

## MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Sublime Woods DEPARTMENT.

Con. 11-8-57

|          |           |       |
|----------|-----------|-------|
| G.O. No. | 1266      | Press |
|          | 1566      | Mis.  |
| 104-106  |           |       |
| Dated    | 11—8—1857 |       |

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 104. Read the following Extract from the Proceedings of the Chief Engineer, dated 15th June 1857, No. 1193.

Read the following letter from Major W. J. BIRDWOOD, District Engineer, Tanjore ; to Colonel C. E. FABER, Chief Engineer, dated 3rd June 1857.

SIR,

I have the honor to forward a statement of the present condition of the portion ( 6 arches on the Southern side) of the Bridge under construction in front of the Northern Branch of the Lower Annicut after the accident, as reported in my letter to your address of the 1st instant. On the night of the day, that I left this last, when I reported progress anticipating the completion of the arches on the 31st Ultimo, and there being uncentered on the 1st instant, the Bund enclosing the unfinished portion of the bridge was breached during a Fresh of 11 feet, or 2 feet over the height of the annicut, the enclosure immediately filled, the Buttresses to the different centerings all built up, gave way, on becoming saturated and the centerings and arches, with one exception, fell in almost immediately.

2. Numbering them from the South in describing the dilapidated portion of the work, the centering of the most Southerly, or No. 1 arch (though still standing with the arch) has given way, the arch exhibiting a crack 4 Inches in breadth in its Northern Haunch, the Pier No. 1 adjoining thrust out of its perpendicular 4 Inches, with a crack round its base 1 Inch in breadth. The centering No. 2, the arch of which had only that afternoon been keyed, has also fallen in, together with the arch, the delris, in a measure, supporting No. 1 pier and arch ; and pier No. 2 is 4 feet out of the perpendicular. The other centerings have all fallen in, but the three remaining piers are quite sound and upright.

3. Had Overseer Koelmeyer acted agreeably to the orders I gave him, on my first visit to this work (and which was carried out as I advised at the Coleroon bridge) where I foresaw and told him what little time he had to spare for the completion of the arches before the freshes might be expected, viz., to build the centering Buttresses of these 6 arches with brick in chunam in the stead of Brick in mud, I do not think the accident would have happened, as the water ran off very shortly after the breach was filled in through the sluice adjoining, and which I am happy to say, has not suffered in the least, he defends himself, however, on the plea of expense and pointed the brick and mud work with chunam only, which, on my inspections since, I did not imagine otherwise than brick in chunam work throughout, as I had ordered.

4. No. 1 Arch I had directed to be taken down immediately, as also Nos. 1 and 2 piers which must be rebuilt, the centering of this sluice has been strongly supported by cross piers and its Southerly Spandril has been built up 4 feet in height since the morning, to counterbalance the thrust in case of the centering giving way, I do not think it likely, but ordered it as a matter of precaution. The embankment in front of the dilapidated portion, I have ordered to be raised 2 feet above the height of the piers, throughout strengthened, and Moodussil work built in front of it, all leakage and drainage runs off through the interstices of the shutters of the adjoining sluice.

5. Mr. Cadell who has had the entire charge of the work, I expected to have met there this morning, he no doubt however will confirm my requisition to the Combaconum Tahsildar for 600 coolies for the next week or 10 days, by which time, I trust, the embankment will be completed, Moodussil work put up, debris of fallen arches, piers and centerings cleared away, and the re-building the piers, and centering buttresses commenced.

6. 2 Lacs of bricks are ready burnt, a kiln of 60,000 stocked, and will be fired this evening, 60,000 on the ground just moulded, others making at the rate of 25,000 daily, besides which the Combaconum Tahsildar has sometime since received orders from Mr. Cadell to supply 2 lacs, and there is plenty of chunam on the spot, so I have every hope with common precaution, that the arches yet will be finished by the middle of August the latest.

7. I have requested Mr. Lawford, who has not up to this period had any executive charge of the work (it being under the immediate orders of Mr. Cadell,) to remain as much as possible on the spot, superintend and expedite its completion and shall visit the work myself constantly.

*Fort Saint George, Public Works Consultation of 11th August 1857.*

8. A supplemental estimate is preparing, and will be submitted for sanction, of the expenditure already incurred and that required on account of the unfortunate mishap.

9. Trusting the arrangements I have made will meet with your approval.

Resolved that in continuation of the Chief Engineers, Proceedings No. 901 of the 4th Instant, a copy of the foregoing report from the District Engineer of Tanjore, be forwarded for the information and orders of Government; but with a record of Colonel Faber's entire dissent from Major Birdwood's opinions as now set forth.

2. The Chief Engineer considers that there is no division of responsibility in questions that are clearly purely professional, nor indeed can the alleged short comings of subordinates be accepted as removing balance from the Officers in charge. It is no excuse that orders were given for building the Centering piers of brick in mortar, when the accident can be referred to their being actually constructed of brick in Clay. It is not Overseer Koelmeyer to whom the Government look, but to the Officer under whom that Subordinate was placed, and from him, to the District Engineer whose duty it is to observe that the instructions and orders issued by the former, are correct and appropriate.

3. In Para. 5 it is stated that the Sub Collector has had the entire charge of the work, and as the Government, have awarded the merit of the success of the other bridge over the Coleroon in Extract Minutes Consultation No 1019, of the 2nd Instant to that able and Zealous Officer, it certainly might appear as if the discredit of the present partial failure should similarly be awarded to Mr. Cadell. But with every deference to the decision of Government, the Chief Engineer considers that membership of the Engineer Establishment of the Department Public Works carried with it the most obvious responsibility for the issue of every professional measure carried into effect. He holds that a Revenue Officer is incompetent to overrule the constructive proceedings of the Engineer, and being thus barred of authority, he demurs to the attachment of any liability whatever for the success or failure of the professional arrangements. This point may be of small practical moment, now that all connexion with Public Works is on the eve of being withdrawn on the part of the Revenue Department, and it therefore may not be material to further prolong the discussion; but Colonel Faber respectfully desires to urge that it is for the adequacy of supplies alone that the Sub Collector has been, or can be responsible; and on the same ground that he felt himself entitled to apply for a favorable mention of the skill and assiduity of the Engineer, Lieutenant A. Francis at the Aunakarum Chuttrum bridge, he is now bound to dissent from Major Birdwood, and to regard the Engineer in charge Mr. Alfred Lawford, in conjunction with himself as answerable, for what has now gone amiss.

4. The Chief Engineer feels sure that the Assistant Engineer himself would have been the very first to protest against the Statement contained in para. 7, which Colonel Faber, holds to be simply disproved by the fact of Mr. Lawford, having exercised full and direct authority over all the executive operations of the work, without probably in a single instance referring his orders for the sanction or allowance of the Sub Collector.

5. Resolved in conclusion to observe that though the disaster is not of great magnitude or likely to cause much delay, the District Engineer himself who was on the work to within a few hours of the accident, thereby committing himself to the sufficiency of the arrangements and preparations for the flood, is clearly the properly responsible Officer, Mr. Lawford's position having become that of a Subordinate engaged in carrying out the orders of his superior.

6. Whatever blame may be imputed by the Government, Colonel Faber considers therefore should not be distributed between the Revenue and professional Departments, but should solely belong to Major Birdwood the District Engineer of Tanjore, since he by his own admission neglected to ascertain the fulfilment of his own directions.

(Signed) C. E. FABER, Colonel,  
Chief Engineer.

*Fort Saint George, Public Works Consultation of 11th August 1857.*

No. 105. Extract from the Proceedings of the Chief Engineer, dated 20th July 1857, No. 2173.

Read letter from the District Engineer of Tanjore.

(Here enter No. 58 of 10th July 1857.)

Read also letter from the Superintending Engineer Southern Circle.

(Here enter No. 184, dated 18th July 1857.)

Resolved to forward copies of the foregoing communications for the information of Government, with reference to Extract Minutes Consultation, No. 1128 of the 11th June 1857, with an expression of the Chief Engineer's opinion that Major Birdwood appears to have misunderstood the relative positions and duties of the Sub Collector and himself, in regard to the Coleroon Bridge, which were clearly defined in the orders of Government of 13th August 1856, No. 1429. The former Officer was responsible for the supply of materials but to the Engineer Department belonged the professional management and responsibility.

2. No explanation has been afforded of the delay in the completion of the Bridge, which appears to have been the original cause of the arches falling, aggravated by Overseer Koelmeyer's disobedience of orders, in using clay instead of chunam, in building the Centring.

3. Mr. Lawford's responsibility seems to rest on the time he was employed at the Bridge and the degree of authority he exercised over the Overseer, which have not been reported by the District Engineer.

(Signed) C. E. FABER, Colonel,  
Chief Engineer.

No. 106. ORDER THEREON, No. 1566; dated 11th August 1857.

With the first of the Proceedings the Chief Engineer submits, as promised in his Proceedings of the 4th June No. 901, a further communication from the District Engineer of Tanjore, reporting upon the damage recently sustained by the bridge now under construction in front of the northern branch of the lower annicut in that District. Major Birdwood, after describing the injuries sustained by the work, attributes the mishap to Assistant Overseer Koelmeyer's not having acted up to certain instructions he had received. The Chief Engineer considers that there can be no division of responsibility in questions that are purely professional, and that the alleged shortcomings of Subordinates cannot be accepted as removing blame from the Officer in charge. Colonel Faber also remarks that as the Government have awarded the merit of the success of the bridge near Aunacaren Choultry over the Coleroon, in Extract Minutes Consultation No. 1019 of the 2nd June to the Sub Collector, it certainly might appear that the discredit of the present partial failure should similarly be awarded to Mr. Cadell, who has had the entire charge of the work, but that he considers that the Engineers of the D. P. W., are alone responsible for the issue of every professional measure carried into effect.

2. With the later Proceedings quoted above, Colonel Faber forwards copies of two letters, one from the District Engineer dated the 10th Ultimo, in which he endeavors to place the responsibility of the Executive on the Sub Collector, and the other from the Superintending Engineer of the Circle, shewing clearly that Major Birdwood has wholly misunderstood the relative position in which he and the Civil Authorities stand as regards Public Works.

The Civil Engineer, in the 1st paragraph of his letter, says that the bridge was under the superintendence of the Sub Collector, and in the second paragraph he adds an expression of his regret that he had not brought the fact to the notice of the Chief Engineer, on assuming charge of the District, and accounts for the omission by the facts that the work had proceeded satisfactorily, and had "received the approbation of Government." Major Birdwood took charge of the District Engineer's office on the 3rd of March 1857. The order to which he refers, is pro-

Fort Saint George, Public Works Consultation of 11th August 1857.

bably that of the 13th of August 1856 para. 3, where the Government observed that much credit was due to the Sub Collector for the zeal and energy with which he had carried on the works of the two Coleroon bridges, but as the Government in the very same paragraph said that the Engineer of the District is the Officer responsible to Government on professional points, and that no other Officer can relieve him of this responsibility, the Government cannot allow that order to be quoted as any justification of Major Birdwood's conduct in having failed to assume charge of the bridge, or having failed to report to the Chief Engineer any difficulties he encountered in endeavouring to do so.

3. The Government concur in the general view expressed by Colonel Faber in respect of professional responsibility. They must observe, however, that he is in error in supposing that the whole credit for the early completion of the bridge at Aunacaren Choultry was claimed for the Sub Collector Mr. Cadell. The Government simply reminded Colonel Faber that he had omitted all reference to the services of that gentleman who had attended to the bridge for the whole of the four years during which it had been under construction.

4. In para. 1 of his letter to the Chief Engineer, of the 3rd June 1857, the District Engineer says that the fresh which breached the bund enclosing the unfinished portion of the bridge was two feet over the crown of the annicut, but it is not said what was the height of the bund which enclosed the arches under construction, nor is it said how the bund was formed. The Government are of opinion that if the bund were not as high as the highest known fresh, or if it were constructed without revetment, so that water might freely percolate, it was obviously wholly inefficient, and the responsibility of the Civil Engineer who when he visited the work, had an opportunity of noticing defects, is very materially increased. The very fact of erecting a bund shewed that a fresh was expected, and no explanation has yet been afforded why it was so constructed as to be useless on the first occasion of its being wanted.

(Signed) H. FORBES,  
Acting Secretary to Government.

N<sup>o</sup> 11/13.  
Extract from the Proceedings of the Chief Engineer  
in the Department of Public Works. S. T. S. G. J.  
Under date the 15<sup>th</sup> June 1857.

Read the following letter

To  
Major W. J. Birdwood  
District Engineer Tanjore  
Colonel C. E. Faber  
Chief Engineer D. S. S.  
Sir,

I have the honor to forward a statement of the present condition of the portion of the bridge under construction in front of the Northern Branch of the Lower Annicut after the accident, as reported in my letter to your address of the 1<sup>st</sup> instant. On the night of the day that I left this last, when I reported progress, anticipating the completion of the arches on the 31<sup>st</sup> ultimo, and there being uncentered on the 1<sup>st</sup> instant, the Bund enclosing the unfinished portion of the bridge was breached during a Fresh of 11 feet, or 2 feet over the crown of the annicut; the enclosure immediately fell, the Buttricks to the different Centerings all built up, gave way, or becoming saturated and the Centerings and arches, with one exception, fell in almost immediately.

Wm. Loring

2. Stammering them from the South  
in describing the dilapidated portion of the work,  
the centering of the most Southerly, or No. 1 arch  
though still standing with the arch, has given  
way, the Arch exhibiting a crack 4 inches  
in breadth in its northern branch, the Pier  
adjoining, thrust out of its perpendicular  
4 inches, with a crack round its base 1 inch  
in breadth. The Centering No. 2, the arch of  
which had only that afternoon been tamped, has also  
fallen in, together with the arch, the debris,  
in a measure, supporting No. 1 pier and  
arch, and Pier No. 2 is 18 inch out of the  
perpendicular. The other Centerings have  
fallen in, but the three remaining Piers  
are quite sound and upright.

3. And Engineer Stammers acted  
obediently to the orders I gave him, on my  
first visit to this work, and which was  
carried out as I directed at the Coleroon  
bridge, where I foresaw and told him  
that little time he had to spare for the  
completion of the arches before the Freshets  
might be expected, viz to build the Centering  
Buttresses of these 6 arches with brick in  
Chunam in the stead of Brick in mud, I  
do not think the accident would have  
happened, as the water ran off very  
shortly after the Breach was filled in

in, through the sluice adjoining, and which  
I am happy to say, has not suffered in the  
least; he defended himself, however, on the plea  
of expense and pointed the brick and mud  
work with Chunam only, which, on my  
inspection since, I did not imagine other-  
wise than Brick in Chunam work through-  
out, as I had ordered. -

4. No. 1 Arch I had directed to be  
taken down immediately, as also No. 1 & 2  
Piers which must be rebuilt; the Centering  
of this sluice has been strongly supported  
by Cross piers and its Southerly span  
has been built up 4 feet in height since the  
morning, to counterbalance the thrust in case  
of the centering giving way, I do not think  
it likely, but ordered it as a matter of pre-  
caution. The embankment in front of the  
dilapidated portion, I have ordered to be  
raised 2 feet above the height of the Piers,  
throughout strengthened, & masonry work  
built in front of it, all leakage and drain-  
age runs off through the interstices of  
the shutters of the adjoining sluice. -

5. Mr. Cadell who has had the  
entire charge of the work, I expected  
to have met there this morning, he  
no doubt however will confirm my  
Requisition

Requisition to the Combaconum Tahsildar for 600 Coolies for the next week or 10 days by which time, I trust, the embankment will be completed, mudupil work put up, debris of fallen arches, piers and Centerings cleared away, and the rebuilding the piers, and Centering buttresses commenced.

6. 2 Lacs of bricks <sup>are</sup> ready burnt; a stock of 60,000 stocked, and will be fired this evening, 60,000 on the ground just moulded, others making at the rate of 25,000 daily, besides which the Combaconum Tahsildar has sometime since received orders from Mr. Cudell to supply 2 Lacs, and there is plenty of Churnam on the spot, so I have every hope with common precaution, that the arches yet will be finished by the middle of August the latest.

7. I have requested Mr. Sanford, who has not up to this period had any executive charge of the work it being under the immediate orders of Mr. Cudell, to remain as much as possible on the spot, superintend and expedite its completion and shall visit the works myself constantly.

8. A supplemental Estimate is

is preparing, and will be submitted for sanction, of the expenditure already incurred and that required on account of the unfortunate mishap.

9. Trusting the arrangements I have made will meet with your approval.

Camp Lower Amman  
June 3<sup>rd</sup> 1887

I have for  
Sd/- W. J. Birdwood  
D<sup>n</sup> Supt. Tanjore

Resolved that in continuation of the Chief Engineer's Proceeding No. 901 of the 4<sup>th</sup> Inst. a copy of the foregoing Report from the District Engineer of Tanjore, be forwarded for the information and orders of Government; but with a record of Colonel Faber's entire dissent from Major Birdwood's opinions as now set forth.

2. The Chief Engineer considers that there is no division of responsibility in questions that are clearly purely professional, nor indeed can the alleged shortcomings of subordinates be accepted as removing blame from the Officer in Charge. It is no excuse that orders were given for building the Centering piers of brick in

in mortar; when the accident can be referred to their being actually constructed of brick in Clay. - It is not Overseer Kellmeyer to whom the Government look, but to the officer under whom that subordinate was placed, and from him, to the District Engineer whose duty it is to observe that the instructions and orders issued by the former, are correct and appropriate.

In Para 5 it is stated that the Sub Collector has had the entire charge of the work, and as the Government have awarded the merit of the success of the other bridge over the Collinson in S. M. C. No. 49 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Div. to that able and zealous Officer, it certainly might appear as if the discredit of the present partial failure should similarly be awarded to Mr. Cadell. But with every deference to the decision of Government, the Chief Engineer considers that membership of the Engineer Establishment of the S. F. R. carries with it the most obvious responsibility for the issue of every professional measure carried into effect. He holds that a Revenue Officer is incompetent to overrule the constructive proceedings of the Engineer, and being  
thus

thus barred of authority, he declines to the attachment of any liability whatever for the success or failure of the professional arrangements. This point may be of small practical moment, now, that all connexion with P. M. is on the eve of being withdrawn on the part of the Revenue Department, and it therefore may not be material to further prolong the discussion; but Colonel Fater respectfully desires to urge that it is for the advantage of supplies alone that the Sub Collector has been, or can be responsible, and on the same ground that he felt himself entitled to apply for a favorable mention of the skill and assiduity of the Engineer South A. Francis in the Anaharam Chutun Bridge, he is now bound to dissent from Major Birdwood, and to regard the Engineer in charge Mr. Alfred Sanford, in conjunction with himself as answerable for what has now gone amiss.

4. The Chief Engineer feels sure that the Assistant Engineer himself would have been the very first to protest against the statement contained in para 5 which Colonel Fater holds to be simply disproved by the fact of Mr. Sanford having exercised full and direct authority over

overall the Executive operations of the work, without probably in a single instance referring his orders for the sanction or allowance of the Sub Collection.

Resolved in conclusion to observe that though the disaster is not of great magnitude or likely to cause much delay, the District Engineer himself who was on the work to within a few hours of the accident, thereby committing himself to the sufficiency of the arrangements and preparations for the flood, is clearly the properly responsible officer, Mr Sanford's position having become that of a subordinate engaged in carrying out the orders of his superior.

Whatever blame may be imputed by the Government, Colonel Fisher considers, therefore should not be distributed between the Revenue and Professional Departments, but should solely belong to Major Birdwood the District Engineer of Tanjore, since he, by his own admission neglected to ascertain the fulfilment of his own directions.

/Sme. Sme. Sme./

Mr. Sme. Sme. Sme. Chief Engineer

No explanation has been

No. 1069 of 18  
The Clerk  
In 1869

22 June - 22 July 1964

afforded of the delay in the completion  
of the Bridge, which appears to have been  
the original Cause of the arches falling,  
aggravated by Overseer Stelmeyers dis-  
obedience of orders, in using Clay -  
instead of Chunan, in building the  
Centrings.

3 Mr. Sawford's responsibility  
seems to rest on the time he was  
employed at the Bridge and the degree  
of authority he exercised over the Over-  
seer, which have not been reported  
by the District Engineer.

/True Extract/

Wm. L. Colman

Chief Engineer

To  
The Secretary to Govt

Wm. L. Colman

170111

Major W. J. Birdwood

De Eng. Tanjore

Colonel C. F. Tabor

Chief Eng. D. P. M.

Sir,

With reference to the accident which happened on the 27<sup>th</sup> May last, at the Lower Coleroon Ancient Bridge, I beg to bring to your notice the fact that the Engineer's Department can scarcely be considered responsible for works under the Superintendence of the Sub Collector.

2. I regret exceedingly not having brought this circumstance to your notice on first assuming charge of the District, but the works having progressed favourably under Mr. Cadell's charge, and received the approbation of Government, though my position was peculiar and not particularly satisfactory so far as I was personally concerned, I considered it better to allow matters to remain as I had found

For W. J. Birdwood 1857. Depart  
from 11<sup>th</sup> August 1858  
about from the 11<sup>th</sup> of  
the 11<sup>th</sup> of August  
at the 11<sup>th</sup> of August  
at the 11<sup>th</sup> of August

1858. 11<sup>th</sup> August

1858. 11<sup>th</sup> August

1858. 11<sup>th</sup> August

1858. 11<sup>th</sup> August

Demands with an  
explanation of his opinion,  
of the circumstances  
relative to the accident  
which occurred to the  
Lower Coleroon Bridge.

1858.

26 Aug 1858

found them; the 1<sup>st</sup> of August being  
at hand, when the Executive Charge  
of the District, must be handed over  
to this Department, and you will allow  
that mine is scarcely a fair position  
when all the Credit of favorable  
progress is given and of course very  
justly so, to the Collector's Department,  
they having the Executive Charge,  
but when that is interrupted then  
the Engineer is called to account for  
it.

District Engr. Office. I have for  
Bangalore 10<sup>th</sup> July 1877  
Lt. Col. Birdwood  
Lt. Sup. Tanjore

No. 184.

Supg Engr. Office S. Circle  
Fort St. George 18<sup>th</sup> July 1877

Q  
J. H. N.

Major P. Lawford

Supg Engr S. Circle

To  
Colonel C. P. T. Aker

Chief Engr. S. Circle

Fort St. George

Sir,

With reference to the letter of

of Major Birdwood dated 10<sup>th</sup> July 1877  
No. 58, urging the now responsibility of  
his Department for the accident at  
the Coleroon Lower Annicut Bridge, I feel  
that it must rest with yourself to  
support that defence or otherwise.

2. But as I have already shown in  
my letter respecting the Bridge at  
Annacoru Choultry, that the success  
of that work was not due mainly to  
the exertions of the Sub Collector, so I  
must equally record my conviction  
that the professional management of  
the Annicut Bridge with its responsibility  
belonged properly to the District Engineer.

3. In this work, as in the other,  
the provision of materials and labor  
depended on the Sub Collector, and  
it seems to me that the accident  
was chiefly owing to the protracted  
operations combined with an unusually  
early monsoon.

4. When I visited the Annicut  
Bridge in February last, I saw no  
reason to doubt its completion by the  
1<sup>st</sup> of May, and Mr. Casell was  
of the same opinion. What causes  
have

have led to its being so much longer  
in construction I know not, but the  
S. M. Monroon burst at Coimbatore  
on the 18<sup>th</sup> May after a long continuance  
of very unsettled weather and frequent  
storms which, I believe, also prevented  
in the Southern Districts and disturbed  
the works greatly.

5. The use of Chumam in  
the centering pillars was certainly  
an obviously desirable precaution, but  
if there was not enough of that  
material for the arches or if, as  
was to have been feared, the  
expense was too great, its omission  
is explained, and at an earlier  
period in the season would have  
been harmless.

6. From private correspondence,  
I am aware that there has all along  
existed a misunderstanding on  
the part of the District Engineer  
as to the extent of the Sub Collector's  
duties and powers in connection  
with the Coleroon Bridges, and  
this feeling has been promoted

by my having, when in Tanjore, person-  
ally desired Mr. Lawford "not to  
interfere with existing arrangements."  
His charge extended over three Taluqs,  
and he could not, and did not  
exercise that exclusive superintendence  
over the Annicut Bridge which belonged  
to St. Francis at Annisaram Choultry.  
Overseer Kollmeyer's Character and  
experience rendered him perfectly  
competent to carry on the works as he  
did last year without the presence  
of an Officer, and it was quite  
natural for him to believe him-  
self under Mr. Lawford's orders  
than those of the Sub Collector which,  
in 1886, and I believe in this year  
also, were directed to him personally.

7. Before any final opinion  
is pronounced by Government as  
to the share of blame due to  
the two Departments concerned,  
I hope that the explanation  
of the Sub Collector, the Assistant  
Engineer, and the Overseer may  
be called for as to the Cause

of the delay that occurred in this  
work.

Supg Sup Office: Circle } I have per  
Toh St George } By S. Sanford Major  
18 July/87 } Supg Sup. S. Circle

True Copies/

Wm. Laker Col.  
Chief Engineer

P.W.D.

N<sup>o</sup> 1566

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation

Under date the 11<sup>th</sup> July 1857

Read the following Ex-  
tracts from the Proceedings  
of the Chief Engineer.

Thereunter (15 June and 20 July/57)  
N<sup>os</sup> 1193 & 2173

At  
the

With the first  
of the Proceedings the  
Chief Engineer submits, as  
promised in his Proceed.  
Call. C. of 11 June/57 N<sup>o</sup> 1128. - viz of the 4<sup>th</sup> Insant, N<sup>o</sup> 901,  
a further communication  
from the District Engineer  
of Tanjore, reporting upon  
the damage recently  
sustained by the Bridge  
now under construction in  
front of the Northern Branch  
of the Lower channel in  
that

Enclosure in the R. P.  
of the Chief Engineer  
to the Secretary General P.W.D.

P.W.D. 11468 of 15/57

Dated 20<sup>th</sup> July 1857  
Recd 21<sup>st</sup> 5 July 1857

No 1193

Office of Engineer,  
under the District Engineer  
of Tanjore and the District  
Engineer. Regarding the  
arrangement for construct-  
ing the Lower Branch.  
Barrage and Canal. A  
decision will be  
taken.

that District. Major Bird-  
wood, after describing  
the injuries sustained by  
the work, attributes the  
mishap to Assistant  
Overseer Sturtevant not  
having acted up to cer-  
tain instructions he had  
received. The Chief Engi-  
neer considers that there  
can be no division of  
responsibility in questions  
that are purely profes-  
sional, and that the  
alleged shortcomings of  
subordinates cannot be  
accepted as removing  
blame from the Officer  
in charge. Colonel Tabor  
also remarks that as  
the Govt have awarded  
the merit of the success  
of the bridge near Au-  
nacum to the country over  
the

the Colonel, in G. M. C.  
No. 1049 of the 2<sup>d</sup> Instant,  
to the Sub Collector, it is  
certainly might appear  
that the discredit of  
the present partial  
failure should similarly  
be awarded to Mr.  
Laddell, who has had  
the entire charge of  
the work, but that  
he considers that the  
Engineers of the S.P.R.  
are alone responsible  
for the issue of every  
professional measure  
carried into effect.

With the later  
proceedings quoted above,  
Colonel Tabor forwards  
copies of two letters, one  
from the District En-  
gineer dated the 10<sup>th</sup> Instant

in

in which he endeavors  
to place the responsi-  
bility of the execution  
on the Sub. Collector, -  
and the other from  
the Superintending  
Engineer of the Circle,  
showing clearly that  
Major Birchwood has  
wholly misunderstood  
the relative positions  
in which he and the  
Civil Authorities stand  
as regards public works.

The Civil Engineer,  
in the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph  
of his letter, says that  
the bridge was under  
the superintendence  
of the Sub. Collector,  
and in the second pa-  
-graph he adds an  
expression of his regret  
that he had not brought  
the

the fact to the notice of the  
Chief Engineer, on assuming  
charge of the District, and ac-  
counts for the omission by  
the fact that the work had  
proceeded satisfactorily, and  
had "received the approba-  
-tion of Govt." Major Birchwood  
took charge of the District  
Engineers Office on the 3<sup>d</sup> of  
March 1857. The order to  
which he refers, is probably  
that of the 13<sup>th</sup> of August 1856,  
para 3, where the Govern-  
-ment observed that much  
credit was due to the Sub  
Collector for the zeal and  
energy with which he had  
carried on the works of  
the two ~~Lahore~~ <sup>Cotacora</sup> bridges -  
but as the Govt in the very  
same paragraph said that  
the Engineer of the District  
is the Officer responsible  
to Govt on professional points,  
and <sup>but</sup> no other Officer can relieve  
him of this responsibility, the  
Govt cannot allow that order  
to be quoted as any justifi-  
-cation of Major Birchwood's  
conduct in having failed  
to assume charge of the bridge,  
or

high as the highest,  
thrown fresh, or if it  
were constructed with  
- out revetment, so that  
water might freely  
percolate, & it was  
obviously wholly inef-  
- ficient, and the res-  
- ponsibility of the Civil  
Engineer who when he  
visited the works had  
an opportunity of no-  
- ticing defects, is very  
materially increased.  
The very fact of erecting  
a bund showed that  
a fresh was expected,  
and no explanation  
has yet been afforded  
why it was so construct-  
- ed as to be useless on  
the first occasion of  
its being wanted.

*Copy to the Chief Engineer  
Dispt 127*

Public Works 1857 Dept<sup>r</sup>

Cons 11<sup>th</sup> Augt.

No 1566.

P

Extract illus. of Cons.

27<sup>th</sup> August 1857

Extract from Chief Engr 31<sup>st</sup> Augt 57

in C. N. 1729 in force - 5<sup>th</sup> 57

Passing orders on the  
pavilion Arches of the Bridge  
in front of the Northern  
branch of the Lower Runi  
Cut in the Bangalore District.

No 104 at 106.

26<sup>th</sup> Augt 1857

26<sup>th</sup> Augt 1857