130

M.R.O. 1—20,002—12-8-65.

(1) Number of Pages 28.

(2) Date of repair 18-5-67.

(3) Initials of the Referencer SYS 2/1/67.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	130.	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	16-5-1874 ~~196~~	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department, 11th May 1874.

Read the following papers :—

No. 265. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 27th January 1874, No. 144.

Read the following letter from A. McC. WEBSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of Sea Customs, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Madras, 24th January 1874, No. 91.

As directed by the Board in their Proceedings of 11th December 1873, No. 2,542, I have the honour to report on the question of raising a revenue from the trade of Madras for the up-keep of the proposed new harbour, and for the payment of interest on the capital expended in its construction.

2. I was directed to report after consultation with the Chamber of Commerce and the Master Attendant; but as I have only recently been able to send them the returns of the trade of the Port, which have necessarily taken a considerable time in compiling, their replies to my reference will probably not be received for some little time. I am unwilling, however, to delay my report any longer, the more so, as I believe the Board are anxious to have it as soon as possible. I therefore now submit it, and will forward the reports of the Master Attendant and Chamber of Commerce as soon as they are received.

3. I beg to forward the undermentioned Statements prepared for the official year 1872-73. The statement of Railway material imported is not yet ready. It will be sent as soon as it is prepared :—

(1.) The tonnage of goods exported and imported.

(2.) The tonnage of vessels visiting the Port, distinguishing Steamers, Ships, and Native Craft, and the actual collection of Port dues from each class.

(3.) The value of exports and imports, including specie.

(4.) Memorandum showing the rates of Port dues, and the period for which one payment is sufficient.

4. The Government in paragraph 2 of their Proceedings state that in order to defray the interest on capital expended and the cost of up-keep of the harbour, a sum of at least £36,000 will be required.

5. I find on reference to the Report of the Breakwater Committee that two methods of levying dues were proposed. The Committee proposed to levy increased Port dues on the shipping, and an *ad valorem* fee on goods. The figures quoted by them at the time cannot be taken in preparing an estimate of what would be collected now, as both the shipping and value of exports and imports have, if their figures were correct at the time, materially increased.

6. The Committee's estimate was as follows :—

On Shipping.

	Tons.		Rs.	A.	P.
Steamers	146,000 at 8 Annas per ton	...	73,000	0	0
Native Crafts	30,000 at 12 ,, ,,	...	29,000	0	0
Ships	119,000 at 1 Rupee ,,	...	1,19,000	0	0
			2,21,250	0	0

On Goods.

		Rs.	A.	P.
Exports and Imports 500,00,000 at 1 per cent.		5,00,000	0	0
	Total...	7,21,250	0	0

According to the Trade and Shipping Returns for 1872-73 the following would be the result at the Committee's rates:—

On Shipping.

	Tons.		Rs.	A.	P.
Steamers	286,111 at	8 Annas per ton ...	1,43,072	0	0
Ships	106,638 at	1 Rupee ,, ...	1,06,638	0	0
Native Crafts	53,726 at	12 Annas ,, ...	40,294	8	0
			2,90,004	8	0

On Goods.

Exports and Imports excluding Treasure 833,01,554, at 1 per cent	8,33,015	8	0	
Total...	11,23,020	0	0	

Increase on last year's returns Rupees 4,01,770. If treasure is taxed at the same rate the increase would be Rupees 5,12,417.

7. Mr. Macfadyen, in his Memorandum on this subject, which was circulated to the Mercantile Firms at Madras, also proposed to levy fees on both the shipping and goods. As to goods, he was in favour of a differential rate per package. His estimate was as follows:—

Shipping.

	Tons.		Rs.	A.	P.			
Steamers ...	146,000 at	8 Annas per Ton ...	73,000	0	0			
Ships	119,000 at	1 Rupee ,, ...	1,19,000	0	0			
Native Crafts	39,000 at	12 Annas ,, ...	29,250	0	0	Rs.	A.	P.
						2,21,250	0	0

Goods.

		Rs.	A.	P.			
Bags	1,519,100 at 1½	Annas per bag	1,42,400	0	0		
Bales and Cases ...	245,529 at 3	.. per package	46,000	0	0		
Trunks and Cheats	20,165 at 3	.. each ...	3,800	0	0		
Packages	100,554 at 2	.. ..	12,500	0	0		
Hhds., Barrels, and Casks	41,584 at 2	.. ..	5,500	0	0		
Add 145,000 tons not included in ab		re at Rs. 1-8-0	2,17,500	0	0		
						4,27,700	0	0
						6,48,950	0	0

8. I do not know how Mr. Macfadyen got his figures. They differ very considerably as will be seen from the returns now submitted. According to last year's returns the result of taxing the trade on his method would be—

Shipping.

	Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.
As shown in paragraph 6	2,90,004	8	0	2,90,004	8	0

Goods.

		Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.
Bags	872,996 at 1½ Annas	81,843	6	0			
Bales and Cases	302,619 at 3 ,, ...	56,741	4	0			
Chests	16,118 at 3 ,, ...	3,022	2	0			
Packages	398,693 at 2 ,, ...	49,836	10	0			
Hhds., Barrels, and Casks	32,559 at 2 ,, ...	4,069	14	0			
					1,55,513	1	0

Other articles at rate per number, not per ton.

Buffaloe horns	492,208 at 1½ Annas per 100 ...	461	7	0		
Timber and Palmyras	483,523 at 1½ ,, each ...	45,330	4	6		
Cocoanuts	163,930 at 1 ,, per 100 ...	102	7	0		
Chanks	512,000 at 1 ,, ,, ,, ...	320	0	0		
					46,214	2	6
Metals, Coal, Coke at Mr. Macfadyen's estimate, say 135 tons, at Rupees 1-8-0 per ton		2,02,500	0	0	2,02,500	0	0
	Total...				6,94,231	11	6
Increase at last year's returns					45,281	11	6

9. By either of these two methods, we should, at the rates proposed, obtain a far larger income than we require, and if either is adopted the rates can be very materially lowered.

10. The Breakwater Committee do not appear to have taken the question of obtaining the required amount by a single tax on the shipping into consideration. They probably were of opinion that such a method was entirely out of the question; as to obtain from this source a sufficient return on an expenditure of £1,000,000 would necessitate a very heavy rate of Port dues, which the shipping could not possibly pay.

11. Owing to the great reduction on the proposed expenditure on the Harbour, we do not now require such a large return as was contemplated by the Committee, and it is, I think, worth consideration whether the amount could not be obtained by one tax only, and that on the shipping. The advantages of this method over a double tax are obvious. The collection of a tax on all goods exported and imported will, it is almost needless to observe, entail very great trouble and will require an increased establishment. It will also lead to very great inquisition and will require constant and careful supervision to guard against laxity on the one hand, and delays and annoyance on the other. When it is considered that at present dutiable goods only pay a tax to Government, it is clear that the determination to charge all goods must of necessity cause very greatly increased work to the establishment and probably delay to the merchants.

12. I leave out of question the proposal in Mr. Macfadyen's Memorandum to charge a differential tax per package. This is, I think, impracticable, and would be very unequal in its incidence. The proposal to collect the tax on the weight, besides being very difficult to carry out, would fall unequally on the different des-

criptions of merchandize; a ton of piece goods paying no more than a ton of iron, while it would necessitate everything being brought into the Custom-house to be weighed.

13. It appears to me that whether we obtain the money we require by a tax on the shipping and goods, or on the goods alone, the consignees will eventually pay, either directly on the goods, or partly directly on them and partly in increased freight, and I believe, therefore, that it will be immaterial to them how the amount is collected, and that if we obtain a revenue from the shipping alone, the consignees will pay no more in increased freight than they would pay in two ways, by the tax being levied on both shipping and goods.

14. If it is determined to levy a tax on goods, the only manner in which such a tax could be collected would be by an *ad valorem* fee, and I would recommend the adoption of that method, but only if it is determined that goods must be taxed. According to last year's returns, a tax of ½ per cent. on all goods excluding treasure would give us Rupees 4,16,507, or more than Rupees 50,000 in excess of the amount required, while a similar tax on treasure as well, would result in a further excess of Rupees 55,321.

15. I beg, however, to recommend that no tax whatever be imposed on goods, and that we should obtain the money we require by a tax on the shipping alone, and I more especially recommend this course, as I think it will be seen that the amount can be obtained by a not very heavy rate of port dues. There will be no difficulty in the collection of such a tax, as the ship will pay it as soon as she enters the Harbour.

16. I calculate that taking the returns for last year as a basis, and I see no reason why we should consider them liable to any great reduction in future years, we should obtain the following result:—

	Tons.		Rs.	A.	P.
Foreign Steamers ...	223,596 at 1 Rupee per ton ...		2,23,596	0	0
Coasting do. ...	62,518 at 4 Annas ,, ...		15,637	0	0
Ships	106,638 at 1 Rupee ,, ...		1,06,638	0	0
Native Craft	53,726 at 4 Annas ,, ...		13,431	0	0
		Total...	3,59,302	0	0

or only Rupees 700 less than the amount the Government require.

17. The present collection of port dues at Madras is as follows:—

	Tons.		Rs.	A.	P.
Foreign Steamers ...	223,596 at 3 Annas		24,512	6	11
Coasting do. ...	62,518 at 4½ Annas		850	3	6
Ships	106,638 at 3 Annas and 1½ Annas..		18,870	12	0
Native Crafts	53,726 at 1½ Annas		4,309	11	6
		Total...	48,542	4	11

and as we shall still require that amount to meet the present expenditure on the port, we must add the rates now paid to the special Harbour rates I have proposed above. The only alteration I would make would be in the rate paid by the coasting steamers. It will be observed that at present this class of steamers pays an

altogether disproportionate amount of Port dues at Madras, amounting only to about 2 pice per ton per annum. This is owing to the present arrangement of grouping ports, by which (Section 5, Act VII. of 1867) coasting steamers pay at only one port in the group, and they do that naturally at the ports of entry; for the Coromandel coast, Gopaulpore, or Tuticorin, where the rates of port dues are less than at Madras. For the future I would recommend that the rate for coasting steamers be assimilated to that charged on native craft or 1½ Annas per ton. This would bring the total rate on steamers of this class to 5½ Annas per ton which is not, I think, excessive.

Gopaulpore, 2 Annas per ton.
Tuticorin, 3 Annas per ton.
Madras, 4 Annas 6 Pice per ton.

18. The result of this proposal, if adopted, will be as follows:—

	Tons.		Rs.	A.	P.
Foreign Steamers ...	223,596, at Rupees 1-3-0 per ton ...		2,65,520	4	0
Coasting do. ...	62,518, at Annas 5-6 do. ...		21,500	14	0
Ships	106,638, at Rupees 1-3-0 do. ...		1,26,632	10	0
Native Crafts ...	53,726, at Annas 5-6 do. ...		18,468	5	0
		Total...	4,32,122	1	0

which will leave a small margin of extra revenue for any unforeseen expenses.

19. It will I think be necessary, if my proposals are adopted, to take Madras out of the Coromandel group and make it a port by itself, so that all vessels entering would have to pay.

20. I beg to forward, for the Board's information, a letter (in original) just received from the Master Attendant in reply to my reference. The Board will observe that he holds the same opinion that I do, viz., that the best method of raising a harbour revenue would be by increased port dues, leaving the question of the apportionment of the extra charges to be settled by shipowners, shippers and consignees themselves.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From H. D. E. DALRYMPLE, Esq., Master Attendant, Administrative Department, to A. McC. WEBSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of Sea Customs, dated Madras, 22nd January 1874, No. 427.

WITH reference to your letter, dated 20th January 1874, No. 77, and the papers specified in the margin, I have the honour to observe that I consider this question under discussion as a financial one, which could be most satisfactorily disposed of by the Board of Revenue and Chamber of Commerce.

Statement of Import Tonnage for 1873-73.
Do. of value of Imports and Exports for 1872-73.
Memorandum showing the rates of Port dues chargeable to vessels.

2. My opinion is this—

To simplify matters, I would charge extra Port dues on all ships entering the harbour, and I have no doubt the shipowners, shippers and consignees would arrange among themselves how the extra charges should be apportioned.

3. I can offer no opinion on the probable income derived from the extra charges upon the trade and shipping of the port.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

Imports from Free Ports, 1872-73.

—	Number.	Probable weight.	Probable contents.
		TONS.	
Bags	3,71,540	27,865½	Principally Grain.
Bales	18,059	4,603½	Gunnies and Piece Goods.
Cases	12,207	1,829	Piece Goods and Liquors of sorts.
Packages	2,12,142	17,583	Unknown.
Cask, Hhds. and Pipe...	456	106½	Beer and Brandy, etc.
Buffaloe Horns	25,984	23	
Timber...	3,52,930	...	
Iron, Spelter, Copper and Metal Ware, etc.	23,824	761½	

Imports from Foreign Ports.

—	Number.	Probable weight.	Probable contents.
		TONS.	
Cases	1,09,355	18,502½	Piece Goods.
Bales	43,852	8,629	Do.
Packages	52,089	3,927½	Unknown.
Cask, Hhds. and Pipe...	28,041	6,470	Beer, etc.
Bags	2,466	185	Grain, etc.
Iron, Spelter and Copper, etc.	2,38,124	8,726	
Coal	...	24,371	
Palmyra	1,50,593	...	
Cocoanuts	1,63,930	...	
Chanks...	5,12,000	...	

MADRAS,
24th January 1874.

(Signed) A. McC. WEBSTER,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

Exports 1872-73.

—	Number.	Probable weight.	Probable contents.
		TONS.	
Bags	4,98,690	33,429	Grain, Coffee, Sugar, Seeds, etc.
Bales	1,29,146	29,121	Cotton, Hides, Skins, Twist, Piece Goods, etc.
Packages	1,24,462	7,346	Different sorts.
Chests	18,118	1,166	Indigo.
Metals...	48,031	1,205	Brass, Copper, Iron, etc.
Buffaloe Horns	4,03,224	260	
Casks, Barrels, Hhds...	23,062	814	Beer, Brandy, Oil, etc.

MADRAS,
24th January 1874.

(Signed) A. McC. WEBSTER,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 4.

Import Tonnage and Collection of Port dues for 1872-73.

—	Vessels.	Tons.	Port dues. Rs.	A.	P.
Foreign Steamers	158	2,23,596	21,512	6	11
Coasting Steamers	69	62,548	850	3	6
Vessels	148	1,06,638	18,870	12	0
Dhonies or Native Crafts...	443	53,726	4,308	11	6
Total...	818	4,46,508	48,542	1	11

(Signed) A. McC. WEBSTER,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 5.

Statement showing the total value of Imports and Exports of Merchandize for the year 1872-73.

IMPORTS.

Year.	Value of Merchandize. Rs.	Value of Treasure. Rs.
1872-73... ...	4,77,94,202	57,11,894

EXPORTS.

Year.	Value of Merchandize. Rs.	Value of Treasure. Rs.
1872-73... ...	3,55,07,352	53,52,831

(Signed) A. McC. WEBSTER,
Acting Collector.

ENCLOSURE No. 6.

Memorandum shewing the rates of Port-dues.

	A.	P.	
Coasting Steamer	4	6	once in 30 days in the same group.
Other Steamers	3	0	do. 90 do. do.
Ships Foreign	3	0	do. 90 do. do.
Ships Coasting	1	6	do. 90 do. do.
Dhonies	1	6	do. 60 do. do.

(Signed) A. McC. WEBSTER,
Acting Collector.

SUBMITTED to Government with reference to G. O., 4th December 1873, No. 2,925.

2. The statistics furnished by the Collector of Sea Customs show that there need be no apprehension whatever about providing for the interest and working fund on the loan which is to be raised for making the harbour. There is some doubt as to how the money should be collected but there is none as to the facility with which £36,000 or even more can be obtained.

3. Authorities differ as to whether the sum should be raised by a tonnage on ships entering the harbour, or a charge on goods landed, and if the latter whether the charge should be fixed by weight, by package or *ad valorem*.

4. The Board are disposed to agree with the Collector of Sea Customs that the sum should be raised entirely by increasing Port dues. Any other method of raising it would necessitate an enormous increase of accommodation at the Customs House and of the establishment employed there. The chief objection to this method is that it will press heavily on the calling trade. If a steamer of 1,000 tons calling to land 100 tons of cargo is charged the same as a steamer of the same size which lands its whole cargo and loads again before leaving the harbour the calling trade will die out. It will probably be possible to avoid this and other similar objections by a sliding scale, but the Board will reserve their views on this point until the Chamber of Commerce have reported.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) J. GROSE,
Secretary.

TRANSFERRED to the Public Works Department, with reference to G. O., 4th December 1873, No. 2,925.

(Signed) D. F. CARMICHAEL,
Secretary to Government, R.D.

27th January 1874.

No. 266. Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 30th March 1874, No. 718:—

Read the following letter from A. McG. WEBSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of Sea Customs, to J. GROSE, Esq., Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Madras, 3rd March 1874, No. 219.

I HAVE the honour to forward the reply of the Chamber of Commerce to my letter to them regarding the means of raising a revenue from the proposed Harbour at Madras.

2. The Board will observe that the Chamber consider my rates too high, and are of opinion that they would, if sanctioned, operate to restrict the calling trade of the port. They propose a tax of 8 Annas per ton on steamers and ships, and of 4 Annas per ton on coasting steamers and native crafts. The amount of

revenue at these rates they estimate roughly at £20,000, leaving £16,000 to be raised by other means.

3. As regards the means of raising the balance of revenue, the Chamber do not give any definite opinion, and though apparently inclining to an *ad valorem* duty on goods, would defer making any proposal until they have ascertained the practice obtaining at other ports.

4. They are, moreover, of opinion that, considering the advantages the Government will derive from the harbour, some portion of the cost of its maintenance should be contributed by Imperial funds.

5. They further state their opinion that, when the harbour is completed, it will not be necessary to provide such a large sum as is now collected for the Port Fund, as they apprehend that the present Marine establishment will be capable of reduction.

6. If the proposal to levy a single tax on the shipping will have the effect anticipated by the Chamber of reducing the calling trade, it must be abandoned; for I fully concur with them that any measure calculated to bring about such a result cannot be too strongly deprecated.

7. The Chamber do not give any opinion on the question to which their attention was drawn, of charging ships according to a sliding scale. This would probably be a difficult matter to arrange; for it would either take the shape of a tax on the number of tons of cargo discharged or shipped, or of a tax for each day the ship remained in harbour, rising to the maximum recommended by me. The former is objectionable as involving weighment. The latter, though not open to that objection, I would not recommend, as we should, if we adopted it, be working in the dark. We could not possibly estimate the receipts of harbour dues in such a case, and we might at any time, and probably would, find our calculations upset by greater activity in shipping and unloading.

8. In the event of the proposal to charge a single rate on the shipping being abandoned—and I fear this must be given up—we shall be obliged to charge a tax on the goods as well. For the present, I will accept the Chamber's opinion that no more than £20,000 can be expected from the shipping. We shall require therefore to collect £16,000, or as much more in moderation as we can get from the goods. I say as much more as we can get, for there are sure to be many extra charges, which will be found necessary when the harbour is completed.

9. I cannot sufficiently insist on the great difficulty and disadvantages of collecting a tax on goods either by weighment or appraisement. I have but little to add to my remarks on this subject in my letter to the Board of the 27th January, except as regards the proposal to charge an *ad valorem* tax. I recommended the imposition of such a tax as being fairer and more equal in its incidence than a tax on the weight of goods, or number of packages; and if Government are prepared to entertain a large additional establishment, and to greatly increase the warehousing capacity of the Custom-House, we should be able to collect the tax,

The Board are aware that at present we accept the valuation of free goods as given by the merchants, and that such goods are not appraised. They are not brought to the Custom-house, but are passed and shipped directly from the beach. If all such goods are to be charged with an *ad valorem* duty, we shall have to appraise them, and it will consequently be necessary to bring them into the Custom-house. It is not to be expected therefore that we could collect an *ad valorem* tax with our present establishment; and as Government will doubtless object to increase it, and to practically support a large number of officials at the expense of the trade of the port, I am afraid that this, the fairest method of collecting a revenue, must be abandoned.

10. The other proposal is to charge a tax on the weight of goods. We cannot, however, obtain the weight of goods by actual weighment, for this would at present necessitate nearly the same establishment and warehouse room as the collection of an *ad valorem* tax. We must therefore look for some means of ascertaining the weight of goods, which, without being absolutely correct, will be sufficiently accurate for all practical purposes, and will at the same time be capable of easy regulation.

11. The only method that appears to me to be at all practicable with our present, or with a very slightly increased establishment, is to collect a tax on the boat-load. The carrying capacity of all registered boats is known and is entered in the license, while the quantity of each class of goods that is estimated to make up a boat-load is specified in the Schedule* annexed to Government Notification, Marine Department, dated 14th October 1873. We have thus a tolerably accurate means of collecting a tax on the weight of goods.

* Enclosure No. 1.

12. Regarding the establishment and supervision necessary for collecting such a tax, I do not anticipate that any considerable increase in our present staff will be necessary. We shall not be able to dispense with the services of the Marine Police, and until the foreshore is reclaimed, a quay constructed, and the land side of the latter enclosed with a wall, we shall be obliged to continue the present practice of attaching a Police peon to every boat engaged in shipping or unloading cargo. These peons will help to check any breach of the rules as to the quantity of cargo allowed per boat, and as the number of boats loading and unloading at any one time is never very great, our present staff of Customs Peons ought to be sufficient to prevent any over-loading.

13. It would, of course, be necessary to provide for the boat owners being liable to heavy penalties for any breach of the rules as to the quantity of cargo to be carried, and for reward to be paid to informers, for there is no doubt that when a tax per trip is charged on the boat, it will be the shipper's interest to make the boats carry as heavy a load as possible, and in a close harbour, the encouragement to do so will be greater, as such over-loading will not be so dangerous as in an open roadstead.

14. The charge for the Marine Police employed on the boats is at present collected in the Marine Police Office. A Register of the number of trips made by each boat is kept in the office, checks are established, and the charges are collected monthly from the boat owners. The boat-trip tax might be collected as the Police charges, only more frequently, or what would be better (as the Port Trustees would probably have to collect the harbour tax) a special but small establishment might be entertained for collecting the tax and registering the trips, the arrangements for checking remaining the same. An additional check would in this case be provided by the double register. This is, however, a matter of detail that does not at present call for any definite settlement. It is sufficient to observe that the cost of collection will not be excessive.

15. I will now proceed to submit an estimate of the revenue that we may look for from this source. I have had a Return* prepared from the accounts of the Marine Police Office showing the number of trips made to and from the shore for the last five years by Masulah boats and by the large boats brought into use since the construction of the Pier. From this Return I estimate the tonnage of goods to be as follows:—

* Enclosure No. 2.

Note.—A Masulah boat-load is 2 tons—a large boat-load ranges from 12 to 14½ tons—the average carrying capacity for the five years being 13 tons.

	Trips.	Tons.	Tons.
1869.			
Masulah boats to Beach	144,419	× 2	= 288,838
Do. to Pier	1,037	× 2	= 2,074
Large boats	183	× 14½	= 2,726
Total...			293,638
1870.			
Masulah boats to Beach	108,267	× 2	= 216,534
Do. to Pier	7,640	× 2	= 15,280
Large boats	2,569	× 14½	= 37,250
Total...			269,064
1871.			
Masulah boats to Beach	88,362	× 2	= 176,724
Do. to Pier	11,419	× 2	= 22,833
Large boats	4,090	× 13	= 53,170
Total...			252,733
1872.			
Masulah boats to Beach	104,165	× 2	= 208,330
Do. to Pier	1,783	× 2	= 3,566
Large boats	1,912	× 13	= 24,853
Total...			236,752

1873.

			Trips.	Tons.	Tons.
Masulah boats to Beach...	...	...	98,507	× 2 =	197,014
Do. to Pier ...	...	...	2,658	× 2 =	5,316
Large boats ...	...	...	2,075	× 12 =	24,900
				Total...	227,230

The above figures give an average annual tonnage of goods carried by boats of 255,883 tons.

16. I must observe, however, that according to the practice obtaining at present, a double charge for Policemen is imposed on those boats, which, taking a cargo from the shore, remain more than an hour alongside the ship. Some of these boats, of course, return empty, and the register of trips cannot therefore be accepted as showing the actual number of trips made by laden boats. I have, however, consulted with Mr. Pryce, the Superintendent of Marine Police, and that officer is of opinion that taking one day with another, not more than fifteen boats per diem are charged the double Police rate without having a double cargo. This for 365 days—fifty-two Sundays and three holidays—gives 310 × 15 = 4,650 boat-trips per annum, or about 4 per cent. on the average number of trips for the last five years, viz., 115,818. The Masulah boats, moreover, are only allowed to carry 1½ tons of dead-weight, and the large boats in proportion, so it will be necessary to correct the above average for the dead-weight tonnage as well as for the percentage of trips made by empty boats. On a rough estimate about 10 per cent. of the trade of the port may be classed as dead-weight. We may therefore estimate the actual tonnage as follows :—

	Tons.
Average for five years	255,883
Deduct 14 per cent. or 10 per cent. for dead-weight correction and 4 per cent. for empty trips	35,823
Net average tonnage...	220,060

A harbour tax of 12 Annas a ton on this amount would yield Rupees 1,65,045, or rather over the £16,000 required. This sum would amount to about one-sixth per cent. on the value of the trade including treasure.

17. I may here observe that my estimate of tonnage, prepared from the number of trips made by the boats, very nearly approximates to that given in my letter of the 24th January, which was prepared from the Custom House Returns of the trade. The Custom House Return being prepared for the official year 1872-73, I have, in making the comparison, taken the average tonnage for the calendar years 1872 and 1873 :—

		Tons.
Tonnage from Custom House Returns excluding timber and Railway materials...	231,092	203,625
Estimate of average tonnage for 1872 and 1873		
Deduct 14 per cent. or 10 per cent. for dead-weight, and 4 per cent. for trips when empty...	32,478	
		199,514

It cannot be expected that such estimates when not based on actual measurement can be very accurate. We can only approximate, but the comparison I have made will show the Board that we cannot be very far wrong in our estimate. If

we err at all, it is on the safe side. It is to be remarked that the Breakwater Committee estimated the tonnage at 382,000 tons.

18. With the tax I have proposed, the cost per trip of each class of boat would be as follows. I take the estimate of the Breakwater Committee of the probable future rates, with an alteration as to the pier dues and to the carrying capacity according to the schedule.

Masulah Boat—Load 2 Tons.

	Pier. Rs.	A.	P.	Beach. Rs.	A.	P.
Boat hire	2	0	0	2	8	0
Pier charge	0	8	0	...	...	...
Tarpaulin	0	4	0	0	4	0
Peon charge	0	3	0	0	3	0
Harbour dues, at 12 Annas per ton per trip	1	8	0	1	8	0
Total cost per trip...	4	7	0	4	7	0

Equal to, at 2 tons per boat, 10 per cent., correction for dead-weight Rupees 2-7-5 per ton. Increase over Committee's estimate of present rates 7 Annas 5 Pies per ton.

Large Boats—Load 13 Tons.

	Rs.	A.	P.
At Committee's rate per trip	2	8	0
Cost of Crew	3	8	0
Pier charges, 13 tons, at 4 Annas	3	4	0
Peon charge	0	3	0
Harbour dues, at 12 Annas per ton per trip	9	12	0
Total cost per trip...	19	3	0

Equal to, at 13 tons per boat 10 per cent., correction for dead-weight Rupees 1-10-3 per ton. Increase over Committee's estimate of present rate by large boat 9 Pies per ton.

19. In reality the increase would be converted into a decrease, if a perfectly accurate comparison were made. The Committee estimate the carrying capacity of a large boat at 16 tons, and charge pier dues at 3 Annas per 1½ tons. In reality, the carrying capacity averages 13 tons, while the pier charges must be estimated at 8 Annas per 2 tons or Masulah boat load. Instead, therefore, of the actual cost per ton being Rupees 1-9-6, it would come to Rupees 1-12-10. To be on the safe side, however, I will accept the Committee's rates per ton.

20. The actual cost per trip may appear large, when it is considered that in most cases the boats will have to go very short distances; but I have no doubt that once the harbour is completed the rates of hire of Masulah boats, if those boats do not disappear altogether, will be very materially lowered, while the number of large boats will increase. It must also be borne in mind that the cost is increased by the addition of the harbour dues.

21. Mr. Parkes, in paragraphs 35 to 38 of his report, discusses the source from which a revenue can be derived, and is of opinion that the actual saving to

the trade would amount to £27,500. In estimating the present cost of shipping goods, he has under-stated the cost at Madras according to the present schedule, which was prepared since his report was submitted. I have prepared a comparative statement* based on the table given in paragraph 26 of his report, which shows the cost of shipping a certain quantity of goods according to present rates, to his rates, and to my proposed rates. This is, however, all in favour of his argument, in paragraph 37, and will go to increase the amount of saving anticipated. I do not think, however, that the saving will come up to his estimate, as his tonnage statement exceeds mine very considerably. That there will be a great saving is indisputable, for, in a close harbour, the Masulah boat will give place to the lighter. The rates by the latter class of boat I have estimated in the 1st paragraph to be only 9 pies per ton, more than the present rates as estimated by the Breakwater Committee. It is, however, difficult, if not impossible, at this time to estimate what will be the actual saving under this particular head, but I think it will be generally admitted that taking into consideration the certain reduction in shipping charges, in insurance, and in demurrage, the increased harbour dues will cost the trade, if anything, but a very small sum per ton. The increase may be roughly estimated at ships 8 annas + goods 12 annas = Rupees 1-4-0 per ton, and that amount will probably be covered by the savings above alluded to.

* Enclosure No. 3.

22. Under present Regulations, boats are allowed to carry 50 per cent. additional cargo in fine weather—*vide* G. O., Marine Department, 14th October 1873. The Deputy Master Attendant informs me that he has had but few applications for permission to do so since the Government Order was issued. In a close harbour, however, the boats would carry this additional load as a rule, but as their doing so will introduce an element of uncertainty in our estimate and collections, the permission should be withheld. If the merchants wish to load their boats more heavily, they would of course be allowed to do so on their agreeing to have their boats registered at the increased carrying capacity, but as long as a boat is registered at a certain capacity, no departure from the proportionate cargo allowed by the schedule to be carried, should be permitted.

23. With reference to the Chamber's remarks in the last paragraph of their Chairman's letter as to the probability of the Marine Department being capable of considerable reduction when the harbour is completed, and to the possibility therefore of a decrease in the present rates of the Port Fund, I beg to observe that such a reduction will probably be practicable. The new rate of Port Fund can be charged either on the shipping by an addition to the rates proposed by the Chamber, or partly on the shipping, and partly on the goods, by an increase to the tonnage rate of 12 Annas. One great advantage in the method I have proposed is that the tax can be so easily regulated; if we find we obtain more money than we require, the rates can be lowered. In the other case they can be increased.

24. In conclusion, I beg to observe that as there seems to be no doubt as to the financial success of the harbour, the question of the best method of collecting a revenue is one that does not appear to press for an early decision. There will be ample time to mature a scheme before the harbour is ready to receive ships.

SCHEDULE A.

ARTICLES COMPOSING A MASULAH BOAT LOAD.

I.—Goods taken by weight or measurement.

These Articles are computed at 2 tons to a boat load, either for shipment or landing.

Articles.	Packages.	Fair weather.	Remarks.
All articles contained in cases or boxes.	.....	100 cubic feet measurement.	
Almonds	Bundles	10	Large.
	Do.	20	Small.
Aniseed	Bundles	20	
Beer	Hogsheads	6	
Do.	Barrels	12	4 Dozen quarts, each,
Do.	Do.	12	6 Do. pints, each.
Benjamin	Bundles	60	
Do.	Cases	12	
Biscuits	Bags	30	
Boat Oars	No.	100	
Butts (containing liquors)	Do.	3	
Beef	Tierces	8	
Canvas	Bales	4	
Crackers from China ...	Boxes	12	
Carpets	Bales	4	
Cutch	Bags	25	
Carriages	No.	1	
Camphor	Tubs	8	
Do.	Boxes	12	
Cotton	Bales	10	Between 300 and 400 lbs. each.
Do., loose	Bags	16	
Coriander seeds ...	Bundles	20	
Cotton seeds	Bags	15	
Champagne	Cases	100 cubic feet.	
Codjoor Nuts	Bundles	12	
Cocoanuts	With husk	1,000	
Do.	Without husk	1,500	
Coprah	Bags	25	
Cheacoy	Bundles	20	
Chillies	Bags	20	
	Bundles	10	
Cloth, country ...	Bales	6	
Coffee	.....	1¼ Tons.	Of 18 cwt. both in cases or bags.
Cinnamon	Cases	15	
Coir	Large bundles ...	30	
Do.	Small do.	60	
Cloves	Bundles	20	Small.
	Do.	15	Large.
Cheya root	Do.	6	Large.
	Do.	8	Small.
Cochineal	Bales	12	
Cow tails	Bundles	10	
Dates	Do.	20	
Drugs	Do.	10	
Do.	Bags	16	
Eating leaves	Bundles	40	
Flour	Bags	20	164 lbs. each dead weight.
	Sacks	15	220 lbs. do.
Do.	Barrels	10	Measurement.
Fish, salted	Bundles	20	
Grain	Bags	25	
Gunny	Bales	6	Say 1¼ Tons weight of 20 cwt.

Articles.	Packages.	Fair weather.	Remarks.
Gunny	Bundles	8	
Gun-powder	Barrels	30	100 lbs. each.
Gallingall	Bundles	20	
Gin, Holland	Cases	30	15 flasks to each.
Ginger	Bags	25	
Gun Carriage ...	No.	1	Complete.
Glue	Bags	16	
Do.	Cases	8	
Glassware	Hogsheads	3	
Do.	Crates	4	
Hay	Trusses	10	
Hemp	Bales	10	
Hemp rope	.....	2 Tons.	
Horns	No.	1,500	20 cwt. to a ton.
Hides	Bales	8	
Do.	Bundles	6	
Hides, green	Bags	20	
Handkerchief's, country.	Trunks	12	
Ham	No.	125	
Indigo	Chests	10	
	Half chests	15	
Jaggery	Bundles	20	
Do.	Bags	25	
Jute	Bales	10	
Leaguers	No.	3	
Liquors	Cases	50	1 Dozen.
		25	2 do.
		20	3 do.
		15	4 do.
Myrabolums	Bags	25	
Do.	Half bags	50	
Do.	Packets	100	
Nuts	Bags	25	
Nutmeg	Do.	20	
Onions	Baskets	30	
Oil	Tins	30	15 Gallons in each tin, 210 gallons to a ton.
Palanquin	No.	1	
Piece Goods	Bales or cases	2 Tons	Of 50 cubic feet.
Pumpkins	No.	100	Large.
Do.	Do.	250	Small.
Puncheons (containing liquor.)	Do.	4	
Pipes do do.			
Do. do. do.	Do.	3	
Potatoes	Half	6	
Piano forte	Baskets	30	
Potatoes	No.	1	
Planks of sorts ...	Bags	20	
Pork	2 Tons	100 cubic feet.	
Plums	Barrels	10	
Pepper	Bundles	20	
Poonack	Do.	20	
Roots	Bags	20	
Do.	Do.	20	
Rattans	Bundles	8	
Reapers	Do.	250	
Rice	No.	60	
Skins	Bags	25	
Do.	Do.	10	
Sharks' fins	Bales	5	
Soap-nuts	Bundles	3	
	Bags	25	

Articles.	Packages.	Fair weather.	Remarks.
Spices of all sorts ...	Bundles	10	Large.
Do.	Do.	20	Small.
Staves	Packs	25	
Sulphur	Bundles	15	
Do.	Barrels	10	
Stick lac	Do.	12	
Do.	Bundles	25	
Do.	Cases	12	
Sugar	Bags	25	
Do.	½ Bags	40	
Do.	Casks	4	
Sugar-candy	Do.	12	
Do.	Tubs	25	
Do.	½ Tubs	50	
Silk	Bundles	10	
Tents	Sets	6	
Tamarind	Bundles	15	
Turmeric	.....	1¼ Tons	Weight.
Tobacco	Bundles	15	
Tea	Chests	25	
Twine, country ...	Bundles	25	
Water	Casks	4	250 Gallons to a ton.

II.—*Dead Weight.*

Computed at 1½ ton to a boat-load.

Ammunition, Snider ...	Boxes	50	
Arm chest	No.	8	
Anchor	No.	1	
Asphalte	Casks	10	
Blackwood	Logs	1¼ ton.	
Cements	Cases	10	
Coals	.....	1½ ton.	
Copper	Cases	3	
Do.	¼ Do.	6	
Guns, Iron or Brass ...	3 Pounders	3	
Do.	4 or 6 Pounders ...	2	
Do.	9 Pounders	1	
Gold lace	Cases	30	
Japan	Chests	10	
Lead sheets	Rolls	4	
Metals of all kinds ...	Packages	1½ ton.	
Nails	Do.	1½ do.	
Paints	Do.	1½ do.	
Pitch	Barrels	10	
Powders of sorts, country.	Bundles	15	
Quicksilver	Packages	1½ ton.	
Red lead	Do.	1½ do.	
Red wood	Pieces	2 do.	
Salt	Bags	25	
Saltpetre	Do.	25	
Steel	Tubs	20	
Shells	13 inches	20	
Do.	10 or 8 inches ...	100	
Do.	5½ do.	150	
Do.	4½ do.	300	
Do.	24 Pounders	150	
Shot	18 do.	200	
Do.	12 do.	300	
Do.	9 do.	400	
Do.	6 do.	500	
Do.			
Treasure. Gold ...	.....	1 ton.	Weight.
Silver ...			
Copper ...			

Articles.	Packages.	Fair weather.	Remarks.
Tar	Barrels...	10	
Tin	Packages	1½ ton.	
Zinc	Cases	3	
Do.	½ do.	6	
	III.—Miscellaneous Articles.		
Bullocks	No.	2	
Cow and calf	No.	1	
Firewood. Ramisapatam ...	No.	500	Large.
Do. ...	No.	1,000	Small.
Cundarungum ...	No.	600	
Checurucottah ...	No.	2,000	
Alumbaray ...	No.	2,000	
Kistnapatam ...	No.	1,000	
Alepanum ...	No.	150	
Cuddalore ...	No.	1,500	
Acheedandoa ...	No.	2,000	
Rangoon	No.	2,000	
Ghee and oil	Dubbers	25	
Horse	No.	1	
Linseed oil, country ...	Jars	20	
Loose oakum	Bundles	.....	Whatever quantity can be stowed conveniently.
Peeul weights of all kinds.	Peeuls	30	
Pigs	No.	15	
Ponies...	Do.	2	
Poultry	Baskets...	.....	Any quantity that can be stowed conveniently.
Sand ballast	Tons	2	
Seed, cocoanuts ...	No.	200	
Sheep	Do.	30	
Lower standards ...	Do.	50	
Middle do. ...	Do..	60	
Upper do. ...	Do.	70	
Sockets	Do.	30	Telegraph Stores.
Cross feet	Do.	250	
Wire	Bundles	35	
Tarpaulins	No.	30	

N.B.—During foul weather or rough surf, 25 per cent. less to be carried in cases of all articles mentioned in this Schedule: And, *when working to or from the Pier*, during fine weather and smooth sea, an addition of 50 per cent. may be carried with permission from the Master Attendant.

NUMBER OF ADULT PASSENGERS COMPOSING A MASULAH BOAT-LOAD.

Europeans ... ... 12 persons.
Natives ... ... 15 do.

N.B.—Two children to be considered equal to one adult.

GOODS.—Large Pier Boats shall carry the ascertained practicable quantity of goods according to their size and measurement, as expressed in the licenses granted under Act IV. of 1842, Section 2, the tonnage being calculated on the same scale as fixed above for Masulah Boats.

PASSENGERS.—Passengers are not to be carried in the Pier Boats excepting in cases of emergency, and then only in the proportion of one adult to a ton.

SCHEDULE B.

Maximum rate of Boat and Catamaran Hire.

Accommodation Boat.

	Rs.	A.	P.
Ordinary trip	3	8	0
Trip beyond 9 fathoms...	5	0	0
Do. in foul weather	6	0	0
Transshipment	1	0	0

—	To Vessels in 4 fathoms or upwards.	To Native Craft under 4 fathoms.	—
Common Boats.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	
Ordinary trip*	2 8 0	1 8 0	* 8 Annas less if proceeding to or from the Pier.
Trip beyond 9 fathoms*	3 8 0	.....	
Transshipment	1 8 0	1 8 0	
Trip in strong current or foul weather* ...	3 8 0	2 8 0	
Trip in strong current beyond 9 fathoms*	5 0 0	.....	
Ballast trip*	2 12 0	1 10 0	
Do. beyond 9 fathoms*	3 12 0	.....	
Water trip (from the beach)	3 8 0	2 8 0	
Do. beyond 9 fathoms	5 0 0	.....	

Large Pier Boats.

Ordinary trip	At the rate of Rupee 1 per ton.	
Trip beyond 9 fathoms	Additional Annas	0-8 do.
Transshipment	Do.	0-12 do.
Trip in strong current or foul weather	Rupees	1-8 do.
Do. beyond 9 fathoms	do.	2-4 do.
Water trip	do.	1-8 do.
Do. beyond 9 fathoms	do.	2-4 do.

Sundry Charges.

Coolies employed for weighing anchors, each man ... ... 1 Rupee.
For tarpaulin, each trip ... ... 4 Annas.
Hire of four casks to contain 500 gallons of water (2 tons)
for one trip ... ... 9 Annas 5 Pies.
For filling casks at the water's edge ... ... 9 Annas.

NOTE.—A Government charge of 2 Annas a ton for water is likewise levied.

If supplied from the Pier end.

	Rs.	A.	P.
Boat hire	2	8	0
Hire of four casks, at 3 Annas each	0	12	0
Water, 2 tons, at 8 Annas per ton	1	0	0
Total...	4	4	0

Small Catamarans.

Ordinary trip	0	8	0
Trip in foul weather or beyond 9 fathoms	1	0	0
Catamaran for rafting timber for one day	1	8	0

Large Catamarans.

			Rs.	A.	P.
Large Catamaran hire, ordinary size of 16 logs per trip	...	...	10	0	0
Do. Coolies per trip for each man	...	...	0	8	0
Do. large size of 22 logs per trip	...	...	15	0	0
Do. Coolies per trip for each man	...	...	0	8	0

The above rates to apply to boats working to and from the beach between Clive's Battery and Parry & Co.'s Office.

—	Accommodation. Boat.			Common Boat.			Catamaran.			Large Catamaran.		
Extra Hire.	Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.
Trips between 6 and 8 P.M.	1	12	0	0	12	0	0	2	6	...		
Do. do. 8 P.M. and 5 A.M.	3	8	0	1	8	0	0	5	0	...		
Do. do. Parry & Co.'s and Marine Villa.	1	8	0	1	8	0	0	5	0	...		
Do. do. Marine Villa and Adyar ...	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	8	0	...		
For every hour, or portion of an hour, beyond the first, a Boat or Catamaran is detained alongside, or on shore, night or day	1	8	0	1	8	0	0	5	0	...		
Detention for each hour	0	12	0	0	12	0	0	5	0	...		
For the coolies for every hour, each man ...	...			...			...			2	0	0
	...			...			...			0	2	0

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

From P. MACFADYEN, Esq., Chairman, Chamber of Commerce, to A. McC WEBSTER, Esq., Acting Collector of Sea Customs, dated Madras, 24th February 1874.

THE Chamber have had under their consideration your letters of the 19th and 20th January in which you submit a scheme for raising a revenue for the up-keep of the proposed harbour, and for the payment of interest on the capital expended on its construction.

2. The Chamber observe that you are strongly in favour of raising the whole of the required revenue from the shipping visiting the port. While the Chamber are entirely of your opinion that this method recommends itself for its simplicity, they cannot agree with you in urging its adoption on the Government. In considering this question of raising a harbour revenue, the Chamber do not doubt that you will agree with them in thinking that the main objects to be held in view are the welfare of the port, and the general extension of the trade of the Presidency, rather than the conveniences of or expenditure by a particular department of Government.

3. The Chamber do not of course imply that economical considerations should be ignored by the Customs' Department, but they think these considerations of little importance in comparison with the ultimate results which both the Government and the Mercantile community look for from the construction of a harbour at Madras. With regard, then, to your proposal that the whole of the harbour revenue should be raised entirely from the shipping, the chief question for consideration is, how such a scheme would affect the trade of the port? The Chamber, after careful inquiry, are unanimously of opinion that the scale of tonnage dues which you suggest would have an injurious effect, and perhaps defeat the very object for which the harbour is mainly intended. At present, as you are aware, the greater portion of the trade of the port is carried by steamers, none of which as yet regard Madras as a terminus or starting point for a

voyage, but merely as a port of call between Europe and Calcutta. It is obvious, therefore, that the large increase in tonnage dues proposed by you might have the effect of causing such steamers as do not now hesitate to make Madras a calling station, where they may land or ship even small quantities of cargo, to avoid the port altogether. The Chamber are very strongly of opinion that any measure calculated to bring about this result is to be deprecated both on local and imperial grounds. They have come to the conclusion, therefore, that it would be unwise to fix tonnage dues at the high limit named by you, viz., Rupees 1-3-0 per ton, on foreign steamers and ships, and 5 Annas 6 Pies per ton on coasting steamers and native craft. Looking at the altered conditions in the carrying trade between Europe and India brought about by the opening of the Suez Canal, and at the gradual diminution in the number of sailing ships, which have been in the habit of bringing full cargoes to, and taking full cargoes from, Madras, the Chamber are not prepared at present to recommend a higher duty than 8 Annas per ton on foreign steamers and ships, and 4 Annas per ton on coasting steamers and native craft. Accepting the tonnage returns furnished by you as a basis of calculation, it will be found that tonnage dues at the above rates would yield a revenue as follows :—

	Tons.			Rs.
Foreign steamers	223,596 at	8	Annas =	1,11,798
Ships	106,633 ,,	8	,, =	53,319
Coasting Steamers	62,518 ,,	4	,, =	15,637
Native Craft	53,726 ,,	4	,, =	13,431
			Total ...	1,94,185

4. Taking the amount in round numbers that might be levied from tonnage dues at the above rates at £20,000, there would remain a balance of £16,000 to be raised by other means to complete the sum of £36,000, which the Government estimate would be required for the annual interest on the cost of the harbour. The Chamber do not apprehend that there would be any serious difficulty in levying this balance of £16,000 by a small tax on the goods landed and shipped at the port. At this distance of time from the period when the harbour may be expected to be completed, the Chamber do not think it necessary to discuss in much detail whether the above amount could best be raised by means of a boat or tonnage tax, or by a small *ad valorem* duty on imports and exports; but they at present incline to the view that by adopting a few simple classifications of goods with some reference to their value, a practicable and inexpensive plan may be found for raising the required money. This is a subject, however, regarding which experience at other harbour-ports may be referred to, and the Chamber will not fail to communicate to you hereafter any further suggestions that may occur to them after ascertaining the results obtained at other ports where similar duties have to be levied.

5. In the foregoing remarks the Chamber have argued, as you also have done in the letters under reply, on the assumption that the sum of £33,000, required to pay interest on the harbour, might be raised entirely from the trade of the port. But whether it would be equitable or even politic to throw the whole burden of maintaining a harbour on the trade is a question to which the Chamber would ask the Government to give their most serious consideration. It has already been pointed out that while the Chamber freely acknowledge that the trade of the port should bear a fair share of the cost of a harbour, the many tangible advantages which the Government would derive from such a work, "whether as a refuge for ships in distress, as an anchorage for Men-of-war, as a secure port for landing at all times and seasons troops or military stores, or as a means of improving the defences of the port," constitute an undoubted claim for a portion of its cost being borne by Imperial funds. In this view of the question, which it is hoped will be accepted by the Government, it is doubtful whether it would be necessary to indent on the trade of the port for so large a sum as £36,000 per annum.

6. The Chamber observe that in your total of Rupees 4,32,122-1-0 which you propose to levy by tonnage dues alone, you include a sum of Rupees 48,542-4-11, the present amount of Port dues collected at Madras itself, and you remark that this amount will still be required "to meet the present expenditure of the port." The Chamber do not understand why, when a harbour has

been provided, it should be necessary to levy a port fund in addition to the ordinary harbour revenue; nor can they admit that it would be just or reasonable that funds raised specially for the benefit of a harbour at Madras should be liable to be expended on improvements or in support of Marine establishments at the out-ports. It will probably be thought desirable hereafter to reduce the present Marine establishment at this port and to modify the constitution of the department. The Chamber do not anticipate therefore that, with a harbour, it would be necessary to provide such a large sum as is now raised, viz., Rupees 48,542-4-11 for expenditure on the Marine establishment of the port.

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

Memorandum.

Years.	Number of trips made to and from the Beach by Masulah Boats.	Number of trips made to and from the Pier by Masulah Boats.	Number of trips made to and from the Pier by large Boats.	Total number of trips made.	Average tonnages of large Boats.
1869	144,119	1,037	188	145,644	14½
1870	108,267	7,640	2,569	118,476	14½
1871	88,362	11,419	4,090	103,871	13
1872	104,165	1,783	1,912	107,860	13
1873	98,567	2,658	2,075	103,240	12
Total...	543,720	24,537	10,834	579,091	67
Average for five years.	108,744	4,907	2,166	115,818	13½

MADRAS,
3rd March 1874.

(Signed) A. McC. WEBSTER,
Acting Collector.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
11th May 1874.

Articles.	Two tons load per Schedule.	Number of trips required for quantity.	Rate per trip.	Cost of quantity.	Cost by large boats of same quantity.	Present rate according to Mr. Parkes' estimate.	Difference between proposed rates and Mr. Parkes' rate.	Difference between proposed rates per Schedule and present rate per Schedule.	KURRACHEE. Harbour.	KURRACHEE. Roads.
			Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.	Rs. A. P.
Grain, per 160 bags ...	25 Bags ...	4	4 7 0	17 12 0	13 15 5	11 0 0	6 12 0	6 0 0	4 0 0	10 0 0
Beer ,, 100 hhds ...	6 Hhds ...	16⅔		73 15 4	57 8 6	45 12 0	28 3 4	25 0 0	15 0 0	25 0 0
Do ,, 100 barrels	12 Barrels	8⅓		36 15 8	28 12 3	22 14 8	14 1 0	12 8 0	10 0 0	20 0 0
Iron, per ton	1¼ Tons ...	1		2 15 4	2 3 10	1 14 0	1 1 4	1 0 0	0 12 0	... ...
Coal or coke, per ton ...	1¼ ,, ...	1		2 15 4	2 3 10	1 14 0	1 1 4	1 0 0	0 12 0	... ...
Oil, per 100 hhds. ...	6 Hhds ...	16⅔		73 15 4	57 8 6	45 12 0	28 3 4	25 0 0	12 0 0	20 0 0
Hides, per 100 bales...	8 Bales...	12½		55 7 6	43 2 4	34 6 0	21 1 6	20 12 0	20 0 0	40 0 0

ENCLOSURE No. 4.

Masula Boats.

(Signed) A. McC. WEBSTER,
Acting Collector.

MADRAS,
March 1874.

In their Proceedings of the 27th January 1874, No. 144, the Board submitted to Government certain statistics of the trade of the port of Madras and expressed an opinion that the £36,000 required for the new harbour (interest on outlay and working expenses) could best be raised by increasing the tonnage dues on vessels, a sliding scale being arranged so as to prevent the increase from pressing too heavily on the calling trade.

2. The Collector of Sea Customs now submits a letter on the subject from the Chamber of Commerce. Nothing is said by the Chamber as to the possibility of devising a sliding scale; but the Chamber of Commerce are of opinion that the collection of the whole of the £36,000 by tonnage-dues on vessels would prevent many ships from calling on their way to other ports to land or ship small quantities of cargo, and be destructive to the interests of the port. They recommend that only 8 Annas a ton should be charged on foreign steamers and ships and 4 Annas a ton on coasting steamers and native craft. This would produce about £20,000. The Chamber think that the rest of the necessary sum should be realized either by a tax on boat-loads, or a tonnage on goods landed and shipped, or an *ad valorem* tax on such goods as further inquiry may show to be most expedient; but they contend that a portion of the expense should be borne by Imperial funds.

3. On this last point the Board cannot agree with the Chamber. Government may fairly be called on to contribute port dues on Men-of-War and Government vessels using the harbour, and landing and shipping charges for troops and stores, but nothing more.

4. Assuming that £20,000 can be raised by tonnage dues on vessels, it remains to determine how the further £16,000 required for the new harbour fund, and the sum required for port expenditure now in existence which will be continued, are to be obtained.

5. The Port dues at Madras for the last five years have been—

	Rs.
1868-69	40,311
1869-70	37,515
1870-71	36,518
1871-72	43,977
1872-73	48,542

It may be possible eventually to reduce the Marine Department and other expenditure, but it will not be safe to assume that less than £40,000 will be wanted.

6. Thus £20,000 must be raised by charges on the landing and shipment of goods.

7. The fairest way in which this could be done is by levying rates on the weight or the value of the goods, but this could not be effected, at all events before the shore is made into a quay surrounded by a wall, without a vast increase of establishment, which, in its turn, would have to be paid for by increasing the dues.

8. Mr. Webster shows that it may be raised by a tax on boat-loads, without any but a very trifling increase in establishment. He estimates the net average of the tonnage annually chargeable at 220,000 tons, and without going minutely

into the figures, the Board will simply state that they are confident that this estimate is below the mark, and may be safely made the basis of calculation. It apparently leaves out of consideration boat-trips in cases where no Policeman accompanies the boats; as for instances, when machinery and timber are brought to shore in rafts, and passengers in boats. It may be safely calculated that the charge per ton need not be more than 14 Annas, and it would be collected on the registered capacity of each boat for each trip.

9. This would be a moderate and feasible charge, and would impose no additional burden on the trade, which will be freed by the new harbour from much of the charges now paid for landing and shipping in an open road-stead, as well as from a portion of the charges for insurance and demurrage. Moreover, it would be easy to modify the charge directly it might be found too light or unnecessarily heavy.

10. It must not be lost sight of, however, that the charge per trip in the case of the large boats which will be used in the harbour will be objectionably great, and the Board are of opinion that before the boat-tax is definitely fixed, arrangements should be made for obtaining information as to how such dues are collected in other ports, and for getting that information discussed by a Committee practically acquainted with the subject. By Section 43 of the Port Trust Bill, the scale of dues is to be fixed by the Port Trustees.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) J. GROSE,
Secretary.

No. 267. *Joint Report of the Chief Engineer and Inspecting Engineer for Ports and Harbours on Mr. Parkes' Estimate for an Enclosed Harbour at Madras.*

I.—Mr. Parkes' estimate for plant being based upon actual cost of £18,000 for one pier at Kurrachee, much of such plant being equally available for two piers, may be accepted without hesitation.

II.—Of the laterite rubble 310,250 tons, or nearly one-third the whole amount, are required for the two curved approaches, each 1,100 feet long, 10 feet high above low water mark, running through the surf into 2½ fathoms of water. For this section the harder and tougher the blocks of laterite are no doubt the better, as they will be greatly exposed to the action of surf while under construction, and their outer sides always. Blocks of the necessary weight and hardness will have to be selected; and there is no evidence from the existing state of the quarry ground at Umbatoor and Seetapett that sufficiently good material is available in adequate quantity at that site. Other and more distant quarries will not improbably have to be resorted to. Of the remaining rubble, 39,150 tons will be deposited at a depth of 2½ fathoms, and 691,420 tons at a depth of four fathoms below water level, at which depth it is liable to no disturbance, and laterite stone of ordinary quality may be used.

Presuming that a sufficiency of good stone is available within 12 miles, and knowing that the Madras Railway will lay down the necessary rails and deliver at 5 annas a ton for that distance, the rate of Rupees 1½ per ton ought to suffice for the expense of quarrying and depositing.

III.—There is no reason to anticipate any enhancement of the rate allowed for making and building up the concrete blocks, which is arrived at by Mr. Parkes from actual experience of several years' work at Kurrachee. Looking to details, the cost for building up in 4 fathoms seems low compared to the rate allowed for building up in 2½ fathoms; but it is the former that is laid down from Kurrachee experience, and the probability is that the latter will be found high.

IV.—Of the lighthouses no details are given.

V.—Contingencies are simply allowed for.

VI.—Mr. Parkes' details of superintendence, given in letter of 4th December, amount to £4,000 per annum, which for four years that the work is to last is only £16,000, or less by 50 per cent. than the sum set down.

30th January 1874.

(Signed) G. W. WALKER.
(„) W. T. FAREWELL.

No. 268. ORDER THEREON, 11th May 1871, No. 1,271.

CIVIL WORKS, No. 29.

ORDERED that the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue above read, and the joint Report of Colonels Walker and Farewell on Mr. Parkes' estimate for a close Harbour at Madras, be communicated to the Government of India with a letter setting forth the case in full detail, and requesting the grant of a loan to carry out Mr. Parkes' scheme if finally approved by the Home Government.

Ordered that the following letter be sent:—

(Here enter No. 1272, dated 11th May 1874.)

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Marine Department.
„ Master Attendant, Administrative Department.
„ Inspecting Engineer for Ports and Harbours.
„ Collector of Sea Customs.
„ Board of Revenue.
„ Revenue Department.
„ Chamber of Commerce.
To W. Parkes, Esq., C.E.

Fwd. S. T Austin.
Spare Copies. will follow

No 1537.

Revenue Department

Govt. of {1874} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

THE MARINE DEPARTMENT,

&c, &c., &c.

Dated May 11th.

Rcd. 16 Encl.

G. O., 11th May 1874, No. 1,271.

MAY

Nos. 265-268

Harbour.—Ordered that the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue and the joint Report of Colonels Walker and Farewell on Mr. Parkes' estimate for a close Harbour at Madras be forwarded to the Government of India.

No 130
Recorded

16 May 74