Archives I - 10,006—16-8 77.

(1) Number of pages 8

(2) Date of repair July 86.

(3) Initials of the Referencer

# TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

## GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Rev. DEPARTMENT

| | |
|---|---|
| G.O. No. 1469 | Press. |
| B.P. No. | Mis. |
| Dated 13.6.1878 | 197 . |

GP.

*Not to be folded or roughly handled*

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

---

29th May 1878, No. 201.

**Port Dues.**

Read the following papers:—

No. 69. *From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieutenant, R.N.R., Master Attendant, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 14th May* 1878.

I have the honor to submit the report of the Special Committee appointed under G.O., dated 26th March 1878, No. 192.

2. The Committee have requested me to ask that the Chamber of Commerce may be furnished with a copy of the report so soon as it has been printed.

---

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

*Report of the Special Committee appointed under G.O., Marine Department, dated 26th March* 1878, *No.* 192.

The circumstances which led to the appointment of this Committee will first be briefly recapitulated.

2. On the 30th November last the Master Attendant submitted to Government certain proposals with the view of placing the Port Funds in a position to meet all but very exceptional demands, and called for the opinion of the Chamber of Commerce and [illegible] by the information placed before them that the [illegible] increase was really required, but inclined to the opinion that the additional revenue said to be needed might best be obtained by enhancing the dues demanded of native shipping, and levying dues at ports which were now free. They proceeded however to suggest that the subject might well be considered by a Special Committee, and this suggestion being adopted, the present Committee were appointed in G.O., dated 26th March 1878, No. 192, "to inquire into and report on the proposal submitted to Government by the Master Attendant, Madras, in his letter, dated 30th November 1877, No. 8420, to raise the Port dues at all ports so as to place the Port Funds in a position to meet all but very exceptional demands."

3. The terms of the order of appointment, taken in conjunction with the expression of doubt by the Chamber of Commerce as to the actual necessity for any increase of dues, might be interpreted as authorizing the Committee to enter into a detailed examination of the nature of the demands now made upon the Port Fund; but they are inclined to believe that all that is really desired is that, assuming an increase of about Rupees 50,000 to be really necessary, they should consider the means by which such increase can be most easily and equitably arrived at. They will accordingly limit their recommendations to this point, merely premising, with reference to the first sentence of paragraph 3 of the Master Attendant's letter, that they do not consider it would be expedient to increase the burdens on shipping with the sole view of relieving Imperial Funds of charges which have hitherto been looked upon as no more than a fair equivalent for service rendered by the Port Fund Establishments. The Committee consider it necessary to say thus much to guard against it being supposed that they are prepared to recommend the adoption of any measures to raise Port Funds for other than strictly port purposes. The existing arrangement under which a portion of the cost of fixed establishments is debited to Imperial Revenues appears to them to be perfectly reasonable in principle and to call for no alteration.

4. In his letter to the Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce, dated 14th February, the Master Attendant mentioned four sources from which he considered funds might be obtained:—

1*st*.—A light due of three pies per ton wherever and whenever dues are collected.
2*nd*.—The levy of dues at some of the minor ports at which no dues are now collected.
3*rd*.—Raising the dues on native vessels from one-half to three-quarters.
4*th*.—Placing the Paumben Channel within the operation of the Act.

5. The adoption of the first and third of these proposals would involve legislative action, and as the Committee were of opinion that, unless some valid reason could be shown to the

contrary, the fiscal powers already possessed should be fully availed of before legislation is resorted to to increase them, they requested the Master Attendant to favor them with an estimate of the amount which could probably be raised by introducing Port dues of two annas per ton at forty-one minor ports at which no dues are now levied, and by raising the rates from two to three annas per ton at thirteen of the fourteen ports at which two annas per ton are now levied.

6. The Master Attendant's estimate amounts to about Rupees 46,000 and will be found in detail in Appendices B and C. From a variety of causes which need not be here detailed the estimates are necessarily somewhat rough,

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| From increased dues, Rupees | | 29,885 |
| „ new dues | „ | 16,323 |

but they may be accepted as being as nearly correct as any that could be framed from the data available. As almost all the vessels frequenting the ports in question fall within the category of coasting vessels only half dues will, as a rule, be levied under the provisions of Part III of the first Schedule to Act XII of 1875, and to prevent trade being unnaturally diverted to other ports now free, it will be necessary to bracket the eighty-four ports shown in Appendix D with some one or other of the ports in Appendix C as is now done in the case of Cocanada and Coringa, Negapatam and Nagore, Calicut and Beypore. It is understood that there is already official agency at all the ports in question by means of which the dues can be levied without any material increase to the charge for Port Establishments. The local authorities will be able to advise as to the arrangements for bracketing, and it may be necessary to come to some agreement with the French authorities at Karikal and Mahé to prevent a diversion of trade to these ports if the dues now levied there are lower than those now proposed. After this has been done there will be 146 duty-paying ports to a sea-board of about 1,500 miles or an average of one port to every 10·3 miles of sea-board. In Bombay there are seventy ports to about 500 miles of the sea-board or one port to every 7·1 miles of sea-board.

7. The Master Attendant's fourth proposal was that the Paumben Channel should be brought within the operation of the Act. As the Public Works expenditure is fluctuating it is impossible to say definitely what the financial effect of the arrangement will be, but the Committee observe that the dredging is now to be carried out by the *Albuquerque* which belongs to the Port Fund, and so far as they can judge from the information before them it seems to be desirable that the channel as well as the port should be brought within the operations of the General Port Fund of the Presidency.

8. To sum up, the recommendations of the Committee are—

1st.—That Port dues not exceeding two annas per ton be levied at the ports shown in Appendix C, with which should be bracketed the ports shown in Appendix D.

2nd.—That Port dues be raised from two to three annas per ton at thirteen ports as shown in Appendix B.

3rd.—That the Paumben Port and Channel be brought within the operation of the Indian Ports Act.

(Signed) J. H. TAYLOR.
„ C. A. AINSLIE.
„ E. JACKSON.
„ J. STURROCK.

MADRAS,
*14th May* 1878.

---

## APPENDIX A.

LIST of Ports at which Dues are now levied under Act XII of 1875.

EASTERN GROUP.

| Ports. | Rates of Port dues now levied. | Rates proposed to be levied in future. |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Ganjam | Annas 2 per ton. | Annas 3 per ton. |
| 2. Gopalpore | „ 2 „ | „ 3 „ |
| 3. Calingapatam | „ 2 „ | „ 3 „ |
| 4. Bimlipatam | „ 2 „ | „ 3 „ |
| 5. Vizagapatam | „ 2 „ | „ 3 „ |
| 6. Cocanada | „ 3 „ | „ 3 „ |
| 7. Coringa | „ 2 „ | „ 2 „ |
| 8. Masulipatam | „ 3 „ | „ 3 „ |
| 9. Madras | „ 2 „ | „ 3 „ |
| 10. Cuddalore | „ 2 „ | „ 3 „ |
| 11. Porto Novo | „ 2 „ | „ 3 „ |
| 12. Tranquebar | „ 2 „ | „ 3 „ |
| 13. Negapatam | „ 2 „ | „ 3 „ |
| 14. Nagore | „ 3 „ | „ 3 „ |
| 15. Tuticorin | „ 3 „ | „ 3 „ |



LIST of Ports at which Dues are now levied under Act XII of 1875—*continued.*

WESTERN GROUP.

| Ports. | Rates of Ports dues now levied. | Rates proposed to be levied in future. |
|---|---|---|
| 16. Cochin | Annas 3 per ton. | Annas 3 per ton. |
| 17. Calicut | „ 3 „ | „ 3 „ |
| 18. Beypore | „ 3 „ | „ 3 „ |
| 19. Tellicherry | „ 2 „ | „ 3 „ |
| 20. Cannanore | „ 2 „ | „ 3 „ |
| 21. Mangalore | „ 2 „ | „ 3 „ |

---

## APPENDIX B.

ESTIMATE of Amount to be raised by fixing the Port dues at Three Annas instead of Two Annas per Ton at the undermentioned Ports.

| Districts and Ports. | Amount. |
|---|---|
| | Rs. |
| 1. Gopaulpore | 3,418 |
| 2. Ganjam | 159 |
| 3. Calingapatam | 2,092 |
| 4. Bimlipatam | 4,532 |
| 5. Vizagapatam | 4,049 |
| 6. Cuddalore | 362 |
| 7. Porto Novo | 215 |
| 8. Tranquebar | 114 |
| 9. Negapatam | 3,155 |
| 10. Nagore | 116 |
| 11. Tellicherry | 2,818 |
| 12. Mangalore | 9,005 |
| Total | 29,885 |

---

## APPENDIX C.

ESTIMATE of the Amount that would be raised by levying Port-dues at Two Annas per Ton at each of the undermentioned Ports at which at present no Dues are levied.

| Districts. | Ports. | Amount. |
|---|---|---|
| | | Rs. |
| Ganjam | 1. Barwah | 725 |
| | 2. Poondy | 44 |
| Vizagapatam | 3. Pentakotta | 49 |
| | 4. Pudimadaka | 13 |
| Godavery | 5. Narsapur | 115 |
| Kistna | 6. Nizampatam | 179 |
| | 7. Kotapatam | 193 |
| | 8. Ipurpolliem | 1,424 |
| | 9. Mottapalli | 83 |
| Nellore | 10. Kottapatam | 413 |
| | 11. Isamokkala | 236 |
| | 12. Pakala | 57 |
| | 13. Kistnapatam | 92 |
| | 14. Iskapally | 13 |
| Tanjore | 15. Terumalavassel | 303 |
| | 16. Veelangani | 52 |
| | 17. Topputorai | 163 |
| | 18. Muttapetta | 330 |
| | 19. Adrampatam | 304 |
| | 20. Ammapatam | 62 |
| | 21. Kottaipatam | 39 |

ESTIMATE of the Amount that would be raised by levying Port dues at Two Annas per Ton at each of the undermentioned Ports at which at present no Dues are levied—*continued.*

| Districts. | Ports. | Amount. |
|---|---|---|
| | | Rs. |
| Madura .. .. | 22. Keelakarai .. .. .. .. .. | 973 |
| | 23. Devipatam .. .. .. .. .. | 2,142 |
| | 24. Tondi .. .. .. .. .. | 431 |
| | 25. Paumben .. .. .. .. .. | 3,660 |
| Tinnevelly .. .. | 26. Kolasegrapatam .. .. .. .. | 319 |
| | 27. Koilpatam .. .. .. .. .. | 123 |
| Malabar .. .. | 28. Chowghaut .. .. .. .. .. | 60 |
| | 29. Ponany .. .. .. .. .. | 631 |
| | 30. Tanur .. .. .. .. .. | 162 |
| | 31. Quilandy .. .. .. .. .. | 186 |
| | 32. Badagara .. .. .. .. .. | 322 |
| | 33. Kallai .. .. .. .. .. | 117 |
| South Canara .. .. | 34. Mulki .. .. .. .. .. | 259 |
| | 35. Manjeshwar .. .. .. .. | 143 |
| | 36. Kumbla .. .. .. .. .. | 129 |
| | 37. Kassergode .. .. .. .. | 183 |
| | 38. Udipi .. .. .. .. .. | 268 |
| | 39. Barkur .. .. .. .. .. | 516 |
| | 40. Kundapur .. .. .. .. .. | 705 |
| | 41. Baindur .. .. .. .. .. | 106 |
| | Total .. | 16,323 |

APPENDIX D.

Ports to be bracketed with Ports in Appendix B.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ganjam .. | 1. Sonnapur. | Madura .. | 33. Numbudalay. |
| Vizagapatam .. | 2. Bapanapaudu. | | 34. Podupatnam. |
| Godavery .. | 3. Conada. | | 35. Carungadu. |
| | 4. Upada. | | 36. Terupalacudi. |
| | 5. Bondamurlanka. | | 37. Madiapatnam. |
| | 6. Nagayalanka. | | 38. Attingari. |
| Kistna .. | 7. Gungadipolem. | | 39. Pillamadam. |
| | 8. Penconnoodi. | | 40. Yenuriangundu. |
| Nellore .. | 9. Morutota. | | 41. Ramasweram. |
| | 10. Boddeovanipolem. | | 42. Mundapum. |
| | 11. Ramapatam. | | 43. Vadalai. |
| | 12. Chinnapalem. | | 44. Morekayapatnam. |
| | 13. Tummalapenta. | | 45. Muttupettai. |
| | 14. Zuvaladinna. | | 46. Yeravudi. |
| | 15. Ponnapudi. | | 47. Valenokum. |
| | 16. Muipadu. | Tinnevelly .. | 48. Vypur. |
| | 17. Pamanjee. | | 49. Attiprom. |
| | 18. Tupili. | | 50. Maddaroyi. |
| | 19. Dugarazapatam. | | 51. Kurkuye. |
| | 20. Pudi. | | 52. Aitakuye. |
| Madras .. | 21. Ennore. | | 53. Velliangode. |
| | 22. Covelong. | | 54. Kuttay. |
| South Arcot .. | 23. Mercanum. | | 55. Parorey. |
| | 24. Codiempolliem. | | 56. Parparangady. |
| | 25. Point Calimere. | Malabar .. | 57. Codaleudy. |
| | 26. Kristnajipatam. | | 58. Malaukadu. |
| Tanjore .. | 27. Cattumavadi. | | 59. Pudiangudi. |
| | 28. Kottapatnam. | | 60. Elatur. |
| | 29. Gopalapatam. | | 61. Kapaat. |
| | 30. Sundrapandiapatnam. | | 62. Kolam. |
| Madura .. | 31. Pasypatnam. | | 63. Cuddalore. |
| | 32. Damotharampatnam. | | 64. Trekodi. |



Ports to be bracketed with Ports in Appendix B—*continued.*

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Madura .. | 65. Kottakkal. | South Canara .. | 75. Katcacheri. |
| | 66. Mutanguel. | | 76. Bekal. |
| | 67. Chumbay. | | 77. Pubbidri. |
| | 68. Calid. | | 78. Ermal. |
| | 69. Darmapatam. | | 79. Uchil. |
| | 70. Egaar. | | 80. Caup. |
| | 71. Pudiangudi. | | 81. Oodiaver. |
| | 72. Bahiara Ch. | | 82. Malpe. |
| | 73. Karicadath. | | 83. Nadkeconta. |
| | 74. Kayal. | | 84. Shevur. |

No. 70. *From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieutenant, R.N.R., Master Attendant, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated 15th May 1878, No. 3703.*

Administrative Department.

I have the honor to forward the following remarks regarding the Proceedings of the Committee appointed in G.O., No. 192, dated 26th March last, to consider the subject of extension of the Port Fund. After due consideration the result arrived at was in favor of recommending Government to proceed in the direction of the full powers granted by the Act, in preference to asking for further legislation; and they therefore recommend the rates in the larger ports to be raised to three annas, and all the native small ports licensed for export and import in the Custom House Manual being brought within the operation of the Act and dues levied. In the event of the proposal of the Committee recommending itself to the favorable consideration of Government, I am of opinion that the expense of the whole Presidency Marine as [illegible] may be safely committed to the [illegible] proper [illegible] present ruling that a very [illegible] number of native vessels evade payment altogether, and there can be no reason why any exemption should be admitted. They all share in the common advantages of trade, and should all be taxed alike; no other class of carriers or subjects of the Presidency are, so far as I can ascertain, untaxed. I have endeavoured to discover the various amounts paid as Port dues, by respective vessels, during any one year, but have not met with much success; an extraordinary amount of ignorance seems to prevail on the subject. The owners assert that the Masters can alone furnish such returns; and the Masters on the other hand refer to the owners. But all agree that the shipping trade is a profitable one. After calling for returns from all the ports of vessels belonging to them, and the annual amount of Port dues they individually pay, the only results were reached of seventy-five vessels of an aggregate tonnage of 9,231, who assert they have paid in Port dues an aggregate sum of Rupees (6,020) six thousand and twenty, the average proportion of tonnage to Port dues thus amounting to Annas (10) ten and Pies (5) five per ton. This is evidently unreliable, as it would more than involve their being perpetually running, and would, if all native vessels paid in same proportion, realize a monstrous sum, in lieu of the Rupees 24,000 now derived.

2. The Committee generally were of opinion that none of the services of the Marine Department, which had reference to Government work, ought to be paid from Port Funds, and they have made a recommendation to the effect that to enable the fund to embrace all Marine matters a fixed sum be annually credited to Port Funds from "Imperial" for the remuneration of the officers performing those services. As the matter is one for the decision of Government, I did not press my objection to this, but I strongly hold to the opinion that the general prosperity of the shipping and mercantile classes rests so completely on the protection given by Government that the small amount which the Committee's recommendation would affect [illegible] reasonably be borne by the trade. The landing and shipping of Government stores, troops, &c., &c., is all from vessels receiving large freight from Government, except in the case of the Indian Marine Transports, with which this department has nothing to do.

3. Nothing has been said by the Committee about the establishment necessary for the collection of the dues at minor ports, and as it would be expensive and unnecessary to introduce a new class for this duty, I would respectfully recommend that the Sea Customs Superintendents at ports where such officers are placed, and the nearest Superintendents to ports where no such authority exists, should receive a percentage on the amounts realized, in lieu of a fixed pay. Many taxes are collected in this way in England, and it would be an incentive to exertion. The peons at the various ports could communicate with the Superintendent on any vessel's arrival.

4. In conclusion I would beg leave to mention that when Mr. Kellner touched here on his way to England last month he informed me that he highly approved of the course I have been recommending, which I explained to him. He had at one time been Chairman of the Simla Committee and he showed me some of the latest proceedings of that body. They only related to Calcutta and Bombay, the name of Madras even never occurred, but it was significant that in mentioning such duties as Shipping Masters, Conservators, and officers dealing with Commercial Marine matters, are daily called upon to fulfil, such in fact as comprise all Madras duties, they admitted that the experience and training of Indian Navy Officers unsuited them for such offices, and they should be selected elsewhere.

5. They then proceed to say that the system of Marine accounts in the two other Presidencies is unsatisfactory in every way, and that owing to the want of method hitherto shown it will be necessary to create another first-class officer, to be called Controller of Marine Accounts, with a monthly salary rising to Rupees 1,500, and a separate office establishment amounting to Rupees 40,000 annually. All these details I would submit are easily and satisfactorily adjusted in my department and justify the necessity for the Administrative Branch.

6. The Madras system seems to be complete.

No. 71. ORDER THEREON, 29th May 1878, No. 291.

Resolved that G.O., dated 26th March 1878, No. 192, with the papers above recorded, be communicated to the Collectors of all Coast Districts for an *early* expression of their opinion through the Board of Revenue.

(True Extract.)

*Chief Secretary.*

To the Board of Revenue.
" Collectors of all Coast Districts.
" Master Attendant, Madras.
" Revenue Department.

Exd. J. Wright.

Revenue Depart.

No 2522

Govt. of 1878 Madras

MARINE.

To

The BOARD OF REVENUE,

&c, &c,

Dated May 29th,

Issued 1876

Rec'd 11 June/78 Encl.

G.O., 29th May 1878, No. 221.

MAY.

Nos. 69—71.

Ord. No.

Port Dues.—Certain papers on the subject the extension of the Port Fund, communicated Collectors of all Coast Districts for their opin through the Board of Revenue.

No 1489 Lodged

10 Jan 1878