651

M.R.O. 1—77,005—3-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 26

(2) Date of repair 21-4-38

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT. [illegible] 23/3/57

G.O. No. 651 Press Mis.

Dated 13 — 3 — 1857.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Fort Saint George, Public Works Consultation of 22nd March 1859.

No. 90. Read the following letter from Colonel C. E. FABER, Chief Engineer; to J. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Secretary to Government, dated 21st February 1859, No. 8086.

SIR,

With reference to Extract Minutes of Consultation, under date the 22nd December 1858, No. 2773, I have the honor to forward the accompanying copy of a letter from the Collector of Canara, No. 4 of the 28th Ultimo, affording the full explanation called for from him in regard to the alleged unsatisfactory character of the work performed by his Department in the construction of certain Bridges on the Sircy and Siddapoor Road, under an Estimate of Rupees 9,960-3-9, sanctioned on the 8th October 1853.

1 Copy of letter from the Collector of Canara, No. 4, dated 28th January 1859.

2. Premising that, as of the total expenditure of Rupees 10,080-0-5, Rupees 6,046-6-4 only were laid out by his Department, the remaining Rupees 3,933-10-1, must have been spent subsequently under direct professional supervision, and comparing the present strength of the Engineer Department with that formerly at his disposal, the Collector shews, that not from any remissness on the part of his Department inferior materials were supplied, or bad workmanship allowed, and that whatever has proved defective or unsatisfactory in the construction of the Bridges has resulted from carelessness, in the first instance, in taking the Sections of the Nullahs to be passed, having led to designs for the requisite Bridges being prepared of so incorrect and unsuitable a description, that it had been found necessary, in some cases, to alter them during the progress of the work, so far as even to pull down abutments intended for timber platforms, and to substitute others capable of sustaining masonry arches, at a great waste of labor and money.

3. Taking the Bridges in the order the District Engineer has reported on them, in his letter of the 19th October 1858, No. 141, the Collector describes the causes of failure or unsatisfactory progress in each case, and I think shows good grounds for assigning any blame that may be attachable for the faulty execution of the works in question, as much to the Engineer as to the Revenue Department, the former having it is certain planned, and afterwards undertaken the completion of the Bridges on most defective information, and without authentic data as to the possibliity of obtaining sufficiently skilled labor, or ascertaining its cost.

4. As with the present better organized and enlarged Department and the knowledge of the country it has acquired, this cannot occur again, and I have every reason to believe that the Estimates lately submitted for the thorough completion of all the Bridges, at a further cost of, Rupees (6,000,) six thousand, are sufficient for the purpose, I beg again to recommend that they may be sanctioned for immediate execution, as they are too late for the Budget of 1859-60 and it is of importance to place the line of communication between Sircy and Siddapore in order without loss of time.

Letter from WILLIAM FISHER, Esq., Collector of Canara; to Colonel C. E. FABER, Chief Engineer, dated Mangalore, 28th January 1859, No. 4.

SIR,

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of Extract Minutes Consultation under date the 22nd December 1858, No. 2773, in which the Government demand from me a full explanation in regard to the alleged unsatisfactory character of the work performed by my department in constructing certain Bridges on the Sircy and Siddapoor Road in this District.

2. I beg also to acknowledge copies of the Reports made on this subject by the District Engineer and Chief Engineer, which accompanied the above Extract.

3. The explanations which it is in my power to offer regarding the alleged unsatisfactory character of the work performed by the Revenue Department, are drawn from the correspondence which has passed between Revenue Officers and the Engineer Department, on the subject of these Bridges.

4. In para. 2 of your Report to Government (No. 5536,) dated 18th November 1858, you observe that whilst the Estimate for these Bridges amounted to Rupees 9,960-3-9, the Collectors Department had expended Rupees 10,080-0-5 in so unsatisfactory a manner, both as regards *material and workmanship, that whilst some of them were completed at a cost much in excess* of their Estimates, others were left unfinished. It is certainly also stated that the Estimates are said to have been insufficient and uselessly prepared, but the main point on which explanation is called for, is the expenditure of Rupees 10,080-0-5, in an unsatisfactory manner.

5. I must here observe that the sum expended by the Revenue Department on these Bridges was Rupees 6,046-6-4 (as per Bill, dated 10th June 1856 and passed by the Chief Engineer on the 17th April 1857) and that the balance Rupees 3,933-10-1, must have been laid out by the Public Works Department, after the Siddapoor Bridges were made over to the District Engineer.

Vide expenditure shown in Civil Engineer's Diary for December 1855.

6. In order to afford explanation regarding Rupees 6,046-6-4, actually expended by the Revenue Department, I shall take the various works seriatim as mentioned in Lieutenant Hunter's Report to your address (No. 141), dated 19th October 1858, and compare the Statements and opinions there expressed with those of Officers who inspected these Bridges at earlier dates; and I hope to be able to show that the expenditure above the Estimate on particular Bridges is not attributable so much to badness of workmanship and material, as to the original faultiness of the Plans and Estimates, and the changes which these and want, both of suitable timber and skilled workmen, subsequently rendered necessary.

7. It must be observed that in place of the enormous Establishments now employed, the Revenue Officers who were charged with carrying out the designs of the Civil Engineer in this instance, had one Maistry to superintend the building of eight Bridges, and the Sudr Ameen's Court at Sircy.

8. The Plans furnished were, in most instances, already acted on, when the Civil Engineer during the hurried tour in March 1855, discovered that the Sections of the Nullahs taken by a Subordinate, were, in most instances, grossly incorrect, and that the Plans were of course often unsuited to the sites. Hence, abutments for some wooden Bridges (as per plan) were pulled down, and arches substituted for them, much labor being thus wasted, on rather paid for, two or three times over. To return however to the point under immediate inquiry, I proceed to allude to each Bridge, in the order observed in the District Engineer's Report above alluded to.

9. *Kansoor Bridge* (*No.* 1) Lieutenant Hunter attributes an expenditure of Rupees 373-13-7 above the Estimate to " *bad workmanship* of the original work *or Estimate*, wherein no foundations " were allowed." The manner in which the District Engineer accounts for the excess by the faultiness of the Plan and Estimate, is correct, but the charge of bad Workmanship still remains undisposed of. All that is said in support of it is, that " the parapet and Wing-walls were destroyed in the Monsoon of 1856, and that as several cracks have since appeared in the arch, its " place is to be supplied by a Timber Bridge."

10. Plan of the Bridge here alluded to, appears to have been furnished by the Civil Engineer in December 1855, to Lieutenant Hankin, who was then in charge of Circuit No. 2, and under whose superintendence the work appears to have commenced; and it is therefore difficult to discover in what way the Collector's Department is to blame for bad workmanship in this Bridge, and the necessity for a new one at a cost of Rupees 1,216.

Vide Civil Engineer's General Obs. for December 1855.

11. *Piaghy Bridge* (*No.* 2.) The charge against the Revenue Department here, seems to be, that certain foundations built of laterite in mud, as planned and estimated for, by the Civil Engineer are now discovered to be insufficient, though sunk to twice the depth allowed in the Plan, and are therefore replaced by others in stone and chunam.

12. No blame can attach to the Collector's Department here, I think. The Bridge was inspected in December 1855, and if Captain Walker's previous Diaries are referred to, it will be found that his complaints of bad workmanship on this line, had reference to Timber, not to stonework. Goa Bricklayers were procurable, but Carpenters were not.

13. *Coodahully Bridge* (*No.* 3.) Lieutenant Hunter states, "that Rupees 1443-3-6, were un-" satisfactorily spent in constructing abutments and Wing-walls, and collecting a small quantity " of Timber at the spot."

14. The Wing-walls have, it appears, fallen and the Timber is said to be of little use, Captain Walker in his general remarks for March 1855 observes of this Bridge : " In the same state as " the Tiaghy Bridge, i. e., Masonry completed, wood-work untouched." In his general observations for December following I find : " Planned for three spans of 30 feet each, but reducible to one " span of that dimension, arrangements for which I laid out in person."

15. It may appear doubtful, whether extra expenditure was incurred in consequence of the unsatisfactory nature of the work originally performed, or, whether the money was wasted, in consequence of the original plans being faulty, or the bad workmanship appertaining to the second structure, as proved by the fall of the Wing-walls in the Monsoon of 1857.

16. The quotations made from Captain Walker's general observations are however sufficiently clear, and will go far to prove, that as the line was made over to the Engineer's Department in December 1855, it is responsible for the workmanship complained of, and not the Collector's Department, which is made to bear the blame.

17. *Heerasy Bridge* (*No.* 4,) No explanation is required here.

18. *Mavincoppah Bridge* (*No.* 5,) Nothing is said here which calls for reply.

19. *Tavilcullah Bridge* (*No.* 7,) The abutments and Wing-walls of this Bridge built by the Revenue authorities, are said by District Engineer, to have been removed by order of Captain Walker after Rupees 348-2-7, had been expended on them; an Arch of 12 feet span being subsequently substituted for them by the Department Public Works at the cost of Rupees 602-10-6, cause of the removal of these abutments is not stated, but may be gathered from the District Engineer's remark, on the undermentioned Bridge.

20. *Bunjenny Bridge* (*No.* 6.) This Bridge is said by Lieutenant Hunter to have been of similar plan to that at Tavilcullah and he adds that the abutments and Wing-walls built by the Revenue authorities at a cost of Rupees 319-15-7, being *"like the rest," without foundations*, had to be removed at a cost of Rupees 26.

21. This assertion is evidently intended to be equally applicable to Tavilcullah Bridge and to that at Bunjenny, but want of foundations was not the cause of the removal of the abutments at either place.

22. Captain Walker in his general observations already quoted, remarks with reference to Bunjenny Bridge " Planned for a single span of 30 feet, and the abutments built. These will " be pulled down, and with their materials a semicircular arch of 12 feet span, on abutments " 1 foot high constructed." With reference to the Tavilcullah Bridge, he says, " same as the last," (Bunjenny) " and worked to an equal extent to be reconstructed as above, but without abutments," nothing whatever is said of bad workmanship and the changes found requisite in both cases, sufficiently account for the removal of the original abutments.

23. *Cubbinhullah Bridge* (No. 8) requires no remark nor does that at Bullah Hullah.

24. I think, I have now shown from references to Records, which are in the Central Office, that blame has been, however unintentionally, unfairly laid at the door of the Revenue authorities.

25. The necessity for further expenditure in order to complete these Bridges, arises from circumstances unconnected with bad workmanship, or bad materials in the abutments, &c., erected by the Collector's Department. The Sections of the Nullahs on this line were taken (if my memory does not deceive me) by an incompetent, or wilfully careless Surveyor. The Civil Engineer, who had important works going on in Bellary, and could not himself test the Sections laid before him, was misled, and consequently Plans of Bridges either unsuitable, or unnecessarily large were sent in with Estimates, which under-rated the value of labor in the Balaghaut, and were framed with the idea, that both stone and timber were procurable at the Bridge sites. Not only did this prove not to be the case, but it was found impossible to obtain Carpenters sufficiently skilled, to undertake the execution of the required Timber Work.

26. Bricklayers were procurable, and all things considered, the Civil Engineer on being able to vist the line of Road, determined to substitute masonry arches, in many instances, for Timber Spans, availing himself occasionally of better sites than those selected by his Subordinate.

27. The original Estimates were also otherwise deficient, no allowances being made for sufficient foundations, or for baling water from, and turning, streams which were perennial.

28. I regret that statements of a nature to induce Government to withhold the sanction applied for, pending receipt of this explanation, should have been so hastily made, as much valuable time has been lost in consequence, and the Monsoon will probably be upon us before anything can be done to complete this line.

29. In my anxiety to forward this report without delay, I may not have put my case in the best possible light, but, I trust, that I have satisfactorily shown that the Revenue authorities were not to blame in the manner represented.

No. 91. ORDER THEREON No. 651; dated 19th March 1859.

The Chief Engineer sends up a letter from the Collector of Canara, furnishing explanation as to alleged unsatisfactory performance of work by his Department in the construction of certain Bridges on the Sircy and Siddapoor Road. This explanation was called for on an Estimate of 6,000 Rupees having been submitted for sanction by the Chief Engineer, in excess of the original sum of 9,960-3-9 sanctioned by Government in 1853, the reason assigned for this further demand being the inefficient manner in which the work was performed under the supervision of the Collector's Department.

2. The Collector states in the first place that the sum expended by his Department was not Rupees 10,080 as stated by the Chief Engineer, but only Rupees 6,046-6-4; the difference having been he supposes laid out by the Department Public Works. He then proceeds, after some general remarks, to furnish explanation with respect to cost of the four Bridges.

3. In the case of the Kansoor Bridge the excess complained of (373 Rupees) was attributed by the Acting District Engineer to the faulty nature of the Estimate and bad workmanship; Mr. Fisher points out that the Estimate was made by the Engineer Department, and the work wholly executed by the same Department.

4. With regard to the Piaghy Bridge, it appears that *the* foundations built of laterite and mud according to the Plan and Estimate of the Engineer Department proved insufficient, and were therefore replaced by others of stone and chunam. Coodahully Bridge.—This work seems to have been in great part built by the Engineer Department who took charge of it in December 1855. The Wing walls fell in 1857, but it is not clear what was the cause of the disaster. It seems however that these Wing walls were built by the Engineer Department.

5. It is unnecessary to go through the remainder of the Collector's remarks. It appears on the whole, as the Chief Engineer fully admits, that the losses and mistakes were due to the Plans and Estimates having been made by the Engineer Department on incorrect sections of the streams.

6. With these remarks the Governor in Council sanctions the Supplemental Estimate of 6,000 Rupees submitted with the Officiating Chief Engineer's letter of the 18th November 1858, No. 5536.

(Signed) J. D. BOURDILLON,
Secretary to Government.

---

2 in Circle

Collectors Cutchery
Mangalore 28th January 1859.

No. 4

From
William Fisher Esqre.
Collector of Canara

To
The Chief Engineer
In the Depart. Pub: Works.
Fort Saint George

Sir

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of Extract Minutes Consultation under date the 22nd December 1858 No. 2773, in which the Government demand from me a full explanation in regard to the alleged unsatisfactory character of the work performed by my department in constructing certain Bridges on the Sircy and Sidapoor road in this District.

2 I beg also to acknowledge copies of the reports made on this subject by the District Engineer and Chief Engineer, which accompanying the above Extract.

3 The explanations which it is in my power to offer regarding the alleged unsatisfactory character of the work performed by the Revenue Department; are drawn from the correspondence which has passed between Revenue Officers and the Engineer Department on the subject of these Bridges.

4 In para 2 of your Report to Government

(No. 5536) dated 18th November 1858 you observe that whilst the Estimate for these bridges amounted to Rupees 9960-3-9, the Collectors Department had expended Rupees 10080-„-5 in so unsatisfactory a manner both as regards material and workmanship that whilst some of them were completed at a cost much in exceſs of their Estimates others were left unfinished. It is certainly also stated that the Estimates are said to have been insufficient and useleſsly prepared, but the main point on which explanation is called for, is the expenditure of Rupees 10080-„-5 in an unsatisfactory manner.

5 I must here observe that the sum expended by the Revenue Department on these Bridges was Rupees 6026-6-4 (as per Bill dated 10th June 1856 and paſsed by the Chief Engineer on the 17th April 1857) and that the balance Rupees 3933-10-1 must have been laid out by the Public Works Departt. after the Sidapoor bridges were made over to District Engineer..

Vide Expenditure shown in Civil Engr. Diary for Decr./55.

6 In order to afford explanation regarding Rupees 6026-6-4 actually expended by the Revenue Department, I shall take the various works seriatim as mentioned in Lieutenant Hunters report to your addreſs (No. 141) dated 19th October 1858, and compare the Statements and opinions there expreſsed with those of Officers who inspected these bridges at earlier dates, and I hope to be able to shew that the expenditure above the Estimate on particular bridges is not attributable so much to badneſs of workmanship and material, as to the original faultineſs of the plans and Estimates, and the changes which these, and want, both of suitable timber and skilled workmen, subsequently rendered neceſsary..

7 It must be observed that in place of the enormous Establishments now employed, the Revenue Officers who were charged with carrying out the designs of the Civil Engineer in this instance, had one Maistry to superintend the building of eight bridges, and the Sudr Ameen's Court at Sirsy..

8 The plans furnished were, in most instances, already acted on, when the Civil Engineer during the hurried tour in March 1855, discovered that the sections of the Nullahs taken by a subordinate, were, in most instances, groſsly incorrect; and that the plans were of course often unsuited to the sites. Hence, abutments for some wooden bridges (as per plan) were pulled down, and arches substituted for them. much labor being thus wasted, or rather paid for, two or three times over.. To return however to the point under immediate inquiry, I proceed to allude to each bridge in the order observed in the District Engineers report above alluded to..

9 Kansoor Bridge (No. 1) Lieutenant Hunter attributes an expenditure of Rupees 373-13-7 above the Estimate to "bad workmanship of the original work or Estimate, wherein no foundations

"were allowed". The manner in which the District Engineer accounts for the excess by the faultness of the plan and Estimate, is correct; but the charge of bad workmanship still remains undisposed of. All that is said in support of it is, that "the parapet "and wing walls were destroyed in the Monsoon of 1856, "and that as several cracks have since appeared "in the arch, its place is to be supplied by a timber "bridge.-

10 Plan of the bridge here alluded to, appears to have been furnished by the Civil Engineer in December 1855, to Lieutenant Hankin, who was then in charge of circuit No. 2, and under whose superintendence the work appears to have commenced; and it is therefore difficult to discover in what way the Collectors department is to blame for bad workmanship in this bridge, and the necessity for a new one at a cost of Rupees 1216.-

Vide Civil Engineers Genl. Ds: for Decr./55

11 Triaghy Bridge (No. 2). The charge against the Revenue Depart.t here, seems to be, that certain foundations built of laterite in mud, as planned and Estimated for, by the Civil Engineer are now discovered to be insufficient, though sunk to twice the depth allowed in the plan, and are therefore replaced by others in stone and chunam.-

12 No blame can attach to the Collectors Department here, I think.- The bridge was inspected in December 1855, and if Captain Walkers previous

Diaries

Diaries are referred to, it will be found that his complaints of bad workmanship on this line, had reference to timber, not to stone work. Goa bricklayers were procurable, but carpenters were not.-

13 Coodahully Bridge (No. 3). Lieutenant Hunter states, "that Rupees 1443-3-6 were unsatisfactorily spent in constructing abutments and "wing walls, and collecting a small quantity of timber "at the spot".-

14 The wing walls have, it appears, fallen and the timber is said to be of little use. Captain Walker in his General Remarks for March 1855 observes of this bridge:- "In the same state as the "Triagly Bridge, i.e. Masonry completed, woodwork "untouched." In his General observations for December following I find:- "Planned for three spans of 30 feet "each, but reducible to one span of that dimension, "arrangements for which I laid out in person".-

15 It may appear doubtful whether extra expenditure was incurred in consequence of the unsatisfactory nature of the work originally performed, or, whether the money was wasted, in consequence of the original plans being faulty, or the bad workmanship appertaining to the second structure, as proved by the fall of the Wing walls in the Monsoon of 1857.-

16 The quotations made from Captain Walke General Observations are however sufficiently clear

and will go far to prove, that as the line was made over to the Engineers Department in December 1855, it is responsible for the workmanship complained of and not the Collectors Department, which is made to bear the blame.-

17 Heerasy Bridge (No. 4) No explanation is required here.-

18 Mavincoppah Bridge (No. 5) Nothing is said here which calls for reply.-

19 Tavilcullah Bridge (No. 7) The abutments and wing walls of this bridge built by the Revenue authorities, are said by District Engineer to have been removed by order of Captain Walker after Rupees 348-2-7 had been expended on them, an arch of 12 feet span being subsequently submitted for them by the D.P.W. at the cost of Rupees 602-10-6. cause of the removal of these abutments is not stated but may be gathered from the District Engineers remark on the undermentioned bridge.-

20 Bunjenny Bridge (No. 6) This Bridge is said by Lieutenant Hunter to have been of similar plan to that at Tavilcullah and he adds that the abutments and wing walls built by the Revenue authorities at a cost of Rupees 319-15-7 being "like the rest without foundations, had to be removed at a cost of Rupees 26.-

21 This aſsertion is evidently intended to be equally applicable to Tavilcullah bridge, and to

to that at Bungenny, but want of foundations was not the cause of the removal of the abutments at either place.-

22 Captain Walker in his General observations already quoted, remarks with reference to Bunjenny Bridge "Planned for a single span of 30 feet; and "the abutments built. These will be pulled down, "and with their materials a semicircular arch "of 12 feet span, on abutments 1 foot high constructed". With reference to the Tavilcullah Bridge, he says:- "Same as the last" (Benjenny)" and worked to an "equal extent. to be reconstructed as above. but without abutments" Nothing whatever is said of bad workmanship and the changes found requisite in both cases, sufficiently account for the removal of the original abutments.-

23 Cubbinhullah Bridge (No. 8). Requires no remark nor does that at Bullah Hullah.-

24 I think, I have now shown from references to records, which are in the Central Office, that blame has been (however unintentionally unfairly laid at the door of the Revenue authorities.

25 The neceſsity for further expenditure in order to complete these bridges, arises from circumstances unconnected with bad workmanship, or bad material in the abutments &c. erected by the Collectors Department. The sections of the Nullahs on this line were taken (if my memory does not deceive me) by

1859 Depart.

No

Enclosure in a Letter

From The Chief Engineer

To The Secretary to Govt.

P.W.D.

Dated 21st } February 1859
Recd

M/a 27/59 No 8086

Copy of a Letter from the Collector of Canara submitting his explanation in regard to the alleged unsatisfactory character of the work performed by his Department in the construction of certain Bridges on the Sircy and Siddapore road in Canara called for in Ext. M. C. dated 22nd December 1858 No 2773.

No 8086

Central Office of P. Works,
Fort St. George 21st February, 1859.

From
The Chief Engineer
To
The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department

Public

Sir,

With reference to Extract Minutes of Consultation under date the 22d December 1858 No 2773, I have the honor to forward the accompanying copy of a letter from the Collector of Canara No 4 of the 28th Ultimo, affording the full explanation called for from him in regard to the alleged unsatisfactory character of the work performed by his Department in the construction of certain bridges on the Sircy and Siddapore Road, under an Estimate of Rupees 9,960-3-9 sanctioned on the 8th October 1853.

Inclosure 1.
Copy of letter from the Collector of Canara No 4 dated 8th January 1859.

2 Premising that, as of the total expenditure of Rupees 10,080-..-5 Rupees 6046-6-4 only were laid out by his Department, the remaining Rupees 3933-10-1 must have been spent subsequently under direct professional supervision, and comparing the present strength of the Engineer Department with that formerly at his disposal, the Collector shews, that not from any remissness on the part of his Department inferior materials

were supplied, or bad workmanship allowed, and that whatever has proved defective or unsatisfactory in the construction of the bridges has resulted from carelessness, in the first instance, in taking the Sections of the Nullahs to be passed having led to designs for the requisite bridges being prepared of so incorrect and unsuitable a description that it had been found necessary, in some cases, to alter them during the progress of the work, so far as even to pull down abutments intended for timber platforms and to substitute others capable of sustaining masonry Arches, at a great waste of labor and money.

3 Taking the bridges in the order the District Engineer has reported on them in his letter of the 19th October 1858 No. 141, the Collector describes the causes of failure or unsatisfactory progress in each case, and I think shows good grounds for assigning any blame that may be attachable for the faulty execution of the works, in question, as much to the Engineer as to the Revenue Department, the former having diss certain planned, and afterwards undertaken the completion of the bridges on most defective information, and without authentic data as to the possibility of obtaining sufficiently skilled labor, or ascertaining its cost.

4 As with the present ~~better~~ organized and enlarged Department and the knowledge of the country it has acquired, this cannot occur again, and I have every reason to believe that the Estimates lately submitted for the thorough completion of all the bridges, at a further cost of Rupees 6,000, six thousand, are sufficient for the purpose, I beg again to recommend that they may be sanctioned for immediate execution as they are too late for the Budget of 1859/60, and it is of importance to place the line of communication between Sircy and Siddapore in order without loss of time.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your Most Obedient Servant
Ths Pears Colonel
Chief Engineer.

Central Office of P. Works
Fort St. George
21st February 1859

To
The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department.

A.6

WOK

[illegible] 1859

Dated 22nd March

No. 127

From The Chief Engineer

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

Dated 21st February 1859

Received 22nd

Encl. 1

No. 8086

Forwards letter No. 4 of 28th January 1859 from the Collector of Canara offering the explanation called for in Extract Minutes Consultation of the 28th December 1858 No. 2773 and again recommends for sanction the Estimate of Rupees 6000 for completing the Bridges on the Sircy and Siddapoor Road.

Cons. 651. 19th March 1859

No. 90.

[illegible] 15th

19/5 9/3

146/5

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.
Public.

No. 651.

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation under date the 19th March 1859.

Read the following letter from the Chief Engineer.

Forwards letter No. 4 of 28th January 1859, from the Collector of Canara, offering the explanation called for in Extract Minutes Consultation of the 28th December 1858, No. 2773, and again recommends for sanction the Estimate of Rupees 6,000, for completing the Bridges on the Sircy and Siddapoor Road. } (Here enter 21st February 1859, No. 8086.)

The Chief Engineer sends up a letter from the Collector of Canara, furnishing explanation as to alleged unsatisfactory performance of work by his Department in the construction of certain Bridges on the Sircy and Siddapoor Road. This explanation was called for on an Estimate of 6,000 Rupees having been submitted for sanction by the Chief Engineer, in excess of the original sum of 9,960-3-9 sanctioned by Government in 1853, the reason assigned for this further demand being the inefficient manner in which the work was performed under the supervision of the Collector's Department.

2. The Collector states in the first place that the sum expended by his Department was not Rupees 10,080 as stated by the Chief Engineer, but only Rupees 6,046-6-4; the difference having been he supposes laid out by the Department Public Works. He then proceeds, after some general remarks, to furnish explanation with respect to cost of the four Bridges.

3. In the case of the Kansoor Bridge the excess complained of (373 Rupees) was attributed by the Acting District Engineer to the faulty nature of the estimate and bad workmanship; Mr. Fisher points out that the Estimate was made by the Engineer Department, and the work wholly executed by the same Department.

4. With regard to the Piaghy Bridge, it appears that *the* foundations built of laterite and mud according to the Plan and Estimate of the Engineer Department proved insufficient, and were therefore replaced by others of stone and chunam. Coodahully Bridge.—This work seems to have been in great part built by the Engineer Department who took charge of it in December 1855. The Wing walls fell in 1857, but it is not clear what was the cause of the disaster. It seems however that these Wing walls were built by the Engineer Department.

5. It is unnecessary to go through the remainder of the Collector's remarks. It appears on the whole, as the Chief Engineer fully admits, that the losses and mistakes were due to the Plans and Estimates having been made by the Engineer Department on incorrect sections of the streams.

6. With these remarks the Governor in Council sanctions the Supplemental Estimate of 6,000 Rupees submitted with the Officiating Chief Engineer's letter of the 18th November 1858, No. 5536.

(A true Extract.)

~~Actg.~~ *Secretary to Government.*

To the Chief Engineer.

Exd. Wm. Thomas.

PWD

No 651 - 23

Extract from the Minutes of Consultation
Under date the 19th March 1859

Read the following letter
from the Chief Engineer

(Here enter 21st Feby /59 - No 8086)

The Chief Engineer sends up a letter from the Collector of Canara, furnishing explanation as to alleged unsatisfactory performance of work by his Department in the construction of certain bridges on the Sawsy and Siddapoor road - This explanation was called for on an estimate of 6000 Rupees having been submitted for sanction by the Chief Engineer in excess of the original sum of 9960-3-9 sanctioned by Government in 1853, the reason assigned for this further demand being the inefficient manner in which the work was performed under the supervision of the Collectors Department.

2. The Collector states in the first place that the sum expended by his Department was not Rs 10,080 as stated by the Chief Engineer, but only Rupees 6,046. 6-4; the difference having been he supposes laid out by the Department Public Works. He then proceeds, after some general remarks, to furnish explanation with respect to cost of the four bridges.

3 In the case of the Kansoor bridge the excess complained of (373 Rupees) was attributed by the Acting District Engineer to the faulty nature of the estimate and bad workmanship, Mr. Fisher points out that the Estimate was made by the Engineer Department and the work wholly executed by the same Department.

4 With regard to the Peughy Bridge, it appears that the foundations built of laterite and mud according to the plan and estimate of the Engineer Department proved insufficient, and were therefore replaced by others of stone and chunam. Coodahilly Bridge. This work seems to have been in great part built by the Engineer Department who took charge of it in December 1855. The wing walls fell in 1857, but it is not clear what was the cause of the disaster. It seems however that these wing walls were built by the Engineer Department.

5. It is unnecessary to go through the remainder

of the Collector's remarks. It appears on the whole, as the Chief Engineer fully admits, that the losses and mistakes were due to the Plans and Estimates having been made by the Engineer Department on incorrect sections of the streams.

6 With these remarks the Governor in Council sanctions the supplemental Estimate of 6000 Rupees submitted with the Officiating Chief Engineer's letter of the 18th November 1858 No. 5536.

10 Copies to the Chief Engr. Decr. 21st

Public Works 1859 Deptt
Dt to Cons 22d March

No 657.

Extract Mins of Cons.
Dd 19th March /59.

With certain remarks sanctioning the supple-
-mental Estimate of
Rupees 6000 for completing
the Bridges on the Sircy
and Siddapoor Road.

No 90 + 91.

C11th March R15th