

(1) Number of pages 18(2) Date of repair 7-1-39(3) Initials of the Referencer gj

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.*Despatches to England*

Dep't G.O. No.	3	Press Mis.
Dated	23-3-	1859.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

1c

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PUBLIC.

No. 3 of 1859.

TO

THE RIGHT HONORABLE LORD STANLEY,
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

MY LORD,

Public Works, 20th October 1857, Nos. 1, 2, 3.	
Do. 12th January 1858, " 15 16.	
Do. 30th March " " 72 at 75.	
Public Works Consultation, 28th Sept. 1858, Nos 49 to 51.	
Do do 23rd Nov. " " 64 65.	
Do do 21st Decr. " " 43 44.	
Do do 18th Jany 1859 " 22 23.	
Do do 18th do " " 35 37.	
Do do 25th do " " 50 at 54.	
Do do 15th Feby. " " 37 at 39.	
Rev. do 15th March " " 16 17.	
Public Works do 22nd " " 14-15 16?	

Para. 1. With reference to our Dispatch of the 3rd November 1857 No. 18 we have the honor to submit for your Lordship's information, in the order in which it is recorded in our Consultations, the further correspondence that has passed with the Government of India regarding the Navigation of the Godavary River.

2. In a Dispatch dated 29th June 1858, No. 8, the late Court of Directors after a review of Lieutenant Haig's scheme for opening the Navigation of this River during the Monsoon months, for a distance of 500 miles from the Sea at a cost of 29½ lacs of Rupees, admitted the feasibility of the project, and the advantages to be derived from it. But they intimated that none of the important works comprized in that scheme should be commenced until Lieutenant Haig had returned to India and re-considered his plans. Looking however to the number of years that would necessarily elapse before the whole of the works referred to could be completed, the Court adverted to the suggestion of Lieutenant Haig for opening the River for immediate use by means of temporary works of a slighter description which could be executed at a small cost in a single season, and referring to the application that we had already made for this purpose to the Government of India, they expressed the hope that it would speedily be found possible to comply with that application.

3. Our Proceedings on this Dispatch will be found entered at length in our Consultation of the 24th September 1858 No. 1967, to which we need not advert further than as regards the temporary works recommended by Lieutenant Haig. It will be seen that in reference to the opinions expressed by the Court of Directors, we resolved to address the Government of India, and in a letter dated 24th September 1858 we accordingly solicited that Government to re-consider their previous decision and accord sanction to the expenditure of Rupees 22,187, the sum estimated for those temporary works.

4. In their reply dated the 10th December the Government of India reiterated their refusal on financial grounds to sanction the outlay applied for. But we had then received your Lordship's letter No. 6 of 30th November 1858, communicating Lieutenant Haig's recommendations for the immediate construction of these very works, and we were of opinion that if the facts so forcibly set forth by Lieutenant Haig, and others of a more positive character brought to our notice in letters addressed to us by Colonel Cotton the Commandant of Engineers and by Colonel Balfour the Inspector General of Ordnance, were presented to the Government of India, they would not persist in this refusal but would sanction the outlay as a simple matter of economy independently of other considerations. We therefore resolved once more to bring the matter to the notice of the Supreme Government.

5. Accordingly on the 20th January 1859 we forwarded your Lordship's letter with its enclosure from Lieutenant Haig, as well as the letters from the Commandant of Engineers and Inspector General of Ordnance referred to above, to the Government of India. We adverted to the considerations set forth in paras. 5 to 7 of Lieutenant Haig's letter, as to the cheapness and rapidity with which both Military Stores and Troops might be conveyed by the Godavery, and earnestly pressed on the Government of India his view that "after the fearful lessons we have had during the last year, to neglect or even delay for a single year to take advantage of the Godavery as a Military high-way appears little short of infatuation" and this more particularly when it seemed clear that by an utterly trifling outlay, and in a very few months, this advantage might be secured over a distance of 300 miles. Lieutenant Haig, we remarked, stated considerations to shew the enormous saving of actual outlay, in the conveyance of Military Stores, to say nothing of increased speed and security, which would be effected by the very trifling expenditure of £3,000, but on this head, we said, we preferred to appeal to the letters of Colonels Cotton and Balfour, who had gone more fully into the subject and had brought forward more positive facts. Colonel Balfour shewed that 1,200 tons of Military Stores were sent last year from Masulipatam to Secunderabad and Nagpore, at a cost of nearly 88,000 Rupees; whereas, with the facilities which would be secured by the execution of the proposed works in the Godavery River, a saving would have been effected of no less than Rupees 54,806-4, without computing the expense of escorts. Considering the larger European Military Force to be maintained hereafter in Central India, in comparison with that heretofore usual, it seemed, we said, unlikely that the quantity of material hereafter to be sent inland from Masulipatam would be much less than in 1857. But even supposing that it amounted to no more than two-thirds of that, there would, we observed, still be a saving *each year* of considerably more* than the whole cost† of the Locks and their Subsidiary works now proposed.

* Rupees 36,000
† Rupees 30,000.

6. We were unwilling to load our Dispatch to the Government of India with heavy extracts from the Enclosures or Abstracts of them, but we earnestly commended the whole of the two papers of Colonels Cotton and Balfour to the consideration of the Governor General in Council. In view of the facts there stated, we pointed out that the allegation of financial difficulties as an impediment to the proposed works was wholly an error. The question was not at all whether the money should be spent, for it was spent already every year. The real question, we stated, was whether it should be spent once for all, and in such a mode as to secure great and permanent good; or, whether the same outlay should be repeated year after year, with no other effect than that of continuing the present very defective and inconvenient modes of conveyance.

7. We therefore expressed our hope that under the facts and considerations laid before them, the Government of India would not persist in their refusal of the small sum asked for, but would accord the whole amount proposed by Lieutenant Haig, both for the River improvements and the Steam-boats, viz. 60,000 Rupees. We remarked that the great importance attached to this matter by this Government was attested by the fact of our thus again and again urging it on the higher authorities in spite of the mortification of repeated refusals, and that no words could prove it more strongly; but that looking to the smallness of the amount required, and to the magnitude of the results to be reasonably expected, to the Public as well as directly to the Government, we were of opinion that no more profitable or beneficial expenditure could be proposed than that recommended by us.

8. Notwithstanding the earnestness of this application, we have just been informed by a Telegraph Message that the Government of India cannot sanction the small charge recommended with reference to the existing financial position of the Government.

9. After having so fully and so clearly shown the Government of India that there would in reality be no expenditure on account of the work which we proposed, because the outlay would be immediately recovered in the saving in the transport of Government Stores, we confess that we were not prepared for such a result; and in now reporting the correspondence, we can only express our deep regret at the decision of the Government of India.

10. Referring to the desire expressed by the late Court of Directors in para. 11 of their Dispatch of the 29th June 1858 that the initiative should be taken by the Government for the encouragement of the trade on the River, we have the honor to bring to your Lordship's notice that under date the 23rd November last we granted authority to a proposal of the District Engineer to transport 100 tons of Salt by the Godavery to Budrachellum as an experimental measure.

We have the honor to be,

Fort Saint George,
23rd March 1859.

MY LORD,

Your Lordships most obedient
humble Servants,

Exd. Wm. Thomas.

No 3 of 1859

To

The Right Honorable Lord Stanley

Secretary of State for India

My Lord,

With reference to our Dis-
patch of the 3rd November 1857
No 18. we have the honor to

submit for your Lordship's
information, in the order in
which it is recorded in our
Consultations ^{Further} the Correspondence

that has passed with
the Government of India
regarding the Navigation of
the Godavary river.

In a despatch dated
29th June 1858, No 8, the late
Court of Directors after a
review of Lieutenant Gaige's
Scheme for opening the Navi-
gation of this river during
the Monsoon months for a
distance of 500 Miles from the

Sea

20th October 1857 - u 1-2-3
12th January 1858 - u 15-16
30th March - u - u 72 @ 75.
Q.W. Cons: 28th Sept 1858 - u 49 to 51.
" " 23rd Nov - u - u 64-65
" " 18th Jan 1859 - u 22-23
" " 18th - u - u 26-27
" " 25th - u - u 50 @ 54
" " 16th February - u 37 @ 39
" " 15th March - u 16-17
P.W. 22nd - u - u 14 to 16.

A
K

Well

See at a cost of 29½ lacs of
rupees, admitted the feasibility
of the project, and the advan-
tages to be derived from it.

But they intimated
that none of the important
works comprised in that
scheme should be commenced
until Lieutenant Haig had
returned to India and re-
considered his plans.

Looking however to the
number of years that would
necessarily elapse before the
whole of the works referred
to could be completed, the
Court advised to the sugges-
tion of Lieutenant Haig for
opening the river for imme-
diate use by means of tempo-
rary works of a slighter
description which could be
executed at a small cost in
a single season, referring
to

to the application that we
had already made for this
purpose to the Government
of India, they expressed the
hope that it would speedily
be found possible to comply
with that application.
3. Our proceedings on
this despatch will be found
entered at length in our Court
of the 24th September 1858. 1967,
to which we need not advert
further than as regards the
temporary works recommended
by Lieut. Haig. It will be seen
that in reference to the opinions
expressed by the Court of Directors
we resolved to address the
Government of India, and in
a letter dated 24th September 1858
we accordingly solicited that
Government to reconsider their
previous decision & accord
sanction to the expenditure of
Rupees 22,187, the sum estimated
for

for those temporary works.
In their reply dated the
10th December the Government
of India reiterated their refusal
of financial ~~aid~~ ^{sanction} the outlay applied
for. But we had then receiv-
ed your Lordships letter of
30th November 1858 communicating
Lieut. Haig's recommendations for
the immediate construction of these
works, and we were of opinion
that if the facts so forcibly
set forth by Lieut. Haig, and
others of a more positive
character ~~that had been~~
brought to our notice in
letters addressed by
Col. Cotton the Commandant
of Engineers & by Col. Dalrymple
the Inspector General of Ordnance,
were presented to the Govt of
India, they would not persist
in this refusal but would
sanction the outlay as a
simple matter of economy in-
dependently of other considerations.
We ^{therefore} resolved once more to bring
the matter to the notice of the
Supreme Government.

QC
5. Accordingly on the 20th
January 1859 we forward-
ed your Lordships letter with
its enclosure from Lieut. Haig,
as well as the letter from
the Commandant of En-
gineers and Inspector General
of Ordnance referred to above, to
the Government of India. We
adverted to the considerations
set forth in paras 5 to 7 of
Lieut. Haig's letter, as to the cheap-
ness and rapidity with
which both military stores
and troops might be conveyed
by the Sodavery, and earnestly
expressed our view that after the fear-
ful lessons we have had
during the last year, to neglect
or even delay for a single year
to take advantage of the Soda-
very as a truly High-way ap-
pears little short of infatua-
tion and this more particularly
when it seemed clear that
by an utterly trifling outlay,
and

"and in a very few months,
this advantage might be
secured over a distance of 300
miles. Lieut. Haig, was remarked,
stated considerations to shew
the enormous saving of actual
outlay, in the conveyance of
military stores, to say nothing
of increased speed and se-
curity, which would be effected
by the very trifling expenditure
of £3,000, but on this head, we said,
we preferred to appeal to
the letters of Colonel Cotton
and Balfour, who had gone
more fully into the subject
and had brought forward
more positive facts. Colonel
Balfour shewed that 1200
Tons of Military stores were
sent last year from Masuli-
patam to Secunderabad and
Singapore, at a cost of nearly
88,000 Rupees; whereas, with
the

Rs 36,000

11C
the facilities which would
be secured by the execution
of the proposed works in
the Godavary river, a saving
would have been effected
of no less than 54,806-4-^{Rs}
without ~~the joint consid-~~
~~eration that in~~ ^{Computing} the expense
of escorts. Considering the
larger European Military
force to be maintained here
after in Central India, in
comparison with that hereto-
fore usual, it seemed, we
said, unlikely, that the quanti-
ty of material hereafter to
be sent inland from Masuli-
patam would be much
less than in 1857. But even
supposing that it amounted
to no more than two thirds
of that, there would, we obser-
ved, still be a saving each
year of considerably more than
the

the whole cost of the locks
and their subsidiary works
now proposed.

+ Rs 30000

We were unwilling
to load our Despatch to the
Government of India with
heavy extracts from the en-
-losures or abstracts of them,
but ^{we} earnestly commended
the whole of the two papers
of Colonels Cotton and Balfour
to the consideration of the
Governor General in Council.
In view of the facts there
stated, we pointed out
that the allegation of finan-
cial difficulties as an
impediment to the proposed
works was wholly an error.

The question was not at all
whether the money should
be spent, for it was spent
already every year. The real
question, we stated, was
whether

13C
whether it should be spent
once for all, and in such
a mode as to secure great
and permanent good; or,
whether the same outlay
should be repeated year
after year, with no other
effect than that of continuing
the present very defective and
inconvenient modes of
conveyance.

We therefore expressed
our hope that under the facts
and considerations laid before
them, the Government of India
would not persist in their
refusal of the small sum
asked for, but would accede
to the whole amount proposed
by Lieutenant Haig, both for
the river improvements and
the steamboats, viz 60000 Rs.

We

We remarked that the great importance attached to this matter by this Govt was attested by the fact of our thus again and again urging it on the higher authorities in spite of the mortification of repeated refusals, and that no words could prove it more strongly; but that looking to the smallness of the amount required, and to the magnitude of the results to be reasonably expected, to the Public as well as directly to the Government, we were of opinion that no more profitable or beneficial expenditure could be proposed than that recommended by us.

Notwithstanding the earnestness of this application, we have just been informed by a
Telegraph

15C
Telegraphic message that the Government of India cannot sanction the small charge recommended with reference to the existing financial position of the Government.

After having so fully and so clearly shown the Government of India that there would in reality be no expenditure on account of the work which we proposed, because the outlay would be immediately recovered in the saving in the transport of Government stores, we confess that we were not prepared for such a result. And in now reporting the correspondence, we can only express our deep regret to the decision of the Govt.

Government of India.

8. Referring to the desire expressed by the late Court of Directors ⁱⁿ para 11 of their Despatch of the 29th June 1858 that the initiative should be taken by the Government for the encouragement of the trade on the river, we have the honor to bring to your Lordships' notice that under date the 23rd November 1858 No. 1366. last we granted authority to a proposal of the District Engineer to transport 100 tons of salt by the Godavery to Pondichellum as an experimental measure.



Lord George
23rd March 1859.

P.M.D.

N^o 3

Letter to the Right
Honorable the Secretary of
State for India.

Dated 23rd March 1859.

Orig^l }
Dups: } For Steamers Nemesis
28th March

Trip: For

Copy to the Govt. of India
of 29th March 1859 N. 735.

Submitting further
correspondence that has
passed with the Government
of India regarding the
navigation of the Godavary
river.

21st March 1859