Date taken out.	For what purpose.			Initials of Referencer.	Date returned.	Initials of attendor.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			

[L. & M.
5,000—19-11-96.]

Local & Munl. (1896) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 1148 L

DATED 20th June 1896

[Despatch Abstract.]

Railway Extention.

Passing orders on the resolution of the Tanjore District Board regarding --- in the district.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Abstract of goods passing from one station to another for the month of June 1895.

No.	names of goods	Pattukkottai to Muthupet						Muthupet to Pattukkottai						Adirampatnam to Muthupet						Muthupet to Adirampatnam						Total					
		No.	weight	No. of bandies	value			No.	weight	No. of bandies	value			No.	weight	No. of bandies	value			No.	weight	No. of bandies	value			No.	weight	No. of bandies	value		
			mds						mds						mds						mds						mds				
1	Mangoes	483000	u	118	1207	8	u	"	"	"	"	u	u	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	483000	u	118	1207	8	u
2	Jack fruits	10370	u	143	1293	7	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	50	u	1	6	4	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	10420	u	144	1299	11	u
3	woods	101	u	10	114	u	u	117	u	6	69	12	u	128	u	7	59	u	u	24	u	2	48	u	u	370	u	25	290	12	u
4	grains	30 klm	u	3	52	8	u	842 klm	u	53	1263	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	222 klm	u	15	333	u	u	1094 klm	u	71	1648	8	u
5	[illegible]	u	1110mds	28	1692	8	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	530mds	13	775	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	1640mds	41	2467	8	u
6	Dried fish	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	1246mds	39	2500	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	72mds	3	150	u	u	u	1318mds	42	2650	u	u
7	Chillies	u	460mds	19	920	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	460mds	19	920	u	u
8	[illegible]	u	160mds	6	480	u	u	u	2790mds	106	8790	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	750mds	26	2430	u	u	u	3700mds	138	11700	u	u
9	[illegible]	u	u	u	u	u	u	1006 klm	u	60	125	12	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	10 klm	u	2	1	4	u	1016 klm	u	62	127	u	u
10	Straw	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	470mds	25	58	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	130mds	7	16	4	u	u	600mds	32	74	4	u
11	[illegible]	u	850mds	28	637	8	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	4mds	1	2	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	854mds	29	639	8	u
12	Salt	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	10290mds	666	25725	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	10290mds	666	25725	u	u
13	Tamarind	u	1780mds	65	2030	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	70mds	3	90	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	1850mds	68	2120	u	u
14	Nuts	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	540mds	26	2460	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	130mds	7	325	u	u	u	670mds	33	2785	u	u
15	onions	u	30mds	1	15	u	u	u	80mds	3	60	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	110mds	4	75	u	u
16	Water pipes	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	174mds	13	780	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	12mds	1	60	u	u	u	186mds	14	840	u	u
17	Kuths	u	u	u	u	u	u	35200	u	40	111	14	u	1200	u	2	4	4	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	36500	u	42	116	2	u
18	Skins	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	29mds	3	145	u	u	u	60mds	3	120	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	89mds	6	265	u	u
[illegible]	Cones	u		u	u	u		u	u	u	u	u		u	160mds	6	80	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	160mds	6	80	u	u
19	Cotton	u		u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	20mds	1	40	u	u	u	40mds	2	80	u	u	u	60mds	3	120	u	u
20	Pots	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	350	u	2	10	15	u	350	u	2	10	15	u
21	Coconut fibre	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	120mds	6	u	15	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	120mds	6	u	15	u
22	Cotton Seeds	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	120mds	4	90	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	150mds	6	112	8	u	u	270mds	10	202	8	u
23	Coconut	15000	u	11	300	u	u	4900	u	4	98	u	u	8000	u	8	180	u	u	1000	u	1	20	u	u	28900	u	24	598	u	u
24	[illegible]	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	60mds	2	120	u	u	u	60mds	2	120	u	u
25	Cloth	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	40mds	2	400	u	u	u	40mds	2	400	u	u
26	[illegible]	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	60mds	2	120	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	60mds	2	120	u	u
27	[illegible]	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	60mds	2	60	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	u	60mds	2	60	u	u
		508471	4390	432	8742	7	u	40217 +	5649mds	390	16672	5	u	9478	11194 mds	713	27141	8	u	1374 + 232 klm	1384 mds	78	4106	15	u	569540 + 2110 klm	22617 mds	1613	56663	3	u

(1) Muthupet to join the Madura Pa

Abstract of goods passing from one station to another for the month of January 1896.

Names of articles	From Pattukkottai to Muthupet				From Muthupet to Pattukkottai				From Adirampatnam to Muthupet				From Muthupet to Adirampatnam				Total				Remarks
	No	Weight	No of bandies	Value	No	Weight	No of bandies	Value	No	Weight	No of bandies	Value	No	Weight	No of bandies	Value	No	Weight	No of bandies	Value	
1 Jackfruits	800 ~~400~~	"	10 ~~23~~	100 ~~230~~	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	800 ~~1400~~	-	10 ~~23~~	100 ~~230~~	"
2 Maravalli-root	"	"	-	-	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
3 Woods	158	"	11	312	"	"	"	"	160	"	8	40	"	"	"	"	318	"	19	352	"
4 Grains	Klms 5946	"	383	8851	Klms 4176	"	261	6264	"	"	"	"	13952	"	872	20928	24074	"	1516	36043	"
5 Coconuts [illegible]	"	"	"	.	"	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
6 Coconuts	3000	"	3	90	-	-	-	-	98000	"	98	2940	"	"	"	"	101000	"	101	3030	"
7 Dried fish	"	"	"	"	"	510	17	1020	"	"	"	"	"	60	2	120	"	570	19	1140	"
8 Salt	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	7440	465	18600	"	"	"	"	"	7440	465	18600	.
9 Tamarind	"	1290	43	1290	"	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	1290	43	1290	.
10 Tobacco	.	.	.	.	.	570	19	1710	"	"	"	"	~~390~~	390 ~~18~~	13 ~~1170~~	1170	"	960	32	2880	.
11 [illegible]	"	630	21	472 8	"	"	"	"	"	60	2	45	"	"	"	"	"	690	23	517 8	"
12 Nuts	"	"	"	"	"	1200	40	1800	"	180	6	270	"	"	"	"	"	1380	46	2070	"
13 [illegible]	"	"	"	"	Klms 1480	"	74	185	"	"	"	"	Klms 400	"	20	50	Klms 1880	"	94	235	"
14 [illegible]	"	"	"	"	"	20	2	100	20000	"	25	2500	12000	"	15	1500	32000	20	42	4100	.
15 Water pipes	"	"	"	"	40	"	8	200	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	40	"	8	200	"

Extract from the Proceedings of the District Board of Tanjore

Dated 26th March 1896.

Present

~~READ~~

C. Stokes Esqr. President

Members

1. M. R. Ry. C. Murugesam Pillai Avargal Deputy Collector Tanjore & Vice President.
2. W. B. Ayling Esqr. Sub Collector Kumbakonam.
3. M. R. Ry. K. Lakshmana Row Avargal Deputy Collector Mannargudi
4. " P. Rajaratna Mudaliyar Avargal Deputy Collector Pattukkottai.
5. " Rai Bahadur R. Subramania Aiyar Avargal District Registrar Tanjore.
6. " K. Jagannatha Chettiyar Avargal Tahsildar of Kumbakonam
7. " S. A. Saminatha Aiyar Avargal Government Pleader Tanjore.
8. " S. A. Sundaram Aiyar Avgl. Sub Assistant Inspector of Schools Negapatam.
9. The Honorable K. Kalliyanasundaram Aiyar Avargal Tanjore.

(1) Muttupet to join the Madura P

10. M.R.Ry. S. Ramaswami Aiyar Avgl. Pattukkottai.
11. " S. Govindaswami Pillai Avgl. Tanjore.
12 " T. Ratnaswami Nadar Avargal Mayavaram.
13 " V. Appaswami Vandayar-Avargal. Tanjore.
14 " A. Annaswami Tevar Avgl. Tanjore.
15 " Venkattarama Aiyar Avgl. Pattukkottai.
16 " Govindaswami Aiyar-Avargal Nannilam.
17 " Venkattarama Aiyar Avgl. Nannilam.
18 " Ramachendra Nayudu Avgl. Nannilam.
19 " C. Sabhanayaga Mudaliyar Avargal, Shiyali.
20 " Vaithinadu Aiyar Avargal Mayavaram.
21 " V. Ponnuswami Nadar-Avargal Kumbakonam.
22 " P. Ratnasabhapati Pillai Avargal, Negapatam.
23 " A. Swami Aiyar Avargal Mayavaram.
24 " Sivaswami Odayar Avgl. Kumbakonam
25 M.R.Ry. Alaga Pillai Avargal Mayavaram
26 " Rengaswami Mudaliyar-Avargal Mannargudi.
27 " Gopala Row Gade Row Sahib Avargal Tanjore.
28 " Syed Gulam Ghouse Shah-Kadiri Sahib Tanjore.

---

x x x x

2 Read G.O. No 871 R dated 18th December 1895 approving the project for a Railway from Mayavaram to Tranquebar provided the District Board Tanjore undertake its construction without assistance from Provincial Funds and can show that it will pay a fair percentage on its Capital cost; and President's memorandum thereon dated 16th March 1896.

The Board consider that it is necessary to set on foot

(1) Muttupet to join the Madura Pa

foot proper enquiries and investigation to enable it to arrive at a decision as to what projects should be taken up and that for this purpose the coöperation and advice of Government should be invoked. To that end stations to register traffic will have to be established and statistics of the trade of the necessary ports obtained. The Board think that the Muttupet-Pattukkottai-Avadayarcovil line should be investigated as also the Mayavaram-Tranquebar line. In regard to the first line, it should be ascertained whether it will be taken up by Government jointly with the District Board and also whether it will be Continued to join the Madura-Paumben line. The investigation should

show

show separately the desirability of taking up the portion from Muttupet to Pattukkottai only. The Board would think 3 registering stations sufficient for the whole route in the 1st case and 2 stations for the 2nd. The Board would sanction Rs 3000 as an allotment from the Reserve for the purposes of this investigation. The Board Considers it unnecessary to investigate the Negapatam-Nagur line or any other line at present. Resolution No 2 dated 29th November 1894 and resolution No 2 dated 31st August 1895 will be Considered incorporated in this resolution.

× × ×

(Signed) G. Stokes
President
(True extract)

For President

Enclosure
to a letter
from
The President
District Board
Tanjore

To
The Chief Secretary
to Govt.
L. & M. Dept.
Madras

Dated 1st
Despd 4th } April 96

Disposal No. 224

Extract from
the Proceedings
of the District
Board of Tanjore
dated 28th March 96

4/1042/M96

Extract from the Proceedings of the District Board of Tanjore

Dated 31st August 1895.

2 READ Endorsement of Government on the memorial of the Inhabitants of Tranquebar No. 832 dated 21st June 1895 praying for the Construction of a Railway between Mayavaram and Tranquebar and letter from the President Taluk Board Kumbakonam thereon No. 460 dated 4th July 1895 submitting a copy of the Taluk Boards' resolution on the subject and President's Note thereon dated 15th August 1895.

The Board are unanimously and strongly of opinion

16

opinion that if the line is constructed, it should be a Railway line and not a Tramway. The railway line would be far more useful. Experience in connection with the Mayavaram Mutbupet line shows that such a line can be made to pay. The Board are strongly of opinion that this is the next work that should be taken up in the district.

× × ×

(Signed) E. C. Rawson
President

(True extract)

For President

---

(17)

Extract from the Proceedings of the District Board of Tanjore

Dated 29th Novr 1894.

2. READ G. O. No. 2012 L miscellaneous dated 11th October 1894 recording report on the Adirampatnam harbour; and district Board's resolution No. 25 dated 28th April 1894 on G. O. No. 159 Financial dated 23rd February 1894. District Board's resolution No. 17 dated 29th October 1894 and this office letter to the Consulting Engineer thereon No. 1164 dated 4th November 1894.

—

The Board is unanimously in favor of the extension from Mutbupet to Adirampatnam to be undertaken as

(1) Muttupet to [illegible] from thence to

as soon as convenient.

× × ×

(Signed) J. Thomson
President

(True extract)

For President

2/104 24/96

69

MEMO.

N. B.—The subject of the accompanying memorandum will come before the next meeting of the District Board to be held on the 28th March 1896. Each member is particularly requested to attend.

5. The Tanjore-Puducottah line *Via* Vallam.
6. The Nidamangalam-Mannargudi branch line.

There is little or no sound information in regard to any of these lines and in order that such may be collected in the proper form, it is necessary for the Board to determine what steps shall be taken to that end. There are, however, in the case of some of these projects general considerations which are sufficient, I think, in themselves to settle the question of present investigation in regard to several of them.

In considering any project, I conceive it to be the duty of the District Board in this matter to look at each project not from any personal stand point or even on its merits as a paying concern only, but to consider what it is necessary to do in order to treat fairly and benefit all parts of the Districts in the order of their need. It is, I conceive, a very pressing duty of the Board to make accessible those parts of the District which are now little or entirely inaccessible if it can do so with a fair prospect of Financial Success. Every inaccessible part of the District is far poorer than it would be were it accessible and is kept poor because it is inaccessible. Pattukkottai Taluq, for example, produces admittedly the best rice in the District but the producers of that rice are nevertheless poor, because owing to the difficulty and expense of bringing that rice to market the balance of profit in their favor is but very small. The Taluk will soon flourish if that margin of profit is increased by a considerable saving in the cost of transport.

As to the first Project:

This is a line from Muthupett to Pattukkottai either direct through Adirampatnam or with a branch to Adirampatnam; but the first point on which the Board should settle is that the line must go to and serve the town of Pattukkottai. This it must do (1) in order that it may be fed from both sides (2) in order to save expense in bridging (3) because Pattukkottai is a large place (4) in order that it may protect in times of famine that tract of inland territory which the Sea cannot protect. The line would run after leaving Pattukkottai town much along the course of the existing road to Avadayarcovil and in Madura it is to join at Pamruti at no great distance from Paumben the Madura-Paumben line.

Parmagudi I presume
W

Now it is admitted on all hands that the Pattukkottai Taluq is almost inaccessible; no roads can be maintained in it any more than in the Delta and it can only be served by a Railway. In its inaccessibility therefore is found the 1st argument in favor of this Project. It will open up an entirely new country not poor in itself but of which the people are poor because they connot realize their produce. If this line be made, it will be possible to run down to a Sea port either Adirampatanam or Muttupett all the heavy produce such as Keeths, cocoanuts &c., which cannot at present be brought out and are now regarded as valueless. Even rice is sometimes unsaleable in these parts. The conditions of this line are very analogous to those of the Mayavaram–Muttupet line. It will make accessible without a competitor even in the country cart, a large tract and must therefore get all the goods and passenger traffic of that tract.

The second general argument in favor of the District Board taking up this line is that it will vastly improve their existing property, the M–M–line. If the line be carried on to a station on the Madura-Paumban line as it will be for protective purposes by Government and the Madura Board, the Mayavaram Paumben line will command all the pilgrim traffic to Rameswaram. Under such circumstances it will be necessary in order to meet the intentions of the grant to move all the Rajah's Chattrams off the coast road to the neighbourhood of the Railway which will again draw the pilgrims to the line. The result will be that not only will we have a considerable local passenger traffic but we will have a very large thro' traffic not only over the new section of our property in question but also over our existing property which will be a source of great profit to the Board in future years.

Further if the Railway to Ceylon be opened this route will be the shortest and most direct route and it will in fact become a line of the very first importance. In fact in speaking to me of it a few days ago an Engineer of long experience and high standing in the S. I. R. Company said that under the circumstances this line would become their Main line.

The 3rd argument in favor of this project is that Government will pay half the cost for the line will be a famine protection line. This is a vast advantage, for Government will advance the capital and recover it from the District Board—an operation which the Board could otherwise finance only with difficulty. It is needless to dwell on the great advantages of this as they are still fresh in memory in connection with M–M–line. It will ensure to the Board the most advantageous terms both for construction and maintenance and far better terms than any theycan get for themselves.

There is another argument which needs mention. There is before Government a scheme for greatly improving the irrigation in Pattukkottai and bringing some 40,000 acres under wet irrigation above and around that place. The tract of country therefore is an improving one which will also add to the probable success of our line in the near future.

The distance between Muttupet and Pattukkottai would require 17 miles of line if the Main line were taken direct and a branch made to Adirampatnam and 16 miles if the line were taken direct to Adirampatnam and from there to Pattukkottai. It is 30 miles from Pattukkotta to Avadayarkovil Total 47 miles. Since land is cheap and bridging less than that required in crossing the drainage in any Delta tract the cost of building a mile of this line might not exceed Rs. 35,000 against Rs. 50,000 of the Mayavaram Muttupet line. The total cost of the line would be on this Estimate Rs. 16,45,000. Taking even 50,000 a mile, the cost would be 23,50,000. As Government would find half, the District Board would have to find 8 or 12 lakhs. The existing available balance of the Railway Guarantee Fund is Rs. 5,73,000 roundly and it increases about 1,30,000 Rs. annually. The District Board can thus find even 12 lakhs and start the line within a short time

with the help of Government, but it can only carry out work without Government aid in small instalments, even at first and afterwards with years intervening.

It has always been the intention of the Board, I believe to extend the Mayavaram-Muttupet line to Adirampatnam. It would be a better scheme considering the above arguments, to take it on to Pattukkottai even if the longer line south were not made. To my mind, the making of the longer line is only a matter of time and it will be made within no long period.

As to the 2nd Project Mayavaram–Tranquebar line.—There has been considerable discussion of this Project on a previous occasion. The present position of this matter is that Government have sanctioned the line *if it will pay*. The District Board have resolved that it is the first line to be taken up in the District, but this conflicts with the resolution to extend the Mayavaram—Muttupet line to Adrampatnam. On the prospects of the line there is no reliable information to be placed before the Board. The appended statement shows the VALUE of the trade of the port of Tranquebar during the last 2 years. The figures lend color to the argument that the port is declining and show that the volume of its trade is insignificant.

Year.	Total value of exports.	Total value of imports.
1893—94	1,74,979	3,217
1894—95	1,46,694	1,869

I append as an Appendix the arguments etc., as taken from Mr. Stokes' Memo on this subject which seem at present to have lost none of their force. One prominent member of the Board is personally much interested in this line and he will place before the Board all the arguments in its favor. It seems to me however that even if he can show by reliable figures that the line will pay, he must go further and show that such a line *is more wanted* than any other. There is another competing line within a few miles of it, the Peralam Karikkal line which runs to a better port. We have here no virgin soil in which to sow as in the case of the first project above mentioned.

As to the 3rd project, the Negapatam—Nagore line :—

This is a line which, it has been asserted, would pay. I surmise that if that were so certain, the S. I. R. would have made it long ago. It seems to me little wanted and if made, it will not benefit the District Board rate payers. If any one is to make this line, it is the S. I. R.

? The S.I.R. hasnt been enterprising

As to the 4th Project Tanjore–Tiruvadi line.

This is a line which is much wanted but its cost is prohibitive as it would require such an enormous extent of waterway, running as it does across many of the rivers in the District where they are widest.

As to the 5th Project.—Tanjore-Pudukota line.

This line though it would run through new country is not much wanted in our interest. The country is very poor. It would run through the high laterite portions of the District where communication is always more or less easy and where it would have therefore to compete with the ordinary cart. Though the construction of this line would probably be very cheap and easy it is not in my opinion now much wanted for protection or otherwise and would not probably pay even a moderate interest on a small capital.

The 6th Project. The Nidamangalam—Mannargudi line.

This is in my opinion a promising line. It follows an existing line of considerable traffic. That traffic however is even now not much inconvenienced and so the line will not open new country though it might slightly develop the existing resources of the tract it might serve. It is certainly as compared with the Pattukkotta line not wanted. It is not a necessity but a luxury.

Since writing the above I have received a paper on Railway extension in the Tanjore District drawn up by Mr. K. Ranganatha Rao B. A. of Kumbakonam. This paper, I have no doubt, has been circulated to all Board Members and so is known to them. He refers incidentally to nearly all the above Projects and proposes in fact much more than 100 miles of line to be made from the Board's own resources. As the Board's unaided resources amount only to 1,50,000 Rs. roundly, a year and as that will only guarantee under the most favourable circumstances 30,00,000 (thirty lakhs) which will only make 60 miles of delta line it is plain that many of his proposals must be given up. It will be noticed that most of his proposals start from Kumbakonam. His most feasible proposal is a line from Kumbakonam to Mannargudi a portion of which line Mannargudi to Nedamangalam I have dealt with above. To the larger line proposed the objection taken is only the stronger. There is not a bit of the country through which the line will run that is not quite accessible being within 10 miles of a Railway Station; and such a line would only compete with existing lines and suffer in the competition. Running for its whole length through rich delta lands and across the drainage it will cost not less than Rs. 50,000 a mile—the average cost of the Mayavaram—Muttupet line—and will therefore have a heavy capital cost on which to pay interest. It follows none of the natural courses of trade and if continued for that purpose to Tirutturaippundi or Muttupet will only compete with our own existing property and draw away its traffic.

In the 2nd para of the paper he advocates a portion of the Muttupet Avadiarkoil line and agrees with what I have insisted on *viz.*, that the line should go to Pattukkottai.

As to any line in the eastern part of the Tirutturaippundi Taluk it must be remembered that such a line will run through the worst drained portions of the District and that it will have to compete with the Vedaraniem canal.

In his last para Mr. K. Ranganada Rao advocates a junction with the Madura system of lines which the line from Muttupet to Avadiarkoil will effect.

I have thus briefly set out some of the general considerations bearing on the choice of the next Project to which the Railway Guarantee Fund should be devoted. Before finally undertaking any project it will be necessary for the President to investigate it in communication with the Railway Engineer and Government and collect facts etc., about it and to lay the matter before the Board. I would now ask the Board to determine in regard to what project such investigation ect., should be undertaken and to indicate in what direction and how they think such investigation can best be made.

G. STOKES,
President.

PRINTED AT THE "POORNACHANDRODAYA PRESS" TANJORE

Extract from a memorandum by Mr. H. E. (now Sir Henry) Stokes, on the construction of Local Fund Railways in the Tanjore District, dated 18th October 1882.

Para 12. "The Local Fund Boards (of Tanjore and Negapatam Circles) are aware that a project for a railway from Mayavaram to Tranquebar has already been investigated, and that full estimates for its construction have been prepared and submitted to Government. They have now received sanction. I venture, notwithstanding my short acquaintance with the District, to express my opinion that this line will not be successful, and that the Local Fund Boards should not commit themselves to it, or devote to it a large proportion of their available resources, before the merits of other projects which promise in my opinion at least to be more remunerative and to confer greater benefits on the District have been fully gone into."

Para 13. "When the Mayavaram-Tranquebar line was proposed by Mr. Webster, it was thought that it would cost only Rs. 25,000 per mile, and that the distance would be only fourteen miles. But the estimates prepared amount for the construction of the permanent way only to Rs. 6,24,610, and the length of line 17¾ miles. Including the cost of land, and of rolling stock, and some additions made by the Consulting Engineer, the estimates as sanctioned amount to Rs. 8,77,187 or Rs. 49, 419 per mile as shown in para I. If we have to give a guarantee of 5 per cent., and if the line does not pay, we shall have used up more than half our resources upon it. If we borrow the money under the Public Works Loans Act, three-fourths of the fund (nearly) will be spent upon it. The statements of traffic and other calculations of returns which have been put forward in its favor appear to me unsatisfactory and insufficient as a basis for so expensive a project. It appears to be assumed in the first place that all the grain exported from Tranquebar and Tirumalavasal and a great portion of that exported from Karrikal will be diverted to Tranquebar and carried over the proposed line; and that the merchants of Karrikal will move in a body to Tranquebar. I believe these assumptions to be unfounded, and that, notwithstanding the construction of the railway, the grain will seek its accustomed outlets. The line is too short to have any effect in this matter. It is found, I am informed, that on the Negapatam line no grain for the port comes to the railway nearer than Kulikarai, 18 miles from Negapatam, though the intervening country is rich and well irrigated and unquestionably contributes largely to the trade of the port. The reason obviously is that it is brought there more speedily, and at less extra cost to the ryots who cart it by road. The trouble and delay of taking it to a railway station, unloading, loading on the railway and again unloading and carting it at Negapatam, are saved; and it is to be remembered that to bring it to a railway station and to send it thence, in many cases involves a considerable detour and increase of the total distance over which it has to be carried for shipment. It seems to be accepted that anywhere within a night's journey by cart of a port the grain will go by cart and not by railway.

Para 14. "If these views be well founded, it is evident that even assuming that the grain from the whole tract of country intended to be served, *i. e.*, the eastern parts of Mayavaram, the Shiyali taluq and the northern and north eastern parts of Nannilam were exported from Tranquebar, only a very small portion of it would come to the line. But Tranquebar is not the only or the most convenient outlet for the produce of this part of the country, but is on the contrary the least used and the least convenient. In extent of trade it is the least important port in the District except Velangani. There is in fact nothing worthy of the name of a port. There is nothing but an open surf-beaten beach."

Para 15. "The town is confined and miserably poor. There are no godowns, or store-houses for goods and no room to build them. The town and place of export are separated from Porayar, where merchants can live and where such trade as exists is carried on, by a dreary swamp two miles wide; and altogether it is a decayed and decaying place. The country through which the line will pass is the worst irrigated part of the delta. Tirumalavasal, which receives such portion of the produce of Shiyali taluq as seeks export on the East Coast, is a much better port and is only 9 miles from Shiyali town, which is the centre of the taluq. It will never be superseded by Tranquebar. When the disadvantages of shipment on the East Coast are so great that grain goes, as it has resently done, from Shiyali to Tuticorin for shipment to Ceylon, it is not likely that a line to Tranquebar, which will merely make another inconvenient port available, will attract it. As to the salt of Tranquebar which it is supposed will be carried by rail into the interior, I doubt whether an ounce of it crosses the Coleroon. The consumption is very local, and it will not be carried to any great extent by rail. The average quantity sold annually at Tranquebar is only 1,850 tons; and nearly a third of this (571 tons) is salt supplied to the French Government for the Karrikal territory."

Para 16. "The transference of trade from Karrikal to Tranquebar is less likely than in the case of Tirumalavasal. It must be for good reasons that trade has gravitated towards Karrikal and the grain &c., is now carried to that place even through Tranquebar itself. It is not difficult to see what the reasons are, and that they will not be affected materially by the construction of the Tranquebar railway. First of all, Karrikal is the natural outlet and nearest port to a much better country, viz., the northern and central parts of Nannilam and the French territory itself; and the produce and trade of the country to be served by the proposed line cannot bear more than a small proportion to those of these tract. The Tranquebar railway will not attract any of the Nannilam traffic, as no portion of the Nannilam taluq will be nearer to it than to Karrikal. The Karrikal merchants now get the produce of south and east Mayavaram, and of northern and central Nannilam, which seeks export by sea; and they are not likely to leave the place, which is convenient for the larger portion of their trade, to settle in a place which commands the smaller portion, where they would lose the larger, and where they would have to spend larger sums in godowns, houses &c., before they could trade at all."

Para 17. "The quantity of British grain exported from Karrikal and which pays frontier duty is more than double the exports of Tranquebar and Tirumalavasal taken together:—

GRAIN IN CWT. EXPORTED FROM

	Tranquebar.	Tirumalavasal.	Karrikal.
1879—80 ...	36,888	1,84,007	4,59,636
1880—81 ...	68,069	1,45,448	4,89,169

And besides this British grain there is a whole produce of the French Territory for export at Karrikal. If the advantages of Karrikal are now such as to enable Karrikal merchants to bring their grain past Tranquebar, the only result of a railway which will cheapen transport to that place will be that they will be able to bring a greater quantity and from a greater distance."

Para 18. "Another reason which I have heard given for the thriving trade at Karrikal is that there are no port dues or charges of any kind there, and that there is also a very prompt, simple, and efficacious procedure in the French Courts for the recovery of debts. Also I would add as a possible cause that some of the British grain taken there perhaps pays no export duty. On the whole, the hope that the Karrikal merchants will move to Tranquebar seems to me utterly chimerical. The present exports of Tranquebar port and the traffic shown by the returns which have been taken would hardly keep the railway going for a fortnight."

(*True extract.*)

1/1042/96

For Presid

Local Fund Department.

Tanjore District Board Office.

Camp, Vallam 1st April 1896.

Disposal No. 224
D. B.

Local & Municipal Dept.
CURRENT No. 1042

From
G. Stokes ESQUIRE,
President District Board,
TANJORE.

To
THE HONORABLE MR. J. F. Price,
Chief Secretary to Government,
Local and Municipal Department,
MADRAS.

G. 6 No 302
d 7-1-96

Sir,

With reference to G.O. No. 871 R. Public Works, dated 18th December 1895, approving the project for a Railway from Mayavaram to Tranquebar provided the District Board Tanjore undertake its construction without assistance from Provincial Funds and can show that it will pay a fair percentage on its capital cost, I have the honor

honor to submit herewith a copy of the district Board's resolution No 2 dated 28th March 1896 for issue of such orders and advice as the Government may deem necessary. In the two resolutions quoted at the end of the resolution submitted (copies of which are enclosed), the Board has decided already that the extension of the Mayavaram-Muttupet line to Adirampatnam should be made and that the Mayavaram-Tranquebar line should also be made. In my memo of which a copy is appended, I urged on the Board that there was before them no sound information on which to base any judgment and I proposed that the projects should be properly investigated

investigated and examined. From the resolution, it will be seen that the Board as at present constituted consider that the following two projects only should be investigated.

1) Muttupet-Pattukkottai-Avadayarcovil line.

2) Mayavaram-Tranquebar line.

2. That the Pattukkottai Taluk requires to be opened up far more than any other part of the district, no one now gainsays. It requires to be so, both because it is the only part of the district at all liable to famine and because it needs railway communication for its development. It is as badly

badly off for roads as any part of the delta. It has a population of over 300 to the square mile and were it possible to get its produce put on the market with any reasonable facility, would soon make a great advance in material prosperity. The line which would completely open up the Taluk is the first project in question. Whether the line as fully projected can be carried out depends on whether the continuation in Madura is to be made and it is on this point that the District Board desires more complete information from Government and its aid

in

in arranging for joint action between this District Board and that of Madura and the Government itself. If it be assumed however that the whole length of line cannot be made, the line should, I think, be made as far as Pattukkottai. As noted in my memo, this might be done in two ways. If there is to be a through line (and in my opinion it is only a matter of time till such a line is made), it would be better to make the line direct from Muttupet to Pattukkottai with a branch to Adirampatnam; but if not to extend the Mayavaram-Muttupet Railway to Adirampatnam and from thence to

Pattukkottai

attukkottai. At present statistics of traffic are being collected at a place called Thambikkinallavankottai. This place is the junction of the roads from Muttupet to Pattukkottai and from Muttupet to Adirampatnam. This does not register the traffic from Pattukkottai to Adirampatnam. It does not therefore give all the traffic which the Railway might get. Copies of the returns are herewith submitted. The returns however show that there is a traffic on the average of nine months amounting to about 70 bandies a day carrying on the average 716 maunds and of a value

over

over Rs 71,000 a month passing through that place. Taking this traffic as mostly paying 3^{d} class rates (i.e) $\frac{2}{3}$ of a pie per maund per mile, we get as nearly as possible a daily earning of Rs 2-6-0 a mile or Rs 17-6-0 per mile per week which is higher than the goods earning on the Mayavaram Muttupet Railway. Muttupet has always been recognized as a very undesirable terminus for the Railway. Though the port of Adirampatnam is poor, considerable trade is done there and Pattukkottai is a large town at which the line might fittingly end.

There is however but little information now collected in regard to this project and

it

it needs more investigation.

I do not concur with the opinion of the Board of Revenue as contained in its Proceedings No 1096 miscellaneous dated 4th March 1896, Revenue, Settlement Land Records and Agriculture, submitted to Government in the Public Works department, Railway branch. The objection taken by it does not in any way apply to the extension to the Town of Pattukkottai but to the line beyond that point. The extension to Pattukkottai would run through very easy country and should not cost more than Rs 35,000 a mile but no survey or detailed estimate has yet been prepared. I am of opinion that a detailed examination

Note
These may be obtained from the P.W.D at Ooty

examination if not a survey should be arranged for at an early date.

3. As regards the 2nd project, more information is available. The line has been surveyed and its cost somewhat accurately ascertained. Its trade prospects however have never been fully investigated. It was rejected on a former occasion for the reasons contained in Mr Stokes' memo. These reasons have, with the efflux of time, not lost but gained force. The Peralam-Karikal line then in nubibus is now under construction and Tranquebar is even now more dead than it was then. It has no port or harbour. Its total

import

import and export trade in 1894-95 was less than 1,50,000 in value. There are however no statistics as to the road traffic between Mayavaram and Tranquebar which, it is asserted, is large. It is proposed to register this traffic. Such registration is not of much value at the best of times but made as it will be in this case, it is of still less value. Government have sanctioned the line if the District Board can show that it will pay. To make this appear is worth much money to many persons and I regret to have to say that I consider that exceptional measures will have to be taken to

Pathna-
Sannie
Nadis?

prevent

prevent the returns being tampered with. Ordinarily we will have to rely in the matter on low paid Gumastahs and after some consideration, it has struck me that the only way in which to obtain at all reliable statistics would be to establish a toll gate worked on the Commission system with a check station, registering independently. I also consider that the registration should in this case be continued for at least 30 months. The argument on which its supporters rely in several of their petitions, is that the line should be made so as to enable Tranquebar to compete with the foreign port of Karikal. I have

pointed

189*6*

Local Fund Department.

Lo[illegible] Dept.
CURRENT No. 1042

From

The President District Board,
TANJORE.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Local and Municipal Department,
MADRAS.

Dated 12th
Despatched 4th April 1896
Received

Disposal No. 224
X

ENCLOSURES. 13

CHIEF SECRETARY
-6 APR. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

95 encl. separately by book post

SUBJECT.

Submitting for orders district Board's resolution No 2/28.3.96 regarding extension of Railway lines in the Tanjore district

A24/4
11/4

R. Form No. 11

No. 435 D

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

RAILWAY BRANCH.

MEMORANDUM.

Dated ~~Madras~~ Ootacamund, 13th June 1896.

Case. Nagore - Negapatam and other railway extensions proposed in Tanjore District

Forwarded to the Honorable the Chief Secretary to Government with the request that he will kindly take necessary action in connection with para 3 of Mr. Hodson's note (Slip B) and His Excellency's remarks thereon, and return papers.

F. D. Fowler

for Joint Secretary to Govt.,
P. W. D. Railway Branch

To
The Hon'ble the Chief Secy to Govt.

189 6

Local Fund Department.

Local and Municipal Dept.
CURRENT No. 1142 L
38

From

The President District Board,
TANJORE.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Local and Municipal Department,
MADRAS.

Dated 12th
Despatched 4th April 1896
Received

Disposal No. 224

ENCLOSURES. 13

CHIEF SECRETARY
-6 APR. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

X 95 sent separately by book post

SUBJECT.

Submitting for orders district Boards resolution No $\frac{2}{28\cdot3\cdot96}$ regarding extension of Railway lines in the Tanjore district

A24/4

R. Form No. 11

No. 435 D

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
RAILWAY BRANCH.

MEMORANDUM.

Dated Ootacamund ~~Madras~~, 13th June 1896.

Case. Nagore - Negapatam and other railway extensions proposed in Tanjore District

Forwarded to the Honorable the Chief Secretary to Government with the request that he will kindly take necessary action in connection with para 3 of Mr. Hodson's note (Slip B) and His Excellency's remarks thereon, and return papers.

F. D Fowler

for Joint Secretary to Govt.,
P. W. D. Railway Branch

To
The Hon'ble the Chief Secy to Govt.

1896

Local Fund Department.

L[illegible] Dept.
CURRENT No. 1142 38

From

The President District Board,
TANJORE.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Local and Municipal Department,
MADRAS.

Dated 12th
Despatched 4th April 1896
Received

Disposal No. 224
x

ENCLOSURES. 13
X 95 sent separately by book Post

CHIEF SECRETARY
-6 APR. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

SUBJECT.

Submitting for orders district Boards resolution No $\frac{2}{28.3.96}$ regarding extension of Railway lines in the Tanjore district

---

R. Form No. 11

No. 435 D

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
RAILWAY BRANCH.

MEMORANDUM.

Dated Ootacamund ~~Madras~~, 13th June 1896.

Case. Nagore-Negapatam and other railway extensions proposed in Tanjore District

Forwarded to the Honorable the Chief Secretary to Government with the request that he will kindly take necessary action in connection with para 3 of Mr. Hodson's note (Slip B) and His Excellency's remarks thereon, and return papers.

F. D. Fowler

for Joint Secretary to Govt.,
P. W. D. Railway Branch

To
The Hon'ble the Chief Secy to Govt.

40

Local & Municipal Dept.
CURRENT No. 1689A L

From:

The P. W. D.
Ry Branch.

No. 435 D.

Dated 13/6/96
Recd 13/6/96.

En. 1 file.

Forwg. with remarks papers reg: certain railway extensions in the Tanjore Dt.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

~~Again G.O., dated~~ ~~189 , No.~~

Current No. 1042 L of 1896, dated 1st April /96 from the Presdt., Dist. Bd., Tanjore

Current No. of 189 , dated from the

FOR ORDERS.

× Recorded in G.O. 30 L 7.1.96

The above current is from the Presd. Tanjore Dt. Bd. with reference to the extension of railways in Tanjore. In × G.O. P.W.D. 871 R of 18.12.95 the project of a line from Mayaveram to Tranquebar was sanctioned on condition that it was constructed without aid from Provincial funds & that it was shown to the satisfaction of Gov. that it would pay a fair percentage on its capital cost. On receipt of this G.O. the Pres. of the Dt. Bd. drew up a memorandum on the subject for the consideration of the Board. In this (submitted with the current) he deals with 6 projected lines of railway in the Tanjore Dt, the last four of which he dismisses very briefly as being either not wanted or ~~[illegible]~~ too costly or unremunerative. This leaves the first two (used) for the (1 [illegible] months) & from this the Pr. [illegible]

(2) Mayavaram – Tranquebar.

This second line to Tranquebar has long been projected, & was in fact sanctioned, including the estimates, in 1882 (G.O. $\frac{1252 \text{ Mis.}}{20.9.82}$) On Mr. (now Sir H.E.) Stokes' recommendation this project was abandoned & the Mayavaram Muttupet line sanctioned & constructed. The arguments against the M.–T. line are put forward in Mr. Stokes' memo in the original of G.O. $\frac{171\text{-}172 \text{ Mis.}}{26.1.83}$, extracts from which are enclosed in the current.

Mr. Gabriel Stokes now states that not only do these arguments still hold good, but that they are rather stronger now than they were in 1882, & therefore it is not possible to guarantee that the line will be remunerative. He also states that there are x several persons financially interested in this line, who will do anything in order to secure its construction.

x I do not think that there are several persons interested. Rathnasabapathi Sami Pillai son of Tavasemuthu Pillai the wealthy arrack Renter of former days is the man.

Mr. Stokes is himself strongly in favour of continuing the first line i.e. the Mayavaram Muttupet line, either as far as Pattukottai, or, if possible right down to Paumben in the Madura District. The reasons in favour of the line to Pattukottai are stated as follows: (1) in order that it may be fed on both sides (2) to save expense in [illegible] expense is to be saved is not

place (4) Protection from famine to the inland country round. If the extension is to go through Pattukottai to Madura the Pres^t. recommends a branch to Adirampatnam from Muttupet, but if the line is to stop at Pattukottai, that it should pass through Adirampatnam. As there is only a difference of 1 mile in the two lines to P. kottai, the latter proposal seems advisable in either case.

With regard to the extension to Madura meets the projected Rameswaram line the Board of Revenue considers that ~~considering~~ having regard to the poorness of the country the line will not be remunerative (B.P. 1098 Mis of 4.3.96). If this extension is approved it will have to be considered whether Govt. will bear part of ~~the~~ its cost, as being a famine protection line. The Dt. Bd. of Madura would also ~~have~~ to be asked its opinion. In ~~para~~ his memo the Pres^d. talks of this line joining the Madura-Paumben line at Pamanti^x, which cannot be discovered [illegible] map.

x This is a misprint for Paramakudi – a [illegible]

I have ascertained this personally from Mr. Stokes

Statistics of traffic between Muttupet & Pattukottai & Adirampatnam, respectively, (are enclosed) for the last nine months, & from this the Pres

44

Re extension of Railway in the Tanjore District

deduces that the earnings of the line will be greater than of the Mayavaram Muttupet. It is also proposed to collect statistics of traffic on the M.-T. line, but it will apparently be necessary to exercise great care in this case to avoid the returns being tampered with by interested persons. The Dt. Bd. has sanctioned Rs 3000 for the expenses connected with the investigation of these lines. The Presᵗ proposes that it should be carried out by a Committee formed of members of the Dist Board conjointly with Railway experts with power to take evidence. It is submitted that this course is advisable as at present there is not sufficient information as to the respective merits of the two lines to enable Govt. to decide which of the two is the better. The committee might consist of 5 members, 3 members of the Dt. Bd, one S. I. R. official, one Govt. railway official, tho' it is doubtful whether the latter could spare time for the purpose.

If ~~the~~ ~~co~~ appointment of a committee be approved, the decision as to which line to adopt must be deferred until

FOR ORDERS.

H.M.

There wd. not be much use in a Comᵗᵉᵉ until some facts are collected for it to consider

---

[G. / 25 A.]
1,000—21-3-96.

DEPARTMENT

C. No.

45

FOR ORDERS.

If however it is ~~[illegible]~~ not approved the following points are submitted for orders.

(1) Should both the Mayavaram Tranquebar & the Muttupet - Pattukottai lines be investigated; or

(2) Should only one be investigated & if so which.

(3) If the Pattukottai line is to be taken up, is it to stop at that town, or to be carried on into the Madura ~~Dt~~ district. If the latter, how is the cost to be met? The cost of the lines is shown below

Mayavaram - Tranquebar Rs 8,77,187
Muttupet - Pattukottai circa Rs 5.60.000
" Avadayarkoil on the southern border of Tanjore Dt. circ Rs 16.45.000

The reserve in favour of the Board is now Rs 5,78.000 & is estimated to be Rs 8.57.000 at the end of 1897-98.

If these questions are to be

G.O. 1896 Rn / 8.4.96

Railway Extension Tanjore Dt.

decided now, it is submitted that the papers may be forwarded to the P.W.D. (Railway) Dept. for remarks

W.W.B.
30-5-96

FOR ORDERS.

H. M. + circ

The C.S. states correctly what was decided in Cl. - Mins for the Dt. Bd. to make definite proposals as to a tollgate & traffic clerks. Mr. Stokes' letter does not do this & it can't be done in the Govt. Office for want of detailed infn

W.S.
J.G.

A-24
6.6.96

DEPARTMENT.

[G.
25 A.]
1,000—21-3-96.

147

DEPARTMENT.

C. No.

FOR ORDERS.

These papers were talked over at the last meeting of Council Mr. G. Stokes being present.

I believe that the following was in substance the decision arrived at.

That this Govt. would take no share in the cost of the construction of any line in the Tanjore Dt. but would agree to the Dt. Bd. constructing a railway from Mannargudi to Pattukottai at its own cost provided that the Bd. could show that there was a reasonable prospect of its paying; ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ and that there was no objection to the erection of a toll gate or toll gates on the road in the direction which it was contemplated that the proposed line should take, in view to testing the traffic.

The Consulting Engineer for Railways said I think that he did not see much use in the proposed Committee but he told me after Council that he would not make any formal objection if it was thought that something of the kind would please the Bd.

I do not know that anything specific was said about surveys & plans. The Bd. can hardly manage this without help - the Govt. cannot lend them a man perhaps the S.I.R. might assist them.

1/6/96.

Railway Extension, Tanj

District

FOR ORDERS.

I don't see the proposed Commee cd be of any use — at all events at present

A.S.H
6.6.96

H. M. & Circ.

The best plan will be for the Bd. to arrange, through the C.E. for Rys, with the S.I.R. to make ~~[illegible]~~ a rough survey & estimate (to begin with) at their cost.

2/6/96

3/6/96

A.S.H
6.6.96

[G. / 24.]
2,000 15-11-95.

DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings :—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. 1042 L of 1896, dated 1st April, from President, District Board, Tanjore

" " 1689 A.L " 1896, " 13th June, " P.W. Depts (Railway Branch)

" " " 189 , " , "

ORDER. No 1148 Lmis Dy 20-6-96

The question, raised by the Dt. Bd. in its resolution No 2 of 28.3.96 as to whether the Govt. would aid ~~the Bd.~~ it by a grant from Provincial funds ~~in~~ towards the cost of construction of additional rail lines in the Tanjore Dt, has already been disposed of in the P.W.D in G.O. No 505 R of 10.6.96.

2. With reference to the concluding portion of the same resolution the Dt. Bd. will be informed that the Govt. has no objection to the proposed establishment of registering stations & toll-gates, as ~~proposed~~ suggested in para 3 of the President's letter, in order to test the traffic with a view to arriving at a decision as to which line of railway, the Mayavaram-Tranquebar, or the Muttupet-Pattukottai, it will be advisable to construct. The Dt. Bd.

OOTACAMUND,
May 8th 1896.

My dear Stuart

You some little time since asked me about a letter & memorandum written by G. Stokes with reference to the project for a Railway line from Mayavaram to Tranquebar.

I have got these up and send them herewith together with the

[illegible]

indefinite & detailed proposals on this point, stating where the tollgates & registering stations are required & the ~~number of staff of clerks~~ staff that ~~that it~~ will be necessary to ~~employ~~ work ~~them~~ there, & submit them for the approval of Govt.

3. The ~~proposals~~ suggestion in para. 5 of the Presidents' letter does not meet with the approval of Govt. as ~~it~~ does not appear that ~~it~~ a committee would ~~be of any~~ ~~use to appoint a committee~~, at any rate for the present serve any useful purpose

(from orders)

W.W.D.
15.6.96

Do
17/6/96

✓

To Pres. Dt. Bd. Tanjore. pto

pto ✓

Copy to P.W.D. with reference to its Memo. No. 435 D of 13.6.96 (with enclosures returned)

W.W.D.
15.6.96

Office take copies
L of L.A.M. no. 659 dt 13-8-96
L of P.W.S. no. 794 D dt 18.8.96
copy of P.D.B. Tanjore letter no. 373 dt 16-4-96 D.B.
copy of notes with g.o.

Despd. 24/6/96

FROM ORDERS.

C. S.

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed
189

AD AGAIN G.O., No
189
DAT

RENT No.

OSURES TO C. No.

OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

TTER OF GOVERNMENT

T WITH DITTO

NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.

t.