

12-11-28

60-4-11

6067178

4X178

for F.W.D. 10

87-11-11-86

Note No. 11059

It is possible that
the issue of settling
may be detrimental
to the work of the Port
and Telegraph Office
and somewhat annoying
to the Residents, and
it would therefore be
advisable to have the
settling out some other
In the other hand it
must be remembered
that having to carry
out settling of in another
spot in China would
be inconvenient to the
Harbin Work, taking
the most consideration
and also the fact
that the British ship

12-11-20

has in existence long
before the Port & Telegraph
Office buildings were
occupied, it seems as
fair that the Port
& Telegraph depart-
ments ^{removing} bear the
expense of the rails &
all ~~the~~ materials up
for meeting

Luc
28/12/85

Yes. I think this is fair
& reasonable.

W.
4.1.86.

SAW

12-11-28

was A Cro 11059.

Dw.

For orders on the
point raised by the
Ch. Supt. of Telegraphs.

Mr. Marrow good's theory
point is that the smelter
forge was established
on the spot objected
to by Mr. Luke long
before the telegraph
office moved into the
present place.

Cu

28.12.45

12-11-20

88
No 475

From

The Chief Superintendent
Madras Division.

To

The Superintendent
Madras Harbour Works.

Dated Madras 14th December 1885.

Sir,

I have the honor to bring to your notice that the noise, made by the rivetting that is carried on in connection with the Harbour Works just outside the new Post and Telegraph Building, is detrimental to the work of the office and a cause of much annoyance to the Residents, and to ask you to be good enough to have the Forge moved some little way further off.

I have &c
15-12-85 P. V. Luke
Chief Superintendent

P.T.O.

N^o 487 M.

From

The Superintendent,

Madras Harbour Works.

To

P. V. Luke Esq. C. I. C.

Chief Superintendent, Telegraphs

Madras 15th December 1885.

Sir,

In reply to your letter N^o 4775 of the 14th Instant, I must express my regret that the rivetting at the South Pier Works is detrimental to your work. It will be extremely inconvenient to alter the site of the rivetting because the work must be carried on in proximity to the heavy rails to which it belongs, and these rails are troublesome and expensive to move.

2. I have never heard of a similar complaint being seriously made ever by those working near a boiler smith's yard, nor do I find much inconvenience myself from a similar batch of riveters outside this office, but I will see if I can shift the work a little further away as I am very confident

Yours

you would not raise such a complaint without very good grounds.

I have &c

Ld. J. N. Thoroughgood

Superintendent.

N^o 490 M.

From

The Superintendent,

Madras Harbour Works

To

P. V. Luke Esq. C. I. C.

Chief Superintendent of Telegraphs

Madras 15th December 1885.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter N^o 487 M of this date, I have now gone further into the subject of the rivetting of rails at the South Pier, and I am sorry to tell you that the whole of the stack of 75 ll rails will have to be shifted to accommodate you. If you will bear the cost of doing this which will be about 23 to 30 rupees I shall be happy to move them and with them the riveters some distance away. I really do not feel justified in shifting the rails at the expense of the Harbour Works.

I

I have &c
15-d, F. N. Thoroughgood
Superintendent.

N^o 4825.

From
The Chief Superintendent
Madras Division.

To
The Superintendent
Madras Harbour Works.

Dated Madras 16th December 1885.

Sir,
In reply to your N^o 490 M. of 15th
December, I have the honor to ask you to
have the rails and riveters shifted and a
Bill of cost not exceeding Rs 23/- to 30/- may
be sent to me for payment.

2 I will pay the amount under
protest and leave the adjustment of the
sum to be finally settled after reference
to higher authority. Meantime please
have the work in its present locality stop-
ped at once.

I have &c
15-d, P. V. Luke
Chief Superintendent.

N^o 491 M.

From
The Superintendent
Madras Harbour Works

To
The Chief Superintendent of
Telegraphs, Madras.
Madras 16th December 1885.

Sir,

In reply to your letter N^o 4825 of this
date, I must inform you that I cannot assert
that the cost of removing the rails referred
to will not exceed Rs 30 - it may come to
Rs 40 - but if you like to pay the cost of re-
moval they shall be removed.

2 I observe that you protest against
payment of cost, but will pay pending
the decision of some higher authority, but
you do not say what that authority is to be.

3 The work shall be stopped as soon
as possible and the rails shifted further
away, but I should like to have some
notion as to what is the least distance
at which you can tolerate the noise.

I have &c
15-d, F. N. Thoroughgood
Superintendent

N^o 4851.

From

The Chief Superintendent
Madras Division.

The Superintendent
Madras Harbour Works.

Dated Madras 17th December 1885.

Sir,

Reply to your N^o 491 of 16th, I have the honor to state that I am much obliged to you for moving the Rivetters farther away from the Telegraph office. I am sorry you should be put to this trouble but really the noise was found to be quite unbearable.

As regards the cost of the removal, I cannot think it is right that work of so noisy a character should be put in hand within 50 yards of a large Public office with people permanently residing on the premises when there is plenty of space elsewhere for it to be carried on without causing annoyance to any one and I do not think therefore that I should be called upon to pay the cost of its removal.

3.

3. If you still consider the charge should be borne by the Telegraph Department, I shall appeal to the Secretary to the Government, Madras, Public Works Department for his decision in the matter.

I have &c

G. V. Luke
Chief Superintendent.

N^o 493. H.

From

The Superintendent
Madras Harbour Works.

To

The Chief Superintendent
of Telegraphs, Madras
Madras 18th December 1885.

Sir

In reply to your letter N^o 4851 of the 17th December, I have the honor to state that since the South Pier of the Harbour, was commenced by me in November 1877, the ground opposite Abercrombie's battery (the site of the present Post office) has always been used for stacking rails and for blacksmiths' shops &c

2

It is extremely inconvenient to have to remove the rails to a spot further away, as it is also to have to remove the forge of the smiths away from the heap of smiths' coal which stands and has stood for eight years near the rail stacks.

3. The large Titan Crane, the girders of which were lately rivetted up and in which there are still some rivets to close, must be erected opposite your office, there is no choice of sites, and you therefore must have had to put up with that noise of rivetting.

4. Close outside my office here steel rails are always being rivetted up precisely as they were outside your office and I am entirely at a loss to understand how such a noise can be called unbearable. There is no reverberation as at rivetting an iron ship or boiler and I find no disturbance in the sound.

5. You say there "is plenty of space elsewhere". I beg leave to state that there is not plenty of suitable space, and that the accommodation I have given you is attended with both inconvenience and outlay of

money as well as delay to a most urgent piece of work, and under these circumstances I do not at all see why the arrangements of eight years standing should be upset at the Harbour Works cost. I therefore shall send in an account for labour of removing the rails which you are at liberty of course to do what you please with.

6. I must however repeat that there is hardly a day on which I am not for a considerable time on the site of the rivetting, and it is perfectly inconceivable to me that the noise can be unbearable as reported. It must surely be owing to some combination of echoes from the many angles and recesses of the new building, for which the Harbour Works are in no way responsible.

7. As to the general principle that a noisy work should not be put in hand near a large public office, I fear that in the construction of large engineering works (such as some of the District Railways in London) the public office has to put up with the nuisance while it lasts.

8. In referring to the Secretary to Government

present P. W. D. you will no doubt
place before him our correspondence.

I have &c
19-4/1 F. W. Thoroughgood.
Superintendent
True copies

H. Rajahmud
Head Clerk Chief Supt's office
Madras Division.

Dec 1
11059/85

N^o 4906.

From

The Chief Superintendent
Govt. Telegraphs, Madras Division.

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Madras
Public Works Department

Dated Madras 21st December 1885.

Sir,

With reference to the correspondence
between myself and the Superintendent of
the Harbour Works, of which a copy is attached,
I have the honor to ask whether I was not
justified in asking for the removal of the
Rivetter's forge.

2 The noise complained of was caused
by the rivetting of bearing plates on to rails,
3 hammer-men working simultaneously at
each rivet, from 6 or 6-30 in the morning,
till dark, within 40 yards from the new Tele-
graph office Building, and likely, I believe
to continue for a month or two at least.

3 I submit that neither the people
living

being in a Public Building, nor those who have their office in it, should be subjected to such an annoyance unless the work causing it could not, without great difficulty, be carried out elsewhere.

4. I made no objection to the noise consequent upon the construction of the Titan Crane, because I am aware that work must be done in situ, but rivetting rails is another matter, and I do not think that I should be called upon to pay for the removal of the rivetters to such a distance from the office that the noise will no longer be a cause of annoyance, and I shall be much obliged by your opinion in the matter.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant.

P. T. WKE.

Chief Superintendent.

Gowri. Telegraphs
Madras Dist.
India

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the

Read the following

Mr. C. S. 11/15/85
Government Telegraph Dept.

From

The Chief Superintendent
Govt. Telegraphs
Madras De.

To

The Secretary to the
Govt. of Madras
Public Works Dept.

Dated No. 21st December/85.

By 26—12—85.

Encl. 1. No 4906.

Guljeer

Forwarding ^{Copy of} Correspondence
between himself and the Superd
Madras Harbour Works, asks
if he should bear the cost for
the removal of Rivetters' forge

B
Circ
From the C. S. of
Telegraphs

4906. 8 21.12.85.

The Govt consider
that it is quite
possible that the
noise of rivetting
complained of
may ^{possibly} be detrimental
to the work of the
Port & Telegraph
Depts, and some-
what annoying
to the residents
in the building;
but the fact that
the

anner J. W. Accounts
Decr 11-1-86.

the blacksmith's shop was in existence before the Post & Telegraph office buildings were occupied must be taken into consideration.

2. As the rails, &c., have been removed at the request and for the convenience of the Telegraph Dept, that Dept should bear the cost of the removal.

US
4-1-86

Core 5/1/86 R 8/1/86

The Board of Commissioners



B. 88 tra 11 Jan 86

B

C. S. of Del. m. S.
S. M. H. W. S.
D. J. S. 11/1/86

entitles him to Presidency
House rent.

US
9-1-86

G. 88 89 to 92 M
11-1-86

17 11-1-86

Wandering

Cu Id up

Examiner J. W. Accounts
Dec 11-1-86