

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Marine DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 242	Press Mis.
Dated 10/10/50	180

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Marine Department,
from 1st to 10th June 1859.*

No. 15. Read the following Proceedings of the Madras Government in the Public Works Department, (*Marine*), dated 28th May 1859, No. 1293.

Vide Public Works Proceedings from 28th to 31st May 1859, Nos. 9 and 10.

(Communicating copy of a letter from the Chief Engineer with its enclosures, being an explanation in respect to the supposed injury to the Tuddry Harbour from the Sea wall near Messrs. Brice and Co's., Pier and Screw Godowns.)

No. 16. ORDER THEREON, 3rd June 1859, No. 240.

Communicated to the Superintendent of Marine with reference to the Proceedings of Government, dated 28th March last, No. 110.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. BELL, Chief Engineer; to J. D. BOURDILLON, Esq., Secretary to Government, dated 12th May 1859, No. 358.

Adverting to Extract Minutes Consultation of the 25th March 1859 No. 707, I have the

1 Copies of letters from Collector of Canara No. 9, dated 7th April 1859.
From District Engineer do. No. 357 of 27th April 1859.
From Messrs. Brice and Co., of Tuddry, dated 11th April 1859.
1 Plan.

honor to forward copies of letters, as per margin, from the Collector and District Engineer of Canara, and Messrs. Brice and Co. of Tuddry, explaining that it was apparently, under erroneous information that the Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Navy reported that the Sea wall lately erected in that Harbour had done much injury, and that it was nevertheless being extended by the District Engineer.

2. The positions of Messrs. Brice and Co.'s Pier and of the Sea wall are shown in the accompanying plan of the Harbour, and it appears that although the latter has had the effect, for the present, of causing the formation of a bank of sand near the former, it has answered its intended purpose, having been built by Messrs. Brice and Co. themselves, to protect their property, and being in course of extension by them and not by the District Engineer.

3. Lieutenant Hunter states that he had issued orders for the repair of the Beacon which the Commander-in-Chief describes as having fallen.

4. I had written thus far when the Proceedings of the Madras Government, under date the 7th May 1859 No. 1081, were received, calling my attention in para. 4 to the orders* of Government, on the subject of Buoys for the Port of Tuddry, to none of which it was believed had answers been submitted.

* February 27th 1858, No. 339.
July 12th " " 1336.
October 9th " " 2099.
November 12th " " 2384.

5. On the receipt of the orders of the 27th February 1858 No. 339, instructions were sent to the District Engineer of Canara to lay down the two Buoys required to mark the entrance of the Harbour at Tuddry, and under date the 17th of March following, Lieutenant Goddard reported that he was unable to do so as, notwithstanding he had applied to the Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Navy, to the Garrison Engineer of Bombay, and to all the Mercantile Firms of that place, he had failed to procure the Buoys and the necessary tackle. As on the same date the Marine Board had informed the Chief Engineer that they had recommended a certain description of Buoy, and had applied to Government "for a number to be sent out from England to be moored with Anchors having but one arm, which are better than Screw Moorings," it was inferred that two of these were intended for Tuddry, and the District Engineer was instructed, accordingly, that the two Buoys he required would be supplied to him by the Marine Board, and it seems to have been considered that the statement made in para. 5 of the letter from this Office of the 10th August 1858, No. 2682, fully met all the orders of Government on the subject.

6. I regret if from this misapprehension any delay has occurred in laying down the Buoys, but it is more than doubtful whether this Department could have procured them, and it is certain that, as the intention was to place them as mere guides to the passage of the Bar, they could not have afforded any assistance to a Vessel warping either in or out of the river, and I trust that these remarks will be deemed a satisfactory explanation of the apparent want of action on the part of this Department.

Letter from W. FISHER, Esq., Collector of Canara; to Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. BELL, Chief Engineer, dated Mangalore, 7th April 1859, No. 9.

In acknowledging Extract from your Proceedings under date 30th March, calling for a report on the Pier and Sea wall at Tuddry, alluded to by the Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Navy, I have the honor to state, that His Excellency appears to me to have been altogether misinformed.

2. I learn with astonishment, that there are only two feet of water at the outer end of Messrs. Brice and Co.'s Pier, where there used to be twenty, but this is a point on which the Commander-in-Chief may have satisfied himself. Should this be the case however, I can hardly think the evil has been occasioned by a sand bank thrown up in consequence of the progress made in lengthening the Sea wall spoken of. This wall was built, I must observe, by Messrs. Brice and Co., and not by the District Engineer, and I can hardly suppose that it has effected a change which some person seems to have attributed to it, as the work of the District Engineer, carried on in spite of protest, such at least seems to be the view Commodore Wellesly took of the case.

3. From what I know of Tuddry I do not understand how the Sea wall could possibly have the effect of throwing up a sand bank at the end of Messrs. Brice and Co.'s Pier, it simply prevents high tides from flooding some low ground on the upper end of which stand Messrs. Brice and Co.'s Cotton Screws, and other buildings. If it has any effect at all on the stream, it is to lessen its breadth to a scarcely appreciable extent at certain times of tide.

4. At any rate, the work has certainly been carried on by Messrs. Brice and Co., who are alone responsible for any damage done to their Pier, or to the Channel it is so much their interest to improve.

5. The District Engineer in replying to this call for information will no doubt give an accurate account of the present state of the Port as regards the effects of the Sea wall spoken of, whether on Messrs. Brice and Co.'s Pier, or on the Harbour itself, as he has Subordinates on the spot who can ascertain exactly how matters stand, but I can only add, that whilst I know that the D. P. W., are not in fault, I believe the information given to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Navy to be altogether worthless.

Letter from Lieutenant J. N. HUNTER, Acting District Engineer, Canara; to Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. BELL, Chief Engineer, dated Mercara, 27th April 1859, No. 357.

In accordance with instructions contained in Extract from your Proceedings No. 9127, dated 30th March 1859, I beg to report on the points noted by the Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Navy.

2. His Excellency on all material points seems to have been altogether misinformed.

3. The Sea wall to which he alludes as being lengthened by the District Engineer to the detriment of Messrs. Brice and Co.'s premises was not lengthened, nor built, nor touched by the District Engineer or any of his Subordinates, but by Messrs. Brice and Co. themselves, for the protection of their Screw house which stands on a spit of sand that has been recovered from the Sea.

4. That the effect of this Sea wall has been to shoal the water in front of Messrs. Brice and Co.'s Pier, I believe to be a fact; but that any harm has happened in consequence is still doubtful, for the Pier in question built originally at small expense some four years ago is now rotten and of little value. His Excellency moreover has entirely omitted to mention the existence of another Pier built at Government expense within the last official year, and at the end of which the water at the time of its construction twelve feet has now deepened to fourteen.

5. This Pier is used by vessels in Tuddry to load and unload cargo, the vessels being moored along side and here I believe the Plead lay on the occasion of the Commander-in-Chief's visit.

6. I may say that the whole history of the Port of Tuddry is included in the facts above stated, the leading events being the construction of a Screw house, Messrs. Brice and Co.'s Pier, Messrs. Brice and Co.'s Sea wall, and lastly the Government Pier, the effect of the Sea wall in silting up is entirely local and does not affect the Channel entrance; that the Channel generally is not affected is evidenced by the fact above quoted as to the increase of water before the Government Pier.

7. The accident to one of the shore beacons noted by His Excellency must be of recent occurrence, as at my visit to the port in the latter end of last year both beacons were standing. Orders have been issued for its immediate reconstruction.

8. I would here note that the beacons are standing pillars and not floating as seems to have been the idea.

9. The plan called for in para. 2 is herewith forwarded.

Letter from Messrs. ALEX. BRICE and Co., to Captain CHARLES A. ORR, Superintending Engineer, Northern Circle, dated 11th April 1859.

We have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated 2nd Instant with Extract of Minute No. 707 of the 25th Ultimo, and with reference to para. 4, we beg to remark

that the Sea wall in question is a work of our own undertaking, and we have as yet not heard that the District Engineer is going to add a considerable length to it, as we may infer from the Commander-in-Chief's remark in para. 3 of the Minutes.

The said wall we have commenced to guard our property and premises against the monsoon Sea, and in order to achieve this object we shall be obliged to finish this work, we have already built 1,900 feet length and expect an additional 300 to 100 feet to be all that is required to close the still open front of our premises.

At present the river thrown up shifting sand banks along the open face of our wall, and it happens that one night will form a bank at 20 feet breadth or take it away, thereby placing our Pier at times dry or in deep water, but we expect, when the Sea wall is finished, as far as we are concerned, that the effect will be permanent, either sand or water, at least on one side. Little anxiety is to be entertained of the wall injuring the Harbour, if there is any bad effect, it will be only with regard to the position of our Pier, and as the river runs off at this point to the Channel, it is very probable that it will tend to keep the course of the water force and make the accumulation of sand impracticable.

ORDER THEREON, 28th May 1859, No. 1293.

Resolved that the explanation furnished in this letter and its enclosures, in respect to the supposed injury to the Tuddry Harbour from the Sea wall near Messrs. Brice and Co.'s Pier and Screw godowns, be communicated to the Bombay Government with reference to their letter of the 7th March 1859, No. 598, and in continuation of the letter from this Government dated 25th Idem, No. 708.

2. Referring to the delay so often pointed out by Government, in fixing the two Buoys at the entrance of the Tuddry Harbour, the Chief Engineer satisfactorily explains that it was owing in the first instance, to the inability of the District Engineer to obtain the required Buoys either from the Bombay Dockyard, the Garrison Engineer's Workshop, or the Merchants of the place; and in the second place, to an impression that the two Buoys in question were included in a number of a certain description, for which the Marine Board had informed the Chief Engineer they had applied to Government. This latter statement is borne out by Mr. Franklin's letter to the Chief Secretary, 10th March 1859, No. 1014, in which after stating that it was the intention of the late Marine Board to have put down at the Tuddry Harbour, two of the six Buoys expected from England by the Tartar, he reported and recommended Lieutenant Taylor's proposition to be allowed to select from the Bombay Dockyard for the purpose in view, two Iron Buoys with shackles and fifteen fathoms of chain cable, a recommendation complied with by Government in para. 3 of their order in the Marine Department, 28th March 1859 No. 110.

3. Colonel Bell has not replied to the enquiry of Government in para. 3 of their recent order of the 7th Instant, No. 1081, whether a Buoy or other mark is necessary to shew the rock on which the Rose Ellis was lost.

(True Extract.)

Secretary to Government.

To the Chief Engineer.
„ Marine Department.

Exd. Wm. Thomas.

Also Memoirs of June 1890

Concerning the
the Superintendent of the
with the Japanese & the
of Genl. dated 23 March last.

99

Com 28th March/90

Unit of 20 lines

For 1st to 10 lines

Memorandum 10th April

According to Sect. 3
in the Public Works
Report, 1903

2/20
27th May/90

No 207
Japan Office

Communications copy
of a letter from the
Chief Engineer with its
enclosures being an
explanation in regard
to the supposed injury
to the Tsubu Maru
from the local water
works Office of the
and the Japanese

With an Order

to the Dept of Marine - Dated 20

154-10