M.R.O. 1—38,000—16-10-29.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 922 Press ~~Mis.~~

112-13 Dated 6-6-1869 No.

Not to be folded or roughly handled.

Rec

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department, 6th April 1869.

No. 112. Read the following Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 3rd February 1869, No. 740.

Read the following letters :—

From the Collector of Malabar, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Calicut, 7th December 1868, No. 336.

ADVERTING to the Board's Proceedings noted, I have the honor, after conferring with the Superintending Engineer, to report that I see no reason why any portion of the tolls collected at Irrity bridge should be paid over to Coorg.

Dated 29th September 1868, No. 6,921.

There would seem no objection to levying a moderate toll on the ghaut within the Coorg limits should that course be deemed necessary.

2. No tolls that I am aware of have been levied on the Perambady Ghaut in the last three years, and certainly none in this district on that ghaut's account. I cannot, therefore, give the return called for in paragraph 2 of the Board's Proceedings.

3. The farm of the Irrity ferry and bridge toll has been let as noted. The expenses of the ferry have been entirely defrayed from the Local Fund.

	Rs.
1866-67—Irrity ferry and bridge and another ferry on cross-road...	6,440
1867-68—Irrity ferry and bridge	5,110
1868-69— Do.	5,110

The bridge itself has been built* from Imperial Funds, and the road of late years has an Imperial maintenance allowance of Rupees 110 per mile on 34 miles, supplemented by a similar allowance from Local Funds.

	Rs.
* In 1859-60...	34,923
Rebuilt in 1866-67	26,381

District Road No. 9.

A very important branch road from the bridge is being opened from Local Funds entirely on an estimate of Rupees 35,300.

From the Acting Collector of South Canara, to the Acting Secretary to the Board of Revenue, dated Mangalore, 7th December 1868, No. 1,193.

WITH reference to the Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 29th September 1868, No. 6,921, I have the honor to state that the proceeds* of the toll levied in this district at the Sulliah bridge, near the foot of the Sumpajee Ghaut, have, in accordance with instructions,† been incorporated with the District Road Fund, and spent on the construction and maintenance of district roads; the cost of the establishment and maintenance of the Toll-gate itself having been debited to the same head.

* Statement enclosed.

† Board's Standing Circular, No. XXII., dated 15th March 1864.

2. No second toll has, I believe, been established within the Coorg territory for the benefit of the Coorg Public Works Fund.

3. The Coorg authorities claim that as the toll is levied for the ghaut, one-half of the proceeds should be handed to them. On this argument they might with

equal justice claim the whole, as the whole of the ghaut proper is in the Coorg territory. But of what use would the ghaut be to Coorg, if the communication is stopped at the foot of it? The ghaut is to open a way to the sea-board, and from the Coorg boundary there are 66 miles of Canara road connecting the ghaut with the port. Bearing in mind the evident object of the ghaut, namely, to allow of Coorg commodities reaching the sea, the proportion of the toll to which Coorg would be entitled, with reference to the whole length of the port seeking road, would be $\frac{1}{4}$, say $\frac{1}{4}$. The balance $\frac{3}{4}$ would still be due to Canara.

4. But tolls are admittedly not meant to meet ordinary but extraordinary* expenses. Hence, it would seem that neither in Coorg nor in Canara should they be any longer applied to ordinary maintenance. The ordinary maintenance of the line should, I argue, be provided for solely out of Imperial Funds, as that line is now placed in the Imperial List. To aid those funds out of the toll would be to aid them unfairly at the expense of the toll-payers, and in defiance of the principle on which the Imperial Government itself abandoned† the toll system for the Road Cess. Still less should these tolls be carried as heretofore to the District Road Fund of either Coorg or Canara, and applied to general uses in those provinces. In my opinion they should be separately brought to account, and faithfully expended for the purpose for which they were originally instituted, namely, extraordinary expenditure in connection with that particular line, and that purpose accomplished in whole or part, they should be discontinued or lowered accordingly.

* Board's Standing Circular, No. 2,347, of 8th May 1861.

† Proceedings of Government, 11th November 1868, No. 2,831, Revenue Department, paragraph 2.

5. If this be admitted, it should then be inquired what extraordinary expenditure is called for in connection with that line.

6. To my mind the improvement of the port to which it all leads is the great desideratum. If the port can be provided for from Imperial Funds separately, and the toll proceeds spared, so much the better. If not, I cannot but think the Coorg authorities will admit that the improvement of the port, which is their port quite as much as ours, would benefit them, and has a claim on the quarter portion of the tolls which might fairly be waived by them on condition of an equal amount being laid aside for the same purpose from the Canara share of these tolls. This would be altogether one-half of the toll laid aside for the improvement of the port. I have already urged‡ before the Coorg claim was ever put forward, that one-half of the toll should be funded for this purpose.

‡ To Board, 31st July 1868, No. 711, paragraphs 15 to 21.

7. The balance of the toll might then be appropriated to annually metalling the heavy sandy crossing of the Netravaty at Panemangalore, till such time as a bridge or causeway is provided from Imperial Funds, or perhaps even to widening the road from time to time, but not to ordinary repairs; and these object saccomplished, this balance also might very advantageously be applied to the furtherance of port improvement.

§ Dated 4th November 1868, No. 41.

8. The Superintending Engineer's views are given in his letter§ enclosed.

9. With reference to the rate of toll to be imposed, I go further towards agreeing with him than have the Board, as I have already proposed* double the present rates, but the Board could not approve.†

* To Board, 11th January 1868, No. 31.

† Board's Procs, 4th March 1863, No. 1,566.

10. The proposition for tolls on ghaut roads from Mysore to the Canara sea-board must also depend on the settlement of the present question, though perhaps we have even a stronger claim on the inhabitants of a foreign territory (Mysore), that they should by way of tolls pay their share in the improvement of the port to which they bring their surplus wealth.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From the Superintending Engineer, 7th Division, to the Acting Collector of South Canara, dated Coonoor, 4th November 1868, No. 41.

IN reply to your letters, Nos. 956 and 957 of 7th October, I have the honor to state, in the first place, that I see no reason whatever for sharing the proceeds of the Sulliah toll with the Coorg Government, when they have it in their power to raise funds for local purposes by imposing a separate toll on the Sumpajee Ghaut.

Govt. Order, No. 2,331 of 7th September 1868, Rev. Dept.
Do. ,, 528 of 22nd March 1862, P. W. D.
Do. ,, 2,162 of 9th Sept. ,,
Do. ,, 1,553 of 15th January 1863.
Do. ,, 1,993 of 22nd July ,,
Do. ,, 2,413 of 25th August ,,
Board's Proceedings, No. 1,566 of 4th March 1868.

And I have already, in a former communication, referred to the heavy tolls on the road between Kandy and Colombo in Ceylon, as affording a precedent for more than one toll on a line of Ghaut road. I have also instanced the numerous tolls on the road between Ootacamund and the Coimbatore Railway Station.

2. I would not, however, multiply the number of tolls below ghaut as proposed by Mr. Cadell, I prefer your proposal to increase the rate at a single toll-bar on each road below ghaut; and I suggest the adoption of the rates subjoined, as sanctioned in the Coimbatore District in paragraph 2 of Government Order, No. 692, of 20th March 1863:—

	Rs.	A.	P.
On every four-wheeled carriage on springs (laden) each ...	0	12	0
Do. do. (unladen) ...	0	4	0
On every two-wheeled carriage on springs (laden) each ...	0	6	0
Do. do. (unladen) ...	0	2	0
Bullocks or buffaloes (laden)	0	0	6
Do. do. (unladen)	0	0	2
Asses (laden)	0	0	2
Do. (unladen)	0	0	1
On every score of sheep, goats, or swine	0	1	8
Do. horse	0	1	0
Do. elephant	1	0	0
Do. camel	0	4	0

3 As to the Board's scruples against tolling Imperial roads and permanent bridges thereon, I would simply refer them to the tolled Imperial road between the foot of Coonoor Ghaut and Coimbatore, to the tolls levied at Suttiamungalum and Bhowany on the permanent bridges over the Bhowany and Cauvery, to the Irrity bridge toll on Trunk Road No. IV., and to the bridge tolls on the coast road between Calicut and Cannanore. I am not in the least partial to tolls as a means of raising funds for maintenance of roads. I think it is a clumsy expedient, and specially objectionable in this country as subjecting traffic to delay and imposition. But if the levy of tolls be discouraged by the Board, it behoves them to find some other means of raising the neces-

sary funds, either by extorting from the Supreme Government a larger allotment of Imperial Funds for the communications of this Presidency, or, failing that, by increasing the Road Cess, or supplementing it by a Cart-tax or other expedient.

4. I would apply all funds levied on roads to their maintenance, completion, and extension; and am not of opinion that, after such application of them, there will be any surplus available for improvements of ports, for which I consider that Imperial Funds should provide, supplemented by Port Funds as far as they will go.

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

Statement showing the receipts from the Toll levied at the Sulliah Bridge, in the District of South Canara, during the official years 1865-66, 1866-67, *and* 1867-68.

Year.	Amount of Collection. RS. A. P.
1865-66	1,200 0 0
1866-67	923 0 0
1867-68	1,416 11 0
	3,629 11 0

MANGALORE,
7th December 1868.

(Signed) H. S. THOMAS,
Acting Collector.

THE foregoing letters will be submitted to Government, with reference to their Order of the 7th September 1868, No. 2,331.

2. From the first letter it appears that no tolls are or ever have been levied on the Perambady Ghaut, but that tolls are levied only at the Irrity bridge, which has altogether cost Rupees 61,000. The bridge and ferry have been farmed for Rupees 5,110, of which Rupees 3,740, besides a similar grant from Imperial Funds, making an aggregate of Rupees 7,480 per annum, are devoted to the repair of the road* (thirty-four miles in length,) in the Malabar District. An important branch road† is also being opened from the bridge at a cost of Rupees 35,300 from the District Road Fund, which will probably absorb the balance of the Toll receipts.

* From Cannanore to Coorg.

† No. 9 from Cherrikal, *via* Veluth, Irkur, Perumparumba and Keeparumba to the Coorg boundary. Item No. 228 in the Road Fund Budget of 1868-69.

3. Under these circumstances the Board consider the claim of Coorg to a share of the tolls untenable; but there can be no objection to the Coorg authorities levying a toll on the ghaut, as is done, notwithstanding the levy of Road Cess under Act III. of 1866, on the Neilgherry ghauts.

4. From the second letter above recorded the Board observe that the toll collected at the Sulliah bridge, near the foot of the Sumpajee Ghaut, yields only Rupees 1,200, and is, in accordance with the general instructions of the Supreme Government, credited to the District Road Fund. The amount is so trifling that it is not worthwhile discussing the views enunciated by the Acting Collector. The Board

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Revenue Department,
6th April 1869.

do not understand to what Proceedings of the Board Colonel Walker alludes in paragraph 3 of his letter* to the Acting Collector; but in lieu of raising the toll, the Board would leave the Coorg authorities to establish a toll on the ghaut itself, to cover the expense of improving and maintaining that work.

* Dated 4th November 1868, No. 41.

No. 113. ORDER THEREON, 6th April 1869, No. 922.

Local Funds, No. 4.
Account.

THE foregoing Proceedings will be communicated to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore, with reference to his letter under date 18th August 1868, No. 465.

The Right Honorable the Governor in Council concurs with the Board of Revenue in considering that the full collections at the tolls on the Irrity and Sulliah bridges should continue to be expended in improving and keeping in repair the communications between those places and the coast, and that there is no objection to the Coorg authorities tolling the ghaut traffic.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. A. DALYELL,
Acting Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.

Exd. F. R. Bantleman.

1872. 22 March /62 to 395-6
" — 9 July — " " 1359-160
" — 20 March /63 " 347-348
" — 15 June " " 351-2
" — 22 July " " 500-502
" — 25 Aug " " 507-508
" 24 Sept 1868 " 87-82
" 11 December " 1705-6

Acting Secretary.

Revenue No. 112.
Rd. 3 Feb.

BOARD OF REVENUE, MADRAS.

1869.

PROCEEDINGS, 3RD FEBRUARY 1869, No. 740.

Dept. of Revenue
Received 9 Feb.

Encl.

To the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Copy to the Collector of Malabar.
" " to the Acting Collector of South Canara.
" " to the Superintending Engineer, 7th Division.

Exd. T. Cartledge.

FEBRUARY.

No. 740.

Seen 9th Feb. 69

Tolls—collected at Irrity bridge in Malabar, and at Sulliah bridge in South Canara,—Collectors' letters regarding claim of Coorg authorities to share of, submitted to Government with remarks.

112. -

Cir. Proceedings Circle

Govt. of {1869} Madras

REVENUE.

To

THE BOARD OF REVENUE.

Dated April, 6th.

Recd. Encl.

G. O., 6th April 1869, No. 922.

APRIL.

Nos. 112-113.

Tolls collected at Irrity and Sullia's bridges in Malabar and South Canara.—Board's Proceedings on this subject to be communicated to Commissioner of Mysore, with reference to the claim of the Coorg authorities to share in it.

Revn. Department 5a

No. 922.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 6th ~~March~~ April 1869.

Read the following Proc. of the Bd. of Revenue.
(P.C. 3d February 1869 No. 740)

The foregoing Proceedings will be communicated to the Chief Commissioner of Mysore with reference to his letter under date 10 August 1868 No. 468

The Rt Honble the Governor in Council concurs with the Board of Revenue that in considering that the full collections at the tolls on the Sankey and Sulkah bridges should continue to be expended in improving and keeping in repair the Communications between

Thos Plues and the
Coast of and That there
is no objection to the
Coins authorities Tolling
the Plant traffic

WD.

14 Copies Folio B of Rec'd Despatch.

I would allow this
Draft Charter
in accordance with
the views of the Board
of Revenue & Stamps.

AJR.