Archives I 10,006—16-8 77.

(1) Number of pages 62

(2) Date of repair 1-4-87

(3) Initials of the Referencer [illegible]

MIL NADU ARCHIVES

ERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P.W.D. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 2202 W.
~~B.P. No.~~

Press.
~~Mis.~~

Dated 28-8-1882. ~~197~~.

K.M.K.

e folded or roughly handled

28TH AUGUST 1882, No. 2202 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

2202
1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

No. 165-A.

READ—the following papers :—

G.O., dated 28th March 1882, Miscellaneous No. 1055, Revenue.

Read—the following letter from the Acting Collector of Malabar, to the Acting Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, dated 25th March 1882, No. 251 :—

In reply to your endorsement on G.O., dated 18th February 1882, No. 452 W., Public Works Department, I have the honor to enclose copy of a letter I have received from the European Merchants of Calicut in regard to the Calicut Pier. The Master Attendant, Madras, will have correct data to show the average yearly receipts from Port dues at Calicut. I subjoin the figures, so far as known in this office, for both Calicut and Cochin from 1876 77 to 1880-81 :—

Years.	Calicut.			Cochin.		
	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.
1876-77	17,229	12	9	27,811	9	0
1877-78	20,885	10	0	28,276	13	3
1878-79	14,632	7	3	29,868	12	6
1879-80	11,830	8	3	28,811	10	0
1880-81	14,226	5	6	31,694	5	0
Total ...	78,804	11	9	1,46,463	1	9

ENCLOSURE.

From the European Merchants of Calicut, to the Collector of Malabar, dated Calicut, 21st March 1882.

We, the undersigned merchants of Calicut, have the honor to thank you for favoring us with a perusal of G.O., Public Works Department, No. 452, and, as you desire, we give you our views relative to the subject thereof—the Calicut Pier.

We venture respectfully to express our dissent from several of the arguments and conclusions which appear to be entertained.

It seems to be considered that because the pier cost a certain sum, and a further amount will be required to put it in repair, the sum of Rs. 4,000 *must* be provided for annually to meet interest on outlay, with the apparent alternative that if that amount cannot be found, the pier shall be allowed to continue its rapid course to ruin, and shortly become entirely useless.

It is possible that the pier could have been built for a much smaller sum than was paid, Rs. 64,000; indeed, we venture to assert that it could.

The largeness of the sum stated as being necessary to pay for the repairs (Rs. 24,500) is due chiefly to the fact that the proverb "a stitch in time saves nine" has been totally lost sight of. Had ordinary annual repairs, tarring and other means of conservation, so necessary in the climate of Malabar, been attended to periodically, the cost would have been small, the structure would have been in fair order, not requiring the outlay above referred to. We have from year to year pointed out the position to the local authorities, but they have pleaded "no sanction." The state of disrepair has considerably increased. Since His Excellency the Governor's visit, more planks have broken away, rails are lying about loose, &c.

We venture to suggest that a sounder view to take is, having got the pier in its present condition, how to make the best of it. If Rs. 4,000 interest and the other charges specified in the Government Order cannot be earned, is it better for Government to accept a half or even a quarter of these, anything in short that will give *some* return, however small, rather than shut up the pier and lose all return. The estimate for establishment seems high when we consider what that establishment is. The working portion seems to consist of a few lascars, who really form the Port Officer's boat crew, and some of whom are taken away by him when required, necessitating the stoppage of one crane, another obstacle to success.

We will consider together paragraphs 6, 7, 8 of the Government Order relative to Pier tolls and use of the pier. There can be no doubt the pier has never had fair play; it has been starved. It is just as useless to build a pier without adding proper appliances for shipping and landing cargo as it would be to make the frame-work of a cart and not put wheels and bullocks to enable it to go. The two cranes on the structure are suitable enough for shipping light cargo, because it is a simple matter to lift the goods a few inches off the pier, swing them round, and "let go" into the barge below; but they are, from their want of power and speed, utterly useless for landing cargo requiring despatch, such as grain arriving by steamer, for it would take probably two or three hours to discharge a boat carrying 12 to 15 tons of cargo. The system of rails is so poor that trucks cannot pass each other, so that there is a constant block. Government some years ago provided a number of trucks for use on the pier; they were never repaired, and several now lie in pieces about the Custom House yard, wheels here, bodies there, and we are not allowed to put more than six bags of 1½ cwts. each on the surviving but decrepit vehicles. How then could it be expected that a large import business, such as that of grain, could be conducted over the pier in its present state. It is only a short time ago that one of the cranes fell over into the sea, owing to a slightly extra weight having been put in the slings. Many hundreds of tons of machinery recently consigned to this port had to be taken on to Beypore and boated some three miles up the river, at great cost, to a suitable place for its being landed, simply because our pier could not land it at all, causing loss to the importers and to the Pier Toll Funds.

It is true the native traders use another landing place, because it would be useless for them to land their cargoes on the beach alongside the pier, which we have shown they cannot at present use, if they can land on the beach nearer home. But we believe that if facilities were given for landing grain expeditiously and cheaply at the pier, it would be used to a great extent, for the amount of loss and damage sustained by importers of this article from its being wetted during passage through the surf are enormous. Only last week many thousand bags of rice had to be landed some three miles away, and carted five or six into Calicut, simply because there was a swell slight but sufficient to prevent landing on the Calicut Beach, and a large cargo boat full of rice went down; and a recurrence of a rough sea may be looked for frequently during the next three months.

Reference is made in paragraph 10 to what occurred when the deputation met His Excellency the Governor here. At that interview it was stated on behalf of Government, when the prosperous condition of the Calicut Port Funds was referred to, that the receipts were unduly swelled by Port dues paid by coasting steamers, a portion of which was applicable to other ports. The reverse of this is the case. Steamers going north pay dues, for the group of which Calicut is one, at Cochin; when coming south, at Mangalore; so that in referring to the Port Funds of Calicut, we are entitled to take a proportion of the special receipts for the group received at these ports. We believe last year's receipts from coasting steamers at Mangalore were Rs. 3,000, at Cochin Rs. 27,000; total Rs. 30,000, of which we may safely take one-fourth, or Rs. 7,500, as applicable to Calicut.

We respectfully submit that no argument as to the impossibility of using the Calicut Port Funds for the repairs of the pier, because they were inadequate, can be based on the fact that at a certain date the balance at credit of these funds was only Rs. 8,113-7-11. Under existing arrangements, by which all Mofussil Port Funds are transferred to Madras, there lumped and disposed of by the Master Attendant, the balance in the local officer's hands may be one anna, and is no criterion of the surplus.

We find that during only the past five financial years the receipts in the Calicut Port Funds, excluding Pier tolls, have been over rupees one lakh, while the charges for the same period have only been Rs. 40,419, leaving a surplus of Rs. 60,000, or an average annual surplus of over Rs. 12,000. In one year the surplus was over Rs. 17,000; surely inadequacy cannot here be pleaded. We would respectfully ask what has become of this surplus.

As to the question of the inadmissibility of using the Port Funds, the bulk of which is contributed by natives. Is it more inadmissible to spend some of the surplus in promoting the general welfare of the local community, and encouraging local commerce, than it is to have it swallowed up in Madras, and spent hundreds, perhaps thousands, of miles away. Indeed, we understood it to be stated at the meeting of the deputation with His Excellency that there was now no wish on the part of Government to divert Port Funds from the places where they were earned.

In many ways the European and Native traders have sympathetic interests. The former may be the importers of the large and increasing quantities of grain, but it is the money of Europeans which buys most of it, to be consumed by the thousands of laborers brought by us to the plantations we own or manage.

In conclusion, we would ask you to state to His Excellency the Governor neither we nor the large body of gentlemen whose interests we represent here wish in any way to evade contributing our fair share of the costs of public improvements, and in some instances we have voluntarily taxed ourselves. But in assessing the rate per ton which we should pay for the use of the pier, and fixing what proportion of the funds paid by native entire mercantile community should be assigned to the upkeep of a public work used by only a portion of the mercantile public, we respectfully submit that the money value of the produce imported and exported by us, compared to the entire trade of the port, should form an important factor in the calculation; and, finally, we would remind His Excellency through you that, owing to the very depressed condition of the industry which we chiefly represent, the present is an inopportune moment to ask us to contribute so heavy a tax as that suggested in the Government Order now before us.

Our views are that if the pier is put into proper repair, and facilities are afforded for the rapid shipment and landing of cargo, instead of its being utterly neglected and discountenanced, it will yield a much larger revenue than it has done. We could scarcely be expected to guarantee the income of a concern of which we had not the management or control in the slightest degree.

Order—dated 28th March 1882, Mis. No. 1055, Revenue.

Transferred to the Public Works Department.

(Signed) E. F. WEBSTER,
Ag. Secretary to Government, R.D.

No. 810 C.

Referred to the Master Attendant for remarks.

(By Order.)

(Signed) ROSS THOMPSON, Lt.-Col., R.E.,
Ag. Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

5th April 1882.

No. 165-B.

G.O., dated 2nd June 1882, No. 202, Marine.

Read—Demi-official from Mr. D. S. Gilkieson, dated 27th May 1882, pointing out certain defects in the Calicut Pier (received through the Private Secretary to the Right Honorable the Governor).

Order—dated 2nd June 1882, No. 202, Marine.

Transferred to the Revenue Department with reference to paragraphs 8 and 9 of No. 452 W., dated 18th February 1882, Public Works Department.

(Signed) C. G. MASTER,
Acting Chief Secretary.

Mis. No. 1847.

Transferred to the Public Works Department in continuation of this Department Miscellaneous No. 1055, dated 28th March 1882.

(Signed) E. F. WEBSTER,
Secretary to Government, R.D.

OOTACAMUND,
12th June 1882.

No. 1286 C.

Referred to the Master Attendant in continuation of No. 810 C., dated 5th April 1882.

(By Order.)

22nd June 1882. (Signed) ROSS THOMPSON, Lt.-Col., R.E.,
Ag. Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

No. 165-C.

From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieutenant, R.N.R., Master Attendant, Administrative Department, Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 26th June 1882, No. 5328.

With regard to the letter of Mr. Gilkieson forwarded to me for remarks, I have the honor to point out that the plea advanced at this late stage by that gentleman is one that cannot be for a moment supported. There has never been any attempt to use the pier for the rice traffic, and for the best of all reasons, viz., its unfortunate position. The rice godowns are behind the old Custom House, and the boats lie just under their very doors. The coolies that bring the bags from the beach deposit them at once in the godowns, and I have never heard any complaint of unusual damage, nor can believe in it. If rice was landed at the pier, besides the Pier dues importers would also have to pay cart-hire for their long distance from the pier to the godowns, and no doubt a road toll, for the Municipality would never keep up the expensive beach road without money, if made the medium of such very large traffic.

2. But for the sake of argument, I am willing to suppose the whole rice trade transferred to the pier; in that case even there would be no occasion for steam cranes; a far quicker method is always available, and one by which any number of boats could be discharged at once, viz., a stage raised between the boat and the pier, such as is generally used in putting rice on boardship, and from which the bags could be handed up with far greater celerity than they could be removed from the shore end.

3. All these points have been already carefully considered, and everything urged that can tend to a profitable use of the pier, but without avail. Mr. Gilkieson admits that the importers are all native merchants, and the natives have never been able to utilise the pier.

4. I have in my hands the letter from the Calicut Merchants to His Excellency the Governor on the pier question. I have waited to answer this until the Administration Report of the whole Port Fund and Marine for the past year is before me, and I can form an opinion as to the future prosperity of the fund, now Madras is removed from it. I hope during the ensuing week to forward such remarks on that letter as circumstances may dictate.

No. 165-D.

From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieutenant, R.N.R., Master Attendant, Administrative Department, Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 30th June 1882, No. 5504.

I have the honor to return herewith the letter from the Calicut Merchants with such remarks as suggest themselves to me. In the first place the didactic style adopted by the writers throughout the whole communication could only be excusable on the score of utility and experience in the various suggestions offered, whereas there is not one remark that throws any light either upon the condition of the pier or its future prospect, the latter being studiously avoided.

2. The pier has been repaired throughout the period of its existence, whenever the District Engineer has seen occasion for it, at an expense of Rs. 3,973, until lately, when having reached a period when the whole wooden portion of the structure had, in the natural order of things, shown symptoms of decay, a sudden demand for the landing

of heavy machinery on a pier only originally constructed for light traffic drew close attention to it, and revealed the fact that very expensive and extensive alterations would be required to place it on such a totally different footing. Nothing, however, will ever make it fit for heavy work, and as the necessity for the introduction of machinery for mining purposes is a very temporary one, and the port of Beypore, in every way suited for landing the heaviest weight, is contiguous, it would be unbusiness-like from the first point of view, and ruinous from a monetary one, to attempt to carry out the wishes of a few European merchants, who have shown themselves in this matter indifferent to all but their own fluctuating interests.

3. As regards Port Funds, the ports of Calicut and Beypore have had by far the lion's share of the West Coast collections. After the railway was finished to Beypore, it was represented by the mercantile community that a pier only was wanted to ensure the success of the railway enterprise and secure the co-operation of the trade. A pier of timber was accordingly constructed in the quiet water immediately behind shingle islet at a cost, I understand, of over Rs. 60,000, or about the same as Calicut. The pier never met with any of the promised support; it never earned enough to employ a staff of any sort; and with no funds to support it, ended a period of inactivity and neglect by being sold and broken up in 1873, and the proceeds realising a few rupees only.

4. Calicut Pier was supplied also on similar misunderstanding: the real facts could never have been placed before Government; it was supposed that it was a necessity for the whole trade of Calicut, whereas only a small portion could ever use it. The first expensive adjunct called for was new Custom House and godowns as buildings rendered necessary only if the whole trade had been diverted to the pier, and now of so little use, that His Grace the Governor, on his visit in 1878, seriously considered the advisability of conversion to a Court House. The expense of this construction was undertaken by Government in the so-called interests of trade. It became evident when too late that the native trade could not equitably, or even possibly, be moved from its old site. The Coote reef offers shelter for the native vessels, and grain, the chief staple, is easily landed and carried into neighbouring godowns.

5. As for Port Funds, the source from which the merchants propose to reconstruct the pier, they have during the past year been devoted to the objects, and those objects only for which they are properly levied. The Provincial and Imperial contributions have been dispensed with. The whole sea-board has been brought within their operation, and much care will be required to keep the fund in a proper state of solvency and efficiency. No unremunerative works can be encouraged. The present balance derived from former years must be somewhat jealously guarded, for it will not be liable to much future increase. The lighthouse at Muttum, the erosions at Cochin and Cruz Milagre, the expenses at Mangalore, the claims of Tellicherry for a jetty, which, I believe, would be remunerative, are all to be considered.

6. The general ignorance on the subject of Port Fund is well illustrated by the remarks of these Calicut Merchants, who attempt in their letter to advise and direct Government. They talk of the fund being swallowed up in Madras, whereas the accounts of Madras are entirely separated, and every rupee collected on the West Coast is traceable through the Accountant-General's books and Administration Reports.

7. In the letter under consideration the necessity of keeping up the pier is so forcibly dwelt upon, and the advantages of repairing it at a considerable expense are so clearly demonstrated, that I cannot see from a mercantile point of view why the merchants should not take it over, and form a small Company to work it. In such a case perhaps, as an exceptional measure, Government might perhaps be disposed to double any amount the merchants would devote towards putting it in order as a final contribution. It is obvious things cannot go on with yearly loss and impending destruction of the work to Port Funds, and unsupported statements, vexatious but inconclusive correspondence, on the part of those who assert their interests to be deeply engaged.

No. 165-E.

ORDER—dated 28th August 1882, No. 2202 W., Public Works.

It is in the opinion of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council unnecessary to deal in detail with the subject of the letter from the merchants at Calicut, dated 21st March 1882. The Government are however willing, as a final settlement, to make over the pier to be worked by a Company formed of the merchants interested in its maintenance, and who profess to be assured of its remunerative character. The Government will further be prepared to allot, as a final contribution, double the amount which may be advanced by the Company towards putting the pier into order.

2. Should these offers not be accepted, the Government must decline to spend any more money on a work which to them has proved a financial failure, and which is of little or no use to the native mercantile community who are largely interested in the trade of the port.

3. The Collector will communicate these offers to the merchants concerned.

(True Extract.)

Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.,
Irrigation Branch.

To the Collector of Malabar.
,, Master Attendant, Madras.
,, Superintending Engineer, Fourth Circle.
,, Revenue Department.
,, Marine do.

Exd. A. F. Goodall.
Spare Copies

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of (1882) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated August, 28th.

Encl.

Recd.

G.O., 28th Aug. 1882, No. 2202 W.

AUGUST.
Nos. 165-A—165-E.

Calicut Pier.

Making certain proposals for the repair and working of the — by a Company formed of the merchants interested in its maintenance.

-5-

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

18th February 1882, No. 452 W.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

Read the following papers:—

No. 82. From the Superintending Engineer, Second Circle, dated 2nd May 1881, No. 185.

No. 82-A. Memorandum to the Master Attendant, dated 10th May 1881, No. 1170.

No. 82-B. From the Master Attendant, dated 16th May 1881, No. 4244.

No. 82-C. To the Superintending Engineer, Second Circle, dated 19th May 1881, No. 84.

No. 82-D. From the Superintending Engineer, Fourth Circle, dated 1st December 1881, No. 525.

No. 82-E. Memorandum to the Superintending Engineer, Fourth Circle, dated 5th December 1881, No. 2928.

No. 82-F. From the Superintending Engineer, Fourth Circle, dated 9th December 1881, No. 542.

No. 83. ORDER THEREON, 18th February 1882, No. 452 W.

THE pier at Calicut was originally constructed in 1869—1871 at a cost of Rs. 64,000. Up to the present time the capital outlay, exclusive of interest, amounts to Rs. 73,000. The structure has of late shown signs of weakness, and it has been considered dangerous to pass any load over it exceeding the weight of the trollies by *one* ton. The cost of repairing the pier in a substantial manner is estimated by the Superintending Engineer at Rs. 24,500. The total capital outlay on the work would thus amount to little short of a lakh of rupees.

2. Interest on this sum at 4 per cent. per annum will amount to Rs. 4,000.

3. Much of the iron work is already greatly deteriorated, and looking to the short life of a structure of this character a large sinking fund to cover deterioration should, properly speaking, be provided for.

4. Annual repairs will probably cost Rs. 300 and establishment Rs. 700.

5. Even leaving aside the question of a sinking fund a sum of not less than Rs. 5,000 per annum would have to be raised to meet interest on capital and maintenance charges.

6. The actual receipts per annum for the past eleven years have averaged Rs. 900 The question thus arises as to how the difference is to be made up.

7. Assuming that the European merchants, who exclusively use the pier (the native craft having a different anchorage and unloading opposite the old Custom House), pass as much traffic as 5,000 tons per annum, the rate would have to be raised from 3 annas to 1 rupee per ton.

8. The estimate of capital outlay given above takes no account of the other improvements pressed on the attention of His Excellency the Governor on the occasion of his recent visit to Calicut, such as powerful steam cranes, &c. If the cost of these were added, it would probably be necessary to raise the rate to Rs. 1-4-0 on the assumed traffic of 5,000 tons.

9. The question for consideration therefore is whether the European mercantile community are prepared to subsidise the work to the extent indicated above. The Collector will be called on, in the Revenue Department, to ascertain the views of the merchants, and report the result at an early date.

10. The suggestion put forward by the deputation which waited on His Excellency at Calicut, that the prosperous condition of the Port Fund warranted an expenditure from that source for either effectually repairing the present pier, or of constructing a new one at another site, is untenable. From information supplied by the Master Attendant, Madras, it would appear that the Calicut Port Fund had a balance at credit of only Rs. 8,113-7-11 in November last—a sum quite inadequate for any large work of improvement. Its application, moreover, to a work like the Calicut Pier is inadmissible, seeing that the bulk of the Port Fund is contributed by native traders, whose interests in this respect are not identical with those of the European merchants.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Superintending Engineer, Fourth Circle.
,, Marine Department.
,, Revenue Department.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

will again be good enough
to direct the attention
of His Excellency to the
fact that since the
famine I have observed
a steady & large increase
in the imports of rice
due partly, no doubt, to
the taste for Bengal rice
then acquired by the people
of Malabar & of the
district served by the
Railway.

Mr Ferguson writes me
that nearly 1000 tons
of rice were landed

at Calicut last month alone, none
of this, nor of the enormous
quantities, landed during
the season out of the
British India Steamers,
has passed over the pier
& this is due to the
undoubted fact that
the cranes at the pier
head are not, & never
were, adapted for the
landing of cargo. They
work very slowly so that
no steamer could stay
long enough in port & no
owner of cargo boats

v

4 would keep them at the
pier the length of time
required for unloading.
The consequence is that
all the grain imported
is landed through the
surf & vast quantities
of it are injured by the
salt water, to the
incalculable loss of the
native importers (all
rice importers are natives)
& to the detriment to
the health of the Co
Summer, who takes the
risk of illness as he
buys the damaged rice
cheaper than the good

---

5 Besides this I am
perfectly certain that
if 2 steam cranes
were put up on the
pier head the tolls
on the rice & on the
cargoes of steamers &
ships from England,
all of which is now
landed on the beach
& pay nothing to the
pier, would be ample
to pay interest on the
value of the pier, provide
establishment & keep the

Structure in repair. Possibly also there might be sufficient to form a sinking fund but, if not, the surplus revenue of the port & ~~of~~ the Calicut pier & portion of the collection made in Cochin of the group of ports, would be ample to provide this.

It has been argued that the port fund is

mainly paid by natives & that therefore the surplus revenue should not be devoted to the pier as only Europeans use it, but I have shown that the imports of rice by the B. I. Steamers, are made by natives alone & that from the present system of ~~boat~~ landing at the beach the native importer suffers in possibil-

8

of the native consumer
a health, so that
the case is a good one
as regards native
interests — the Europeans
would, of course, come
in for a share of the
benefit in facilities for
shipping our ~~cargo~~ coffee & for
landing our imports
from Europe.
Apologizing for the trouble
I give you
Believe me
Yours very truly
D. S. Gillies

Hon H E Sullivan

220 W

—11—

For orders

I herewith submit for orders a letter dated 21st. March 1882 from several firms at Calicut having reference to G.O. 18. Feb. 1882 No 452 W on the subject of devoting such a sum to the repairs of the pier at the port as would make it sufficiently substantial for the duty chiefly needed by ~~the~~ merchants — also a letter No 5504 dated 30 June/82 from the Master Attendant replying to the above

There is another letter from the same officer No 5328 of 26 June also dealing with the matter and as taken ~~together~~ they cover nearly all the ground of discussion it is needless for me to say much on a matter

---

I do not think we should be justified in sanctioning further expenditure on this unprofitable work which is a convenience to only a small section of the trading community

The pier receipts are insufficient to cover the cost of establishment & contingencies & from the time of its construction have never yielded a farthing in the way of interest on outlay

I think the proposal to make it over to the merchants on the terms specified in the Master Attendant's letter is a good one — If as they seem to consider, it can be made remunerative it wd. be worth their while to accept the offer — I have not however the faintest idea that private enterprise will ever come to the front

H S

Cir: 28/7 R. ~~H.S.~~ turned
outy 24/7 1/8/82

which I have previously considered from any point of view in the anxious desire to meet if possible the views of the merchants

It is certainly disappointing to find that instead of making any practical proposals for the support of a work, which mainly if not entirely was entered on by Government on their own representations and solicitations, they content themselves with putting forward a number of entirely unsupported, and as I believe unwarranted, statements as to the prime cost of the work being excessive, the neglect of the most ordinary repairs to keep it in serviceable condition &c &c

One of the statements made that the native traders use another "landing place because "it would be useless to

"land their cargoes on "the beach alongside of "the pier which we have "shewn they cannot use" is little short of astounding in its audacity

On examining these and previous statements I am certain that the admission will be found that the [illegible] pier from its distance from the native portion of the harbour and of the Old Custom House would be of little or no use to the native merchants, and it is notorious that after the Scheme was sanctioned by Government on the pressing representations of the European merchants the Collector & Government were deluged with petitions from the native merchants inveighing against the Scheme for compelling them to make use of the new Custom House — Notwithstanding all opposition their prayers had to be attended to, and the native merchants have carried their point and retained the use of the old Custom House

I made the most careful enquiries on the occasion of both my visits to Calicut and am prepared distinctly to say that the above statement in their present letter is a mis-representation of the well known facts of the case. Under extremely exceptional circumstances during 2 or 3 days in the year native merchants might possibly make use of the pier but this is all — they might possibly add say on an average 20 or 30 Rs per annum to the earnings of the pier (900 per annum) but certainly no more.

As the merchants will not even guarantee one half of interest and Establt on the repaired work I confess I see no practical solution of the difficulties unless it be in the formation of the small company, suggested in para 7 of Captain Taylor's letter, to whom under certain conditions it might be made over — If the merchants have the slightest faith in their own statements as to the great utility of the work to the port, and what it would be made under proper repairs and working, they should eagerly seize on an offer of the kind.

Order Submitted.

20/7/82

Revenue Department,

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letter from the Acting Collector of Malabar, dated 25th March 1882, No. 251.

In reply to your endorsement on G. O. dated 18th February 1882, No. 452 W, P. W. Department, I have the honor to enclose copy of a letter I have received from the European merchants of Calicut in regard to the Calicut Pier. The Master Attendant, Madras, will have correct data to shew the average yearly receipts from port dues at Calicut. I subjoin the figures so far as known in this office for both Calicut and Cochin from 1876-77 to 1880-81.

Years.	Calicut.			Cochin.		
1876-77	17,229	12	9	27,811	9	"
1877-78	20,885	10	"	28,276	13	3
1878-79	14,632	7	3	29,865	12	6
1879-80	11,830	8	3	28,811	10	"
1880-81	14,226	5	6	31,694	5	"
Total	78,804	11	9	146,463	1	9

No.

Mis: No. 1055.

Ordy. — d/ 28th May 1882

Transferred to the
Public Works Department.

Fort Saint George,
28th March 1882.

Acting Secy. to Govt.

Exd
Cd

P. W. C. No. 2100

P.W. E-1
4

E-1

Recd. 31 Mar 82

10

No. 810. Ca/ 5 April/82

Endt on the above

Referred to the Master Attendant for remarks.

(By order)

R W Thompson
Lieut Col R.E.

Actg Under Secy to Govt P.W.D.

Calicut 21st March 1882

15

To
Encl

The Collector of Malabar.

Sir,

We the undersigned merchants of Calicut, have the honor to thank you for favoring us with a perusal of G.O. P.W.D. no. 452 and as you desire, we give you our views relative to the subject thereof, the Calicut Pier.

We venture respectfully to express our dissent from several of the arguments and conclusions which appear to be entertained

1. It seems to be considered, that because the pier cost a certain sum, and a further amount will be required to put it in repair, the sum of Rs 4000 must be provided for annually to meet interest on outlay, with the apparent alternative that if that amount cannot be found,

the Pier shall be allowed to continue its rapid course to ruin and shortly become entirely useless.

It is possible that the Pier could have been built for a much smaller sum than was paid, Rs 64000. indeed we venture to assert that it could

The largeness of the sum stated as being necessary to pay for the repairs (Rs 24500) is due chiefly to the fact that the proverb "a Stitch in time saves nine" has been totally lost sight of. Had ordinary annual repairs, tarring, and other means of conservation, so necessary in the climate of Malabar, been attended to periodically, the cost would have been small, the structure would have been in fair order, not requiring the outlay above referred to. We have from year to year pointed out the position to the local Authorities, but they have pleaded "no Sanction" The state of disrepair has

Considerably

Considerably increased. Since His Excellency the Governors visit, more planks have broken away, rails are lying about loose &c. &c.

We venture to suggest that a Sounder view to take is;- having got the Pier in its present Condition, how to make the best of it. If Rs4000 interest and the other Charges specified in the G. O. cannot be earned, is it better for Government to accept a half or even a quarter of these, Any thing in short that will give some return, however small, rather than shut up the pier and loose all returns. The estimate for establishment seems high, when we Consider what that establishment is - The working portion seems to Consist of a few lascars who really form the Port Officers Boat Crew; and some of whom are taken away by him when required. necessitating the stoppage of one crane, another obstacle to success

We will Consider together, paras 6, 7, 8 of the G.O. relative to Pier Tolls, and use of the Pier. There Can be no doubt the Pier has never had fair play, it has been Starved. It is just as useless to build a Pier without adding proper appliances for shipping and landing Cargo, As it would be to make the frame work of a Cart, and not put wheels And bullocks to enable it to go. The two Cranes on the Structure are Suitable enough for Shipping light Cargo, because it is a Simple matter to lift the goods a few inches off the Pier, Swing them round, and "let go" into the barge below, but they are from their want of power and Speed utterly useless for landing Cargo requiring despatch, Such as grain Arriving by Steamer, for it would take probably 2 or 3 hours to discharge a boat Carrying 12/15 tons of Cargo. The System of rails is So poor

that

that trucks Cannot pass each other, So that there is a Constant block. Government Some years ago provided a number of trucks for use on the Pier; they were never repaired and several now lie in pieces about the Custom-house yard, wheels here, bodies there, and we are not allowed to put more than 6 bags of 1½ Cwts each on the Surviving but decrepid vehicles. How then could it be expected that a large import business Such as that of grain Could be conducted over the Pier in its present State. It is only a short time ago that one of the Cranes fell over into the Sea, owing to a Slightly extra weight having been put in the Slings. Many hundreds of tons of Machinery recently Consigned to this port had to be taken on to Beypore and boated Some 3 miles up the river, at great Cost, to a Suitable place for its being landed, simply because our Pier Could not land it at all, Causing loss to the importers and to the Pier Toll funds.

It is true the Native Traders use another landing place, because it would be useless for them to land their Cargoes on the beach alongside the Pier which we have shown, they cannot at present use, if they can land on the beach nearer home. But we believe that if facilities were given for landing grain expeditiously and cheaply at the Pier, it would be used to a great extent. For the amount of loss and damage sustained by importers of this Article from its being wetted during passage through the Surf, are enormous. Only last week many thousand bags of rice had to be landed some 3 miles away, and carted 5 or 6 into Calicut simply because there was a swell, slight but sufficient to prevent landing on the Calicut beach, and a large Cargo boat full of rice went down. And a recurrence of a rough sea may be looked for frequently during the next three months.

Reference

Reference is made in para 10 to what occurred when the deputation met His Excellency the Governor here. At that interview it was stated on behalf of Govt. when the prosperous Condition of the Calicut Port funds were referred to, that the receipts were unduly swelled by port dues paid by Coasting Steamers, a portion of which was applicable to other ports. The reverse of this is the Case. Steamers going north pay dues, for the group of which Calicut is one, at Cochin — when coming South, at Mangalore, so that in referring to the Port funds of Calicut, we are entitled to take a proportion of the special receipts for the group received at these ports. We believe last year's receipts from Coasting Steamers at Mangalore were Rs. 3000, at Cochin 27,000. Total 30,000, of which we may safely take 1/4 or Rs 7500 As. applicable to Calicut.

We respectfully submit that no argument as to the impossibility of using the Calicut Port funds for the repair of the Pier, because they were inadequate, can be based on the fact that at a certain date the balance at credit of these funds was only Rs 8113-7-11. Under existing arrangements by which all Mofussil Port funds are transferred to Madras, there lumped and disposed of, by the Master Attendant, the balance in the local Officer's hands may be one anna and is no criterion of the surplus.

We find that during only the past five financial years, the receipts

in

in the Calicut Port funds, excluding Pier Tolls, have been over Rupees one lac, while the charges for the same period, have only been Rs 40,419, leaving a surplus of Rs 60,000 or an average annual surplus of over Rs 12,000/. In one year the surplus was over 17000 Rs/ Surely inadequacy cannot here be pleaded. We would respectfully ask what has become of this surplus.

As to the question of the inadmissibility of using the Port funds, the bulk of which is contributed by Natives. Is it more inadmissible to spend some of the surplus in promoting the general welfare of the local community, and encouraging local commerce, than it is to have it swallowed

up

as in Madras, And spent hundreds perhaps thousands of miles away. Indeed we understood it to be stated at the Meeting of the deputation with His Excellency, that there was now no wish on the part of Government to divert Port funds from the places where they were earned.

In many ways, the European And Native traders have Sympathetic interests. The former may be the importers of the large and increasing quantities of grain, but it is the money of us Europeans which buys most of it, to be consumed by the thousands of labourers brought by us to the Plantations we own or manage.

In Conclusion we would ask

you

you to State to His Excellency the Governor, neither we nor the large body of gentlemen whose interests we represent here wish in any way to evade Contributing our fair Share of the Costs of public improvements, And in some instances we have Voluntarily taxed ourselves. But in Assessing the rate per ton, which we should pay for the use of the Pier, and fixing what proportion of the funds paid by Native Entire mercantile Community should be Assigned to the upkeep of a public Work used by only a portion of the Mercantile Public, we respectfully submit that the money value of the produce imported and exported by us, compared to the Entire trade of the Port should form an important factor in the Calculation. And finally we would remind His Excellency through you that owing to the very depressed Condition of the industry which we chiefly represent, the present is an inopportune moment to Ask us to Contribute so heavy a tax as that suggested in the G. O. now before us.

[illegible]

Our Views are, that if the Pier is put into proper repair And facilities are afforded for the rapid shipment and landing of Cargo, instead of its being utterly neglected and discountenanced, it will yield a much larger revenue than it has done. We could Scarcely be expected to guarantee the income of a concern of which we had not the management or Control in the slightest degree

We have &c

sd/ Hunde & Co.
sd/ Barry & Co
sd/ G Kinke & Co
sd/ Andrew & Co.
sd/ Peirce Leslie & Co

True Copy

M. Watters
Ag. Collector.

In a letter from the
Collector of Malabar
to the Secretary to the
Government of Madras
Dated 25th March 1882. No 25

Rev. 1659/82

Marine DEPARTMENT.

Reference on No. of 188
replying the above should be quoted.

CHIEF SECRETARIAT, MADRAS.

22

Print

Ord. d/ 2nd June/82 No. 202 Marine

READ the following D.O. from Mr D.S. Gilkison d/27 May 1882 pointing out certain defects in the Calicut Pier (received thro' the Private Secretary to the Right Honble the Governor).

Orders d/ 2nd June 1882 No 202

Transferred to the Revenue Dept with reference to paras 8 & 9 of No 452. W. d/ 18th February '82 Public Works Department.

G Masters
Actg Chief Secretary

Ootacamund
2nd June/82

To
The Revenue Department

2/6
7W

Rec'd [illegible]
2/6

3-3-82 [illegible] 930
25-3-82 " 1055

P 13

No 1286 C d/22/6/82

Referred to the
Master Attendant
in continuation of
No 810 C d/5th April 1882.
(Brown)

Jos Thompson
Lt Col RE
Ag Under Secy to Govt
PWD

L.C. 452 d/- 18-2-82-
Memo 810C - 5-4- "

REVENUE (1882) DEPARTMENT.

~~[illegible]~~

Revenue
1/6

No. 2899

From The Marine Departt.

Enc 1
4386

Dated 2d }
Recd 2d } June

No. 22 Enc: 1.

R/15/6
Encl 2
No 1286 C d/ 22/6/82

SUBJECT.

Transferring D.O. from Mr. D. S. Gilkison pointing out certain defects in the Calicut Pier.

P 12

Print

Memo No 1847

Transferred to the P. W. Dept. in continuation of this Depts miscellaneous No 1055 d/ 28 March 1882.

Secretary to Govt.

Administrative Department.

P 14

No. 5328

MADRAS,
Marine Office,
24 26th June 1882.

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

To
Colonel R. H. Sankey C. B. R. E.
Secretary to Government,
Public Works *Department,*
Fort Saint George.

SIR,

With regard to the letter of Mr. Gilkisson forwarded to me for remarks, I have the honor to point out that the plea advanced at this late stage by that gentleman is one that cannot be for a moment supported. There has never been any attempt to use the Pier for the rice traffic, and for the best of all reasons, viz its unfortunate position. The rice godowns are behind the old Custom house, and the boats lie just under their very doors. The coolies that bring the bags from the beach deposit them at once in the godowns, and I have never heard any complaint of unusual damage, nor can believe in it. If rice was landed at the Pier, besides the price dues importers would also have to pay cart hire for their long distance from the Pier to the godowns, and no doubt a road toll, for the Municipality would never keep up the expensive beach road without money, if made the medium of such very large traffic

2 But for the sake of argument, I am willing to suppose the whole rice trade transferred to the Pier, n that case even there would be no occasion for steam cranes, a far quicker method is always available, and one by which any number of boats could be discharged at once, Viz a stage raised between the boat and the Pier, such as is generally used in putting rice on boardship, and from which the bags could be handed up with far greater celerity than they could be removed from the shore end.

3 All these points have been already carefully considered, and everything urged that can tend to a profitable use of the Pier, but without avail. Mr Gilkison admits that the importers are all Native Merchants, and the Natives have never been able to utilize the Pier

Referred to the Master Attendant with G. 810 C d/5-6-82 RS 6/7

4 I have in my hands the letter from the Calicut Merchants to His Excellency the Governor on the Pier question. I have waited to answer this until the Administration report of the whole Port Fund and Marine for the past year is before me, and I can form an opinion as to the future prosperity of the Fund, now Madras is removed from it. I hope during the ensuing week to forward such remarks on that letter as circumstances may dictate.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedt Servant
J W Taylor
Master Attendant

Administrative Department

NM

(188) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE MASTER ATTENDANT,
ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT,
Madras,

To

THE ~~CHIEF~~ SECY. TO GOVERNMENT,
~~MARINE DEPARTMENT,~~ P. W. Dept.
Fort St. George.

No. 5328

Dated 26 } June. 1882.
Received }

No.

CURRENT No. 11[illegible]

Encl 2

Subject.

Reporting on the letter of Mr Gilkison regarding the Calicut Pier

Await reply to memo No 810 C of 5.21.82

1/7/82

Cor. 5/8
Cor. 28/7 ~~[illegible]~~ Rets.
W. 72.6
4/7. Re 25/8

810

Administrative Department.

No. 5504

MADRAS,
Marine Office,
30th June 1882.

36

From

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

To

Colonel R. H. Sankey C. B. R. E.

Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department,
Fort Saint George.

SIR,

I have the honor to return herewith the letter from the Calicut merchants with such remarks as suggest themselves to me. In the first place the didactic style adopted by the writers throughout the whole communication could only be excusable on the score of utility and experience in the various suggestions offered, whereas there is not one remark that throws any light either upon the condition of the Pier or its future prospect, the latter being studiously avoided.

2 The Pier has been repaired throughout the period of its existence, whenever the District Engineer has seen occasion for it, at an expense of Rupees 3973; until lately when having reached a period when the whole wooden portion of the structure had in

the natural order of things, shown symptoms of decay, a sudden demand for the landing of heavy machinery on a Pier only originally constructed for light traffic drew close attention to it and revealed the fact that very expensive and extensive alterations would be required to place it on such a totally different footing. Nothing however, will ever make it fit for heavy work, and as the necessity for the introduction of machinery for mining purposes is a very temporary one, and the Port of Beypore in every way suited for landing the heaviest weight, is contiguous, it would be unbusinesslike from the first point of view, and ruinous from a monetary one, to attempt to carry out the wishes of a few European Merchants, who have shown themselves in this matter indifferent to all but their own fluctuating interests.

3 As regards Port Funds, the Ports of Calicut and Beypore have had by far the lions share of the West Coast collections. After the railway was finished to Beypore, it was represented by the mercantile Community that a pier only was wanted to ensure the success of the railway

enterprise

...ly 17/6 No 21/6

enterprise and secure the cooperation of the trade. A Pier of timber was accordingly constructed in the quiet water immediately behind Shingle islet at a cost I understand of over Rs 60,000, or about the same as Calicut. The Pier never met with any of the promised support, it never earned enough to employ a Staff of any sort, and with no funds to support it ended a period of inactivity and neglect by being sold and broken up in 1873, and the proceeds realizing a few rupees only.

4 Calicut Pier was supplied also on similar misunderstanding, the real facts could never have been placed before Government, it was supposed that it was a necessity for the whole trade of Calicut, whereas only a small portion could ever use it. The first expensive adjunct called for was new Custom house and Godowns as buildings rendered necessary only if the whole trade had been diverted to the Pier, and now of so little use that His Grace the Governor on his visit in 1878, seriously considered the

advisability of conversion to a Court house. The expense of this construction was undertaken by Government in the so called interests of trade. It became evident when too late that the Native trade! could not equitably, or even possibly, be moved from its old site. The Coote reef offers shelter for the native vessels, and grain the chief staple is easily landed and carried into neighbouring godowns.

5 As for Port Funds, the source from which the Merchants propose to reconstruct the Pier, they have during the past year been devoted to the objects and those objects only for which they are properly levied. The Provincial and Imperial contributions have been dispensed with. The whole sea-board has been brought within their operation, and much care will be required to keep the Fund in a proper state of solvency and efficiency. No unremunerative works can be

ly 1772 No 21/

be encouraged. The present balance derived from former years must be somewhat jealously guarded, for it will not be liable to much future increase. The Lighthouse at Muttum, the erosions at Cochin and Cruz Milagre, the expenses at Mangalore, the claims of Tellichery for a Jetty, which, I believe, would be remunerative are all to be considered.

6 The general ignorance on the subject of Port Fund is well illustrated by the remarks of these Calicut Merchants, who attempt in their letter to advise and direct Government. They talk of the Fund being swallowed up in Madras, whereas the accounts of Madras are entirely separated, and every rupee collected on the West Coast is traceable through the Accountant General's books and Administration reports.

7 In the letter under consideration the necessity of keeping up the Pier is so forcibly dwelt upon, and the advantages of repairing it at a considerable

expense are so clearly demonstrated that I cannot see from a Mercantile point of view why the Merchants should not take it over, and form a small Company to work it. In such a case perhaps, as an exceptional measure, Government might perhaps be disposed to double any amount the Merchants would devote towards putting it in order, as a final contribution. It is obvious things cannot go on with yearly loss and impending destruction of the work to Port Funds, and unsupported statements vexatious but inconclusive Correspondence on the part of those who assert their interests to be deeply engaged.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most Obedt Servant
J. W. Taylor
Master Attendant
Administrative Department

MM

L.C. 2261 - 15-7-68.
" 3304 - 19-11- "
" 1570 - 13-5-69
" 1886 - 10-6- "
" 6782r - 1-9-77
" 328r - 26-6- "
B. 2798r - 4-12-80
A. 452r - 18-2-82 (origl.)
memo 810 C - 5-4- "
" 1286 C - 22-6- "

P.W. (1882) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE MASTER ATTENDANT,
ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT,
Madras,

To

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

No. 5504

Dated 30 June 188
Despd 7 July
Received

No.

Subject.

Returning Petition of Calicut Merchants regarding Pier with remarks.

Cir: 5/8

M.S. 17(a)/7 Retd 25/8 Retd:
Copy 24/7 Cir: 18/7 ~~Retd 8~~

No. 2202 W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 28th Aug/82

Read the following :—

Pro. Revenue Dept. —	(H.C. Mis. No. 1055 d/28th March/82)
Endorsement in the Marine Dept. on letter from Mr. D.S. Gilkison d/27th May 1882 —	(" No. 1847 d/12th June 1882.
From The Master Attendant Madras	(" " 5328 d/26th " ")
do do	(" " 5504 d/30th " ")

It is in the opinion of the Right Hon'ble the Governor in Council unnecessary to deal in detail with the subject of the letter from the Merchants at Calicut dated 21st March 1882. The Govt. are however willing as a final settlement to make over the pier to be worked by a Company formed of the Merchants interested in its maintenance, and who profess to be assured of

~~Hon. H.E. Sullivan~~

Draft for Approval

its remunerative character. The Govt. will further be prepared to allot, as a final contribution, double the amount which may be advanced by the Company towards putting the pier into order.

2. Should these offers not be accepted, the Govt. must decline to spend any more money on a work which to them has proved a financial failure, and which is of little or no use to the Native Mercantile Community, who are largely interested in the trade of the Port.

3. The Collector will communicate these offers to the Merchants concerned.

4/8/82

Issued

7/9 66/6

Collr. of Malabar 5

Master Attendant, Madras 13

S.E. Fourth Circle 9 ✓

Revenue Depts. 21 ✓

Marine Depts. 7 ✓ 21

R.S.

Cir: 5/8 1

4386
4900 See

Govt. of (1882) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Mem 29-8-82 4-70 h.
Recd 5-40 p.m.

Dated

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. 28th Augt. 1882, No. 2202W.

Nos. 154 & 155 E

Calicut Pier.

Making certain proposals for the repair & working of the ——— by a Company formed of the merchants interested in its maintenance

29/8.

Dr 29/8