Marine (1896) Department.

G.O., No. 142 Mar.

DATED 6/3/96.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Mr E. D. Rozario. Manager, office of Agent for Govt Consignments —

The grant of a charge allowance of Rs 30 per mensem to — for the period he was in charge of the office in addition to his own duties

Sanctioned

[M. 6.
500—13-8-96.]

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	195	Mar:	21-3-96				

MARINE ~~PUBLIC WORKS~~ DEPARTMENT.

No. 142 marine dt 6 march/96.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

From the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, No. 1217/38 G. d/13th FebY. 1896.

Endorsement thereon by the Accountant-General, No. 514 d/21st Feby. 1896.

W
2 Mar

Sanctioned, the charge of the Office, having, in the opinion of the Government, entailed a substantial increase of responsibility and additional work.

27/2/96

CHM
26.2.96

DESPATCHED
6-MAR 96

DESPATCHED
6-MAR 96

To

The Presy. Port Officer.
,, Accountant-General.

(40—4,000—2-11-95.)

Charge Allowance to the Managers of the Office of the Agent for Govt. Consignments

No. 142 Marine d/ 6-3-96.

D.W.

Marine C No. 187

I have signed this inadvertently. It is not clear that Mr Rozario had charge of 2 offices.

CWM

D.W. 24/2/96

There seems no reason
allowance as recommended.

C.S.
25 Feby 96

CWM
25.2.96

utant General

H.S. 27/2 R 3/3.

9/3

12/3

tant General

to suppose that the office Manager vacated his own appointment not having been formally Gazetted to act as Agent for Govt. Consignments. The P. O. would really be misleading Govt. if he, thus making the application under Art. 176 of the C.S.R, had previously relieved Mr. Rozario of this appointment of office Manager.

R.S.
24 Feb 96

C.S.

But what are the dual duties? Apparently they are not stated, unless Manager of the office & being in charge of the office are separate billets.

CWMS
24.2.96

D.A.

The office Manager [illegible] to do the work of the Agent for Govt. Consignments without being relieved of his own duties. His case comes, therefore, under Art. 176 of C.S.R.

"Manager of the office" and "being in charge of the office" are essentially different. The officer who is "in charge of the office" has a great deal of Executive work outside the "Manager's" duties. It is in consideration of this work that the extra allowance is recommended.

R.S.
25 Feb 96

CWMS
25.2.96

9/3 22/3

H.S. 27/2 R3/3.

No. 1217/38 G

Presidency Port Office,
Madras, 13 February 1896.

Heading.

Allowance.

15 II 96

From
Commander W. J. Powell, R.I.M.
~~The~~ PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,
MADRAS,

To
The ~~CHIEF~~ SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
~~FORT ST. GEORGE.~~
Chepauk

SIR,

With reference to para 3 of my letter recorded with G.O. Marine No. 389, dated 19th December 1895 I have the honor to report that Mr: E. D. Rosario, Manager of the Office of Agent for Government Consignments, was in charge of that office from 24th December 1895 to 6th February 1896, and as during this time he had additional work and responsibility to discharge I recommend the grant to him (under article 176 of the Civil Service Regulations) of a charge allowance of Rupees (30) Thirty per mensem for the period in question, minus the first 30 days.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your obdt: servant,
Walter Powell
Commander, R.I.M.,
Presidency Port Officer

H.E. 27/2 R3/3.

Marine Current No: 187

Recd: 24-2-96

Marine (1896) Department.

From

The Presidency Port Officer,
Madras,

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secy. to Government,
Marine Department,
Fort St. George.

No. 1217/38 G

Dated 13 } February 1896.
Received

No. ____

Subject.

Recommending the grant of a charge allowance to Mr. E. D. Rozario, Manager of the office of Agent for Govt. Consignments

No. 514

Fort Saint George
Accountant General's Office
21st February 1896

Forwarded to Government.

There is no objection to a charge allowance at Rs 30/- per mensem being granted under Article 176 Civil Service Regulations to Mr E D Rozario, Manager of the office of Agent for Government Consignments for the period from 23rd January ~~the thirty first day of his taking charge~~ to 6 February 1896 provided that Government consider that the charge entailed on Mr Rozario a substantial increase of responsibility and additional work.

J H Marein
Offg Accountant Genl.

To
The Chief Secretary to Government,
Marine Department

KGH

Marine Current No. 187

Government of Madras.
1896

~~P. W. DEPARTMENT.~~

~~CURRENT N.~~

DISPOSAL.

Recd: 24.2.96

No. dated

From

The Accountant General
Madras

No. 514 ~~Enclos.~~
Dated 21. 2. 96
~~Received~~

No. 72 d/17-12-95 Marine ✓
" 67 " 14-12-95 " ✓
~~" 72 d/17-12-95~~
" 388 " 19-12-95 " ✓
" 389 " 19-12-95 " ✓
" 14 M " 14-1-96 " ✓

SUBJECT.

Mr E. D. Rozario, Manager Office of the Agent for Govt. Consignments. Forwarding, with remarks, letter from the Presy. Port Officer regarding the grant of a charge allowance to ——

29—2,000—23-9-95.

19-2-10

4.10-12

[10]

5,000—21-7-09.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Block No. 3

Paper taken out of the Records from the charge of the Referencer,

Dept. Marine ~~Press~~ Mis. ~~Rout.~~ No. 142, dated 6-3-19 , Rack No. / Range.

Date taken out.	For what purpose.			Initials of Referencer.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			
19-2-10	Marine Misc	198 476	10		3/5/10	
2-10-12	MRo	~~357/1~~ 3571/12		Bms	3/2/13	

Date taken out.	FOR WHAT PURPOSE.			Initials of Referencer.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			

Govt. of 1896 | Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

2 12-08

Dated

Recd.

Encl.

G.O. 6th March 1896. No. 143-4 Marine

Audit of the Harbour Works Accounts

Ordered that the application from the Chairman of the Harbour Trust Board for a reconsideration of the rate fixed by the Govt. of India for the —, be forwarded for the orders of that Govt.

Audit of the Harbour Works Accounts

Forwarding, for orders, application 81 from the Chairman of the Harbour Trust Board for a reconsideration of the rate fixed by the Govt. of India for the — ×

Cha: 1121 # 27-12-99

Govt. of {1896} Madras.

MARINE.

Dated March, 6th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O. No. 143, 6th March 1896.

MARCH.

Audit of the Harbour Works Accounts

Ordered that the application from the Chairman of the Harbour Trust Board for a reconsideration of the rate fixed by the Government of India for the — be forwarded for the orders of that Government.

No. 143, MARINE, 6TH MARCH 1896.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

From W. AUSTIN, Esq., I.C.S., Chairman, Harbour Trust Board, Madras, to the Joint Secretary to Government, Marine Department, dated 21st February 1896, No. 5087 A.

Referring to G.O., No. 2770 W., dated 2nd November 1895, I am requested by the Trustees to again address Government with reference to the fee charged for the audit of the Harbour Works Accounts.

2. The Board has since obtained information from Calcutta and Bombay as to the audit fees paid by the respective Trusts at those ports, and would submit that, in view of the amounts paid by them, the fees fixed for Madras are excessive.

3. The figures compare as follows:—

	RS.	
Calcutta—		
Disbursements, 1894–95	41,04,607	
Audit fee	5,000	= ·12 per cent.
Bombay—		
Disbursements, 1894–95	48,71,153	
Audit fee	2,500	= ·05 ,,
Madras (Harbour Works— (Constn account)		
Disbursements, 1893–94	2,21,586	
Audit fee	3,878	= 1¾ ,,
Disbursements, 1894–95	2,24,260	
Audit fee	3,925	= 1¾ ,,
Revenue Account—		
Disbursements, 1893–94	5,08,205	
Audit fee	1,000	= ·19 ,,
Disbursements, 1894–95	5,34,373	
Audit fee	1,000	= ·18 ,,

X

4. The Trustees wish also to bring prominently to notice that the audit fees which Government has directed should be paid by the Trust, during the past two years, aggregate Rs. 9,803, or an average of Rs. 4,900 *per annum*. The Bank of Madras pays, to two duly qualified Public Accountants, for the bi-annual audit of the accounts of that institution, only Rs. 1,800; and the audit of the accounts of the Madras Bank is a far more complicated, laborious and more responsible undertaking than the audit of the Harbour Trust Accounts; and moreover the fees fixed for Madras upon transactions of only about one-sixth of Bombay are just double the amount paid by the Trustees of that port. If the receipts and disbursements were both taken into account at all three ports, the disproportion would be still greater.

5. The Trustees, therefore, hope that Government will be pleased to represent to the Government of India the enormous difference in the amounts paid by the Calcutta and Bombay Port Trusts, and by the Madras Bank for audit fees, as compared with the fees which the Board has been directed to pay, with a view to obtaining a reduction in the rate fixed (1¾ per cent.) for the audit of the Harbour Works Accounts.

Order—No. 143, Marine, dated 6th March 1896.

Ordered that the Government of India be addressed.

[Here enter No. 144, Marine, dated 6th March 1896.]

(True Extract.)

Under Secy. to Government.

To the Chairman, Harbour Trust Board.
„ „ Examiner P.W. Accounts.

Exd. C. M. Brisson.
Spare Copies

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

Letter—from

Colonel D. McNEIL CAMPBELL, R.E.,
Joint Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Marine Department,

To

The SECRETARY to the GOVERNMENT of INDIA,
Public Works Department.

Sir,

I am directed to forward, for the orders of the Government of India, the accompanying copy of a letter[*] from the Chairman of the Harbour Trust Board requesting a reconsideration of the rate fixed by the Government of India for the audit of the Harbour Works Accounts.

2. In your letter No. 299 M., dated 6th August 1895, it was decided that the Madras Harbour Trust Board should be charged a fixed annual fee at the rate of $1\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. on the outlay[†] on works for the services of the Examiner of Accounts and his office.

3. In the Chairman's letter recorded with G.O. No. 2770 W., dated 2nd November 1895, a copy of which is enclosed, a reduction of this rate was solicited, but His Excellency the Governor in Council was not then prepared to apply to the Government of India for a reconsideration of the orders which had been passed, as the sum fixed did not appear to be unreasonable.

4. The Chairman now submits further information from which it would appear that the amount payable by the Madras Harbour Works is in excess of that recovered from the Trusts both at Calcutta and Bombay. I am accordingly to forward the application for reconsideration, and such orders as the Government of India may consider necessary.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

(Signed) D. McNEIL CAMPBELL, Colonel, R.E.,
Joint Secretary to Government.

Madras,
6th March 1896.

---

[*] No. 5087 A., dated 21st February 1896, printed in G.O. No. 143, Marine, dated 6th March 1896.

[†] Excluding payments in England and exchange thereon.

Exd. C. M. Brisson.
Spare Copies

Govt. of {1896} Madras.

MARINE.

Dated March, 6th.

Recd. *Encl.*

No. 144, 6th March 1896.

MARCH.

Audit of the Harbour Works Accounts

Forwarding, for orders, application from the Chairman of the Harbour Trust Board for a reconsideration of the rate fixed by the Government of India for the —.

~~Marine Current No. 181~~

2907/56

18.C

Recd. 22.2.96

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

From

THE CHAIRMAN,
HARBOUR TRUST BOARD,
MADRAS.

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
Marine Department.

DATED *21st February* 1896.

DESPATCHED 22nd ,,

RECEIVED ,,

No. 5087(a)

SUBJECT.

MADRAS HARBOUR WORKS ACCOUNTS.

Audit Fee —— Requesting, for reasons given, that a representation be again made to the Government of India, for a reduction in the rate fixed *viz.* 1¼%.

G. C. & CO., SCOTTISH PRESS,

1/Pen

Madras Harbour Trust.
SECRETARY'S OFFICE,
21st February 1896.

No. 5087 (a)

FROM

WARE AUSTIN, ESQ., I. C. S.,
CHAIRMAN, HARBOUR TRUST BOARD,
MADRAS.

TO

COL. D. McNEIL CAMPBELL, R. E.,
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
Marine Department.

SIR,

x

Referring to G. O. No. 2770 W., Public Works, dated 2nd November 1895, I am requested by the Trustees to again address Government with reference to the fee charged for the audit of the Harbour Works Accounts.

rd. Com [illegible] [illegible]

2. The Board has since obtained information from Calcutta and Bombay, as to the audit fees paid by the respective Trusts at those ports, and would submit, that in view of the amounts paid by them, the fees fixed for Madras are excessive.

3. The figures compare as follows :—

Calcutta ...	... Disbursements 1894–95,	Rs. 41,04,607	
	Audit Fee	,, 5,000	= ·12%
Bombay ...	... Disbursements 1894–95,	,, 48,71,153	
	Audit Fee	,, 2,500	= ·05%
Madras Harbour Works ...	Disbursements 1893–94,	,, 2,21,586	
	Audit Fee	,, 3,878	= 1¾%
	Disbursements 1894–95,	,, 2,24,260	
	Audit Fee	,, 3,925	= 1¾%
Revenue Account	... Disbursements 1893–94,	,, 5,08,205	
	Audit Fee	,, 1,000	= ·19%
	Disbursements 1894–95,	,, 5,34,373	
	Audit Fee	,, 1,000	= ·18%

7803
2000
9803

4. The Trustees wish also to bring prominently to notice that the audit fees which Government has directed should be paid by the Trust, during the past two years, aggregate Rs. 9,803, or an average of Rs. 4,900 *per annum*. The Bank of Madras pays, to two duly qualified Public Accountants, for the bi-annual audit of the accounts of that institution, only Rs. 1,800; and the audit of the accounts of the Madras Bank is a far more complicated, laborious, and more responsible undertaking than the audit

of the Harbour Trust Accounts; and moreover the fees fixed for Madras upon transactions of only about one-sixth of Bombay, are just double the amount paid by the Trustees of that port. If the receipts and disbursements were both taken into account at all three ports, the disproportion would be still greater.

5. The Trustees, therefore, hope that Government will be pleased to represent to the Government of India the enormous difference in the amounts paid by the Calcutta, and Bombay Port Trusts, and by the Madras Bank for audit fees, as compared with the fees which the Board has been directed to pay; with a view to obtaining a reduction in the rate fixed ($1\frac{3}{4}\%$) for the audit of the Harbour Works Accounts.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Chairman,
Harbour Trust Board.

No. 1108 W of 9-5-95
" 1109 W - 9-5-95
" 2029 W - 15-8-95
" 2770 W - 2-11-95

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Letter from the Chairman H. T. B. (H. E. No. 5087(a) d/ 21 Feby 96)

3 P.

Chairman H. T. B. /
The Exr P. W. A. /

Despd 25/3

W / 2 Mar

Ordered that the Government of India be addressed.

(H. E. No. 144 marine (W.) d/ 6 March/96)

To

The Secretary to the
Government of India,
Public Works Dept.

Sir,

I am directed to forward for the orders of the Government of India the accompanying copy* of a letter from the Chairman of the Harbour Trust Board requesting a reconsideration of the rate fixed by the Government of India for the audit of the Harbour Works Accounts.

* No. 5087(a) dated 21 Feby 1896, printed in G.O. No. 143 Marine d/ 6th March 1896.

W

BP 431/2b

(40—4,000—2-11-95.)

2. In your letter No. 299 M

[illegible] Trust Board should be charged a fixed annual fee at the rate of 1¾ per cent on the outlay* on works for the services of the Examiner of Accounts and his office.

Rate fixed for the Audit of the Madras Harbour Works Accounts.

* excluding payments in England and exchange thereon.

3. In the Chairman's letter recorded with G.O. No. 2770 W dated 2nd November 1895, a copy of which is enclosed, a reduction of this rate was solicited, but His Excellency the Governor in Council was not then prepared to apply to the Government of India for a reconsideration of the orders which had been passed, as the sum fixed did not appear to be unreasonable.

4. The Chairman now submits further information from which it would appear that the amount payable by the Madras Harbour Works is in excess of that recovered from the Trusts both at Calcutta & Bombay. I am accordingly to forward the application for reconsideration, and such orders as the Govt. of India may consider necessary.

27/2/96

prvd 25/3/96

R.S. circ 27/2. Rd: 6/3

arms 27-2-96

No. 695/71 G

Press ~~Miscellaneous~~ ~~Routine~~ No. 72/4 dated 190

…e taken out.	For what purpose. Department.	C. No.	Year.	Initials of clerk taking the paper or of attender.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
5/3/04	Mar	636	of 03		2/4/04	
21208	Lil	5025	of 1896		9-2-09	

should
be charged a fixed amount

Heading. No. $\frac{695}{71}$ G

Dredgers "Wenlock"

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE,
Madras, 28th February 1896.

From

Commander H. A. Street, R.I.M.,
PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,
Madras,

To

THE ~~CHIEF~~ SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
~~Fort Saint George.~~ Chepauk

SIR,

I have the honor to acquaint you, for the information of Government, that the Port officer, Pamban, has brought to notice that the Pamban channels are greatly in need of dredging, and that in consequence of the accumulation of sand in the Horse Shoe Channel the steamers making use of it are constantly running aground.

2. Messrs. Mackinnon Mackenzie & Co. of Calcutta have also addressed me on the subject, and as the matter seems urgent it is advisable

to

charge as soon as possible. On enquiry I find that the state of the "Venlock's" bottom is so foul — she appears to have been docked last in December 1894 — that it would be useless to employ her in dredging until she has had her bottom cleaned and painted. It is reported that she is unlikely to be able to go at a greater speed under her own steam than 2 knots an hour, so it will be necessary to have her towed to Bombay, for she, could not possibly steam against the head winds likely to be experienced on the voyage. I therefore beg that sanction may be accorded (a) to my making the best arrangements possible for having the vessel towed to Bombay and (b) to her being docked at that port. The cost of towing will be, I expect, between Rupees (3,000) Three thousand and Rupees (4,000) Four thousand, and the cost of docking, painting, &c., may be put down approximately at Rupees (3,000) Three thousand, and this expenditure Rupees (7,000) seven thousand can be debited to Port Funds of Eastern and Western groups and Madras on the li laid down in G.O. Financial No. 586 of 13th August 1895.

04830.8.95

3. It will be unnecessary to have the vessel towed back from Bombay

4. An estimate of the cost of towing the vessel to Bombay will be submitted in due course but as the matter is urgent I beg that early sanction may be accorded to my sending the vessel to that port as soon as possible.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,

H A Street
Commander, R.I.M.,
Presidency Port Officer

he ch
fee
on
The
of C
3.
re
da
Cap
re
so
The
a
Ap
In
The

Urgent

Marine (1896) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,

Madras,

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

~~PUBLIC WORKS~~ (MARINE) DEPARTMENT,

~~Madras,~~
Chepak

No. 695/71 G

Dated 28 } February 1896
Received }

No.

No. 368 d/ 14-9-94 marine
" 404 " 16-10-94 "
" 441 " 13-11-94 "
" 451 " 16-11-94 "
" 474 " 12-12-94 "
" 88 " 19-3-95 "
" 586 " 13-8-95 Finl
(& 104 d/ 30-8-95 marine)

Subject.

Requesting permission to send the Dredger "Wenlock" to Bombay for docking.

Recd. 15 Mar

6-3-97
Marine Current No: 915

Recd. 28-2-96

Vide (No. 216-

104

No. 845. marine d/ 7 march/96. (Marine)

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Letter from the Presy: Port Officer (R.C. No. 695/71 G d/ 28 Feby 96)

I do not see how this expense is to be avoided – if docking is absolutely necessary. She is close to the place where she is wanted. Cannot she make her way there at 2 miles an hour – & do her work with a foul bottom! Last time we proposed to get her scraped & cleaned on the beach, but that was held to be impossible. If she goes to Bombay, I know they will report that to put her in working order will cost another 8000 rupees – but I think this must be resisted.

The hon. Mr. Stokes should see this.

W
4 Mar

The proposals of the Presidency Port Officer are approved.

2. There being no budget provision for the expenditure, the question of funds will be considered in the Financial Dept.

7/3/96

To,
The Presy Port Officer
" Accountant Genl.
" Financial Dept.

DESPATCHED
7 MAR 96
(40–4,000–2-11-95.)

Copy
7.3.96

It was Capt Powell, I think who told us that the "Wenlock" couldn't be beached in order to have her bottom cleaned. If Capt Street is of the same opinion, I don't see what we can do but send her to Bombay as

with it we are ~~one~~ not
seeing after the upkeep of
the vessel in a proper way.
We let her lie at Tuticorin until
found that she can't steam
against a moderate head wind,
& then, when we want to use her,
we find that time is lost by
the necessity of docking before
use is possible. This is not
the way to deal with an iron
vessel. Every such vessel
should be docked at fixed intervals ~~[illegible]~~,
the length of which will depend on
the water in which she lies. I believe
ship owners usually dock iron vessels at
intervals of not more than 6 months,
but perhaps, if we laid this vessel
up during the S.W. monsoon in
Cochin, in practically fresh water,
she might go longer. Another thing
we do not attend to is overhaul of
machinery. Capt Campbell tells
me at the Calcutta dockyard that
once a year the machinery ought
to be overhauled by the skilled staff
of a dockyard. I think Capt Street
sh'd be asked to advise on these
points & to lay down some regular
system.

In this connection, we'd ask when
the Pearl fishery Str. was last docked
& what the arrangements are for her
being docked & having her machinery
overhauled at regular intervals?

5/3/96

6/3

H/B

Docking of the Dredger "Wenlock" —

Urgent

The Hon Mr. Bliss C.I.E.

No. 145. Marine d/ 7-3-96

(1) Issue &
(2) send back to
Chr
6/
9/3

Marine Current No: 216

Marine (1896) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,
Madras,

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
~~PUBLIC WORKS~~ (MARINE) DEPARTMENT,
~~Madras.~~ Chepak

No. 695/72 G

Dated 28 } February 1896.
Received }

No.

Subject.

Informing of the difficulty of docking the Dredger "Wenlock" at Colombo.

H E/B

Recd: 28-2-96

No. 146. Marine d/ 7th March /96

Approved
4 Mar

3/3/96

The P.P.O.

3.3.96

Vide C No. 215 –

DESPATCHED
7 - MAR 96

truth is we are ~~we~~ not
seeing after the upkeep of
the vessel in a proper way.
We let her lie at Tuticorin until
found that she can't steam
against a moderate head wind,
then, when we want to use her,
we found that time is lost by
the necessity of docking before
use is possible. This is not
the way to deal with an iron
vessel. Every such vessel
should be docked at fixed intervals,
the length of which will depend on
the water in which she lies. Ship
owners usually dock iron vessels at
intervals of not more than 6 months,
but perhaps, if we laid this vessel
up during the S.W. monsoon in
Cochin, in practically fresh water,
she might go longer. Another thing
we do not attend to is overhaul of
machinery. Capt Campbell tells
me at the Calcutta dockyard that
once a year the machinery ought
to be overhauled by the skilled staff
of a dockyard. I think Capt Street
should be asked to advise on these
points & to lay down some regular
system.

In this connection, Wd. ask when
the Pearl fishery Str. was last docked
& what the arrangements are for her
being docked & having her machinery
overhauled at regular intervals?

5/3/96

#

Docking of the dredger "Wenlock" —

Urgent

The Hon Mr. Bliss C.I.E.

No. 145. marine d/ 7-3-96

(1) Issue &
(2) send back to

9/3

Heading. No. $\frac{695}{72}$ G.

dredger "Wenlock"

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE,

Madras, 28th February 1896.

From

Commander H. A. Street, R.I.M.

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,

Madras,

To

THE ~~CHIEF~~ SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

MARINE DEPARTMENT,

~~Fort Saint George.~~ Chepak.

SIR,

Cn. 215 marine

In connection with my letter No. $\frac{695}{71}$ G, dated 28th February 1896, reporting the state of the dredger "Wenlock" and asking sanction to sending her to Bombay to be docked, I have the honor to acquaint you, for the information of Government, that in order to ascertain whether the Vessel could be taken on the patent slip at Colombo I directed Mr. T. H. Baker, Port officer, Tuticorin, to to proceed there and to furnish me with a report on the matter after having inspected the slip. I have this day received his report which is to the effect that the "slip" is out of order and also is too small for the "Wenlock." I beg that my action in the matter may be approved.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your obedient Servant,

H. A. Street
Commander R. I. M.
Presidency Port Officer

Marine (1896) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,
Madras,

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
~~PUBLIC WORKS~~ (MARINE) DEPARTMENT,
~~Madras~~ Chepauk

No. 695/72 G

Dated 28 } February 1896.
Received }

No.

Subject.

Informing of the difficulty of docking the Dredger "Wenlock" at Colombo.

Marine Current No. 216

H E/β

Recd: 28.2.9

No. 146. Marine d/ 7th Mar

w/ 4 Mar

Approved

3/3/96

The P. P. O.

3.3.96

Vide C No. 215-

DESPATCHED
7 - MAR 96