

(1) Number of pages 6
(2) Date of repair 11/6/86
(3) Initials of the Referencer iof

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

Revenue DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	639	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated 15 - 2 - 1879 - 197.		

Not to be folded or roughly handled

2-2 my

No. 77.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 15th January 1879.

Read the following replies to G.O., dated 29th May 1878, No. 291:—

From the Collector of Ganjam,	dated 3rd July	1878, No.	1,965.
" " of Vizagapatam,	" 22nd June	" "	841.
" " of Godavari,	" 8th July	" "	173.
" " of Kistna,	" 29th August	" "	1,852.
" " of Nellore,	" 29th July	" "	3,052.
" " of South Arcot,	" 13th August	" "	347.
" " of Tanjore,	" 1st October	" "	3,662.
" " of Madura,	" 5th "	" "	380.
" " of Tinnevely,	" 29th June	" "	460.
" " of South Canara,	" 20th July	" "	1,311.
" " of Malabar,	" 22nd June	" "	179.
" " of Sea Customs, Madras,	dated 2nd Sept.	" "	1,507.

In G.O., dated 29th May 1878, No. 291, Marine Department, the Government call upon all Collectors of Coast Districts to express their opinion, through the Board of Revenue, on certain papers connected with proposals for the extension of Port Funds.

These papers contain a report by a Committee appointed to consider the subject, who premise "that they do not consider it would be expedient to increase the burdens 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 establishment," and conclude by summarising their recommendations (subject to the above proviso) as follows:—

1st.—That Port dues not exceeding 2 Annas per ton be introduced 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 2 to 3 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.

2. The Collectors of Coast Districts, with one exception, concur generally in the recommendations above made, though the Collector of Malabar sees difficulty in the way of establishments. The Collector of Godavari doubts the advisability of introducing Port dues as proposed if there is no intention of doing anything for the ports newly taxed, and considers that a possible effect of the introduction of the dues at these small ports would be to drive the trade into the larger ports and thus reduce the number of places to which imports would come, thereby making distribution throughout the country more difficult.

3. This fear is not felt by the other Collectors consulted, and the Board do not think that the dues proposed are so heavy as to be likely to divert *bona fide* trade to any serious extent. Under the present immunity from dues possessed by the smaller ports an insignificant portion of the trade which would otherwise naturally have

sought the larger ports may have been diverted to the free ports. This the small ports will probably lose if dues are introduced and a proportionately trading diversion may take place the other way, but the Board do not think that anything more need be anticipated. The Committee themselves seem to have apprehended something of the kind with regard to the French Ports in the Tanjore District, and suggested that steps might be taken to guard against it, but the Collector feels satisfied that there will be no serious diversion of *long file* trade, and the Board are disposed to concur with him.

4. The Collector of Calicut apparently would not object to dues being levied if adequate funds could thereby be raised for improving the ports in question. Under the present system of working the Ports Fund Act no port has any claim to the local expenditure of Port dues, but the Board read the Committee's report as being so far in accord with the spirit of the views expressed by the Collector of Calicut that the introduction of increased dues is recommended only on the assumption that it is desired with the view of increasing the efficiency of port administration, and not merely to relieve Imperial Funds of a charge which has hitherto been looked upon as equitable. The Collector of Tinnevely forwards a letter from the local Master Attenbury remarking that Captain Phipps is an officer of considerable experience in these matters, and his opinion seems to be reasonable. Captain Phipps commences with approving the proposals of the Committee, but adds that he regrets that it is not considered advisable to levy a small due for the Coast Lights which he thinks would be but fair and willingly paid. In paragraph 5 of their report the Committee point out that this would involve legislative action, and as it appears that a sufficient sum can be raised in an equitable manner under existing Acts, the Board concur with the Committee in considering legislation to be uncalled for. The same objection lies to his proposal to levy dues from coasting vessels oftener than once in sixty days.

5. Captain Phipps then follows his chief by proposing that the entire charges of the Port establishments should be thrown on Port Funds. This point is dealt with in paragraph 3 of the Committee's report. Full material for forming an opinion on the point is not before the Board, and does not seem to have been before the Committee, but there are certainly strong *prima facie* reasons in support of their view that Port Funds should not be raised with the sole view of relieving the Imperial exchequer of charges which have hitherto been looked upon as no more than a fair equivalent for service rendered.

6. A misprint in the heading to Appendix D has led to some Collectors proposing to bracket a port with dues at 2 Annas per ton with another port at which higher dues are levied. This is of course impossible, as payment of dues at a bracketed port clears a vessel from payment at the other ports with which it is bracketed. The Board's proposals for bracketing, based on the Collector's recommendations and on existing Sea Customs arrangements are given in an appendix. The whole of the ports and sub-ports are shown in the list, but as the bracketing of the minor ports is proposed by the Committee only with the view of preventing an unnatural diversion of trade to petty ports left free, and as it seems doubtful whether any such diversion is likely to take place to any serious extent, the Board think it would suffice if the introduction of dues is confined for the present to ports at which there is a Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent of Sea Customs. These are marked with an asterisk in the list, as are also Baliapatam and Attipuram which the Collector of Malabar thinks may be raised to the position of ports with a permanent establishment.

7. The Collector of Madras reports that the Superintendent of the Panambur Channel suggests that less dues should be demanded from vessels using the roadstead merely for safe anchorage than from those using it for discharging cargo. This is provided for by Section 57, Act XII of 1875.

8. The question of establishments is not fully gone into by most Collectors, but the Board are of opinion that as a rule the work can be done by the existing Sea Customs establishments. It may be necessary to entertain new establishments in Malabar where the sub-ports are very numerous, but such a step, if called for at all, is required more in the interests of the Sea Customs Department than with a view to

the collection of Port dues, and the Board would adopt Captain Taylor's recommendation that the duty of collecting the dues should be entrusted to the officers of the Sea Customs establishment who would receive as remuneration a small percentage on the amounts levied.

(A true Extract.)

J. H. Smith

Acting Secretary.

To the Chief Secretary to Government, Marine Department, with twelve original letters and their enclosures to be returned, and a statement.

Copy to all Collectors of Coast Districts.
" to the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Ed. T. D. Ryan.

Districts.	Dues at 3 Annas.	Dues at 2 Annas.	Remarks.
Ganjam ...	1. Ganjam* ... 2. Gopalpur* ... 3. Calingapatam* ...	1. {Sonnapur.* Barwa.* 2. {Poondy.* Bapanapadur.* 3. {Conada ... Pentakotta.* Pudimadaka.* 1. Upada. 2. {Narsapur.* Bandamurlanka. Masulipatam.* Nagayalanka.* Nizampatam.* Kottapalem. Jungadipalem.* Penumudi.* Morutala.* Boddrovaniapalem.* 5. {Ipurpalem.* Motapalli. Kottapattam.* 1. Itamukala. 2. Pakala.* Ramapatam.* 3. {Chinnapalem. Tamalapenta. Juvaladinne. Iskapalli.* 4. {Ponnapudi. Maipadu. Kistnapatam.* Kanuparti. Pamanje. 5. {Tupili. Dugarajupatam.* Pudi.	Conada to be by itself, as there is no port with which it can conveniently be bracketed.
Vizagapatam ...	1. Bimlipatam* ... 2. Vizagapatam* ... Cocanada* ...		
Godavari ...	1. {Coringa* ...		
Kistna... ..			
Nellore			
Madras... ..	Madras. 1. Cuddalore* ... 2. Porto Novo.*	1. Mercanam.*	
South Arcot ...	1. Tranquebar* ... Nagore* ... 2. {Negapatam* ...	1. {Tirumalavassel.* Kodimpalli.* 2. Valangani.* Toputorai.* 3. {Point Calimere.* Muttupottai.* 4. {Adrampatam.* Krishnajiipatam.* 5. {Anmapatam.* Kattumavadi.* Kottaiipatam.* 6. {Gopalapatam.* Sundrapandiapatam.* Pasipatam.* Damodarsapatam.* 7. {Tondi.* Nambidalai. Pudupatam.* Canengadu. Torupalancudi. 2. {Devipatam.* Mudiapatam.*	
Tanjore			
Madura			

Board of Revenue.

MADRAS.

THE CHIEF SECT. TO GOVT.
MARINE DEPARTMENT.

11th January 1879.

Printed 30th.
Received 1st February 1879.

PRINTING, 15th JANUARY 1879, No. 77.

Printed 30th.
Received 1st February 1879.
JANUARY.
No. 77.

Port Fund. — Reviewing reports from Collec-
tors of Coast Districts on proposals to extend
the — to all ports.

Mis 2/15 Feb/79
No. 639

Districts.	Dues at 3 Annas.	Dues at 2 Annas.	Remarks.
Madura—(Contd.)		3. { Attangarai. Pillaimadam. Emanagundu.* Paumben.* Rameswaram. Mandapam. Vadalai. Marakayapatnam. Muttupettai. 4. { Kilakarai.* Ervadi. Valinekkam. 1. Vypur.* 2. Koilpatam.* 3. Kulasegrapatam.*	
Tinnevely ...	Tuticorin* ...	1. { Attiprom.* Madayi. 2. { Kurkuye. Allakuye. 3. { Chowghat.* Velliyangode. 4. { Ponani.* Kuttayi. Paraparma. Tanur.* 3. { Parpanangadi. Cadalongdi. 4. { Molankadara. Padiangadi. Elatur. Kapalt. 5. { Qulandi.* Kolam. Cuddalore. Trikodi. Kottaikal. 6. { Badagarai.* Muttungal. Chombayi. 7. { Kallai.* Talayi. 8. { Darmapatam. Egaar. Padiangadi.* 9. { Balliapatam.* Etticolum. Kurai. Katocheri. 1. { Bekal. Kassergode.* 2. { Kumbha.* Manjeshwar.* 4. { Mulki.* Padbidri. Yermal. Uchil. 5. { Kap. Udiyavanu. Malpe.* 6. { Barkur or Hanjakat- ta.* 7. { Kandapur.* Maikinkatta.* 8. { Baindur.* Sivar.	
Malabar ...	1. Cochin* ... 2. { Calicut* ... Beyepore* ... 3. Tellicherry* ... 4. Cannanore* ...		
Canara ...	1. Mangalore* ...		