

(1) Number of Pages.....6
(2) Date of repair.....4-3-66
(3) Initials of the Referencer.....[Signature]

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

.....RW.....DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	40	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	6-8-1873	196 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following:—

No. 474. From Captain H. BAILEY
Colonel G. W. WALKER, R.E.
Department, dated Calicut, 9th

acting District Engineer, Malabar, to
Secretary to Government, Public Works
Department, 1873, No. 59.

With reference to Government Order
honour to submit the following explanation
satisfactory to enable Government to ex-
of duty and carelessness made by Cap-
February 1873.

1,252, of the 2nd ultimo, I have the
and trust that it will be sufficiently
to me from the charges of neglect
Wood in his letter, No. 22, of 22nd

2. In September 1871, I submitted
reconstructing the Muchitta Bridge at a
washed down one of the abutments during

for sanction, a plan and estimate for
ter site, a set of the current having
the previous monsoon.

3. The Superintending Engineer has
approved of the square wing walls proposed
estimate for sanction.

ing (as he informed me personally) dis-
by me, forwarded a revised plan and

4. These were sent to me for execution

, and are forwarded herewith.

5. Had I noticed that the projection
was not sufficient to support an embankment
have referred the matter to the Superintending
is marked on it, I did not notice it at the time.

the wing walls as shown on the plan
at with slopes of one to one, I would
ing Engineer, but as only their length

6. When at the bridge site in February
Mahoney where the new channel for the river
was to be built; and when sending him the
to carry out, made on it a rough sketch of

ary 1872, I pointed out to Overseer
lah was to be cut and how the bridge
copy of the plan (forwarded herewith)
the site to refresh his memory.

7. In April 1872, I inspected the work
ment, and found that one abutment and wing
the excavation for the other was nearly com-
nullah in progress; the work being carried out agreeably to the plan and estimate.
This was noted in my diary for that month.

for the first time after its commence-
g walls had been built 7 feet high; that
completed, and the new channel for the

8. My next visit was in August when I made the remark given in the first
paragraph of Captain Wood's letter under reply.

9. In October I again inspected and measured the work and noted the
quantity of masonry short executed.

10. I would beg to point out that paragraph 4 of Captain Wood's letter
under reference is scarcely fair. On the margin of the copy of Overseer Mahoney's
letter forwarded herewith, there is the remark in my own hand-writing "copy of
plan enclosed." I believed that with the Overseer's letter and the copy of the
plan, Captain Wood would have no difficulty in seeing why the Overseer could
not make the embankment its full height.

11. When further explanation was called for, I gave all I considered could
possibly be required.

12. Believing that it was one of the rules of the department that earthen
embankments should have a slope of one to one at least, I did not think it neces-
sary to point out that as the height of the embankment was $17\frac{1}{4}$ feet, and the

projection of the wing walls only 1 height shown in the plan without ground at the beginning of the monsoon when expense was incurred they would be

13. Captain Wood had the measurement of the wing walls having been seemed to me that with it before him

14. My letter of explanation. Captain Wood says, in paragraph forwarded herewith.

15. To prevent delay (being sent it myself and sent it in to be copied in office letter book that it has been copied Captain Wood marks as in the original)

16. I enclose my diaries for April, May, June, July, and August 1872. In that for April I have entered "one Cootiaddy and foot of ghaut raised excavated, and I made the remark in letter under reference, when I again not near the place between those dates

17. With reference to paragraph of Captain Wood's letter, I hardly know what to say.

18. He had the working copy of the plan showing who was responsible, and yet he tells Government that as I do not mention that any one else is responsible, he imagines it follows that I am.

19. I could hardly suppose an officer of Captain Wood's standing knowing so little of the common routine of office work as to require to be told that the person who signs a paper is responsible for it.

20. With reference to paragraph 11 of Captain Wood's letter, I have the honour to state that I was not aware till I had seen his letter that he considered he had any cause of complaint against me.

21. I have already explained that I believed Captain Wood had all the information he could require, and as I was absent from range head-quarters when his call for further information was sent, I consider that my reply having been received in his office on the seventh day from the date of his letter showed my willingness to supply him with any information he required at the very earliest possible date.

22. The sum of Rupees 30 referred to in paragraph 5 of the G. O. under reference was re-credited to the Muchitta Bridge, and does not form a part of the final expenditure.

23. I have to express my regret that measurements for works under 2,500 Rupees should not have been entered in the station books.

24. The mistake has arisen from the forms of accounts sent by the Controller for such works having the columns for measurements omitted, and also because

embankment could not be raised the rise in tamping the earth, especially work was being done, and even if this slip during the monsoon.

its on the plan (the splay and projected on it by Overseer Mahoney), and it could have seen at once what I meant.

,181, of 13th February 1873, which letter, he is unable to understand, is

om head-quarters at the time), I wrote despatched, and find on referring to my copied into it. The word "to" which entered in the letter book as a figure 4.

ay, June, July, and August 1872. In ment and wing walls of bridge between et. Foundations for the other nearly in the first paragraph of Captain Wood's and the work on the 11th of August; I was my diaries show.

of Captain Wood's letter, I hardly know

the plan showing who was responsible, and yet he tells Government that as I do not mention that any one else is responsible, he imagines it follows that I am.

I could hardly suppose an officer of Captain Wood's standing knowing so little of the common routine of office work as to require to be told that the person who signs a paper is responsible for it.

With reference to paragraph 11 of Captain Wood's letter, I have the honour to state that I was not aware till I had seen his letter that he considered he had any cause of complaint against me.

I have already explained that I believed Captain Wood had all the information he could require, and as I was absent from range head-quarters when his call for further information was sent, I consider that my reply having been received in his office on the seventh day from the date of his letter showed my willingness to supply him with any information he required at the very earliest possible date.

The sum of Rupees 30 referred to in paragraph 5 of the G. O. under reference was re-credited to the Muchitta Bridge, and does not form a part of the final expenditure.

I have to express my regret that measurements for works under 2,500 Rupees should not have been entered in the station books.

The mistake has arisen from the forms of accounts sent by the Controller for such works having the columns for measurements omitted, and also because

the orders are that expenditure on such works should be charged to sub-heads of estimates, but under the headings of materials and labour.

25. Such being the case measurements on such works Captain Wood supposed

26. The accounts afford no means of measurement should be charged to materials at such rates as cannot be made out while the work is in progress.

27. Measurements will, however, be made on such works.

28. If Government consider the bridge height, there is almost sufficient balance remaining unexpended to carry it out, but if that were done there would be no permanent support for the upper part of the embankment. The wing walls will, therefore, have to be raised 5 feet for their whole length, and for this additional masonry will be required. By tamping and turfing the embankment could be got to stand for a time, but I find that slopes of less than one to one will not stand permanently.

29. As reported in my letter, No. 78 of the 24th November 1872, to the address of the Superintending Engineer, one flood which has occurred since I joined the range, would, I believe, reach the beams, would not quite cover the bridge.

30. This, however, was such a flood as I had never been experienced previously, and even if there should be another of the same kind, I do not think the bridge would get damaged, as it is the backwater in the large river which raises that in the nullah the bridge is over. Therefore, there, therefore, be no current to do any injury.

31. The wood-work of the old bridge was about 1½ feet lower, and it never was carried away; it used to get covered with water occasionally and that was all.

32. Captain Wood has it seems to me not acted fairly in the way he has laid this matter before Government.

33. He states that I forwarded Overseer Mahoney's letter without remark; this I have shown in paragraph 11 is not correct.

34. He does not let Government know that a copy of the plan had been sent him.

35. He charges me with gross neglect of duty in April, May, June, and July, when my diaries in his office showed that such a charge was quite unfounded.

36. And he leads Government to suppose that I am responsible for the design, when the copy of the plan in his possession showed it was not the case.

37. I have to apologize for the length of this letter, but have thought it better to leave nothing unexplained.

Memorandum by the Chief Engineer, Department Public Works.

I HAVE to remark on the papers relating to the Muchitta Bridge as follows,

viz.:-

1st.—That the Superintending Engineer would appear to have overlooked the entries in the estimate which show that a new channel averaging nearly five yards in depth was to be cut, in which the bridge was to be

placed, when he substituted the plan of a bridge without a section of approaches.

2nd.—That the cause alleged for the failure of the bridge, namely, that the slope given to the wing walls was inconsistent with that required for the approach, when the bridge is found to be nearly five yards deep, and thus apparently

3rd.—That Captain Bailey undoubtedly given cause of offence by his report of the circumstances which led his wing walls to be lower than he had planned it. The Inspection list, of 11th August, does not appear to have been followed up by proper inquiry and report, and the want of remark in for the Over-seer's explanation, to which Captain Wood objects, a copy of the plan being closed, for, with plan and estimate before him, Captain Wood must have been quite as unable as I am at present to see any sufficiency in the Over-seer's reason for reducing the height of the bridge, which might have been built exactly as planned, failing any

4th.—Again, though the plan shows Lieutenant-Colonel Farewell's responsibility for it, an error of plan, if existent, should have been detected by the officer who inspected the work, and it in the original, who knew the site, and raised 7 feet high on one of the abutments and wing walls had been there having been none detect, seeing that the bridge was in a cutting and not approach by embankments 15½ feet high, as appears to have been imagined by Captain Wood from the plan, (see paragraph 8 of his first letter with G. O., No. 1,252, of 2nd May). Captain Bailey appears to me to have been too easily satisfied with his Over-seer's excuse for taking a most extraordinary liberty with the plan sent for his guidance, and to have failed to apprehend and confess his own responsibility, incurred by acquiescence in the mistake, to an extent which created a not unreasonable prejudice against him in the mind of his District Engineer to whom he was personally unknown.

(Signed) G. W. WALKER, Colonel, R.E.,
Chief Engineer.

10th July 1873.

No. 475.

ORDER THEREON, 30th July 1873, No. 1,912.

CIVIL WORKS, No. 27.

Ordered that the Chief Engineer's Memorandum be communicated through the Revenue Department to the Malabar Local Fund Board, together with previous Order, No. 1,252, of 2nd May, for their consideration and decision whether the Muchitta Bridge shall be allowed to stand as at present erected, or raised to the height originally planned and sanctioned. It is some satisfaction to learn from Captain Bailey that the mistake committed of

building it 4 feet lower than it was planned, is not likely to lead to its destruction, or render it useless even in excessive floods, there being no current except when they begin to recede and consequently to be in contact with its timbers as they are floods of the adjacent river, the jungle stream itself, and the former bridge timbers 1½ feet less in height never carried away.

2. In their former order the Government indirectly absolved Captain Bailey from the charge of negligence in inspection, pointing out the facts of the work having been closed on the 24th May, and having seen it within a month previous to that date. But they cannot absolve him of responsibility for his Over-seer's proceedings, nor do they consider his explanations were so full and complete as they should have been.

3. The Inspecting Engineer for Communications will take note of the Chief Engineer's remarks as to the necessity of insisting on every bridge plan being accompanied by a section of its site and approaches.

(True Extract.)

G. Walker, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the District Engineer, Malabar.

- „ Revenue Department. ✓
- „ Financial „
- „ Inspecting Engineer for Ports and Communications.
- „ Officiating Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Communicated to the
Board of Revenue

Exd. W. H. French.

20 Spare Copies.

To H. H. French
Sep 12/8

Recd 10/3 Sept
No 2345

Sobdt. of 1873: Madras
PUBLIC WORKS.

THE DISTRICT ENGINEER, MALABAR.

Dated 5th Aug 1873
Recd 5th August 1873

G. O. 8012 July 1873

JULY

Nos. 474-475

Muchilla Bridge - Passing orders on
letter from the Acting District Engineer,
Malabar, submitting explanations with re-
ference to the faulty construction of the
bridge.

With Order

6 Aug 1873 No 40