Office of Origin 72
Date of Issue 16-7-37
Initials of References
M.R.O. 1—82 400—23-11-50

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

Cons. 30-6-57

G.O. No. 1258 Press Mis.

5557

Dated 27—6— 1857

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 55. Read the following letter from Colonel C. E. FABER, Chief Engineer; to H. FORBES, Esq., Acting Secretary to Government, dated 16th May 1857, No. 397.

SIR,

I have the honor to submit for the consideration of the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, the following explanations on certain points noticed in Extract Minutes Consultation 12th March 1857, No. 461, containing the annual review of the Budget works proposed in list No. 2 for execution in the year 1857-58.

2. From the first para. of the order in question, it might be inferred that there was delay on the part of the Central Office, in submitting the Budget for 1857-58,

Para. 1. whereas, the following circumstances will show that notwithstanding the lateness of certain orders issued from the Government Office on the subject, the Budget had been prepared with remarkable celerity, and forwarded to Government even before the time, at which the corresponding Budget for 1856-57, was submitted in last year. The final monthly list of Estimates was closed on the 2nd December, in accordance with Extract Minutes Consultation 14th October 1856, No. 1868; and on the 12th Idem, an Official Memo. No. 8824 was addressed to the Secretary to Government D. P. W., soliciting permission (for the reasons therein stated) to forward a supplemental list to be closed on the 15th Idem.

3. This permission was given in a Memo. on the same date, and the supplemental list was accordingly submitted on the date specified, viz. 15th December 1856.

4. Every exertion was then made towards completing the Budget Statement, but on the 3rd January 1857, in Extract Minutes Consultation No. 11 of that date, no less than 157 estimates were returned to the Central Office, not only for a selection to be made of those which were considered of the most pressing importance, but the selection was to be extended to those sanctioned *during* the year (112 in number,) and also to all those remaining unexecuted from *last* year, 50 lacs of Rupees being fixed as the limit of expenditure to be proposed on new works for the year 1857-58.

5. Government, in observing that the time was then so short, trusted that careful attention might be given to the matter, in order that the revised list might be submitted at an early date; and it was hoped that it might be ready by the 15th January, the *date fixed* for the submission of those documents. From this, there was evidently no reason to suppose that Government were dissatisfied with what had been done in the Central Office.

6. The magnitude of the work thus imposed at the last moment on the Central Office, will be readily understood; but it was entered upon with the greatest energy, and carried through with the most untiring exertions, the lists being finally sent up to Government on the 23rd January, only eight days later than the appointed time. With the object of lessening the labour of review in the Government office, the works which admitted of being postponed till the year 1858-59, were also distinguished from the rest by crosses in red ink.

7. On the 30th January 1857, the Government called for a list of works which had been omitted from the Budget in revising it. This was prepared and submitted on the 4th February, and is that referred to in the 1st para. of the Extract Minutes Consultation under acknowledgment.

8. Thus, it will appear that the operations of the Central Office in so far as the Budget was concerned, were prompt and effective; and that they were not marked by any tardiness, such as that which the wording of the order of Government para. 1 might, and most probably will, cause to be supposed.

9. With regard to the remarks of Government in para. 17, it has to be explained that the

Para. 17. estimate for the Jail at Salem was transferred from the list No. 2 to list No. 1, on my own representation, contained in my letter of the 31st January last, No. 9925. The estimate for the Post Office at Madras, which the Government remark should have found a place in Statement No. 1, was omitted by me in consequence of the whole question regarding that Building not having been determined at the time the Budget of the

Central Office was closed. The Chamber of Commerce had not then replied to the *second* reference made to them, and their decision might have occasioned considerable modification of the plan and estimate; and it was only on the 26th January last, i. e. after the Budget had been submitted to Government, that the order for the inclusion of the estimate in list No. 1, was passed, "it being left to the Government of India on the proposal coming before them, to take the opinion of Mr. Riddell, the Director General," then shortly expected to return to India. It is obvious, that had the estimate been included in the Budget Statement, in the *then* imperfect state of the information regarding it, this office might, and no doubt would have been justly blamed for doing so.

10. The points noticed in para. 19 were briefly adverted to in para. 7 of my letter of the 23rd January last, accompanying the Budget. It was there stated that the District Engineer of Ganjam was collecting the information called for by the Government of India in Colonel Baker's letter of the 11th July 1856, No. 3173, as regards the Mahanuddee embankments, but that the amount proposed for those works in the Budget, had been entered under the emergency for their execution recognized in the correspondence marginally indicated, and also on the strong opinion expressed by Lieutenant Colonel F. C. Cotton in its favor—that the detailed information called for in regard to the project for the extension of the Eastern Coast Canal from the Palaur river to the Alamparva, was furnished under date 8th September 1856, No. 6379, and that it would be again submitted in complying with Extract Minutes Consultation 29th September 1856, No. 1753. Although these circumstances clearly shewed that the subject had not been lost sight of in the Central office, no distinct allusion is made to them in the para. of the order of Government in question, but the Government of India are led to infer that their orders have been overlooked, and have been unattended to, by the Chief Engineer.

Para. 19

Extract Minutes Consultation 26th April 1856, No. 575. 12th January 1857. No. 71.

11. As regards the requisition contained in this para, a separate report is submitted to Government as an Appendix.

Para. 19.

12. In paras. 27 and 28, Government notice the delay in the submission of an estimate for the improvements made in the Penitentiary, and remark severely upon the alleged laxity of the supervision exercised by me. As these remarks have been specially replied to in my letter of the 25th April last, No. 12,102, it is not necessary for me to travel over the same ground again, but I would respectfully solicit, that that letter may be considered an Appendix to this; and be submitted for the information of the Government of India, before whom the remarks of Government have been placed with the Budget.

Paras 27 and 28

13. The circumstances under which the Samulcottah and Cocanada Canal was executed were placed before Government by the Board of Revenue, Department of Public Works, and are adverted to in Extract Minutes Consultation 30th January 1855, No. 152, which the Government have apparently overlooked in the present review. Para. 2 of this Extract runs as follows "The estimate for the Samulcottah and Cocanada "channel was submitted by the Board with their letter of the 6th November last, "after the transmission of the last Budget to Calcutta, in which, therefore it is "not included; and the project for the improvement of the Coringa and Cocanada "harbours has not been so much as laid before Government. Yet the former work is now re- "ported to have so far advanced that the Acting Civil Engineer reckons upon its completion, "in three months' time from the date of his letter, whilst the work at the Cocanadah river "mouth," he states, "cannot be stopped," "and that we must either push on with it, or lose the "benefit of all that has been done." However irregular and unauthorized the proceedings of "the Acting Civil Engineer, the Government cannot under such circumstances, prohibit alto- "gether the further progress of the works at the risk of what has already been laid out being "entirely lost. The Samulcottah channel must therefore be finished." This extract furnishes the explanation called for as regards the above channel.

Para. 29.

14. In para. 31, Government remark that certain estimates for the repairs of roads in Ganjam, Masulipatam, North Arcot, and Malabar, having been submitted to Government before the date of the Budget, should have been included therein. To this it may be replied, that of the 4 Items referred to the first and second

Para. 31.

viz. those for Masulipatam and Ganjam were forwarded to Government on the 17th and 21st January; i. e. nominally *before* the Budget lists were despatched, but really *after* they were colsed; because it is obvious that unless this closure took place some days before the despatch, it would be impossible to have the documents fair copied, the totals made up and other necessary work attended to. The 3rd and 4th Items were omitted from the local Officers' Budget lists, and were, therefore, overlooked in the Central office.

15. In para. 34, a mistake occurs on the part of the Government office, which I take the liberty of pointing out, not unbecomingly to impute blame, but merely to show that even in offices filled by experienced and able servants, mistakes will sometimes occur. The error I allude to, is in the allowance made for the repairs of the road from Saint Thomas' Mount to Sydapet, which is stated to be Rupees 4,760 instead of Rupees 1,760. This is not a simple typographical or clerical error, but runs throughout the statements appended to the Budget, and the entire amount has been set apart for expenditure.

Para. 34.

16. The severe remarks made by Government in para. 36, have been called forth by the solitary instance of Captain Orr not having forwarded the information regarding the repairs of irrigation works in the Kistnah Division, but it appears from an explanation received from him, that the delay on his part arose from his being under the impression that the information was to have been supplied by the Collector of Guntoor, to whom the Chief Engineer's Circular of the 3rd May 1856, was specially addressed, with copies to the District Engineers for information. It would also seem from a letter sent by the Acting Collector of Masulipatam in reply to a reminder from this office on the subject, dated 26th November 1856, that Captain Orr had been called upon by that Officer for accounts of the expenditure on repairs in the Engineer Department, but that up to the date of his letter (24th December 1856,) he had not been supplied with the necessary information. Hence it is manifest that the delay has occurred partly from misapprehension of orders, which in the transition state of the Department could not altogether be prevented, nor which under any amount of organization, can be invariably insured.

17. With regard to the observations contained in para. 43, I beg to state that the orders of Government of the 25th April 1856, No. 565, para. 13 had not been overlooked, but were literally complied with, as far as circumstances permitted in submitting the Budget of this year in perusing those orders, it must be remembered that the last monthly list previous to the submission of the Budget for 1856-57, was forwarded to Government on the 26th January 1856, and the Budget itself on the 29th of that month, making a difference of only 3 days between the submission of these two documents. It was to the inconvenience caused by this circumstance, that the remarks of Government were specially directed, for the orders conveyed in consequence, were,—

Para. 43.

1st. That no Estimates be submitted later than those forwarded for the month of November, and which were to be before Government in the first few days of December.

2nd. That the local Officers should be instructed to take early steps for the preparation and submission of their Estimates.

3rd. That such as are received in the Chief Engineer's office be disposed of promptly, so as not to leave an accumulation to be turned in at the last moment.

4th. That the local Budget lists be closed at the end of November and,

5th. That the general lists for the Budget of the Chief Engineer be laid before Government by the 10th of January, so as to allow time for their full consideration.

18. In accordance with the first of the above orders, the last monthly list of the past year was placed before Government on the 15th of December, and with regard to the second, the views of Government were communicated to the local Officers for their information and guidance. All the Estimates received in the Chief Engineer's office were disposed of promptly in accordance with the third requisition, as may be seen by the statement entered in the margin; from which it appears that there were only 50 Estimates of more than 4 weeks standing, and these were for the most part, Estimates on which further information had been called for. The local Budget lists were closed, as directed at the end of November; and the general Budget was closed on the 17th, and was laid

Estimates.	No.
1 week old	50
2 Do.	40
3 Do.	27
4 Do.	10
Above 4 weeks	30
Total...	157

before Government on the 23rd January, a few days later than the time declared sufficient for full consideration of the projects in the Government office, but which delay took place in consequence of the orders of Government itself, and ought therefore not to be charged to the Chief Engineer.

See para. 5 of this letter.

19. It will thus be seen that the orders of Government of the 25th April 1856, No. 565 para. 13 were literally complied with, so far as circumstances permitted and that the inconvenience complained of, did not arise from defective arrangements, for which the Chief Engineer is responsible. I trust, therefore, that I may be permitted to pronounce the accusation contained in the last sentence of para. 13 to be groundless, and the censure wholly unmerited.

20. I now proceed to notice the circumstances connected with the large number of Estimates submitted in December, the inconvenience resulting from which though not owing to the Chief Engineer's arrangements, is the main point against which the censure of Government may be supposed to be directed, and this inconvenience it must be observed, is the result of the Budget system, and not that of any defect in existing arrangements; for it must be obvious, that so long as the early months of the official year are devoted to the carrying out of the executive operations provided for in the Budget, it is only in the 4th, 5th and 6th months of the year, i. e. in August, September, and October that the planning operations for the prospective year can be executed. It is impossible, therefore, to devote more than a brief space of time to in-door and office work; in the earlier part of the year, so that the number of estimates submitted in it will in general be few; and it is only in the three months previous to the submission of the Budget i. e. in the months of August, September, and October, when the monsoon rains cause a general cessation of out-door operations, that the necessary estimates for the ensuing Budget can be prepared and submitted for the sanction of Government. Viewed in this light, and considering that the number of estimates comprised in the Budget lists of the past two years, have been, as stated in the margin, the average number of estimates for examination in each month would be 159, or, supposing that in compliance with the orders of Government contained in para. 44, they were equally distributed over each of the six months, the average would be 80; but I must not fail to bring to the notice of Government that the insisting upon such punctuality in a matter of office routine, must greatly impede the progress of the executive operations of the Department, and thus cause a much greater amount of real injury to the interests of Government than the present inconvenience of dealing with a large number of estimates, which however, are not more than the average number of the month, considering the circumstances under which they are submitted. It must also be noticed that the nearer the estimates are to the actual date of the season in which they are to be carried into effect, the more likely are they to correctly represent what is necessary, all localities being exposed to monsoon and other influences which may affect the accuracy of the dimensions, or the prices of labor and materials, involved in the calculations of the preliminary data.

1856-57.	
List No. 1	58
" 2	414
Total.....	472
1857-58.	
List No. 1	24
" 2	458
Total.....	482
Average	477

21. It is now necessary to reply to the serious reflection contained in para. 44, wherein it is alleged that "it is quite impossible that the 157 projects sent at one "time to the Government could have received due attention in the Cen-

Para. 44.

"tral office, and that even the mere formal preparation of them in a shape suitable for submission, "must have occupied the whole time of the Chief Engineer's whole establishment, to the total "neglect of all other duty," and further "that the organization of the whole department is still "defective, and requires far more attention than Colonel Faber has yet bestowed upon it." These charges, I beg most emphatically to deny.

22. In the first place, supposing that the 157 estimates were the work of only one month, containing 26 working days, this would give an average of 2 estimates for each day for each of the three professional Officers; but considering that there were 30 estimates of more than 4 weeks standing, most of which had already been partially considered—that many of the simpler estimates were drafted upon by other than the three Officers, and that most of the projects were devoid of any complexity; it will be seen that the undertaking was by no means so arduous as is supposed.

See para. 18.

23. In the second place, the only departments of the office that were principally concerned in the examination and preparation of the estimates, were the estimate and copying departments; and therefore, as regards the work performed in the *four* other branches of the office, the remarks of Government are wholly inapplicable, as the ordinary occupation of these is not affected in any appreciable degree, by the number of estimates received in any month in the office. Even in the two branches principally concerned, the work was but slightly increased, as the following statements will show.

Estimate Department.

	Number of Estimates in hand, including repairs.	Number disposed of.	Balance at the end of the month.
September 1856	93	83	10
October	121	108	13
November	159	153	6
December	140	138	2
January 1857	112	107	5
February	71	68	3
March	96	93	3

Thus, the number of estimates examined in November, was only 45 in excess of that for October, 18 above that for December, and 46 above that for January.

Copying Department.

Number of papers copied and despatched in October 1856	766.
do. in November	782
do. in December	740

Here also it will be seen, that the works performed in November, did not exceed the average out-turn of each month from that department of the Central office.

24. An examination of the work performed in the other departments, will show that the estimates in question have affected them in a still smaller degree. But I must not fail to mention in this place, that the inconvenience experienced in the Government office arises partly from the operation of the orders of 18th October 1855 enjoining the submission of estimates in *monthly* lists. If it were not for this order, the projects received in the Central office could be submitted to Government, as they were examined and passed by the professional Officers, and thus the labor of dealing with them in the Government office, would be distributed over a period longer by one month than under the present arrangements, and would consequently obviate, to some extent, the inconvenience now complained of.

25. In accordance with the orders of Government, the local officers have been instructed to submit their Budgets in the early part of November, but under the explanations afforded in para. 20, I must not conceal my apprehensions that the last month will still exhibit a larger number of estimates submitted for the consideration of Government than in any preceding month, notwithstanding the strict orders issued for their equal distribution over every month of the year.

26. I trust that the explanations above afforded will tend to demonstrate to the Right Honorable the Governor in Council that the inconveniences complained of are owing to causes over which the Central office has but little, if any direct, control, and that they are in fact the

natural results of the present Budget system, and the orders of 18th October 1855. Thus assured, I doubt not that Government will remove from the Head of the Department of Public Works, the public censure conveyed in the orders now under review, and upon which I would respectfully venture to remark that supposing all the allegations contained in them had been strictly correct, the language employed is scarcely suited to the position of the head of a large Department, whose authority needs support at the hands of his superiors, instead of being weakened by a condemnation thus shewn to have been unmerited, and still further by the extensive and public circulation of that censure to all the officers ostensibly his subordinates.

27. In conclusion it only remains for me to respectfully solicit that in justice to myself, this letter, with the separate replies to paras. 19 and 27, may be laid before the Government of India, in connection with the orders of the Madras Government transmitted to that authority with the Budget of 1857-58; for both personally and as representing the Officers associated with me in the Central office, I feel that the despatch No. 461 of the 12th March last, holds me up to discredit and even accusation in matters, where, if zeal, energy, and collective industry are of merit, we might reasonably have anticipated acknowledgment, instead of widely circulated reprehension.

No. 56. ORDER THEREON, No. 1258; dated 27th June 1857.

1. The above letter is laid before Government, in reply to certain observations recorded by them in their recent review of the Budget of Public Works for 1857-58, which the Chief Engineer considers as reflecting on himself and the Department of which he is the head. The explanations furnished by Colonel Faber were in many cases hardly called for, as the annual review was but a record of facts connected with the progress and submission of the Budget; but as that Officer has entered into a lengthened explanation in reference to the remarks made by Government, they deem it proper to notice them in the order in which they appear in Colonel Faber's letter, with a view to show that all the points brought forward by the Chief Engineer have received their full consideration.

2. Colonel Faber remarks, that from para. 1 of the annual review, it might be inferred that there was delay on the part of the Central Office in submitting the last Budget, but this is a very forced construction of the words of the Government order, it merely states that on the 23rd January the Chief Engineer submitted the Budget for transmission to the Government of India, and with a later Memo., dated 4th February, the Officer late in charge of Central Office, furnished a list of sanctioned works which had been excluded from the Budget. The words are plain and simple, and not easily to be misunderstood, and although the Government cannot admit that there was not delay in the submission of the Budget, they are unable to allow that the fact was declared in the words to which the Chief Engineer refers. Colonel Faber next proceeds to remark that, notwithstanding the late date of certain orders issued by the Government, the Budget was prepared with remarkable celerity, and forwarded even before the time, at which the previous year's Budget was submitted. The lateness of the orders to which Colonel Faber alludes, was attributable to his own acts. He forwarded in December, no less than 131 estimates, expecting that Government would be able to pass orders on them within a time, which would have allowed of no consideration being given to each project. As regards the submission of the Budget before the date of that for the previous year, it must be remarked that the delay of one year cannot be justified by the greater delay of another, and that whatever may have been the fact of the case as regards 1856-57, the Budget for 1857-58 did not reach Government in what they consider to have been the proper time.

3. Colonel Faber next takes exception to the Government having subsequently expressed dissatisfaction at so large a number as 157 estimates having been sent in for their consideration, in the last month of the year, while by an official Memo. of so late a date as the 12th December, they granted permission for the submission of a supplemental list of projects. This permission was granted at the express request of the Chief Engineer, and under the supposition that, among the projects proposed in the supplemental list, there would be some of so much importance as to supersede others already before the Government, but in this supposition the Government were generally disappointed. Colonel Faber goes on to state that on the 3rd January 1857, estimates were returned to him, in order that he might make a selection of the most important of them, as well as of the 112 that had been sanctioned during the year, and those which remained unexecuted in the previous year; so that the whole expenditure might be limited to 50 lacs. These facts are true, but their recapitulation was unnecessary, and does not appear to serve any useful object. As far therefore as regards this part of the Chief Engineer's letter, the Government have only to remark that there certainly was delay in the submission of the annual Budget, and that it arose from the Chief Engineer's error in sending up estimates for 157 new projects for the consideration of Government in the last month of the year.

Paras. 4 to 8

4. In para. 9, the Chief Engineer explains that the estimate for the Salem Jail was transferred in the Government office, from Statement No. 2 to Statement No. 1 at his own request. This explanation was needless, the fact was not denied by Government, and they found no fault with the Chief Engineer in the instance he now refers to—his omission to enter in his Budget the estimate for the Post and Electric Telegraph office, was clearly an error, for the fact that the question was still pending, was no reason at all for the omission, and the same consideration would have equally justified Colonel Faber in excluding all the other estimates then before Government, which up to that time had received no attention from them. As regards the imperfection of the estimate under the then circumstances, it is only necessary to point out that many imperfect estimates were included in the list submitted by the Chief Engineer, which were rejected by the Government, without any fault or blame being imputed to the Chief Engineer for their insertion.

5. Referring to para. 19 of the annual review which called the Chief Engineer's attention to the general report required from him on the several points noticed by the Government of India, in respect to some of the projects entered in Statement No. 1 of the Budget of 1856-57, Colonel Faber complains that no distinct allusion is made to the circumstance of his having supplied the information required regarding the extension of the Sadras Canal; but that, on the contrary, the Government of India are left to infer that their orders had been overlooked by the Chief Engineer. Colonel Faber has apparently overlooked the fact that the allusion, of the omission of which he complains, was actually made in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the report which accompanied the Budget to the Government of India, a copy of which was furnished to the Chief Engineer, the matter having been thus prominently noticed in the report, did not need recapitulation in the review. As regards the general report required on the other points noticed by the Supreme Government, Colonel Faber now forwards, as an Appendix to his letter, a tabulated list of the correspondence he has had on the subject, which he desired the Government to accept in lieu of the general report required from him. This demand is wholly inadmissable, the list or Appendix will therefore be returned to the Chief Engineer, and he will be requested to furnish a separate report, embodying, as far as practicable, information on all the points noticed by the Government of India, divided as regards each work. From this report, information regarding the extension of the Sadras Canal to the frontier of Pondicherry, will of course be excluded, as having been already furnished to the Government of India.

6. Referring to the remarks of Government in respect to the improvements undertaken without estimate in the Penitentiary, the Chief Engineer requests that his letter of the 25th April last, No. 12,102, may be forwarded, together with his present communication, for the information of the Government of India; but this letter has already been separately disposed of, and needs no remark in this place; neither does it seem necessary to the Government to forward it separately to the Supreme Government as it will come before them in due course in the printed Proceedings of Government. The letter in question contains no justification whatever of the fact, that a large sum of money was expended without a sanctioned estimate.

7. The Chief Engineer next explains that the circumstances under which expenditure was incurred on the Samulcottah and Coconadah Canal, prior to the receipt of sanction, were laid before Government by the late Board of Public Works, and were adverted to in Extract Minutes of Consultation 30th January 1855, but it is to be observed that when an entry of such a heavy expenditure as was incurred on the work in question was made in the Budget, it was the business of the Chief Engineer to have furnished a brief abstract of the circumstances, in the column of remarks, or to have made such a note of the fact, as would have enabled the Government to apprehend it at once. Even in the Budget of 1856-57, the work is entered in Statement No. 1, without any allusion to the expenditure already incurred. Further it must be noticed that, in consequence of the absence of explanation, on the part of the Civil Engineer, the Government are even now left in doubt about the progress of the work, it appears that in a letter dated the 10th January* 1855, the Civil Engineer stated that the work had then so far advanced that he anticipated its completion in three months, and yet at the end of November 1856, or 19 months afterwards, there remained a balance of Rupees 63,296, or about 55 per cent. of the total estimate. The explanation called for by Government is still therefore required from the Civil Engineer.

* Vide Extract Minutes Consultation 30th January 1855, No. 152.

8. The explanation submitted in para. 14, regarding the omission of certain estimates for road repairs in Ganjam, Masulipatam, North Arcot and Malabar, is satisfactory, and is accepted by the Government.

9. In para. 15, Colonel Faber points out an error on the part of Government in allowing a sum of 4,760 Rupees instead of Rupees 1,760 for the repair of the road from Saint Thomas' Mount to Sydapet; he remarks that it was not a simple typographical or clerical error, as it ran throughout the Statement appended to the Budget. This error has been already rectified, and as pointed out in Extract Minutes of Consultation 19th Ultimo, No. 960, it arose from the first figure appearing in the Chief Engineer's own list, more like a four than a unit.

10. In para. 36, of the annual review, the Government, alluding to the delay in furnishing explanation regarding a large amount set down for irrigation repairs in the Kistnah Division, remarked that, had the organization of the Department of which Colonel Faber is the head, received that attention from him which they had a right to expect, it would not have been necessary for them to interfere to procure from his Subordinates, replies to letters from the Chief Engineer of nearly one year's standing. Colonel Faber alleges that the delay arose partly from misapprehension of orders, which in the transition state of the Department could not altogether be prevented; but this can hardly be admitted as a valid excuse, as it is obvious that it could be brought forward to account for any extent of delay, and any number of errors.

11. Adverting to para. 43 of the annual review, in which the Government pointed out the inconvenience caused by the Chief Engineer, in submitting, at the last moment, no less than 157 estimates for the month of November, involving an expenditure of 30,77,174 Rupees,

Colonel Faber enumerates the rules laid down in the order of Government of the 25th April 1856, para. 13, for the submission of estimates, and argues that those orders were literally complied with by him. On this it is to be observed that the Government never intended, and could never have been understood by Colonel Faber to have intended, that 157 estimates should be sent up in the last month of the year, in which the Budget itself was to be closed. It is obvious that whatever attention the Government could possibly bestow on so large a number of estimates, providing for works of importance and magnitude, granting even that they withdrew consideration from all the other public business of the country, would fall far short of that attention which was necessary to enable them confidently to discriminate between such as were of great importance and of pressing necessity, and those which were of lesser consequence, and would admit of postponement for a time.

12. The Chief Engineer further notices at length the circumstances under which the large number of estimates were submitted in December. He states that the inconvenience arose from the Budget system, and not from any defect in existing arrangements, and in support of this statement, he alleges that so long as the early months of the official year are devoted to the carrying out of the executive operations provided for in the Budget, it is only in the months of August, September and October, that the planning of operations for the prospective year can be executed. The Government cannot admit the validity of this reasoning; because, as the Chief Engineer only claims the early months of the official year, that is May, June, and July, for arranging executive operations, the business of preparing plans and estimates for submission in the ensuing official year, may obviously be undertaken by the local Officers in the other months of the year, viz. from November to April; during which period, all the details for large projects having been got ready, it will not be difficult to complete the Reports so as to submit them from the commencement of the official year. Besides this, as the District Engineers are not Executive Officers, much of their time must be available for work of this nature throughout the year, to a greater or less degree according to circumstances, and finally, although engaged early and late in each day in executive operations, the Executive Officers have, no doubt time in the interval to devote to the preparation of projects.

13. Colonel Faber goes on to state that according to the number of estimates comprised in the Budget lists of the past two years, the average number of estimates for examination in each month would be 159; that if they were equally distributed over each of the six months according to the orders of Government, the average would be 80; and that if the punctuality required by Government were insisted on, it must greatly impede the progress of the executive operations of the Department. This argument is fallacious; because the figures given by the Chief Engineer, are not based upon correct calculation. He computes the average number of estimates for examination in each month, from the aggregate number of works included in the Budget; and seems to forget that that document contains several Projects sanctioned in previous years, which are brought forward, only because the works remain uncommenced, or are still in progress. Thus, for instance, the Budget lists Nos. 1 and 2 for 1857-58, contain estimates to the number of 482, as shewn by the Chief Engineer; but many of them are those sanctioned in previous years, and the number of estimates actually sanctioned by Government in 1856-57 for entry in the Budget of 1857-58, do not amount to more than 150, or less than one-third of the number given by the Chief Engineer; and this number (viz. 150) being distributed over six months, the result will be about 25 estimates for each month instead of 80 as represented by Colonel Faber.

14. Lastly, the Chief Engineer takes exception to the orders of Government of 18th October 1855, enjoining the submission of estimates in monthly lists; and asserts that the in-

for 1857/58, whereas, the following circumstances will show that notwithstanding the lateness of certain orders issued from the Government Office on the subject, the budget had been prepared with remarkable celerity, and forwarded to Government even before the time, at which the corresponding budget for 1856/57 was submitted in last year. The final monthly list of Estimates was closed on the 2d December, in accordance with Extract Minutes Consultation 14th October 1856, No. 1868; and on the 12th idem, an Official Memo: No. 8824 was addressed to the Secretary to Government D.P.W. soliciting permission (for the reasons therein stated) to forward a supplemental list to be closed on the 15th idem.

3 This permission was given in a Memo: on the same date, and the supplemental list was accordingly submitted on the date specified, viz 15th December 1856.—

4 Every exertion was then made towards completing the budget statements, but on the 3d January 1857, in Extract Minutes Consultation No. 11 of that date, no less than 157 Estimates were returned to the Central Office, not only for a selection to be made of those which were considered of the most pressing importance, but the selection was to be extended to those sanctioned during the year (112 in number), and also to all those remaining unexecuted from last year, 50 lacs of Rupees being fixed as the limit of expenditure to be proposed on new works for the year 1857/58.

5 Government, in observing that the time was then so short, trusted that careful attention might be given to the matter, in order that the revised list might be submitted at an early date; and it was hoped that it might be ready by the 15th January, the date fixed for the submission of those documents. From this, there was evidently no reason to suppose that Government were dissatisfied with what had been done in the Central Office.—

6 The magnitude of the works thus imposed at the last moment on the Central Office, will be readily understood; but it was entered upon

upon with the greatest energy, and carried through with the most unsparing exertions, the lists being finally sent up to Government on the 23rd January, only 8 days later than the appointed time. With the object of lessening the labour of review in the Government Office, the works which admitted of being postponed till the year 1858/59 were also distinguished from the rest by crayon in red ink.

7 On the 30th January 1857, the Govt called for a list of works which had been omitted from the budget in framing it. This was prepared and submitted on the 4th February, and is that referred to in the 1st para of the Extract Minutes Consultation under acknowledgement.

8 Thus, it will appear that the operations of the Central Office in so far as the budget was concerned, were prompt and effective; and that they were not marked by any tardiness such as that, which the wording of the order of Government para 1, might & most probably will, cause to be supposed.

9 With regards to the remarks of Para 17 Government

15

Government in para 17, it has to be explained that the Estimate for the Jail at Salem was transferred from the list No 2 to list No 1, on my own representation, contained in my letter of the 31st January last No 9925. The Estimate for the Post Office at Madras, which the Government remarks should have formed a place in Statement No 1, was omitted by me in consequence of the whole question regarding that Building not having been determined at the time the budget of the Central Office was closed. The Chamber of Commerce had not then replied to the second reference made to them, and their decision might have occasioned considerable modification of the Plan and Estimate, and it was only on the 26th January last, i. e. after the budget had been submitted to Government, that the order for the inclusion of the Estimate in list No 1, was passed, "it being left to the Govt
" of India on the proposal coming before them,
" to take the opinion of Dr Riddell, the
" Director General," then shortly expected to return to India. It is obvious, that had the Estimate been included in the budget statement, in the then imperfect state of the information

information regarding it, this office might, and no doubt would have justly claimed for doing so.

10 The points noticed in para 19 were briefly adverted to in para 7 of my letter of the 23rd January last, accompanying the budget. It was there stated that the District Engineer of Tanjore was collecting the information called for by the Government of India in Colonel Baker's letter of the 11th July 1856, No. 3173, as regards the Kuthanundee embankments, but that the amount proposed for those works in the budget had been entered under the emergency for their execution recognized in the Correspondence marginally indicated, and also on the strong opinion expressed by Lieutenant Colonel F. C. Cotton in its favor - that the detailed information called for in regards to the project for the extension of the Eastern Coast Canal from the Palar river to the Alamparva, was furnished under date 8th September 1856 No. 6379 - and that it would be again submitted in complying with Extract Minutes Consultation 29th September 1856 No. 1758 - Although these circumstances clearly showed that the subject had not been lost sight of

Para 19

G. O. No. 6. 26th April 1856, No. 575. 12th Jan. 1857, No. 19.

of in the Revenue Office, no distinct allusion is made to them in the para of the order of Government in question, but the Government of India are left to infer that their orders have been overlooked, and have been unattended to, by the Chief Engineer

Para. 19.

11 As regards the requisition contained in this para, a separate report submitted to Government as an appendix.

Paras 27 and 28

12 In paras 27 and 28, Government notice the delay in the submission of an Estimate for the improvements made in the Penitentiary, and remarks severely upon the alleged laxity of the supervision exercised by me. As these remarks have been specially replied to in my letter of the 25th April last, No. 12, 102, it is not necessary for me to travel over the same grounds again, but I would respectfully solicit, that that letter may be considered an appendix to this; and be submitted for the information of the Government of India, before whom the remarks of Government have been placed with the budget.

The

The circumstances under Para 29
which the Samulcottah and Cocanada
Canal was executed were placed
before Government by the Board
of Revenue Department of Public
Works, and are adverted to in Extract
Mennites Consultation 30th January 1855,
No. 152, which the Government have
apparently overlooked in the present
review. Para 2 of this extract
runs as follows "The Estimate
"for the Samulcottah and Cocanada
"Channel was submitted by the
"Board with their letter of the
"6th November last, after the
"transmission of the last budget
"to Calcutta, in which, there-
"fore it is not included; and
"the project for the improve
"-ment of the Caringa and Cocanada
"harbours has not been so much, as laid
"before Government. Yet the former work
"is now reported to have so far, advanced
"that the Acting Civil Engineer reckons
"upon its completion, in three months'
"time from the date of his letter, whilst
"the work at the Cocanada River
"mouth," he states, "cannot be stopped,"
"and that we must either push on with
"it, or lose the benefit of all that has
"been done." The Conservancy irregular and
"unauthorized the proceedings of the
"Acting Civil Engineer, the Government
"cannot under such circumstances, forbid
"but altogether the further progress of
"the works, at the risk of what has already
"ready been laid out being entirely lost.
"The Samulcottah channel must therefore
"be finished". This Extract furnishes the
explanation called for, as regards the
above channel.

Paras 31. 11. In para 31, Government
remark that certain Estimates for the
repairs of Roads in Ganjam, Masulipatam,
North Arcot, and Malabar, having been
submitted to Government before the date

of the budget, should have been included therein. To this it may be replied, that of the 4 items preferred to the first and second viz: those for Masulipatam and Ganjam were forwarded to Government on the 17th and 21st January; i.e. nominally before the budget lists were despatched, but really after they were closed; because it is obvious that unless this closure took place some days before the despatch, it would be impossible to have the documents fair copied - the totals made up - and the necessary work attended to. The 2nd and 4th items were omitted from the local officers' budget lists, and were, therefore, overlooked in the Central Office.

15. In para 84, an mistake occurs on the part of the Government Office, which I take the liberty of pointing out, not unbecomingly to impute blame, but merely to show that even in Offices filled by experienced, and able servants, mistakes will sometimes occur. The prior [illegible] to, is in the

Para 84

allowance made for the repairs of the road from Saint Thomas Mount to Chingleput, which is stated to be Rs. 4760 instead of Rupees 1760. This is not a simple typographical or clerical error, but runs through out the statement appended to the Budget, and the entire amount has been set apart for expenditure.

16. The remarks made by Government in para 84, have been called forth by the solitary instance of Captain Orr not having forwarded the information regarding the repairs of irrigation works in the Western Division but it appears from an explanation received from him, that the delay on his part, arose from his being under the impression that the information was to have been supplied by the Collector of Guntoor, to whom the Chief Engineer's Circular of the 8th May 1856 was specially addressed, with copies to the District Engineers for information. It would also seem from a letter sent by the Acting Collector of Masulipatam in reply to a reminder

from this Office on the subject, dated 26th November 1856, that Captain Orr had been called upon by that Office, for accounts of the expenditure on repairs in the Engineer Department, but that up to the date of his letter (24th December 1856) he had not been supplied with the necessary information. Hence it is manifest that the delay has occurred partly from misapprehension of orders, which in the transition state of the Department could not altogether be prevented, nor which under any measure of organization, can be invariably insured. —

17. With regard to the observations contained in Para 43, I beg to state that the orders of Government of the 25th April 1856, No 565 para 13 had not been overlooked, but were literally complied with, as far as circumstances permitted in submitting the budget of this year. In perusing those orders, it must be remembered that the last monthly list previous to the submission of the budget for 1856/57, was forwarded to Government on the 26th January 1856, and the budget itself on the 29th of that month, making a difference of only 3 days between the submission of these two documents. It was to the inconvenience caused by this circumstance, that the remarks of Government were specially directed, for the orders conveyed in consequence were, viz.

Para 43.

1st That no Estimates be submitted later than those forwarded for the month of November, and which were to be before Government in the first few days of December.—

2nd That the local Officers should be instructed to take early steps for the preparation and submission of their Estimates.

3rd That such papers received in the Chief Engineer's Office be disposed of promptly, so as not to leave an accumulation to be returned in at the last moment.—

4th That the local budget lists be closed at the end of November and,

5th That the general lists budget

of the Chief Engineer be laid before Government by the 15th of January, to admit allow time for their full consideration.

18. In accordance with the first of the above orders, the last [illegible] bill of the public [illegible] was placed before Government on the 15th December. With regard to the second, the [illegible] were communicated to the Government [illegible] for their information and guidance. All the Estimates received in the Chief Engineer's Office were disposed of promptly in accordance with the third condition, as may be seen by the statement entered in the margin, from which it appears that there were [illegible] Estimates of more than 4 weeks standing, and these were the most part [illegible] on which further information had been called for. The last budget [illegible] as directed at the end of [illegible], and the general budget was [illegible] and was laid before Government on the 23rd January [illegible]

Estimates	
1 weeks old	50
2 Do	40
3 Do	24
4 Do	10
4 weeks	30
Total	154

few days later than the time declared sufficient for full consideration of the projects in the Government Office, but which delay took place in consequence of the orders of Government itself, and ought therefore not to be charged to the Chief Engineer.

See para 5 of this letter.

19. It will thus be seen that the orders of Government of the 25th April 1856 No. 565 para 13 were literally complied with, so far as circumstances permitted, and that the inconvenience complained of, did not arise from defective arrangements, for which the Chief Engineer is responsible. I trust, therefore, that I may be permitted to pronounce the accusation contained in the last sentence of para 4th to be groundless, and the censure wholly unmerited.

20. I now proceed to notice the circumstances connected with the large number of Estimates submitted in December, the inconvenience resulting from which though not owing to the Chief Engineer's arrangements, is the main point against which

can be prepared and submitted for the sanction of Government. Viewed in this light, and considering that the number of Estimates comprised in the budget lists of the past two years, have been, as stated in the margin, the average number of Estimates for examination in each month would be 159, or, supposing that in compliance with the orders of Government contained in para 44, they were equally distributed over each of the six months, the average would be 80, but I must not fail to bring to the notice of Government that the insisting upon such punctuality in a matter of office routine, must greatly impede the progress of the executive operations of the Department, and thus cause, a much greater amount of real injury to the interests of Government than the present inconvenience of dealing with a large number of Estimates, which however, are not more than the average number of the months, considering the circumstances under which they are submitted. It must also be noticed

1856/57	
List No 1	58
" No 2	414
Total	472
1857/58	
List No 1	24
" No 2	458
Total	482
Average	477

the wonderful Geographical Position of this Island, and its immense resources, it cannot be said, with any degree of confidence, that the budget estimates, which will be framed for each year, will not be found to exceed the average, or by far exceed the limit, which may be fixed by the Legislature, as the maximum of the expenditure chargeable upon the Revenue of the year, as provided for in the budget, which is to be framed and submitted to the Legislature in the month of August, or September, when the Revenue for the first six months of the year, ie in August, can be known. Under such circumstances, I would respectfully suggest, that the Estimates for the ensuing budget

that the nearer the estimates are to the actual dates of the season in which they are to be carried into effect, the more likely are they to correctly represent what is necessary, all localities having exposed to weather, and other influences which may affect the accuracy of the dimensions, or the prices of labor and materials, involved in the calculations of the preliminary data.—

21. It is now necessary to reply to the serious reflections contained in para 44, wherein it is alleged that "it is quite impossible that the 157 projects sent at one time to the Government could have received due attention in the Central Office, and that even the mere formal preparation of them in a shape suitable for submission, must have occupied the whole time of the Chief Engineer's whole establishment, to the total neglect of all other duty;" and further "that the organization of the whole department is still defective, and required far more attention than

Paras 44

"Colonel Faber has yet bestowed upon it" Prose, charges, I beg most emphatically to deny.—

22. In the first place, supposing that the 157 Estimates were the work of only one month, containing 26 working days, this would give an average of 2 Estimates for each day for each of the three professional officers; but considering that there were 30 estimates of more than 4 weeks standing, most of which had already been partially considered—that many of the simpler Estimates were drafted upon by other than the three officers—and that most of the projects were devoid of any complexity, it will be seen that the undertaking was by no means so arduous, as is supposed.—

see para 18.

23. In the second place, the only departments of the office that were principally concerned in the examination, and preparation of the Estimates, were the Estimate and copying departments, and therefore, as regards the work performed in the four other branches

of the Office, the remarks of Government are wholly inapplicable; as the ordinary occupation of these is not affected in any appreciable degree, by the number of Estimates received in any months in the Office. Even in the two branches principally concerned, the work was but slightly increased, as the following Statements will show.

Estimate Department—

	Number of Estimates received in the month, including re-transmissions.	Number of Estimates examined in the month.	Balance at the end of the month.
September 1856	93	83	10
October	121	108	13
November	159	153	6
December	140	138	2
January	112	107	5
February	71	68	3
March	96	93	3

Thus, the number of Estimates examined in November, was only 45 in excess of that for October—18 above that for December—and 46 above that for January.

Copying Department—

Number of papers copied and despatched in October 1856	766
Do. in November	782
Do. in December	740

Here

Here also it will be seen, that the work performed in November, did not exceed the average output of each month from that department of the Central Office.—

24. An examination of the work performed in the other departments, will show that the Estimates in question have affected them in a still smaller degree. But I must not fail to mention in this place, that the inconvenience experienced in the Government Office, arises partly from the operation of the orders of the 18th October 1855. enjoining the submission of Estimates in Monthly lists. If it were not for this order, the projects received in the Central Office could be submitted to Government, as they were examined and passed by the professional Officers and thus the labor of dealing with them in the Government Office, would be distributed over a period longer by one month than under the present arrangements, and would consequently obviate, to some extent, the inconvenience now complained of.—

25. In accordance with the orders of Government, the local officers have been instructed to submit their budgets in the early part of November last under the explanations afforded in para 20. I must not conceal any apprehensions that the last month will still exhibit a larger number of Estimates submitted for the consideration of Government than in any preceding month, notwithstanding the strict orders issued for their equal distribution over every month of the year.—

26. I trust that the explanations above afforded will tend to demonstrate to the Right Honorable the Governor in Council that the inconveniences complained of are owing to causes over which the Central Office has but little, if any direct control, and that they are in fact the natural results of the present budget system, and the orders of 18th October 1855. That affirmed, I doubt not that Government will remove from the Head of the De-

partment of Public Works, the particular censure conveyed in the orders now under review, and upon which I would respectfully venture to remark that in preferring all the allegations contained in them has been strictly correct, the language employed is scarcely suited to the position of the head of a large Department, whose authority needs support at the hands of his superiors, instead of being weakened by a condemnation thus shewn to have been unmerited, and still further by the extension and publication of that censure to all the Officers subordinate to him.—

27. In conclusion it only remains for me to respectfully solicit that in justice to myself, this letter, with the separate replies to paras 19 and 24, may be laid before the Government of India, in connection with the orders of the Madras Government transmitted to that authority with the Budget of 1857/58; for both personally and as representing the Officers associated with me

me in the Central Office, I feel that the despatch No 461 of the 12th March last, holds me up to discredit and even accusation in matters, where, if zeal, energy, and collective industry are of merit, we might reasonably have anticipated acknowledgement, instead of hasty circulated reflections.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant
Alex Taylor Colonel
Chief Engineer

Central Office of Ord.
Fort St George
16th May 1854

To
The Secy. to Govt
P.W.D.

Compd Shay

Abstract of Correspondence which has taken place on certain projects referred to in Extract Minutes Consultation 12th March 1857 No. 461 para 19.

No.	Budget/56/57 Head	Estimate	Para	Lieut. Colonel Baker's letter No. 3173 11th July 56 — Subject.	Correspondence which has taken place
				Irrigation.	
1	17	326100	8	Constructing a portion of the Kistnah Southern high level Channel in continuation from Ingampanda to Inkole.	Extract Pro. No. 5803, 15th Augt. 1856 circulating Lieut. Colonel Baker's letter. Chief Engineers letter No. 91 dated 3d April 1857 to Distt. Engineer Calling attention to above.
				Points out that no designs have been submitted for the agueducts across the several Streams alluded to, nor have the Streams themselves been marked on the Sketch maps. Enclo. 4 3 plans 1 Sketch	District Engineers letter No. 221. 13th April 57 furnishing a Sketch Map with the Streams marked on it. thus with the designs of the agueducts which were omitted to be forwarded to Government with the Project are herewith submitted. No further information required.
2	18	139700	9.	Opening a Channel along the Western bank of the Kistnah from Vallabapooram to	Extract Pro. No. 5803. 15th Augt. 56 Circulating Lieut. Colo. Baker's letter District Engr. letter No. 60, dated 2nd Septr. Furnishing

the progress and submission

C13 Lines 216 &c

No. 1055. 27th May 1857.

Copy to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and Canals for information.

By Order &c

Secretary to the Board.

Copy to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and Canals for information.

By Order &c

Secretary to the Board.

Public Works Department Office. Fort St. George 27th May 1857.

Copy to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and Canals for information.

By Order &c

Secretary to Government.

Public Works Department Fort St. George 27th May 1857.

Sir,

With reference to the Consultation noted in the margin, I have the honor to forward herewith a Sketch Map of the Country through which the Kistnah Southern high level Channel is intended to be carried, and to point out that no designs have been submitted for the agueducts across the several Streams alluded to, nor have the Streams themselves been marked on the Sketch Map.

2. I have also the honor to submit herewith a Sketch Map of the Country through which the Kistnah Western high level Channel is intended to be carried, and to point out that no designs have been submitted for the agueducts across the several Streams alluded to, nor have the Streams themselves been marked on the Sketch Map.

3. I have the honor to request that the explanations may be submitted for the information of the Court of Directors.

No. 1055. 27th May 1857.

C13 Lines 216 &c

to be de water at Adanijhol
-leem.

Refers to Kistnah project generally and observes, that assurance is required regarding the sufficiency of Sujjly and the Security of the Canal now proposed from the river encroachment and some further information relating to the Cost of the bridges and minor Channels of to Government. Extract distribution below.

Summoning the required information.

Extract Pro. No. 6509 13th Septr. Forwarded above to Govt. Extract Mins: Cons: No. 1942 20th Octr. /56 returning above to be resubmitted with our general Report

District Engineers letter No. 127 dated 15th Novr. 1856 urging the execution of the works.

Chief Engrs. letter No. 8651. 5th Decr. /56. Forwards above Extract Mins: Cons: No. 39. 7th Jany. /57 Govt. authorize the works.

Extract Pro. No. 9470. 15th Jany. /57 Communicates above to Collr. of Gunture and Distrct. Engineer No. further information required

3 | 1 | 64840 | 12 | Embanking the Mahanadi from its Junction with the Kolanda nuanchka to Russelcondah

Extract Pro. No. 5502. 15th Augt. /56 Emulating Lieut. Colls. Cotton letter.

Refers to Letter No. 1915 22nd March /56 sanctioning

Extract Pro. No. 5819. 15th Augt. to Distrct. Engr.-

Extract Pro. No. 5820 to Lieut. Colls

an advance of Rupees 30,000 for the above works and observes.

1st The Sections run merely along the banks of the river and do not shew the relative levels of their banks and of the adjacent Country.

2nd No information is given of the site of the Embankments what area of floodway they enclose between them what volume of water is discharged by the river in the highest floods or to what extent the Embankments would limit the present spread of the water yet on these points depend the sufficiency of the floodway and the stability of the Embankments.

3rd To shew that the evils attendant upon the Damoodah Embankments are

Colls. F. C. Cotton.

District Engineers letter No. 712 17th Septr. Reports that Embankments have been breached.

Extract Pro. No. 6869-27th Septr. Calling for report on Embankments.

District Engineers letters Nos. 822-4th October Replies to above.

Extract Pro. No. 7345-18th Octr. Calls for a more full report.

Chief Engineers letter No. 7346. 18th October to Govt. forwarding Lieut. Harrington's observations.

District Engineers letter No. 942-29th Octr. Replies to No. 7345.

District Engineers letter No. 1014-13th Novr. Reports on Embankments.

Extract Pro. No. 8060-13th November Points out where the above report is defective.

District Engineers letter No. 1075-20th Novr. Refers to former Reports-

								are not likely to result in this Case.	District Engineers letter No. 1042 - 12th November — forwards Sketch map. Extract Pro: No. 8500 - 29th Nov. Points out that the map is too Small. Dist. Engineers letter No. 1123 8th Decr. Promises further information. Chief Engineers letter No. 8815. 12th December — forwards to Govt. Copy of Distt. Engineers letter No. 1014 and requests annual grant of Rupees 600. Extract Mins: Cons. No. 71 12th Jany. /57 Sanctions Rs. 600. Extract Pro: No. 9503 - 16th Jany. Communicates above to Collr. and Distt. Engineer. Exent. Engineers /in charge/ letter No. 141. 11th February Forwards further Report. on — Embankments. Acting Supdg. Engineer No. 6. Letter No. 10559 - 18th March forwards above to Govt. Extract
									Extract Mins: Cons: 495 - 18th March /57 Orders on above. Extract Pro: No. 11157 - 21st March Communicates above to District Engineer. She further information required has not yet been received and Lieut. Colo. Cotton has been again — requested to forward his report. on the Subject.
								Navigation Works.	Extract Pro: No. 5803 - 15th Augt /56 Circulates Lieut. Colonel Baters letter. Supdt. E. C. Canal letter No. 219 30th August /56 Furnishes the required information. Chief Engineers letter No. 6379 8th Septr. Forwards above information to Govt. Extract Mins: Cons: No. 1758. 29th September orders on above. Extract Pro: No. 6946. 30th September Communicates above to Supdt. No further information required.
4	55	37500	13	Extending East Coast Canal from the Palaur to — Pondicherry frontier.				Observes that the Canal passes the necks of several backwaters — open to the Sea and therefore affected by the tides and it is not clear how its level can be steadily maintained unless there be a lock at each point where it	

							S. enters and emerges from these Tidal Lagoons. The Number and position of such Locks should be distinctly shewn. There is no specification of the Works and the Estimate is a very general one.
5	14	6482	15	Constructing Locks and Calingulahs at Yalarsud and Clinicapaveram and an Embankment to Weyairoo.	Ex: Pro: No: 5863. 15: Augt. Circulates Printd Coll: Bakers letter. Ex: Pro: No: 5817. 15: Augt. to Coll: and Distt. Engr: Distt. Engrs letter No: 593. 31: Septr. Furnishes required information. Chief Engrs letter No: 7343. 18th Octr. Forwards above to Govt. Ex: Mins: Cons: No: 2096. 11th Novr. orders on above. Letter 2097. 11th Novr. /56 Govt. of Madras to Govt. of India Ex: Pro: No: 8116. 15: Novr. Communicates above to Distt. Engrs Godavery and Rishnah.	Project for Keeping open a navigable Communication from the Weyairoo into the Colair Lake, and the Sea. Desires to be furnished with a Statement of the nature, and extent of the expected traffic and of the probable returns.	Collector of Rajahmundry letter No: 272. 25th Nov: Furnishes information. Chief Engineers letter No: 8882. 15th December Forwards above to Government. Secy. Government of India No: 5879 19th December Sanctions Estimate of Rupees 64820. Ex: Mins: Cons: No: 43. 8th Jany. /57 orders on above. Ex: Proceedings No: 9459 dated 15th Jany. /57 Communicates above to Collector and Distt. Engineer. No further information required. Ex: Pro: No: 5803. 15th Augt. 1856 Circulates Lieut. Colt. Bakers letter. Ex: Pro: No: 5818 15th August. to Collector and Distt. Engineer. Ex: Pro: No: 7642. 30th Octr. 1856 Messrs. Price and Co: letter 30th August. /56 with Collector of Canara's letter No: 41. 22nd December /56.
6	50	36021	17	Opening a Canal from the Tuddry River to Coomptah.	Observes that the length of the Canal is not stated and that there is no scale on the maps. Also that such tolls should be imposed on this and every other Canal of	Furnishing	

of navigation as will defray the cost of maintenance and afford a fair return for the outlay on the work.

furnishing information in part:-
Chief Engrs letter No 9516. 16th January/57 Forwards above to Govt.
Ex: Mins: Con: No 212. 28th January/57 orders on above.
Ex: Pro: No 9954 of/2? Feby. 1857 Communicates above to Collr and Distt Engineer.
The further information required, and called for, as noticed in the Govt. order of 28th Jany./57 is
1st Length of the Coomptah Canal
2nd Calculation of the charge per ton per mile at the proposed rates of 2old.
3rd Chief Engrs opinion on the District Engrs. Establishment for the annual maintenance of the Canal.
4th To call the attention of the District Engineer and Collr. to the extention of the Canal to Honore, and to the improvement at Kutgulbeth suggested by Messrs Brice & Co.

Trunk Roads.

1 29 41257 18 — 14439 / 53690 For increased width of metalling on T.R. No 1

Observes that for a road running parallel to a Rail Road it appears that a width of 18 feet of metalling should be sufficient. a decision upon this item is therefore suspended until the actual effect of the Rail road on the Traffic of the road shall have been ascertained.

The railroad has not been sufficiently long in existence to shew what its effect will be on the road traffic.
Traffic returns are regularly kept and a comparison of them with the former returns will be made in due course.

8 20 8258021 Masonry works consisting of 16 Bridges & 65 Tunnels on Trunk Road No 6 between Cavoor & Moodegunda.

Ex: Pro: No 5803. 15th August 1856 Circulates Lieut Colls Bakers letter.

Observes that the designs of masonry works in this & most of the Trunk Road Projects are drawn to a Standard pattern without any

any variation to suit local peculiarities that there is no report on the nature of the soil and that the foundation appear to be some what deficient in depths.

9 2 46330 22 Repairing and improving 94/2 miles of Trunk Road No 6 from Cuntacheu=pooram to Dundagedda near Itchapoor.

An approximate Estimate of the larger Bridges required.

Chief Engineers Report No 8662. 6th Decr 1856. 99 forwarded to Govt.

two Estimate.

One of Rs 23790. for Masonry works between Chicacole and Cuntacheu=pooram.

and one of Rupees 2943 0 for do between Cuntacheupooram and Itchapoor.

These Estimates are to be brought forward for the Budget of 1858/59.

Ex. Pro. No 5803. 15th August /56 Circulates Lieut Colo Battersletter.

The information not having been received has been again called for.

10 35 106333 24. Bridges over the Pennaur on Trunk Road No 8.

Remarks that some doubt is felt regarding the sufficiency of the foundations in the probable event of Sand being found in the river bed to a greater depth than that of the Sub: Structure.

11 23 39142 28 6. Bridges on Trunk Road No 11 between Kullooru and Kulcudda.

53142

Chingleput 91584

12482 8 ---- Do ---- Do -

21387 between Kulcudda and

N Arcot 33869. Goolcherroo.

2 " Do Do ---

between Chittoor & Kullooru

The remark regarding apparent deficiency of foundation applies to the whole of the designs for these bridges.

Madras Engr Office

Ex. Pro. No 5803. 15th August /56 Circulates Lieut Colo Battersletter.

Distt Engr Cuddapah, letter No 467. 21st August — furnishing information in part.

Ex. Pro. No 7652. 30th Octr /56 to Distt Engr North Arcot.

Distt Engr N Arcot letter No 73. 10th January /57 — furnishing information.

Ex. Pro. No 9703. 23d Jany. /57 to Distt Engr N Arcot.

Chief Engineers letter — No 92. 3d April /57 to District Engineer of Cudda. -pah Calling for information

Distt Engr Cuddapahs letter No 1186. 8th Apl /57 furnishing information.

Correspondence relating to the above is forwarded to

to Government from which it will be seen that of the 16 Bridges the foundation of two the Chittoor and Calamagoonta are considered to be insufficient in part. the probable increased expenditure on account of the former will be 8 1/2 per Cent. on the Estimate and of the latter 3/4 per Cent:

Trunk Roads.

12 6 45 75 29. Completing branch Road from the ferry at Vizagapatam to Punchadandah and Constructing the line upto Poolaputty on Trunk Road No. 6. 38 1/2 Miles.

Partial repair to the Masulipatam and Hyderabad Road from Chicacole to Masulipatam.

Expresses a doubt as to the efficiency of "Sand Potters earth" for road metalling, and suggests, as the roads are represented to be important and therefore subject to heavy traffic that the additional cost of proper metal might perhaps wisely be incurred.

Ex. Pro: No 5803. 15th August/56 Circulates Lieut Col. Baker's letter Distt Engrs letter No 60. 2nd Septr Para 5 furnishes required information.

Ex Pro. No 6509. 13th Septr/56 Forwards above to Govt.

Ex. Mins. Cons: No 1942 dated 22nd October/56 orders on above.

Ex. Pro: No 7612. 29th October/56 Communicates above to Collr and Distt Engineer.

Ag. Collr of Masulipatam No 214. 6th Novr/56 regarding postponement of work &c.

Ex. Pro. No 8114. 15th Novr/56 Forwards above to Distrct Engineer. Distt. Engineer letter No 135. 26th Novr/56 replies to above.

Ex: Pro: No 8721. 3rd Decr/56 Forwards above to Collr Distt Engrs letter No 164. 3rd Jany/57 regarding materials for road.

Chief Engrs letter No 9658 22nd Jany. forwards above to Govt Ex: Mins: Cons: No 465 dated 13th March/57 orders on above as further information required.

Ex. Pro. No 5803. 15th Augt/56 Circulates Lt. Col. Baker's letter Distt Engr Bellary letter No 374 25th Novr forwards incomplete Estimate.

13. 26 31 100 30. Earth work &c and minor Bridges of the portion of the Bellary and Cuddapah road from Rajahmundry to Gooty.

24 78 10. Completing the Cuddapah and Bellary frontier Roads.

do do do 409. 8th Decr do do

Ex: Pro: Nos 8762 & 8993. dated 11th & 18th Decr/56 returns above for completion Distrct Engineer Cuddapah. letter No 729. 29th Novr/56.

D
L.1

Observations.

In their present shape are essentially isolated portions of a Project for one work Viz: a road from Cuddapah to Bellary a complete project for this whole line should be submitted.

Forwards Estimate for completing road from Cuddapah to Bellary frontier.

Chief Engrs report to Govt. on above Estte of £ 10,758 No 8662. 6th Decr /56.

The Estte in the limits of the Bellary Distt requires to be furnished with it as well, together with the Estimate received from Cuddapah, be submitted for entry in the Budget of 1858/59.

14 43422033 Constructing a Bridge of 25 arches across the river Vaga at Madura on the high road No 4 from Madras to Travancore.

Ex. from Proceedings 1st 5803. 15th August 1856 - Circular Lt Col Baker's letter.

Points out that the wells of the above bridge appear rather deficient in depth and suggests for consideration whether it would not be advisable to carry to a greater depth than 8 feet - the

The information not having been received has been again called for.

the foundation by cylinders of the Amherstby bridge which it is represented will be founded on Sandy soil -

Buildings

15 57 50340 37 Additions and alterations to the Sea Customs House.

19700 Improving the internal accommodation of the Sea Customs House for the landing and shipping of goods and their conveyance to and from the Custom House.

Observes that the projected arrangements for the new import sheds appear to be unexceptionable but a doubt may be entertained whether the Verandah on the Sea front into which it appears that the doors of the building open

The Offg. Garrison Engineer has been requested to furnish information on the points noticed.

open / can be conveniently used as an export — ware houses.

The details of the tramway if correctly — shewn in the drawings are apparently susceptible of improvement.

Central Office of Works,
Fort Saint George
16th May 1857.

/ Signed / C. E. Faber Colonel
Chief Engineer

Lt. Col. Smith

P.W.D.

N° 1258

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation

Under date the 27th June 1857.

Read the following

letter from the Chief Engineer

N° 1 Fine. Date 16th May 1857. N° 397

1. The above letter is laid before Government, in reply to certain observations recorded by them in their record review of the Budget of Public Works for 1857/58, which the Chief Engineer considers as reflecting on himself and the Department of which he is the head. The explanations furnished by Colonel Fisher were in many cases hardly called for, as the annual review was but a record of facts connected with the progress and submission

Ex a letter from the Chief Engineer
dated 16 May 1857 - N° 397.

P. W. D.
in N° 1004 of 57

of the Budget; but as that Office has entered into a lengthened explanation in reference to the remarks made by Government, they deem it proper to notice them in the order in which they appear in Colonel Faber's letter, with a view to shew, that all the points brought forward by the Chief Engineer have received their full consideration.

2. Colonel Faber remarks that from para 1 of the annual Reviews, it might be inferred that there was delay on the part of the Central Office in submitting the last Budget, but this is an erroneous construction of the words of the Government order, as already stated. On the 23rd January the Chief Engineer submitted the Budget for transmission to the Government of India, and with a letter dated 4th February, the Office was late in charge of Central Office, forwarded a list of sanctioned works which had been excluded from the Budget. The words are plain and simple, and not easily to be misunderstood, and although the Government cannot admit that there was not delay in the submission of the Budget, they are unable to allow that the words were declared in the words stated, or that the Chief Engineer referred Colonel Faber, nor proceeded to remark that, notwithstanding the late date of certain orders issued by the Government, the Budget was prepared with the remarkable celerity, and forwarded even before the time, at which the previous year's Budget was submitted. The lateness of the orders to which Colonel Faber alludes, was attributable to his own acts. He forwarded in December, no less than 31 Estimates, expecting that Government would be able

to

to pass orders on them within
a time, which would have
allowed of no consideration
being given to the project.
As regards the submission of
the Budget before the date
of that for the previous year,
it must be remarked that
the delay of one year cannot
be justified by the greater
delay of another, and that
whatever may have been
the fact of the case, as regards
1856/57, the Budget for 1857/58
did not reach Government
in what they consider to have
been the proper time.

3. Colonel Fuller replies
takes exception to the Govern-
ment having subsequently
expressed dissatisfaction at
so large an increase as
1857

Comms 4 C 8.

157 estimates having been
sent in for their consider-
ation in the last month of
the year, while by an Offi-
cial Memo of so late a
date as the 12th December,
they granted permission for
the submission of a Supple-
mental list of projects.
This permission was granted
at the special request of the Chief Engineer and
under the supposition that
among the projects proposed
in the Supplemental list there
would be some of so much
importance as to supersede
others already before the Govern-
ment, but in this supposi-
tion the Government were
generally disappointed. Co-
lonel Fuller goes on to state
that on the 31st January 1857
estimates

estimates were returned to him, in order that he might make a selection of the most important of these, as well as of the 112 that had been sanctioned during the year, and those which remained unexecuted in the previous year, so that the whole expenditure might be limited to 80 lacs. These facts are true, but their recapitulation was unnecessary, and does not appear to serve any useful object. So far therefore as regards this part of the Chief Engineer's letter the Government have only to remark that there certainly was delay in the submission of the annual Budget, & that it arose from the Chief Engineer's error in sending up Estimates for 187 new projects for the consideration of Government in the last months of the year.

4 In para 9 the Chief Engineer explains that the Estimate for the Salem Jail was transferred in the Government Office from Statement No 2 to Statement No 1 at his own request. This explanation was needless, the fact was not denied by Government, and they found no fault with the Chief Engineer in the instance he now refers to— his omission to enter in his Budget the Estimate for the Post and Electric Telegraph Office; ~~this~~ was clearly an error, for the fact that the question was still pending was no reason at all for the omission, and the same consideration would have equally justified Colonel Fraser in excluding

excluding all the other Esti-
=mates then before Govern-
=ment, which up to that
time had received no atten-
=tion from them – As regards
the imperfection of the
Estimate under the
then circumstances, it is
only necessary to point-
out that many imperfect
Estimates were inclu-
=ded in the list sub-
=mitted by the Chief Engi-
=neer, which were rejected
by the Government, without
any fault or blame
being imputed to the
Chief Engineer for their
insertion.

Referring

to para
19 of the annual review
which called the Chief
Engineer's attention
to the general report
required from him on
the several points noti-
=ced by the Government
of India, in respect to
some of the projects entered
in Statement No. 1 of the
Budget of 1856/57, Colonel
Fraser complains that
no distinct allusion is
made to the circumstance
of his having supplied
the information required
regarding the extension
of the Madras Canal;

but

but that, on the contrary, the Government of India ought to infer that their orders had been overlooked by the Chief Engineer. Colonel Fisher has apparently overlooked the fact that the allusion, the omission of which he complains, was actually made in paragraphs b and j of the report which accompanied the Budget to the Government of India, a copy of which was furnished to the Chief Engineer — the matter having been there prominently noticed in the report, did not need recapitulation in the review. As

As regards the General report required on the other points noticed by the Supreme Government, Colonel Fisher now forwards, as an appendix to his letter, a tabulated list of the correspondence he has had on the subject, which he desired the Government to accept in lieu of the general report required from him. This demand is wholly inadmissable, the list or appendix will therefore be returned to the Chief Engineer, and he will be requested to furnish a detailed report

report, embodying, as far as practicable, information on all the points noticed by the Government of India, divided as regards each work. From this report, information regarding the extension of the Cudrass Canal to the frontier of Condicherry, will of course be excluded, as having been already furnished to the Government of India.

6. Referring to the remarks of Government in respect to the improvements undertaken on without

without estimate in the ~~condemned~~ Penitentiary, the Chief Engineer requests that his letter of the 25th of April last No. 12102, may be forwarded, together with his present communication, for the information of the Government of India, but this letter has already been separately disposed of, and needs no remark in this place; neither does it seem necessary to the Government to forward it separately to the Supreme Government, as it will come before them in due course in the

the printed Proceedings of Government. The letter in question contains no justification whatever of the fact, that a large sum of money was expended without a sanctioned Estimate.

The Chief Engineer next explains that the circumstances under which expenditure was incurred on the Coonoor Ghaut and Co-coonoor Canal, prior to the receipt of Sanction, were laid before Government by the late Board of Public Works, and were adverted to in Ex: Mins: of Consultation 30th January 1855, but it is to be observed that on

when an entry of such a heavy expenditure as was incurred on the work in question was made in the Budget, it was the business of the Chief Engineer to have furnished a brief abstract of the circumstances, in the Column of Remarks, or to have made such a note of the fact, as would have enabled the Government to apprehend it at once. Even in the Budget of 1856/57, the work is entered in Statement No 1, without any allusion to the expenditure already incurred.

Further it must be noticed that, in consequence of the absence of explanation in the part of the Civil Engineer, the Govt are even now left in doubt about the progress of the work; it appears that in a letter dated the 10th January/55, the Civil Engineer stated that the work had then so far advanced that he anticipated its completion in three months,

x Vide Ex/m C 30 Jan/1855 No 152

months, and yet at the end of November 1856, or 19 months afterwards, there remained a balance of Rupees 63,296, or about 55 per cent of the total estimate. The explanation called for by Government is still therefore required from the Civil Engineer.

8 The explanation submitted in para 14 regarding the omission of certain estimates for road repairs in Ganjam, Masulipatam, North Arcot, and Malabar, is satisfactory, and is accepted by the Government.

9 In para 15 Colonel Faber points out an error on the part of Government in allowing a sum of 4760 Rupees instead of Rupees 1760 for the repair of the road from Saint Thomas's Mount to Sydapet, he remarks that it was not a simple typographical or clerical error, as it ran throughout the statement appended to the Budget.

Budget. This error has been already rectified, and as pointed out in Extract Minutes of Consultation 19th Instant No 960, it arose from the first figure appearing in the Chief Engineer's own list, more like a four than a unit.

10 In para 36 of the annual review, the Government, alluding to the delay in furnishing explanations regarding a large amount set down for irrigation and repairs in the Kistnah Division, remarked that, had the organization of the Department of which Colonel Faber is the head, received that attention from him which they had a right to expect, it would not have been necessary for them

them to interfere to procure from his Subordinates, replies to letters from the Chief Engineer of nearly one years standing. Colonel Faber alleges that the delay arose partly from a misapprehension of orders, which on the transition state of the Department could not altogether be prevented, but this can hardly be admitted as a valid excuse, as it is obvious that it could be brought forward to account for any extent of delay, and to any number of cases.

11. Adverting to para 43 of the command's Review,

review in which the Government pointed out the inconvenience caused by the Chief Engineer in submitting, at the last moment, the Estimate for three 137 extra rates for the months of November investigating and expenditure of 3977474 Rupees, Colonel Faber enumerates the orders which clearly in the order of March in the order of April 1856, of the 28th para 18, for the submission of estimates, and argues that those orders were literally complied with by him. On this it is to be observed that the Government

Government never intended, and could never have been understood by Colonel Faber to have intended, that the 107 estimates should be voted in the last month of the year, in which the Budget itself was to be closed. It is obvious that notwithstanding attention the Government could possibly bestow on so large a number of estimates, providing for works of importance and magnitude, granting even that they were considerations from all the other public business of the Country, would fall

fall far short of that attention which was necessary to enable them confidently to discriminate between such as were of great importance and of pressing necessity, and those which were of lesser consequence, and would admit of postponement for a time.

The Chief Engineer further stated at length the circumstances under which the large number of estimates were submitted in December. He stated that the inconvenience

inconveniences would arise from the Budget system, and not from any defect in existing arrangements, and in support of this statement he alleged that so long as the early months of the Official year were devoted to the carrying out of the executive operations provided for in the Budget, it would only in the months of August, September, and October, that the planning of operations for the prospective year can be executed. The Government cannot admit the validity of

the reasoning, because, as the Chief Engineer only claims the early months of the Official year, that is May, June, and July, for arranging executive operations, the business of preparing plans and Estimates for submission in the ensuing Official year, may obviously be undertaken by the local Officers in the other months of the year, viz from November to April; during which periods, all the statute for large

large projects having been got ready, it will not be difficult to complete the Reports so as to submit them from the commencement of the Official years. Besides this, as the District Engineers are not Executive Officers, much of their time must be available for work of this nature throughout the year, to a greater or less degree according to circumstances, and finally, although engaged early and late in each day in executive operations, the executive Officers have, no doubt time in the intervals to devote to the preparation of projects.

Oberst Faber

13. Please to state what proportion according to the number of Estimates comprised in the Budget lists of the last two years the average number of estimates for examinations in each month would be 1891 that if they were equally distributed over each of the six months according to the order

orders of Government, the average would be 80; and that if the punctuality required by Government were insisted on, it much greatly impede the progress of the execution operations of the Department. This argument is fallacious; because the figures given by the Chief Engineer, are not based upon correct calculations. He computes the average number of Estimates for examination in each month, from the aggregate number of number of works included in the Budget, and seems to forget that that document contains several Projects sanctioned in previous years, which are only brought forward, only because the works remain uncommenced, or are still in progress. Thus, for instance, the Budget Estimate No 142 for 1887/88 contains Estimates to the number of 482, as shown by the Chief Engineer; but many of them are those sanctioned in previous years, and the number of Estimates actually

actually sanctioned by Govt in 1856/57 for entry in the Budget of 1857/58, do not amount to more than 150, or less than one third of the number given by the Chief Engineer; and their number (viz 150) being distributed over six months, the result will be about 25 Estimates for each month instead of 80 as represented by Colonel Faber.

14. Lastly the Chief Engineer takes exception to the orders of Government of 8th October 1855, enjoining the submission of Estimates in monthly lists, and asserts that the inconveniences complained of, arises partly from this order. The Govt can see nothing in the order which is likely to create such inconvenience

See Rule II of Para 1.

inconvenience. It is already provided in the order which alluded to, that projects requiring early consideration may be separately submitted; and there would nothing therefore to prevent the Chief Engineer from submitting separately, such projects as required special attention, a proceeding which would have had the effect of reducing the number of Estimates to be included in the last Monthly

monthly list, or the 1st of the month preceding that in which the Budget was to be closed.

15. In concluding their notice of this part of the subject, the Government must observe that, much of the difficulty advanced by the Chief Engineer, would will have no existence if, as Head of the Public Works Department, he exercised a wise discretion, and made judicious arrangements in the disposal of Estimates coming before him. Whenever Estimates come up from the Provinces, the Chief Engineer ought, first to determine, with reference to the works remaining in each District for execution in the next Official year, what projects should be recommended and what may be properly postponed for another year; and by adopting this course, he will be able to submit to Government only such Estimates as are

are complete in every respect, and are likely to be executed in the next Official year. As however the Budget is to be closed in the Central Office in the latter part of November, and is to be submitted to Government in the early part of December, the Government are willing to allow the Chief Engineer the further facility of submitting the Estimates for the months of September in two lists, that is one about the 16th or 17th of the month, and the other on the 1st or 2nd of October. Further, from the Latter date, up to the 15th of November, Estimates may be sent to Government weekly as they are disposed of in the Central Office; but Estimates so submitted in the latter part of the year, should as far as possible be confined to those for important projects, which will not admit of postponement to another year.

Sd

By an arrangement of this kind the number of Estimates remaining before Govt for consideration in the month of November will be very few; and the Chief Engineer will himself have no difficulty in submitting his Budget in the early part of December. It is hoped that the Chief Engineer will avail himself of these facilities, and by careful attention to the instructions now given obviate much of the inconvenience experienced both by himself & the Govt.

Having thus noticed the several observations which the Chief Engineer has thought fit to submit in reference to the remarks recorded by Government in their review of the projects submitted for execution in 1857/58, the Right Honorable the Governor in Council now resolves to forward Colonel Fraser's letter to the Government of India in compliance with that Officer's request; and do at the same time to submit a copy of these proceedings for the information of that Government only further remarking that the will always be happy to pay regard to any explanations of circumstances, of which he may have taken an erroneous view; and, if convinced that the Government have been misled, will willingly recall any

Censure

censure which they may have unjustly bestowed; but on the present occasion he sees nothing which has been advanced by the Chief Engineer, to entitle him to a retractation of the sentiments recorded by the Court in the order to which Colonel Fraber replies.

As the C. Engr has thought himself unjustly censured, the Govr has been unwilling to refuse him the opportunity he seeks of defending his official proceedings, but Regiment remark that they consider that the time both of the Govr & of the C. Engr has been very needlessly occupied in again going over matters which were fully discussed & in

Letter of the late Board

Copies to the Chief Engr. with Encls. Dispy.

6 — Clerk of Council

Public Works 1857 Deptt.
D.to Cons: 30th June.

No: 1258.

Extract Mins: of Cons:
D.d 27th June 1857.

From Chief Engr 15 July 1857. C.d No: 1648
& Cons: 11th Aug.
In compliance with the Orders of Govt. contained in G.M.C. within mentioned regarding certain works noticed by Col. Baker—

From Secy 17th Aug. 1857. C.d No: 1666.
Cons: 20th October

Passing orders on a letter from the Chief Engr submitting explanations on the points noticed in the Order of the 12th March reviewing the Budget of 1857-58, and expressing his hope that the Govt will remove the public censure recorded against him, and that his explanations will be submitted to the Govt of India.

No 55 & 56.

From the Chief Engr 0/1 Aug. 1857 No. 1541
in Cons 11 August.

13th June No 16th