

(No. 57.)



1863.

[SECOND SESSION.]

T A S M A N I A.

P O R T C H A R G E S.

R E P O R T O F T H E S E L E C T C O M M I T T E E.

Brought up by Mr. Davies, and ordered by the House to be printed, 4 August, 1863.



REPORT from the Select Committee appointed to enquire into the Operation and Results of the Acts of Parliament which regulate the Management and Control of the Ports of Hobart Town and Launceston, with power to send for Papers and Witnesses.

THURSDAY, 25 JUNE, 1863.

A SELECT Committee appointed at the late Session of Parliament to enquire into the operation and results of the Acts of Parliament which regulate the management and control of the Ports of Hobart Town and Launceston, with power to send for Papers and Witnesses, was re-appointed for similar purposes with like powers.

Resolved, That leave be granted for the appointment of more than Seven Members.

Then the following Members were nominated to be of the said Committee :—

MR. CHAPMAN.
MR. ALLISON.
MR. BALFE.
MR. DAVIES.

MR. LETTE.
MR. ROSE.
MR. HAGGITT.
MR. MURRAY (*Mover.*)

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

TUESDAY, 30 JUNE, 1863.

The Committee met at 11 A.M., and elected Mr. Davies to the Chair.

Members present—Mr. Murray, Mr. Balfe, Mr. Allison, Mr. Davies, Mr. Lette, and Mr. Chapman.

THURSDAY, 2 JULY, 1863.

The Committee met at 11:30 A.M.

Members present—Mr. Murray, Mr. Rose, Mr. Davies, Mr. Lette, Mr. Chapman.

TUESDAY, 7 JULY, 1863.

The Committee met at 11:25 A.M.

Members present—Mr. Balfe, Mr. Lette, Mr. Rose, Mr. Haggitt, Mr. Davies, Mr. Murray.

THURSDAY, 9 JULY, 1863.

The Committee met at 11:20 A.M.

Members present—Mr. Davies, Mr. Rose, Mr. Lette, Mr. Murray, and Mr. Balfe.

WEDNESDAY, 29 JULY, 1863.

The Committee met at 12-15 A.M.

Members present— Mr. Chapman, Mr. Murray, Mr. Davies, Mr. Lette, and Mr. Haggitt.

FRIDAY, 31 JULY, 1863.

The Committee met at 11-35 A.M.

Members present— Mr. Haggitt, Mr. Lette, Mr. Rose, Mr. Murray, Mr. Chapman, and Mr. Davies.

TUESDAY, 4 AUGUST, 1863.

The Committee met at 11-20 A.M.

Members present— Mr. Davies, Mr. Rose, Mr. Murray, Mr. Balfe, Mr. Lette, and Mr. Haggitt.*WITNESSES examined, and their Expenses.*

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Profession.</i>	<i>From whence summoned.</i>	<i>Number of Days absent from Home.</i>	<i>Expenses allowed.</i>
1. A. H. Maning, Esquire	Merchant and Ship-owner.	Hobart Town.	—	—
2. W. Crosby, Esquire, <i>J.P.</i>	Merchant.	ditto.	—	—
3. W. Belbin, Esquire	Ship-owner.	ditto.	—	—
4. W. Boyes, Esquire, <i>J.P.</i>	ditto.	ditto.	—	—
5. Captain W. Fisher	ditto.	ditto.	—	—
6. Captain Gallagher	Master Mariner.	ditto.	—	—
7. C. M. Maxwell, Esquire, <i>J.P.</i>	Master Warden.	ditto.	—	—

QUESTIONS sent on printed Forms to—

C. T. Weetman, Esquire, Launceston.
 E. P. Tregurtha, Esquire, ditto.
 E. L. Ditcham, Esquire, ditto.
 J. Aikenhead, Esquire, ditto.
 George Fisher, Esquire, ditto.
 M. Gaunt, Esquire, ditto.
 Captain Woods, ditto.

W. Williams, Esquire, Launceston.
 W. Johnstone, Esquire, ditto.
 H. Dowling, Esquire, ditto.
 J. Crookes, Esquire, ditto.
 Marine Board, Launceston.
 Mr. Ackerman, ditto.

PROGRESS REPORT of the Select Committee on Port Charges.

Your Committee have very fully considered one portion of the subject remitted to them,—viz. that of Light-houses maintained by the Colony,—and have decided to bring up a Progress Report.

Looking to the importance properly attached to that paragraph of the Report of the Proceedings of the Inter-colonial Conference at Melbourne, which suggests “that in the opinion of the Members of the Conference the system of maintaining Coast Lights, established in consequence of the Report of Commissioners in 1856, should be reconsidered, and recommending that a Joint Commission should be appointed, by united action on the part of the respective Governments, to consider and report on the entire subject,” your Committee have summoned before them many of the leading Merchants and Ship-owners of the Port of Hobart Town, and have received replies to printed Queries which they addressed to thirteen Merchants and Ship-owners at the Port of Launceston.

Supplied thus with a mass of valuable evidence on this single branch of the subject of the working of the Acts of Parliament relating to the Ports, your Committee have arrived at the following Resolutions, which, with the evidence on which they are founded, they respectfully submit for the careful consideration of your Honorable House:—

1. That the evidence justifies the Committee in recommending an alteration in the Light-house Rates as early as possible; and this Committee would recommend that all Vessels entering Inwards at the Ports of this Colony should pay One Shilling a Ton on their registered tonnage; provided that no Vessel should be called upon to pay the sum more than once in Six months.

2. That, in the opinion of this Committee, the subject of a further contribution towards the maintenance of the Tasmanian Light-houses be immediately brought under the notice of the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria, with the view of obtaining further aid from those Colonies.

3. That a Bill be introduced empowering the Marine Boards to apply monies derived from Wharfage Dues towards the maintenance of Light-houses.

Your Committee would suggest that, as the Parliaments of the various Australian Colonies are now in Session, no time should be lost by the Government of Tasmania in opening communication with the various Australian Governments on the subject of the Light Dues, as suggested in Resolution No. 2; the view which your Committee have taken being, that the contributions of the other Colonies are not commensurate with the advantages which they derive from the Lights.

Your Committee are also of opinion that Guide Lights should be erected at the Tamar Heads, the expense of their maintenance being estimated by the Master Warden of the Port of Hobart Town at about £250 per annum each; and thus the dangerous nature of the navigation of that River to Vessels wishing to enter the Port at night would, to a certain extent, be obviated.

JOHN DAVIES, *Chairman.*

Committee Room, 4th August, 1863.

APPENDIX.

THURSDAY, 2 JULY, 1863.

A. H. MANING, *Esquire, called in and examined.*

I am a merchant and ship-owner, and have vessels trading between the Australian Colonies and this Port. I have been so for 20 years.

I have found the Lights of Tasmania undoubtedly beneficial to my vessels; and when we have traded to Port Phillip all the Lights have been useful.

It would be difficult to regulate the charge for Light Dues on vessels which might derive no advantage from them.

I consider the Light Dues a most legitimate and direct charge on vessels; and that it would be improper to collect them in any other way.

The charge of Nine-pence per ton is not an excessive charge as regards the vessel which makes one voyage annually; but it presses heavily on the Inter-Colonial trader which makes 8 or 10 trips a year. The payment should be regulated so that the Inter-Colonial trader should not pay more than 2 or 3 times a year,—the present rate to be continued in the case of other vessels. I see no principle in exempting whalers, as at present. All vessels using the Lights should pay for them.

I consider the expense of maintaining Lights is unequally borne by the Colonies. In the Goose and the Swan Island Light-houses Tasmania has a small interest. One ship outward bound from Victoria for England, say the *Great Britain*, would have more value on board than a dozen of the Inter-Colonial traders. The same remark applies to the steamers from New Zealand to Victoria, carrying gold, and passing the Lights three times a month.

Kent's Group and King's Island are of very little interest to Tasmania,—say, 1-8th of Kent's Group, and 1-10th of King's Island. They are fairway Lights from Sydney and Victoria; and so indeed are Goose and Swan Island Light-houses fairway Lights between Victoria and Adelaide.

I am of opinion that the total abrogation of the Light Dues would not affect the number of ships visiting the Ports.

If Inter-Colonial Shipping seek relief from Light Dues, they should be required to pay twice or four times a year; but still the charge should be kept up on the foreigner.

The basis of the expense of lights should be obtained from the tonnage of each Port *pro rata*.

I have seen the Master Warden's letter, and I agree with him.

It is unjust to make any difference for steamers. They make money by them, and they should be classed with Inter-Colonial traders.

The *City of Hobart* is an illustration. She has paid us no Light Dues while engaged between New Zealand and Victoria.

The greater proportion of our traders to New Zealand never see these Lights.

By Mr. Lette.—Should not Adelaide pay a proportion of the King's Island Light? Most unquestionably; it is a fairway Light, and should pay a larger proportion of the expense than Tasmania.

I should give three months' notice to the other Colonies that, unless they paid their due proportion, the Lights would be stopped as regarded Tasmania. Sydney should also contribute, as it is a fairway Light for that Colony.

It would hardly be fair to New Zealand to charge any portion of Swan Island to it: it is the Colonies owning tonnage that should pay.

If New South Wales and Victoria should be required to pay a proportion of King's Island and Kent's Group, it should be a larger proportion than that of Tasmania.

MR. WM. BELBIN, *Ship-owner in the Inter-Colonial Trade.*

I have considered the Light Dues and Port Charges, and I have seen Mr. Maxwell's letter,—the suggestions in which I consider equitable.

It is not fair for Tasmania to pay all the Light Dues, especially as most of our traders are now in the New Zealand trade, and see no Lights. I have heard Mr. Maning's evidence, and agree with him entirely in all his remarks.

By Mr. Murray.—I don't think vessels should be admitted free of Light Dues. I think the charge fair, and not out of the way.

The Port Charges at Melbourne are made once a year, and are called Tonnage Dues.

Mr. Belbin withdrew.

WILLIAM CROSBY, *Esquire, J. P.*

I am a Merchant and Ship-owner. While I was a Shipmaster trading to the Colony I had ample opportunities of judging of the Light Dues.

With regard to vessels employed out of these Ports, I have long been of opinion that steamers are charged too low, and other vessels too high. Steamers derive more advantage from the Lights. I do not think the Light Dues should be abolished; but that they should be kept up by the Shipping, for whose use they are established.

According to home usage the vessels pay every time they pass a light.

I think the Governments of other Colonies should contribute more largely in proportion than they do at present, as the advantages which they derive are greater than those enjoyed by Tasmanian vessels.

South Australian vessels derive great advantages from the King's Island Light-house, and they should pay their proportion of the expense quite as much as Tasmania does.

I have not read Mr. Maxwell's letter.

[Letter handed to Captain Crosby.]

I have now read it; and I am of opinion that, if the Light Dues could be lowered in proportion to the amount which they cost, as he suggests, it would be of advantage. I do not agree as to paying twice or more in each year by Inter-colonial Traders.

By Mr. Chapman.—So long as it is necessary to maintain Light-houses vessels should be required to pay even ten times a year, if they make so many trips.

I look on King's Island and Kent's Group Lights as National or Australian Lights, not Tasmanian. Swan and Goose Island are, I consider, local lights, as our vessels can neither go to Melbourne nor to Adelaide without them.

English ships nearly always prefer going through Banks' Straits.

I do not look upon Swan and Goose Island Lights as the others; but I think Victoria and New South Wales should contribute more largely than they do at present, as they are more largely benefited. Very few of our vessels go through Banks' Straits.

I am of opinion that Swan and Goose Islands are of greater advantage to the ships trading to Victoria than to this Colony, and Victoria should, therefore, contribute more largely.

The Low Head, South Bruni, and Iron Pot are local lights.

Do you think it fair that the whole cost of the four Lights should be borne on the shipping belonging to the Ports, or should it be distributed over the whole Colony? No. I don't think so; though I think the Light Dues should be raised on steamers and lowered on other vessels. If the Light Dues were abolished, passengers would be carried cheaper, and freight would be lower.

Do you think it equitable that a certain rate, say 9d. a ton, should be paid once in six months? I have already said that each Vessel passing a Light should pay for it.

Is it equitable that 9d. Dues should be charged on Vessels which never see the Lights? In England the Vessels only pay for the Lights they pass.

By Mr. Davies.—Is it equitable to charge Vessels on the North-west Coast,—Vessels trading to the Mersey, Table Cape, and Circular Head? It is contrary to Home practice, but is resorted to here. It would be equitable for the Vessels only to pay for the Lights they pass.

3 JULY, 1863.

WM. BOYS, *Esq., J.P.*

I am a Merchant and Ship-owner, and am acquainted with the mode of levying Light Dues in other Colonies, as well as in Tasmania.

I have had a little conversation with Mr. Maxwell on the subject. I have glanced through Mr. Maxwell's letter. I see his object, and agree with it.

My attention has been directed to the question of making the Ports free to Colonial traders. I do not think it would be of any advantage. It is much better that they should pay their share than that it should fall on the General Revenue. Additional Wharfage should not be placed on Goods,

I know the various Light-houses.

I think if I had had control I should have stopped King's Island and Goose Island Lights unless the other Colonies paid their due proportion of the expense.

Swan and Goose Island Lights are equally useful to the Victorian homeward-bound Vessels. Inter-Colonial Vessels should pay for the Lights. It is difficult to say what share each Vessel should pay.

I think the Rates should not be made beyond sufficient to keep up the Lights.

By Mr. Chapman.—I am of opinion that King's Island and Kent's Group, and Swan and Goose Island Lights, are Australian Lights, more especially Victorian; the others are local Lights, and should be maintained by Tasmania alone.

I consider that 9*d.* a ton is an exceedingly heavy charge. On one Vessel of ours of 165 tons, trading to Port Albert, which made fifteen trips last year, we paid £6 3*s.* 9*d.* each trip. She had the advantage of four lights.

By Mr. Lette.—King's Island, in a small degree, is useful to Adelaide for her homeward Vessels. Vessels from Adelaide to New Zealand would go as well to the south as through the Straits.

CAPTAIN FISHER *called in and examined.*

I am a Ship-owner engaged in the Inter-colonial trade. I have considered with attention the subject of Light Dues. I am of opinion that some modification should be adopted in the mode of levying the Dues, and I should long ago have suggested their abolition could I have seen any substitute. I believe their abolition would benefit some Ports, but not Hobart Town; Launceston would be benefited.

Conscientiously I believe that Inter-Colonial traders should pay as at present.

I have heard Mr. Boys's evidence.

Swan and Goose Islands are just as much Victorian Lights as Tasmanian, and Victoria should pay a larger per-centage proportion of the expenses.

No doubt Adelaide should pay a portion of the King's Island Light.

I agree with previous witnesses as to Australian Lights. I consider that the share of Tasmania is very excessive. I consider the charge of 9*d.* a ton very heavy. Tasmanian shipping entering inwards should pay a charge for the three local lights, and a per-centage charge according to shipping for the other Lights.

By Mr. Chapman.—While the present system remains and forms so excessive a charge, should not a portion be sustained by Wharfage Rates? It might, if any part of the present Wharfage (which I think high) could be spared. No doubt the Lights are a severe tax on our small Vessels which make, say ten trips a year.

In Melbourne there are Port Charges payable only once in Six months. If the Colonial trader could be charged only twice a year it would be of advantage, but I don't see how the Lights are to be kept up.

By Mr. Rose.—I think the Steamers should pay as much Light Dues as Sailing Vessels. I am aware they do not. The Steamers pay 4*d.*, other Vessels 9*d.* It would be just that a Steamer entering three times a month should pay 9*d.*, the same as the Vessel coming only once a year.

The practice in England is to pay for the Lights you see, but it would not answer here, in consequence of want of Shipping.

If the other Colonies paid a large proportion of the expense, there might be a reduction of Light Duties.

7 JULY, 1863.

CAPTAIN GALLAGHAN, of the barque "*Isabella Brown*."

I am the Commander of the *Isabella Brown*, 358 tons register. I am last from London. My Light Dues inwards were £3 19s. 2d., and outwards £3 4s. 10d., the general average being 3s. 4d. a ton register. Here the Light Dues are 9d. a ton.

In the Baltic Seas a halfpenny a ton is charged inwards, and the same outwards. If I went into port a second time in one year 60 per cent. was taken off.

I have been in the Mauritius trade for some years, and I once made a third voyage there during one year, and I found my Light Dues were not charged there for that voyage.

At Home a yearly sum is charged for Coasting Lights, a sum about equal to my Light Dues.

I have had Colonial experience; and have a certificate as Pilot for Hobart Town, Melbourne, and Adelaide.

I have not seen the King's Island Light, but I know its geographical position. Any ship bound from Melbourne and Sydney must use that Light, and also vessels from Adelaide to New Zealand.

I consider Adelaide ought to pay more than Tasmania for the King's Island Light, as we don't use it.

Swan and Goose Island Lights I consider quite Australian Lights. The three local Lights are Iron Pot, South Bruni, and Low Head.

In nine cases out of ten ships from England to Sydney, I think, take Bass's Straits, using Kent's Group Light.

I should not take Banks' Strait, though it is much used by coasters.

The *Great Britain* went through Banks' Strait, and used Swan and Goose Island Lights.

I have seen remarks in the papers, and always thought hitherto that Sydney, Adelaide, and Victoria paid for the maintenance of the Straits Lights.

Many of the homeward bound vessels use the Straits Lights.

I served my time on the English Coast. I have never been charged for Lights I could not see. Whichever channel I used, I paid for the Lights. It is not so here, for you are charged for all Lights whether you use them or not.

North of Scotland $\frac{1}{2}$ d. a ton is charged. If I used the British Channel, I paid $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per ton.

I think the English customs should be established here; that is, for vessels using the lights to pay for them. It is unfair to make me pay for Swan Island Light if I have not seen it. I have not used it for seven years, and yet I always pay for it.

Colonial traders if required to pay once or twice a year would pay quite enough.

In the Mauritius trade cattle ships are exempt after two voyages in each year.

For Foreign vessels the charge of 9d. is not too high, coming as they do only once a year.

The Inter-colonial traders who use the Port should pay 6d. tonnage lights; 9d. is too much, but not for a London ship.

Steamers should be charged the same as sailing vessels.

I think the Mauritius arrangements should be adopted here.

I never heard the Light Dues in London spoken of as excessive.

9 JULY, 1863.

Captain WM. FISHER called in and examined.

I have been a Master Mariner trading out of this Port, and am now a Ship-owner and Merchant.

I know the Port Charges of Hobart Town and Launceston.

I have considered the Port Charges, and consider them, as they bear upon us, moderate; the only charge is that of removes, by the Harbour Master.

The arrangement for exemption from Pilotage is very easy;—three consecutive voyages in the Inter-Colonial Trade exempt the master from Pilotage, which I think is 9*d.* a ton.

I have no alteration to suggest. Foreign ships are only compelled to take a Pilot inwards. It is optional outwards.

Two regular Pilots of late have been sufficient for Hobart Town; there used to be four. They are paid by a tonnage charge; and they are very badly paid.

I think the Marine Board of Hobart Town necessary. The Master Warden ought to be paid; the other Wardens might do the duty for the honour. The Master Warden gives much time and attention to the duty; the others only meet once or twice a week.

The Harbour Master and Master Warden might be combined if it were possible to command the services of a proper person to fulfil the duties. The Master Warden's time is more taken up by correspondence than anything else. The Marine Board works satisfactorily. I believe it is absolutely necessary to have a man thoroughly conversant with nautical matters on the Marine Board.

Are you acquainted with the Port of Launceston? I am.

Are you cognizant of the Port Charges levied in that Port? I am.

In your opinion are the Port Charges reasonable, excessive, or otherwise? Very excessive, very high.

If excessive, will you point out the particulars? In Launceston you are compelled to have a Pilot every time for a certain period; and then, for a certain time, you pay whether you have a Pilot or not. The removes, and other Port Charges, are the same as at Hobart Town. In Launceston you pay for an Exemption Certificate; here you do not.

The Launceston River is intricate, and it is necessary to employ a Pilot.

I know that the high charges are detrimental to the interests of the Port. It is necessary to take advantage of the Steam Tug. It is a saving to all parties.

I consider the expense of the Steam Tug to be very heavy on the shipping.

I once commanded a Steamer myself, and know the expense of sea-going Steamers.

I have never looked very carefully into the Steam Tug expenses.

The Steam Tug charges for going right out; but if detained at George Town there was an extra charge. I am not sure as to the number of Pilots, I think 6 or 7. I know Captain Ling; I remember him at Launceston.

I think it is necessary to have a boat and crew in the harbour at Launceston.

Do you consider that the Port of Launceston would be injured by the abrogation of the Marine Board at Launceston, and the administration of its duties transferred to the Customs Department or to the Municipal Council? I do not think either would be an improvement on the present arrangement. I have thought it over many times. The transfer as above would be a step in the right direction. I think it possible to make some beneficial change, and thus reduce the expenditure.

By Mr. Davies.—I have had vessels trading to Launceston. I had a vessel in the trade between Mauritius and Melbourne. I wrote to the Master to call at the Low Head for orders. I found, on making application at the Telegraph Office, that half Pilotage would be required before I could give the order.

The charges are so excessive that I have stopped vessels from Melbourne coming for orders. The high charges certainly depreciate the trade there. Vessels trading between here and Melbourne would occasionally call at Launceston to procure a cargo but for the excessive charges. I speak from my own observation,—not so much from what I have heard. I have never before seen the notice in the Launceston newspaper now shown to me. If a vessel comes off the Low Head I do not think she can refuse a Pilot. According to the notice now read it appears the Master can refuse.

Do you think the Pilots should be paid by Fees or by fixed Salaries? We can procure Captains who are good Pilots at the Ports. The Launceston Pilots should be paid by Fees. I think the Shipping Master is required at Launceston. The Master Warden might act as Shipping Master more efficiently.

The Chamber of Commerce should have the election of the Wardens. Members of the Chamber of Commerce are admitted on payment of £2 2*s.* a year entrance fee; and I don't think it keeps out nautical men.

The Master Warden should have a Clerk. The Messenger at Hobart Town is also Signal-man.

By Mr. Murray.—Do you think the salaries fair for the Pilots? Yes, if there is plenty of work for them. I don't think you could get good men at less salary.

If the Steam-tug were stationed at George Town or the Pilot Station, it would not be economical, but it certainly might be more useful to vessels outside. The boat will keep much better in fresh water than in salt.

I don't think a Steam Dredge could be profitably employed on the Tamar.

Will you favour the Committee with your opinion as to the beneficial results, or otherwise, of the working of the Marine Board to the Port at Launceston? I know a little of the working of the Board. If the Master Warden were made Harbour Master also, it would be necessary to have an Assistant. Launceston is different to Hobart Town. I know the machinery at Launceston is expensive.

31 JULY, 1863.

CRAWFORD M. MAXWELL, *Esq.*, *Master Warden, called in and examined.*

I have made out a number of Returns, as requested by the Minute of the Committee, and I now put them in, numbered 1 to 8.

Return No. 4 is made out in accordance with Mr. Chapman's suggestions,—viz., charging every Vessel entering Inwards at One Shilling a ton per registered ton once every six months. This is calculated to produce £1981 3s.

Return No. 5 is made out supposing that Vessels paid every time they came in.

Return No. 6.—In the Light-house Accounts it will be found that £500 was expended for Repairs which will not necessarily be again incurred.

Return No. 7.—This is an abstract of my letter, respecting the amount of contribution from other Colonies, which, I am of opinion, is not fairly regulated at present.

Return No. 8 is a Return of Victorian Lights.

Guide Lights could not be established in the Tamar without a Staff of a Superintendent and two men to manage them; the expense of the men's wages is £80 each. If the men were put under the charge of the Superintendent of Low Head a saving would be effected. The oil would cost about £40 per Light if such Light were a very small one. The expense would depend upon the class of Light.

I can send down an estimate of the expense of the Lanterns, &c.

They might possibly be kept up by one man, but it is very undesirable to have less than two men.

By Mr. Davies.—The South Brunel Light is useful to English Vessels and others from South Australia. The Melbourne Vessels also sometimes use it in the summer time.

Ships coming from London have the benefit of the King's Island Light.

By Mr. Chapman.—The Marine Board is just in the position it was five years ago in a money point of view. The first three years gave us a surplus of £1600, and the last two years there has been a deficiency of £1600.

Judging by experience of the last half-year, I estimate the Revenue of next year as likely to be the same as last year. The fixed expenditure will be about the same, though we had last year unusual repairs.

There will be a deficiency of income to the extent of £500 or £600 at the present rate of expenditure and the present contribution of other Colonies. It will be indispensably necessary for the Legislature to take steps to enable the Marine Board to meet the expenditure, even if the present rates of Light Dues be maintained.

I see no reason to change my opinion as expressed in my letter to the Colonial Treasurer of 5th January last as to the Lights. I still remain of the same opinion.

Ten per cent. of our Colonial traders go to New Zealand.

In Return No. 7 I have stated my opinion as to the contribution of other Colonies. I do not think New South Wales vessels should pay for the Swan Island and Goose Island, as they never see them, unless it is a vessel coming from New South Wales to Hobart Town, and then it is entered as a Hobart Town

vessel. I think Victoria and South Australia should contribute to Swan and Goose Island Lights at a higher rate than at present.

If the contributions were made on that scale this Colony would receive £3094, while at present it only receives £1505. In that case there would not be any necessity for Legislative Aid, and the Marine Board could reduce the existing rates from 9*d.* to 6*d.* a ton on Colonial Vessels, not on English Vessels, and we should have a margin of £300 or £400 for repairs, putting Steamers on an equality with Sailing Vessels. The whole Revenue for Light Dues then would be £2500 and £3000, equal to £5500. Our Light-houses last year cost £6000, but then there were £500 for repairs.

By Chairman.—Do you think the additional Wharfage Rate would be agreeable to the Colony as a temporary measure? I think it would be acceptable to the great body of Ship-owners, but not to the shop-keepers and importers,—it would be pleasing to one body, but not to another.

The only possible way would be to apply to the Government to aid the Light Dues.

I don't think a wharfage rate would spread it fairly over the whole Colony. I think a small tax as additional wharfage would come out of the pockets of persons paying it, and not out of those of the general public.

By Mr. Lette.—My estimate of expense includes everything;—stationery, messenger, fire, &c. I don't think any retrenchment can be made in it. Our men get lower wages than the common sailors, who get £84.

By Mr. Chapman.—I have had a good deal of correspondence with the Chamber of Commerce and Marine Board of Launceston about the Launceston Guide Lights, urging the establishment of those Lights. If we were in funds we would have erected them years ago.

The Superintendent of Low Head has two Assistants. I know the localities, but my knowledge is confined to having been there twice; the distance is about half a mile.

I think it undesirable to alter the Port Dues—they should be fixed, and generally known.

It would be best to settle the question as regards contribution from the other Colonies before any lowering of the Light Dues takes place, and the exaction of Wharfage Dues in lieu thereof.

If the Wharfage Rates at Hobart Town and Launceston were raised 33 per cent., the Marine Board would be enabled to reduce the Light Dues to the rate of 1*s.* per ton payable once in Six months by every Vessel.

I don't think that New Zealand should be charged any portion of the expense of the Lights.

I should recommend the adoption here of the Victorian rule, that a payment should cover the charge to the end of the current half-year.

No. 1.

RETURN showing the Tonnage of Vessels arriving in the Port of HOBART TOWN during the Year 1862.

	<i>Tons.</i>
Tonnage of Sailing Vessels arriving at the Port of Hobart from Australia and New Zealand	40,307
Tonnage of Steam Vessels arriving at the Port of Hobart from Australia	6758
Tonnage of Whalers arriving at the Port of Hobart from South Seas	8263
Tonnage of English and Foreign Vessels arriving at Port of Hobart	6004

No. 2.

RETURN showing the Number and Tonnage of Colonial Traders arriving at the Port of HOBART TOWN during the first and second Six Months of the Year 1862.

	<i>Number.</i>	<i>Tons.</i>
Number and Tonnage from 1st January to 30th June, 1862	42	6907
Number and Tonnage from 1st July to 31st December, 1862	53	8300
Number and Tonnage of Steam Vessels from 1st January to 30th June	2	648
Number and Tonnage of Steam Vessels from 1st July to 31st December, 1862	1	285

No. 3.

PORT OF LAUNCESTON, 1862.

	Tons.
No. 1. 38 Sailing Vessels entered Inwards from Australia and New Zealand, (83 entries)	11,875
No. 2. 12 Sailing Vessels entered Inwards from all other ports, (12 entries).....	4898
13 Coasters entered 23 times, of the total tonnage of	2344
No. 3. 4 Steamers entered inwards 79 times.....	12,363
The "Titania" from the Coast, 56 tons, also entered 40 times	2240
No. 4. Number of all Vessels entered Inwards from Australia and New Zealand—	
4 Steamers,—“Black Swan”	129 tons.
“Royal Shepherd”	183 „
“Aldinga”	267 „
“Golden Age”	111 „
	690
38 Sailing Vessels	5600

No. 4.

ENTERED INWARDS AT HOBART TOWN.

1862.	Tons.	
From January to June.—42 Vessels from Australia, &c.....	6907	
December.—53 ditto.....	8300	
January to December.—3 Steamers	933	
English and Foreign.....	6004	
	22,144 at 1s.....	£1107 4 0

1862.

AT LAUNCESTON.

38 Vessels from Australia, &c. 5600 tons × 2 =	11,200	
4 Steamers	690 tons × 2 =	1380
English and Foreign.....		4898
	17,478 at 1s.....	£873 19 0
		£1981 3 0
If at 9d. per ton—Hobart Town.....	830 8 0	
Launceston.....	655 11 0	
	£1485 19 0	

In the calculation above the Return of Tonnage from Launceston is assumed to be correct.

C. M.

No. 5.

ENTERED INWARDS AT HOBART TOWN, 1862.

	Tons.	
Vessels from Australia and New Zealand	40,307	
Steam Vessels.....	6,758	
	47,065 at 6d....	£1176 12 6
English and Foreign Vessels	6,004 at 9d....	225 3 0
		1401 15 6
Light Dues at Northern Ports, estimated at		1100 5 0
		£2500 0 0

ABSTRACT of Light-house Accounts.

Years.	Cost of Main-tenance.		Light Dues.		Contributions from New South Wales and Victoria.		Total Receipts.		Surplus.		Deficiency.		Repairs.	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
1858.....	4583	0 0	4830	0 0	—	—	4830	0 0	247	0 0	—	—	—	—
1859.....	3898	0 0	4020	0 0	620	0 0	4650	0 0	752	0 0	—	—	109	0 0
1860.....	3726	0 0	3733	0 0	597	0 0	4330	0 0	604	0 0	—	—	—	—
1861.....	4640	0 0	3441	0 0	610	0 0	4051	0 0	—	—	589	0 0	31	0 0
1862.....	5676	0 0	3407	0 0	1212	0 0	4619	0 0	—	—	1057	0 0	545	0 0
									1603	0 0	1646	0 0		

No. 7.

MEMO.—King's Island and Kent's Group, if supported by the Three Colonies in proportion to tonnage, the following would be the share of each:—

Victoria, 53 per cent., say 50 per cent.	£ 1058
N. S. Wales, 38 ditto, say 35	740
Tasmania, 10 ditto, say 15	317
	<u>£2115</u>

Swan Island and Goose Island:—

Victoria, 83 per cent., say 80 per cent.	£ 1296
Tasmania, 17 ditto, say 20 per cent.	324
	<u>£1620</u>

This Colony would thereby receive	£ 3094
At present the Colony receives— $\frac{3}{4}$ of Kent's Group	£652
$\frac{1}{4}$ of King's Island	£853
	<u>1505</u>
	<u>£1589</u>

No. 8.

COST of Light Houses in Victoria for 1862.

Cape Otway	£ 1215	s. 1	d. 2
Gabo Island	1242	13	5
Shortland's Bluff	1332	18	8
Gellibrand's Point	975	1	4
West Channel	1881	4	4
Swan Spit	1384	11	8
Geelong South Channel	972	1	5
Williamstown Jetty	49	7	4
Sandridge	72	7	7
Portland	50	0	0
Geelong	73	0	0
	<u>£9248</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>

The above does not include the expense of transport, stores being conveyed by Government vessels.