

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,  
5th December 1873.*

No. 77. Read the following letter from J. W. RUNDALL, Esq., District Engineer, Tinnevely, to Colonel G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Palamcottah, 6th November 1873, No. 118:—

I HAVE the honour to forward, herewith, a revised estimate for constructing a landing Pier at Tuticorin.

1 Revised Estimate, Rupees 6,700.  
1 Comparative Statement.

2. The original estimate was framed by me upon data (as to the cost of wood procurable from Ceylon and the Western Coast) furnished by Captain Phipps.\* At the time I objected to the rates, as I considered them very low, but

\*Master Attendant.

Captain Phipps assured me that they were sufficient and that he could get the work taken up on contract at these rates.

3. This being the case, I adopted the rates given by him; but we have been unable to procure the timber at the original rates, and I am, therefore, compelled to forward this revised estimate.

4. On the receipt of sanction for the estimate, as the Master Attendant wished to carry out the work himself, I handed the money over to the Collector, promising such professional assistance as might be necessary, but the Master Attendant has been unable to get the work carried out for the rates of the estimate.

5. One reason which Captain Phipps gives for the increase in the rate of the iron-wood piles is that an export duty on timber has been imposed in Ceylon, from which place alone they are to be obtained. The planking was procured from the Western Coast at the original rate. The copper procured from Bombay has cost somewhat more.

6. Under these circumstances I trust the revised estimate may be sanctioned and the extra sum placed to my credit from Port Funds.

No. 78. ORDER THEREON, 5th December 1873, No. 2,926.

CIVIL WORKS, No. 3.

Under the circumstances explained, His Excellency the Governor in Council sanctions the revised estimate, amounting to Rupees 6,700, for a landing Pier at Tuticorin.

2. It is observed that the amount\* of the original estimate was allotted from Port Funds in the orders of the Marine Department, No. 219, dated 21st

\*Rupees 5,400.

August 1873. That department will now be requested to transfer to the Public Works Department a further sum of Rupees 1,300 to allow of the completion of the work during the current year.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. W. WALKER, Colonel, R.E.,

Secretary to Government.

To the District Engineer, Tinnevely.

„ Officiating Controller of Public Works Accounts, with Abstract Estimate.  
„ Marine Department.

Exd. E. C. Shunker.

Spare Copies

24-4-91  
G.O. of 1873 India

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

THE DISTRICT ENGINEER, TINNEVELLY,

&c., &c., &c.

Dated December 5th.

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 5th December 1873, No. 2,926.

DECEMBER

Nos. 77-78

*Pier at Tuticorin.*—Revised estimate, amounting to Rupees 6,700, for a landing Pier at Tuticorin, sanctioned; Marine Department to transfer to the Public Works Department the further sum required for the completion of the Pier.

27TH MAY 1886, No. 262, MARINE.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers:—

From Messrs. ANDERSON, ADAMSON & Co. and others, Merchants and Traders of Tuticorin, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Tuticorin, 20th March 1886.

We have the honor to address you on a matter of first importance to the mercantile community of this port and district, as well as to the vast numbers of passengers who constantly travel between here and Ceylon, viz., the inadequacy of the jetty erected by Government at Tuticorin for the accommodation of the already large and steadily-increasing traffic of the port, and which we would respectfully submit is a matter calling for the careful attention of the Government.

2. We would beg to point out that, in order to provide satisfactorily for the expeditious discharge and shipment of cargo, and the safety and convenience of passengers, at least 50 yards should be added to the length of the jetty, the necessity for which will, we trust, be made manifest on learning that the steam launch built and maintained by the Agents of the British India Steam Navigation Company, Limited, and of which mention was made in Government Notification of 31st December 1884, (No. 568, Marine), cannot come within 30 yards at low water, and even at high water touches the ground alongside. The inconvenience and danger thus caused to passengers may be better estimated by a reference to statistics, which show that during the year ending 31st December 1885, the number of native passengers travelling to and from Ceylon and Tuticorin reached the large total of 35,052.

3. The recent notification published at page 364 of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, and the levying since 1st September 1885 of pier dues at the rate of half-an-anna per individual on all passengers embarking and disembarking from steamers and native craft at this port, led us to hope that Government had in contemplation a scheme for the better accommodation of passengers and cargo, the expenses of which the proceeds of this toll were intended to defray. But no improvement in existing arrangements has yet taken place, which fact causes this imposition to appear to a discriminating public equally irksome and unnecessary in the utter absence of any apparent reason why they should be so mulcted.

4. We would therefore submit that the toll be abolished altogether, and the barrier and unsightly wooden building erected at the end of the jetty, in which the dues are collected, removed, or that an equivalent be granted in the shape of increased facilities for the landing and embarking of passengers with safety and despatch, and the prevention of the constant blockage of the jetty by packages of various articles of export and import for which the present width of the jetty is obviously insufficient.

5. The value of imports for the official years ending 31st March 1883, 1884 and 1885, were Rs. 38,25,931, Rs. 40,44,994, and Rs. 41,62,090, while the exports during these years amounted in value to the enormous sums of Rs. 1,24,63,918, Rs. 1,36,40,091 and Rs. 1,24,83,275, respectively. Looking to these figures and to the fact of the gradual silting up of the harbour—caused, we have reason to believe, at this part at least, by the multitude of wooden piles of which the present Government jetty is constructed—we would respectfully suggest for the consideration of the Government whether it would not be more satisfactory to have the present old jetty entirely gutted out, and a new jetty supported on iron piles substituted, having a breadth of, say, 25 feet, and extending seawards at least 150 feet farther than the present one.

6. We would also point out that the part of the foreshore coming under Port Rules and lying to the south of the pier is in a condition which beggars language to describe. It seems to be the receptacle for all the wreckage, broken iron, wood and rubbish that can possibly be brought together, and finally it constitutes a great latrine. The Hon. H. S. Thomas, who lately visited this port in connection with the pearl fishery, can testify to the general condition of the foreshore. A few months ago, the present Collector of Tinnevely, J. Lee-Warner, Esq., was requested to walk over and examine the part referred to. A short examination of only a portion sufficed to convince this gentleman, and to compel him to beat a rapid retreat from the offensive stench. Our present Sub-Collector, W. M. Thorburn, Esq., can also speak of the condition of the foreshore.

7. We would respectfully state that this is not a condition of matters that ought to be allowed to continue a moment after it is known, and would strongly urge that not only should the foreshore be cleansed of these objects offensive to both sight and smell, but that something might be done to improve, if not beautify, the foreshore, and make it possible to be used as a place of healthful resort and recreation for the inhabitants.

From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieutenant, R.N.R., Master Attendant, Madras,  
to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 4th May 1886,  
No. 3944.

Administrative Department.

I have the honor to return the papers relating to the improvement and embellishment of Tuticorin, and to remark thereon that I should very gladly welcome any change for the better, and when the number of signatures to the letter from the inhabitants is taken into consideration, those gentlemen should have no difficulty in framing a project which would bring about the accomplishment of their wishes. But the success of it must depend upon themselves, and upon the rigorous working of the Municipal Act. A large proportion of the cooly labor of Tuticorin is transacted on the beach, and unless ample latrine accommodation is provided, and measures taken to ensure its being used, the beach must remain foul. I cannot, however, say that, on the recent visit of the Hon. Colonel Shaw-Stewart and myself, the evil complained of presented itself in any extraordinary form. The Marine Department has no establishment to carry out conservancy duties, but all that can be done in regard to wreckage and laying up of boats I am sure Mr. Phipps will give his cheerful attention to.

2. I enclose a statement of the receipts and charges of the Tuticorin Pier from its construction in 1876 up to date. It will be seen that it has a credit balance of Rs. (26,667-13-2) twenty-six thousand six hundred and sixty-seven, Annas thirteen, and Pies two. This sum is included at present in the General Port Fund of the port, but has no real connection with it.

3. If Tuticorin is brought under the operation of the recent Act III of 1885, the object of which is to enable the community of any outport to provide funds for carrying out local improvements, some portion of the credit balance might be utilized in the direction of embellishment suggested by the signatories to the letter.

4. As regards the pier itself, it was lengthened in 1882-83 about as much as the additional length now proposed, 50 yards. But the bottom is so flat that a very slight increase was obtained in the depth of water. The extension of another 50 yards would only give six inches more depth, and with iron piles and beams would probably absorb half the credit balance. On our recent visit, I was struck with the freshness of the planking of the new work, and on asking the reason, Mr. Phipps informed me it was very seldom used, landing and shipping being carried on almost entirely at the old portion. I directed Mr. Phipps to send in an estimate for doubling the inner end, which I still await. The only vessel that would benefit by the extension appears to be the British India Steam Navigation launch, of which prominent mention is made in the letter from the inhabitants, which launch would seem to have been purchased without due consideration as to her draught of water. I have visited the port very

often in the last twelve years, and cannot observe any appreciable silt, or advance of the beach line, towards the sea. The substitution of iron piles for timber in any new work would be an improvement well worth the extra expense.

5. I would suggest respectfully that the gentlemen who forward this petition be asked to give some practical expression of their views as to beach improvements, in order that some idea may be formed of the cost.

6. Under the circumstances of the case, and with regard to local desires so strongly expressed, I cannot recommend the removal of the present tolls. Though 35,000 passengers seems to be a large number, it only represents, at present rate, Rs. (1,093) one thousand and ninety-three, and the extension would be almost entirely on passengers' account. A flat-bottomed boat to warp between the present end of the pier and a depth available for the launch would be a cheap settlement of that difficulty, and its operations could be extended *ad libitum*. I am glad to see that Mr. Lee-Warner gives his opinion favorably on the present condition of the beach. I attribute this improvement to Mr. Phipps' recent return from leave. He understands Tuticorin and its people thoroughly.

#### ENCLOSURES.

#### Receipts and Charges of the Tuticorin Pier.

|                                                                                                                                    | Charges.                                 |                |                |                | Receipts.   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
|                                                                                                                                    | Cost of erection, extension and repairs. | Establishment. | Contingencies. | Total charges. |             |
|                                                                                                                                    | RS. A. P.                                | RS. A. P.      | RS. A. P.      | RS. A. P.      | RS. A. P.   |
| Total expenditure incurred up to January 1876 on the Tuticorin Pier, including the cost of cranes, transit, and rolling stock, &c. | 10,000 0 0                               | ..             | ..             | 10,000 0 0     | ..          |
| 1876-77 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | 1,300 0 0                                | 225 0 0        | 32 4 0         | 1,557 4 0      | 3,496 7 0   |
| 1877-78 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | ..                                       | 300 0 0        | 28 7 0         | 328 7 0        | 12,181 0 5  |
| 1878-79 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | ..                                       | 300 0 0        | 23 4 0         | 323 4 0        | 4,337 10 1  |
| 1879-80 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | ..                                       | 300 0 0        | 36 0 0         | 336 0 0        | 2,664 6 9   |
| 1880-81 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | ..                                       | 300 0 0        | 38 7 0         | 338 7 0        | 3,460 6 4   |
| 1881-82 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | ..                                       | 300 0 0        | 32 0 0         | 332 0 0        | 3,933 14 3  |
| 1882-83 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | 6,094 0 0                                | 300 6 0        | 41 8 0         | 6,435 8 0      | 3,728 5 8   |
| 1883-84 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | 169 7 8                                  | 300 0 0        | 36 2 0         | 505 9 8        | 4,185 0 10  |
| 1884-85 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | 463 5 7                                  | 300 0 0        | 32 12 0        | 796 1 7        | 4,762 15 2  |
| 1885-86 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | 200 0 0                                  | 300 0 0        | 29 15 6        | 529 15 6       | 5,400 3 5   |
| Total ..                                                                                                                           | 18,226 13 3                              | 2,925 0 0      | 330 11 6       | 21,482 8 9     | 48,150 5 11 |

|          |    | MEMORANDUM.    |    | RS. A. P.   |
|----------|----|----------------|----|-------------|
| Receipts | .. | ..             | .. | 48,150 5 11 |
| Charges  | .. | ..             | .. | 21,482 8 9  |
|          |    | Credit balance | .. | 26,667 13 2 |

From J. LEE-WARNER, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely, to the Chief Secretary to Government, (through the Master Attendant, Administrative Department), dated Tinnevely, 23rd April 1886, No. 202.

With reference to endorsement, Register No. 592 C., dated 1st April 1886, referred to me for report, I have the honor to state that the signatories of the petition seem to complain of three distinct matters:—

- (1) The inadequacy of the present pier to meet the requirements of the port.
- (2) The imposition of a small pier due under G.O., No. 314, Marine, dated 27th July 1885.
- (3) The evil state of the foreshore between the Bank building and a portion of the foreshore occupied by Mr. Milligan.

2. As regards (1), I agree entirely with the petitioners. The present pier is not only inconveniently narrow, but old and rickety. Being built on wooden piers, it tends to silt up that

part of the harbour, and it is too short by at least 50 yards. I would recommend the building of a new pier on iron piles throughout; or, if that is too costly, at least the continuation of the present pier on iron piles for 50 yards. As regards (2), the imposition of a small landing charge was not notified without due consideration; and I remember that the public had an opportunity of urging their objections at the time. I do not therefore agree with the suggestion of Captain Phipps that the operation of the Government order referred to should be suspended for the present; but I think that every penny realized under it should be spent upon improving the pier and pier arrangements. I am right, I believe, in stating that the present pier is not even furnished with a good head light.

As regards (3), I paid Tuticorin a sudden visit a few days back, and I found to my surprise that the foreshore complained of was wonderfully improved and that there was little or no fouling. I see no reason why this improved state of things should not be maintained, especially as the office of the Assistant Superintendent of Police is immediately opposite. Captain Phipps may be instructed to see that if wreckage is permitted to be landed here, it is not unnecessarily detained before it is taken away to the godowns of the parties bringing it ashore: and if the hauling up of boats at this port is continued, the police should patrol there in the mornings to see that the boats are not used as a cover to persons making the edge of the foreshore such a nuisance as has been the custom hitherto.

3. The letter of the Port officer on the subject, as well as the petition sent for report, is enclosed.

From G. A. PHIPPS, Esq., Port Officer, Tuticorin, to the Collector of Tinnevely, dated Tuticorin, 19th April 1886, No. 82.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt, for report, of a petition (herewith returned) from certain merchants and residents of this place.

2. The chief complaint is apparently in regard to the jetty, which is considered to be unequal to the present requirements of the trade. With reference to this, I beg to state that Captain Taylor and the Hon. Colonel Shaw-Stewart, when here on the late port inspection tour, approved of the inner part being doubled in width, and this work will be undertaken as soon as the necessary sanction and materials can be obtained. Petitioners also complain that the steam launch is sometimes unable to come alongside to land passengers, owing to the low state of tide, and at other times touches the ground. This is, no doubt, a great inconvenience, but it is not of continual recurrence. I think it would be a great mistake to extend the present pier, now already 600 feet long, on similar wooden piles, and would suggest that any further extension should be upon iron piles, which would not tend to the accumulation of silt to which the thick wooden ones of the old pier have much contributed. The extension on iron piles for 150 feet would not be very costly, and could be met from the surplus collection of pier dues, of which there is a good balance to credit.

3. The complaint regarding the tolls levied upon passengers embarking and disembarking is, I may say, universal, as it was only instituted in September last during my absence. I think that petitioners should then have made their objections. The amount realized for the seven months ending 31st March is Rs. 714-3-6, and the tolls from goods during the same time were Rs. 2,680-5-3. The original pier was partly constructed out of funds subscribed by petitioners and their relatives, and I beg to suggest that the G.O., No. 314, Marine, dated 27th July 1885, suspended for the present.

4. With regard to the last complaint—that of hauling up of boats and landing of wreckage on the beach south of the bank, which is considered a nuisance, as it tends to make convenient cover to persons who use the place as a latrine—this I am endeavouring to remedy, but in a seaport like Tuticorin, boat-owners cannot keep their property in repair unless they are permitted to use a part of the foreshore for hauling up their boats upon. The part always permitted for this purpose has gradually in late years been lessened, and I propose to continue doing away with its being used for this purpose entirely. It has been usual to charge a fee for building boats or vessels, also for docking and for any use of the ground for storing wreckage prior to sale, which is credited to Port fund. It is the duty of the police to prevent the ground being fouled, and I am aware that a watch is kept for this purpose and prosecutions often take place.

From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieut., R.N.R., Master Attendant, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 7th May 1886, No. 4118.

Administrative Department.

In continuation of my letter, No. 3944, dated 4th May 1886, I have the honor to submit the accompanying estimate for doubling the width of the inner portion of the Tuticorin pier, amounting to Rs. (3,981) three thousand nine hundred and eighty-

one, received from the Port Officer, Tuticorin, and the necessity of the improvement having been explained in the letter above quoted, respectfully to solicit the early sanction of Government to the same, the amount being met from the surplus earnings of the pier.

ORDER—dated 27th May 1886, No. 262, Marine.

The reports from the Collector of Tinnevely and the Master Attendant will be communicated to the memorialists, who will be requested to favor Government, through the Collector, with a further expression of their views, pending which, orders will be deferred on the estimate submitted by the Master Attendant. The complaints which have been made regarding the state of the foreshore within port limits will be considered in the Judicial Department.

2. The Government entirely agree with the Collector and the Master Attendant in thinking that it would be unadvisable to suspend the levy of pier dues.

3. The attention of the Master Attendant will be drawn, with reference to the papers read in G.O., 3rd March 1885, No. 85, to the Collector's remarks regarding the want of a good light at the head of the pier.

(True Extract.)

E. F. WEBSTER,  
Chief Secretary.

To the Memorialists.

„ Collector of Tinnevely.  
„ Master Attendant, Madras.  
„ Judicial Department.

Exd. A. Raitt.

1530 May 19 June 18

Communicated to the  
Supt. Engineer D. F. C. L.

1530 May 19 June 18

Govt. of {1886} Madras.

MARINE.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 27th May 1886, No. 262.

1530 May 19-6-18

MAY.

Tuticorin Pier.

Passing orders on certain papers respecting the improvement of the —, &c.

With order

27TH MAY 1886, No. 262, MARINE.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following papers:—

From Messrs. ANDERSON, ADAMSON & Co. and others, Merchants and Traders of Tuticorin, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Tuticorin, 20th March 1886.

We have the honor to address you on a matter of first importance to the mercantile community of this port and district, as well as to the vast numbers of passengers who constantly travel between here and Ceylon, viz., the inadequacy of the jetty erected by Government at Tuticorin for the accommodation of the already large and steadily-increasing traffic of the port, and which we would respectfully submit is a matter calling for the careful attention of the Government.

2. We would beg to point out that, in order to provide satisfactorily for the expeditious discharge and shipment of cargo, and the safety and convenience of passengers, at least 50 yards should be added to the length of the jetty, the necessity for which will, we trust, be made manifest on learning that the steam launch built and maintained by the Agents of the British India Steam Navigation Company, Limited, and of which mention was made in Government Notification of 31st December 1884, (No. 568, Marine), cannot come within 30 yards at low water, and even at high water touches the ground alongside. The inconvenience and danger thus caused to passengers may be better estimated by a reference to statistics, which show that during the year ending 31st December 1885, the number of native passengers travelling to and from Ceylon and Tuticorin reached the large total of 35,052.

3. The recent notification published at page 364 of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, and the levying since 1st September 1885 of pier dues at the rate of half-an-anna per individual on all passengers embarking and disembarking from steamers and native craft at this port, led us to hope that Government had in contemplation a scheme for the better accommodation of passengers and cargo, the expenses of which the proceeds of this toll were intended to defray. But no improvement in existing arrangements has yet taken place, which fact causes this imposition to appear to a discriminating public equally irksome and unnecessary in the utter absence of any apparent reason why they should be so mulcted.

4. We would therefore submit that the toll be abolished altogether, and the barrier and unsightly wooden building erected at the end of the jetty, in which the dues are collected, removed, or that an equivalent be granted in the shape of increased facilities for the landing and embarking of passengers with safety and despatch, and the prevention of the constant blockage of the jetty by packages of various articles of export and import for which the present width of the jetty is obviously insufficient.

5. The value of imports for the official years ending 31st March 1883, 1884 and 1885, were Rs. 38,25,931, Rs. 40,44,994, and Rs. 41,62,090, while the exports during these years amounted in value to the enormous sums of Rs. 1,24,63,918, Rs. 1,36,40,091 and Rs. 1,24,83,275, respectively. Looking to these figures and to the fact of the gradual silting up of the harbour—caused, we have reason to believe, at this part at least, by the multitude of wooden piles of which the present Government jetty is constructed—we would respectfully suggest for the consideration of the Government whether it would not be more satisfactory to have the present old jetty entirely gutted out, and a new jetty supported on iron piles substituted, having a breadth of, say, 25 feet, and extending seawards at least 150 feet farther than the present one.

6. We would also point out that the part of the foreshore coming under Port Rules and lying to the south of the pier is in a condition which beggars language to describe. It seems to be the receptacle for all the wreckage, broken iron, wood and rubbish that can possibly be brought together, and finally it constitutes a great latrine. The Hon. H. S. Thomas, who lately visited this port in connection with the pearl fishery, can testify to the general condition of the foreshore. A few months ago, the present Collector of Tinnevely, J. Lee-Warner, Esq., was requested to walk over and examine the part referred to. A short examination of only a portion sufficed to convince this gentleman, and to compel him to beat a rapid retreat from the offensive stench. Our present Sub-Collector, W. M. Thorburn, Esq., can also speak of the condition of the foreshore.

7. We would respectfully state that this is not a condition of matters that ought to be allowed to continue a moment after it is known, and would strongly urge that not only should the foreshore be cleansed of these objects offensive to both sight and smell, but that something might be done to improve, if not beautify, the foreshore, and make it possible to be used as a place of healthful resort and recreation for the inhabitants.

From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieutenant, R.N.R., Master Attendant, Madras,  
to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 4th May 1886,  
No. 3944.

Administrative Department.

I have the honor to return the papers relating to the improvement and embellishment of Tuticorin, and to remark thereon that I should very gladly welcome any change for the better, and when the number of signatures to the letter from the inhabitants is taken into consideration, those gentlemen should have no difficulty in framing a project which would bring about the accomplishment of their wishes. But the success of it must depend upon themselves, and upon the rigorous working of the Municipal Act. A large proportion of the cooly labor of Tuticorin is transacted on the beach, and unless ample latrine accommodation is provided, and measures taken to ensure its being used, the beach must remain foul. I cannot, however, say that, on the recent visit of the Hon. Colonel Shaw-Stewart and myself, the evil complained of presented itself in any extraordinary form. The Marine Department has no establishment to carry out conservancy duties, but all that can be done in regard to wreckage and laying up of boats I am sure Mr. Phipps will give his cheerful attention to.

2. I enclose a statement of the receipts and charges of the Tuticorin Pier from its construction in 1876 up to date. It will be seen that it has a credit balance of Rs. (26,667-13-2) twenty-six thousand six hundred and sixty-seven, Annas thirteen, and Pies two. This sum is included at present in the General Port Fund of the port, but has no real connection with it.

3. If Tuticorin is brought under the operation of the recent Act III of 1885, the object of which is to enable the community of any outport to provide funds for carrying out local improvements, some portion of the credit balance might be utilized in the direction of embellishment suggested by the signatories to the letter.

4. As regards the pier itself, it was lengthened in 1882-83 about as much as the additional length now proposed, 50 yards. But the bottom is so flat that a very slight increase was obtained in the depth of water. The extension of another 50 yards would only give six inches more depth, and with iron piles and beams would probably absorb half the credit balance. On our recent visit, I was struck with the freshness of the planking of the new work, and on asking the reason, Mr. Phipps informed me it was very seldom used, landing and shipping being carried on almost entirely at the old portion. I directed Mr. Phipps to send in an estimate for doubling the inner end, which I still await. The only vessel that would benefit by the extension appears to be the British India Steam Navigation launch, of which prominent mention is made in the letter from the inhabitants, which launch would seem to have been purchased without due consideration as to her draught of water. I have visited the port very

often in the last twelve years, and cannot observe any appreciable silt, or advance of the beach line, towards the sea. The substitution of iron piles for timber in any new work would be an improvement well worth the extra expense.

5. I would suggest respectfully that the gentlemen who forward this petition be asked to give some practical expression of their views as to beach improvements, in order that some idea may be formed of the cost.

6. Under the circumstances of the case, and with regard to local desires so strongly expressed, I cannot recommend the removal of the present tolls. Though 35,000 passengers seems to be a large number, it only represents, at present rate, Rs. (1,093) one thousand and ninety-three, and the extension would be almost entirely on passengers' account. A flat-bottomed boat to warp between the present end of the pier and a depth available for the launch would be a cheap settlement of that difficulty, and its operations could be extended *ad libitum*. I am glad to see that Mr. Lee-Warner gives his opinion favorably on the present condition of the beach. I attribute this improvement to Mr. Phipps' recent return from leave. He understands Tuticorin and its people thoroughly.

#### ENCLOSURES.

#### Receipts and Charges of the Tuticorin Pier.

|                                                                                                                                    | Charges.                                 |                |                |                | Receipts.   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
|                                                                                                                                    | Cost of erection, extension and repairs. | Establishment. | Contingencies. | Total charges. |             |
|                                                                                                                                    | RS. A. P.                                | RS. A. P.      | RS. A. P.      | RS. A. P.      | RS. A. P.   |
| Total expenditure incurred up to January 1876 on the Tuticorin Pier, including the cost of cranes, transit, and rolling stock, &c. | 10,000 0 0                               | ..             | ..             | 10,000 0 0     | ..          |
| 1876-77 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | 1,300 0 0                                | 225 0 0        | 32 4 0         | 1,557 4 0      | 3,496 7 0   |
| 1877-78 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | ..                                       | 300 0 0        | 28 7 0         | 328 7 0        | 12,181 0 5  |
| 1878-79 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | ..                                       | 300 0 0        | 23 4 0         | 323 4 0        | 4,337 10 1  |
| 1879-80 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | ..                                       | 300 0 0        | 36 0 0         | 336 0 0        | 2,664 6 9   |
| 1880-81 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | ..                                       | 300 0 0        | 38 7 0         | 338 7 0        | 3,460 6 4   |
| 1881-82 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | ..                                       | 300 0 0        | 32 0 0         | 332 0 0        | 3,933 14 3  |
| 1882-83 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | 6,094 0 0                                | 300 6 0        | 41 8 0         | 6,435 8 0      | 3,728 5 3   |
| 1883-84 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | 169 7 8                                  | 300 0 0        | 36 2 0         | 505 9 8        | 4,185 0 10  |
| 1884-85 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | 463 5 7                                  | 300 0 0        | 32 12 0        | 796 1 7        | 4,762 15 2  |
| 1885-86 .. .. .                                                                                                                    | 200 0 0                                  | 300 0 0        | 29 15 6        | 529 15 6       | 5,400 3 5   |
| Total ..                                                                                                                           | 18,226 13 3                              | 2,925 0 0      | 330 11 6       | 21,482 8 9     | 48,150 5 11 |

#### MEMORANDUM.

|                   | RS. A. P.   |
|-------------------|-------------|
| Receipts .. .. .  | 48,150 5 11 |
| Charges .. .. .   | 21,482 8 9  |
| Credit balance .. | 26,667 13 2 |

From J. LEE-WARNER, Esq., Collector of Tinnevely, to the Chief Secretary to Government, (through the Master Attendant, Administrative Department), dated Tinnevely, 23rd April 1886, No. 202.

With reference to endorsement, Register No. 592 C., dated 1st April 1886, referred to me for report, I have the honor to state that the signatories of the petition seem to complain of three distinct matters:—

- (1) The inadequacy of the present pier to meet the requirements of the port.
- (2) The imposition of a small pier due under G.O., No. 314, Marine, dated 27th July 1885.
- (3) The evil state of the foreshore between the Bank building and a portion of the foreshore occupied by Mr. Milligan.

2. As regards (1), I agree entirely with the petitioners. The present pier is not only inconveniently narrow, but old and rickety. Being built on wooden piers, it tends to silt up that

part of the harbour, and it is too short by at least 50 yards. I would recommend the building of a new pier on iron piles throughout; or, if that is too costly, at least the continuation of the present pier on iron piles for 50 yards. As regards (2), the imposition of a small landing charge was not notified without due consideration; and I remember that the public had an opportunity of urging their objections at the time. I do not therefore agree with the suggestion of Captain Phipps that the operation of the Government order referred to should be suspended for the present; but I think that every penny realized under it should be spent upon improving the pier and pier arrangements. I am right, I believe, in stating that the present pier is not even furnished with a good head light.

As regards (3), I paid Tuticorin a sudden visit a few days back, and I found to my surprise that the foreshore complained of was wonderfully improved and that there was little or no fouling. I see no reason why this improved state of things should not be maintained, especially as the office of the Assistant Superintendent of Police is immediately opposite. Captain Phipps may be instructed to see that if wreckage is permitted to be landed here, it is not unnecessarily detained before it is taken away to the godowns of the parties bringing it ashore: and if the hauling up of boats at this port is continued, the police should patrol there in the mornings to see that the boats are not used as a cover to persons making the edge of the foreshore such a nuisance as has been the custom hitherto.

3. The letter of the Port officer on the subject, as well as the petition sent for report, is enclosed.

From G. A. PHIPPS, Esq., Port Officer, Tuticorin, to the Collector of Tinnevely, dated Tuticorin, 19th April 1886, No. 82.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt, for report, of a petition (herewith returned) from certain merchants and residents of this place.

2. The chief complaint is apparently in regard to the jetty, which is considered to be unequal to the present requirements of the trade. With reference to this, I beg to state that Captain Taylor and the Hon. Colonel Shaw-Stewart, when here on the late port inspection tour, approved of the inner part being doubled in width, and this work will be undertaken as soon as the necessary sanction and materials can be obtained. Petitioners also complain that the steam launch is sometimes unable to come alongside to land passengers, owing to the low state of tide, and at other times touches the ground. This is, no doubt, a great inconvenience, but it is not of continual recurrence. I think it would be a great mistake to extend the present pier, now already 600 feet long, on similar wooden piles, and would suggest that any further extension should be upon iron piles, which would not tend to the accumulation of silt to which the thick wooden ones of the old pier have much contributed. The extension on iron piles for 150 feet would not be very costly, and could be met from the surplus collection of pier dues, of which there is a good balance to credit.

3. The complaint regarding the tolls levied upon passengers embarking and disembarking is, I may say, universal, as it was only instituted in September last during my absence. I think that petitioners should then have made their objections. The amount realized for the seven months ending 31st March is Rs. 714-3-6, and the tolls from goods during the same time were Rs. 2,680-5-3. The original pier was partly constructed out of funds subscribed by petitioners and their relatives, and I beg to suggest that the G.O., No. 314, Marine, dated 27th July 1885, suspended for the present.

4. With regard to the last complaint—that of hauling up of boats and landing of wreckage on the beach south of the bank, which is considered a nuisance, as it tends to make convenient cover to persons who use the place as a latrine—this I am endeavouring to remedy, but in a seaport like Tuticorin, boat-owners cannot keep their property in repair unless they are permitted to use a part of the foreshore for hauling up their boats upon. The part always permitted for this purpose has gradually in late years been lessened, and I propose to continue doing away with its being used for this purpose entirely. It has been usual to charge a fee for building boats or vessels, also for docking and for any use of the ground for storing wreckage prior to sale, which is credited to Port fund. It is the duty of the police to prevent the ground being fouled, and I am aware that a watch is kept for this purpose and prosecutions often take place.

From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieut., R.N.R., Master Attendant, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 7th May 1886, No. 4118.

Administrative Department.

In continuation of my letter, No. 3944, dated 4th May 1886, I have the honor to submit the accompanying estimate for doubling the width of the inner portion of the Tuticorin pier, amounting to Rs. (3,981) three thousand nine hundred and eighty-

one, received from the Port Officer, Tuticorin, and the necessity of the improvement having been explained in the letter above quoted, respectfully to solicit the early sanction of Government to the same, the amount being met from the surplus earnings of the pier.

ORDER—dated 27th May 1886, No. 262, Marine.

The reports from the Collector of Tinnevely and the Master Attendant will be communicated to the memorialists, who will be requested to favor Government, through the Collector, with a further expression of their views, pending which, orders will be deferred on the estimate submitted by the Master Attendant. The complaints which have been made regarding the state of the foreshore within port limits will be considered in the Judicial Department.

2. The Government entirely agree with the Collector and the Master Attendant in thinking that it would be unadvisable to suspend the levy of pier dues.

3. The attention of the Master Attendant will be drawn, with reference to the papers read in G.O., 3rd March 1885, No. 85, to the Collector's remarks regarding the want of a good light at the head of the pier.

(True Extract.)

E. F. WEBSTER,  
Chief Secretary.

(True copy)

*Sub Secretary*

*As under Secretary*

To the Memorialists.  
" Collector of Tinnevely.  
" Master Attendant, Madras.  
" Judicial Department.

*Public Works Dept.*

*These copies will follow from Madras*

Exd. A. Raiff.

26-4-86  
18209

Pat. 4657

Govt. of (1886) Madras.

MARINE.

B. No. 1550 W. d/19 June 1886

Communicated to the  
Superintending Engineer  
III Circle.

15-6-86

17/6/86

Issued

Recd. 17/6/86

Encl.

G.O., 27th May 1886, No. 262.

B. No. 1550 W. d/19 June 1886

MAY.

19-6-86  
19/6

Tuticorin Pier.

Passing orders on certain papers respecting the improvement of the —, &c.

19/11/86  
25/6

2 Copies to be