed on trade, nor inequitably affect any branch of legitimate business.

2. For convenience I have expressed the terms of this scheme in tons, which, however, will also be shown in trips, the word that most generally obtains at present.

3. The import and export cargo from Europe is the most important item. This is almost entirely landed and shipped from the Pier. The duty of conducting this work falls upon the Pier Contractor, superintended by the Pier Master, Traffic Manager and staff, Peons, &c.

4. The present charge for this duty is 8 annas a trip, half of which is given to the contractor, the remaining half goes for establishment, upkeep, repairs, &c., of the Pier and its belongings.

5. The Pier Contractor delivers all free goods and machinery at the inner end of the Pier, and carries the remainder into the Custom House, and unloads it into sheds.

6. Before the Pier was constructed all this work was done by an individual called the Custom House Contractor, and by some extraordinary oversight he has been allowed since that period to continue in his position and make the same charges as before, although the main portion of the work is done for him and charged in its proper place. He has no contract, and apparently never had one, and no responsibility, except what he has taken upon himself with a view to keep things quiet. I had always been under the impression that he was paid by the Custom House out of revenue for the sole duty he exercises of arranging and giving out packages. His scale of charges is traceable on an old almost effaced card, but he has private separate arrangements with most of the great importers, which have been carried out under the supposition that the charge was one authorised by the Collector. Here at once is an instance where the trade directly suffers, and reform is demanded. I propose that all the duty be transferred to the Pier Contractor to be called Harbour Contractor, and that he conduct the small additional duty that will devolve upon him, receiving a small increase, say 5 annas in lieu of 4; and I would suggest that all goods intended for the Custom House be made to pass over the Pier as a safeguard against loss or damage until the new jetties are completed.

7. The charges connected with this branch of business I estimate as follows:—

		Per Ton RS.	A.	P.
Nominal boat-hire to Pier is at present Rs. 1-8-0, but a deduction of 8 annas is made from it for Pier porterage.	Boat-hire	0	8	0
	Porterage	0	5	0
	Police..	0	2	0
	Tax for Harbour	1	0	0
		1	15	0

8. The present trip to consist of two tons.

9. The ordinary boat-hire may be reduced, when more shelter is given, to one rupee a trip, or 8 annas a ton, the sum thus saved being credited to the Government to cover additional capital required for the Harbour since the accident to its walls.

10. The establishment required for the work will be treated of in conclusion.

11. It is to be observed that these charges are simply for work done, and do not interfere with agency and commission at present ruling.

12. With regard to the Beach cargo or free goods, there is absolutely no choice, but for the Harbour management to take all duties upon itself and realise the greater portion of the present profits.

13. It will be manifestly impossible to levy a rupee a ton in excess of present rates, and there is very much in the existing arrangements that call for alteration in the interests of trade.

14. The profits at present made are not earned by any service. It is an astounding fact that with no responsibility, no expenses of landing or shipping, which falls on the boatman, large charges are sanctioned and paid, simply because the trade cannot look into matters, and are powerless to help themselves. Large importers assure me that so multifarious are the charges now obtaining that they really never know what they do pay under the head of porterage. I propose to land and separate all free goods through the medium of a responsible contractor to arrange the various cargoes, and enable every merchant to see that the terms of his Bill of Lading are complied with. The saving under this head alone to the trade will be enormous.

15. A sufficient space on either side of the iron Pier enclosing the new jetties should be handsomely palisaded, and large covered sheds placed to ensure a weather protection. The present charges for watching would be done away with, as the porterage and police charge will cover everything, by which another large saving to trade will be effected. A very sufficient style of shed is being erected within the Custom House, iron pillars and teak beams, circular in shape, covered with corrugated iron. A narrow covered way should lead also from the main shed to the inner end of the jetty for protection to Europeans.

16. The expense of these improvements can be met from Port Funds.

17. The charges would be almost identical with the bonded goods—

	Per Ton RS.	A.	P.
Boat-hire	0	12	0
Porterage	0	5	0
Police	0	2	0
Harbour revenue	1	0	0
	2	3	0

Grain, which is now subject to much loss, would be greatly benefited at the same rate as now rules, *e.g.*, if we name 14 bags to a ton, the present rate of 2½ annas a bag exactly amounts to Rs. 2-3-0. Other goods in same proportions.

18. The same test may be applied to all other goods with almost same conclusions. It corresponds very nearly with the Bombay Port Trust rate on packages recommended by the Madras Chamber of Commerce.

19. *Boat-hire.*—With regard to this item it has been the practice hitherto to deduct 8 annas a trip for the facilities offered by the Pier, thus reducing the hire to one rupee a trip, while the Masulah boats landing on the Beach receive Rs. 1-8-0, the men unloading their own boats. It will be for the Committee to discuss this plan among others. I am myself in favor of doing all the Beach work by cooly contract, in which case, if one rupee a trip would rule both on Pier and Beach, a reduction of 4 annas a ton is thus at once reached, bringing the total charge to Rs. 1-15-0 a ton.

20. The crew of the Masulah boats working inside the Harbour might be reduced to six rowers, one tindal, and one boy, which would cause a reduction of expense.

21. I find on looking to old Almanacs that 50 years previous to 1873 the rate of boat-hire to vessels in the outer roads was only Rs. 1-8-0, and inner roads 15 annas, but it would appear that, owing to the competition of the lighters, which injured greatly the Masulah boat trade, an increase of 1 rupee was made, bringing it up to Rs. 2-8-0 a trip.

22. I find that in practice even now the dubashes charge the consignees Rs. 2 a trip, although the charge is only Rs. 1-8-0, and they also charge porterage, although that is met from the real hire of Rs. 1-8-0. All these matters demand consideration, and are clearly connected with the prosperity of the Harbour, and the levy of revenue without pressing too much on trade.

23. For the joint establishment of Pier and Beach, I recommend that the Pier Master's present pay be increased from—

	Increase. Rs.
Pier Master and General Superintendent, Rs. 225 to 275	50
Deputy to be Assistant Traffic Manager, Rs. 60 to 120	60
Present Head Clerk, giving security Rs. 500, combining Cash-keeper's duty, Rs. 25 to 40	15
Two Clerks, Rs. 20 and 17	37
One Head Coniscopoly, security Rs. 500	16
Four Coniscopolies, at Rs. 10	40
Six Peons, at Rs. 7	42
	260

24. This will be met from the porterage after paying the contractor.

25. Mr. Thorowgood's estimate for Harbour I enclose, but that may stand over for the present.

Report of Trades' Association through the Chairman.

1. I see no good grounds for delaying the consideration of Captain Taylor's proposals. In G.O., No. 2512, of 14th October, the Government stated that in appointing the Committee "the object of the Government was to obtain their advice as to the best arrangements for managing the Harbour and levying dues for its use," because "it is essential that a reasonable revenue should be raised."

2. The Government are fully entitled to some return for the monies already expended, and as Captain Taylor proposes a plain and practical scheme, and shows how funds can be obtained without, perhaps, *any* increase upon present rates, I consider that it should at once be discussed, if the Committee have any desire to assist Government with practical advice.

3. I do not see that Mr. Parkes' views at all affect the consideration of the real question before the Committee. Those views can have reference only to the construction and maintenance of the Harbour Works, and can scarcely relate to the question as to the dues that may be fairly levied upon goods shipped and imported.

4. As a whole I entirely approve of Captain Taylor's proposed scheme, and hope that, before long, it, or something similar, may be adopted.

21*st December* 1881. (Signed) ROBERT G. ORR.

MINUTE of dissent by the Hon. P. MACFADYEN.

I am not in favor of Captain Taylor's proposal that the whole control of the trade of the port should be handed over to the Marine Department. To effect this fresh legislation will be necessary, and this being the case I beg respectfully to express my opinion that it would be better to proceed with the Port Trust Bill, whose provisions have met with the approval of the Chamber of Commerce, and which having been amended by and reported on by a select Committee could be passed in the Legislative Council without further prolonged discussion. The proposed consolidated rate for landing and shipping is a wide departure from the arrangements at present existing, and I feel confident that a body like the Port Trustees, in which all trading interests would be represented, is better adapted to inaugurate such a change than any Government Department however well intentioned.

(Signed) P. MACFADYEN.

MINUTE by A. M. SAUNDERS, Esq.

I agree with the remarks made above by the Hon. Mr. Macfadyen.

6*th April* 1882. (Signed) A. M. SAUNDERS.

MINUTE by J. H. TAYLOR, Esq.

As the only member of the Committee, who has advanced any practical scheme for the levy of Harbour dues, I feel it necessary to add some remarks that have suggested themselves after the discussion of the scheme in Committee. It seemed to me to be thoroughly understood by the Committee that a consolidation of the various existing charges is the only method by which the sum required can be raised, and the necessary establishment supported. This therefore, or some almost identical plan, would be forced upon any Port Trust, Marine Board or Department. As many of the members of the Committee are not familiar with the subject before them, I may be allowed to point out what the nature of all existing Port Trusts is.

They all possess Harbours more or less secure, never exposed like Madras. They have advanced through all the phases of initial expense to their Governments, of assistance and support from them, until a period has arrived when they can stand alone with ample funds at command, with no prospect of any future State support being needed, and when the funds raised from port dues, from mercantile and shipping interests, can reasonably be administered by mercantile and shipping men. Nothing can be more equitable, and Government may well grant the necessary powers.

But the situation of Madras is entirely different, so much so that the title Port Trust would be inadmissible.

A debt of (60) sixty lakhs has been incurred, raised from the credit of the whole empire, which is responsible for it, and for its interest; that debt is rapidly advancing towards a million, and no one can say in the exposed position of Madras Harbour, and with walls erected on sand, when that debt may not be extended. A Port Trust could not go on raising money on its own resources, and guarantees it would not possess, for the sum it is now contemplated to raise will merely cover the interest of the present debt.

The mercantile community seek to secure the largest share in the administration, yet their interests would soon conflict with those of Government. The position would be anomalous and charged with grave and increasing difficulties.

Then as to the purely executive duties connected with the Harbour, I by no means wish them transferred to the Marine Department, or to my sole control. No one appreciates the value of technical experience and advice more than myself, and I have always respectfully recommended to Government that a Marine Board, as nearly as possible constituted as a Port Trust, should be the medium of communication between the Government, the public, and the Harbour authorities. The Chamber of Commerce might be invited to select two of their members to represent the Chamber, the Trade Association two, one of the boat-owners selected by themselves, the Collector, the Master Attendant, and his (Deputy, the Executive Officer of the Port), the District Engineer, and the Harbour Works' Engineer, Government Solicitor. Of this Board the non-official members should be entitled to a fee for attendance, which I would propose to be about Rs. (25) twenty-five. Meetings might be held monthly, at which all objects and references connected with the Harbour could be brought to notice. A paid Secretary would also be a desideratum at the same fee.

This would represent a sum of Rs. (150) one hundred and fifty monthly, (1,800) one thousand and eight hundred per annum. The Government would thus be kept at a small charge in direct communication with the best advice that can be available.

As to responsibility I may be allowed to point out that nothing in this arrangement will cause any increase in its present amount, while by consolidation under one controlling authority it will in all probability be materially reduced.

Government will have, moreover, the security of the zeal and intelligence of its own officers and establishment, while the contractor or contractors, if the Board select that course of proceeding, will be chosen for their solvency and give ample security. I cannot anticipate any difficulty on that head.

The responsibility at present sits very easily on the shoulders of those who bear it, and if the Board elect to do the work departmentally, the payment hitherto made as compensation for all causes of loss combined being calculated, any office would be glad to enter into an insurance that would remove even the shadow of loss.

Nine-tenths of the English import cargo and much of the export are already administered by the Pier Department, and the extension of the duty to the whole trade is a mere matter of detail, which a practical Board could easily dispose of satisfactorily.

30*th March* 1882. (Signed) J. H. TAYLOR.

MINUTE by R. J. MELVILLE, Esq.

I agree with Captain Taylor. I consider it premature to start a Port Trust when the only things to be entrusted to the Trustees are an incomplete Harbour and a debt of more than half a million of money. Anything that could be done by Port Trustees could be done as well by a Harbour Committee, on which, if considered advisable, the mercantile or trading community might be more fully represented than at present. I add this to meet one of the objections suggested in the Hon. Mr. Macfadyen's minute of dissent.

6th April 1882.

(Signed) R. J. MELVILLE.

MINUTE by R. G. ORR, Esq.

Captain Taylor's Minute accompanying this report appears to me conclusive as against a Port Trust in the present state of Harbour affairs. As stated in my dissent of 23rd August I still consider that a Committee or Board can afford Government all the practical advice Government may require, and will fully represent various local interests. To invest such a body with legal powers, as would be the case with a Port Trust, would be, I respectfully submit, inexpedient and entirely unnecessary.

5th April 1882.

(Signed) R. G. ORR.

MINUTE by R. C. WALKER, Esq.,

I concur in the views expressed in Mr. Macfadyen's minute. The objections raised by Captain Taylor to the formation of a Port Trust appear to me to be chimerical. In fact the Marine Board as proposed by him would be very similar in constitution to a Port Trust, only without the powers and organization of the latter body, than which it would, therefore, in my opinion, work far less satisfactorily both to Government and the mercantile community.

5th April 1882.

(Signed) R. C. WALKER.

No. 22.

ORDER—dated 5th June 1882, No. 1382 W., Public Works.

The Committee, reassembled under G.O., 14th October 1881, No. 2512 W., for the purpose of reporting on certain points connected with the management of the Madras Harbour, levying dues for its use, and landing and shipping goods, have unanimously recommended a consolidated charge of Rs. 2-2-0 per ton on all goods landed and shipped in the Harbour for which the goods would be taken charge of, landed or shipped, guarded, and the porterage to and from the Custom House defrayed.

2. His Excellency the Governor in Council therefore now directs the Master Attendant to place himself in communication with the Advocate-General in view to the draft of a short Bill being prepared to enable the Government to levy this charge, and to entrust the duty to such Government Officer or Department, or specially constituted body, as it may think fit, and to credit the proceeds :—

1*st*, to the expenses connected with the performance of the service;

2*nd*, and any surplus towards—

1*st*, defraying the interest on the Capital cost of the Harbour,

2*nd*, and to form a Sinking Fund for reducing the Capital cost.

3. As regards the administrative agency to be employed with the above object, the Government, after very carefully weighing all that has been advanced in favor of the immediate creation of a Port Trust, are of opinion that under the existing circumstances of the Harbour Works such a measure would clearly be premature, though ultimately it might be both useful and advisable.

4. On the passing of the Bill above directed to be framed His Excellency in Council will nominate such executive agency as will in his opinion offer the best available guarantees for securing the highly important interests involved and satisfying the reasonable requirements of the trading community.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Master Attendant, Madras.
" R. C. Walker, Esq.
" A. M. Saunders, Esq.
" the Superintending Engineer, Fifth Circle.
" the Superintendent, Madras Harbour Works.
" the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce.
" the " Trades, Association.
" the Marine Department.
" the Revenue Department.
" the Legislative Department.

Exd. C. Howarth.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

P. 5861

Govt. of {1882} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated June, 5th. 7241 W

Read. Encl.

G.O., 5th June 1882, No. 1382 W.

JUNE.

Nos. 21-22.

Madras Harbour.

Passing orders on the report of the Committee appointed to report on the management of the — levying dues for its use and landing and shipping goods.

No. 9/2241 61

Encl to G.O. Date 5th Sept. No. 677.

Encl to the letter from

Administrative Department.

No. 6684

MADRAS,
Marine Office,
5th August 1882.

From

J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., LIEUT., R.N.R.,
Master Attendant,
Administrative Department,
Madras,

To

The Hon'ble Master Esquire
&c &c &c

Chief Secretary to Government,
Marine Department,
Fort Saint George.

SIR,

I have the honor to report, for the information of Government, that I have been in consultation with the Advocate General on the subject of the short Bill for levying tolls in the Madras Harbour, and have also had communication with the Chamber of Commerce on the subject. The last letter from that body is forwarded with this, and it will be seen from it that the Chamber is of opinion that the Government in taking the whole charge of the Harbour might lay itself open to a great deal of inconvenience and difficulty, and even, as they allege, pecuniary loss. I am not aware that any of the test cases submitted by the Chamber have ever arisen or are likely to occur, but I have no doubt a great deal of obstruction and annoyance to Government might be caused by parties, who, for purposes of their own, might choose to distort and exaggerate even the most insignificant circumstances into complaint calling for redress and

remedy

remedy. The latter from the Chamber may be considered to represent their views that as far as possible Government action should be restricted to collecting the toll, with the expenses of Establishment and upkeep. And the language of the latter seems to support the idea that the arrangement will be satisfactory to the traders now as any permt arrangement must be of a temporary character, lasting only until the completion of the Harbour, its final cost, and the development of its capacity for shelter and its general facilities for trade, I beg respectfully to represent that it may perhaps seem to Government to be advisable to meet the Chamber on this basis, and change the character of the Bill into one simply dealing with the Harbour in much the same terms now used in the Pier Act.

2 The Advocate General entirely concurs in this, and points out that a very short bill would alone be necessary, and nothing in it would then interfere with the Pier Act, the Boat Act, and the Marine Police Act, all of which would retain their present powers

3 The Pier Act simply states Clause 1 that Tolls according to such rates

10 (24) 62

as shall from time to time be settled and approved by the Governor of Madras in Council shall be levied &c. &c., but if it is considered necessary or advisable to name in the Bill a rate which will be sufficient for all purposes, then I would respectfully suggest the levy of one Rupee (for the interest of money spent up to this time upon the Harbour, and four annas for all other purposes required for the performance of duties connected with the Port) upon every ton of goods entering or leaving the Port: this would be collected on the Piers and on the Beach, and the Mercantile public would be free to take their goods, and in all respects exercise their present freedom, which the Chamber declares to be their desire

4 As the boat hire has already been reduced one Rupee a trip, or about 10 annas a ton, owing to the facilities offered by the Harbour, this arrangement ought to recommend itself as a very satisfactory one.

5 The simplicity of this method has much to recommend it, but the use of the Custom House sheds is an imperative necessity for the Port until private accommodation

accommodation of sufficient capacity is provided, which even then will never be so convenient as the present site — into which the Pier railway discharges all goods in security. How to provide for this shelter and the charges connected with it and the delivery of goods has to be considered; perhaps the Collector could give advice upon this point. The dues paid for warehousing would go some way towards expenses, if indeed they did not suffice entirely, but as the receipt and delivery of goods have always been an extra charge on the public, perhaps a somewhat similar arrangement to the one previously existing, under a responsible Contractor, would meet the difficulty.

6 The incomplete condition of the Harbour is without doubt a grave consideration, when taking absolute charge over its working is contemplated, and though all parties agree that the facilities offered by it justify a levy of money to recoup the Government for its construction, yet the many accidents to which it may yet be

11/3241 (65

be subject might interfere with Harmonious working under any Department or body. If the present arrangements, which are considered vested interests by the parties concerned, are entirely set aside.

A very short notice would be all that was necessary to set the proposal in this letter in action, and only the small extension of staff mentioned in my letter recorded in G.O.P.W. Department, No. 1382 W, dated June 5th 1882. The Bill would require to provide for lien on goods until the tolls were paid, and penalties against any infringement of the Law and order in the Harbour. The palisades and sheds would be a convenience to all parties, for business on the flat sand could not be safely conducted by unsheltered Europeans, and more protection to property would be a great consideration.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most Obedt Servant
J. Taylor
Master Attendant
Administrative Department

12/2881

Octacammund
7th August/82

Ac 677
Transferred to the
Public Works Depart.
Report with reference
to G.O. dt. 1882 R. dated
the 5th June 1882.
Chamber of
Commerce

Marine (1882) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE MASTER ATTENDANT,
ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT,
Madras,

To

THE CHIEF SECY. TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
Fort St. George.

No. 6684

Dated 5 Augt 1882.
Received 6

No.

CURRENT No.

Subject.

Reporting on the short
Bill for levying tolls
in the Madras Harbour

Chamber of Commerce,
Madras, 10th July 1882.

From

The Chairman,
Chamber of Commerce,
Madras.

To

The Master Attendant,
Madras.

Sir

The Chamber have had your letter of the 26th ultimo under consideration, and while thanking you for the details you have been good enough to furnish on various matters connected with the proposed future management of the Harbour, they desire me to state that your explanation does not afford them all the information sought for in my letter of the 21st ultimo.

The Chamber do not understand how the hire of Boats is to be arranged for. Boat hire is included in your consolidated rate, and it is therefore, to be presumed that Boats will be provided by you, but you state that this is not intended to interfere with the selection of boats by the parties directly interested any more than is done now. You

You refer to Boat hire as an invariable item, for you recognise only the legal rate, but you must be aware that a hard and fast tariff is not suited to the exigencies of trade and that as a matter of fact the legal rate of boat hire is not recognised and that rates vary if circumstances warrant their doing so, and in the opinion of the Chamber it is perfectly fair and reasonable that emergent rates should be paid for emergent work.

Do you mean when you refer to a shipper's power of selection that he is to engage his own boats in any way he chooses, refer the boats to you for their legal hire and then pay them himself any extra hire that may have been agreed upon? Is he to take charge of his goods and ship them on his own responsibility in the boats he has selected? If so it appears to the Chamber that although you nominally undertake the responsibility of shipment and seek in your scheme as a consequence of such responsibility to make a profit for Government on shipping you really contemplate that your Department shall

14/224

shall be relieved of responsibility at the point when shipment commences.

To enable you clearly to appreciate the difficulties which occur to the Chamber in the working of the scheme you have proposed to Government assuming that it involves the shipping and landing of goods by your Department and not by those interested, I am desired to submit for your consideration the following Cases which, it is believed, would be common enough in practice, and to request that you will be good enough to explain in what way the Department which is to have charge of the shipping and landing arrangements of the Port would deal with them.

1. What, for example will be the effect of the new arrangement when a merchant has a chartered ship or steamer whose lay days are just expiring, so that it is imperative to ship Cargo as rapidly as possible to avoid going on demurrage? Under present arrangements the merchant would probably pay extra boat hire to secure as many boats as possible and get

the

the ship loaded before the lay days run out. If he were compelled to get shipment effected through the proposed special Department, he would probably be told that he could not have more than a fair proportion of the Port accommodation. He would be unable to offer any inducement to the boatmen and others concerned to exercise greater despatch and he would be unable to prevent the ship going on demurrage. Here is a case where possibly the merchant could not establish a claim against the Government Department, but where undoubtedly he would incur loss which he could have avoided had Trade been left to itself.

2) Or, again, take the case of a merchant who has sold produce in London for shipment by a certain date. The time is nearly run out before his ship comes in. Were it open to him to make his own arrangements he could probably get his produce shipped within the Contract date. If he were only one of many shippers whose produce had been handed over to the special Department proposed, very probably he could not complete shipment in time, and he might lose his market, or even have claims for damages brought against him.

3) Again, take the case of a merchant who has sold documentary bills for a certain mail date. His ship or steamer possibly arrives on the morning of the mail day. Were he left to himself, he could most probably get his produce shipped and his documents ready in time, but a special Department must follow its routine regulations, which means delay, or at least a want of special expedition, and it is just as likely as not that he would miss his mail - which, with a rising exchange means - lose money. At any rate he cannot by special personal exertion save his mail as he might under present circumstances.

Many similar cases of emergency could be cited to you, but the foregoing will suffice to show you the practical difficulties that occur to the Chamber, and in reference to shipping, I am only further

further to add that the Chamber will be much obliged if you will state in the closest detail the exact procedure, step by step, that will be followed from the time Goods enter the gates of your Palisade to the moment in which Crate's receipts are handed to the owner, and with whom the responsibilities attaching to the charge of goods during that period and their proper shipment in proper time will rest?.

So far as landing is concerned, the Chamber feel that similar queries must be put to you. Will the power of selecting boats rest with Steamer Agents? if so will not the discharge of the steamer and the landing of her cargo virtually rest with them as at present? In what way will your Department interfere with the landing and if not at all, on what grounds do you propose to make a profit for Government out of it?

If it is really your intention to relieve the Agents of ships and steamers from all the work and responsibility of landing, what assurance can you give the Chamber that the work will be more expeditiously done than is now the case with Government Cargo, the discharge of which already rests with your Department?

The Chamber approve of the arrangements you propose to make on the beach and the Custom House buildings for the enclosure and protection of Goods in course of shipment or landing, and they fully recognize the necessity of proper means of levying the Harbour Dues on goods, but they so far fail to see the necessity for Government interference beyond the beach. I am desired by the Chamber to state that in their opinion it would be better to make your Consolidated rate exclude the cost of boat hire, the existing arrangements for the provision of which should not be interfered with.

I have &c
(Signed) Clement Simpson
Chairman.

(True copy)
J. W. Taylor
Master Attendant
Administrative Department

C.P. 7917

P.W.D. 760

No.

No. 2048 12/24

Sea Custom House
Madras 16th August 1882

From

R. J. Arbuthnot Esquire
Collector Sea Customs
Madras

To

Colonel R. H. Sankey R.E.
Secretary to Government
Public Works Department

Sir,

I have the honour to reply to No. 5613 E., dated 10th August 1882 P.W.D. referring to me for an expression of my opinion a letter No. 6684, dated August 5th from the Master Attendant, Administrative Deptt. together with a file of papers connected with the subject under discussion viz: the scheme for landing and shipping and barging dues for the Madras Harbour.

2. In the letter of the Master Attendant, a scheme is proposed in which in deference to the vested objections of the Chamber of Commerce to the whole

Sir

business connected with the landing and shipping of goods being taken out of their hands; the action of Governments confined to providing shelter and guard for goods before being shipped and after being landed and in the Act proposed to be passed to legalize the levy of a due for such Service, the Master Attendant proposes to name a rate of one Rupee. I would propose that as in the Pier Act no rate should be named but that it should be left open to Government to fix the rate from time to time.

3. In Para 5 it is stated that the use of the Custom House sheds is an "imperative necessity" until private accommodation of sufficient Capacity is provided". I have already in my letter No 1212, dated May 11th 1882, pointed out that half the sheds of the Custom House could be spared for the shelter of free goods but that the sheds must first be effectively separated from that part of the yard still required for dutiable goods.

4. The fees at present levied for Godown rents which I presume are those referred to by the Master Attendant as Warehousing fees vary in respect of different articles as shown in the accompanying list. These rates are not leviable for the first 15 days. The Revenue derived from this source is shown under the head of Customs and would not be available for any of the purposes suggested by the Master Attendant.

5 Whatever rate it may eventually be decided to levy in the proposed enclosure and sheds should be levied on goods in the Custom House whether dutiable or free. The rate is a Harbour due and has nothing to do with Customs.

I have the honour to be

Sir

Your most obedt Servant

[illegible]

Collector Sea Customs

12/241

1882.

Dy

From

G.O. 1382 Way 5.6.82
" 2011 Way 16.8.82

118

	Per Month. Rs.	A.	P.
Silk piece goods, per case	0	6	0
Indigo, per chest	0	6	0
Opium	0	4	0
Cotton, Hemp, Jute and Safflower, per bale of 300 lbs. ...	2	8	0
Sugar, Rice, and Seeds, per 100 bazaar maunds	0	4	0
Cutch, per 100 bazaar maunds	0	2	0
Shell lac and lac dye, per chest	0	3	0
Vermillion, per box	0	2	0
Arsenic, do	0	2	0
Brass leaf, per box			
China paper, per case	0	3	0
China cases of Nankin, Cassia, Camphor, Silk, Aniseed, &c., per case	3	0	0
Ginger or Turmeric, per 100 bazaar maunds	0	0	6
Betelnut, per bazaar maund	0	1	0
Cloves, do do			
Coffee, Pepper, Cardamum, Cumminseed, Aniseed, in bags or bales, per bazaar maund	0	1	0
Sugar, spices or any other similar articles, per hogshead.	0	8	0
Do do do do per tierce	0	4	0
Sugar candy, per tub	0	2	0
Tea, per whole chest	0	1	0
Do. per smaller box	0	0	6
Paint, per keg of 56 lbs.	0	0	6
Salmon, Herrings, or other Fishes, per keg	0	2	0
Turpentine, Linseed, or other vegetable oil, per jar. ...	0	1	0
All cordage, per cwt	0	1	0
Rosin or Dammer, per bazaar maund.	0	2	0
Tobacco, unmanufactured, per 1 maund bale.	0	8	0
Gunnies, per large bale	0	6	0
Gunnies, per smaller bale	0	12	0
Chillies, per large bale	0	8	0
" per smaller bale	0	3	0
Coffee, per large bale	0	0	6
" per smaller bale	1	0	0

for
Opinion,
the Masters
Rules &c. relative
the Scheme for
the and keeping
Madras Harbour
returning the

Encd.

P.W.S.

Circ. 29/8/82
Revr 29/8/82

No. 2050 2/1941

Sea Custom House.
Madras 17th August 1882

From R J Sinclair Esquire
Collector Sea Customs
Madras

To

Colonel R. H. Sankey R.E.
Secretary to Government
Public Works Department

Sir

I have the honour to enclose the list referred to in Para 4 of my letter dated 16th Instant No 2048, which was by an oversight omitted to be forwarded therewith.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
R J Sinclair
Collector Sea Customs

Encl.

22/2241

(1882.) Department

From The Collector of Customs Madras.

To The Secretary to Government F.W. Dept.

Dated 1st August 1882

Rec'd

No. 205

Encl: 1

Forwards the list referred to in the Office letter No. 2048 dated 16th instant, omitted to be sent therewith.

Rec'd 26/8

Ans 29/8

Cir. 20/8 Rec'd 26/8

For Orders

In G.O. 5th June 1882 No 1382 W the Government on the unanimous recommendation of the Committee assembled for reporting on the levy of Harbour dues was directed the preparation of a short bill to enable the consolidated charge of R2-2-0 to be levied on all goods landed or shipped at Madras

The Master Attendant has now after communication with the Advocate General and the Chamber of Commerce reported on the subject in his No 6684 of the 5th August

The Collector of Sea Customs to whom I communicated it observes & refers certain points which require to be settled before taking the orders of Government

has likewise now submitted his opinion in his letter No 2048 of the 6th idem, & subsequently by No 2050 of the 17th.

On the position taken up by the Chamber of Commerce and under the advice of the Advocate General the Secretary of State is now prepared to modify his first scheme and to give up entirely that portion which relates to vesting the whole landing and landing of goods through the agency of his department and is now content to adopt a system which seems to find favor with the mercantile community of vessels obliging all goods landed or landed in the Harbour paying a cess of Rs 1-4-0 per ton

Should this be accepted by Government it would seem best on the opinion of the Advocate General

is immaterial - The Legislative Dept will see to it

24/3/24

Agreed upon

Should accept it - I have not come across the Advocate General's opinion nor the draft Bill nor do we know it to be

as my client will suffice for all purposes and that the existing Pier, Boat, and Marine Police Acts would remain in force & unchanged

The Collector of Sea Customs suggests that an write the pier act - no specific amount for the dues should be named in the Act & this would certainly appear to be desirable as it will then be easy for Government from time to time to readjust the rate as circumstances seem to require

Judging from the discussions which have taken place since the introduction of dealing with the case as originally worded, the effect has already been to [illegible] the eyes of all concerned to certain undoubted evils connected with the landing & loading of goods and to the [illegible] by which these

submitted proposals in modification of his original scheme - which contemplated the lading and landing of goods through the agency of the Marine Department. It is now suggested, and in this the Chamber of Commerce are understood to concur, that the action of Government should be restricted to collecting the toll. A short Bill framed on this basis may now be drawn up for submission to the Legislature Council. No change would, it is stated, be needed in the Pier, Boat, and Marine Police Act.

3. The suggestion of the Collector of Sea Customs that the rate to be levied should not be specified in the Act is approved, it being left open to Government to fix it from time to time as circumstances may require.

4. The arrangement in regard to the warehousing of goods at the Custom house, the rate to be levied for such shelter, and the appropriation of the proceeds, have not been made clear to Govermat. Further information on these subjects should be submitted by the Collector of Sea Customs.

To The Advocate General 3r
The Master Attendant, Madras 3
" Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce, Madras 3
" Collector of Sea Customs, Madras 5
" Chairman, Trades Association, Madras 3
" Supdt M. & W. Works 3
" Mr. Fifth Circle 1
" Marine & Revenue Secretariat Depts 2

(The Chief Secretary to Govt (Countersigned) R. S. 51
&c &c

Attd
25/7/82

5869.

Govt. of [1882] Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

19-82

Dated

Read. Encl.

G. O. 31st Augt 1882, No. 724/W.

Nos. 1926 to 1927

Bill for the Survey of Kankipuri dues.

Directing the framing of a short ——— on the basis suggested by the Inspector Attendant & calling for further information in connection with the arrangements in regard to the warehousing of goods at the Custom Houses.

Circulate the month