

Marine (1897) Department.

G.O., No. 633 *was*

DATED 16 July 1897

[Despatch Abstract.]

Gopal pro Rer: Stating that under the circumstances reported by the Supt. Engineer, it is not considered desirable to purchase the engine ^{in regard to} for the lengthening of the —, further, and directing that Mr. J. J. Minchin be informed accordingly by the Collector.

g

U. 7. 97

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

For orders

The proposal to
lengthen the pier emanated
from Mr. Munchie - vide
letter on p. 3 of p. 403 Marine
of 30 April 1897. Under the
circumstances reported by
the Sub-Engineer it will
perhaps not be worthwhile
to pursue the enquiry
further. The result may
perhaps be communicated
to Mr. Munchie through the
Collector -

AA
14719

12/7/87
u

CS.

Under the circum-
stances reported by the
Superintending Engineer,
His Excellency the Governor
in

in Council does not consider
it desirable to pursue the
inquiry further - W. F. J. V.
The Minister will be informed
accordingly by the Collector,
with reference to his letter
No. 15/144 d/17. February 1897.

L.S.

14/7/97

To The Collector, Ganga
" S.F.O.
" P.W. Dept. 9/7/97

Marine
Public Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 963
~~6670~~

Order No. 789 d/12 July 1897

Transferred
to the Marine Dept.

The Collector, Ganga
Govt.

From J. C. L. Armistice Esq.
Supt. Engineer, D. Circle
To the Chief Engineer, P.W.D.
No. 3086 N

Dated 2.7.97.

Received 9.7.97 12.7.97

Enclosures.

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Gopalpur pier - States that the
piles of the - would not be
long enough for the deeper water
further seaward.

O.L.S 278

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	14104	PW	26597
403	7	30-4-97	
938	C	7/15-2-97	
78	7	22-1-97	
76	7	22-1-97	
68	7	23-1-97	
66	2	12-12-96	
13	14	7/10-1-96	
71	5	7/12-12-95	
350	C	25-11-95	
41	7	1-2-95	
18	7	17-1-95	
106	7	28-3-94	
56	7	16-2-94	
41	84	12-1-94 + No. 679-1-94	
41	84	C 7/16-9-92	
392	C	7/29-8-92	
286	10	7/28-10-91	
2638	10	7/1-10-91	
2442	10	7/12-9-91	
212	D	7/15-8-91	
672	D	7/11-8-91	
295	D	7/1-9-91	
515	D	7/2-7-91	
1356	10	9/15-5-91	

From

L

J. C. Lammie Esqre M.I.C.E.
Superintending Engr P.W.D.
The Chief Engineer
P. W. Department.
Madras

Cacup Brook canal Esch Delta

Dated 2. July 1897

Sir,

With reference to C.O. Plan No: 1410²⁰
dated 26 $\frac{5}{94}$ Communicating marine
C.O. no: 403 of the 30 $\frac{4}{94}$, I have the honor
to inform you that without the plans of
the Structure and the lines of Soundings
prepared when the Pier was first designed
I am unable to offer any opinion, ~~except~~
that it seems pretty certain that the
piles would not be long enough for the
deeper water further seaward.

The pier being formed of a triple row of piles, reducing its width one half would only make one row of piles available, or sufficient to lengthen the pier by only one fourth of its length, an alteration not worth carrying out.

I have the honour to be,

SW
Your most obedt son

68. J. C. Lawrence
Superintendent Engle Pass

FROM

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

FIRST CIRCLE,

TO

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DATED
DESPATCHED
RECEIVED

189

No.

ENCLOSURES

SUBJECT.

S. E. I.
6 300.-4-4-95

26 May 1898
Gopalpur Pur

The promise referred to is apparently that given in G.O. 41 Marine, of 1st Feb 95. Flag D. but it will be seen from G.O. 106 Marine, of 28 March 94 that the promise meant no more than that the Govt. intended to spend no more money on the structure, not even on its removal, because it was then thought that the cost of removal would be prohibitive. If it is now found that the piles can be taken up at a cost which will admit of their utilisation elsewhere to better advantage, then there seems nothing in the previous promise to prevent this being done.

L.S.
15 Apr 98

FROM

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
FIRST CIRCLE,

TO

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DATED
DESPATCHED
RECEIVED

189

No.

ENCLOSURES

SUBJECT.



D. A. C. No. 4. 22/11/98
GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
Madras
6 April 1898

My dear Sir,

Up at Gopalpur
the statement was made that
Govt had promised that the
pier there should not be removed.
Would you very kindly get
your office to look the papers
up & tell me, for His Excellency's
information, if this statement
of a promise made by Govt is
correct.

Yours sincerely,
J. A. C.

C. W. L.
C. W. L.
P. T. A.
P. T. A.

Papers
11/4/98

FROM

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

FIRST CIRCLE

TO

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DATED

DESPATCHED

RECEIVED

No.

ENCLOSURES

SUBJECT.

189

No. 26 D. 7 16th April 96

My dear Sir.

your letter of 6th about
Gopalpur pier.

The facts are as follows:
In their address to Lord Wenlock
during his 13th tour in Sept.
and Oct. 1894, the residents of
Lhatrapur prayed that the
Gopalpur pier might be al-
together removed or altogether
left untouched.

They were told in L. J. Main
No. 4 of 1st July 95 that "the
pier has been and will be left
as it is, but that no repairs

will be in future made to
it".

This is the only promise
on record, and it was given
because the cost of removal
was supposed to be prohibitive.
If it is ever found that the
pier can be entirely removed
at a cost which will admit
of its utilisation elsewhere to
better advantage, there is no-
thing in the above promise
to prevent this being done,
and it would be only in ac-
cordance with the original
prayer of the Lhatrapur
people (So) Yours sincerely
W. B. de Winton

FROM
SUPERINTENDING
FI
TO
THE CHIEF ENGINEER
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT

DATED
DESPATCHED
RECEIVED

No.

ENCLOSURES

SUBJECT.

[Faint handwritten notes on a separate sheet, possibly a cover or memo, with some legible words like "order" and "work"]

[Faint handwritten notes on another sheet, including the date "1-2-05" and some illegible text]

Chas

has there not a proposal
to remove the pier
at Gopalpur?
Please let me see

Logans

L.H.

22-5-11

R.K.

Please send up the
file - soon.

R.S.

23-5-1

CTW

Submitted

DM

W

Please see list
immediately below this
slip. R.S.

29-5-1

30-5-1

See. I thought of moving the
pier to handle but I hear
from Mr. Wolfe Murray that
it is of some use where it
is, and it had better remain. L.H.
21-5-11