

(1) Number of pages 22
(2) Date of repair 20.1.87
(3) Initials of the Referencer (cw)

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	711 W	Press.
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	16. 3. 1881	197.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

(Signature)

No. 2587.

Superintendent of Works Office
Camp Sautaravur

21st February 1881.

Depd 28. — 29.

From

The Superintendent of Works
Tuticora

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W. Department
Madras

Sir

I have the honor in accordance with para 5 of G. O. No. 2563 W of the 8th November 1880 to forward herewith an Estimate amounting to Rs 13,525 of the construction of a Quay wall in the tidal creek at Malakipattam accompanied by the necessary plans, Specification and Report.

2 The design is based on Colonel Hasted's design prepared in September 1878. I have added piers and steps for the convenience of passenger landing, and an open tiled shed, for the temporary shelter of either passengers or goods. These additions are I think substantial improvements and are concurred in by the Collector, the Local Master Attendant, and the Master Attendant Administrative Department Madras, all of whom have been consulted.

3 The eventual loss on the construction of the previous jetty is Rs 574 instead of Rs 408, as previously reported by me. This is due to the

recourses having been incorrectly booked in the Division Office, two items having been booked twice over.

The loss as finally adjusted, is Rs 198-4-6 in labor, and Rs 385-10-1 on the resale of timber originally purchased for Rs 3181-6-0, or 12 per cent.

I regret that the error in the accounts was not discovered previous to my reporting on the matter before. The total loss has now been entered in the Estimate forwarded.

In G. O. No. 2969 M. N. of the 3rd January, the sum of Rs 2500 was placed at my disposal for the collection of materials, if a further sum of Rs 4000 be given in the current year, the work can be commenced at once, the balance of the Estimate viz Rs 10,525, being placed at my credit in next official year.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant

J. W. Ramsall

Superintendent of Works

P. P. S.

$\frac{2}{711}$

$\frac{9}{711}$

4. O. 2563W - 8-11-80
2969W - 31-12-80.

J. S. W. C. A. 1425.
From Encl.
The Superintendent of Works
Tritna.

To
The Chief Engineer
P. W. Department

C.E. to 593 of 9 March 81
Dated 21st February 1881
Desp. 28 — Do
Recd. 7th March —
N^o 2587

Masulipatam Quay
wall at. Construction of.
Forwards plan Estimate
Specification & Report for
the —

J. S. W. C. A.

80-81.
P. W. SECRETARIAT-1879-80.

KEEP-WITH.

Current No. 1425.

Letter No. 2587.

Dated the 21st February 1881.

from the Supd. of Works.
Tritna.

Notes of Remarks.

The Estimate with Plan
Specification & Report for Con-
structing a Quay Wall in
the Creek below the tidal
Lock at Masulipatam
amounts to Rs 13,526.

The design for the Quay
Wall is reported to be the
same as that prepared by
Lieut. Col. Hastie, R.E., but
2 additions have been made
1st the provision of steps for the
convenience of passengers
launching, & 2nd the addition
of an open tiled shed for
merchants & others trans-
acting business, or for the
temporary storage of goods.
The additions have been
approved of by the Master
attendant.

The Ratio more or less agree
with the Dist Schedule.

Rs. 1000 for Balis has been
provided for in the Estimate.

The Plan & Estimate done
by the Master attendant of
the Masulipatam.

8th March 1881.

J. S. W. C. A.

MADRAS.

4
4.0.2563w - 8.11.80
2969w - 31-12-80

Administrative Department.

4
7/11
MADRAS,

Marine Office,

11th March 1881.

No. 2391.

From

THE MASTER ATTENDANT,

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT,

MADRAS,

To

The Dy. Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department.

Sir,

With reference to your Memo: No. 593, dated 9th Instant, received this day, I have the honor to return the plan and estimate relating to the Moolipala -
- from quay duly countersigned.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Yours most Obedt. Servant.

W. H. Mason

Master Attendant.

Administrative Department.

MS

From J.W.C. 15/4.
The Master Attendant
Madras

Dated
Received

To
The

From

THE MASTER ATTENDANT,
ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT,
MADRAS.

No.

Dated 11 March 1880.
Recd 11 March 1880.

188

No 2391.

Returning Plan and
Estimate of the
Masulipatam Quay
Countersigned

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

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

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

Read the following papers:—

No. 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 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 G.O., Marine, 5th October 1876, No. 395. Public Works Department, 5th May 1875, No. 1,271. 1875, and Captain Taylor was of the same opinion. Mr. Leman obtained from the

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

57
711

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 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.

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 mere 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. Lewan, 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 Fort 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,
13th 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. (3,861) 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 Kottapatam, 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 ly 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.)

(Signed) R. H. SANKEY, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary 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.

To

THE MARINE DEPARTMENT,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated November, 8th.

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 8th November 1880, No. 2,563 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.

C. No. 1425-

P. W. Secretariat.

Note by Budget Section.

Work

Remarks and References.

Constructing a Quay
wall in the creek
below the tidal lock
at Masulipatam

Fund Local Excluded (Part Fund)
Service Head. Miscellaneous Public Improvement
Dept Head - Original Work.
Amount of estimate Rs. 12,515

Expenditure in previous year "

Allotment in current year " 2,500

Balance required to complete " 10,015

Total Rs. 12,515

Note of available funds.

Out of the balance of Rs. 10,015, the
Supply Works Section applies for Rs. 1000 for
expenditure during the current off year,
in addition to the sum of Rs. 2500 allotted from
Part Fund in G.O. No. 2769 G. of 31st Decr 1881,
and Rs. 10,015 in the next off year. The same
Dept should be asked to provide funds as follows.

Works	Estab.	Tools	Total
Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1880/81	1000	875	1962
1881/82	10,015	2,506	12,781

Budget Superintendent. Clerk

* * Include charge on Rs. 2500
already appropriated.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 16th March 1881.

Read the following:—

+ from the Supt. of W. Kistna H.O. No 2587 of 21st February 1881.
" - Master attendant " 2391 of 11th March 1881.

The estimate, amounting to Rupees 13,525, for constructing a quay wall in the creek below the tidal lock at Masulipatam is sanctioned.

2. Rupees 2,500 have already been allotted for the work from Port Funds, in G.O. (Marine) No 633 of 23rd Decr 1880, & the Accountant General will now be instructed in the Marine Department to place the balance required at the

the disposal of the Public
works Dept., as shown
below:—

Works	Exhibit	Books	Total
1880-81. — 1,000	— 875	— 87	1,962
1881-82 — 10,025	— 2,506	— 250	12,781

+ include charges
on Rs 2000 already
allotted.

3. This sanction has
been registered as Local
Excluded no/s B of 1880-81,
& classified as Miscellaneous,
Public Improvement, Original
works.

cy *S* 14/5

Prescribed

Plt
14-3-87

To the S. of W. Kitchin
with 3 enclos
- Ser of P. W. A. with
the estimate:— (detailed & abstract)
" Marine Dept. ✓ Desd
21-3-87

C. 14.3. P. 10.3.

12.6.22

1564

Capt. of 1881. Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated

Issued

Recd.

And

O. O. 16 Mar 1881. No. 711 to

Nos. 1564

Quay wall in the creek
below the tidal lock at
Mussutipatam. Sanctions
estimate for construction
a —