

(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 8

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 3-90

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 10/9

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

Pw துறை

அரசாணை எண்.
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.

119 W

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் :

17.1.1893

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

ஆவண. கா-1-18,008-15-6-87.

ஆதாரம்

From, W. Joppo Esquire, Executive
Engineer Eastern Division, Kistna,
to the Superintending Engineer, 2nd
Circle, dated Bangalore, 7th December
1892, No. 5162.

I have the honor to supply
herewith in detail a statement of
the costs incurred in dredging at
the tidal creek, Kasulipatam,
called for in G. O. No. 2077 of 26.7.92,
bearing your endorsement No. 1134 K.S.
of 4.8.1892.

Cost of dredging.

752 Cys - Rs. 213.6.9

Other items.

Caul Knig - 45.6.7

Iron nails - 0.12.0

Charities - 6.3.6

Unloading nut coal 2.14.0

Dredging dredge 4.2.0

Materials - 8.10.9

Total Rs. 280.7.7

2. The total cost is Rs. 280.7.7
against Rs. 213.6.9 reported to you
previously in my letter No. 722 of
19.5.1892. The difference is due to
certain charges which had not at
that time, been adjusted.

3. The misunderstanding occurred in this way; not long before the canals were to be closed, the Marine Department expressed the desirability of having the creek cleared and an estimate was prepared & submitted for sanction. As this could only be carried out by dredging & only in the hot weather, it was desirable to send the dredger to Masulipatam before the canals closed (1st March). The dredger could, it was thought, in the event of the estimate not being sanctioned, as well as to that place as at Baginada, where the estimate for the work received sanction, it could be promptly carried out.

4. The Head Quarters Sub D^r Officer was, therefore, ordered to send the dredger to Masulipatam, which he did.

5. The work is in the Southern Sub D^r, and no orders were given by me either to the Head Quarters Sub D^r Officer or the Southern Sub D^r Officer to start it, but the latter was aware that the work was contemplated.

6. It, however, appears that the Head Quarters Sub D^r Officer

told the man in charge of the dredger that it was urgently required at Masulipatam for work in the tidal creek and he, having arrived there, immediately started work. The Southern Sub D^r Officer did not stop it, or promptly ask for orders with the result that before the fact came to my knowledge liabilities amounting to Rs 280.7.7 had been incurred. 2/19

7. The Head Quarters Sub D^r Officer's explanation is herewith sent for your information. I do not think that he is to blame as the instructions given by him were, I believe, merely general instructions to the dredge master to ensure his reaching Masulipatam before the canals closed, and with the object of the master's being prepared for taking up the work without delay when ordered to do so by the Southern Sub D^r Officer in whose Sub D^r it lay. The mistake did not, I am of opinion, occur through the negligence or want of attention of any officer or subordinate, but rather through excess zeal in endeavouring to carry

out their duties without delay.

8. The work that was actually done, being only a small part of the whole, is not likely to have been of much use although carried out in the right part of the creek.

(Enclosure)

From the Officer in charge, H.
Quarters Sub D^s to the Executive
Engineer, Eastern District, dated
13.9.1892, No 992.

In reply to your No 2435
of 31.8.1892, I have the honor to
explain as follows. I handed
over charge of the Southern Sub
D^s on the 6th February and returned
to Bangalore. Towards the end
of the month, I received orders to
send No 2 Dredge with 2 punts
down to Bangalore for the purpose
of dredging the creek below the
Tidal Lock. I cannot find
any written order, it might have
been written but was probably
verbal. The dispatch of the dredge
& punts had to be done rapidly,
as there was unusually little water
& there was some doubt as to whether
the dredge would reach Bangalore or
not. I was certainly under the

impression that the dredging was
to have been begun at once, but as the
work was not to be done under my
immediate orders, I did not think
that any mistake would occur.
I gave the majority in charge of the
Dredge to understand that he was
to begin work at once not doubting
that he would receive confirmatory
orders, or otherwise, from the Officer
in charge of Southern Sub D^s. But
it seems, the majority started work
on my orders and the Southern
Sub D^s officer does not seem to
have taken any action one way or
the other. Any orders to commence
dredging or otherwise would not
have been communicated to me,
but would of course, have been
sent direct to the Officer in charge
Southern Sub D^s. The estimate for
the work was, I believe, submitted
by that officer (and also my) prede-
cessor in office, and as I have
said its sanction or otherwise would
not have been communicated
to me, and the fault lay in the
Dredge majority who was then only
a temporary hand starting work
on my orders, and not taking

3/119

orders from the Southern Sub D^o
Officer under whom the work
would have been carried out if
sanctioned.

pc 2415Kf
6-1-93

Forwarded to the Chief
P.D.
Engineer in reply to G. O. No. 2079 of
26th July 1892 in regard to charges
for dredging the tidal creek at
Kasipatnam.

Superintending Engineer,
C. N. Circle.

S.

30/12/92

Ind
2/12

From

The Suptg Engineer
2nd Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

Recd. 9/1/93
dated 6 January 193
2415K
No 2154K

Dredging at the
Tidal Creek at
Masulipatam -
Submits a state
of the cost of
No 2079W of 26-7-92 ✓

#111

For orders.
Submitted with reference
to the Honorable Member's
receipt on C. No 7295

10/1/93
11/1/93
For

The money must be paid.
There is no source but
Govt. funds.

Uco
12/Jan

No. 119W of 17 Jan 93

Recorded.

13/1/93
13/1/93

hth
No. 2079W of 26 July 92
has already dealt with the
question of charging the outlay
LC 20/1