Date taken out.	Department.	C. No.	ols.	Initials of Referencer.		

R.O.
10

Marine (1896) Department.

G.O., No. 253 Marine

DATED 16th April 1896

[Despatch Abstract.]

Remeasurement of cargo boats at C[illegible]in:

Passing orders on Correspondence regarding the

M. 5
500—18-8-96.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	1175	Ma:	5-3-96				
SC	223	〃	14-6.94				
	334	〃	18-8-94				
	50	〃	10-2-94				

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Gobt. of {1896} Madras.

MARINE.

Dated April, 16th.

Rec *Encl.*

G.O. No. 253, 16th April 1896.

APRIL.

Remeasurement of Cargo Boats

Declining to interfere with the discretion of the Port Officer in the matter of the — at Cochin.

No. 253, Marine, 16th April 1896.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

Read—the following papers :—

From Messrs. Aspinwall and Company, Cochin, dated 3rd February 1896.
Letter from the Presidency Port Officer, dated 26th February 1896, No. 646/66 G.
" " " 21st March " No. 646/100 G.

Order—No. 253, Marine, dated 16th April 1896.

The correspondence quoted above has arisen out of an order issued by the Port Officer, Cochin, in consequence of which all cargo boats have been remeasured and their carrying capacity reduced where necessary. Several of the merchants take exception to the method by which the carrying capacity is calculated. They represent that, under the system adopted by the Port Officer, the carrying capacity of boats has practically been cut down about 2½ times less than what it really is, and that though this system may be necessary in surf-bound ports, it is not so in Cochin, where the port is not surf-bound and boats travel in deep water from ship to jetty; and the latter being in the river there are no risks in landing. As an argument in support of their contention it is mentioned that a 1,000-ton vessel will carry 2,000 tons dead weight, and though the merchants do not claim the same proportionate carrying capacity for cargo boats, they urge that the principle of dead weight and measurement capacities, even in cargo boats, should be recognized, and allowance made for the exceptional circumstances of the Port of Cochin where the dead weight capacity should, they consider, be calculated as being half as much again as per measurement.

2. The Presidency Port Officer was called on to consider these points and his letter No. 646/100 G., dated 21st March 1896, is the reply. He points out that the statement made as to the carrying capacity of boats being cut down 2½ times is not quite correct, that though the boats are no longer permitted to carry the same quantity of cargo as formerly, the reduction has not been so great as represented, and that the reduction actually made was necessary owing to the frequent jettisoning of cargo from boats plying to and from the ships in the roadstead; the boats having been loaded with a greater quantity of dead weight cargo than they could safely carry. This statement is supported by a return prepared by the Port officer showing a long list of boats compelled to jettison cargo between January and August 1895. It is pointed out that the Port officer is, in his capacity of Registering officer, responsible for deciding the safe load of boats, and that there is no proof that he has underestimated this load.

3. With regard to the contention of Messrs. Aspinwall and Company that Cochin is not a "surf-bound" port, the Presidency Port Officer points out that there is a bar over which at times deeply laden boats find considerable difficulty in crossing safely, and that boats are sometimes totally lost in crossing this bar.

4. The comparison between the respective carrying capacities of a decked vess l and an open boat is said to be untenable, and it is pointed out in conclusion that the boat owners are not unanimous in considering that the action of the Port Officer at Cochin is likely to have a prejudicial effect on the trade of the port.

5. On full consideration of all the circumstances, His Excellency the Governor in Council is not prepared to interfere with the discretion of the Port Officer in the matter.

(True Extract.)

Under Secy. to Government.

To Messrs. Aspinwall and Company, Cochin.
„ the Presidency Port Officer.

Exd. Md. Pahilvan,
Spare Copies

Marine ~~Public Works~~ Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following

Endts.

From Messrs. Aspinwall & Co., Cochin, dated 3rd February 1896.
~~Endorsement to~~ the Presy. Port Officer, ~~Madras, No. 63 E., d/14th Feby. 96.~~
Letter from - do - No. 646/66. G., d/26th - do -
~~Endt. to - do -~~ - ~~No. 117 E., dated 5th March 1896.~~
Letter from - do - No. 646/ 100 G., d/21st March '96.

No. 253 Marine, d/16th April 1896

A.SH
15.4.96

The correspondence quoted above has arisen out of an order issued by the Port Officer, Cochin, in consequence of which all cargo boats have been remeasured and their carrying capacity reduced where necessary. Several of the merchants take exception to the method by which the carrying capacity is calculated. They represent that under the system adopted by the Port Officer, the carrying capacity of boats has practically been cut down about 2½ times less than what it really is, and that though this system may be necessary in surf-bound ports, it is not so in Cochin, where the port is not surf-bound and boats travel in deep water from ship to jetty; and the latter being in the river there are no risks in landing. As an argument in support of ~~this~~ their contention it

40—300—6-3-96.

it is mentioned that a 1000 ton vessel will carry 2000 tons dead weight, and though the merchants do not claim the same proportionate carrying capacity for cargo boats, they urge that the principle of dead weight and measurement capacities, even in cargo boats, should be recognised, and allowance made for the exceptional circumstances of the Port of Cochin, where the dead weight capacity should, they consider, be calculated as being half as much again as per measurement.

2. The Presidency Port Officer was called on to consider these points and his letter No. 646/100 G. dated 21st March 1896 is the reply. He points out that the statement made as to the carrying capacity of boats being cut down 2½ times is not quite correct, that though the boats are no longer permitted to carry the same quantity of cargo as formerly, the reduction has not been so great as represented, and that the reduction actually made was necessary owing to the frequent jettisoning of cargo from boats plying to and from the ships in the roadstead; the boats having been loaded with a greater quantity of dead weight cargo than they could safely carry. This statement is supported by a return prepared by the Port Officer showing a long list of boats compelled to jettison cargo between January and August 1895. It is pointed out that the Port Officer is, in his capacity of Registering Officer, responsible for deciding the safe load of boats, and that there is no proof that he has underestimated this load.

3. With regard to the contention of Messrs. Aspinwall & Co. that Cochin is not a "surf-bound" port, the Presidency Port Officer points out that there is a bar over which at times deeply laden boats find considerable difficulty in crossing safely, and that boats are sometimes totally lost in crossing this bar.

4. The comparison between the respective carrying capacities of a decked vessel and an open boat is said to be untenable, and it is pointed out, in conclusion that the boat owners are not unanimous in considering that the action of the Port Officer at Cochin is likely to have a prejudicial effect on the trade of the Port.

5. On full consideration of all the circumstances, His Excellency the Governor in Council is not prepared to interfere with the ~~decision~~ discretion of the Port Officer in the matter.

DESPATCHED
MAY

To

Messrs. Aspinwall & Co. Cochin,
The Presy. Port Officer.

30/3/96

A/6

Remeasurement of
Cargo boats at Cochin

To be returned to Ootaca:
:mund after issue

m/17.4

Cochin. 17th September. 1895.

The Collector of Malabar.
Calicut.

Sir,

We the undersigned, representing all the principal merchants and boatowners in this place, have the honor to bring to your notice a recent order issued by the local Port Officer regarding the carrying capacity of cargo boats, and which if enforced must seriously injure the shipping interests of this port.

An extract from the Circular notice issued by this official is enclosed herewith and the order to which we take exception is that reading as follows:-

> "The quantity of cargo now specified is the
> "authorized quantity in deadweight each boat
> "should ply with when loaded."

We would mention in explanation that the quantity fixed by the Port Officer in each boat's register is arrived at by measuring the said boat, and we maintain that the result does not determine the maximum "weight" which she can carry, which would be quite contrary to all recognized custom and experience, but merely the cubical measurement capacity. For example a vessel of say 1000 Tons nett register is capable of carrying at least 2000 Tons deadweight, but according to our Port Officer's views, her cargo should be limited to 1000 tons!

As showing the very serious difference which this innovation would make, and taking Rice and/or Paddy as the chief article concerned, we beg to mention that a boat which has always been in the habit of carrying at least 300 Bags is now limited to 200 Bags, and when this curtailment is extended over the whole fleet of the port, it must be needless to point out that not only will the cost of transport be heavily enhanced, but the loading and discharging of vessels seriously retarded.

We are unable to ascertain what reason has prompted the Port Officer to pass the order, but we can only say that boats have ever since there construction been in the habit of carrying the cargoes which this official now determines is too much, and as there is no single instance on record of any mishap having occurred in consequence of overloading, we respectfully beg to submit that this is sufficient evidence to prove that there is no necessity or cause for any reform, and that therefore, this unwarrantable order, so detrimental to the interests concerned, should be rescinded.

We would further add that as cargo boats are uninsurable, it is not at all likely that the owners thereof would run the risk of losing same by giving them more cargo than they could safely carry, or even if they did, would the crews acquiesce in a matter which threatened their own safety.

Respectfully begging that the matter may receive your prompt and favorable consideration, and that the Port Officer may be instructed not to interfere with a custom which has been in vogue for many years and with respect to which no evidence can be produced to shew that a reform is necessary.

We have the honor to be
Sir
Your obedient Servants.
(Signed.) Aspinwall & Co.
Volkart Brothers.
Peirce Leslie & Co.

No 6/

Salvadore Fernandez
Francis Noranho.
Sagai Fernandez
Marian Fernandez.
Thomas Gonsalvas
Veerchund Hemraj
Soonderjee Dewjee
Mowjee Canjee
and other boat owners

(Signed.) Hajee Moosa Hajee Ahmed
Gopal Mahadeva & Co
Damjee Ooka & Co.
Lukhmechund Maneckchund
Hajee Abdulla Hajee Adam
Hajee Essa Salley Md & Sons
Runchordass Khetsey & Co
Haji Osman Haji Allarakia & Son
Hunsraj Deojee
K. Moidun Cooty
Premchund Canjee
Mooljee Jaitha & Co.
Cummursee Khetsey & Co
Maneckchund Durrumsee.
and others.

Encls 20
Mar 605/86

Circular Notice.

The amended Registered Boat licenses, as per attached list, are herewith returned; their receipts are to be acknowledged.

2. Each Boat has been remeasured (as per endorsement) and the number of crew reduced where necessary.

The quantity of cargo now specified is the authorized quantity in dead weight each Boat should ply with when loaded.

3. When the Registered Tindal of a Boat requires to be changed it should be notified as per Rule 10 - and Boat owners are cautioned of the penalty they incur when convicted of disobedience to any of the Boat Rules.

Cochin.
10 · 9 · 95.

(Signed.) M. Woodhouse
Port Officer

Encls 19
Mar 105/86

Cochin 2nd October 1895.

The Presidency Port Officer.
Madras.

Sir,

We have the honor to submit herewith copy of a Petition addressed by us to the Collector of Malabar and which has been rejected for the reasons stated in the copy of that Officials' Proceedings also enclosed herein.

As we the petitioners were under the impression that the proper channel for such appeal was through the Collector we were much disappointed to find that our petition had been thrown out, and for reasons which leave no satisfaction, but only the feeling of an uncourteous dismissal.

The matter, however, being of serious import to all concerned in the shipping interests of this port, we venture to lay our Petition before you; and respectfully beg that it may receive your prompt and careful consideration.

We will not trouble you by repeating or adding to what is already contained in our appeal, but should you desire any further particulars we shall be happy to give you all the information we can furnish.

Trusting that our grievance will be made apparent to you and receive the support which we now solicit, and it being important that the matter should be finally settled without delay, respectfully requesting that same will receive your prompt attention.

We have the honor to be
Sir
Your obedient Servants
(Signed) Aspinwall & Co. + others

Enclo B

Trias 105/86

Heading. No. 646/1039 M.

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE,

Madras, 22d October 1895.

ASPINWALL & Co
24 OCT 95
COCHIN

To

Messrs Aspinwall & Co
and others
Cochin.

~~Sir,~~ Gentlemen,

I am in receipt of your letter of 2d October 1895, on the subject of which a full report has also been called for and received from the Port Officer at Cochin and in reply beg to inform you that I quite approve of the action taken by that Officer to prevent the overloading of cargo boats. That such action was urgently called for owing to the loss of cargo by boatmen jettisoning the same is proved, to say nothing of the danger to life.

2. In my opinion the dead weight should be limited to the registered ton of the boat. The question of a 1000 ton ship carrying 2000 tons dead weight has no bearing on the case which is that of

an

an open boat working in a seaway.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your Obedient Servant.

Charles C Hewett

Commander R. I. M.

Ag: Presidency Port Officer.

From

THE PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,

Madras,

To

Dated }
Received } 189 .

No.

E No 17

Mar 05/96

24th October 1895.

M. Woodhouse Esq.
Port Officer.
Cochin.

Sir,

In replying to a Petition sent to him in connection with your recent order regarding the carrying capacity of cargo boats, the Presidency Port Officer writes us that he approves of your action because "that such action was urgently called "for owing to the loss of cargo by boatmen jettisoning "the same is proved to say nothing of the danger "to life."

As we are unable to find any records to prove the urgency or necessity for the step taken, we should be much obliged if you could furnish us with the particulars which you have apparently sent to the Presidency Port Officer, for we should appreciate it being similarly proved to us that cargo boats have hitherto been overloaded.

Thanking you in anticipation.

We remain, Sir,

Yours faithfully.

Sd/ Aspinwall & Co

Enclos 6
Mar 105/96

PORT OFFICE.

COCHIN 25. 10. 1895.

ASPINWALL & Co.
OCT 95
COCHIN.

No 30
7/5

Heading
Loss of Cargo from Boats.

FROM

M. WOODHOUSE, Esq,
Port Officer,
COCHIN.

To

~~The~~ Messrs Aspinwall & Co
" Cochin

Enclosures:—
Nil

~~Sir,~~ Gentlemen,

In reply to your letter of yesterday asking to be furnished with the particulars of loss of cargo from Boats, submitted by me to the Presidency Port Officer, I beg to state that the particulars of jettisoned cargo noted before me have already been supplied to you. All the other instances were obtained from the several Officers before whom the protests were noted.

I regret being unable to supply you with the particulars you ask as this correspondence is now closed; final orders having been received from the Presidency Port Officer, Madras.

I have the honour to be
Gentlemen
Your most Obedt Servt

M Woodhouse
Port Officer

Encl No 15
Mar 105/96

25th October 1895.

M. Woodhouse Esq
Port Officer
Cochin

Sir,

Your letter No 30/75 of date to hand, from which we note you are unable to supply us with the information asked for in our letter of 24th idem. "as this correspondence is now closed."

In our opinion this is very far from being the case, nor do we take the view expressed by the Presidency Port Officer Madras as final, as it is clear from the remarks made he is labouring under a very wrong impression.

We have therefore again to request that you will be good enough to furnish us with the particulars asked for, or if you still decline to do so, would you favor us with the names of the "several officers before whom the protests were noted", so that we may get the information ourselves.

The only particulars we have got are of 3 protests signed before you, and 3 before Mr. Black.

We have the honor to be
Sir
Your obedient Servants

(Signed) Aspinwall & Co

PORT OFFICE.

No 30
76

COCHIN 26. 10. 1895.

ASPINWALL & Co
28 OCT 95
COCHIN.

Heading
Loss of Cargo from Boats.

FROM

M. WOODHOUSE, Esq,
Port Officer,
COCHIN.

To

~~Th~~ Messrs: Aspinwall & Co
Cochin

Enclosures:—
Nil

Gentlemen,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th Instant, and in reply beg to state that all the particulars you ask for were obtained from

1. Mr W. N. Black (Aspinwall & Co)
2. Mr Badenoch (Peirce Leslie & Co)
3. The Superintendent, Sea Customs, Malipuram
4. The Port Officer, Cochin,

I have the honor to be
Gentlemen
Your most Obedt Servt

M Woodhouse
Port Officer

Encls 14
Inw 10th/86

Enclo 13
[illegible] 105/96

28th October 1895.

G. Badenoch Esq.
Special Magistrate & Justice of the Peace.
Cochin.

Sir,

We shall feel obliged if you will kindly favor us with a statement (in form as annexed) the numbers of the cargo boats, the tindals of which have noted protests before you in consequence of having jettisoned cargo owing to bad weather &c &c, and the quantity of cargo (bags) they carried before the time of jettisoning from 1st January 1889. to date.

We have the honor to be
Sir.
Your obedient Servants

(Signed.) Aspinwall & Co

Encls 12
Mar 05/86

TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS, PEIRCE.

PEIRCE, LESLIE & Co
2, LIME St SQUARE, LONDON, E.C.
COCHIN, CALICUT, TELLICHERRY,
& COIMBATORE,
SOUTHERN INDIA.

Cochin 4th November 1895.

Messrs Aspinwall & Co.
Agents B. I. S. N. Coy "Ltd"
Cochin

Dear Sirs,

In reply to your letter of 28th Octr. I beg to inform you the following protests have been noted before me.

Date	Boat No.	No. of Bags	Steamers	No. Jettisoned
27/12/93	52	199 B. Paddy	Landaura	189 ✓ (got aground)
13/3/94	6	160 "	Golden Cross	portion ✓
17/3/94	6	160 "	-do-	do ✓
19/3/94	148	200 "	Guernsey	unknown
2/5/94	107	180 "	Wardha	7 ✓
2/5/94	159	200 "	-do-	9 ✓
28/12/94.	169.	280 "	Sirsa.	66. ✓

Yours faithfully

Justice of the Peace & 1st class
Special Magistrate.

	20.	do	145.	275.	38.
August	10.	Scindia	186.	150.	15.

Encls 11
Mar 105/56

4th October 1895.

M. Woodhouse Esq.
Port Officer
Cochin.

Sir,

Owing to absence from Cochin, I have been unable to reply to your letter No $\frac{30}{65}$ of 16th Sept. ere this.

I now beg to annex the information asked for, and may state that these are the only instances of protests for jettisoned cargo which have been signed before me since March 1889.

Might I ask you to be good enough to give me a similar return of all cases of jettison in which protests have been signed before you, since March 1889.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Yours obedient Servant

(Signed) W. A. Black
Special Magistrate and
Justice of the Peace
Cochin.

Date		Steamers Names	No of Boat	No of Bags in Boat	No of Bags jettisoned.
1895. May.	20.	s.s. "Nevasa"	29.	253	43.
"	20.	" do	145.	275.	38.
August	10.	" Scindia	186.	150.	15.

Encls 10
[illegible] 105/56

PORT OFFICE.

COCHIN 7th Octr 1895

Heading
Protests

No. 30/72

FROM

M. WOODHOUSE, Esq.,

Port Officer,

COCHIN.

To

W. N. Black Esqre
~~The~~ Justice of the Peace
Cochin

Enclosures:—
Nil

Sir,

I beg to thank you for your letter of the 4th Inst and the information contained. The following protests of Jettisoned Cargo have been noted before me viz:-

Date	Boat No.	Steamer	No. of Bags	Jettisoned	
26th Augst '95	154	"Teviotdale"	160	27	✓
25 — Do —	111	"Nadir"	300	23	✓
26 June '95	49	"Ellora"	520 coils Rope	47 coils	✓

The above are the only protests of Jettisoned Cargo from Cargo Boats noted in this office.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your most Obedt Servant

M Woodhouse
Port Officer &
Magistrate

Encl 9
Mar 60 5/56

28th October. 1895.

The Superintendent
Sea Customs
Malipuram

Sir,

We shall feel obliged if you will kindly favour us with a Statement (in form as annexed) shewing the numbers of the cargo boats, the tindals of which have noted protests before you in consequence of having jettisoned cargo owing to bad weather &c &c, and the quantity of cargo (bags) they carried before the time of jettisoning from 1st. January 1889 to date.

We have the honor to be
Sir
Your obedient Servants
(Signed.) Aspinwall & Co

No. 176

Sea Custom Office
Malipuram 11. 11. 95

To,
Messrs Aspinwall & Co.
Cochin

Sirs,

As requested in your letter of the 28th ultimo I have the honor to forward herewith a Statement as per form received, shewing the number of the Cargo Boats the tindals of which have noted Protests before me in consequence of having jettisoned Cargo—

I have the honour to be,
Sirs,
Your most Obdt Servt

G. L. D'Silva
Suptt.

Encls 8
Mas 105/96

Date		Boat No.	Steamer	No. of Bags	Jettisoned
1892 July	4	36	"Landaura"	170 Bags Rice	34
"	"	107	do	× 170 do	Boat broken up
"	"	51	do	× 174 do	do
"	"	57	do	160 do	37
"	"	151	do	140 do	18
"	"	14	do	× 169 do	Boat broken up
1893 June	8	103	"Hounslow"	107 do Paddy	18
"	"	96	do	108 do do	23
"	12	85	do	× 76 do do	Boat broken up
1894 June	25	61	"Balcarris Brook"	× 90 do do	Boat sunk
July	14	123	"Stanley Hall"	129 Bags Rice	21
"	25	69	do	128 Paddy	unable to state how many bags were jettisoned
1895 July	4 ✓	92	"Mombassa"	220 Rice	26.
"	11 ✓	26	"Chindwara"	68 Packages	40.

11-11-95.

× These boats stranded owing to heavy weather, & there was no loss by jettison.

Cochin 14th November 1895

The Presidency Port Officer
Madras.

Sir,

We have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter No 646/1039 M dated 22nd October from which we observe you state that you quite approve of the action taken by the Port Officer here to prevent the overloading of cargo boats and that such action was urgently called for, owing to the loss of cargo by boatmen jettisoning same, is proved.

The delay in replying to this has been caused by our trying to obtain the proofs which have led you to this conclusion. We applied to the local Port Officer, as per correspondence enclosed, to favor us with the statements he made to you, but this was denied us, and we have only just got the particulars from the different sources to which he referred us.

From these returns we have compiled a statement marked A shewing the jettisons which have taken place at this port and Narrakal since beginning of 1889, but as apparently there were none prior to 1892 we will deal with figures only from that date.

The following figures will shew the quantity of Rice and Paddy imported into Cochin and Narrakal for the following years.

	Total	
1st July '92 c 30th June '93	1.348.514	Bags
1st July '93 c 30th June '94	902.908	do
1st July '94 c 30th June '95	1.290.177	do
	3.541.599	

The yearly average landing is therefore 1180533.

The jettisonings are as follows:-

	Total
1st. July '92. c 30th June '93.	130
1st. July '93. c 30th June '94	276
1st. July '94 c 30th June '95.	232
	638.

The yearly average jettisoned being 213. Bags

We would here state that in dealing with the returns, which in cases where the quantity jettisoned is "unknown" and "portion", we have put down half the cargo to be on the safe side, further that we have not included the boat which is returned as "got aground", as this could not be classed as jettison.

To sum up the percentage of cargo jettisoned, to that landed is .018 or practically nil.

This seems a fallacious method where human life is concerned. The question is whether boats are overloaded or [illegible] R.S. 27 Feb 96

Accidents will of course sometimes happen, and it would be folly to expect that in landing such a large quantity of grain, particularly at certain seasons of the year, there should be no jettisoning through stress of weather, but what we do assert is, that in no single instance in the returns before us, has the jettison been caused by overloading of the boat.

This seems an unwarranted assertion L.S.

We are ignorant of the "proofs" which the Port Officer has put before you, but we have done our utmost to obtain all the information we can, and we believe what we submit to you is correct. We therefore not only most emphatically deny the charge that boats at this port are overloaded, but we further assert that the recent action taken by that officer is not only totally unjustifiable, but is an unwarranted and uncalled for interference with the trade of this port. By all means let him supervise the working of these boats, but before he attempts to make sweeping changes, it would be well if he worked on more correct data.

If overloading of boats had been in vogue here, and heavy losses of cargo generally, surely the first to complain would be the Insurance Companies, but no word from them, nor could there be when such claims as jettison are practically unheard of, and in this respect we believe our port will compare favourably with any other.

As to "the danger to life" – this is the first time even such an argument has been brought forward, and we can hardly think it is seriously meant. Is it likely that any native boatman would jeopardise his life by taking more cargo than his boat could carry?

We would now refer again to the carrying capacity of the boats of this port. We note you are of opinion that the D/W should be limited to the registered tonnage, but we presume the method of obtaining that registered tonnage will also be taken into account.

We believe the custom in vogue at all ports in the Presidency is the same when measuring boats, i.e. multiply the length by the breadth and depth, then divide by 100 (40 cubic feet being the recognised measurement of 20 cwts) which practically cuts down a boat about 2½ times less than what she really is. This may be necessary when dealing with surf bound ports, (as nearly all in the Presidency are) where boats run greater risk in loading and consequently require a greater free board, but in this respect Cochin is unique, we are not surf bound and boats travel in deep water from ship to jetty, and the latter being in the river, are subjected to no risks in landing.

We therefore submit that rules framed for the majority of the ports are not applicable to this one, and should consequently be modified accordingly.

We will give one example. Take licensed boat No 145 her measurements are 30'3" x 10'2" x 5'1" (actual length is 42'6") which give 1564 cubic feet capacity, or tonnage of 39 tons of 40 cubic feet, but instead of this the rules only allow 15¾ tons! i.e. taking 100 cubic feet to the ton! This we have been informed by the Port Officer is to represent her D/W. carrying power, so that while she can take only 205 Bags Rice, according to this she may carry 140 Bales of Yarn of 2¼ cwts each, which it would be perfectly impossible for her to do.

This boat has been working for some years, her usual cargo is 250/300 Bags Rice or 70 Bales Yarn, so it will be seen the present action of the Port Officer has entirely reversed matters.

The above example is only one of many which we might quote, but think this will suffice for our argument.

The question of a 1000 ton vessel carrying 2000 tons D/W. you state has no bearing on the case, but we presume that the statement will not be denied. It is not our intention to claim the same proportionate carrying capacity for cargo boats, but we do submit that the principle of D/W and measurement capacities, even in cargo boats, should be recognized, and our contention is that considering how the carrying capacities in these boats is arrived at (calcul

by again

to the ton) also the exceptional circumstance under which cargo is landed at this port, in so far as there is no surf, and the boat being in "liquid" from ship to shore, D/W capacity should be calculated as being half as much again as per measurement. We have therefore to beg that you will be good enough to give this matter your most considerate attention, for it is one which very seriously affects this port, and moreover is one wherein we do not think we are asking more than we are entitled to, seeing we are only contending for what has been in vogue here for many years

As to the serious effects on the trade of the port, we would like to point out, that our great want here is, not boats, but men. It is with the greatest difficulty, at certain seasons of the year, that we can get sufficient men to carry on the work of the port, when we remind you, that owing to this being a tidal port, it is next to impossible for boats to do two trips a day, it will be seen at a glance that if the carrying capacity of these boats is reduced, still further delay and expense will be incurred both to ship and shippers

As it is this port has not got a very good name for despatch, and we do not think it will be improved by cutting down the carrying capacity of the boats 25/35%! for, what we submit, no reason at all.

There are many other points in this boat question we should like to address you on, but fear our letter has already assumed too great a length.

We will therefore conclude by again begging that you will b [illegible] consider our remarks.

We have the honor to be
Sir
Your obedient Servants
(Signed.) Aspinwall & Co.

Encl 5
Mer 105/96

A

Date		Boat No	Steamer	No. of Bags	Jettisoned
1892 July	4	36	Landaura	170 Bags Rice	34
	"	57	do	160 " do	37
	"	151	do	140 " do	18
1893 June	8	103	Hamslow	107 " Paddy	18
	"	96	do	108 " do	23
December	27	52	Landaura	199 " do	189 (got aground)
1894 March	13	6	Golden Cross	160 " do	Portion
	17	6	do	160 " do	do
	19	148	Guernsey	200 " do	unknown
May	2	107	Wardha	180 " do	7
	"	159	do	200 " do	9
July	14	123	Stanley Hall	129 " Rice	21
	25	69	do	128 " Paddy	unable to state how many bags were jettisoned
December	28	169	Sirsa	280 " do	66
1895 May	20 ✓	29	Nevasa	253 " do	43
	" ✓	145	do	275 "	38
June	26 ✓	49	Ellora	520 coils Rope	47 coils
July	14 ✓	92	Mombassa	220 Bags Rice	26
	11 ✓	26	Chindwara	68 packages	40
August	10 ✓	186	Scindia	150 Bags	15
	25 ✓	111	Sadie	300 "	23
	26 ✓	154	Teviotdale	160 "	27

Encls 4
MCR 105/56

---

finst

Heading. No. 646/1217 M

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE,
Madras, 12th December 1895

ASPINWALL & CO
14 DEC 95
COCHIN.

To

Messrs. Aspinwall & Co.;
Cochin

~~Sir~~ Gentlemen,

In reply to your lette of 14th November 1895, I have the honor to state that having carefu considered over the matter I see no reason to alter the decision arrived at in this office lette No. 646/1039 M of 22nd October 1895 and that the action of the Por Officer, Cochin is approved an confirmed.

I have the honor to be,
Gentlemen,
Your obedient Servan
Walter S. Bewle

Commander R.I.
Presidency Port Offic

M.D.

Cochin 20th December 1895.

To

The Presidency Port Officer.

Madras.

Sir,

We have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter No $\frac{646}{1217}$ dated 12th inst.

It is much to be regretted that you have not considered it worthwhile to favor us with the reasons which have induced you to give the decision you have arrived at, or in any way to justify the action of the Port Officer Cochin, beyond approving and confirming same.

From this we infer that your opinion is, a Port Officer may without any notice, without any just cause or reason, upset, alter or cancel any custom or practice which may have been in vogue at a port for years, that his action whether right or wrong is final, and that those interested are to accept same without rhyme or reason!

In this instance the Port Officer, Cochin, has brought a very serious charge against the boatowners of this port, viz overloading of cargo boats, and consequent heavy loss through jettisoning, to say nothing of the danger to life.

We have sent you proof by figures obtained from the Authorities that this charge is perfectly unjustifiable and unwarranted. You do not question the returns we sent, so presume you accept them as correct, being possibly corroborated by the ll report previously sent to you by the t Officer.

On the strength of this false charge,

From

The Presidency Port Officer,

Madras,

To

Dated }
Received } 189 .

No.

[illegible] 105/96

the Port Officer, Cochin, was pleased to issue an order stating that the measurement of a boat was to represent her dead-weight capacity! So that by a stroke of his pen, this veritable autocrat upsets a custom which has been in vogue for years, and reduces the carrying capacity of the port by 30 per cent.

Notwithstanding this, and the unfounded charge against boatowners, the only reason vouchsafed to us is "the action of the Port Officer Cochin is approved and confirmed"!

With these facts before us, we think it can hardly be expected that the matter can be allowed to rest here. We have therefore again to request that you will be good enough to give this and our previous letters your further full consideration. In the event of your not seeing your way to take any further notice, we would ask you to be good enough to return to us all the enclosures sent in our letter of 14th. November last.

We have the honor to be
Sir
Your obedient Servants
(Signed) Aspinwall &Co.

Enclos 2
Mar 105/56

Heading ________ No. 646 M
31

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE,
Madras, 16th January 1896

ASPINWALL & Co
20 JAN. 96
COCHIN.

To

Messrs Aspinwall & Co
Cochin.

~~Sir,~~ Gentlemen,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated 20th December 1895 and to return herewith the enclosures called for.

12 m h

Enclosures per packet post.

I have the honor to be
Gentlemen,
Your Obedient Servant
Charles L Hewett
Commander R. I. M.
Deputy Conservator of the Port
for Presidency Port Officer

nmd

1896

Presidency Portofficer
Madras 16th January
Ry 20th Do

CHIEF SECRETARY GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
5-FEB 1896

From
The Presidency Port Officer,
Madras,
To
Dated
Received } No. 189 .

Cochin, 3rd February, 1896

The Chief Secretary
Government of Madras
Fort St. George
Madras

Sir,

A difference of opinion and a dispute as to facts have arisen between ourselves and the Presidency Port Officer regarding a new order which has been issued by the local Port Officer in the matter of loading cargo-boats, and as we are unable to get any satisfactory answer from the former official to our representations we are compelled to appeal to you and lay before you our grievance, with the hope that you will be pleased to enquire into the same, and cause such orders to be passed as you may thereafter think necessary.

We have therefore the honor to enclose herewith copies of all letters sent by us together with the original replies received regarding this matter.

As these papers will shew very fully the cause and effect of the dispute, we will not now enlarge on same, but should further information be required on any point, we shall be glad to supply it to the best of our power.

We have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servants

Marine Current No: 105

16.2.96

G 73
Encls: 20

Recd: 8.2.96

No. 63 E. d/ 14th Febry: 1896

Referred to the Presidency Port officer for a full statement of the grounds on which the carrying capacity of cargo boats at the port of Cochin has been reduced. The stament of the merchants that there is no sufficient reason, either on the score of loss of cargo or danger to life, to justify the reduction should be fully met.

D. McN. Campbell Col. R.E.
Jt: Secy. to Govt P.W.D
(Marine)

12.2.96

To
The Presidency Port Officer
in original. to be returned

114

List showing Boats which have jettisoned cargo since Jan

Consecutive No.	Date.	Boat No.	Tonnage Old		Tonnage revised September 1895.		Loaded with Quantity	Ap D we
	1895.		Fine weather Tons	Foul weather Tons	Fair weather Tons	Foul weather Tons		
1	Jany: 10th	107	13 +	9 3/4	15 3/4 +	11 3/4	240 Bags Rice	1
2	April 13th	134	15 +	11	16 16/100 +	12 9/100	280 " Paddy	
3	May 20th	29	13 1/3 +	9 3/4	15 3/4 +	12	253 " Rice	1
4	" "	145	13 +	10	15 3/4 +	12	275 " "	
5	5th June	+ 92	13 +	9 3/4	—		220 " — "	1
6	June	+ 52	10 2/3 +	8	Not revised		200 " "	1
7	"	+ 22	13 1/2 +	10	14 89/100 +	11 1/4	200 " "	1
8	"	+ 138	11 2/3 +	8 3/4	16 1/2 +	12 1/4	230 " "	1
9	"	+ 128	11 2/3 +	8 3/4	Not revised		220 " Rice & paddy	18
10	July	+ 26	8 2/3 +	6 1/2	14 +	10 1/2	68 Packages	Unk
11	"	+ 145	13 1/3 +	10	15 3/4 +	12	160 Bags Rice	1
12	"	+ 153	12 +	9	14 1/2 +	11	200 " "	16
13	"	+ 52	10 2/3 +	8	broken up		200 " Rice & paddy	16
14	"	+ 53	10 2/3 +	8	16 +	12	198 " Rice & paddy & 6 empty casks	10
15	"	+ 152	12 2/3 +	9 1/2	15 +	11 1/2	170 Bags rice & Paddy	1
16	Augt 10th	186	16 +	12	18 +	13 1/2	150 Bags Rice	
17	" 25th	111	12 +	9	18 +	13 1/2	300 " Rice	22
	" 21	15			12.3		11	

1896

Encls/
Mar 20th/96

No. 646/66 G

Heading.

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE,
Madras, 26th 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,

In reply to Marine Department Reference No. 63E, dated 14th February 1896 — enclosures returned herewith — I have the honor to state that, I am informed by the Port Officer, Cochin, that in Augu last two instances of jettisoning good occurred — one in Narakal Roadstead by which 38 cases of merchandize valued at Rs 76,300/- were lost, and the other in Cochin Roads involving the loss of 23 bag of rice. In the course of his enquiry into the cause of the jettisoning in each case, it appeared that the boats had been overladen, and that in order to

1896

the cargo had to be thrown overboard. As it seemed to the Port Officer that many of the boat owners had hitherto attached no meaning to the figures in the licences of their boats denoting the quantity of cargo each boat could safely carry, he considered it necessary to remeasure the boats, and after doing so amended their licences and issued a notice that the quantity of cargo specified in the amended licence represented the actual quantity in dead weight each boat could safely carry. His object in doing this was to make it clear that, a boat's register tonnage should apply to the safe limit of immersion, and therefore to her capacity for dead weight cargo – a principle which apparently had hitherto been overlooked by some of the boat owners.

2. As far as I have been able to ascertain, the only goods likely to be affected by fixing the limit of immersion of a boat to her capacity for dead weight cargo are rice and paddy, but judging from the Statement [illegible] herewith

Port Officer had before this, taken no
in checking the overloading of boats

supplied by the Port Officer, Cochin, shewing the number of bags which have been jettisoned since 10th January 1895, I am inclined to think that the action of the Port Officer was a step in the right direction. I do not consider that the despatch of vessels will be seriously retarded nor that boat owners will be heavy sufferers.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
H. A. Street
Commander, R.I.M.,
Presidency Port Officer.

Port Officer had before this, taken no
checking the overloading of boats

(189) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,
Madras,

To

THE CHIEF SECY. TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
Fort St. George.

No.

Dated
Received } 189 .

No.

Subject.

1896

Marine (1896) DEPARTMENT.

Marine Current No: 202

From

THE PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,

Madras,

Encls: (Mar: current 105/
... Encls /96
+
1 Encls.)

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

~~PUBLIC WORKS~~ (MARINE) DEPARTMENT,

~~Madras~~
Chepak

No. 646/66 G.

Dated 26th
Received } February 1896.

No.

Subject.

ubmitting a full report
e the grounds on which
carrying capacity
cargo boats at the
rt of Cochin has been
duced.

Port Officer had before this, taken no
action in checking the overloading of boats
Enclosed I have the honor to submit
a return shewing more or less the loss
es of cargo by jettison since January
the propensity to

No. 30/73

Port Office,
Cochin 16th October 1895

Heading
Cargo Boats

From

M. Woodhouse Esqre.,
Port Officer,
Cochin.

To

The Presidency Port Officer,
Madras.

Sir,

In reply to your Memorand
646/1158 P dated 11th October 1895
-warding for perusal and return 3
closures) I have the honor to report
instances of Jettisoning goods from
cargo Boats having been recently re
-ed to me; and that these Boats have
upon investigation, been found to
carry more dead weight tonnage
is sanctioned by their licenses, is
reason why I revised the tonna
the Boats, and issued the notice

1896

astead loaded with 300 bags of rice or 22½
s dead weight, jettisoned or hove off the
t Buoy No 3 of the bags, in order, to
e the lives of her crew, the boat and the
handise of the cargo, which was sea
maged, the protest being noted be-
me

I then next day charged the Boat
r with permitting his boat to ply
t cargo beyond the quantity
ified in its license, who after mak-
several excuses, finally asked
informed definitely what the
age figures in the license represent-

In order to prevent any future
derstanding as to the quantity
go, each boat could safely and
g to carry, the notice appealed

duced.

Port Officer had before this, taken no
action in checking the overloading of boats
Enclosed I have the honour to submit
a return shewing more or less the loss
es of cargo by jettison since January
1st 1895: and as the propensity to
overload is a serious consideration, if
permitted to continue unchecked, I
should be incurring a grave and serious
responsibility if Rule 17 of the Boat
Rules should henceforth continue to be
ignored.

6 - That Boat owners might have as little
reason to complain as possible with reference
to the dead weight tonnage specified
upon their Boats' licenses all the cargo
Boats were last month remeasured accord-
ing to the rule for measurement of open
native craft (notification dated 1st Febru-
ary 1894, Fort Saint George Gazette -)
In every instance increasing the Boats'
tonnage 15 to 50 per cent.

7. In conclusion, I beg to enclose
the copy of a letter I have lately been
favored

stead loaded with 300 bags of rice or 22½
s dead weight, jettesoned when off the
t Buoy No3 of the bags, in order, to
e the lives of her crew, the boat and the
mainder of the cargo, which was sea
maged, the protest being noted be-
me.

I then next day charged the Boat
r with permitting his boat to ply
cargo beyond the quantity
ified in its license, who after mak-
several excuses, finally asked
informed definitely what the
age figures in the license represent-

In order to prevent any future
nderstanding as to the quantity
o, each boat could safely and
ng in ly carry, the notice appealed

duced.

---

action in checking the overloading of boats
Enclosed I have the honour to submit a return shewing more or less the losses of cargo by jettison since January 1st 1895: and as the propensity to overload is a serious consideration, if permitted to continue unchecked, I should be incurring a grave and serious responsibility if Rule 17 of the Boat Rules should henceforth continue to be ignored.

6 - That Boat owners might have as little reason to complain as possible with reference to the dead weight tonnage specified upon their Boats' licenses, all the cargo Boats were last month remeasured according to the rule for measurement of open native craft (notification dated 1st February 1894, Fort Saint George Gazette -) In every instance increasing the Boats' tonnage 15 to 50 per cent.

7. In conclusion, I beg to enclose the copy of a letter I have lately been
favored

favored with from Messrs John, Grieve & Co merchant and boat owners to Messrs Aspinwall & Co also merchant and boat owners which, whilst agreeing with my action is expressed more clearly and practically than I can venture to imitate.

I am &c

(Sd) M. Woodhouse

Port Officer

No 30/79

Port Office

Cochin 29th November 1895

Heading

Cargo Boats. No 30/79.

From

M. Woodhouse Esqre,

Port Officer,

Cochin

The Presidency Port Officer,

Madras.

With reference to your Memo No 646/1376 P
td 21st November 1895 forwarding letter
om Messrs Aspinwall & Co with 12 enclo-
res herewith returned) I have the honour
report that subsequent to the issue of
Circular Notice to Boat owners on
19th August last, all the licensed Boats
of

of the Port have been remeasured under the new rules for the measurement of open native craft, resulting in the increase of 30 per cent of tonnage more than that shown upon the Boats licenses.

This alteration was reported in the (monthly Abstract for August 1895 and was made (subject to your approval) in order that Boat owners should obtain the fullest benefit of the increased tonnage, and I submit that no boats can ply across the Bar, to and fr[illegible] the Roadstead, all the year round wit[illegible] amount of safety, if they carry any more cargo, for the simple reason that Cochin Boats are open undecked lighters, with a single square sail, powerless alike to contend with a strong tide or head wind: nor is it unusual for these Boats to drift North or South of the harbour entrance and casualties occur.

For instance, within the past 6 weeks Boats Nos 21 and 194 of 29¼ and 17 tons respectively

respectively; the one with a cargo of rice and the other of hoop-iron, were totally lost at night on the northern sands, the crew saving themselves with difficulty by swimming to the shore.

2. Cochin is claimed (vide page 4 of Messrs Aspinwall & Co's letter) to be almost unique in having a tidal river and that the boats are in *liquid* from ship to jetty; but Masulipatam, Mangalore or Cocanada may equally claim such a distinction, and at such ports the Boats are not loaded beyond the D/W tonnage indorsed upon their licenses.

3. At Cochin 76 per cent of the licensed cargo boats are owned by natives several of whom have informed me that they do not want to overload their boats beyond the D/W tonnage; but if other Boats are allowed a relaxation of this rule the natives will do likewise.

In

that the letter of Messrs [illegible]
(the other European Firm, besides Messrs Aspinwall & Co who are Boat owners) should receive equal weight and favorable consideration at your hands as that of the petitioners.

4. At page 4 (of Messrs Aspinwall & Co's letter) an illustration is given [illegible] that Boat No 145 should or [illegible]
ought to be classed as a vessel of 39 Tons of 40 cubic feet, whereas this Boat has been proved to be incapable of carrying more than her D/W registered tonnage with safety, as when returning from sea in May with 275 bags of rice part argo, 38 bags were jettisoned to save the Boat from foundering, and it was owing to casualties happening to jettisoning from cargo Boats that the Agents of the South British Fire & Marine Insurance were induced to enquire why Boats were permitted to carry more

cargo

respectively, the one with a c

and that the issue of the Notice to Boat Owners appealed against, and my subsequent action of re-measuring the Boats, which I beg you will be pleased to confirm.

5. That such an action on my part in endeavoring to check the overloading of Boats and causing Rule 17 of the Boat rules to be recognised and respected should be construed (vide page 3 of Messrs Aspinwall & Co's letter) as unjustifiable and an unwarrantable and uncalled for interference I consider to be a most unjust and undeserving reflection on me, having been compelled, as it were, to perform a disagreeable duty in as reasonable and impartial a manner as possible under the circumstances.

In conclusion I beg to express my opinion that should the compromise contemplated in your memo under reference be arrived at, it will

Port Office [illegible] letter No 20 da

PORT OFFICE,

times utterly impossible to [illegible] between bags of cargo worth more than Rs 20 and those of less value, and the result will be a revival of the old order of things viz – the overloading of boats beyond their registered carrying capacity.

I am &c
(Sd) M. Woodhouse.
Port Officer.

True Copies
W. B. Fernandez
Manager
Presidency Post Office.

respectively, thee are with a cargo of rice
and the

Cargo boats.

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICE,

Madras, 21st March 1896.

From

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

PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,

Madras,

To

THE ~~CHIEF~~ SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

MARINE DEPARTMENT,

Chepâk

~~Fort Saint George~~.

Enclosures herewith returned

SIR,

With respect to Marine Department Memorandum, No. 117 C, dated 5th March 1896, I have the honor to state that the complaint made by Messrs. Aspinwall & Co. of Cochin, that the carrying capacity of cargo boats at that port had been cut down by the Port Officer about 2½ times what it had been formerly, is not quite correct. It is true that the boats are no longer permitted to carry the same quantity of cargo as formerly, but the reduction was made by the Port Officer, in his capacity as Registering Officer under the Boat Rules, because he found that the frequent jettisoning of cargo from boats plying to and from vessels in

Cochin

respect

quantity of dead weight cargo than they could safely carry, or in other words, that it had been the practice to load the boats without any regard to their capacity for carrying dead weight cargo. That this was the case, will be seen on reference to para 3 of the Port Officer's letter to this Office — No 30/73 dated 16th October 1895 — copy attached — on the subject, and I would point out that, the Registering Officer at Cochin is, the authority there for deciding the question as to what constitutes a safe boat load, and that Messrs Aspinwall & Co. have not proved that the boats are capable of taking safely 2½ times the quantity of dead weight cargo now fixed by him as a safe boat load, or in fact any additional quantity of cargo.

2. With regard to Messrs Aspinwall & Co's statement that as Cochin is not a "surf-bound" port the action of the Port Officer was unnecessary, I would observe that Cochin has a bar over which

at

Port Officer in his letter No 70/79 da

29th November 1895 to this Office on the subject — copy attached, remarks "that no boats can ply across the bar to and from the Roadstead, all the year round with any amount of safety if they carry any more cargo", that is, more dead weight cargo than the quantity now fixed by him, and in support of this statement he supplies an instance in which recently two boats were totally lost. This, I submit, shows the necessity of l i it g the carrying capacity of Cochin boats to the quantity of dead weight cargo each has now been l used to convey.

No comparison is possible between the respective carrying capacities of a decked vessel and an open boat, and even the carrying capacity of a decked vessel of 1000 tons is limited to the freeboard necessary for her to have during certain seasons of the year.

4. The Port Officer's action would

not

respectively, the one with a cargo of rice
and the

s tran
gressed the boats' licenses, entered thereon
t that the cargo each was licensed to carry
was limited to dead weight capacity.

5. In conclusion, I beg to bring to notice that Messrs. John, Grieve & Co. of Cochin, who are also boatowners, view the action of the Port Officer with favor — see copy of letter attached — and this shows that the boatowners are not unanimous in the opinion that the action of the Port Officer is likely to affect seriously the trade of the port.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Obedient Servant,
H. O. Street
Commander R. I. M.
Presidency Port Officer.

B.

respectively the

From

THE PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,

Madras,

To

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

~~PUBLIC WORKS~~ (MARINE) DEPARTMENT,

~~Madras~~
Chepak

No. 646/100 G

Dated 21st } March 1896.
Received }

No.

Subject.

Submitting further information regarding the carrying capacity of cargo boats the Port of Cochin.

Encls / d mar 10 5 & 202 inc
Recd: 25. 3. 9

Remeasurement of Cargo boats at Coch

253 Marine 16th April 9

No. 334 d/ 18-8-94 marine
" 50 " 10-2-94 "
" 223 " 14-6-94 "
" 117 E " 5-3-96 "

G.O. sent
[illegible]

23-2-11

27-9-24 II ✓

[R. O. / 10]
5,000—14-5-10.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Block No. II

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

Dept. Marine Press/Mis./Rout. No. 253, dated 16-4- 1909 Rack No. Range,

Date taken out.	For what purpose.			Initials of Referencer.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department	C. No.	Year.			
23/2/11	Marine	175	11		27-4-11	

Date taken out.	For what purpose.			Initials of Referencer.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			

[Ref. / 4]

15,000—18-5-03.

[illegible] DEPARTMENT.

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

~~Press~~ / Miscellaneous / ~~Routine~~ No. 259 dated 21-4-1908.

Date taken out.	For what purpose.			Initials of clerk taking the paper or of attender.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			
[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]		
2-10-12	KNRo	3571	12	Dms	3-2-13	

Date taken out.	For what purpose.			Initials of clerk taking the paper or of attender.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			

Railway

Marine (1896) Department.

G.O., No. 254 marine

DATED 18th April 1896

[Despatch Abstract.]

The late Mr. J. Pottinger, 3rd Officer of the S. S. Meenake

Ordered that the Secretary of State be addressed relative to the circumstances attending the death of—.

No $\frac{4}{254}$ mar, D 18-4-96

Despatch to the Secretary of State.

[M. I.
500—12-6-96.]

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Govt. of {1896} Madras.

MARINE.

Dated April, 18th.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O. No. 254, 18th April 1896.

APRIL.

The late Mr. F. Pottinger, 3rd Officer of the S.S. "Meenatchy"

Ordered that the Secretary of State be addressed relative to the circumstances attending the death of —.

No. 254, MARINE, 18TH APRIL 1896.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

READ—the following paper:—

Petition from Mrs. ELIZABETH POTTINGER, 12. Grosvenor Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, to His Excellency the Governor of Madras, dated 26th February 1896.

Mr. Pottinger has had a letter from the Governor of Pondicherry, stating that the body found in that place, and buried in my son's name, was that of a native fisherman, recognized at once by his own family and friends in his village. I appeal to you to have a closer inquiry made as to the remains interred at Negapatam. I should be so thankful if you would also make inquiries at Nagore, where fishermen say they saw my son's boat. I also beg of you to hold an impartial inquiry as to the Captain's and Officer's conduct of the S.S. *Meenatchy*, on board of which vessel my son was 3rd Officer at the time of his disappearance.

My husband has already written to the 1st and 2nd Officers of the *Meenatchy* to give an account of the accident, but can get no answers; also to the clerk Mr. Martin, but no answer from him. I have been three times to the London Office to procure the address of a lady who could give information, and they refused it me, until a detective from Scotland Yard obtained it for me.

Captain Phillips has cast the blame on my son in order to screen himself. It is not true that my son returned to his ship, turned the lascars out and deliberately went boat-sailing against orders; also the Captain said he told him on the day of the accident, in the presence of the Officers, he was not to take the boat out without two lascars. If this is so, the two Officers were responsible for allowing him to leave the ship's side, but I have been told the orders were never given. My son had permission to go boat-sailing with Mr. Edwards and returned to the ship at his request to speak to the 2nd Officer. After tea my son asked Mr. Edwards to go out again, but he refused, in the presence of Mr. Clarke, 2nd Officer, who was playing chess with Mr. Edwards at the time.

The Captain and Officers saw him in the boat and also knew that he did not intend going far. No boat was put out that night, or the next morning, the Captain's excuse being that the night was dark and Mr. Pottinger's boat having no light, it was useless to send a search party not knowing in which direction to steer. But if the search party had had a light, Mr. Pottinger could have seen and hailed them.

The *Meenatchy* left port six hours earlier than usual in order, the Captain says, to seek for the boat, but in reality cut off all chances of saving my son.

At 5 P.M., the 3rd September, the Agents wrote saying that my son's boat was supposed to have been sailing eastwards from Nagore. If a proper search party had been formed, they must have known who was in that boat. No means were taken to bring him back and I was coolly told that he was an able-bodied man with oars in his boat and could easily get back. As the boat was full of water or capsized this was impossible, and I would ask you of what use are port-boats and life-boats if they are not to help those who are in danger. There is no doubt that my son's life has been sacrificed through the negligence of the Company's servants.

There was only a boy with my son and Mr. Edwards in the boat on that morning

No. 4/[illegible] Marine, 18th April 1896.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

Letter—to

The Right Honourable the SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA.

My Lord,

In continuation of the correspondence ending with our despatch No. 1, Marine, dated 8th February 1896, we have the honour to forward, for your Lordship's information, the accompanying copy of a letter from the mother of the late Mr. Pottinger and to request that the writer may be informed that everything possible has been done by the Government which is likely to throw light on the circumstances attending her son's death; that all the information collected has already been sent to the India Office where it can, with your Lordship's permission, be seen; and that, if any additional particulars are hereafter discovered, they will be similarly communicated.

We have the honour to be,
My Lord,
Your Lordship's most obedient, humble servants,

(Signed) A. E. HAVELOCK.
(„) H. W. BLISS.
(„) J. GROSE.

Ootacamund,
18th April 1896.

Exd. T. K. Narayana Aiyangar.

Marine

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Endorsement from the Private Secy to H.E. the Governor on petition from Mrs. Elizabeth Pottinger, 12 Grosvenor Road Twickenham, Middlesex, dated 26th February 1896.

Dated 18th March 1896

5P

No. 254 Marine d/18th April 1896

Ordered that the Secretary of State be addressed.

~~No. 255 Marine d/18th April 18~~

To.

3P

The Rt. Hon the Secy. of State for India

4/254 Marine 1/18-4-

6P My Lord

In continuation of the correspondence ending with our Despatch No. 1 Marine dated 8th February 1896 we have the honor to forward for your Lordship's infor mation the accompanying copy of a letter from the mother of the late Mr. Pottinger and to request that the writer

(40—4,000—2-11-95.)

writer may be informed that everything possible has been done by the Government which is likely to throw light on the circumstances attending her son's death; that all the information collected has already been sent to the India office where it can, with your Lordship's permission, be seen, and that if any additional particulars are hereafter discovered they will be similarly communicated.

We have &c

Draft to be sent to [illegible] comment

C.W.S.
11.4.96.

16/4/96

O.L.S. 1
R 20/4

P. W. Department.

No. 254 - ~~[illegible]~~ Marine, d/18th April 18

Read the following:—

Endorsement from the Private Secretary to H.E. The Governor, dated 18th March 1896, on petition from Mrs. Elizabeth Pottinger, 12. Grosvenor Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, dated 26th February 1896.

FOR ORDERS.

This unfortunate case seems to have been as closely investigated as the circumstances permitted after the lapse of time at which it was reported to the British Police Authorities, and the Government can apparently do nothing ~~further~~ further to throw light on the matter.

2. The imputations against the Captain of the Meanatchy, cannot, even if substantiated, be taken cognisance of by Government.

3. The present letter may perhaps be communicated to the India Office with a request that the writer may be informed that everything possible has been done which is likely to throw light on the circumstances attending her son's death, that all the information collected has already been sent to the India Office where it can, with the permission of the

D.S.W.
10.4.96

Secretary

H.E.

Secretary of State, be seen, and that if any additional particulars are hereafter brought to ~~notice~~ light they will be similarly communicated.

4. It does not seem desirable to engage in an independent correspondence with private persons at Home in regard to this affair.

1/4/96

W.

FOR ORDERS.

The late Mr. Pottinger – Circumstances attending the death of –

CH 103
11.4.96

254 Memo

H.E. 1/4 R. 11/4.

Ch. Secy.
15/3

12. Grosvenor Road.
Twickenham.
Middlesex.

26. 2. '96.

To the
Govenor General of Madras.

Dir Sir,

Mr. Pottinger has had a letter from the Govenor of Pondicherry stating that the body found in that place, and buried in my sons' name, was that of a native fisherman, recognised at once by his own family and friends in his village. I appeal to you to have a closer inquiry made as to the remains interred at Nagapatam. I should be so thankful if you would also make inquiries at Nagore where fishermen say they saw my son's boat. I also beg of you to hold an impartial inquiry as to the Captain's and Officer's conduct, of the s.s. "M. Meanatchy" on board of which vessel my son was 3rd officer at the time of his disappearance.

My husband has already written to the 1st. and 2nd. officers of the "Meanatchy" to give an account of the accident, but can get no answers; also to the clerk Mr. Martin, but no answer from him. I have been three times to the London office to procure the address of a lady who could give information, and they refused it me, until a dectective from Scotland Yard obtained it for me.

Captain Phillips has cast the blame on my son in order to screen himself. It is

eastwards from Nagore. If a proper search
party had been formed, they must have
known who was in that boat. No means
were taken to bring him back and I was
cooly told that he was an able bodied man
with oars in his boat and could easily
get back. As the boat was full of water
or capsized this was impossible, and I
would ask you of what use are port-boats
and life boats if they are not to help those
who are in danger. There is no doubt that
my son's life has been sacrificed through
the negligence of the company's servants.

There was only a boy with my son and
Mr Edwards in the boat on that morning.

A gentleman wrote from India, that a Captain
Rait told him that the boat was found
on the coast, but he forgot where.

Could you ascertain where this boat
was found. I beseech you to make all
inquiries that are possible.

I remain,

Yours faithfully.

Elizabeth Pottinger.

H.2.1/4 K.11/4.

---

not true that my son returned to his
ship, turned the lascars out and deliberately went boat-sailing against orders, also
the Captain said he told him on the day of
the accident in the presence of the officers
he was not to take the boat out without two
lascars. If this is so, the two officers
were responsible for allowing him to leave
the ships side, but I have been told
the orders were never given. My son
had permission to go boat-sailing with
Mr Edwards and returned to the ship at
his request to speak to the 2nd officer. After tea
my son asked Mr Edwards to go out
again, but he refused, in the presence of
Mr Clarke, 2nd officer, who was playing
chess with Mr Edwards at the time.

E.1 / Reas 334/86

The Captain and officers saw him in
the boat and also knew that he did not
intend going far. No boat was put out
that night, or the next morning, the captain's excuse being that the night was
dark and Mr Pottinger's boat having no
light, it was useless to send a search
party not knowing in which direction to
steer. But, if the search party had
had a light Mr Pottinger could have
seen and hailed them.

The "Meanatchy" left port six hours
earlier than usual in order, the Captain
says, to seek for the boat, but in reality
cut off all chances of saving my son.

At 5. p.m. the 3rd Septr. the Agents
wrote saying that my son's boat was
supposed to have been seen sailing

Petition from Mrs Elizabeth Pot-
-tinger, 12 Grosvenor Road,
Twickenham. Middlesex.

DATED 26th February 1896.

64

TRANSFERRED to the Chief Secretary to Government for disposal.

(By Order.)

H A Stuart

Private Secretary.

18/3/6

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
Madras,
18th March 1896.

E. 1/4. R 11/4.

Supt Sec

Marine Current No: 334

Encls 1

Recd 20. 3. 96

(1896) DEPARTMENT.

Fr A. A. Stuart Esq I.C.S.
~~The~~ PRIVATE SECRETARY TO THE
RIGHT HONORABLE THE GOVERNOR.

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY
TO GOVERNMENT,
DEPARTMENT.

UNDER SEC.
10 MAR 96
PUBLIC & T.D. DEPT.

No. 95 of 2-4-95 marine ✓
" 122 " 29-4-95 " ✓
" 162 " 7-6-95 " ✓
" 185 " 24-6-95 " ✓
Des. " 4 " 5-7-95 " ✓
" 360 " 3-12-95 " ✓
" 73 " 8-2-96 " ✓

Dated 18th } March 1896.
Received

ENCLOSURE.-

Subject.

TRANSFERS a petition from Mrs Elizabeth Pottinger, 12 Grosvenor Road, Twickenham Middlesex requesting that enquiries may be caused to be made as to the disappearance of her late son who was the 3rd Officer in the S.S. "Mecanatchy".