M.R.O. 1—22,400—28-11-86.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Revenue (Forest) DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1767 Press Mis.

Dated 3 - 12 18

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Fort Saint George, Public Works Consultation of 3rd March 1857.

No. 83. Read the following letter from Colonel C. E. FABER, Chief Engineer ; to H. FORBES, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, D. P. W., dated 29th January 1857, No. 10139.

SIR,

1. In Extract from the Minutes of Consultation No. 155, dated 22nd Instant, Government are pleased in reviewing my report No. 8645, dated 5th December 1856, on an estimate of Rupees (17,520) seventeen thousand, five hundred and twenty, prepared by the Superintendent of the East Coast Canal, for embanking 16½ miles of the Canal between Streehurrycottah and Nimamoody ;

1st. to express surprise at " the estimate being sent up both by the Canal Superintendent, and " myself, without any reference to the former refusal of sanction to a proposition almost " precisely the same, " ascribing " the omission to oversight " on the part of both, and remarking that " it seems to indicate defect in our office arrangements."

2nd. to again express surprise at the direct variance between my opinion respecting the embankment, as expressed on the two occasions.

3rd. to remark that " such differences must tend to lessen the confidence of the Government in " the degree of care with which question are considered."

and 4th to observe that " the large variation between the two estimates also appears to be " very strange, it not being apparent why if certain work could be done on 16½ miles for " Rupees 17,520 it should require Rupees 77,620 to do a very little more work on 22 miles, " and yet that both estimates are alike supported by myself."

2. To these observations of Government I beg to offer the following replies.

1st. the refusal of Government to sanction the estimate of Rupees 77,620, for widening, and slightly deepening the Canal for the whole distance of 22 miles from Ummun Covil to Doogorauzpatam, for the improvement of the navigation, having been communicated in Extract Minutes of Consultation No. 918, dated 15th December 1855, that estimate was cancelled.

3. The estimate subsequently forwarded, provided solely for the construction of an embankment, differing *widely* I would submit, from the object of the estimate originally recommended, no reference therefore to the refusal of Governmet was considered necessary, and I trust consequently, that the impression as to any existing defect in this instance, in my own office arrangements, or in those of the Canal Superintendent will be removed.

4. Respecting the embankment, it is true I expressed an opinion that it was not necessary, the Canal as I then supposed, being secured from sand drifts by the Pulicat Lake, but that this was merely an opinion, liable to modification, is clearly evinced by the remark contained in my Report of 30th October 1855, that " the proposition of the Superintendent for a western bund " will therefore be further discussed with that Officer before it is adopted."

5. This opinion on a further communication from the present Canal Superintendent, I saw reason for abandoning, and on the grounds expressly stated in my Report fowarding the subsequent estimate, to the effect that an embankment on the *west* side was found necessary, as the breadth and depth of the Canal in some places, had been so reduced by the sand blown into it by the westerly winds, that a wood boat could with difficulty pass.

6. It was further remarked, and shown on the map which accompanied the Report, that this part of the Canal has *not* the advantage of Islands to the westward, to shelter it from the sand drifts, as is the case with the rest of the unembanked portions.

7. The foregoing remarks also reply to the 2nd and 3rd observations of Government, and will I trust be considered sufficient to explain the variance between my opinions as expressed on the two occasions of the Canal estimates being submitted, and to remove the want of confidence of Government in the degree of care with which questions are considered in the Central office.

Fort Saint George, *Public Works Consultation of 3rd March* 1857.

8. The 4th observation of Government respecting the large variation between the two estimates is clearly answered by the accompanying comparative Statement showing the cost of improving the Canal navigation in one instance, and that of merely securing it from sand drifts in the other.

No. 84. ORDER THEREON, No. 497 ; dated 3rd March 1857.

Ordered that the foregoing letter be recorded.

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

2

Central Office of P. Works,
Fort Saint George,
29 January 1857.

No. 1039.

From,

The Chief Engineer

To,

The Secretary to Government P. W. D.

Public
Navigable Canals

Sir,

In Extract from the Minutes of Consultation No. 155, dated 22nd. instant Government are pleased in reviewing my Report No. 8625, dated 5th. December 1856, on an Estimate of Rupees (17520) Seventeen thousand, five hundred and twenty, prepared by the Superintendent of the Eastern Coast Canal, for embanking 16½ miles of the Canal between Streehurry cottah and Nimamoody;

1st. to express surprise at "the Estimate being sent up both by "the Canal Superintendent, and myself, without any reference "to the former refusal of sanction to a proposition almost "precisely the same," ascribing "the omission to — oversight on the part of both, and remarking that" it "seems to indicate "defect in our Office arrangements."

2nd. to again express surprise at the direct variance between my opinion respecting the embankment, as expressed on the two occasions.

3rd. to remark that "such differences must tend to lessen the

Confidence

"confidence of the Government in the degree of care with which
"questions are considered."

and 4th. to observe that "the large variation between the two Es-
"timates also appears to be very strange, it not being apparent
"why if certain work could be done on 16½ miles for Rupees
"77,520 it should require Rupees 77,620 to do a very little more
"work on 22 miles, and yet that both Estimates are alike supported
"by myself."

2. To these observations of Government I beg to offer the following replies.

1st. the refusal of Government to sanction the Estimate of Rupees 77,620. for widening and slightly deepening the Canal for the whole distance of 22 miles from Ummun Coil to Doogorauk patam, for the improvement of the Navigation, having been communicated in Exc: Mins: Cons: No. 918 dated 15th. December 1855, that Estimate was cancelled.

3. The Estimate subsequently forwarded, provided solely for the construction of an embankment, differing widely I would submit, from the object of the Estimate originally recommended, no reference therefore to the Refusal of Government was considered necessary, and I trust consequently, that the impression as to any existing defect in this instance, in my own Office arrangements, or in those of the Canal Superintendent will be removed.

4. Respecting the embankment, it is true I expressed an opinion that it was not necessary, the Canal as I then supposed, being secured from Sand drifts by the Pulicat Lake, but that this was merely an opinion, liable to modification, is clearly evinced by the remark contained in my Report of 30th. October 1855, that "the proposition of the Superintendent for a western "bund will therefore be further discussed with that Officer before "it is adopted."—

5. This opinion on a further communication from the present Canal Superintendent, I saw reason for abandoning, and on the grounds expressly stated in my Report forwarding the Subsequent Estimate, to the effect that an embankment on the west side was found necessary, as the breadth and depth of the Canal in some places had been so Reduced by the Sand blown into it by the westerly winds, that a wood boat could with difficulty pass.—

6. It was further remarked, and shown on the Map which accompanied the Report, that this part of the Canal has not the advantage of Islands to the westward, to shelter it from the Sand drifts, as is the case with the rest of the unembanked portions.

7. The foregoing remarks also reply to the 2nd. and 3rd. observations of Government, and will I trust be considered sufficient to explain the variance between my opinions as expressed on the two occasions of the Canal Estimates being submitted, and to remove the want of confidence of Government in the degree of care with which questions are considered in the Central Office.

The

8 The 4th. observation of Government respecting the large variation between the two Estimates is clearly answered by the accompanying comparative Statement showing the cost of improving the Canal Navigation in one instance, and that of merely securing it from Sand drifts in the other.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obt. Servt.

Central Office of P. Works,
Fort Saint George,
29 January 1857.

Lieutenant Colonel
Chief Engineer.

Cons: 27th January /57 № 2842.
" 18th Dec.r /55 " 47848.

Copy sent G.L.&C.
D/24 Dec.r/56 № 17
Paras 12 & 30
Collection &c

№ 883484.

19 July R 26th

Pub. Works
Cons 3d March 185[illegible] Department
№ 277

From,
The Chief Engineer.

To
The Secretary to Government,
P. W. D.

Dated 29 January 1857.
Received 9th February 1857.
№ 1639.

Enclosure 1

Forwards a Reply to Govt. Cons. № 155 dated 22nd January 1857 in which Govt. review the Report of the Chief Engineer № 8645 dated 5th December 1856 on an Estimate of Rupees 17529 of Seventeen thousand five hundred and twenty, prepared by the Supt. E. C. Canal for embanking 16½ miles of the Canal between Sirchuriy Cottah and Sirnamoody.

№ 407
Recorded
Fort St. George 3d March 1857