

No of Sheets - 7

Date of Repair - Feb 2. 88

Initial of the Referee.

over ✓

Tamilnadi Archives.

Govt of Tamilnadi.

G.O. No 1517 P.W.D.

dt 7-6-1887

1517
7TH JUNE 1887, No. 1517 W., PUBLIC WORKS.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

READ—the following circular from the Government of India, Public Works Department (Civil Works—Miscellaneous), dated Simla, 21st May 1887, No. 165 M.:—

The undermentioned paper is forwarded to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, for information, with reference to correspondence ending with its letter, No. 51 D., dated 27th April 1887.

(By Order.)

(Signed) R. B. BUCKLEY,
Under Secretary.

ENCLOSURES.

Despatch from the Government of India, Public Works Department, Civil Works, Miscellaneous, to the Right Hon'ble VISCOUNT CROSS, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, dated Simla, 16th May 1887, No. 25, Public Works.

In Public Works Despatch, No. 1, dated the 3rd February 1887, addressed to His Excellency the Governor of Madras, your Lordship referred to the action taken by the Harbour Board with reference to the authorized design of the Madras Harbour. We have received from the Secretary to the Government of Madras the papers marginally noted, of which copies have already, we understand, been forwarded to your

Proceedings of the Government of Madras, Nos. 784 W. and 785 W. of the 14th March 1887.

Lordship by His Excellency the Governor. These papers afford an explanation concerning the action taken by the Harbour Board which will no doubt be accepted as satisfactory, for it is clear that the Board had no intention of carrying into execution any alteration in the harbour without the sanction of competent authority, while they were not in any way exceeding their authority in asking the Superintending Engineer of the works to prepare a design for any proposals which they might wish to make.

2. In Lord Kimberley's Despatch, No. 56 P. W. of 25th September 1884, reference was made to the views of Sir John Hawkshaw's Committee and to those of Mr. Parkes, on the subject of the proposed change in the position of the entrance to the harbour, and it was said that "Mr. Thorowgood, who is in full possession of Mr. Parkes' views, and of the reasons which have led him and the committee to adhere to the eastern entrance, has already started on his return to Madras, and will be able to furnish the authorities there with any additional particulars they may require, and it is to be hoped that conflicting views may be reconciled by further discussion."

3. At the time when this despatch was received we thought it better to take no immediate action concerning the question of the entrance, partly for the reason that it was evidently our duty to allow scope for the further discussion which Lord Kimberley thought would have beneficial results, and partly because there was no apparent advantage to be gained by attempting to arrive at an early decision on the matter.

Letter, dated 9th March 1882, from Mr. Parkes, to the Secretary to Government of Madras, Public Works Department, paragraphs 44 and 45.

Letter, dated 10th February 1883, from Mr. Parkes, to the Under Secretary of State for India, paragraph 14.

The opinions expressed by Mr. Parkes in the documents noted in the margin showed that, if it should prove desirable to alter the entrance, the alteration could be both more cheaply and more expeditiously made when the works had

been completed in accordance with the authorized design.

4. The difference of opinion to which Lord Kimberley referred may be said to have been the difference between the opinion of Sir John Hawkshaw's Committee, in which Mr. Parkes concurred, and the opinion of all persons or bodies in India who were interested in the harbour, or who had been officially or professionally consulted concerning it.

Among those who maintained an opinion favorable to an alteration in the site of the entrance were:—

The Madras Committee of local professional gentlemen, which reported on the 30th June and 22nd September 1883.

The Madras Chamber of Commerce.

The professional advisers of the Government of India.*

All Commanders of first class steamers using the port of Madras who had been consulted.

The local Nautical authorities.

The Madras Government.

We are not in a position to know whether the opinion of the gentlemen who were members of Sir John Hawkshaw's Committee may have been in any way modified, but it is a fact that the experience of the last three years and the further discussions which have taken place have in no way altered the opinion of all competent authorities in this country. That opinion is steadfastly opposed to the retention of the eastern entrance, and generally, although not quite unanimously, in favor of a north-east entrance to the harbour.

5. The Government of India has hitherto refrained from the assertion of any very decided opinion on this question of the entrance. We think that the time has now come when our opinion may be advantageously expressed. The balance of evidence is strongly adverse to the eastern entrance, and it may well be deemed hardly politic or safe to compel the Madras Harbour Board to construct a harbour in a manner which is opposed by nearly all, if not by all, persons in India who are competent to judge of the matter, or who have interests at stake in the work. But we would add that the opposition of the Madras Government and of all Madras local authorities to the eastern entrance has our entire concurrence, and that we are convinced that no harbour at Madras, which is made with an eastern entrance, can be at all effective. We append a brief summary by our Consulting Engineer, Mr. Molesworth, of the opinions he has previously recorded on the subject.

6. We understand from the reports of Mr. Parkes and of Sir John Hawkshaw's Committee, that there is no engineering difficulty in constructing a north-east entrance. The committee, indeed, appear to admit that the question of the proper site for the entrance is more a nautical than an engineering one. The absolute unanimity of all commanders of steamers using the port, against the eastern entrance, must, we think, have great weight in this respect.

7. We would ask your Lordship to take this question of the position of the entrance again into consideration; for we are convinced that the matter cannot be set at rest until either our views and those of the other authorities in this country are accepted, or the views held by Sir J. Hawkshaw's Committee and Mr. Parkes have received the support of the highest nautical authorities. It would seem to be essential, in the latter case, that the opinion of those authorities should be given after they have fully satisfied themselves, by local investigation, concerning all the circumstances, and have shown good cause for setting aside the opinion of all the commanders of local experience who have been acquainted for many years past with the various conditions of the problem.

Memorandum by Mr. G. L. Molesworth, C.I.E., dated 30th May 1887.

No new engineering feature has been imported into the case since I wrote my notes of July 17th, 1883, and April 19th, 1884.

With regard to the engineering points at issue I may sum up my opinions as follows:—

1st.—It is impossible, with an eastern entrance, to exclude from the harbour waves of considerable magnitude, even should the entrance be narrowed to 450 feet.

2nd.—The adoption of a north-east or south-east entrance is the only mode of excluding such waves from the harbour.

3rd.—The north-east entrance appears to be preferable to the south-east entrance, because the north is less exposed than the south to encroachments from sand.

4th.—The re-entering curve proposed by the Madras Committee in the overlapping arm to the north-east elbow is open to serious objections, but I notice that Mr. Thorowgood, in his letter, dated January 31st, 1887, has submitted a sketch in which this is modified to meet the objection to a re-entering curve raised in my note of July 17th, 1883.

* Mr. G. L. Molesworth.
Colonel H. A. Brownlow, R.E.
" W. S. Trevor, R.E.

5th.—A prolongation of the present face of the harbour so as to avoid the necessity for this re-entering curve would throw the entrance 200 or 300 feet nearer to shoal water.

6th.—The alternative plan for forming a north-east entrance by the prolongation of the south-east face so as to overlap the present eastern entrance as suggested in my note of July 17th, 1883, would afford shelter to the harbour and would at the same time allow more sea room for vessels entering the harbour, but it would involve greater expense.

The feasibility of entering or leaving the harbour by the north-east is a question for nautical men to decide, and whether an entrance at the north-east elbow would allow sufficient sea room is also a nautical point on which I do not feel qualified to offer an opinion.

ORDER—dated 7th June 1887, No. 1517 W., Public Works.

Communicated to the Chairman, Madras Harbour Trust Board, with reference to G.O., No. 784 W., dated 14th March 1887.

(True Extract.)

Captain, R.E.,
Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Chairman, Madras Harbour Trust Board.
" Marine Department.

Exd. A. Aubert.
Spare Copies

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Gobt. of 1887 Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated June, 7th.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 7th June 1887, No. 1517 W.

JUNE.

Madras Harbour

Position of the entrance.—Copy of a despatch from the Government of India, to the Secretary of State, requesting reconsideration of the question of the —, communicated to the Chairman, Madras Harbour Trust Board.

No. 25 Public Works.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

CIVIL WORKS.

Miscellaneous.

To

THE RIGHT HON'BLE VISCOUNT CROSS,
Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

Simla, May 16, 1887.

MY LORD,

In Public Works Despatch No. 1, dated the 2nd February 1887, addressed to His Excellency the Governor of Madras, your Lordship referred to the action taken by the Harbour Board with reference to the authorized design of the Madras Harbour. We have received from the Secretary to the Government of Madras the papers marginally noted, of which copies have already, we understand, been forwarded to your Lordship by His Excellency the Governor. These papers afford an explanation concerning the action taken by the Harbour Board which will no doubt be accepted as satisfactory, for it is clear that the Board had no intention of carrying into execution any alteration in the Harbour without the sanction of competent authority, while they were not in any way exceeding their authority in asking the Superintending Engineer of the works to prepare a design for any proposals which they might wish to make.

2. In Lord Kimberley's Despatch No. 56 P. W. of 25th September 1884, reference was made to the views of Sir John Hawkshaw's Committee and to those of Mr. Parkes, on the subject of the proposed change in the position of the entrance to the Harbour, and it was said that "Mr. Thorowgood who is in full possession of Mr. Parkes' views, and of the reasons which have led him and the Committee to adhere to the Eastern Entrance, has already started on his return to Madras, and will be able to furnish the authorities there with any additional particulars they may require, and it is to be hoped that conflicting views may be reconciled by further discussion."

3. At the time when this despatch was received we thought it better to take no immediate action concerning the question of the entrance, partly for the reason that it was evidently our duty to allow scope for the further discussion which Lord Kimberley thought would have beneficial results, and partly because there was no apparent advantage to be gained by attempting

to arrive at an early decision on the matter. The opinions expressed by Mr. Parkes in the documents noted in the margin, showed that, if it should prove desirable to alter the entrance, the alteration could be both more cheaply and more expeditiously made when the works had been completed in accordance with the authorized design.

4. The difference of opinion to which Lord Kimberley referred may be said to have been the difference between the opinion of Sir John Hawkshaw's Committee, in which Mr. Parkes concurred, and the opinion of all persons or bodies in India who were interested in the harbour, or who had been officially or professionally consulted concerning it.

Among those who maintained an opinion favorable to an alteration in the site of the entrance were:—

The Madras Committee of local professional gentlemen, which reported on the 30th June and 22nd September 1883.

The Madras Chamber of Commerce.

The professional advisors of the Government of India*

All Commanders of first class steamers using the Port of Madras who had been consulted.

The local Nautical authorities.

The Madras Government.

We are not in a position to know whether the opinion of the gentlemen who were members of Sir John Hawkshaw's Committee may have been in any way modified, but it is a fact that the experience of the last three years and the further discussions which have taken place have in no way altered the opinion of all competent authorities in this country. That opinion is steadfastly opposed to the retention of the eastern entrance, and generally, although not quite unanimously, in favour of a north-east entrance to the Harbour.

5. The Government of India has hitherto refrained from the assertion of any very decided opinion on this question of the entrance. We think that the time has now come when our opinion may be advantageously expressed. The balance of evidence is strongly adverse to the eastern entrance, and it may well be deemed hardly politic or safe to compel the Madras Harbour Board to construct a harbour in a manner which is opposed by nearly all, if not by all, persons in India who are competent to judge of the matter, or who have interests at stake in the work. But we would add that the opposition of the Madras Government and of all Madras local authorities to the eastern entrance has our entire concurrence, and that we are convinced that no harbour at Madras, which is made with an eastern entrance, can be at all effective. We append a brief summary by our Consulting Engineer, Mr. Molesworth, of the opinions he has previously recorded on the subject.

6. We understand from the reports of Mr. Parkes and of Sir John Hawkshaw's Committee, that there is no engineering difficulty in constructing a north-east entrance. The Committee, indeed, appear to admit that the question of the

proper site for the entrance is more a nautical than an engineering one. The absolute unanimity of all commanders of steamers using the port, against the eastern entrance, must, we think, have great weight in this respect.

7. We would ask Your Lordship to take this question of the position of the entrance again into consideration; for we are convinced that the matter can not be set at rest until either our views and those of the other authorities in this country are accepted, or the views held by Sir J. Hawkshaw's Committee and Mr. Parkes have received the support of the highest Nautical authorities. It would seem to be essential, in the latter case, that the opinion of those authorities should be given after they have fully satisfied themselves, by local investigation, concerning all the circumstances, and have shewn good cause for setting aside the opinion of all the commanders of local experience who have been acquainted for many years past with the various conditions of the problem.

We have the honor to be,

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's most obedient and humble Servants,

(Signed) DUFFERIN.

" F. S. ROBERTS.

" T. C. HOPE.

" A. COLVIN.

" G. CHESNEY.

" A. R. SCOBLE.

" J. B. PEILE.

Documents accompanying.

Memo. by Mr. Molesworth, C.I.E., dated 9th May 1887.

8/13
1817
4

1517
3

17/12/17
4250/17

Copy.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.
CIVIL WORKS.
Miscellaneous.

To
THE RIGHT HON'BLE
THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA.

No. 25 Public Works.

Dated Simla, May 16, 1887.

Received

MADRAS HARBOUR.

Position of entrance.

States that the Government of India concurs in the opinion of the local authorities concerning the entrance to the Madras Harbour, and requests a re-consideration of the question of its position.

1517
6

Enclosure to Despatch No. 25 Public Works of 1887.

Memorandum by Mr. G. L. Molesworth, C.I.E., dated 9th May 1887.

No new engineering feature has been imported into the case since I wrote my notes of July 17th, 1883, and April 19th, 1884.

With regard to the engineering points at issue I may sum up my opinions as follows:—

- 1st.—It is impossible with an eastern entrance to exclude from the harbour waves of considerable magnitude; even should the entrance be narrowed to 450 feet.
- 2nd.—The adoption of a north-east or south-east entrance is the only mode of excluding such waves from the harbour.
- 3rd.—The north-east entrance appears to be preferable to the south-east entrance, because the north is less exposed than the south to encroachments from sand.
- 4th.—The re-entering curve proposed by the Madras Committee in the overlapping arm to the north-east elbow is open to serious objections, but I notice that Mr. Thorewood, in his letter, dated January 31st, 1887, has submitted a sketch in which this is modified to meet the objection to a re-entering curve raised in my note of July 17th, 1883.
- 5th.—A prolongation of the present face of the harbour so as to avoid the necessity for this re-entering curve would throw the entrance 200 or 300 feet nearer to shoal water.
- 6th.—The alternative plan for forming a north-east entrance by the prolongation of the south-east face so as to overlap the present eastern entrance as suggested in my note of July 17th, 1883, would afford shelter to the harbour and would at the same time allow more sea room for vessels entering the harbour, but it would involve greater expense.

The feasibility of entering or leaving the harbour by the north-east is a question for nautical men to decide, and whether an entrance at the north-east elbow would allow sufficient sea room is also a nautical point on which I do not feel qualified to offer an opinion.

All communications
should be addressed
to the Secretary.

No. 165 *h*

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

CIVIL WORKS—*Miscellaneous.*

*Print
with initials*
Simla, 21st May 1887.

The undermentioned paper forwarded to the *Gout of Madras*
P. H. Deptt. for information, with reference
to correspondence ending with its letter
No. 514, dated 27th April 1887.

By order,

A. B. Buckley

Under Secretary.

Document referred to.

Ch. B.
Copy of despatch to Secretary of State No.
25 P. H. dated 16th May 1887. *Enclosure.*

Pub 4280

17th Club

No 1517 W of 7th June 1887

Mr

2286/187

Sec 2

Communicated to
the Chairman Madras
Harbour Trust Board
with reference to go.
No 784 W of 16th March
1887

Mr
6.6.87

- 1203 W of 11.5.87
- 1179 W of 29.4.87
- 1001 W of 1.4.87
- 2/784 W of 1.4.87
- 784.5 W of 1.4.87

To The Chairman M.H.B.
" Marine Dept D

14.1.87

1517/87
M.5.6.87

With order

1517/87

4280

Govt. of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated

Recd

Encl.

G.O. 7th June 1887 No. 1517

Madras Harbour.

Position of the Entrance.

Copy of a despatch
from the Govt of India
to the Secy of Works
requesting reconsideration
of the question of the
Entrance to the Harbour
Madras Harbour Trust
Sd.

40 .60
2 15

Wgt. 9/16