

*Duplicate*  
Administrative Department.

No. 976

MADRAS,  
Marine Office,  
4 February 1882.

From

J. H. TAYLOR, Esq., LIEUT., R.N.R.,

Master Attendant,  
Administrative Department,  
Madras,

To

Colonel. R. H. Sankar, R. E. C. B.

Chief Secretary to Government,  
P. W. Marine Department,  
Fort Saint George.

SIR,

I have the honour to report that in January Mr. Parkes paid a visit to this Department for the purpose of procuring information for his report called for in G.O. No. 3169 W, dated 21<sup>st</sup> December 1881.

2 The opinion, as given by the universal judgment of all the Marine Officers and by all Nautical men, who have visited the port since the erection of the Harbour Wall was to the effect that in any plan for reconstruction of the Harbour, measures must be taken to close the sea face, substituting a side entrance in 6 fathoms.

3 Independently, however, of the inconvenience of the Easterly opening, it was undoubtedly a source of weakness to the work. The

subsidence of the outer line of the blocks on a former occasion proved incontestably that the current swirled round the corner and cut out the rubble base, and it is in my judgment incontestably proved to have done so on the last occasion by the fact patent to all observers that the broad section of both Piers was the first to give way, with-  
out the opposition of a first class Cyclone, the Titan cranes having been withdrawn to a considerable distance, and so not Contributing to the result. We are in fact as far as ever from knowing what the effect of that would be. It was the current chiefly that worked the present destruction, and it requires no Engineering knowledge to point out that a return to the original form of Construction, if that is Contemplated will be followed by a similar result at a slightly extended period. The total disappearance of Sir A. Cotton's break-water, and that of a large quantity of the rubble North of the Harbour shows the treacherous quality of the Madras sand, and the depth of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  fathoms does not, as is now proved, dispose of the danger.

On the occasion of the recent disaster, there was no wind to speak of, and the  
Storm

storm which caused the sea evidently broke up on reaching the land. As regards the height of the sea itself, many opinions have been given. It certainly came up to the level of the T head of the Pier, and washed up the number of planks usual on occasions of rough weather, but it is described on all sides to have been worse inside the Harbour than out, a pyramidal kind of sea which the experienced boatmen were afraid to tempt. They, however, one and all declared that if their services had been required outside the walls, they would have ventured. Now this they could not possibly have done in a heavy cyclone sea, and thus the question of the amount of mischief due to that source is still unsolved. The opinion of Nautical men freely delivered during the past two years, with one exception, has condemned the present work, and since the accident has suggested that the ruin should be retained as a backbone for a sloping work of large loose blocks tipped over and forming a broad base and coming to the surface in a something similar manner, though not on so large a scale as Plymouth breakwater.

The Marine Department Diver has always assured me that wave and current actions were powerful even at  $7\frac{1}{2}$  fathoms, and when endeavouring to clear the moorings of the red buoy marking the Harbour mouth on the occasion of its final removal, he was violently driven against the cable and his helmet bent in.

5. I respectfully submit to Government that such an important work does not appear to me to have sufficient Submarine Supervision. There should I consider be means by which the Chief Engineer and the Harbour Constructor or Superintendent or responsible officer of that class be able to go down and witness for themselves the actual features of the sea and current action. I have in my store a good Diving Bell which only wants a little refitting to be in perfect readiness. It was got out from England for the purpose of recovering Anchors, goods &c but when the Diving dress was invented, it was found so much more suitable for such work that the Bell was laid aside, but for inspection it would now be invaluable. I do not wish to

to disparage the working divers, but in a matter of this importance their unsupported statements are not reliable enough to justify a reconstruction of the work on its former plan. I believe the rubble has largely disappeared, and that if the new work has even double the old section it will only take one or two storms to inflict the same amount of destruction. If the first harbour had stood it would have formed a cheap and comfortable method of carrying on the trade of the Port except during rough days, but beach improvements would not have been safe, as a storm of any kind near or far would send enough sea on to injure the boat traffic, and prevent wharf construction, but now that more money must be forthcoming, it would be advisable in the best interest of Madras to make the Harbour more complete, even at a much increased outlay.

6. I have been very urgent with the Harbour Committee to adopt a plan for strengthening the Port Trust, and offering satisfactory assurance to Government that the

the interest on their Capital Amount can  
be met without increasing the charges on  
the Mercantile Community, and with that  
view have prepared a plan which only  
waits the further enquiry of the collector  
of Sea Customs to be brought again before  
the Committee with any change the collector  
may see fit to recommend. It is high time  
I respectfully submit that steps were taken  
in this direction.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most Obedient Servant

W. Taylor

Master Attendant

Administrative Department.

9-7-28

(188 ) DEPARTMENT.

P. W. G. No 1210

From

THE MASTER ATTENDANT,

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENT,

Madras,

To

THE ~~CHIEF~~ SECY. TO GOVERNMENT,

*Mr.* ~~MARINE~~ DEPARTMENT,

Fort St. George.

B. N. 495 May 23 - Schuyler

Revised into  
reference to  
G. O. 424 w. d. 16 Feb: 82.

No. 976

Dated

4 } February. 1882.

Received

No.

Subject.

Reporting in connection  
with the Harbour, and  
the entrance into it.

*This is a  
supplement to  
the original  
B. N. 495 May 23 - Schuyler  
has been  
the subject  
with order.*

*Att*

24/2/82

1024/2