

(1) Number of pages 70 -
(2) Date of repair 15-12-86 d-16-12-86
(3) Initials of the Referencer bmj ✓

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P. W. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	2563 W.	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.

Dated

8-11-1880 → 197 →

ASP.
be folded or roughly handled

2563
T

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

8th November 1880, No. 2,563 W.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

Read the following papers:—

p. 33. Proceedings of the Madras Government, Marine Department, dated 19th August 1880, No. 408.

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue, dated 10th July 1880, No. 940.

from J. KELSALL, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Marine Department, Ootacamund, (through the Board of Revenue,) dated Masulipatam, 17th June 1880, No. 1,314.

I HAVE the honor to forward my Report on the Port of Masulipatam called for in G.O., dated 13th May 1880, No. 189.

2. A plan of the port, the tidal creek, and the tail end of the canal was forwarded to Government with my letter No. 986, dated 4th May 1880. Boats coming in from the sea after crossing the bar come up a tidal creek about three miles long. One of the river canals from Bezvada runs down to the head of this creek, and by a lock you pass from the canal to the creek or *vice versa*.

3. Above the lock on the bank of the canal there is a very good stone-paved quay with cranes. When the canal is open the cargo boats pass through the lock, are loaded alongside the quay, and then go out to the shipping. But when the canals are closed, as they usually are for three months every year, the bed of the canal is dry and the quay is useless. The boats are then loaded as best they can be in the tidal creek below the lock. It is a tidal creek, and the banks are always more or less limy and sticky. The bags are piled in this mud to the ruin of the bottom ones and then carried by coolies up planks slippery with mud. The coolies often fall in the water.

4. All this, as has often been pointed out, can be prevented by a quay built below the lock alongside which boats can load. Mr. Leman first proposed this in G.O., Marine, 5th October 1876, No. 395. 1875, and Captain Taylor was of the same opinion. Mr. Leman obtained from the Public Works Department, 5th May 1875, No. 1,271.

Public Works Department an estimate for Rs. 8,200 for a "stage on piles" which was what he and the District Engineer considered best adapted for the wants of the place.

5. The estimate (Rs. 8,200) was sanctioned in G.O., dated 30th July 1877, No. 441, to be met from Port Funds and to be promptly commenced. A beginning was made, but the local Master Attendant, Captain Richardson, strongly objected to it. He seems from his letters to think he had been overlooked and slighted, and he said that the proposed design must be a failure. The work was therefore stopped, and there was a conference of Collector (Mr. Horsfall), Superintending Engineer (Colonel Hasted), and Master Attendant (Captain Richardson) who resolved that plans and estimates for a stone quay should be prepared and that Government

should be asked to sanction this instead of the wooden jetty." Colonel Hasted then prepared an estimate for Rs. 11,350, and this having been approved of by the local authorities was submitted to Government in the Marine Department through the Master Attendant of Madras on 27th September 1879. But it never got beyond Captain Taylor, who, on 16th October 1879, No. 7,973, replied he "was not of opinion that anything should be done with regard to the present estimate till it is ascertained what effect the opening of the East Coast Canal has on the trade of the port of Masulipatam. It is feared the canal will divert much of the trade to Ipurupalem or Kottapatam, if not to Madras itself." This is why the "work was not commenced" (paragraph 7 of Captain Taylor's letter).

6. In the earlier part of his letter, copy of which for convenience I annex, Captain Taylor says that Rs. 3,861 have already been spent on the abandoned wooden jetty. I do not know where this information comes from, but I think there must be some mistake. There is not at this moment a trace of anything having been spent, and Rs. 3,800 can hardly have gone this way. The boatmen and the Sea Custom Superintendent tell me nothing was done; that the site was only marked out with stakes when Captain Richardson interfered. Captain Richardson describes the work in much the same language. And again, Colonel Hasted's letter, promising to "stop all work till Captain Richardson had been pacified," comes so close after the sanctioning of the estimate that much money cannot have been spent in the interval. There may be such a debit against Port Funds, but it must be for some other work.

7. The estimate is with Captain Taylor, Master Attendant, if Government please to call for it. I have not myself seen it, but it was approved of by Mr. Horsfall, Colonel Hasted, and Captain Richardson.

8. I do not agree with Captain Taylor that we should wait to see what effect on the exports of the port the Buckingham Canal will have. The canal has been open now for some time; yet the imports and exports of the port are very considerable. At this moment there are eight ships and a steamer specially chartered on the berth loading.

	1878-79.	1879-80.
Exports	1,632,379	2,485,992
Imports	1,538,995	1,191,121

9. I do not know if the plan and estimate show the exact place where the quay should be built, but the best place is immediately below the lock. To this place there is a pretty fair road. But if the quay is built lower down the creek, the laden bandies will have great difficulty in getting to it, and the mud lower down is deeper and more tenacious.

10. Just below the lock is the best place for the quay, but only if the Public Works Department can promise not to throw a dam across the tidal creek. This year they have put a dam across the creek about 250 yards below the lock, intending to bale or pump out the water and then deepen the creek by excavation. If this is done each year, of course boats will not be able to get up to the new quay; but my own opinion is that there is no occasion for the dam. The Public Works Department have not been able to get rid of the water, and I believe that not a square yard of mud has been taken out. Just the same thing I am told happened some years ago under Mr. Norris. This upper reach of the creek, sometimes called the tidal cut, must be deepened by dredging. This year owing to this dam which has answered no good purpose, boats have been kept lower down the creek where the mud banks are steeper and more tenacious and where bandies find it difficult to get at them.

11. I agree with Captain Taylor that this is all that can be done for the port. The construction of a canal or road to Karrimidu, exactly opposite the shipping, or an alteration in the tidal creek so as to make it run straight out to sea instead of winding about, have been shown to be impracticable.

12. With regard to the other proposals it was decided, after considerable correspondence, that the offices of Sea Customs, Superintendent, and Master Attendant could not be amalgamated. I have recommended* that Captain Jarvis should have magisterial powers,

* No 303, dated 11th May 1880

From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieutenant, R.N.R., Master Attendant, Administrative Department, Madras, to J. KELSALL, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, dated 16th October 1879, No. 7,973.

With reference to your letter of the 30th ultimo, No. 2,187, I have the honor to return, as requested, the estimate for the construction of a stone quay at Masulipatam, amounting to Rs. (11,350) eleven thousand three hundred and fifty, and to observe that, if the sum of Rs. (3,861-9-4) three thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, annas nine, and pies four already spent on the abandoned wooden jetty be included, the total outlay would amount to Rs. (15,211-9-4) fifteen thousand two hundred and eleven, annas nine, and pies four.

2. I am not of opinion that anything should be done with regard to present estimate involving so large an expenditure as (Rs. 11,350) eleven thousand three hundred and fifty, till it is ascertained what effect the opening of the East Coast Canal has on the trade of the port of Masulipatam. It is feared that the canal will divert much of the trade to Ipurupalem or Kottapatam, if not to Madras itself.

SUBMITTED to Government with reference to the order quoted.

2. The Board concur with the Collector in considering that a stone quay should be constructed without delay, and that the best position is immediately below the lock; there will probably always be much shipping of cargo notwithstanding the completion of the canal, and the existing hindrances to trade and risk of damage to cargo arising from the want of a quay should be removed as soon as possible.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary.

From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieutenant, R.N.R., Master Attendant, Administrative Department, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated Madras, 7th August 1880, No. 6,862.

I HAVE the honor to return the Proceedings, Board of Revenue, No. 940, dated July 10th, 1880, forwarded to me 27th idem, endorsement No. 1,500, with the following remarks.

2. From the earliest period of my occupation of my present appointment, I have advocated a quay at Masulipatam as the first and greatest certain measure of relief that is available, and a plan that seemed to promise as well as any more experiment can do was sanctioned in Government Order, 30th July 1877, to be promptly commenced at an estimated cost to Port Funds of Rs. (8,200) eight thousand and two hundred. In October the Port Fund expenditure on the work began to come in, Rs. (600) six hundred, November Rs. (3,000) three thousand, thereafter a falling off until however the whole exhibited an outlay of Rs. (3,860) three thousand eight hundred and sixty, nearly half the estimate for the whole work. This original estimate always appeared to me greatly in excess of the requirements of the site, as the ruins and foundations of the old Fort are, I believe, still available, and concrete might have been made of them; but, however, I had no reason to suppose but that the work was hastening towards completion.

3. In a letter dated 27th September 1879 I received a new plan and estimate amounting to Rs. (11,350) eleven thousand three hundred and fifty, in which no mention was made of the former work, nor any hint given that it was suspended. I had to ask for information on that head, and the reply was not of such a nature as to justify me in asking Government to adopt a totally different, and much more expensive, plan, while no trace of the earlier sanctioned work over two years in hand was traceable. Mr. Kelsall will, however, see by my letter, which he copies in his report, that the estimate was returned to him. The last report I had the honor to forward to Government deals, in my opinion, with the measures best suited to the relief of the port. Discipline being the first necessity. At this moment two large vessels, probably 300 tons each, are grounded right across the creek, one of them I believe under attachment by civil process. Robberies and delays are the rules among the boatmen. An energetic officer located in the Fort with magisterial powers, and Marine and Custom Conservancy, would soon effect wonders, but the pay available is

small, and not enough for two departments. The amalgamation I upheld was fully approved of as a satisfactory measure by all authorities, but fell through owing to personal objection of Mr. Richardson, the Master Attendant, on the part of Mr. Leman, the Collector. It is due, however, to Mr. Richardson to state that his action in the case, which gave rise to this objection, was upheld by Government, but the report against him was that he was hasty and unfit to be trusted with magisterial functions. The distance of the Port from the town is so great that personal charge is on every account demanded, and that only difficulty may now be removed. I am respectfully of opinion that before any more expense is incurred, an explanation of the expenditure of Rs. (3,800) three thousand and eight hundred on the first quay be afforded. What- ever may be adduced on the subject of the trade of the port, it remains *undoubted* that while troublesome for passengers it is a port at which steamers receive greater despatch than any other.

P.S.—Mr. Jarvis has been recently given magisterial powers under G.O., No. 289, dated June 30th last, but though much more work will thus be demanded of him, no increase of pay is mentioned, and his condition will be more deplorable than before.

This letter will be referred to the Collector of Kistna and to the Public Works Department for information as regards the work connected with the quay at Masulipatam being two years in hand and not now traceable.

2. The information must reach Government before the close of the current month.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. DAVIDSON,
Chief Secretary.

To the Public Works Department, with original papers to be returned.

No. 33-A. From T. E. MARSHALL, Esq., Acting Master Attendant, Administrative Department, Madras, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 13th September 1880, No. 7,961.

As requested in your official memorandum, No. 420, dated September 10th, I have the honor to annex a memorandum showing the several items of the debit of Rs. (3,860) three thousand eight hundred and sixty on Port Funds, on account of the Masulipatam quay.

MEMORANDUM.

	Name of Work.	Amount of Estimate.	Expenditure during the Month.			Per centage for Establishment.		
		RS.	RS.	A.	P.	RS.	A.	P.
Statement from Examiner of Public Works Accounts showing expenditure from the Port Fund during the month of October 1877.	Kistna, Masulipatam, constructing quay.	8,200	510	0	0	127	8	0
Do. of November 1877 ...	Do. ...	...	2,475	9	8	618	14	5
Do. of December " ...	Do. ...	...	77	8	7	19	6	2
Do. of January 1878 ...	Do. ...	...	5	10	0	1	6	6
Do. of February " ...	Do. ...	...	20	8	0	5	2	0
			3,089	4	3	772	5	1
			772	5	1			
Total ...	...	...	3,861	9	4			

MADRAS,
12th September 1880.

(Signed) T. E. MARSHALL,
Acting Master Attendant,
Administrative Department.

No. 33-B. From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieutenant, R.N.R., Master Attendant, Administrative Department, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 12th October 1880, No. 8,997.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 518 of 8th instant, and to inform you that I addressed a letter to the Superintending Engineer, Kistna, dated 5th September 1878, No. 6,666, regarding the expenditure of Rs. (3,881) three thousand eight hundred and sixty-one on the Masulipatam quay, when I heard the work was suspended, and that on the 27th idem I received from the Collector of the district the revised estimate, amounting to Rs. (11,300) eleven thousand and three hundred, which, I mentioned in my letter to Government, dated 7th August last, No. 6,862, I did not feel justified to recommend, while no trace of the earlier sanctioned work was reported, and the expenditure above-mentioned was also referred to in the same letter. I simply adverted to what took place on the matter in 1878, and did not refer to the credits, as they were given subsequently. The first credit, viz., Rs. (13-1-9) thirteen, anna one and pies nine, shown in the statement forwarded by you, only appeared in the account received from the Public Works Department, dated 4th September 1878.

No. 33-C. From the same Officer, dated Madras, 19th October 1880, No. 9,249.

I HAVE the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 543, dated 15th October 1880, and to inform you that the credits referred to have been duly received by this office in sums varying from Rs. (13-1-9) thirteen, anna one and pies nine to Rs. (740) seven hundred and forty, from September 1878 to the present year.

No. 34. ORDER THEREON, 8th November 1880, No. 2,563 W.

THE Board of Revenue in their Proceedings recorded in the above quoted Proceedings of the Madras Government express their concurrence with the Collector of the Kistna District in opinion that a stone quay should be constructed without delay at Masulipatam, and that the best position for this would be immediately below the lock.

2. The Master Attendant in a previous communication to the Collector had expressed an opinion that nothing should be done towards carrying out the work till the effect of the opening of the Buckingham Canal on the trade of the port had been ascertained, as he feared that much of it would be diverted to Ipurpalem or Kottapattam, if not to Madras itself.

3. In his letter above quoted however, No. 6,862 of the 7th August 1880, Captain Taylor explains that he had always advocated the construction of this quay as the most certain measure of relief now available, and so far as can be judged he only now hesitates to recommend the immediate execution of the work till certain explanations have been afforded regarding expenditure alleged by him to have taken place on a similar work sanctioned in Government Order of the 30th July 1877, but which was never actually carried out.

4. The Superintendent of Works, Mr. Rundall, in his No. 1,020 K.S., of the 28th August 1880, considers that the proposed quay wall, wharf, and basin would undoubtedly be a great convenience to the trade of the port, and as this opinion is both strongly supported by the Collector and Chief Engineer (who not long since visited Masulipatam), His Grace the Governor in Council sees no reason to doubt the advisability of commencing the work so soon as a thoroughly reliable project can be framed for sanction.

5. The Superintendent of Works will therefore lose no time in submitting an estimate after full consultation with the several authorities concerned, viz., the Collector of the Kistna District, the Port Officer of Masulipatam, the Master Attendant of Madras, and any others whose opinion may be of value.

6. The correspondence on this case has, the Government regret to observe, brought to light certain irregularities that cannot be passed over without notice.

7. An estimate amounting to Rs. 8,200 was duly sanctioned for constructing a quay at Masulipatam in G.O. of 30th July 1877, No. 441 (Marine), but no sooner had work actually commenced than it was suspended by, so far as can be understood, the decision of a Committee consisting of the Collector of the District, the Superintending Engineer, and the Port Officer. There was apparently no authority whatever for convening such a Committee, who, moreover, not only thus took on themselves directly to traverse an order of Government, but who failed either collectively or individually to report to the Chief Engineer or to Government the action they had thus taken. It is needless to do more than state the bare facts connected with the proceeding in order to show its extremely reprehensible character.

8. Again, in laying the matter before Government, the Master Attendant in his letter No. 6,862 of the 7th August 1880, stated the case in such a way as to lead to the supposition that a serious malversation of funds had taken place on the part of the Public Works Department. He complained that his Port Funds were debited with Rs. 3,860 as outlay for the work, of which however no trace could be found though having been over two years in hand.

9. With reference to this, explanations furnished by the Superintendent of Works have shown to the satisfaction of Government, not only that the work was stopped almost immediately after its commencement, and that the total loss would be little over Rs. 400, but also what is of more consequence, in reference to Captain Taylor's allegations, that the Examiner had month by month intimated to his office that certain sums (arising from sales of timber bought as it appears originally for the work and sold from time to time) should be credited against the outlay debited to Port Funds. At the time therefore of writing the letter alluded to Captain Taylor had in his office clear proof that the total amount actually debited against the work could not have been more than Rs. 1,303-10-0, instead of Rs. 3,860 as reported by him.

10. The Government are thus constrained to remark that the Master Attendant without proper inquiry made a very misleading representation, and they must impress upon him the necessity of being more cautious in future.

(True Extract.)

Major, R.E.,
Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Marine Department.
" Superintendent of Works, Kistna.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

★
BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of (1880) Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

THE MARINE DEPARTMENT.

Dated November, 8th.

Issued

Recd.

G. O., 5th November 1880, No. 2563 W.

NOVEMBER.

Nos. 33-34.

Construction of a Quay, &c., below the lock at Masulipatam.—Passing orders regarding the —, and remarking on a very misleading representation made by the Master Attendant.

No. 940.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF REVENUE, dated 10th July 1880.
Read the following letter from J. KELSALL, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, to R. DAVIDSON, Esq., C.S.I., Chief Secretary to Government, Marine Department, Outacamund, (through the Board of Revenue,) dated Masulipatam, 17th June 1880, No. 1,314:—

I HAVE the honor to forward my report on the Port of Masulipatam called for in G.O., dated 13th May 1880, No. 189.

2. A plan of the port, the tidal creek, and the tail end of the canal was forwarded to Government with my letter, No. 986, dated 4th May 1880. Boats coming in from the sea after crossing the bar come up a tidal creek about three miles long. One of the river canals from Bezvada runs down to the head of this creek, and by a lock you pass from the canal to the creek or *vice versa*.

3. Above the lock on the bank of the canal there is a very good stone-paved quay with cranes. When the canal is open the cargo boats pass through the lock, are loaded alongside the quay, and then go out to the shipping. But when the canals are closed, as they usually are for three months every year, the bed of the canal is dry and the quay is useless. The boats are then loaded as best they can be in the tidal creek below the lock. It is a tidal creek, and the banks are always more or less slimy and sticky. The bags are piled in this mud to the ruin of the bottom ones and then carried by coolies up planks slippery with mud. The coolies often fall in the water.

4. All this, as has often been pointed out, can be prevented by a quay built below the lock alongside which boats can load. Mr. Leman first proposed this in 1875, G.O., Marine Department, 5th October 1876, No. 395. and Captain Taylor was of the same opinion. Mr. Leman obtained from the Public Works Department, 5th May 1875, No. 1,271. an estimate for Rs. 8,200 for a "stage on piles" which was what he and the District Engineer considered best adapted for the wants of the place.

5. The estimate (Rs. 8,200) was sanctioned in G.O., dated 30th July 1877, No. 441, to be met from Port Funds and to be promptly commenced. A beginning was made, but the local Master Attendant, Captain Richardson, strongly objected to it. He seems from his letters to think he had been overlooked and slighted, and he said that the proposed design must be a failure. The work was therefore stopped, and there was a conference of Collector (Mr. Horsfall), Superintending Engineer (Colonel Hasted), and Master Attendant (Captain Richardson) who resolved that "plans and estimates for a stone quay should be prepared and that Government should be asked to sanction this instead of the wooden jetty." Colonel Hasted then prepared an estimate for Rs. 11,350, and this having been approved of by the local authorities was submitted to Government in the Marine Department through the Master Attendant of Madras on 27th September 1879. But it never got beyond Captain Taylor, who, on 16th October 1879, No. 7,973, replied he "was not of opinion that anything should be done with regard to the present estimate till it is ascertained what effect the opening of the East Coast Canal has on the trade of the port of Masulipatam. It is feared the canal will divert much of the trade to Ipurupalem or Kottapatam, if not to Madras itself." This is why the "work was not commenced" (paragraph 7 of Captain Taylor's letter).

6. In the earlier part of his letter, copy of which for convenience I annex, Captain Taylor says that Rs. 3,861 have already been spent on the abandoned wooden jetty. I do not know where this information comes from, but I think there must be some mistake. There is not at this moment a trace of anything having been spent, and Rs. 3,800 can hardly have gone this way. The boatmen and the Sea Custom Superintendent tell me nothing was done; that the site was only marked out with stakes when Captain Richardson interfered. Captain Richardson describes the work in much the same language. And again, Colonel Hasted's letter, promising to "stop

all work till Captain Richardson had been pacified," comes so close after the sanctioning of the estimate that much money cannot have been spent in the interval. There may be such a debit against Port Funds, but it must be for some other work.

7. The estimate is with Captain Taylor, Master Attendant, if Government please to call for it. I have not myself seen it, but it was approved of by Mr. Horsfall, Colonel Hasted, and Captain Richardson.

8. I do not agree with Captain Taylor that we should wait to see what effect on the exports of the port the Buckingham Canal will have. The canal has been open now for some time; yet the imports and exports of the port are very considerable. At this moment there are eight ships and a steamer specially chartered on the berth loading.

		1873-74.	1874-80.
Exports	...	1,632,379	2,435,992
Imports	...	1,533,995	1,191,121

9. I do not know if the plan and estimate show the exact place where the quay should be built, but the best place is immediately below the lock. To this place there is a pretty fair road. But if the quay is built lower down the creek, the laden bandies will have great difficulty in getting to it, and the mud lower down is deeper and more tenacious.

10. Just below the lock is the best place for the quay, but only if the Public Works Department can promise not to throw a dam across the tidal creek. This year they have put a dam across the creek about 250 yards below the lock intending to bale or pump out the water and then deepen the creek by excavation. If this is done each year, of course boats will not be able to get up to the new quay; but my own opinion is that there is no occasion for the dam. The Public Works Department have not been able to get rid of the water, and I believe that not a square yard of mud has been taken out. Just the same thing I am told happened some years ago under Mr. Norris. This upper reach of the creek, sometimes called the tidal cut, must be deepened by dredging. This year owing to this dam which has answered no good purpose, boats have been kept lower down the creek where the mud banks are steeper and more tenacious and where bandies find it difficult to get at them.

11. I agree with Captain Taylor that this is all that can be done for the port. The construction of a canal or road to Karrimidu, exactly opposite the shipping, or an alteration in the tidal creek so as to make it run straight out to sea instead of winding about, have been shown to be impracticable.

12. With regard to the other proposals it was decided, after considerable correspondence, that the offices of Sea Customs, Superintendent, and Master Attendant could not be amalgamated. I have recommended* that Captain Jarvis should have magisterial powers.

* No. 303, dated 11th May 1880.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieutenant, R.N.R., Master Attendant, Administrative Department, Madras, to J. KELSALL, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, dated 16th October 1879, No. 7,973.

With reference to your letter of the 30th ultimo, No. 2,187, I have the honor to return, as requested, the estimate for the construction of a stone quay at Masulipatam, amounting to Rs. (11,350) eleven thousand three hundred and fifty, and to observe that, if the sum of Rs. (3,861-9-4) three thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, annas nine, and pies four already spent on the abandoned wooden jetty be included, the total outlay would amount to Rs. (15,211-9-4) fifteen thousand two hundred and eleven, annas nine, and pies four.

2. I am not of opinion that anything should be done with regard to present estimate involving so large an expenditure as (Rs. 11,350) eleven thousand three hundred and fifty, till it is ascertained what effect the opening of the East Coast Canal has on the trade of the port of Masulipatam. It is feared that the canal will divert much of the trade to Ipurupalem or Kottupatam, if not to Madras itself.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) D. PURUSHOTTAMAYA,
Deputy Collr., for Ag. Collr.

SUBMITTED to Government with reference to the order quoted.

2. The Board concur with the Collector in considering that a stone quay should be constructed without delay, and that the best position is immediately below the lock; there will probably always be much shipping of cargo notwithstanding the completion of the canal, and the existing hindrances to trade and risk of damage to cargo arising from the want of a quay should be removed as soon as possible.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary.

To the Chief Secretary to Government, Marine Department.
Copy to the Collector of the Kistna District.
" " Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Exd. A. Grubert.

all work till Captain Richardson had been pacified," comes so close after the sanctioning of the estimate that much money cannot have been spent in the interval. There may be such a debit against Port Funds, but it must be for some other work.

7. The estimate is with Captain Taylor, Master Attendant, if Government please to call for it. I have not myself seen it, but it was approved of by Mr. Horsfall, Colonel Hasted, and Captain Richardson.

8. I do not agree with Captain Taylor that we should wait to see what effect on the exports of the port the Buckingham Canal will have. The canal has been open now for some time; yet the imports and exports of the port are very considerable. At this moment there are eight ships and a steamer specially chartered on the berth loading.

	1873-79.	1879-80.
Exports	1,632,379	2,485,992
Imports	1,538,995	1,191,121

9. I do not know if the plan and estimate show the exact place where the quay should be built, but the best place is immediately below the lock. To this place there is a pretty fair road. But if the quay is built lower down the creek, the laden bandies will have great difficulty in getting to it, and the mud lower down is deeper and more tenacious.

10. Just below the lock is the best place for the quay, but only if the Public Works Department can promise not to throw a dam across the tidal creek. This year they have put a dam across the creek about 250 yards below the lock intending to bale or pump out the water and then deepen the creek by excavation. If this is done each year, of course boats will not be able to get up to the new quay; but my own opinion is that there is no occasion for the dam. The Public Works Department have not been able to get rid of the water, and I believe that not a square yard of mud has been taken out. Just the same thing I am told happened some years ago under Mr. Norris. This upper reach of the creek, sometimes called the tidal cut, must be deepened by dredging. This year owing to this dam which has answered no good purpose, boats have been kept lower down the creek where the mud banks are steeper and more tenacious and where bandies find it difficult to get at them.

11. I agree with Captain Taylor that this is all that can be done for the port. The construction of a canal or road to Karrimidu, exactly opposite the shipping, or an alteration in the tidal creek so as to make it run straight out to sea instead of winding about, have been shown to be impracticable.

12. With regard to the other proposals it was decided, after considerable correspondence, that the offices of Sea Customs, Superintendent, and Master Attendant could not be amalgamated. I have recommended* that Captain Jarvis should have magisterial powers.

* No. 303, dated 11th May 1880.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

From J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., Lieutenant, R.N.R., Master Attendant, Administrative Department, Madras, to J. KELSALL, Esq., Acting Collector of the Kistna District, dated 16th October 1879, No. 7,973.

With reference to your letter of the 30th ultimo, No. 2,187, I have the honor to return, as requested, the estimate for the construction of a stone quay at Masulipatam, amounting to Rs. (11,350) eleven thousand three hundred and fifty, and to observe that, if the sum of Rs. (3,861-9-4) three thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, annas nine, and pies four already spent on the abandoned wooden jetty be included, the total outlay would amount to Rs. (15,211-9-4) fifteen thousand two hundred and eleven, annas nine, and pies four.

2. I am not of opinion that anything should be done with regard to present estimate involving so large an expenditure as (Rs. 11,350) eleven thousand three hundred and fifty, till it is ascertained what effect the opening of the East Coast Canal has on the trade of the port of Masulipatam. It is feared that the canal will divert much of the trade to Ipurupalem or Kottapattam, if not to Madras itself.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) D. PURUSHOTTAMAYA,
Deputy Collr., for Ag. Collr.

SUBMITTED to Government with reference to the order quoted.

2. The Board concur with the Collector in considering that a stone quay should be constructed without delay, and that the best position is immediately below the lock; there will probably always be much shipping of cargo notwithstanding the completion of the canal, and the existing hindrances to trade and risk of damage to cargo arising from the want of a quay should be removed as soon as possible.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) C. A. GALTON,
Secretary.

To the Chief Secretary to Government, Marine Department.
Copy to the Collector of the Kistna District.
" " Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.

Exd. A. Grubert.

Administrative Department.

No. 6862

MADRAS.

Marine Office,

7th August 1880.

From

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

Master Attendant,
Administrative Department,
Madras.

To

The Honble R. Davidson, C. S. I.,
Chief Secretary to Government,
Marine Department,
Fort Saint George.

Sir,

I have the honor to return the
Proceedings Board of Revenue, dated
July 16th 1880, forwarded to me 27th ult., under
No. 1500, with the following remarks:

From the earliest period of my
appointment of my present appointment, I have
endeavored to carry out the
first and greatest concern of the
relief that is available, and as far as
seemed to promise as well as any means
experiment can do, was sanctioned in G.O.
30th July 1877, to be promptly commenced at
an estimated cost to Port Trusts of (18,200) Rs.
Eight thousand and two hundred Rupees.
In October the Port Trusts' expenditures,
on the work began to come in (600) Rs.

Yours
Simon

1880.

Board of Revenue,
MADRAS.

To

The CHIEF SECT. to GOVT.,
MARINE DEPARTMENT.

Dated July 19th.

Printed 19th.

Received

PROCEEDINGS, 19th JULY 1880, No. 910.

JULY.

No. 901.

Part of Manuscript - La Koda -
Examination of the same will be made
on 20th July 1880, and the result will be
communicated to the Board of Revenue
on 21st July 1880.

thousand, though a falling off until
however the whole exhibited an outlay
of Rupees (3860) three thousand eight hundred
and sixty, nearly half the estimate for the
whole work. This original estimate always
appeared to me greatly in excess of the
requirements of the site, as the ruins and founda-
tions of the old Fort are, I believe, still
available, and concrete might have been made
of them, but, however, I had no reason to
suppose but that the work was hastening
towards completion.

3 In a letter dated 27th September
1879, I received a new plan and estimate
amounting to Rupees (11350) eleven thousand
three hundred and fifty, in which no mention
was made of the former work, nor any
hint given that it was suspended, I had
to ask for information on that head,
and the reply was not of such a nature
as to justify me in asking Government
to adopt a totally different, and much
more expensive, plan, while no trace of
the

76
the earlier sanctioned work over two years
in hand was traceable. Mr. Holwell will,
however, see by my letter, which he copied in
his report that the estimate was returned
to him. The last report I had the honor
to forward to Government deals in my
opinion with the measures best suited to
the relief of the Port. Discipline being
the first necessity. At this moment, two
large vessels, probably 300 tons each, are
grounded right across the creek, one of them
I believe under attachment by civil process.
Robberies and delays are the rule among
the boatmen. An energetic officer located
in the Fort with Magisterial powers, and
Marine and Customs Conservancy, would soon
effect wonders, but the pay available is
small, and not enough for two Departments.
The amalgamation I upheld was fully
approved of as a satisfactory measure by
all authorities, but fell through owing to
personal objection of Mr. Richardson, the
Master Attendant, on the part of Mr.
Simons.

Senan, the collector. It is true, however,
to Mr. Richardson to state that his action
in the case, which gave rise to this objection,
was upheld by Government, but the report
against him was that he was hasty, and
unfit to be trusted with Magistrial
functions. The distance of the Port from
the Town is so great that personal charge
is an every constant demand, and that
only difficulty may now be removed, I am res-
pectfully of opinion that before any
more expense is incurred, an explanation
of the expenditure of Rupees (3800) three
thousand and eight hundred on the first
May be afforded. Whatever may be decided
on the subject of the Trade of the Port,
it remains undoubted that while troublesome
for passengers, it is a port at which Steamers
receive greater despatch than any other.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most Obedt Servant

W Taylor

Master Attendant
Administrative Department.

159.
P. S. Mr. Jarvis has been recently given
Magistrial powers under G.O. No 289, dated
June 30th last, but though much more
work will thus be demanded of him, no
increase of pay is mentioned, and his
condition will be more deplorable than
before.

W Taylor

Master Attendant
Administrative Department.

Leman, the Collector. It is clear, however,
to Mr. Richardson to state that his action
in the case, which gave rise to this objection,
was upheld by Government, but the report
against him was that he was hasty and
unfit to be trusted with Magistrial
functions. The distance of the Port from
the Town is so great that personal charge
is on every account diminished, and that
only difficulty may now be removed. I am res-
pectfully of opinion that before any
more expense is incurred, an explanation
of the expenditure of \$4,800 (3800) there
thousand and eight hundred on the first
May be afforded. Whatever may be decided
on the subject of the Trade of the Port,
it remains undoubted that while transients
for passengers, it is on par with which steamers
arrive greater despatch than any other.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedt Servant
W. Taylor

159.
P. S. Mr. Jones has been recently given
Magistrial powers under G. O. No 289, dated
June 30th last, but though much more
work will thus be demanded of him, the
increase of pay is mentioned, and his
condition will be more deplorable than
before.

W. Taylor
Master Attendant
Revenue Marine Dept.

Marine Department.

19

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following ~~Proceedings~~ ^{Proceedings}

of the Board of Revenue of 10th July 1880 No. 940.

Read also letter from the Master Attendant Madras, dated 7th August 1880 No. 6862.

Order thereon 19th August 1880. No. 408.

This letter will be referred to the Collector of Kistna and to the Public Works Department for information as regards the work connected with the Quay at Masulipatam being two years in hand and not now traceable.

2. The information must reach Government before the close of the current month.

(True Extract)

A. J. S. S. S.
Chief Secretary

To The Public Works Department
with original papers to be returned

Marine Department
Board of Revenue
The Master Attendant
Madras, dated 7th August 1880 No. 6862.
Order thereon 19th August 1880 No. 408.
This letter will be referred to the Collector of Kistna and to the Public Works Department for information as regards the work connected with the Quay at Masulipatam being two years in hand and not now traceable.
2. The information must reach Government before the close of the current month.
(True Extract)
A. J. S. S. S.
Chief Secretary
To The Public Works Department
with original papers to be returned

No 524 of 25980.
Enc. B.

TO, W.

I ATTACH HERETO A MEMO.
SHEWING THE OUTLAY ON THE WORK
IN QUESTION AS PER THE BOOKS OF
THIS OFFICE COMMENCING FROM
OCTOBER 1877 TO JULY 1880.

2. PRIOR TO MARCH 1880 STATE-
MENTS OF REFUNDS WERE NOT SUBMIT-
TED TO THIS OFFICE SO THAT IT IS
DIFFICULT TO TELL WHETHER THE
REFUNDS OF EXPENDITURE ARE OWING
TO SALE OF TIMBER OR TO ANY
OTHER CAUSE.

3. THE REFUNDS SINCE MARCH
1880 ARE ON ACCOUNT OF SALE OF
TIMBER.

M.
25/9 FOR OFFG.C.

[Signature]
25/9

0.27.780. 2.17.210.0.87

12-

letter from the Master
Attendant, No. 79 61, dated
13th Sept^r, 1880.

The figures of the Master
Attendant agree with
Capt. Richardson's as
given in para: 10 of
the Randall's letter.

2. Is not the confusion
simply due to the
fact that there is
a good deal of
work (perhaps in
connection with the
widening of the creek)
common to both
Estimates.

3. But if the total ex-
penditure of £. 3862
about £450 represent
a dead loss, and
the amount has been

should have been commuted.

Govt. of 1880} 31/12/80

Dated
Recd.
1880. No.
Nos.

Recd. after 5 pm.
urgent
20/8

[Signature]

included as such in
detailed estimate
for the quay wall.
The rest of the ex-
penditure however must
form an item of
unexecuted work in
the estimate for the
quay wall.

R. 172573. 1880.

C.

Will you
please examine
this and clear up
if possible the
apparent discrepancy.
It is possible that
all the outlay on
the timber as
originally purchased
was debited by your
Office to the work
but the recovery
actually made by
Sale of the same
or contingent thereon
not being as yet
been given.

16. 8. 80 Rtl

L. Charles Dyer.

R. 172573. 1880.

No. 147

13.
C. With reference to
your note of the 25th
instant showing as per
attached statement several
repairs in respect of the
credited to the Quay
at Brasenapton com-
mencing in April 1878.
I wish to know if at
any time between this
date and time of
Captain Layton's letter
No 6862 of 7th August
1880 (in which that
Officer quotes the outlay
as given by you without
saying anything about the
several repairs) your
Office had intimated
either to the Post-Office
at Brasenapton, the
Master of the vessel at
Brasenapton, or to any
other Office which it
should have communicated.

into the Marine
Department the amount
of such refunds

It is necessary to
have this information
as it is clear that
the Post-Office should
in all cases be promptly
credited with all
refunds, and not be
left as otherwise
colours to be the case
in debit for nearly 2½
years of amounts
which recoveries had
been made

From the remarks in
para 2 of your private
note it seems possible
that although the
refunds were not
intimated through
your Office they may
have been so by the
disbursing Office direct

i.e. the En: Enquirer
may have intimated
them to the Post-Office
Office at Kensington
If this be probable
it might be as well to
ascertain the fact as
early as possible from
the Executive Enquirer

Att

29.9.80

replied 1/10
W

Nº 6164/25.10.80
Enc. 13

Yes. The Master
Attendant at Masters
was furnished monthly
with statements from
this Office showing the
refunds (noted in the
statement sent with
this Office note of 25th
ultimo) credited, as
well as the charges

Debited, to the Survey at
Maulipatam.

M.

for Office in Maulipatam

5/10

Statement of Expenditure incurred on erecting a Quay
at Maulipatam as per Register of Works—15.

	Amount
Oct 1877	510 - -
Nov - do	2475 9 8
Dec - do	77 8 7
Jan 1878	5 10 -
Feb - do	20 8 -
Total Rs	3089 4 3
Apr 1878	12 1 9
June do	8 3 7
July do	
Aug do	
Feb 1879	
March do	
Total Rs	
July 1879	
Aug - do	
Oct - do	
March 1880	
Supplemental - do	
Total Rs	
July 1880	
Total Rs	

Abstract of the foregoing

Outlay in 1877-78.

" 1878-79.

" 1879-80

1880-81

Grand Total 1303 10 -

M. J. J.

For Off^r Examiner P. M. J.

Debit, to the Survey at
Mushlipatam.

M.

5/10 for Office in Mysore

Statement of Expenditure incurred on erecting a Quay
at Mushlipatam as per Register of Works—

	Amount
1877 { October 1877	510 - -
1878 { November do	2475 9 8
1878 { December do	77 2 7
1878 { January 1878	5 10 -
1878 { February do	20 8 -
	Total Rs. 3089 4 3
1879 { April 1878	10 2 1
1879 { June do	8 3 7
1879 { July do	12 1 1
1879 { August do	15 1 1
1879 { February 1879	12 1 1
1879 { March do	12 1 1
	Total Rs. 58 5 2
1880 { July 1879	12 1 1
1880 { August do	12 1 1
1880 { October do	12 1 1
1880 { March 1880	12 1 1
1880 { Supplemental do	12 1 1
	Total Rs. 60 5 5
1881 { July 1880	12 1 1
	Total Rs. 12 1 1

Abstract of the foregoing

Outlay in 1877-78.	3089 4 3
" 1878-79.	
" 1879-80	
1880-81	
Grand Total	3785 10 3

M. J. J.

For Off^r Examiner P. M. J.

P.W.D.

27 SEP 80

No. 100

Administrative Department

Nº 4961

Machias

Marine Office

13th September 1880

From

The Acting Master Attendant
Administrative Department
Machias

To

The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Fort Saint George

Sir

As requested in your official
Memo. Nº 420, dated September 10th, I have
the honor to enclose a Memo. showing the
several items of the debit of Repairs (3860)
Three thousand eight hundred and sixty
on Port. Funds, on account of the Masulipatan
- town quay

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most Obedt Servant

[Signature]

By Master Attendant

Administrative Department

ML

P.W.D.

27 SEP 80

No. 100

Administrative Department

Nº 4961

Madras

Marine Office

13th September 1880

From

The Acting Master Attendant
Administrative Department
Madras

To

The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Fort Saint George

Sir

As requested in your official
Memo. Nº 420, dated September 10th, I have
the honor to enclose a Memo. showing the
several items of the debit of Rupees (3560)
Three thousand eight hundred and sixty
on Port. Funds, on account of the Municipality
- town quay

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most Obedt Servant

[Signature]

By Master Attendant

Administrative Department

M

Memo.

19

Name of work	Amount of estimate	Expenditure during the month		Percentage of Establishment	
		Rs.	P.	Rs.	P.
Statement from His Honor Examiner Public Works Accounts, showing expenditure of money from the Port Fund, during the month of October 1877.	8200 . .	510 . .	127	8 .	
Do of November 1877	Do	2475	98	618	145
Do of December 1877	Do	77	87	19	62
Do of January 1878	Do	510		1	66
Do of February 1878	Do	208		5	21
		3089	43	772	51
		772	51		
Total Repairs		3861	94		

Motions

Marine Office
13th September 1880

James D. Hall
By Master Attendant
Administrative Department

M. S.

No. 5947.

18th October 1880.

18.

From

THE MASTER ATTENDANT,

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT,

MADRAS,

To

The Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter P. 518, of 8th instant, and to inform you that I addressed a letter to the Superintending Engineer, Krishna, dated 5th September 1878, P. 666, regarding the expenditure of Rupees (3861) Three thousand eight hundred and sixty one on the Masulipatam quay when I heard the work was suspended, and that on the 27th idem I received from the Collector of the district the revised estimate, amounting to Rupees (11300) Eleven thousand three hundred, which, I mentioned in my letter to Government, dated August 7th last, P. 684. I did not feel justified to recommend, while no trace of the earlier sanctioned work was reported, and the expenditure

P.W.D.

27 SEP 80

No.

6119

Order 15 } 27 Sept. 1880

Madras.

27.9.80

transmission of Rupees
amounting to small
amount of deficit to
cost funds on
account of the
Masulipatam Quay

G.O. 30.7.77. No 441

S. S. 75. 1271

Mis 754249. 8.77

1272. 28.5.80

Rev. Lord R. 10.7.80. 7.80

Mis 2052. 24.30.8.80

Mis 20342. 21.8.80. 10.7

420 10.9.80

Recd. 27.9.80
Encl. 25 Sept
27.9.80 Sub. 6.10.80

expenditure above mentioned was also re-
ferred to in the same letter. I simply
adverted to what took place on the matter
in 1878, and did not refer to the credits, as
they were given subsequently. The first
credit, viz. Rupees (15-1-9) thirteen, an-
na one, and pie nine, shown in the
statement forwarded by you, only appeared
in the account received from the Public
Works Department dated 4th September
1878.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servant

W. Taylor

Master Attendant

Administrative Department

Administrative Department.

MADRAS,

Marine Office,

19th October 1880.

No. 9249.

From

THE MASTER ATTENDANT,
ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT,

MADRAS,

To

The Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department.

SIR,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter N^o 543, dated October 15th 1880, and to inform you that the credits referred to have been duly received by this Office in sums varying from Rupees (13-1-9) Thirteen, anna one, and pice nine, to Rupees (740-0-0) seven hundred and forty, from September 1878 to the present year.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servant

W Taylor
Master Attendant
Administrative Department.

From

THE MASTER ATTENDANT,

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT,

MADRAS,

To

The Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department.

Dated

Received

No. 8997.

19th October 1880.

Attestation

Attestation of the
Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department,
MADRAS.

MM

P.W.D.
81760

N.P.

The Secy. to Government
Cuthbertson
Catharman

The Master Attorney
Administrative Department
Maurice

Recd 19 October 1880

Respecting the
disbursement from
A.B. 1.9 to 1870
some misunderstanding
from the year 1875 to
the present year

The Mr. Atto's report
has clearly misleading
as it gave Gov. L
understand that nearly
half the amt. of the
orig. Est. had been
simply wasted. While
in fact the bulk of
the Expend. had been
recorded & credited to
Gov. funds. This
should certainly be
noticed & the omission
reprehended - as seen
in the Ch. Dr. accounts
& proposals. L.P.

Cir 22.10.80. Dec 26.10.80.
O.L. Shul 30 Oct

For orders

Under remarks on
my office note of the
6 September on the subject
of the disbursement may
be that he desired me to
ask the Master Attorney
to give the several items
of the total debits against
the work is given by him
as 3860 - 4314

It has taken some
time to elicit all the facts
of the case, but from
the communications sent
last week with the Examiners
P.W. Account and the Master
Attendant, it will be seen
that the former had
duly intimated from
time to time the
revenues by sales he
as credits in receipt
of the above expenditure
as they successively passed

through his Office:
in other words the
Quarterly Attendance had
been kept constantly
informed of credits which
in the aggregate had
reduced the total debts
against the work at the
time he penned his
letter to Government No.
6862 of the 7th August 1880
to Rs 1303-10-0 instead
of the Rs 3860 as therein
stated by him.

In explanation of
this Captain Taylor in
his letter to me No 2997
of the 12th October¹⁸⁸⁰ stated
he had "simply" adverted
"to what took place in
the matter in 1878, and
did not refer to the
credits as they were

tenor of his letter of the
7th August and especially
the following words in the
concluding para "I
am respectfully of
opinion that before any
more expense is incurred
an explanation of the
expenditure of Rs 3800
be afforded".

This taken with prior
observations that there
was no "no trace" of
the work on which such
outlay had occurred led
the Government in their
"Report" proceedings under
Slip. Memo No 342 of 21st
August 1880 to call on the
Department for explanation
in explanation which
should reach them "before
the end of the current
month", and to the
Reminder No 1756 of
the 8th ultimo.

From the way in which
the charges were formulated
by Captain Taylor it is

and ~~clearly~~ ^{and} ~~they~~ ^{they} reached Port.
which they reached Port.
the ~~place~~ ^{place} supposed
that some very serious
unpleasantness will occur

It is now clear from the
Supp. Inquiries letter that the
total loss will amount to a
little over Rs 400; and my
previous note of the 6th ult.
will have shown that there
was most reprehensible
conduct in all the proceedings,
but all this I venture to
submit does not in any
way justify the manner
in which Captain Taylor
with his full knowledge
that he was (see his
letter no 9229 of the
19th October) admitted himself
to have been in possession
of, placed the matter
before the Government

As before brought to
notice this is not the
first time that misleading
representations connected
with the work of this
Department have been
made by Captain Taylor

and I trust I may
not be considered as
overstepping my duty
in venturing now to
express a hope that
measures may be taken
to prevent the repetition
of such, as not only is
much valuable time
lost in the correspondence
which has to be undertaken
in order to refute such
statements, but if continued
an undesirable relation
could be established
between the Department
and Government

As regards the main
question to which the
correspondence relates
viz. the character of
constituting a way in
below the book at hand
- Captain I am unable
to answer with the
Department's attention but
nothing should be done

"with regard to the
"present estimate the
"it is ascertained what
"effect the opening of
"the East Coast Canal has
"on the trade of the port
"of Alexandria" as "it
"is feared the Canal will
"divert much of the trade
"to Suez, or
"to the port of Suez, if not to
"Suez itself."

The Sup. of works
Mr. Rendall considers
that "the proposed
"quay wall, wharf and
"basin would undoubtedly
"be a great convenience
"to the trade of the Port"
and the Collector seems
to be entirely of the
same opinion.

From all I could
judge on the occasion
of my late visit to
the place I agree with
the opinion, and

as Mr. Rendall is in
the spot he could be
instructed of Government
opinion to re-investigate
the matter, and after
consultation with the
several responsible
Officers, Collectors Port-
-Office & Master Attendant
submit the scheme for
sanction.

— Pitt —

22/10/50

Of the earlier sanctioned work over two years in "hand was traceable" it may be sufficient to mention the fact that very shortly after the work was commenced the operations were stopped on the urgent representation of the representative of Captain Taylor's own Department, Captain Richardson.

3. In neither the Marine nor the P. W. Dept. was this cessation of the work reported at once as it should have been for the consideration and orders of Govt.; and however well advised the Committee may have been to suspend action on the work till orders had been received, they had no such powers vested in them in this respect as they

assumed. 26

4. Colonel Hasted's removal from the Division is stated by Mr. Rundell as the probable cause of failure to report the action taken, but I cannot think that this is a valid excuse. The Collector Mr. Lorian who was no doubt President of the Committee also so far as can be ascertained as well as Captain Richardson, failed to report on the matter to the heads of their respective Departments.

In fact the Committee and its proceedings were both informal and irregular.

5. Again in reference to Captain Taylor's statements in regard to the outlay of Rs 3860 which he

impies had been rectified
thrown away by the officers
of this Dept. and would
have to be added to the
estimate for Rs 11,350 there
is no foundation in fact.

6. The total loss as shown
by Mr. Shindall will if
anything be, under Rs 470
and thus it will be seen
has been duly provided
for in the estimate which
he now strongly recommends
should be sanctioned.

7. From what I was
enabled to see of the state
of matters at Maichpatam
during my late tour I
can safely undertake
strongly to support the
recommendation now made
after the details have been
sufficiently examined.

The delay advised by the
Master Attendant that

211
nothing "should be done
"with regard to the present
"estimate till it is ascer-
"tained what effect the
"opening of the East Coast
"Canal has on the trade
"of the port &c" would
to the best of my judgment
be extremely inadvisable.

8. In conclusion I
may be permitted to remark
that as this is not the
first time in which the
Master Attendant has
no doubt, acting on im-
perfect information, misled
the Govt in regard to
expenditure on works con-
nected with his Depart-
ment by officers of the
P. W. D., I would venture
to submit for consideration
whether it would not be
desirable, with a view to
prevent such misapprehensions

in future, if he were con-
directed in all cases to
ascertain through the Chief
Inquirer the correct ruling
before submitting his re-
presentation to Govt. This
would not only save time,
but it may be hoped would
prevent the irritation which
not unnaturally arises at
times from mistaken state-
ments of fact.

Wm. H. L. Stanley
Supt. of Gates P.O.

6th Sept 1880.

Wm. H. L. Stanley
Supt. of Gates P.O.

28

Chas. J. S. S. S. S. S.

Chennai 423

Off. Memo.

The undersigned is directed to request the Master Attendant to be so good as to supply, for the information of Govt, the several items of the debit of Rs 3860 on Port funds referred to in his letter of the 7th Aug^r, N^o 6862.

(Sig.) R.H.S.

Master Attendant, Chennai

13th Nov 80
No 2563 P. W. Department.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 8 Nov 80

Read the following

Proceedings of the Marine Dept. N^o 408 of 19th Sept 80/
From the Master Attendant N^o 1791 of 13th Sept 80/
— do. — do. — N^o 8997 of 12th Dec 80/
— do. — do. — N^o 9249 of 19th Dec 80/

The Council of Revenue in their proceedings have reported the above quoted R.M. G. Express their concurrence with the Collector of the Quilon District that a plain gray shawl be constituted without delay at Anandipalam and that the best position for this would be immediately below the rock.

2. The Master Attendant

in a previous Communi-
-cation to the Collector
had expressed an opinion
that nothing should be
done towards carrying out
the work till the effect
of the opening of the Quek-
-inghau Canal on the trade
of the port had been
ascertained, as he feared
that much of it would
be diverted to Suakalm
or Gattapalam, if not to
Madras itself.

3. In his letter above
quoted dated 11.5.82
of the 7th August 1880
Captain Taylor explains
that he had always ad-
-vised the construction
of this quay as the most

certain means of relief
now available, and he fear-
ed that he feared the
only way to pro-
-ceed was to command the immediate
execution of the work
till certain explanations
have been afforded re-
-garding the conditions alluded
to him to have taken
place on a similar work
mentioned in L. O. of the
30th July 1877. But which
has never actually con-
-sisted in

4. The Superintendent
of Works, Mr. Durdall
in his letter of the
20th June 1880, states
that the proposed quay
will, if constructed, be
a great improvement.

A great Commission to
the Head of the post and
as this opinion is both
strongly expressed by the
Collector and Chief Officer
(who has since visited
Lambert's) and the
the Governor in Council
has no reason to doubt
the advisability of com-
mencing the work as soon
as a thoroughly practical
project can be planned
for execution.

5. The Superintendent
of Works will therefore
have no time in submitting
an estimate after full
consultation with the local
authorities concerned to
the Collector of the District
and the District Officer.

3.
of Lambeth, the holder
Attendant of Lambeth
and any other whose
opinion may be of value.
6. The Correspondence
on this case has, the
Govt. report to observe,
brought to light certain
irregularities that can-
not be passed over
without notice.
7. An estimate amounting
to Rs 500 was duly
submitted for considera-
tion a grant at Lambeth.
Lambeth in G. O. of 30th July
1877 No 441 (Lambeth) but
no answer had been
actually commenced
than it was suspended
by, so far as can be

understand, the decision
of a Committee consisting
of the Collector of the
District, the Superintendent
Engineer, and the Civil
Officer. There was ap-
parently no authority
whatever for convening
such a Committee. Who
therefore not only does
look on themselves dis-
respectfully to the
order of Govt, but who
failed either collectively
or individually to report
to the Chief Engineer or
to Govt the action they
had thus taken. It is
undesirable to do that.

It is also to be
observed that the
Committee had no
authority to do so.

its extremely reprehensible
character. 8.
Again, in laying the
matter before Govt. the
Assistant Engineer in his
letter No 5862 of the 21st
April 1880 stated that
there was such a large sum
to lead to the supposi-
tion that a serious mal-
versation of funds had
taken place on the part
of the P.W. Department.
He complained that his
post funds were debited
with Rs 3060 as onlay
for the work of which
however no trace could
be found though having
been over two years in
hand.

9. With reference to this,

Explanations furnished
by the Superintendent of
Works, never came to
the satisfaction of Court.
that the work was stopped
almost immediately after
its commencement, and
that the total loss would
be little more than
that which is of more con-
sequence in reference to
Captain Taylor's allegations.
is the fact which has not
transpired that the Committee
had month by month
submitted to his office
that certain sums arising
from sales of timber would
as it appears originally
for the work and sold
from time to time/ should.

had credited against the
outlay debited to Court
funds. At the time therefore
of writing the letter alluded
to Captain Taylor had
in his office clear proof
that the total amount
actually debited against
the work could not have
been more than \$2300.00
originally of \$3000.00 as
reported by him.

10. The Court are thus
contrained to remark
that the Master's statement
without furnishing any
proper inquiry made
a very misleading re-
presentation, and they
must impress upon him

to the necessity of being done
by Combs in fact.

Att

3/11/80

Marine Dept. 7
S. W. Chittam. 16
21

18/4/80
C

For Mr. Huntington

Draft has been
seen by the
Chief Justice,
who sees no
objection to
its issue.

At 70972 617
65716

Gobi. of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. of 1880 No. 25310.

Hcs. 3244

Construction of a
canal below the lock at
Masulipatam.

Passing orders regarding
the same and remitting
the same to any interested
representation made
by the Masulipatam.

34
3