Public Works
~~Marine~~ (1896.) Department.

G.O., No. 739

DATED 9th September 1896.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Progress Report: G. regarding the Estg of India Cotn of the E. Coast — of the measures Dr for safty Colb.

J.C 9/9

H. E.
INDEXED
11/9

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

IRRIGATION.
ACCOUNT.

Government {1896} of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Recd.	1896.	*Enclosures*
Regd.		*Spare copies*

Letter, No. 769 I., 19th September 1896.

SEPTEMBER.

Funds

Requesting that the Government of India may be pleased to reconsider the demand for additional — for the Srívaikuntam anicut system, Tinnevelly division, and to sanction the balance of the amount required.

No. 769 I., 19th September 1896.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.
Account.

Letter—from

Colonel R. R. E. DRAKE-BROCKMAN, R.E.,
Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Public Works Department,
Irrigation Branch,

To

The SECRETARY to the GOVERNMENT of INDIA,
Public Works Department.

Sir,

With reference to your telegram, No. 64 A.I., dated 19th August 1896, I am directed to forward a copy of Proceedings of Madras Government, No. 768 I., dated 19th September 1896, and to explain that the delay in applying for the additional funds required for repairing the damages caused to the works of the Srívaikuntam anicut system by the abnormal floods in the Támbraparni and its tributaries is due to the difficulty experienced in estimating the requirements until the estimates for repairing the damages were mostly made, and to the necessity for enquiring thereafter what amounts could be surrendered from existing grants on behalf of the urgent works which could not be postponed till next official year.

2. As the existing grant for the system has already been exceeded, and as it has been possible to provide by re-appropriation only Rs. 6,150 out of the additional grant of Rs. 30,000 applied for, I am directed to request that the Government of India may be pleased to reconsider the demand, and, if possible, sanction the balance of the amount required, so that the outlay already incurred in excess of the grant may be covered by an appropriation, and urgent works on which it has been necessary to restrict further outlay may be proceeded with to completion.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government,
Irrigation Branch.

Ootacamund,
19th September 1896.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

IRRIGATION.
ACCOUNT.

Government {1896} of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Recd.	} 1896.	*Enclosures*
Regd.		*Spare copies*

G.O., No. 768 I., 19th September 1896.

SEPTEMBER.

Funds

Sanctioning certain transfers of — for the Srívaikuntam anicut system, Tinnevelly division, and directing that the Government of India be addressed for the balance of the additional grant required.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.
Account.

Read—the following papers:—

Telegram from the Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch, Ootacamund, dated Simla, 19th August 1896, No. 64 A.I.

Your telegram, 23rd July, additional 30,000 for Srívaikuntam system should be provided by re-appropriation within existing grant under 42. Please explain by letter why demand was not put forward earlier.

Memo. No. VI./55 T.N.

With reference to Proceedings of Madras Government, No. $\frac{601}{A}$ I., dated 23rd July 1896, the undersigned has the honour to inform the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, that the Government of India has not sanctioned the additional grant of Rs. 30,000 therein applied for for repairing the damages caused to the works of the Srívaikuntam anicut system by the floods in December last. Until the grant for this system can be augmented by a re-appropriation of the total grant under "42. Major works (Working expenses)," expenditure under this head should be restricted.

2. Though the floods occurred in December last, it is observed that additional funds for expenditure during the current year were applied for only on the 24th May 1896 in letter No. 609 T.N. In this office memo. No. 34 T.N., dated 5th June, the Superintending Engineer was asked to explain why the proposed expenditure will not bear postponement to the next financial year. This explanation was furnished in his No. 1075 T.C., dated 7th July 1896, on which G.O., No. $\frac{601}{A}$ I., dated 23rd July 1896, was passed. The Government of India now desires it to be explained by letter why the demand for additional funds was not put forward earlier. The Superintending Engineer is requested to be so good as to submit the explanation required at his earliest convenience.

(Signed) R. R. E. DRAKE-BROCKMAN, Col., R.E.,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

26th Aug. 1896.

From W. HUGHES, Esq., Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Trichinopoly, 30th August 1896, No. 1014 T.N.

With reference to your No. VI./55 T.N., dated 26th August 1896, I have the honour to state that the Executive Engineer's first application for additional funds reached my office on the 18th May 1896, and I do not think he could have ascertained much earlier what grants he was likely to require. The cost of repairing flood damages could only be roughly guessed until the estimates were mostly made, and moreover the amount spent on these works from last year's grant was not known until sometime

in April. The application was sent to you from my office on 27th May, and all the subsequent delay arose from your inability to obtain the required funds by transfer from other circles and my subsequent enquiry as to the amounts which could be surrendered from existing grants.

2. The Executive Engineer, Tinnevelly, has been ordered sometime ago to restrict work on the Srívaikuntam anicut system as far as possible. The minimum grant required will be reported in a few days.

Telegram from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, dated 26th August 1896, No. 47.

Please wire what portion of current year's grant under 42. Repairs, Gódávari delta, can be spared for urgent demands elsewhere.

Telegram from the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Waltair, 3rd September 1896.

Your telegram, dated 26th ultimo. Rupees five thousand available for transfer from Central division, Gódávari, under 42. Maintenance and Repairs.

Telegram from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to the Superintending Engineer, III Circle, dated 26th August 1896, No. 48.

Please wire what portion of current year's grant under 42. Repairs, Kurnool canal, can be spared for urgent demands elsewhere.

Telegram from the Superintending Engineer, III Circle, to the Chief Engineer, for Irrigation, dated Bellary, 30th August 1896.

Your telegram 26th. Funds not available 42. Canal Repairs. Grant already too low, more required later on.

No. 164 I.

Submitted to Government with a recommendation that the sum of Rs. 5,000, which can be spared from the current year's grant for the Gódávari delta system, may be transferred to the Tinnevelly division where an outlay of Rs. 32,583 has been incurred up to end of July 1896 against a grant of Rs. 19,883. The Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, has already been instructed to restrict further expenditure. No funds can be spared from the Kistna delta system for which an additional grant of Rs. 1,23,000 has just been sanctioned by the Government of India to repair damages caused by the unprecedented floods this year. The Superintending Engineer, III Circle, wires that the grant for the Kurnool-Cuddapah canal is already too low. In his application printed in Proceedings of Madras Government, No. 730 I., dated 27th August 1896, the Superintending Engineer, V Circle, represented that an additional grant of Rs. 8,500 for the Cauvery delta system was absolutely necessary, but this demand has not been complied with. From the above it will be seen that the grant for the Srívaikuntam anicut system cannot be augmented by re-appropriation, as suggested by the Government of India, to the full extent required.

(Signed) R. R. E. DRAKE-BROCKMAN, Col., R.E.,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

8th September 1896.

ORDER—No. 768 I., dated 19th September 1896.

The following transfers of funds are sanctioned :—

Irrigation.
42. Major Works (Working Expenses).

From Gódávari Delta System. Gódávari Central Division.	RS.	*To* Srívaikuntam Anicut System. Tinnevelly Division.	RS.
Maintenance and repairs	5,000	Maintenance and repairs	5,000
Establishment	1,150	Establishment	1,150
Total ...	6,150	Total ...	6,150

2. The following letter will be sent.

[Here enter No. 769 I., dated 19th September 1896.]

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government,
Irrigation Branch.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Superintending Engineer, I Circle.
" " " III Circle.
" " " VI Circle.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

Code Class. Dd

INDIAN TELEGRAPHS. Monthly Number. 15330

To (Office) Madras | From (Office) Pollachi

Words.	Day.	Hour.	Minute.	Official Instructions.
28/5	30	16	28	Dpd

To (Person) Madras Works Irrigation | From (Person) S. E. 3rd Circle

Your Telegram Twenty Sixth funds not available 42 Canal repairs Grant Already too low more required later on.

84 Word Form. C. C 2.

Recd. from LN. At Hrs. Mts. by

Sent to LN. At Hrs. Mts. by

MADRAS 30-8-96

Telegraph Master.

G G P—No. 534 T—24-7-95—10,00000.

Dealt 26/8/96

Sd. F. J. Wilson 26-8-96

Lees 26/8 BR.

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION.
4 - SEP 96
No. 1734 d

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

50

Deferred Telegram

To

Supt Eng, 1st Circle.

No 47.

"Please wire what portion of current year's grant under 42 repairs, Godavari Delta, can be spared for urgent demands elsewhere."

4

To

Supt Eng 4th Circle.

No 48.

"Please wire what portion of current year's grant under 42. repairs, Kurnool Canal, can be spared for urgent demands elsewhere."

Sd. F. J. Wilson
26.8.96

Dest
26/8/96

1ccs
26/8

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE,

No. 10147N.

Trichinopoly, 30 August 1896.

From W. Hughes Esquire
~~The~~ Sperintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer,
Irrigation

SIR,

ENCLOSURES.

With reference to your no $\frac{VI}{55.T.N.}$ dated 26 August 1896, I have the honor to state that the Executive Engineer's first application for additional funds reached my office on the 18 May 96 and I do not think he could have ascertained much earlier what grants he was likely to require. The cost of repairing flood damages could only be roughly guessed until the estimates were mostly made and moreover the amount spent on these works from last year's grant was not known until sometime in April. The application was sent on from my office on 27 May and all the subsequent delay arose from your inability to obtain the required funds by transfer from other Circles and my subsequent enquiry as to the amounts which could be surrendered from existing grants.

2 The Executive Engineer himself has been ordered sometime ago to restrict work on the Srivaikuntham Anicut System as far as possible the minimum grant required will be reported in

250—20.4.96

P. W. D. 6th CIRCLE.

FROM THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, 6th CIRCLE.

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION. 1 SEP 96 No. 7270

TO THE CHIEF ENGINEER, for Irrigation

NO. 101478

Dated 30 / Received 31 } August 1896.

Enclosure.

Damages caused to the works of the Srivaikuntham Anicut System by the floods in Dec 1895 —

Explaining why the demand for additional funds for the — was not forwarded earlier.

OWE.3 / 8/9/96

in a few days.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servt.
(Signed)
A Sriniwasa Rao. H.C.S.R.
Supg Engineer's office
for Supg Engr

(2)

Note for despatches.
Memo & telegrams
to be despatched &
then file submitted
to S for approval
of action taken
[illegible]
26/5

Urgent

No 55 IN 4/26 8/96

Memo

With reference to P.W.D. No 601 I, of 23rd July 1896, the undersigned has the honour to inform the Supg. Engr, Vizagapatam, that the Govt of India has not sanctioned the add.l grant of Rs 30000 therein applied for for repairing the damage caused to the works of the Srivaikuntham Anicut system by the floods in Dec last. Until the grant for this system can be augmented by a reappropriation

of the total grant under "42 Major Works (Working Expenses", expenditure under this head should be restricted.

7. Though the floods occurred in Dec last, it is observed that add.l funds for expenditure during the current year were applied for only on the 24th May 1886 in letter No. 609 T.N. In this office memo No. 326 T.N. dy 5 June the Supt Eng was asked to explain why the proposed expenditure will not bear postponement to the next financial year. This explanation was furnished in his No. 1075 T.C. dy 7th July 1886 on which Govt No. 609/A1 dy 28th July 1886, was passed. The Govt of India now desires it to be explained by letter why the demand for add.l funds was not put forward earlier. ~~The Supt Eng is requested to~~ ~~the board~~ requested to be so good as to submit the explanation required at his earliest convenience.

Rnedts 31/8/86

26/8/86

To the Sec VI
No. 2618 (37).

Public Works (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 7684

Order (1) Telegram 13

From Govt of India.

No. 64 A.S.

Dated Aug 19. } 1896.
Received .. 20 }

Enclosures –

Spare copies –

SUBJECT.

Srivaikuntham System.

Stating that an addnl Rs 30,000 for — should be provided by reappropriation within existing grant under 42, and requesting explan^n why demand was not put forward earlier.

Send to Madras for file
Recd 20/8

P. W. 29
1,000—5-8-96.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	Lab. Case		
R72	J.N-	30.8.96	

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

INDIAN TELEGRAPHS

Code Class. 120 Monthly Number. 976

To (Office) Ootacamund From (Office) Ootac

Words. 40/12 Day. 19 Hour. 16 Minute. 13 Official Instructions. Ft

To (Person) Madras Works From (Person) Works

Cd. 2 your telegram 23rd July addition 30000 for Sivaganganam system should be provided by reappropriation within existing grant under 42 please explain by letter why demand was not put forward earlier

Hrs. Mts. by LN. Sent to LN. Hrs. Mts. by

Telegraph Master.

120 T—No 18 2 96—1600,000

OOTACAMUND 19-8-96

F. C. I.

BACK PAPERS. FURTHER PAPERS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
IRRIGATION BRANCH.

No. 768 I, dated 19th December 1896

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Urgent

UNDER date the

READ the following

Telegram from the Govt of India, No 6445 dy 19. 8. 96.
Memo to S.E. N Circle, 55 T.N. dy 26. 8. 96
From do 1014 T.N. dy 30. 8. 96
Telegram to S.E. 1st Circle 47 dy 26. 8. 96
Do from do. dy 3. 9. 96
Do to S.E. IIIrd Circle 48 dy 26. 8. 96
Do from do. dy 30. 8. 96
No 1643 I dy 8. 9. 96.

Submitted to Govt with a recommendation that the sum of Rs 5000 which can be spared from the current year's grant for the Godavari Delta System may be transferred to the Tinnevelly Dist.

re an outlay of
32,583 has been
incurred up to end
of July 1906 against
a grant of Rs 19,883.
The Supt Eng. V. Circle,
has already been in-
structed to restrict
further expenditure.
No funds can be
spared from the Kistna
Delta system for which
an add.l grant of
Rs 123,000 has just
been sanctioned by the
Govt of India to repair
damages caused by
the unprecedented floods
this year. The Supt Eng.
V. Circle, writes that
the grant for the
Kurnool-Cuddapah

Canal is alrea
too low. In his
application printed
in P.W.G. No. 730 S.,
dt 27th Augt 1906, the Supt.
Eng. V. Circle, repre-
sented that an add.l
grant of Rs 8500
for the Cauvery Delta
System was absolutely
necessary, but this
demand has not
been complied with.
From the above it
will be seen that
the grant for the
Srivaikuntham Anicut
System cannot be
augmented by reap-
propriation, as suggested
by the Govt of India,
to the full extent
required.

+ In press.

ed therein.

The following transfers of funds are sanctioned:—

A.S.H. 15.9.96

Irrigation.

42. Major Works (Working Expenses)

From		To	
Godavari Delta System.		Trivaikuntham Ancut System	
Godavari Central Dn.	Rs	Tinnevelly Dist.	Rs
Maintc. & Repairs	5000	Maintenance Repairs	5000
Establishment.	1150	Establishment.	1150
Total	6150	Total	6150

2. The following letter will be sent:—

No. 769 I, dt. 19th September 1896

To

The Secretary to the Govt of India.

Sir,

With reference to your telegram, No. 64 A.I., dt 19th Aug 1896, I am directed to forward a copy of Govt

A.S.H. 15.9.96

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

IRRIGATION BRANCH.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the

READ the following

No. 768 I, dt 19th September 96

& to explain that the delay in applying for the add.l funds required for repairing the damage caused to the works of the Trivaikuntham Ancut system by the abnormal floods in the Tambraparni & its tributaries is due to the difficulty experienced in estimating the requirements until the estimates for repairing the damages were

ently made & to the
necessity for enquiring
therefrom what amounts
could be surrendered
from existing grants
on behalf of the urgent
works which could
not be postponed till
next official year.

52 As the existing
grant for the system
2. has already been
expended, & as it has
been possible to pro-
vide by reappropriation
only Rs 6,150 out of
the addl. grant of
Rs 30,000 applied for,
I am directed to re-
quest that the Govt
of India may be
pleased to reconsider

12 Pres

the demand, and
if possible, sanct
the balance of the
amount required
so that the outlay
already incurred
excess of the gran
may be covered by
an appropriation
urgent works on wh
it has been necess
to restrict further
outlay may be pr
ceeded with to comple

JJ
5/9
96

Recd
8/9
96

To
The Chief Engr for I
Supdg Engr 1st Circle
Do IIIrd Circle
Do VI Circle
Sd J.W.R.

5/9 1896

Public Works (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 8176

7689

Order

within

From

The Chief Engineer for Irrigation

No. 164-I

Dated 8th Sept 1896

Received 11.9.96

Enclosures 5

Spare copies –

Issue

17/9

D. 17/9

17.9.96

7689

SUBJECT.

Sivaikuntham Anicut System – Furnishing explanation as to why the demand for the annual funds for the — was not forwarded earlier and requesting the Govt of Madras to sanction the balance of amount now required

7.2.9
notify RB/8
VCC
14/8

0-L3.395
R17/9

the present time, and in no way regulate the levy of wharfage fees. The following instances may be cited by way of example:—

(1) The object of wharfage fees as now recognised is *not* "to prevent boats loading and unloading goods except at authorized places." If such a principle were generally acted upon, the canal would become next to useless, and the traffic in firewood, grain and other produce would be absolutely killed, since it is idle to suppose that such goods could stand the cost of transport by road to the nearest wharf instead of being loaded or unloaded wherever wanted, as they are of course allowed to do. Both the navigation and the wharf rules give discretion to Executive Engineers to forbid loading or unloading except at wharves, but this power was conferred in order to check abuses and not to hamper legitimate traffic.

(2) The Board rightly state that one object of wharfage fees is to place all boats on the same footing. It is therefore perfectly anomalous at the present time to claim exemption for *salt boats alone*, since no other boats are so exempted. It is altogether contrary to fact, as things now exist, to say that the effect of wharfage fees "is to place a tax upon salt alone." It is, however, absolutely true to say that to exempt salt from paying fees which every other commodity now pays is to bolster up the salt trade at the expense of the Buckingham canal, a work on which Government has incurred enormous outlay, and on which Capital and Revenue accounts are kept up.

(3) The various contentions of the Board that (*a*) because it is convenient for salt to continue to be loaded at the Salt Cotaurs, (*b*) because the conservancy of the banks is attended to, and (*c*) because a very short length of side channel is maintained by the Salt Department, salt boats at Salt Cotaurs should be exempted from wharfage fees, form no valid ground for such exemption. On a similar line of argument, coal, shells, firewood and other goods might just as well claim exemption. In all such cases, it is clearly for the private convenience of the trade in question that the Government wharves are not used, and such convenience forms no ground whatever for exemption. If such principles were admitted and exemption from wharfage allowed on grounds so inadequate, the Government wharves would soon be deserted altogether.

5. If the instorage system is to be again introduced, and salt boats using the Salt Cotaurs are still to be exempted from payment of wharfage, the canal will lose annually considerable sums in wharfage fees, as salt will again become a principal item of traffic—*vide* paragraph 7 of note, printed with G.O. No. 619 I., dated 14th July 1893. In case of the exemption from wharfage being still allowed to salt boats using Salt Cotaurs, some arrangement should therefore be made providing that this lost revenue is adjusted by book transaction to the revenue account of the canal, and that the Salt Department furnish to the canal staff proper checks to show that the boats *do* actually load or unload at the Salt Cotaurs. By means of wharf clearance tickets, &c., the canal staff have at present a perfect check upon the movements of all boats except specially exempted salt boats using Salt Cotaurs.

6. It is difficult to see any logical or even intelligible ground upon which salt boats using the Salt Cotaurs can continue to be exempted from payment of wharfage—

(1) The boats are *not* the property of Government, but of private owners, and it is only reasonable that these owners should pay wharfage fees, since, as I have already shown in paragraph 4 of my letter, printed with G.O. No. 632 I., dated 17th July 1893, such levy of fees is strictly proportionate to profits, and is the only way of touching boats doing an exceptionally good business.

(2) It is ridiculous to suppose that the levy of so small a fee as one anna per ton for wharfage can make any material difference in the cost of so highly priced an article as salt. The exemption of such fees on salt boats makes, however, a great difference to the annual revenue of the canal and enables the Salt Department to make arrangements with its contractors to transport salt to Madras at a slightly reduced rate, and one that is, moreover, wholly fictitious, *i.e.*, is specially relieved by Government from an impost that every other class of goods has to pay.

(3) Even if Government boats were used to transport salt to the Salt Cotaurs, it would form no valid ground for exemption, since the Government boats of the Forest Department conveying firewood have never been allowed any such exemption from payment of wharfage fees.

7. A great deal has been done to improve the canal of late years; the traffic is steadily increasing, and the blocks to traffic that occurred during the drought of 1891, and frequently in former years are rapidly, if proper precautions are taken, becoming an impossibility. The canal will, ere long, when the license and wharfage fees have been raised, show a very much better return than it has ever yet done, and as the cost of carriage along it is extremely low, the officers in charge of it may well bring to notice that its earnings will be unduly knocked down by special exemption from wharfage fees being allowed to any cargo boats whatever.

8. I therefore request to be favoured at an early date with orders whether G.O. No. 798 I., dated 21st December 1887, is to be still held to be in force; if so, whether it is only intended to apply to salt boats using Salt Cotaurs; or whether this Government Order is superseded by G.O. No. 632 I., dated 17th July 1893, which lays down detailed rules for wharves.

Enclosures.

From the Wharf Superintendent, to the Executive Engineer, Buckingham Canal, dated 7th March 1895, No. 165.

I beg to report that the Government salt has this day commenced to be transported from Vayalur to Madras Depôt by canal.

2. Wharfage fee for unloading at Salt Cotaurs has not been collected under G.O. No. 798 I. of 21st December 1887.

3. The salt here transported has been ascertained from the enclosed letter of the Inspector of Salt and Abkári Revenue, Madras Depôt, to be the Government property and not one of private merchants.

From the Inspector, to the Wharf Superintendent, Madras Basin, dated 7th March 1895.

With reference to your letter, dated 7th March 1895, I have the honour to inform you that the salt from Vayalur is Government property and is being transported to Madras under contract by Abdul Khadar Mustan Sahib.

No. 457 B.C.

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for favour of very early orders. It would appear that G.O. No. 798 I., dated 21st December 1887, has been cancelled by G.O. No. 632 I., dated 17th July 1893.

(Signed) W. L. C. BADDELEY, Major, R.E,
Superintending Engineer, II Cirlcle.

30th March 1895.

From Colonel R. R. E. DRAKE-BROCKMAN, R.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), dated 13th April 1895, No. 178 M.

I have the honour to forward endorsement No. 457 B.C., dated 30th March 1895, from the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, with its enclosures (to be returned), and request to be favoured with the Board's remarks on the question therein raised whether salt boats passing to the Salt Cotaurs should be still exempted from paying wharfage fees.

2. Up to the present time, salt has been paying wharfage fee, as it was bought by the contractors at Ennore. It is unreasonable that the alteration of rules in the

Salt and Abkári Department as to where the contractors should buy salt should affect the receipts of the canal. If this be allowed, it is impossible to tell whether the receipts of the canal are improving or not, and to make fair comparison between different years.

3. There seems to be no valid reason why salt should escape wharfage fees any more than firewood and the tax in the latter case is relatively much heavier than in the former, as the value of the goods is so much less.

4. The Buckingham canal is on a fair way to show receipts exceeding expenditure, and the salt trade, being benefited largely by it, should not be exempted from such taxes as are generally imposed and found by experience to be not more than the traffic can well bear.

5. If suitable to the Salt and Abkári Department, the charges may be made a book-transfer between the departments, or they may be levied on the boats which are, it is believed, private boats engaged by that department.

Read—Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), dated 17th July 1895, Mis. No. 3009.

Read—again the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue (Separate Revenue), dated 16th May 1895, Mis. No. 1207 :—

Read—letter from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated 13th April 1895, No. 178 M.

Resolution—Mis. No. 1207, dated 16th May 1895.

The Deputy Commissioner, Central Division, is requested to report what arrangements have been made for the payment of wharfage fees on boats conveying salt for storage at the Madras Depôt and if, by the terms of the contract, the transport contractor is not to bear the charge, whether a case for an application to Government for exemption can be made out under present circumstances.

Read—also letter from the Deputy Commissioner, Central Division, dated 8th June 1895, No. 2507.

Abstract.—Reporting that no arrangements have been made for the payment of wharfage fees on boats conveying salt for storage at the Madras Salt Depôt and expressing his opinion that if any fees are to be levied at all, they should be borne by Government.

Resolution—Mis. No. 3009, dated 17th July 1895.

Prior to the introduction of the outstorage system in 1890, the excise salt manufactured in the factories of the Vayalur, Ennore and Covelong Circles was transported in boats and stored at the Madras Salt Depôt, and the boats carrying such salt paid no wharfage fees until 1887. In that year the Salt Cotaurs, including the salt depôt premises, were declared to be a wharf. The question of the levy of wharfage fees was then raised by the canal authorities, and Government, after considering the arguments put forward by the Board against the proposed levy of wharfage fees on salt boats, was pleased in its order, dated 21st December 1887, No. 798 I., Public Works, to sanction an exemption in favour of all licensed boats entering or leaving Madras laden with salt.

2. As long as the salt of the outlying factories was stored at the depôt, this order was observed, but since the introduction of the outstorage system, the rule has not been taken advantage of. The salt brought by licensees from the factories to Madras (not to the depôt) has paid wharfage, apparently because (although the wording of the Government Order above referred to is such as to render it applicable to all salt boats entering and leaving Madras), the intention of the Government was considered to be to exempt only boats carrying salt from the out-factories *for storage at the depôt.* No objection was raised by the licensees as they were using the banks of the canal for loading and unloading, as it is used for other articles.

3. After the passing of the Canals and Ferries Act (II of 1890), Government in its Order, dated 17th July 1893, No. 632 I., Public Works, notified under section 16 (IV) thereof, a set of rules for the regulation of traffic at the wharves on the canal in general and at the Madras wharf in particular. Rule II of the rules relating to the latter requires all boats that load or unload within the limit of one mile from the Madras wharf to pay the prescribed wharfage. No mention was made in these rules of the exemption accorded in G.O. No. 798 I., Public Works, dated 21st December 1887, to boats carrying salt, the reason presumably being that there was not the same necessity to do so inasmuch as at that time no salt was going to Madras for storage at the depôt. Now that the monopoly system has been ordered to be re-introduced into the factories of the Vayalur and Ennore Circles, the existing stocks of the licensees' salt are being purchased by Government and transported to the Madras depôt for storage, and Government salt will, from the season of 1896, be likewise sent there. The Board has therefore again to address Government on the subject of wharfage fees and to request orders for the continuance of the exemption accorded in G.O. No. 798 I., Public Works, dated 21st December 1887, in the case of the boats carrying salt to the Madras depôt for storage.

4. The Executive Engineer, Buckingham Canal sub-division, supported by the Chief Engineer, considers that wharfage fees should be paid. He details at length his arguments in favour of the imposition of the fees, but as most of them were before Government when it passed its order of 1887, the Board does not consider it necessary to traverse them in detail. It will simply remark that, highly taxed as it is, salt is entitled to exceptional treatment as compared with the other articles of trade, firewood, &c., referred to by the Executive Engineer, if it can possibly be accorded. His main objection to the exemption claimed is the loss to the canal funds of "considerable sums in wharfage fees," a canal on which Government has incurred enormous outlay and on which Capital and Revenue accounts are kept. In reply to this, the Board would raise the question of whether wharfage fees were originally intended as a means of augmenting the general revenue of the canal or to cover the interest on the capital cost and expenditure connected with the maintenance of wharves for the convenience of the public. If the latter be the case, it would point out that the canal authorities have been put to no expense whatever either in the original construction or subsequent upkeep of the salt depôt wharf and the side channels which are maintained exclusively by this department. The Deputy Commissioner, Central Division, to whom the Board made a reference on the subject, states that at an expenditure of less than one year's wharfage fees on salt boats, he is prepared to dig other side channels which will render it quite unnecessary for such boats to unload from the Buckingham canal at all.

5. It may be added that no arrangements were made by the Board with the boat contractors who are transporting salt to the depôt on behalf of Government for the payment of the wharfage fees and that the fees, if levied, will have to be borne by Government and paid by book-transfer.

6. It may be urged that if the exemption be granted in favour of boats unloading Government salt at the depôt, Government salt will compete at an advantage over excise salt brought for sale to Madras in so far as the wharfage fees exceed the cost of upkeep of the depôt wharves and channels, but the Board submits that ere long all the licensees of the Vayalur and Ennore Circles will revert to the monopoly system and there will be no more excise salt sold at the local platforms and brought to Madras.

(True Copy and Extract.)

(Signed) EDMUND MILLETT,
Assistant Secretary.

Mis. No. 3492, Revenue.

Transferred to the Public Works Department with copy of note by the Honourable Mr. Bliss.

(Signed) W. B. AYLING,
Ag. Asst. Secy. to Government.

OOTACAMUND,
28th August 1895.

No. 21 I.

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

With his endorsement, No. 457 B.C., dated 30th March 1895, the Superintending Engineer, II Circle, forwarded for orders a copy of letter, No. 3017, dated 9th March 1895, from the Executive Engineer, Buckingham Canal division, in which he raised the question whether paragraph 2 of the rules passed in G.O. No. 632 I., dated 17th July 1893, for regulation of traffic at the Madras wharf, ordering that boats which load or unload within the limit of one mile of the Madras wharf, should pay the prescribed wharfage fee, cancels G.O. No. 798 I., dated 21st December 1887 or not. Under this latter order the Salt Department claims exemption from payment of the fees, that department having commenced to transport salt from Vayalur to the Salt Cotaurs at Madras in supersession of the outstorage system introduced in 1890–91 under which the fees were levied on the salt contractors and paid, it may be remarked, without demur.

2. The Executive Engineer explains at length his reasons why the exemption should not be allowed, and the Board of Revenue in its Proceedings, No. 3009, dated 17th July 1895, brings forward its reasons to the contrary which, in the opinion of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, are based on a misconception of the actual state of affairs which is totally different from what it was in 1887.

3. The first argument brought forward by the Board is that it is not considered necessary to traverse the arguments of the Executive Engineer, Buckingham Canal division, in his letter, as most of them were before Government when it passed its order of 1887 and which are detailed in Board's Resolution, dated 3rd October 1887, No. 535, printed with G.O. No. 798 I., dated 21st December 1887.

4. In paragraph 2 of this resolution the object of imposing wharfage fees is given but not at all fully. The reasons may be described as follows :—

(*a*) To bring the receipts and disbursements into equilibrium (*vide* note by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, printed with G.O. No. 562 W., dated 20th February 1883).

(*b*) To meet the cost of construction and maintenance of wharves.

(*c*) To regulate the traffic and provide establishment for the conservancy of the canal.

(*d*) To provide means of collecting the necessary statistics for submission to the Government of India.

5. In paragraph 3 of the same resolution the Board submits that the avowed objects of the tax will not be attained in the case of the Salt Cotaurs and suggests that salt boats are called upon to pay a fee for which they obtain no convenience and that the object of the fees would be attained by enhancing the canal tolls. As remarked in paragraph 2 these arguments could only be brought forward in ignorance of the real objects of wharfage fees as detailed in paragraph 4 *supra*, as the chief object of introducing wharfage fees was originally to bring the receipts and disbursements into equilibrium. The imposition of this tax did not enhance the charge, the tolls having been considerably reduced. Prior to the assumption by the Public Works Department in October 1879 of the duty of levying tolls on the Buckingham canal, the Collector of Chingleput was accustomed to levy, under the orders of the Board of Revenue, a toll of As. 4 per ton upon every cargo boat and As. 4 per trip on every passenger boat passed through the Shadyankuppam lock towards Madras. From this toll it is believed that salt boats were not exempted and in paragraph 10 of the memorandum on the Cochrane canal, printed as appendix 11 to the first report of the Commissioners appointed to enquire into and report upon the system of superintending and executing Public Works in the Madras Presidency, it is specially mentioned that tolls were at that time levied on every description of goods which entered Madras. Again in paragraph 5 of Memorandum, dated 11th March 1878, by the Collector of Chingleput, printed with G.O. No. 1801 A.W., dated 8th July 1878, it is stated that Government do pay tolls on salt boats using the northern canal, but nothing towards licenses on the south canal which was at that time in a very undeveloped state.

6. From the earliest days of the canal, therefore, no mention can be found of any exemption of salt traffic from tolls except for a short period in 1887.

7. In paragraph 4 of its proceedings of 1887, it is stated that the tax is on salt alone. This statement is possibly based on the idea that salt gets but little benefit in return and this may have been partially true in 1887 when the canal was incomplete and in admittedly bad order, but since navigation has been so much improved is no longer the case. It is certainly not a tax on salt alone neither is salt an exceptional case as if salt is to be exempted, because it does not actually use a wharf why should not a similar concession be granted to Messrs. Arbuthnot and Co., Messrs Binny and Co., and other firms with factories alongside the canal and who do not actually use the wharves. These firms do not seek to evade wharfage fees on this account.

8. The argument that wharfage fees can be evaded by constructing side channels to the Salt Cotaurs is one which regularly does duty, but the Board does not apparently realize that if this was allowed salt boats would get the full benefit of the improved line of navigation without paying the ordinary fees whether called wharfage fees or tolls. No railway would ever permit sidings to be constructed from their line to enable consignees to avoid terminal charges and it is inconceivable that Government would go to the trouble and expense of constructing side channels merely to evade their own tolls and in order to benefit Imperial at the expense of Provincial funds.

9. Having assumed that the arguments brought forward when the question was last before Government, but which it is submitted no longer apply, would still hold good, the Board in paragraph 4 of its Proceedings of 17th July 1895, Mis. No. 3009, remarks that salt, highly taxed as it is, is entitled to exceptional treatment as compared with other articles of trade, but does not explain why it should receive this exceptional treatment in the shape of what practically amounts to a grant from Provincial to Imperial funds—a grant which was not considered necessary when the outstoarge system was still in force. The Government of India insist on statistics of canal borne traffic and so long as capital and revenue accounts are maintained, it is submitted that the financial results attained should not be partially concealed as they would be if salt received a bounty from canal funds.

10. Another reason given by the Board which has not already been dealt with is that no arrangements were made by the Board with the boat contractors for payment of wharfage fees, but this seems hardly a reason why these fees should be remitted as the rules were published in the Fort St. George and District Gazettes so long ago as 1893, and therefore, there is no reason why proper arrangements should not have been made. A simple way out of this difficulty will be, as the Board suggests, for Government to pay the charges from salt revenue as then they will be paid from Imperial funds to which they are a legitimate charge.

11. The question of wharfage fees having been raised the Chief Engineer for Irrigation would suggest that the present time is a convenient oppertunity to settle once for all the position of the Public Works and Salt Departments with regard to the East Coast canal system. At present the Salt Department construct new and improve and maintain existing channels at the cost of Salt funds when, in the opinion of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, these channels should be carried out and maintained by the Public Works Department from Navigation funds. It is suggested therefore that all channels connected with any line of navigation, outside the limits of salt factories, should be constructed and maintained by the Public Works Department as ordinary component parts of the system. If this is done and the Salt Department