M.R.O. 14—18,000—27-8-24

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

---

## Government of Madras.

Revenue **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1580 — Press ~~Mis.~~

381.382

Dated 25-8-1864

***Not to be folded or roughly handled***

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 25th August 1864.*

No. 381. Read the following Proceedings of the Madras Government in the Marine Department:—

Passing Orders on the dues to be levied on the Madras Pier. | (Here enter 20th August 1864, No. 171.)

No. 382. ORDER THEREON, 25th August 1864, No. 1,550.

Miscellaneous.

Communicated to the Board of Revenue, for information.

(True Extract.)

*Deputy Secretary to Government.*

To the Board of Revenue, with Proceedings, Marine Department, No. 171.

Exd. T. O'Connor.

## *Proceedings of the Madras Government, Marine Department, 20th August 1864.*

Read the following papers:—

No. 21. From H. D. E. DALRYMPLE, Esq., Master Attendant in charge of the Marine Superintendent's Office; to J. D. SIM, Esq., for Chief Secretary to Government, Marine Department, Fort Saint George, dated Madras, 23rd July 1864, No. 1852.

With reference to the Orders of Government marginally noted, I have the honor to forward the correspondence, between the Chamber of Commerce and myself, regarding the dues to be levied on the Madras Pier.

No. 118, dated 28th June 1864.
To the Chamber of Commerce, dated 29th June 1864, No. 1660.
To do. dated 9th July 1864, „ 1700.
From do. dated 18th „ 1864.

2. As we differ regarding the amount of dues, and the mode of levying them, I annex two Tables of charges, which I respectfully submit for the consideration of His Excellency the Governor in Council, who will decide which is to be adopted.

3. I adhere to my opinion that a fixed charge on each boat-load of cargo would be the simplest mode of realizing the revenue of the Pier, and that it would save much confusion, dispute, and delay.

4. With reference to the subjoined Tables of charges, I respectfully suggest that all the Pier dues should be taken by the Collector of Sea Customs, and not by the Marine Department.

### TABLE A.

*Of fixed Charges.*

| | Rs. | A. | P. |
|---|---|---|---|
| One boat-load of Export or Import cargo, with the following exceptions. | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Do. of grain | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Heavy Machinery *on Rafts.* | | | |
| A boiler | 17 | 8 | 0 |
| Large sized pieces of machinery | 10 | 8 | 0 |
| Moderate sized pieces | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| *In Boats.* | | | |
| Smaller pieces of machinery. | | | |
| Cases of sheet copper / Do. of galvanized iron sheets, &c., for roofing, &c. | 3 | 8 | 0 |
| Passengers | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Captains of Ships per diem | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Ships' market boats | 0 | 4 | 0 |

### TABLE B.

| | Rs. | A. | P. |
|---|---|---|---|
| A bale, case, or heavy bag | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| A small package | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| A Butt, Pipe or Leaguer | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| A Puncheon | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| A Hogshead or Tierce | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Beer (bottled) in barrel | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| Wines and Spirits in cases, per dozen | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| A bag of rice or other grain | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| *Machinery.* | | | |
| On raft—a boiler | 17 | 8 | 0 |
| On do.—large pieces | 10 | 8 | 0 |
| On do.—moderate sizes | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| *In Boats.* | | | |
| Smaller pieces of machinery. | | | |
| Cases of sheet copper / Do. of galvanized iron sheets, &c., for roofing, &c., per ton | 2 | 8 | 0 |
| Passengers | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Captains of Ships, per diem | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Ships' market boat, per diem | 0 | 4 | 0 |

From H. D. E. DALRYMPLE, Esq., Master Attendant in charge of the Marine Superintendent's Office; to the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, dated Madras, 29th June 1864.

I have the honor to inform you that, notwithstanding all the opposition I have had to encounter in my endeavours to utilize the Madras Pier with the crippled means at first at my disposal, I have succeeded up to this date, from the 4th of last March, in passing over the Pier 28,000 tons of cargo, and when our new cranes are set up, and the additional line of rail into the Custom House is laid down, I think that 20,000 tons of cargo, per month, may be easily passed over the Pier.

2. As arrangements are now progressing, and ere long under the Orders of Government toll will be levied on the Pier under Act V of 1863, I now solicit the assistance of the Chamber in framing rules for the landing and shipping cargo on and from the Pier, and to settle the amount of charges to be levied on export and import goods of every description.

3. On looking into the former correspondence on the subject between my predecessor (the Superintendent of Marine) and the Chamber, I find a "Tariff of maximum rates of toll to be levied on the Madras Pier," and some of the rates therein specified are requested to be modified in a letter from the then Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce.*

* From the Honorable W. R. Arbuthnot, Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, dated 24th August 1861.

4. In carefully going into the scale of charges therein agreed to by the Chamber, I find that the toll on a boat-load of Hogsheads of Beer would amount to Rupees 2-4-0; of bales of Cotton average size Rupees 3; and of Indigo Rupees 3. I also find, not objected to by the Chamber, a boat-load of six chests of Wine Rupees 3; bags of Grain average size Rupees 2-5-6; crates of Crockery Rupees 2-4-0; small Tents Rupees 4-8-0; one four-wheeled Carriage Rupees 4-8-0; one Cart Rupees 3; and another charge, evidently a mistake, being an impost amounting to no less than Rupees 14-1-0 on a boat-load of Rattans.

5. After maturely considering the subject in all its bearings, I have come to the conclusion that the levy of toll on every article of commerce, landed on or shipped from the Pier, would create great delay, annoyance, and often difference of opinion as to rates and that it will be a preferable measure, and for the interests of all concerned if a fixed charge on every boat-load of cargo, without reference to quality or quantity be charged, and that amount of toll to cover all expenses from the boat to the Custom House, or from Custom House to boat, and when the goods are free to and from the platform opposite the Custom House.

6. I now propose that on every boat-load of export or import cargo of any description shipped from or landed on the Pier, a uniform rate of toll of Rupees 1-12-0 be levied, and this charge to cover all expenses of buoys, moorings, chains, slings, cranes, trucks and coolies made use of or worked in the boats, on the Pier, and to and from the platform or Custom House as required.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) W. H. BARTLETT,
*Ag. Asst. Supt. of Marine.*

---

From H. D. E. DALRYMPLE, Esq., Master Attendant in charge of the Marine Superintendent's Office; to the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, dated Madras, 9th July 1864, No. 1700.

With reference to my letter to the Chamber, under date 29th June 1864,* No. 1666. I have the honor to propose the following modification of the Pier dues therein suggested by me.

2. I propose that all imported grain in bags be subject to a charge of one Rupee only per boat-load.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) H. D. E. DALRYMPLE,
*Master Attendant in charge of the Marine Supt's. Office.*



From H. TOLPUTT, Esq., Chairman, Chamber of Commerce; to H. D. E. DALRYMPLE, Esq., Master Attendant in charge of Office of Superintendent of Marine, dated Madras, 18th July 1864.

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 29th June, No. 1666, which has had the careful consideration of the Chamber. I am desired in reply to express the opinion of the Chamber that any opposition manifested on the part of the public to the use of the Pier, has arisen solely from the injudicious proceedings of the Native subordinates of your Department in coercing the boatmen to bring cargo to the Pier against the wishes of the owners, and in many cases to the detriment of their interests. The charges lately made by the persons authorized by you to conduct the landing and shipping at the Pier, have been excessive, and, coupled with the coercion above alluded to, have created particularly among the Native merchants a strong feeling of dislike to, and distrust of, the advantages of the Pier, which it is highly desirable to remove. In seconding your efforts to utilize the Pier up to the present, many members of the Chamber have subjected themselves to considerable inconvenience and delay in shipping caused by the insufficient appliances for the proper working of the Pier, and the Chamber are glad to learn that the necessary number of cranes, waggons, &c., will be speedily provided.

2. The Chamber are aware that individually you have done your utmost to utilize the Pier with the insufficient means at your disposal, and have repudiated on your own part any attempt to force its use, but that considerable coercion has been used ostensibly under your direction the Chamber have no doubt whatever, and I am desired to express their hope that you will take effectual measures to prevent in future any such abuse of authority.

3. The use of the Pier according to Act V of 1863 is *entirely voluntary*, and it is obviously the interest of Government to attract traffic to it by moderate charges and greater facilities for working than are practicable on the shore.

4. With reference to the 3rd and 4th paragraphs of your letter, I am desired to point out that the Chamber in no way agreed to the tariff of charges proposed by Mr. Franklin in his letter of the 22nd July 1861. Their reply expressly guards against any such agreement, and states that "the rates are considered generally too high." But as they were suggested merely as maximum rates, which it was proposed to take power under legal enactment to levy, the Chamber limited themselves to pointing out a few articles which "were assessed at rates out of proportion to others." It will be observed that Mr. Franklin did not contemplate the actual levy of the full rates referred to.

Under date 24th August 1861.

5. The Chamber fully appreciate the advantages of the Pier to the commerce of Madras, and are most anxious to second the efforts of Government to render it as extensively useful as possible, but they are strongly of opinion that any charges for its use, which shall be much in excess of the present cost of conveying cargo to and from the boats, will seriously militate against its utility. They also consider that under efficient and economical management the Pier may be made to give a fair return for its cost without a high scale of charges.

6. The Chamber infer from your proposed tariff that you contemplate making merchandize alone, or principally, support the cost of working the Pier, including interest on the outlay of Government on it, and I am desired to point out the manifest unfairness of this apparent intention, and to submit that the amount required to be levied should be distributed in the following manner, viz.,

(1.) The advantages of the Pier to passengers will be such as to justly require a reasonable contribution on their part.

(2.) The use of the Pier to Government is sufficiently obvious to demand that the State shall bear a fair proportion of its cost.

(3.) To a large proportion of the merchandize landed and shipped at Madras the Pier is not necessary, but in the opinion of the Chamber it is desirable to attract this traffic to it always, instead of (as will obviously be the case under a high scale of charges) only when the surf renders shipments from the beach dangerous.

(4.) The shipping in the roads may fairly be called on to contribute a quota for certain extra advantages hereafter mentioned which it derives from the Pier.

(5.) I am further desired to point out to Government that, if necessary, a large proportion of the cost and expenses of the Pier ought in fairness to be set against the profits arising from the present tonnage dues for the use of the roadstead, which are entirely out of proportion to the value of the facilities afforded to shipping.

7. Taking all these points into consideration, the Chamber are of opinion that the uniform charge for Pierage of Rupee 1-12-0, for boat-load proposed by you, is excessive in itself, entirely out of proportion to the value given for it, and calculated to defeat the interests of Government in attracting traffic to the Pier. It simply doubles the present expense of shipping and landing, and it is manifestly anomalous that the cost of wharfage should equal the cost of transports in boats from one to three miles instead of, as is universally the case, bearing but a small proportion to it.

8. With regard to the mode of levying any charge, the Chamber entirely concur with you in the desirability of rendering this as simple as is practicable; but after mature consideration the Chamber are of opinion that a fixed rate per boat-load as suggested by you can only be levied on export cargo, and on certain descriptions of import cargo.

9. *Exports.*—A boat-load being almost invariably the property of a single shipper an uniform rate can be levied with facility. The present cost of conveying a boat-load of ordinary produce from the roadside to on board the boat averages 4 Annas, and the Chamber consider that the charge for Pierage should not exceed 8 Annas per boat-load.

10. *Imports.*—As import cargo is generally landed without any distinction of ownership, it will be clearly impracticable to collect an uniform charge per boat-load where the cargo belongs to different owners without giving rise to endless disputes.

(1.) In the case of coast cargo imported, such as sugar, jute, and other articles belonging generally to one owner (grain excepted), the same charge per boat-load as on export cargo can be levied.

(2.) It appears to the Chamber reasonable that the charge for grain, coastwise, being intended for the food of the population, should be taxed as lightly as possible, and the present cost of portage from the boat to the roadside, or into the godown fronting the beach being from 3 to 3½ Annas, the Chamber suggest 6 Annas per boat-load as a fair rate for Pierage when the Pier is made use of. At certain seasons, indeed, the appliances of the Pier would probably be found insufficient for the grain trade of the port alone.

(3.) In addition to the difficulty of levying an uniform rate per boat-load of general European cargo, the Chamber consider that such a course would afford too many facilities for peculation to render it desirable for their interests, and I am therefore desired to propose the following rates:—

*Bales and Cases.*—For the sake of facilitating collection, the Chamber will waive their previous suggestion of a scale according to weights, and suggest a charge of 2½ Annas per package. On small packages by Overland and Coasting Steamers and sailing Ships, 1 Anna per package; *Casks Hhds. or Tierce*, 3 Annas each; *Bottled Beer in barrels*, 1 Anna per barrel. *Wines and Spirits in cases*, 6 Pie per dozen.

*Machinery.*—The advantage of the Pier in landing Machinery is proportionately so much greater than for ordinary cargo, that the Chamber consider a rate of Rupees 2-8-0 per ton may fairly be levied on moderately sized pieces or packages. Boilers and large pieces might be assessed at Rupees 10 each, *Carriages* Rupees 5 each, *Pianos* and *Tents* Rupees 3-8-0 each.

*Iron and Coals.*—As the use of the Pier does not appear to be contemplated for these, the Chamber will suggest no specific charge.

*Passengers.*—The Chamber consides that a charge of 4 Annas for each passenger landing or embarking may fairly be levied. In the case of Captains and others going backwards and forwards on the same day only one rate to be charged.



*Ships' Provisions.*—At present shipping save a boat-hire every day by sending their own boats to the Pier-head every morning for provisions, and the Chamber consider that a charge of 4 Annas per boat will be perfectly legitimate.

11. The Chamber would respectfully urge upon Government the advisability of giving their proposed scale a fair trial for one year, after which the experience gained will be a sure guide towards any alterations necessary. If the Pier should be found to answer the expectations of the public, a considerable change will, in all probability, be effected in the whole system of boats, and the introduction of larger boats or lighters will necessitate an extension of the tariff. It will also be a question for future consideration whether the present rates of boat-hire may not be modified.

12. In conclusion, the Chamber desire to express strongly their opinion that to ensure the economical working of the Pier it is highly desirable that the executive management of it shall be entirely independent of the Native subordinates of your Department or that of the Sea Customs. The most effective means of working it will probably be found in letting the work by public contract, the Contractor being subjected to efficient European superintendence to ensure strict regularity of traffic.

---

From H. D. E. DALRYMPLE, Esq., Master Attendant in charge of the Marine Superintendent's Office; to the Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, dated Madras, 22nd July 1864, No. 1848.

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter, under date 18th July 1864, in reply to mine of the 29th ultimo.

2. The opinions of the Chamber expressed in paragraph 1, would have commanded my utmost respect, did I not know that instead of being founded on the personal observation or knowledge of any member of that honorable body, they were derived entirely from their shipping dubashes, whose interests have been notoriously affected by the opening of the Pier for the traffic of the port.

3. In regard to the undue interference, coercion, &c., &c., alleged to have been practised by my subordinates on the Pier, I beg to remind you of my Circular to the Houses of Agency, when the Pier was opened for traffic, requesting their assistance and support, which appeal was but feebly responded to: and then finding myself unsupported by the Mercantile community as a body, I considered it my duty to use all fair and legitimate means to induce the boat-owners and boatmen to ply their boats between the shipping and the Pier, and had I not done so, having to combat with prejudice, opposition, and intrigue of every description, the Pier up to this date would have been a complete failure, and a disgrace to the Madras Presidency.

4. With reference to the sentence quoted in the margin, I have to remark that the landing and shipping of cargo at the Pier has been, from the first, placed under the superintendence of the same Custom House Maistry, who has hitherto been employed by all the Merchants in Madras in performing that duty between the beach and the Custom House, and if his charges have been excessive the Merchants have themselves to blame for submitting to the imposition. The only case of over-charge by this individual, which was brought to my notice by a member of a House of Agency was immediately dealt with in a summary manner, and he was constrained to re-call his bill, and revise his charges.

"The charges lately made by the person authorized by you to conduct the landing and shipping at the Pier have been excessive."

5. I now beg to bring to your notice, for the information of the Chamber, that since the Pier was opened in March last, I have received on a moderate computation about one hundred oral and written complaints from Merchants and others regarding the working of it, its hindrances and short-comings; but on going immediately and thoroughly into each complaint, securing if possible the presence of all parties concerned, I have had the satisfaction of proving that the greater number were based on information entirely false, and the remainder rested on a very slight foundation of facts. In every instance they were to be traced to the animus of the shipping dubashes, whose perquisites had been interfered with, and who themselves generally connived to elude examination.

6. With reference to paragraph 5, in which the Chamber are strongly of opinion that the charges for the use of the Pier should little exceed the cost of landing goods on the beach, it would seem that the Chamber make no account of the fact that by availing themselves of the Pier, damage from salt-water and breakage, which so constantly occur in landing cargo on the beach is, barring rare accidents, entirely avoided. I can testify from daily personal observation that out of thirty thousand tons of cargo, which have now passed over the Pier since last March, the loss by damaged goods can be estimated at only Rupees 300, and on every occasion, when an accident occurred, it was caused by the carelessness either of the boatmen or of the coolies, working under the Custom House Conicopoly on the Pier, who has made good the loss.

7. I may also here remind the Chamber that, to meet the often expressed wishes and demands of the Mercantile community, the Indian Government have constructed a Pier at a cost now of 11 lakhs of Rupees, and it seems but equitable that the trade of the port should contribute towards paying a moderate interest on the sum expended, and a fair proportion of the expenses necessarily incurred in keeping the Pier in good working order.

8. With reference to paragraphs 7 and 10, I am still of opinion that a fixed charge might be levied on every boat-load of import or export cargo, the consignee in one case, and the shipper in the other to pay the charge and recover it afterwards from the owners of the goods. The Conicopolies attached to the Mercantile Firms, and in attendance on the Pier could easily look after the interests of their employers, and under this arrangement great delay, inconvenience, and annoyance would be avoided.

9. I have no objections to recommend, as an experiment, a modification on the fixed rates per boat-load, and I am prepared to propose 1 Rupee 4 Annas per boat-load of goods of every description, excepting heavy machinery, and 8 Annas on boat-loads of grain; but if this mode of levying the toll is considered by Government to be inexpedient, I am quite ready to adopt your scale of charges with some slight alterations.

10. As casks of every description for safety must be slung with much care and hoisted up singly, which causes delay, I propose for a Butt,* Pipe or Leaguer 6 Annas,* and for bottled Beer in barrels 1½ Anna per barrel. I agree to all the other charges proposed by the Chamber, excepting for heavy machinery, such as boilers. The transport of a large boiler from the raft to the road across the beach costs Rupees 35, and I think it fair that half that sum should be charged, say Rupees 17-8-0.

* The present beach-rate paid by the Merchants.

11. I also consider that your proposed charge of Rupees 2-8-0 per ton, on moderate sized pieces or packages of machinery, should include cases of sheet copper and of galvanized iron sheets and roofing, the cost of which now per case (across the beach), according to size, being from 8 Annas to 1 Rupee.

12. With reference to grain, I know from some of the grain merchants who patronize the Pier, that the loss by robbery and damage by salt-water when landing it on the beach greatly counter-balances the difference of cost in landing it on the Pier, and 8 Annas a boad-load is a very moderate charge for landing it dry and in good order, and placing it in safety on the platform in front of the Custom House, or on the carts conveying it to the Merchants' godowns.

13. I approve of the charge of 4 Annas proposed by the Chamber to be levied on all passengers landing or embarking at the Pier, and only one rate to be charged on Captains of ships for the day.

14. I also approve of the charge of 4 Annas per day on the ships' boats, which carry the provisions and market supplies from the Pier, and to simplify matters I propose that a fixed charge of 8 Annas a day be levied on each ship, the Captain holding a weekly ticket to represent the same.

15. Adverting to paragraph 2 of your letter, I am gratified to know that my personal endeavours to utilize the Pier are acknowledged by the Chamber; but as I act under the orders of Government I claim no commendation for having simply done my duty to the best of my ability



16. In conclusion, I have to inform you that I shall, without further delay, forward this correspondence for the orders of Government.

(True Copy.)
(Signed) W. H. BARTLETT,
*Acting Assistant Superintendent of Marine.*

No. 22. From H. TOLPUTT, Esq., Chairman, Chamber of Commerce; to the Honorable A. J. ARBUTHNOT, Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated Madras, 30th July 1864.

With reference to the correspondence lately forwarded to you by the Master Attendant in charge of the Marine Superintendent's Office, between himself and the Chamber, on the subject of the Pier, I have the honor to request that you will lay before His Excellency the Governor in Council the following remarks on the allegations contained in Mr. Dalrymple's letter, No. 1848, of 22nd July.

1. The Chamber observe with much regret the spirit in which their representations on the subject of the abuse of authority by the subordinate officers of the Master Attendant's Department have been received by Mr. Dalrymple, and consider it due to themselves to give the most unqualified contradiction to the assertion contained in the 2nd paragraph of his letter under notice, an assertion entirely unfounded and in the opinion of the Chamber equally uncalled for. It was not without considerable personal inquiry on the part of myself and many members of the Chamber that the attention of Mr. Dalrymple was called to the fact of coercion being practised on the boatmen. Private representations on the subject had been made to him, and were met with the stereotyped reply that members were misled by their dubashes, and that no orders had been given by him to compel boats to go to the Pier. The Chamber now learn with much surprise that Mr. Dalrymple "considered it his duty to use all fair and legitimate means to induce the boat-owners and boatmen to ply their boats to the Pier," and the Chamber need no further confirmation of the ground of their complaint.

2. It was not to be supposed that the Chamber could induce every shipper to meet Mr. Dalrymple's wishes in using the Pier when it was notoriously unfit for traffic. I can, however, safely assure His Excellency the Governor in Council that a fair amount of assistance was rendered sufficient to test the working capacities of the Pier (which was all that was necessary), and in many cases at considerable inconvenience and expense to members, who abstained from complaining of the high charges to which they were subjected solely to avoid any appearance of opposition to the use of the Pier, and through a desire to give it in every respect a fair trial. It was understood that the charges made were sanctioned by Mr. Dalrymple, whose duty clearly it was to see that they were fair and reasonable.

3. With reference to paragraph 5 of Mr. Dalrymple's letter, I am desired to express the opinion of the Chamber, that if he had made his inquiries in any other manner than through his principal Native subordinate who, it must be remembered, was in most cases the subject of complaint the result would most probably have been very different; and the Chamber think it right to suggest the possibility of Mr. Dalrymple being equally deceived with themselves by the Native testimony on which he appears to place so much reliance. Shipping dubashes as a class are not immaculate, but in this case they have, in the opinion of the Chamber, been unjustly stigmatised.

4. So much importance being attached by Mr. Dalrymple to the alleged influence of these dubashes, the Chamber think it right to explain to Government their exact position.

(1.) Their business is to attend to the provisioning of ships. They are chosen for this duty by the *Captains* and not by Merchants, although certain of them have the support of particular houses in order to insure greater attention to ships consigned to such houses. They are an independent class and not the servants of particular Firms.

(2.) With the shipment of produce they have nothing whatever to do, unless whereas in some cases they possess boats of their own, they are employed in the same manner as any other boat-owner.

(3.) Their position with regard to the landing of cargo is this : They procure boats under the orders of the Captain, land the cargo and recover from the consignees the cost of landing. It is evident therefore that their charges will be very little affected by the use of the Pier, since they will simply recover the Pier charges in addition to the boat-hire. Their principal ground of objection to the Pier is the impossibility of now landing cargo as quickly as desired by the Captains. Their dislike to appear before the Master Attendant as complainants against his Native subordinates will be understood when it is borne in mind that the latter have abundant means of retaliation without fear of detection by preventing the dubashes from obtaining boats.

5. The experience of the Chamber does not lead them to attach so much importance as Mr. Dalrymple, in paragraph 5 of his letter, to the advantages of the Pier. Landing and shipping from it proceed with great facility in fine weather when it is least required, but when there is a high sea with a current running, only a few boats can be worked at one side of the Pier, which seriously militates against its utility. The boats now in use are not strong enough to stand the shock of bumping against the Pier, and cargo is frequently damaged by leakage through this cause, as much as it would have been in conveyance through the surf. But if the Pier continues to be worked satisfactorily a better description of boats will probably come into use.

6. The Chamber is not disposed to change the proposals contained in my letter of the 18th July with regard to the Pier charges and mode of levying them. The rates in question were adopted after mature consideration, and the Chamber will leave them to the consideration of His Excellency the Governor in Council.

7. In conclusion, I am desired by the Chamber to express their conviction that the objects of Government in attracting traffic to the Pier will not be furthered by the "fair and legitimate means" which Mr. Dalrymple has thought fit to employ, and to record their decided protest against any arbitrary interference with the liberty of themselves, the boat-owners or boatmen in the pursuit of their ordinary business.

---

No. 23. ORDER THEREON, 20th August 1864, No. 171.

The foregoing papers contain the views of the Master Attendant and Chamber of Commerce as to the tolls which should be levied upon the Pier under (Madras) Act V of 1863. The Master Attendant is in favor of charging for merchandize and baggage by the boat-load, on the ground that "the levy of toll on every article of commerce landed on or shipped from the Pier would create great delay, annoyance, and often difference of opinion as to rates." The Chamber on the other hand are of opinion that a "fixed rate per boat-load can only be levied on export cargo and on certain "descriptions of import cargo." "Import cargo being generally landed without any distinction "of ownership," the Chamber think it "will be impracticable to collect an uniform charge per boat-"load where the cargo belongs to different owners without giving rise to endless disputes."

2. The Master Attendant has accordingly submitted two Tables of Tolls, one of which (Table A) provides for merchandize and baggage, with certain exceptions being charged for by the boat-load, while the other specifies the amount of toll to be levied for each description of article. In neither of these tables is any toll provided for cattle or other animals, carts or carriages, on all of which the levy of tolls is contemplated by the Act. Nor are the definitions in either table sufficiently precise. According to Table B a heavy bag is to be charged, Annas 2 Pie 4, a small package 1 Anna. A large piece of machinery landed on a raft is to be Rupees 10-8-0, a piece of a moderate size so landed Rupees 7. Such vague definitions are certain to lead to disputes if not to frauds which can only be prevented by specifying in each case a definite maximum of weight or dimensions.

3. The plan of charging per boat-load cannot be universally followed, but it has so much to recommend it, that it should be adopted wherever practicable. The Chamber of Commerce state that this method may be followed in respect to exports and some descriptions of imports. In other cases separate charges must be levied on each description of article. The option of compounding might probably be allowed to boat-owners that is, on payment of a certain fixed sum monthly ; a boat might



be allowed to make as many trips daily and carry to and fro as much merchandize as she could from a Ship to the Pier and *vice versa*. The Master Attendant being now absent on leave, the Governor in Council resolves to entrust the revision of the Tables to the Honorable Mr. C. Pelly, Member of the Board of Revenue, who will prepare a revised table for the sanction of Government, obtaining such information as he may require on the subject from the 1st Assistant Master Attendant and Collector of Sea Customs, and discussing the subject with the Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce. The revised tables should be laid before Government not later than the 30th instant.

4. It is to be understood that the use of the Pier is to be strictly voluntary, and measures are to be taken to ensure a clear understanding on this point. The Pier dues must be collected by the Marine Department, not by the Collector of Sea Customs.

(True Extract.)

*Secretary to Government.*

To the Honorable C. Pelly.
" Chairman Chamber of Commerce.
" Assistant Master Attendant.
" Revenue Department.

Exd. J. Tulloch.

Revenue 1864 Voll.
Pros. of Govt for Augt.
No. 2226.

Proceedings of the
Madras Govt in
the Marine Dept.

Dated 24th August
Recd 25th 1864

No. 171.

Fort St. George
25th Augt 1864.

Passing order on
the dues to be levied
on the Madras Pier.

No. 1550. 25th Augt

William Ordnance

No. 1550

Communicated to the
Board of Revenue, for
information.

5 Copies to the Bd of Revenue with Proc. No. 2171 Dept. 25th Augt.

No. 381 & 382.