M.R.O. 1—5,000—16-10-50.

(1) Number of pages 72.

(2) Date of repair 29. 12. 1964.

(3) Initials of the Referencer

RAS RECORD OFFICE

---

overnment of Madras

Marine, DEPARTMENT

O. No. / ~~No.~~ 116 - Marine. Press / ~~Mis.~~

Dated 20 - 5 - 1882. ~~195.~~

Not to be folded or roughly handled

covering my advances to the doing

And your honor is aware that the shipment of limestones has been carried on in the Islands for many years without any damage to the islands or the mainlands.

I beg that your honor taking the above circumstances into consideration be pleased to permit me as usual to ship lime-stones in conformity with my contract with the Zemindar

I beg to remain, Sir

Your honor's most obedient servant

nber
1-79 } (Signed) Syed Ibrahee

(~~True copy~~)

Petitioner is informed that in the marine limit the Port of Paumbeen, the Ramnad Zemindary has no ht or title to rent out the coral stones, further that the removal of the sand stones a large amount of it is let into the Paumbeen channel which the Govt Madras are expending a large amount of money wrove under section 41 of Act XII of 1875 the servator of a Port is empowered to prevent the moval of any stones &c. that may by being moved damage or be detrimental to such ks. It is my opinion that the removal of ne in certain places is likely to prove so I e to grant your permission.

(Signed) I. H. Baker
Master attendant
and conservator of the port of Paumbeen

ben
November 1879

(True copy)

Spl. Asst Collector

Ramnad
29 November 1877

No 1

4

3/ From

3/

The Special Collector
Ramnad

To

The Conservator of Ports
Paumben

Sir,

I understand that by a notice issued under Section 41 of the Indian Ports Act XII of 1875 you have prohibited the renters of Corals in the islands east and west of Paumben from gathering the same. The right to these islands has been enjoyed by the Zemindar of this Estate from time immemorial. I have the honor to request you will be good enough to let me know whether the above Act has been extended to this District and whether the Port of Paumben has been defined by Government. If so what are its limits.

I have &c

(Sd) E. Turner

Special Collector

(True Copy)

Special Collector

5/ No 232 x 5/ Master Attendant's Off.
Paumben, 2nd December

5

From
The Master Attendant
Paumben.

To
The Special Asstt Collector
Ramnad

Sir,

With reference to your letter No $\frac{175}{29\cdot 11\cdot 79}$ I have the honor to inform you that Paumben was constituted a port under the Port Act XXII of 1855 in 1859 Vide Fort Saint George Gazette dated 11th 1859 page 1193 and the late Mr Damot then Head Government Pilot appointed Conservator, the Port limit Beacons were erected in 1862 by Captain Hankin Superintendent of Operations and the limits defined as under.

To the east. The boundary pillars on the point near the Light house and on the shore two miles east of the Southwest point of the island of Ramesvarem.

To the west. The boundary pillars one mile west of Tonitorei point on the north and South shores of the mainland and a line drawn from the south pillar to the estern extremity of Pullee island. So much of the sea shores between the limits above described whether of the mainland or of the islands as are within 50 yards of the highwater mark spring tides together with the basins harbours waters or creeks between them and the several channels leading thereto.

To the north. The space enclosed by two lines running due north from the northern boundary pillars to 6 fathoms water.

To the south. The space enclosed by two lines running due south from the southern boundary pillar on the Rameswaram island and the west end of Pullee tevoo to 6 fathoms water.

I would also draw your attention to the latter portion of section 2 clause A of the present Act XII of 1875.

I have made a reference to the Head of my Deptt Madras and will again communicate with you when I receive an answer.

I have &c
(Signed) F. H. Baker
Master attendant
(True copy)
E Turner
Spl Asst Colr

---

2 8/ No 1

Spl Asst Collector's Office
Ramnad
January 1880

From
The Spl Asst Collector
Ramnad
To
The Collector of
Madura

Pamben Master Attendant's Office

Administrative Department
Madras Marine Office
6th December 1879
No 9507
Memorandum
From
The Master Attendant
Administrative Depto
Madras
To
The Port Officer
Pamben
Reference
His letter No 233 dated 2nd December 1879.

Has the honor to state that the Port of Pamben so far as Conservancy is concerned, is controlled by the Indian Ports Act No XII of 1875: at present the portion relating to port dues does not apply.

(By order)
(Sd) W H Bartlet
1st Asstt Master Attendant
Administrative Deptt
(True Copy)
E Turner
Spl Asst Collector

ward herewith
in the marg
Sketch map
Pamben port tak
the Master
t having a hou
an Ports Act
f Corals from
oundaries of the
also the islan
long to the Esta
Zemindar
to the trees
the Corals being
the same. Mr

Baker says in his endorsement on the (?)

petition (Copy enclosed) that the Zemindar has no right or title to rent out the Coral Stones and that by the removal thereof "a large amount of silt is let into the Pamben Channel". Pamben seems to have become a port under the Port Act XII 1855 under a Notification published in 1859 but till now, which is more than 20 years, no objection was made to the enjoyment of the Zemindar's rights over these islands and I think that the Government most probably did not wish to do so. As Mr. Baker's action in the matter is likely to cause a permanent loss in this source of income to the Estate I request that you will be good enough if you think fit to take such steps as may be necessary for the removal of the objection above mentioned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obdt. Servant

Spl Asstt. Collector

From
The Spl Asstt. Collector
Ramnad
To
The Collector of
Madura
No. 1
Dated 5th January 1880
No. of Enclo. 6 (Six)

Forwarding copies of certain correspondence noted within and requesting to take such steps as may be necessary for the removal of the objection raised by the Master Attendant Pamban about gathering Corals in Pamben and adjacent islands as within mentioned.

No. 280

Enclo: 1

Marine Office
Pamban
12th Jan. 1880

From
The Master Attendant
Pamban.
To
The Special Asst. Collector
Ramnad.

Sir

With reference to your No. 5/8.1.80 I have the honour to inform you that the Coral Contractor in making his complaint to you has not stated the truth, I have prohibited his removing coral within Marine limits only as unfortunately I have not the power to do so outside of them, the Islands within Marine limits are as follows Shingle, Coorsuddy, Pulli, Pullevassal, also the coast included within the Limit Beacons.

With reference to the

question you ask in the second para: of your letter I must state that I have great objections to the indiscriminate removal of coral from the Islands forming the Southern Boundary of the Keelakari Channel and on the following grounds.

1st The Contractor does not take the dead coral from the Islands themselves but fishes it up from the bottom thereby removing the natural dam that has for years prevented the sand from being washed into the Channel during the strong winds and heavy seas of the S.W. Monsoon.

2nd That as the coral is not being taken away by small quantities but wholesale, it will not take long before the consequences

will show themselves in the silting up of the already shallow parts of the Channel.

Were the Contractor made to take coral only in places where the removal would be beneficial and not detrimental to the Channel it would be a good thing, I feel sure that no owner of a large brig or vessel using the Channel would for the sake of gain do anything that would be detrimental to the navigation but the Contractor is only a Dhoney owner therefore it is quite immaterial to him whether the channel is spoilt or not.

In conclusion I would state that I think it is not improbable that the whole of the Keelakari may be brought under the Port Act 12 of 1875 under Section 5 clause a, and I certainly shall recommend it. It must appear plain to all that it is decidedly wrong that one man should be the gainer at the expense of hundreds, especially as it lays in the power of Govt. to rectify it.

I enclose a statement obtained from the Custom House showing the quantity of coral exported for three months.

I have the honour
to be
Sir
Your most obed. Servant
T. H. Baker
Master Attendant

Spl. Asst. Collector's office
(Camp) Keelachuluvanoor
Dated February 1880

No. 38

17/

From
The Spl. Asst. Collector
Ramnad

To
The Collector of
Madura

Sir,

With reference to your Docket No. 96 dated 12th January last, I have the honor to forward herewith a Statement showing the income derived by renting out Corals in the islands attached to the Estate. From this it will appear that Coral has been gathered within the boundaries of the Pamben port, excluding Pamben village from Fasly 1282. In Pamben however the Corals were not rented out separately but they were included in the rent given out for cutting Stones on the Sea Shore. We have been renting out this Stone from Fasly 1276 and the income derived therefrom is shewn in the margin. The Corals have now become very valuable and I think will fetch a much larger income in future years. The average income from this source within the limits of the Pamben port excluding the island of Pamben is Rs 36. This source of income has

Fasly	
1276	41
1277	25
1278	76
1279	76
1280	76
1281	76
1282	47-9-6
1283	—
1284	196
1285	7-8-9
1286	32
1287	—
1288	34-8-0
1289	25

ot been included in the assets of the Estate on which the Peshcush was fixed because at that time no rent was realized but I believe this does not affect the right of the Zemindar to this or any other sources of income likely to be now or hereafter obtained from these islands in any way. The Peshcush was fixed on the actual income obtained at the time of fixed settlement from land and sea. At that time the Estate derived no income from the sea except what was realized by renting out the Chank royalty. This and also the income derived from the Cheyroot grown in the islands and on the mainland on the sea coast were included in the assets upon which the Peshcush was fixed.

I beg to forward herewith another letter received from Mr Baker in which he objects to the gathering of Corals even in the islands situated beyond the limits of Paumben port. The Coral Contractor of Paumben and other islands complains that he has sustained a great loss owing to Mr Baker's objections to gathering Corals in the islands within the Paumben port and I request therefore that the subject be soon disposed of.

I have the honor to be
your most obedt Servant

No. 12

13

MASTER ATTENDANT'S OFFICE.
Paumben 12th April 1880

From
The Master Attendant
Paumben.

MANAGER'S OFFICE
14 APR 80
RAMNAD

To
The Special Assistant Collector
Ramnad

Sir

I regret pressure of work in consequence of the ending of the official year has prevented my answering your No. $\frac{44}{22\text{-}3\text{-}80}$ before.

I really do not see how I can be more explicit than I was in my letter No. $\frac{2\ 80}{12\text{-}1\text{-}80}$;x to prevent the Contractor from removing coral from objectionable places would require constant and irksome supervision if he would only restrict himself to collecting dead coral washed up on the Islands forming the southern boundary to the Kulak dry channel no harm would accrue but it must be plain to all that if the natural barrier that is now penning back the sand be removed the silt must be washed by the SW sea into the channel thereby in same time putting a stop to traffic.

x This has already been sent to Collr with Spl Asst Collr's letter No $\frac{38}{24\text{-}2\text{-}80}$

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient St.
J H Baker
Master Attendant

Port Office

No. 12 / 1880

Master Attendant's Office,
Paumben 1880

From
The Master Attendant
Paumben.

To
The

Dated }
Received } 18

No. 12
Enclosure
Subject.

Resub the D.C. for reference
18/5/80

No. 88 21/1987 21/

Marine Office
Paumban 22nd May 1880.

24 MAY 80

From.
The Port Officer
Paumban

To.
The Special Assistant Collector
Ramnad

Sir,

With reference to your No. $\frac{51}{16.4.80}$ I have the honour to inform you it is my opinion that unless under strict supervision it will be better not to rent out the Islands along the Keelakari Channel, to the Coral Contractors, and my reasons are as follows.

1st. The Keelakari Channel extending from Paumban to Valinookum Point is already very shoal and the removal of the natural barrier that is keeping back the sand will be highly detrimental and cause silt to accumulate.

2nd. As the Coral when rented out formerly was taken away in very large quantities, it is palpable that in a year or two such a quantity will be carried away that the natural breakwater the reefs now make will be removed; consequently the small craft will gain no advantage by using the Channel during the S.W. monsoon as there will be little or no difference between the state of the sea outside and the sea inside the Channel.

There can be no objection to the letting of the Islands to the westward of Valinookum Point as they are out of the limits of the Channel.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obt St.
[illegible]
Port Officer

No 94 23/ × 23/ Ramnad
10th June 1880

11th

From

The Special Asstt Collector
Ramnad

To

The Collector of
Madura

Sir,

I have the honor to forward ×2 letters from the Master Attendant, Pamban, with reference to your letter No 51 dated 11th March 1880.

×No 12/12-4-80 +
No 88/22-5-80
to be returned

2 The Master Attendant is averse from allowing coral to be taken from the bottom of the sea or from any of the islands within the channel limits from Pamben to Valinokom point, i.e. the whole extent of coast line of the Ramnad Zemindary.

3 I presume therefore that we must give up selling the coral entirely. I think however it will be practically impossible to preserve the coral, and that the only result attained will be that the Zemindar will lose the right of quarrying coral and private persons will attain to it. You will never stop people from quarrying coral over so large an area. The distance to Valinokom is about 50 miles. There

---

G L No: 67/1880

Marine Office
Paumban 22nd May

No 88

From
The Port Officer
Paumban

To
The Spl. Astt Collector
Ramnad

Dated 22nd
Despd. do } May 1880.
Received

Encls Nil

Answering the enquiry regarding the removal of Coral along the Kelakari Channel.

are a great number of islands and the whole coast of the island of Rameswarem to conserve. Even supposing you detect them in the act (and even now they are taking large quantities of coral all along the coast of Pamben itself) what then? I doubt whether you would ever get a conviction in the Ramnad Criminal Courts as at present constituted.

4 The income now derived from coral amounts to Rs 400 and is likely to increase greatly as coral has been found most valuable as manure for coffee. A European merchant from Tuticorin has already applied to me for the lease of two coral islands in which to store coral for shipment to Colombo and elsewhere. Under these circumstances it seems to me a question whether the matter should not be referred to the Marine Department, Madras for more minute enquiry. Mr Baker's statements are very general.

5 There is another question. Supposing it decided that coral must not be taken from the sea-board, does that debar us from selling as heretofore, quarries in land either in the island or in the mainland for burning lime and other purposes?

---

12 8br

25/

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt Servant
Sd
Civl Asstt Colr

25/

are a great number of islands and the whole coast of the island of Rameswaram to conserve. Even supposing you detect them in the act (and even now they are taking large quantities of coral all along the coast of Pamben itself) what then? I doubt whether you would ever get a conviction in the Ramnad Criminal Courts as at present constituted.

4 The income now derived from coral amounts to Rs 400 and is likely to increase greatly as coral has been found most valuable as manure for coffee. A European merchant from Tuticorin has already applied to me for the lease of two coral islands in which to store coral for shipment to Colombo and elsewhere. Under these circumstances it seems to me a question whether the matter should not be referred to the Marine Department, Madras for more minute enquiry. Mr Bakers statements are very general.

5 There is another question. Supposing it decided that coral must not be taken from the sea-board, does that debar us from selling as heretofore quarries in land either in the island or in the mainland for burning lime and other purposes?

12 Sh

25/

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt. Servant.

Actg Collr

25/

297 27/

17 8/

27/
Marine Off
Pamban 5th October

From

F. A. Baker Esquire
Port Officer
Pamban

To

The Manager
Ramnad Zeminda
Ramna

Sir,

With reference to your No $\frac{115}{16\text{-}8\text{-}81}$ I hav the honor to state that I consider it unn sary to make any further remarks reg the subject therein treated, but to emph state that the wholesale carrying away o coral on and adjacent to, the Islands o the Keelakarai and Pamban Chann and Ports is highly detrimental to t conservancy of them and it is my op that the practice should be put a immediate stop.

I have in a former letter sugg that coral should only be removed in such places as might be from tim to time pointed out by me, by on fu consideration I think it best that no should be removed as no reliance ca placed in the Dhony people who collect

I have &c

(Signed) F. A. Baker
Port Officer

(True copy) : T Rajan

Mana

Cirlr 296/26-6-80

From

The Spl Actg Collr
Ramnad

III

To

The Collr of
Madura

15 JUN 80

Dated 10th June 1880

No 94

Enclosures 2

Forwarding 2 letters from the Master Attendant Pamban regarding his objection towards collecting corals from certain Islands and asking if the matter should not be referred to the Marine Deptt Madras for more minute enquiry)

No. 3592. 23/

1854

29/ Madras 28th Nov /4

To
The Master Attendant
Paumben

Sir

Referring to the correspondence ending with your letter to the Manager of Ramnad dated 5th October 1851 No 297 on the subject of reeting coral, I have the honor to point out that coral is reproductive & its partial removal ~~longer~~ does not ~~at one time will not make the place destitute~~ imply the destruction of a reef or bank. It may be ~~I admit that it is~~ inadvisable to allow its removal on the side of the channel but see no reason why the same rule should apply to the other parts. I request you to forward to me a statement mentioning the places in which coral is now collected & whether you think the process can be allowed ~~in each quarter~~ to continue in each place where it is now proceeding, or whether there are objections thereto & in the latter case please give with your reasons for your ~~people~~ opinion. The mere fact that no reliance can be placed on the Dhony people cannot be a sufficient ground to upset a long-standing enjoyment.

I do not know what the rate of the natural growth of coral may be; but I believe it is considerable.

To
The Master Attendant
Paumben

Dated 28th Nov/79
No 3592

Requesting to forward statement mentioning the places in which coral is now collected

---

No 202

15 8/

From

The

To

The

Sir

With reference dated 4th August las… pondence noted in t… honour to report as f…

Spl Asstt Collr's letter to Collr No 1 / 5-1-80
Collector's 96 / 12-1-80
S. A. Collr's 38 / 24-2-80
Collector's 51 / 11-3-80
S. A. Collr's 94 / 10-6-80

2 The right to g… the Paumben and ot… the Estate is rented… Island of Paumben, … not rented out sep… included in the ren… stones on the sea sho… from this rent is s…

Fasli	Rent Rs
1276	41-"-"
1277	45-"-"
1278	76-"-"
1279	76-"-"
1280	76-"-"
1281	76-"-"
1282	47-9-6
1283	"-"-"
1284	196-"-"
1285	7-8-9
1286	32-"-"
1287	"-"-"
1288	34-8-"
1289	25-"-"
1290	52-"-"
1291	36-"-"
	800-10-3

3 The corals in… south and west of t… are rented out sep…

4 The… the limits… is Rs 57-3… Rs 343-7-2 The… ble and… they will… future yea…

5 This… ded in the… cush was… was realized… in believing… of the Zemi… income… from these… was fixed… time of Per… and sea… income fr… by renting… also the inc… grown in… in the sea co… which the…

6 In… Paumben ob… Paumben an… ence on the… The chiru…

…red by you in the docket under
…nsulted with the Paumben Master
…nd beg to forward copy of his letter
…d 5th October last in which he emphas-
…o that the carrying away of the coral

verage income from this source within
of the Pamben port, or Pamben Island
.. while that of the other islands is
corals have now become very valua:
have every reason to believe that
fetch a much larger income in
s.

source of income has not been inclu.
assets of the Estate on which the Pesh
fixed because at that time no rent
. I entirely concur with Mr Turner
that this does not affect the right
indar to this or any other sources of
w or hereafter likely to be obtained
Islands in anyway. The Peshcush
on the actual income obtained at the
manent settlement both from land
At that time the Estate derived no
m the sea except what was realized
ut the chank royalty. This and
me derived from the Chei root
the Islands and on the main land
st were included in the assets upon
eshcush was fixed.

1880 Mr Baker, the Master Attendant
jected to the gathering of corals in the
d other Islands and a long correspond:
ubject took place as referred to above
n of the Advocate General was sought
to the effect that the Port Officer could
taking of coral from the bottom of
the limits of the port. The collection
Islands was not interfered with.
ster Attendant, Madras now consider
moval of coral stone from the reefs
of the islands causes serious injury
connected with the Pamben Pass.

---

on and adjacent to
Keelakarai and
Ports is highly de
of them and it is
practice should
stop.

8. The income
amounts to Rs 68
is likely to increa
that the coral mu
these Islands, we
the coral entirely
will be a perma
from this source
buoyant condition

	Fasly	Rs
Pamben	1284 -	196
Keelakarai	1286 -	441
Kuthiugal	1289 -	47
		684

G

IV

The Manager of
Ramnad Estate

To
The Collector of
Madura

No 22
Enclosure One

ing in regard to
l of coral
the bottom of the
in the islands of

No 361. 25/

Marine Office
35/ Paumben 15th November 1881.

No 8 From

F. H. Baker Esquire,
Port Officer,
Paumben.

To,

The Master Attendant
Administrative Department,
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor respectfully to bring the following matter to your notice.

1st Before Kilakarai and Paumben Sub ports were brought under the Port Act the Port Officer of Paumben as Officer in charge of the Kilakarai Pilot Department was Ex-Officio Conservator of the Kilakarai channel - Although never officially appointed as such and the Beacons, buoys &c were under his charge; as some of the Beacons are now within the limits of the ports of which the Sea Custom Officers are Conservators I should feel indebted if you will kindly instruct me whether they the Sea Custom Officers are responsible for their upkeep and preservation or whether I am.

2nd From information gathered from questioning the Tindals of Dhonies I find that two men one at Mandapam named Kather Sulban Achari and one at Kilakarai named V.C. Mirrumohamad derive a good income by allowing the Dhony men to collect coral on the Islands along the Kilakarai channel and in the Port of Pamban they having acquired that right by paying an annual rent to the Zemindary of Ramnad, the coral however appears not to be collected from the Islands but along the reef round these, the Solicitor General has already stated his opinion that the Zemindar has no claim or right to the coral in the water, I would therefore respectfully suggest that I be empowered to allow the Dhony men to fish up coral at such places as I may consider it can be done consistent with the preservation of the channels at such a rate per ton as you may sanction; the Government would derive a good revenue from this and the indiscriminate manner of taking the coral any where now carried on would be put a stop to; a lower rate than that charged by the contractors would be eagerly accepted, thus benefitting both the Dhony men and Government.

I enclose a statement taken from the Tindal of one of these coral Dhonies, also one showing the amount of coral in tons that

2187

has been taken away from the Isla
adjacent to Pamban during this year.

37

Signed &c
(Sd) T. H. Baker
Port Officer.

37

(True Copy)

W. J. Ricketts
Ty Dy Colr
for Colr

Compd

Enclosure No. 8.

To a letter

from

The Collector of
Madura

No. 542.

Dated 1st March 1882.

&c.

1285/82

Copy of letter from Port Officer Pamban to Master Attendant Madras No. 361, dated 15th Nov. 1881.

32

195

28

No. 522

Marine Office
Paumbam 12th February 1882

From

J. H. Baker Esqre
Port Officer
Pambam

To,

The Collector
of
Madura

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE
15 FEB 82
MADURA

Sir,

With reference to your No. $\frac{303}{7\text{-}2\text{-}82}$. I have the honor to inform you as follows.

Coral is collected from all the Islands adjacent to Pamban, and those forming the natural protection to the Keelacarray Channel, the coral itself does not as all must well know form on the Islands themselves but is obtained about High water mark, where it is, in a decayed state thrown by the action of the sea, coral in a live state is also dredged up from the bottom and conveyed to Colombo.

It is almost impossible to enumerate all the places from which Coral is thus obtained as the Dhoney men shift about according to the state of weather, wind, and sea; but I may safely state that it is procured from, or near to, all the Islands from Corresaddy Teevoo to Anaper Teevoo.

My objection to the whole sale removal of this natural barrier is as before stated that it acts as a prevention to the sand being washed into the Channels during the S.W. monsoon a glance at the chart will show this; the very act of dredging up the coral must also disturb and set into a state of flotation a quantity of sand and mud which the current will carry into the Channels; the least objectionable places where this work can be carried on is to the South of the Islands.

In Conclusion I would beg to point out that I think it is questionable whether the Ramnad Zemindary has any right to lease out this Coral fishery because as before mentioned it is collected at High water mark or from under the sea, the Advocate General has already expressed his opinion on the matter.

I have the honor to be
Your most obed^t. Serv^t.
J. A. Baker
Port Officer

1. It is very doubtful whether the rule of law mentioned by the A. G. applies to this country as well as to England.

2. It has always been the custom of the Estate to lease the coral fishery, & its right to do so has never been questioned any more than its right to collect chanks.

3. The mischief to be prevented is not at all clear & Mr. Baker although requested to do so has not pointed out the localities from which he considers it objectionable & those from which he considers it unobjectionable to collect coral.

4. Mr. Baker himself in his letter has proposed to collect coral & credit Govt with the proceeds, a proposal which is inconsistent with his objections. He has not stated nor apparently [illegible] and so

[illegible] which may be removed?

No. 1132.

Proceedings of the Court of Wards, dated 24th April 1882.

Read the following letter from H. J. STOKES, Esq., Collector of Madura, to the Secretary to the Court of Wards, dated 1st March 1882, No. 22:—

I HAVE the honor to forward the report* called for by Government in G.O., No. 274, dated 15th June 1881, Marine Department. The matter concerns the Ramnad Estate under the Court's management, and I therefore submit it through them for transmission to Government with any remarks they may deem necessary to make. A copy of the Government Order appears to have been supplied to the Board.

* No. 542, dated 1st March 1882, with eight enclosures.

Enclosure No. 1.

From H. J. STOKES, Esq., Collector of Madura, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Madras, dated 1st March 1882, No. 542.

WITH reference to paragraph 2 of G.O., No. 274, dated 15th June 1881, referring for report the questions raised in the Madras Master Attendant's letter regarding removal of coral by the Estate, I have the honor to submit the Manager's letter, No. 202, dated 14th November.

2. The right to quarry coral in the Paumben Islands attached to the Estate has been rented on behalf of the Zemindar since Fasli 1276, and that in the south and west of Kilakarai and Kunthugal Islands since Faslis 1284 and 1282 respectively. In Fasli 1288 this right was leased to one Syed Ibraghee, and the Master Attendant, Paumben, prohibited the removal of the coral from the port limits on the ground that a large amount of silt was by this removal let into the Paumben Channel. He then raised objections to the gathering of coral even in the islands situated beyond the limits of the Paumben port. Finally he considered it objectionable to rent out the islands along the Kilakarai channel unless under strict supervision. Thus he was averse from allowing coral to be taken from the bottom of the sea or from any of the islands within the channel limits from Paumben to Vellinokam Point, *i.e.*, the whole extent of coast line of the Ramnad Zemindari.

3. The matter was referred to the Master Attendant, Madras, who submitted it to the Advocate-General. The latter recorded the opinion quoted in the Government Order. On the receipt of the Government Order, the Master Attendant, Paumben, was asked to forward a statement, mentioning the places in which coral is now collected and whether the process can be allowed to continue in each place where it is now proceeding and whether there are any objections thereto, and in the latter case to give his reasons. Mr. Baker answered by stating that it was almost impossible for him to enumerate all the places from which coral is obtained, and questioned the right of the Zemindar to lease out the coral fishery on the opinion of the Advocate-General.

4. The mischief to be prevented is not at all clear. Mr. Baker first objected to the removal of coral from the port limits, then extended the objection beyond them and finally deprecated the removal of coral from any place along the whole coast line of the Ramnad Zemindari. Mr. Baker, although requested to do so, has not pointed out the particular localities from which he considers it objectionable, and those from which he considers it unobjectionable, to collect coral.

5. On the other hand, Mr. Baker himself in his letter, No. 361, dated 15th November last, to the Master Attendant, Madras, proposed to collect coral and credit Government with the proceeds—a proposal which is inconsistent with his objections. He has not stated, though asked, nor apparently considered, the rate at which coral grows and so replaces what may be removed.

6. As the demand for coral is growing daily for purposes of manure for coffee in Ceylon, the right to collect it is likely to become more and more valuable.

7. I beg to forward papers as per list enclosed in original, and request that they may be returned when no longer required.

ENCLOSURES Nos. 2 to 8.—Correspondence as per list.

ENCLOSURE No. 9.

ENCLOSURES to Letter to Chief Secretary to Government, No. 542, dated 1st March 1882.

Description of Papers.	Number of Papers.
1. Letter No. 1, dated 5th January 1880, from the Special Assistant Collector, Ramnad	6
2. Letter No. 38, dated 24th February 1880, from the Special Assistant Collector, Ramnad	3
3. Letter No. 94, dated 10th June 1880, from the Special Assistant Collector, Ramnad	3
4. Letter No. 202, dated 14th November 1881, from the Manager, Ramnad Estate	2
5. Letter No. 3592, dated 28th November 1881, from the Collector of Madura to the Master Attendant, Paumben..	1
6. Letter No. 522, dated 12th February 1882, from Port Officer, Paumben	1
7. Copy of letter from Port Officer, Paumben, to Master Attendant, Madras, No. 361, dated 15th November 1881	1

SUBMITTED for the orders of Government.

2. The gathering of coral for manure seems to be an industry of growing importance, to which the Zemindari has, in the opinion of the Advocate-General, no right. The Board think it should be placed under the control of the Collector, who, in communication with the Marine Department, could determine the localities where it might be quarried without detriment to the passage.

(True Copies and Extract.)

Acting Secretary.

To the Chief Secretary to Government, Marine Department,
with seven original enclosures to be returned.
Copy to the Collector of Madura.
" " Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Exd. A. Raitt.

Enclosures Nos. 2 to 8.—Correspondence as per list.

Enclosure No. 9.

Enclosures to Letter to Chief Secretary to Government, No. 542, dated 1st March 1882.

Description of Papers.	Number of Papers.
1. Letter No. 1, dated 5th January 1880, from the Special Assistant Collector, Ramnad	6
2. Letter No. 38, dated 24th February 1880, from the Special Assistant Collector, Ramnad	3
3. Letter No. 94, dated 10th June 1880, from the Special Assistant Collector, Ramnad	3
4. Letter No. 202, dated 14th November 1881, from the Manager, Ramnad Estate	2
5. Letter No. 3592, dated 28th November 1881, from the Collector of Madura to the Master Attendant, Paumben..	1
6. Letter No. 522, dated 12th February 1882, from Port Officer, Paumben	1
7. Copy of letter from Port Officer, Paumben, to Master Attendant, Madras, No. 361, dated 15th November 1881	1

Submitted for the orders of Government.

2. The gathering of coral for manure seems to be an industry of growing importance, to which the Zemindari has, in the opinion of the Advocate-General, no right. The Board think it should be placed under the control of the Collector, who, in communication with the Marine Department, could determine the localities where it might be quarried without detriment to the passage.

(True Copies and Extract.)

C. Gibson

Acting Secretary.

To the Chief Secretary to Government, Marine Department,
with seven original enclosures to be returned.
Copy to the Collector of Madura.
" " Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Exd. A. Raitt.

(Paumben Islands)

Marine 1882. Deptt

Court of Wards,

MADRAS.

To

THE CHIEF SECY. TO GOVT.,
MARINE DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT No. 322

Printed May 3rd.

Received 9 May

PROCEEDINGS, 24TH APRIL 1882, No. 1132.

(Desp 5/5/82 ...)

SUBMITTING for the orders of Government, with the Board's opinion, letter from the Collector of Madura regarding the removal of coral from the Paumben Islands along the coast of the Ramnad Zemindari.

Administrative Department.

45/

23 P 45/X

No. 4023

MADRAS,
Marine Office,
12th May 1882.

From

J. H. TAYLOR, ESQ., LIEUT., R.N.R.,
Master Attendant,
Administrative Department,
Madras,

To

C. G. Master Esquire
Acting Chief Secretary to Government,
Marine Department,
Fort Saint George.

SIR,

I have the honor to inform you that Mr. J. H. Stokes, Collector of Madura, furnished me with a copy of his report* to Government, with reference to para 2 of G. O. No. 2744, dated June 15th 1881, regarding the removal of Coral stone from the Paumben Pass, which I forwarded to the Port Officer, Paumben, for further report, and I now respectfully beg to offer the following remarks.

*No. 542 dated March 1st 1882.

2 It is stated in the Collector's report that the right to quarry coral in the Paumben islands attached to the estate, and in the South and West of Hoelakari and Kunthangal islands, has been rented on behalf of the Zemindar, but I am informed

by the Port officer, Paumben, that the only place coral is obtained by "quarrying" is in Paumben island about 1 mile East of the lighthouse. The coral taken away by the Dhonies to Colombo for manure is dredged up from the bottom on the reefs surrounding the islands, or is collected in a decayed state on the shores of the Islands about high water mark, where it is deposited by the action of the sea. The opinion of the Advocate General embodied in my letter recorded in G. O. No 274, dated June 15th 1881, shows that, while the Zemindar is entitled to the enjoyment of the soil of the islands, he has no right over the land covered by the sea surrounding the islands. As the sea washes the shores up to high water mark that portion may also be excepted. The Government have therefore only to notify to the Zemindar the limits within which he has a right to lease the islands, beyond which he is to exercise

no

no control, and thus put a stop to the removal of coral stone from the reefs and fringes of the islands, a practice so injurious to the channels and channel marks connected with the Paumben Pass.

3 The Collector states that the Port officer, Paumben, answered that it was impossible for him to enumerate all the places from which coral is obtained; but he proceeds to remark that Mr Baker first objected to the removal of coral from the port limits, then extended the objection beyond them, and finally deprecated the removal of coral from any place along the whole coast line of the Ramnad Zemindari. The information required is thus pretty nearly supplied. Mr Baker, however, reports that he could only reply that the Dhoney men worked in different places according to state of wind and weather, on all the islands from Coorisundy to Anapartive

4 Mr Stokes observes that the mischief to be prevented is not clear. This is pointed out in para 4 of my letter recorded

in G. O. No. 274, dated June 15th 1881. The new beacon on Shingle islet, which is the leading mark for entering the pass, and imperatively required for the navigation, has been completely undermined, and its erection endangered by the removal of the coral rocks between the beacon and the sea. The beacon is so close to the sea that it is now made the subject of direct attack by the waves, and the South West monsoon now approaching may very probably destroy it. On this point the Port officer reports as follows—

"I first prohibited coral being collected within the limits of the port on account of silt having accumulated to the South Eastward of the Custom buoy in the Sand Bank channel caused by the removal of coral along the edge of the reef surrounding Coorisundy and Pallivasal Islands. It would be palpably plain to any one inspecting the

the place that this removal of the dam that keeps back the sand must cause silt and be detrimental to the maintenance of the channel."

"The Dhonies then commenced work off the Shingle Islet and I had to stop that, but unfortunately too late to prevent damage being done to the beacon lately erected there."

"When asked for my opinion regarding the renting of the coral along the Herlakary channel, I replied that, without strict supervision, it was objectionable, as the wholesale removal of it would not only allow the sand to silt up in the channel, but might possibly remove the natural breakwater that is so valuable to small native coasters during the strong winds of the S. W. monsoon."

5 In para 5 of the Collector's letter, it is stated on the other hand Mr. Baker himself in his letter No. 361, dated November 15th 1881, to the Master Attendant, Madras, proposed to collect coral and credit Government with the proceeds, a proposal which is

inconsistent

in G. O. No. 274, dated June 15th 1881. The new beacon on Shingle islet, which is the leading mark for entering the pass, and imperatively required for the navigation, has been completely undermined, and its erection endangered by the removal of the coral rocks between the beacon and the sea. The beacon is so close to the sea that it is now made the subject of direct attack by the waves, and the South West monsoon now approaching may very probably destroy it. On this point the Port officer reports as follows—

"I first prohibited coral being collected within the limits of the port on account of silt having accumulated to the South Eastward of the Custom buoy in the Sand Bank channel caused by the removal of coral along the edge of the reef surrounding Coorisuddy and Pallivessal Islands. It would be palpably plain to any one inspecting the place that this removal of the dam that keeps back the sand must cause silt and be detrimental to the maintenance of the channel."

"The Dhonies then commenced work off the Shingle Islet and I had to stop that, but unfortunately too late to prevent damage being done to the beacon lately erected there."

"When asked for my opinion regarding the renting of the coral along the Keelakarry channel, I replied that, without strict supervision, it was objectionable, as the wholesale removal of it would not only allow the sand to silt up in the channel, but might possibly remove the natural breakwater that is so valuable to small native coasters during the strong winds of the S. W. monsoon."

5 In para 5 of the Collector's letter, it is stated on the other hand Mr. Baker himself in his letter No. 361, dated November 15th 1881, to the Master Attendant, Madras, proposed to collect coral and credit Government with the proceeds, a proposal which is

inconsistent with his objections. The Port officer's explanation is as follows. "Under the present system the men go and collect as when and where they choose; if the Government had it, it would pay to appoint one or two peons to supervise and see that the Coral was only taken from such places as I might from time to time point out".

6 The report calls for no further remarks, and I have to solicit the early orders of Government on the matter.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt Servant

Master Attendant

Administrative Department

Marine (1882) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE MASTER ATTENDANT,
ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT,
Madras,

To

THE CHIEF SECY. TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
Fort St. George.

No. 4023.

Dated 12 } May, 1882.
Received 14 }

No. ~~CURRENT No.~~ 341

Subject.

Reporting on the subject of removing coral stone from the Paumben Pass.

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

Marine

Again G.O., dated 188 , No.
Current No. 322 of 1882, dated 24th April from the Court of Wards

Current No. 341 of 1882, dated 12th May from the Master Attendant.

Order 20th May/82, No. 116

The Government agree with the Board as to the rights of the Zamindari.

2. The Collector's assertion that Mr. Baker's proposals to collect coral & credit Government with the

Para. 1. is rather indefinite inasmuch as the Bd. have expressed no opinion on the question of the Zr.'s right. It is quite clear that Crown rights extend to H. W. mark & the Estate has been deriving an income from violation of Crown rights

Marine (1882) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE MASTER ATTENDANT,
ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT,
Madras,

To

THE CHIEF SECY. TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
Fort St. George.

No. 4023.

Dated 12 } May, 1882.
Received 14 }

No.
CURRENT No. 341

Subject.

Reporting on the subject of removing coral stone from the Pamban Pass.

---

26 P 53 X — 53

Papers to be read in Proceedings :—

Marine

Again G.O., dated 188 , No.

Current No. 322 of 1882, dated 24th April from the Court of Wards

Current No. 341 of 1882, dated 12th May from the Master Attendant.

Order 20th May/82, No 116

The Government agree with the Board as to the rights of the zamindari.

2. The Collector's assertion that Mr. Baker's proposals to collect coral & credit Government with the

Resol. is rather indefinite inasmuch as the Bd. have expressed no opinion on the question of the Zr.'s right. It is quite clear that Crown rights extend to H.W. mark & the Estate has been deriving an income from violation of Crown rights the proceeds are inconsistent with his objections to the indiscriminate removal of live coral to the detriment of the natural barrier reef, seems to be based on a misapprehension.

3. The Government resolve to prohibit absolutely the removal of coral anywhere along the coast line of the Ramnad Zamindari, that is to say, from Pámban to Valinokam Point, unless it is certified by the Port officer that no injury to the channel will be caused thereby.

4. The Collector in communication with the port officer will arrange for quarrying on behalf of Government any coral which, in the opinion of the ~~Port officer~~ Master Attendant, may be safely removed. Receipts on this account will be credited to Government.

5. These

the proceeds are inconsistent with his objections to the indiscriminate removal of live coral to the detriment of the natural barrier reef, seems to be based on a misapprehension.

3. The Government resolve to prohibit absolutely the removal of coral anywhere along the coast line of the Ramnad zamindari, that is to say, from Pámban

---

27 P 55/

X 55/

Pámban to Valináhom Point, unless it is certified by the Port officer that no injury to the channel will be caused thereby.

4. The Collector will, in communication with the port officer, arrange for quarrying on behalf of Government any coral which, in the opinion of the ~~Port officer~~ Master Attendant, may be safely removed. Receipts on this account will be credited to Government.

5 These orders have no reference, it is to be understood, to the dead [illegible] coral ~~above water~~, to which the Zamindár [illegible] ~~is entitled~~.

[illegible]

To the Court of Wards	6	Desp. 9/6
" Coll.r of Madura	6	
" Govt. Solicitor	3	
" Master Attendant	6	

A.W.P.
13/5/82

C. [illegible]

Removal of coral from near Pamban channel.

H. E. the Governor
Hon: W. Hudleston
Hon: D. F. Carmichael.

Print early [illegible]

P. S.

Despatch as altered (the Hon. M.H. regards the cert. use dead coral as = jetsam.)

M.P.
19/5/82

C.H.S. Rig/5

× 52/ × 52/

20th May 1882, No. 116, Marine.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Court of Wards, dated 24th April 1882, No. 1132 :—

Read—the following letter from H. J. STOKES, Esq., Collector of Madura, to the Secretary to the Court of Wards, dated 1st March 1882, No. 22 :—

I have the honor to forward the report* called for by Government in G.O., No. 274, dated 15th June 1881, Marine Department. The matter concerns the Ramnad Estate under the Court's management, and I therefore submit it through them for transmission to Government with any remarks they may deem necessary to make. A copy of the Government Order appears to have been supplied to the Board.

* No. 542, dated 1st March 1882, with eight enclosures.

Enclosures.

From H. J. STOKES, Esq., Collector of Madura, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Madras, dated 1st March 1882, No. 542.

With reference to paragraph 2 of G.O., No. 274, dated 15th June 1881, referring for report the questions raised in the Madras Master Attendant's letter regarding removal of coral by the Estate, I have the honor to submit the Manager's letter, No. 202, dated 14th November.

2. The right to quarry coral in the Pámban Islands attached to the estate has been rented on behalf of the Zemindar since Fasli 1276, and that in the south and west of Kilakarai and Kunthugal Islands since Faslis 1284 and 1282, respectively. In Fasli 1288 this right was leased to one Syed Ibraghee, and the Master Attendant, Pámban, prohibited the removal of the coral from the port limits on the ground that a large amount of silt was by this removal let into the Pámban channel. He then raised objections to the gathering of coral even in the islands situated beyond the limits of the Pámban port. Finally he considered it objectionable to rent out the islands along the Kilakarai channel unless under strict supervision. Thus he was averse from allowing coral to be taken from the bottom of the sea or from any of the islands within the channel limits from Pámban to Vallinokam Point, *i.e.*, the whole extent of coast line of the Ramnad Zemindari.

3. The matter was referred to the Master Attendant, Madras, who submitted it to the Advocate-General. The latter recorded the opinion quoted in the Government Order. On the receipt of the Government Order, the Master Attendant, Pámban, was asked to forward a statement, mentioning the places in which coral is now collected and whether the process can be allowed to continue in each place where it is now proceeding, and whether there are any objections thereto, and in the latter case to give his reasons. Mr. Baker answered by stating that it was almost impossible for him to enumerate all the places from which coral is obtained, and questioned the right of the Zemindar to lease out the coral fishery on the opinion of the Advocate-General.

4. The mischief to be prevented is not at all clear. Mr. Baker first objected to the removal of coral from the port limits, then extended the objection beyond them, and finally deprecated the removal of coral from any place along the whole coast line of the Ramnad Zemindari. Mr. Baker, although requested to do so, has not pointed out the particular localities from which he considers it objectionable, and those from which he considers it unobjectionable, to collect coral.

5. On the other hand, Mr. Baker himself in his letter, No. 361, dated 15th November last, to the Master Attendant, Madras, proposed to collect coral and credit Government with the

Removal of coral from near Pamban channel.

H E the Governor
Hon: W Huddleston
Hon: D. F. Carmichael.

Print early [illegible]

Despatch as altered. (The Hon. M.A. regards the cast-up dead coral as = jetsam.)
M.P.
19/5/82

[illegible] 19/5

× 52 × 52

20th May 1882, No. 116, Marine.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following Proceedings of the Court of Wards, dated 24th April 1882, No. 1132 :—

Read—the following letter from H. J. STOKES, Esq., Collector of Madura, to the Secretary to the Court of Wards, dated 1st March 1882, No. 22 : —

I have the honor to forward the report* called for by Government in G.O., No. 274, dated 15th June 1881, Marine Department. The matter concerns the Ramnad Estate under the Court's management, and I therefore submit it through them for transmission to Government with any remarks they may deem necessary to make. A copy of the Government Order appears to have been supplied to the Board.

* No. 542, dated 1st March 1882, with eight enclosures.

Enclosures.

From H. J. STOKES, Esq., Collector of Madura, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Madras, dated 1st March 1882, No. 542.

With reference to paragraph 2 of G.O., No. 274, dated 15th June 1881, referring for report the questions raised in the Madras Master Attendant's letter regarding removal of coral by the Estate, I have the honor to submit the Manager's letter, No. 202, dated 14th November.

2. The right to quarry coral in the Pámban Islands attached to the estate has been rented on behalf of the Zemindar since Fasli 1276, and that in the south and west of Kilakarai and Kunthugal Islands since Faslis 1284 and 1282, respectively. In Fasli 1288 this right was leased to one Syed Ibraghee, and the Master Attendant, Pámban, prohibited the removal of the coral from the port limits on the ground that a large amount of silt was by this removal let into the Pámban channel. He then raised objections to the gathering of coral even in the islands situated beyond the limits of the Pámban port. Finally he considered it objectionable to rent out the islands along the Kilakarai channel unless under strict supervision. Thus he was averse from allowing coral to be taken from the bottom of the sea or from any of the islands within the channel limits from Pámban to Vallinokam Point, *i.e.*, the whole extent of coast line of the Ramnad Zemindari.

3. The matter was referred to the Master Attendant, Madras, who submitted it to the Advocate-General. The latter recorded the opinion quoted in the Government Order. On the receipt of the Government Order, the Master Attendant, Pámban, was asked to forward a statement, mentioning the places in which coral is now collected and whether the process can be allowed to continue in each place where it is now proceeding, and whether there are any objections thereto, and in the latter case to give his reasons. Mr. Baker answered by stating that it was almost impossible for him to enumerate all the places from which coral is obtained, and questioned the right of the Zemindar to lease out the coral fishery on the opinion of the Advocate-General.

4. The mischief to be prevented is not at all clear. Mr. Baker first objected to the removal of coral from the port limits, then extended the objection beyond them, and finally deprecated the removal of coral from any place along the whole coast line of the Ramnad Zemindari. Mr. Baker, although requested to do so, has not pointed out the particular localities from which he considers it objectionable, and those from which he considers it unobjectionable, to collect coral.

5. On the other hand, Mr. Baker himself in his letter, No. 36½, dated 15th November last, to the Master Attendant, Madras, proposed to collect coral and credit Government with the

proceeds—a proposal which is inconsistent with his objections. He has not stated, though asked, nor apparently considered, the rate at which coral grows and so replaces what may be removed.

6. As the demand for coral is growing daily for purposes of manure for coffee in Ceylon, the right to collect it is likely to become more and more valuable.

7. I beg to forward papers as per list enclosed in original, and request that they may be returned when no longer required.

From E. TURNER, Esq., Special Assistant Collector, Ramnad, to the Collector of Madura, dated 5th January 1880, No. 1.

I have the honor to forward, herewith, copies of the correspondence noted in the margin.

1. Letter No. 175, dated 29th Nov. 1879, from the Special Assistant Collector, to the Master Attendant, Pámban.
2. Letter No. 232, dated 2nd December 1879, Master Attendant's reply to the above.
3. Letter No. 9507, dated 6th Dec. 1879, from the Master Attendant, Madras, to the Master Attendant, Pámban.
4. Letter No. 249, dated 9th Dec. 1879, from the Master Attendant, Pámban, to the Special Assistant Collector.

2. I enclose also a rough sketch map showing the boundaries of the Pámban port taken from the Marine Survey map at the Master Attendant's Office at Pámban.

3. The Master Attendant has, by a notice issued under Section 41 of the Indian Ports Act, XI of 1875, prevented the renter of corals from gathering the same within the boundaries of the port. The island of Pámban and also the islands situated within its port limits belong to the estate from time immemorial, and the Zemindars have all along enjoyed the right to the trees, &c., in the said islands, and also to the corals, limestones, &c., lying on the borders of the same. Mr. Baker says in his endorsement on the renter's petition (copy enclosed) that the Zemindar has no right or title to rent out the coral stones, and that by the removal thereof "a large amount of silt is let into the Pámban channel." Pámban seems to have become a port under the Port Act XXII of 1855, under a Notification published in 1859, but till now, which is more than twenty years, no objection was made to the enjoyment of the Zemindar's rights over these islands, and I think that the Government most probably did not wish to do so. As Mr. Baker's action in the matter is likely to cause a permanent loss in this source of income to the estate, I request that you will be good enough, if you think fit, to take such steps as may be necessary for the removal of the objection above mentioned.

From SYED IBRAGHEE, to the Master Attendant, Pámban, dated Pámban, 19th November 1879, and endorsement by T. H. BAKER, Esq., Master Attendant and Conservator of the Port of Pámban, dated 20th November 1879.

I, Syed Ibraghee, son of Seeni Marikayer of Mandapom, beg to bring the following lines to your honor's benign notice and consideration.

2. I beg to inform your honor that I have, as my previous contractors have done, taken the contract of limestone, which are gathered on the [illegible] of the islands by the blowing of the waves from that Ramnad Zemindari, for a sum of Rs. 4 for the Fasli 1288, and have paid 23½ rupees in the Ramnad Taluk Treasury—*vide* Revenue Inspector's No. 1, dated 20th August 1879, herein enclosed for your honor's perusal—and on receipt of the contract I have advanced Rs. 1,000 for dhony men of Mandapom to ship limestone to Colombo in this northerly monsoon, and the dhony men were shipping in the islands. I, who came from Mannar, was told by them that your honor has prevented shipping stones by issuing a notice on the 8th instant.

3. By your honor's notification I am not only subjected to the loss of gain which I was expecting if allowed to ship without objection, but also am placed in a bad position in recovering my advances to the dhony people. And your honor is aware that the shipment of limestones has been carried on in the islands for many years without any damage to the islands or the mainlands.

4. I beg that your honor, taking the above circumstances into consideration, be pleased to permit me, as usual, to ship lime stones in conformity with my contract with the Zemindar.

Endorsement.

Petitioner is informed that in the Marine limits of the Port of Pámban the Ramnad Zemindari has no right or title to rent out the coral stones; further, that by the removal of the said stones a large amount of silt is let into the Pámban channel, which the Government of Madras are expending a large amount of money to improve. Under Section 41 of Act XII of 1875, the Conservator of a Port is empowered to prevent the removal of any stones, &c., that may, by being removed, damage or be detrimental to such port, as it is my opinion that the removal of stone in certain places is likely to prove so, I refuse to grant your permission.

From E. TURNER, Esq., Special Assistant Collector, Ramnad, to the Conservator of Ports, Pámban, dated Ramnad, 29th November 1879, No. 175.

I understand that by a notice issued under Section 41 of the Indian Ports Act, XII of 1875, you have prohibited the renter of corals in the islands east and west of Pámban from gathering the same. The right to these islands has been enjoyed by the Zemindar of this estate from time immemorial. I have the honor to request that you will be good enough to let me know whether the above Act has been extended to this district, and whether the port of Pámban has been defined by Government; if so, what are its limits.

From T. H. BAKER, Esq., Master Attendant, Pámban, to the Special Assistant Collector, Ramnad, dated Pámban, 2nd December 1879, No. 232.

With reference to your letter, No. 175, dated 29th November 1879, I have the honor to inform you that Pámban was constituted a port under the Port Act, XXII of 1855, in 1859 (*vide Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 11th June 1859, page 1193), and the late Mr. Daviot, then Head Government Pilot, appointed Conservator. The port limit beacons were erected in 1862 by Captain Hankin, Superintendent of Operations, and the limits defined as under :—

To the East.—The boundary pillars on the point near the light-house and on the shore two miles east of the south-west point of the island of Rámesvaram.

To the West.—The boundary pillars one mile west of Tonitorei Point on the north and south shores of the mainland, and a line drawn from the south pillar to the western extremity of Pullee island. So much of the seashores between the limits above described whether of the mainland or of the islands as are within fifty yards of the high-water mark spring tides, together with the basins, harbours, waters, or creeks between them, and the several channels leading thereto.

To the North.—The space enclosed by two lines running due north from the northern boundary pillars to six fathoms water.

To the South.—The space enclosed by two lines running due south from the southern boundary pillar on the Rámesvaram island and the west end of Pullee tevor to six fathoms water.

2. I would also draw your attention to the latter portion of Section 2, Clause (*a*), of the present Act XII of 1875.

3. I have made a reference to the head of my department at Madras, and will again communicate with you when I receive an answer.

From T. H. BAKER, Esq., Master Attendant, Pámban, to the Special Assistant Collector, Ramnad, dated Pámban, 9th December 1879, No. 249.

Adverting to my letter, No. 232, dated 2nd instant, I have the honor to forward copy of a docket received from the Master Attendant, Madras.

From W. H. BARTLETT, Esq., First Assistant Master Attendant, Madras, to the Port Officer, Pámban, dated Madras, 6th December 1879, No. 9507.

His letter, No. 233, dated 2nd December 1879.

Has the honor to state that the Port of Pámban, so far as conservancy is concerned, is controlled by the Indian Ports Act No. XII of 1875; at present the portion relating to port dues does not apply.

From E. TURNER, Esq., Special Assistant Collector, Ramnad, to the Collector of Madura, dated 24th February 1880, No. 38.

With reference to your docket, No. 96, dated 12th January last, I have the honor to forward herewith a statement showing the income derived by renting out corals in the islands attached to the estate. From this it will appear that coral has been gathered within the boundaries of the Pámban port, excluding Pámban village, from Fasli 1282. In Pámban, however, the corals were not rented out separately, but they were included in the rent given out for cutting stones on the seashore. We have been renting out this stone from Fasli 1276, and the income derived therefrom is shown in the margin. The corals have now become very valuable, and I think will fetch a much larger income in future years. The average

Fasli.	RS.	A.	P.	Fasli.	RS.	A.	P.
1276	41	0	0	1283	..		
1277	25	0	0	1284	196	0	0
1278	76	0	0	1285	7	8	9
1279	76	0	0	1286	32	0	0
1280	76	0	0	1287	..		
1281	76	0	0	1288	34	8	0
1282	47	9	6	1289	25	0	0

income from this source within the limits of the Pámban port excluding the island of Pámban is Rs. 36. This source of income has not been included in the assets of the estate on which the peishcush was fixed, because at that time no rent was realized, but I believe this does not affect the right of the Zemindar to this or any other sources of income likely to be now or hereafter obtained from these islands in any way. The peishcush was fixed on the actual income obtained at the time of fysal both from land and sea. At that time the estate derived no income from the sea except what was realized by renting out the chank royalty. This and also the income derived from the cheyroot grown in the islands and on the mainland on the sea coast were included in the assets upon which the peishcush was fixed. I beg to forward herewith another letter received from Mr. Baker, in which he objects to the gathering of corals even in the island situated beyond the limits of Pámban port. The coral contractor of Pámban and other islands complains that he has sustained a great loss owing to Mr. Baker's objection to gather corals in the islands within the Pámban port, and I request therefore that the subject be soon disposed of.

From T. H. BAKER, Esq., Master Attendant, Pámban, to the Special Assistant Collector, Ramnad, dated Pámban, 12th January 1880, No. 280.

With reference to your No. 5, dated 8th January 1880, I have the honor to inform you that the coral contractor, in making his complaint to you, has not stated the truth. I have prohibited his removing coral within Marine limits only, as unfortunately I have not the power to do so outside of them, the islands within Marine limits are as follows:—Shingle, Corressuddy, Pulli, Pullevassal, also the coast included within the limit beacons.

2. With reference to the question you ask in the second paragraph of your letter, I must state that I have great objections to the indiscriminate removal of coral from the islands forming the southern boundary of the Kilakarai channel and on the following grounds:—

First.—The contractor does not take the dead coral from the islands themselves, but fishes it up from the bottom, thereby removing the natural dam that has for years prevented the sand from being washed into the channel during the strong winds and heavy seas of the south-west monsoon.

Second.—That as the coral is not being taken away by small quantities but wholesale, it will not take long before the consequences will show themselves in the silting up of the already shallow parts of the channel.

3. Were the contractor made to take coral only in places where the removal would be beneficial and not detrimental to the channel, it would be a good thing. I feel sure that no owner of a large brig or vessel using the channel would for the sake of gain do any thing that would be detrimental to the navigation, but the contractor is only a dhony-owner, therefore it is quite immaterial to him whether the channel is spoilt or not.

4. In conclusion, I would state that I think it is not improbable that the whole of the Kilakarai may be brought under the Port Act XII of 1875, under Section 5, Clause (*a*), and I certainly shall recommend it; it must appear plain to all that it is decidedly wrong that one man should be the gainer at the expense of hundreds, especially as it lays in the power of Government to rectify it.

5. I enclose a statement obtained from the Custom House showing the quantity of coral exported for three months.

From E. TURNER, Esq., Special Assistant Collector, Ramnad, to the Collector of Madura, dated Ramnad, 10th June 1880, No. 94.

I have the honor to forward two letters* from the Master Attendant, Pámban, with reference to your letter, No. 51, dated 11th March 1880.

2. The Master Attendant is averse from allowing coral to be taken from the bottom of the sea or from any of the islands within the channel limits from Pámban to Vallinokom Point, *i.e.*, the whole extent of coast line of the Ramnad Zemindari.

3. I presume, therefore, that we must give up selling the coral entirely. I think, however, it will be practically impossible to preserve the coral; and that the only result attained will be that the Zemindar will lose the right of quarrying coral and private persons will attain to it. You will never stop people from quarrying coral over so large an area. The distance to Vallinokom is about fifty miles. There are a great number of islands and the whole coast of the island of Rámesvaram to conserve. Even supposing you detect them in the act (and even now they are taking large quantities of coral all along the coast of Pámban itself) what then? I

doubt whether you would ever get a conviction in the Ramnad Criminal Courts as at present constituted.

4. The income now derived from coral amounts to Rs. 400, and is likely to increase greatly as coral has been found most valuable as manure for coffee. A European merchant from Tuticorin has already applied to me for the lease of two coral islands in which to store coral for shipment to Colombo and elsewhere. Under these circumstances it seems to me a question whether the matter should not be referred to the Marine Department, Madras, for more minute inquiry. Mr. Baker's statements are very general.

5. There is another question:—Supposing it decided that coral must not be taken from the sea-board, does that debar us from selling, as heretofore, quarries in land either in the island or in the mainland for burning lime and other purposes?

* No. 12, dated 12th April 1880.
No. 88, dated 22nd May 1880.

From T. H. BAKER, Esq., Master Attendant, Pámban, to the Special Assistant Collector, Ramnad, dated Pámban, 12th April 1880, No. 12.

I regret press of work, in consequence of the ending of the official year, has prevented my answering your No. 44 of 22nd March 1880 before.

2. I really do not see how I can be more explicit than I was in my letter No. 280 of 12th January 1880; to prevent the contractor from removing coral from objectionable places would require constant and irksome supervision; if he would only restrict himself to collecting dead coral washed up on the islands forming the southern boundary to the Kilakarai channel, no harm would accrue, but it must be plain to all that if the natural barrier that is now penning back the sand be removed, the silt must be washed by the south-west sea into the channel, thereby in same time putting a stop to traffic.

From T. H. BAKER, Esq., Port Officer, Pámban, to the Special Assistant Collector, Ramnad, dated Pámban, 22nd May 1880, No. 88.

With reference to your No. 51 of 16th April 1880, I have the honor to inform you it is my opinion that, unless under strict supervision, it will be better not to rent out the islands along the Kilakarai channel to the coral contractors, and my reasons are as follows:—

First.—The Kilakarai channel extending from Pámban to Vallinokam Point is already very shoal, and the removal of the natural barrier that is keeping back the sand will be highly detrimental and cause silt to accumulate.

Second.—As the coral when rented out formerly was taken away in very large quantities, it is palpable that in a year or two such a quantity will be carried away that the natural breakwater the reefs now make will be removed; consequently the small craft will gain no advantage by using the channel during the south-west monsoon as there will be little or no difference between the state of the sea outside and the sea inside the channel.

2. There can be no objection to the letting of the islands to the westward of Vallinokam Point as they are out of the limits of the channel.

From M.R.Ry. T. RAJARAM ROW, Manager, Ramnad Estate, to the Collector of Madura, dated Tirushuli, 14th November 1881, No. 202.

Special Assistant Collector's letter to Collector, dated 5th January 1880, No. 1.
Collector's letter, dated 12th January 1880, No. 96.
Special Assistant Collector's letter, dated 24th February 1880, No. 38.
Collector's letter, dated 11th March 1880, No. 51.
Special Assistant Collector's letter, dated 10th June 1880, No. 94.

With reference to your docket, No. 2224, dated 4th August last, and the former correspondence noted in the margin, I have the honor to report as follows.

2. The right to quarry coral stone in the Pámban and other islands attached to the estate is rented out annually. In the island of Pámban, however, the corals were not rented out separately, but they were included in the rent given out for cutting stones on the seashore. The income derived from this rent is shown in the margin.

Faslis.	Rent.			Faslis.	Rent.		
	RS.	A.	P.		RS.	A.	P.
1276	41	0	0	1285	7	8	9
1277	25	0	0	1286	32	0	0
1278	76	0	0	1287	..		
1279	76	0	0	1288	34	8	0
1280	76	0	0	1289	25	0	0
1281	76	0	0	1290	52	0	0
1282	47	9	6	1291	36	9	6
1283	..						
1284	196	0	0		806	10	3

3. The corals in the other islands situated south and west of Kilakarai and Kunthugal are rented out separately and their annual rent is given below :—

South and West of Kilakarai.

	Faslis.	RS.
1. Manivali. 2. Meesal. 3. Mulli. 4. Valli. 5. Appa.	1284	181
	1285	313
	1286	441
	1287	300
	1288	300
	1289	320
	1290	220
	1291	380
	Total	2,455

South and West of Kunthugal.

	Faslis.	RS.	A.	P.
6. Kunthugal. 7. Malai. 8. Pallivasel. 9. Poomavarichan. 10. Manivali.	1282	22	0	0
	1283	22	0	0
	1284	33	0	0
	1285	33	0	0
	1286	33	0	0
	1287	45	0	0
	1288	45	0	0
	1289	47	0	0
	1290	16	8	0
	1291	68	0	0
	Total	364	8	0

4. The average income from this source within the limits of the Pámban port or Pámban island is Rs. 57-3-0, while that of the other islands is Rs. 343-7-2. The corals have now become very valuable, and I have every reason to believe that they will fetch a much larger income in future years.

5. This source of income has not been included in the assets of the estate on which the peishcush was fixed because at that time no rent was realized. I entirely concur with Mr. Turner in believing that this does not affect the right of the Zemindar to this or any other sources of income now or hereafter likely to be obtained from these islands in any way. The peishcush was fixed on the actual income obtained at the time of permanent settlement both from land and sea. At that time the estate derived no income from the sea except what was realized by renting out the chank royalty. This and also the income derived from the Chey-root grown in the islands and on the main land on the sea coast were included in the assets upon which the peishcush was fixed.

6. In 1880 Mr. Baker, the Master Attendant, Pámban, objected to the gathering of corals in the Pámban and other islands, and a long correspondence on the subject took place as referred to above. The opinion of the Advocate-General was sought, and it was to the effect that the Port Officer could prohibit the taking of coral from the bottom of sea within the limits of the port. The collection of corals on the islands was not interfered with, but the Master Attendant, Madras, now considers that the removal of coral stone from the reefs and fringes of the islands causes serious injury to the channels connected with the Pámban Pass.

7. As desired by you in the docket under reference, I consulted with the Pámban Master Attendant and beg to forward copy of his letter, No. 297, dated 5th October last, in which he emphatically states that the carrying away of the coral on, and adjacent to, the islands along the Kilakarai and Pámban channels and ports is highly detrimental to the conservancy of them, and it is his opinion that the practice should be put an immediate stop.

8. The income now derived from coral amounts to Rs. 684 as shown above, and is likely to increase greatly. If it is decided that the coral must not be collected in these islands, [illegible] must give up selling the coral entirely, and the consequence will be a permanent loss to the estate from this source of income which is in a buoyant condition.

	Fasli.	RS.
Pámban	1284	196
Kilakarai	1286	441
Kunthugal	1289	47
Total		684

From T. H. BAKER, Esq., Port Officer, Pámban, to the Manager, Ramnad Zemindari, dated Pámban, 5th October 1881, No. 297.

With reference to your No. 115, dated 16th August 1881, I have the honor to state that I consider it unnecessary to make any further remarks regarding the subject therein treated, but to emphatically state that the wholesale carrying away of the coral on, and adjacent to, the islands along the Kilakarai and Pámban channels and ports is highly detrimental to the conservancy of them, and it is my opinion that the practice should be put an immediate stop.

I have in a former letter suggested that coral should only be removed in such places as might be from time to time pointed out by me, but on further consideration I think it best that none should be removed as no reliance can be placed on the Dhony people who collect it.

From H. J. STOKES, Esq., Collector of Madura, to the Master Attendant, Pámban, dated Madura, 28th November 1881, No. 3592.

Referring to the correspondence ending with your letter to the Manager of Ramnad, dated 5th October 1881, No. 297, on the subject of renting coral, I have the honor to point out that coral is reproductive and its partial removal does not imply the destruction of a reef or bank. It may be inadvisable to allow its removal on the side of the channel, but see no reason why the same rule should apply to other parts. I request you to forward to me a statement mentioning the places in which coral is now collected and whether you think the process can be allowed to continue in each place where it is now proceeding, or whether there are objections thereto and in the latter case, please give your reasons for your opinion. The mere fact that no reliance can be placed on the Dhony people cannot be a sufficient ground to upset a long standing enjoyment.

2. I do not know what the rate of the natural growth of coral may be; but I believe it is considerable.

From T. H. BAKER, Esq., Port Officer, Pámban, to the Collector of Madura, dated Pámban, 12th February 1882, No. 522.

With reference to your No. 303, dated 7th February 1882, I have the honor to inform you as follows :—

Coral is collected from all the islands adjacent to Pámban, and those forming the natural protection to the Kilakarai channel, the coral itself does not, as all must well know, form on the islands themselves, but is obtained about high-water mark, where it is in a decayed state thrown by the action of the sea. Coral in a live state is also dredged up from the bottom and conveyed to Colombo.

It is almost impossible to enumerate all the places from which coral is thus obtained as the dhonymen shift about according to the state of weather, wind, and sea, but I may safely state that it is procured from, or near to, all the islands from Corrisuddy Teevoo to Anapar Teevoo.

My objection to the wholesale removal of this natural barrier is, as before stated, that it acts as a prevention to the sand being washed into the channels during the south-west monsoon. A glance at the chart will show this. The very act of dredging up the coral must also disturb and set into a state of flotation a quantity of sand and mud which the current will carry into the channels. The least objectionable places where this work can be carried on is to the south of the islands.

In conclusion I would beg to point out that I think it is questionable whether the Ramnad Zemindari has any right to lease out this coral fishery, because, as before mentioned, it is collected at high-water mark or from under the sea. The Advocate-General has already expressed his opinion on the matter.

It is very doubtful whether the rule of law mentioned by the Advocate-General applies to this country as well as to England.

2. It has always been the custom of the estate to lease the coral fishery, and its right to do so has never been questioned any more than its right to collect chanks.

3. The mischief to be prevented is not at all clear, and Mr. Baker, although requested to do so, has not pointed out the localities from which he considered it objectionable, and those from which he considers it unobjectionable to collect coral.

4. Mr. Baker himself in his letter, dated 16th November 1881, No. 361, proposed to collect coral and credit Government with the proceeds, a proposal which is inconsistent with his objections. He has not stated nor apparently considered the rate at which coral grows, and so replaces what may be removed.

(Signed) H. J. S.

From T. H. BAKER, Esq., Port Officer, Pámban, to the Master Attendant, Madras, dated Pámban, 15th November 1881, No. 361.

I have the honor respectfully to bring the following matter to your notice :—

1st.—Before Kílakarai and Pámban sub-ports were brought under the Port Act the Port Officer of Pámban as officer in charge of the Kílakarai Pilot Department was ex-officio Conservator of the Kílakarai channel. Although never officially appointed as such, and the beacons, buoys, &c., were under his charge, as some of the beacons are now within the limits of the ports of which the Sea Custom Officers are Conservators, I should feel indebted if you will kindly instruct me whether the Sea Custom Officers are responsible for their upkeep and preservation, or whether I am.

2nd.—From information gathered from questioning the tindals of dhonies, I find that two men, one at Mandapom named Kakur Subban Achari, and one at Kílakarai named U. C. Mir Mohamad derive a good income by allowing the dhonymen to collect coral on the islands along the Kílakarai channel and in the port of Pámban they having acquired that right by paying an annual rent to the Zemindari of Ramnad; the coral, however, appears not to be collected from the islands but along the reef round them. The Solicitor-General has already stated his opinion that the Zemindar has no claim or right to the coral in the water. I would therefore respectfully suggest that I be empowered to allow the dhonymen to fish up coral at such places as I may consider it can be done consistent with the preservation of the channels at such a rate per ton as you may sanction. The Government would derive a good revenue from this, and the indiscriminate manner of taking the coral anywhere now carried on would be put a stop to. A lower rate than that charged by the contractors would be eagerly accepted, thus benefiting both the dhonymen and Government.

2. I enclose a statement taken from the tindal of one of these coral dhonies, also one showing the amount of coral in tons that has been taken away from the islands adjacent to Pámban during this year.

Resolution—dated 24th April 1882, No. 1[illegible]2.

Submitted for the orders of Government.

2. The gathering of coral for manure seems to be an industry of growing importance, to which the Zemindari has, in the opinion of the Advocate-General, no right. The Board think it should be placed under the control of the Collector, who, in communication with the Marine Department, could determine the localities where it might be quarried without detriment to the passage.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) E. GIBSON,
Acting Secretary.

To the Chief Secretary to Government, Marine Department,
with seven original enclosures, to be returned.
Copy to the Collector of Madura.
" " Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

READ—the following letter from J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieut., R.N.R., Master Attendant, Madras, to the Acting Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 12th May 1882, No. 4023 :—

Administrative Department.

I have the honor to inform you that Mr. J. H. Stokes, Collector of Madura, furnished me with a copy of his report* to Government, with reference to paragraph 2 of G.O., No. 274, dated 15th June 1881, regarding the removal of coral stone from the Pámban Pass, which I forwarded to the Port Officer, Pámban, for further report, and I now respectfully beg to offer the following remarks.

* No. 542, dated 1st March 1882.

2. It is stated in the Collector's report that the right to quarry coral in the Pámban islands attached to the estate, and in the south and west of Kílakarai and Kunthangal islands, has been rented on behalf of the Zemindar, but I am informed

67 X 67

by the Port Officer, Pámban, that the only place coral is obtained by "*quarrying*" is in Pámban island, about one mile east of the light-house. The coral taken away by the dhonies to Colombo for manure is *dredged up* from the bottom on the reefs surrounding the islands, or is collected in a decayed state on the shores of the islands about high-water mark, where it is deposited by the action of the sea. The opinion of the Advocate-General embodied in my letter recorded in G.O., No. 274, dated 15th June 1881, shows that, while the Zemindar is entitled to the enjoyment of the soil of the islands, he has no right over the land covered by the sea surrounding the islands. As the sea washes the shores up to high-water mark, that portion may also be excepted. The Government have, therefore, only to notify to the Zemindar the limits within which he has a right to lease the islands, beyond which he is to exercise no control, and thus put a stop to the removal of coral stone from the reefs and fringes of the islands, a practice so injurious to the channels and channel-marks connected with the Pámban Pass.

3. The Collector states that the Port Officer, Pámban, answered that it was impossible for him to enumerate all the places from which coral is obtained; but he proceeds to remark that Mr. Baker first objected to the removal of coral from the port limits, then extended the objection beyond them, and finally deprecated the removal of coral from any place along the whole coast-line of the Ramnad Zemindari. The information required is thus pretty nearly supplied. Mr. Baker, however, reports that he could only reply that the dhonymen worked in different places according to state of wind and weather on all the islands from Coorisuddy to Anaparteevo.

4. Mr. Stokes observes that the mischief to be prevented is not clear. This is pointed out in paragraph 4 of my letter recorded in G.O., No. 274, dated 15th June 1881. The new beacon on Shingle islet, which is the leading mark for entering the pass, and imperatively required for the navigation, has been completely undermined and its erection endangered by the removal of the coral rocks between the beacon and the sea. The beacon is so close to the sea that it is now made the subject of direct attack by the waves, and the south-west monsoon now approaching may very probably destroy it. On this point the Port Officer reports as follows :—

"I first prohibited coral being collected within the limits of the port on account of silt having accumulated to the south-eastward of the eastern buoy in the sand-bank channel caused by the removal of coral along the edge of the reef surrounding Coorisuddy and Pallivasal islands. It would be palpably plain to any one inspecting the place that this removal of the dam that keeps back the sand must cause silt and be detrimental to the maintenance of the channel.

"The dhonies then commenced work of the Shingle islet and I had to stop that, but unfortunately too late to prevent damage being done to the beacon lately erected there.

"When asked for my opinion regarding the renting of the coral along the Kílakarai channel, I replied that, without strict supervision, it was objectionable, as the wholesale removal of it would not only allow the sand to silt up in the channel, but might possibly remove the natural breakwater that is so valuable to small native coasters during the strong winds of the south-west monsoon."

5. In paragraph 5 of the Collectors letter it is stated on the other hand that Mr. Baker himself in his letter, No. 361 dated 15th November 1881, to the Master Attendant, Madras, proposed to collect coral and credit Government with the proceeds, a proposal which is inconsistent with his objections. The Port Officer's explanation is as follows :—

"Under the present system the men go and collect when and where they choose. If the Government had it, it would pay to appoint one or two peons to supervise and *see that the coral was only taken from such places as I might from time to time point out.*"

6. The report calls for no further remarks, and I have to solicit the early orders of Government on the matter.

ORDER—dated 20th May 1882, No. 116 Marine.

The Government observe that the Advocate-General's opinion is against any rights belonging to the Zemindar.

2. The Collector's assertion that Mr. Baker's proposals to collect coral and credit Government with the proceeds are inconsistent with his objections to the indiscriminate removal of live coral to the detriment of the natural barrier reef, seems to be based on a misapprehension.

3. The Government resolve to prohibit absolutely the removal of coral anywhere along the coast-line of the Ramnad Zemindari, that is to say, from Pámban to Vallinokam Point unless it is certified by the Port Officer that no injury to the channel will be caused thereby.

4. The Collector will, in communication with the Port Officer, arrange for working on behalf of Government any coral which, in the opinion of the Master Attendant, may be safely removed. Receipts on this account will be credited to Government.

5. These orders have no reference, it is to be understood, to the dead coral washed on shore of which the Zemindar may be allowed the benefit.

(True Extract.)

Acting Chief Secretary.

To the Court of Wards.
,, Collector of Madura.
,, Government Solicitor.
,, Master Attendant, Madras.

Exd. T. O'Connor and J. Wright.

Govt. of [1882] Madras.

MARINE.

Order, dated 20th May 1882, *No.* 116.

Coral.—Passing orders on Proceedings, Board of Revenue, and letter from the Master Attendant regarding the removal of coral from the Pamban Islands along the coast of the Ramnad Zemindari.

Print all papers

60

72
9 -11
24-11-11
5-1-15
8-12-15
12.6.17
6-4-18
22.6.
16.3.27.II

~~3-12-60/2~~

72

PRESS.

Marine DEPARTMENT.
G.O. DATED 20 May/82
No. 116

First copy sent to Press.
Returned for signature. 8/6
Despatched in print. 9/6

[Despatch Abstract.]

Coral. Passing
on Pro. Rd. Mes
letter from the Mr
regards the remova
coral from the Pam
Islands along the coa
the Ramnad Zemind