

action has been taken
in view to its removal.

19/3/86

19/3/86

Despatch

22/3/86

No 45 Wd March 22 1886

22-5

8/4
Cu
22/3

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

14th October 1881, No. 2512 W.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

Read the following paper:—

No. 46. Report of the Harbour Committee, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 28th September 1881.

WE have the honor to inform you that, acting on the instructions contained in G.O., No. 2011 W., of the 16th August 1881, we have considered the questions therein referred to us in connection with the harbour.

2. The only dues at present levied are such as can be collected from sailing vessels and steamers, and we have arrived at the unanimous conclusion that the harbour ought to look for the greater part of its income rather to charges on goods than to dues on vessels coming to the port. Before elaborating any scheme for raising a revenue from goods we thought it desirable to obtain advice as to whether, without fresh legislation, Government could give effect to any recommendations we might make. We accordingly consulted the Government Solicitor, and we annex a copy of the opinion received from him. It will be seen that he is quite clear that before goods can be touched for the purpose of harbour revenues, legislation will require to be resorted to. Under these circumstances we have deemed it our duty to consider the direction that we would recommend this legislation should take. Government may introduce an Act empowering themselves to levy dues on goods, or they may proceed with the Port Trust Bill, which we understand has already been before the Legislative Council. By a majority of seven to two, we have decided respectfully to ask Government to expedite as much as possible the passing of the Port Trust Bill, as we believe that measure will best meet the requirements, both immediate and future, of the Harbour administration. We have given every weight to the various arguments that have been adduced in favor of a purely Government administration, but, in the opinion of the majority of the Committee, the interests of Government as well as of the trade of the port will be best guarded by a body like the Trustees to be created under the Port Trust Bill. This being the result of our deliberations, and having in view the fact that one of the most important functions of the Harbour Trustees will be to frame a scale of charges for both goods and vessels, we have not thought it desirable or necessary to go into the question of the dues that ought to be levied. As no effect could be given to our recommendations it seems best not to anticipate the course that a legally created body of Trustees may take.

The immediate management of the harbour will require to remain as it is, pending such legislative action as Government may see fit to take.

(Signed)	P. MACFADYEN.
(")	C. A. GALTON.
(")	J. H. TAYLOR, with dissent.
(")	ROBERT G. ORR.
(")	F. N. THOROWGOOD.
(")	EARNEST BARCLAY.
(")	J. G. COLEMAN.
(")	R. C. WALKER.
(")	J. PENNYCUICK.

From EARNEST BARCLAY, Esq., Government Solicitor, to the Master Attendant, Madras, dated Madras, 14th September 1881, No. 391.

With reference to the enclosed Proceedings of the Committee appointed under G.O., Public Works Department, dated 16th August 1881, No. 2011 W., under date the 6th instant, I have now, as arranged in Committee, to advise you that the Government has no power to impose any port dues on goods landed or shipped at this port.

2. The only Act which relates to port dues at the port of Madras is Act XII of 1875. The Indian Ports Act, 1875, and the provisions of that Act only enable Government to levy port dues on vessels entering this port.

3. I shall be obliged if you will communicate this opinion to the Chairman of the Committee, with a view to a day being fixed for the Committee meeting again to carry out the directions contained in the above-mentioned order of Government.

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

I HAVE the honor to record with the following remarks my dissent from the recommendation of the majority of the Committee appointed in G.O., No. 2011 W., dated August 16th last, to consider questions relating to the harbour at Madras. The Committee with few exceptions have declined entering into any arguments, or giving any opinion except upon the one point of establishing at once a Port Trust. I cannot see that this advice is asked for by the terms of the Government Order. I believe the Committee to be a practical one to advise Government upon management, ways and means, &c., so that if the harbour is ultimately made over to private hands, it will not be done in entire ignorance of the principles that will govern future action.

The following objections to an early Port Trust Board present themselves forcibly to my judgment.

(1.) There is very little to place in trust at present. The moneys arising from port dues, and landing and shipping charges when definitely settled, will be all required for the interest on harbour outlay and the establishment. To create more paid officers to conduct this business would be a useless expense, and a Board would only embarrass the Marine officers, who will have to provide for the safety of the ships in bad weather, and to anticipate storms and make requisite preparation for them.

2. The harbour is as yet experimental, and no one can say, even approximately, what sum will be required for repair and contingencies. The erosion of the North Beach has cost a large sum, and will be a standing source of expense which will be ignored by a Port Trust as not within port limits.

3. The chief use of a Port Trust would be to institute improvements, like docks, slips, &c., as mercantile requirements indicated, but no one would dream of undertaking such things until the beach had been exposed to a storm or very rough weather.

4. The trade of the port now suffers severely from the private actions of individuals into whose hands it has drifted, extortionate charges prevail, and great discontent in trade generally. A complete change of front could now be taken by Government, and the port put in a healthy condition, whereas if it is at once made over to those whose interests are concerned in perpetuating the present system, the chief benefit of the harbour will probably be lost to the town.

Again, in the interests of Government, I would respectfully recommend that complete information be obtained as to the sums that will be levied on the beach. The clamour that has attended a rise in port dues, which dues will only just provide for the establishment, clearly indicates to my mind that efforts will be made to show that the trade will suffer if the full interest for the harbour is called for. If rates are to be charged in addition to those now obtaining, *no doubt they would be excessive*, though

money enough without extra charge could be obtained if the whole business of the port was remodelled. This the Government could carry out, but I see no disposition that way in any members of the mercantile world, and I fear the official members of a Trust would give way to the mercantile ones in a matter in which they might be supposed to have special knowledge.

Again, there is no precedent, all Port Trusts without exception have been the outcome of undoubted financial prosperity, and the sites of such Trusts are always at a distance from, and entirely removed from, the influence of such ocean vicissitudes and contingencies as threaten Madras, unless future experience shows that the harbour can keep them out.

Finally, the responsibility of the harbour will be thrown upon Government by a Trust when any difficulty arises, such as may reasonably be anticipated, so that the plea that Government would be saved all trouble about it is unreliable. Madras as an integral portion of the Marine is now able to dispense with any Imperial support in money, and if a fair adjustment of the future charge (in the direction I have indicated) was followed, would continue to do so, without either the assistance of the present increase of port dues or any additional charges on shippers or ship. But if removed from the General Port Fund, the port will soon become a heavy Imperial charge.

Mr. C. S. Crole, than whom no officer of Government has more carefully studied the subject, and who knows the wants and difficulties of the port, has in his letter to Government, dated 20th October 1880, recorded his opinion that the introduction of a complete Port Trust must almost of necessity be postponed for some considerable time, and the working of a simple enactment would, while providing for all present necessities, supply a sure ground work on which to base a complete Port Trust Act, when legislation in that direction may seem desirable. That opinion coincides with my own. I by no means say the time may not come when a Trust will be useful, and I would welcome it when the season arrived, but I believe it to be advisable for Government to be in a position to show (before parting with its authority) that the money can be equitably and satisfactorily raised, and general contentment throughout the trade be secured.

MEMORANDUM OF DISSSENT.

I am unable to agree with the majority of the Committee in their recommendation that a Port Trust should be appointed for the management of harbour affairs.

I consider such a step would be both inexpedient and premature—inexpedient because the interests of the most influential section of the projected Port Trust Board will, I believe, be at variance with public interests, and premature because it is impossible to predict what expenditure may yet have to be incurred by Government, either for the possible extension of the breakwater or for its repair and maintenance. I submit that the control of all such expenditure should be solely with Government and not with a practically irresponsible body. Until the harbour has become an assured success, causing no anxiety as to its stability or usefulness, I can see no good reason why the executive officers of the port should be trammelled by a Board whose non-official members are *not* “experts” (as they have been designated), and can bring no practical experience or technical knowledge to bear upon the management of the harbour. I have not heard a single argument advanced to show how “the interests of Government will be best guarded by a body like the Trustees;” if this body would undertake to find and advance any capital that may be required or give a guarantee even for the interest on capital already expended, or in any way take upon itself some burden of responsibility, I could, perhaps, understand the statement I have quoted from the accompanying letter. I concur with the majority in considering that the framing of a scale of charges for both goods and vessels will be “one of the most important functions of the Harbour Trustees,” but I venture to think that when that function has been performed the legitimate occupation of the Board will be gone. When the time arrives that the harbour receipts far exceed the expenditure there may be a *raison d’être* for a Port Trust, (to take charge of surplus funds), but in the meantime I

respectfully submit that a standing Harbour Committee can afford all the assistance and advice of which the Government may stand in need.

MADRAS,
23rd August 1881.

(Signed) ROBERT G. ORR,
Chairman, Madras Trade Association.

No. 47. ORDER THEREON, 14th October 1881, No. 2512 W.

THE papers above recorded contain the Report of the Committee assembled under G.O., No. 2011 W., dated 16th August 1881.

2. While thanking the Committee for their Report, the Honorable the Governor in Council observes that it is apparent that they have misapprehended the object for which they were requested to assemble and the scope of the Proceedings of Government indicating the points on which an expression of their opinion was desired.

3. 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, and for landing and shipping goods under the improved facilities afforded, pending the transfer of the harbour to a Trust Board, the formation of which at present the Government consider would be premature. Meanwhile, however, it is essential that a reasonable revenue should be raised from the use of the harbour, to cover current expenses and interest on capital expenditure. Legislation may be necessary, but there need be no difficulty on that account.

4. The Honorable the Governor in Council would be glad if the Committee would reassemble and afford the Government such advice as they may wish to offer in the direction indicated.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Marine Department.
" Honorable P. Macfadyen.
" J. G. Coleman.
" Collector of Sea Customs.
" Secretary of the Trades Association.
To Major J. Pennycuik, R.E.
" R. C. Walker, Esq.
" F. N. Thorowgood, Esq.
To the Government Solicitor.

Master Attendant

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies



BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of (1881) Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

THE MARINE DEPARTMENT,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated October, 14th.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 14th October 1881, No. 2512 W.

OCTOBER.
Nos. 46-47.

Madras Harbour—The Committee appointed for reporting on certain points connected with the immediate management of the — requested to reassemble for further reporting on the best arrangements for managing the — and levying dues for its use, and for landing and shipping goods.

2nd Differ
Accor.

	341	✓
	1	✓
	341	✓
	2,014	✓
Packages — 398,693 @ 1/2 —	37,377	✓
Hoogsheads } Barrels and } 32,559 @ 2 — Casks }	4,070	✓
Buffaloe horns — 492,208 @ 8 — per 100	2,461	✓
Planks & pal- myras — 483,523 @ 1 1/2 Rs. per 100 —	7,252	✓
Cocconuts — 163,930 @ 8 annas per 100 —	819	✓
Chank — 512,000 @ 4 — per 100	1,280	✓
Metals, coke, coal and other ar- ticles not included above tons } 145,000 at 1 Rupee per ton —	145,000	✓
Rupees —	319,943	✓

3rd


 Return to the
 Department
 Mr

Proposed Harbour Dues

1st Tonnage Fee

For 1878/79—

Estimated Tonnage carried by		
Lighters and Masulah boats—tons	285,341	✓
Harbour dues @ Rupee 1 per ton	1	✓
Rupees—	285,341	✓

2nd Differential rate on packages

According to statistics of 1872/73—

		Rupees	
Bags—	872,996 @ 1/2 anna—	81,843	✓
Bales & Cases—	302,619 @ 2—	37,827	✓
Chests—	16,118 @ 2—	2,014	✓
Packages—	398,693 @ 1/2—	37,377	✓
Hogsheads Barrels and Casks }	32,559 @ 2—	4,070	✓
Buffalo horns—	492,208 @ 8— per 100	2,461	✓
Planks & pal-			
-myras—	483,523 @ 1/2 Rs. per 100—	7,252	✓
Cocoanuts—	163,930 @ 8 annas per 100—	819	✓
Chank—	512,000 @ 4— per 100	1,280	✓
Metals, coke, coal and other ar-			
ticles not included above tons	145,000	✓	
145,000 at 1 Rupee per ton—			
Rupees—	319,943	✓	

G. O., 14th October 1881, No. 2512 W.

OCTOBER.
 Nos. 46-47.

Madras Harbour—The Committee ap-
 pointed for reporting on certain points con-
 nected with the immediate management of
 the — requested to reassemble for further re-
 porting on the best arrangements for manag-
 ing the — and levying dues for its use, and
 for landing and shipping goods.



Revenue for the
 Madras Harbour
 M.A.

To
 Date
 Issued
 Received

G. O., 14th October 1881, No. 2512 W.

OCTOBER.
 Nos. 46-47.

Madras Harbour—The Committee appointed for reporting on certain points connected with the immediate management of the — requested to reassemble for further reporting on the best arrangements for managing the — and levying dues for its use, and for landing and shipping goods.

3rd An ad valorem fee

For 1878/79—

Imports—Free goods—Rs.
 Dutiable Do.—"
 Exports—Free goods—"
 Dutiable Do.—"

Harbour dues on Rupees 67, up the whole consolidated charge at 1/2 per cent will give—Rs. 2-4— on Rupees 2-8—

4th Fee per Boat Load

For 1878/79—

Masulah boat trips 1
 2 Rupees per trip for Harbour
 Lighter trips 7512 @ 12 tons
 90144 tons @ 1 Rupee per ton
 Harbour dues —

Abstract

As per method No 1 Rupees 285,341
 — Do. — " 2 — " — 319,943
 — Do. — " 3 — " — 338,978
 — Do. — " 4 — " — 307,030

Madras
 Marine Office
 September 24th 1881

in the plans proposed for Harbour de to Port Dues or Charges on every well balance with the cost keep. The fees now proposed are the Capital and sinking fund will be seen that all four methods give result and cover the sum, to which, however, will have fee for boat hire and four annas. The whole consolidated charge at 1/2 per cent will give—Rs. 2-4— on Rupees 2-8— with the proper rate at present.

J. J. Layton
 Master Attendant
 Administrative Department

3rd An ad valorem fee

For 1878/79—

Imports—Free goods—Rs.	139,61,983	Rupees	
Dutiable D ^o —"	2,62,68,756		4,02,30,739 ✓
Exports—Free goods—"	52,26,148		
Dutiable D ^o —"	23,38,703		2,75,64,851 ✓
Harbour dues on Rupees 67	7,95,590		6,77,95,590 ✓
at 1/2 per cent will give—	Rupees 338,978		

4th Fee per Boat Load

For 1878/79—

Masulah boat trips	78,443 @	Rupees	
2 Rupees per trip for Harbour dues			2,16,886 ✓
Lighter trips 7512 @ 12 tons per trip =			
90,144 tons @ 1 Rupee per ton for			
Harbour dues			90,144 ✓
	Rupees		3,07,030 ✓

* equal to 1 Rupee per ton

Abstract

As per method No 1	Rupees 285,341
" 2	" 319,943
" 3	" 338,978
" 4	" 3,07,030

Madras
Marine Office
September 24th 1887

W. Taylor

Master Attendant
Administrative Department

It will be observed that in the plans proposed for Harbour dues no reference is made to Port Dues or Charges on Shipping, as they will pretty well balance with the cost of establishments and upkeep. The fees now proposed are to meet the interest on the capital and sinking fund of the Harbour, and it will be seen that all four methods approach nearly the same result and cover the sum required for that purpose, to which, however, will have to be added about 1 Rupee for boat hire and four annas for portage, bringing up the whole consolidated charge to the merchant to Rupees 2-4— or Rupees 2-8— a ton, which is considered the proper rate at present.

W. Taylor

Master Attendant
Administrative Department

Confidential

R.D.

9 SEP 81

P. W. Innes 2/81
70611

Administrative Department

Confidential

R.D.

9 SEP 81

* Mr. Macfadyen

Madras
Marine Office
September 24th 1881

No 8339

From

J. H. Taylor Esq^r Lieut R.N.R.

Master Attendant

Administrative Department
Madras

To

The Honble R Davidson C.S.I.

Chief Secretary to Government

Marine Department

Sir

Fort Saint George

The report of the Committee appointed under G.O. No. 2011 W, dated August 16th 1881, to advise Government on points relating to the Harbour, will shortly be before Government, and I feel it my urgent duty to preface it with certain remarks, which I respectfully request may be considered Confidential, because though capable of easy proof, they are of a nature to cause angry discussion. During the two meetings of the Committee, no argument was encouraged, no proposition set forth bearing upon any other subject than the establishment of a Port Trust. Mr. Orr, who also represented the Trade, had much to advance, but did not obtain a hearing. The Chairman simply stated that in his opinion a Port Trust was advisable, and the seven members constituting the majority simply agreed with him. For form's sake, the Government Solicitor was asked as to the power of Government to levy tolls without legislation, and on his reply at the second meeting, a previously prepared resolution was read and passed, with only my own and Mr. Orr's dissent. The Chairman put only one question. Why not a Port Trust as well as any other manage-

-ment

present and prospective cost of opposing the erosion
of the North beach upon Government, and all the
responsibility of the silting up on the South side.
The recent decision of the Government of India on
the loan required for Madras Municipal drainage
and water works will govern Harbour operations.
And though permanent improvement and increased
revenues admit the Municipality into the market
for the purposes of a loan, Repairs to the Harbour,
which would really mean inroads on the capital
sum, would not command pecuniary support.

2 Then the portion of the Port outside the Har-
bour walls from the Adyar to the north of Roy-
poream requires consideration. The lighthouse, the
flotam and jetsam account, the Shipping Office
and all matters connected with the Board of
Trade will be outside the Port Trust. There will
have to be a dual government and conflicting
interests in many possible cases, but no ar-
gument has been set forth in favour of a Port Trust
or any hint as to its probable method of management.

I have the honour to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant

W. Taylor

Master Attendant

Administrative Department

P. W. K. 1061