

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

8th March 1882, No. 601 W.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

Read the following papers:—

No. 75. From G. D. LEMON, Esq., Acting Collector of Madras, to the Acting Under Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 28th February 1882, No. 61.

WITH reference to G.O., No. 3186 W., dated 24th December 1881, I have the honor to submit the Report of the Committee.

Mr. Thorowgood was present at our meetings and agreed to all the compensations proposed except those of the first five people on the list. These cases have been treated in the same way as all the rest, and there is no doubt that he would have agreed to these also had he been here.

The papers received with the Government Order under reply are herewith returned.

Report of the Committee appointed under Government Order, 24th December 1881, No. 3186 W.

WE find that all the land alluded to in the Government Order above quoted has been submerged and the buildings that were on it have been destroyed, except those belonging to the first five persons named in Mr. Barlow's lists, and it is necessary we should recommend the Government to pay to the owners the value of these lands, &c. The sums proposed will be found in the last column of the statement annexed.

2. It is to be noted first of all that long before the Harbour Works were commenced there had been continual erosion and loss of land by the encroachment of the sea, and some of the claimants for compensation had, by 1876, when the Harbour Works were commenced, lost a considerable part of the land which they imagined, or say they imagined, was in their possession. We have taken into consideration for compensation only such lands and buildings as were above high water mark in 1876.

3. The rates of compensation claimed vary from Rs. 250 a ground (of 2,400 square feet) to Rs. 150, and the only reason given for the high rates demanded are that the land fetched high rents which were charged on timber merchants and people who stored timber on the land prior to its removal into Madras. These rents are said to have been Rs. 2 a ground a month while timber was lying on it, but the timber trade is with Burmah chiefly, and by native vessels, and their arrivals are regulated by the south-west monsoon. We believe the source of income was very doubtful, and that the land was seldom or never rented for more than six months of the year at the full rate, and that no one plot was ever entirely rented out. The soil was heavy sand, useless or nearly so for agricultural purposes.

4. We considered the rates demanded for the most part too high, and with the assistance of the Tahsildar, and by inquiries of the claimants themselves, decided on the following as fair rates,

viz., Rs. 150 a ground for the lands nearest Madras, Rs. 120 for those a little further off, and Rs. 90 for those furthest away. The two first are the rates taken by Mr. Barlow, the last has been raised by us from Rs. 50 to Rs. 90.

5. The claimants have in all but a few cases agreed to the terms offered them, and the only cases requiring explanation are Nos. 1 to 6, 9 and 13.

6. Of these No. 1, Vira Chetti, claimed Rs. 200 per ground of 2,400 square feet. We offered him Rs. 150 and he refused, his land was chiefly used for a timber store though there were a few fishermen's huts paying a ground rent to him on it. It will be protected, it is believed, by the revetment wall now in progress, but its use and value will be gone, for timber cannot be dragged up the stone wall. The price offered, Rs. 1,500, we think a fair price, and we would advise that he be left to take this sum or retain the land as he pleases.

7. The next four are the "Medalists," men rewarded by Government for valor in saving life.—See Captain Taylor's letter, dated 12th December 1881, No. 11085. These lands have not been damaged, though the houses have, and it is believed that the stone revetment will, in future, protect them if they are rebuilt, but the people have manifested a great objection to remaining, and as the cost of the land to Government even at the rate of Rs. 150 per ground will only be Rs. 300, we have thought it best to propose for them compensation for houses and land, and advise the Government to give them the chance of rebuilding their houses in some safer place.

8. No. 6 is Adinarayana Naiken. He is a boat overseer, and his demand is Rs. 20,000. This seems to be at Rs. 185 a ground on what was left in 1876, and for 2 cawnies, 3 grounds, and 1470 square feet which he lost before the Harbour works were begun. For loss prior to 1876, Nature, not Government, is responsible, and therefore that and all similar claims were at once rejected.

9. His rate was reduced for the reasons already given. It is true he did sell a small patch at Rs. 185 a ground in the cotton famine year for a cotton press, but he cannot adduce any other evidence that the value of the remaining whole is as great as this, and we believe it to have been an exceptionally high rate paid for a particular purpose in a year when the cotton trade was in a state of considerable excitement. Mr. Gould, the Administrator General, on behalf of the estates under his management, only asks Rs. 150 a ground for the adjacent land and therefore this rate was offered and he agreed to take it.

10. No. 9, Venkatasubbu Chetti. This plot was known as the old saw-mills and was surrounded by a wall, but no mills were ever at work there, nor was the building completed. For the land from this point we only propose Rs. 120 per ground, taking into consideration the situation, further distance, from Madras, and for the building we offered Rs. 2,000. The offer was accepted.

11. No. 13, Parthasaradi Chetti, asks Rs. 150, and we offer Rs. 120 for the land per ground, this was not used for timber, being occupied by huts, a temple, and certain houses. These latter were estimated to the best of our ability and the owner agreed to our offer. The huts are the property of the fishing people.

12. From T. Cundasami Chetty, No. 15, to the end, we only offer Rs. 90 a ground, and to this all but Nos. 16 and 20 have agreed.

13. We can safely say that the compensation offered is liberal. No. 17, Manavaliah, told us we had offered him Rs. 90 a ground for land which he bought at Rs. 35 a few years ago, while No. 12, Sabapathi Chetti, is offered Rs. 742 for what cost him Rs. 250 in 1875.

14. There were huts to the number of 120 more or less in seven plots, these were the property of fishermen or other squatters on the land who paid a small ground rent. The huts were their property and are estimated to value Rs. 7 to Rs. 15 each.

15. The claimants for these sums are not at present known and it will take some time to find them out. We would therefore advise that the inquiry into these claims and the payment of them be left with the Collector, and that the disbursement of the other sums be sanctioned at once. Also that the Collector be authorized to expend without further reference a sum of Rs. 1,200 in payments not exceeding Rs. 15 for huts proved to his satisfaction to have been destroyed.

16. We have proposed nothing especial for compensation for loss of interest, or rents, during the period between 1876, because, *first*, it is not possible to make any fair estimate, and, *secondly*, it is not claimed by any one, but we have made our estimate of the value of the land per ground sufficiently high to cover any such loss.

17. It seems probable that there would be no further erosion at present, but rather that land will reappear until next north-east monsoon, and the question of what is to be done in anticipation of the probable further erosion and destruction of buildings at the close of the year has not been referred to us, still we think we may advise that an estimate by a skilled estimate maker should be at once commenced of lands and buildings likely to be lost before any damages done. These estimates which we have made have been made by us entirely in the dark as may be imagined, for two of us have never seen the lands or the buildings.

18. There are two cases with which we have not dealt. Mr. Vanderwart and that of B. Kuther Saib. In Mr. Vanderwart's case the damage done to a wall has been repaired, and the other man claims rent for the house rendered vacant by his tenants' fear of the encroachment of the sea. These houses have not suffered any damage, and it seems best in the present state of affairs for us to leave them to be dealt with hereafter, so that their present value can at any future time be authoritatively referred to and stated.

19. The mussulman's back-wall is also being replaced by the Harbour authorities, and he limits his claim to four months' rent, at Rs. 60, which we think may be allowed him. We understand that a stone revetment has been proposed to protect the land and the buildings, &c., now standing, but Mr. Parkes seems to advocate a scheme whereby the Government is to purchase all property on the sea or eastern side of some line to be drawn in an inland direction from the revetment spoken of before to a point to the northward and not yet decided on, and until this is settled we cannot decide what is best to be done for the persons likely to be injured. But in case Mr. Parkes' proposition is approved, a valuation of all lands and buildings eastward of his line of limit of possible early damage by encroachment of the sea is imperative.

20. We would beg to advise that the compensation money now proposed for lands and buildings already lost, if approved, be made available for disbursement at once. The people have been long waiting and it was understood as one of the conditions of acceptance of our offers that there was to be no further delay in a well considered settlement of this matter.

(Signed) G. D. LEMON,
Acting Collector of Madras.

(Signed) W. H. BURTON, Lieut.-Col., R.E.,
Executive Engineer, Presidency.

Numbers.	Name of Owner's of Properties.	Grant or Certificate extant.	Survey extant in 1862.	Further loss in land by erosion of the Sea between the Survey year 1862 and Harbour Works commencement year 1876 from natural cause.	Difference for Compensation.	Value for Land demanded by the Owners.	Value for Building and huts demanded by the Owners.	Value for Trees demanded by the Owners.	Total Value demanded by the Owners.	Amount of Compensation which the Committee propose the Government should offer.	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Veera Chetti, P.	..	..	..	0 10 0	2,000	Rs. 310 30 huts	Rs. A. P. 15 8 0 1 Coconut and 7 Poorsan	Rs. A. P. 2,325 8 0	Rs. A. P. 1,500 0 0	Offer of Rs. 150 per ground was refused, vide Report.
2	Calliani Annall and Veerasawmi Nattian.	..	0 0 1,200	..	0 0 1,200	100	600 a house	9 0 0 1 Coconut and 2 Poorsan	709 0 0	450 0 0	
3	Paupen ..	..	0 0 1,200	..	0 0 1,200	100	600 a house	..	700 0 0	450 0 0	
4	Amavasy ..	..	0 0 1,200	..	0 0 1,200	100	560 a house	..	660 0 0	350 0 0	
5	Cundappah Chetti ..	..	0 0 1,200	..	0 0 1,200	100	1,500 a house	25 0 0 2 Cocoanuts and 1 young Coconut.	1,625 0 0	650 0 0	
6	Andinarayanasawmi Naiken ..	4 1 600	2 6 1,971	0 3 501	2 3 1,470	*20,000	..	100 0 0 10 Poorsan trees	20,100 0 0	7,757 0 0	
7	Administrator General ..	1 12 78	0 23 648	0 4 1,808	0 18 1,240	†3,705	..	120 0 0 16 Cocoanuts and 1 Poorsan.	3,855 0 0	2,777 8 0	Said he would agree
8	Alankari Annall ..	1 12 22	0 21 880	0 4 280	0 17 600	†2,588	..	..	2,588 0 0	2,587 8 0	
9	Venkatasubboo Chetti ..	2 5 800	1 17 2,106	0 6 1,181	1 11 925	*7,100	..	..	..	6,246 4 0	
10	Candasawmi Chetti ..	0 10 1,800	0 6 1,503	0 0 1,261½	0 6 241½	†1,220	70 5 huts	..	1,290 0 0	732 0 0	
11	Rajoo Chetti ..	0 8 1,216	0 6 1,695	0 0 1,115	0 6 580	†1,250	110 7 huts	..	1,360 0 0	792 4 0	
12	Sabapathi Chetti ..	0 8 1,056	0 5 2,051	..	0 6 490½	§1,240	..	..	1,240 0 0	742 8 0	
13	M. Parthasaradi Chetti ..	0 16 1,413½	0 14 744	0 1 2,381½	0 12 762½	† Demands the lump sum of 16 huts and 2 houses.	..	..	7,251 12 0	4,203 0 0	
14	Palaanthan Chetti ..	0 8 1,200	0 7 480	0 0 1,745	0 6 1,135	†975 2 houses and 1 hut.	..	..	3,575 0 0	2,304 0 0	
15	T. Candasawmi Chetti ..	0 21 400	0 13 1,650	0 1 70	0 12 1,580	†2,550 12 huts.	..	..	2,700 0 0	1,138 4 0	

16	Subbaraya Chetti, Candappa Chetti and Veerasawmi Chetti.	2 17 5	2 4 2,399	0 2 899	2 2 1,500	†10,125	270 21 huts and a well.	..	10,395 0 0	4,556 4 0	Offer of Rs. 90 per ground refused although they had papers which showed they bought at 40, 50 and 60 Rupees a ground.
17	Manavali ..	..	0 6 2,097	..	0 6 2,097	§1,720	..	..	1,720 0 0	618 12 0	
18	Mahomed Fakir Saib ..	..	0 1 1,876	..	0 1 1,876	†350	250 1 building and 1 well.	15 0 0 2 Cocoanuts trees and 1 Poorsan.	615 0 0	250 8 0	
19	Administrator General ..	2 4 200	1 7 913	..	1 7 913	†6,276	720 20 huts	..	6,996 0 0	4,707 1 0	Said he would agree.
20	Seethiah Naiken ..	1 10 900	1 9 1,527	..	1 9 1,527	†6,727	1,040 2 huts	..	7,767 0 0	3,027 4 2	
21	Salar Meah Saib ..	1 14 1,300	1 13 2,252	..	1 13 2,252	†7,579	..	70 0 0 39 Poorsan trees	7,649 0 0	3,446 8 0	
22	Tirumalai Achari ..	0 9 1,200	0 10 633	..	0 9 1,200	†1,900	..	..	1,900 0 0	855 0 0	
Total ..		..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	50,141 9 2	

* Rate not given.
† Rate Rs. 150 a ground.
‡ Do. Rs. 200 a ground.
§ Do. Rs. 250 do.

(Signed) G. D. LEMON,
Acting Collector of Madras.
(Signed) W. H. BURTON, Lieut.-Col. R.E.,
Executive Engineer, Presidency.

No. 539 C.

REFERRED to the Engineer-in-Chief, Madras Harbour Works, for any remarks he may wish to make.

A very early reply is requested.

3rd March 1882.

(Signed) R. H. SANKEY, Colonel, R.E.,
Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

No. 75-A. From W. PARKES, Esq., M. INST. C.E., Engineer-in-Chief, Madras Harbour Works, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 4th March 1882, No. 6 W.

I HAVE the honor to return herewith the papers accompanying your reference to me, No. 539 C. of 3rd March, and to state that I concur generally in the recommendations of the Committee as to the mode of dealing with the claimants for compensation.

2. I would beg however to call attention to an error into which the Committee appear to have fallen as to the season at which further erosions may be anticipated. The time of erosion is the *south-west* not the *north-east* monsoon as stated in paragraph 17, and it may be expected to commence in May or June. The settlement of the question of how further encroachments are to be dealt with is therefore more urgent than the reporters have assumed.

No. 76.

ORDER THEREON, 8th March 1882, No. 601 W.

THE recommendations of the Committee are approved, and the Collector is authorised to adjust the claims in the manner proposed.

2. The Government Solicitor will render the Collector such assistance as may be needed in the settlement of the claims.

3. The Superintendent of the Harbour Works will arrange for clear surveys being made of the ground for which compensation is paid.

4. The charges will be debited against the Harbour Works.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. H. SANKEY, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Collector of Madras.

„ Superintendent of Madras Harbour Works.
„ Examiner of Public Works Accounts.
„ Government Solicitor.
„ Revenue Department.
„ Marine „

Exd. S. T. Austin.

Spare Copies

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of (1882) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

THE COLLECTOR OF MADRAS,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated March, 8th.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 8th March 1882, No. 601 W.

MARCH.

Nos. 75-76.

Claim for compensation for damage done to property by the encroachment of the sea, north of the Harbour.—The Collector authorised to adjust the — in the manner proposed by the Committee appointed to consider the same, and the Government Solicitor directed to render the Collector such assistance as may be needed in the settlement of the claims.

Administrative Department.

No. 234

MADRAS,

Marine Office,

23rd January 1882.

From

J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., LIUT., R.N.R.,

Master Attendant,

Administrative Department,

Madras,

To

The Honorable R. Davidson C.S.I.

Chief Secretary to Government,

Marine Department,

Fort Saint George.

SIR,

In my letter No. 7498, dated August 19th last, embodied in G.O. Public Works Department, No. 2149 W, dated 31st idem, reference is made to an estimate of Rupees (97) ninety seven for repairs to the Marine Dispensary. The Executive Engineer, Presidency, intimates that the necessary funds have not been placed at his disposal for carrying out the work, and as the Dispensary rooms are in a very bad state, I have the honor to request that the necessary arrangements may be made, in view to the early execution of the repairs by the Executive Engineer.

I have the honour to be

Sir

Your most Obedient Servant

J. H. Taylor

Master Attendant
Administrative Department

MM

12-9-M-1881
1-7-M-1881

Marine (1881) DEPARTMENT.
(Bldg) 6

From
THE MASTER ATTENDANT,
ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT,
Madras,
To
THE CHIEF SECY. TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
Fort St. George.

No. 234

Dated 11 } January 1882.
Received 11 }

No.

CURRENT No. 23

Subject.

Request to order being required
for early execution of
repairs to the Marine
Dispensary.

No 24

Transferred to
the P. W. Dept.

N. D. Anderson
Chief Secy.

11/1/82

No. 139W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 16th January 1882
Read the following:

Read in the Marine Dept (MR No 24 of 11 Jan 1882)

The Superintending
Engineer 5th Circle is
authorised to put in hand
the repairs to the Marine
Dispensary Madras es-
timated to cost Rs 97,
the necessary funds being
made available by the
Financial Department
from Port funds.

Rs 97
Establishment - 24
Tools & Plant - 2
x Rs 123

RS

B

16.1.82

S. & B. Circle ✓
Marine Dept ✓
P. W. Dept ✓

CH. 17-1-82

Set No 139 Waf 16th Jan 1882

50 1519 W. 17-6-81
2149 W. 31-8-81.

Waf 16th Jan 1882

Entd. in Receipt Regr.

Jan 20/11